

KARNATAKA LOKAYUKTA : BENGALURU

No:

Date: 01-10-2021

ORDER

In “The New Indian Express” – English daily dated 01-10-2021, a news item with the heading **“Oily discharge from Mangaluru Refinery Polluting Water Bodies”** has been published. Instead of repeating the contents of the said news item, it is useful to extract the same, which reads as here under:

“DISCHARGE of blackish oily water from the Mangalore Refinery and Petrochemicals Ltd (MRPL) into the storm water drain in the refinery area, has contaminated water bodies in the region, setting off alarm bells among those living in and around Jokatte and Thokur. Locals complain that they have been seeing blackish water flowing into the Thokur stream since the last one week.

The Nagarika Horata Samiti, a committee formed by locals to take up community issues, complained to MRPL officials about the problems they are facing due to discharge of blackish water. However, contaminated water continues to flow into the Thokur stream and River Phalguni. Locals pointed out that the problem had cropped up about six years ago when petrochemical waste water was let into storm water drains. However, back then, immediate action was taken after a massive protest.

Speaking to The New Indian Express, MRPL General Manager (corporate communications) Dr. Rudolph Noronha maintained that as soon as they received a complaint from locals about oily water being found in the marshy land in the refinery area, the environment officials checked the area and found layers of the oil in the water. Some units were shut down owing to low

demand in the light of the Covid-19 pandemic and they carried out maintenance of those units, he pointed out.

KSPCB issues notice to MRPL

“SOME of the cleaned oily water, which is stored in the Contaminated Rain Water (CRW) system, must have escaped to the neighbouring storm water channels. We have deployed our gully suckers and we have a super-sucking equipment to remove oil along the path leading to the storm water channel. We have also reported the matter to the Karnataka Pollution Control Board (KSPCB). With their guidance, we will prevent recurrence of this kind of situation. We have plans to deploy oil catchers along the storm water channels,” Dr Noronha explained.

KSPCB officer Keerthi Kumar told TNIE that they have collected samples and a notice has been issued to MRPL to take immediate action.”

2. The News Item extracted above indicates that the Mangaluru Refinery and Petrochemicals Limited is discharging blackish oily water into storm water drain in the refinery area and has contaminated water bodies in the region. Further, it indicates that the contaminated water is flowing into the Thokur stream and River Phalguni, on account of which the local people are unable to use the water which has led to hold a massive protest to take action against the industry in question.

3. It is needless to point out that the preservation of water bodies such as streams, rivers etc., and maintaining the quality of the water is very much important for the well

being of human beings, animals, birds etc., and it also helps to increase the underground water level. The news item extracted above indicates that the Industry is discharging the chemical effluents into the water bodies illegally and violating the rules and regulations prescribed by the Pollution Control Board. In this regard the Pollution Control Board is stated to have issued a notice to the industry in question and collected samples for examination of the quality of the water. It is needless to point out that using of such contaminated water either for domestic purpose or for agricultural operations would result in serious health hazards, details of which need not be elucidated in this proceedings.

4. The right to healthy environment and pollution free water is a part of right to life and liberty guaranteed under Article 21 of Constitution of India. It is well settled that the right to life means quality life. Therefore, the existence of right to life and liberty guaranteed under Article 21 of Constitution of India creates an obligation and duty on the State and the authorities of the State who are entrusted

with the responsibilities of preventing the environmental pollution.

5. In this connection, it is useful to extract the observations made by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **A.P. Pollution Control Board V/s Prof. M.V. Naidu (Retd.) and others** reported in **2001 (2) SCC 62**, which reads as hereunder;

"Drinking water is of primary importance in any country. In fact, India is a party to the Resolution of the UNO passed during the United Nations Water Conference in 1977 as under:

"All people, whatever their stage of development and their social and economic conditions, have the right to have access to drinking water in quantum and of a quality equal to their basic needs."

Thus, the right to access to drinking water is fundamental to life and there is a duty on the State under [Article 21](#) to provide clean drinking water to its citizens.

Adverting to the above right declared in the aforesaid Resolution, in Narmada Bachao Andolan Vs. Union of India (2000(7) Scale 34 (at p.124), Kirpal J observed"

"Water is the basic need for the survival of human beings and is part of right of life and human rights as enshrined in [Article 21](#) of the Constitution of India....." There is therefore need to take into account the right to a healthy environment along with the right to sustainable development and balance them.

