खाजगी कामाकरिता सने रेकेन. 33/2093 निशाणा क. ४७/८४ व अर्ज क. 33 ८ /२०१४ दिनांक 3 /९४/२०१४ नकलेस अर्ज आला तारिख <u>पाने/</u> सम्बी/दीढी लिहणावळ रूजवात अजिची पूर्तता झाली तारिख दोन हजार चौदा सरचार्ज कागद दोन हजार चीदा नक्कल नेण्यास दिलेली तारिख पोस्टेज नक्कल तयार झालेली तारिखँ सहाय्यके अधिभक मुख्य न्यायदंडाधिकारी कोर्ट, रायगड-अलिबाग

रायगड-अलिबाग 0 5 JUN 20 नक्कल अर्जवार तर्फे जिल्हा जिल्हा जिल्हा विली तारीख 0 5 JUN 2014

सहाय्यक अधिधक मुख्य न्यायदंडाधिकारी कोर्ट, रायगड अलिबाग Received On : 05/03/2013
Registered On : 05/03/2013
Decided on : 02/06/2014
Duration : Y. M. D. 01 02 29

IN THE COURT OF THE CHIEF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE, RAIGAD AT ALIBAG.

(Before S. S. Tambe)

Maharashtra Pollusion Control Board

Sion East, Mumbai 22, (Represented by)

Regular Criminal Case No.33/2013. Exhibit: 46/B.

)..'Complainant.

Shri. Bhagavan Solunke)
Regional Officer Raigad		ý
having his office at Navi Mum	bai.) .
Versus		
[1] M/s. Hi Tech Carbon) Accused.
A unit of Aditya Birla Nuvo I	₋td.,)
village - Talvali and Lohop		.)
Tal. Khalapur, Dist. Raigad.)
(Summons to be served on)
Shri Vinay Bhalerao Unit Hea	ıd)
Age: 53 yrs., Occu. Service	***)
M/s. High Tech Carbon)
village – Talvali and Lohop) .
Tal. Khalapur, Dist. Raigad.)
[2] Shri Vinay Bhalerao Unit He	ad)
Age: 53 yrs., Occu. Service)
M/s. High Tech Carbon)
village - Talvali and Lohop)
Tal. Khalapur, Dist. Raigad.		3
[3] Shri. Subhash Deshpande		
Factory Manager,)
Age: 50 yrs., Occu.: Service)
M/s. High Tech Carbon)
village – Talvali and Lohop) .
Tal. Khalapur, Dist. Raigad) .
黎德斯		

Dambe /2014

[4]	Shri. Prashant Kumbhar)
	Officer Safety and Environment)
	Age: 50 yrs., Occu.: Service	ý
ž	M/s. High Tech Carbon	ń
94	village - Talvali and Lohop	Ś
	Tal. Khalapur, Dist. Raigad.	Ś

CHARGES: Under sections 15 and 16 of the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986 r/w Environment Impact Assessment Notification 2006.

Smt. Minal Manohar, Ld. Adv. for M.P.C.B. Mumbai. Shri. P. M. Thakur, Ld. Adv. for accused.

IUDGMENT

(Pronounced on 02.06.2014)

- The complaint was filed on 05/03/2013 against accused No.1 to 4. The process was issued against accused on 19/03/2013 u/sec.15 and 16 of Environment (Protection) Act, 1986 r/w Environment Impact Assessment Notification 2006.
- The complainant P.W.1 Bhagwan Solunke Regional Officer of M.P.C.B. Board Raigad examined vide Exh.27. He was cross-examined by accused Advocate. Mean time accused No.1 to 4 filed an application vide Exh.41 and 38 to plead guilty and discharge respectively.
- Accused No.1 has filed an application to plead guilty vide Exh.41 along with documentary evidence vide Exh.42 to 46 to support his contention.
- Accused No.2 to 4 have filed an application vide Exh.38 u/sec. 245 (1) of Cr.P.C. for discharge.

- No.1 that fine should be allowed as Rs.1,00,000/- which must be deposited to the Board. The complainant further filed written letter addressing to the Adv. of the complainant that accused No.1 is pleading guilty then we may accept plead guilty. The complainant Board would like to consider plead guilty in favour of the complainant Board. Hence, it is found that the complainant is having no objection if accused No.1 pleaded guilty and deposited fine to the complainant M.P.C.B.
- The present complaint is Part Heard in which complainant is examined and his evidence recorded along with the documents. Subsequently, the accused have filed an application to plead guilty and discharge.
- Advocate Mr. P.M. Thakur. They both filed the judgment M/s. Arvind

 Ltd., v. Karnataka State Pollution Control Board Cri. Petition

 No.2782/2008 judgment dtd.17/07/2008 of Hon'ble Karnataka High

 Court and M/s. Puravankara Projects Ltd., v. Karnataka State

 Pollution Control Board Cri.Writ Petition No.5205/2008 judgment

 dtd.07/06/2013. In both these cases accused pleaded guilty and the amount of fine deposited to the complainant. On this point complainant and accused as well as their Ld. Adv. agreed that accused No.1 is ready to plead guilty and the fine amount to be deposited to the complainant.
- 8] In this case, accused No.2 to 4 have filed an application

59mbe 02106/2014 u/sec.245(1) of Cr. P.C. Complainant filed say vide Exh.39. The complainant submitted that as the accused do bonafide efforts and accused No.1 is pleading guilty then there will be no any objections. On this point for clarification of the No Objection to accused Nos. 2 to 4 in view of an application Exh.39 say of complainant I heard Ld. Adv. Mrs. Manohar. She submitted that the complainant is having No Objection to discharge the accused Nos. 2 to 4 in this case.

- Hence, when the complainant is ready to take fine amount of Rs.1,00,000/- from accused No.1 and after that complainant is also ready for not to proceed against accused Nos. 2 to 4 and also given written No Objection vide Exh.39 in favour of accused No.2 to 4 and also in view of two judgments cited by complainant and accused which supports the contention of complainant to settle the dispute by taking fine from the accused.
- Hence, in the above facts and circumstances, no purpose will be served by keeping the said complaint pending when complainant being M.P.C.B. Board of Govt. of Maharashtra is having no interest to proceed against the accused and they settled their dispute by collecting fine from the accused, this Court proceed to pass the following order:-

ORDER

- [1] Accused No.1 is convicted vide Sec.241 of Cr.P.C. for comming an offence u/sec. 15 & 16 of the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986.
- [2] Accused No.1 is hereby directed to pay fine of Rs.1,00,000/-(Rs. One Lakh only) within one week from today before the complainant i.e. M.P.C.B. Board Mumbai i/d. of fine accused No.1 to

106/2014

(Judgment)

Reg. Cri. Case No.33/2013.

suffer S.I. for three (03) months.

Accused No.2 to 4 are hereby discharged and acquitted u/sec. [3] 15 & 16 of the Environment Protection Act, 1986 from this case.

The complaint is dispose of accordingly. [4]

Alibag.

Date: 02.06.2014.

(S.S. Tambe) Chief Judicial Magistrate,

Raigad Alibag.





म्बाबदंडाधिकारी को

वायकर-वाचित्राव

05 JUN 2014