BEFORE THE NATIONAL GREEN TRIBUNAL, WESTERN ZONE BENCH, PUNE

M.A.No.105/2014 (WZ) Kalpataru Properties - R.6

In

APPLICATION NO. 64/2014 (WZ) Anil Tharthare Vs. The Secretary Environment Deppartment Govt. of Mah. & Ors

HON'BLE MR JUSTICE V.R. KINGAONKAR, JUDICIAL MEMBER CORAM:

HON'BLE DR. AJAY A. DESHPANDE, EXPERT MEMBER

Present: Applicant/ Appellant : Aditya Pratap Adv

Respondent Nos.2,3 : D.M.Gupte a/w Supriya Dangare

Advs

T.N.Subramaniam Sr.Adv a/w Respondent No.6

Saket Mone Adv, i/b Vidhi

	Partners
Date and	Orders of the Tribunal
Remarks	
Item No. 2	Heard Counsel.
September 9, 2014	An interim relief is sought by the Applicant. At this juncture, since
Order No.4	the Application of Project Proponent, is being considered by SEIAA, for
1/	grant of EC and is at the final stage, after recommendation of SEAC, for
	consideration of decision thereon, we direct that it shall be expeditiously
Allo	decided, as far as within two (2) weeks and response of the Respondent
	Nos.1 to 3, shall be filed within three (3) weeks in the matter. This is
20 11	necessary in order to know the stand of the Authorities in the context of
11	following issues:
	i) Whether there is necessity for seeking EC, in case of such a
	project where change is is sought after initial period, even
0	though life of EC was not specifically mentioned in the original
	EC?
	ii) Whether project could be delisted only because Project
	Proponent was found absent, when the meeting was held on
	23/24th May, 2013? If so, under which provisions it could be
	delisted?
	iii) What is the provision regarding grant of EC for an
	additional/substantial change in the project while considering
	the appraisal thereof in the process of EC?
	The reply affidavit of Respondent Nos. 1 to 3, should clearly
	indicate the above three (3) aspects, as well as the response to the
	complaints of the Applicants.

