

**BEFORE THE NATIONAL GREEN TRIBUNAL  
EASTERN ZONE BENCH, KOLKATA**

**O.A. No. 23/THC//2013/PB/17/EZ**

**BANSHI BADAN JANA & ORS**

**VS**

**UNION OF INDIA & ORS**

**CORAM:** **Hon'ble Mr. Justice Pratap Kumar Ray, Judicial Member**  
**Hon'ble Prof. (Dr.) P. C. Mishra, Expert Member**

**PRESENT:**

<b>Applicants</b>	: Mr. Lokenath Chatterjee, Advocate Ms. Washima Ansar, Advocate
<b>Respondent No. 1</b>	: Mr. Gora Chand Roy Choudhury, Advocate
<b>Respondent No. 2, 6, 9 &amp; 10</b>	: Mr. Bikas Kargupta, Advocate
<b>Respondent No. 5</b>	: Mr. Ashok Prasad, Advocate
<b>Respondent No. 8</b>	: Mrs. Arpita Chowdhury, Advocate
<b>Respondent No. 7</b>	: Mr. Arindam Guha, O.S, GSI
<b>Respondents 3 &amp; 4</b>	: None

Date & Remarks	Judgement of the Tribunal
<b>Item No. 6</b> <b>16<sup>th</sup> September,</b> <b>2015.</b>	<p><b>Justice Pratap Kumar Ray, J.M.: (O R A L)</b></p> <p>Heard Id. Advocates for the parties. Respondent No. 1 i.e. MoEF &amp; CC has filed a supplementary affidavit which is on record. Copy has been served to other respondents and the applicants. Id. Adv. for the project proponent i.e. respondent No. 7 has not opposed this affidavit.</p> <p>A writ petition bearing No. WP No. 444/2012 was initially filed before the Hon'ble Calcutta High Court, which, on transfer, has been placed before us for consideration. In the said writ petition, the applicants, who are Secretaries and Chairperson of thirteen Fishermen Cooperative Societies and residents of Nayachar Island and earning their livelihood through fishing, have alleged that the Govt. of West Bengal has allowed establishment of a 2000 MW power plant through a company named Universal Crescent Power Project Ltd. and also an Industrial Park in Nayachar Island. They further allege that Nayachar Island falls under CRZ I category where such industrial activities are</p>

prohibited and in order to establish the power plant the Govt. of West Bengal through the State Coastal Zone Management Authority have recommended for reclassification from CRZ I status to CRZ III status in terms of CRZ Notification 1991 & 2011, The applicants have also expressed their concern that the establishment of power plant and industrial park in Nayachar will evidently destroy the mangrove barrier and affect Sundarban which act as a protective sheath of Kolkata and entire South Bengal from natural disasters. As the applicants will be directly affected with loss of their livelihood due to such activities in the fragile ecosystem, they have prayed for the following main relief before the Tribunal :

“

- A) A writ of and/or in the nature of Mandamus commanding the respondents not to take any steps/further steps for implementation of Thermal Power Project and Industrial Park at the instance of respondent No.7 at Nayachar Island, Haldia, Purba Midnapore;
- B) A writ of and/or in the nature of Mandamus, commanding the respondents to forthwith take steps for continuation of the Integrated Brackish Water Aqua Culture Development Project initiated by the respondent No. 6 at Nayachar Island, Purba Midnapore;
- C) A declaration that the decision of the Ministry of Environment and Forest to reclassify Nayachar Island as communicated by letter dated January 28, 2008 being annexure-P13 to this writ application is ultra vires the notification dated 19<sup>th</sup> February 1991 as amended upto date issued by the Ministry of Environment & Forests, New Delhi.
- D) A writ of and/or in the nature of mandamus commanding the respondents not to dispossess the fishermen from Nayachar Island and dis-engage them from Integrated Brackish Water Aqua Culture Development Project as initiated by the respondent No. 6.
- E) A writ and/or in the nature of certiorari commanding the respondents to produce the records of the case so that

conscionable justice may be administered by passing appropriate order.....”

We have perused the respective affidavits filed by the Project proponent and the Government respondents. Before arriving at any conclusion, it may be useful to discuss the events chronologically.

