

No. 2 / 2013 dated: 29-1-2013

TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

REVISED CAUSE LIST

Cases posted for 30-1- 2013

Venue: Court Hall of the Commission

Time : 11.30 to 13.30 and 14.30 onwards

Sl.	Case No.	Name of the Parties	Counsel or parties	Remarks
1	M.P.No.31 of 2012	Central Training Centre, CRPF, Coimbatore Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CE, Commercial 3) SE, Coimbatore EDC	Thiru. T.Sekar, DIG	For orders.
2	M.P.No. 19 of 2012	Christian Medical College Versus TANGEDCO	Thiru. J.P. Peter	For orders.
3	S.M.P.No.4 of 2012	M/s. Srinivasa Balaji Paper (P) Ltd., Versus SE, Dindigul EDC	Thiru. C. Velusamy Thiru. R. Kumaresan	For orders.
4	R.P.No.1 of 2012	M/s. Sree Kaderi Ambal Mills Ltd., Versus 1) TNEB 2) CE, NCES, TNEB 3) SE, Tirunelveli EDC	Adv. Seshadri	For orders.
5	R.P.No.4 of 2012	TANGEDCO Versus Kongu Vellalar Maha Sabha and others.	Thiru. V. R. Geethananthan	Praying to review the order dated 28-9-2012 passed in M.P.No.10 of 2012. For arguments.
6	P.P.A.P.No.6 of 2012	OPG Power Generation Pvt., Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CE, PPP, TANGEDCO	Adv. Rahul Balaji	Praying to fix the rate for the supply of infirm power from the date of commissioning to the date of commercial operation. For arguments.
7	P.P.A.P.No.8 of 2012	Sterlite Industries (I) Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CE/PPP, TANGEDCO	Adv. Rahul Balaji	Praying to direct the respondents to accept the supply of infirm power. For arguments.
8	D.R.P.No.15 of 2012	Orchid Chemicals & Pharmaceuticals Ltd., Versus 1) CE, NCES, TANGEDCO 2) SE, Chengalpattu EDC	Adv. R.S. Pandiyaraj	Praying to direct the respondents to give refund/adjustment of Rs.24,50,952/- towards excess demand charges collected from the petitioner. For arguments.
9	D.R.P.No.21 of 2012	Raghu Rama Renewable Energy Ltd., Versus 1)TANGEDCO 2) CE, PPP, TANGEDCO 3) SE, Ramnad EDC	Adv. Rahul Balaji	Praying to direct the respondents to refund the sum of Rs.2,22,26,000/- along with interest of Rs.53,35,560/- as compensation towards short supply for the period from November 2011 till May 2012. For arguments.
10	D.R.P.No.23 of 2012	K.S.R. Textiles (P) Ltd., Versus 1) TNEB 2) SE, Mettur EDC	Adv. R.S. Pandiyaraj	Praying to set aside the impugned notice dated 22-9-2012 levy of excess over demand charges Rs.34,21,346/-. For arguments.

11	M.P.No.4 of 2012	Indian Wind Power Association Versus Nil	Adv. Rahul Balaji	Praying to extend the time for implementation of RPO to next year March 2013 instead of March 2012. For arguments.
12	M.P.No.5 of 2012	Indian Wind Power Association Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CE, NCES, TANGEDCO	Adv. Rahul Balaji	Praying to extend the banking period for the year 2011-2012 to May 31 st 2012. For arguments.
13	M.P.No.7 of 2012	The Southern India Mills Association Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CE, NCES, TANGEDCO	Adv. N.L. Rajah	Praying to extend the banking period for the year 2011-2012 by a further period of three months. For arguments.
14	M.P.No.13 of 2012	Cuddalore PowerGen Corporation Ltd., Versus TANGEDCO	Adv. Rahul Balaji	Praying to pass orders extending the date for financial closure of the project till 30-4-2014. For arguments.
15	M.P.No.14 of 2012	1) IWPA 2) Tata Power Co., Ltd., 3) Ushdev power Holdings Pvt., Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & 2) LDC	Adv. Rahul Balaji	Praying to issue a direction bestowing must run status on all wind energy generators. For arguments.
16	M.P.No.24 of 2012	Tamil Nadu Newsprint and papers Ltd., Versus Nil	Adv. Rahul Balaji	Praying to declare that the petitioner's captive power plant comprised of steam powered turbo generators as cogeneration plants. For arguments.
17	M.P.No.25 of 2012	JSW Steel Ltd., Versus Nil	Adv. Rahul Balaji	Praying to declare that the petitioner's captive power plant comprised of steam powered turbo generators as cogeneration plants. For arguments.
18	I.A.No.1 of 2012 in M.P.No.27 of 2012	Orchid Chemicals and Pharmaceuticals Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) SE, Chennai EDC/South	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj	Praying to set aside the impugned order of the respondent and extend the benefit of tariff change from Tariff III to Tariff IIA. For arguments.
19	M.P.No.29 of 2012	Savita Oil Technologies Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) SLDC	Adv. Rahul Balaji	Praying to declare that the petitioner do no fall under the regulation 6(1)(b) of the RPO Regulation and entitled to the benefits under RPO without waiting for 3 year cooling period. For arguments.
20	M.P.No.34 of 2012	Brakes India Ltd., Versus TANGEDCO	Thiru. N.L. Rajah	Praying to clarify that the demand available to the petitioner should be calculated only on the basis of the energy injected into the grid and non on the basis of the energy consumed by the petitioner. For arguments.

(By Order of the Commission)

S. Gunasekaran
Secretary