

code ECLI ECU: LTO: TBBUC: 2017: 007.001358

File no. 41690/3/2016

ROMÂNIA
COURT of BUCHAREST
SECTION II CONTENCIOUS ADMINISTRATIVE AND
Civil Sentence no. 1358 Public hearing on 03/03/2017

The Court consists of:

PRESIDENT: Mihai Dragutescu REGISTRAR: Andrei Roberto Gavra



Pending settlement of the action brought by the applicant BANKWATCH ROMANIAN ASSOCIATION contradictory with the defendants ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY GORJ and SC COMPLEX ENERGETIC OLTENIA SA, with object being suspension of the enforcement act by agreement No.4 / 2016.

Discussing proceedings were held in open court dated 22.02.2017 being recorded in the concluding session since then, which makes part at the present decision, when the Court, in need of time to deliberate, adjourned on 03.03.2017 when, sitting in the same composing, decides the following:

COURT

The cases brought before the Court of Bucharest on 11.11.2016 Bucharest, in which the applicant Romania Bankwatch requested to the court under article 14 of Lg.554 / 2004 of administrative litigation, against Protection Agency of SC Environmental and Energy Complex Oltenia SA in the decision to be taken:

Suspension of environmental agreement No 4/2016 issued for the continuation of mining work within the license area of the LMC Lupoia for the following reasons:

III. Well-justified case:

On 19.03.2015 were published on the website APM Gorj ads on submitting the application for issuing of environmental permits for projects:

10. The continuation of the mining works within the license area for the UMC Pinoasa proposed to be located on the territory of the communes Calnic, Farcasesti and Negomir, Gorj County, holder of SC CEO SA
11. The continuation of the mining works within the license area for UMC Tismana H. Common site Calnic, Gorj County, holder of SC CEO SA
12. The continuation of the mining works within the license area for UMC Tismana I, joint site Calnic, Gorj County, holder of SC CEO SA
13. The continuation of the mining works within the license perimeter for the Rosia UMC, proposed to be located in the Extravillan of Farcasesti village, Jud Gorj, holder of SC CEO SA
14. The continuation of the mining works within the license area for the Jilt Nord, proposed to be the Matasari village, Gorj County, holder of SC CEO SA
15. Continue mining work within the licensing perimeter for Jilt Sud. Proposed to be the joint location of the silk Road. Gorj County, holder of SC CEO SA
16. Continuation of the mining works within the licensing perimeter for the UMC Peseana Sector of Peseana South. Gorj County, holder of SC CEO SA
17. Continue the mining works within the license area for UMC Rosiuta, Jud Gorj, holder of SC CEO SA
18. Continuation of the mining works within the licensing perimeter for the UMC Peseana -Sector of North Peseana. Gorj County, Holder of SC CEO SA.
19. Continuation of the mining works within the licensing perimeter for the UMC Lupoia -Gorj County. Holder of SC CEO SA.

On 01.04.2015, 10 days after the date of submission of the environmental agreement, the project guidelines numbered 1 to 10 were published on the site.

They do not have former published and have not been certified framing decisions for these projects.

For the career Lupoia the Technical-economic indicators were not adopted, making reference to the indicators adopted in 1984. It is clear that in a market economy in 2016 indicators and technical and economical economy since Socialist 1984, do not correspond. Consequently, his career has a cause false without justification from the economic point of view, and no feasibility study.

Although the public concerned questioned the way in which the consultation was carried out and relevant comments were made on the quality of the environmental report that was the basis for the issuance the administrative act under review was not taken into account, as the environmental agreement was illegally issued.

From the analyzed procedures for environmental impact assessment for projects listed results the following:

6. Guidelines were not made during the context of a public consultation procedure

7. Decision of framing was not communicated to the public, which has not had the opportunity to participate in the decision.

8. The annexes to the impact assessment report have not been communicated to the public on the environment, as referred to in the report, nor any additions to the documentation mentioned on the first page of the environmental agreement.

9. The cumulative effects of all quarries and installations have not been assessed industry in the area. Only 6 quarries have been assessed as regards pollution from the thermal power plants in the area, no parameters for greenhouse gas emissions, particulate matter, raw material transport, etc.

