

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

INDEX

IN

REPLY BY WAY OF AFFIDAVIT

(On behalf of the Respondent No. 3)

(In Compliance with the Hon'ble Tribunal's Order dated
28.08.2024)

IN

O.A. No. 1101 OF 2024

Rafeek Ahamad & Ors.

Applicant(s)

Versus

State of Uttarakhand & Ors.

Respondent(s)

S.No	Particulars	Pg. No.
1.	Index	
2.	Reply by way of affidavit.	
3.	Annexure 1	

Place: New Delhi

Filed by

Dated:



Deepak Bora

Advocate

Counsel for the State of Uttarakhand

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

REPLY BY WAY OF AFFIDAVIT

(On behalf of the Respondent No. 3)

(In Compliance with the Hon'ble Tribunal's Order dated
28.08.2024)

IN

O.A. No. 1101 OF 2024

Rafeek Ahamad & Ors.
Applicant(s)

Versus

State of Uttarakhand & Ors.
Respondent(s)

Affidavit of Karmendra
Singh S/o Sh. Vijay
Bahadur Singh,
presently posted as
District Magistrate,
Haridwar,
Uttarakhand.

(DEPONENT)

I, the above-named deponent, do hereby solemnly affirm
and State:

जिला मजिस्ट्रेट
हरिद्वार

1. That the deponent is presently posted as District Magistrate, Haridwar, Uttarakhand.
2. That on 28.08.2024, after the course of hearing in the present matter, this Hon'ble Tribunal was pleased to pass certain directions and direct the respondents to file a reply by the form of an affidavit to the Original Application. The relevant paras of the said Order dated 28.08.2024 are being quoted here for the kind perusal of this Hon'ble Tribunal:

5. *"The original application raises substantial issues relating to compliance with environmental norms.*
6. *Issue notice to the respondents for filing their reply in the form of an affidavit before the Tribunal at least one week before the next date of hearing. If any respondent directly files the reply without routing it through his advocate then the said respondent will remain virtually present to assist the Tribunal."*



3. That the Respondent No. 3 respectfully submits that the statements contained in Paragraphs 1 and 2 of the application pertain to the incident that occurred on February 20, 2023, at an unauthorized firecracker warehouse located in Mohalla Kanoon Goyan, Panchayat Dharamshala, Roorkee, District Haridwar, Uttarakhand, along with the consequences arising therefrom. As these paragraphs merely recount the


जिला मजिस्ट्रेट
हरिद्वार

events and associated implications of the said incident, Respondent No. 3 deems it unnecessary to provide a detailed response to the same.

4. That the Respondent No. 3 submits that the statements made in Paragraphs 3 and 4 of the application are matters of record and are admitted only to the extent that they accurately reflect such records. Any assertions or implications contrary to the record are expressly denied.
5. That the Respondent No. 3 further submits that the contents of Paragraphs 5, 6, and 7 of the application are also matters of record. However, it is significant to bring to the attention of this Hon'ble Court that, as per the investigation conducted, an unauthorized storage facility for firecrackers was being operated by Respondents No. 5 and 6. It is submitted that Respondents No. 5 and 6 did not obtain the requisite permission or license for such an operation from the Competent Authority under the Explosive Rules, 2008. Furthermore, Respondents No. 5 and 6 failed to implement the essential safety measures mandated for the storage of explosive materials, thereby violating statutory requirements.
6. That the Respondent No. 3 respectfully submits that the statements contained in Paragraphs 8, 9, 10, and




जिला मजिस्ट्रेट
हरिद्वार

11 of the application are matters of record and are admitted to the extent they align with the records. However, it is reiterated that the incident occurred at an unauthorized and illegal firecracker godown. The said godown was situated in a highly congested area, accessible only by a narrow road approximately six feet in width, which severely hampered the movement and operational efficiency of firefighting teams during the incident.

7. That the Respondent No. 3 further submits that the contents of Paragraphs 12 and 13 of the application are matters of record. It is reiterated, as stated in the preceding paragraphs, that the unfortunate incident was a direct result of the illegal storage of firecrackers by Respondents No. 5 and 6, who failed to ensure any fire safety or precautionary arrangements. It is pertinent to highlight that firecrackers are classified as "Explosives" under Schedule-1 (Part-I) (C) of the Manufacture, Storage, and Import of Hazardous Chemical Rules, 1989, as amended from time to time. However, it is submitted that a godown storing firecrackers does not fall under the definition of "industrial activities" as provided under the said Rules.

