BEFORE THE NATIONAL GREEN TRIBUNAL EASTERN ZONE BENCH, KOLKATA

R.A. NO. 46/2016/EZ IN Appeal No. No. 4/2014/PB/8/EZ & M.A. No. 822/2016/EZ

THEMRIE TUITHUNG & ORS

VS

UNION OF INDIA & ORS

-

CORAM:	Hon'ble Mr. Jus <mark>tice S.P.Wangd</mark> i, Judicial Member Hon'ble Prof. (Dr.) P. C. Mishra, Expert Member
PRESENT: A	Applicants : Mr. Ritwick Dutta, Advocate
	Mr. Rahul Ganguly, Advocate
R	espondent No. 1 : Mr. Gora Chand Roy Chowdhury, Advocate Mr. K. Mukherjee, Advocate
R	espondents No. 2 & 3 : Mr. Karma Thinlay, Sr. Advocate
11	Mr. Sapan <mark>B</mark> iswajit, advocate
	Mr. Subhayu Roy, Advocate
	Mrs. Pou <mark>shali Banerj</mark> ee, Advocate Mr. Zangpo Sherpa, Advocate
R	Respondent No. 4 : Mr. Kushagra Shah, Advocate
	Orders of the Tribunal
Date & Remarks	R C
Item No. 5	
21 st	PA
November,	Mr. Kushagra Shah, Ld. Advocate appearing for the
2016.	TRIDE
2016.	Respondent No. 4, Ministry of Tribal Affairs, Govt. of
5	India, prays for further time to file affidavit-in
	opposition on behalf of the Ministry.
	Having regard to the fact that in a Review
	Application, affidavit-in-opposition is not considered
	mandatory, we have proceeded to hear the case.
	Heard in part.

1

The principal question raised in the RA is that while passing the impugned judgement the matter pertaining to non-compliance of Forest Rights Act which had been raised by the appellants during the course of hearing of the Appeal, had been overlooked by us.

Mr. Ritwick Dutta, Ld. Advocate for the review applicants has placed before us a letter dated 3rd August 2015 of the MOEF addressed to the Principal Secretary of Forests, Govt. of Manipur, which appears to be relevant in the matter in issue.

Let the letter be placed on record appropriately on or before the next date.

In the meanwhile, since a copy has been served on the Ld. Sr. Counsel for the State Respondents 2 and 3, liberty is granted to them to file response thereto. We direct Mr. Karma Thinlay, Ld. Sr. Counsel for the State to examine the issues raised by the applicant particularly, to the one pertaining to the noncompliance of the Forest Rights Act as elaborated in paragraph 5.2.7 of the supplementary affidavit filed on behalf of the applicants at pages 105-106 of the paper book. Since compliance of the Forest Rights Act is mandatory, we expect the State of Manipur to come out with a fair understanding of the matter and place before us appropriate proposal in the event the requirements of the Act have not been complied with.



