

BEFORE THE NATIONAL GREEN TRIBUNAL PRINCIPAL
BENCH, NEW DELHI

Original Application No. 64/2016 (WZ)

In the matter of :

Akhil Bhartiya Mangela Samaj & OthersApplicant(s)

Versus

Maharashtra Pollution Control Board & OthersRespondent(s)

INDEX

S.No	Particulars	Pages
1	Objections on behalf of M/s Ankit Petroproducts (P) Ltd. Against the revised report filed by the committee with the NGT along with supporting affidavit.	
2	Minutes of the Extracts of Board Resolution authorizing Mr. Anand Ramachandran.	----
3	Annexure A : Consent to operate dt. 15.07.2019 issued by MPCB in favor of M/s Ankit Petroproducts (P) Ltd.	
4	Annexure B : Letter dt. 23.11.2017 by M/s Ankit Petroproducts (P) Ltd.	----
5	Annexure C : Letter dt. 23.11.2017 by M/s Mayfair Biotech (P) Ltd.	----
6	Vakalatnama	

Dated : 23.09.2021

M/s Ankit Petroproducts (P) Ltd.
(through its Authorised Representative)
Through

Vkhera
Vinod Khara,
Advocate

R-556, Shanker Road
New Rajinder Nagar
New Delhi-110060

Enrolment No. : D-957/1994

Mobile No. 9811130268

E-mail : vkheraadv@yahoo.com

BEFORE THE NATIONAL GREEN TRIBUNAL PRINCIPAL
BENCH, NEW DELHI

In Re :

Original Application No. 64/2016 (WZ)

In the matter of :

Akhil Bhartiya Mangela Samaj & OthersApplicant(s)

Versus


Maharashtra Pollution Control Board & OthersRespondent(s)

**Objections on behalf of M/s Ankit Petroproducts (P) Ltd. to
the revised report filed by the committee as mentioned in
Table No. 85 pertaining to the applicant.**

Most Respectfully Sheweth:

1. That the applicant/objector has filed amongst others, its earlier objections filed as I.A.No. 31/2021 in the present OA against the report filed by the committee wherein in table No. 85 pertaining to the objector, the objector had been penalized for an amount of Rs. 136.027 Lakh which in the revised report has been put at Rs. 57.559 Lakh.

2. That in the revised report filed by the committee, objector now has been categorised as SSI instead of LSI, thereby acknowledging its mistake in the original report wherein the objector has been categorised as LSI. As per the calculation of the committee itself, the amount of penalty upon the objector should have been one third of the original penalty amount, since the factor of ratio of penalty from LSI to SSI is one third as per the formula and report of the committee itself and thus the




amount of Rs. 136.027 Lakh should have been reduced to Rs. 45.34233333333333 Lakhs but the committee in its latest report has penalized the objector at Rs. 57.559 Lakh instead. The objector has previously been penalised with distribution recovery factor of .0084995 while now arbitrarily it has been changed to .0035695. This distribution recovery factor has been changed arbitrarily and as such the same is liable to be set aside. It is submitted that though objector has and is challenging the distribution recovery factor as given in original report as well.

Micro Enterprise

3. That the objector has been penalized to the amount as mentioned hereinabove while erroneously considering the unit of the objector as LSI. It is submitted that although in its revised report the committee has admitted its mistake since in the revised report at Serial Number it has now been categorized as Small Scale Industry instead of Large Scale Industry but still the revised report filed by the committee is still erroneous since objectors unit is not even a Small Scale Industry but is a Micro Enterprises. It is registered under 'The Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises Development Act, 2006' (hereinafter referred to as '*MSMED Act*') as a 'Micro Enterprises'. The MSMED Act classifies industries as

- (i) a *micro enterprise*, where the investment in plant and machinery **does not exceed twenty five lakh rupees;**
- (ii) a small enterprise, where the investment in plant and machinery is more than twenty-five lakhs rupees but does not exceed five crore rupees;




(iii) a medium enterprise, where the investment in plant and machinery is more than five crore rupees but does not exceed ten crore rupees;

As per the certificate of Micro Enterprise issued to applicant/objector, it is having an investment of Rs. 11,00,000/- (Rupees Eleven Lakhs) in plant and machinery & has employed 6 workers. Certificate issued, which was given to MPCB at the time of documentation of consent to operate has already been annexed with the original objections as **Annexure - 1**.

