No.19/ 2024 dated: 05-04-2024

Time: 11.00 AM

## TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

## CAUSE LIST for 10-04-2024 (Court Sitting will be held through Virtual & Physical Mode)

**Venue: Court Hall of the Commission** 

SI.	Case No.	Name of the Parties	Counsel / Party	Remarks
No	00			
1	M.P.No.16 of 2024	M/s.OPG Power Generation Pvt. Ltd. Versus (i) CMD / TANGEDCO (ii) CFC/Revenue (iii) Director (Finance) (iv) SE/ Chennai EDC / North	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	To direct the Respondents to forthwith implement the order of the Commission in T.A.No.19 of 2022 & batch, dated 29.12.2023 and to impose penalty upon the Respondents in accordance with Section 142 of the Electricity Act, 2003 for non-compliance of the order of the Commission in T.A.No.19 of 2022.
2	M.P.No.17 of 2024	CE/PPP, TANGEDCO  Versus  M/s.SEPC Power Pvt. Ltd.	Adv.Richardson Wilson	For admission.  To approve power dispatched from M/s.SEPC Power Ltd (Tuticorin) - 525 MW to the grid on pass through basis as per the directive issued by the MoP, Gol in Ref.No.23/13/2021-R&R(pt-1) dt.23.10.2023 under section 11 of the Electricity Act, 2003, to meet out the Tamil Nadu growing demand supply gap on an 'as and when required basis and to approve/ratify the tariff for the

3	I.A.Nos.1 of 2024 &	M/s.SEPC Power Pvt.	M/s.J Sagar Associates	power supplied from 01.10.2023 to 31.03.2024 and to supplied from 01.04.2024 to 30.06.2024 as per the tariff fixed by ministry of Power, Government of India stated in Para 17 above by relaxing certain provisions of PPA/Addendum 3 as a one-time measure and to take into consideration the sums already paid by TANGEDCO as per the MoP directions.  For admission.  Hold and declare that the petitioner is
	D.R.P.No.3 of 2024	Versus TANGEDCO	Adv.Richardson Wilson	entitled to fixed cost for non-supply of power in periods mentioned in Para-2 above as this situation of non-supply arose only due to factors beyond SEPC's control and Direct TANGEDCO to pay fixed charges to SEPC for the period of non-supply in FY 2022-2023 i.e., Rs.243,59,11,020 along with pendente lite interest, and extend the term of PPA by 4 months and pass any other orders.  For admission of I.A.No.1 of 2024 along with main petition.
4	M.P.No.14 of 2024	Thiru.N.Muthukumaar Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CFC / Revenue (iii) CE/NCES (iv) SE/Tiruppur EDC	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	To impose penalty upon the respondents in accordance with section 142 of the Electricity Act, 2003 for non-compliance of the orders of the Commission dated 07.12.2021 in D.R.P.No.12 of 2021

	1			T -
				and consequently
				direct the respondents
				to make payments of
				the entire sum as
				directed in the said
				orders.
				For counter.
5	M.P.No.15 of 2024	M/s.OPG Power	Adv.Rahul Balaji	To impose penalty
		Generation Pvt. Limited		upon the respondents
		Versus	Adv.N.Kumanan &	in accordance with
		(i) CMD/TANGEDCO	Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	section 142 of the
		(ii) Chairman /	Adv.A.i .velikataelialapatily	Electricity Act, 2003
		TANTRANSCO		for non-compliance of
		(iii) SE/Chennai		the orders of the
		EDC/North		Commission dated
		EDC/NORth		
				15.12.2020 in
				D.R.P.No.12 of 2019
				and consequently
				direct the respondents
				to make payments of
				the entire sum as
				directed in the said
				orders.
				For counter.
6	M.P.No.25 of 2023	M/s.Vijay Velavan	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj	Direct the
		Spinning Mills Private		Respondents, to
		Limited		revise the Energy
		Versus		Wheeling Agreement,
		(i) TANGEDCO	Adv.N.Kumanan	by ordering to
		(ii) SE/Palladam EDC	Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	expunge the
				inconsistent portions
				of the Energy
				Wheeling Agreement
				as contained in page
				No.3 and Page No.10
				in para 24 IV and
				further direct the
				Respondents, to
				execute a fresh Energy
				Wheeling Agreement
				in terms of Para 5.5.8
				of the Order of the
				Hon'ble Commission,
				as contained in Order
				No.9 of 2020 dated
1				16.10.2020 and further
1				direct the
				Respondents to
				accept the invoice of
				•
				the petitioner.
				For filing I.A.
				seeking leave to file
1				Additional Counter
				Affidavit.

7	M.P.No.26 of 2023	Naveen Cotton Mill Private Limited Versus (i) TANGEDCO (ii) SE/Tirunelveli EDC (iii)SE/ TANGEDCO	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj  Adv.N.Kumanan Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	Direct the Respondents, to revise the Energy Wheeling Agreement, by ordering to expunge the inconsistent portions of the Energy Wheeling Agreement as contained in page No.6 Clause 21 and further direct the Respondents, to execute a fresh Energy Wheeling Agreement in terms of Para 5.5.8 of the Order of the Hon'ble Commission, as contained in Order No.9 of 2020 dated 16.10.2020 and further direct the Respondents to accept the invoices of the petitioner.  For filing I.A. seeking leave to file
				Additional Counter Affidavit.
8	M.P.No.38 of 2023	CFC/Deposits &	Adv.N.Kumanan &	To declare that the
		Documentation, TANGEDCO Versus	Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	petitioner lost Captive Status for the FY 2022- 2023.
		M/s.KAS Onsite Power Solutions LLP	Adv,Rahul Balaji	For further hearing.
9	M.P.No.3 of 2024	CFC/Revenue, TANGEDCO	Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	To waive the belated payment surcharge amounting to Rs.137.13 crores as on 31.03.2023 in respect of all local bodies on payment of 50% of the outstanding dues by them.  For further hearing.
10	D.R.P.No.9 of 2023	M/s.OPG Power Generation Pvt. Limited Versus CMD/TANGEDCO	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	To declare that the 'change in law' events in terms of Article 10 of the PPA dated 12.12.2013 and consequently direct

