

Item No. 02

(Court No. 1)

**BEFORE THE NATIONAL GREEN TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI**

(By Video Conferencing)

Original Application No. 134/2021

In re : News item published in The Hindustan Times
dated 17.06.2021, titled "**Blast in firecracker unit in
Maharashtra's Palghar, at least 10 injured**"

Date of hearing: 25.06.2021

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ADARSH KUMAR GOEL, CHAIRPERSON
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR AGARWAL, JUDICIAL MEMBER
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M. SATHYANARAYANAN, JUDICIAL MEMBER
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE BRIJESH SETHI, JUDICIAL MEMBER
HON'BLE DR. NAGIN NANDA, EXPERT MEMBER**

Respondent: Mr. Raj Kumar, Advocate for CPCB
Ms. Manasi Joshi, Advocate for MPCB
Ms. Ashima Mittal, SDM Dahanu

ORDER

1. Proceedings in this matter have been initiated *suo moto* on the basis of media report published in The Hindustan Times dated 17.06.2021 to the effect that 10 workers were injured in a blast inside a fire cracker factory in Maharashtra's Palghar district on Thursday morning, inside the premises of Vishal Fireworks, located at Dehane village about 15 Kms from Vangaon-Dahanu Road.

2. On 18.06.2021, advance notice was issued by the Registry for today's hearing to CPCB, Maharashtra State PCB, District Magistrate, Palghar, Director of Industrial Safety and Health, Maharashtra and Vishal Fireworks, Palghar. Response has been filed on behalf of District Magistrate, Palghar, Director of Industrial Safety and Health, Maharashtra and CPCB. Response of CPCB also takes into account report of State PCB. During the hearing, Counsel for CPCB, State PCB

are present and SDM, Dahanu is present in person. There is no response from the industrial unit in question.

3. The report of the District Magistrate, Palghar dated 24.06.2021 shows that the incident took place on 17.06.2021 at 10:35 A.M. due to spark from the welding work which fell on the explosive meant for making firecrackers. The fire was extinguished at 4:00 P.M. The owner had license from the Explosive Department. Eight persons were injured and were admitted to Hospital. A criminal case under Section 308/34 Indian Penal Code (IPC) has been registered in Police Station.

4. The report is reproduced below:

“The firecrackers company named ‘Vishal Fire Works’ is situated at land bearing Gat No. 154 admeasuring area of 3810.00 Square Meter, Village Dahane, Taluka Dahanu, District palghar, State Maharashtra. This land is owned by Shri. Naresh Karnawat and others and also there are more six godowns. On Dated 17/06/2021 at morning 10:35 a.m. while the welding work was going on in the company and the sparks flying from the welding work was fell on twin bundles which were brought for making the firecrackers, the packing box the liquor powder for making the firecrackers and fire was started. The fire was extinguished by fire brigade till 4.00 pm. The owner of the company has been owned two licenses from the Explosive Department, CBD. Belapur, New Mumbai. The details of that licenses are as 1) E/WCC/MH/20/67(E22263) valid till 31/03/2023 and 2) E/WCC/MH/24/128(E14899) valid till 31.03.2026. It was informed that the copies of this licenses were burned and destroyed in the fire.

*In this incident the **eight persons were injured and they were admitted to ‘Seva Nursing Home’ Dahanu and ‘Sankalp Nursing Home ‘Dahanu for the medical treatment.** There details are as follows:*

Sr. No	Name	Age	Injury
---------------	-------------	------------	---------------

1	<i>Navnit Lote</i>	32	50%
2	<i>Mahesh Ramji More</i>	40	40%
3	<i>Asif Khan</i>	32	35%
4	<i>Prmchand ishwar Chauhan</i>	25	20%
5	<i>Sukhdev Charansingh Lothe</i>	50	25%
6	<i>Mangesh Radkya Rayat</i>	35	40%
7	<i>Sunil Ganpat Kathya</i>	30	40%
8	<i>Ajit Jayesh Dalvi</i>	17	30%

The offence has been registered u/s 308, 34 of IPC by FIR No.155/2021 in the Dahanu Police Station against 1) Urmilaben Jethamal Shah having residence at Kesharimalwadi, near to Marathi School, Jakeria road, Malad East, Mumbai 2) Naresh Mohanalal Karnavat having residence at Sawata, Tal: Dahanu, Dist: Palghar and 3) Navdeep Darshan Lote Having Residence address Anand Vilas Bunglow, Patelpada, Dahanu and the under investigation.”

5. The action taken report filed by the Director of Industrial Safety and Health, Maharashtra, apart from repeating the above information, mentions that the Directorate is carrying out detailed inquiry and proposes to take action under Section 92 of the Factories Act, 1948 for the contraventions which may be found during the inquiry. Further, apart from eight victims mentioned in the report of the District Magistrate, the report mentions one more victim - Yogesh Madhu Karbat, aged 22 who was a worker admitted to Sankalp Hospital, Dahanu with 8% burn injury and was discharged on 17.06.2021.

6. Report of CPCB mentions that the State PCB issued closure directions on 18.06.2021 under the Water (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1974, the Air (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act,

1981 and the Hazardous and Other Wastes (Management & Transboundary Movement) Rules, 2016 for negligence of the unit on safety aspects. The unit was operating without valid consent. The Electricity Department has given disconnection report. Earlier CPCB had issued an Advisory on 08.05.2020 that SPCBs/PCCs shall ensure that pollution control equipment, connectivity of OCEMS with CPCB/SPCB servers, effluent treatment plants including safety equipment and its machineries shall be kept in good operable conditions before resuming operation. The SPCBs/PCCs shall ensure that all the units shall take utmost care in handling hazardous chemicals by deploying trained manpower. The SPCBs/PCCs shall closely monitor the situation and ensure that the environmental norms are not violated by any unit.

Number of accidents involving chemical spillage, release of gases, fire, etc. have been reported in the recent past in industrial units. Another communication was sent on July 01, 2020 to all SPCBs/PCCs that industries will take adequate measures to prevent accidents and comply with all the provisions of E(P) Act, 1986, Air Act,1981 and Water Act,1974. In case of accidents releasing pollutants in the environment, SPCBs/PCCs shall monitor environmental quality for relevant parameters & assess environmental impacts and damage. They shall also recover environmental compensation towards damage and restoration.

