

**BEFORE THE NATIONAL GREEN TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI
I.A. NO. 494-495/2024
IN
ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 820 OF 2024**

IN THE MATTER OF:

News Item titled ""22 साल सेबंद कं पनी मेंकाट ददए 1 हजार सेज्यादा पेड़, नोएडा मेंवन दवभाग नेजब्त दकया कटेपेड़ ़ों सेभरा ट्रक" appearing in Navbharat Times dated 11.06.2024

AND IN THE MATTER OF:

Vikrant Tongad

...Applicant/Proposed Intervener

INDEX

S. No.	Particulars	Page No.
1	Additional Affidavit on behalf of the Applicant/Proposed Intervener in I.A. no. 494-495/2024	169-180
2	Annexure AA-1 Copy of the Order, dated: 11.09.2018, passed by this Hon'ble Tribunal in O.A. No. 805/2017, <i>Kshitij Agnihotri Vs. Ministry of Environment, Forest & Climate Change & Ors.</i> ,	181-189
3	Annexure AA-2 Copy of the Order, dated: 25.03.2025, passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, in W.P. (C) No. 13381/1984, <i>M.C. Mehta Vs. Union of India & Ors.</i>	190-206
4	Annexure AA-3 Copy of the Order, dated: 01.05.2025, passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, in W.P. (C) No. 13381/1984, <i>M.C. Mehta Vs. Union of India & Ors.</i>	207-224
5	Annexure AA-4 Copy of the List of 17 Non-Attainment Cities in India, as per CPCB	225-228

Proof of service **Through**

229



AKASH VASHISHTHA
(Advocate for the Applicant)
490, Lawyers' Chamber Block-II,
Delhi High Court, New Delhi-110002
Ph: 9717006866

Email: akashvashishtha.official@gmail.com

Dated:- 12.09.2025

**BEFORE THE NATIONAL GREEN TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI
I.A. NO. 494-495/2024
IN
ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 820 OF 2024**

IN THE MATTER OF:

News Item titled ""22 साल सेबंद कं पनी मेंकाट ददए 1 हजार सेज्यादा पेड़, नोएडा मेंवन दवभाग नेजब्त दकया कटेपेड़ ़ो सेभरा ट्रक" appearing in Navbharat Times dated 11.06.2024

AND IN THE MATTER OF:

Vikrant Tongad ...Applicant/Proposed Intervener

**ADDITIONAL AFFIDAVIT ON BEHALF OF THE
APPLICANT/PROPOSED INTERVENER IN
I.A. NO. 494-495/2024**

FACTS IN BRIEF:

1. That the afore-captioned Original Application pertains to the illegal felling of more than 1000 trees in DCM company situated in Greater Noida, District Gautam Budh Nagar, Uttar Pradesh.
2. That vide Order, dated: 13.05.2025, this Hon'ble Tribunal had observed as follows:

“ ...

8. Learned counsel appearing for the State of U.P. has placed reliance upon the notification dated 07.01.2020 (page 134) issued under Section 21 and 23 of the Uttar Pradesh Protection of Trees Act, 1976 and has submitted that 29 species of trees are prohibited species in the State of U.P and other species not

covered by notification are exempted species of trees for which there is no regulation for felling.

9. In the present case, 980 trees have been cut, and only three trees out of them fall in the prohibited category, meaning thereby the felling of 977 trees in the present case is unregulated, for which no regulatory framework in the State of U.P. has been provided.

10. The submission for the counsel for the State of U.P. is that if the exempted category trees are standing on lands other than Government and Forest land, the same can be cut without any regulation or control.

11. Learned counsel for the applicant in I.A No. 495/2024 and 494/2024 has sought a short adjournment to place on record the relevant orders of the Tribunal and the Hon'ble Supreme Court in this regard.

...”

3. That this Hon'ble Tribunal vide Order, dated: 11.09.2018 in O.A. No. 805/2017, *Kshitij Agnihotri Vs. Ministry of Environment, Forest & Climate Change & Ors.*, had, inter alia, held that even without the Uttar Pradesh Trees Protection Act, 1976, felling of trees indiscriminately is not permitted as it violates Article 21 of the Constitution and that the state has no power to permit unregulated cutting of trees in violation of law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

The relevant parts of the said Order, are extracted as under:

“ ...