4. In 2010, applicant/objector had given its land on lease ad-measuring 248 sq. mtrs. only, out of the total area of 2100 sq. mtrs. to Mayfair Biotech Pvt. Ltd. (hereinafter referred to as '*Mayfair*'). Mayfair manufactured products similar to that of applicant/objector. Due to maintenance related activities, Mayfair could not start its production till 2012. It is submitted here that Mayfair (now the erstwhile leaseholder at the time of filing of this petition/objection) which had since June 2017 discontinued its operations), is/was also a Micro Enterprises and having investment of Rs. 15 Lakh in plant and machinery and having employed 10 workers. Certificate issued to Mayfair, which was given to MPCB at the time of documentation of consent to operate, is also annexed with the original objections as **Annexure - 2**.


5. That the above documents amongst other, have been filed with the committee, MPCB and different authorities on different occasions. The documents filed with the committee, MPCB and different authorities, time and again



have been ignored by them. Even now after filing of the objections by the objector, the committee has ignored the documents filed by the objector since even now the report is erroneous as even now the objector has been penalized as Small Scale Industry instead of Micro Enterprise. It is submitted the parliament of this country realized the difference between various categories of industries and therefore categorized them under different heads. The parliament acknowledged that the difficulties faced by these industries is different from each other and as such it passed the MSMED Act, 2006. As per this Act a Micro Enterprises is a unit lower than Small Scale Industry. As can be seen from the vast difference between a Small Scale Industry and Micro Enterprises, the investment difference is huge between the two therefor their working is also different.


6. However in the report filed by the committee it has failed to give any classification to Micro Enterprise, thereby totally disregarding the MSMED Act, 2006 passed by supreme legislature of this country. It is noteworthy that the committee had chosen to ignore the statutory Act passed by the parliament of this country even though all the members of the committee are members of the government bodies itself.

7. It is submitted that the objector is a very small business unit, probably, the only Micro Enterprise in the area, having no voice since nobody listens to such an




individual case of the smallest unit and the committee has also chosen to ignore the case of the objector and has clubbed it earlier with Large Scale Industry, and now with Small Scale Industry and has therefore penalized it with such hefty amount, ignoring the actual status of Micro Enterprises of the objector.

8. That even a bare perusal of the water and electricity consumption of objector also shows that not only it is a Micro Enterprise by the actual scale of consumption and operation but also shows that no water pollution has or could have been done by objection. It is submitted here that the unit of objector is having only half an inch raw water pipe line for the past 30 years, from where an average of two hours per day of raw water is sent by MIDC authorities and hence, the unit of the objector functions for eight hours a day due to unavailability of constant water and as such it is unimaginable that any LSI unit could run in such limited sources. It is pertinent to mention here that the bills of water and electricity are either very less or minimum and even the audited extract of the accounts & sales figure as well, shows not only that applicant/objector is a Micro Enterprise and is not a SSI as erroneously shown in the report of the committee (contrary to all prima-facie evidences available with both MPCB and NGT committee) but also shows that it was closed for most of the time and which clearly shows that in the report erroneous number of days has been given and thus, applicant/objector has been wrongly imposed with the increased penalty. In the case of water consumption, applicant/objector for the main period in question as well as on regular basis was getting average




monthly bills of Rs. 6001/- from April, 2016 to November, 2016 for the consumption of 195.3 cubic Mtrs of water and which shows that there could not have been level of wastage and level of pollution as shown in the above report. Similarly, month-wise consumption of electricity by applicant/objector also shows that it was very minimal, at times it was zero consumption, therefore, only minimum bill amount was charged, which only suggests that there was very less or no production in the unit of the applicant/objector. Since there is no production / less production at the relevant point of time, therefore, the question of the applicant / objector causing such large scale pollution as shown in the above report does not arise. As submitted hereinabove, in fact the unit of the applicant/objector is ZLD with no outlet connection to Common Effluent Treatment Plant (hereinafter referred to as 'CETP') since it is/was having no positive discharge as such the question of the applicant / objector causing any kind of pollution to any water body does not arise. Similarly, year-wise sales figure of the applicant / objector from the period of 2004-05 to 2017-18, shows very minimum or negligible sales meaning thereby, there was either very less/minimal or no manufacturing activities in the said unit. Hence there was zero (negligible) income of the applicant/objector. Statement showing water bills has been annexed with the original report as **Annexure - 4**, electricity bills as **Annexure - 5** and sales figure as **Annexure - 6**. Similarly, the net worth figure of Mayfair (the erstwhile leaseholder) as given by chartered accountant shows no means of income of its Director. This report has been annexed with the original objections as **Annexure - 7**.