	I	T	T	1
11	D.R.P.No.12 of 2023	M/s.Narbheram Solar TN Private Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CE/NCES (iii) SLDC /	Adv.Rahul Balaji  Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	the respondents to pay the difference amount totalling to Rs.4,55,83,235/- being the amounts disputed by TANGEDCO towards financial impact of change in law events, for the period from 01.04.2020 to 31.03.2022.  For arguments of the respondent.  To refix the condition of achieving minimum 17% CUF by fixing an appropriate band and direct to restrain the respondents from
		TANTRANSCO		issuing backing down / curtailment for any reason other than grid safety and security issues and also direct the respondents to refund an amount of Rs.13,51,82,821 deducted towards CUF penalty for the financial year 2019-2020 and 2020-2021.  For arguments of the respondent.
12	D.R.P.No.13 of 2023	M/s.NVR Energy Pvt Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CE/NCES (iii) SLDC / TANTRANSCO	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	To review the working and applicability of Clause-6 of the PPA with regard to CUF and working of such provision, inlcuding revising the CUF band to 12% - 19% to cover variations and direct to restrain the respondents from issuing backing down / curtailment for any reason other than grid safety and security issues and also direct the respondents to refund an amount of Rs.11,53,11,360 deducted towards CUF penalty for the

	Г	T	Γ	I
				financial year 2019-
				2020 and 2020-2021.
				For arguments of
				the respondent.
13	M.P.No.28 of 2023	M/s.Techno Electric &	Adv.Rahul Balaji	To issue an order of
		Engg. Co. Limited		interim stay of the
		Versus		impugned letter
		(i) CMD/TANGEDCO	Adv.N.Kumanan &	No.CFC/REV/FC/REV/A
		(ii) CFC/General	Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	O/H/F.APPC/D.No.291/
				2022 dt.01.04.2022
				capping the APPC for
				the FY 2021-22 at
				Rs.2.017 per unit and
				all proceedings
				pursuant and
				consequent thereto in
				order that the full
				APPC price and
				exercise Regulatory
				power and call for the
				records comprised in
				the impugned Letter
				dated 01.04.2022
				capping the APPC rate
				for the FY 2021-22 at
				Rs.2.017 per unit and
				quash the same as
				being illegal and
				without authority of
				law and strictly
				comply with the
				regulations and directives fixing the
				APPC by this
				Commission.
				For arguments
				of the respondent.
	Batch c		f adjustment of lapsed u	inits –
			arguments	
14	D.R.P.No.5 of 2024	M/s.ARS Energy Private	Adv.Rahul Balaji	To quash the
		Ltd		impugned demand
		Versus		letter dated 30.1.2024
		(i) SE/Chennai North	A de N. Konse en	seeking to levy a sum
		EDC, TANGEDCO	Adv.N.Kumanan &	of Rs.2,71,02,948/-
		(ii) CMD/TANGEDCO	Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	towards "Grid
		(iii) Chairman /		Availability Charges"
		TANTRANSCO		as well as the audit
		(iv) Director (Oprns.),		slips on the basis of
		TANTRANSCO Ltd		which the said
		(v) Director(Distn.),		impugned demand
		` TANGEDCO "		was issued, as the
				letter and claims
				therein are illegal,
<u> </u>	1		1	

		1	1	barred by limitation
				and have been issued
				without authority of
				law.
				For counter.
15	T.A.No.7 of 2022	Kamachi Industries	Adv.Rahul Balaji	W.P.No.475 of 2021
		Limited	_	trd. by Hon'ble High
		Versus		Court of Madras in the
		(iChairman/TANTRANS	Adv.N.Kumanan &	matter of adjustment
		CO (ii)	Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	of units.
		MD/TANTRANSCO		
		(iii) CE/Grid Operations (iv) Director/Operations		
		& ors.		
16	T.A.No.8 of 2022	M/s.ARS Energy Pvt.	Adv.Rahul Balaji	W.P.No.11480 of 2021
.	117 111 1010 01 2022	Limited	/ aviitariai Balaji	trd. by Hon'ble High
		Versus		Court of Madras in the
		(i) Chairman /	Adv.N.Kumanan &	matter of adjustment
		TANTRANSCO	Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	of units.
		(ii) MD/TANTRANSCO		
		(iii) CE/Grid Operations		
		(iv) Director/Operations		
		(v) Director/Distribution		
		(vi) SE/Chennai EDC/North		
17	T.A.No.9 of 2022	Suryadev Alloys &	Adv.Rahul Balaji	W.P.No.12062 of 2021
''	117411010 01 2022	Powers Pvt. Limited	/tavirtana Balaji	trd. by Hon'ble High
				Court of Madras in the
		Versus		matter of adjustment
		(i)Chairman / TANGEDC	Adv.N.Kumanan &	of units
		(ii)MD/TANTRANSCO &	Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	
		Ors.		
18	T.A.No.10 of 2022	Tulsyan NEC Limited	Adv.Rahul Balaji	W.P.No.12083 of 2021
'0	1.A.NU. 10 01 2022	Versus	Auv.Naiiui Balaji	trd. by Hon'ble High
		(i) Ch/TANTRANSCO	Adv.N.Kumanan &	Court of Madras in the
		(ii) MD/TANTRANSCO	Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	matter of adjustment
		(iii) CE/Grid Operations	. ,	of units.
		(iv) Director/Operations		
		(v) Director/Distribution		
		(vi) SE/Chennai		
40	T A No. 44 -4 0000	EDC/North	Adv Debut Detail	W D No 40504 - 5 0004
19	T.A.No.11 of 2022	Kamachi Industries Limited	Adv.Rahul Balaji	W.P.No.12584 of 2021 trd. by Hon'ble High
		Versus	Adv.N.Kumanan &	Court of Madras in the
		(i) Chairman/	Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	matter of adjustment
		TANTRANSCO		of units.
		(ii) MD/TANTRANSCO		
		(iii) CE/Grid Operations		
		(iv) Director/Operations		