Competing human rights to healthy environment and sustainable development:

There is building up, in various countries, a concept that right to healthy environment and to sustainable development are fundamental human rights implicit in the right to 'life'.

Our Supreme Court was one of the first Courts to develop the concept of right to 'healthy environment' as part of the right to "life" under Article 21 of our Constitution. [See *Bandhua Mukti Morcha Vs. Union of India* (1984(3) SCC 161)]. This principle has now been adopted in various countries today. In today's emerging jurisprudence, environmental rights which encompass a group of collective rights are described as "third generation" rights. The "first generation" rights are generally political rights such as those found in the *International Convention on Civil & Political Rights* while "second generation" rights are social and economic rights as found in the *International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights*. "Right to Healthy Environment". (See Vol.25) 2000 *Columbia Journal of Environmental Law* by John Lee P.283, at pp.293-294 fn.29) The right to sustainable development has been declared by the UN General Assembly to be an inalienable human right (*Declaration on the Right to Development*) (1986). The 1992 Rio Conference declared that Human beings are at the centre of concerns for sustainable development. Human beings are entitled to a healthy and productive life in harmony with nature”.

6. Apart from the above constitutional mandate to protect and improve the environment, the Water Act prohibits the use of streams and wells for disposal of polluting matters and also provides for restrictions on

outlets and discharge of effluents without obtaining consent from the Pollution Control Board. Prosecution and penalties have been provided which include sentence of imprisonment.

7. In this regard it is useful to extract Sec. 24 & 43 of the Water Act, 1974 which reads as hereunder;

Section 24. *Prohibition on use of stream or well for disposal of polluting matter, etc. (1) Subject to the provisions of this section- (a) no person shall knowingly cause or permit any poisonous, noxious or polluting matter determined in accordance with such standards as may be laid down by the State Board to enter (whether directly or indirectly) into any 21[Stream or well or sewer or on land]; or (b) no person shall knowingly cause or permit to enter into any stream any other matter which may tend, either directly or in combination with similar matters, to impede the proper flow of the water of the stream in a manner leading or likely to lead to a substantial aggravation of pollution due to other causes or of its consequences. (2) A person shall not be guilty of an offence under sub-section (1), by reason only of having done or caused to be done any of the following acts, namely,- (a) constructing, improving or maintaining in or across or on the bank or bed of any stream any building, bridge, weir, dam, sluice, dock,*

pier, drain or sewer or other permanent works which he has a right to construct, improve or maintain; (b) depositing any materials on the bank or in the bed of any stream for the purpose of reclaiming land, or for supporting, repairing or protecting the bank or bed of such stream provided such materials are not capable of polluting such stream; (c) putting into any stream any sand or gravel or other natural deposit which has flowed from or been deposited by the current of such stream; (d) causing or permitting, with the consent of the State Board, the deposit accumulated in a well, pond or reservoir to enter into any stream. (3) The State Government may, after consultation with, or on the recommendation of, the State Board, exempt, by notification in the Official Gazette, any person from the operation of sub-section (1) subject to such conditions, if any, as may be specified in the notification and any condition so specified may by a like notification be altered, varied or amended.

Section 43. *Penalty for contravention of provisions of section 24 Whoever contravenes the provisions of section 24 shall be punishable with imprisonment for a term which shall not be less than 29[one year and six months] but which may extend to six years and with fine.*

8. Sec. 7 of the Environment Protection Act, 1986 strictly prohibits discharge of any environmental pollutant

in excess of such standards. The contravention or failure to comply with the said provision is punishable with **imprisonment for a term which may extend to five years or with fine which may extend to Rs. 1 lakh or with both** as provided under Sec. 15 of the said Act. Further, Sec. 10 of the said Act empowers the concerned authority to enter and **seize any such equipment, industrial plant etc., if it is necessary to prevent or mitigate environmental pollution.**

9. It is needless to point out that Sec. 5 of the Environment Protection Act, 1986 empowers the Chairman of State Pollution Control Board to issue directions in writing to any person, officer or any authority for violations of standards and Rules relating to discharge of chemical effluents and such person, officer or authority shall bound to comply with such directions issued by the Chairman of State Pollution Control Board. Further, the said provision also enables the Chairman of State Pollution Control Board to direct the closure, prohibition or regulation of any

industry, operation of process or stoppage or regulation of the supply of electricity or water or any other service.

