M
W.P(C)No. 725 OF 1994
L.....T.....T.....T.....T.....T.....T.....T.....T....R
ITEM No. 2 COURT No. 3 SECTION PIL
A/N MATTER

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

I.A. Nos. 7, 9-10, 12 in
Writ Petition(Civil) No.725/94

NEWS ITEM"HINDUSTAN TIMES"A.Q.F.M.YAMUNA Petitioner (s)

VERSUS

CENTRAL POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD & ANR Respondent (s)

(For directions and impleadment and office report)

WITH

I.A. Nos. 20 & 21 in WP(C) No. 4677/1985 (M.C. Mehta vs. Union of India & Ors.) (with office report)(Re: Construction of STP in Delhi/New Delhi)

WITH

I.A. No. 1207 in I.A. No. 45 in I.A. No. 22 in WP(C) No.4677/1985, I.A. Nos. 1183, 1216, 1251 in WP(C) No. 4677/1985 (M.C. Mehta vs. Union of India & Ors.)(With office report)(re: Common Effluent Treatment Plant)

Date : 31/01/2001 These Petitions were called on for hearing today.

CORAM :
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE B.N. KIRPAL
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE RUMA PAL

For appearing parties:

Mr. Ranjit Kumar, Sr. Adv. (AC)
Mr. M C Mehta, Adv.(NP)

Mr. Kirit N Raval, ASG
Mr. Krishan Mahajan, Mr. C V Subba Rao,
Mr. K C Kaushik, Ms. Niranjana Singh,
Mr. R.N. Verma, Mr. C Radhakrishna,
Mr. Ajay Sharma, Ms. Varuna B Gugnani,
and Mr. B V Balramdas, Advs.
(for Union of India - M/o Environment)

Mr. Mahabir Singh and Mr. S R Sharma, Advs.
(for Haryana State Pollution Control Bd. and
State of Haryana)

Mr. Vijay Panjwani, Adv.
(for C.P.C.B.)

Mr. Ajay K. Agrawal, Adv.
Ms. Alka Agrawal, Adv.
(for State of U.P.)

Mr. Mukul Rohtagi, ASG.
Mr. D N Goburdhun, Ms. Geeta Luthra and
Ms. Pinky Anand, Advs.
(for Govt. of NCT of Delhi)

Mr. Mukul Rohtagi, ASG.
Mr. Dhruv Mehta and Ms. Shobha, Advs.
for M/s KL Mehta & Co., Advs.
[For NCT in IA 1207 in IA 45
in IA 22 in WP(C)4677/85]

Mr. R B Misra, Adv.
Mr. Kamlendra Misra and Ms. Sangeeta
Sharma,Advs. (for U P Jal Nigam)

Mr. Pradeep Misra, Adv.
(for UP Pollution Control Bd.)

Mr. Sudhir Kulshreshtha, Adv.
Mr. Anil Kumar Sharma, Adv.
(for Municipal Corpn., Ghaziabad)

Mr. Girish Chandra, Adv.
(for GDA)

Mr. Ashok K Srivastava, Adv.for NOIDA.

Mr. R C Verma, Adv.
(for Delhi Pollution Control Board)

Mr. Vishnu B Saharya, Adv. for
M/s. Saharya & Co. (for DDA)

Mr. R S Suri, Adv.
(for Delhi Jal Board)

Ms. Sheil Sethi, Adv. (NP)
(for National Capital Region Planning Bd.)

Mr. Ajay Verma and Mr. Pavan Kumar, Advs.
(for M/s. Ashoka Distillery)

Ms. Rakhi Ray, Adv. for
Ms. Bina Gupta, Adv.
(for M/s Frost Falcon Distilleries Ltd.)

Ms. Binu Tamta, Adv.
(for M/s.Haryana Distillery)

Mr. K K Lahiri, Mr. Ejaz Maqbool,
Mr. B K Mishra and Ms. Safali Shukla, Advs.
for Maqbool, Mishra & Co., Advs.

