

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL APPEAL No.1555/2013

M/S PARANJAPE SHEMES BANGALORE & ANR.

APPELLANTS

VERSUS

OBEDULLA KHAN

RESPONDENT

O R D E R

1. We have heard the learned senior counsel appearing for the appellants.

2. The short submission made by the learned senior counsel appearing for the appellants is that the two complaints filed by the Karnataka State Pollution Control Board against the appellants, pursuant to the violation of Section 15 of the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986 (in short, the "Environment Protection Act") and Sections 41(2), 42(1)(c), 44, 45A and 47 of the Water (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1974 (in short, the "Water Act") are same as the complaints filed by the private respondent before us. In any case, the two complaints given by the respondent are identical. On the first set of complaints given by the Karnataka State Pollution Control Board, the appellants have already been held guilty. However, the High Court, vide the impugned order, has chosen to quash the proceedings only with respect to the complaint given by the respondent under the Water Act.

3. We have perused the complaints. There is no difficulty in holding that the complaints filed by the Karnataka State Pollution Control Board are similar to the complaints filed by the respondent. In any case, they deal with the very same act on the part of the appellants. All the complaints deal with the same violation. The appellants have already been punished in the proceedings emanating from the two complaints filed by the Karnataka State Pollution Control Board and the appeals against the same are pending.

4. In our considered view, the High Court ought not to have quashed only one complaint while letting the other complaint to be proceeded with. Considering the above, we are inclined to set aside the impugned order.

5. The appeal is, accordingly, allowed. The complaint filed by the respondent against the appellants under the Environment Protection Act stands quashed.

6. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

.....J.
(M.M. SUNDRESH)

.....J.
(NONGMEIKAPAM KOTISWAR SINGH)

New Delhi
August 28, 2025

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

Criminal Appeal No(s).1555/2013

M/S PARANJAPE SHEMES BANGALORE & ANR.

Appellant(s)

VERSUS

OBEDULLA KHAN

Respondent(s)

(IA No. 10568/2012 - PERMISSION TO FILE LENGTHY LIST OF DATES, IA No. 13167/2013 - VACATING STAY)

Date : 28-08-2025 This matter was called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.M. SUNDRESH
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NONGMEIKAPAM KOTISWAR SINGH

For Appellant(s) : Mr. Siddhartha Dave, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Parantap Singh, Adv.
Mr. Gaurang Bhushan, Adv.
Ms. Pooja Rathore, Adv.
Ms. Alekhya Shastry, Adv.
Ms. Astha Singh, Adv.
Ms. Astha Singh, AOR

For Respondent(s) : Respondent-in-person (Not Present)

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

1. The appeal is allowed in terms of the signed order.
2. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

(ARJUN BISHT)
ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS

(POONAM VAID)
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

(signed order is placed on the file)