



275  
उत्तर प्रदेश प्रदूषण नियंत्रण बोर्ड  
UTTAR PRADESH POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD



Ref No. : H07040/सी०-7/0.A.No-234/2020/2024

Date : 16/02/2024

To,

**The Registrar General,**  
Principal Bench,  
Hon'ble National Green Tribunal,  
Copernicus Marg, New Delhi.

**Sub.: Regarding submission of Reply/Response with reference to Hon'ble NGT order dated 14-12-2023 in the matter of O.A. No. 234/2020 Anuradha Vs. Triveni Engineering & Industries Ltd. & Ors.**

Sir,

In compliance of the direction passed by Hon'ble National Green Tribunal during hearing on 14-12-2023 in the matter of O.A. No. 234/2020 Anuradha Vs. Triveni Engineering & Industries Ltd. & Ors., Reply/Response of U.P. Pollution Control Board as obtained from Regional Officer, U.P. Pollution Control Board, Moradabad is enclosed herewith with the request to put up before Hon'ble National Green Tribunal for kind perusal.

**Encl: As Above**

Yours Sincerely,

Chief Environment Officer

**Reply/Response of UPPCB with respect to objections made by unit in compliance of order dated 14-12-2023 passed by Hon'ble NGT, New Delhi in O.A. No. 234/2020 Anuradha Vs. Triveni Engineering & Industries Ltd. & Ors.**

S.No.	Observations as per the Joint Inspection Report	Reply of the unit	Response of UPPCB
	<p>As per Daily Manufacturing Reports (DMRs) provided by the unit it was observed that on the day of inspection the unit was crushing 5220 TCD of cane, which is more than the consented capacity. As per DMRs provided by the unit, average cane crushing for the month of December, 2020 is found to be 5091.5 TCD, which is more than consented capacity of 5000 TCD.</p> <p><b>Conclusions</b> The unit operational capacity was found more than consented capacity.</p>	<p>It is humbly submitted that the conclusion drawn by the Committee is incorrect, misleading and smacks of non - application of mind. The answering respondent would like to rely upon the Certificate issued by the District Cane Officer, Rampur, for the Crushing Season 2020-21, wherein the seasonal crushing average was 4932 TCD by the unit whereas the consented capacity is 5000 TCD. In other words, the unit crushed lesser than the consented capacity, if determined on a seasonal basis. A true copy of the Certificate issued by the District Cane Officer, Rampur is annexed herewith and marked as <b>Annexure R-3</b>.</p> <p>14. It is quite possible that in a particular day, there may be a variance in the amount of cane crushed. At times, it is beyond the reasonable control of any Sugar Manufacturer to control the amount of cane it is crushing since the entire cane received by it has to be crushed, and that may result in minor deviation, but on an average the total crushing capacity for the season cannot be breached. Moreover, since the average of a month i.e., December 2020 is taken as a criteria in the Report in question to suggest a breach beyond the consented capacity of 5000 TCD, though marginally, in the sameway, it is the Appellant's submission that average of the entire crushing season</p>	<p>It is to mention here that the Consent to operate issued by UPPCB is for cane crushing capacity of 5000 Ton of cane crushed per day. The unit is required to operate within the consented cane crushing capacity as mentioned in the CTO. The joint committee has recommended to the unit to operate at consented capacity of 5000 TCD as granted by UPPCB. The unit has itself accepted that the unit has done crushing in excess of the consented capacity.</p>

ACE

		<p>should be considered, which would demonstrate that the Appellant is thoroughly complaint. The same is clearly evident from the certificate issued by the District Cane officer.</p> <p>15. Therefore, since quantity of crushing of sugarcane is based on supply by farmers, which is beyond the control of the unit, a slight variation on some days cannot be ruled out. Therefore, it would be appropriate, practical and pragmatic for the crushing capacity visà-vis actual crushing carried out to be determined on a seasonal basis.</p> <p>16. In this regard, it may be noted that the Joint Inspection Committee has reported that the unit generates 126.55 Litres of effluent / ton of cane crushed. Running on consented capacity (5000 TCD), the unit would generate about 632 KLD of effluent, whereas, as noted by the Joint Inspection Committee itself, the ETP capacity of the unit is 840 KLD (in addition to 600 KLD of SRS). Therefore, even if there were to be a minor variation in crushing by the unit, the ETP systems installed at the unit are suitably capable to treat the effluent generated so that there is no pollution whatsoever caused on account of such effluent generation.</p>	
<p>2.</p>	<p><b>RE: UNIT DOES NOT HAVE REQUISITE FLOWMETERS INSTALLED</b></p>		
	<p>17. The unit has not installed flow meter at the main inlet channel of ETP however, it was observed that flow meter was installed at the feed to primary clarifier from equalization.</p> <p>18. The unit has installed flow meter in the outlet channel carrying</p>	<p>In respect of the observation that no separate flowmeter was installed at the ETP outlet as well as the SRS outlet, it is humbly submitted that firstly, the answering Respondent was under no statutory obligation to install the said flow meters. As far as an inlet flow-meter is concerned, it is apposite to refer to the Point No. 7 of the Special Conditions provided under the Consent to Operate issued by UPPCB to the</p>	<p>The unit is required to install flow meter at the outlet of ETP for measurement of the daily discharge done by the unit as already directed while issuing consent to the unit.</p> <p>During inspection dated 23-12-2020 conducted by</p>