11. As regards the merits, we are unable to find any nexus in the object of encouraging agro forestry to exempting the cutting of

all the trees, except few, from the purview of the regulatory regime under the UP Trees Protection Act. It is well known that naturally growing trees cannot be termed as 'agro forestry' which refers to the trees grown by the agriculturists. There may certainly be need to encourage agro forestry and relax regulatory regime for such species. Such species have to be so specified. Omnibus exemption of all species, except few, can hardly be said to be promotion of agro forestry. Reference to the provisions of UP Trees Protection Act shows that no tree is allowed to be felled except a tree which is completely dead or which has fallen without aid of human agency or unless permission is granted in accordance with the provisions of the said Act which has the safeguards of requiring planting of more trees wherever cutting of a tree, becomes necessary for any valid reason. Even without the Uttar Pradesh Trees Protection Act, 1976 felling of trees indiscriminately is not permitted as it violates Article 21 of the Constitution.

12. It is well settled that an exemption provision has to be applied to an exceptional situation. General exemption without creating defined category of exception results in defeating the main statute, by arbitrary exercise of power. The legislative mandate is to provide strict regulatory regime with regard to the subject matter covered by the statute. In fact, the agro forestry is not even shown to be covered by the regulatory regime. The definition of tree under Section 3(xi) of the Act is as follows:

“3(xi) “tree” means any woody plant whose branches spring from and are supported upon an trunk or body and whose trunk or body is not less than five centimeter in diameter at a height of thirty centimeters from the ground level and is not less than one metre in height from the ground level, and the expressions “timber trees” and “fruit trees” means respectively the trees of the species specified in Schedule I and Schedule III, respectively.”

13. *In any case, the agro forestry could be specifically defined in the exemption granted for the purpose. Omnibus exemption from the Act requiring regulation of cutting of trees, with regard to every species of trees, except few, cannot be held to be advancing the need of environment. The impugned notification does not merely restrict the exemption to agro forestry and goes much beyond.*

...

15. *There is no impact assessment with regard to the impact of exemption of species of trees covered by the impugned Notification which was a must before such Notification was issued. If the exemption is granted in respect of all the trees in the non-forest areas, it is obvious that the forest cover will get reduced. The plea that impugned Notification will result in increasing the forest cover is without any basis and is an argument only in air.*

16. *Thus, following points emerge from the discussion:*

(i) *Unregulated cutting of trees without limitation of specific species of agro forestry is in violation of Forest Conservation Act read with the law laid down in T.N Godavarman (supra).*

(ii) *The Tribunal has jurisdiction to consider challenge to unregulated cutting of trees.*

(iii) *The impugned notification is not merely restricted to agro forestry, as claimed.*

(iv) *The State of UP has no power to permit unregulated cutting of trees, in violation of law laid down by Hon'ble Supreme Court.*

(v) Even while permitting agro forestry by exercise of power to exempt regulatory regime against cutting of trees, impact on environment including ground water level must be taken into account.

(vi) In the present case, impugned notification is arbitrary exercise of power, adversely impacting the environment.

...”

(Emphasis supplied)

(A True Copy of the Order, dated: 11.09.2018, passed by this Hon’ble Tribunal in O.A. No. 805/2017, *Kshitij Agnihotri Vs. Ministry of Environment, Forest & Climate Change & Ors.*, is annexed herewith and marked as **ANNEXURE AA-1**)

4. That the Notification, dated: 07.01.2020, issued by the State of Uttar Pradesh exempting all but 29 species of trees from the rigours of the UP Protection of Trees Act, 1976, is squarely in violation of the Order, dated: 11.09.2018, passed by this Hon’ble Tribunal in O.A. No. 805/2017, *Kshitij Agnihotri Vs. Ministry of Environment, Forest & Climate Change & Ors.*
5. That it is submitted that it is not open for the State of Uttar Pradesh to have issued such a Notification exempting all but 29 species of trees when the issue has been settled by this Hon’ble Tribunal in *Kshitij Agnihotri* (supra). Further, the said Notification, dated: 07.01.2020, frustrates the intent and operation of the UP Protection of Trees Act, 1976.
6. That the Hon’ble Supreme Court, while discussing the vitality of protecting natural tree-cover and the long period of 100 years for regeneration, had, vide Order, dated: 25.03.2025, in W.P. (C) No. 13381/1984, *M.C. Mehta Vs. Union of India & Ors.* In Re: Taj Trapezium Zone, had, inter alia, observed as under:

“ ...

