BEFORE THE NATIONAL GREEN TRIBUNAL, PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI

Appeal No. 70 of 2013

Super Smelters Limited Vs. Union of India & Anr.

CORAM : HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE P. JYOTHIMANI, JUDICIAL MEMBER HON'BLE DR. D. K. AGRAWAL, EXPERT MEMBER

Present:

Appellant: Mr. Bibhu Tripathy, Advocate and Mr. Jitendra Mohapatra, Advocate

| Date and Remarks Orders of the Tribunal Item No. 4 June 7, 2013 We have heard Learned Counsel appearing for the Appellant in both the Appeals. Admit. Issue notice to the Respondents by registered post/acknowledgement due and dasti as well. Notice returnable on 22 nd July, 2013. Process to be filed by the Appellant in both the Appeals by Monday i.e. on 10 th June, 2013. The submissions of the learned counsel for the Appellant while insisting for the order of stay is that while the unit in question has started operation from 2007, it was by clarification letter of MoEF dated 17.12.2008, for the first time such unit was required Environmental Clearance from the Government of India. On reference to the impugned order, we see that even after the clarification letter was issued on 17.12.2008, the Pollution Control Board has been continuously issuing orders every year by way of consent to operate to the unit in question without insisting EC. The impugned order solely relies upon a single factor that the unit should be closed down on the basis of wants of EC. In such view of the matter and also taking into consideration, number of persons have been employed in the unit, we are of the view that the impugned order must be stayed. Accordingly there shall be an order of interim stay of the impugned order of the Respondent No. 2 (Pollution Control Board) till the next date of hearing, however, subject to the condition that the Appellant's unit shall comply with all environmental norms as has been laid down by the earlier orders of consent to operate. | | Monupatra, navocate |
|---|----|--|
| Item No. 4 June 7, 2013 Appellant in both the Appeals. Admit. Issue notice to the Respondents by registered post/acknowledgement due and dasti as well. Notice returnable on 22 nd July, 2013. Process to be filed by the Appellant in both the Appeals by Monday i.e. on 10 th June, 2013. The submissions of the learned counsel for the Appellant while insisting for the order of stay is that while the unit in question has started operation from 2007, it was by clarification letter of MoEF dated 17.12.2008, for the first time such unit was required Environmental Clearance from the Government of India. On reference to the impugned order, we see that even after the clarification letter was issued on 17.12.2008, the Pollution Control Board has been continuously issuing orders every year by way of consent to operate to the unit in question without insisting EC. The impugned order solely relies upon a single factor that the unit should be closed down on the basis of wants of EC. In such view of the matter and also taking into consideration, number of persons have been employed in the unit, we are of the view that the impugned order must be stayed. Accordingly there shall be an order of interim stay of the impugned order of the Respondent No. 2 (Pollution Control Board) till the next date of hearing, however, subject to the condition that the Appellant's unit shall comply with all environmental norms as has been laid down by the earlier orders of consent to | | Orders of the Tribunal |
| June 7, 2013 Appellant in both the Appeals. Admit. Issue notice to the Respondents by registered post/acknowledgement due and dasti as well. Notice returnable on 22 nd July, 2013. Process to be filed by the Appellant in both the Appeals by Monday i.e. on 10 th June, 2013. The submissions of the learned counsel for the Appellant while insisting for the order of stay is that while the unit in question has started operation from 2007, it was by clarification letter of MoEF dated 17.12.2008, for the first time such unit was required Environmental Clearance from the Government of India. On reference to the impugned order, we see that even after the clarification letter was issued on 17.12.2008, the Pollution Control Board has been continuously issuing orders every year by way of consent to operate to the unit in question without insisting EC. The impugned order solely relies upon a single factor that the unit should be closed down on the basis of wants of EC. In such view of the matter and also taking into consideration, number of persons have been employed in the unit, we are of the view that the impugned order must be stayed. Accordingly there shall be an order of interim stay of the impugned order of the Respondent No. 2 (Pollution Control Board) till the next date of hearing, however, subject to the condition that the Appellant's unit shall comply with all environmental norms as has been laid down by the earlier orders of consent to | | We have heard Learned Counsel appearing for the |
