

TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

CAUSE LIST

Cases posted for 29-1- 2014

Venue: Court Hall of the Commission

Time : 2.30 pm

Sl.	Case No.	Name of the Parties	Counsel or parties	Remarks
1	P.R.C.No.3 of 2013	Anu Cashews Versus 1)TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv. Rahul balaji	Praying to direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month for any delay in settlement of invoices beyond the period of 30 days from the date of invoice. For maintainability.
2	P.R.C.No.4 of 2013	Binaguri Tea Company Pvt., Ltd., Versus 1)TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv. Rahul balaji	Praying to direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month for any delay in settlement of invoices beyond the period of 30 days from the date of invoice. For maintainability.
3	P.R.C.No.5 of 2013	India Fashions Ltd., Versus 1)TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv. Rahul balaji	Praying to direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month for any delay in settlement of invoices beyond the period of 30 days from the date of invoice. For maintainability.
4	P.R.C.No.6 of 2013	Savita Oil Technologies Ltd., Versus 1)TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv. Rahul balaji	Praying to direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month for any delay in settlement of invoices beyond the period of 30 days from the date of invoice. For maintainability.
5	P.R.C.No.7 of 2013	M.Babanna Versus 1)TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv. Rahul balaji	Praying to direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month for any delay in settlement of invoices beyond the period of 30 days from the date of invoice. For maintainability.
6	P.R.C.No.8 of 2013	P.M. Granite Exp. Pvt.Ltd, Versus 1)TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv. Rahul balaji	Praying to direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month for any delay in settlement of invoices beyond the period of 30 days from the date of invoice. For maintainability.
7	P.R.C.No.9 of 2013	Spero Power Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1)TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv. Rahul balaji	Praying to direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month for any delay in settlement of invoices beyond the period of 30 days from the date of invoice. For maintainability.

8	P.R.C.No. 10 of 2013	Scientific Mes-Technik Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1)TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv. Rahul balaji	Praying to direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month for any delay in settlement of invoices beyond the period of 30 days from the date of invoice. For maintainability.
9	P.R.C.No.11 of 2013	Elveety Industries Pvt., Ltd., Versus 1)TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv. Rahul balaji	Praying to direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month for any delay in settlement of invoices beyond the period of 30 days from the date of invoice. For maintainability.
10	P.R.C.No.12 of 2013	Sri Kumaraswamy Mineral Exports Pvt., Ltd., Versus 1)TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv. Rahul balaji	Praying to direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month for any delay in settlement of invoices beyond the period of 30 days from the date of invoice. For maintainability.
11	P.R.C.No.13 of 2013	Orange County Resorts and Hotels Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv. Rahul balaji	Praying to direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month for any delay in settlement of invoices beyond the period of 30 days from the date of invoice. For maintainability.
12	P.R.C.No.14 of 2013	Zuri Hotels and Resorts Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv. Rahul balaji	Praying to direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month for any delay in settlement of invoices beyond the period of 30 days from the date of invoice. For maintainability.
13	P.R.C.No.15 of 2013	Om Sakthi Wind Power Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv. Rahul balaji	Praying to direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month for any delay in settlement of invoices beyond the period of 30 days from the date of invoice. For maintainability.
14	P.R.C.No.16 of 2013	Sree Rayalaseema Hi-Strenth Hypo Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv. Rahul balaji	Praying to direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month for any delay in settlement of invoices beyond the period of 30 days from the date of invoice. For maintainability.
15	P.R.C.No.17 of 2013	Krishna Kumar Orthopaedic Hospital and Institute of Orthopaedics (P) Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv. Rahul balaji	Praying to direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month for any delay in settlement of invoices beyond the period of 30 days from the date of invoice. For maintainability.
16	P.R.C.No.18 of 2013	Maris Spinners Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv. Rahul balaji	Praying to direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month for any delay in settlement of invoices beyond the period of 30 days from the date of invoice. For maintainability.