10. With regard to the assessment of the impact on environmental factors including human health:

a) The analysis is performed to very general level. All scientific findings are based on data collected from other study / old reports, many or even older than 20 years and they were not even available to the public. Even data on human health in the region is based on reports from 2005-2009 years. The report's findings on human health, conclusions identical in all reports, are hilarious. Studies estimate that the illnesses would rather be due to traffic impact than to the emissions from extraction and burning coal. This ignores recognized scientific reports and documentation on the impact of these emissions on human health (<http://faracarbune.ro/cum-ne-imbolnavesc-termocentrale/>). The project is not fully described often referring to areas of the career or elements that are nowhere explained. The environmental agreement also mentions as the opening date of the works the periods prior to the issuance of the environmental agreement (in this case 2013), although it is not legal to start the quarry before the environmental agreement was reached. Not all the necessary advice to reach the environmental agreement has been obtained.

b) the expert who conducted the studies is the company with the same shareholder as the beneficiary. As a humble this is not indentent, it is not objective, and it is a joint ict of interests.

c) there is no water management advice or measures to protect the quality of surface groundwater, including the quality of drinking water.

6. Fragmenting the project

c. Important part of this project is How would be building coal deposit that serve neighboring quarries or restore channel emergency and restoration work of

environment post-closing are evaluated separately and alone. By Order 135/20 IO approving the Methodology for application of environmental impact assessment for projects private and public art. 5 paragraph 3 the fragmentation of projects and implementation of a procedure for assessing environmental impact, separate each piece is prohibited.

d. The project was subject to environmental assessment only for the surface the expanding of the career was desired now. However the perimeter established by mining exploitation license is much higher. The environmental assessment should aim throughout the mine and only a piece that is intended to extend this time.

c. The impact of the coal deposits required for this project, mentioned in the environmental agreement, is not analyzed in the documentation, although environmental impact assessments should have been made for these coal deposits in the same procedure. Also, the impact of the tailings dumps has not been analyzed.

10. The environmental permit for Energy Strategy of **Romania** No10938 / 12.10.2012 are infringed.

11. The environmental approval is based on a strategy of mining industry for the period 2012 - 2035 which was never adopted by the Romanian Government.

12. There is a government decision to approve sealing **civil** the forest area to be deforested though it is over 10 hectares.

I 0. The audience was not consulted, nor the documentation relevance was not being made available across the public.

11. The protected areas have not been taken into account instead as **protective measures are not provided for protected species.**

He showed on the need for extraction of lignite, currently half the amount of coal extracted in stock due to lower demand for lignite. **In these** conditions resulting environmental destruction that is unnecessary to extend of the lignite careers. This is confirmed by taking technical and economic indicators of 1984, which no longer correspond to economic reality of 2016.

IV. Imminent damage

Environmental effects of the agreement will lead to: obtain subsequent documentation based on an environmental permit issued unlawfully, allowing activities that will irreparably harm environmental quality. Environmental agreement provisions are final, they can not be changed later so that his career will be executed without any measures to reduce the impact on the environment career. Thus, the entire area of 1028 ha which is the subject of an environmental agreement will be excavated. 565.05 ha of forest will be cleared before the court to rule on the merits. There will be irreparably affected species **protected from appropriation, as well as the health of residents. Admission of the action and termination of the environment agreement** will occur too late for will not be able to take measures to protect the environmental factors, as they are already destroyed. It is impossible to restore the environment to the same quality.

Therefore, it is necessary, under the precautionary principle in decision making, to suspend the environmental agreement in order to prevent damage caused by the unlawful actions of clearing, removal of topsoil and excavation.

The following provisions were invoked in law: HG 445/2009, Order 135/2010, Ordinance 57/2007, Order 19/2010, Lg. 107/1996, art. 14 of lg.554 / 2004.

the defendant Environmental Protection Agency Gorj issued to the beneficiary company Oltenia Energy Complex the Environmental Agreement No 4 of 19.04.2016 for the project „further work mining license area of UMC Lupoaia ”.

The applicant Bankwatch Romania Association, the non-profit association active in the field of environmental protection has made this request for suspension of the implementation of the environmental Agreement No 4 of 19.04.2016, which the court considers, for the reasons mentioned, to be well founded.

According to Article 14(1) of LG No 554/2004, the Law on administrative proceedings "In duly justified cases and in order to prevent imminent damage, after the application, under the terms of Article 7, of the public authority which issued the act or superior order of precedence, the injured party may request the competent court to order the enforcement of the

administrative act to be suspended unilaterally until the court or tribunal has ruled on the merits."