| registered post/acknowledgement due and dasti as well. Notice returnable on 22 nd July, 2013. Process to be filed by the Appellant in both the Appeals by Monday i.e. on 10 th June, 2013. The submissions of the learned counsel for the Appellant while insisting for the order of stay is that while the unit in question has started operation from 2007, it was by clarification letter of MoEF dated 17.12.2008, for the first time such unit was required Environmental Clearance from the Government of India. On reference to the impugned order, we see that even after the clarification letter was issued on 17.12.2008, the Pollution Control Board has been continuously issuing orders every year by way of consent to operate to the unit in question without insisting EC. The impugned order solely relies upon a single factor that the unit should be closed down on the basis of wants of EC. In such view of the matter and also taking into consideration, number of persons have been employed in the unit, we are of the view that the impugned order must be stayed. Accordingly there shall be an order of interim stay of the impugned order of the Respondent No. 2 (Pollution Control Board) till the next date of hearing, however, subject to the condition that the Appellant's unit shall comply with all environmental norms as has been laid down by the earlier orders of consent to | | Appellant in both the Appeals. |
| Notice returnable on 22 nd July, 2013. Process to be filed by the Appellant in both the Appeals by Monday i.e. on 10 th June, 2013. The submissions of the learned counsel for the Appellant while insisting for the order of stay is that while the unit in question has started operation from 2007, it was by clarification letter of MoEF dated 17.12.2008, for the first time such unit was required Environmental Clearance from the Government of India. On reference to the impugned order, we see that even after the clarification letter was issued on 17.12.2008, the Pollution Control Board has been continuously issuing orders every year by way of consent to operate to the unit in question without insisting EC. The impugned order solely relies upon a single factor that the unit should be closed down on the basis of wants of EC. In such view of the matter and also taking into consideration, number of persons have been employed in the unit, we are of the view that the impugned order must be stayed. Accordingly there shall be an order of interim stay of the impugned order of the Respondent No. 2 (Pollution Control Board) till the next date of hearing, however, subject to the condition that the Appellant's unit shall comply with all environmental norms as has been laid down by the earlier orders of consent to | | Admit. Issue notice to the Respondents by |
| Process to be filed by the Appellant in both the Appeals by Monday i.e. on 10 th June, 2013. The submissions of the learned counsel for the Appellant while insisting for the order of stay is that while the unit in question has started operation from 2007, it was by clarification letter of MoEF dated 17.12.2008, for the first time such unit was required Environmental Clearance from the Government of India. On reference to the impugned order, we see that even after the clarification letter was issued on 17.12.2008, the Pollution Control Board has been continuously issuing orders every year by way of consent to operate to the unit in question without insisting EC. The impugned order solely relies upon a single factor that the unit should be closed down on the basis of wants of EC. In such view of the matter and also taking into consideration, number of persons have been employed in the unit, we are of the view that the impugned order must be stayed. Accordingly there shall be an order of interim stay of the impugned order of the Respondent No. 2 (Pollution Control Board) till the next date of hearing, however, subject to the condition that the Appellant's unit shall comply with all environmental norms as has been laid down by the earlier orders of consent to | | registered post/acknowledgement due and dasti as well. |
| Appeals by Monday i.e. on 10 th June, 2013. The submissions of the learned counsel for the Appellant while insisting for the order of stay is that while the unit in question has started operation from 2007, it was by clarification letter of MoEF dated 17.12.2008, for the first time such unit was required Environmental Clearance from the Government of India. On reference to the impugned order, we see that even after the clarification letter was issued on 17.12.2008, the Pollution Control Board has been continuously issuing orders every year by way of consent to operate to the unit in question without insisting EC. The impugned order solely relies upon a single factor that the unit should be closed down on the basis of wants of EC. In such view of the matter and also taking into consideration, number of persons have been employed in the unit, we are of the view that the impugned order must be stayed. Accordingly there shall be an order of interim stay of the impugned order of the Respondent No. 2 (Pollution Control Board) till the next date of hearing, however, subject to the condition that the Appellant's unit shall comply with all environmental norms as has been laid down by the earlier orders of consent to | | Notice returnable on 22 nd July, 2013. |
