

**CIVIL JUDGMENT No. 3534 of 25 NOVEMBER 2013**  
**ILFOV COURT CIVIL SECTION (Case No. 3753/93/2013)**

Pages 6 to 8:

.....85/2003, by sale-purchase of land, exchange of land, lease of land, etc. Or, in these circumstances, where within the perimeter of the license there are several owners of land, it is impossible to acquire at the same time and from all holders, all the areas to be affected.

There is also a technical explanation for the gradual expansion of the lignite quarry, since the land is occupied by removing it from the forestry base in stages, in sections, as the working fronts advance, within the mining perimeter, delimited by STEREO 70 coordinates, in strict accordance with the working technology for lignite quarries.

It also stated that the public had been informed of the decisions challenged by the applicant.

The decisions challenged by the applicant were issued on the basis of the Methodology for establishing the value equivalence of land and for calculating the monetary obligations for the permanent removal or temporary occupation of land from the national forest fund, once by Order No. M.M.P. No. 924/2011, the provisions of Articles 19 and 35 of this normative act being fully respected.

As regards the condition of imminent damage, the applicant has not proved that it is satisfied, the mere challenge by the applicant to the legality of the acts not being sufficient to satisfy the requirement laid down in Article 14 of Law No 554/2004.

In law, the statement of defence was based on the provisions of Article 205 of the New Code of Civil Procedure.

By civil judgment no.4140/13.09.2013, pronounced in case no.23825/3/2013 of the Bucharest Court, it was ordered to decline jurisdiction to resolve the present case in favour of the Ilfov Court.

The case was registered with the Ilfov Court on 09.10.2013 under no.3753/93/2013.

At the first trial date of 11.11.2013, the plaintiff filed its action requesting the suspension of the decision no.37/23.05.2013 issued by the Territorial Inspectorate of Forestry and Hunting Ramnicu Valcea.

At the trial date of 11.11.2013, the court rejected as unfounded the exceptions of prematurity for failure to comply with the preliminary procedure, lack of interest and lack of subject matter as unfounded for the reasons stated in the judgment of that date.

At the request of the parties, written evidence was taken.

Having analysed all the evidence adduced in the case, the Court finds as follows:

In fact, through the decisions issued by ITRSV RM. Vâlcea under no.3/12.01.2012, no.8/07.02.2012, no.12/16.02.2012, no.17/04.03.2012, no.34/03.04.2012, no.37/03.04.2012, no.132/18.12.2012, no.135/19.12.2012, no.1 /08.01.2013, No.5/30.01.2013, No.5/30.01.2013, No.7/31.01.2013, No.9/04.02.2013, No.11/04.03.2013, No.16/07.03.2013, No.18/01.04.2013, No.26/18.04.2013 and No.37 /18.04.2013 ordered the definitive removal from the forestry circuit and the clearing of areas of land under 1 ha each, owned by Complexul Energetic Oltenia, in order to achieve the objective "Extension of the Tismana I lignite quarry in the license perimeter".

From the content of the contested decisions, it appears that the basis for taking those measures was the exploitation license issued by ANRM approved by GD no.328/2004; the notice for public consultation, the environmental agreements no. GJ-17/19.11.2012, no.GJ-2/12.03.2010 issued by APM Gorj (objective in continuation), the supporting memorandum, the topographical survey, the favourable opinion of the Tg. Jiu, the owner's agreement, the technical file of transmission and cooling including the payment of the final removal fee (documents also submitted to the file).

According to Article 14 of Law 554/2004 on Administrative Litigation, in well-justified cases and for the prevention of imminent damage, after having referred the matter to the public authority that issued the act or to the hierarchically superior authority, in accordance with Article 7 of the same normative act, the injured party may request the competent court to order the suspension of the execution of the unilateral administrative act, until the court of first instance has given its decision.

According to Article 2, paragraph 1, letter t of Law no. 554/2004, circumstances related to the state of facts and law, which are likely to create a serious doubt as to the legality of the administrative act, and according to letter s, imminent damage is the future and foreseeable material damage or, as the case may be, the serious disruption of the functioning of a public authorization or a public service.

