

\$~59

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ W.P.(C) 1788/2020
SMT.SIMA SEN AND ANR. Petitioners
Through: Mr.Rajeev Ranjan Panday, Adv.

versus

SENIOR ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEER DELHI POLLUTION
CONTROL COMMITTEE AND ORS. Respondents
Through: Mr.Sanjay Dewan, Ms.Nishima Arora
an Ms.Shivani Pruthi, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA

ORDER
14.02.2020

%
CM 6215-16/2020

Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

WP(C) 1788/2020 & CM 6217/2020 (Stay)

This petition has been filed challenging the orders dated 16.01.2020 and 24.01.2020 issued by the respondent no.2 *inter-alia* directing the closure of the restaurant of the petitioner as also imposing the Environmental Compensation of Rs.2 lacs on the petitioner.

In the Impugned Orders, it has been asserted that the petitioner was found to be engaged in running a restaurant without the mandatory 'Consent to Operate' under the Water (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1974 and the Air (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1981. Certain other discrepancies were also found in restaurant, which have been stated in the notice dated 16.01.2020.

The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that after the issuance of the notice dated 16.01.2020, the petitioner has taken steps for regularization of running of the restaurant from the premises in question. The learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the petitioner is ready and willing to abide by all other conditions as may be imposed by the respondent no.2 for allowing the petitioner to operate its business from the premises.

In view of the above, the present petition is disposed of directing that the contents of the present petition be treated as a representation of the petitioner to the respondent no.2 and the respondent no.2, after granting an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner, shall dispose of such representation by way of a speaking order within a period of one week from the communication of this order.

Needless to state, in case the petitioner is aggrieved of the order passed by the respondent no.2, it shall be open to the petitioner to challenge the same in accordance with the law.

It is further made clear that this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the submissions made by the petitioner in the present petition.

Dasti under the signature of the Court Master.

NAVIN CHAWLA, J

FEBRUARY 14, 2020/Arya