

**No. 12 / 2014 dated: 21-3-2014**

**TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION**

**REVISED CAUSE LIST**

**Cases posted for 25-3- 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.3 of 2011	JSW Steel Ltd., Versus CMD, TANGEDCO	M/s. Iyer & Thomas Adv. Karthick Seshadri  Adv.P.H.Vinod Pandian	Praying to make rules on calculation of deemed demand for power purchased on reliability charges or purchased under inter state open access rules. For further arguments.
2	D.R.P.No.4 of 2011	JSW Steel Ltd., Versus CMD, TANGEDCO	M/s. Iyer & Thomas Adv. Karthick Seshadri  Adv.P.H.Vinod Pandian	Praying to make a rule for grid support to consumers who are having CPP within their premises. For further arguments.
3	D.R.P.No.20 of 2011	MMS Steel & Power Pvt., Ltd., Versus TANGEDCO	Adv. Rahul Balaji  Adv.P.H.Vinod Pandian	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.
4	P.P.A.P. No.1 of 2011	1. Sakthi Sugars Ltd., 2. TNPL Versus TNEB / TANGEDCO	Thiru. Shivakumar “ Suresh  Adv.P.H.Vinod Pandian	Praying to fix the power purchase price for using coal instead of bagasse by the petitioner. For arguments.
5	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  Adv. Rahul Balaji	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.
6	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  Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj	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.
7	M.P.No.12 of 2012	Gangadhar Narasingdas Agarwal Versus TANGEDCO	Thiru. Srinath Sridaran  Adv.P.H.Vinod Pandian	Praying to punish the respondent for failure to comply with the orders of the Commission dated 11-7-2011 in D.R.P.No. 14 of 2011. For arguments.
8	D.R.P.No.5 of 2013	TCP Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CE, Planning and RC	Adv. Rahul Balaji  Adv.P.H.Vinod Pandian	Praying to direct the respondents to make payment of Rs.9,19,24,107/- together with interest of Rs.4,00,38,655/- for supply of 450 million units. For arguments.

**(By Order of the Commission)**

**S. Gunasekaran  
Secretary**