- (1) The Nayachar Island, which falls under CRZ-I under CRZ notification, 1991 & 2011 is located near the mouth of Haldi river within the Hooghly river system and is marked by mangrove forest(s) and fluvio-tidal flat. It is a north-northeast, south-southwest tending sand bar, which is undergoing erosion on its eastern side and accumulation of sand on its western side. It also make a sudden change in slope. Its location along coastal area is prone to cyclone. It is also to be mentioned here, that the area nearby located at 10 km south at Ganga Sagar has recorded earthquake with a magnitude of 5.2 (Mb) with the focal depth of 36 km..... “ (vide para 7 of affidavit filed by R5).
- (2) The Project proponent submitted application on 4.4.2010 seeking prior environment clearance for 1320 MW power plant in terms of EIA Notification 2006.
- (3) MoEF, Govt. of India, while considering the proposal by UCPPL for a proposed Super Thermal Power Project stage I ( 2x660 MW) at Nayachar Island issued terms of reference on 19.5.2011. In terms of EIA notification 2006, such project require Environmental Clearance from the Ministry of Environment & Forest, Govt. of India.
- (4) M/S Universal Crescent Power Pvt. Ltd. (UCPPL) approached the State Pollution Control Board on 9.10.2011 for conducting public hearing for its proposed Sagar Super thermal Power Project (Stage I ( 2x660 MW) at Nayachar Island, which is a part of Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) signed by M/s UCPPL with the Govt. of West Bengal to set up 10,000 mw capacity thermal power plants in phases in the State of West Bengal.
- (5) The State Pollution control Board conducted Public Hearing on 4.01.2012 at Nayachar Island as per provision of EIA notification 2006 and forwarded the proceedings of the public hearing and other relevant documents to the Ministry of Environment & Forests, Govt. of India on 20.01.2012.
- (6) When EIA was presented before the Expert Appraisal

Committee (Thermal Power) of Ministry of Environment & Forest in its 44<sup>th</sup> meeting held during March 5-6, 2012, the Committee noted that prima facie the island where the power project is being proposed appears to have unique and fragile ecology and felt that the site does not appear suitable for setting up a thermal power plant. The EAC decided to undertake site inspection by a sub-group chaired by Dr. C.R.Babu.

- (7) The sub-group conducted the site visit during 10<sup>th</sup>-12<sup>th</sup> April 2012 and submitted a detailed report as annexed in Annexure-I of the reply affidavit filed by MoEF & CC, the respondent 1, filed on dt. 22.8.2013 in the Principal Bench. After a detailed analysis based on field visit and available literature the group arrived at the following conclusion as mentioned under 5.1. to 5.6 of the report :

5.1 : The Nayachar Island is an evolving land mass in Hugli estuary complex and is ecologically fragile and sensitive to any alterations due to dynamic nature of erosion and sedimentation forces which regulate estuarine environment in macrotidal estuary of Hugli. In fact, in Hugli estuary many islands were emerged and many of them engulfed by thrust of tides, currents and waves. **Since it is in the mouth of estuary which is narrowed down from 50.8km wide to 9.2 km wide, the influence of tides, currents and waves is much higher and thus increase the tidal range northwards. It plays an important role in maintaining morphological equilibrium of the estuary tidal spillage and hence should not be reclaimed/altered.**

5.2. To prevent erosion, the Koltaka Port Trust(KPT) planted 1000s of mangrove species which stabilised the island and permitted natural accretion by silt-depositing tidal inundations. But destruction of mangroves and construction of embankments for Benfish farms made the island forever prone to storm overwashes. Further, Hugli estuary is macrotidal in natural and hence reclamation by restricting the tidal spill through marginal embankments removes shallow intertidal wetlands from the reach of the estuary and hence increases its mean depth and throws the estuary out of morphological equilibrium. The estuary then responds to restore disturbed equilibrium by active in-channel sedimentation and bank erosion to decrease mean depth. In this process Nayachar serves as a large and shallow tidal over spill and is

environmentally critical for equilibrium of the estuary. **Any reclamation of the island will result in more disturbance of the Hugli estuary. In fact the KPT's efforts to maintain the channel depth for navigation to Kolkata and Haldia Ports failed in spite of reclamation of the estuary in various ways due to continued sedimentation of channels and erosion due to interventions made by KTP.**

