

SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) NO(s). 476 OF 2005

JEEDIMETLA EFFLUENT TREATMENT LTD.

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

A.P.POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD & ORS.

Respondent(s)

(With appln(s) for stay and office report)(FOR FINAL DISPOSAL)

WITH

Writ Petition (C) No.497 of 2005

(With appln. for direction/stay and office report)(FOR FINAL DISPOSAL)

Writ Petition (C) No.441 of 2005

(With appln.(s) for stay and ex-parte stay and permission to file additional documents and directions)(FOR FINAL DISPOSAL)

Writ Petition (C) Nos.499, 498, 513, 511, 555, 548, 552, 553, 554, 563, 564, 566, 567, 570, 568, 571, 573, 584, 588, 591, 594, 595, 596, 604, 605, 606, 622, 626, 611, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 627, 632 of 2005 and 382 of 2006

(With appln.(s) for stay/direction and office report)
(FOR FINAL DISPOSAL)

Date: 17/07/2007 These Petitions were called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.H. KAPADIA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE B. SUDERSHAN REDDY

For Petitioner(s) Mr. Krishna Kumar,Adv.

Mr. Arun Jaitley, Sr.Adv.
Mr. S. Chandra Shekhar, Adv.

For Respondent(s)

-State: Mr. Anoop G. Chaudhary, Sr.Adv.
Mr. Manoj Saxena, Adv.
Mr. Rajnish Kr. Singh, Adv.
Mr. Rahul Shukla, Adv.
Mr. T.V. George, Adv.

-APPCB: Mr. Ranjit Kumar, Sr.Adv.
Mr. Nikhil Nayyar,Adv.

1
Mr. Ankit Sehgal, Adv.

-CPCB: Mr. Vijay Panjwani ,Adv

Mr. Mohanprasad Meharia,Adv.(NP)

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following
ORDER

In Writ Petitions(C) No.476, 497, 499, 498, 513, 511, 555, 548, 552, 553, 554, 563, 564, 566, 567, 570, 568, 571, 573, 584, 588, 591, 594,

595, 596, 604, 605, 606, 611, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 622, 627, 626, 632 of 2005 and 382 of 2006:

In these cases, an Action Plan has been submitted to the Court. That action plan has been prepared by the Competent Authority after hearing the affected parties. This Court is not inclined to go into the validity of the parameters prescribed by the Competent Authority under the Action Plan. The question basically which has been raised on behalf of the petitioners is that under the said Action Plan, the parameters applicable for discharge into the river cannot be applied to the discharge into nallas. We do not find merit in this contention on behalf of the petitioners. These are matters of technical details. It is a matter of degree. We do not wish to interfere. The Action Plan is accepted by the Court which shall be implemented at the earliest possible time.

Accordingly, the Writ Petitions are disposed of. Interim orders stand vacated.

In Writ Petition (C) No.441/2005:

It is not in dispute that the petitioner meets the inlet standards prescribed by the Action Plan. It is made clear, however, that the petitioner shall also comply with the outlet standards prescribed and

2

mentioned in the Action Plan. However, fulfillment of outlet standards can happen only after the connectivity is established with the S.T.P. The requisite amount has also been deposited by the petitioner. It is made clear that the outlet standards will have to be complied with by the petitioner after the connectivity is given with the S.T.P. The connectivity may be given as per the Action Plan.

Accordingly, the Writ Petition stands disposed of.

(N. Annapurna)
Court Master

(Madhu Saxena)
Court Master