12. We, therefore, accept the recommendations made in paragraph 20 by the CEC, subject to the following riders:

(i) An applicant shall apply to the local Divisional Forest Officer for lopping/pruning of overgrown trees encroaching upon the electric poles, high tension lines and other electric installations. Needless to add that permission for lopping/pruning of trees shall be granted in such a manner that the same should not lead to felling or destruction of any tree or permanent damage to any tree;

(ii) The CEC shall monitor the implementation of the permission granted by the local Divisional Forest Officer with a view to ensure that the work done remains confined to lopping/pruning of the trees and that there is no permanent damage caused to the trees; and

(iii) We may also add here that the applicant who applies for permission for lopping/pruning of the tree, shall provide photographs of the trees to the Divisional Forest Officer and the CEC before lopping/pruning and after lopping/pruning is done in terms of the permission granted by the local Divisional Forest Officer. Both set of photographs shall be uploaded on the Management Information System module by the CEC.

...

15. It is true that Shri Shiv Shankar Agarwal has filed an affidavit where he has accepted that he felled 454 trees without prior permission of this Court. We have perused three reports of the CEC. It will take a minimum of 100 years to again regenerate or recreate the green cover created by 454 trees which were brazenly cut without permission of this Court. Notwithstanding the embargo put by this Court which is in force right from the year 2015, he has indulged in this illegality. Destruction of so many trees adversely affects the environment and lives of several human beings.

...”

(Emphasis added)

(A True Copy of the Order, dated: 25.03.2025, passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, in W.P. (C) No. 13381/1984, *M.C. Mehta Vs. Union of India & Ors.* In Re: Taj Trapezium Zone is annexed herewith and marked as **ANNEXURE AA-2**)

7. That the special emphasis laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court to preserve the ecology and environment in Taj Trapezium Zone (TTZ), a zone of high pollution, by protecting every single tree in the region, by way of a special permission regime in case of tree-cutting is evident of the strict view taken by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in matters of tree-cutting. It is submitted that whether a tree is cut legally (with permission) or illegally (without permission), the effect is the reduction in the capacity and loss of purification of air, the first element of life, and degradation of environment.

8. That the Hon'ble Supreme Court, with the intent to increase the rigour of protection in TTZ area and also to extent such protection to other UNESCO world heritage structures, i.e., Agra Fort and Fatehpur Sikri, had, vide Order, dated: 01.05.2025, in *M.C. Mehta* (supra), observed as follows:

“ ...

The recommendations indicate that as far as areas located within an aerial distance of 5 kilometers from the Taj Mahal are concerned, the original order dated 8th May, 2015 will continue to operate. Ordered accordingly. In such cases, applications will have to be made to this Court seeking permission to fell trees irrespective of the number of trees to be felled, i.e., even if trees to be felled are less than 50, permission of this Court will be required. On such application being made, this Court will seek the recommendation of the CEC on such application and will thereafter consider the prayer for felling of trees. Therefore, order dated 8th May, 2015 will continue to operate subject to what is observed above in case of areas located

within an aerial distance of 5 kilometers from the Taj Mahal. Therefore, as far as this area is concerned, no tree felling shall be permitted without prior permission of this Court.

The recommendations of the CEC in relation to the areas that are located beyond an aerial distance of 5 kilometers from the Taj Mahal deserve acceptance, except clause (iv) of the recommendation. We want to add the following riders in the accepted recommendations:

(a) While granting permission, the Divisional Forest Officer (for short, 'DFO') and CEC shall be bound by the provisions of Uttar Pradesh Protection of Trees Act, 1976.

(b) Unless there is a grave and immediate urgency for felling the trees, while granting permission, the DFO and CEC shall impose a condition that unless compliance with all other conditions, including the condition of compulsorily afforestation is made, actual tree felling will not be permitted. DFO or CEC, as the case may be, will first verify whether the conditions imposed have been complied with. Only thereafter, actual permission for felling/lopping of trees shall be granted. We make it clear that an exception can be made only when there is a grave and immediate urgency to fell trees, in the sense that if felling of trees is not immediately undertaken, there will be real possibility of loss of human lives.

(c) We also approve clause 2 of the recommendations regarding lopping/pruning of trees. However as far as felling of trees in an emergency is concerned, the direction issued above will apply.

(d) We clarify that clause (v) of recommendation will also apply if multiple applications are made for felling of 50 or more trees in a particular area within a span of one year.

