



सत्यमेव जयते

File No: 10382
Government of India
Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change
(Issued by the State Environment Impact Assessment
Authority(SEIAA), TAMIL NADU)



Dated 28/05/2024



To,

RAMASAMY GOPALAKRISHNAN
RAMASAMY GOPALAKRISHNAN
Thiru. R. Gopalakrishnan S/o. Sri. Ramasamy 70/1E, Karpagam Nagar, Thirumangalam Town & Taluk,
Madurai District. , Appayanaickenpatti Village, VIRUDHUNAGAR, TAMIL NADU, 600026
dhanalakshmi bluemetals@gmail.com

Sub: Rejection of Terms of Reference (ToR) to the proposed Project under the EIA Notification 2006-and as amended thereof -regarding.

Sir,

This is in reference to your application submitted to SEIAA vide proposal number SIA/TN/MIN/439532/2023 dated 09/05/2024 for Rejection of prior Terms of Reference (ToR) to the project for the Proposed Rough Stone & Gravel quarry lease over an extent of 1.08.0 Ha at S.F.Nos. 199/6A of Appayanaickenpatti Village, Vembakottai Taluk, Virudhunagar District, Tamil Nadu under the provision of the EIA Notification 2006-and as amended thereof.

The particulars of the proposal are as below :

(i) TOR Identification No.	TO23B0108TN5864192N
(ii) File No.	10382
(iii) Clearance Type	Fresh ToR
(iv) Category	B1
(v) Project/Activity Included Schedule No.	1(a) Mining of minerals
(vi) Name of Project	Rough Stone & Gravel Quarry of Thiru. R. Gopalakrishnan
(vii) Name of Company/Organization	RAMASAMY GOPALAKRISHNAN
(viii) Location of Project (District, State)	VIRUDHUNAGAR, TAMIL NADU
(ix) Issuing Authority	SEIAA
(xi) Applicability of General Conditions	no

1. In view of the particulars given in the Para 1 above, the project proposal interalia including Form-1(Part A and B) were

submitted to SEIAA for an appraisal by SEAC under the provision of EIA notification 2006 and its subsequent amendments.

2. The above-mentioned proposal has been considered by Expert Appraisal Committee of SEIAA in the meeting held on 03/05/2024. The minutes of the meeting and all the Application and documents submitted [(viz. Form-1 Part A, Part B)] are available on PARIVESH portal which can be accessed by scanning the QR Code above.
3. The SEIAA has examined the proposal in accordance with the Environment Impact Assessment (EIA) Notification, 2006 & further amendments thereto and after accepting the recommendations of the SEAC hereby decided Rejection Terms of Reference for instant proposal of MR. RAMASAMY GOPALAKRISHNAN under the provisions of EIA Notification, 2006 and as amended thereof.

The proposal was placed in the 416th SEAC meeting held on 13.10.2023. Based on the presentation & documents furnished by the PP, the SEAC noted the following:

- Earlier three proposals belonging to the same cluster was appraised in 399th SEAC meeting held on 10.08.2023 and 400th SEAC meeting held on 11.08.2023. The following decision was taken by the Committee during the appraisal.

1. An educational institution, namely, PSR Engineering College, with 5800 Nos. of students & 500 teachers, is located very close (within 500m) to the proposed quarry. Further, 1800 students are residing in the college hostel.
2. It is also noted that based on the Writ Petitions filed in the Hon'ble High Court against operation of mines in the area, the Hon'ble High Court had appointed an Advocate Commissioner to inspect the site and give a report. The Commission appointed by the Court had inspected site and submitted detailed report to the Court stating, among others, that "...The staff of the college and the counsel for the college had shown several broken window glass panes and shown cracks in several buildings but without expertise and assistance of a structural engineer and other experts to gauge the effect of explosion and it's impact on the buildings it is not possible for me say anything on the subject, however on 09.07.2021 we could hear explosive noise between 5 pm to 6 pm while inspecting near the workshop building in PSR Engineering College".
3. There are considerable number of structures located nearby.
4. Besides, the proposed site is also surrounded by the presence of fireworks and Vaippar River.
5. The proposed mining activity involves blasting and there were serious complaints by the public during the PH held for the other proposals, for the safety of the persons.

Hence, considering the above facts, the Committee decided not to recommend the proposal.

Since the locational factors are identical and as already three proposals belonging to the same cluster were appraised and not recommended based on the sensitivity of the proposed site, the Committee decided **not to recommend** this proposal for **Terms of Reference**.

The Authority, after discussions, accepted the decision of SEAC. rejected the proposal and decided to request Member Secretary, SEIAA-TN to grant rejection letter to proponent as per the 416th SEAC minutes. Further. Authority decided to close and record this proposal.

6.This issues with the approval of the Competent Authority. As Per section 16,sub-section(I) of NGT Act,2010, If any person aggrieved by this order of refusing to grant environmental clearance for carrying out any activity may prefer an appeal to the tribunal, within a period of thirty days from the date on which the order or decision or direction or determination is communicated to him.

Additional Terms of Reference

N/A

Annexure 1

Plant/equipment configuration and capacity

Plant / Equipment / Facility	Configuration	Remarks if any
NA	NA	NA

Details of Products & By-products

Name of the product /By-product	Product / By-product	Quantity	Unit	Mode of Transport / Transmission	Remarks (eg. CAS number)
NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Send Approval Copy To (In case of multiple use comma as separator)

