

State Environment Impact Assessment Authority (SEIAA),
Haryana

Minutes of 166th Meeting of State Environment Impact Assessment Authority (SEIAA), Haryana held on 19.09.2023, under the Chairmanship of Sh. Sameer Pal Srow, IAS (Retd.), Chairman, SEIAA, Haryana at Bay's No. 55-58, 1st Floor, Paryatan Bhawan, Sector-2, Panchkula, Haryana.

List of Participants

1. **Prof. R. Baskar,** **Expert Member, SEIAA**
FGGS School of Sciences.
IGNOU, Delhi

(Attended Meeting through “VC”)

2. **Shri Pardeep Kumar, IAS** **Member Secretary, SEIAA**
Director, Environment & Climate Change
Department, Haryana

At the outset, the Chairman, State Environment Impact Assessment Authority, Haryana (SEIAA), (hereinafter refer to as, “The Authority”), greeted the Members and requested the Member Secretary to give a brief background of the Proposals to be placed before the Authority as **“Agenda Items (Sr. No. 1 to 9)”** for discussions in the said meeting.

“Later, the Minutes of the 165th Meeting of SEIAA held on 05.09.2023 were **“CONFIRMED”** as part of the proceedings of 166th Meeting” being held on 19.09.2023.

Meeting : 166th
Date : 19.09.2023

AGENDA ITEMS
(Sr. No. 1 to 9)

The Authority took up the following Proposals during 166th Meeting for consideration and decisions thereof:

Item No. 166.01

Corrigendum in EC for Mining of Stone at Manakwas, Plot No. 2, Near Village Mankawas, Tehsil- Charkhi Dadri, Bhiwani, Haryana by M/s United Mining Corporation

1.	Proposal	Corrigendum in EC
2.	Project Proponent	M/s United Mining Corporation
3.	Location & Category of the Project	Manakwas, Plot No. 2, Near Village Mankawas, Tehsil- Charkhi Dadri, Bhiwani, Haryana 1 (a)
4.	Project Cost	₹ 1.5 Crores as per Form (I).
5.	Project Consultant	Ind Tech House Consult
6.	NABET, ACCREDITATION	NABET/EIA/2023/SA 0174 Validity: 31/10/2023

The said Proposal was submitted to the Authority, (SEIAA) (as **online Proposal**) **vide No. SIA/HR/MIN/302860/ 2023 dated 03.08.2023** for Corrigendum in **Environment Clearance**, within the scope and meaning of category 1(a) of EIA Notification dated 14.09.2006. The Project Proponent has deposited Scrutiny fee of **₹ 1,50,000/- vide DD No. 011490 dated 03.08.2023** (in compliance of Haryana Government, Environment & Climate Change Department Notification No. DE&CCH/3060 dated 14.10.2021).

Appraisal & Recommendations of SEAC:

The said case was taken up during **275th meetings of SEAC held on 22.08.2023** and the Appraisal Committee (SEAC) made recommendations to the Authority

to issue corrigendum with regard to EC letter dated 28.03.2017 be issued mentioning that PP shall not carry any mining activity in the forest area measuring 2.73 hectare.

Findings and Decision of THE AUTHORITY (SEIAA):

The said Proposal was taken up during **166th Meeting of SEIAA held on 19.09.2023.**

After having gone through the relevant record placed on the file, besides perusing the recommendations of the Appraisal Committee (SEAC); the Authority observed that Project Proponent i.e. **M/s United Mining Corporation** has approached the Authority, **after the gap of 6 years**, with the request to reduce the size of the project by issuing a corrigendum in the Environment Clearance (EC) dated 28.03.2017, **Granted for 22.90 hectares area at Plot No. 2, Near Village Mankawas, Tehsil- Charkhi Dadri, Bhiwani, Haryana.**

As per the request, 2.73 hectare has been proposed to be reduced from the total area (i.e. 22.90 hectares as per Environment Clearance), being the forest area.

The Authority after due deliberations, **decided to decline the proposal** as the same is devoid of merit and relevance. At the time of grant of Environment Clearance, Project Proponent was categorically made to understand that **“no mining activity can be carried out / permitted in the forest land”**. Therefore, if the intent & objective of the Project Proponent is to use this instrument for the purpose of **One time Settlement (OTS)** with the concerned department, the Authority has no comment to make or interfere directly or indirectly in this regard. This is a matter of a contract and consideration between the Project Proponent and the concerned Department. It needs to be emphasized that Project Proponent is under obligation to comply with the relevant Act / Rules alongwith directions of the Hon’ble Courts, besides the guidelines issued by MOEF & CC, GOI, from time to time.

Accordingly, proposal is filed, without expressing any comment(s) on the OTS and other terms & conditions of the contract between the Project Proponent and Department.

Meeting : 166th
Date : 19.09.2023

Item No. 166.02

EC for Capacity expansion of mining of Stone along with associated minor minerals from 60,00,000 TPA to 85,00,000 TPA over and area 54.00 ha at village Atela Kalan, Tehsil and district Charkhi Dadri and state Haryana by M/s M S K (JV).

1.	Proposal	<u>Grant of Expansion in EC</u>
2.	Project Proponent	M/s M S K (JV).
3.	Location & Category of the Project	Village Atela Kalan, Tehsil and District Charkhi Dadri and State Haryana 1(a)
4.	Project Cost	₹ 40 Crore
5.	Project Consultant	M/s Vardan Environet
6.	NABET, ACCREDITATION	(No. NABET/EIA/2023/SA 0158 Valid upto : 05/04/2026.

The project was submitted to the SEIAA, Haryana vide **online proposal No. SIA/HR/MIN/431911/2023 dated 08.06.2023** for obtaining **Environmental Clearance for Capacity Expansion** under Category 1(a) of EIA Notification 14.09.2006. The Project Proponent has deposited due Scrutiny fee (as applicable) of ₹ 1,50,000/- vide DD No. 004710 dated 11.04.2022 (in compliance of Haryana Government, Environment & Climate Change, Department Notification No. DE&CCH/3060 dated 14.10.2021).

Appraisal & Recommendations of SEAC:

The said case was taken up in 271st meeting held on 29.06.2023 and SEAC recommended the Project to SEIAA for **Grant of Environment Clearance**.