9. Thus, the revised amount of Rs. 57.559 Lakhs levied upon considering it as SSI though it is only a Micro Enterprise as per MSMED Act, is gross violation of natural justice and is total travesty of justice.

ZLD Unit

10. Since objector is a ZLD unit, therefore, there is no question of the objector discharging any effluent from its unit into CETP. It is submitted that the chemistry of the products of objector shows that it is not discharging any effluent into CETP since its process do not generate any effluent. In fact, the water in the storage tank is never emptied into CETP discharge line since there is no connection to the discharge line or into any other water body for that matter, and the water in the storage tank from where MPCB had drawn samples and on the basis of which the penalty was imposed upon it, is basically recycling mother liquor and the same serves as input material for the next product, as such, there is/was no output line or positive discharge flowing into CETP. Thus, the question of the applicant/objector polluting the water body does not arise. The flow process chart of the objector has already been filed along with earlier objections as **Annexure - 8**. It is submitted that the closure report dated 03.12.2016 for objector reads as follows 'And Whereas the board officials visited your industry on 24.11.2016 to verify compliance of concerned conditions and collection of joint vigilance sample from ETP outlet. Sub Regional Officer Tarapur-I communicated analysis reports of waste water collected from ETP outlet/V notch/by pass line/ treated effluents




sumps'. Therefore MPCB themselves was not clear as to the place from where waste water was collected, while also ignoring that objector is a Zero Liquid Discharge Unit having no discharge of effluent in their process meant for disposal as such there are no ETP outlet/V notch/by pass line/treated effluents sumps in the unit of the objector. It is submitted that the document of MPCB itself shows that the objector was/is a ZLD unit. The document is annexed herewith as **Annexure - A**.

Number of days of non compliance

11. With regard to the number of days of non compliance, on the basis of which also, the penalty is imposed, since in the above formula, 'N' is the number of days, therefore it becomes essential to put the clear picture with regard to that. It is submitted that applicant/objector had stopped manufacturing from the year 2005 and Mayfair could start production in skeletal only since the year 2012. After the closure order was given by MPCB on 06.12.2016, applicant/objector and Mayfair had stopped their manufacturing from Tarapur unit, after all compliances and visits by the officials of MPCB.

(Docket sheet of the process and inspection reports of SRO and RO and the MPCB HO as well as the correspondence is enclosed). The same has been filed as **Annexure - 9**.


Restart orders were given by MPCB on 24.10.2017. Applicant/objector got GST number on 22.04.2019 and thereafter only, it became eligible to start its production. The proof of the same has been filed as **Annexure -10**.



Therefore, effectively there was no production in Tarapur unit from 06.12.2016 to 22.04.2019. Since inspection of the unit of applicant/objector was done on 24.11.2016, closure directions were given on 03.12.2016, actual closure date is 06.12.2016, compliance report was filed on 17.09.2017, the same was approved on 17.10.2017 by MPCB, conditional restart order was given on 24.10.2017 but in actuality, restart in the unit of the applicant / objector was on 19.07.2019. The GST certificate of the applicant/objector has been filed as **Annexure - 11**. It is pertinent to mention here that only after getting the GST the objector could have started its operation.

Thus, number of days of non-compliance is 13 only, though the same is also challengeable, because of the ZLD nature of the unit which is very clearly mentioned in the consent letter dated 15.07.2019, as issued by MPCB to the applicant/objector. In the said letter it is clearly mentioned that *'The daily quantity of trade effluent from the factory shall be NIL'*. The same is annexed as **Annexure - 12**.