**5.3.** As has been pointed out that storms surge of even 3 m high over and above high tides of 4 to 5 m high make the entire island inundated, unless a high platform is raised by land filling. This is also evident by the distribution pattern of the drainage channels that connect the creeks. **In fact some portion of STPP is within the CRZ and is within the marsh.** Any alteration that prevents sedimentation process may change the navigating channels which in turn influence flood and ebb tides, currents and waves in the estuary. Similarly prevention of natural erosion processes may also result change in the equilibrium of the estuary. **To sum up being low lying island, Nayachar Island is vulnerable to wave over wash during high magnitudinal tropical storms, which may increase in future due to climate change.**

**5.4. In macrotidal estuary no island is stable.** Further, Nayachar has arisen from Haldia sand, erosion may reach to sand base of the island engulfing the entire island. Nayachar cannot be compared to Jurong of Singapore which is formed by land filling between 7 islands and has geological foundation of hard rocks and is surrounded by sea long known for its stability and absence of tidal currents and is free from cyclones. **Nayachar island, like another island in Hugli estuary, is inherently unstable as the deepest parts of estuary were located where the island now accreted.**

**5.5.** Since the north eastern part is subjected to erosion during last 40 years and north directed flood tidal currents of the estuary and its offshore may create problem for disposal of outfall. Similarly the **proposed Jetties may also be affected by erosion.**

**5.6. The emissions may adversely impact the mangroves and intertidal vegetation which are critical in maintaining the morphological equilibrium of the island in the estuary.**

(8) In the light of above conclusion the sub-group recommended in paragraph 6 of the report that –

**“ The Nayachar Island is unsuitable for location of STOP or any other polluting industrial complex. There is no example where an estuarine island is used for location of TPP in macrotidal and highly dynamic estuary like Hugli estuary. The Nayachar Island should be left as such so that it serves as a natural laboratory for understanding the ecology of mangrove succession which is little understood. At best the island can be used for promoting eco tourism and restoration of existing benfish, aquaculture farms without any major alterations on the ground and damage to the ecology of the Island.”**

**(9)** It is also important to note paragraph 1.3 which reads as under :-

**“Based on the presentation made by the project proponent, the committee prescribed TORs for detailed EIA studies. Since it was never mentioned that TPP will be located in an estuarine island, no TORs on marine environment was prescribed. “**

It is thus clear that there was no mention anywhere in the proposal that the power plant was proposed in an estuarine island for which no TORs on marine environment was prescribed.

**(10)** The report of Sub-group was placed before the Expert Appraisal Committee (Thermal Power) in its 54<sup>th</sup> meeting held during Aug 6-7,2012 and the EAC accepted the report and agreed that the site is not suitable for a power plant if the geomorphology of the island is to be preserved. The relevant portion of the minute of 54<sup>th</sup> EAC (Thermal Power) meeting is as under :

**“ xxxxxx The report was deliberated and Dr. C.R.Babu, Vice-Chairman, EAC and Chairman, of the Sub-Group presented the observations/findings made during the site visit based on visual as well as documents made available to the group. The Committee accepted the report and agreed that based on the submissions made by the sub-group the site was not suitable for a power plant if the morphology of the island is to be preserved.**

The Principal Secretary, Department of Environment, Govt. of West Bengal along with the Secretary, Dept. of Industries, Govt. of West Bengal and the Resident Commissioner, Govt. of West Bengal at New Delhi were also present.

The Committee informed the representatives of M/s Universal crescent Power Pvt. Ltd. and the Govt. of West Bengal officials to study the detailed report and take a conscious decision and revert back to the Committee with their views. The committee also informed the project proponent that they might identify alternative site suitable for location of a thermal power plant and apply afresh which could be duly considered de-novo.”

(11) The Ministry of Env. & Forest thereafter received a report of the Committee constituted by the West Bengal Govt. refuting the report of the Subgroup of EAC that the site is not suitable for a Thermal Power project. The Expert committee constituted by the State of West Bengal is of the opinion that Nayachar Island is stable from morphological and other stabilities criteria and outside CRZ area, hence suitable for setting up of a thermal power plant. The observation of Subgroup of EAC vis-a-vis Export committee constituted by State of West Bengal have been dealt in the minutes of EAC (thermal) held on 19-20 Sept2013.

(12) After a threadbare discussion on the report of the Expert Committee constituted by the State of West Bengal, the EAC decided that the acceptability of the site as suitable for setting up of a thermal power project needs further deliberation and can be taken up only after adequate information as noted in the minutes are available.

