

केन्द्रीय प्रदूषण नियंत्रण बोर्ड CENTRAL POLLUTIÓN CONTROL BOARD

पर्यावरण, वन एवं जलवाय परिवर्तन मंत्रालय भारत सरकार MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT, FOREST & CLIMATE CHANGE GOVT. OF INDIA Put up to circular

August 10, 2015

The Member Secretary, Punjab State Pollution Control Board, Vatavaran Bhavan, Nabha Road, Patiala-147 001,

Sub: NGT Order for submission of inspection report

Sir,

The Hon'ble NGT (Principal Bench) in its Order dated August 03, 2015 in the matter of M/s Rama Shyama Paper Ltd. Vs. Smt. Sunaina Singh & others (Copy enclosed) has directed for circulation of the attached Oder to All State Pollution Control Boards and Pollution Committees. In this order, the Hon'ble Court has directed that the joint inspection reports made by the Officers of the Boards should contain complete functioning of the Unit / Industry, water sources, water utilization, quantum of discharge, anti pollution devices installed, their complete details and functioning, fixation of Electromagnetic flow meters, if source of water is ground, whether the unit has permission from the CGWA or not, if any bye pass arrangement, whether the conditions of consent order have been complied with or not etc.

In this regard, you are requested to circulate the NGT order among the Technical & Scientific Officers of your Board in order to comply the direction, while submitting any inspection report to the Court.

Enc.: as above

Yours faithfully,

(A.B. Akolkar) Member Secretary

Parivesh Bhawan, East Arjun Nagar, Delhi-110032 दूरभाष/Tel : 43102030, 22305792, वेबसाईट/Website : www.cpcb.nic.in

BEFORE THE NATIONAL GREEN TRIBUNAL, PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI

Original Application No. 223 of 2015

IN THE MATTER OF:

Ramaa Shyama Papers Ltd. Vs. Smt. Sunaina Singh & Ors.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SWATANTER KUMAR, CHAIRPERSON

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. NAMBIAR, JUDICIAL MEMBER

HON'BLE DR. D.K. AGRAWAL, EXPERT MEMBER HON'BLE PROF. A.R. YOUSUF, EXPERT MEMBER

Applicant: Present:

Mr. Pinkai Mishra, Sr. Adv., Mr.

Amandeep Singh and Mr. Vinay Ranjan,

Advs.

Respondent No. 1: Respondent No. 2:

Ms. Sunaina Singh, Adv.

Mr. Pradeep Misra, Adv., Mr. Daleep Kr.

Respondent No. 3:

Respondent No. 4 & 5:

Dhayani, Adv.

Mr. Raj Kumar, Adv. with Mr. S.L.

Gundli, SLO - CPCB

Ms. Savitri Pandey and Ms. Azma

Parveen, Advs.

	4553	
Da	marks	Orders of the Tribunal
1	tem No.	List this matter on 11th August, 2015.
	ugust 3,	In the meanwhile, we direct the joint inspection
A	2015	team to record its clear findings on the issues whether the
00	2	industry is compliant and non-polluting and if it could
	NATIO	permitted to run or not. We have repeatedly informed the Officers of the
1	N Z	Boards that when a joint inspection report is made, the
1	A.	recommendations are to be clear and unambiguous. It is unfortunate that despite specific directions, the reports
		are non-specific and lacks clarity. The purpose of
		team must have the responsibility of its report and
		recommendations. If in future such ambiguous reports are
		submitted to the Tribunal, we will be compelled to impose
		heavy costs on the Officers who have conducted the
		inspection.
		At the cost of repetition we observe that the reports
		should contain complete functioning of the Unit/Industry
		water source, water utilization, quantum of discharge, ant

pollution devices installed, their complete details and functioning, fixation of electromagnetic flow meters, if source of water is ground, whether the Unit has permission from the CGWA or not, if any bye pass arrangement, if any, point of discharge, point where effluent is taken and its analysis, whether the conditions of the consent order is have been strictly complied with or not, how they deal with hazardous waste and its disposal, if any. If any deficiencies are noticed during the course of inspection, their in pact on environment and whether the team recommends operationalisation of the Unit/industry or not with reasons either way should also be given.

We make it clear that if any report is now lacking these aforesaid particulars, action would be taken against the Officers. These directions are necessitated as the Trib unal rely on the inspection report, particularly joint inspection report, for passing appropriate orders in acc ordance with law. While relying upon such reports the Tr ibunal has to adopt an approach which totally protects re-environment. If the reports are vague and incorrect, either way, the consequences are serious. For a Unit if it is complaint and because of the vague report it is directed to be closed it will be injustice. So also if the unit is not compliant and because of vague, uncertain and indefinite report the Unit is permitted to operate, the damage to the environment can be great and serious. We issue these directions as inspite of the directions which have been issued earlier to the Boards, the reports are wanting in compliance. This is the last opportunity we grant to the Boards. The CPCB and State Pollution Control Board should strictly comply to these directions.

Let copy of this order be circulated to the Chairman and Member Secretaries of the Boards as well as put on the website of CPCB and NGT. (Swatanter Kumar) (M.S. Nambiar) (Dr. D.K. Agrawal) (Prof. A.R. Yousuf)