

3546

BEFORE THE HON'BLE NATIONAL GREEN TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH AT NEW DELHI

I.A NO. 304/2024

IN

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 702/2022

IN THE MATTER OF:

DEEPAK KUMAR & ANR

....APPELLANT(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF UTTRAKHAND & ORS

....RESPONDENT (S)

IN THE MATTER OF:

PANKAJ KUMAR

....APPLICANT

INDEX

NDOH-18.12.2024

Sr. No	<u>Particular</u>	<u>Pg. No</u>
1.	REJOINDER ON BEHALF OF THE APPLICANT TO THE REPLY FILED BY THE ORIGINAL APPLICANT TO I.A NO. 304/2024 WITH SUPPORTING AFFIDAVIT.	1-18
2.	ANNEXURE A-1:- COPY OF ORDER DT. 17.07.2024 IN CA NO. 2522/2018.	19-23
3.	PROOF OF SERVICE	24

Bani Dikshit/ Uddhav Khanna/ Dhruva Vig
Advocates for the Applicant
Add: D-1061, LGF, New Friends Colony,

3547

Place : New Delhi
Date :14 .12.2024

New Delhi 1100245
Email: banidikshit.advocate@gmail.com
Phone: 9810993368/ 9718917845

BEFORE THE HON'BLE NATIONAL GREEN TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH AT NEW DELHI

I.A. No. 304 OF 2024

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 702 OF 2022

IN THE MATTER OF:

DEEPAK KUMAR & ANR.

.....Appellant(s)

Versus

STATE OF UTTARAKHAND & ORS.

.....Respondent(s)

AND IN THE MATTER OF:

PANKAJ KUMAR

....Applicant

REJOINDER ON BEHALF OF THE APPLICANT TO THE
REPLY FILED BY THE ORIGINAL APPLICANT TO I.A. NO.
304/ 2024.

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHOWETH:

1. The Applicant herein is a Respondent in the Captioned Original Application, more specifically Respondent No. **03**, and was impleaded as a party to the Captioned Original Application vide order dated 11.10.2023, whereby IA No. 732/2023 filed by the Original Applicant seeking Impleadment of 17 stone crushers was allowed.
2. Thereafter, the present Applicant herein was constrained to file the present Application challenging the maintainability of the Captioned

4575/24

Application, respectfully on account of the want of power and jurisdiction of this Hon'ble Tribunal to sit in judicial review of the notifications and policies issued by the Central and State Governments in their prerogative as the legislative authorities.

3. At the very outset, it is submitted that the contents of the Counter Affidavit/ Reply preferred by the Original Applicant, in so far as they do not pertain to matters of fact and record, are untenable, misconceived and unsupported by facts and law. It is respectfully submitted since the Original Applicant has undertaken a reply through different submissions marked as separate sub-headings, the Applicant herein is only preferring a limited response to the said sub-headings, without undertaking a specific para-wise response. The Applicant reserves its right to file a detailed rejoinder if and when the need arises with permission of this Hon'ble Tribunal. The Applicant further seeks to rely upon the submissions already made in the present Application vis-à-vis the aspect of the Ld. NGT sitting in judicial review of the policies of the State Government and travelling beyond its jurisdiction.
4. The Applicant herein submits the following response to the submissions raised by the Original Applicant in its Counter Affidavit/ Reply:
 - A. NGT's original jurisdiction can be sourced to Sections 14 and 15 r/w 20, which do not restrict or limit NGT's jurisdiction so as to exclude the power to quash a government notification.

4/5/2015

5. At the very outset, it is completely wrong to suggest that the Section 14 of the NGT Act, 2020 does not place any fetters on the power of the Ld. NGT to quash a government notification. Section 14 of the NGT Act, 2020 or even Section 15 of the said Act nowhere ascribes such power to the Ld. NGT which is sought to ascribed to the Ld. NGT by the Original Applicant herein.
6. In fact, it is the Original Applicant's own stance that the invocation of NGT's power is incumbent upon the substantial question relating to the environment arising out of *IMPLEMENTATION* of a Schedule 1 enactment.
7. Thus, even from a bare perusal of the language of Section 14 of the NGT Act, 2020, it is clear that the jurisdiction of the Ld. NGT can be invoked for the proper and effective *implementation* and enforcement of the legislations (acts, rules, notifications, circulars etc.) already in place and issued by the competent legislative authorities. The term 'implementation' used in the said provision cannot and ought not to be expanded beyond its reasonable interpretation.

