



Crl.O.P.No.6241 of 2014 etc.,

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

WEB COPY

RESERVED ON : 30.11.2023 & 01.12.2023

PRONOUNCED ON : 22.12.2023

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN

Crl.O.P.Nos. 6241, 9182, 10781, 12111, 12190, 12499, 14660,
15563, 15572, 17323, 17326, 24125 & 31654 of 2014
8463, 8464 & 18137 of 2016 and 2498 of 2017
M.P.No.1 of 2014 (13 Nos.) M.P.No.2 of 2014 (3 Nos.)
Crl.M.P.Nos. 4411 to 4413, 8611 of 2016 and 1752 & 1753 of 2017

Crl.O.P.No.6241 of 2014 :-

1. M/s. VLB Trust,
Rep. by its Chairperson and
Managing Trustee,
S.Malarvizhi,
Kovaipudur,
Coimbatore – 641 042.
2. S.Malarvizhi,
W/o. Late S.Venkatram,
Chairperson and Managing Trustee,
M/s.VLB Trust,
Kovaipudur,
Coimbatore – 641 042.
3. K.P.Muruganantham
Authorized Singatory,
M/s.VLB Trust,
Kovaipudur,
Coimbatore – 641 042.

... Petitioners



Crl.O.P.No.6241 of 2014 etc.,

Vs.

The Tamil Nadu Pollution Control Board,
Rep. by its District Environmental Engineer,
Coimbatore (South)
K.Ravichandran,
42-D, S.N.R.College Road,
Peelamedu, Coimbatore – 641 004.
Coimbatore District.

... Respondent

Prayer: Criminal Original petition filed under Section 482 of Code of Criminal Procedure, to call for the entire records connected with the proceedings of C.C.No.46 of 2014 pending on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate No.VII of Coimbatore and quash the same.

For Petitioners in Crl.O.P.No.
6241 of 2014 : Mr.E.K.Kumaresan

For Petitioners in Crl.O.P.No.
10781 of 2014 : Mr.B.Kumar, Senior Counsel
For Mr.M.S.Ramachandran

For Petitioners in Crl.O.P.No.
12111 of 2014 : Mr.B.Kumar, Senior Counsel
For Mr.R.Karthikeyan

For Petitioners in Crl.O.P.Nos.
9182, 12190, 12499, 14660,
17323, 24125 of 2014
and 8463 & 8464 of 2016 : Mr.R.Saravanakumar

For Petitioners in Crl.O.P.Nos.
15563 & 15572 of 2014 : Ms.M.Sneha

For Petitioners in Crl.O.P.No.
31654 of 2014 : Mr.R.Thirunavukarasu

For Petitioners in Crl.O.P.No.
8611 of 2016 : Mr.AR.M.Arunachalam



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.6241 of 2014 etc.,

For Petitioners in Crl.O.P.No.
2498 of 2017 : Mr.R.Mohan

For Respondent
in all Crl.O.Ps : Mr.R.Shanmugasundaram
Advocate General
Assisted by
Mrs.Shanmugavalli Sekar
Standing Counsel for TNPCB

COMMON ORDER

These petitions have been filed to quash the complaints lodged as against the petitioners in all the petitions, for the offences under Sections 15 r/w. 16 & 19(a) of the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986.

2. Since the issues raised in all these petitions are common and the petitioners preferred these petitions for similar prayer, this Court is inclined to pass common order.

3. The crux of the complaint in all the petitions is that as per the notification S.O.No.394(E) published in Gezette No.185, dated 16.04.1987, the State Pollution Control Boards are authorised to take legal action for the indicative violation under the provisions of the Environment Production Act. All the jurisdictional environmental



Crl.O.P.No.6241 of 2014 etc.,

engineers are authorised to launch prosecution on behalf of the Tamil Nadu Pollution Control Board. Further, the Ministry of Environment and Forest, Government of India, vide its Environment Impact Assessment Notification, dated 14.09.2006, mandates that on and from the date of publication, the required construction of new projects or activities or expansion or modernization of existing projects or activity listed in the schedule to its notification entailing capacity addition with change in process and or technology shall be undertaken in any part of India only after the prior environmental clearance from the central government or as the case may be, by the State level environment impact assessment authority.

