

TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

REVISED CAUSE LIST

Cases posted for 26-2-2014

Venue: Court Hall of the Commission

Time : 2.30 pm

Sl.	Case No.	Name of the Parties	Counsel or parties	Remarks
1	D.R.P.No.26 of 2012	Madurai Power Corp. Pvt., Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) TANTRANSCO	Adv. Rahul Balaji Adv.P.H.Vinod Pandian	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
2	D.R.P.No.27 of 2012	Samalpatti Power Co. Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) TANTRANSCO	Adv. Rahul Balaji Adv.P.H.Vinod Pandian	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.26 of 2013	M/s. Sai Regency Power Corporation Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) TANTRANSCO 3) SLDC	Adv. Jenasen " E. Manoharan Adv.P.H.Vinod Pandian	Praying to direct the respondents to release the sum of Rs.2,35,76,000/- withheld from the sums payable to the petitioner for supply of energy. For admission.
4	M.P.No.4 of 2012	Indian Wind Power Association Versus Nil	Adv. Rahul Balaji	Praying to extend the time for implementation of RPO to next year March 2013 instead of March 2012. For arguments.
5	M.P.No.5 of 2012	Indian Wind Power Assn., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CE, NCES, TANGEDCO	Adv. Rahul Balaji Adv.P.H.Vinod Pandian	Praying to extend the banking period for the year 2011-2012 to May 31 st 2012. For arguments.
6	M.P.No.7 of 2012	The Southern Ind.M Assn. Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CE, NCES, TANGEDCO	Adv. N.L. Rajah Adv.P.H.Vinod Pandian	Praying to extend the banking period for the year 2011-2012 by a further period of three months. For arguments.

7	M.P.No.3 of 2013	The Southern India Mills Association Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2)CE, NCES, TANGEDCO	Adv. N.L Rajah Adv.P.H.Vinod Pandian	Praying to direct that the surplus banked energy remaining unadjusted is eligible for encashment with the respondent at the rate of Rs.5.50/- per unit. For arguments.
8	M.P.No.6 of 2013	Indian Wind Power Association Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2)CE, NCES, TANGEDCO	Adv. Rahul Balaji Adv.P.H.Vinod Pandian	Praying to direct that the surplus banked energy remaining unadjusted is eligible for encashment with the respondent at the rate of Rs.5.50/- per unit. For arguments.
9	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.
10	M.P.No.34 of 2012	Brakes India Ltd., Versus TANGEDCO	Thiru. N.L. Rajah Adv.P.H.Vinod Pandian	Praying to clarify that the demand available to the petitioner should be calculated only on the basis of the energy injected into the grid and non on the basis of the energy consumed by the petitioner. For arguments.
11	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.

(By Order of the Commission)

S. Gunasekaran
Secretary