However, what the Original Applicant seeks to attribute to the Ld. NGT's power and jurisdiction under Section 14 of the NGT Act through its interpretation, is the power to even strike down or set aside a Schedule 1 enactment, which is beyond the scope and mandate of the '*implementation*' of a Schedule 1 enactment.

4/2/2021

8. Furthermore in the present OA, even though the Original Applicant was purportedly aggrieved with the issuance of the permits and Environmental Clearances granted to the various stone crushers, the Original Applicant resorted to file the present OA challenging *inter alia* the Impugned Notification dated 06.12.2020 and the 2021 Stone Crusher Policy, without impleading the Stone Crushers as a party to the said proceedings, in an attempt to bypass the requirement of meeting the strict threshold of Section 16 of the NGT Act, under which the grant of Environmental Clearances is to be mandatorily challenged. It was only pursuant to this Hon'ble Tribunal's intervention that the said Stone Crushers were impleaded as parties.
9. Strictly, as per law, when any person is aggrieved by the issuance of the CTE and EC, a challenge thereto is required to be preferred under Section 16 of the NGT Act, 2010, and within the prescribed timelines provided therein. In this regard, the relevant extract of Section 16 of the NGT Act, is reproduced below:

“Section 16. Any person aggrieved by,—

...

(h) an order made, on or after the commencement of the National Green Tribunal Act, 2010, granting environmental clearance in the area in which any industries, operations or processes or class of industries, operations and processes shall not be carried out or shall be carried out subject to certain safeguards under the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986 (29 of 1986);

...

427/11

may, within a period of thirty days from the date on which the order or decision or direction or determination is communicated to him, prefer an appeal to the Tribunal: Provided that the Tribunal may, if it is satisfied that the appellant was prevented by sufficient cause from filing the appeal within the said period, allow it to be filed under this section within a further period not exceeding sixty days."

10. From the facts and circumstances of the present case at hand, it can be reasonably deduced that the present proceedings before this Hon'ble Tribunal, although cloaked as an Original Application under Section 14 and 15 of the NGT Act, is clearly a challenge to the EC granted to the various Stone Crushers, a challenge to which will necessarily fall under Section 16 of the NGT Act, and only within the statutory timeline prescribed therein. While the Original Applicant has surreptitiously attempted to veil the present challenge as one under Section 14 and Section 15 of the NGT Act, in so far as the umbrella prayer (e),(f) for the quashing of all the ECs and CTEs are concerned, the same cannot and will not, in any manner come within the contours of Section 14 and Section 15 of the NGT Act, and is necessarily a appeal, notwithstanding the terminology, attracting the provisions of Section 16 of the NGT Act, which would, *inter alia*, entail that the challenge of the Original Applicant, in so far as the prayer (e),(f) is concerned, is barred by limitation, as discussed below.
11. In fact, it cannot be ruled out that the Original Applicant was conscious of the statutory scheme of Section 16 of the NGT Act, which mandates

that any challenge to the EC is required to be made in the prescribed period of 90 days from the issuance of the EC, and not thereafter. In order to overcome this legal hurdle, the Original Applicant has cloaked the present application/ petition as one under Section 14 and Section 15, as opposed to Section 16 of the NGT Act. The Original Applicant has failed to appreciate that it is settled law that the nomenclature of the petition / application is wholly inconsequential and immaterial, and the contents and the reliefs sought reveal the real nature of the application filed by the Original Applicant. Even otherwise, the even a bare reading of the prayers (e) and (f) leave no room for doubt that the OA is seeking quashing of the Stone Crusher's ECs, necessitating an appeal under Section 16 of the NGT Act. The contours of Section 14 of the NGT Act, are wholly different and the same cannot be invoked for seeking quashing for the clearances and permits, especially with an intent to avoid the strict timelines of Section 16.