Pvt. Limited Versus (i) Ch./TANTRANSCO & Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.R.Venkatachalapathy  D.R.P.No.3 of 2023  Mis.MALCO Energy Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CE/PPP (iii) SE/Mettur EDC (iv) S.D.C  Tamil Nadu Newsprint & Papers Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CE/PPP (iii) SE/Karur EDC (iv) S.D.C  Tamil Nadu Newsprint & Papers Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CE/PPP (iii) SE/Karur EDC (iv) S.D.C  D.R.P.No.4 of 2023  Tamil Nadu Newsprint & Papers Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CE/PPP (iii) SE/Karur EDC (iv) S.D.C  D.R.P.No.5 of 2021  M/s.Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO Ltd (ii) CE/GTS, TANGEDCO (iii) SE/GTS, Ramnad Circle  D.R.P.No.7 of 2022  M/s.Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO Ltd (ii) CE/GTS, TANGEDCO (iii) SE/GTS, Ramnad Circle  Adv.Anirudh Krishnan  Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy  Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy  Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy  Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy  Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy  Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy  Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy  Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy  Direct the respondents to pay a total sum of Rs.128 crores along with interest towards Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy  Direct the respondents to pay a total sum of Rs.128 crores along with interest towards  Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy  Direct the respondents to pay a total sum of Rs.128 crores along with interest towards  Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy  Direct the respondents to pay a total sum of Rs.128 crores along with interest towards  Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy  Direct the respondents to pay a total sum of Rs.128 crores along with interest towards  Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy  Direct the respondents to pay a development to pay a total sum of Rs.128 crores along with interest towards  To offset the adverse financial impact on the generating company as a result of operating and mintalning the power plant as per the	- 00	T A N - 40 - ( 0000	000000000000000000000000000000000000000	Adv. Dalad Dala"	W D N = 45004 = 1 0004
Versus (i) C.H.Z.H.X.H.Z.H.Z.C. (ii) MD/TANTRANSCO & Ors.     21   D.R.P.No.3 of 2023   M/s.MALCO Energy Limited   Versus (i) C.M.D.T.A.N.C.E.D.C. (ii) C.E.P.P. (iii) SE/Mettur EDC (iv) SLDC   Versus (i) C.M.D.T.A.G.E.D.C. (ii) C.E.P.P. (iii) SE/Mettur EDC (iv) SLDC   Adv.R.R.H.L.B.L.B.L.B.L.B.L.B.L.B.L.B.L.B.L.B.L	20	T.A.No.12 of 2022	OPG Power Generation	Adv.Rahul Balaji	W.P.No.15861 of 2021
Comparison of the sum of the su					
D.R.P.No.3 of 2023   M/s.MALCO Energy Limited   Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CE/PPP (iii) SE/Mettur EDC (iv) SLDC   Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) SE/Mettur EDC (iv) SLDC   Adv.Rahul Balaji   To set aside the impuged communications dated 13.02.2015 and 24.04.2015 and the consequential demand of the 3rd respondent letter dt.29.06.2015 demanding a sum of Rs.8,58.23,430/- and pass other orders. For arguments.   For arguments and the sum of the 3rd respondent letter dt.29.06.2015 demanding a sum of Rs.8,58.23,430/- and pass other orders.   For arguments and the consequential demand of the 3rd respondent letter dt.29.06.2015 demanding a sum of Rs.8,58.23,430/- and pass other orders.   For arguments and the consequential demand of the 3rd respondent letter dt.29.06.2015 demanding a sum of Rs.2,64.97,433/- and pass other orders.   For arguments and the consequential demand of the 3rd respondent letter dt.21.07.2015 and dt.					
D.R.P.No.3 of 2023			` '		
D.R.P.No.3 of 2023   M/s.MALCO Energy Limited   Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (iii) CE/PPP (iii) SE/Mettur EDC (iv) S.D.C   Adv.Richardson Wilson   Adv.Rod. 2015 and the consequential demand of the 3rd respondent letter dt.29.06.2015 demanding a sum of Rs.3,58,23,430/- and pass other orders. For arguments.   To set aside the impuged of the 3rd respondent letter dt.29.06.2015 demanding a sum of Rs.3,58,23,430/- and pass other orders.   For arguments.   To set aside the impuged of the 3rd respondent letter dt.29.06.2015 demanding a sum of Rs.3,58,23,430/- and pass other orders.   For arguments.   To set aside the impuged communications dated 13.02.2015 and decommunications dated 13.02.2015 and the consequential demand of the 3rd respondent letter dt.21,07.2016   Adv.Richardson Wilson   Adv.A.2015 and the consequential demand of the 3rd respondent letter dt.21,07.2016   demanding a sum of Rs.2,64,97,493/- and pass other orders.   For arguments.   Direct the respondents to pay a total sum of Rs.128 crores along with interest towards illegal deduction, compensation for deviation 15% of the contracted value, power supplied to the captive consumers, power supplied to the captive consumers as a last chance.   Adv.Anirudh Krishnan   To offset the adverse power supplied to the captive consumers as a last chance.   Adv.Anirudh Krishnan   To offset the adverse power supplied to the captive consumers as a last chance.   Adv.Anirudh Krishnan   To offset the adverse power supplied to the captive consumers as a last chance.   Adv.Anirudh Krishnan   To offset the adverse power supplied to the captive consumers as a last chance.   Adv.Anirudh Krishnan   To offset the adverse power supplied to the captive consumers as a last chance.   Adv.Richardson Wilson   Adv.Richardson W			` '	Adv.A.P. venkatachalapatny	of units.
Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CE/PPP (iii) SE/Mettur EDC (iv) SLDC  Tamil Nadu Newsprint & Papers Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (iii) CE/PPP (iii) SE/Karur EDC (iv) SLDC  Tamil Nadu Newsprint & Papers Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (iii) CE/PPP (iii) SE/Karur EDC (iv) SLDC  Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.Richardson Wilson  To set aside the impugned communications dated 13.02.2015 and pass other orders. For arguments.  Adv.Richardson Wilson  To set aside the impugned communications dated 13.02.2015 and pass other orders. For arguments.  Adv.Richardson Wilson  To set aside the impugned communications dated 13.02.2015 and pass other orders. For arguments.  Adv.Richardson Wilson  Adv.Richardson Wilson  To set aside the impugned communications dated 13.02.2015 and the consequential demand of the 3rd respondent letter dt.21.07.2016 demanding a sum of Rs.2,64,97,493/- and pass other orders. For arguments.  Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy  Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy  Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy  Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy  Direct the respondents to pay a total sum of Rs.128 crores along with interest towards in the pay a total sum of Rs.128 crores along with interest towards in the pay a total sum of Rs.128 crores along with interest towards in the pay a total sum of Rs.128 crores along with interest towards in the pay a total sum of Rs.128 crores along with interest towards in the pay a total sum of Rs.128 crores along with interest towards in the pay a total sum of Rs.128 crores along with interest towards in the pay a total sum of Rs.128 crores along with interest towards in the pay a total sum of Rs.128 crores along with interest towards in the pay a total sum of Rs.128 crores along with interest towards in the pay a total sum of Rs.128 crores along with interest towards in the pay a total sum of Rs.128 crores along with interest towards in the pay a total sum of Rs.128 crores along with interest towards in the pay a total sum of Rs.128 crores along with interest towards in the pay a total sum of Rs.128 crores along with int			Ors.		
Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CE/PPP (iii) SE/Mettur EDC (iv) SLDC	21	D.R.P.No.3 of 2023	M/s.MALCO Energy	Adv.Rahul Balaji	To set aside the
(i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) SE/Mettur EDC (iv) SLDC    D.R.P.No.4 of 2023   Tamil Nadu Newsprint & Papers Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CE/PPP (iii) SE/Marur EDC (iv) SLDC    Adv.Rahul Balaji			Limited		impuged
(iii) CE/PPP (iii) SE/Mettur EDC (iv) SLDC			Versus	Adv.Richardson Wilson	communications dated
Consequential demand of the 3rd respondent letter dt.29.06.2015 demanding a sum of Rs.8,58,23,430/- and pass other orders. For arguments.    D.R.P.No.4 of 2023   Tamil Nadu Newsprint & Papers Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CE/PP (iii) SE/Karur EDC (iv) SLDC   Adv.Richardson Wilson   Adv.2015 and the consequential demand of the 3rd respondent letter dt.21.07.2016 demanding a sum of Rs.2,64,97,493/- and pass other orders. For arguments.   Adv.Anirudh Krishnan   Adv.Ap.15 and the consequential demand of the 3rd respondent letter dt.21.07.2016 demanding a sum of Rs.2,64,97,493/- and pass other orders. For arguments.   Adv.Anirudh Krishnan   Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy   Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy   Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy   Department (Demanding a sum of Rs.128 crores along with interest towards illegal deduction, compensation for deviation 15% of the captive consumers, power supplied 10% over and delayed payment along with interest. For arguments as a last chance.   Adv.Anirudh Krishnan   To offset the adverse power supplied 10% over and delayed payment along with interest. For arguments as a last chance.   Adv.Anirudh Krishnan   To offset the adverse power supplied 10% over and delayed payment along with interest.   For arguments as a last chance.   Adv.Anirudh Krishnan   To offset the adverse power supplied 10% over and delayed payment along with interest.   For arguments as a last chance.   Adv.Anirudh Krishnan   To offset the adverse power supplied 10% over and delayed payment along with interest.   For arguments are result of operating and maintaining the power   Adv.Richardson Wilson   Constitution			(i) CMD/TANGEDCO		13.02.2015 and
D.R.P.No.4 of 2023   Tamil Nadu Newsprint & Papers Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) SE/Rarur EDC (iv) SLDC   Wis-Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) SE/GTS, Ramnad Clrcle   D.R.P.No.7 of 2022   Mis-Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (ii) CF/ST, Ramnad Clrcle   D.R.P.No.7 of 2022   Mis-Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (ii) SE/GTS, Ramnad Clrcle   D.R.P.No.7 of 2022   Mis-Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (ii) CF/ST, TANGEDCO (iii) SE/GTS, Ramnad Clrcle   D.R.P.No.7 of 2022   Mis-Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (ii) CMD/TANGEDCO (iii) SE/GTS, TANGEDCO (iii) SE/GTS, TANGEDCO (iii) SE/GTS, TANGEDCO (iii) SE/GTS, TANGEDCO (iii) SE/GTS, Tanger Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy   D.R.P.No.7 of 2022   Mis-Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (ii) Principal Secretary to Govt., Energy Department, GoTN (iii) CMD/TANGEDCO   Adv.Richardson Wilson   D.R.P.No.7 of 2022   Mis-Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (ii) Principal Secretary to Govt., Energy Department, GoTN (iii) CMD/TANGEDCO   Adv.Richardson Wilson   D.R.P.No.7 of 2022   Mis-Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (ii) Principal Secretary to Govt., Energy Department, GoTN (iii) CMD/TANGEDCO   Adv.Richardson Wilson   D.R.P.No.7 of 2022   Mis-Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (ii) Principal Secretary to Govt., Energy Department, GoTN (iii) CMD/TANGEDCO   Adv.Richardson Wilson   D.R.P.No.7 of 2022   D.R.P.No.7 of 2022   Mis-Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (ii) Principal Secretary to Govt., Energy Department, GoTN (iii) CMD/TANGEDCO   Adv.Richardson Wilson   D.R.P.No.7 of 2022			(ii) CE/PPP		24.04.2015 and the
(iv) SLDC    Continue			(iii) SE/Mettur EDC		consequential demand
D.R.P.No.4 of 2023  D.R.P.No.4 of 2023  Tamil Nadu Newsprint & Papers Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CE/PP (iii) SE/Karur EDC (iv) SLDC  D.R.P.No.5 of 2021  M/s.Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (iii) SE/GTS, Ramnad Circle  D.R.P.No.7 of 2022  M/s.Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (i) CE/GTS, TANGEDCO (iii) SE/GTS, Ramnad Circle  D.R.P.No.7 of 2022  M/s.Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (i) CE/GTS, Tangenco (iii) SE/GTS, Tangenco (iii) SE/GTS, Ramnad Circle  D.R.P.No.7 of 2022  M/s.Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (i) CE/GTS, Tangenco (iii) SE/GTS, Tangenco (iii			(iv) SLDC		of the 3rd respondent
D.R.P.No.4 of 2023  D.R.P.No.4 of 2023  D.R.P.No.4 of 2023  D.R.P.No.4 of 2023  D.R.P.No.5 of 2021  D.R.P.No.5 of 2021  M/s.Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (i) CE/GTS, TANGEDCO (ii) SE/GTS, Ramnad Circle  D.R.P.No.5 of 2021  M/s.Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (i) CE/GTS, TANGEDCO (iii) SE/GTS, Ramnad Circle  D.R.P.No.7 of 2022  D.R.P.No.7 of 2022  M/s.Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (ii) CE/GTS, TANGEDCO (iii) SE/GTS, Ramnad Circle  D.R.P.No.7 of 2022  M/s.Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (ii) CE/GTS, TANGEDCO (iii) SE/GTS, Ramnad Circle  D.R.P.No.7 of 2022  Adv.Anirudh Krishnan (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (Rameswaram) Limited Ver			, ,		