7. The report mentions that the raw material which was being used for manufacturing fireworks was as follows:-

- i) Potassium Nitrate -250 kg
- ii) Barium Nitrate -165 kg
- iii) Sulphur -180 kg
- iv) Aluminium -180 kg

v) Powder Sutali -350 kg.

8. CPCB has given following suggestions in the present matter:-

i) *Directorate of Industrial Safety & Health, Maharashtra is the appropriate authority in respect of Industrial Safety, Identification of Dangerous Operations, Hazardous Process, Hazardous Chemicals etc. under Factories Act, 1948 and Maharashtra Factories Rules, 1963, The Manufacture, Storage and Import of Hazardous Chemicals Rules, 1989. They may take up Safety audit ensuring proper implementation of O&M safety measures.*

ii) Fire crackers manufacturers have to take measures to comply with MSIHC Rules as they handle Scheduled Hazardous chemicals and being explosive in nature.

iii) *In the present case, the injured need to pay compensation as per directions of Hon'ble NGT issued in many matters and in fire cracker matter (Hon'ble NGT, PB in O.A. No. 44/2021 In Re. News item published in The New Indian Express dated 12.2.2021 titled "At least 19 dead in Virudhunagar Firecracker factory blast, more than 30 injured"). A copy of the Hon'ble NGT order dated 11.06.2021 is annexed as Annexure-V for kind reference.*

iv) *Maharashtra PCB may assess compensation for non compliance to consent conditions/ E(P) Act and Rules as well as on chemical fumes discharged."*

9. From the reports of District Magistrate, Palgarh, Director of Industrial Safety and Health, State PCB and the CPCB, it is seen that the safety norms have not been followed in the operation of the unit in violation of Manufacture, Storage and Import of Hazardous Chemical Rules, 1989 ("the 1989 Rules") and Chemical Accidents (Emergency Planning, Preparedness and Response) Rules, 1996 (The 1996 Rules). Nine persons have received burn injuries who need to be compensated. These facts have not been disputed by the concerned industrial units.

10. This Tribunal has dealt with several cases of accidents resulting in death and injuries and damage to the environment on account of non-compliance of the safety norms by the industrial units and also on

account of failure of the Regulatory Authorities in monitoring such compliances¹. The Tribunal has accordingly issued direction for remedial action for payment of compensation to the victims and restoration of the environment and also for taking precautions to prevent reoccurrence of

1

- i. Order dated 01.06.2020, relating to incident of gas leak dated 07.05.2020 in **LG Polymers India Pvt. Limited** at Vishakhapatnam, resulting in death of 11 persons and injuries to more than 100, apart from other damage (OA No. 73/2020, In re: Gas Leak at LG Polymers Chemical Plant in RR Venkatapuram Village Visakhapatnam in Andhra Pradesh);
- ii. Order dated 03.02.2021, relating to incident dated 03.06.2020 in a chemical factory, **Yashyashvi Rasayan Pvt. Ltd.** at Dahej, District Bharuch, Gujarat resulting in deaths and injuries and other damage (OA No. 85/2020) (Earlier OA 22/2020) (WZ), Aryavart Foundation through its President vs. Yashyashvi Rasayan Pvt. Ltd. & Anr.);
- iii. Order dated 19.02.2021, in relation to incident of **oil well blow out on 27.05.2020 at Baghjan in the Tinsukia District of Assam** resulting in deaths, injuries and damage to the environment (OA No. 43/2020(EZ), Bonani Kakkar vs. Oil India Limited & Ors.).
- iv. Orders dated 06.07.2020 and 22.12.2020, relating to incident dated 30.06.2020 on account of gas leakage at **Sainor Life Sciences** factory at Parawada in industrial area on the outskirts of Vishakhapatnam (OA No. 106/2020, News item published in the local daily "Economic Times" dated 30.06.2020 titled "Another Gas Leakage at Vizag Factory kills two, critically injures four...");
- v. Orders dated 08.07.2020 and 22.12.2020, dealing with the incident dated 01.07.2020 resulting in death of 6 person and injury to 17 due to blast of boiler in **M/s Neyveli Thermal Power Station** (NLCIL), Cuddalore (OA No. 108/2020, News item published in the "Indian Express" dated 01.07.2020 titled "Tamil Nadu Neyveli boiler blast: 6 dead, 17 injured") and;
- vi. Orders dated 23.07.2020 and 22.12.2020, in relation to incident of **fire engulfed the chemical plant of Visakha Solvents Ltd**, Vizag on 13.07.2020 at Ramky CETP Solvents building in Pharma City resulting in injuries (OA No. 134/2020, News item published on 13.07.2020 in the local daily named "India Today" titled "Massive fire engulf Vizag chemical plant, explosions heard, injuries reported").
- vii. Order dated **18.12.2020**, in relation to incident of **explosion in a plastic recycling factory at Sujapur in Malda on 1.12.2020** resulting in death of six persons, including two minors and serious injuries to four persons (OA No. 272/2020, News item published in the "Times of India" dated 20.11.2020 entitled "Six killed as blast tears through Malda Plastic recycling factory").
- viii. Order dated **18.12.2020**, in relation to incident of **methane gas leak in a sugar factory** called Lokenete Bapurao Patil Agro Industries Ltd. in Mohol Taluka of Solapur District, Maharashtra on 21.11.2020 resulting in deaths and injuries and other damage (OA No. 274/2020, News item published in the "Indian Express" dated 23.11.2020 entitled "Maharashtra: Two Killed, eight injured in methane gas leak in sugar factory").
- ix. Order dated 08.01.2021, in relation to **Gas Leak in Agro Company** (O.A No. 107/2020, In RE: News item published in the local daily "Indian Express Sunday Express" dated 28.06.2020 titled "Gas Leak in Agro Company Claims life of one")
- x. Order dated **04.06.2021**, in relation to News item published in Navbharat Times dated 24.12.2020 titled "**Gas leaks in IFFCO Plant, 2 Officers dead**" (O.A No. 04/2021, In re : News item published in Navbharat Times dated 24.12.2020 titled "Gas leaks in IFFCO Plant, 2 Officers dead")
- xi. Order dated **11.02.2021**, in relation to accident of **toxic gas leak in Rourkela Steel Plant in Orissa**" (O.A. No. 09/2021, In re: News item published in The Indian Express dated 07.01.2021 titled "Four workers dead due to toxic gas leak in Rourkela Steel Plant")
- xii. Order dated **11.06.2021**, in relation to accident of **Virudhunagar firecracker factory blast** (O.A. No. 44/2021, In re: News item published in The News Indian Express dated 12.02.2021 titled "At least 19 dead in Virudhunagar firecracker factory blast, more than 30 injured")
- xiii. Order dated **11.06.2021** in relation to accident of **quarry blast in Hirenagavalli, Chikkaballapu, Karnataka** (O.A. No. 59/2021, In re: News item published in Times Now News dated 23.02.2021 titled "Karnataka: Six killed in quarry blast in Hirenagavalli, Chikkaballapur")
- xiv. Order dated **11.06.2021** in relation to accident of **fire at UPL plant, Jhagadia, District Bharuch, Gujarat** (O.A. No. 60/2021, In re: News item published in The Hindu dated 23.02.2021 titled "Two dead, 5 missing in fire at UPL Plant")
- xv. Order dated **02.03.2021** in relation to accident of **massive fire broke out at an illegal factory at Pratap Nagar, North Delhi** (O.A. No. 65/2021, In re: News item published in The Times of India dated 28.02.2021 titled "Delhi: Man charred to death as illegal factory catches fire")
- xvi. Order dated **16.03.2021** in relation to Incident of **explosion of 3,000 kg reactor at the production wing of Tyche Industries Limited, on the outskirts of Kakinada, Andhra Pradesh (AP) on March 11, 2021** (O.A. No. 79/2021, In re: News item published in The Hindu dated 14.03.2021 titled "Safety lapses led to reactor blast at pharma unit")
- xvii. Order dated **23.03.2021** in relation to Incident of **blast in chemical boiler factory at Pirana-Piplaj road in Ahmedabad, Gujarat** (OA No. 258/2020, In Re: News item published in the "Indian Express" dated 04.11.2020 titled "Ahmedabad: Nine killed as godown collapses after factory blast")
- xviii. Order dated **16.06.2021** in relation to Incident of **fire in a chemical unit- SVS Aqua Technologies, at Village Urawade, District Pune, Maharashtra** (OA 130/2021, In re: News item published in The Times of India dated 08.06.2021 titled "**18, mostly women, killed in fire at Pune chemical unit**").
- xix. Order dated **17.06.2021** in relation to Incident of **Incident of fire in Ambika Industries, GIDC Sachin, Pandesara, Tal: Choraasi, District Surat-394221, Gujarat** (OA 31/2021 (WZ), Rakesh Sureshchandra Kapadiya v. Gujarat Pollution Control Board & Ors.)

