

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

Appeal No. 60 of 2015 (SZ)

Appellant(s)
M/s Lee Pharma Limited
Medak District,

Vs.

Respondent(s)
1) Central Pollution Control Board,
MoEF, represented by its Secretary
2) Telangana State Pollution Control
Board, Sanathnagar, Hyderabad,
rep. by its Member Secretary.

Appeal No. 61 of 2015 (SZ)

Appellant(s)
M/s.Sri Krishna Pharmaceuticals Limited
Renga Reddy Distrct.

Vs.

Respondent(s)
1) Central Pollution Control Board,
MoEF, represented by its Secretary
2) Telangana State Pollution Control
Board,Sanathnagar,Hyderabad
rep. by its Member Secretary

Appeal No. 62 of 2015 (SZ)

Appellant(s)
M/s Orch Laboratories P. Limited
(Formerly known as Metrochem Industries)

Vs.

Respondent(s)
1) Central Pollution Control Board,
MoEF, represented by its Secretary
2) Telangana State Pollution Control
Board, Sanathnagar, Hyderabad,
rep. by its Member Secretary.

Appeal No. 63 of 2015 (SZ)

Appellant(s)
M/s Saraca Laboratories
Limited, Medak District

Vs.

Respondent(s)
1) Central Pollution Control Board,
MoEF, represented by its Secretary
2) Telangana State Pollution Control
Board, Sanathnagar, Hyderabad,
by its Member Secretary.

Appeal No. 65 of 2015 (SZ)

Appellant(s)
Shri Ram Chlorochem Limited
Medak District
Telangana State

Vs.

Respondent(s)
Central Pollution Control Board MoEF
New Delhi and another

Appeal No. 68 of 2015 (SZ)

Appellant(s) Respondent(s)
M/s. Vasudha Pharma Chem Ltd., Vs. Central Pollution Control Board MoEF
Rangareddy District New Delhi and another
Telangana State

Appeal No. 69 of 2015 (SZ)

Appellant(s) Respondent(s)
M/s. Glochem Industries Limited Vs. Central Pollution Control Board MoEF
Visakapatnam, New Delhi and another
Andhra Pradesh

Appeal No. 70 of 2015 (SZ)

Appellant(s) Respondent(s)
M/s. Glochem Industries Limited Vs. Central Pollution Control Board MoEF
Medak District New Delhi and another
Telangana State

Appeal No. 01 of 2016 (SZ)

Appellant Respondent
M/s. Posh Chemical Pvt. Ltd., Vs. The Central Pollution Control Board
Ranga Reddy District, Telangana MoEF, Rep. by its Secretary
New Delhi and another

Appeal No.02 of 2016 (SZ)

Appellant Respondent
M/s. Synthokem Labs Pvt. Ltd., Vs. The Central Pollution Control Board
Medak District, MoEF, Rep. by its Secretary
New Delhi and another

Appeal No.03 of 2016 (SZ)

Appellant
M/s. Veer-Chemie & Aromatics Pvt. Ltd.
Hyderabad, Telangana

Respondent
Vs. The Central Pollution Control Board
New Delhi and another

Appeal No. 04 of 2016 (SZ)

Appellant
M/s. Rasula Pharmaceuticals &
Fine Chemicals, Hyderabad, Telangana

Respondent
Vs. The Central Pollution Control Board
MoEF, Rep. by its Secretary
New Delhi and another

Appeal No.05 of 2016 (SZ)

Appellant
M/s. Virchoew Laboratories Ltd.
Hyderabad

Respondent
Vs. The Central Pollution Control Board
MoEF, Rep. by its Secretary
New Delhi and another

Appeal No.06 of 2016 (SZ)

Appellant
M/s. Smilax Laboratories Ltd.
Ranga Reddy District, Hyderabad

Respondent
Vs. The Central Pollution Control Board
MoEF, Rep. by its Secretary
New Delhi and another

Appeal No.07 of 2016 (SZ)

Appellant
M/s. Inventaa Chemicals Ltd.,
Krishna District, Andhra Pradesh

Respondent
Vs. The Central Pollution Control Board
MoEF, Rep. by its Secretary
New Delhi and another

Appeal No.08 of 2016 (SZ)

Appellant
M/s. Porus Laboratories Pvt. Ltd.
Ranga Reddy District, Telangana

Respondent
Vs. The Central Pollution Control Board
MoEF, Rep. by its Secretary
New Delhi and another

Appeal No.09 of 2016 (SZ)