The said Proposal was taken up during **162nd Meeting of SEIAA held on 19.07.2023**. The Authority, after having gone through the details and relevant record placed on file, alongwith considering the recommendations of the Appraisal Committee (SEAC), **observed that District Survey Report (DSR), pertains to some other District, instead of Charkhi Dadri, where Mining activities are to be carried out.**

Besides this the Authority also observed and examined the proposal pertaining to enhancement of Production Capacity from existing 60,00,000 TPA to 85,00,000 TPA. The Appraisal Committee has recommended the same but without any justification. Whereas,

the Authority deemed it appropriate to understand, whether proposed enhancement of production capacity will cause any dent on the Environment and other parameters, upon considering the proposal.

This is due to a recent incident, occurred in District-Bhiwani (Mining Site - Dadam), where many lives were lost and thereafter, it was also found that indiscriminate mining has made serious dents on the Environment / local surroundings by disturbing the eco-system (fauna & flora) and adversely affecting the normal life of the people. Hon'ble NGT also made serious observation and constituted a team of Experts to study and understand the reasons, leading to such unfortunate incident.

Therefore, it is more than imperative and urgent to understand, before considering, such proposals, where production capacity of this magnitude i.e. 60,00,000 TPA to 85,00,000 TPA is proposed to be enhanced, without expressing justification and possible dent on the Environment. The Authority is of the view that Appraisal Committee, while considering such proposals should have sought reasonability and circumstances for considering the proposal of enhancement of this magnitude. Therefore, a response needs to be called from Mines & Geology Department, Haryana in this regard.

Further, the Authority decided to constitute a Sub-committee of the followings:

1. **Member Secretary, SEIAA (Head of the Sub-committee);**
2. **Member Secretary, SEAC (Member);**
3. **Representative of Member Secretary of HSPCB (Member);**
4. **Mining Officer, Charkhi Dadri (Member);**
5. **Regional Officer of HSPCB of the relevant area (To assist the Sub-committee).**

The Sub-committee shall visit the project site and submit a detailed report about the proposal.

In view of the above, the Authority decided to **REFER BACK** the case to **Appraisal Committee (SEAC)** to re-examine the issues of capacity enhancement. Further, the Appraisal Committee needs to look into the precedents, if any and the circumstances and justification for considering such proposals.

Thereafter, the case was taken up during **273rd meeting of SEAC held on 28.07.2023**. The sub-committee constituted by SEIAA in its 162nd meeting, visited the site on 25.07.2023. The sub-committee has submitted its report and observed that the proposed enhancement of production capacity (from 60 MTPA to 85 MTPA) may be considered subject to certain conditions:

1. The project proponent will provide the provision of a dense multilayer green belt with 5 rows of avenue plantations all around the project's boundary using indigenous local species of plants to control air emissions, and noise pollution, and maintain ecosystem equilibrium.

2. The project proponent must implement sufficient dust suppression measure using water gun and sprinklers in critical with high PM¹⁰ and PM^{2.5} level to meet CPCB norms for ambient air quality.
3. Blasting operations should only be conducted during the daytime and must follow controlled practices to minimize ground vibrations and fly rocks. Drills should use dust extractors or water injection systems.
4. An Occupational Health Specialist should be appointed for regular medical examinations of workers engaged in the project. Workers with ailments like BP, diabetes, smoking habits, etc., should undergo health check-ups once every six months, and necessary preventive measures should be taken. National Institute recommendations for mine worker occupational environment should be implemented.
5. Mining operations should be limited to 2 meters above the groundwater table and should not intersect the groundwater table.
6. Pollution due to transportation should be effectively controlled, and mineral transportation should be carried out through covered trucks only. Vehicles should not be overloaded, and only those with a PUGC (Pollution Under Control Certificate) should be allowed to ply.
7. Rainwater harvesting measures should be planned, developed, and implemented in consultation with the Central Groundwater Board/Haryana Water Resource Authority to augment groundwater resources
8. Air pollution prevention and control measures should be implemented in surrounding villages i.e. Khanak, Baganwala and Tosham areas with heavily saturated Ambient Air Quality to bring down AAQ within prescribed standards. The project proponent will provide six Continuous Ambient Air Quality monitoring stations at different locations to cover Air quality profile of the lease mining area and surrounding.
9. Illumination and sound at the project during night time should not disturb nearby villages. Flood lights should be oriented away from villagers, and noise level should be kept within prescribed limits for day and night hours.
10. Vibration studies should be conducted before blasting to evaluate the impact on nearby habitats Alternative mineral extraction methods should be considered near sensitive areas vulnerable to blasting vibrations.
11. Main haulage roads should have permanent water sprinklers, and other roads should be regularly wetted with water tankers fitted with Sprinklers.
12. Mineral transportation through villages should not be allowed, and a bypass road should be constructed to mitigate sound, dust, and accident impacts. The project proponent should bear the cost of widening and strengthening existing public road networks if used for the project.
13. Regular monitoring of groundwater levels and quality should be conducted by establishing a network of wells and piezometers, and data should be sent to relevant authorities periodically.
14. Critical parameters like PM¹⁰, PMs, NO, and SO, will be monitored on a daily basis through CAAQMS (Continuous Ambient Air Quality Monitoring Stations) and water quality should be monitored periodically, and data should be made public via the company's website and display boards at the project site.
15. Noise levels in the work environment should be controlled below 85 dBA, and workers should be provided with ear plugs/muffs.

16. Personnel in dusty areas should wear protective respiratory devices, and receive adequate training and information on safety and health aspects.
17. Prior permission from competent authorities is required for the drawl of surface water and groundwater.

Further, the PP has also submitted an affidavit clarifying the issue of capacity enhancement. The PP submitted as under:

1. Atela Kalan Mine is situated in district CharkhiDadri, Haryana as per approved District Survey Report. Khasra no. and area are mentioned in the approved DSR on page no. 09 which was submitted to SEAC on 30.06.2023.
2. The total Geological reserve is estimated as 74,338,540 Metric Tonne and extractable reserves at 90% recovery are 66,904,686 Tones as per approved Mining Plan. Total extract reserve up to May 2023 is 35,015,010.79 Metric Tonne. Thus, the proposed balance mineable reserve is 31,889,675.21 Metric Tonne.
3. Previous mining plan was approved for the production capacity of stone 60,00,000 TPA. Earlier the mine was in development stage and production was less with limited equipment. Now, the mine is fully developed and, number and capacity of the mining equipment have increased, enabling us to increase the production from 60,00,000 TPA to 85,00,000 TPA. Now, Mining plan is approved for the production of 85,00,000 TPA till the end of mine.
4. As no exploration was done in the area thus the status of the reserves remain the same as it was on 15.09.2014.
5. The Targeted Quantity of Masonary stone yearly to be produced in the next 4 years, till the end of mine.

