

**BEFORE THE HON'BLE NATIONAL GREEN TRIBUNAL**  
**EASTERN ZONE BENCH KOLKATA**  
**ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 86 /2024**

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

PRADEEP SINGH SHEKHAWAT

...APPLICANT

VERSUS

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

...RESPONDENTS

**INDEX**

<b>S.No.</b>	<b>Particulars</b>	<b>Page No.</b>
<b>1.</b>	Rejoinder to the Counter Affidavit filed by Respondent No. 2	1 - 18
<b>2.</b>	Proof of Service	19

THROUGH



**Madhav Bhatia, Adv.**

**Vivek Sura Adv.**

A-446, LGF, Defence Colony

, New Delhi-110024,

Mob:9910572585

Email: madhavbhatia@vertarilegal.com

**DATE: 14.02.2025**

**PLACE: KOLKATA**



**BEFORE THE HON'BLE NATIONAL GREEN TRIBUNAL  
EASTERN ZONE BENCH KOLKATA  
ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 86 /2024**

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

PRADEEP SINGH SHEKHAWAT ...APPLICANT

VERSUS

UNION OF INDIA & ORS. ...RESPONDENTS

**REJOINDER TO THE COUNTER AFFIDAVIT DATED 12.12.2024  
FILED BY THE RESPONDENT NO.2 IN REPLY TO IA NO. 86/2024/EZ**

1. That the Applicant is filing the present Rejoinder in response to the Counter Affidavit filed on behalf of Respondent No. 2, i.e., the State of Assam on 12.12.2024 in response to IA no. 86 of 2024/EZ. At the outset, the Applicant emphatically denies every submission, allegation and aversion made by the said Respondent in their Counter Affidavit unless specifically admitted by the Applicant.
2. The instant Original Application was filed by the Applicant to raise a substantial question relating to the environment under Section 14 of the National Green Tribunal Act, 2010, arising out of the failure of the Respondents to curb the concerning surge in the illegal mining of minor minerals including sand, gravel, clay and stone in the State of Assam, without obtaining the requisite permissions under the Air (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1981 ('**Air Act**'), The Water (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1974 ("**Water Act**") and the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986 ("**EP Act**"). Further, the Applicant also sought directions against the Respondents to prohibit conducting auctions of

Minor Mineral Concession Areas (MMCA) in various districts of State of Assam such as Cachar, Tinsukia, Udalguri, Goalpara, Golaghat, Kamrup Metro, Lakhimpur and Nagaon without following the mandatory procedure for preparation of a District Survey Report (“**DSR**”) which is a pre-requisite and a *sine qua non* for granting any mining leases(s)/permit under the provisions of the Environment Impact Assessment Notification dated 14.09.2006 (“**EIA Notification**”) issued by Union Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change (“**Respondent No. 1**”) and as amended by way of Notification dated 15.01.2016, the Sustainable Sand Mining Management Guidelines, 2016 (“**SSMMG Guidelines, 2016**”) and the Enforcement & Monitoring Guidelines for Sand Mining, 2020 (“**EMGSM Guidelines, 2020**”).

3. That the contents of the Original Application are not being repeated herein for the sake of brevity. That the Applicant reaffirms and reiterates the averments made, the grounds and contentions raised in the O.A, and the same are not being repeated herein for the sake of brevity. That the Applicant craves leave of this Hon'ble Tribunal to treat the same as having being incorporated herein and to rely upon the same at the time of urging the present Rejoinder.

#### **PRELIMINARY OBJECTIONS**

4. That the gist of the Response made by Respondent No. 1 in its Counter Affidavit dated 12.12.2024 can be summarized as under:
  - 4.1 Respondent No. 2 admits DSRs were not finalized before e-auctions and mining leases but claims they are now being prepared and uploaded for public consultation.

4.2 Respondent No. 2 attributes DSR delays to floods and asserts all mining operations comply with the Mines and Minerals (Development and Regulation) Act, 1957 (“**MMDR Act**”), EIA Notification, and pollution control laws, with Environmental Clearance and Consent to Establish /Consent To Operate duly issued.

4.3 Respondent No. 2 argues halting mining due to missing DSRs would harm state revenue and infrastructure projects, and committees have been formed to expedite DSR finalization.

