BEFORE THE NATIONAL GREEN TRIBUNAL, PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI

Execution Application No. 01 of 2016 In Original Application No. 402 of 2014

IN THE MATTER OF:

Gujarat Tanners, Jajmau Kanpur Vs. Uttar Pradesh Pollution Control Board

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SWATANTER KUMAR, CHAIRPERSON

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SONAM PHINTSO WANGDI, JUDICIAL MEMBER

HON'BLE DR. D. K. AGRAWAL, EXPERT MEMBER HON'BLE PROF. A. R. YOUSUF, EXPERT MEMBER

Present: Applicant

Respondent No. 1:

Mr. Vaibhav Misra and Ms. Saumya Misra, Advs. Mr. Pradeep Misra and Mr. Daleep Kr. Dhyani,

Advs.

Respondent No. 2

Mr. B.V. Niren, Adv.

Date an	d Orders of the Tribunal	
Remarks		
Item No.	We have heard the Learned counsel appearing for	
01		
Fohmromr	the parties.	
February		
01, 2016	We see no reason to interfere with the impugned	
A S	we see no reason to interiere with the impugned	
V	order dated 10 th December, 2015 primarily for two	
	order dated 10th December, 2013 primarily for two	
	reasons. Firstly, the said order would be appealable before	
	reasons. Firstly, the said order would be appearable before	
A III	the Appellate Authority and secondly, the joint inspection	
	the Appenate Authority and secondry, the John Inspection	
The same of the same of	report had clearly shown that the Applicant industry is a	
22	report had clearly shown that the Applicant middstry is a	
	polluting industry as its chromium was found to be 9.47	
	politicing industry as its chromatin was lound to be 5.17	
	as opposed to the prescribed value of 2.	
	as opposed to the presented value of 2.	
	Learned counsel appearing for the Applicant submits that	
	they had already taken steps by installing ETP and other	
	anti-pollution devices and they would be completely	
	compliant and non-polluting.	
	T. 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	
	It is also pointed that the consent granted to the	
	Applicant is for 25 hides and developed the smalles of	
	Applicant is for 35 hides per day but the applicant is	
	using 75 hides non der Deficiencies have start have	
	using 75 hides per day. Deficiencies have also been	

pointed out in regard to installation of DG sets.

If the Applicant has taken steps as claimed he has liberty to inform the UP Pollution Control Board and request for joint inspection.

If such an application is received, the joint inspection team shall conduct inspection of the industry after informing the industry to start its operation atleast three days prior to its inspection. The inspection shall be conducted strictly in accordance to the directions issued by the Tribunal vide its order dated 28th January, 2016 in the matter of Original Application No. 39 of (Oxford Tanners Vs. Uttar Pradesh Pollution Control Board & Anr.).

After operating for one week the industry shall shut down its business and await report of the joint inspection team. The Board would also give its opinion as to whether they are prepared to grant consent to the Applicant on the basis of the joint inspection or not.

We make it clear that the joint inspection report shall be filed in the Registry which would proceed with the same in accordance with law.

Accordingly, Execution Application No. 01 of 2016 in Original Application No. 402 of 2014 stands disposed of without any order as to costs.

(Swatanter Kumar)
,JM (Sonam Phintso Wangdi)

CP

	,EM (Dr. D.K. Agrawal)
	,EM (Prof. A.R. Yousuf)