The abovementioned legal provisions lay down the conditions under which an application for suspension of the operation of the administrative act may therefore be admissible: to make a prior complaint, on the one hand, and to invoke a well-justified case and imminent damage, on the other.

In the present case, the applicant's request fulfills all these conditions, as derived from the administered samples.

The complainant made a prior complaint against environmental Agreement No 4/2016, Complaint registered under No 72 of 02.1 1.2016 to the environmental Protection Agency Gorj, file 52 — 56 vol.I folder.

The justified case assumes that from the outset a huge doubt as to the legality of the act is established and that the reasons for the suspension appear to be substantiated, and in the present case the court considers that, in the appearance level, the illegality of the act issued by the Gorj Environment Protection Agency to the benefit of the defendant company Oltenia Energy Complex was proven.

It should be noted that the court will only take a critical analysis of legality from the position of the appearance of legality/illegality of the acts, "failing the substance", where the evidence administered, specific to an application for suspension of execution, does not involve in-depth evidence and, let alone, technical evidence.

It is noted by reading the act, that it was issued for the project 'continuation of mining works within the license perimeter of UMC Lupoiaia', the holder being the company of Oltenia SA — Sucursala Minera Division Tg-Jiu — the Lupoiaia quarry Minera Unit with the site of Gorj County and the City of Motru and locality of Catunele, in order to establish the conditions and measures for the protection of the environment to be complied with for the implementation of the project, which provides for: „*The execution of works for the extraction of lignite within the licensed area concerned, the extraction of lignite, the transport and the laying of the tailings (soil above coal slag), the transport and storage of lignite, the ecological reconstruction of the affected*

land. According to the provisions of Article 2 pet.3 of the GEO No 1952005/2005, on the protection of the environment, the environmental heart shall be the administrative act issued by the Competent environmental Protection Authority, which sets out the conditions and, where appropriate, measures for the protection of the environment, which must be observed when a project is being carried out."

The Framework level of the environmental Agreement is set out in Annex No 18 of the methodology for applying environmental impact assessment to public and private projects, Approved by order of the Minister of Environment and Forestry No 135/2010 containing the following elements:

The Environment Agreement shall have the framework content set out in Annex No 18.

The environmental agreement shall include at least:

(a) specific requirements for the protection of environmental elements during the construction of the project, including the organization of the site, as well as during the period of operation, demolition/decommissioning, where appropriate, including all necessary conditions of the fi fulfilled by the project holder;

(b) the conclusions of the analysis of the safety report, where appropriate;

(c) the main reasons and considerations on the basis of which it was issued; including information on the conduct of the public engagement process and how the comments of the public concerned have been taken into account;

(d) a description of the main measures to avoid, reduce and, where possible, compensate for major adverse effects on the environment during the project, including site organization, the requirements of community legislation concerned, if applicable.

The apparent illegality of the environmental Agreement No. 4/2016 stems from two aspects: A formal aspect, the lack of any acts required to issue it, and the second one concerns the fact that, although formally it contains certain components (other than the missing ones), they appear to be specified in breach of legal provisions or, at least, failure to comply with the minimum conditions required for the lawful issue.

The project for which environmental Agreement No 4 is issued is the mining (its continuation) within the license area of the UMC Lupoia, which is the largest boundary and most exploitation on the list published by APM Gorj on 19.03.2015 on its website, On the exploitation of the soil license perimeter, which results from the very content of environmental Agreement No 4/2016 — on page 19 of the Agreement, the direct, indirect and cumulative impact of the other activities existing in the area is mentioned under the heading: Lupoia, in kmp, is 23,679, together with Rossiuta, The Motru mining basin.

A first aspect of illegality arising from the lack of an essential act for the agreement is the non-submission of an urban planning certificate by Complexul Energy Oltenia SA for environmental approval, in the framing phase.

The provisions of Article 8 of order No 1284/2010 implementing environmental impact assessment for public and private projects, issued by the Minister for the Environment and forests, are as follows:

"1) To achieve the initial assessment phase, the project holder requests the issuance of the environmental agreement with the county authority for environmental protection by submitting a notification regarding the intention to carry out the project, accompanied by the urban planning certificate issued under the terms of the law on the authorization of construction works, the plans attached to it and proof of payment of the tariff for this step. '

In response to this case, the recipient of the agreement itself describes the factual situation confirmed by the documents in the file, indicating that it has requested the launch of the environmental impact assessment procedure and that " the environmental Protection Agency, considering that:

The project falls within the scope of Government Decision No 445/2009 on the assessment of environmental impact of public and private projects falling within Annex No 1, pet.19, The project does not fall within the scope of Article 28 of the GEO No 5772007 concerning the protected area regime,

It decided that the procedure for assessing the environmental impact (pet.1 above) should be initiated for the project "continuation of mining work within the license perimeter of the UMC Lupoia", issuing the evaluation phase Decision No 1363717. 02.2015. '

This procedure has been carried out in application of Article 12 of order No 1284/2010 of the Minister for the Environment and forests:

". Art.12.- (1) Following the screening stage in the proceedings of environmental impact assessment and evaluation of the appropriate competent authority for environmental protection shall, as appropriate:

(a) carrying out environmental impact assessment and appropriate assessment for projects:

(i) referred to in Annex No 1 to Government Decision No 445/2009, and for the projects referred to in Annex No 2 to Government Decision No 445/2009, which has been decided that environmental impact should be covered,

The beneficiary of the environmental agreement, like its issuer, claims that it has not been submitted

an urban planning certificate at the entry stage because it would not be necessary, in the interpretation of article 8 of order no 1284/2010, is requested, In the opinion of the defendant SCE Oltenia SA, only in the case of authorization to carry out construction works — an argument put forward in the present and written conclusions — Tab 65 vol.III, back side.

The present court disagrees with this view, it is very easily noted that the reference to 'authorization to carry out construction works' is used to render it

the title of the normative document — the law — on the basis of which and under the conditions under which the act of which is issued is issued

submission is requested: *"accompanied by the urbanism qualifier issued under the terms of the law on the authorization to perform construction works, the plans to which it is attached*

and the proof of the acquitarii of the lariff... '

Instead of making the Article 'the city certificate issued on the basis of the LG shall be filed.

no 1991' has been used..issued under the law authorizing the execution of construction works', the interpretation of the defendant that only when requesting the start of the evaluation phase for the project involving the authorization of construction works is, in the view of the present court, based on an incorrect, unduly restrictive interpretation of the law.

Moreover, the urban planning certificate may also be issued in cases where authorization is not sought for the execution of construction works but merely as an information act, As defined by Article 6 of LG No 50/1991 and Article of LG No 3501/1991 concerning urban planning and spatial planning.

The known provisions of LG No 50/1991 and LG No 350/2001 concerning urban planning and

spatial planning recognizes the primary function of information, what may or may not be followed by the authorization to execute the construction works.

In the present case, not only in the letter of the law, but also in its spirit, even if it was not followed by requests for the authorization of building, the provisions of the art. 8 appear with a justified application in the sense of the request for the urban planning certificate.

In the view of the present court, beyond the existence of a clear formula for the purpose of the need to submit an urban development certificate, and therefore the legal requirement, which exists, as previously cited, and from the perspective of opportunity, it appears imperative to submit the urbanism certificate that presents triada of information - legal, economic and technical - absolutely necessary for a project to exploit soil and subsoil such as mining - Lupoaia career.

If there is also an impact on human settlements, as stated in the environmental agreement, it appears to be absolutely justified to submit at the framing stage, the urban planning certificate and the annexd plans.

The procedure to issue the environmental agreement involves the environmental assessment which the Gorj environmental Protection Agency, in the present case, assessed as necessary for the project, triggered it, as defendant S CEO Oltenia SA himself mentioned.

The environmental assessment shall consist of the development of the environmental report, the consultation of the public and public authorities concerned by the effects of the implementation of the plans and programs, taking into account the environmental report and the results of these consultations in the decision-making process and ensuring that the decision is informed.

The environmental assessment procedure for plans and programs is carried out in three steps:

- the step of framing the environmental assessment procedure,
- project completion phase plan and prepare the environmental report,
- stage of analysis of the quality of the environmental report.

According to the first stage of the environmental assessment, the holder of the program's leap plan shall notify the competent environmental protection authority in writing and inform the public of the initiation of the process of drawing up the plan or program and of its first version, by repeated announcements in the media and by displaying on his website (or the authority, if it does not have its own page).

With the notification, the holder shall submit the first version of the plan/program to the competent environmental authority. It is recommended that the documentation be submitted in at least two copies, one of which is required by the Authority for analysis and the other is made publicly available.

The documentation shall contain the declaration of urbanism, under the terms of Article 8 of order No 1284/2010, and after the submission of the complete documentation, the public has at its disposal a time frame of 15 calendar days to submit comments and suggestions to the environmental authority.