That the objector has also submitted documents with the MPCB which was duly acknowledged by them wherein MPCB officials were informed that they are not doing any work in their unit and asked them to do inspection since inspite of repeated requests MPCB has not been doing the inspection and the objector wants to start their work. The letter dated 23.11.2017 is annexed herewith as **Annexure - B**. A letter dated 23.11.2017 from Mayfair Biotech (P) Ltd.



informing the MPCB that they are stopping their operations in the unit since the MPCB officials are not inspecting the unit is annexed herewith as **Annexure - C**. This letter was also duly acknowledged by MPCB. It is submitted that like other documents, the committee has failed to take note or mention these two documents as well. The conditional restart order was given by MPCB on 24.10.2017 for a temporary period of 90 days but the objector closed its unit on the 30th day itself vide its letter dated 23.11.2017. Thus there was negligence on part of MPCB in not sending the inspecting team or the sending the closure after 3 months of inspection and as such the objector should not be penalized for the negligence of MPCB and accordingly to pay the penalty under Environmental Compensation with regard to number of days of non compliance.


Thus, as can be seen from the above and from the original objections filed which are not repeated herein for the sake of brevity and the same be read as part and parcel of the present objections as well, it is submitted that the applicant/objector has been wrongly penalized, ignoring that the objector is a ZLD unit, micro enterprise and there has been wrong calculation in the number of days of non compliance, along with other submissions made in the original objections and which are repeated herein for the sake of brevity and the same be read as part and parcel of the present objections.

Under the bonafide facts and circumstances mentioned above, it is once again prayed that this Hon'ble Tribunal be kind enough to set aside the report of the committee and accordingly, the order passed by this Hon'ble Tribunal,



whereby a penalty of Rs. 57.559 Lakh has been imposed, be set aside and waived against the applicant/objector in the largest interest of justice.

Dated : 23.09.2021


M/s Ankit Petroproducts (P) Ltd.
(through its Authorised Representative)
Through


Vinod Khera,
Advocate
R-556, Shanker Road
New Rajinder Nagar
New Delhi-110060
Enrolment No. : D-957/1994

BEFORE THE NATIONAL GREEN TRIBUNAL PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI

In Re :

Original Application No. 64/2016 (WZ)

In the matter of :

Akhil Bhartiya Mangela Samaj & OthersApplicant(s)

Versus


Maharashtra Pollution Control Board & OthersRespondent(s)

A F F I D A V I T

I, Anand Ramachandran S/o Sh. Sh. K S Ramachandran aged about 60 years, director of Ankit Petroproducts (P) Ltd. having its registered office at Plot No.L-12, MIDC Tarapur, Tal & Dist. Palghar-401506 Maharashtra, presently at Delhi do hereby solemnly affirm and declare as under:

1. I am one of the Director of Ankit Petroproducts (P) Ltd. and has been duly authorized by Board of Directors and being well conversant with the facts of the case, competent to swear this affidavit.

2. The accompanying objections to the revised report of the committee has been drafted under my instructions and which has been read by me and which are correct and which are not repeated herein for the sake of brevity and which be read as part and parcel of the present affidavit.



Anand Ramachandran
DEPONENT

VERIFICATION: Verified at Delhi on this 23rd day of September, 2021 that the contents of my above affidavit are true & correct & nothing material has been concealed therefrom.

S/o Sh. K.S. Ramachandran
Identified
has solemnly affirmed
Delhi on
that the contents of the Affidavit
have been read and explained to him
correct to his knowledge

Vinod Khera
DEPONENT

Vickram Singh
Identify the Deponent
has signed in my presence

Oath Commissioner Delhi 23 SEP 2021



ANKIT PETROPRODUCTS PVT. LTD

L-12 MIDC TARAPUR INDUSTRIAL AREA BOISAR THANE DISTRICT - 401506

CIN NO. U24100MH1990PTC055798

Tel:+91-98166 19177

GST NO. 27AAACA4572A1Z5

EXTRACTS OF THE MINUTES OF THE RESOLUTION PASSED AT THE MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTOR OF M/s Ankit Petroproducts (P) Ltd.

