

ITEM NO.29

COURT NO.11

SECTION XIA

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

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (Civil)...../2009  
CC 16349/2009

(From the judgement and order dated 23/05/2009 in  
12156/2008 of The HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM)

WPC No.

CITIZEN INTEREST AGENCY

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

COCHIN PORT TRUST &amp; ORS.

Respondent(s)

IA 1 (C/delay in filing SLP and office report)

WITH

SLP(C) NO. 14331 of 2010

(With office report)

Date: 06/08/2010

These Petitions were called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE G.S. SINGHVI

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASOK KUMAR GANGULY

For Petitioner(s)

Mr. C.S. Vaidyanathan, Sr.Adv.

Mr. P. Sreekumar, Adv.

Mr. Jayaprasad, Adv.

For Mr. Ramesh Babu M.R., A.O.R.

For Respondent(s)

Mr. Mukul Rohtagi, Sr. Adv.

Mr. U.A. Rana, Adv.

Mrs. Mrinal Majumdar, Adv.

For M/s Gagrat &amp; Co., Advs.

Mr. Ajit Kumar Pande, Adv.

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following

## O R D E R

Delay condoned.

perused the records. Heard learned counsel for the parties and

In our view, the High Court did not commit any error by declining the petitioner's prayer for

2

quashing the environment clearance given by the Ministry of Environment and Forest, Government of India, no objection certificate issued by the Kerala State Pollution Control Board and for restraining respondent No.9 from installing the cement handling, packing and storing plant at the Q-1 Wharf of Cochin Port Trust and further to quash clause (i)(a) of para 2 of the Coastal Regulation Zone Notification dated 19.2.1991.

The reasons assigned by the High Court for not entertaining the petitioner's prayer do not suffer from any legal infirmity warranting interference under Article 136 of the Constitution.

The special leave petitions are accordingly dismissed.

(A.D. Sharma)  
Court Master

(Phoolan Wati Arora)  
Court Master