| The submissions of the learned counsel for the Appellant while insisting for the order of stay is that while the unit in question has started operation from 2007, it was by clarification letter of MoEF dated 17.12.2008, for the first time such unit was required Environmental Clearance from the Government of India. On reference to the impugned order, we see that even after the clarification letter was issued on 17.12.2008, the Pollution Control Board has been continuously issuing orders every year by way of consent to operate to the unit in question without insisting EC. The impugned order solely relies upon a single factor that the unit should be closed down on the basis of wants of EC. In such view of the matter and also taking into consideration, number of persons have been employed in the unit, we are of the view that the impugned order must be stayed. Accordingly there shall be an order of interim stay of the impugned order of the Respondent No. 2 (Pollution Control Board) till the next date of hearing, however, subject to the condition that the Appellant's unit shall comply with all environmental norms as has been laid down by the earlier orders of consent to | | Process to be filed by the Appellant in both the |
| Appellant while insisting for the order of stay is that while the unit in question has started operation from 2007, it was by clarification letter of MoEF dated 17.12.2008, for the first time such unit was required Environmental Clearance from the Government of India. On reference to the impugned order, we see that even after the clarification letter was issued on 17.12.2008, the Pollution Control Board has been continuously issuing orders every year by way of consent to operate to the unit in question without insisting EC. The impugned order solely relies upon a single factor that the unit should be closed down on the basis of wants of EC. In such view of the matter and also taking into consideration, number of persons have been employed in the unit, we are of the view that the impugned order must be stayed. Accordingly there shall be an order of interim stay of the impugned order of the Respondent No. 2 (Pollution Control Board) till the next date of hearing, however, subject to the condition that the Appellant's unit shall comply with all environmental norms as has been laid down by the earlier orders of consent to | | Appeals by Monday i.e. on 10 th June, 2013. |
| while the unit in question has started operation from 2007, it was by clarification letter of MoEF dated 17.12.2008, for the first time such unit was required Environmental Clearance from the Government of India. On reference to the impugned order, we see that even after the clarification letter was issued on 17.12.2008, the Pollution Control Board has been continuously issuing orders every year by way of consent to operate to the unit in question without insisting EC. The impugned order solely relies upon a single factor that the unit should be closed down on the basis of wants of EC. In such view of the matter and also taking into consideration, number of persons have been employed in the unit, we are of the view that the impugned order must be stayed. Accordingly there shall be an order of interim stay of the impugned order of the Respondent No. 2 (Pollution Control Board) till the next date of hearing, however, subject to the condition that the Appellant's unit shall comply with all environmental norms as has been laid down by the earlier orders of consent to | | The submissions of the learned counsel for the |
| 2007, it was by clarification letter of MoEF dated 17.12.2008, for the first time such unit was required Environmental Clearance from the Government of India. On reference to the impugned order, we see that even after the clarification letter was issued on 17.12.2008, the Pollution Control Board has been continuously issuing orders every year by way of consent to operate to the unit in question without insisting EC. The impugned order solely relies upon a single factor that the unit should be closed down on the basis of wants of EC. In such view of the matter and also taking into consideration, number of persons have been employed in the unit, we are of the view that the impugned order must be stayed. Accordingly there shall be an order of interim stay of the impugned order of the Respondent No. 2 (Pollution Control Board) till the next date of hearing, however, subject to the condition that the Appellant's unit shall comply with all environmental norms as has been laid down by the earlier orders of consent to | 1 | Appellant while insisting for the order of stay is that |