4.4 Respondent No. 2 claims it has complied with NGT’s stay on mining in certain districts and has now uploaded DSRs for all 35 districts to address any legal concerns.

4.5 The Respondent No. 2 allege that the Applicant’s objections to the draft DSRs are frivolous, motivated by private interest, and that only those directly affected by mining activities can raise objections.

5. That the applicant seeks leave of this Hon’ble Court to make preliminary submissions/objections to the above responses of Respondent No. 1 in its Counter Affidavit.

**A. Absence of DSR at the Time of Auctions & Mining – An Admission of Illegality**

6. The State of Assam’s admission that District Survey Reports (DSRs) were not finalized before conducting e-auctions and granting mining leases is a direct acknowledgment of illegality. Absence of DSR can also be seen from a perusal of the annexures attached with the reply, each of which records that even draft DSRs were not ready till at least 26.09.2024 (last minutes of meeting put on record by Respondent) and



those DSRs which were put up for discussion in the meeting feel terribly short of fulfilling the statutory provisions. The EIA Notification, 2006 (Clause 7(iii)) explicitly mandates that DSRs must be finalized before any mining lease is granted. Additionally, the Sustainable Sand Mining Management Guidelines, 2016 (Clause 4.1 & 9.1) prohibit the allocation of mining leases in the absence of an approved DSR. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in *State of Bihar v. Pawan Kumar* (2022) 2SCC 348 has unequivocally held that DSR is it required to be prepared before auction/e-auction/ grant of mining lease by the mining department since it's absence will be in conflict with environmental laws and thus preparation of DSR and obtaining of Environmental Clearance(“EC”) is also a condition precedent to carry on mining activities. The Respondents' claim that DSRs are now being prepared does not rectify the legal violation that has already occurred, as subsequent compliance cannot validate actions that were initially undertaken unlawfully. It is submitted that the auctions conducted, and leases granted before finalizing the DSR must be declared null and void since auctions were held without DSRs and hence the quantum and area of mining was not identified. The mining auction itself were faulty and a clear violation of orders of Hon'ble Supreme Court.

7. It has come to the knowledge of the Applicant that the Respondent No. 2 has been mechanically granting ECs without even preparation of a duly prepared DSRs. It is submitted that instead of cancelling or revoking such illegal ECs, granted without requisite DSRs, the Respondent No. 2 is perpetuating its illegalities by not following the procedures for preparation of such DSRs, and is merely trying to the valuable right to public hearing to a mere paper formality. It is pertinent that all previously granted Environmental Clearances (ECs) should have automatically



been cancelled by the Respondent No. 2 since they had been issued without notified District Survey Reports (DSR). Since the public was not in possession of a finalized DSR, the public hearings conducted for such ECs were fundamentally flawed and must be reconducted to ensure compliance with due process. It is humbly submitted that Environmental compensation shall be imposed on all mining activities that operated without a valid EC, as such operations constitute a clear violation of the EIA Notification, 2006, rendering the ECs void ab initio.

### **B. Delay Justifications Do Not Exempt Compliance with the Law**

8. The Respondents' attempt to attribute the delay in DSR preparation to natural calamities, such as floods, is not a legally justifiable excuse for proceeding with mining activities before fulfilling mandatory legal requirements. The law does not provide exemptions for environmental due diligence based on administrative or natural disruptions. The requirement for a finalized DSR is a precondition, not a procedural formality that can be bypassed or deferred. The Supreme Court in *Mangal Singh Bundela v. State of Madhya Pradesh & Ors.*, Civil Appeal No. 4593 of 2022 reaffirmed that no mining operations shall be conducted in term of the e-auction without finalizing of the DSR and hence mining operations conducted before DSR approval must be stayed, irrespective of administrative or procedural challenges. Moreover, the issuance of EC, Consent to Establish (“CTE”), and Consent to Operate (“CTO”) in the absence of an approved DSR is a blatant violation of Section 25the Water Act, 1974 and Section 21 of Air Act, 1981, as these approvals cannot be granted without an environmental risk assessment based on a finalized DSR. It is submitted that there is a categorical admission in the Minutes of Meeting

(“**MOM**”) dated 12.09.2024 that 74 units have already being issued the CTE/CTO which is clearly a breach of settled principle of law, the extracts of which are as follows:

*“The district wise status of CTE/CTO permission for various mining units was also reviewed and it was apprised that CTE/CTO for 74 (Seventy-four) units have already being issued by Pollution Control Board, Assam.”*

It is humbly submitted that any EC, CTE, or CTO issued without a prior DSR is therefore ultra vires and must be revoked. It is additionally submitted that Environmental compensation shall be imposed on all mining operations, crushers, and brick kilns that have operated without Consent to Establish (CTE) and Consent to Operate (CTO) in the State of Assam, effective from the date of commencement of production until the date of obtaining valid CTO. The Applicant reserves its right to challenge the same in appropriate proceedings.

### **C. Economic and Developmental Concerns Cannot Override Environmental Law**

9. The Respondents’ argument that halting mining operations due to the absence of DSRs would adversely impact state revenue and infrastructure projects is legally untenable. The Supreme Court in *Vellore Citizens Welfare Forum v. Union of India* (1996) has firmly established that economic considerations cannot override environmental protections, and the “*Precautionary Principle*” must be applied to ensure sustainable development. Similarly, the Doctrine of Public Trust, prohibits the State from permitting the exploitation of natural resources in a manner that prioritizes commercial benefits over environmental



safeguards. The requirement for scientific mining, as prescribed under the MMDR Act, 1957, and the Sustainable Sand Mining Management Guidelines, 2016, ensures that revenue generation is not prioritized at the cost of environmental destruction. The formation of committees to expedite DSR preparation does not cure the fundamental illegality of mining operations initiated without an approved DSR. The proper course of action is not to continue mining while preparing a DSR, but to halt all mining operations until lawful compliance is ensured.

#### **D. Post-Facto Compliance Does Not Cure Past Illegality**

10. The Respondents' assertion that they have complied with the NGT's stay order and subsequently uploaded DSRs for all 35 districts does not rectify the legal violations that have already occurred. The law is clear that environmental assessments must precede mining activities, not follow them as a remedial measure. The Supreme Court in *Alembic Pharmaceuticals Ltd. v. Rohit Prajapati* (2020) ruled that post-facto environmental clearances are illegal and cannot be used to validate activities that commenced without prior approval. Similarly, the Hon'ble NGT in *Subhash Bhai Ishwar Bhai Parmar v. State of Gujarat* 2022 SCC OnLine NGT 3854, quashed all mining leases that were granted before DSR finalization, reaffirming that subsequent compliance does not cure past non-compliance. The fact that DSRs have now been uploaded for public review does not negate the illegality of the auctions, mining leases, and pollution control consents (CTE/CTO) granted (if any) before their finalization. The Respondents' argument only confirms that unlawful mining operations took place, necessitating the immediate cancellation of these leases and the recovery of the full value of illegally extracted minerals.



### **E. Rebuttal to the Allegation of Private Interest and Legitimacy of Objections**

11. The Respondent No. 2 has alleged that the Applicant's objections to the draft DSRs are frivolous, motivated by private interest, and should only be raised by individuals directly affected by mining activities. It is submitted that this claim is baseless as the Applicant's objections are bona fide and supported by the findings of the (SEAC) in its meeting dated 26.09.2024, which identified similar issues. It is submitted that the objections are firmly rooted in the Public Trust Doctrine, as upheld by the Supreme Court in *Fomento Resorts & Hotels v. Minguel Martins* (2009), which mandates the State to protect natural resources for public benefit. The issues raised relate to illegal auctions and mining activities conducted without finalized DSRs, violating Article 21 of the Constitution and undermining environmental protections. It is pertinent to note that, no law restricts objections to DSRs solely to those directly affected by mining activities, as the EIA Notification, 2006, and guidelines encourage public participation in resource management. The Respondent No. 2's claim is a diversionary tactic to distract from the deficiencies in the draft DSRs, including incomplete data, lack of replenishment studies, and violations of statutory guidelines, all of which substantiate the Applicant's legitimate concerns.

### **PRELIMINARY SUBMISSIONS**

12. It is submitted that a perusal of the annexures attached with its reply to the present Interim Application by the Respondent No.2 further strengthens the case of the Applicant as there are glaring admissions, defaults and omissions recorded in these Annexures which are the Minutes of



Meeting pertaining to preparation of DSR in the present OA. The details of omissions and defaults are given below.