such incident in future. It has been found that the monitoring mechanism and safeguards for protection of life and health of the workers and other persons in the adjoining area who may be affected by such incidents were not adequate. There is need to revamp the systems to ensure immediate medical health and financial compensation on 'Restitution' principle to the affected victims. The current mechanism needs to be revised by the Regulatory Authorities to ensure that before such units are allowed to function, adequate safeguards exists in terms of risk coverage, health care availability in the vicinity and taking safety precautions as per laid down statutory provisions for mock drills and safety audits and such other additional safeguards as necessary based on experience of recent incidents and recommendations in the reports relating thereto.

11. In recent order dated 11.06.2021 in *O.A. No. 44/2021, In re: News item published in The News Indian Express dated 12.02.2021 titled "At least 19 dead in Virudhunagar firecracker factory blast, more than 30 injured"* dealing with the incident of 12.02.2021 at Virudhnagar in Tamil Nadu resulting in death of 19 persons and injury to 30 persons in a fireworks factory, the Tribunal constituted an eight Member Committee headed by a former judge of the High Court, with representatives from MoEF&CC, CPCB, State Disaster Management Authority, Chemical Engineering Department of the IIT Chennai, Nominee of Chief Control of Explosives, Nagpur, Nominee of Petroleum and Explosives Safety Organization (PESO), Delhi and Chief Inspector of Factories, Tamil Nadu. The Committee gave its report dated 22.04.2021 about the cause of the incident and the remedial measures required. While it is not necessary to

refer to the cause of incident in that case but it is necessary to reproduce the relevant parts of the report about the enactments dealing with the safety norms and the compensation norms and remedial measures to prevent accidents:

“A. VIII. APPLICABLE ENACTMENTS AND RULES RELEVANT FOR INDUSTRIAL SAFETY

1. *Under the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986., which is the umbrella legislation, Union of India has notified two sets of Rules namely- The Manufacture, Storage and Import of Hazardous Chemicals Rules, 1989 (MSIHC).*

(i) The Chemical Accidents (Emergency Planning, Response Preparedness and Response) Rules, 1996.

(ii) The MSIHC Rules -further amended in October, 1994 and January, 2000 to widen the scope and provide for stricter controls. The main objectives of the MSIHC rule are to

- *To prevent major accidents arising from industrial activities*
- *Limiting the effects of such accidents*

The Rules endeavor to achieve these objectives by having a quantity-based approach. The requirement can be grouped as low level, medium level and high level as shown below:

Low Level Control:

- *Proof of safe operation*
- *Reporting major accident*
- *Preparation of MSDS*
- *Proper labeling of container*
- *Information regarding imports*

Medium Level Control

- *Low level control and*
- *Notification of site*
- *Preparation of On-site/ Off -site Emergency Plan*
- *Informing public likely to be affected*

High Level Control

- *Medium level control, and*
- *Safety report*
- *Safety audit.*

2. The low-level requirements are applicable to industrial activities having hazardous chemicals in quantities less than that of the prescribed threshold quantities. These units must show evidence that they have identified major accident hazards and have taken adequate steps to prevent major accidents and to limit the consequences of such accidents.

3. The middle level requirements are applicable to units having hazardous chemicals in quantities equal to or more than the prescribed threshold quantities. These units must notify their sites by submitting a detailed report and obtain approval for the activity. The unit is further required to prepare the On-site Emergency Plan detailing how major accidents at the site will be dealt with.

4. The high-level requirements are applicable to industrial activities having certain hazardous chemicals in quantities more than the prescribed quantity that is higher than middle level threshold quantity. Such units are required to prepare an elaborate Safety Report and are also required to carry out periodical Safety Audit.