Calendar program based on balance mineable Reserve

Year	ROM in (Million TPA)	Total Stone in MTPA @98%
2023-2024	8.50	8.33
2024-2025	8.50	8.33
2025-2026	8.50	8.33
2026-2027	6.39	6.26
Total	31.89	31.25

6. SEIAA, Haryana granted the Environmental Clearance to similar case for the Capacity Expansion Mining of Stone from 5.6 MTPA to 9 MTPA at Khasra No 216, over area of 29.50 ha Located at Kalyana 2 Village Kalyana, Tehsil & District Charkhi Dadri, Haryana proposed by M/s SBIPL Projects Limited. (Vide EC letter No. EC23B001HR137089 dated: 31.05.2023) (copy enclosed).

A detailed discussion was held on the report of sub-committee constituted by SEIAA as well as the reply submitted by the PP in support of their contention to increase the capacity of production. Report submitted by sub-committee is self-explanatory, however, it is recommended that the certain conditions raised by the sub-committee may be considered and

added while granting of Environment Clearance to the project. The report of committee is also enclosed with the concerned file.

Further, PP also submitted that in past also the SEIAA has granted environment clearance to some other projects in nearby area while raising their capacity of production (EC letter enclosed) and further submitted that as per record DSR is of District Charkhi Dadri and not of some other district.

After detailed deliberations on the documents produced during the presentation, submissions made by the PP and keeping in view the report of sub-committee constituted by SEIAA, the committee has decided to recommend the case to SEIAA for granting Environment Clearance as per the conditions conveyed vide Minutes of 271st meeting of SEAC and certain conditions observed by the sub-committee may also be considered and added while granting EC to the project.

Findings and Decision of THE AUTHORITY (SEIAA):

The said Proposal was taken up during **166th Meeting of SEIAA held on 19.09.2023.**

Upon deliberations, the Authority decided to defer the case for the next meeting.

Meeting : 166th
Date : 19.09.2023

Item No. 166.03

EC for Proposed Hospital over an area measuring 14340.35 sqm falling in the revenue estate of Village Dabra, Tehsil and District Hisar, Haryana by M/s Hisar Nirog Healthcare Private Limited.

1.	Proposal	Grant of Fresh Environment Clearance (EC)
2.	Project Proponent	M/s Hisar Nirog Healthcare Private Limited
3.	Location & Category of the Project	Village Dabra, Tehsil and District Hisar 8 (a)
4.	Project Cost	₹ 100 Crore as per Form (I).
5.	Project Consultant	Ind Tech House Consult
6.	NABET, ACCREDITATION	NABET/EIA/2023/SA 0174 Validity: 31/10/2023

The said Proposal was submitted to the Authority, (SEIAA) (as **online Proposal**) **vide No. SIA/HR/INFRA2/437667/2023 dated 21.07.2023** for Grant of **Environment Clearance**, within the scope and meaning of category 8(a) of EIA Notification dated 14.09.2006. The Project Proponent has deposited Scrutiny fee of **₹ 1,50,000/- vide DD No. 021697 dated 12.07.2023** (in compliance of Haryana Government, Environment & Climate Change Department Notification No. DE&CCH/3060 dated 14.10.2021).

Appraisal & Recommendations of SEAC:

The said case was taken up during 276th meeting of SEAC held on 07.09.2023 and the Appraisal Committee (SEAC) made recommendations to the Authority for **Grant of Environment Clearance.**

Findings and Decision of THE AUTHORITY (SEIAA):

The said Proposal was taken up during **166th Meeting of SEIAA held on 19.09.2023.**

After having gone through the relevant record placed on the file, besides considering the recommendations of the Appraisal Committee (SEAC); **decided to GRANT ENVIRONMENT CLEARANCE under Category 8 (a) to the Project; within the scope & meaning of EIA Notification dated 14.09.2006, with the following conditions:**

1. That Project Proponent shall maintain **22.53% of net plot area as Green Area i.e. 3231.41 sqm** (as offered in the proposal & committed the same at the time of presentation before the Appraisal Committee without any deviation). The Green Area i.e. 3231.41 sqm (22.53%) Acres shall not be reduced/ modified or put to use for any other use / purpose.
2. That PP shall plan to provide adequate space in the periphery area / outer corridor for the smooth & hassle free movements for FIRE TENDERS & AMBULANCES.
3. That Project Proponent shall make efforts for the installation of Solar Power infrastructure for the concern & good cause of Environment.
4. That the Project shall not carry out any activities in the controlled area, Natural Conservation Zone, Eco-Sensitive Zone, Wildlife Sanctuary, if any.
5. That in view of the increasing Number of electrical vehicles, Project Proponent is expected to encourage & make efforts for the installation of electrical charging points, at the Project site.
6. That PP shall make efforts to develop **“Miyawaki Forest”**, in all corners of the Project Land/ Area.
7. That PP shall make arrangements for the **“Quick and Safe disposal of Anti-biotic Waste”** by following the relevant guidelines.

Accordingly, the case is disposed of.

Meeting : 166th
Date : 19.09.2023

Item No. 166.04

EC (under violation) for Commercial Colony Project "Picasso Centre" under TOD zone at Village Ghata, Sector-61, Gurgaon Manesar Urban Complex & District: Gurugram, Haryana by M/s ERA resorts private limited.

1.	Proposal	Grant of Fresh Environment Clearance (EC) Under violation Category
2.	Project Proponent	M/s ERA resorts private limited
3.	Location & Category of the Project	Village Ghata, Sector-61, Gurgaon Manesar Urban Complex & District: Gurugram, Haryana 8 (a)
4.	Project Cost	₹ 142.82 Crore as per Form (I).
5.	Project Consultant	OCEAO-Enviro Management Solutions India Pvt. Ltd.
6.	NABET, ACCREDITATION	NABET/EIA/2124/RA 0217 Validity: 04/08/2024

The said Proposal was submitted to the Authority, (SEIAA) (as **online Proposal**) **vide No. SIA/HR/INFRA2/437631/2023 dated 24.07.2023** for Grant of **Environment Clearance**, within the scope and meaning of category 8(a) of EIA Notification dated 14.09.2006. The Project Proponent has deposited Scrutiny fee of **₹ 2,00,000/- vide DD No.038478 dated 09.12.2022** (in compliance of Haryana Government, Environment & Climate Change Department Notification No. DE&CCH/3060 dated 14.10.2021).

