

BEFORE THE NATIONAL GREEN TRIBUNAL

SOUTHERN ZONE, CHENNAI

Application No. 299 of 2013 (SZ) (Suo Motu)

Applicant(s) Respondent(s)
Tribunal on its own motion on the Vs. (1) The Principal Secretary,
News item reported in "the Hindu" dated Environment and Forests, Govt of
25.10.2013 about beach at Adyar Estuary Tamil Nadu, Chennai
with trash, rubble.

- (2) The Secretary, PWD, Chennai
(3) The Commissioner,
Corporation of Chennai,
Chennai.
(4) The Chairman, TNPCB, Chennai
(5) The Member Secretary, Tamil Nadu
Coastal Zone Management
Authority, Chennai

Legal Practitioners for Respondents
M/s. M.K. Subramanian
for R-1, R-2& R-5
Shri R. Suryaprakash for R-3
Smt. H.Yasmeen Ali for R-4

Application No. 164 of 2014 (SZ)

Applicant(s) Respondent(s)
P. Edwin Wilson, Vs. The State of Tamil Nadu,
Purasawalkam, Chennai. Rep. by its Chief Secretary & 15 others

Legal Practitioner for Applicant(s) Legal Practitioner for Respondent(s)
M/s. Syed Azam Mohammed and M/s. M.K.Subramanian
A.M.Sinduja for R-2 and R-6
M/s. Abdul Salem and
S.Saravanan & Vidyalakshmi
for R-1,R-3, R-4, R-7, R-10 and R-15
Mr.R.Surya Prakash for R-5,
Mrs. C.Sangamithirai for R-8.
Mrs. Rita Chandrasekar for R-9
Shri. R. Janakiraman for R-10
M/s. R. Senthil Kumar and
Raghavendra Ross Divakar for R-11
Mr. B. Manoharan for R-12
M/s. P. Gnanasekaran for R-13
Sri. D.S. Ekambaram for R-14

Note of the Registry	Orders of the Tribunal
Order No.	<p data-bbox="547 293 954 327">Date: 18th November, 2015</p> <p data-bbox="547 356 1406 1267">The counsel for the parties are present. Pursuant to the directions given by the Tribunal in the last hearing, a status report is filed by the 4th respondent, Principal Secretary, Municipal Administration and Water Supply Department, Secretariat, Chennai. A perusal of the report would indicate that the last bi-monthly meeting was convened and conducted under the chairmanship of the Chief Secretary of the State on 12.11.2015 in order to appraise the progress of the Integrated Cooum river Eco-restoration project. The report would also speak about the work assigned to each of the line Departments and the time schedule with which they should execute the work and the same is recorded.</p> <p data-bbox="547 1319 1406 1939">A perusal of the main report would indicate that the total project cost for the short term action plan is Rs.1646.54 crores, which according to the counsel for the 4th respondent has got to be allocated to all the line Departments as found in the status report filed this day. When a query is made, the learned counsel for the 4th respondent would submit that out of this proposed project cost of Rs.1646.54 crores, Rs.604.77 crores have already been allotted to different Departments as found in the status</p>

report. It is also submitted by him that the short term action plan commenced on 1.4.2015 and the total project cost as shown in the main report is Rs.1646.54 crores for the execution of the project for a period of 36 months. When a further query is raised on the amount allocated to each of the Departments out of the Rs.604.77 crores, the counsel for the 4th respondent seeks time to file the report in the next hearing on instructions from the parties.

The report filed today by the 4th respondent would indicate that there is a progress on implementation of the project pursuant to the directions of the Tribunal and the allotment of work to each of the line Departments and also time schedule have been shown in the report which in the considered opinion of the Tribunal is found satisfactory and the same is recorded. The counsel for the 4th respondent is directed to file further progress report in the next hearing duly indicating the physical and financial targets proposed and achieved by each of the line Departments till 30.11.2015.

Insofar as, the removal of encroachments, which was noticed, recorded and in respect of which directions were issued in the last hearing, the counsel for the 4th respondent would submit that the demarcation is in progress and it would be over before the end of December 2015 and also

the report would be filed in the next hearing.

The counsel for the 13th respondent filed reply this day. A direction was issued to the concerned District Environmental Engineer (DEE) in whose jurisdiction, the respondents 11, 12 and 13 industries are situated to make an inspection and take necessary action and file a report this day. The learned counsel for the Tamil Nadu State Pollution Control Board (Board) would submit that as per the directions of the Tribunal, an inspection was made and the samples were taken from the aforesaid industries and tested. No fault was found from the samples taken from the units of respondents 11 and 13, but it was not so in the case of the 12th respondent, which necessitated to issue show cause notice and the same was served upon the 12th respondent industry. The counsel for the Board further adds that the action taken report against the 12th respondent would be filed in the next hearing.

A memo filed by the 12th respondent this day is recorded. A reading of the same would clearly indicate that it is not found to be satisfactory and is of no consequence.

A direction was issued on the earlier occasion to the Board to find out the industries which are situated on the banks of river Cooum and other major water bodies in Chennai such as Adyar river and Buckingham Canal on the

entire stretch which are causing pollution and file a report, but it is not yet done. The counsel for the Board would submit that already an inspection was made and the report has already been prepared and it would be submitted before this Tribunal in the next hearing. The matter is posted to 22.12.2015.

P.S.Rao
(Expert Member)

Justice M. Chockalingam
(Judicial Member)