8. That the Respondent No. 3 respectfully submits that the statements made in Paragraph 14 of the




जिला मजिस्ट्रेट
हरिद्वार

application are matters of record and are admitted to the extent that they accurately reflect such records. Any assertion or implication contrary to the record is expressly denied. It is further reiterated that the firecracker godown in question does not fall under the definition of "industrial activities" as prescribed under the Manufacture, Storage, and Import of Hazardous Chemical Rules, 1989, as amended from time to time.

9. That the Respondent No. 3 submits that the contents of Paragraph 15 of the application pertain to orders passed by the Hon'ble National Green Tribunal (NGT) in similar matters. As such, no specific response is required from the answering Respondent concerning this paragraph.

10. That the Respondent No. 3 respectfully submits that the statements made in Paragraph 16 of the application are matters of record and are admitted to the extent they accurately reflect the records. Any statements or implications contrary to the record are expressly denied.

11. It is humbly submitted that following the unfortunate incident of February 20, 2023, an F.I.R. bearing No. 198/2023 was registered under Section 154 of the Cr.P.C. against Alok Jindal and Ayush Jindal, who are




जिला मजिस्ट्रेट
हरिद्वार

Respondents No. 5 and 6 in the present matter. A copy of the F.I.R. has already been annexed by the applicants with the Original Application as Annexure A/2. Upon conclusion of the investigation, Charge Sheet No. 115/2023 was filed, prosecuting the accused persons under Sections 304, 308, 338, and 286 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, along with Section 3 of the Explosive Substances Act, 1908. The said charge sheet has been submitted before the First Additional District Judge, Roorkee, District Haridwar.

12. Additionally, in compliance with the directions of the Hon'ble National Green Tribunal (NGT) in this matter, a Joint Committee comprising officials from various departments conducted a site inspection on November 8, 2024. A copy of the inspection report, along with the charge sheet filed on June 16, 2023, is being marked and submitted herewith as **Annexure No. 1**.

13. That the Respondent No. 3 submits that the contents of Paragraphs 17, 18, 19, and 20 of the application pertain to the provisions of the National Green Tribunal Act, 2010, specifically regarding the powers vested in the Hon'ble NGT for awarding compensation to victims of industrial accidents. These are statutory provisions, and no detailed response from the answering Respondent is required in this regard.




जिला मजिस्ट्रेट
हरिद्वार

14. That the Respondent No. 3 further submits that the contents of Paragraphs 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, and 26 of the application outline the applicants' plea for compensation, as determined by the Hon'ble Tribunal in similar matters, along with the identification details of the applicants for compensation. The answering Respondent takes note of these submissions and does not deem it necessary to provide a specific response, as the determination of compensation lies within the discretion and authority of the Hon'ble Tribunal.

I, the above-named deponent, do hereby verify that the contents of Para nos. 1 to 14 of this affidavit are true to my knowledge, which all I believe to be true. That no part of this affidavit is false and nothing material has been concealed.



DEPONENT

I, GIRISH CHANDRA TYAGI ADV., do hereby identify the deponent who has produced the records of the case before me and I am satisfied that he is the same person as alleged.

जिला मजिस्ट्रेट
हरिद्वार


IDENTIFIER
GIRISH CHANDRA TYAGI
Advocate
Reg. - UP 5196/2000, UK 4004/04
Civil Court Roorkee
Mob: 9997080765
22/11/24

Solemnly affirmed before me today, the 29 day of November 2024 by the deponent who has been identified by theaforesaid person.

I have satisfied myself by examining the deponent that he has understood the contents of this affidavit, which have been read over and explained to him.

OATH COMMISSIONER/NOTARY




जिला मजिस्ट्रेट
हरिद्वार
1957
Time..... 2:10 AM/P.M.

VERIFIED & ATTESTED


(S. K. MAHESHWARI)
Advocate & Notary Public
R.No.-42(5) 2006, Exp. Dt.-26/09/2025
Ch. No.-142
Teh. Roorkee, Distt.-Haridwar (U.K.)