D.R.P.No.4 of 2023  D.R.P.No.4 of 2023  D.R.P.No.4 of 2023  D.R.P.No.4 of 2023  D.R.P.No.5 of 2021  D.R.P.No.5 of 2021  M/s.Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (i) CE/GTS, TANGEDCO (ii) SE/GTS, Ramnad Circle  D.R.P.No.5 of 2021  M/s.Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (i) CE/GTS, TANGEDCO (iii) SE/GTS, Ramnad Circle  D.R.P.No.7 of 2022  D.R.P.No.7 of 2022  M/s.Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (ii) CE/GTS, TANGEDCO (iii) SE/GTS, Ramnad Circle  D.R.P.No.7 of 2022  M/s.Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (ii) CE/GTS, TANGEDCO (iii) SE/GTS, Ramnad Circle  D.R.P.No.7 of 2022  Adv.Anirudh Krishnan (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (Rameswaram) Limited Ver					
D.R.P.No.4 of 2023  Tamil Nadu Newsprint & Papers Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CE/PPP (iii) SE/Karur EDC (iv) SLDC  D.R.P.No.5 of 2021  M/s.Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO Ltd (ii) CE/GTS, TANGEDCO (iii) CE/GTS, TANGEDCO (iii) CE/GTS, Ramnad Circle  M/s.Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO Ltd (ii) CE/GTS, TANGEDCO (iii) SE/GTS, Ramnad Circle  M/s.Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO Ltd (ii) CE/GTS, TANGEDCO (iii) SE/GTS, Ramnad Circle  Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy  Direct the respondents to pay a total sum of Rs.128 crores along with interest towards illegal deduction, compensation for deviation 15% of the contracted value, power supplied to the captive consumers, power supplied to the captive consumers, power supplied to the captive consumers, power supplied 10% over and delayed payment along with interest.  For arguments.  To est aside the impugned communications dated 13.02.2015 and 24.04.2015 and 24.04.2					
D.R.P.No.4 of 2023  D.R.P.No.4 of 2023  Tamil Nadu Newsprint & Papers Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CE/PPP (iiii) SE/Karur EDC (iv) SLDC  D.R.P.No.5 of 2021  M/s.Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (iii) CE/GTS, TANGEDCO (iii) SE/GTS, Ramnad Circle  D.R.P.No.7 of 2022  M/s.Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (iii) SE/GTS, Ramnad Circle  D.R.P.No.7 of 2022  M/s.Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (ii) CE/GTS, TANGEDCO (iii) SE/GTS, Ramnad Circle  M/s.Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (ii) CE/GTS, TANGEDCO (iii) SE/GTS, Ramnad Circle  M/s.Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (ii) CE/GTS, TANGEDCO (iii) SE/GTS, Ramnad Circle  Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy  Direct the respondents to pay a total sum of Rs.128 crores along with interest towards illegal deduction, compensation for deviation 15% of the contracted value, power supplied to the captive consumers, power suppl					
D.R.P.No.4 of 2023   Tamil Nadu Newsprint & Papers Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CE/PPP (iii) SE/Karur EDC (ii) SE/Karur EDC (iv) SLDC   M/s.Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CE/GTS, Ramnad Circle   D.R.P.No.7 of 2022   M/s.Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (i) CE/GTS, TANGEDCO (iii) SE/GTS, Ramnad Circle   M/s.Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (i) CE/GTS, TANGEDCO (iii) SE/GTS, Ramnad Circle   M/s.Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (i) CE/GTS, TANGEDCO (iii) SE/GTS, Ramnad Circle   M/s.Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (i) CE/GTS, TANGEDCO (iii) SE/GTS, Ramnad Circle   M/s.Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (i) CE/GTS, Tangument along with interest. For arguments as a last chance.   To offset the adverse financial impact on the generating company as a result of operating and maintaining the power bight as per the					•
Papers Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CE/PPP (iii) SE/Karur EDC (iv) SLDC   M/s.Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (i) CE/GTS, TANGEDCO (iii) SE/GTS, Ramnad Circle  D.R.P.No.7 of 2022  M/s.Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (iii) CE/GTS, TANGEDCO (iiii) SE/GTS, Ramnad Circle  M/s.Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (iii) CE/GTS, TANGEDCO (iiii) SE/GTS, Ramnad Circle  Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy  Adv.A.	22	D.R.P.No 4 of 2023	Tamil Nadu Newsprint &	Adv.Rahul Balaii	
Versus (i) CE/PPP (iii) CE/PPP (iii) SE/Karur EDC (iv) SLDC		III III OIT OI EVEU		Tariitairai Balaji	
(i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CE/PPP (iii) SE/Karur EDC (iv) SLDC  Adv.Richardson Wilson  Adv.Aication Wilson  Adv.Aicatio			•		
(ii) CE/PPP (iii) SE/Karur EDC (iv) SLDC  24.04.2015 and the consequential demand of the 3rd respondent letter dt.21.07.2016 demanding a sum of Rs.2,64,97,493/- and pass other orders. For arguments.  25. D.R.P.No.5 of 2021  26. M/s.Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (iii) SE/GTS, TANGEDCO (iii) SE/GTS, Ramnad Circle  27. D.R.P.No.7 of 2022  28. D.R.P.No.7 of 2022  29. D.R.P.No.7 of 2022  29. M/s.Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (i) Principal Secretary to Govt., Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (i) Principal Secretary to Govt., Energy Department, GoTN (ii) CMD/TANGEDCO  29. Adv.Anirudh Krishnan (To offset the adverse financial impact on the generating company as a result of operating and maintaining the power than the consequential demand of the 3rd respondent to the contraction pass other orders.  29. Adv.Anirudh Krishnan (To offset the adverse financial impact on the generating company as a result of operating and maintaining the power than the consequential demand of the 3rd respondent letter dt.21.07.2016 demanding as a per the contracted payments.  29. D.R.P.No.5 of 2021  29. D.R.P.No.7 of 2022  20. D.R.P.No.7 of 2022  21. D.R.P.No.7 of 2022  22. D.R.P.No.7 of 2022  23. D.R.P.No.7 of 2022  24. D.R.P.No.7 of 2022  25. D.R.P.No.7 of 2022  26. D.R.P.No.7 of 2022  27. D.R.P.No.7 of 2022  28. D.R.P.No.7 of 2022  29. D.R.P.No.7 of 2022  29. D.R.P.No.7 of 2022  20. D.R.P.No.7 of 2022  20. D.R.P.No.7 of 2022  21. D.R.P.No.7 of 2022  22. D.R.P.No.7 of 2022  23. D.R.P.No.5 of 2021  24. D.R.P.No.7 of 2022  25. D.R.P.No.7 of 2022  26. D.R.P.No.7 of 2022  27. D.R.P.No.7 of 2022  28. D.R.P.No.7 of 2022  29. D.R.P.No.7 of 2022  29. D.R.P.No.7 of 2022  29. D.R.P.No.7 of 2022  29. D.R.P.No.7 of 2022  20. D.R.P.No.7 of 2022  20. D.R.P.No.7 of 2022  20. D.R.P.No.7 of 2022  20. D.R.P.No.7 of 2022  21. D.R.P.No.7 of 2022  22. D.R.P.No.7 of 2022  23. D.R.P.No.7 of 2022  24. D.R.P.No.7 of 2022  24. D.R.P.No.7 of 2022  25. D.R.P.No.7 of 2022  26. D.R.P.No.7 of 2022  27. D.R.P.No.7 of 2022  28. D.R.				Adv Richardson Wilson	