The Court finds that there is no doubt as to the legality of the decisions which are the subject of the present case since: the area removed from the forestry circuit by each decision is less than 1 ha, which entails the competence of the territorial inspectorates to approve them in accordance with Article 40(a) of Law 46/2008; proof of public consultation has been provided; Completul Energetic Oltenia has held a licence for the exploitation of lignite mineral resources in the Tismana I perimeter since 2004; the environmental agreements mentioned in the decisions have not been annulled in administrative proceedings; the provisions of Article 3 are not applicable to the construction permit. paragraph 1 letter e of Law no.50/1991 but the special provisions contained in GD no.445/2009 which at art.2 letter b letter (i) specifies that the development approval represented by the decision of the competent authority or authorities, gives the right to the project holder to carry out the project; this is materialized in: (i) the construction permit, for the projects provided for in Annex no. 1 (the project of the respondent falling under item 19 of Annex 1).

The other aspects invoked by the applicant, namely that the lignite quarry expansion project involves the deforestation of 58.9586 ha of forest, that the defendant Complex proceeded to slice the project and carry out environmental assessments on the pieces in violation of the internal rules on the matter, as well as the practice established by the decisions of the European Court of Justice, cannot be received and analysed in the summary procedure governed by Article 14 of Law 554/2004 as it would mean prejudging the merits of the action for annulment of the administrative act. Similarly, it cannot be verified through the present action whether the public consultation procedure complied with the Aarhus Convention to which Romania acceded by Law no. 86/2000.

The High Court of Cassation and Justice has consistently ruled that in the context of an application for suspension it is not possible to open the case on the merits. Thus, by Decision no.4587/06.10.2011, the ICCJ held that in order to establish a well-founded and justified case requiring the suspension of an administrative act, the court must not proceed to analyse the criticisms of illegality on which the request for annulment of the administrative act is based, but must limit its examination only to those manifest circumstances of fact and/or of law which are capable of producing a serious doubt on the presumption of legality enjoyed by an administrative act.

In conclusion, the Court finds that the requirement of a well-founded case is not met, since a summary examination of the arguments put forward by the applicant in the light of the relevant legal provisions shows that they are not such as to create a serious doubt as to the legality of the contested act.

With regard to the occurrence of imminent damage, the court finds in fact that the areas have already been cleared and excavated (according to the defendant's submissions in the statement of defence and the documents submitted in support - the contract of execution and its annexes), that it is a question of the extension of the existing quarry and that the applicant has not proved that it has brought an action for annulment of the contested decision.

The applicant's mere assertion that a lignite quarry is a project with a major negative impact on the environment does not prove the imminence of damage, given that the administrative act enjoys a presumption of legality and truthfulness and the suspension of its execution is an exceptional situation which occurs when the law provides for it, within the limits and conditions specifically regulated.

In view of the reasons set out above, the court finds that the requirements laid down in Article 14 of Law 554/2004 are not met, and consequently rejects the application as unfounded.

It is to be noted that the defendant SC Complexul Energetic Oltenia SA has reserved the right to request separate legal costs.

FOR THESE REASONS,  
IN THE NAME OF THE LAW  
RESOLVES:

Dismisses the application filed by the applicant BANKWATCH ROMÂNIA ASSOCIATION with registered office in sector 1, Bucharest, Bd. Dinicu Golescu, nr. 41, bl. 6, sc. 1, et. 1, ap. 5 in contradiction with the defendants ITRSV RM. VÂLCEA RM. VALCEA, established in Carol I, no. 37, Vâlcea County, SC COMPLEXUL ENERGETIC OLTENIA SA established in Targu-Jiu, Alexandru Ioan Cuza, no. 5, Gorj County as unfounded.

Take note that the defendant SC Complexul Energetic Oltenia SA has reserved the right to seek separate legal costs.

With appeal in 5 days from communication.

Delivered in public sitting, today 25.11.2013.

President,  
Alina Dumitrescu

Register,  
Marioara Rusu

Redact. D.A  
Tehnored M.R/5ex