

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.15898 of 2018

=====

Md. Abdul Kalam @ Md. Abul Kalam Son of Kabir Shekh Resident of
Village and P.O.- Pali , P.S. Ghanshyampur, District- Darbhanga Proprietor of
M/S K.B.R. Int. Udyog.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar, through the Chief Secretary, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Principal Secretary, Department of Forest and Environment, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Principal Secretary, Department of Industry, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
4. The Principal Secretary, Department of Mines & Geology, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
5. The Bihar State Pollution Control Board, Patna through its Member Secretary, Paryavaran Bhawan, Patliputra Industrial Area, Patna.
6. The Chairman, the Bihar State Pollution Control Board, Paryavaran Bhawan, Patliputra Industrial Area, Patna.
7. The Member Secretary, The Bihar State Pollution Control Board, Paryavaran Bhawan, Patliputra Industrial Area, Patna.
8. The Regional Officer, Regional Officer, Muzaffarpur, Industrial Estate Bela, Muzaffarpur.
9. The State Environment Impact Assessment Authority, Bihar, Patna through its Member Secretary, Beltron Bhawan, Shastri Nagar, Patna.
10. The Chairman, The State Environment Impact Assessment Authority, Bihar, Beltron Bhawan, Shastri Nagar, Patna.
11. The Collector, Darbhanga District at Collectorate Compound Laheria Sarai, Darbhanga.
12. The District Mining Officer, Darbhanga.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Abhay Kumar Thakur, Mr. Sachin Kumar Mr. Sanjay Kumar, Advocates
For the State	:	Mr. Anant Prasad Singh -SC15
For SEIAA	:	Mr. Kumar Ravish, Mr. Kashyap Kaushal, Advocates
For the Mines	:	Mr. Naresh Dixit, Advocate
For BSPCB	:	Mr. Shivendra Kishore, Sr. Advocate Mr. Abhimanyu, Smt. Binita Singh Advocates

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MADHURESH PRASAD
ORAL ORDER

2 20-08-2018 It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner in

presence of learned counsel for the respondents that he is not

conducting his brick kiln activity under any old technique. In



view of such assertion made by learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner, without expressing any opinion it is evident that he has no cause of action to challenge the draft notification which has been annexed, wherein cut-off date, 31.08.2018, has been fixed as the last date of operation in respect of brick kiln under the old technique excluding the cleaner technique.

Therefore, no order need be passed in the writ petition at this stage as the same is premature. If the petitioner feels aggrieved for any action it would be open to him to approach the Court at an appropriate stage.

With the aforesaid observation, the writ petition stands disposed of.

(Madhuresh Prasad, J)

mrl./-

U			
---	--	--	--