(iii) SE/Karur EDC (iv) SLDC    Consequential demand of the 3rd respondent letter dt.21.07.2016 demanding a sum of Rs.2,64,97,493/- and pass other orders.   For arguments.			1 3 7	Adv. Richardson Wilson	
Civit   SLDC   Civit					
D.R.P.No.5 of 2021   M/s.Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (iii) SE/GTS, Ramnad Circle   M/s.Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (ii) CRJS, Ramnad Circle   M/s.Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (iii) SE/GTS, Ramnad Circle   M/s.A.P.Venkatachalapathy   D.R.P.No.7 of 2022   M/s.Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (i) Principal Secretary to Govt., Energy Department, GoTN (ii) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CMD/TANGEDCO (iii) CMD/TANGEDCO (iii) SE/GTS, Ramnad Circle   M/s.Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (i) Principal Secretary to Govt., Energy Department, GoTN (ii) CMD/TANGEDCO   Adv.Richardson Wilson   Adv.Richardson Wilson   Lietter dt.21.07.2016 demanding a sum of Rs.2,64,97,493/- and pass other orders. For arguments.    Adv.Anirudh Krishnan					
demanding a sum of Rs.2,64,97,493/- and pass other orders. For arguments.  D.R.P.No.5 of 2021 M/s.Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (i) CE/GTS, TANGEDCO (iii) SE/GTS, Ramnad Circle  Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy  Adv.A.P.Venkatachalap			(IV) SEDC		
D.R.P.No.5 of 2021					
D.R.P.No.5 of 2021    M/s.Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO Ltd (ii) CE/GTS, TANGEDCO (iii) SE/GTS, Ramnad Circle    D.R.P.No.7 of 2022   M/s.Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (i) Principal Secretary to Govt., Energy Department, GoTN (ii) CMD/TANGEDCO (iii) Coversus (i) Principal Secretary to Govt., Energy Department, GoTN (ii) CMD/TANGEDCO (iii) CMD/TANGEDCO (iii) Adv.A.Anirudh Krishnan (Adv.Anirudh Krishnan (Adv.Anirudh Krishnan (Adv.Anirudh Krishnan (Adv.Anirudh Krishnan (Adv.Anirudh Krishnan (Adv.Anirudh Krishnan (I) Principal Secretary to Govt., Energy Department, GoTN (II) CMD/TANGEDCO (III) Adv.Richardson Wilson   Adv.Richardson Wilson   Direct the respondents to pay a total sum of Rs.128 crores along with interest towards illegal deduction, compensation for deviation 15% of the contracted value, power supplied to the captive consumers, power supplied to the captive consumers, power and delayed payment along with interest.    For arguments as a last chance.   To offset the adverse financial impact on the generating company as a result of operating and maintaining the power plant as per the					
D.R.P.No.5 of 2021  M/s.Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO Ltd (ii) CE/GTS, TANGEDCO (iii) SE/GTS, Ramnad Circle  Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy  Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy  Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy  Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy  Begin and delayed payment along with interest. For arguments.  Adv.A.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy  Begin and delayed payment along with interest. For arguments as a last chance.  Adv.Anirudh Krishnan  To offset the adverse financial impact on the generating company as a result of operating and maintaining the power plant as per the					
D.R.P.No.5 of 2021  M/s.Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO Ltd (iii) SE/GTS, TANGEDCO (iiii) SE/GTS, Ramnad Circle  Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy  Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy  Direct the respondents to pay a total sum of Rs.128 crores along with interest towards illegal deduction, compensation for deviation 15% of the contracted value, power supplied to the captive consumers, power supplied 10% over and delayed payment along with interest.  For arguments as a last chance.  To offset the adverse financial impact on the generating company as a result of operating and maintaining the power plant as per the					
(Rameswaram) Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO Ltd (ii) CE/GTS, TANGEDCO (iii) SE/GTS, Ramnad Circle  Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy  D.R.P.No.7 of 2022  M/s.Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (i) Principal Secretary to Govt., Energy Department, GoTN (ii) CMD/TANGEDCO  Adv.Richardson Wilson  Adv.A.Kumanan & to pay a total sum of Rs.128 crores along with interest towards illegal deduction, compensation for deviation 15% of the contracted value, power supplied 10% over and delayed payment along with interest. For arguments as a last chance.  To offset the adverse financial impact on the generating company as a result of operating and maintaining the power plant as per the	22	D D D No E of 2024	M/o Arkov Energy	Adv Animudh Krichnen	
Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO Ltd (ii) CE/GTS, TANGEDCO (iii) SE/GTS, Ramnad Circle  Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy  Rs.128 crores along with interest towards illegal deduction, compensation for deviation 15% of the contracted value, power supplied to the captive consumers, power supplied 10% over and delayed payment along with interest.  For arguments as a last chance.  24 D.R.P.No.7 of 2022  M/s.Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (i) Principal Secretary to Govt., Energy Department, GoTN (ii) CMD/TANGEDCO  Adv.Richardson Wilson  Rs.128 crores along with interest towards illegal deduction, compensation for deviation 15% of the contracted value, power supplied 10% over and delayed payment along with interest.  For arguments as a last chance.  To offset the adverse financial impact on the generating company as a result of operating and maintaining the power plant as per the	23	D.R.P.NO.5 01 2021		Auv.Amruum Krisiman	
(i) CMD/TANGEDCO Ltd (ii) CE/GTS, TANGEDCO (iii) SE/GTS, Ramnad Circle  Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy  Circle  Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy  With interest towards illegal deduction, compensation for deviation 15% of the contracted value, power supplied to the captive consumers, power supplied 10% over and delayed payment along with interest.  For arguments as a last chance.  To offset the adverse financial impact on the generating company as a result of operating company as a result of operating and maintaining the power plant as per the			1 .		
