BEFORE THE NATIONAL GREEN TRIBUNAL PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI

Original Application No. 188/2014

Toxics Link Vs. U.O.I & Ors.

| CORAM: | HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE U.D. SALVI, JUDICIAL MEMBER | | |
|--------|-------------------------------------------------|--|--|
| | HON'BLE MR. RANJAN CHATTERJEE, EXPERT MEMBER | | |

| Present: | Applicant | | : Ms. Maneka Kaur, Adv. | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|
| | Respondent No. | . 1 | : Mr. Krishna Kumar Singh, Adv. for MoEF | | |
| | Respondent No. | . 4 | : Mr. Ravinder Shrivastava, Mr. Ashutosh Kumar and | | |
| | | | Ms. Pooja Katara and Mr. Himanshu Setia, Advs. | | |
| | Respondent No. | | : Mr. Gopi Chand SO | | |
| | Respondent No. | . 4 | : Mr. Ashutosh Kr. Ms. Namikt Choudhary and Ms. | | |
| | 5 1 . 3 | _ | Pooja Katara, Advs. | | |
| | Respondent No. | . 5 | : Mr. Dhananjaya Baijal , Mr. Nikhil Nayyar, Adv | | |
| | Respondent No. | 6 | : Mr. Anil Shrivastava, Standing Counsel for Mr. | | |
| | Respondent No. | . 0 | Sanyam Saxena, Adv. | | |
| | Respondent No. | 7 | : Mr. Shurvodeep Roy, Adv. | | |
| | Respondent No. | | : Mr. G. Indira, Mr. Sumit Kr. Adv. | | |
| | Respondent No. | | : Ms. Yogmaya Agnihotri, Adv. | | |
| | Respondent No. | | : Mr. Shubham Bhalla, Adv. | | |
| | Respondent No. | | : Mr. D. K. Thakur, Mr. Deepak Jain Mr. Alok Misra, | | |
| _ <u> </u> | | | Advs. | | |
| | Respondent No. | . 13 <mark>& 42</mark> | : Mr. Bal <mark>endu Se</mark> kher, Adv. <mark>,</mark> Mr. Akashay Abrol, | | |
| | | | Advs. | | |
| 1 | Respondent No. | . <mark>14 &4</mark> 3 | : Mr. Atma ram N.S. Nadkarni, Adv. General, Datta | | |
| | 4 | | Prasad Lawande, Mr. P. Bhandari, Mr. S. S. Rebello, | | |
| - | | | Mr. A. Gomes Pereira, Mr. Debarshi B., Mr. | | |
| | _ > | 170 44 | Anshuman Shrivastava, Adv. | | |
| | Respondent No. | | : Mr. Anil Grover, AAG and Mr. Rahul Khurana, Adv. | | |
| | Respondent No. | | : Mr. D.K. Thakur, Mr. Deepak Jain, Advs. | | |
| | Respondent No. | | : Mr. D.K. Thakur, Adv. | | |
| | Respondent No. | . 10 | : Mr. Jayesh Gaurav , Adva.for JSPCB, Adv. | | |
| | Respondent No. | 19 & 49 | : Mr. Devraj Asjhok, Adv.KSPCB | | |
| | Respondent No. | | : Mr. Tayenjam Momo Sinmgh,Advs. | | |
| | Respondent No. | | : Mr. Pragyan Sharma and Mr. Pulkt Prakash, Mr.Ravi Kant, Advs. | | |
| | Respondent No. | 24 | :Ms. Enatoli, Adv. | | |
| | Respondent No. | | : Mr. A.K. Panda, Adv. Mr. M. Paikaray ,Advs. | | |
| | Respondent No. | | : Ms. Richa Kapoor with Mr. Rohit, Mr. Ashish Negi advs. | | |
| | Respondent No. | . 28 | : Mr. Yogesh Kana and Mr. Jayant Patel, Advs. | | |
| | Respondent No. | 29& 58 | : Mr. M. Yogesh Kanna, with Mr. Jayant Patel, Advs. | | |
| | Respondent No. | | : Mr. Mukesh Verma, Adv. | | |
| | Respondent No. | . 32 | : Mr. Pradeep Mishra, Adv., Mr.Dallep Kr. Dhayani, Advs. | | |
| Respondent No. 34 : Ms. Prerna Singh , Mr. Prashant Mathur, Advs | | | | | |
| | Respondent No. | | : Mr. Anil Sristava standing cousel for Mr. Uranav | | |
| | - | | Rishi, Adv. | | |
| | Respondent No. | 36 | :Ms. Deepika Ghatowal, Adv. | | |
| | Respondent No. | | : Mr. Devraj Ashok, Adv. | | |
| | Respondent No. | | :Mr. G. Indira and Mr. Sumit Kumar, Advs. | | |
| | Respondent No. | . 39 | : Ms. Yogmaya Agnihotri, Adv. and Mr. C. D. Singh, | | |
| | Respondent No. | 52 | AAG and Mr. Appoorav and Mr. V. C. Shukla, Advs. : Mr Pragyan Pradip and Mr. Ravi Kant and Mr. | | |
| | - | | Pulkit, Advs. | | |
| | Respondent No. | | : Mr. K. Enatoli Sema andMr. Amit Kumar, Advs. | | |
| | Respondent No. | | : Mr. Soumyajit Pani, Mr. P. Venkatesan, Advs. | | |
| | Respondent No. | | : Mr. S. S. Rebello and Mr. Debarshi B. Adv. | | |
| | Respondent No. | | : Mr. Anil and Mr. Naginder, Advs. | | |
| | Respondent No. | | : Mr. Benipal with MR. Anil Soni, Advs. | | |
| | Respondent No. Respondent No. | | : Mr. Rahul Verma, Adv. : Mr. Savitri Pandey and Ms. Azma Parveen, Advs. | | |
| | Respondent No. | | : Mr. Savitri Pandey and Ms. Azma Parveen, Advs. : Mr. Sapam and Ms. Kalyani, Advs for MPCB & FEM | | |
| | Respondent No. | | : Mr. Devashish, Mr. Aasia, Ms. Anu, Advs. | | |
| | -100pondone no | • • • | | | |

