

**BEFORE THE NATIONAL GREEN TRIBUNAL
WESTERN ZONE BENCH, PUNE**

THROUGH PHYSICAL HEARING (WITH HYBRID OPTION)

**Execution Application No.16/2023(WZ)
Earlier E.A. No.21/2023(PB)
In
Original Application No.119/2023(WZ)
Earlier O.A. No.363/2015(PB)**

Dr. Sarvabhoun Bagali

.....Applicant

Versus

State of Karnataka & Ors.

....Respondent(s)

Date of hearing: 01.12.2023

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DINESH KUMAR SINGH, JUDICIAL MEMBER
HON'BLE DR. VIJAY KULKARNI, EXPERT MEMBER**

Applicant : Mr. Aagney Sail, Advocate

Respondent(s) : Mr. Tushar Thombare, Addl. Collector, Solapur for R-3
Mr. Aniruddha Kulkarni, Advocate for R-4/SEIAA
Mr. Pratik M. Pawar, Advocate for R-5

ORDER

1. From the side of applicant, learned counsel Mr. Aagney Sail has appeared, who submits that there is a clerical error in mentioning the Prayer No.“A” in the I.A., which is not numbered by the Registry because of its being defective to the effect that a prayer was made for impleading the State of Karnataka through its Chief Secretary as one of the respondents in the present matter, although it should have been the State of Maharashtra. But he states that he has submitted an amended memo of parties, in which the respondent No.7 has been shown as State of Maharashtra through its Chief Secretary, which is correctly impleaded and even notices have been served upon the said party as per the service affidavit dated 30.11.2023.

2. In view of above, we direct the Registry to allot a number to the said I.A. seeking impleadment of the State of Maharashtra through its Chief Secretary. We also at the same time direct the learned counsel for applicant to make correction in the said impleadment application by incorporating necessary amendment in Prayer Clause "A".

3. None has appeared from the side of respondent No.1/Dy. Commissioner & Chairman, District Sand Monitoring Committee; respondent No.2/Karnataka State Environment Impact Assessment Authority; respondent No.6 and respondent No.7 despite sufficient service.

4. From the side of respondent No.3/District Collector, Solapur, Mr. Tushar Thombare, Addl. Collector, Solapur has appeared in-person, who seeks four weeks' time to file reply affidavit, the same is allowed with the direction that a copy of the same shall be served upon all other parties, who may file rejoinder affidavit against the same, if any, within one week thereafter.

5. From the side of respondent No.4/SEIAA- Maharashtra, learned counsel Mr. Aniruddha Kulkarni has appeared, who seeks four weeks' time to file reply affidavit, the same is allowed with the direction that a copy of the same shall be served upon all other parties, who may file rejoinder affidavit against the same, if any, within one week thereafter.

6. From the side of respondent No.5, learned counsel Mr. Pratik M. Pawar has appeared, who submits that he would be filing Vakalatnama along-with reply affidavit within a period of four weeks, the same is allowed with the direction that a copy of the same shall be served upon all other parties, who may file rejoinder affidavit against the same, if any, within one week thereafter.

Put up this matter for further consideration on 01.02.2024

Dinesh Kumar Singh, JM

Dr. Vijay Kulkarni, EM

December 01, 2023
Execution Application No.16/2023(WZ)
Earlier E.A. No.21/2023(PB) In
Original Application No.119/2023(WZ)
Earlier O.A. No.363/2015(PB)
P.Kr