

TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

CAUSE LIST

Cases posted for 15-4- 2014

Venue: Court Hall of the Commission

Time : 2.30pm

Sl.	Case No.	Name of the Parties	Counsel or parties	Remarks
1	I.A.No.1 of 2013 in D.R.P.No. 3 of 2013	Yogalakshmi Spinning Mills Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1)CFC, Revenue 2) SE, Gopi EDC	Adv. R.S. Pandiyaraj	Praying to set aside the impugned notice dated 9-10-2012 issued by 2 nd Respondent. For arguments.
2	I.A.No.1 of 2013 and DRP 16 of 2013	M/s. Cauvery Power Gen. Chennai Pvt. Ltd. Versus (1) TANGEDCO (2) S.E/Chennai EDC	Thiru Vinod Kumar Adv.P.H.Vinod Pandian	Praying to declare that the levy and collection of maximum demand charges from the petitioner is illegal and contrary to law. For arguments.
3	D.R.P.No. 17 of 2013	Kaveri Gas Power Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) SE, Nagapattinam EDC 3) TANTRANSCO	Adv. Vinod Kumar Adv.P.H.Vinod Pandian	Praying to declare that the respondent is not entitled to make the allotment of electricity generated at the petitioner's 6.79 MW capacity power to a particular consumer. For arguments.
4	D.R.P.No.18 of 2013	ITC Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) Director Finance 3) SE, Tirunelveli EDC 4) SE, Chennai EDC	Adv.Krishna Srinivasan	Praying to direct the respondent to make payment of Rs.91,16,143/-. For arguments.
5	M.P.No. 11 of 2013	Subhashri Bio Energies Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CE, NCES 3) SE, Namakkal EDC	Thiru. S. Durairaju Adv.P.H.Vinod Pandian	Praying to direct the respondents to bill the power drawn by the petitioner under H.T.Tariff IA. For arguments.
6	R.P.No. 2 of 2013	Spictex Cot Mills (P) Ltd., Versus 1)CFC, Revenue 2) SE, Udumalpet EDC	Adv. R.S. Pandiyaraj	Praying to review the order dated 17-4-2013 made in D.R.P.No.2 of 2012. For arguments.
7	D.R.P.No. 20 of 2013	KEC Industries Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv. Rahul Balaji Adv.P.H.Vinod Pandian	Praying to direct the respondent to make payment of a sum of Rs.21,34,127/- being the interest due against delayed payments made till February 2012. For arguments.

8	D.R.P.No.21 of 2013	Century Floor Mills Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv. Rahul Balaji Adv.P.H.Vinod Pandian	Praying to direct the respondents to make payment of a sum of Rs.26,71,104/- being the interest due against delayed payments made till 14-2-2013 for power supplied. For arguments.
9	M.P.No.12 of 2013	TANFAC Versus Nil	Adv.Rahul Balaji	Praying to declare that the petitioner's 2.23 MW plant as cogeneration plant. For arguments.
10	M.P.No.82 of 2013	SESA Sterlite Ltd., Versus Nil	Adv. Rahul Balaji	Praying to declare that the petitioner's waster heat recovery boiler system is a cogeneration plant. For arguments.

(By Order of the Commission)

S. Gunasekaran
Secretary