10. It is useful to extract Sec. 5, 7, 10 and 15 of the Environment Protection Act, 1986, which reads as hereunder;

Section 5. *Power to give directions - Notwithstanding anything contained in any other law but subject to the provisions of this Act, the Central Government may, in the exercise of its powers and performance of its functions under this Act, issue directions in writing to any person, officer or any authority and such person, officer or authority shall be bound to comply with such directions. Explanation - For the avoidance of doubts, it is hereby declared that the power to issue directions under this section includes the power to direct- (a) the closure, prohibition or regulation of any industry, operation or process; or (b) stoppage or regulation of the supply of electricity or water or any other service.*

Section 7. *Persons carrying on industry operation, etc., not to allow emission or discharge of environmental pollutants in excess of the standards - No person carrying on any industry, operation or process shall discharge or emit or permit to be discharged or emitted any environmental pollutants in excess of such standards as may be prescribed.*

Section 10. *Powers of entry and inspection - (1) Subject to the provisions of this section, any person empowered by the Central Government in this behalf shall have a right to enter, at all reasonable times with such assistance as he considers necessary, any place- (a) for the purpose of performing any of the functions of the Central Government entrusted to him; (b) for the purpose of determining whether and if so in what manner, any such functions are to be performed or whether any provisions of this Act or the rules made thereunder or any notice, order, direction or authorisation served, made, given or granted under this Act is being or has been complied with; (c) for the purpose of examining and testing any equipment, industrial plant, record, register, document or any other material object or for conducting a search of any building in which he has reason to believe that an offence under this Act or the rules made thereunder has been or is being or is about to be committed and **for seizing any such equipment, industrial plant, record, register, document or other material object if he has reason to believe that it may furnish evidence of the commission of an offence punishable under this Act or the rules made thereunder or that such seizure is necessary to prevent or mitigate environmental pollution.** (2) Every person carrying on any industry, operation or process of handling any hazardous substance shall be bound to render all assistance to*

the person empowered by the Central Government under sub-section (1) for carrying out the functions under that sub-section and if he fails to do so without any reasonable cause or excuse, he shall be guilty of an offence under this Act. (3) If any person wilfully delays or obstructs any persons empowered by the Central Government under sub-section (1) in the performance of his functions, he shall be guilty of an offence under this Act. (4) The provisions of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, or, in relation to the State of Jammu and Kashmir, or an area in which that Code is not in force, the provisions of any corresponding law in force in that State or area shall, so far as may be, apply to any search or seizures under this section as they apply to any search or seizure made under the authority of a warrant issued under section 94 of the said Code or as the case may be, under the corresponding provision of the said law.

Section 15. *Penalty for contravention of the provisions of the act and the rules, orders and directions - (1) Whoever fails to comply with or contravenes any of the provisions of this Act, or the rules made or orders or directions issued thereunder, shall, in respect of each such failure or contravention, be punishable with imprisonment for a term which may extend to five years with fine which may extend to one lakh rupees, or with both, and in case the failure or contravention continues, with additional fine which may extend to five thousand rupees for every*

day during which such failure or contravention continues after the conviction for the first such failure or contravention. (2) If the failure or contravention referred to in sub-section (1) continues beyond a period of one year after the date of conviction, the offender shall be punishable with imprisonment for a term which may extend to seven years.

11. In view of the above mentioned statutory provisions, it is needless to point out that the Karnataka State Pollution Control Board has been entrusted with the responsibilities of taking effective steps for preventing the environmental pollution by not only initiating criminal prosecution against the owner of pollutant industry and also to stop the functioning of the industry by giving necessary directions under Sec. 5 of the Environment Protection Act. However, as could be seen from the News Item extracted above, the Pollution Control Board appears to have failed in taking effective steps to prevent the water pollution highlighted in the News Item and also failed to initiate the appropriate steps to prevent discharge of pollutant substances as provided under various enactments referred to above. The News item highlights that the problems highlighted is being

faced by the local people for about last six years. If what is highlighted in the News Item is true, it indicates to me that there is a dereliction of duty of the public servants of the State who are required to prevent discharge of effluent substances to the water bodies.