1  
AEE

	<p>combined treated effluent from ETP &amp; SRS to treated effluent storage lagoon.</p> <p>19. The unit is having separate 600 KLD of Sulphate Recovery System (SRS) installed for treatment spray pond/ cooling tower overflow. Flow meter is installed at inlet of SRS, however separate flow meter at outlet of SRS is not installed to estimate the - treated effluent generation from SRS. The treated effluent from SRS outlet is combined with treated effluent from ETP and discharged into the lagoon. The OCEMS records the continuous combined flow of treated effluent from ETP and SRS.</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b> No separate flowmeter was installed at ETP outlet as well SRS outlet.</p>	<p>answering Respondent herein where the following condition is stated:</p> <p>7. <i>Unit shall operate and maintain the installed electromagnetic flow meter at water source and outlet of ETP with running hours and maintain the records of water extracted and treated effluent supplied to irrigation or discharge in drain.</i></p> <p>22. Clearly, there is no requirement to install a flow-meter at the inlet of the-ETP. Even apart from the consent to operate, at no point in time was a direction issued to the unit to install a flow-meter at the inlet of the ETP System. Therefore, in the absence of a specific direction, no fault can be ascribed to the unit for not having installed a flow-meter at the inlet of ETP.</p> <p>23. Be that as it may, it may be noted that as noted in the Joint Inspection Report, after the first stage of the ETP system i.e. equalisation tank, the Sugar Manufacturing Unit had already installed an ETP meter. Therefore, there can be no grievance regarding non-installation of flow meter at the inlet of ETP.</p> <p>24. Further, as regards flow-meter installed at the common channel of Effluent Treatment Plant (ETP) and Sulphate Reduction System (SRS) and not individually on the two, it is the respectful submission of the answering Respondent that the ETP and SRS are jointly a part of the overall Effluent Treatment Plant (ETP) and the SRS and ETP go into a common channel. Therefore, it is the common channel after ETP and SRS, which the ETP outlet for</p>	<p>CPCB, UPPCB and district administration Rampur, it was found that the unit has not installed flow meter at the outlet of ETP.</p> <p>The joint committee has recommended to install flow meter at ETP outlet as well as at outlet of SRS to estimate the separate effluent generation after treatment from ETP as well as SRS.</p> <p>At present the unit has installed flow meter at ETP inlet, inlet and outlet of SRS and at final outlet of channel carrying combined effluent of ETP outlet and SRS outlet.</p>
--	---	---	---

h  
AEE

		<p>the unit. As such, the installation of flow-meter at this point satisfies the requirement to place a flow-meter at the outlet of ETP.</p> <p>25. Crucially, this has been the arrangement at the unit since long. It would be pertinent to note that prior to the Joint Committee inspection carried out on 23.12.2020, the subject Sugar Manufacturing Unit had been inspected by UPPCB, CPCB and IIT Roorkee (as directed by CPCB) on multiple occasions and in these inspections, no objection was raised with the placement / location of the flow-meters at the unit. Neither was relocation of flowmeters at the locations/ places suggested / directed. The answering Respondent humbly submits that it has always acted in accordance with the CPCB Charter and the directions of UPPCB/CPCB from time to time and has installed flow-meters at various locations.</p> <p>26. Be that as it may, after taking into account the Observations of the Joint Committee, the answering Respondent has now installed the flow meters, both at the inlet of the ETP and well as SRS outlet separately. A copy of photographs evidencing the flowmeters installed as various locations is annexed herewith and marked as <b>Annexure R-4 (Colly)</b></p>	
<b>3.</b>	<b>RE: STORAGE LAGOON IS OF OVER CAPACITY</b>		
	<p>27. As per the data for average effluent generation provided by the unit, effluent generation was found much less than the 15 days holding capacity of storage lagoon, which</p>	<p>29. In respect of the conclusion drawn that treated effluent storage lagoon was found of overcapacity the same is denied as the same is within the permissible limits per law. It is submitted that the as per guidelines of Ministry of Environment, Forest</p>	<p>During inspection dated 23-12-2020 of joint committee it was found that effluent generation data of the unit is much less than the consented discharge</p>

↓  
AER

	<p>indicates overcapacity of the treated effluent storage lagoon</p> <p><b>Conclusions (Para 5)</b> 28. The treated effluent storage lagoon was found of overcapacity.</p>	<p>and Climate Change (MoEF), Notification GSR 35(E) dated 14.01.2016/ CPCB charter, the treated waste water discharge limit is 200 litres / ton of cane crushing. Given that answering Respondent's plant capacity is 5000 TCD hence, the maximum effluent discharge per day equals to 1000 KLD i.e. (5000 TCD X 0.2 KLD/ ton of cane crushing).</p> <p>Further, as per conditions of the consent to operate issued by UPPCB, the answering Respondent was required to restrict the capacity of treated effluent storage lagoon to 15 days holding capacity. In other words, lagoon holding capacity of the unit should have been not more than 15000m<sup>3</sup> (i.e. 1000 KLD X 15 day =15000m<sup>3</sup>). The answering Respondent humbly submits that the subject Sugar Manufacturing Unit is having lagoon capacity which is approximately 12990m<sup>3</sup> which if calculated, comes to just 13 days lagoon holding capacity. Hence, the answering Respondent was fully compliant and was working in accordance with the conditions of treated effluent storage capacity. A true copy of MoEF Notification No. GSR 35(E) Clause No. 4(1) ii (3) dated 14.01.2016 is annexed herewith and marked as <b>Annexure - R-5</b>.</p>	<p>data which indicates that the storage lagoon is of over capacity. The joint committee has recommended to dismantle the extra lagoon observed adjacent to treated effluent storage lagoon.</p> <p>The reply of the unit shows that the storage lagoon capacity is within the limit of 15 days effluent discharge as per the consent granted to the unit and also as per the guidelines of notification no. GSR 35(E) dated 15-01-2016 of MoEF &amp; CC, Govt. of India.</p>
4.	<b>Re: ALLEGATION THAT THERE ARE TWO IMPERMEABLE LAGOONS IN THE ETP AREA</b>		
	<p>30. The joint team also observed 02 impermeable lagoons in the ETP area, one is adjacent to the treated effluent storage lagoon, which was reportedly filled with rainwater and second lagoon reported to be used for storage of waste water generated from backwash. The lagoon was</p>	<p>32. It is submitted that the 'lagoons' adjacent to treated effluent storage as observed by the Joint Committee were not 'lagoons', as referred in the traditional sense, where treated effluent is stored, but rather, more in the nature of impermeable 'tanks' which were being used as a part of the ETP set-up itself to ensure proper treatment of the effluent generated during the crushing process.</p>	<p>The joint committee has observed 02 impermeable lagoons which are filled with rain water and the second one is reported to be used for storage of waste water generated from back wash and was found filled with black and</p>