(e) Whenever permissions are granted by the DFO and CEC, as the case may be, they shall submit a detailed report before this Court within a period of 15 days from the date of grant of permission. We also make it clear that a fresh report shall be filed after compliance is made with the conditions imposed.

(f) We also clarify that the direction contained in clause (iii) of paragraph 12 of order dated 25th March, 2025 regarding uploading of photos before and after lopping/pruning will apply to lopping/pruning/removal of trees in terms of clause 2 of Report No. 20 of 2025.

We direct the CEC to file a fresh report indicating what restrictions on tree felling should be imposed for protecting the other two world heritage structures within the TTZ Area, namely Agra Fort and Fatehpur Sikri. CEC to file a report before this Court within a period of two months.

...”

(Emphasis added)

(A True Copy of the Order, dated: 01.05.2025, passed by the Hon’ble Supreme Court, in W.P. (C) No. 13381/1984, *M.C. Mehta Vs. Union of India & Ors.* In Re: Taj Trapezium Zone is annexed herewith and marked as **ANNEXURE AA-3**)

9. That vide Order, dated: 01.05.2025, passed in *M.C. Mehta* (supra), the Hon’ble Supreme Court has made it amply clear that the provisions of the Uttar Pradesh Protection of Trees Act, 1976 shall apply to all species of trees (other than Eucalyptus, Poplar or *Melia dubia*), and for felling of trees in all other cases than those mentioned in Category A in Para 1 of the recommendations of the CEC, as also extracted in the Order, dated: 01.05.2025. Further, the Hon’ble Supreme Court makes

no distinction between the trees that are prohibited to be cut and the trees which may be exempted by the State of Uttar Pradesh.

10. That it is the submission of the Applicant that since Greater Noida also experiences very high AQI levels round-the-year, the same principles of tree protection are required to be extended to Greater Noida.
11. That further, since the State of Uttar Pradesh has 17 Non-Attainment Cities, in terms of air pollution, as per CPCB, the act of exempting a large number of species frustrates the intent and operation inter alia of Air (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1981, Commission for Air Quality Management in NCR & Adjoining Areas Act, 2021, the strenuous and persistent efforts of the Hon'ble Supreme Court as well as this Hon'ble Tribunal, the CPCB as well as the State Pollution Control Boards, and other statutory bodies.

(A True Copy of the List of 17 Non-Attainment Cities in India, as per CPCB is annexed herewith and marked as **ANNEXURE AA-4**)

12. That a tree, being a tree, regardless of the species, performs all ecological services and a cluster of trees, becoming an ecosystem, performs all ecosystem services. A Tree, regardless of its species, still attracts biodiversity and is itself a part of biological biodiversity, withing the meaning of 'Biological diversity', under Section 2(b) of the Biological Diversity Act, 2002, which reads as thus:

"2. Definitions.—In this Act, unless the context otherwise requires,—

...

(b) "biological diversity" or "biodiversity" means the variability among living organisms from all sources and the ecological complexes of which they are part and includes

diversity within species or between species and of eco-systems;”

13. That further the Notification, dated: 07.01.2020, exempting a large number of species from the ambit of the Uttar Pradesh Protection of Trees Act, 1976, is in conflict with the operation of Sections 18, 23, 36 and 41 of the Biological Diversity Act, 2002.
14. That further the Notification, dated: 07.01.2020, exempting a large number of species from the ambit of the Uttar Pradesh Protection of Trees Act, 1976 is arbitrary and perverse, issued by the State in a colourable exercise of power.
15. That in view of the above facts and circumstances, the Notification, dated: 07.01.2020, issued by the State of Uttar Pradesh exempting a large number of species of trees from the ambit of the Uttar Pradesh Protection of Trees Act, 1976, is ultra vires, and hence, liable to be quashed/set-aside.