12. Notwithstanding the same, and as discussed in the foregoing paragraphs of the Rejoinder, the settled position of law as on date clearly suggests that the Ld. NGT has no jurisdiction to sit in judicial review of notifications and policies issued by the Central and/or State Governments. In this regard, reliance is placed on the submissions made in the Application bearing IA No. 304/2024 filed by the Applicant herein, and upon the judgments relied therein, being *Tamil Nadu Pollution Control Board v. Sterlite Industries (I) Ltd*, [2019 SCC

45/11/24

OnLine SC 221 and Environment Support Group v. Biodiversity Authority (SLP (C) No. 7951/2014).

13. From the aforesaid judgments which have been mentioned in the Application bearing IA No. 304/2024, it is clear that the position of law as it stands today, as declared by the Hon'ble Supreme Court is that it is the Constitutional Courts, i.e. High Courts which are empowered to deal with a challenge to the legality and validity of notifications/policies issued by the legislative authorities. The same is brought out from the very fact that the Hon'ble Supreme Court set aside the order whereby the proceedings wherein a notification/ policy had been. challenged where being transferred to the Ld. NGT, and the Hon'ble Supreme Court categorically held (while relying upon *Sterlite supra*) that such issue ought to be decided by the Hon'ble Court and not the Ld. NGT.
14. The Original Applicant has submitted that there is no explicit or implicit limitation on the power of the NGT in the NGT Act, 2010 to pass an order, decision or award quashing a government notification. However, such a contention is completely contrary to the principles enshrined by the Hon'ble Supreme, which has duly delineated and interpreted the powers of the Ld. NGT in light of the fact that the power in Section 14 which the Original Applicant is trying to carve out for this Hon'ble Tribunal is conspicuously absent in Section 14.

15. In fact, even Section 15 which lists down the powers of the Hon'ble NGT pursuant to exercise of Section 14 jurisdiction, is completely and intentionally silent about the power of the Ld. NGT to strike down notifications and policies. The powers of relief/ compensation to victims, restitution of the environment and property damaged cannot be expanded to mean the power to sit in judicial review of legislative prerogative.

B. Apex Court has held in a catena of judgments that NGT has wide jurisdiction to pass orders to safeguard environment, a right sourced to Article 21. Therefore, an interpretation which confers jurisdiction upon NGT should be favoured over one which takes away its jurisdiction.

16. It is pertinent to submit that the reliance placed by the Original Applicant upon the decisions mentioned in Sub-heading B under reply is completely misleading and not relevant to the facts and circumstances of the present case at hand.

17. The Original Applicant has cited the said decisions to purportedly contend that the Ld. NGT has wide powers and special jurisdiction for enforcement of environmental rights, which as a necessary corollary would mean the power to adjudicate the plea assailing a government notification on the ground that it violates fundamental right to clean and healthy environment. However, none of the decisions go beyond the

4/2/2015

powers ascribed to the Ld. NGT, and nowhere suggest what the Original Applicant is contending.

18. In fact the decision of *MantriTechzone* cited by the Original Applicant itself says that “*such question should arise out of implementation of the enactments specified in Schedule1*”, and the “*this grants a glimps into the wide range of powers that the Tribunal has been cloaked with respect to restoration of the environment*”.
19. The decisions cited by the Original Applicant only suggest that the Ld. NGT has wide powers to act in the interest of the environment and take restorative measures whenever the environment and ecology are being compromised and jeopardized. The question whether Ld. NGT has the power to strike down notifications/polices is not answered by these judgements.
20. It is pertinent to note that specific emphasis has been laid down on the following observations in the said decisions: *As stated supra. the typical nature of the Tribunal, its breadth of powers as provided under the statutory provisions of the Act as well as the Scheduled enactments, cumulatively, leaves no manner of doubt that the only tenable interpretation to these provisions would be to read the provisions broadly in favour of cloaking the Tribunal with effective authority. An interpretation that is in favour of conferring jurisdiction should be preferred rather than one taking away jurisdiction.*

4.5.17/2017

21. However, it is also pertinent to note that the 'jurisdiction' being talked about herein, is the jurisdiction of the Ld. Tribunal to take wide measures for the purposes of restoration and restitution of the environment, and not 'jurisdiction' to determine and adjudicate upon the legality and validity of a legislation including subordinate legislation.

