

HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND AT NAINITAL

Writ Petition Misc. Bench No. 1045 of 2025

9th December, 2025

Ganpati Packaging Industries

.....Petitioner

Versus

Uttarakhand Pollution Control Board

and Another

.....Respondents

Presence:-

Mr. Rahul Consul, learned counsel for the petitioner.

Mr. Aditya Pratap Singh, learned counsel for respondents.

Coram: Hon'ble Ravindra Maithani, J.

Hon'ble Alok Mahra, J.

Hon'ble Ravindra Maithani, J. (Oral)

By means of the present petition, the petitioner seeks a writ of mandamus directing the respondents to take a decision, within a time-bound period, on the petitioner's letter/representation dated 24.11.2025 submitted before the Regional Office, Uttarakhand Pollution Control Board, Kashipur. The petitioner further seeks a writ, order, or direction in the nature of mandamus commanding the respondents to grant renewal of the NOC to the petitioner's industrial unit for a further period of three months, i.e., from 01.01.2026 to 31.03.2026.

2. The petitioner is running a Packaging Plant in

Udham Singh Nagar, for which the Uttarakhand Pollution Control Board has granted consent to operate until 31.12.2025. It is the case of the petitioner that he intends to shift his manufacturing unit to another place and, for this purpose, seeks an extension of three months to continue operating the plant at its present site. It is further submitted that the petitioner has already submitted a representation dated 24.11.2025 for redressal of this grievance; however, no decision has been taken on the said representation by respondent no. 2 – the Regional Office, Uttarakhand Pollution Control Board, Kashipur, till date.

4. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner runs a Packaging Plant for which the consent to operate has been granted till 31.12.2025. The plant is to be shifted at another place. However, the petitioner now seeks an extension of three months' time to complete the shifting process. Till then, the petitioner prays that the consent to operate at the present location be extended.

6. Learned counsel for the respondents would submit that the petitioner has already filed an affidavit before the Civil Court, in a dispute between the petitioner

and the landlord, undertaking to vacate the premises on or before 31.12.2025. Therefore, the consent cannot be extended. However, he submits that the representation submitted by the petitioner shall be decided within a period of two weeks, in accordance with law.

7. The Court takes on record the statement made by learned counsel for the respondents.

8. Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of with a direction to the respondents to take a decision on the petitioner's representation dated 24.11.2025 within a period of two weeks.

(Alok Mahra, J.)
09.12.2025

Mamta

(Ravindra Maithani, J.)
09.12.2025