1  
AEE



	<p>found filled with black water &amp; same was reported to be pumped back to ETP via flexible pipe. Temporary pump &amp; flexible pipe was observed near the lagoon. The sample was not collected from these lagoons as in the lagoon adjacent to main treated effluent storage lagoon no coloured effluent was observed and little quantity of water at bottom was visible in one of the lagoon. Also, sample could not be collected from the lagoon separately filled with backwash water as the effluent was visible too oily and greasy.</p> <p><b>Conclusion (Para 5)</b></p> <p>31. Two impermeable lagoons in the ETP area were observed, one is adjacent to the main treated effluent storage lagoon, which was reportedly filled with rain water and second lagoon is reported to be used for storage of waste water generated from backwash which was filled with black &amp; greasy wastewater.</p>	<p>33. In respect of <b>one lagoon</b>, reported to be used for storage of waste water generated from backwash, it is submitted that the said impermeable 'tank' was used to temporarily hold backwash to enable proper treatment of the backwash by routing the same into the ETP on the same day. This was done to ensure that no untreated effluent is discharged from the unit.</p> <p>34. However, subsequent to Joint committee Inspection, the practice of taking back wash water into -small lagoon (tank) has been stopped. Now, Activated Carbon Filter / Multi Grade Filter backwash is directly taken into equalization tank and treated conventionally.</p> <p>35. Further, as far as the recommendation of Joint Committee (Please see Point 6.0 (11) of Recommendations) to dismantle of the aforesaid lagoon is concerned, it is submitted that the aforesaid lagoon now forms a part of the distillery's duly approved layout plan, which is set adjacent to the sugar unit and would be used as 'Condensate lagoon'. Hence, the said lagoon no longer is a part of the sugar Unit; and is being operated and controlled by the adjacent distillery only. Effectively, therefore, for the purposes of the sugar unit, the lagoon is unavailable i.e. akin to having been dismantled. A copy of photograph of the lagoon is annexed herewith and marked as <b>Annexure R-6</b>.</p> <p>36. As far as the <b>other lagoon</b> is concerned, the same was evidently not in use even during the inspection, as the same was lying empty. As far as recommendation of Joint Committee (Please see Point 6.0 (11) of Recommendations) to dismantle of the aforesaid lagoon is concerned, it is submitted that</p>	<p>greasy waste water.</p> <p>It is clear from the above that the storage of waste water in the impermeable lagoon may contaminate the ground water.</p> <p>The joint committee has recommended to dismantle/level the impermeable lagoons and to discontinue the practice of storing back wash effluent in lagoon.</p> <p>The unit has now discontinued the storage of back wash water of sugar unit in the lagoons and the above two lagoons are made pucca lagoons and 01 is used in storing the treated condensate water of distillery unit and the second pucca lagoon is used as spent wash storage lagoon of distillery unit.</p>
--	---	--	--

✓  
AEE

		<p>the aforesaid lagoon currently forms a part of the duly approved layout plan of a distillery which is setup adjacent to the sugar unit and would be used by them as 'CT Water' lagoon. Hence, the said lagoon no longer is a part of the Unit and is being operated and controlled by the adjacent distillery only. Effectively, therefore, for the purposes of the sugar unit, the lagoon is unavailable i.e. akin to having been dismantled. The photographs of the lagoon used by the distillery-is annexed herewith and marked as <b>Annexure – R-7</b>. A true copy of the approved layout plan of the distillery indicating the lagoons are now part of the distillery unit is annexed herewith and marked as <b>Annexure – R-8</b>.</p>	
5.	<b>RE: SUGGESTION THAT ETP OPERATION NEEDS IMPROVEMENT</b>		
	<p>37. The analysis of sample collected from aeration tank for MLSS/MLVSS were found (1581/1305), which is at lower side as against desired level of 2000-2500 mg/ l, which indicates the ETP was not properly stabilized. <b>Conclusion (Para 5)</b> 38. ETP operation and maintenance need to be improved. Analysis of sample collected from aeration tanks indicates that the ETP was not properly stabilized.</p>	<p>39. It is submitted that the conclusion of Joint Committee is absolutely vague and based on incorrect facts. The answering Respondent humbly submits that ETP of subject Sugar Unit has always been operating smoothly and is being maintained as per the settled protocols of CPCB and UPPCB and the same is well equipped with the latest state of the art technology. The same is fully functional, adequate and working within the prescribed norms. 40. It is submitted that as far as the observation of joint committee that the analysis of sample collected from aeration tank or MLSS/MLVSS were found (1581/1305), which is at lower side as against the desired level of 2000-2500 mg/l is concerned, it is submitted that Sugar factory effluent has organic and inorganic constituents, and to bring such organic and inorganic constituents in the effluent within desirable</p>	<p>During joint inspection dated 23-12-2020 the sample collected by joint committee from aeration tank was found having MLSS/MLVSS at lower side i.e. 1581/1305 mg/l. As per the directions issued by CPCB the MLSS value in aeration tank should be more than 2500 mg/l for reduction in BOD level and proper treatment of industrial effluent. The unit has submitted reply that the unit is maintaining the MLSS value as per the direction of committee and has annexed the analysis report of</p>

✓  
AEE

		<p>level, the effluent is treated through an activated sludge process. The process involves supply of air and micro nutrients in aeration tank to increase MLSS as per need, but, when the quantity of biomass (MLSS) has increased beyond 3000 – 4000 mg / litre then process of treatment is slowed down by 30 – 40% and to maintain sludge parameter i.e. F/M ratio at optimum level (2000 – 2500 mg / litre) one has to take out excess bio mass (MLSS). During this process for a short time MLSS decreases and to increase its quantity one has to add nutrients and excess air in aeration tank by reducing the air in equalization tank and increasing it in aeration tank.</p> <p>41. When joint team visited on 23.12.2020, only one day before, excess biomass (MLSS) was taken out to sludge bed in ordinary course to bring the process to normal. At this time maximum air was added, again in the routine course due to which the MLSS has appeared low in aeration tanks. Thus, reduction in biomass level was only due to the procedural activity necessitated for the purpose of achieving desirable biomass level and not for any other reason. Therefore, no fault can be found on part of the unit in this regard.</p> <p>42. Apart from the above, the answering Respondent has been regularly carrying out performance analysis of its ETP from an independent NABL approved laboratory and has always been found to be compliant, which is evident from the reports dated 20.11.2020, 1.12.2020, 25.01.2021, 19.02.2021, 17.03.2021 and 10.04.2021. A true copy of reports dated 20.11.2020, 21.12.2020, 25.01.2021, 9.02.2021, 17.03.2021 and 10.04.2021 is annexed</p>	<p>private NABL approved laboratory of different dates. The unit has also submitted that online monitoring system is available on the outlet of ETP.</p> <p>It is to be submitted here that the analysis report submitted by the unit are of different dates and not of the date of joint inspection and the unit has also not informed UPPCB for the sampling of the above mention dates. In the online effluent monitoring system the data of MLSS is not shown and the unit has also not submitted the calibration certificate of the online system.</p> <p>That based on above observations of the joint committee recommendations were made that the unit shall maintain adequate MLSS/MLVSS ratio in aeration tank and proper stabilization of ETP should be done.</p>
--	--	--	--

