

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

**Appeal No. 57 of 2013 (Appeal No. 22 of 2013 (SZ))  
And  
Appeal No. 58 of 2013 (Appeal No. 23 of 2013 (SZ))**

**M/s Sterlite Industries (India) Ltd. Vs. Tamil Nadu Pollution Control Board**

**CORAM :** HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SWATANTER KUMAR, CHAIRPERSON  
HON'BLE DR. D. K. AGRAWAL, EXPERT MEMBER  
HON'BLE DR. G. K. PANDEY, EXPERT MEMBER  
HON'BLE DR. R.C. TRIVEDI, EXPERT MEMBER

**Present:** **Appellant:** Mr. C A Sundaram, Sr. Advocate, Ms. Rohini Musa and Mr. Prashanto Sen, Advocates and Mr. Zafar Inayat, Advocate  
**Respondent No. 1 to 3:** Mr. Raju Ramachandran, Sr. Advocate and Mr. Yogesh Kanna, Advocate, Mr. Subramonium Prasad, Mr. M.K. Subramaniaum, Mr. Varun Tandon, Advocates  
**Respondent No. 5:** Mr. Raj Panjwani, Sr. Advocate along with Mr. Rahul Chauhdary, Advocate

<b>Date and Remarks</b>	<b>Orders of the Tribunal</b>
<b>Items No. 1 &amp; 2 July 15, 2013</b>	<p>We have heard the Learned Counsel appearing for the parties on merits or otherwise of the report submitted by the Special Expert Committee dated 10<sup>th</sup> July, 2013.</p> <p>This report does not indicate that the Appellant company of being a pollutant or prudent polluter or otherwise. Upon stack sampling or ambient air quality monitoring, it is not being found that the industry was emitting SO<sub>2</sub> gas or substances which were in violation to the prescribed standards.</p> <p>The Special Expert Committee makes certain recommendations to further improve the working of the plant of the appellant industry. The Learned Counsel appearing for the appellant has undertaken to comply with the recommendations within a time bound schedule, which has been stated in the comments, submitted on behalf of the company before us today. Let the appellant industry proceed to comply with the recommendations/suggestions made by Special Expert Committee within a time bound</p>

schedule.

Since the Appellant company is neither an existing pollutant nor is a threat of future pollution (not violating prescribed standards) resulting in health hazards, we see no reason to vary our Interim Order dated 31<sup>st</sup> May, 2013. The Order shall continue till pronouncement of the judgment.

We make it clear that we shall endeavor our best to pronounce the judgment at the earliest.

.....,CP  
(Swatanter Kumar)

.....,EM  
(Dr. D. K. Agrawal)

.....,EM  
(Dr. G.K. Pandey)

.....,EM  
(Dr. R.C. Trivedi)