Next, the environmental authority, in this case the environmental Protection Agency Gorj issues the reasoned decision whether or not to qualify for the environmental assessment procedure for plans and programs, in accordance with GD No 106/2004 establishing the procedure for carrying out the environmental assessment for plans and programs, Transposing Directive 200 L/42/EC on the

assessment of the effects of certain plans and programs on the environment.

Consequently, it is concluded that in the procedure for issuing environmental Agreement No 4/2016, i.e. in the first stage, no land planning certificate was used, the area which was to constitute the mining exploitation, so that, at least in appearance, there is no element of procedural legality required by the relevant legal provisions for the issue of the act the suspension of which is sought in the present case.

Also, another document missing from the documentation submitted in view of issuing the environmental agreement is the water management opinion at the time of the start of the procedure and the carrying out of the environmental impact assessment, which is clear from the comparison of objective data from the procedure: The defendant S CE Oltenia SA initiated the procedure by notification by the operator to APM Gorj at 09.02.2015 below No 1363 and the decision of the initial assessment stage lv 20.02.2015 was issued, and subsequently the submission of the draft is submitted to 03.03.2015.

The water management authorizations invoked by the defendant S CE Oltenia SA are Nos 340/15.10.2015 and N° 10,2016, i.e. after the steps of the assessment and the assessment of environmental impact — The report on the environmental impact is displayed at 02.09.2015 on the site-U1 APM Gorj, i.e. before the first water management permit was granted, all the more so before the second one in 31.10.2016, although the assessment of the impact on the water network was already carried out.

The appearance of illegality also appears in connection with two elements that conjugate to question the lack of another act, namely a government decision.

In the environmental agreement is mentioned in the *"stage of preparation of the mining field for exploitation", "clearing of existing vegetation"*, described as operations in the sense that *'it shall comprise the phases of: fowling; cleaning of the jacks and [partial asonation (crown sectioning or parts of the crown of trees) and the area on which the grubbing-up will take place is mentioned as 567,07 ha: 'grubbing-up involves the felling of the forest vegetation from the 567,07 ha area...the forest land to be grubbed up is situated within the administrative limit of the commune of Catania and the city of Motru, jud. Gorj, and from a forest cadastre point of view it is located in the radius of the willer School Motru.'*

But there is no government resolution for the final removal of the occupied land vegetation, from forest background.

According to the provisions of Article 40 b of the forestry code (Law No 46/2008) *'Applications for permanent removal or temporary occupation of land from the forestry fund, under the conditions laid down in Articles 36 to 39, with the consent of the owner and approved favorably by the forestry management and forestry services, as appropriate, by the national Forest Regie - Romsilva, in the case of publicly owned forest land, and by the specialized territorial sub-units of the central public authority responsible for forestry, .is approved by:*

a) head of the central public authority responsible for forestry, for areas up to 10 ha; with the possibility of delegation of competence to the heads of the specialized territorial sub-units of the central public authority responsible for forestry, up to 1 ha;

b) government, on a proposal from the central public forestry authority, for areas over 10 ha."

As has been shown, the area of land occupied by forest vegetation, in relation to which the environmental Agreement No. 4/2016 is issued, is 567,07 ha, so it is necessary to issue a government decision on deforestation for the extension of the exploitation season, which also requires the government to issue a decision on the matter. missing from the documentation submitted for the issuance of the environmental agreement.

The lack of such an act, which concerns the whole area subject to grubbing-up, is linked to another aspect of illegality, linked to what the applicant has called as being

"slicing of the project", The environmental assessment does not take into account and evaluate important project components, and is not a comprehensive project-wide analysis, because environmental agreements are issued separately on a career-by-career basis — I-10, Continue mining works in the perimenas belonging to the CEO of the company without analyzing their cumulative effect, although they are all placed in the same mining basin of Gorj county.

Also as an objective element concerning the content of the agreement, There is no assessment of the environmental effect of the coal deposit to be used for mining, this assessment is not identified in the environmental agreement, and the post-closure works are assessed separately and on a one-off basis, without an analysis of the cumulative effect, although according to Article 5(3) of order No .I 35/2010, fragmentation of projects is prohibited.