1  
AER

		<p>herewith as <b>Annexure R-9 (Colly).</b></p> <p>43. In fact, it may be noted that the fact that the ETP had been working properly is clearly evident from the data retrieved from the Online Continuous Emission Monitoring System ("OCEMS"). UPPCB has failed to consider the material fact that the OCEMS data, is monitored 24x7 by both UPPCB and CPCB and had there been any deviation, as alleged, then as per the SOP, both UPPCB and CPCB would have intimated the answering Respondent through SMS or email. Admittedly, nothing has been communicated to the answering Respondent, which shows, that the subject Sugar Unit is fully compliant and the parameters level in the effluent discharge were within the prescribed limit. This would be possible only when the ETP set-up was working properly. Therefore, when the parameters / norms of the treated effluent discharge are within norms, there is no question of the ETP set-up not working adequately and properly, as alleged in the report.</p> <p>44. It may be noted that on 21.01.2021 and 03.02.2021, during the Magh Mela, as per the directions of the committee formed by DM Rampur, the Unit/ETP was inspected by SDM and the officials of UPPCB and the same was found to be working smoothly without any traces of coloured/contaminated discharge. A true copy of the Report dated 21.01.2021 and 03.02.2021 are collectively annexed herewith and marked as <b>Annexure R-10 (Colly).</b></p> <p>45. Further, on 22.01.2021 and 27.01.2021, the samples were again collected and analyzed by the</p>	
--	--	--	--

AEK

		Office of R.O., UPPCB, Moradabad. The reports dated 03.02.2021 related thereto, also prove that the ETP was functioning smoothly and the discharge levels were within the prescribed parameters. A true copy of Reports prepared by the Office of R.O., UPPCB dated 03.02.2021 is annexed herewith and marked as <b>Annexure R -11 (Colly)</b> .	
<b>6.</b>	<b>RE: ALLEGATION THAT SRS IS NOT FUNCTIONING PROPERLY</b>		
	<p>46. It is also visible from analysis results that the sulphate value - at inlet of ETP (300 mg/l) and- is higher than the outlet (381 mg/l). The value of Sulphate as per analysis result of samples collected from inlet of SRS is 563 mg/l whereas the value of Sulphate was 864 mg/l at outlet of SRS, which shows that the Sulphate is higher at outlet of SRS as compared to the inlet, which is defeating the purpose of Sulphur Recovery System and indicates that SRS is not functioning properly.</p> <p><b>Conclusion (Para 5)</b></p> <p>47. Sulphate Removal System (SRS), which is installed to treat Sulphur containing effluent is not operated properly as Sulphur content in effluent increases from 563 mg/l at inlet to 864 mg/l at outlet of SRS. The unit has not disclosed the name of all chemicals used in SRS to treat Sulphur</p>	<p>48. The answering Respondent humbly submits that the aforesaid allegation is denied being incorrect and factually untenable. It is submitted that the answering Respondent has installed a well designed, state of the art ETP and Sulphate Recovery System (SRS) and is always working to ensure that proper treatment of the effluent discharge and operation of the ETP and SRS system. It is extremely important to note that sample analysis as recorded in the Main Report, shows that the Sulphur/sulphate is mentioned to be higher at the Outlet (864 mg/l) compared to what it is recorded at the Inlet (563 mg/l) of SRS, and such a result is not technically possible. It is submitted that SRS when functional is supposed to reduce sulphur, therefore even if the SRS does not work, which certainly is not the case reported by them, in that case also, it will, at best, remain the same. Assuming but not admitting that the effluents were not treated, even then the readings at the outlet would not increase automatically on its own from what has been recorded at the point of inlet of SRS.</p> <p>49. Thus, it is not scientifically possible that after treatment the readings will exponentially increase like it has been shown in the Report of the Joint Committee. This clearly demonstrates and establishes</p>	<p>That it is submitted that during inspection dated 23-12-2020 the sample collected from outlet of secondary clarifier of ETP showed sulphate value of 114 mg/l and at outlet of SRS it showed 864 mg/l which were mixed in channel before storage in common lagoon and the sample collected from storage lagoon showed the value of sulphate 390 mg/l which clearly indicates the dilution of sulphate content from SRS outlet with ETP treated effluent. So the joint committee has recommended to effectively operate the SRS plant so that sulphate content from SRS unit is also gets reduced.</p> <p>The unit in its reply has not mentioned anything about modification/effective operation of SRS unit to</p>

↓  
AEG

	<p>containing effluent, hence presence of Sulphur may be due to addition of a chemical coagulants in large quantity such as aluminum sulphate (alum) or ferric sulphate, which help to form larger clumps, making it easier to settle down to the bottom.</p>	<p>the fact that report prepared is unreliable and cannot be made the basis for coming to the conclusion regarding allegations of answering Respondent violating environmental norms. The answering Respondent most humbly submits that there are clear contradictions in the Report furnished by the Joint Committee and therefore cannot be relied upon to hold the answering Respondent liable for violating any environmental norms.</p> <p>50. In fact, the unit was using main following chemicals - in SRS unit: PAC (poly aluminium chloride), lime (calcium hydroxide) and Flocculent (Poly Acrylamide). Therefore, the observation of the inspection team that sulphur levels may increase through the SRS system is completely incorrect.</p> <p>51. It is further relevant to mention that the third party NABL approved lab analysis report dated 21.12.2020, 25.01.2021, 19.02.2021 and 17.03.2021 respectively, clearly proves beyond any doubt that the SRS system was running properly and achieving desired result. A true copy of reports dated 21.12.2020, 25.01.2021, 19.02.2021 and 17.03.2021 is annexed herewith and marked as <b>Annexure R-12 (Colly)</b>.</p>	<p>reduced the sulphur content from its outlet.</p>
<p>7.</p>	<p><b>RE: ALLEGATION THAT TREATED EFFLUENT IS BEING DISCHARGED THROUGH COMMON CHANNEL AFTER MIXING WITH ETP OUTLET</b></p>		
	<p>34. Table - 5 comprising of the Samples which were collected from inlet &amp; outlet of SRS and the analysis thereof</p> <p>35. Samples which were collected from inlet, outlet &amp; various units of ETP and treated</p>	<p>53. In response to the allegation that the effluent from SRS was being discharged through common channel in 12990m<sup>3</sup> treated effluent storage lagoon after mixing with ETP outlet wherein it become diluted with ETP treated effluent, it is submitted that the Unit has been discharging ETP</p>	<p>Same as point 6 above.</p>