5. The MSIHC rules require the occupier to disclose the necessary information to the public in the neighborhood that is likely to be affected by a major accident at the site.

i. The Chemical Accidents (Emergency Planning, Response Preparedness and Response) Rules, 1996 complement the MSIHC Rules and provide much needed statutory backup for Crisis Management setup and organizational support. The Chemical Accidents (EPPR) Rules, 1996 envisage a **Four-tier Crisis Management System** in the country at the Central, State, District and Local levels. The Central Crisis Group is to be headed by the Secretary, Environment & Forests, the State Crisis Group by the Chief Secretary, the District and Local Crisis Groups by the District Collector and Sub-Divisional Magistrate respectively.

ii. Central Crisis Group (CCG)

The Central Government has constituted a Central Crisis Group (CCG) for management of chemical accidents and has set-up a Crisis Alert System (CAS). The CCG and the CAS are responsible for rendering advice and help during an emergency. The CCG has also been entrusted with the task of continuously monitoring the post-accident situation and to suggest measures for prevention and recurrence of such accidents. In order to be able to respond quickly during an emergency, a small Co-ordination Committee has been constituted.

3. *As part of the Rapid Safety Audit for the Major Accident Hazard (MAH) units, compliance with respect to following acts/rules shall also be assessed:*

The Manufacture, Storage and import of Hazardous Chemicals Rules, 1989 amended 2000. Schedule-5 of the Rules prescribes the duties and responsibilities of the authorities concerned with corresponding legal backing.

- The Chemical Accidents (Emergency Planning, Preparedness and Response) Rules, 1996*
- Public Liability Insurance Act, 1991, amended 1992 and the Public Liability Insurance Rules, 1991, amended 1993.*
- Explosive Act, 1884 and Explosive Rules, 1983, Gas Cylinder Rules, 2004 and Static and Mobile Pressure Vessels (Unfired) Rules, 1981.*
- The Factories Act, 1948 and The Tamil Nadu Factories Rules 1950.*

IX Violations under Explosives Rules, 2008:

- 1. Rule 7*
- 2. Rule 19*
- 3. Rule 26(7)*
- 4. Rule 28*
- 5. Conditions 26 and 35*
- 6. Violations of SOPs (issued from time to time by Licensing Authority).*

X. STATUS OF ONSITE AND OFF-SITE EMERGENCY PLAN MOCK DRILLS AND SAFETY SoPs:

Onsite status:

- a. Various training programmes were reported to have been arranged for certified foremen/ supervisors/ managers by PESO, Sivakasi from time to time.*
- b. Directorate of Industrial Safety and Health (Govt. of TN) has established a dedicated Training Centre at Sivakasi to impart training for various levels of stakeholders of the industry*
- c. Mobile Team under the aegis of Additional Director of Industrial Safety and Health, Virudhunagar is available for making surprise and routine inspections of factories in Virudhunagar District.*
- d. No illustrative posters for observing safety at the site or even in another factory premises that the committee*

visited, though posters were exhibited to the committee at the time of meeting with public officials.

- e. Instructions of safety at the site are too long and scripted in small letters.*
- f. Absence of personal supervisions by the foreman.*

Offsite status:

A. Six important stages of fireworks manufacture

- 1. Storing & weighing of chemicals*
- 2. Mixing of Chemicals*
- 3. Filling of Chemicals*
- 4. Manufacturing of firecrackers*
- 5. Packing of finished crackers*
- 6. Moving & storing in the Magazine*

1. Storing & weighing of chemicals:

- i. Raw Materials shall be stored separately and shall be weighed using weighing scale exclusively provided for each raw material.*
- ii. Weighing scale and measuring weights shall be made of Non-Ferrous materials.*
- iii. Only the trained and assigned persons shall be allowed in the ingredient shed for weighing the chemicals.*

2. Mixing of chemicals:

- i. All the raw materials shall be carried to Mixing room separately in nonferrous containers exclusively used for the purpose.*
- ii. Chemicals required only for half-an-hour manufacturing shall be mixed.*
- iii. Before entering the Mixing and filling rooms, all workers shall discharge the static electricity in the copper plated provided for that purpose.*

3. Filling of Chemicals

- i. Before filling the pellets, it shall be ensured that the pellets are dried properly and shall be free from any dirt or grit.*

4. Manufacturing of firecrackers:

- i. The tip composition for chakra shall be mixed only for half an hour requirement and work shall be completed*

within the time. Worker shall not be allowed to go out of the working shed before completion.

- ii. The manufactured products shall be exclusively dried in the drying platform.*
- iii. Cutting of fuses shall be done only by experienced workers under proper supervision.*
- iv. Every day, the collected waste shall be safely transported and disposed by a trained worker by using the burning pit after the working hours of the factory under the supervision of the foreman.*
- v. Pellets shall be manufactured only in the manufacturing shed. It shall be dried under the roofed drying shed and shall not be dried in other open places in between the working sheds.*
- vi. Aluminum powder shall not be used for making colour pellets.*

5. Packing of finished crackers:

- i. Finished crackers shall be packed in paper boxes and arranged in the boxes in such a way that the crackers shall not be dislocated during transportation.*
- ii. The carton boxes shall not be dragged in the floor & it shall be handled gently to avoid friction.*

6. Moving & storing in the Magazine:

- i. The magazine shall be fitted with lightning arrester and the carton boxes containing finished crackers shall be placed in safe manner. Packing and storing of semi-finished products shall not be carried out inside the magazine.*

B. General safety guidelines

- 1. All workers should wear cotton dresses before entering the factory.*
- 2. Electronic devices like mobile phones, radio shall not be carried inside the premises where fireworks are manufactured, handled, stored or used.*
- 3. Workers who are under the influence of intoxicants shall not be allowed inside the factory.*
- 4. Automotive equipped with engines or motors which are capable of generating spark shall not be allowed inside the factory premises.*
- 5. All the safety provisions under Schedule XXIV of Rules 95 of Tamil Nadu Factories Rules 1950 shall be strictly followed.*

C. Directions by Hon'ble National Green Tribunal – Status of Onsite and Offsite Action taken to bring the fireworks factory under hazardous process Industry