17	P.R.C.No.19 of 2013	Texonic Instruments Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv. Rahul balaji	Praying to direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month for any delay in settlement of invoices beyond the period of 30 days from the date of invoice. For maintainability.
18	P.R.C.No. 20 of 2013	Maris Hotels and Theatres (P) Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv. Rahul balaji	Praying to direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month for any delay in settlement of invoices beyond the period of 30 days from the date of invoice. For maintainability.
19	P.R.C.No.21 of 2013	Bhabani Pigments Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv. Rahul balaji	Praying to direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month for any delay in settlement of invoices beyond the period of 30 days from the date of invoice. For maintainability.
20	P.R.C.No.22 of 2013	R.Madan Mohan Rao Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv. Rahul balaji	Praying to direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month for any delay in settlement of invoices beyond the period of 30 days from the date of invoice. For maintainability.
21	P.R.C.No.23 of 2013	Powerica Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv. Rahul balaji	Praying to direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month for any delay in settlement of invoices beyond the period of 30 days from the date of invoice. For maintainability.
22	P.R.C.No.24 of 2013	Devi Sea Foods Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv. Rahul balaji	Praying to direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month for any delay in settlement of invoices beyond the period of 30 days from the date of invoice. For maintainability.
23	P.R.C.No.25 of 2013	VVD and Sons Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv. Rahul balaji	Praying to direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month for any delay in settlement of invoices beyond the period of 30 days from the date of invoice. For maintainability.
24	P.R.C.No.26 of 2013	Nalco Metal ProductsLtd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv. Rahul balaji	Praying to direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month for any delay in settlement of invoices beyond the period of 30 days from the date of invoice. For maintainability.
25	P.R.C.No.27 of 2013	TCP Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv. Rahul balaji	Praying to direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month for any delay in settlement of invoices beyond the period of 30 days from the date of invoice. For maintainability.

26	P.R.C.No.28 of 2013	Hindustan Platinum Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv. Rahul balaji	Praying to direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month for any delay in settlement of invoices beyond the period of 30 days from the date of invoice. For maintainability.
27	P.R.C.No.29 of 2013	The Metal Powder Company Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv. Rahul balaji	Praying to direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month for any delay in settlement of invoices beyond the period of 30 days from the date of invoice. For maintainability.
28	P.R.C.No. 30 of 2013	Spikepower protection systems & Technologies Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC (Revenue)	Adv. Rahul balaji	Praying to direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month for any delay in settlement of invoices beyond the period of 30 days from the date of invoice. For maintainability.
29	P.R.C.No. 31 of 2013	Natesan Synchrocones P. Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC (Revenue)	Adv. Rahul balaji	Praying to direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month for any delay in settlement of invoices beyond the period of 30 days from the date of invoice. For maintainability.
30	P.R.C.No. 32 of 2013	TCP Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) SE, Sivagangai EDC	Adv. Rahul balaji	Praying to direct that if any charges towards demand charges or energy charges paid till such time are found to be collected in excess to be refunded. For maintainability.
31	P.R.C.No.33 of 2013	Mangalam Fashions Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv. Rahul balaji	Praying to direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month for any delay in settlement of invoices beyond the period of 30 days from the date of invoice. For maintainability.
32	P.R.C.No. 34 of 2013	Woodside Fashions Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv. Rahul balaji	Praying to direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month for any delay in settlement of invoices beyond the period of 30 days from the date of invoice. For maintainability.
33	P.R.C.No. 35 of 2013	Natesan precision components Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv. Rahul balaji	Praying to direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month for any delay in settlement of invoices beyond the period of 30 days from the date of invoice. For maintainability.
34	P.R.C.No. 36 of 2013	Tamil Nadu Gears and Shafts Corporation Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv. Rahul balaji	Praying to direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month for any delay in settlement of invoices beyond the period of 30 days from the date of invoice. For maintainability.

35	P.R.C.No. 37 of 2013	Nupower Renewables Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv. Rahul balaji	Praying to direct the respondents to make payment of invoices fallen due for payment together with interest at the interest rates as per the Energy Purchase Agreements and APTEL order dated 17 th April 2012. For maintainability.
36	P.R.C. No. 38 of 2013	Rajapalayam Mills Ltd., Versus TANGEDCO	Adv. N.L Rajah	Praying to direct the respondent to effect the order dated 7-9-2010 passed in R.A.No.4 of 2013 and apply to all consumers. For maintainability.
37	D.R.P.No.19 of 2013	Century Floor Mills Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, TANGEDCO 3) SE, Central EDC 4) SE, Udumalpet EDC	Adv. Rahul Balaji	Praying to set aside the communication of the Chief Financial Controller, Revenue dated 14-9-2012. For counter.
38	M.P.No. 11 of 2013	Subhashri Bio Energies Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CE, NCES 3) SE, Namakkal EDC	Thiru. S. Durairaju	Praying to direct the respondents to bill the power drawn by the petitioner under H.T.Tariff IA. For counter.
39	P.P.A.P.No. 8 of 2011	CE, NCES, TANGEDCO Versus 1. M.R.K. Co-Opt. Sugar Mills and 15 others.	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.
40	P.P.A.P.No. 9 of 2011	CE, NCES, TANGEDCO Versus 1. Arashi Hi-Tech Bio Power Ltd., and four others.	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.

(By Order of the Commission)

S. Gunasekaran
Secretary