✓  
AEE

	<p>effluent storage lagoon, and its analysis in Table- 6.</p> <p><b>Conclusion (Para 5)</b></p> <p>52. The treated effluent from SRS being discharged through common channel in 12990 m3 treated effluent storage lagoon after mixing with ETP outlet wherein it become diluted with ETP treated effluent which is reflected in the analysis results. The values of sulphate in effluent from Outlet of Secondary Clarifier (114 mg/l) and Outlet of SRS (864 mg/l), which were stored in common lagoon (390 mg/l) clearly indicates the dilution of sulphate content from SRS with ETP treated water.</p>	<p>treated effluent and effluent from SRS through common channel as per the charter directions and mentioned in the GSR 35 (E) dated 14.01.2016 only (annexed as Annexure R- 3 to this Reply). It is apposite to mention here that the charter clearly provides that a single outlet point from the Unit is allowed for final effluent discharge as well as for the waste water from spray pond overflow or cooling tower blowdown. Hence, the both treated steams are being stored in treated water lagoon to its final disposal for irrigation as per the statutory compliance. It is further submitted as mentioned hereinbefore that SRS is part of ETP and therefore there is no requirement to keep separate channels.</p>	
8.	<b>RE: ALLEGATION REGARDING CONTAMINATION OF GROUNDWATER</b>		
	<p>54. The analysis results of Groundwater samples— 01 (borewell depth — 50ft.), collected from hand-pump at Mahmadpur shows COD-06mg/l and total hardness-669 mg/l, which were exceeding the acceptable limit and pH in slightly acidic range. Similarly, results of Groundwater sample- 03 (borewell depth — 40 - SOR) from hand-pump at Mahmadpur village shows color-28 hazen, COD-46 mg/l, BOD- 5.8 mg/l Total Hardness-1275 mg/l and</p>	<p>57. At the very outset it is pertinent to note here that the analysis of groundwater samples cannot be termed as conclusive and it is rather speculative as the Joint Inspection team itself notes as follows:  <i>"The ground water contamination found may be due to the infiltration/ seepages of sulphate containing treated effluent discharged for irrigation to nearby villages which reaches up to shallow depth leading to high concentration of sulphate, colour, conductivity, COD, Total hardness and low pH value in groundwater, which can be further ascertained by study of ground water of nearby areas by Competent Department."</i></p> <p>58. A bare perusal of the conclusion arrived at by the</p>	<p>That during joint inspection dated 23-12-2020, the sample collected from the ground water shows high color, conductivity, COD, total hardness, sulphate concentration. The joint committee has concluded that the ground water contamination may be due to seepage of sulphate containing treated effluent discharge which is use by near by villagers. The joint committee</p>

✓  
AEG

<p>Sulphate-498 mg/l, which were exceeding the acceptable limit. Also, groundwater sample — 04 (borewell depth — 50 - 60 R) collected from handpump near ITI from Sarakthal village shows Total Hardness-693 men, which was exceeding the acceptable limit of Drinking Water Standards (BIS) IS 10500:2012.</p> <p>55.Hence, groundwater samples—01, 03 and 04 having borewell depth ranging from 40 to 60 feet had high colour, conductivity, COD, Total hardness and Sulphate concentration whereas hand pump — 02 having borewell depth 200 feet showed all the parameter within limit except for Iron (Fe)-0.76 mg/L which was exceeding the Permissible limit of Drinking Water Standards (BIS) IS 10500:2012</p> <p><b>Conclusion (Para 5)</b></p> <p>56. Analysis results of groundwater (shallow depth) shows high Colour, Conductivity, COD, Total hardness and Sulphate concentration. The ground water contamination found may be due to the infiltration/seepages of sulphate containing treated effluent discharged for irrigation to nearby villages which</p>	<p>Joint Committee makes it clear that a conclusive report on the Groundwater Samples has not been given. Therefore, it cannot be concluded from the report that the groundwater report is attributable to the unit.</p> <p>59. This is particularly because quality of ground water is influenced by the excessive use of fertilizers and pesticides for agricultural production. It is further submitted that the groundwater samples can also be affected from various other factors such as animal excreta, existing village ponds. Furthermore, ground water due to its long standing with minerals and rocks is generally more mineralized than surface water. Therefore, to link the levels of various parameters in groundwater only to the unit, would be completely incorrect.</p> <p>60.In any case, as far the samples are concerned, it may be noted that <b>hardness</b> and high levels of <b>sulphur</b> are naturally and geologically found in the area and therefore, such high levels cannot be attributed to the unit. Notably, an assessment study which was carried out by the Department of Chemistry, Government Raza (P.G.) College, Rampur, Uttar Pradesh, in the year 2010 found that hardness and sulphate are higher in all blocks of Rampur District. A true copy of the Report prepared by Department of Chemistry, Government Raza (P.G.) College, Rampur, is annexed herewith and marked as <b>Annexure R-13</b>.</p> <p>61.Further, as far as other indicators / parameters are concerned, it is the answering Respondent's submission that groundwater sample No. 3 shows extreme variations in all parameters. The answering</p>	<p>has also concluded that this data can be further assessed by the study of ground water of nearby areas from competent authority.</p> <p>The unit has not submitted report done by competent authority for the above point. <b>That UPPCB vide its letter dated 29-12-2023 - has revoked the show - cause notice dated 05-04-2021 with the direction that the unit shall conduct monitoring of ground water of the irrigated area, treated effluent and surface waterbody of near by area of the unit on paid basis through UPPCB.</b></p> <p><b>That the unit has obtained regular consent to operate from UPPCB in which condition has been imposed that the unit shall submit ground water quality report of the premises as well as irrigated area done by approved laboratory of MoEF&amp; CC, Govt. of India.</b></p> <p><b>The unit has not done monitoring of ground water on paid basis by UPPCB as well as has not submitted</b></p>
--	---	--

✓  
A.E.F.