Appraisal & Recommendations of SEAC:

The said case was taken up during 276th meeting of SEAC held on 07.09.2023 and the Appraisal Committee (SEAC) made recommendations to the Authority for **Grant of Environment Clearance (under violation Category)**.

Findings and Decision of THE AUTHORITY (SEIAA):

The aforesaid Proposal was taken up during **166th Meeting of SEIAA held on 19.09.2023.**

The Authority after having gone through the details & record, placed on the file alongwith perusing the recommendations made by the Appraisal Committee, arrived at the conclusion that this is a clear cut case of violations, under EIA Notification dated 14.09.2006. The Authority further observed as under:

1. That as per the Condition No. 8 of the License No. 278 of 2007 dated 17.12.2007, issued by Directorate Town & Country Planning, Haryana; Project Proponent was fully aware and under obligation to obtain Environment Clearance within the scope & meaning of EIA Notification dated 14.09.2006, for the said Project, **before commencing any construction activities.**
2. That despite knowing it, fully- well that construction activities cannot be carried out, without obtaining Environment Clearance, the Project Proponent wilfully, indulged in construction activities by raising, a Built Up Area of 28999.412 Sqmtrs (312147.07 Sqfts) at the Project Site, **in utter violation of EIA Notification dated 14.09.2006.**
3. That Project Proponent has, not only failed to comply with the provisions of EIA Notification dated 14.09.2006 i.e. construction without Environment Clearance, rather also mislead the Haryana State Pollution Control Board by disclosing incorrect size / area of the Project (CTE dated 27.08.2018). This is factually established through the details captured from the Google Earth Imageries i.e. Keyhole Markup Language (KML) file record, which indicates that construction activities, commenced around 2015 & 2016.

Therefore, it is clearly understood and established that construction activities at project site started, much before the date of grant of Consent to Establish. Looks like that the Project Proponent mislead the concerned Authorities in this regard by concealing the factual position on the ground.

4. Total Cost of the Project as disclosed by the Project Proponent (as per application Form-I & IA) is **Rs. 142.82 Crore.**

The Authority after due deliberations, arrived at the conclusion that a project of this magnitude i.e. 28999.412 Sqmtrs (312147.07 Sqfts) was developed without obtaining requisite Environment Clearance. This amounts to clear cut violations under EIA Notification dated 14.09.2006.

Thus, Authority in all fairness has decided to proceed to take action against the Project Proponent within the scope & meaning of EIA Notification dated 14.09.2006 / Environment (Protection) Act, 1986.

Such reckless and irresponsible acts on the part of the Project Proponent, not only put the buyers/users under stress, tension, but also put the future of investors under uncertainty (Due to non-compliances and violations), leading to the undue delay and escalation of cost of the Project.

Such, misadventures on the part of the Project Proponent cannot be pardon or overlooked. Therefore, appropriate action for such violations within the scope & meaning of EIA Notification dated 14.09.2006 is must to uphold the sanctity & spirit of Environment Protection / Conservation Laws.

In view of the above, the Authority decided to impose Environment Compensation Cost & Penalty for the violations made by the Project Proponent i.e. unauthorized construction (i.e. 28999.412 Sqmtrs (312147.07 Sqfts), without valid EC, in the light of the observations / directions made by the Hon'ble Courts in the Cases, mentioned below:

1. *Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in Civil Appeal No. 10854 of 2016 titled as M/s Goel Ganga Developers India Pvt. Ltd Versus Union of India alongwith Civil Appeal No. 10901 of 2016 & Civil Appeal No. 5157-5158 of 2018.*
2. *Hon'ble NGT in Original Application No. 661 of 2018 titled as Mr. Praveen Kakkar Versus Ministry of Environment, Forest & Climate Change & Ors.*
3. *Hon'ble NGT in Original Application No. 976 of 2019 titled as Gurinder Singh Versus Union of India.*
4. *Hon'ble NGT in Appeal No. 2 of 2023 titled as VSR Infratech Pvt. Ltd Versus State of Haryana & Ors.*

The above referred Cases have been taken as guidance & reference for imposing the Environment Compensation Cost & Penalty in the instant Case for the violations / non-compliances EIA Notification dated 14.09.2006 & other aspects as observed from the record / material available on file.

TABLE-1

Environment Compensation Cost & Penalty

1	2	3	4	5
Sr. No.	<u>Unauthorized Construction</u> (Commercial & Residential Both) without valid Environment Clearance	Project Cost	Environmental Compensation Cost @ 6 % of the Project cost i.e. 142.82 Crore	Penalty
1.	28999.412 Sqmtr (312147.07 Sqfts)	<u>₹ 142.82 Crore</u>	<u>₹ 856.92 lakh</u>	<u>₹ 125.00 lakh</u>
2.	<u>Total (Environment Compensation Cost & Penalty)</u>		(₹ 856.92 + ₹ 125.00) = ₹ 981.92 lakh	

In view of the above, the Authority deemed it appropriate to direct the Project Proponent to deposit Compensation for Damage to Environment & Penalty, so imposed i.e. **₹ 981.92 lakh in this case, within 30 days** from the receipt of the Order **in accordance with the directions issued by MOEF & CC, GOI vide Office Memorandum No. F. No. IA3-22/30/2022-IA.III(182415) dated 28.07.2022.**

The Authority upon considering all the facts & details discussed above, deemed it fair & appropriate to **GRANT ENVIRONMENT CLEARANCE** to the Project **subject to the condition** that above mentioned revised Penalty & Environment Damage Assessment Cost, so assessed i.e. **₹ 981.92 lakh** by this Authority, shall be deposited by the Project Proponent **within 30 days**, from the date of Grant of Environment Clearance.

Accordingly, Environment Clearance in favour of M/s ERA resorts private limited for Commercial Colony Project "Picasso Centre" under TOD zone at Village Ghata, Sector-61, Gurgaon Manesar Urban Complex & District: Gurugram, Haryana; is hereby GRANTED.

In case of failure to comply with the above directions, the Authority may contemplate to initiate action under Section 5 of the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986

to issue directions against the unauthorized/ illegal construction, made by the Project Proponent for demolition of the structure alongwith, other measures to recover the above mentioned Environmental Compensation Cost & Penalty at the risk & cost of the Project Proponent.

