

TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

REVISED CAUSE LIST

Cases posted for 14- 9- 2011

Venue: Court Hall of the Commission

Time : 2.30pm

Sl.	Case No.	Name of the Parties	Counsel or parties	Remarks
1.	S.M.P.No.2 of 2011	Thiru. V. G. Manoharan CE/Planning Versus Nil	Thiru. V. G. Manoharan	For Orders.
2.	S.M.P.No.3 of 2011	Director Generation TANGEDCO Versus Nil	Thiru. R. Balasubramanian	For Orders.
3.	S.M.P.No.4 of 2011	Thiru. S. Amalorphanathan Former CE, NCES Versus Nil	Thiru. S. Amalorphanathan	For Orders.
4.	S.M.P.No.5 of 2011	Thiru. S. Santhana Gopala Krishnan Versus Nil	Thiru. S. Santhana Gopala Krishnan	For Orders.
5.	M.P.No.13 of 2011	TANGEDCO Versus Nil	Thiru. T. Natarajan CE/Commercial	Praying to permit the petitioner to continue the maximum ceiling limit of Rs.9/- per kwhr of the reliability charges as ordered in M.P.No.16 of 2010 for the period from 1-6-2011 to 31-5-2012. For arguments.
6.	P.P.A.P.No.5 of 2011	TANGEDCO Versus 1) Ind-Barath Power Gencom Ltd., 2) OPG Power Generation Pvt., Ltd., 3) The Madras Aluminium Co., Ltd.,	Adv. R. Selvakumar	Praying to fix a tariff for 600 MW for a period not exceeding one year i.e. from June 2011 to May 2012. For arguments.
7.	I.A.No.1 of 2011 in M.A.P.No.1 of 2007 and M.A.P.No.2 of 2008	PPN Power Generating Company Pvt., Ltd., Versus TNEB.	Adv. Rahul Balaji Adv. R. Selvakumar	Arguments on admissibility of IA.
8.	T.A.No. 1 of 2011 - W.P.No.22738 of 2009	Santhi Castings Works Versus 1) TNEB 2) SE, Coimbatore EDC	Adv. R.S. Pandiyaraj	Praying to permit the petitioner to run the industry continuously in optimum demand with restricted power holidays without evening peak hour restrictions. For arguments.

9.	T.A.No. 2 of 2011 - W.P.No. 23526 of 2009	Sendhur Alloys Foundry Versus 1) TNEB 2) SE, Coimbatore EDC	Adv. R.S. Pandiyaraj	Praying to permit the petitioner to run the industry continuously in optimum demand with restricted power holidays without evening peak hour restrictions. For arguments.
10.	T.A.No. 3 of 2011 - W.P.No.23527 of 2009	Ramprasad Tubes & Bars (P) Ltd., Versus 1) TNEB 2) SE, Coimbatore EDC	Adv. R.S. Pandiyaraj	Praying to permit the petitioner to run the industry continuously in optimum demand with restricted power holidays without evening peak hour restrictions. For arguments.
11.	T.A.No. 4 of 2011 - W.P.No.1368 of 2010	Sidhi Smelters (P) Ltd., Versus 1) TNEB 2) SE, Chennai EDC	Adv. K. Seshadri	Praying to permit the petitioner to run the industry continuously in optimum demand with restricted power holidays without evening peak hour restrictions. For arguments.
12.	T.A.No. 5 of 2011 - W.P.No.1737 of 2010	Ferrolinks Versus 1) TNEB 2) SE, Coimbatore EDC 3) AO/R, Coimbatore EDC	Adv. Rahul Balaji	Praying to permit the petitioner to run the industry continuously in optimum demand with restricted power holidays without evening peak hour restrictions. For arguments.
13.	T.A.No. 6 of 2011 W.P.No. 1944 of 2010	Meenakshi Udyog (I) Pvt., Ltd., Versus 1) TNEB 2) SE, Dharmapuri EDC	Adv. K. Seshadri	Praying to permit the petitioner to run the industry continuously in optimum demand with restricted power holidays without evening peak hour restrictions. For arguments.
14.	T.A.No. 7 of 2011 W.P.No.1945 of 2010	D.S.Metals (P) Ltd., Versus 1) TNEB 2) SE, Chennai EDC	Adv. K. Seshadri	Praying to permit the petitioner to run the industry continuously in optimum demand with restricted power holidays without evening peak hour restrictions. For arguments.
15.	T.A.No. 8 of 2011 W.P.No. 1228 of 2010	Rajinikanth Foundation Versus 1) TNEB 2) SE, Coimbatore EDC 3) AO/R, Coimbatore EDC	Adv. Rahul Balaji	Praying to permit the petitioner to run the industry continuously in optimum demand with restricted power holidays without evening peak hour restrictions. For arguments.

16.	T.A.No. 9 of 2011 W.P.No. 1229 of 2010	Rangamma Steels and Malleables Versus 1) TNEB 2) SE, Coimbatore EDC 3) AO/R, Coimbatore EDC	Adv. Rahul Balaji	Praying to permit the petitioner to run the industry continuously in optimum demand with restricted power holidays without evening peak hour restrictions. For arguments.
17.	T.A.No. 10 of 2011 W.P.No. 2372 of 2010	A.K.C.T. Cidambaram Cotton Mills (P) Ltd., Versus 1) TNEB 2) SE, Tiruvannamalai EDC	Adv. R.S. Pandiyaraj	Praying to permit the petitioner to run the industry continuously in optimum demand with restricted power holidays without evening peak hour restrictions. For arguments.
18.	R.A.No.1 of 2011 – Appeal No.23 of 2011	TMT Muthammal Textiles Mills Ltd., Versus TNEB	Adv. Shoba Adv. Vallinayagam	To consider and decide the date of effect of order dated 7-9-2010. For arguments.
19.	R.A.No.2 of 2011 – Appeal Nos.79 & 80 of 2011	National Textiles Corporation Ltd., Versus TNEB	Adv. Sanjay Ghose Adv. Vallinayagam	To consider and decide the date of effect of order dated 7-9-2010. For arguments.
20.	R.A.No.3 of 2011 – Appeal No.120 of 2011	Southern India Mills Association Versus TNEB	Adv. N.L. Rajah Adv. Vallinayagam	To consider and decide the date of effect of order dated 7-9-2010. For arguments.
21.	M.P.No.18 of 2011	JSW Steel Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) TNEB	Adv. Rahul Balaji	Direct the respondents to categorize integrated steel plant as a continuous process industry. For arguments.

(By Order of the Commission)

(M.Velayudhaperumal)
Assistant Secretary