1. *In 2006, Home Department, Government of Tamil Nadu has suggested the feasibility of either transferring the Fireworks from the “Dangerous Operations” category to “Hazardous Process” category or providing two different categories within the dangerous operation category for bigger and smaller firework factories.*
2. *The Director of Industrial Safety and Health, then Chief Inspector of Factories, sent proposal to Government to bring the fireworks factories under the first schedule of the Factories Act, 1948 so that the specific provisions, relating to hazardous process under Chapter IV A could be made applicable. The compulsory disclosure of information by the occupier (Section 41B), specific responsibility of the occupier in relation to hazardous processes (Section 41C), permissible limits of exposure of Chemicals and toxic substances (Section 41F), workers participation in Safety Management (Section 41G), right of workers to warn about imminent danger (Section 41H) would automatically apply to Fireworks Factories if covered under the first Schedule.*
3. *Government considered the proposal and issued amendments in G.O. (Ms) No.271, Labour and Employment (M2) Department Dated.23.12.2010.*
4. *But the Tamil Nadu Fireworks and Amorges Manufacturers’ Association (TANFAMA) filed a writ petition in the Hon’ble High Court of Madras against the impugned G.O. and obtained an interim stay for its operation. The counter affidavit has been filed on 30.11.2011 and case is pending till date.*
5. *The preparation of onsite emergency plan and offsite emergency plan are mandatory for the factories covered under the hazardous process. Since the stay granted by the court is still in operation, the provision of hazardous process industries could not be applied to fireworks industries. Hence, the orders issued by Hon’ble National Green Tribunal could not be implemented in fireworks factories since the above factories could not be covered under first Schedule of Factories Act, 1948 as explained above.”*

“B. XII. STEPS TO BE TAKEN FOR COMPENSATION OF VICTIMS

a. State assistance

1. *Compensation is reported to have been so far provided at Rs. 3,00,000 to 16 cases of death and Rs. 1,00,000 for one injured, both under CM Fund.*
2. *The injured persons have a range of injury of burns from 20% to 75%. Some have also been discharged as outpatients.*

3. *Some injured have taken at Rajaji Government Hospital at Madurai, some people at Grace Kennet hospital at Madurai, some more were taken at Senthil Hospital & Dhanuskodi hospital at Sattur and some at Government hospital at Thoothukudi.*

b. Norms for compensation

1. *The compensation that is payable for victims of the tragedy could never be arbitrary. The need to compensate or right to secure compensation could themselves be not a matter of debate at all. Only the scale of compensation and the persons who would become liable to pay the compensation will require to be appraised.*
2. *There are several compensation regimes for deaths and injuries and different enactments which are dis-similar and grossly variant. The Workmen Compensation Act, which is surely applicable, provides compensation that will have scales of compensation determined on the age and the income of the workman. The liability shall be on the principal employer. Here the problem is that the licensee has sub-leased the premises to three different persons whom we have named above but have not gathered statements from any one of them since they appear to be in judicial custody after arrest, pending investigation into criminal offences instituted against them.*
3. *The Public Liability Insurance Act casts an absolute liability, caps the entitlement to a paltry sum of Rs.50,000/- for death and Rs.25,000/- for grievous injury. It cannot be efficacious to look for relief under the said Act.*
4. *The scales of compensation under different enactments for transport accidents as in Carriage by Air Act, Railways & Motor Vehicles Act are different. In the first three enactments set out, there is absolute liability and the compensation ranges between Rs.8 lakhs and Rs.15 lakhs. The Motor Vehicles Act contemplates three regimes: absolute liability under Section 140, prescribing Rs.2 lakhs for death, Rs.50,000/- for grievous injuries and compensation up to Rs.800,000/- under a structured formula of strict liability norm under Section 163A. Just compensation under Section 166 is what is most scientific and driven essentially through two decisions in Sarla Varma Vs. DTC - (2009) 6 SCC 121 and as modified by National Insurance Company Vs. Pranay Sethi - (2017) 16 SCC 680. The compensation is determined based on a multiplier formula which will be applied against the multiplicand that is quantified as the likely contribution to the family by the deceased victim. The conventional heads of claims, such as, loss to estate, loss of love and affection, loss of consortium towards spouse, funeral expenses are all added. In the amendment contemplated by Amendment Act 32 of 2019, the minimum threshold amount that will*

- become payable shall be not less than Rs.5 lakhs for fatal accident and Rs.2 lakhs for grievous injuries.
5. In traumatic accidents such as bomb blasts or fire accidents due to electrocution or terrorist activities, public law remedies have been resorted to, where the compensation shall not always be made to depend on the age of the victims and the number of dependents. They are invariably fixed sums within the broad age brackets, such as persons less than 20 years of age and above the said age limit. In *MCD Vs. Uphaar Tragedy Victims Association* - (2011) 14 SCC at page 481 - the compensation was fixed at Rs.10 lakhs in the case of those aged more than 20 years and Rs.7.5 lakhs to those aged less than 20 years and compensation of Re.1 lakh was awarded to each of the injured victims. The amount carried interest at 9%.
 6. In *Dabwali Fire Tragedy Victims Vs. Union of India & Others*, a Division Bench of the P & H High Court provided compensation by examining the recommendations of the One-man Commission that elicited details about the age of the victims, the number of dependents of each of them, the income of the deceased persons, in amounts ranging between Rs.1 lakh and Rs.15 lakhs. The decision of the Division Bench passed in CWP 13214 of 1996 through its decision on 09.11.2009, was confirmed by the decision of the Supreme Court in - (2013) 10 SCC at page 494. In *Sanjay Gupta v State of UP* (2015)5 SCC 283, the Supreme Court was dealing with an incident of devastating fire that broke out in a Consumer Show held at Victoria Park, Meerut. It was organised by a private company through contractors engaged by them after seeking permission from the State Government. It resulted in death of 64 persons and grievous injuries to several others. The Commission of Enquiry found the State and its authorities to be prima facie responsible for statutory violations while granting permission and during the show. No doubt, in this case there was no violation of any law in the grant of licence, but there had been a lack of care to see that the premises had been used only by the persons who held the licence.
 7. In *Sanjay Gupta (Supra)* the Supreme Court had taken note of the compensation awarded in *Uphaar Tragedy Victims Association* case, decided in 2011 as well as *Dabwali fire tragedy* case, decided in 2013. They observed that the State Government should see that the victims did not remain in a constant state of suffering and despair and interim compensation of Rs.30 lakhs was directed to be paid, which subsequently through a direction issued in the same case and reported in (2018) SCC 634, to be distributed on pro-rata basis through the Jurisdictional District Judge.
 8. There have been other earlier decisions of the Supreme Court when fixed sums have been awarded through public law remedy. In what was referred as boat tragedy case

dealing with deaths of children due to boat capsizing in *MS Grewal Vs. Deep Chand Sood* (2001) 8 SCC 151, the court awarded compensation at the rate of Rs 5 lakhs for each child and on the recommendations of former Chief Justice Chandrachud's report in *Lata Wadhwa Vs. State of Bihar* in (2001) 8 SCC at page 187 – the compensation ranged between Rs.2 lakhs per child and an amount upto Rs.5 lakhs per adult. To persons who had burn injuries to the extent of 10% or below, the Supreme Court awarded, in modification of the Chief Justice's Report, a minimum amount of Rs.2 lakhs.