29/11/2024

मा० एन०जी०टी० द्वारा मूल आवेदन सं० 1101/2024 रफीक अहमद एवं अन्य बनाम उत्तराखण्ड राज्य एवं अन्य में पारित आदेश दिनांक 28.08.2024 के अनुपालन में संयुक्त निरीक्षण आख्या।

प्रकरण दिनांक 20.02.2023 को मौहल्ला कानून गोयान, पंचायती धर्मशाला, रुड़की के समीप श्री आलोक जिंदल पुत्र श्री प्रसन्न प्रकाश एवं श्री आयुष जिंदल पुत्र श्री सुशील जिंदल निवासी मौहल्ला कानून गोयान, पंचायती धर्मशाला, रुड़की द्वारा बनाये गये अनधिकृत पटाखों आदि के गोदाम में आग/विस्फोट की घटना तथा उक्त घटना से जन हानि के मुआवजा से सम्बन्धित है।

मा० एन०जी०टी० द्वारा मूल आवेदन सं० 1101/2024 "रफीक अहमद एवं अन्य बनाम उत्तराखण्ड राज्य एवं अन्य" में पारित आदेश दिनांक 28.08.2024 के अनुपालन में विषयगत स्थल का संयुक्त निरीक्षण दिनांक 08.11.2024 को किया गया। निरीक्षण में निम्नलिखित अधिकारी उपस्थित थे:-

1. श्री धनीराम सैनी, नायब तहसीलदार, तहसील रुड़की।
2. श्री पंकज राजपूत, राजस्व उपनिरीक्षक, तहसील रुड़की।
3. श्री सुंदरपाल, अग्निसमन अधिकारी, रुड़की।
4. सुश्री अंशु चौधरी, उपनिरीक्षक, कोतवाली, रुड़की।
5. डा० राजेन्द्र सिंह, क्षेत्रीय अधिकारी, उत्तराखण्ड प्रदूषण नियंत्रण बोर्ड, रुड़की।

निरीक्षण के समय श्री गोपाल जिंदल पुत्र श्री सुशील कुमार, निवासी-93, कानून गोयान, तहसील रुड़की एवं श्री सुशील कुमार पुत्र श्री प्रसन्न प्रकाश निवासी-93, कानून गोयान, तहसील रुड़की उपस्थित थे। निरीक्षण आख्या निम्नवत है:-

1. श्री आलोक जिंदल एवं श्री आयुष जिंदल द्वारा विषयगत स्थल पर अनधिकृत रूप से पटाखों आदि का गोदाम बनाकर पटाखों आदि को भण्डारित किया गया था। पटाखों आदि के भण्डारण/विक्रय हेतु श्री आलोक जिंदल एवं श्री आयुष जिंदल द्वारा सक्षम स्तर से विस्फोटक पदार्थ नियम, 2008 के प्रावधानों के अन्तर्गत वांछित लाईसेंस/अनुमति प्राप्त नहीं की गयी थी।
2. श्री आलोक जिंदल एवं श्री आयुष जिंदल द्वारा जिन दुकानों को पटाखों आदि के गोदाम के रूप में प्रयोग किया जा रहा था वह स्थल लगभग 6 फुट संकरी सड़क से जुड़ा हुआ अत्यन्त घनी आबादी वाला क्षेत्र है, जो पटाखों जैसे अन्य विस्फोटक पदार्थों के भण्डारण हेतु सर्वथा अनुपयुक्त जगह थी।
3. श्री आलोक जिंदल एवं श्री आयुष जिंदल द्वारा विषयगत स्थल को गोदाम के रूप में प्रयुक्त किये जाने हेतु आवश्यक सुरक्षा उपायों-यथा अग्निशमन यंत्रों की व्यवस्थाएँ आदि नहीं की गयी थी।
4. पटाखों The Manufacture, Storage and import of Hazardous Chemical Rule, 1989 (as amended time to time) के Schedule-1 (Part-I) के अन्तर्गत (C) Explosives के अन्तर्गत वर्गीकृत है, तथापि विषयगत प्रकरण मात्र पटाखों आदि के अनधिकृत भण्डारण एवं रख-रखाव से सम्बन्धित है।

दिनांक 20.02.2023 को आग/विस्फोट की घटना के विरुद्ध पुलिस विभाग द्वारा भारतीय दण्ड संहिता, 1860 की धारा 304, 338, 308 एवं 286 तथा विस्फोटक पदार्थ अधिनियम, 1908 की धारा 3 के अन्तर्गत मा० सक्षम न्यायालय में "राज्य सरकार बनाम आलोक जिंदल एवं अन्य" वाद (प्रथम सूचना संख्या-198/2023) दाखिल किया गया है। वर्तमान में प्रकरण मा० प्रथम अपर जिला जज, रुड़की के समक्ष विचाराधीन है।



[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]