(iii) CE/GTS, TANGEDCO (iii) SE/GTS, Ramnad Circle  Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy  lillegal deduction, compensation for deviation 15% of the contracted value, power supplied to the captive consumers, power supplied 10% over and delayed payment along with interest.  For arguments as a last chance.  Adv.Anirudh Krishnan  (i) Principal Secretary to Govt., Energy Department, GoTN (ii) CMD/TANGEDCO  Adv.Richardson Wilson  illegal deduction, compensation for deviation 15% of the contracted value, power supplied 10% over and delayed payment along with interest.  For arguments as a last chance.  To offset the adverse financial impact on the generating company as a result of operating and maintaining the power				A de N. Karana an ara O	_
(iii) SE/GTS, Ramnad Circle  Circle  Compensation for deviation 15% of the contracted value, power supplied to the captive consumers, power and delayed payment along with interest.  For arguments as a last chance.  Poffset the adverse financial impact on the generating company as a result of operating and maintaining the power (ii) CMD/TANGEDCO  Compensation for deviation 15% of the contracted value, power supplied 10% over and delayed payment along with interest.  For arguments as a last chance.  To offset the adverse financial impact on the generating company as a result of operating and maintaining the power plant as per the					
Circle    Circle				Adv.A.P. venkatachalapatny	· ·
contracted value, power supplied to the captive consumers, power supplied 10% over and delayed payment along with interest.  For arguments as a last chance.  24 D.R.P.No.7 of 2022 M/s.Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (i) Principal Secretary to Govt., Energy Department, GoTN (ii) CMD/TANGEDCO Adv.Richardson Wilson contracted value, power supplied to the captive consumers, power supplied 10% over and delayed payment along with interest.  For arguments as a last chance.  To offset the adverse financial impact on the generating company as a result of operating and maintaining the power plant as per the					
power supplied to the captive consumers, power supplied 10% over and delayed payment along with interest.  For arguments as a last chance.  M/s.Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (i) Principal Secretary to Govt., Energy Department, GoTN (ii) CMD/TANGEDCO  Adv.Richardson Wilson  power supplied to the captive consumers, power supplied to the captive consumers, power supplied 10% over and delayed payment along with interest.  For arguments as a last chance.  To offset the adverse financial impact on the generating company as a result of operating and maintaining the power plant as per the			Circle		
Captive consumers, power supplied 10% over and delayed payment along with interest.  For arguments as a last chance.  24 D.R.P.No.7 of 2022 M/s.Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (i) Principal Secretary to Govt., Energy Department, GoTN (ii) CMD/TANGEDCO Adv.Richardson Wilson captive consumers, power supplied 10% over and delayed payment along with interest.  For arguments as a last chance.  To offset the adverse financial impact on the generating company as a result of operating and maintaining the power plant as per the					
power supplied 10% over and delayed payment along with interest.  For arguments as a last chance.  24 D.R.P.No.7 of 2022 M/s.Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (i) Principal Secretary to Govt., Energy Department, GoTN (ii) CMD/TANGEDCO Adv.Richardson Wilson payment along with interest.  For arguments as a last chance.  To offset the adverse financial impact on the generating company as a result of operating and maintaining the power plant as per the					
Over and delayed payment along with interest.  For arguments as a last chance.  24 D.R.P.No.7 of 2022 M/s.Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (i) Principal Secretary to Govt., Energy Department, GoTN (ii) CMD/TANGEDCO Adv.Richardson Wilson over and delayed payment along with interest.  For arguments as a last chance.  To offset the adverse financial impact on the generating company as a result of operating and maintaining the power plant as per the					
payment along with interest.  For arguments as a last chance.  24 D.R.P.No.7 of 2022 M/s.Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (i) Principal Secretary to Govt., Energy Department, GoTN (ii) CMD/TANGEDCO Adv.Richardson Wilson payment along with interest.  For arguments as a last chance.  To offset the adverse financial impact on the generating company as a result of operating and maintaining the power plant as per the					
D.R.P.No.7 of 2022 M/s.Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (i) Principal Secretary to Govt., Energy Department, GoTN (ii) CMD/TANGEDCO Adv.Richardson Wilson interest. For arguments as a last chance.  Adv.Anirudh Krishnan To offset the adverse financial impact on the generating company as a result of operating and maintaining the power plant as per the					
D.R.P.No.7 of 2022  M/s.Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (i) Principal Secretary to Govt., Energy Department, GoTN (ii) CMD/TANGEDCO  For arguments as a last chance.  Adv.Anirudh Krishnan  To offset the adverse financial impact on the generating company as a result of operating and maintaining the power plant as per the					
24 D.R.P.No.7 of 2022 M/s.Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (i) Principal Secretary to Govt., Energy Department, GoTN (ii) CMD/TANGEDCO Adv.Richardson Wilson last chance.  Adv.Anirudh Krishnan To offset the adverse financial impact on the generating company as a result of operating and maintaining the power plant as per the					
D.R.P.No.7 of 2022  M/s.Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (i) Principal Secretary to Govt., Energy Department, GoTN (ii) CMD/TANGEDCO  Adv.Anirudh Krishnan  To offset the adverse financial impact on the generating company as a result of operating and maintaining the power plant as per the					_
(Rameswaram) Limited Versus (i) Principal Secretary to Govt., Energy Department, GoTN (ii) CMD/TANGEDCO Adv.Richardson Wilson financial impact on the generating company as a result of operating and maintaining the power					
Versus (i) Principal Secretary to Govt., Energy Department, GoTN (ii) CMD/TANGEDCO Versus generating company as a result of operating and maintaining the power	24	D.R.P.No.7 of 2022		Adv.Anirudh Krishnan	
(i) Principal Secretary to Govt., Energy Department, GoTN (ii) CMD/TANGEDCO Adv.Richardson Wilson as a result of operating and maintaining the power plant as per the					
Govt., Energy Department, GoTN (ii) CMD/TANGEDCO Adv.Richardson Wilson plant as per the					
Department, GoTN maintaining the power (ii) CMD/TANGEDCO Adv.Richardson Wilson plant as per the					
(ii) CMD/TANGEDCO Adv.Richardson Wilson plant as per the					
					maintaining the power
			(ii) CMD/TANGEDCO	Adv.Richardson Wilson	
directions of the GoTN	1				directions of the GoTN