Appellant
M/s. Kopallee Pharma Chemicals P Ltd.
Hyderabad, Telangana

Respondent
Vs. The Central Pollution Control Board
MoEF, Rep. by its Secretary
New Delhi and another

Appeal No.10 of 2016 (SZ)

Appellant
M/s. Porus Laboratories Pvt. Ltd.
Kodad mandal, Nalgonda District

Respondent
Vs. The Central Pollution Control Board
MoEF, Rep. by its Secretary
New Delhi and another

Appeal No.11 of 2016 (SZ)

Appellant
M/s. Shree Vinayaka Life Science Pvt. Ltd.
Hyderabad, Telangana

Respondent
Vs. The Central Pollution Control Board
MoEF, Rep. by its Secretary
New Delhi and another

Appeal No.12 of 2016 (SZ)

Appellant
M/s. Porus Laboratories Pvt. Ltd.
Krishna District, Andhra Pradesh

Respondent
Vs. The Central Pollution Control Board
MoEF, Rep. by its Secretary
New Delhi and another

Appeal No.13 of 2016 (SZ)

Appellant
M/s. Emmennar Pharma Pvt Ltd.
Vishakapatnam Dist, Andhra Pradesh

Respondent
Vs. The Central Pollution Control Board
MoEF, Rep. by its Secretary
New Delhi and another

Appeal No. 14 of 2016 (SZ)

Appellant
M/s. Enpiar Pharma Pvt. Ltd
Medak District, Telangana

Respondent
Vs. The Central Pollution Control Board
MoEF, Rep. by its Secretary
New Delhi and another

Appeal No.15 of 2016 (SZ)

Appellant
M/s. Standard Products Mfg. Co.
Hyderabad, Telangana

Respondent
Vs. The Central Pollution Control Board
MoEF, Rep. by its Secretary
New Delhi and another

Appeal No.16 of 2016 (SZ)

Appellant
M/s. RAchem Pharma Pvt. Ltd.
Krishna District, Andhra Pradesh

Respondent
Vs. The Central Pollution Control Board
MoEF, Rep. by its Secretary
New Delhi and another

Appeal No.17 of 2016 (SZ)

Appellant
M/s. Konar Organics Ltd.
Ranga Reddy District, Telangana

Respondent
Vs. The Central Pollution Control Board
MoEF, Rep. by its Secretary
New Delhi and another

Appeal No.18 of 2016 (SZ)

Appellant
M/s. Kreative Organics Pvt Ltd
Ranga Reddy District, Telangana

Respondent
Vs. The Central Pollution Control Board
MoEF, Rep. by its Secretary
New Delhi and another

Appeal No.20 of 2016 (SZ)

Appellant
M/s. Saiteja Drugs and
Intermediates Pvt. Ltd.
Nalgonda Dist., Telangana

Respondent
Vs. The Central Pollution Control Board
MoEF, Rep. by its Secretary
New Delhi and another

Appeal No.21 of 2016 (SZ)

Appellant
M/s. Vijayasri Organics,
Medak District

Respondent
Vs. The Central Pollution Control Board
MoEF, Rep. by its Secretary
New Delhi and another

Appeal No.22 of 2016 (SZ)

Appellant
M/s. Vision Drugs Pvt Ltd., Nalgonda
District, Telangana

Respondent
Vs. The Central Pollution Control Board
MoEF, Rep. by its Secretary
New Delhi and another

Appeal No.23 of 2016 (SZ)

Appellant
M/s. VVR Organics Pvt. Ltd., Nalgonda
District, Telangana

Respondent
Vs. The Central Pollution Control Board
MoEF, Rep. by its Secretary
New Delhi and another

Appeal No.24 of 2016 (SZ)

Appellant
M/s. Posh Chemicals Pvt. Ltd. Unit-II
Ranga Reddy District, Telangana

Respondent
Vs. The Central Pollution Control Board
MoEF, Rep. by its Secretary
New Delhi and another

Appeal No.25 of 2016 (SZ)

Appellant
M/s. Kekule Pharma Limited, Medak
District, Telangana

Respondent
Vs. The Central Pollution Control Board
MoEF, Rep. by its Secretary
New Delhi and another

Appeal No.26 of 2016 (SZ)

Appellant
M/s. Sriram Labs Pvt Ltd., Nalgodan
District , Telangana

Respondent
Vs. The Central Pollution Control Board
MoEF, Rep. by its Secretary
New Delhi and another

Appeal No.27 of 2016 (SZ)

Appellant
M/s. Avra Laboratories Pvt. Ltd
Parawada Dist., Vishakapatnam

Respondent
Vs. The Central Pollution Control Board
MoEF, Rep. by its Secretary
New Delhi and another

