

\$~32

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ W.P.(C) 10182/2016

ROSHAN CHAPAGAIN & ANR

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr.Siddharth Luthra, Sr.Adv. with
Ms.Purnima Raj and Mr.Shrey Sinha, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS

..... Respondent

Through: Ms.Shiva Lakshmi, CGSC with
Mr.Sriram Krishna and Mr.Ruchir Ranjan Rai,
Adv. for R-1, 2 & 3.

Mr.Rahul Mehra, Sr.Standing Counsel with
Mr.Sanjoy Ghose, ASC, Mr.Tushar Sanny and
Ms.Pratishtha Vij, Adv. for GNCD.

Mr.Harsha Peechara with Mr.Ashish Tiwari, Adv.
for SDMC.

CORAM:

HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

HON'BLE MS.JUSTICE SANGITA DHINGRA SEHGAL

ORDER

26.10.2016

%

1. In view of the fact that the Supreme Court is seized of the issue relating to pollution management of municipal sewage and solid waste, it is submitted by Mr.Siddharth Luthra, the learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioners that the prayer for consideration of the representations dated 02.05.2016 and 30.04.2016 is not pressed and that the writ petition may be confined only to the extent of the issues raised by the petitioners with regard to Ganga Rejuvenation Programme proposed by the Union of India. The statement of the learned Senior Counsel is placed on record.

2. On behalf of the Union of India Ms.Shiva Lakshmi, Standing Counsel

for Central Government has accepted notice.

3. We have heard the learned counsel for both the parties.

4. Having regard to the fact that a detailed representation was made by the petitioners on 30.07.2014 making various suggestions for purification/prevention of pollution of water bodies, we consider it appropriate to dispose of the writ petition with a direction to the respondent Nos.1, 2, 3 & 5 to look into the issues raised by the petitioners in the said representation dated 30.07.2014 and consider the feasibility of adoption of the suggestions made therein. The response of the respondents be communicated to the petitioners within three months from today.

5. So far as the issues raised in the representations dated 02.05.2016 and 30.04.2016 are concerned, the petitioners are at liberty to take recourse to the appropriate remedy as available under law.

6. Writ petition is accordingly disposed of.

CHIEF JUSTICE

SANGITA DHINGRA SEHGAL, J

OCTOBER 26, 2016

pmc