12. It is needless to point out that on account of discharge of pollutant substances if the members of public suffer any damage or loss same is required to be compensated by the pollutant industry applying the principle polluter must pay. In this connection it is useful to extract the observations made by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Vellore Citizens Welfare Forum Vs Union of India and others (1996 (5) SCC 647** wherein the Hon'ble Supreme Court has evolved the "precautionary principle" and "the polluter pays principles" and has directed the concerned authorities to implement these principles and compute the compensation payable by the polluting industry to the individuals affected and that payable for restoring the damage it has caused to the environment. It is useful to extract the relevant

observations made by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in para no. 16, 20 and 25 which reads as hereunder;

“16. The constitutional and statutory provisions protect a person's right to fresh air, clean water and pollution-free environment, but the source of the right is the inalienable common law right of clean environment. It would be useful to quote a paragraph from Blackstone's commentaries on the Laws of England (Commentaries on the Laws of England of Sir William Blackstone) Vol. III, fourth edition published in 1876. Chapter XIII, “Of Nuisance” depicts the law on the subject in the following words:

“Also, if a person keeps his hogs, or other noisome animals, or allows filth to accumulate on his premises, so near the house of another, that the stench incommodes him and makes the air unwholesome, this is an injurious nuisance, as it tends to deprive him of the use and benefit of his house. A like injury is, if one's neighbour sets up and exercises any offensive trade; as a tanner's, a tallow-chandler's, or the like; for though these are lawful and necessary trades, yet they should be exercised in remote places; for the rule is, ‘sic utere tuo, ut alienum non leadas’; this therefore is an actionable nuisance. And on a similar principle a constant ringing of bells in one's immediate neighbourhood may be a nuisance.

... With regard to other corporeal hereditaments; it is a nuisance to stop or divert water that used to run to another's meadow or mill; to corrupt or poison a watercourse, by erecting a dye-house or a lime-pit, for the use of trade, in the upper part of the stream; to pollute a pond, from which another is entitled to water his cattle; to obstruct a drain; or in short to do any act in common property, that in its consequences must necessarily tend to the prejudice of one's neighbour. So closely does the law of England enforce that excellent rule of gospel-morality, of ‘doing to others, as we would they should do unto ourselves’.”

20. It is thus obvious that the Environment Act contains useful provisions for controlling pollution. The main purpose of the Act is to create an authority or authorities under Section 3(3) of the Act with adequate powers to control pollution and protect the environment. It is a pity that till date no authority has been constituted by the Central Government. The work which is required to be done by an authority in terms of Section 3(3) read with other provisions of the Act is being done by this Court and the other courts in the country. It is high time that the Central Government realises its responsibility and statutory duty to protect the degrading environment in the country. If the conditions in the five districts of Tamil Nadu, where tanneries are operating, are permitted to continue then in the near future all rivers/canals shall be polluted, underground waters contaminated,

agricultural lands turned barren and the residents of the area exposed to serious diseases. It is, therefore, necessary for this Court to direct the Central Government to take immediate action under the provisions of the Environment Act.

25. *Keeping in view the scenario discussed by us in this judgment, we order and direct as under:*

1. The Central Government shall constitute an authority under Section 3(3) of the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986 and shall confer on the said authority all the powers necessary to deal with the situation created by the tanneries and other polluting industries in the State of Tamil Nadu. The authority shall be headed by a retired Judge of the High Court and it may have other members — preferably with expertise in the field of pollution control and environment protection — to be appointed by the Central Government. The Central Government shall confer on the said authority the powers to issue directions under Section 5 of the Environment Act and for taking measures with respect to the matters referred to in clauses (v), (vi), (vii), (viii), (ix), (x) and (xii) of sub-section (2) of Section 3. The Central Government shall constitute the authority before September 30, 1996.

2. The authority so constituted by the Central Government shall implement the “Precautionary Principle” and the “Polluter Pays Principle”. The authority shall, with the help of expert opinion and after giving opportunity to the polluters concerned assess the loss to the ecology/environment in the affected areas and shall also identify the individuals/families who have suffered because of the pollution and shall assess the compensation to be paid to the said individuals/families. The authority shall further determine the compensation to be recovered from the polluters as cost of reversing the damaged environment. The authority shall lay down just and fair procedure for completing the exercise.

