

No. 31 / 2014 dated: 7-4-2014

TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

REVISED CAUSE LIST

Cases posted for 17-4- 2014

Venue: Court Hall of the Commission

Time : 2.30pm

Sl.	Case No.	Name of the Parties	Counsel or parties	Remarks
1	P.P.A.P.No.5 of 2012	SPEC Power (P) Ltd., Versus TANGEDCO	Adv. Rahul Balaji Adv.P.H.Vinod Pandian	Praying to approve the addendum 2 to the power purchase agreement. For arguments.
2	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 Adv.P.H.Vinod Pandian	Praying to issue a direction bestowing must run status on all wind energy generators. For arguments.
3	D.R.P.No.28 of 2012	1) Green Infra Wind Power Projects Ltd., 2) Green Infra Wind Generation Ltd., 3) Green Infra Wind Farms Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) SLDC 3) TANTRANSCO	Adv. Rahul Balaji Adv.P.H.Vinod Pandian	Praying to issue a direction in view of the MUST RUN status on all wind energy generators. For arguments.
4	M.P.No.21 of 2014	Tamil Nadu Spinning Mills Association Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) TANTRANSCO 3) SLDC	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj	Praying to direct the respondents to forbear from enforcing forced back outs on WEG by ensuring compliance with the must run status of WEG and also direct to adequately compensate the losses incurred by the petitioners due to the illegal enforcement of continued back outs of their wind mills from 24-6-2013. For arguments.
5	M.P.No.22 of 2014	Indian Wind Power Association Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) TANTRANSCO 3) SLDC	Adv.Rahul Balaji	Praying to issue a direction bestowing must run status on all wind energy generators. For arguments.
6	M.P.No.23 of 2014	Indian Wind Power Association Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) TANTRANSCO 3) SLDC	Adv.Rahul Balaji	Praying to direct the respondents to adequately compensate for the losses accrued to them due to illegal enforcement of back outs from 24-6-2013. For arguments.
7	D.R.P.No. 45 of 2014	Arasan Syntex Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) TANTRANSCO 3) SLDC	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj	Praying to direct the respondents to forbear from enforcing forced back outs on WEG HTSC Nos.665,808,1238 and R2462 and also direct to adequately compensate the losses incurred by the petitioners due to the illegal enforcement of continued back outs of their wind mills. For arguments.

8	I.A.No.1 of 2013 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.
9	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.
10	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.
11	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.
12	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.
13	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.
14	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.
15	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.
16	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.
17	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