C. Reliance upon Tamil Nadu Pollution Control Board vs. Sterlite Industries (I) Ltd. [2019 SCC OnLine SC 221] is misplaced.

22. The contention of the Original Applicant that *Sterlite (supra)* pertains to exercise of Appellate jurisdiction by the Ld. NGT, and does not apply in cases of exercise of powers/ jurisdiction under Section 14 and Section 15 of the NGT Act is completely frivolous and misleading.

23. Although it is true that in *Sterlite (supra)*, the Hon'ble Supreme Court makes an observation that "...It is clear, therefore, that under the NGT Act, the Tribunal exercising appellate jurisdiction cannot strike down rules or regulation made under this Act", however, it is pertinent to note that such observation was made in the facts and circumstances of that case, since the Ld. NGT therein was exercising jurisdiction under Section 16 of the NGT Act.

24. However, the interpretation that such observation is only applicable in cases where the Ld. NGT exercises its appellate jurisdiction under Section 16 of the NGT Act, and not in cases where it exercises

4/2/2019

jurisdiction under Section 14 and 15 of the NGT Act, is completely misleading and an attempt to circumvent the position of law as on date.

25. In fact, it was the Hon'ble Supreme Court itself which has clarified this aspect in ***Environment Support Group v. Biodiversity Authority (SLP (C) No. 7951/2014***, when the Hon'ble Supreme Court was pleased to stay the proceedings in **OA No. 10/2014** pending before the Ld. NGT, Chennai, and thereafter completely set aside the said proceedings, as the same were left to be decided by the Hon'ble High Court. In fact, in the said case the Hon'ble Supreme Court was presented with the proposition laid down in ***Sterlite (supra)***, which prompted the Hon'ble Supreme Court to set aside the proceedings which had been transferred to the Ld. NGT and registered as Original Application (under Section 14 jurisdiction). Therefore, in light of the same, the contention raised by the Original Applicant is completely baseless and misleading.

D. Supreme Court of India in *L. Chandra Kumar v. Union of India and Ors.*, (1997) 3 SCC 261 has held that Tribunal has the power of judicial review.

26. The question of 'jurisdiction' of the Ld. NGT to adjudicate upon issues which are seized by the Hon'ble High Courts was clearly dealt with by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***The State of Andhra Pradesh vs. Raghu Ramakrishna Raju Kanumuru (M.P.)***. The following key observations were made by the Hon'ble Supreme Court:

4 2/11/2014

“7. Dr. Abhishek Manu Singhvi, learned Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of the appellant, submitted that when the High Court of competent jurisdiction was already in seisin of the matter, the learned NGT could not have entertained a lis with regard to the same cause of action. He submitted that though this fact was brought to the notice of the learned NGT, the learned NGT refused to vacate the interim order dated 6th May 2022, which was in conflict with the order of the High Court dated 16th December 2021.

“8. Dr. Singhvi submitted that NGT is a Tribunal, which is subordinate to the High Court in so far as the territorial jurisdiction of the High Court is concerned. He, therefore, submitted that the very continuation of the proceedings before the learned NGT is not sustainable in law.

*“11. In any case, no law is necessary to state that insofar as the Tribunals are concerned, they would be subordinate to the High Court insofar as the territorial jurisdiction of the High Court is concerned. A reference in this respect was also made to the judgment of the Constitution Bench of this Court in the case of **L. Chandra Kumar v. Union of India and Others**²”*

“12. We are, therefore, of the considered view that it was not appropriate on the part of the learned NGT to have continued with the proceedings before it, specifically, when it was pointed that the High Court was also in seisin of the matter and had passed an interim order permitting the construction. The conflicting orders passed by the learned NGT and the High Court would lead to an anomalous situation, where the authorities would be faced with a difficulty as to which order they are required to

4/5/22

follow. There can be no manner of doubt that in such a situation, it is the orders passed by the constitutional courts, which would be prevailing over the orders passed by the statutory tribunals”

“13. In that view of the matter, we are of the considered view that the continuation of the proceedings before the learned NGT for the same cause of action, which is seized with the High Court, would not be in the interest of justice.”

