

**BEFORE THE NATIONAL GREEN TRIBUNAL,
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI**

Original Application No. 573/2016

Shailesh Singh

Vs.

Beltek Canadian Water Ltd.

CORAM:

**HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE JAWAD RAHIM, JUDICIAL MEMBER
HON'BLE DR. NAGIN NANDA, EXPERT MEMBER**

Present:

Applicant	:	
Respondent No. 1	:	Mr. Pawan Upadhyay, Adv.
Respondent No. 2	:	Mr. Pradeep Misra and Mr. Daleep Dhyani, Adv.
Respondent No. 4	:	Mr. B.V. Niren, Mr. Vinayak Gupta, Adv.
Respondent No. 5	:	Mr. Dharendra Kumar Yadav, Adv. (Standing Counsel State of U.P.)
Respondent No. 6	:	Mr. R.H.A. Sikander, Adv., Mr. Mohd. Danish, Adv.
CPCB	:	Mr. Raj Kumar, Adv. with Mr. Bhupender Kumar, LA

Date and Remarks	Orders of the Tribunal
<p>Item No. 5</p> <p>April 28, 2017</p> <p>Hb</p>	<p>Mr. Pradeep Mishra submits that inspection has been conducted and copy of the same is filed. We have perused it, however, the learned counsel for the project proponent submits that he may be granted opportunity to respond to the finding of the report.</p> <p>Besides, we notice that there are some submissions in the report which are difficult to understand, for instance. in the last column there is a mention that on an average 38 KLD of water is being supplied by M/s A-One Mineral Water Solution. It is not mentioned in the report as to whether the company has consent to extract water and from water where is being extracted.</p> <p>The very purpose of the inspection was to get direct material information on the extraction of Ground Water and quantity of water extracted.</p> <p>Mr. Pradeep Mishra seeks time to submits an explanatory note. We permit him to do so. Copy of the</p>

	<p>Item No. 5 April 28, 2017</p>	<p>same be made available to the Project Proponent who may file response to it, at least one week before the date of hearing.</p> <p>List it on 15th May, 2017.</p> <p>.....JM (Dr. Jawad Rahim)</p> <p>.....EM (Dr. Nagin Nanda)</p>
--	---	---