(13) In a subsequent meeting of EAC (Thermal Power) held during 18-19 Nov 2013 the Committee sought for the following information within three months :-

1. Verification that the project site is located in non-CRZ area, taking into account the natural drainage pattern of the island.
2. Effect of alteration in the morphology of the island due to power plant on the dynamic equilibrium of the Hugli estuary.
3. Hydro dynamic study by a reputed institute such as CWPRS, Pune/IIT, Roorkee to assess the stability of the island and safety of the TPP.
4. Chemical, biological and ecological aspects of the island and its surrounding environment studies by a reputed institute such as NIO/Annamalai University.

5. Disaster management studies and plan in consultation with NDMA.
6. Cumulative impact assessment and the impact on critically polluted area of Haldia.
7. Short term and long-term plans along with MoUs/agreements for 100% fly ash utilization.
8. Details of all the court cases pending against the project.

**(14)** In spite of a letter dt. 10.01.2014 and a reminder dt. 21.8.2014 from the Ministry of Env. & Forest to the Project proponent to expedite the studies sought by the EAC in its meeting held in Nov 2013, the said information is yet to be provided by the project proponent for which the proposal has been de-listed as informed by the Ministry in its letter dt. 3.2.2015.

**Thus admittedly there is no Environment Clearance/CRZ clearance for the proposed project from the Ministry of Environment, Forest & Climate change.**

The MoEF has rightly de-listed the proposal in the absence of necessary information sought for from the project proponent as it appears from the affidavit filed by respondent No. 1. The relevant portion of the affidavit is quoted below :-

“17. That the Ministry vide letter dated 10.01.2014 and a reminder on 21.08.2014 had requested the Project Proponent to expedite the studies sought by the EAC in its meeting held in November 2013 so that the same could be appraised by the EAC at the earlier. Since the said information was not received beyond six months, the proposal has been delisted from the pending list of Ministry as per the Ministry’s policy and the same has been informed to the project proponent vide this Ministry’s letter dated 03.02.2015.....”

The Central Govt. in the Ministry of Environment & Forest issued Coastal Zone Regulations vide the Coastal Regulation Zone Notification dated 19.02.1991 published in the gazette dated



23.02.1991. The MoEF notified CRZ Notification 2011 on 6<sup>th</sup> January, 2011 in supersession of CRZ Notification 1991. These notifications are the outcome of the exercise of the power under Section 3(1) and Section 3(2)(v) of the **Environment (Protection) Act, 1986 and Rule 5 (3)(d) of the Environment (Protection) Rules, 1986** declaring the coastal stretches as Coastal Regulation Zone (CRZ in short) and regulating activities in the CRZ. The CRZ Notification 2011 declares the following areas as CRZ and imposes restriction on setting up and expansion of industries, operations or process and the like :

“

- i) The land area from High Tide Line (hereinafter referred to as the HTL) to 500 mts on the landward side along the sea front.
- ii) CRZ shall apply to the land area between HTL to 100 mts or width of the creek whichever is less on the landward side along the tidal influenced water bodies that are connected to the sea and the distance upto which development along such tidal influenced water bodies is to be regulated shall be governed by the distance upto which the tidal effects are experienced which shall be determined based on salinity concentration of 5 parts per thousand (ppt) measured during the driest period of the year and distance upto which tidal effects are experienced shall be clearly identified and demarcated accordingly in the Coastal Zone Management Plans (hereinafter referred to as the CZMPs).

**Explanation** : For the purposes of this subparagraph the expression tidal influenced water bodies means the water bodies influenced by tidal effects from sea. In the bays, estuaries, rivers, creeks, backwaters, lagoons, ponds connected to the sea or creeks and the like.

(iii) the land area falling between the hazard line and 500 mts from HTL on the landward side, in case of seafront and between the hazard line and 100 mts line in case of tidal influenced water body the word 'hazard line' denotes the line demarcated by Ministry of Environment and Forests (hereinafter referred to as the MoEF) through the Survey of India (hereinafter

referred to as the Sol) taking into account tides, waves, sea level rise and shoreline changes.

(iv) land area between HTL and Low Tide Line (hereinafter referred to as the LTL) which will be termed as the intertidal zone.