#### **A. Glaring Deficiencies in the draft DSR's**

13. The Minutes of Meeting (“MOM”) of State Expert Appraisal Committee (“SEAC”) dated 26.09.2024 discussed some of the draft DSR's that had been prepared and found multiple deficiencies and statutory breaches in each case. Out of the total 5 districts for which the draft DSRs were reviewed none was found to be in proper order on the date of the meeting. This is one day after the internal deadline for submissions of DSRs as set by Respondents. On average, 10-15 faults were recorded in each reviewed draft DSRs. The said violations in brief pertain to DSRs not following the mandated template as described notification of 25.07.2018. The reviewed DSR's also failed to comply with the procedure of preparation of DSRs as mandated under Schedule X of the EIA as amended in 2016. The issues in the DSRs *inter alia* pertained to the following:

- Absence of geo-tagged photographs of mining areas, leased areas, proposed areas and other required maps.
- No proper quantification or measurement of different mineral resources.
- Lack of river mapping to delineate mining areas and their ecological impact.
- Absence of cluster maps essential for cumulative impact assessment.
- Unscientific methodology for data collection, leading to unreliable assessments.
- Incorrect determination of permissible excavation depth.
- Failure to recognize rare earth minerals in some areas, despite evident geological markers.

- Unauthentic and unverified data for replenishment rates.
- Use of outdated production data (2017-2020) for estimating production of sand, making the projections unreliable.
- Improper consolidation of all minor minerals into a single DSR, contrary to prescribed guidelines.
- Mentioning of incorrect maximum depth of digging as 3 meters, while guidelines mandate 1 meter.

14. Given the gravity of these deficiencies, it is imperative that all finalized DSRs be presented before the Hon'ble National Green Tribunal (NGT) for review before being officially notified. The presence of fundamental errors and statutory non-compliance in the draft DSRs raises serious concerns about their accuracy, scientific validity, and adherence to environmental safeguards. Furthermore, if significant modifications are made to the DSRs to rectify these deficiencies, it is essential that the public consultation process be reconducted to ensure transparency and public participation, as mandated under the EIA Notification, 2006. This is crucial to uphold the principles of environmental governance, public trust, and due process, ensuring that no mining lease is granted based on flawed or incomplete DSRs.

#### **B. Issues pertaining to the knowledge partner**

15. At the outset, the preparation of the DSR appears to have been entirely outsourced to a private consultant - RSP Green Development & Laboratories Pvt. Ltd, with no involvement from public officers, which is in violation of the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *State of Bihar v. Pawan Kumar*, (2022) 2 SCC 348. It is submitted that in Para 15 of *Pawan Kumar* (supra), the Hon'ble Supreme Court criticized the practice of outsourcing the preparation of DSRs to private consultants and held that DSRs must be prepared by Sub-Divisional Committees



composed of officers from various State Government departments. It is submitted that the public officers are expected to play a leading role in ensuring the accuracy, objectivity, and integrity of the DSR, especially given its significant environmental and resource management impacts, and that outsourcing this process is a clear violation of the *Pawan Kumar (supra)* guidelines.

16. Secondly, the SEAC in its meeting dated 26.09.2024 raised serious concerns about the quality and half hearted preparation of the DSRs. It SEAC recorded that the same knowledge partner was involved in the preparation of DSRs in Tripura and Punjab where the reports were not accepted by SEAC/ SEIAA due to poor quality of DSR which caused huge loss to state exchequer in Punjab. These observations raise a serious doubt on the authenticity of whatever draft DSRs that have been prepared and makes it clear it that the draft DSRs which have been issued after the present OA, are deficient and fault on accounts of various raise and hence cannot be relied upon. The observation of the SEAC is extracted before for kind perusal of the this Hon'ble Tribunal:

Looking at such shortcomings in the draft DSR and half-hearted response, the house wanted to know as to for many districts M/s RSP Green Development & Laboratories Pvt. Ltd are engaged as knowledge partners assisting the DSR preparation in Assam. It was emphatically replied that they are working for 15 districts in Assam. Given the seriousness of time, importance of matter and NGT court case it could not be appreciated that proper justice could not be expected to be done to the cause of preparation of the large numbers of DSRs. Hon'ble Chairman of SEIAA & SEAC noted the same with concern along with the respected Members of the house. SEAC and SEIAA members also observed that M/s RSP Green Development & Laboratories Pvt. Ltd prepared DSRs for the state of Tripura and Punjab but due to poor quality of DSRs, those were not accepted by respective SEAC/SEIAA during appraisal. It has reportedly resulted in huge loss to the state exchequer of Punjab.

