

BEFORE THE NATIONAL GREEN TRIBUNAL, PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI

Original Application No. 1/2012  
And  
M.A. No. 683/2013 in  
Original Application No. 1/2012

Sanjay Agnihotri Vs Union of India & Ors.

**CORAM:** HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DR. P. JYOTHIMANI, JUDICIAL MEMBER  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. NAMBIAR, JUDICIAL MEMBER  
HON'BLE DR. G.K. PANDEY, EXPERT MEMBER  
HON'BLE PROF. DR. P.C. MISHRA, EXPERT MEMBER  
HON'BLE PROF. A.R. YOUSUF, EXPERT MEMBER

Original Applicant : Ms. Parul Gupta, Adv.  
Applicant / Appellant: Rishi Sehgal, Adv., (M.A. No. 683/2013).  
Respondent No. 2 : Mr. Pradeep Misr &, Mr. Daleep Kumar Dhayani, Adv.  
Respondent No. 3 : Mr. N.K. Gupta, Sr. Env. Eng., CPCB  
Respondent No. 4 : Mr. Gautam Kumar, Adv. and Mr. Avijit Bhushan, Adv.  
Respondent No. 5 : Mr. Ravindra Kumar, Advocate  
Respondent No. 6 : Rishi Sehgal, Adv.  
Respondent No. 7: Ms. Savitri Pandey, Adv.

Date and Remarks	Orders of the Tribunal
<p>Item Nos. 5 &amp; 6 January 22, 2014</p>	<p><b><u>Original Application No. 1/2012</u></b></p> <p>The learned Counsel appearing for the UP Government has filed an action plan for reducing pollution level in NOIDA apart from long term and short term measures by giving copies to all the respective Counsel in accordance with direction given by this Tribunal.</p> <p>Post this matter on 4<sup>th</sup> February, 2014.</p> <p><b><u>M.A. No. 683/2013 in Original Application No. 1/2012</u></b></p> <p>Pursuant to the earlier direction, the CPCB has filed an inspection report. This relates to M/s Nano Electrotech Pvt. Ltd. which is involved in the manufacturing of printed circuit board. Earlier in the analysis report of the CPCB, we found the parameter relating to copper beyond the permissible limit and, therefore, we directed the industry to be inspected again by the CPCB after the rectification by the industry concerned. In the present report, CPCB has stated that the copper and other parameters are meeting with the general standards. Mr. N.K. Gupta, Sr. Env. Engineer appearing for CPCB who has filed report would submit that on inspection it was found that the industry has carried on the</p>

direction by installing one additional tube-settler and from installation of Ion-exchange to further treat the effluents after physico-chemical process. According to CPCB, as a result there is a drastic reduction in the parameters (metals) as observed in this report.

However, in respect of hazardous waste management, it is stated in the report that the industry has applied for authorisation. On an enquiry, it is found that such authorisation has not been given so far. It is also informed that this industry is in operation for the past six years and is generating 300 kg hazardous waste every year. In such view of the matter, the learned Counsel appearing for the UP Pollution Control Board (UPPCB) also seeks time to find out the position apart from that regarding the amendment to be carried out in the consent conditions under the Air as well as the Water (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Acts.

We make it clear that the pendency of this case shall not be treated as impediment for obtaining authorisation in accordance with law.

Stand over to 4<sup>th</sup> February, 2014.

....., JM  
(Dr. P. Jyothimani)

....., JM  
(M.S. Nambiar)

....., EM  
(Dr. G.K. Pandey)

....., EM  
(Prof. Dr. P.C. Mishra)

....., EM  
(Prof. A.R. Yousuf)