				under section 11(1) and determine the price payable for the energy that was injected during the year 2009-10 and 2010- 11 into the Tamil Nadu Grid for which payments to the tune of Rs.92.10 crores have not been made by the respondent and direct the 2nd respondent herein to make the said payment to the petitioner herein. For arguments as a last chance.
25	R.A.No.1 of 2024	M/s.KR Wind Energy LLP Versus (i) CE/NCES, TANGEDCO (ii) CFC/Revenue, TANGEDCO (iii) SE/Dindigul EDC	Adv.Richardson Wilson	Direct the respondents to give adjustment of the banked energy available in the Group Captive Generator's account, maintained in the generation end EDC and to treat the unutilised banked energy for encashment at 75% of the relevant tariff rate as per the Wind Tariff Orders issued by the Commission.  Remand made by Hon'ble APTEL in its order dated 30.11.2023 in Appeal No.853 of 2023 setting aside the orders of the Commission in D.R.P.No.1 of 2023 for consideration afresh in accordance with law.  For arguments.

26	D.R.P.No.10 of 2023	M/s.Krishnaveni Carbon Products Pvt Limited Versus	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj	To quash the 3rd respondent's impugned demand
		(i) CE/NCES, TANGEDCO (ii) CFC/Revenue (iii) SE/Tirunelveli EDC	Adv.Richardson Wilson	notice No.SE/TEDC/TIN/DFC/ AO/WIND/AS/F.OASoft ware/ D.No.354/23 dt.08.05.2023. For arguments.
27	I.A.No.1 of 2023 & D.R.P.No.18 of 2023	M/s.Sri Gomathy Mills Pvt. Limited Versus (i) CE/NCES, TANGEDCO (ii) CFC/Revenue, TANGEDCO (iii) SE/Tirunelveli EDC	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj  Adv.Richardson Wilson	Direct the 3rd respondent not to take any coercive action of disconnecting the petitioner's HTSC No.4 till this matter is finally disposed of and also quash the impugned demand notice dated 10.03.2023 for Rs.1,03,99,200/- and the BOAD Audit Slip No.28 dt.1.8.2019 as illegal, arbitrary and contrary to the Wind Tariff Orders. For arguments.

(By order of the Commission)

Secretary
Tamil Nadu Electricity
Regulatory Commission