4. The petitioners in all the petitions are involved in the construction of residential/commercial buildings and in the course of their business, they commenced construction to develop housing unit/commercial complex of more 20,000 square metre. The petitioners projects involve construction of residential/commercial building area of more than 20,000 square meters and it requires prior environmental clearance, as per the notification dated 14.09.2006. The construction of all the petitioners are categorized as Category B project as per Schedule



Crl.O.P.No.6241 of 2014 etc.,

8(a) of the said notification dated 14.09.2006. Therefore, it is mandates that the petitioners ought to have been obtained prior environmental clearance for their projects/ constructions.

5. Further, the petitioners submitted their applications to the Tamil Nadu State Level Environmental Impact Assessment Authority (hereinafter called as “SEIAA”) for obtaining environmental clearance for the proposed projects. It was placed before the Environment Assessment Committee and the same were pending before the SEIAA. However, the petitioners had commenced the constructions and substantial progress have already been put up without any prior environmental clearance.

6. On inspection, the respondent found that though the petitioners itself being aware of the above said mandate as contemplated in the notification dated 14.09.2006, they commenced construction and made substantial progress in their construction activity without getting any prior environmental clearance from the authority concerned. Therefore, the petitioners are in violation of the provisions of the notification and they are liable to be punished for the offences under Section 15(1) r/w Sections 16(1) of the Environment (Protection) Act,



Crl.O.P.No.6241 of 2014 etc.,

1986. Therefore, the respondent issued notice to the petitioners for violation of the provisions under the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986.

All the petitioners submitted their respective reply for the notice issued by the respondent, thereby admitted that they commenced the constructions without prior environmental clearance. Hence the complaints.

7. The learned Senior Counsel and other learned counsel appearing for the respective petitioners in all the petitions submitted that prior commencement of construction, the petitioners duly applied for necessary clearance and approval from the Director of Town and Country Planning and Commissioner of Corporation. All of sudden, the SEIAA informed that the petitioner ought not to have commenced construction without getting prior environmental clearance, for which they sought for apology from the petitioners to proceed their construction further. In fact, draft apology letter was also prescribed by them. Though the petitioners submitted their apology letter, their application for prior environmental clearance was not considered. On receipt of the notice, they had promptly replied about the fact. Further after construction, the petitioners were issued environmental clearance certificate on payment of necessary fees. Therefore, no prosecution can be initiated as against the petitioners.



Crl.O.P.No.6241 of 2014 etc.,

WEB COPY

7.1. They further submitted that insofar the educational institutions are concerned, by way of subsequent Office Memorandum dated 09.06.2015, it was clarified with regards to existing notification No.S.O.3252 (E) dated 22.12.2014, on applicability of Environment clearance. Accordingly, Forest and Climate change has exempted the school, college and hostel for educational institution from obtaining prior environmental clearance under the provisions of the Environmental Impact Assessment Notification, 2006 (EIA) dated 14.09.2006 subject to Sustainable Environmental Management. Subsequently, by the Office Memorandum dated 19.05.2022, it was further clarified with regard to applicability of SEIAA notification for educational institutions. Accordingly, exemption provided for educational institutions by the Ministry's Notification No.S.O.3252 (E) dated 22.12.2014 shall be applicable to all educational institutions covered under the definition of educational institution as mentioned in Noise Pollution (Regulation and Control) Rules, 2000.

7.2. In fact, the petitioners were also paid the fine and obtained environmental clearance certificate. In support of their contention, they relied upon the following judgments :-



Crl.O.P.No.6241 of 2014 etc.,

(i) 2022 SCC Online Mad 3850 – TRIL Info Park Limited, rep. by its authorised signatory Vs. Tamil Nadu Pollution Control Board

(ii) 2023 SCC Online Mad 4358 – Voorna Property Developers Private Limited and anr Vs. Tamil Nadu Pollution Control Board

(iii) 2022 SCC Online SC 362 – Pahwa Plastics Pvt. Ltd., and anr Vs. Dastak NGO and ors.

(iv) (2023) 6 SCC 615 – Electrosteels Steels Limited Vs. Union of India & ors.

8. The respondent filed counter and the learned Advocate General appearing for the respondent submitted that the respondent is a competent person to initiate prosecution as against the petitioners. Without any prior environmental clearance, the construction/physical/operation activities relating to the projects have been started at the sites and it amounts to violations under the Environment (Protection) Act. In order to deal with such cases, the Ministry has issued guidelines in the official memorandum stating that the State Government will need to initiate credible action on the violation by invoking powers under Section 19 of the Environment (Protection) Act, for taking necessary legal action under Section 15 of the Act. Therefore, the respondent rightly initiated prosecution as against the petitioners.



