## BEFORE THE NATIONAL GREEN TRIBUNAL, PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI

## M.A. No.791/2016 In Appeal No. 36/2013

## IN THE MATTER OF:

Alka Sareen & Anr. Vs. Union of India & Ors.

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

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAGHUVENDRA S. RATHORE, JUDICIAL MEMBER

HON'BLE MR. BIKRAM SINGH SAJWAN, EXPERT MEMBER HON'BLE MR. RANJAN CHATTERJEE, EXPERT MEMBER

Present: Applicant: Mr. Hemant Sarin, Adv.

Mr. Mukul Singh, Adv. for MoEF

Respondent: Mr. Anil Grover, AAG with Mr. Rahul Khurana, Adv. for State of Haryana, HSPCB, HUDA,

Date and Remarks	Orders of the Tribunal
Item No. 06	M.A. No.791/2016
September 09, 2016	We have heard the Learned counsel appearing for
A	the p <mark>arties.</mark>
N - 1/	This is an Application praying for recalling of the
3 3	o <mark>rder date</mark> d 27 <sup>th</sup> February, 2015 passed in Appeal No. 36
E	of 2016.
11/2	Having heard the Learned counsel appearing for the
1 1 2	parties and the fact that the Appeal preferred by the
2011	Appellant was disposed of at that stage as the wildlife
	clearance had not been granted, being one of the
	conditions of the Environmental Clearance order dated
	01st March, 2013. Now the wildlife clearance had been
	granted vide order dated 26th February, 2016. The same
	was challenged before the Tribunal. However, vide order
	dated 09th May, 2016 in the Original Application filed
	against the order dated 26th February, 2016 has been
	withdrawn as wildlife clearance does not form part of the
	Schedule – I of the National Green Tribunal Act, 2010.
	The contention of the Learned counsel appearing for the
	Applicant is that whether he challenges or not the wildlife

the Project Proponent, permission granted to contentions on merits for grant of Environmental Clearance would still be available to him in accordance We find substance in this contention. with law. Consequently, for this we need not find it essential to recall our order dated 27th February, 2015 but still direct that the appeal may be heard on merits. We make it clear that the before the next date of hearing the Appellant if he so desires, should challenge the wildlife permission granted to Project Proponent in accordance with law failing which it will be presumed that the Appellant has no challenge to the said order.

Accordingly, M.A. No. 791 of 2016 stands disposed of without any order as to costs.

List Appeal No. 36 of 2013 for hearing on 21st October, 2016.

,CP
(Swatanter Kumar)
TM.
,JM (Raghuvendra S. Rathore)
(Itagila, citata e, Italia e,
,,EM
(B.S. Sajwan)
$\mathbf{F}\mathbf{M}$

(Ranjan Chatterjee)