## **PARAWISE REPLY TO THE COUNTER AFFIDAVIT**

17. That the contents of Para 1 and 2 of the Counter affidavit are matters of record and merit no response.
18. That the contents of Para 3 of the Counter Affidavit are denied and disputed in response thereto the contents of the instant OA are reaffirmed and reiterated. The absence of a finalized District Survey Report (DSR) before conducting e-auctions and permitting mining operations renders the entire process illegal and void ab initio, as mandated by the EIA Notification, 2006, along with binding rulings of the Supreme Court and NGT. The Respondents' admission that auctions were conducted without a finalized DSR confirms clear non-compliance. Post-facto preparation of DSRs does not cure these past illegalities. Further, the draft DSRs uploaded by the Respondents are incomplete, defective, and fail to meet statutory requirements, including mandatory replenishment studies under the EIA Notification, 2006, SSMG, 2016, and EMGSM, 2020. These draft DSRs lack finalized data, fail to account for individual assessments for each minor mineral as required under Clause 4.3.10.3 of the CAG guidelines, and remain a procedural formality with no substantive legal validity. Consequently, all ongoing auctions and mining activities conducted without finalized DSRs are illegal. The Respondents cannot justify mining operations based on defective draft DSRs, and any continuation of such activities constitutes a flagrant violation of environmental laws and binding judicial precedents. The contents of the OA and the Preliminary Objections of the present Rejoinder Affidavit and reiterated.
19. That the contents of Para 4 of the Counter Affidavit are denied and disputed. It is submitted that if there was no finalized DSR then, as

suggested in this paragraph, how the environmental clearances were granted is also questionable. This raises serious questions about how this was done in the absence of a finalized DSR. It is further submitted that, pursuant to Notification No. S.O. 3611(E) dated 25.07.2018, the DSR shall form the basis for applications for the EC and not the other way around. It is further vehemently denied that EC was obtained through legitimate procedure since DSR is a mandatory pre-requisite and basis for granting Environmental Clearance and admittedly the present mining was going in with Environmental clearance which was obtained without DSRs. The Respondents' reference to the Assam Minor Mineral Concession Rules, 2013, does not supersede national environmental laws and judicial precedents. The State cannot override the EIA Notification, 2006, or the MMDR Act, 1957, through subordinate legislation. The Supreme Court in *Mangal Singh Bundela (supra)* held that no state authority can grant mining leases unless it fully complies with national environmental laws. The contents of the OA and the Preliminary Objections of the present Rejoinder Affidavit and reiterated.

20. That the contents of Para 5 of the Counter Affidavit are denied and disputed and in response thereto, the contents of the instant OA are reaffirmed and reiterated. It is submitted that the putting of DSRs in public domain does not absolve the Respondent No. 2 of its failure to ensure compliance with national environmental laws before granting mining leases. It is well settled principle that the DSR finalization must precede auctions—not follow them. The Supreme Court in *Pawan Kumar (Supra)* ruled that mining leases granted before DSR preparation are void and must be revoked. The Respondents' admission that DSRs were incomplete at the time of e-auctions is sufficient to quash the entire process. Additionally as per Respondent No. 2's own admission the DSR

have still not been finalized and is still at the stage where DSR is put in public domain and comments from public are received. Additionally it is submitted that the draft DSRs uploaded to the public domain to invite objections are defective in nature and do not comply with relevant statutory provisions and accordingly the Applicant has raised objections to the same. The contents of the OA and the Preliminary Objections of the present Rejoinder Affidavit are reiterated.

A copy of the objections dated 28.09.2024 raised by the Applicant to the Draft DSRs are part of the record and have already been annexed and marked as **ANNEXURE A-45 (COLLY)** in the rejoinder.