Crl.O.P.No.6241 of 2014 etc.,

WEB COPY

8.1. He further submitted that the Central government vide notification No.934(E) dated, 16.04.1987, authorized the Chairman or the Member Secretary of the State Pollution Control Board or the Regional Officers of the State Pollution Control Board, who has been authorized under delegated powers under Sections 20, 21 and 23 of the Water (P&CP) Act. Accordingly, the powers has been delegated to the District Environmental Engineers, Tamil Nadu Pollution Control Board by the B.P.MS.No.264 dated 04.01.1989 and B.P.Ms.No.3 dated 21.01.1983. Therefore, the District Environmental Engineers are authorized to initiate prosecution vide B.P.Ms.No.58 dated 04.09.2013.

8.2. Further B.P.No.58 of 2013 is a comprehensive board resolutions which within its sweep includes provides authorization to initiate prosecution to the District Environmental Engineers or Assistant Environmental Engineers against the construction projects violations under the Environment (Protection) Act, for commencing construction work without obtaining prior environmental clearance under Environmental Impact Assessment Notification dated 14.09.2006. Therefore, there is no necessity to obtain any separate authorization or



Crl.O.P.No.6241 of 2014 etc.,

sanction to initiate prosecution as against the petitioners. Mere issuance of an apology would not amount to compounding of an offence and in any event, there are no documents to substantiate that the offence has been compounded in any manner. Hence, he prayed for dismissal of these petitions.

9. Heard the learned counsel appearing on either side and perused the material placed before this Court.

10. It is not in dispute that the petitioners had put up construction more than 20,000 square meters without prior environmental clearance certificate, though they had submitted application for prior environmental clearance before the SEIAA. After inspection, notice was issued to the petitioners and also received reply from them. Thereafter, on payment of fee, the environmental clearance certificate was also issued to the petitioners. Therefore, before issuance of prior environmental clearance, the petitioners had commenced construction and substantial progress have been made in their respective constructions sites. Therefore, it is in violation under the provisions under Section 15(1) r/w. 16(1) of the Environment (Protection) Act. They were served with show



Crl.O.P.No.6241 of 2014 etc.,

cause notice and initiated prosecutions.

WEB COPY

11. It is pertinent to note that the National Green Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi, declared the notifications dated 12.12.2012 & 27.06.2013 as ultra vires on the ground that they suffer from the infirmity of lack of inherent jurisdiction and authority. However, the prior environment clearance is pertaining to the official memorandum dated 14.09.2006. It was issued by the Ministry of Environment and Forest, Government of India, under the powers conferred upon its by sub-Section (1) and clause (v) of sub Section (2) of Section 3 of the Environment (Protection) Act. As per the provisions of the notification, the project or activities falling under category A of the Schedule require prior permission from the Central Government while projects and activities falling under category B require prior permission from the State Government. These permissions are to be obtained before any construction work or preparation of the land by the project management except for securing the land is started on project or activity.

12. Subsequently, another notification was issued on 12.12.2012 by the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate change, superseding



Crl.O.P.No.6241 of 2014 etc.,

the notification dated 16.11.2010. However, in that notification it was stated that in case of violation in respect of notification dated 14.09.2006, it will proceed to verify the veracity of the complaint through the regional offices and upon such verification, the explanation of project proponent will be asked for. If the Ministry is satisfied that it is a case of violation, then before proceeding any further, the authorities would require the project proponent to submit its environment related policy, plan of action and a written commitment to ensure that violation will not be repeated within 60 days in terms of the office memorandum dated 12.12.2012.

13. Therefore, the said order of the National Green Tribunal is no way connected with the earlier notification dated 14.09.2006. In fact, for the violation committed by the petitioners, they had paid fine amount and it is nothing to do with the criminal prosecution initiated by the respondent for the offence under Section 15 r/w 16 & 19(a) of the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986. Therefore, it would not be presumed that the criminal prosecution is hit by doctrine of double jeopardy.

14. Insofar as the competency for initiation of prosecution is concerned, it is relevant to rely upon the judgment of this Court reported in **2022 SCC Online Mad 3850** in the case of **TRIL Info Park Limited**,



Crl.O.P.No.6241 of 2014 etc.,

rep. by its authorised signatory Vs. Tamil Nadu Pollution Control

Board., which held as follows :-

“19. It is also relevant to note that the complaint has been filed by the District Environmental Engineer, Tamil Nadu Pollution Control Board. In this regard, it is useful to refer Section 19 of the Environment (Protection) Act. The same reads follows:

“Section 19 in The Environment (Protection) Act, 1986:

19 Cognizance of offences:- No court shall take cognizance of any offence under this Act except on a complaint made by

(a) the Central Government or any authority or officer authorised in this behalf by that Government; or

(b) any person who has given notice of not less than sixty days, in the manner prescribed, of the alleged offence and of his intention to make a complaint, to the Central Government or the authority or officer authorised as aforesaid.?