| 17.12.2008, for the first time such unit was required Environmental Clearance from the Government of India. On reference to the impugned order, we see that even after the clarification letter was issued on 17.12.2008, the Pollution Control Board has been continuously issuing orders every year by way of consent to operate to the unit in question without insisting EC. The impugned order solely relies upon a single factor that the unit should be closed down on the basis of wants of EC. In such view of the matter and also taking into consideration, number of persons have been employed in the unit, we are of the view that the impugned order must be stayed. Accordingly there shall be an order of interim stay of the impugned order of the Respondent No. 2 (Pollution Control Board) till the next date of hearing, however, subject to the condition that the Appellant's unit shall comply with all environmental norms as has been laid down by the earlier orders of consent to | | wh <mark>ile the u</mark> nit in question has started operation from |
| Environmental Clearance from the Government of India. On reference to the impugned order, we see that even after the clarification letter was issued on 17.12.2008, the Pollution Control Board has been continuously issuing orders every year by way of consent to operate to the unit in question without insisting EC. The impugned order solely relies upon a single factor that the unit should be closed down on the basis of wants of EC. In such view of the matter and also taking into consideration, number of persons have been employed in the unit, we are of the view that the impugned order must be stayed. Accordingly there shall be an order of interim stay of the impugned order of the Respondent No. 2 (Pollution Control Board) till the next date of hearing, however, subject to the condition that the Appellant's unit shall comply with all environmental norms as has been laid down by the earlier orders of consent to | A. | 2007, it was by clarification letter of MoEF dated |
| On reference to the impugned order, we see that even after the clarification letter was issued on 17.12.2008, the Pollution Control Board has been continuously issuing orders every year by way of consent to operate to the unit in question without insisting EC. The impugned order solely relies upon a single factor that the unit should be closed down on the basis of wants of EC. In such view of the matter and also taking into consideration, number of persons have been employed in the unit, we are of the view that the impugned order must be stayed. Accordingly there shall be an order of interim stay of the impugned order of the Respondent No. 2 (Pollution Control Board) till the next date of hearing, however, subject to the condition that the Appellant's unit shall comply with all environmental norms as has been laid down by the earlier orders of consent to | | 17.12.2008, for the first time such unit was required |
| even after the clarification letter was issued on 17.12.2008, the Pollution Control Board has been continuously issuing orders every year by way of consent to operate to the unit in question without insisting EC. The impugned order solely relies upon a single factor that the unit should be closed down on the basis of wants of EC. In such view of the matter and also taking into consideration, number of persons have been employed in the unit, we are of the view that the impugned order must be stayed. Accordingly there shall be an order of interim stay of the impugned order of the Respondent No. 2 (Pollution Control Board) till the next date of hearing, however, subject to the condition that the Appellant's unit shall comply with all environmental norms as has been laid down by the earlier orders of consent to | | Environmental Clearance from the Government of India. |
| 17.12.2008, the Pollution Control Board has been continuously issuing orders every year by way of consent to operate to the unit in question without insisting EC. The impugned order solely relies upon a single factor that the unit should be closed down on the basis of wants of EC. In such view of the matter and also taking into consideration, number of persons have been employed in the unit, we are of the view that the impugned order must be stayed. Accordingly there shall be an order of interim stay of the impugned order of the Respondent No. 2 (Pollution Control Board) till the next date of hearing, however, subject to the condition that the Appellant's unit shall comply with all environmental norms as has been laid down by the earlier orders of consent to | 11 | On reference to the impugned order, we see that |
| continuously issuing orders every year by way of consent to operate to the unit in question without insisting EC. The impugned order solely relies upon a single factor that the unit should be closed down on the basis of wants of EC. In such view of the matter and also taking into consideration, number of persons have been employed in the unit, we are of the view that the impugned order must be stayed. Accordingly there shall be an order of interim stay of the impugned order of the Respondent No. 2 (Pollution Control Board) till the next date of hearing, however, subject to the condition that the Appellant's unit shall comply with all environmental norms as has been laid down by the earlier orders of consent to | | even after the clarification letter was issued on |