At its registered office at C-7, Amul Commercial Centre, Road No. 1, Chembur - 400071, Maharashtra, on 19th day of March, 2021 at 3.00 p.m. it is resolved that Sh. Anand Ramachandran Director of the company is authorized to file or to defend the case filed in National Green Tribunal in the case titled as Akhil Bhartiya Mangela Samaj & Others Versus Maharashtra Pollution Control Board & Others & any subsequent appeal or any other case arising out this case relating to the environmental damages imposed upon the company Ankit Petroproducts and in which amongst other Ankit Petroproducts (P) Ltd. is one of the party. He is authorized to engage any Advocate for filing/defending/contesting the said cases or appeal/ revision or other litigation in any court including that of Apex Court he is authorized to do all other as may be required.

For and On behalf of Board of Director of

M/s Ankit Petroproducts (P) Ltd.

Anand Ramachandran

01221870 Certified to be True

Annexure A.

MAHARASHTRA POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD

Tel : 25802272		Regional Office, Thane
Fax : 25805398		5 th Floor, Office Complex Bldg.,
Website: http://mpcb.gov.in		Near Mulund Check Naka,
E-mail Id: rothane@mpcb.gov.in		Wagale Estate, Thane-400 604.

RED/S.S.I

Date: 15/07/2019

Consent No: RO-THANE/CONSENT/TR-I/1907000516

Consent to Operate under Section 26 of the Water (Prevention & Control of Pollution) Act, 1974 & under Section 21 of the Air (Prevention & Control of Pollution) Act, 1981 and Authorization / Renewal of Authorization under Rule 6 of the Hazardous & Other Wastes (Management & Transboundary Movement) Rules, 2016 [To be referred as Water Act, Air Act and H&OW (M&TM) Rules respectively].

.....
 CONSENT is hereby granted to,

M/s. ANKIT PETROPRODUCTS PVT. LTD.,
 Plot No. L- 12, MIDC Tarapur,
 Tal. & Dist. Palghar - 401506.

located in the area declared under the provisions of the Water Act, Air act and Authorization under the provisions of H&OW(M&TM) Rules and amendments thereto subject to the provisions of the Act and the Rules and the Orders that may be made further and subject to the following terms and conditions:

1. The Consent to Operate is granted for a period up to: 30/04/2024.
2. The Consent is valid for the manufacture of -

Sr. No.	Product Name	Maximum Quantity	UOM
1.	Epoxy Resins	10.0	MT/M
2.	Poly Vinyl Acetate	20.0	MT/M
3.	Acrylic Epoxy Resin & Emulsion	15.0	MT/M
4.	Thermoset Polymers	0.8	MT/M

3. CONDITIONS UNDER WATER ACT:

- (i) The daily quantity of trade effluent from the factory shall be Nil
- (ii) The daily quantity of sewage effluent from the factory shall not exceed 0.7 M³.
- (iii) Trade Effluent Treatment: N.A.
- (iv) Trade Effluent Disposal: N.A.
- (v) Sewage Effluent Treatment: The applicant shall provide comprehensive treatment system as is warranted with reference to influent quality and operate and maintain the same continuously so as to achieve the quality of treated effluent to the following standards.

(1) Suspended Solids	Not to exceed	100	mg/l.
(2) BOD 3 days 27o C.	Not to exceed	100	mg/l.
- (vi) Sewage Effluent Disposal: The treated effluent shall be connected to soak pit which shall be cleaned periodically.
- (vii) Non-Hazardous Solid Wastes:

Sr. No.	Type of waste	Quantity	Treatment	Disposal
			N.A.	

- (viii) Other Conditions: Industry should monitor effluent quality regularly.

4. The daily water consumption for the following categories is as under:

- (i) Domestic purpose ... 1.0 CMD
- (ii) Water gets Polluted & Pollutants are Biodegradable ... 1.0 CMD
- (iii) Water gets Polluted, Pollutants are not Biodegradable & Toxic ... 0.0 CMD
- (iv) Industrial Cooling, spraying in mine pits or boiler feed ... 1.0 CMD

5. CONDITIONS UNDER AIR ACT:

Control Equipment: Control Equipment: Air Pollution control equipments installed shall be operated & maintained round the clock to limit the emissions under following standards.