19. The above provision makes it very clear that complaint can be filed by the Central Government or any authority or officer authorised in this behalf by that Government, i.e., the Central Government. The Notification issued by the Central Government in this



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.6241 of 2014 etc.,

regard reads as follows:

**“OFFICERS AUTHORISED FOR TAKING
COGNIZANCE OF OFFENCES NOTIFICATION :-**

S.O. 394(E).-In exercise of the powers conferred under clause (a) of section 19 of the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986 (29 of 1986). the Central Government hereby authorises the officers and authorities listed in column (2) of the Table hereto for the purpose of the said section with the jurisdiction mentioned against each of them in column (3) of that Table:

TABLE

<i>Sl.No.</i>	<i>Officer</i>	<i>Jurisdiction</i>
<i>(1)</i>	<i>(2)</i>	<i>(3)</i>
<i>1</i>	<i>Any Director, Joint Secretary. Adviser or Additional Secretary to the Government of India in the Department of Environment, Forests and Wildlife.</i>	<i>Whole of India</i>
<i>2</i>	<i>The Chairman or Member-Secretary of the Central Pollution Control Board constituted under section 3 of the Water (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1974 (6 of 1974).</i>	<i>Whole of India</i>
<i>3</i>	<i>The Government of the State (represented by the Secretary to the State Government in-charge) of environment.</i>	<i>Whole of India</i>
<i>4</i>	<i>The Chairman or Member-Secretary of the State Pollution Control Board constituted under section 4 of the Water (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1974 (6 of 1974) or a State Pollution Control Board constituted under section 5 of the Air (Prevention and</i>	<i>Whole of India</i>



Crl.O.P.No.6241 of 2014 etc.,

Sl.No.	Officer	Jurisdiction
	<i>Control of Pollution) Act. 1981 (14 of 1981).</i>	
5	<i>Collector</i>	<i>Whole of Revenue District</i>
6	<i>Zonal Officers of the Central Pollution Control Board who have been delegated powers under sections 20,21.23 of the Water (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1974 (6 of 1974) and section 24 of the Air (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act. 1981 (14 of 1981).</i>	<i>Area as laid down by the Central Government</i>
7	<i>Regional Officers of the State Pollution Control Board who have been delegated powers under section 20, 21 and 23 of the Water (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act. 1974</i>	<i>Area as laid down by the State Board</i>
8	<i>Regional Officers of the State Pollution Control Board who have been delegated powers under section 24 of the Air (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1981.</i>	<i>Area as laid down by the State Board</i>
9	<i>Any Regional/Zonal Officers or a Director in charge of a Region/Zone of the Ganga Project down by the Ganga Project Directorate.</i>	<i>Zonal/Regional area as laid down by the Ganga Project Directorate</i>
10	<i>Any Deputy Secretary, Director. Joint Secretary or Additional Secretary to the Government of India in the Ganga Project Directorate.</i>	<i>Whole of the State in which the Ganga Action Plan is under implementation</i>



Crl.O.P.No.6241 of 2014 etc.,

<i>Sl.No.</i>	<i>Officer</i>	<i>Jurisdiction</i>
<i>11</i>	<i>Joint Secretary (Legal) in the Department of Environment Forests and Wildlife. Ministry of Environment & Forests. New Delhi – 110003</i>	<i>Whole of India</i>
<i>12</i>	<i>Chairman or Member Secretary of the Committee notified under the Water (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1974 and the Air (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1981 in respect of Union Territories.</i>	<i>Whole of Union Territory</i>
	<i>Seed Inspector(s)</i>	<i>Area as laid down by the respective State Govt. in the notification issued under Clause 12 of the Seeds Controller Order 1983</i>

Note: Principal Notification No SO. 394(E), published in Gazette No.185. Dt:16 4 1987No.9 and 10 and entries relating thereto inserted vide \$0.2371E1. dt.29.3.89 published in the Clarette No. 171. dt. 29.3.89. S.N. 11 and entries relating thereto inserted vide \$.0.656(E), d.24.8.1989 published in the Gazette No 519, dt 21.8.1989.”

