

**BEFORE THE NATIONAL GREEN TRIBUNAL
SOUTHERN ZONE, CHENNAI**

**Application No. 31 of 2014 (SZ)
and
M.A.No.162 of 2014**

Applicant(s)
Anjan Drug Private Limited
Aminjkarai, Chennai-29

Vs.

Respondent(s)
The Chairman, Tamil Nadu
Pollution Control Board, Chennai
and 4 others

Legal Practitioners for Applicant(s)
M/s. V. Srinivasa Babu and N. Fidelia

Legal practitioners for respondent(s)
Smt. H. Yasmeen Ali, for R-1 and R-2
Shri P. Gnanasekaran, for R-3 and R-4
M/s. Ramu and R. Vishnu for R-5

Note of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
Order No.	<p>Date : 13th October, 2015</p> <p>The matter is posted for placing the submissions by the respective counsel. The counsel for the parties are present. It is brought to the notice of the Tribunal that the applicant M/s. Anjan Drug Private Limited is having its industry located at Plot No.109 & 116, SIDCO – Pharmaceuticals Industrial Estate, Alathur, Kancheepuram District. Aggrieved over an order of closure dated 24.01.2014 issued by the 1st respondent, Tamil Nadu State Pollution Control Board (Board) the applicant made his application before this Tribunal. After hearing both sides, an order of interim stay of the order of closure was issued by the Tribunal on 18.02.2014 on the strength of which</p>

the applicant industry is carrying on its activities. While the matter stood so, the 5th respondent, who was the original complainant before the 1st respondent Board complaining that pollution is being caused by the applicant industry, filed an application to implead him as party respondent in the proceedings. Accordingly he was impleaded and shown as the 5th respondent and the 5th respondent has also filed its reply.

Last inspection of the Unit of the applicant was made by the 2nd respondent District Environmental Engineer (DEE) of the 1st respondent Board on 25.02.2014. It is now contended by the counsel for the applicant that after the aforesaid inspection by DEE all the defects and deficiencies originally noticed, which according to the 5th respondent were responsible for causing the pollution, were taken care of and thus all the precautionary and preventive measures were taken. Therefore, the application has got to be allowed since there is nothing further to pursue.

In answer, the counsel for the 1st respondent Board would submit that the subsequent to the inspection that was made on 25.02.2014 no further inspection was made. Under such circumstances, in the considered opinion of the Tribunal it becomes necessary to issue a direction to

the 2nd respondent DEE to make an inspection of the applicant's Unit in the presence of both the applicant and also the 5th respondent and file a status report in the next hearing. The matter is posted to 18.11.2015.

P.S. Rao
(Expert Member)

Justice M. Chockalingam
(Judicial Member)