| to operate to the unit in question without insisting EC. The impugned order solely relies upon a single factor that the unit should be closed down on the basis of wants of EC. In such view of the matter and also taking into consideration, number of persons have been employed in the unit, we are of the view that the impugned order must be stayed. Accordingly there shall be an order of interim stay of the impugned order of the Respondent No. 2 (Pollution Control Board) till the next date of hearing, however, subject to the condition that the Appellant's unit shall comply with all environmental norms as has been laid down by the earlier orders of consent to | | 17.12.2008, the Pollution Control Board has been |
| The impugned order solely relies upon a single factor that the unit should be closed down on the basis of wants of EC. In such view of the matter and also taking into consideration, number of persons have been employed in the unit, we are of the view that the impugned order must be stayed. Accordingly there shall be an order of interim stay of the impugned order of the Respondent No. 2 (Pollution Control Board) till the next date of hearing, however, subject to the condition that the Appellant's unit shall comply with all environmental norms as has been laid down by the earlier orders of consent to | | continuously issuing orders every year by way of consent |
| the unit should be closed down on the basis of wants of EC. In such view of the matter and also taking into consideration, number of persons have been employed in the unit, we are of the view that the impugned order must be stayed. Accordingly there shall be an order of interim stay of the impugned order of the Respondent No. 2 (Pollution Control Board) till the next date of hearing, however, subject to the condition that the Appellant's unit shall comply with all environmental norms as has been laid down by the earlier orders of consent to | | to operate to the unit in question without insisting EC. |
| EC. In such view of the matter and also taking into consideration, number of persons have been employed in the unit, we are of the view that the impugned order must be stayed. Accordingly there shall be an order of interim stay of the impugned order of the Respondent No. 2 (Pollution Control Board) till the next date of hearing, however, subject to the condition that the Appellant's unit shall comply with all environmental norms as has been laid down by the earlier orders of consent to | | The impugned order solely relies upon a single factor that |
| consideration, number of persons have been employed in the unit, we are of the view that the impugned order must be stayed. Accordingly there shall be an order of interim stay of the impugned order of the Respondent No. 2 (Pollution Control Board) till the next date of hearing, however, subject to the condition that the Appellant's unit shall comply with all environmental norms as has been laid down by the earlier orders of consent to | | the unit should be closed down on the basis of wants of |
| the unit, we are of the view that the impugned order must be stayed. Accordingly there shall be an order of interim stay of the impugned order of the Respondent No. 2 (Pollution Control Board) till the next date of hearing, however, subject to the condition that the Appellant's unit shall comply with all environmental norms as has been laid down by the earlier orders of consent to | | EC. In such view of the matter and also taking into |
| must be stayed. Accordingly there shall be an order of interim stay of the impugned order of the Respondent No. 2 (Pollution Control Board) till the next date of hearing, however, subject to the condition that the Appellant's unit shall comply with all environmental norms as has been laid down by the earlier orders of consent to | | consideration, number of persons have been employed in |
| interim stay of the impugned order of the Respondent No. 2 (Pollution Control Board) till the next date of hearing, however, subject to the condition that the Appellant's unit shall comply with all environmental norms as has been laid down by the earlier orders of consent to | | the unit, we are of the view that the impugned order |
| 2 (Pollution Control Board) till the next date of hearing, however, subject to the condition that the Appellant's unit shall comply with all environmental norms as has been laid down by the earlier orders of consent to | | must be stayed. Accordingly there shall be an order of |
| however, subject to the condition that the Appellant's unit shall comply with all environmental norms as has been laid down by the earlier orders of consent to | | interim stay of the impugned order of the Respondent No. |
| unit shall comply with all environmental norms as has been laid down by the earlier orders of consent to | | 2 (Pollution Control Board) till the next date of hearing, |
| been laid down by the earlier orders of consent to | | however, subject to the condition that the Appellant's |
| | | unit shall comply with all environmental norms as has |
| operate. | | been laid down by the earlier orders of consent to |
| | | operate. |