9. In all the cases before us, we do not have data of the number of dependents for the deceased persons. In respect of injuries, a few have been treated as outpatients and immediately discharged while some persons are still undergoing treatment. The percentage of burns have varied from 5% to 75%. Unfortunately, among the injured victims, there have been casualties during the treatment, for on as late as 05.04.2021, the tally of dead was 27. In this accident, there is no report of any child as having been injured or dead. We confronted only a few persons who are injured and who are less than 18 years of age. We do not think it would be proper for us to assess compensation for everyone by eliciting the age, income, etc. **It will be appropriate to take the examples of lumpsum amounts awarded through public law remedies and allow for independent rights to be pursued by any victim through statutory forums prescribed under the Workmen Compensation Act, if so advised. The Workmen Compensation Act itself does not recognise any payment other than through the Commissioner and any compensation that we will recommend could be directed to be paid to the party under notice to the Workmen Compensation Commissioner so that they are not treated as amounts awarded by 'contracting out'. In the decisions which we have referred, the ex-gratia payment made by the government will not be required to be deducted. On the other hand, we believe that the State Government shall take responsibility for 10% of liability for lack of effective supervision through Inspector of Factories and 10% on the Central Government for their failure to implement the safety laws. Rest of the 80% shall be levied on the licensee and his lessees jointly and severally and the 10% each as we have fixed on the Central and State Governments shall be several. One of us, (Kulkarni) is of the view that on account of the quoted provision of immunity, the payment by the State and the Centre shall be by way of contribution in gratis rather than responsibility by default. Further, as per rule 2(37) of the aforesaid rules, the occupier who has the control and who is responsible for managing the affairs of premises is solely**

responsible for the accident for the violations of rules and conditions of the licence.

10. **Taking note of the fact that in the Uphaar tragedy victims case the maximum compensation was Rs.10 lakhs, but it related to an incident that took place in 1997, almost 25 years back, we will double the compensation for death at Rs.20 lakhs per family of each of the deceased victims and Rs.15 lakhs to persons who have burns in excess of 50% and Rs.10 lakhs for persons who have burns from 25 to 50% and Rs.5 lakhs for persons who have injuries between 5 to 25%. Victims who were treated as outpatients and who had but minor degree of burns or other forms of simple injuries shall be paid Rs.2 lakhs. The amounts shall be directed to be paid within the time the Tribunal may set and direct a further liability of interest at 12% p.a. for default of payment. The compensation is not merely a financial reparation for the loss of lives and injuries that have restitutive attributes but also designed to be punitive for the criminal negligence in carrying out hazardous activities in brazen violation of several laws that we have outlined above. The compensation amounts must necessarily therefore, be higher than what could occasion in a straightforward case of granting compensation as a welfare measure such as under the Workmen's (Employees') Compensation Act.**
11. *The amounts on the same scales could be made also to victims of accidents in the same district just before and after our visit."*

“C. XIII. REMEDIAL MEASURES TO PREVENT ACCIDENTS

Sl No	Activity	At whose instance
1	<i>Video clips of safety through WhatsApp and mobile devices apart from periodical workshops imparting norms of safety to be circulated to all employees</i>	<i>Central Government - Explosives experts State government - Industrial safety</i>
2.	<i>Strict vigilance to ensure conformity as regards working only in sheds and not in open spaces</i>	<i>PESO and District Revenue Authority</i>
3.	<i>Drone surveillance of various sheds</i>	<i>PESO and District Revenue Authority</i>

4.	<i>Submit the compliance of the occupier once in a six months or quarterly basis and mandated to be uploaded on the public domain on the website of the respective regulatory agency.</i>	<i>Manufacturer/ Licensee</i>
5.	<i>Permanent closure of sheds which have in the past been found guilty of breaches.</i>	<i>Licensing authority</i>
6.	<i>Punitive fines of not less than Rs. 50 lacs for instances of violations of conditions of license such as grant of lease, sublease, employment of more personnel than authorised, use of banned chemicals etc.</i>	<i>Licensing authority</i>
7.	<i>Public liability insurance for all factories to be made obligatory.</i>	<i>Collector</i>
8.	<i>Group insurance providing for higher compensation of not less than Rs.5,00,000 than the limit hitherto observed for Rs. 50,000.</i>	<i>Licensing authority</i>
9.	<i>Existing manpower of the various regulatory authorities to be strengthened in order to have periodical post clearance monitoring and ensure better compliance</i>	<i>Central government State Government</i>
10.	<i>Defaulting industries need to be immediately inventoried and regulated within a time frame</i>	<i>Revenue Division of the Collectorate</i>
11.	<i>Firecrackers' manufacturing and bulk storage facilities under the ambit of Consent Management within specified time frame as mandated</i>	<i>Tamil Nadu Pollution Control Board</i>
12.	<i>Occupational Health surveillance i.e., periodical health check-up of the employees</i>	<i>Directorate of Industrial Safety and Health</i>
13.	<i>Fire-fighting facilities such as dry powder extinguisher, soda ash, limestone etc. are in place to handle the accident in the Fireworks Industry/ metal-based fire accident.</i>	<i>State Fire Services</i>