21. That the contents of Paras 6 and 7 are denied and disputed and in response thereto, the contents of the instant OA are reaffirmed and reiterated. The establishment of an internal committee to review DSR progress does not override the binding legal requirement that DSRs must be finalized before grant of EC or E-auction. The Hon'ble Supreme Court and this Hon'ble Tribunal have consistently ruled that administrative delays cannot be used as an excuse to bypass legal requirements. The failure to finalize DSRs before mining commenced remains a fatal illegality. It is submitted that the Draft DSR uploaded on the public domain are flawed and lack/omits crucial information such as Absence of Replenishment Study, relies on Incomplete Data, Single DSRs for all minor minerals, Outsourcing to private consultants, Failure to provide Mineral Potential, Failure to identify specific mining sites for the sake of brevity the same is not repeated and the Applicant herein reaffirms and reiterates the contents of Para 16 of the instant OA. It is further submitted that the Respondents by virtue of the present OA have acknowledged the absence of DSRs and undertook to issue belated draft

DSRs which is noted in the interim Order dated 23.07.2024, subsequently, the filing of the Draft DSRs and its preparation prima facie appears to be made with a predicted mind in order for the auctions and mining to continue and also the said Drafts of DSR relies on inaccurate and incomplete data which asserts that the Respondents are trying to conceal the losses that they have caused to the Government exchequer due to ongoing illegal mining activities. It is additionally submitted that a perusal of the MOM of SEAC meeting dated 26.09.2024 makes it clear that the structure of the DSR does not follow the required template and the reporting authorities were once again reminded to comply with the same in the last para of MOM. The contents of the OA and the Preliminary Objections of the present Rejoinder Affidavit are reiterated.

22. That the contents of Para 8 and 9 of the Counter Affidavit are vehemently denied and disputed. It is submitted that averments made in Para 16 (16.1 to 16.14) and in subsequent paras are not pre-mature and are also not unwarranted since the Respondents have already approved mining plans and given ECs without finalizing the DSR for auctions and mining minor minerals and are in violation to the EIA Notification 2006 and S.O. 3611(E) dated the 25.07.2018 and also to Sustainable Sand Mining Management Guidelines, 2016 and Enforcement and Monitoring Guidelines for Sand Mining, 2020. It is further submitted that the Respondent's contentions in Para 9 regarding the representations and objections made to the draft DSRs are false and frivolous and the Respondents are trying to make false assertions by giving it the color of Private (Self) Interest Litigation and trying to deviate the court. It is submitted that the issues raised by the Applicant bear a close proximity to the observations made by SEAC in its meeting dated 26.09.2024, which the Applicant wasn't aware of at the time of filing of the

objections. The fact that the Applicant and the SEAC found similar issues in the draft DSRs proves it beyond any doubt that the present OA is *bonafide*. It is unfortunate that allegations have been raised against the counsel in the present matter. Such assertions not only undermine the professional integrity of the counsel but also detract from the core issues at hand. It appears that the averments raised by the State are a misguided attempt to interfere with the fair administration of justice. Such tactics, which seek to cast aspersions on counsel rather than engage with the merits of the case, not only obstruct the judicial process but also undermine the principles of fairness and impartiality that are fundamental to the justice delivery system. It is submitted that the resources in questions are national resources and it is the duty and responsibility of the nation to manage it for the public at large by virtue of the Public Trust Doctrine which they have failed to adhere to since without finalized DSRs the Respondents have allowed illegal auctions and mining activities and have violated Article 21 of the citizens. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has held in the case *Fomento Resorts & Hotels & Anr vs Minguel Martins & Ors (2009) 3 SCC 571* that “*natural resources including forests, water bodies, rivers, sea shores, etc. are held by the State as a trustee on behalf of the people and especially the future generations*”. It is submitted that Respondents by giving it a color of self-interest litigation are as a matter of fact trying to shadow the flaws that are in the draft DSRs and that EC has been granted for the mining activities which Respondent No. 2 has admitted are without final DSR. It is further submitted that the allegations that the Respondents are raising through their counter are unwarranted and uncalled for since it expands the scope of locus for no reason since allegations were raised on the council. Also, the minutes of the meeting dated 22.08.2024,

12.09.2024, and 26.09.2024 were also not put on record earlier when all the objections were already disclosed in the Rejoinder and the same is being done now just to interfere with the administration of justice. It is additionally submitted that 09.10.2024 and 25.10.2024 which are alleged to be attached as annexure 3 of the reply are not present on record. The contents of the OA and the Preliminary Objections of the present Rejoinder Affidavit and reiterated.