Standards for Emissions of Air Pollutants:

- (i) TPM Not to exceed 150 mg/Nm³
- (ii) SO₂ Not to exceed 7.2 kg/Day

Conditions for D.G. Set: - N.A.

Standards for Stack Emissions:

(i) The applicant shall observe the following fuel pattern:-

Sr. No.	Type Of Fuel	Quantity	UOM
1.	LDO	200.0	Ltr/day

(ii) The applicant shall erect the chimney(s) of the following specifications:-

Sr. No.	Chimney Attached To	Height (mtrs)
1.	Boiler	13.0

(iii) The applicant shall provide ports in the chimney/(s) and facilities such as ladder, platform etc. for monitoring the air emissions and the same shall be open for inspection to/and for use of the Board's Staff. The chimney(s) vents attached to various sources of emission shall be designated by numbers such as S-1, S-2, etc. and these shall be painted/ displayed to facilitate identification.

(iv) The industry shall take adequate measures for control of noise levels from its own sources within the premises so as to maintain ambient air quality standard in respect of noise to less than 75 dB(A) during day time and 70 dB(A) during night time. Day time is reckoned in between 6 a.m. and 10 p.m. and night time is reckoned between 10 p.m. and 6 a.m.

(v) **Other Conditions:**

- 1) The industry should not cause any nuisance in surrounding area.

6. CONDITIONS UNDER HAZARDOUS & OTHER WASTE (MANAGEMENT & TRANSBOUNDARY MOVEMENT) RULES, 2016:

S. No.	Type Of Waste	Qty	UOM	Disposal
	Industry shall not generate any type of hazardous waste.			

a. Whenever due to any accident or other unforeseen act or even, such emissions occur or is apprehended to occur in excess of standards laid down, such information shall be forthwith Reported to Board, concerned Police Station, office of Directorate of Health Services, Department of Explosives, Inspectorate of Factories and Local Body. In case of failure of pollution control equipments, the production process connected to it shall be stopped, and shall not be restarted unless permission is obtained from board.

Handwritten signature

7. Industry shall comply with following additional conditions:

- i. The applicant shall maintain good housekeeping and take adequate measures for control of pollution from all sources so as not to cause nuisance to surrounding area / inhabitants.
- ii. The applicant shall bring minimum 33% of the available open land under green coverage/ tree plantation.
- iii. Solid waste—The non hazardous solid waste arising in the factory premises, sweepings, etc., be disposed of scientifically so as not to cause any nuisance / pollution. The applicant shall take necessary permissions from civic authorities for disposal to dumping ground.
- iv. The applicant shall provide for an alternate electric power source sufficient to operate all pollution control facilities installed by the applicant to maintain compliance with the terms and conditions of the consent. In the absence, the applicant shall stop, reduce or otherwise, control production to abide by terms & conditions of this consent regarding pollution levels.
- v. The applicant shall not change or alter quantity, quality, the rate of discharge, temperature or the mode of the effluent/emissions or hazardous wastes or control equipments provided for without previous written permission of the Board.
- vi. The applicant shall provide facility for collection of environmental samples and samples of trade and sewage effluents, air emissions and hazardous wastes to the Board staff at the terminal or designated points and shall pay to the Board for the services rendered in this behalf.
- vii. The applicant shall make an application for renewal of the consent at least 60 days before the date of the expiry of the consent.
- viii. The firm shall submit to this office, the 30th day of September every year, the Environmental Statement Report for the financial year ending 31st March in the prescribed Form-V as per the provisions of rule 14 of the Environment (Protection) (Second Amendment) Rules, 1992.
- ix. An inspection book shall be opened and made available to the Board's officers during their visit to the applicant.
- x. The applicant shall install a separate electric meter showing the consumption of energy for operation of domestic and industrial effluent treatment plants and air pollution control system. A register showing consumption of chemicals used for treatment shall be maintained.
- xi. Separate drainage system shall be provided for collection of trade and sewage effluents. Terminal manholes shall be provided at the end of collection system with arrangement for measuring the flow. No effluent shall be admitted in the pipes / sewers down- stream of the terminal manholes. No effluent shall find its way other than in designed and provided collection System.
- xii. Neither storm water nor discharge from other premises shall be allowed to mix with the effluents from the factory.

