

TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

CAUSE LIST

Cases posted for 25-6-2014

Venue: Court Hall of the Commission

Time : 2.30 pm

| Sl. No. | Case No. | Name of the Parties | Counsel or parties | Remarks |
|---------|---------------------|--|---|---|
| 1 | S.M.P.No. 4 of 2013 | Electro Automotive Madras Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) Thiru. N. Azhagarsami AE, Enforcement CEDC South. 2) Thiru. N. Ravichandran, AEE, Construction, Adyar 3) EE, Adyar 4) SE, CEDC/South | Thiru. R.Venkatraman | Summon to appear in person. |
| 2 | S.M.P.No. 2 of 2014 | M.Kubendran Versus 1) AE, Sindupatti 2) AEE, Sindupatti 3) EE, Usilampatti 4) SE, MEDC, Madurai | Thiru. M. Kubendran | Summon to appear in person. |
| 3 | D.R.P.No.17 of 2012 | PTC India Ltd., Versus 1) SV Sugar Mills Ltd., 2) TNEB 3) TANGEDCO 4) SLDC | M/s.RnR Associates Adv.Rahul Balaji | Praying to direct the SV Sugar to pay Rs.8,53,70,112/- crore along with interest at 18% p.a. till the date of filing this petition. For arguments. |
| 4 | D.R.P.No.25 of 2012 | PTC India Ltd., Versus 1) Auomira Energy Co.P.Ltd., 2) TANGEDCO | M/s.RnR Associates | Praying to direct the 1st respondent to make a payment of Rs.1,19,31,776/- along with interest of Rs.26,76,248/- for not complying with its contractual obligations. For arguments. |
| 5 | D.R.P.No. 6 of 2012 | Karmic Business Specialities Pvt., Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, TNEB 3) SE, Tirunelveli EDC | Adv. P. Subba Reddy " K. Aparna Devi | Praying to direct the respondents to release outstanding dues as per PPA. For arguments. |
| 6 | D.R.P.No.15 of 2011 | 1. Terra Energy Ltd., 2. Shree Ambika Sug. Ltd. Versus 1. TNEB 2. TANGEDCO 3. CE, Operation, SLDC 4. PTC India Ltd., | Adv. Rahul Balaji M/s.RnR Associates | Praying to declare the action of TNEB and PTC in treating the non-acceptance of generation and supply of power for the month of September and October 2009 as arbitrary and illegal. For arguments. |

| | | | | |
|----|----------------------|--|---|---|
| 7 | D.R.P.No.16 of 2011 | 1. Shree Ambika Sug.Ltd., 2. Terra Energy Ltd., Versus 1. TNEB 2. TANGEDCO 3. CE, Operation, SLDC 4. PTC India Ltd., | Adv. Rahul Balaji M/s.RnR Associates | Praying to direct PTC to make payment of Rs.4,97,14,775/- being the amount illegally deducted from the bills of 1 st petitioner. For arguments. |
| 8 | 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. |
| 9 | 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. |
| 10 | P.P.A.P.No.5 of 2012 | SPEC Power (P) Ltd., Versus TANGEDCO | Adv. Rahul Balaji | Praying to approve the addendum 2 to the power purchase agreement. For arguments. |
| 11 | D.R.P.No.26 of 2012 | Madurai Power Corp. Pvt., Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) TANTRANSCO 3) SLDC | Adv. Rahul Balaji | Praying to declare that the respondents are bound to issue dispatch instructions under the PPA strictly in terms of Article 6.3 thereby disentitling them from issuing part / zero power dispatch instructions under the terms of the PPA between the parties except in the event of an emergency affecting the grid system. For arguments. |
| 12 | D.R.P.No.27 of 2012 | Samalpatti Power Co. Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) TANTRANSCO 3) SLDC | Adv. Rahul Balaji | Praying to declare that the respondents are bound to issue dispatch instructions under the PPA strictly in terms of Article 6.3 thereby disentitling them from issuing part / zero power dispatch instructions under the terms of the PPA between the parties except in the event of an emergency affecting the grid system. For arguments. |

(By Order of the Commission)

S. Gunasekaran
Secretary