(v) the water and the bed area between the LTD to the territorial water limit (12 Nm) in case of sea and the water and bed area between LTL at the back to the LTL on the opposite side of the bank, of tidal influenced water bodies.”

The classification of Coastal Regulation Zone was made under the said Notification of 2011 into four categories viz. CRZ-I, CRZ-II, CRZ-III & CRZ-IV. Nayachar Island was classified as CRZ-I as per CRZ Notification 1991 as revealed from the proposal on reclassification of Nayachar Island. CRZ-1 areas are ecologically sensitive and geomorphological features play a role for maintaining the integrity of the coast. The areas are :

- a) Mangroves, in case mangrove area is more than 1000 Sq. Mts., a buffer of 50 meters along the mangroves shall be provided.
- b) Corals and coral reefs and associated biodiversity;
- c) Stand Dunes;
- d) Mudflats which are biologically active’
- e) National parks, marine parks, sanctuaries, reserve forests, wildlife habitats and other protected areas under the provisions of Wile Life (Protection) Act, 1972 (53 of 1972), the Forest (conservation) Act, 1980 (69 of 1980) or Environment (Protection) Act, 1986 (29 of 1986); including Biosphere Reserves;
- f) Salt Marshes;
- g) Turtle nesting grounds;
- h) Horse Shoe crabs habitats;
- i) Sea grass beds
- j) Nesting grounds of birds;
- k) Areas or structures archaeological importance and heritage sites.”

Under section 8 of the said notification it mandates that no new construction shall be permitted in CRZ-I area except-

- (i) (a)Projects relating to Department of Atomic Energy;

(b) pipelines, conveying systems including transmission lines;

(c) facilities that are essential for activities permissible under CRZ-I;

(d) installation of weather radar for monitoring of cyclones movement and prediction by Indian Meteorological Department;

(e) construction of trans harbour sea link and without affecting the tidal flow of water, between LTL and HTL;

(f) development of green field airport already approved at only Navi Mumbai;

(ii) Areas between LTL and HTL which are not ecologically sensitive, necessary safety measures will be incorporated while permitting the following, namely:-

(a) Exploration and extraction of natural gas;

(b) Construction of dispensaries, schools, public rain shelter, community toilets, bridges, roads, jetties, water supply, drainage, sewerage which are required for traditional inhabitants living within the biosphere reserves after obtaining approval from concerned CZMA;

(c) Necessary safety measure shall be incorporated while permitting such developmental activities in the area falling in the hazard zone;

(d) Salt harvesting by solar evaporation of seawater;

(e) Desalination plants;

(f) Storage of non-hazardous cargo such as edible oil, fertilizers and food grain within notified ports;

(g) Construction of trans harbour sea links, roads on stilts or pillars without affecting the tidal flow of water.;

Regulation is a subordinate legislation issued in exercise of power provided under section 3(1) and section 3(2)(v) of the **Environment (Protection) Act, 1986** as referred to above. The regulation and its status as subordinate legislation has been identified by the Apex Court and also in the English Court by different judgments in the case of **Sukdev Singh Vs. Bharatram Sardar Singh Raghubanshi**, AIR 1975 SC 1331 a judgment of Constitution Bench at page 1341 in which it is held that “there is no substantial difference between a rule and a regulation inasmuch as both are subordinate legislation under power conferred by the Statute.....This regulation imposed obligation on the statutory authority. The Statutory authority cannot deviate from the conditions of service.” In the case of **LIC and Ors. Vs. Retired LIC Officers Association and Anr.**, 2008 (3) SCC 321 it is held in para 17 – regulation is subordinate legislation. In the case of **Wicks Vs. Director of Prosecution reported in 1947 All. E.R. (1) page 206** which has been referred to in the case of **M/s East India Commercial Company Ltd, Calcutta Vs. Collector of Customs, Calcutta**, reported in AIR 1962 SC 1893 it is held that a regulation validly made under an act should be regarded as though it were itself an enactment.

Hence from the aforesaid judgment of the Apex Court and the English Court it is clear that the regulation framed in exercise of power under the Act and the rules is a subordinate legislation and has the binding force and effect.