21. On a careful perusal of the above notification, Central Government has authorised the Chairman or Member-Secretary of the State Pollution Control Board



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.6241 of 2014 etc.,

constituted under Section 4 of the Water (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1974 (6 of 1974) or a State Pollution Control Board under Section 5 of the Air (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1981 (14 of 1981) are competent to file complaint as per Sl.No.4 of the above Notification. Besides Sl.No.7 and 8 are also authorised Regional Officers of the State Pollution Control Board who have been delegated powers under Section 20, 21 and 23 of the Water (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1974 and under Section 24 of the Air (Prevention and control of Pollution) Act, 1981. Only 5 categories have empowered under the Notification by the Central Government to file a complaint viz., Chairman or Member Secretary of the TNPCB and State Pollution Control Board constituted under Section 5 of the Air (Prevention and control of Pollution) Act, the Regional Officers who have been delegated powers under Section 20, 21 and 23 of the Water (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act 1974 and Regional Officers of the State Pollution Control Board who have been delegated powers under Section 24 of the Air (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1981.

22. The complaint in this case has been filed by the Tamil Nadu Pollution Control Board, Represented



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.6241 of 2014 etc.,

by Thiru R.Umaiyaakunjaram, District Environmental Engineer. Such a view of the matter when the Central Government authorised State Pollution Control Board to file a complaint, complaint filed by the Board cannot be faulted and maintainable. Therefore, contention of the Petitioner Counsel as to the filing of complaint by Tamil Nadu Pollution Control Board cannot be countenanced.”

Thus, it is clear that the respondent has authority to launch prosecution as against the petitioners and as such the respondent is a competent to lodge complaint as against the petitioners.

15. Further the grounds raised by the petitioners and the documents produced before this Court have to be considered before the trial Court by let in evidence. All the grounds are mixed question of facts and law and it requires deliberate trial before the trial Court by let in evidence. Therefore, this Court finds no ground to quash the proceedings initiated as against the petitioners.

16. Insofar as the petitions in Crl.O.P.Nos.6241 & 15572 of 2014 are concerned, it is relevant to rely upon the Judgment of the



Crl.O.P.No.6241 of 2014 etc.,

Hon'ble Supreme Court of India reported in **2022 7 MLJ 497 (SC)** in the case of ***D.Swamy Vs Karnataka State Pollution Control Board and others***, wherein the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India held as follows:-

“41. The EP Act does not prohibit ex post facto Environmental Clearance. Grant of ex post facto EC in accordance with law, in strict compliance with Rules, Regulations, Notifications and/or applicable orders, in appropriate cases, where the projects are in compliance with, or can be made to comply with environment norms, is in our view not impermissible. The Court cannot be oblivious to the economy or the need to protect the livelihood of hundreds of employees and others employed in the project and others dependent on the project, if such projects comply with environmental norms.

*44. Even though this Court deprecated ex post facto clearance, in **Alembic Pharmaceuticals Ltd. Vs. Rohit Prajapati and others** (supra), this Court did not direct closure of the units concerned but explored measures to control the damage caused by the industrial units. This Court held:-*

“However, since the expansion has been undertaken and the industry has been functioning, we do not deem it appropriate to order closure of the



Crl.O.P.No.6241 of 2014 etc.,

entire plant as directed by the High Court.””

WEB COPY

17. Therefore, the Environmental Protection Act does not prohibit *ex post facto* Environmental Clearance. Similarly, the grant of *ex post facto* environmental clearance in accordance with law, in strict compliance with Rules, Regulations, Notifications and/or applicable orders, in appropriate cases, where the projects are in compliance with, or can be made to comply with environment norms, is in our view not impermissible. As per the notification and subsequent clarification, the Committee decided and granted environmental clearance subject to the payment of compensation.

18. It is also relevant to rely upon the Judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in ***Civil Appeal No.4795 of 2021 dated 25.03.2022*** in the case of ***Pahwa Plastics Pvt. Ltd and others Vs Dastak NGO and others***, wherein it was held as follows:-

“63. Ex post facto environmental clearance should not be granted routinely, but in exceptional circumstances taking into account all relevant environmental factors.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.6241 of 2014 etc.,

Where the adverse consequences of denial of ex post facto approval outweigh the consequences of regularization of operations by grant of ex post facto approval, and the establishment concerned otherwise conforms to the requisite pollution norms, ex post facto approval should be given in accordance with law, in strict conformity with the applicable Rules, Regulations and/or Notifications. The deviant industry may be penalised by an imposition of heavy penalty on the principle of 'polluter pays' and the cost of restoration of environment may be recovered from it.