Thus, according to this Article (3) *where an investment is phased in or located on land within the territorial range of several neighboring territorial administrative units, the environmental impact assessment shall be carried out for the whole investment.*

From North to South, UAT Calnic is a neighbor of UAT Pestrana, which in turn is located near the Motru exploitation, including the Laupoia cararion, but separate environmental agreements have been sought (and obtained) for each of the above sites, based on the environmental impact assessment carried out not by the cumulative effect of these sites, but by taking one on its own.

Another issue on which the appearance of illegality is claimed, i.e. the justified case, concerns the fact that the environmental agreement no. 4/2016 is issued following the environmental impact analysis without the use of accurate data: In the part highlighting the project under way and for the continuation of the environmental agreement, no updated technical economic indicators are indicated for the Lipoia quarry, but even in the environmental Agreement No 4/2016 it is noted that the mining objective is taken into account, Technical-economic indicators approved before 1989 by acts of central government: 'the technical-economic indicators of the investment were approved with HCB (Council of Ministers judgment) No 33/1984' — sheet 1 sided of environmental agreement No 4/2016.

Consequently, For the assessment of environmental impact, the activity of CE Oltenia SA is analyzed on the basis of technical-economic indicators approved in 1984, but under these conditions the projection of environmental effects, because this is the environmental impact assessment, is not adapted to the real situation on the ground, unless the plans, the projects and evolution of the mining exploitation were, is and will continue to be according to these indicators approved in 1984, an aspect on which the defendants did not make any appearance.

As regards the non-communication of the decision on the assignment to the public, like the applicant's argument that the annexes to the environmental impact assessment report referred to in the report and the additions to the documentation mentioned on the first page of the environmental agreement have not been communicated to the public, the court will not take these arguments into account, On the contrary, at the level of appearance it considers that, in this respect, APM Gorj respected the legal steps of the procedure — On 20.03.2015, the site of APM Gorj showed the definition stage, the report on the environmental impact was published in 02.09.2015, the publications were published in local print newspapers in Gorj (Gorj exclusive) and public debates took place.

However, the court will retain the absence of the above mentioned documents from the documentation submitted to carry out the procedural steps for the issuance of the environmental agreement, considering that the legal conditions for the issue of environmental agreement No 4/2016 were apparently not fulfilled, what constitutes in the justified case requested as a condition for suspending the execution of the administrative act.

As regards the last condition necessary to order suspension of the enforcement of an administrative act, this is 'imminent damage' as defined in Article 2 (s). future and foreseeable material damage or, where appropriate, serious foreseeable disturbance to the functioning of a public authority or a public service.';

In the case of environmental disputes, the imminent damage is of a specific nature. Of a nature likely to lead to environmental damage and to the threat to the principle of sustainable development', see Decision No 206/13.01.2012, irrevocable, of the High Court of Cassation and Justice, given in case No 4803/2/2010, file No 7479, volume.III.

In this case, the environmental agreement envisages the grubbing-up of 567 hm irreversible operation in case of execution, (even reforestation cannot have the same effect as clearing of secular forest) the possible execution of operations for which the environmental agreement was issued may take place, If the act is deemed to meet the requirements of legality and reliability, after final judgment by the courts having dealt with the substantive issue of annulment of environmental Agreement No 4/2016.

The court therefore finds that all the conditions required by Article 14(1) of LG No 554/2004 have been met, In order to prevent imminent damage and as it is a well-justified case, it will order the suspension of the implementation of the environmental Agreement no. 4/2016 issued by the Gorj Environment Protection Agency for the project "continuation of mining works within the license area of the UMC Lupoaia" until the court on the matter has ruled.

**FOR THESE REASONS,
IN THE NAME OF THE LAW
DECIDES**

Accept the action brought by the complainant BANKWATCH ROMANIA ASSOCIATION, based in sector 6, Bucharest, No 24, BOISOARA STREET, ap. 2, in contradiction with the defendants THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY GORJ, based in TARGU JIU, no. 76, UNIREA STREET, GORJ County and SC OLTENIA SA, BASED IN TARGU JIU, no. 5, ALEXANDRU IOAN CUZA STREET, GORJ County.

Suspend the execution of environmental Agreement No. 4/2016 issued by the Gorj environmental Protection Agency for the project "continuation of mining works within the license area of the UMC Lupoaia" until the court ruled on the substance.

With appeal within 15 days from communication.

The appeal to be lodged with the Bucharest Court of first Instance – Section II.

Delivered in open session today, 03.03.2017.

PRESIDENT,

Mihai Dragutescu

Traducator autorizat,

REGISTRAR,

Andrei Roberto Gavra

