

where interaction with Jarawas is most likely to occur) by two villages; (7) The Respondent has submitted that despite regulation of traffic on the Andaman Trunk Road, there continues to be interaction with members of the Jarawa Tribe. Further, if regulation were sufficient, it should be consistently adopted and even the operation of resorts should be regulated as opposed to strict closure.

5. The Petitioner submits that the ground realities as prevailing in areas in and around the Buffer Zone have already been set out in detail in the Petitioner's affidavit dated 13.12.2010, and the interpretation of the notification dated 30.10.2007 that has been explained in some detail in the affidavit dated 13.12.10. As such, no further reply on this aspect is needed at this stage, and the Petitioner shall make submissions supporting its interpretation at the hearing before this Hon'ble Court. With respect to the other issues raised in the Additional Affidavit filed by the Respondent, the Petitioner seeks leave to prefer a point-wise response to the points as summarized in paragraph 4 above.
6. In response to Point No. 1, the Petitioner reiterates the contents of its affidavit dated 13.12.10 to the effect that the interpretation accorded to the notification dated 30.10.2007 cannot be oblivious to the settlers who reside in the nearby revenue villages, and the notification cannot be interpreted in a manner that prejudices the livelihood of the settlers. The notification seeks to protect the members of the Jarawa Tribe by insulating them from tourist intrusions / presence on a commercial scale.
7. With respect to Point No. 2, it is stated that the closure notices issued to some establishments in the Buffer Zone referred to in Para 3 of the affidavit filed by the Respondent, had been wrongly issued and they were subsequently withdrawn, and a clarification was issued by the A&N Administration to bring normalcy to the lives of settlers who had been living in the area for 40-50 years.