3. The authority shall compute the compensation under two heads namely, for reversing the ecology and for payment to individuals. A statement showing the total amount to be recovered, the names of the polluters from whom the amount is to be recovered, the amount to be recovered from each polluter, the persons to whom the compensation is to be paid and the amount payable to each of them shall be forwarded to the Collectors/District Magistrates of the area concerned. The Collector/District Magistrate shall recover the amount from the polluters, if necessary, as arrears of land revenue. He shall disburse the compensation awarded by the authority to the affected persons/families.

4. The authority shall direct the closure of the industry owned/managed by a polluter in case he evades or refuses to pay the compensation awarded against him. This shall be in addition to the recovery from him as arrears of land revenue”.

13. Therefore, the authorities concerned have not only the responsibility and duty to prevent the discharge of pollutant substances to the water bodies and the fields of neighbouring land owners, they have also duty and obligation to assess the damage caused to the members of public on account of discharge of effluent substances and compensate the loss.

14. It is needless to point out that the Deputy Commissioner/District Magistrate is also entrusted with the responsibility of taking steps to prevent the public nuisance. In this connection it is useful to extract Sec. 133 of Code of Criminal Procedure which reads as hereunder;

133. Conditional order for removal of nuisance.—(1) *Whenever a District Magistrate or a Sub-divisional Magistrate or any other Executive Magistrate specially empowered in this behalf by the State Government, on receiving the report of a police officer or other information and on taking such evidence (if any) as he thinks fit, considers— (a) that any unlawful obstruction or nuisance should be removed from any public place or from any way, river or channel which is or may be lawfully used by the*

public; or 62 (b) that the conduct of any trade or occupation, or the keeping of any goods or merchandise, is injurious to the health or physical comfort of the community, and that in consequence such trade or occupation should be prohibited or regulated or such goods or merchandise should be removed or the keeping thereof regulated; or (c) that the construction of any building, or, the disposal of any substance, as is likely to occasion configuration or explosion, should be prevented or stopped; or (d) that any building, tent or structure, or any tree is in such a condition that it is likely to fall and thereby cause injury to persons living or carrying on business in the neighbourhood or passing by, and that in consequence the removal, repair or support of such building, tent or structure, or the removal or support of such tree, is necessary; or (e) that any tank, well or excavation adjacent to any such way or public place should be fenced in such manner as to prevent danger arising to the public; or (f) that any dangerous animal should be destroyed, confined or otherwise disposed of, such Magistrate may make a conditional order requiring the person causing such obstruction or nuisance, or carrying on such trade or occupation, or keeping any such goods or merchandise, or owning, possessing or controlling such building, tent, structure, substance, tank, well or excavation, or owning or possessing such animal or tree, within a time to be fixed in the order— (i) to remove such

obstruction or nuisance; or (ii) to desist from carrying on, or to remove or regulate in such manner as may be directed, such trade or occupation, or to remove such goods or merchandise, or to regulate the keeping thereof in such manner as may be directed; or (iii) to prevent or stop the construction of such building, or to alter the disposal of such substance; or (iv) to remove, repair or support such building, tent or structure, or to remove or support such trees; or (v) to fence such tank, well or excavation; or (vi) to destroy, confine or dispose of such dangerous animal in the manner provided in the said order, or, if he objects so to do, to appear before himself or some other Executive Magistrate subordinate to him at a time and place to be fixed by the order, and show cause, in the manner hereinafter provided, why the order should not be made absolute. (2) No order duly made by a Magistrate under this section shall be called in question in any Civil Court. Explanation.—A “public place” includes also property belonging to the State, camping grounds and grounds left unoccupied for sanitary or recreative purposes.

15. The Hon’ble Supreme Court in the case of **Municipal Council, Ratlam V/s Sri. Vardichan and others reported in (1980) 4 SCC 162** had an occasion to deal with the powers conferred upon the Deputy Commissioner/District

Magistrate under Sec. 133 of Cr.P.C. and has observed as under;

9. *So the guns of Section 133 go into action wherever there is public nuisance. The public power of the magistrate under the Code is a public duty to the members of the public who are victims of the nuisance, and so he shall exercise it when the jurisdictional facts are present as here. "All power is a trust — that we are accountable for its exercise — that, from the people, and for the people, all springs, and all must exist." [Vivian Grey, Bk. VI Ch. 7, Benjamin Disraeli] Discretion becomes a duty when the beneficiary brings home the circumstances for its benign exercise.*

10. *If the order is defied or ignored Section 188 IPC comes into penal play:*

"Whoever, knowing that, by an order promulgated by a public servant lawfully empowered to promulgate such order, he is directed to obtain from a certain act, or to take certain order with certain property in his possession or under his management, disobeys such direction, and if such disobedience causes or tends to cause danger to human life, health or safety, or causes or tends to cause a riot or affray, shall be punished with imprisonment of either description for a term which may extend to six months, or with fine which may extend to one thousand rupees, or with both."

