

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

**M.A.No.102 of 2017 (SZ)
in
Application No. 77 of 2017 (SZ)**

Applicant(s)

M/s. Saivijay Pragti Steel
Udyog Private Limited,
Rep. by its Representative,
Bellary District,
Karnataka State.

Vs. Respondent(s)

Padma Kodali,
Bellary District,
Karnataka State.

Legal Practitioners for Applicant(s)

M/s. K. Venkatasubramani

Legal practitioners for respondent(s)

Mrs. A. Yogeshwaran for R1
M/s. R. Thirunavukarasu and
M. Swarnalatha for R2
M/s Devraj Ashok for R3
M/s.Me. Sarashwathy for R4
M/s. D.S. Ekambaram for R5

Application No. 77 of 2017 (SZ)

Applicant(s)

Mr. Padma Kodali, Bellary Dist
Karnataka State

Respondent

Vs. Karnataka State Pollution Control
Board Rep. by its Member Secretary
and others

Legal Practitioners for Applicant(s)

M/s. A. Yogeshwaran

Legal Practitioners for Respondents

M/s. R. Thirunavukarasu and
M. Swarnalatha for R-1
Mr. Devraj Ashok for R-2
Mrs. Me. Saraswathy for R-3
Mr. D.S. Ekambaram for R-4
Mr. K. Venkatasubramani for R-5

Note of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
Order No. 3	Date: 9 th October, 2017 <u>M.A.No.102 of 2017:</u> This is an application filed by respondent No.5 to receive the additional documents. No objection has been

filed. In the interest of justice, the application is allowed and the additional documents are received subject to the relevancy and admissibility.

The Miscellaneous Application is disposed with no order as to costs.

Application No. 77 of 2017:

By order dated 22.02.2017 when the Central Pollution Control Board (CPCB) was directed to depute a Senior Officer to inspect the industry and submit a report on the compliance of the industry to the anti-pollution measures as well as compliance of the directions issued by the Karnataka State Pollution Control Board (KSPCB), as stated by the industry. It was directed that cost of the inspection shall be borne by the applicant.

Learned counsel appearing for the CPCB submitted that the cost of inspection has not so far been paid, even though, the inspection was made more than 6 months back.

The applicant is absent. Miss. R. Renika Devi, who represented the learned counsel appearing for the applicant submitted that the response to the report filed by the CPCB would be submitted. But the learned counsel who represented the learned counsel appearing for the applicant

is not in a position to say why the payment has not been made as directed.

The applicant is directed to pay cost of the inspection within 10 days without failure. It is made clear that the applicant is at liberty to pay the amount directly to the Regional Office of the CPCB at Bangalore and produce the receipt.

The applicant is also granted one more opportunity to file the response if any, within 10 days without failure.

List the matter on 30.10.2017.

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