<p>reaches up to shallow depth leading to high concentration of sulphate, colour, conductivity, COD, Total hardness and low pH value in groundwater, which can be further ascertained by study of ground water of nearby areas by Competent Department. Deep borewells are complying w.r.t BIS drinking water standards 10500:2012</p>	<p>Respondent humbly submits that these extreme variations clearly indicate that there may possibly be something wrong with the installation / working of the handpump from which Sample No. 3 was taken or that there may be a localised issue in the immediate vicinity of the hand-pump, such as the local village pond which is used by the villagers for dumping excreta / animal waste etc. which are responsible for the extreme values.</p> <p>Had values in groundwater sample No. 3 in any way attributable to the sugar unit, then similar variations would have been detected in the other hand-pumps as well. However, that is not the case inasmuch as all other handpumps show that most of the values are within BIS 10500:2012 specifications. Crucially, the treated effluent from the unit is not even being discharged for irrigation purposes close to the location of handpump No. 3 but rather to other locations at a distance. Therefore, in the submission of the answering Respondent, the samples from handpump No. 3 must be completely excluded from consideration while determining whether the unit has caused groundwater pollution as alleged.</p> <p>62.As regards colour in groundwater, it may be noted that the same is visible only in handpump No. 3 (which must be excluded for the aforesaid reasons) and in none of the other handpumps, which demonstrate that the unit is not responsible for the same.</p> <p>63.As regards pH in groundwater, it may be noted that the same is visible only in handpump No. 1 (apart from handpump No. 3 which must be excluded for the aforesaid reasons) and in none of the other</p>	<p><b>report of ground water quality done by approved laboratory of MoEF&amp; CC, Govt. of India. So on above basis the reply of the unit can not be relied.</b></p>
--	--	--

↓  
A&E

		<p>handpumps. Further, even in handpump No. 1, the levels are minimally lower than the prescribed norms (<i>only 0.1 lower than permissible</i>). In the Respondent's submission, the unit cannot be held responsible for the same, inasmuch as if the unit was responsible, then pH values would have been lower in all handpumps and not merely in 1 of the handpumps.</p> <p>64. In fact, as far as levels of groundwater vis-à-vis discharge from the unit is concerned, it may be noted that the unit releases treated effluent for irrigation purposes mostly around the farms abutting the unit boundary. Crucially, the groundwater samples in handpump No. 2 i.e. where the unit has been discharging treated effluent for irrigation purposes, has parameters within limits. This also indicates that the higher levels of pH and colour found in some other samples are not attributable to the unit.</p> <p>65. Pertinently, UPPCB has failed to consider the material fact that the OCEMS data, is monitored 24x7 by both UPPCB and CPCB and had there been any deviation, as alleged, then as per the SOP, both UPPCB and CPCB would have intimated the answering Respondent through SMS or email. Admittedly, nothing has been communicated to the answering Respondent, which shows, that the subject Sugar Unit is fully compliant and the parameters level in the effluent discharge were within the prescribed limit.</p>	
<p>9.</p>	<p><b>RE: ALLEGATION REGARDING POSSIBILITY OF DILUTION IN PRIMARY CLARIFIER</b></p>		
	<p>66. Analysis results of primary clarifier showing reduction of 97% in bod 96% in cod, 80% in TSS just</p>	<p>68. The observation and conclusion drawn by the Joint Committee is false and technically not possible and raises serious doubts about the way the samples</p>	<p>That the objections made by the unit is regarding sample analysis done by CPCB. So</p>

↓  
AEE

<p>after the treatment through bar screen, equalization tank ph correction tank (lime dosing) which seems unrealistic, hence possibility of dilution in primary clarifier on the day of inspection can't be ruled out.</p> <p><b>Conclusion (Para 5)</b></p> <p>67. Similarly, the performance analysis of ETP system shows that effluent quality at outlet of secondary clarifier is poor than outlet of primary clarifier. However, Sulphur removal efficiency is observed in biological treatment system than the SRS, indicates that possibility of dilution of ETP units especially in primary clarifier could not be ruled out.</p>	<p>have been collected or the testing has been done.</p> <p>69. <i>Firtly</i>, the allegation that dilution cannot be ruled out is nothing but a figment of imagination of the Joint Committee. In fact, it is the submission of the answering Respondent, that it seems that the sample collected at the outlet of primary clarifier has been mixed up with the sample collected at the outlet of the secondary clarifier. This is evident in view of the figures mentioned in table 5 of the report - pH level at the ETP inlet is '4.8' whereas pH level at outlet of primary clarifier is '7.6'. Then again, pH level at outlet of secondary clarifier is '5.6' and the pH level after merging of SRS outlet is '7.4'. The pH levels cannot vary in this manner, with the effluent becoming acidic to basic to acidic to again basic.</p> <p>70. In fact, (1) pH level at outlet of secondary clarifier (essentially the outlet of ETP) is shown to be '5.6', and (2) pH level in table 5 at the outlet of SRS before merging with ETP treated effluent is shown to be '7.2', whereas, (3) pH level after the merging of SRS outlet is '7.4'. Scientifically, effluent from ETP at 5.6 pH and effluent from SRS at 7.2 pH cannot merge to become 7.4 pH. Evidently, the sample collection process suffers a patent defect.</p> <p>71. Rather, it is very possible that the sample at the outlet of primary clarifier has been mixed up with the sample at the outlet of the secondary clarifier. If the pH levels at the sample shown to be collected at outlet of SRS before merging with ETP treated effluent ['7.2'] would mix with pH levels at the sample wrongly shown to be collected at outlet of the primary clarifier ['7.6'] (and which should be the pH level at the outlet of the secondary clarifier), only</p>	<p>clarification on this point can be given by CPCB.</p> <p>That the unit has submitted reports of private laboratory and report of RO UPPCB, Moradabad of different dates from the date of joint inspection. It is to be mentioned here that the joint committee has made its conclusion and recommendation based on the observations and analysis of sample collected during inspection dated 23-12-2020. During joint inspection dated 23-12-2020 the sample collected from different parts of ETP are found either non-complying or indicating dilution. The ground water was also found contaminated from the treated water of unit used for irrigation. As per the sample taken from the lagoon the COD was found above the prescribed limit which indicates that proper treatment of the ETP was not being done by the unit.</p> <p>Based on above facts the joint committee has categorized the unit in non-</p>
---	---	--