Accordingly, case is disposed of.



Meeting : 166th
Date : 19.09.2023

Item No. 166.05

EC for Expansion of Common Effluent Treatment Plant from 16 MLD to 26 MLD based on SBR Technology at Village Barhi, District-Sonipat by Haryana State Industrial and Infrastructure Development Corporation (HSIIDC) Ltd.

1.	Proposal	<u>Grant of Fresh EC</u>
2.	Project Proponent	Haryana State Industrial and Infrastructure Development Corporation (HSIIDC) Ltd
3.	Location & Category of the Project	Village Barhi, District-Sonipat 7 (h)
4.	Project Cost	Rs. 57.42 Crores as per Form (I).
5.	Project Consultant	Gaurang Environmental Solutions Pvt. Ltd
6.	NABET, ACCREDITATION	<u>NABET/EIA/2023/RA 0192 (Rev.02)</u> <u>Validity: 07/12/2023</u>

The said Proposal was submitted to the Authority, (SEIAA) (as **online Proposal**) **vide No. SIA/HR/INFRA2/414529/2023 dated 17.01.2023** for Grant of **Environment Clearance**, within the scope and meaning of category 7(h) of EIA Notification dated 14.09.2006. The Project Proponent has deposited Scrutiny fee of **₹ 1,50,000/- vide DD No.197212 Dated 30.01.2023** (in compliance of Haryana Government, Environment & Climate Change Department Notification No. DE&CCH/3060 dated 14.10.2021).

Appraisal & Recommendations of SEAC:

The case was taken up in 261st meeting held on 27.02.2023. However, the case was deferred on request of PP.

Then the case was taken up in 266th meeting held on 28.04.2023. A letter dated 26.04.2023 is received from PP wherein it is mentioned as under:

- Environmental Clearance for Development of Industrial Estate and CETP issued from SEIAA, Haryana vide letter no SEIAA/HR/2018/98 Dated 13.02.2018 (**Annexure-1**).
- An amendment in EIA Notification was issued by MoEF&CC, New Delhi regarding applicability of EIA Notification, 2006 for CETP projects (**Annx 2**).

As per the Notification “Environmental clearance for CETPs setup for or within projects or activities which do not require environmental clearance are exempted, and if any of the existing or proposed member units of the said CETP produces or proposes to produce any product requiring environmental clearance, then the CETP shall need environmental clearance”.

It is further submitted by PP that keeping in view the above quoted notification, there may not be the need of prior environmental clearance for the said expansion project and PP would like to affirm the same by studying in details of the said matter. Therefore, PP requested that their case may kindly be kept in abeyance till their further request.

A detailed discussion was held on the request made by the PP vide letter dated 26.04.2023. After due deliberation, the committee acceded with the request of PP and decided that the case be held in abeyance and shall be taken up as and when PP makes a written request to take up their case.

The case was taken up in 276th meeting held on 07.09.2023. However, still neither PP nor consultant appeared in the meeting. It is observed by the committee that the case has been fixed in several meetings of SEAC but neither PP nor Consultant appeared before the committee to represent their case. In this regard, the instructions issued by MoEF&CC vide OM dated 18.11.2020 also brought to the notice of the Committee which reads as under:

.....
e) *“in case a Project Proponent or his consultant did not attend the meeting or does not reply to the queries raised for more than six month, the MS should write to the Regional Office of the Ministry to carry out a site inspection so as to check if construction/operation of the project has started.”*

The committee after having a discussion on the circumstances of the case as well as keeping in view the above mentioned instructions issued by the MoEF & CC, unanimously decided to send the case to SEIAA for taking further necessary action as per **para-e)** referred above.

Findings and Decision of THE AUTHORITY (SEIAA):

The aforesaid Proposal was taken up during **166th Meeting of SEIAA held on 19.09.2023.**

After having seen the relevant record placed on the file and considering the recommendations of the Appraisal Committee (SEAC); the Authority after due

deliberations; decided to **REFER BACK** this case to the Expert Appraisal Committee with the directions to re-consider the proposal in their forthcoming meeting.

Further, the Authority also decided to direct Project Proponent as well as the Project Consultant to remain present before the Expert Appraisal Committee during the course of proceedings.

Accordingly, the case is referred back.



Meeting : 166th
Date : 19.09.2023

Item No. 166.06

EC for Proposed Sand Mining project at Village Dostpur, Tehsil & District Palwal, Haryana (Mining lease area: 65.98 ha) by M/s Darsh Buildinfra Private Limited.

1.	Proposal	Grant of Fresh EC
2.	Project Proponent	M/s Darsh Buildinfra Private Limited
3.	Location & Category of the Project	Village Dostpur, Tehsil & District Palwal, Haryana 1 (a)
4.	Project Cost	Rs. 3.87 Crores as per Form (I).
5.	Project Consultant	Eco Paryavaran Laboratories and Consultants Pvt. Ltd
6.	NABET, ACCREDITATION	NABET/EIA/2223/SA 183 Validity: 17/12/2023

The Project was submitted to the SEIAA, Haryana vide **online Proposal No. SIA/HR/MIN/432052/2023 dated 20.06.2023** for grant of **Environmental Clearance** under Category 1(a) of EIA Notification 14.09.2006. The Project Proponent has deposited due Scrutiny fee (as applicable) of ₹ 1,50,000/- vide DD No. 045227 dated 16.02.2023 (in compliance of Haryana Government, Environment & Climate Change, Department Notification No. DE&CCH/3060 dated 14.10.2021).

Appraisal & Recommendations of SEAC:

The said case was taken up in 276th meeting of SEAC held on 07.09.2023 and observed that earlier, the case was taken up during 163rd Meeting of SEIAA held on 02.08.2023. After having gone through the details and relevant record placed on file, alongwith considering the recommendations of the Appraisal Committee (SEAC), the Authority observed as under:

1. Whereas, the said Project is proposed to come up for Mining activities at Village Dostpur, Tehsil & District Palwal, Haryana (Mining lease area: 65.98 ha) by M/s Darsh Buildinfra Private Limited and “TEST REPORTS” at Page No. 185 & 186, pertains to Village Palsari, Bharampur, District Roop Nagar, Punjab and Village Hadiwal, District SBS Nagar, Punjab. This is baffling and bemusing as why the TEST REPORTS of some other States have been attached for seeking Environment Clearance in the said case.
2. District Survey Report (DSR) submitted by the Project Proponent and the same scrutinized by the Appraisal Committee (SEAC) is not in accordance with the directions of MOEF & CC, GOI, issued vide OM dated 28.04.2023 and the judgement

dated 10.11.2021 of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India passed in Civil Appeal No. 3661 of 2020.

