

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

**ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 33/2013 (T_{HC})
(M.A. NO. 614/2014)**

AND

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 30/2013 (T_{HC})

KARNAIL SINGH & ORS. VS. CPCB & ORS.

AND

JAI SINGH & ORS. VS. U.O.I. & ORS.

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE U.D. SALVI, JUDICIAL MEMBER
HON'BLE MR. RANJAN CHATTERJEE, EXPERT MEMBER**

Present: (Original Application No. 33/2013 Thc):

Applicant /Appellant: Mr. Karan Jund Mullanpur, Adv.
Respondent No. 1 : Mr. Raj Kumar, Adv., Mr. Bhupender Kumar, LA (CPCB)
Respondent No. 11 : Mr. Atul Sood, Adv., Mr. Raktim Gogoi, Adv., Mr. Kartikeya Singh, Adv.
Respondent No. 15 : Mr. Nitin Kaushal and Mr. Rahul Meera, Adv.
: Mr. Atul V. Sood and Mr. R. Gogoi and Mr. Kartikeya Singh, Adv
Mr. Naginder Beni Pal, Adv.for State of Punjab

(Original Application No. 30/2013 Thc):

Applicant /Appellant: Mr. Karan Jund Mullanpur, Adv.
Respondent No. 1 : Ms. P.B. Singh, Adv. , Mr. Pankaj Agarwal Adv.
Respondent No. 2 : Mr. Raj Kumar, Adv Mr. Bhupender Kumar, LA
Respondent No. 08 : Mr. Atul Sood, Adv., Mr. Raktim Gogoi, Adv., Mr. Kartikeya Singh, Adv.
Respondent No. 9 : Mr. Jatin Kumar, Adv. , Mr. Arpit Marwah, Adv.
Respondent No. 13 : Mr. Nitin Kaushal and Mr. Rahul Meera, Adv.
For PPCB : Mr. Ashish Negi, for Adv. Mr. Richa Kapoor, Adv.
Mr. Naginder Beni Pal, Adv.for State of Punjab

Date and Remarks	Orders of the Tribunal
<p>Item No. 05&06</p> <p>August 11, 2016</p> <p style="text-align: center;">jg</p>	<p>These are two applications making grievance about the pollution caused by the industries named therein.</p> <p>ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 33/2013 (THC)</p> <p>The applicant has sought several reliefs directing the respondent no.2-State of Punjab to direct the respondent industries to install water, air and noise pollution preventive measures and not to dispose of waste /effluents directly in the ground water through borewells and directly into the rivers and nullahs. The area of</p>

mischief has been defined in the said application as Teh. Derabasi, District Mohali and Dhabri river.

We have before us the Joint Inspection Reports of the teams comprising of the officers of CPCB and PPCB annexed to the affidavit dated 08-07-2016 of the Environmental Engineer of PPCB.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the applicant seeks time to study the said reports and make comments in order to co-relate the mischief and the facts emerging from the Joint Inspection Reports.

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 30/2013 (T_{HC})

This application is industry specific in a sense it seeks directions for closure and payment of environmental compensation against the respondent no.8-M/s. Nectar Life Science Ltd.

The applicant also seeks direction to the official respondents not to grant EC to respondent- no. 9-M/s. Rajasthan Liquors Ltd.-a distillery unit to avoid future air, water and soil pollution in the area.

According to the Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent- no. 9- M/s. Rajasthan Liquors Ltd. submits that the environmental clearance has been granted on 26-09-2012 and, therefore, nothing survives as against respondent no.9 unless the EC granted is challenged in accordance with law. Such challenge to the EC is not before us. Nothing, therefore, really survives as against the respondent- no. 9- M/s. Rajasthan Liquors Ltd. Respondent- no. 9- M/s. Rajasthan Liquors Ltd. is, therefore deleted from the array of the parties.

Necessary amendments be carried out in the

	<p>application.</p> <p>List these matters on 15th September, 2016.</p> <p>.....,JM (U.D. Salvi)</p> <p>.....,EM (Ranjan Chatterjee)</p>
--	--

