

CLARIFICATIONS

1. Q. What is the share of voting power of CPI in CPAL?
A. No clarification required.
2. Q. What is the reason for denying jurisdiction by the central government (Para 24)?
A. No clarification required.
3. Q. On what grounds have the appellants approached the Supreme Court under Article 136 (Para 24)?
A.3 No clarification required.
4. Q. What were the reasons for which the council decided that the licence of the CPAL Kamalpur facility will stay intact (Para 14)?
A. Council found no illegality with the operations of the production unit.
5. Q. Were there other pharmaceutical companies, i.e. other than CPAL, also operating in the Kamalpur region where the plant had been set up by CPAL?
A. No clarification required.
6. Q. Whether CPAL is a private or public company?
A. No clarification required.
7. Q. Whether CPI is a private or public company?
A. It is a public limited company.
8. Q. Whether the daily usage of water by the company was within the 1 million litre permit limit granted by the State Pollution Control Board?
A. Yes, the company was abiding by the SPCB's directions.
9. Q. Whether there is any board at Central and State level for monitoring problems related to water pollution and its prevention?
A. The laws are pari material with Laws of India
10. Q. What happened to the suit which was filed by the central government of Asgard in boston, Massachusetts, as mentioned in para 17?
A. No clarification required.
11. Q. How much area of land was approved for the establishment of Special economic zone?
A. No clarification required.
12. Q. In which H.C was the decision of the Ld. District Judge appealed against?
A. No clarification required.

13. Q. When was the SLP filed (Date) before the Hon'ble Supreme Court?
A. 4th April, 2018
14. Q. How much of FDI was allowed for the pharmaceutical sector in the state of Asgard?
A. The present policy trend of FDI as applicable in India.
15. Q. Was there any decision given by the Court of Boston with respect to the claim filed by the Central Govt. of Asgard?
A. No clarification required.
16. Q. Were there other steps taken by the Government apart from filing the case. If yes, what were the steps?
A. No clarification required.
17. Q. Was CPAL providing any employment to the residents of Kamalpur?
A. No clarification required.
18. Q. What was the basis of claim made by various leaders of the local communities with respect to the recession of excessive water by CPAL?
A. No clarification required.
19. Q. With regards to Para 10 and Para 13, with the increase in production, did CPAL draw more water than what was prescribed to it?
A. No clarification required.
20. Q. Were any steps taken by the company to treat the industrial effluent it produced. If yes, what were they?
A. No clarification required.
21. Q. Was it a direct or an indirect entry of the industrial effluents into the wells, ditches and other water bodies around the pharmaceutical cluster?
A. No clarification required.
22. Q. Under what statute did the High Court pass the interim Order?
A. No clarification required.
23. Q. In 2009, several pharmaceuticals companies set up their production units in Agathia's Pharmaceutical cluster. Are these companies still having their units there?
A. Yes, the units are still there.
24. Q. Please throw some light on any adherence regarding Environment Impact Assessment?
A. Yes, all the procedural mandates were fulfilled.
25. Q. Is there any restriction with regards to the admissibility of the arguments to any specific statute or law?
A. The arguments need not be limited to a specific statute.