

TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

CAUSE LIST

Cases posted for 24- 1- 2012

Venue: Court Hall of the Commission

Time : 2.30pm

Sl.	Case No.	Name of the Parties	Counsel or parties	Remarks
1.	P.P.A.P.No.2 of 2011	TANGEDCO Versus Sun Paper Mills Ltd.,	Adv.P.H.Vinod Pandian Adv. Thriyambak. J.Kannan	For orders.
2.	M.P.No.31 of 2011	DCW Ltd., Versus Nil	Adv. Rahul Balaji	Praying to declare that the petitioner 2 X 25 MW plant being a co-generation plant, not required to procure power from NCES. For admission.
3.	P.P.A.P.No. 8 of 2011	CE, NCES, TANGEDCO Versus 1. M.R.K. Co-Opt. Sugar Mills. 2. Cheyyar Co-Opt. Sugar Mills. 3. Terra Energy Ltd., 4. Rajashree Sugars & Chemicals Ltd., 5. Dharani Sugars & Chemicals Ltd., 6. Kothari Sugars & Chemicals Ltd., 7. Terra Energy Ltd., 8. EID Parry (I) Ltd., 9. Subramania Siva Co-Opt. Sugar Mills. 10. Bannari Amman Sugars Ltd., 11. Arunachala Sugars Ltd., 12. Auro Energy Ltd., 13. Ambika Sugars 14. Shakthi Sugars Ltd., 15. Rajashree Sugars & Chemicals Ltd., 16. EID Parry India Ltd.,	Adv. P.H. Vinod Pandian	Praying to fix power purchase tariff for sugar mill co-generation plants commissioned based on power purchase agreements executed prior to 15-5-2006 for the period from 1-4-2010. For admission.
4.	P.P.A.P.No. 9 of 2011	CE, NCES, TANGEDCO Versus 1. Arashi Hi-Tech Bio Power Ltd., 2. G.K. Bio Energy Pvt., Ltd., 3. Chennai Metro Development Authority. 4. Auromira Energy Ltd., 5. Subashree Bio-Energies (P) Ltd.,	Adv. P.H. Vinod Pandian	Praying to fix power purchase tariff applicable for biomass power plants commissioned based on power purchase agreements executed prior to 15-5-2006 for the period from 1-4-2010. For admission.

5.	I.A.Nos.1 & 2 of 2011 and D.R.P.No.23 of 2011	Orchid Chemicals & Pharmaceuticals Ltd., Versus 1. CE, NCES, TNEB 2. SE, Chengalpattu EDC	Adv. R.S.Pandiyaraj	Praying to direct the respondents to calculate the equivalent demand based on the energy supplied instead of energy adjusted. For admission and interim relief.
6.	D.R.P.No. 24 of 2011	Terra Energy Ltd., Versus 1. TNEB 2. SE, Cuddalore EDC	Adv. Rahul Balaji	Praying to direct the respondents to make payment of Rs.5,40,90,289/- in terms of clause 7 of PPA dated 26-3-2004. For admission.
7.	D.R.P.No. 25 of 2011	Terra Energy Ltd., Versus 1. TNEB 2. SE, Tanjavur EDC	Adv. Rahul Balaji	Praying to direct the respondents to make payment of Rs.3,31,49,875/- in terms of clause 7 of PPA dated 31-3-2004. For admission.
8.	D.R.P.No. 26 of 2011	Shree Ambika Sugars Ltd., Versus 1. TNEB 2. SE, Cuddalore EDC	Adv. Rahul Balaji	Praying to direct the respondents to make payment of Rs.15,34,33,236/- in terms of clause 7 of PPA dated 18-8-2004. For admission.
9.	D.R.P.No. 27 of 2011	Shree Ambika Sugars Ltd., Versus 1. TNEB 2. SE, Tanjavur EDC	Adv. Rahul Balaji	Praying to direct the respondents to make payment of Rs.1,67,24,532/- in terms of clause 7 of PPA dated 15-3-2004. For admission.
10.	M.P.No.33 of 2011	RL Clean Power Pvt., Ltd., Versus 1. TANGEDCO 2. SE, Sivagangai EDC	Adv. Rahul balaji	Praying to declare the TANGEDCO proceedings No. 83 dated 16-3-2011 is in violation of Tariff Order No.1 of 2010 dated 27-5-2010. For admission.
11.	I.A.No.1 of 2011 and M.P.No. 34 of 2011	PPS Enviro Power (P) Ltd., Versus 1. TANTRANSCO 2. TANGEDCO 3. SLDC	Adv. A. Jenasenan “ E. Manoharan	Praying to direct the respondents to issue NOC under the captive scheme. For admission and interim relief.
12.	D.R.P.No.21 of 2011	Aswin Textiles (P) Ltd., Versus 1. CFC/Revenue, TNEB 2. SE, Udumalpet EDC	Adv. R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv. P.H. Vinod Pandian	Praying to set aside the impugned notice dated 16-11-2011 issued by SE, Udumalpet EDC. For counter.
13.	D.R.P.No.22 of 2011	Raghav Industries Ltd., Versus 1. CFC/Revenue, TNEB 2. SE, Namakkal EDC	Adv. R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv. P.H. Vinod Pandian	Praying to set aside the impugned notice dated 11-11-2011 issued by SE, Namakkal EDC. For counter.

14.	M.P.No.17 of 2011	M/s. Clover Energy (P) Ltd., Versus 1. TANTRANSCO 2. TANGEDCO	Adv. A. Jenasenan ' E. Manoharan Adv. P.H. Vinod Pandian	Praying to clarify that the petitioner is eligible to apply and procure REC immediately without the waiting the period of 3 years. For arguments.
15.	M.P.No.16 of 2011	Simran Wind Project Pvt., Ltd., Versus 1. TANGEDCO 2. TNEB	Adv. Rahul Balaji	Praying to clarify that the licensee is required to pay pooled cost of power to generators under the REC scheme as modified from time to time. For arguments.
16.	I.A.No.1 of 2011 in D.R.P.No.19 of 2011 and D.R.P.No.19 of 2011	SJLT Spinning Mills Pvt., Ltd., Versus 1. TANGEDCO 2. CE, Commercial, TNEB 3. SE, Namakkal EDC	Adv. R.S. Pandiyaraj	Direct the respondents to fix pro-rata demand and energy quota based on the present wind energy generation. For arguments.

(By Order of the Commission)

S. Gunasekaran
Secretary