कमशःपृष्ठ 2

OFFICE COPY

जिला मजिस्ट्रेट
हरिद्वार


6. मा० एन०जी०टी० में विचाराधीन मूल आवेदन सं०-1101/2024 के संदर्भ में याचीगणों यथा- श्री रफीक अहमद पुत्र श्री रहिमुल्ला, निवासी इमागबाड़ा वाली गली, महियाम, रुड़की; श्री सोनू पुत्र श्री खुशीद निवासी गाँव बदेडी, राजपुतान, भारापुर भौरी, रुड़की एवं श्री सगीर अहमद पुत्र श्री अली अहमद निवासी 466, महियाम, रुड़की से दिनांक 13.11.2024 को व्यक्तिगत रूप से सम्पर्क किया गया। उपरोक्त याचीगणों के अनुसार विषयगत प्रकरण में जनहानि के एवज में उन्हें वर्तमान तक किसी प्रकार का मुआवजा नहीं मिला है।
7. श्री आलोक जिंदल एवं श्री आयुष जिंदल द्वारा अवैधानिक रूप से बनाये गये पटाखों आदि के गोदाम में आग/विस्फोट के कारण जनहानि आदि के दृष्टिगत सम्बन्धित कोतवाली द्वारा अभियुक्तगणों के विरुद्ध चार्जशीट (आरोप पत्र संख्या-115/2023) दाखिल किया जा चुका है। चार्ज शीट की छायाप्रति संलग्न है। (संलग्नक-1)। सम्बन्धित वाद मा० प्रथम अपर जिला जज, रुड़की के समक्ष विचाराधीन है।

उपरोक्तानुसार निरीक्षण आख्या प्रस्तुत है।

1. श्री धनीराम सैनी, नायब तहसीलदार, तहसील रुड़की।	
2. श्री पंकज राजपूत, राजस्व उपनिरीक्षक, तहसील रुड़की।	
3. श्री सुंदरपाल, अग्निशमन अधिकारी, रुड़की।	
4. सुश्री अंशु चौधरी, उपनिरीक्षक, कोतवाली, रुड़की।	
5. डा० राजेन्द्र सिंह, क्षेत्रीय अधिकारी, उत्तराखण्ड प्रदूषण नियंत्रण बोर्ड, रुड़की।	

अपर उपजिलाधिकारी, रुड़की




VERIFIED & ATTESTED

(S. K. MAHESHWARI)
Advocate & Notary Public
R.No.-42(5) 2006, Exp. Dt.-26/09/2025
Ch. No.-142
Teh. Roorkee, Distt.-Haridwar (U.K.)

OFFICE COPY


जिला मजिस्ट्रेट
हरिद्वार



केवल प्रतिलिपि फीस हेतू

प्रार्थना पत्र देने का दिनांक	नोटिस का दिनांक	जारी करने का दिनांक	हस्ताक्षर मुख्य प्रतिलिपिक
28 14/11/23	18/11/23	18/11/23	 18/11/23

जमाना/लप प्रथम अपर सत्र न्यायाधीश नडकी

सत्र प्रतिलिपि अर्थात् 155/2023

रखणार बनाम गोलोक जंगल राम

धारा 304, 380, 388, 208 काठि पीपी

अ 3 विरुद्ध पत्र गोलोक जंगल

नामा न्यायी

मुद्रा न्यायी 138/2023

जमाना आरोप पत्र न्यायी जमाना

द्वारा उक्त सखान है।




 जिला मजिस्ट्रेट
 हरिद्वार



संज्ञी गवाणिका

संज्ञी गवाणिका संज्ञी गवाणिका - (संज्ञी) 9634768388

(संज्ञी)

17) संज्ञी गवाणिका संज्ञी गवाणिका - (संज्ञी) - 8077454591

(संज्ञी)

18) संज्ञी गवाणिका संज्ञी गवाणिका - (संज्ञी) - 7505995744

(संज्ञी)

19) संज्ञी गवाणिका - (संज्ञी)

75000007100

(संज्ञी)

20) संज्ञी गवाणिका संज्ञी गवाणिका - (संज्ञी)

7055988055

(संज्ञी)

WASCO

संज्ञी गवाणिका

संज्ञी गवाणिका

संज्ञी गवाणिका

संज्ञी गवाणिका



VERIFIED & ATTESTED

(S. K. MAHESHWARI)

Advocate & Notary Public
R.No.-42(5) 2006, Exp. Dt.-26/09/2025
Ch. No.-142

Ten. Roorkee, Distt.-Haridwar (U.K.)

संज्ञी गवाणिका

संज्ञी गवाणिका
हरिद्वार