Sections 3(1) and 3(2)(v) of Environment (Protection) Act, 1986 as referred to above read as such:-

“Section 3 (1)- **Power of Central Government to take measures to protect and improve the environment.**-(1) **Subject** to the provisions of this Act, the Central Government shall have the power to take all such measures as it deems necessary or expedient for the purpose of protecting and improving the quality of the environment and preventing, controlling and abating environmental pollution.”

“Section 3(2)(v) – restriction of areas in which any industries, operations or processes or class of industries, operations or processes shall not be carried out or shall be carried out subject to certain safeguards;”

Rule 5(3)(d) of the **Environment (Protection) Rules, 1986** as referred to above reads as such:-

“5. **Prohibition and restriction on the location of industries and the carrying on processes and operations in different areas.**

Having regard to the clause 8 of the Regulations, no construction in CRZ could be made except the identified construction in clause 8(i) as quoted above. Thermal Power Project is not an identified exempted category construction. Hence its construction is prohibited.

On the issue of reclassification of the Nayachar Island, the West Bengal State Coastal Zone Management Authority (SCZMA) proposed to rectify the earlier classification of Nayachar Island as per the recent mapping and ground surveys conducted by two authorised agencies. As per reclassification in this island, the mud flats and mangroves are CRZ-I(A) and other areas upto 100

meters from the HTL of the creek is CRZ-III. The Ministry agreed with the re-classification proposal of Nayachar Island as revealed from the affidavit of MoEF & CC dt. 10.8.2015, subject to following conditions in letter dt. 28.01.2008 :

“ a) With regard to the Coastal Regulation Zone boundary as per the approved coastal Zone Management Plan of West Bengal dated 27.9.1996, the coastal Regulation zone area for Haldia shall be 100 mts from High Tide Line. The same stipulation is applicable for Nayachar Island, which is 100 mts as Coastal Regulation zone area from the High tide Line.

b) the coastal Regulation Zone area of 100 mts along Nayachar Island shall be Coastal Regulation Zone-III except for the buffer zone, mangrove area, inter tidal vegetation, marshes and mudflats. These areas shall be classified as coastal Regulation Zone-I(i).

c) The West Bengal Coastal Zone Management Authority shall prepare a management plan for conserving the Coastal Regulation Zone-I(i) areas and ensure that no development other than those activities permissible under the said notification is permitted.

d) Any shoreline protection structures proposed for the island shall be undertaken only after obtaining necessary clearance from the Ministry of Environment and Forests.

Subsequently, the Ministry of Environment & Forest, Govt. of India notified CRZ notification, 2011 on 6<sup>th</sup> January 2011 in supersession of CRZ notification, 1991. Accordingly, the SCZMA is required to prepare new CZMP by 31<sup>st</sup> January 2014. As per the affidavit of Respondent No. 1, the draft CZMPs have not been submitted by West Bengal.

Having regard to the affidavit filed by the MoEF, we are of the considered view that there is no scope to allow construction

of the thermal power plant and Industrial Park, as the case may be, in the area as it will disturb the fragile ecosystem of Nayachar Island and create eco-problem and will damage the environment. Considering the aforesaid aspects and the legal issue, we are of the opinion that the application as filed by the applicants fishermen association is to be allowed. Hence, we allow the application and pass the following orders :-

- i) The project proponent (respondent No. 7) is restrained from taking any further steps for construction of Thermal Power Project and Industrial Park in any manner whatsoever in Nayachar Island.
- ii) The respondent No. 6 shall continue with the Integrated Brackish Water Aqua Culture Development Project at Nayachar Island. The State respondents will take steps and measures for the benefit of fishermen of the locality whose right to 'live' under Article 21 of the Constitution of India and maintenance of their livelihood is to be protected. Compliance report to be filed by the Chief Secretary, Govt. of West Bengal by two months in the Registry of this Tribunal.
- iii) As per prayer (c ) i.e. reclassification of Nayachar Island from CRZ I to CRZ III is concerned, we are keeping the point open to consider the same as and when cause of action will arise. If re-classification of Nayachar Island is approved by the MoEF & CC considering the

	<p>new CZMP by the State Coastal Zone Management Authority, the applicants will be at liberty to approach this Tribunal afresh.</p> <p>The application is partly allowed to the above extent. There will be no order as to costs.</p> <p>..... Justice Pratap Kumar Ray, JM</p> <p>..... Prof. (Dr.) P. C. Mishra, EM</p>
--	---