“14. We, therefore, quash and set aside the proceedings pending before the learned NGT in O.A. No.361 of 2021.”

27. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India clearly considered the decision of *L. Chandra Kumar (supra)*, to come to the aforesaid findings. Therefore, the contention raised by the Petitioner herein is completely frivolous and misleading.

E. Large number of precedents exist where this Hon'ble Tribunal has quashed government notifications.

28. The Original Applicant has relied upon certain judgments to contend that that the Ld. NGT in the past has quashed government notifications in exercise of its original jurisdiction. However, the Original Applicant has not presented the true and correct facts before this Hon'ble Court. In fact, in the very first judgement cited by the Original Applicant herein, i.e. *S.P. Muthuraman vs. Union of India [OA No. 37 of 2015]*, certain Appeals had been filed against the said decision of the Ld.

4/5/2025

NGT, and the Hon'ble Supreme Court, while disposing of the other appeals by issuing various orders and granting various reliefs, admitted one of the Appeals bearing C.A. No. 2522/2018, which had been tagged along with these appeals, with the following observations:

“C.A. No. 2522/2018

One of the issues raised by the Union of India in this appeal is whether the National Green Tribunal has jurisdiction to strike down subordinate legislation.

Appeal admitted.

Liberty to file a reply”

Rest of the cases

.....However, in the appeal filed by the Union of India being C.A. No. 2522/2018, we will be considering the question whether the National Green Tribunal has jurisdiction to set aside the subordinate legislation. The appellants may file impleadment / intervention applications in C.A. No. 2522/2018.

A copy of the Order dated 17.07.2018 in CA No. 2522 of 2018 is annexed herewith as Annexure A-1.

Copies of the Office Report(s)/ Orders showing the tagged matter being filed with regard to OA No. 37 of 2015, and the decision dated 07.07.2015 which has been relied upon by the Original Applicant had been challenged and was tagged with other Appeals including CA No. 2522 of 2018.

4/8/2018

29. As such, an attempt has been made by the Original Applicant to bring out various judgments to show that the Ld. NGT has in the past quashed government notifications, without however bringing to the notice of this Hon'ble Tribunal that the said decision has been challenged before the Hon'ble Supreme Court and that the Hon'ble Supreme Court has admitted the appeal to adjudicate the issue whether the Ld. NGT has jurisdiction to strike down notifications/ policies etc.
30. Therefore respectfully, the very issue which has been raised by the Applicant herein, i.e. the power of the Ld. NGT to sit in judicial review of government polices/ notifications etc. is presently under consideration before the Hon'ble Supreme Court, and till such time a decision is taken by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in this regard, this Hon'ble Tribunal, respectfully, cannot entertain the Captioned Original Applicant. This is further strengthened by the fact that even the present position of law supports the contention of the Applicant herein, which provides that the Ld. NGT cannot strike down government notifications and polices. In this regard, reliance is being placed upon the submissions made hereinabove and in IA No. 304/2022, which are not being repeated herein for the sake of brevity.
- F. Arguendo, it is submitted that this Hon'ble Tribunal has the power to mould relief to safeguard the interest of environment.
31. In light of the aforesaid submissions, it is completely wrong to suggest, while giving a highly expansive interpretation to *Ankita Sinha* as cited by the Original Applicant, that the power of Ld. NGT to mould the

U.S. Sinha

reliefs prayed for and to grant appropriate reliefs be expanded to setting aside and striking down government notifications and/or policies etc. The Applicant herein relies upon the submissions made in the present rejoinder and in IA No. 304/2024, which are not being repeated herein for the sake of brevity.

32. In view of the aforesaid, it is respectfully submitted that the prayers made by the Petitioner in the present Petition be allowed. Further, the prayer clause of the captioned Counter Affidavit is wrong and denied. The Petitioner most respectfully prays for any further orders/ directions as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the present case.