Mr. K K Lahiri and Mr. Rajesh Kumar, Advs.
(for M/s. Haryana Organics)

Mr. R K Maheshwari, Adv.(NP)

Mr. M C Dhingra, Adv.(NP)

Mr. S N Terdol, Adv.(NP)

Mr. Raj Kumar Mehta, Adv.(NP)

Mr. Maninder Singh, Adv.(NP)

Mr. Dalip Kumar Malhotra, Adv.(NP)

Ms. B. Vijay Lakshmi Menon, Adv.(NP)

Mr. N S Bisht, Adv.(NP)

Mr. Ravindra Bana, Adv. (NP)

Ms. Laxmi Arvind, Adv.(NP)

Mr. J D Jain, Adv.(NP)

Ms. Anil Katiyar, Adv.(NP)

Mr. Goodwill Indeevar, Adv.(NP)

Ms. Hemantika Wahi, Adv.(NP)

M/s. Lawyers Associates, Advs.(NP)

Mr. C S Ashri, Adv.(NP)

Ms. Naresh Bakshi, Adv.(NP)

Mr. M L Lahoty, Adv.(NP)

Ms. Rachna Joshi Issar, Adv.(NP)

Mr. Praveen Kumar, Adv. (NP)

Mr. Himanshu Shekhar, Adv.(NP)

Mr. K C Dua, Adv.(NP)

Mr. M K D Namboodiri, Adv.(NP)

Mr. Prashant Chaudhary, Adv.(NP)

Ms. Madhu Sikri, Adv.(NP)

Mr. Sudharshan Menon, Adv.(NP)

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following

O R D E R

.....L.....I.....T.....T.....T.....T.....T.....J
.SP2

At the outset, Mr. K N Raval, the learned Additional Solicitor General informs the Court that in order that the concept of National Capital Region becomes effective, a meeting is shortly being called of the representatives of the States of Haryana, Rajasthan,
.PA

Uttar Pradesh and Delhi, so that uniform fiscal structure is evolved. In our opinion, without such an evolution the concept of National Capital Region may remain a dead letter and, therefore, it will be appropriate if all the States concerned can come to an agreement in this regard whereby the tax and other fiscal measures and benefits are similar, if not identical, in so far as relocated industries and population are concerned. The information

regarding progress of the same be given to the Court within four weeks.

Apropos a suggestion which was mooted on the last hearing, the Court is informed that a meeting between the Union Minister for Urban Development and the Chief Minister of Delhi is scheduled to take place within a week and the decisions arrived at will have a bearing on the points in issue. On request, these matters are adjourned. List after four weeks.

Mr. Vijay Panjwani informs that there is no improvement in the quality of water in the river Yamuna and looking at the magnitude of the task of monitoring the quality thereof, the Central Pollution Control Board may be permitted to record the readings once a month instead of once a fortnight. Ordered accordingly.

With regard to the distilleries which have been closed, it is reported by the learned Amicus Curiae that a Sub-Committee has been constituted and its report is expected by 8th February, 2001. Basing on the said report, a decision will be taken by the Committee as to

.PA

whether to re-open the distilleries or not. Hopefully, the matter will be finalised by 15th February, 2001.

.SP1

(D.P. WALIA) (S.L. GOYAL)
COURT MASTER COURT MASTER

~

.PA

Order passed on 31.1.2001 when WP(C) No.725/1994@@
CCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCC
(Yamuna Pollution matter) was listed for hearing@@
CCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCC

.SP2

At the outset, Mr. K N Raval, the learned Additional Solicitor General informs the Court that in order that the concept of National Capital Region becomes effective, a meeting is shortly being called of the representatives of the States of Haryana, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh and Delhi, so that uniform fiscal structure is evolved. In our opinion, without such an evolution the concept of National Capital Region may remain a dead letter and, therefore, it will be appropriate if all the States concerned can come to an agreement in this regard whereby the tax and other fiscal measures and benefits are similar, if not identical, in so far as relocated industries and population are concerned. The information regarding progress of the same be given to the Court within four weeks.

.SP1

(D.P. WALIA) (S.L. GOYAL)
COURT MASTER COURT MASTER