Appeal No.28 of 2016 (SZ)

Appellant
M/s. Inventaa Chemicals Ltd.,
Medak District, Telangana

Respondent
Vs. The Central Pollution Control Board
MoEF, Rep. by its Secretary
New Delhi and another

Appeal No.29 of 2016 (SZ)

Appellant
M/s. Enal Drugs Pvt. Ltd.,
Ranga Reddy District, Telangana

Respondent
Vs. The Central Pollution Control Board
MoEF, Rep. by its Secretary
New Delhi and another

Appeal No.30 of 2016 (SZ)

Appellant
M/s. Dymes Pharma Pvt. Ltd.
Hyderabad

Respondent
Vs. The Central Pollution Control Board
MoEF, Rep. by its Secretary
New Delhi and another

Appeal No.31 of 2016 (SZ)

Appellant
M/s. Porus Laboratories Pvt. Ltd.
Nalgonda

Respondent
Vs. The Central Pollution Control Board
MoEF, Rep. by its Secretary
New Delhi and another

Appeal No.32 of 2016 (SZ)

Appellant
M/s. Aktinos Pharma Pvt Ltd.,
Medak District
Telangana

Respondent
Vs. The Central Pollution Control Board
MoEF, Rep. by its Secretary
New Delhi and another

Appeal No.33 of 2016 (SZ)

Appellant
M/s. Synthokem Labs Pvt. Ltd.,
Hyderabad.

Respondent
Vs. The Central Pollution Control Board
MoEF, Rep. by its Secretary
New Delhi and another

Appeal No. 113 of 2016 (SZ)

Appellant(s)
M/s. Vasant Chemicals P.Ltd.
Rep. by its Chief Executive Officer
Mr. N. Srikanth, Jeedimetla
Hyderabad

Vs. Respondent(s)
Central Pollution Control Board,
MoEF & CC, rep. by its Member
Secretary, Govt. of India, New Delhi
and another

Appeal No. 114 of 2016 (SZ)

Appellant(s)
M/s. AVRA Laboratories Pvt. Ltd.
Rep. by its Authorised Signatory
Mr. A.V. Rama Rao,
Nacharam, Hyderabad.

Vs. Respondent(s)
Central Board Pollution Control Board,
MoEF & CC,. Rep. by its Member
Secretary, Govt. of India, New Delhi
and another

Appeal No. 115 of 2016 (SZ)

Appellant(s)
M/s.Vegesna LaboratoriesP. Ltd
Rep. by its Managing Director
Mr. V.V. Suryanarayana
Viskhapatnam Dist.

Vs. Respondent(s)
Central Board Pollution Control Board,
MoEF & CC,. Rep. by its Member
Secretary, Govt. of India, New Delhi
and another

Legal Practitioners for Appellant(s)
M/s.V. Suthakar
Mr. K.S. Viswanathan, T. Hemalatha
Mr. M.Gopi

Legal Practitioners for Respondents
Mr. D.S. Ekambaram for R-1
Mr. T. Sai Krishnan for R-2

Note of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
Order Nos.7 to 49	<p data-bbox="558 405 862 446">Date: 25th May, 2017</p> <p data-bbox="558 534 1430 1677">Mr. D.S. Ekambaram, the learned counsel appearing for respondent No.1, the Central Pollution Control Board (CPCB) submitted that as per the affidavit of the Regional Director, South, CPCB, Bangalore, dated 21.04.2017, out of the 45 appellants except M/s Smilax Laboratories Limited, Medak District the appellant in Appeal No.19 of 2015, all other appellants have installed the OCEMS as directed by the impugned orders. Except the appellants in Appeal No.59 of 2015, M/s. Nifty Labs Private Limited, Krishna District and in Appeal No.116 of 2016, M/s. CIREX Pharmaceutical Limited, Medak District, Telangana State, all others have provided the connectivity also, as per the said directions. Learned counsel appearing for the CPCB therefore submitted that the appeals could be disposed as infructuous, in view of the compliance to the directions in the impugned notices.</p> <p data-bbox="558 1803 1430 1983">Learned counsel appearing for the appellants submitted that to avoid any further confusion and to place the record straight, let an affidavit be filed by the concerned</p>

CPCB to the effect that the CPCB will not proceed with further action pursuant to the impugned orders.

Learned counsel appearing for the CPCB prays time to file the affidavit.

List the matters on 25.05.2017.

.....J.M.
(Justice M.S. Nambiar)