1  
AEE

		<p>then is it possible that the pH level of the treated effluent after mixing with the SRS effluent would be 7.4 as shown in samples.</p> <p>72. In this regard, it may further be noted that as per the Table - 6 the in order to bring the pH level from 4.8 at the ETP Inlet Channel to 7.6 at the Outlet of Primary Clarifier, with volume of ETP Primary Clarifier being 101 m<sup>3</sup>, the answering Respondent would have to utilise approximately 2424 m<sup>3</sup> of water. Similarly, in order to bring down the COD registered at the ETP Inlet Channel at 1569 mg/L to 62 mg/L at the Outlet of Primary Clarifier, the answering Respondent would have to dilute approximately 2556 m<sup>3</sup> of water. Notably, the water consumption as recorded in the Groundwater Extraction Log has remained constant from 01.12.2020 to 23.12.2020. A true copy of the log book showing Ground Water extraction from 01.12.2020 to 23.12.2020 is annexed herewith and marked as <b>Annexure R- 14</b>. Therefore, the observation of the Joint Inspection team is impossible.</p> <p>73. <i>Secondly</i>, it is relevant to mention that the answering Respondent regularly gets the samples analyzed from a third-party laboratory i.e., M/S Environmental and Technical Research Center which is duly accredited laboratory by Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, Govt. of India. The reports related thereto are self-explanatory and prove that the ETP at the Sugar Unit is fully compliant. A true copy of the recognition letter dated 20.10.2023 issued by CPCB for M/S Environmental and Technical Research Center is annexed herewith</p>	<p>complying category.</p> <p>Based on above facts, observations and recommendations of joint committee UPPCB vide its letter dated 05-04-2021 has issued show cause notice against the unit.</p> <p>In compliance of directions of Hon'ble NGT in O.A. No. 234 / 2020 Anuradha Vs. State of U.P. passed on 15-03-2021, the joint committee of CPCB and UPPCB and District Administration Rampur held meeting through video conferencing on 08-07-2021 and has assessed environmental compensation of Rs. 35,40,000/- against the unit for violation of 118 days calculated from the date of inspection (23-12-2020 (date of default found) to 19-04-2021 (date of inspection of RO officials Moradabad, unit found complying).</p> <p>UPPCB vide its letter dated 09-11-2021 has imposed environmental compensation of Rs. 35,40,000/- against the unit.</p>
--	--	--	---

1  
AFG



		<p>and marked as <b>Annexure R – 15</b>. A true copy of the NABL accreditation for M/S Environmental and Technical Research Center is annexed herewith and marked as</p> <p><b>Annexure R– 16.</b></p> <p>74.It is pertinent to mention that even prior to the date of inspection i.e. 23.12.2020 and thereafter, the samples were analyzed by M/s Environmental and Technical Research Center as well by the Office of R.O., UPPCB, Moradabad and the reports prepared as per those analysis establishes that that the ETP had been running smoothly and operating as per parameters prescribed by law. A Chart summarizing the all the aforesaid reports along with the independent reports is annexed herewith and marked as <b>Annexure R- 17 (Colly)</b>.</p> <p>In this background, the answering Respondent proceeds to give a response to the recommendations of the Joint Committee</p>	
<b>10.</b>	<b>REPLY TO THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE:</b>		
	<p><b>a. Point 1:</b> The unit shall ensure to operate the mill at consented capacity of 5000 TCD as granted by UPPCB under Water (Prevention &amp; Control of Pollution) Act, 1974 (as amended).</p>	<p>The answering Respondent submits that the reply given against the allegation regarding breaching the consented capacity is reiterated and not repeated herein for the sake of brevity.</p>	<p>That the reply submitted by the unit on observations of joint committee are not acceptable and are baseless as the unit is showing data of analysis reports which are of different dates than the date of joint committee. The point made by the unit that it has installed OCEMS but the unit has not submitted calibration certificate of the OCEMS. In</p>
	<p><b>b. Point No. 2:</b> The unit shall obtain the valid NOC from Central Ground Water Authority (CGWA)/Uttar Pradesh Ground Water Department (UPGWD) to</p>	<p>It is submitted that the answering Respondent has all the valid consents for operating the subject Sugar Manufacturing Unit including the NOC from the Central Ground Water Authority and Uttar Pradesh Ground Water Department to abstract ground water.</p>	

✓  
AES

	<p>abstract ground water.</p>	<p>The answering Respondent had obtained the Ground Water Extraction NOC from the CGWA vide NOC No. CGWA/NOC/IND/ORIG/2017 dated 13.07.2017 which was valid upto 12.07.2019. A true copy of the NOC dated 25.07.2017 issued by the CGWA, Ministry of Water Resources, River Development and Ganga Rejuvenation is annexed herewith and marked as <b>Annexure R-18</b>. The answering Respondent had in fact submitted its application for renewal of the NOC on 22.06.2019 with the CGWA. A true copy the application submitted on 22-06.2019 with the CGWA is annexed herewith and marked as <b>Annexure R-19</b>. It is pertinent to mention at this juncture that to address a situation where the Statutory Authorities fail to grant renewal of NOCs before the time when the earlier NOC was to expire, the CWGA issued a Notification dated 24.09.2020 wherein in Para 44 of the said Notification it was provided that the NOCs in such cases shall be deemed to have been extended till the date of renewal. The relevant portion of Para 44 of the said Notification is being reproduced for the sake of convenience hereunder:</p> <p><i>“(vi) If the application for the renewal is submitted in time and the CGWA/ the respective statutory authority is unable to process the application in time, No Objection certificate shall be deemed to be extended till the date of renewal of No Objection certificate.”</i></p> <p>Therefore, the NOC from CGWA was deemed to be extended till the time the same was renewed by the CGWA. A true copy of the relevant extract of the Notification dated 24.09.2020 issued by the CWGA</p>	<p>the treated water lagoon the COD was found above the norms which shows improper treatment of the ETP. The unit has converted the kaccha lagoon found during inspection in to pucca lagoon after the recommendation of the joint committee.</p> <p>The unit has not submitted the monitoring report of ground water, irrigated area on paid basis by UPPCB and also from laboratory recognized by MoEF &amp; CC, Govt. of India.</p> <p>Based on above facts and findings of joint committee the unit was non-complying during joint inspection dated 23-12-2020 and UPPCB has issued directions as well as imposed environmental compensation against the unit in line of recommendations of joint committee under the provisions Environmental laws and in compliance of directions of Hon'ble NGT passed in O.A. No. 234 of 2020.</p>
--	-------------------------------	---	--

AGB

		<p>is annexed herewith and marked as <b>Annexure - R-20</b>. It is further submitted that while the application of answering Respondent for the subject Sugar Manufacturing Unit for renewal of NOC was pending, the Uttar Pradesh Ground Water (Management and Regulation) Act, 2019 was enacted and brought into force on 07.08.2019 to provide for protecting, conserving, controlling and regulating ground water to ensure its sustainable management in the State of UP, both quantitatively and qualitatively. With the said enactment of Uttar Pradesh Ground Water (Management and Regulation) Act, 2019, the authority to grant as well as renew any such NOC for ground water extraction was given to the State Ground Water Department and accordingly, an application for issuance of NOC for ground water extraction was duly filed by the subject Sugar Manufacturing Unit with the concerned District Ground Water Management Council which was approved and NOC was issued by State Ground Water Department to abstract ground water. The said NOC(s) so obtained by the Unit are valid up to 17.06.2026 and 26.02.2026 respectively. A true copy of the NOCs issued by the State Ground Water Department is annexed herewith and marked as <b>Annexure - R-21 (Colly)</b>.</p>	
	<p><i>c. Point No. 3</i> - The unit shall ensure proper operation &amp; maintenance of ETP and also ensure proper stabilization of ETP.</p>	<p>The reply against allegations that ETP is not functioning properly hereinabove are reiterated and not repeated herein for the sake of brevity</p>	
	<p><i>d. Point No. 4</i> - The unit shall maintain adequate MLSS/MLVSS</p>		