3. With regard to Green Belt Development Plan submitted by the Project Proponent and the same appraised by the SEAC is not convincing as number of plant recommended are nearly 3000 per Hectare (five year plan), which otherwise should be around 45000 trees. This needs to be re-examined and re-appraised in the good interest of environmental remedial measures and environmental protections activities.

In view of the above, the authority referred back the case to SEAS to re-look into all observations listed above at Sr. No. 1 to 3 and any other relevant issue pertaining to the project.

The case was taken up in 276th meeting held on 07.09.2023. The PP alongwith consultant appeared before the committee and presented their case. The PP submitted reply of observations raised by SEIAA vide letter dated 22.08.2023.

The PP submitted that a mistake that occurred in the already submitted EIA report of above said mining site. In the said EIA report, there was a typo-error in the test reports in pages 185 and 186. They have further submitted that the said erred pages have been replaced with corrected pages in the said test reports. They have further assured that this was an oversight on their part, and they deeply regret the inconvenience caused to the authority and further submitted that every care will be taken in future to avoid such things.

In compliance to the observations raised by SEIAA, they have further submitted the followings:

1. The corrected Test Reports specifically in reference to page no.185 & 186 of above said mining site as ANNEXURE-1,
2. Approved and signed copy of DSR as ANNEXURE-II,
3. Revised EMP with plantation record as ANNEXURE-III

A discussion was held on the submission as well as documents submitted by PP. The DSR was thoroughly scrutinized and in which the name of Block Dostpur (proposed site is shown at Sr. No. 5 of District Wise Block Wise detail of re-verified area of District Palwal.

Dr.Madhvi Gupta, State Mining Engineer, representative from the office of Directorate, Mines & Geology, Haryana was also present during the meeting. She further authenticated the documents such as copy of DSR regarding the present case.

The committee after deliberation recommended this case to SEIAA along with additional stipulation (given below) and other standard and specific conditions which committee has already conveyed vide MoM of 272nd meeting of SEAC.

Additional stipulations:

1. The PP shall develop total 15 ha. of community/panchayati area in the nearby village and project site area as green belt in consultation with local people and other stake holders to meet with the demand of public hearing and shall do plantation of 45000 trees on the project site as proposed.

Findings and Decision of THE AUTHORITY (SEIAA):

The aforesaid Proposal was taken up during **166th Meeting of SEIAA held on 19.09.2023.**

After having seen the relevant record placed on the file, besides perusing the recommendations of the Appraisal Committee (SEAC); the Authority observed that the **DSR (District Survey Report)** pertaining to the Project was that of a copy of DSR of the adjoining District Faridabad, with minor tweaking of contents, here & there.

This is a serious matter, where such manipulated and fabricated contents cannot be entertained. It is more surprising and disappointing that Appraisal Committee has also failed to spot the almost same and similar content presented in the DSR. This is a case of plagiarism i.e. **“Presenting work / details from another source as your own, without the consent, by incorporating it into your work without any reference”.**

This is clearly an attempt to mislead the Authority by misplacing / mis-presenting the record for consideration.

In view of the above, the Authority **decided to REFER BACK** the case with the following directions:

1. **District Survey Report (DSR)** should be strictly as per the directions of Hon’ble Supreme Court of India vide its order dated 10.11.2021 **in Civil Appeal No. 3661-3662 of 2022 titled as State of Bihar V/s Pawan Kumar.**
2. District Survey Report (DSR) as required in the case should be in accordance with the directions of MOEF & CC, GOI issued **vide OM dated 28.04.2023.**
3. **Enforcement and Sand Mining Guidelines, 2020** should be kept in mind while preparing and submitting the DSR alongwith other details like Replenishment Study, Approved Mining Plan etc.

Accordingly, the case is Refer Back to SEAC.

Meeting : 166th
Date : 19.09.2023

Item No. 166.07

EC (Under Violation) for Expansion of Commercial Project “AIPL Joy Street” at Sector 66, Gurugram, Haryana by M/s Landmark Apartments Pvt. Ltd.

1.	Proposal	<u>Grant of EC (Under Violation) for Expansion</u>
2.	Project Proponent	M/s Landmark Apartments Pvt. Ltd
3.	Location & Category of the Project	Sector 66, Gurugram, Haryana 8(a)
4.	Project Cost	Rs. 226.6986 Crore as per Form (I & IA).
5.	Project Consultant	M/s Vardan Environet
6.	NABET, ACCREDITATION	(No. NABET/EIA/2023/SA 0158 Valid upto : 05/04/2026.

The Project was submitted to the SEIAA, Haryana vide **online Proposal No. SIA/HR/INFRA2/422450/2023 dated 17.03.2023** for grant of **Environmental Clearance (violation)** under Category 8(a) of EIA Notification 14.09.2006. The Project Proponent has deposited due Scrutiny fee (as applicable) of ₹ 2,00,000/- vide DD No.844061 dated 02.06.2022 (in compliance of Haryana Government, Environment & Climate Change, Department Notification No. DE&CCH/3060 dated 14.10.2021).

Appraisal & Recommendations of SEAC:

The case was taken up in 276th meeting of SEAC held on 07.09.2023 and The PP alongwith consultant appeared before the committee and presented their case. During the last meeting the reply submitted by the PP with regard to observations raised by SEIAA in 162nd meeting was not found satisfactory and PP was asked to re-submit the reply. The PP submitted their revised reply vide letter dated 31.08.2023 (**copy attached**) which is also reproduced below:

Sr. No	Observation raised	Reply												
01	<p>PP and consultant should give a detailed justification in variation of cost of project informed to authority as well as to HSPCB. The cost should be justified on the basis of balance sheet duly certified by CA</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="248 472 874 835"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="248 472 363 553">S. No.</th> <th data-bbox="363 472 667 553">Details as per record</th> <th data-bbox="667 472 874 553">Rs In Crore</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="248 553 363 633">01</td> <td data-bbox="363 553 667 633">As per Form I & IA</td> <td data-bbox="667 553 874 633">Rs.226.6986</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="248 633 363 714">02</td> <td data-bbox="363 633 667 714">As per earlier EC dated 11.07.2012</td> <td data-bbox="667 633 874 714">Rs. 260.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="248 714 363 835">03</td> <td data-bbox="363 714 667 835">As per CTO dated 08.06.2021 (issued by HSPCB)</td> <td data-bbox="667 714 874 835">Rs.323.20 Crore</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	S. No.	Details as per record	Rs In Crore	01	As per Form I & IA	Rs.226.6986	02	As per earlier EC dated 11.07.2012	Rs. 260.00	03	As per CTO dated 08.06.2021 (issued by HSPCB)	Rs.323.20 Crore	<p>Project Cost which was mentioned in the earlier EC letter was tentative, as per assumption and was given in the year 2012. Now, our project is finalized and balance sheet closed & certified for a total cost of Rs. 226.6986 Crore till final construction of project.</p> <p>Penalty and Environmental Compensation Cost for the violations (under EIA Notification dated 14.09.2006) is calculated on Rs. 226.6986 Crore which is the final project cost as per project balance sheet.</p> <p>At the time of CTO permission dated 7.10.2020, unaudited financial Cost of Rs.323 Cr. (including cost of Land, Building overheads) was taken.</p> <p>But for EC expansion, Audited Financial Rs. 226.6986 Crore (including cost of Land and Building) is taken into consideration. Hence, this is a CA certified audited financial cost, the damage assessment was calculated on the amount. CA certificate is attached Annexure 1. And Undertaking is attached Annexure 1A</p>
S. No.	Details as per record	Rs In Crore												
01	As per Form I & IA	Rs.226.6986												
02	As per earlier EC dated 11.07.2012	Rs. 260.00												
03	As per CTO dated 08.06.2021 (issued by HSPCB)	Rs.323.20 Crore												
02	The PP and consultant should revisit the damage assessment keeping in view Hon'ble NGT in Appeal No. 02 of 2023 and M.A. No. 28 of 2023	Damage assessment was already submitted and SEAC has recommended the assessment amount in its 271 meeting held on 30062												
03	Green Area detail.	We have proposed green area as 30% of plot area i.e. 4803.01 Sq.mtr. Revised Green area Layout is attached as Annexure 2.												
04	The PP and Consultant should give the present status of ATR for which observations were raised by the IRO, MOEF & CC while conducting Certified Compliance Report of the project on dated 24.02.2023	We have already obtained CCR from MOEF& CC and we have also submitted ATR of Non Compliances report filed by RO, MOEF GOI, Chandigarh with their office. Copy of CCR and ATR submitted is attached Annexure 3.												

The reply was discussed in the meeting. The PP further submitted affidavit dated 07.09.2023 (**copy attached**) stating therein that they have maintained 30% green area at their project site.

The committee after due deliberations recommended this case to SEIAA for granting of Environment Clearance along with standard as well as specific conditions which have already been conveyed vide MoM of 271st meeting of SEAC.

Findings and Decision of THE AUTHORITY (SEIAA):

The recommendations of the Appraisal Committee (SEAC) were taken up during **166th Meeting of SEIAA held on 19.09.2023.**

Upon perusal of relevant record and details placed on file, alongwith glancing through the recommendations of the Appraisal Committee (SEAC), the Authority **observed** that the Project Proponent has violated the provisions of EIA Notification dated 14.09.2006 by carrying out construction beyond the prescribed limit of Environment Clearance dated 11.07.2012 i.e. **excess construction of 2707.318 Sqm.**

Further, the Appraisal Committee during 271st Meeting held on 30.06.2023; **discussed on the Damage Remediation Budget submitted by the PP and further decided to direct the PP to revise and Damage Remediation Budget as under:**

S. No.	Particular	Cost in Rs.	% of total
1.	1% Penalty as per SOP 7th July 2021, Clause No 12.a (ii)	₹ 5.77 Lakh	1 %
2.	0.25 % Penalty as per SOP 7th July 2021	₹6.17 Lakh	0.25 %
3.	Environmental Damage Assessment Cost	₹ 11.54 Lakh	-
Total Amount		₹23.48 Lakh	-

Upon taking all facts into consideration and further considering the size of the excess construction, (i.e. **2707.318** Sqm Approx.); the Authority decided to revised the recommendations of the Expert Committee and further proceeded to impose a **Penalty and**

Environmental Compensation Cost to the tune of Rs. 65.50 lakh within the scope & meaning of EIA Notification dated 14.09.2006 / Environment (Protection) Act, 1986 by considering the **orders dated 22.02.2023** passed by the Hon'ble NGT in Appeal No. 02 of 2023 titled as **VSR INFRATECH PVT LTD VS STATE OF HARYANA.**

In view of the above, the Authority deemed it appropriate to direct the Project Proponent to deposit Compensation for Damage to Environment & Penalty, so imposed i.e. **₹ 65.50 lakh in this case, within 30 days** from the receipt of the Order **in accordance with the directions issued by MOEF & CC, GOI vide Office Memorandum No. F. No. IA3-22/30/2022-IA.III(182415) dated 28.07.2022.**

The Authority upon considering all the facts & details discussed above, deemed it fair & appropriate to Grant Environment Clearance to the Project **subject to the condition** that above mentioned revised Penalty & Environment Damage Assessment Cost, so assessed i.e. **₹ 65.50 lakh** by this Authority, shall be deposited by the Project Proponent **within 30 days**, from the date of Grant of Environment Clearance.

Accordingly, Environment Clearance in favour of M/s Landmark Apartments Pvt. Ltd for Expansion of Commercial Project "AIPL Joy Street" at Sector 66, Gurugram, Haryana; is hereby GRANTED.

In case of failure to comply with the above directions, the Authority may contemplate to initiate action under Section 5 of the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986 to issue directions against the unauthorized/ illegal construction, made by the Project Proponent for demolition of the structure alongwith, other measures to recover the above mentioned Environmental Compensation Cost & Penalty at the risk & cost of the Project Proponent.

Accordingly, case is disposed of.

Meeting : 166th
Date : 19.09.2023

Item No. 166.08

EC for Proposed Residential Colony under NILP on land measuring 53.3833 Acres in the revenue estate of village Naurangpur, Sector-79 & 79B, Gurugram, Haryana by M/s Loon Land Development Limited.