8. Applicant shall not carry out any activities which require prior Environmental Clearance as per EIA notification 2006 & as amended.

9. This Board reserves the right to amend, to revoke, suspend the consent issued or add any conditions in this consent and the same shall be binding on the Applicant.

10. The consent should not be construed as any exemption from obtaining necessary NOC from other Govt. agencies as may deemed fit necessary

11. The applicant shall obtain permission from Central Ground Water Board for the use of Ground Water.

Chandigarh

12. The applicant shall comply with the provision of E-Waste Management Rules, 2016.
13. This is issued without pre-justice of the Hon'ble NGT orders passed or being passed in Application No. 64/2016 filed by Akhil Bhartiya Mangela Samaj & Ors. V/s. MPCB & Ors.
14. Industry shall submit Bank Guarantee of Rs. 25,000/- in favor of Regional Office, Thane within 7 days period towards compliance of consent conditions.
15. The Capital investment of the industry is Rs. 10.99 Lakh

For and on behalf of the
Maharashtra Pollution Control Board

(D. B. Patil)

Regional Officer, Thane

To,
M/s. ANKIT PETROPRODUCTS PVT. LTD.,
Plot No. L- 12, MIDC Tarapur,
Tal. & Dist. Palghar - 401506

Received Consent fee of -

Sr. No.	Amount (Rs.)	Transaction No.	Date	Drawn On
1	7500/-	TXN1904002072	22/04/2019	-

Copy to:

1. CAO/ Cess Wing/ Master File.
2. Sub Regional Officer, M.P.C. Board, Tarapur-I

(Handwritten Signature)

Annexure B



ANKIT PETROPRODUCTS PVT. LTD

L-12 MIDC TARAPUR INDUSTRIAL AREA BOISAR THANE DISTRICT - 401506
CIN NO. U24100MH1990PTC055798

GST NO. 27AAACA1521A1Z5

Tel: +91 98166 19177

23/11/2017

To
Regional Officer
MPCB 5th Floor Office Complex Bldg
Near Mulund Check Naka
Wagle Estate Thane 400 604

Sub: Restart Order MPCB/ROT/Restart/1454 DT 24.10.2017 IN CONNECTION WITH THE EARLIER CLOSURE ORDER ISSUED TO MAYFAIR BIOTECH (ANKIT PETRO) DATED 3.12.2016

Dear Sir,

We wish to bring to your notice the letters referred in the above mentioned subject and the letters written earlier by Mayfair Biotech Pvt Ltd to whom we had leased the unit for their operations.

Further to your letter dated 24.10.2017 for restart permission we wish to inform you that no field officer has visited the premises for inspection after the restart order given to us. Mayfair Biotech is holding Consent No: ROT/UAN/0000026369/E & J/GEN/1706000941 dated 23/6/2017 valid till 31/05/2018. They wish to discontinue operations due to financial constraints and we Ankit Petroproducts will be starting operations soon. At the moment the factory is not having any operations our Consent No RO-THANE/CONSENT/1707000628/TR V dated 13/7/2017 is enclosed for your reference. Please depute your Officer for diligence.

Thanking you
For Ankit Petroproducts Pvt Ltd

Encl: Copy of letter from Mayfair Biotech
Copy of Letter from MIDC for Sub-lease and no dues
cc...SRO Office Tarapur Dist Palghar 401506

SUB-REGIONAL OFFICE
MAHARASHTRA POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD
TARAPUR, MIDC COLONY, BOISAR,
TALUKA & DIST. PALGHAR, PIN 401 504.

मादिराक काबुल
ज. प्र. सि. ज. ठाणे
कामगिरीम संकुल इमारत
ज. म. त. ज. 11/11/17
ज. म. त. ज. 11/11/17



Annexure C.

Corp Office: C-7, Amul Complex, Rd No 1, Chembur, Mumbai - 400 071.

Fact: L 12 MIDC Tarapur Dist Palghar 401 506

Phones: + 91-22-25280776, + 91-22-25283972 E-mail: mayfairbio@gmail.com:

URL: www.mayfairbiotech.co.in & www.mayfairbiotech.net

23/11/2017


To
Regional Officer
MPCB 5th Floor Office Complex Bldg
Near Mulund Check Naka
Wagle Estate Thane 400 604

Sub: Restart Order MPCB/ROT/Restart/1454


With reference to your above restart order dated 24th October '2017 we wish to inform you that no person from your office has come to visit the factory.