14.	<i>Provision for appropriate clothing, gloves, and footwear</i>	<i>Licensee</i>
15.	<i>Increased automation that avoids physical handling of dangerous chemicals and substances</i>	<i>Industrial Entrepreneurs / Dept of Industries & Commerce</i>
16.	<i>Through CSR funds of the industries located in the district, more focus should be given to the development of education to the local communities and their upliftment.</i>	<i>Licensing authorities for MSMEs & Factories Ministry of Commerce/ Company Affairs</i>
17.	<i>Crisis Management System and Co-ordination Committee constituted shall meet periodically and review effective monitoring mechanism and suggest measures for prevention and recurrence of such accidents.</i>	<i>Central Government, State Government and District Collector</i>
18.	<i>As per section 9B of Explosive Act 1884 punishment for certain offences given is very moderate. The same requires legislative review for greater stringency.</i>	<i>Legislature</i>
19.	<i>Since the unit in which the accident occurred is no more in a state to take manufacturing activity, the licence granted by PESO, NOC granted by District Authorities, Arms Act license for sulphur, factories Act license shall be cancelled.</i>	<i>The respective licensing authorities</i>
20.	<i>The workers who are engaged in most hazardous operations viz. mixing, filling of chemicals, colour pellets making shall be certified after training and those alone shall be employed. The unit shall not functional unless these workers are certified.</i>	<i>Licensees/ employers</i>
21.	<i>To monitor the ambient air quality in all clusters of firework factories, minimum of two Continuous Ambient Air Quality Stations shall be installed, through which impact on environment due to incidental explosion can be quantified.</i>	<i>Tamil Nadu Pollution control Board</i>

”

12. Considering the above report, the Tribunal held that remedial measures are required for preventing such incidents including monitoring mechanism for compliances by such units having safeguards for timely medical health and ensuring availability of insurance covers and in absence thereof, while the owner and operator of such activity is liable to provide compensation to the victims, where such compensation is not made available within reasonable time, the State itself will be liable to pay compensation with liberty to recover the same from the owner/occupier of the activity.

13. The discussion and directions in the said order are reproduced below:-

“Persons responsible – Liability of the State for its failure

7. The persons who had taken licences had further rented out the premises. Some private persons have been identified. It is also clear that incidents are frequent. Activities are highly dangerous but are not being regulated by the State PCB, Labour Department and the District Magistrate. The State has failed to put in appearance or give any explanation for its failure to protect lives of citizens by enforcing the law. The reason may be negligence of the concerned officers or incompetence. In such circumstances, the victims have to be compensated by the State and the State can recover the amount from erring parties. Primary liability is of the occupiers of the premises where activities were carried out leading to the incidents and the operators of the hazardous activity. It is the occupier who allowed the activities and the operators obviously were directly involved. The liability is joint and several and absolute. As found by the Committee there was failure to follow safety norms. Under MSIHC Rules 1989, Director Industrial Safety and District Magistrate have crucial role to oversee safety norms. In schedule V to the Rules, their responsibilities are clearly laid down. State PCB has responsibility to ensure that no industrial activity have potential for pollution of air or Water are run without consent to establish and consent to operate. Incidents are frequent but the State authorities have failed to perform their regulatory obligations for safety in operation of hazardous activities. We note that GO dated 23.12.2010 has been issued by the State to declare that the firecracker activities are covered by the Factories Act but the High Court has granted stay on 30.11.2011. However, this could not prevent either the State PCB

or the District Magistrate or the Director Industrial Safety to discharge their statutory responsibility for ensuring safety of the workers and other citizens. Thus, the State cannot avoid responsibility to pay compensation to the victims in these circumstances. The victims need immediate relief and it is not possible for the victims to chase the violators who are scattered and whose means are not known. It is the State who have by its failure permitted illegal hazardous activities being carried out which has resulted in deaths and injuries. Public trust doctrine applies in the circumstances. The State is at liberty to recover from the violators or the erring officers. We have taken this view recently while dealing with another similar incident in Gujrat where hazardous activity was found to be operated illegally resulting in deaths and injuries and the violator did not appear to have known sources for payment of compensation. Vide order dated 23.03.2021 in O.A. No. 258/2020, In Re: News item published in the "Indian Express" dated 04.11.2020 titled "Ahmedabad: Nine killed as godown collapses after factory blast" this Tribunal held that the State will be liable to pay compensation to the victims except the victims who was responsible for the incident with liberty to recover from erring persons. Relevant extract from the order is as follows:-

"9.For death of all other persons and injured, the State will be liable to pay compensation, without prejudice to its right to recover the same from the violators of law or erring officers, following due process of law. The responsibility for compliance will be of the Chief Secretary, Gujarat, through the District Magistrate, Ahmedabad. In the light of directions already issued for preventive action by way of compliance of laid down safety norms, the State of Gujrat needs to take remedial measures to ensure that such incidents do not occur and hold accountable persons responsible for failure of the oversight. We also direct a joint Committee of Director, Industrial Safety and Health (DISH), Gujarat, and State PCB in coordination with respective Municipal Corporations and District Magistrates to conduct survey of the entire State to ascertain if any other such activities are going on, and if so to take remedial action by way of closing such illegal activities. The State PCB will be the nodal agency for coordination and compliance. The said Committee may give its report to the Chief Secretary, Gujarat within three months for further remedial action."

Principle of absolute liability

8. It is established law since *MC Mehta (1987) 1 SCC 395* and later judgements that liability of the person undertaking hazardous activities for commercial gains for any accident and loss is absolute.

Quantum of compensation

9. From the report, it is clear that 27 persons have died and 26 injured on account of fire incidents which were result of unscientific handling of hazardous chemicals in violation of law. We also find that scale of compensation based on restitution principle needs to be awarded. Procedure of this Tribunal is summary and akin to public law remedy. Compensation can be assessed on reasonable basis guided by restitution principle atleast at floor level, leaving other remedies of the victims open. Thus, broadly agreeing with the Committee, we direct that the scale of compensation should be Rs.20 lakhs in respect of each of the deceased victims and Rs.15 lakhs to persons who have burns in excess of 50% and Rs.10 lakhs for persons who have burns from 25 to 50% and Rs.5 lakhs for persons who have injuries between 5 to 25%. Victims who were treated as outpatients and who had but minor degree of burns or other forms of simple injuries shall be paid Rs.2 lakhs.

10. Accordingly, we hold that **the compensation assessed has to be paid by the State of Tamilnadu through the District Magistrate, Virudhunagar. Compliance will be responsibility of the Chief Secretary. Payment be ensured within one month from today. Ex gratia amount already paid may be deducted. We request the TN State Legal Services authority to provide legal aid to ensure that payment is made to genuine heirs of the deceased and to the injured without undue hassle.**

Remedial Measures

11. Apart from requirement of compensating the victims, the issue remains how such incidents are to be prevented and if such incident happens what steps are to be taken to prevent loss of lives and health. There is need for review of the matter at highest level in the State to consider the remedial steps. Hazardous activities need to regulated in terms of quantity of material to be used in the process of hazardous activities, number of persons to be allowed to work and safeguards to be followed and monitoring compliance of such safeguards.