Manipur and MSPCB

J & K SPCB West Bengal SPCB : Mr. Sapam and Ms. Kalyani Devi, Mr. Z. H. Iraac and Mr. S. Vijaynanda Sharma, Advs.

: Mr. G. M. Kawoosa, Adv.

: Mr. Amit, Ms. Asha Nayar Basu, Advs.

Mr. Anil Shrivastava, Mr. Sanyam Sexena, aDvs. for the State of Arunachal Pradesh

Mr. Upendra Misra for the State of Meghalaya

Mr. Rudreshwar Singh and Mr. Gautam, Adv. Ms. Divya Singh, Advs for the State of Bihar

Mr. Gopal Singh, Ms. Ritu and Mr.Shreyas, Adv. for the State of Tripura and Tripura SPCB

Ms. Aruna Mathur, Mr. Avneesh Arputham , Advs. For the Sikkim SPCB

Mr. Shiv Mangal Sharma, Mr. Saurabh Rajpal, Mr. Adhiraj R. Advs for State of Rajasthan

Mr. Rajkumar with Ms. Niti Choudhary, Adv.

Mr. Amit Agrawal for West BengalPCB

Mr. D. K. thakur and Mr. Deepak Jain, Advs

Mr. Sarthak Chaturvedi, Mr. Rohit Pandey and Mr. Devendra Tripathi, Advs for Andaman and Nicobar

Mr. Gopal Singh, Mr. Rituraj and Mr. shreyas Jain, advs for State of Tripura

Mr. Suryanarayana Singh, Sr. adv. for State of HP

Mr. Devashish B. and Ms. Priyanka Singh, Ms. Anu Tyagi, Advs.

Mr. Ranjan Mukherjee and Mr. Upendra Mishra, adv. for State of Meghalaya

Mr. Jogy Scari and Ms. Beena Victor, advs for State of Kerala, SPCB

Mr. Yusuf Khan and Ms. Anuradha Arpntham, Advs
Advs for State of Sikkim and SPCB

Mr. Arma Mathur, Mr. Avneesh Arpntham, Advs.

| Date and Remarks | Orders of the Tribunal |
|------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|
| Item No.04 December 01, 2015 | Heard. Perused Record. |
| 11/1/2 | Menace of mercury being released in the |
| | environment on account of indiscrete disposal of CFL is |
| W. | the subject matter of the present application. We have, |
| -31 | therefore, directed the formulation of scheme for |
| | environment friendly disposal of CFL and recovery of |
| | mercury. On the last date we observed that the MoEF |
| | was expected to give serious consideration to the |
| | present case, consider the divergent views and arrive at |
| | rational approach for formulation of the scheme in |
| | question. We expected the scheme to see the light of |
| | the day and in the event of the scheme being not |
| | formulated we wanted the concerned Joint Secretary of |
| | the MoEF to remain present before us to appraise us of |
| | Remarks Item No.04 December |

the propositions which are irreconcilable and come in the way formulation of the scheme in his view. If he was present we could have understood the problem better and could have extended our help in setting things right. However, none from the MoEF except its Counsel who appears to be scarcely briefed is present before us. He has chosen to file a reply which sings the old tune.

We, therefore, expect the Joint Secretary to remain present before us on the next date with the scheme for environment friendly disposal of CFL. We hope and trust that he may not create a situation which may force us to take coercive measures.

List this case on 6th January, 2016

| | (U.D. Salvi) | ,JM |
|-----------|---------------|----------------------------|
| PEEN TRIB | (Ranjan Chatt | ,EM <mark>erjee)</mark> |