

Item No. 09

Court No. 1

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

Original Application No. 602/2023  
(IA No. 58/2024)

Sardar Satnam Singh & Ors.

Applicant(s)

Versus

State of Uttar Pradesh

Respondent(s)

Date of hearing: 24.07.2024

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRAKASH SHRIVASTAVA, CHAIRPERSON  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR TYAGI, JUDICIAL MEMBER  
HON'BLE DR. A. SENTHIL VEL, EXPERT MEMBER**

Respondents: Mr. Atif Suhrawardy, Adv. for CPCB (Through VC)  
Mr. Alok Agarwal, Mr. Sanjeev Kumar Singh, Mr. Mayank Bughani & Mr.  
Bhishm Pratap Singh, Advs. for R - 7  
Mr. Daleep Dhyani, Adv. for UPPCB (Through VC)

**ORDER**

1. In this original application, the grievance relates to the pollution caused by the Project Proponent, Bajaj Energy Pvt. Ltd. by throwing the fly ash at the side of Sharda Canal, not creating pond near the power plant for collecting the fly ash and not making the provision for the greenery.

2. The Tribunal in the previous order had noted some of the Environmental Clearance (EC) conditions and had required the Project Proponent to place on record the status of compliance of all the EC conditions, especially the conditions relating to management of fly ash and development of green belt.

3. Learned Counsel for the Project Proponent seeks four weeks' time to file the comprehensive reply covering all the said aspects

4. In terms of the previous direction of the Tribunal, the compliance report by the Central Pollution Control Board (CPCB) has been filed wherein the clarification in respect of applying the general standard for discharge in surface water in terms of the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986, Schedule-VI to ascertain the abnormality in the present case has been furnished as under:

*“The drain was passing nearby the industry boundary wall. There is no other identified possible wastewater source in this drain (either industrial or domestic) near M/s Bajaj Energy Private Limited, Maksudapur, District:- Shahajahpur, U.P. The drain ultimately meets into inland surface water body (Khannot River).*

*Sample was collected from the drain for verification of any untreated industrial wastewater discharge including domestic sewage in the drain and the analysed parameters were compared with the General Standard for discharge in Inland Surface Water notified under the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986 for the stated purpose.”*

5. Learned Counsel for the CPCB has submitted that since there is no other industrial unit and no other identified possible water source in the drain in question, therefore, the discharge in the drain is by the project proponent, M/s. Bajaj Energy Pvt. Limited.

6. Counsel for Respondent No. 7 submits that he will clarify the position in its reply. Let the same be filed within four weeks.

7. List on 22.10.2024.

Prakash Shrivastava, CP

Arun Kumar Tyagi, JM

Dr. A. Senthil Vel, EM

July 24, 2024  
Original Application No. 602/2023  
(IA No. 58/2024)  
DV