1  
AER

	ratio in aeration tank while operating the ETP and ensure proper stabilization of ETP.		
	<b>Point No. 5</b> - The unit shall install flow meter to measure separate flow at ETP outlet.	The reply against allegations separate flow meter in Para no. 9 hereinabove are reiterated and not repeated herein for the sake of brevity.	
	<b>Point No. 6</b> - The unit shall relocate the inlet flow meter from feed to primary clarifier to main inlet channel of ETP to avoid any possibility of effluent bypass before ETP	Following the recommendations the answering Respondent has installed the flow meter at the inlet channel of the ETP.	
	<b>g. Point No. 7</b> - The unit shall install a separate flow meter at outlet of SRS to estimate the separate effluent generation after treatment from SRS	In reply to the said recommendation the Reply given hereinabove is reiterated and not repeated herein for the sake of brevity.	
	<b>h. Point No. 8</b> - The unit shall install a flow meter at the pumping point of treated effluent from storage lagoon for keeping the record of treated effluent quantity being pumped to farmers for irrigation purpose.	It is submitted that the answering Respondent was under no statutory obligation to install the said flow meter. Assuming but not admitting, that even if the alleged installation was required, the same was never notified to answering Respondent in the past during the course of inspection done in recent past and the same was pointed for the first time in the Joint Committee report dated 23.12.2020. Notably, prior to the joint committee inspection, the subject Sugar Manufacturing Unit had been inspected by UPPCB, CPCB and IIT Roorkee (as directed by CPCB) and they had never recommended the answering Respondent to install the said flow meters or relocation of flow meters at these locations/ places. The answering Respondent has always acted in accordance with the CPCB Charter and the directions of UPPCB/CPCB from time to time and have	

4  
F  
AGG

		installed flow meters at various locations. Be that as it may, the answering Respondent has installed flow meter in the delivery line of lagoon pump for irrigation in accordance with the recommendation of the Joint Committee. A copy of the photographs evidencing the installation of flow meter in the delivery line of lagoon pump is are annexed herewith and marked as <b>Annexure-R - 22.</b>	
	<i>i. Point No. 9</i> - The unit shall restrict the capacity of treated effluent storage lagoon to 15 days holding capacity	The reply given hereinabove is reiterated and not repeated herein for the sake of brevity.	
	<i>j. Point No. 10</i> - Large volume of back-wash water stored in a separate lagoon/ storage shall immediately be treated in ETP and the unit shall dismantle/level the lagoon. Also, the unit shall discontinue the practice of storing backwash effluent in lagoon.		
	<i>k. Point No. 11</i> - The unit shall dismantle/level the extra lagoon observed adjacent to treated effluent storage lagoon.	The reply given against the allegation of two impermeable lagoons existing herein above is reiterated and not repeated herein for the sake of brevity.	
	<i>m. Point No. 12</i> - Since the Temporary Pond behind molasses tank no.- 02 was being used as molasses storage earlier, hence the unit shall submit a time bound action plan for dismantling/levelling the pond in a scientific manner	It is submitted that the temporary pond behind molasses tank no. 2, was earlier being used for molasses storage (lined pit) after taking due permission of competent authority. During the inspection also, levelling/ refilling work was in progress which was observed by the joint committee officials also. The said pond was duly dismantled. A copy of photograph evidencing the dismantled pond is annexed herewith and marked as <b>Annexure - R- 23.</b> It will be apposite to mention that post	

1  
AEG

		dismantling of temporary pond, at present the site forms a part of the distillery duly approved layout plan, which is set adjacent to the sugar unit and is currently being used by them as 'Water storage Tank'. Hence, the site in question is no longer a part of the Unit and is being operated and controlled by the adjacent distillery only. A copy of photograph of the of water storage tank is attached herewith as <b>Annexure – R-24.</b>
	<i>n. Point No. 13</i> - The unit shall ensure levelling of low-lying area where ponding was observed after treating the filled water for ETP.	It is submitted that the filled water in low lying area has already been shifted to ETP for treatment and its disposal. Further, the levelling of the said area has already been done. It may be noted that presently on the site in question, a portion of distillery has been constructed and forms a part of the distillery, which is set adjacent to the sugar unit and no longer remains a part of the Unit. A copy of photograph showing a portion of distillery constructed on the site is enclosed herewith as <b>Annexure – R-25</b>
	<i>o. Point No. 14</i> - The unit shall ensure the proper treatment/operation of its SRS system.	In reply to the said recommendation the Reply given hereinabove is reiterated and not repeated herein for the sake of brevity.
	<i>p. Point No. 15</i> - The unit shall maintain volume-wise records for the press mud and boiler ash generation & disposal.	It is submitted that with respect to the recommendation that the unit shall maintain volume-wise records for the press mud and boiler ash generation & disposal, it is submitted that the Joint Committee has itself observed and mentioned (in Point 23 of the Observations) that the logbook is being maintained however, for reasons unknown has still recommended for logbook to be maintained. The observation made by the Joint Committee with regard to aforesaid aspect is contradictory and hence, cannot be relied upon. Notably, the answering Respondent's

✓  
AEE



		Sugar Manufacturing Unit is already maintaining volume wise record of press mud and boiler ash generation & its disposal. A true copy of records of press mud and boiler ash generation and its disposal is annexed herewith and marked as <b>Annexure – R-26 (Colly)</b> .	
	<b>q. Point No. 17</b> – The contamination in Ground Water has been observed, hence it is recommended that Uttar Pradesh Ground Water Department may be asked to look into the matter, and arrangement for deep borewell for drinking water should be made	In reply to the said recommendation the Reply given against the allegation of Groundwater hereinabove is reiterated and not repeated herein for the sake of brevity.	
	75. That from a bare perusal of the submissions made hereinabove, it crystal clear that the allegations levelled against the answering Respondent in the instant Original Application were nothing but in the realm of conjectures and surmises. 76. Therefore, in view of the foregoing submissions made, the answering Respondent humbly submits that the instant Original Application being bereft of merit should be dismissed with exemplary costs		

2  
AEE