Drawn by:



Bani Dikshit and Uddhav Khanna

421/2024
APPLICANT

Uddhav Khanna

Filed by:



Bani Dikshit and Uddhav Khanna, Dhruva Vig
Advocates for the Applicant

D0161, LGF, New Friends Colony,

New Delhi-110025

Mob: 9810993368

Email: uddhavkhanna.advocate@gmail.com

Uddhav Khanna

Dhruva Vig

Place: New Delhi

Date: 10/12/2024

421/2024



BEFORE THE HON'BLE NATIONAL GREEN TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH AT NEW DELHI

I.A. No. 304 OF 2024

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 702 OF 2022

IN THE MATTER OF:

DEEPAK KUMAR & ANR.

.....Appellant(s)

Versus

STATE OF UTTARAKHAND & ORS.

.....Respondent(s)

AND IN THE MATTER OF:

PANKAJ KUMAR

....Applicant

AFFIDAVIT

I, Mr. Pankaj Kumar, S/O Late. Devi Prakash, R/O, Village Jeevangarh, P.O. Ambari Dist, Dehradun, Uttarakhand- 248125, aged about 44 years, presently at Vikas Nagar, Dehradun do hereby solemnly affirm and state as under:

1. That I am the Applicant in the accompanying Application and as such I am fully acquainted with the facts and circumstances of the instant case and thus competent to swear this Affidavit.
2. That I further state that the contents of the accompanying reply have been thoroughly read and understood by me and I declare that the reply has been prepared on my instructions.

4/12/24

3. That the contents of the accompanying reply are all true to my knowledge. The same has been read over to me and understood by me to be true.
4. That the annexures to the accompanying reply are true copies of their respective originals.



VERIFICATION

I, the deponent above named, do hereby verify and state that the contents of the foregoing paragraphs of the above affidavit are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief and that no part of it is false and nothing material has been concealed therefrom. Verified by me at Vikas Nagar, Dehradun on this 10 of Dec, 2024.

Vikas Nagar
DEPONENT

Vikas Nagar
DEPONENT

Receipt No. 137/10.12.2024.

ATTESTED
10/12/2024
VINEET CHAUHAN
ADVOCATE & NOTARY
REG. No. 54(01)/2022
VIKASNAGAR, DEHRADUN

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

Civil Appeal No(s). 5618/2015

SAS REALTORS PVT. LTD.

Appellant(s)

VERSUS

S.P. MUTHURAMAN & ORS.

Respondent(s)

WITH

C.A. No. 7193-7194/2015

C.A. No. 7191-7192/2015

C.A. No. 9108/2015

C.A. No. 1119-1120/2016

C.A. No. 13844-13845/2015

C.A. No. 13842-13843/2015

C.A. No. 2522/2018

C.A. No. 3309-3312/2018

O R D E R

C.A. Nos. 7193-7194/2015 and C.A. Nos. 7191-7192/2015

Learned counsel for the appellants says that these appeals have become infructuous.

The civil appeals are disposed of on having become infructuous.

C.A. No. 2522/2018

One of the issues raised by the Union of India in this appeal is whether the National Green Tribunal has jurisdiction to strike

down subordinate legislation.

Appeal admitted.

Liberty to file a reply.

Rest of the cases

Subsequent to the order of the National Green Tribunal, a Committee has been constituted in terms of para 163(4). The Committee has also given a report which has been placed before the Tribunal.

Since the correctness or otherwise of the report is already before the Tribunal, we are not inclined to entertain these appeals.

The appeals are accordingly disposed of. However, in the appeal filed by the Union of India being C.A. No. 2522/2018, we will be considering the question whether the National Green Tribunal has jurisdiction to set aside the subordinate legislation.

The appellants may file impleadment / intervention applications in C.A. No. 2522/2018.

.....J.
[MADAN B. LOKUR]

.....J.
[DEEPAK GUPTA]

NEW DELHI;
July 17, 2018.

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

Civil Appeal No(s). 5618/2015

SAS REALTORS PVT. LTD.