We are stopping our operations and handing over the entire factory to the actual owner M/s. Ankit Petroproducts Pvt Ltd.

They already have the consent to operate and the products are nil effluent. Their consent No as given by them to us is RO-Thane/Consent/1707000628/TRV dated 13th July 2017 valid till 30/04/2019.


SUB-REGIONAL OFFICE
MAHARASHTRA POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD
TARAPUR, MIDC COLONY, BOISAR,
TALUKA & DIST. PALGHAR, PIN 401 504.

✓
म.प्र.राज्य. कायदालय
म.प्र.पि. व. इकाई
महाराष्ट्र राज्य प्रदूषण नियंत्रण बोर्ड
म.प्र.राज्य, मुंबई विकास विभाग
म.प्र.राज्य, मुंबई (ए. १) ४०० ०७१



BEFORE THE NATIONAL GREEN TRIBUNAL PRINCIPAL
BENCH, NEW DELHI

In Re :

Original Application No. 64/2016 (WZ)

In the matter of :

Akhil Bhartiya Mangela Samaj & OthersApplicant(s)

Versus

Maharashtra Pollution Control Board & OthersRespondent(s)


KNOW ALL to whom these presents shall come that I/We Anand Ramachandran S/o Sh. Sh. K S Ramachandran director of Ankit Petroproducts (P) Ltd. having its registered office at Plot No.L-12, MIDC Tarapur, Tal & Dist. Palghar-401506 Maharashtra, the above named applicant do hereby appoint Sh. Vinod Khera, Advocate, R-556, Shanker Road, New Rajinder Nagar, New Delhi-110060, Enrolment No. : D-957/1994, Mobile No. 9811130268, E-mail : vkheraadv@yahoo.com (hereinafter called advocate/(s) to be my/our Advocate in above-noted case & authorize them:-

To act, appear and plead in the above-noted case in this Court or in any other Court in which the same may be tried or heard and also in the Appellate Court including High Court subject to payment of fees separately for each court by me/us.

To sign, file, verify and present pleadings, appeals, cross-objections or petitions executions, review, revision, withdraw, compromise or file other petitions, affidavits, other documents as may be deemed necessary or proper for the execution of the said case in all its stages subject to payment of fees for each stage.

To file and take back documents, to admit and/or deny the documents of opposite party.

To withdraw or compromise the said case or submit to arbitration any differences or disputes that may arise touching or in any manner relating to the said case. To take execution proceedings.



To deposit, draw and receive moneys, cheques, cash and grant receipts thereof. To do all other acts and things which may be necessary to be done for the prosecution and in the course of the prosecution of the said case.

To appoint and instruct any other legal practitioner or person authorizing him to exercise the power and authority hereby conferred upon the Advocate.

And I/We the undersigned do hereby agree to ratify and confirm all acts done by the Advocates or their substitute in the matter as my/our own acts, as if done by me/us to all intents and purposes.

And I/We undertake that I/We or my/our duly authorized agent would appear in court on all bearings and will inform the Advocate for appearance when the case is called.

And I/We undersigned do hereby agree not to hold the advocate or his substitute responsible for the result of the said case. The adjournment costs whatever ordered by the Court shall be of the Advocate which he shall receive and retain for himself.

And I/we undersigned do hereby agree that in the event of the whole or part of the fee agreed by me/us to be paid to the advocate remaining unpaid, he shall be entitled to withdraw from the prosecution of the said case until the same is paid up. The fee settled is only for the above case and above court. I/we hereby agree that once the fee is paid, I/we will not be entitled to refund of the same in any case whatsoever, and in case the above case prolongs for more than three years, the original fee shall be paid again by me/us.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF I/we do hereunto set our hand to these present the contents of which have been understood by me/us, on this 18th day of September, 2021.

Vickers
ADVOCATE (S)

Paul Michael
CLIENT (S)

I hereby identify applicant who has signed in my presence.

Vickers
ADVOCATE