

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

**Original Application No. 32(THC)/2014
(CWP No. 9503 of 2012)**

M.A. Nos. 180/2014 & 181/2014

And

**Original Application No. 33(THC)/2014
(CWP No. 8923 of 2012)**

And

Original Application No. 463/2015

In the matters of : -

Kishan Paryavaran Sangharsh Samiti, Jaipur Vs. State of Rajasthan & Ors.

And

Gautam Chand Chopra Vs. State of Rajasthan & Ors.

And

Pali Water Pollution Control Foundation Pali Vs. UOI & Ors.

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

**Present: Applicant (for O.A. No. : Mr. Dipesh Choudhary, Mr. Aditya N.
32/2014THC) Prasad, Advs.**

**Respondents For : Mr. Shiv Mangal Sharma, AAG, Mr.
State of Rajasthan Saurabh Rajpal, Adv.
and RSPCB**

**Respondent No. 5 : Mr. M.S. Singhvi, Sr. Adv. with Mr.
Vinay Kothari, Advs.
: Mr. Anoop Kr. Saxena, Adv. for RIICO
and Ministry of Textile**

**Applicant (for O.A. No. : Mr. M.S. Singhvi, Sr. Adv. with Mr.
463 OF 2015) Vinay Kothari, Advs.**

Date and Remarks	Orders of the Tribunal
Item No. 08-10 May 13, 2016	It appears that the pleadings have not been completed in all these matters. We direct the Respondents to file their responses replies in all these matters within two weeks failing which they may note that the assertions made in each of the cases will be deemed to have been admitted by the concerned Respondents not filing the Replies. Advance copy of the Reply be furnished to the Applicant who may file Rejoinder thereto, if any, within a week thereafter.

Compliance Report dated 10th May, 2016 filed by RSPCB reveals that the Pali Water Pollution Control Treatment & Research Foundation has submitted DPRs in respect of (Unit – II, III & IV) and the same were rejected-vide letter dated 11th February, 2016. Letter dated 11th February, 2016 annexed to the Report reveals that the DPRs were rejected for following reasons:

1. All the DPRs are proposing similar concept without considering the conditions of present site and thus, the proposal may be provided with the site specific lay out, hydraulic process flow diagram, etc.
2. There is a need to reconsider the advanced technologies proposed viz. Disc Media Filters against presently adopted technology for removal of TSS which is not only cost effective but also energy efficient.
3. The required Unit specific retrofitting of the civil, electrical and mechanical components of the CETP have been generalized in the proposal, which is far from acceptable.
4. The capital equipment inventory and costing as also the operating cost estimates need careful revision.

It appears that the DPRs proposed were not site specific and lacked use of advanced technologies namely Disc Media Filters for removal of TSS and there was generalisation of the retrofitting of the civil, electrical and mechanical components of the CETP. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the Foundation

submits upon instructions that the revised DPRs removing these shortcomings have been submitted to the Pollution Control Board for their approval. According to the Pollution Control Board, some clarification sought in the month of April, 2016 has been received from the Foundation. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the Pollution Control Board on instruction makes a statement that the revised DPRs will duly be considered and a decision to grant approval or not to such revised DPRs will be taken by the Board within fortnight.

List the matters on 30th May, 2016 at Jodhpur.

.....,JM
(U.D. Salvi)

.....,EM
(Ranjan Chatterjee)