1.	Proposal	Grant of Fresh <u>Environment Clearance</u>
2.	Project Proponent	M/s Loon Land Development Limited
3.	Location & Category of the Project	village Naurangpur, Sector-79 & 79B, Gurugram, Haryana 8(b)
4.	Project Cost	₹ 2733 Crore as per Form (I & IA).
5.	Project Consultant	M/s Ind Tech House Consult
6.	NABET, ACCREDITATION	NABET/EIA/2023/SA 0174 Validity: 31/10/2023

The Project was submitted to the SEIAA vide online Proposal No. SIA/HR/INFRA2/422756/2023 dated 21.03.2023 for obtaining Environmental Clearance under Category 8(b) of EIA Notification dated 14.09.2006. The Project Proponent has deposited due Scrutiny fee of ₹ 2,00,000/- vide DD No. 500919 dated 23.01.2023 (in compliance of Haryana Government, Environment & Climate Change, Department Notification No. DE&CCH/3060 dated 14.10.2021).

Appraisal & Recommendations of SEAC:

The case was taken up in 276th meeting of SEAC held on 07.09.2023 and the PP alongwith consultant appeared before the committee and presented their case. They further submitted reply to the observation raised by SEIAA in its 164th meeting in the form of affidavit dated 07.09.2023. The PP has further stated in affidavit that they have changed salient feature of their project as mentioned in the affidavit. The submission of PP was discussed thoroughly in the meeting.

After due deliberation, the committee decided to recommend the case to SEIAA for grant of environment clearance with the condition that PP shall not do any construction activity on the freezed area i.e. 16.7413 acre and further reiterated the remaining condition conveyed vide Minutes of 265th Meeting of SEAC

Findings and Decision of THE AUTHORITY (SEIAA):

The recommendations of SEAC were taken up during **166th Meeting of SEIAA held on 19.09.2023.**

After having seen the relevant record placed on the file and considering the recommendations of the Appraisal Committee (SEAC); the Authority after due deliberations; **decided to GRANT ENVIRONMENT CLEARANCE under Category 8 (a) to the Project; within the scope & meaning of EIA Notification dated 14.09.2006, with the following conditions:**

1. That the Project shall not carry out any construction activities in the Freezed Area (i.e.16.7413 Acres), controlled area, Natural Conservation Zone, Eco-Sensitive Zone, Wildlife Sanctuary, if any.

Violations or non-compliance, (directly or indirectly), in this regard shall lead to withdrawal / cancellation of EC Granted for the Project within the scope & meaning of Section 5 of the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986 .

- 2. That PP shall maintain 21% of net plot area as Green Area i.e. 45422.665 Sqm (as offered in the proposal & committed the same at the time of presentation before the Appraisal Committee without any deviation). The Green Area i.e. 45422.665 Sqm (21%) Acres shall not be reduced/ modified or put to use for any other use / purpose.**
- 3. That Project Proponent shall make efforts for the installation of Solar Power infrastructure for the concern & good cause of Environment.**
- 4. That in view of the increasing Number of electrical vehicles, Project Proponent is expected to encourage & make efforts for the installation of electrical charging points, at the Project site.**

Accordingly, the case is disposed of.

Meeting : 166th
Date : 19.09.2023

Item No. 166.09

EC for Expansion of Proposed Mixed land use colony under TOD policy on land measuring 15.03125 acres in Sector -113, Gurgaon, Manesar Urban Complex Gurgaon, Haryana by M/s Union Buildmart Pvt. Ltd.

1.	Proposal	Grant of EC for Expansion
2.	Project Proponent	M/s Union Buildmart Pvt. Ltd
3.	Location & Category of the Project	Sector -113, Gurgaon, Manesar Urban Complex Gurgaon, Haryana 8(b)
4.	Project Cost	₹ 2733 Crore as per Form (I & IA).
5.	Project Consultant	M/s Ind Tech House Consult
6.	NABET, ACCREDITATION	NABET/EIA/2023/SA 0174 Validity: 31/10/2023

The Project was submitted to the SEIAA vide online Proposal No. **SIA/HR/MIS/75100/2018 dated 14.04.2022** for obtaining Environmental Clearance under Category 8(b) of EIA Notification dated 14.09.2006. The Project Proponent has deposited due Scrutiny fee of **₹ DD No. 500411 dated 25.01.2022** (in compliance of Haryana Government, Environment & Climate Change, Department Notification No. DE&CCH/3060 dated 14.10.2021).

Appraisal & Recommendations of SEAC:

The said was taken up in 276th meeting held on 07.09.2023. The PP as well as their consultant appeared before the committee for presenting their case. They have submitted an affidavit dated 07.09.2023 (copy attached) with regard to reply of the observations raised by SEIAA in its 153rd Meeting. It is submitted by PP that application for crossing the revenue rasta has been moved and they are in process to purchase the said Revenue Rasta for which estimated cost of **Rs.2,83,57,896/- (Rupees Two Crore Eighty Three Lakh Fifty Seven Thousand Eight Hundred Ninety Six)** has also been deposited with the concerned authority. They have further

submitted detail of both the ECs. They further submitted that they have proposed **12274.3 Sqm. (20.24%)** green area for development.

Findings and Decision of THE AUTHORITY (SEIAA):

The recommendations of SEAC were taken up during **166th Meeting of SEIAA held on 19.09.2023.**

The Authority after having gone through the details & record placed on the file alongwith perusing the recommendations of the Appraisal Committee (SEAC), observed that :

1. Whereas, the Appraisal Committee in their recommendation mentioned that Rs. 2.85 Crore on account of purchase of Government Land has been deposited by the Project Proponent, **but no documentary evidence / proof in this regard has been placed on the file.**
2. Project Proponent has to ensure that cost of the Government Land (as per the Government Policy) has to be deposited with the concerned Department, before approaching the Authority.
3. The Appraisal Committee is required to give a clear cut commentary and recommendations after perusal of the issue pertaining to re-shuffling of land between the two different projects / entity i.e. **M/s Union Buildmart Pvt. Ltd. and M/s Vibrant Infratech Pvt. Ltd.** It is re-emphasized that recommendations on this issue are thoroughly examined and verified within the scope of EIA Notification dated 14.09.2006 and relevant Government Policies.
4. The Appraisal Committee is required to ensure that recommendations made are “only” after satisfying themselves in regard to the documents/ details placed on the record.

Accordingly, the case is refer back to SEAC.

The meeting ended with a vote of thanks.