64. The question in this case is, whether a unit contributing to the economy of the country and providing livelihood to hundreds of people, which has been set up pursuant to requisite approvals from the concerned statutory authorities, and has applied for ex post facto EC, should be closed down for the technical irregularity of want of prior environmental clearance, pending the issuance of EC, even though it may not cause pollution and/or may be found to comply with the required norms. The answer to the aforesaid question has to be in the negative, more so when the HSPCB was itself under the misconception that no environment clearance was required for the units in question. HSPCB has in its counter affidavit before the NGT clearly stated that a



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.6241 of 2014 etc.,

decision was taken to regularize units such as the Apcolite Yamuna Nagar and Pahwa Yamuna Nagar Units, since requisite approvals had been granted to those units, by the concerned authorities on the misconception that no EC was required.

65. It is reiterated that the 1986 Act does not prohibit ex post facto EC. Some relaxations and even grant of ex post facto EC in accordance with law, in strict compliance with Rules, Regulations, Notifications and/or applicable orders, in appropriate cases, where the projects are in compliance with environment norms, is not impermissible. As observed by this Court in Electrosteel Steels Limited (supra), this Court cannot be oblivious to the economy or the need to protect the livelihood of hundreds of employees and others employed in the units and dependent on the units in their survival.

66. Ex post facto EC should not ordinarily be granted, and certainly not for the asking. At the same time ex post facto clearances and/or approvals cannot be declined with pedantic rigidity, regardless of the consequences of stopping the operations. This Court is of the view that the NGT erred in law in directing that the units cannot be allowed to function till compliance of the statutory mandate.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.6241 of 2014 etc.,

67. Accordingly, the appeal is allowed. The impugned order is set aside in so far as the same is applicable to the units of the Appellants established and operated pursuant to CTE and CTO from the HSPCB in respect of which applications for ex post facto EC have been filed. The Respondent shall take a decision on the applications of the Appellants for EC in accordance with law within one month from date. Pending decision, the operation of the Pahwa Yamuna Nagar Unit and the Apcolite Yamuna Nagar Unit, in respect of which consents have been granted and even public hearing held in connection with grant of EC, shall not be interfered with.”

19. The petitioners in Crl.O.P.Nos.6241 & 15572 of 2014, being the Educational Institutions, are entitled to get the benefit of exemption from obtaining the environmental clearance for the buildings constructed even before the notification No.S.O.3252 (E) dated 22.12.2014 and the subsequent notification dated 19.05.2022.

20. In view of the above, the entire proceedings cannot be sustained as against the petitioners in Crl.O.P.Nos.6241 & 15572 of 2014, and the same are liable to be quashed. Accordingly, the



Crl.O.P.No.6241 of 2014 etc.,

proceedings in C.C.No.46 of 2014 pending on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate VII, Coimbatore, and the proceedings in C.C.No.3 of 2014 pending on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate, Sriperumbudur, are hereby quashed.

21. In result, the Criminal Original Petitions in Crl.O.P.Nos.9182, 10781, 12111, 12190, 12499, 14660, 15563, 17323, 17326, 24125 & 31654 of 2014, 8463, Crl.O.P.Nos. 8464 & 18137 of 2016 and Crl.O.P.No.2498 of 2017 are dismissed and the Criminal Original Petitions in Crl.O.P.Nos.6241 & 15572 of 2014 are allowed. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

22.12.2023

Internet: Yes
Index : Yes/No
Speaking/Non Speaking order

rts



Crl.O.P.No.6241 of 2014 etc.,

WEB COPY To

1. The Judicial Magistrate No.VII,
Coimbatore.
2. The Judicial Magistrate,
Sriperumbudur.
3. The District Environmental Engineer,
Tamil Nadu Pollution Control Board,
Coimbatore (South)
42-D, S.N.R.College Road,
Peelamedu, Coimbatore – 641 004.
Coimbatore District.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.6241 of 2014 etc.,

G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN. J.

rts

COMMON ORDER IN
Crl.O.P.Nos. 6241, 9182, 10781, 12111, 12190, 12499, 14660,
15563, 15572, 17323, 17326, 24125 & 31654 of 2014
8463, 8464 & 18137 of 2016 and 2498 of 2017
M.P.No.1 of 2014 (13 Nos.) M.P.No.2 of 2014 (3 Nos.)
Crl.M.P.Nos. 4411 to 4413, 8611 of 2016 and 1752 & 1753 of 2017

22.12.2023