Appellant(s)

VERSUS

S.P. MUTHURAMAN & ORS.

Respondent(s)

WITH

C.A. No. 7193-7194/2015 (XVII)

(FOR MODIFICATION OF COURT ORDER ON IA 5/2016)

C.A. No. 7191-7192/2015 (XVII)

C.A. No. 9108/2015 (XVII)

(FOR ON IA 3/2016 FOR ON IA 5/2016)

C.A. No. 1119-1120/2016 (XVII)

C.A. No. 13844-13845/2015 (XVII)

C.A. No. 13842-13843/2015 (XVII)

C.A. No. 2522/2018 (XVII)

(FOR STAY APPLICATION ON IA 32145/2018
FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT ON IA
32147/2018

FOR PERMISSION TO FILE LENGTHY LIST OF DATES ON IA 32150/2018
FOR PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS ON IA 32156/2018)

C.A. No. 3309-3312/2018 (XVII)

(IA No.44893/2018-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED
JUDGMENT and IA No.44888/2018-STAY APPLICATION and IA
No.44891/2018-PERMISSION TO FILE LENGTHY LIST OF DATES and IA
No.44894/2018-PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS)

Date : 17-07-2018 These appeals were called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MADAN B. LOKUR
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK GUPTA

For Appellant(s) Mr. Jogy Scaria, AOR

Mr. Ramesh Babu M. R., AOR

Mr. Mohan Parasaran, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Ashwin Kumar D.S., Adv.

Mr. D. L. Chidananda, AOR

Ms. Rohini Musa, AOR

Mr. Rajesh Kumar, AOR

Mr. Satish Mishra, Adv.

Mr. Kumar Dushyant Singh, AOR

Mr. Kailash Vasdev, Sr. Adv.

Mr. R. Mohan, Adv.

Mr. V. Balaji, Adv.

Mr. M.S.M. Asaithambi, Adv.

Ms. Sripradha Krishnanan, Adv.

Mr. Rakesh K. Sharma, AOR

Mr. Gurmeet Singh Makker, AOR

For Respondent(s)

Mr. A.N.S. Nadkarni, ASG

Mr. Divya Prakash Pande, Adv.

Mr. Niraj Kumar, Adv.

Mr. S.S. Rebello, Adv.

Ms. Ridhi Kackkar, Adv.

Mr. Sanjai Kumar Pathak, Adv.

Mr. Ritesh Kumar, Adv.

Mr. Anmol Chandan, Adv.

Mr. Gurmeet Singh Makker, AOR

Mr. T. V. S. Raghavendra Sreyas, AOR

Ms. Gayatri Gulati, Adv.

Ms. Sneh Dhillon, Adv.

Mr. Sanjay Upadhyay, Adv.

Mrs. Lalita Kaushik, AOR

Mr. Prakhar Pandey, Adv.

Ms. Upma Bhattacharjee, Adv.

Ms. Anitha Shenoy, AOR

Ms. Srishti Agnihotri, Adv.

Ms. Remya Raj, Adv.

CPCB

Mr. Vijay Panjwani, AOR

Mr. Rahul Pratap, Adv.

Mr. K. Parameshwar, AOR

Mr. G. Prakash, AOR

Mr. Rakesh K. Sharma, AOR

Ms. Rohini Musa, AOR

Mr. K.S. Mahadevan, Adv.
Mr. Krishna Kumar, Adv.
Mr. Rajesh Kumar, AOR
Ms. Swati Bansal, Adv.

Mr. Avijit Roy, AOR

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following

O R D E R

C.A. Nos. 7193-7194/2015 and C.A. Nos. 7191-7192/2015

The civil appeals are disposed of on having become infructuous in terms of the signed order.

C.A. No. 2522/2018

Appeal admitted.

Rest of the cases

The appeals are disposed of in terms of the signed order.

The appellants may file impleadment / intervention applications in C.A. No. 2522/2018.

(MEENAKSHI KOHLI)
COURT MASTER

(KAILASH CHANDER)
COURT MASTER

[Signed order is placed on the file]