

TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

REVISED CAUSE LIST

Cases posted for 20-12- 2012

Venue: Court Hall of the Commission

Time : 11 am

Sl.	Case No.	Name of the Parties	Counsel or parties	Remarks
1	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	Praying to review the order dated 3-11-2011. For admission.
2	D.R.P.No.26 of 2012	Madurai Power Corp. Pvt., Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) TANTRANSCO	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 admission
3	D.R.P.No.27 of 2012	Samalpatti Power Co. Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) TANTRANSCO	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 admission
4	M.P.No.48 of 2012	Sri Seethalakshmi Steel Casing (P) Ltd., Versus 1) TNEB 2) SE, Coimbatore EDC	Adv. Pandiyaraj	Praying to grant of optimum demand concept. For admission.
5	M.P.No.49 of 2012	DCW Ltd., Versus 1) CMD, TANGEDCO 2) CE, NCES, TANGEDCO 3) SE, Udumalpet EDC	Adv. C. Seethapathy	Praying to direct the respondent to implement the Commission Order No.1 of 2009 and impose penalty for not following the provision 8.11 of the Order No.1 of 2009. For admission.
6	D.R.P.No.5 of 2011	Saheli Exports Pvt., Ltd., Versus TNEB	Adv. P. Vinod Kumar “ Chitra Narayan Adv. Vinod Pandian	For impleading PTC.
7	D.R.P.No.9 of 2011	Lance Tanjore Power Co., Ltd., Versus TNEB	Adv. P. Vinod Kumar “ Chitra Narayan “ Aswin Unnikrishnan	Praying to adjudicate the dispute between the petitioner and respondent arising out of the issuance of notice dated 26-8-2010, whereby demand has been made for an amount of Rs.1,59,57,115/- For arguments.

8	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 arguments.
9	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 arguments.
10	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 arguments.
11	I.A.No. 1 of 2011 and D.R.P.No. 28 of 2011	Best Cotton Mills Versus 1) CFC, TNEB 2) SE, UEDC, Udumalpet	Adv. R.S.Pandiyaraj	Praying to set aside the impugned notice dated 9-12-2011 issued by SE, Udumalpet EDC. For arguments.
12	I.A.No.1 of 2012 and D.R.P.No. 1 of 2012	Super Sales India Ltd., Versus 1) CFC, TNEB 2) SE, UEDC, Udumalpet	Adv. R.S.Pandiyaraj	Praying to set aside the impugned notice dated 9-12-2011 issued by SE, Udumalpet EDC. For arguments.
13	I.A.No.1 of 2012 and D.R.P.No. 2 of 2012	Spictex Cotton Mills (P) Ltd., Versus 1) CFC, TNEB 2) SE, UEDC, Udumalpet	Adv. R.S.Pandiyaraj	Praying to set aside the impugned notice dated 9-12-2011 issued by SE, Udumalpet EDC. For arguments.

14	D.R.P.No. 4 of 2012	Bannari Amman Spinning Mills Ltd., Versus 1) CFC, TNEB 2) SE, DEDC, Dindigul.	Adv. R.S.Pandiyaraj	Praying to set aside the impugned notice dated 7-12-2011 issued by SE, Dindigul EDC. For arguments.
15	I.A.No.1 of 2012 and D.R.P.No. 5 of 2012	Bannari Amman Spinning Mills Ltd., Versus 1) CFC, TNEB 2) SE, DEDC, Dindigul.	Adv. R.S.Pandiyaraj	Praying to set aside the impugned notice dated 7-12-2011 issued by SE, Dindigul EDC. For arguments.
16	D.R.P.No.20 of 2011	MMS Steel & Power Pvt., Ltd., Versus TANGEDCO	Adv. Rahul Balaji	Direct the respondent of Rs.4.67 per unit amounting to Rs.2,30,33,089 for power supplied between 24-5-2010 to 21-6-2010. For arguments.
17	M.P.No.23 of 2011	Ind Barath Thermal Power Ltd., Versus 1) MD, TANTRANSCO 2) DO, TANTRANSCO	Adv. Rahul Balaji	Praying to punish the respondents for non-compliance of the orders passed in M.P.No.42 of 2011 dated 20-4-2011. For appraisal of the status of the pending case before APTEL.
18	M.P.No.24 of 2011	TANGEDCO Versus Nil	Adv. P.H. Vinod Pandian	Status to be reported.
19	M.P.No.33 of 2012	Dharmapuri Paper Mills Pvt., Ltd., Versus 1) Director Distribution, TANGEDCO 2) CE, Commercial 3) CE, Distribution 4) SE, Dharmapuri EDC	Adv. Rahul Balaji	Praying to issue a direction to the respondents to provide uninterrupted power supply during the sanctioned working days without any unscheduled load shedding or power cuts. For arguments.

(By Order of the Commission)

S. Gunasekaran
Secretary