13. *Section 133 CrPC is categoric, although reads discretionary. Judicial discretion when facts for its exercise are present, has a mandatory import. Therefore, when the Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Ratlam, has before him, information and evidence, which disclose the existence of a public nuisance and, on the materials placed, he considers that such unlawful obstruction or nuisance should be removed from any public place which may be lawfully used by the public, he shall act. Thus, his judicial power shall, passing through the procedural barrel, fire upon the obstruction or nuisance, triggered by the jurisdictional facts. The Magistrate's responsibility under Section 133 CrPC is to order removal of such nuisance within a time to be fixed in the order. This is a public duty implicit in the public power to be exercised on*

behalf of the public and pursuant to a public proceeding. Failure to comply with the direction will be visited with a punishment contemplated by Section 188 IPC. Therefore, the Municipal Commissioner or other executive authority bound by the order under Section 133 CrPC shall obey the direction because disobedience, if it causes obstruction or annoyance or injury to any persons lawfully pursuing their employment, shall be punished with simple imprisonment or fine as prescribed in the section. The offence is aggravated if the disobedience tends to cause danger to human health or safety. The imperative tone of Section 133 CrPC read with the punitive temper of Section 188 IPC make the prohibitory act a mandatory duty.

16. Therefore, it is needless to point out that there is a statutory obligation on the part of the authorities of the State to take effective steps to prevent the environmental pollution. In my view the issues raised in the “The New Indian Express” and the observations made by me above, requires immediate attention of the State i.e., Deputy Commissioner, Dakshina Kannada District, Karnataka State Pollution Control Board, City Corporation and the jurisdictional Tahasildar.

17. Further, the Lokayukta is also entrusted with the responsibility of redressing the grievances of the members of the public/aggrieved, whenever such grievances are brought or comes to his knowledge before him either by means of complaint or by suo-moto and take action against

public servants who are responsible for mal-administration.

18. The news item published in 'The New Indian Express' referred to above, in my considered view, can be treated as source material to initiate suo-moto proceedings in exercise of the powers conferred on me under Sections 7(1)(b) and 9(3)(a) of the Karnataka Lokayukta Act, 1984. Accordingly, I hereby exercise my suo-moto power and initiate suo-moto proceedings. The office is directed to register this as suo-moto proceedings.

19. For the purpose of investigation of the issues raised in the news item published in 'The New Indian Express', I am of the view, that it would be just and necessary to hear the officers mentioned herein below and implead them as Respondents to this proceedings. Accordingly, the office is directed to implead the following officers as Respondents:

1.	The Deputy Commissioner, Dakshina Kannada District, Mangaluru.
2.	The Commissioner, City Corporation, Mangaluru;
3.	Karnataka State Pollution Control Board, Bengaluru represented by its Member

	Secretary;
4.	Tahasildar, Dakshina Kannada, Mangaluru.
5.	Senior Environmental Officer, KSPCB, Plot No.23 & 24 Near ESI Hospital, Bikampady Industrial Area, Mangaluru - 575 011.
6.	Mangalore Refinery and Petrochemicals Limited, Mangalore, Represented by its Managing Director,

20. **Issue notice to the officers referred to above. They are directed to submit their comments/up-to-date status report setting out the steps taken by each one of them to prevent the water pollution highlighted in the news item and also with regard to the observations made by me above within three weeks from today. In the meanwhile it is needless to point out that the authorities referred to above are required to take immediate steps to prevent the discharge of effluent substances by the industry concerned to the water bodies.**

The office is also directed to send the copy of the paper publication to all the parties of the proceeding. The copy of the proceedings may also be sent to the news paper reporter of 'The New Indian Express' for further assistance, if he is so desirous.

List this case on **04.11.2021**.

Sd/-

(Justice P. Vishwanatha Shetty),
Lokayukta,
Karnataka State.

*sk

21) ARLO-4 (Compt.Sec.) }