In a recent order dated 3.2.2021 in OA 85/2020, Aryavrat Foundation vs. Yashyashvi Rasayan Pvt Ltd, the Tribunal observed

“We note that in the recent past the Tribunal has come across the number of incidents of leakage of gases and handling of hazardous chemicals. On investigation, this Tribunal has found that most of the accidents are result of non-compliance of laid down safety norms under the 1989 Rules and the Chemical Accidents (Emergency Planning, Preparedness and Response) Rules, 1996 [1996 Rules]. There is, thus, need for the establishments handling hazardous chemicals to strictly follow the laid down norms, which need to be overseen by the statutory regulators...

In view of frequent accidents resulting in deaths and injuries, the Chief Secretaries of all the States/UTs may evolve a

mechanism to ensure that the companies dealing with hazardous substance must forthwith pay compensation for deaths and injuries to the victims at least as per Workmen Compensation Act, 1923 wherever applicable or the principle of restitution laid down in Sarla Verma (supra), National Insurance Company Ltd. v. Pranay Sethi, (2017) 16 SCC 680 to the victims either directly or through the District Magistrate.

Conduct of safety audits of all establishments having potential for such accidents may be ensured. All States/UTs may also ensure availability of healthcare facilities in the vicinity of such establishments. PCB and DM must assess cost of restoration of environment which should be recovered from company and spent on such restoration. The States and UTs in accordance with 1989 and 1996 Rules need to step up vigilance, surveillance and monitoring to avert such accidents. Preparedness to meet such eventualities be ensured. Regular mock drills may be ensured in respect of onsite and offsite emergency plans. We may also refer to the directions issued by this Tribunal to the MoEF&CC and all the States/UTs on the subject of strengthening regulatory and oversight measures, vide order dated 01.02.2021 in OA 837/2018, Sandeep Mittal vs. Ministry of Environment, Forests & Climate Change & Ors.”

12. *The Committee has suggested measures in a tabular form indicating the authorities who have to adopt such measures. We are in broad agreement with the said suggestions.*

13. *Apart from the measures suggested by the Committee, there is also need for a study of the carrying capacity of the area to sustain the extent of such activities having regard to the potential for accidental, occupational and environmental hazards. The study may include number of units to be allowed, size of operation of such units, quantity of material to be used, siting criteria for location of the units, arrangement for fire management and health services. **Let such study be conducted by the Director of Industrial Safety in coordination with the State PCB and CPCB within three months and report submitted to the Chief Secretary, Tamil Nadu for further action. The Committee may take the assistance of any other experts/individual.***

14. *Further, there is need for review at highest level in the State. We direct the Chief Secretary, Tamilnadu to hold a meeting with all the concerned stake holders, as identified by the Committee in the table in the report quoted above, titled ‘Remedial Measures to Prevent Accidents’, within one month. **After necessary deliberations, appropriate remedial measures be identified to avoid recurrence of such incidents in future. The same may be implemented through the District Magistrate or any other appropriate authority as per law, which may be overseen by the Chief Secretary. The State PCB may incorporate appropriate conditions in consents including prohibiting use***

of banned chemicals, compliance of 1989 and 1996 Rules. Further, mechanism to ensure taking of insurance policies covering risk to life and health of all workers and others likely to be affected by fire or other accidents. Mechanism may provide monitoring of compliance and stopping activities of units not following laid down sops and regulations. Substance of this order and regulatory measures may be published in local area in vernacular language for information of local inhabitants to facilitate information and compliance.”

14. Following the above discussion, we are of the view that the same principles need to be applied to the present case. The compensation for victims has to be on the same scale i.e. Rs.15 lakhs to persons who have burns in excess of 50%, Rs.10 lakhs for persons who have burns from 25 to 50%, Rs.5 lakhs for persons who have injuries between 5 to 25%. and Rs.2 lakhs to victims who were treated as outpatients and who had minor degree of burns or other forms of simple injuries.

15. All the nine victims whose names have been mentioned earlier will be entitled to compensation at the said scale. The compensation may be initially paid by the State of Maharashtra through the District Magistrate, Palghar within one month. We request the Maharashtra State Legal Service Authority to provide legal aid to ensure that payment is made to genuine persons without undue hassle. The State will be at liberty to recover the same from the occupier/owner of the premises.

16. We further direct that review be conducted at the highest level in the State to consider remedial steps. Hazardous activities need to be regulated in terms of quantity of material to be used in the process of hazardous activities, number of persons to be allowed to work and safeguards to be followed and monitoring compliance of such safeguards. Apart from the measures suggested by the Committee, there is also need

for a study of the potential for accidental, occupational and environmental hazards from such activities in the State. The study may include number of units to be allowed, size of operation of such units, quantity of material to be used, siting criteria for location of the units, arrangement for fire management and health services. **Let such study be conducted by the Director of Industrial Safety in coordination with the State PCB and CPCB within three months and report submitted to the Chief Secretary, Maharashtra for further action. The Committee may take the assistance of any other experts/individual.**

17. The State may also consider the measures suggested in the report of the Committee quoted earlier. The Chief Secretary, Maharashtra may hold a meeting with all the concerned stake holders, as identified by the Committee in the table in the report quoted above, titled 'Remedial Measures to Prevent Accidents', within one month. **After necessary deliberations, appropriate remedial measures be identified to avoid recurrence of such incidents in future. The same may be implemented through the District Magistrate or any other appropriate authority as per law, which may be overseen by the Chief Secretary. The State PCB may incorporate appropriate conditions in consents including prohibiting use of banned chemicals, compliance of 1989 and 1996 Rules. Further, mechanism to ensure taking of insurance policies covering risk to life and health of all workers and others likely to be affected by fire or other accidents. Mechanism may provide monitoring of compliance and stopping activities of units not following laid down sops and**

regulations. Substance of this order and regulatory measures may be published in local area in vernacular language for information of local inhabitants to facilitate information and compliance.

The application is disposed of.

A copy of this order be forwarded to the Chief Secretary, Maharashtra, State PCB, Director of Industrial Safety and Health, Maharashtra, District Magistrate, Palghar, Member Secretary, Maharashtra, Legal Service Authority by e-mail for compliance.

Adarsh Kumar Goel, CP

Sudhir Agarwal, JM

M. Sathyanarayanan, JM

Brijesh Sethi, JM

Dr. Nagin Nanda, EM

June 25, 2021
Original Application No. 134/2021
SN