In view of the above mentioned facts and circumstances, it is humbly prayed that this Hon'ble Tribunal may be pleased to allow the present Original Application.



**Madhav Bhatia, Adv.**  
**Vivek Sura Adv.**  
**Vertari Legal**

A-446, LGF, Defence Colony,  
New Delhi-110024,  
Mob:9910572585

**DATE: 14.02.2025**  
**PLACE: KOLKATA**

Email: madhavbhatia@vertarilegal.com

BEFORE THE HON'BLE NATIONAL GREEN TRIBUNAL

EASTERN ZONE BENCH KOLKATA

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO 86 /2024



IN THE MATTER OF:  
 PRADEEP SINGH SHEKHAWAT

...APPLICANT

VERSUS

UNION OF INDIA &amp; ORS.

...RESPONDENTS


AFFIDAVIT

I, Pradeep Singh Shekhawat, S/o Govind Singh, R/o A-34, A, Vivekanand Colony, Naya Khera, Jaipur, Rajasthan-302023, aged about 37 Years, do hereby solemnly affirm and state on oath as under.

1. That I am the Applicant No. 1 in the captioned matter and as such am fully conversant with the facts and circumstances of the case and competent to swear this Affidavit.

2. That I have gone through the contents of the accompanying Rejoinder that has been drafted by my counsel according to my instructions and the contents of the same are true and correct to my knowledge.


VERIFICATION

**ATTESTED**  
  
 Anil Kumar Jain  
 Notary (Govt. of India)  
 JAIPUR (Raj.)

  
**DEPONENT**

14 FEB 2025

Verified on this day \_\_\_ of \_\_\_ 2025 that the contents of the present Affidavit are true and correct to my knowledge and nothing material has been concealed.

**ATTESTED**  
  
 Anil Kumar Jain  
 Notary (Govt. of India)  
 JAIPUR (Raj.)

  
**DEPONENT**

14 FEB 2025



## Office

---

**From:** Office  
**Sent:** 15 February 2025 19:06  
**To:** rashmibothra24@gmail.com; surendra\_kr15@rediffmail.com; apu7law@gmail.com; mrdey@rediffmail.com  
**Cc:** Litigation Team  
**Subject:** Rejoinder to Counter Affidavit in Pradeep Singh Shekhawat vs Union of India & Ors.; OA 86/2024  
**Attachments:** Rejoinder to Reply by Respondent No. 2 in IA.pdf

Dear Sir/Ma'am,

I act for and on behalf of the counsel for Applicant in matter titled "Pradeep Singh Shekhawat vs Union of India & Ors.; OA 86/2024".

Please find attached an advance copy of the Rejoinder to Counter Affidavit to the Interim Application. The matter is next listed before the Hon'ble NGT East on 18.02.2025. Kindly treat this email as sufficient proof of service.

**Prem Kumar**  
Head Clerk

**Vertari Legal**  
A – 446 (LGF), Defence Colony, New Delhi – 110024  
e-mail: [office@vertarilegal.com](mailto:office@vertarilegal.com)  
Mobile: + 91 7042706702

Disclaimer & Privilege Notice: This e-mail is confidential. It may also be legally privileged, contains proprietary and confidential information and is sent for the intended recipient(s) only. If, by an addressing or transmission error, this mail has been misdirected to you, you are requested to notify us immediately by return email message and delete this mail and its attachments. You are also hereby notified that any use, any form of reproduction, dissemination, copying, disclosure, modification, distribution and/or publication of this e-mail message, contents or its attachment(s) other than by its intended recipient(s) is strictly prohibited. Any opinions expressed in this email are those of the individual and may not necessarily represent those of Vertari Legal. You may not copy, forward, disclose or use any part of it. If you have received this message in error, please delete it and all copies from your system and notify the sender immediately by return e-mail.