APPLICANT

Through



AKASH VASHISHTHA
(Advocate for the Applicant)
490, Lawyers' Chamber Block-II,
Delhi High Court, New Delhi-110002
Ph: 9717006866

Email: akashvashishtha.official@gmail.com

Dated:- 12.09.2025

**BEFORE THE NATIONAL GREEN TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI
I.A. NO. 494-495/2024
IN
ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 820 OF 2024**

IN THE MATTER OF:

News Item titled ""22 साल सेबंद कं पनी मेंकाट ददए 1 हजार सेज्यादा पेड़, नोएडा मेंवन दवभाग नेजब्त दकया कटेपेड़ ़ो सेभरा ट्रक" appearing in Navbharat Times dated 11.06.2024

AND IN THE MATTER OF:

Vikrant Tongad

...Applicant/Proposed Intervener

AFFIDAVIT

I, Vikrant Tongad, S/o Lt. Sh. Baljeet Singh, aged about 35 years, R/o 81, Bhanauta, Greater Noida, Uttar Pradesh - 201311, do hereby solemnly affirm and state as under:

1. That I am the Applicant in the above titled Original Application and am conversant with the facts and circumstances described in the present case and as such, I am competent to swear this affidavit.
2. That the contents of the accompanying Additional Affidavit are true and correct and nothing material has been concealed therefrom.



I, IDENTIFIED THE
DEPONENT WHO HAS
SIGNED IN MY PRESENCE



DEPONENT

VERIFICATION

Verified on this _____ that the contents of the above mentioned affidavit are true and correct and nothing material has been concealed therefrom.



ATTESTED

NOTARY PUBLIC



DEPONENT

**BEFORE THE NATIONAL GREEN TRIBUNAL,
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI**

**Original Application No. 805 of 2017
(M.A. No. 65 of 2018 & M.A. No. 229 of 2018)**

IN THE MATTER OF:

**Kshitij Agnihotri
Vs.**

Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change &Ors.

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ADARSH KUMAR GOEL, CHAIRPERSON
HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE JAWAD RAHIM, JUDICIAL MEMBER
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.P. WANGDI, JUDICIAL MEMBER
HON'BLE DR. NAGIN NANDA, EXPERT MEMBER**

Present: Applicant: Mr. Arvind Kumar Shukla, Mr. Alok shukla, Mr. Nihal Ahmad, Ms. Neena Shukla and Mr. Kunal Yadav, Advs.

**Respondents: Mr. Kumar Abhishek and Mr. Amit, Advs.
Mr. Sanjay Upadhyay and Mr. Bhanwar Pal Singh and Ms. Sharmishtha Shukla, Advs. for State of Uttar Pradesh
Mr. Vivek Gupta, Adv.
Mr. Pradeep Misra and Mr. Daleep Dhyani, Advs.**

Date and Remarks	Orders of the Tribunal
<p>Item No. 11</p> <p>September 11, 2018 dv</p>	<p>1. Challenge in this application is to the Notification dated 31.10.2017, issued by the State of Uttar Pradesh under Section 21 of the Uttar Pradesh Trees Protection Act, 1976. The Notification purports to grant exemption to all categories of trees other than those specified in the Notification from the operation of the regulatory provisions of the Act.</p> <p>2. According to the applicant, the impugned Notification has been issued to encourage the saw mills. The impugned Notification will have adverse impact on the environment. The water bodies and the water table will be adversely affected. It is further stated that trees absorb and retain water in their roots and large part of that water circulates in the ecosystem. Some of this moisture is transpired into the atmosphere. When this process is broken, the atmosphere and water bodies begin to dry out</p>

	<p>Item No. 11</p> <p>September 11, 2018 dv</p>	<p>and at one point in the future, the level of fresh water resources available will become scarce. Plants absorb Carbon Dioxide CO₂ (a greenhouse gas) from the atmosphere and use it to produce food (carbohydrates, fats etc. that make up trees) and in return, it gives Oxygen. Destroying the forests mean CO₂ will remain in the atmosphere and in addition, destroyed vegetation will give off more CO₂ stored in them as they decompose. This will alter the climate of that region. Cool climates may get a lot hotter. With less trees, humans would not be able to survive because the air would be rendered unsuitable for breathing. If anything, people would have to wear gas masks that filter the air. Big cities like Delhi NCR are facing crisis in winters and the condition of other big cities like Kanpur, Agra, Lucknow are not better. Instead of taking corrective measures, the State is issuing new license to wood-based industry without having availability of timber. This will only encourage illegal cutting of trees. Trees are a crucial part of the Carbon cycle, a global process in which carbon dioxide constantly circulates through the atmosphere into organism and back again. Carbon is the second most valuable element to life after water. Anyway, trees take Carbon from the atmosphere through photosynthesis in order to make energy. This carbon is then either transferred into Oxygen and released into the air by respiration or is stored inside the trees until they decompose into the soil. Therefore, absence of trees would result in significantly higher amounts of Carbon dioxide in the air and lower amounts of oxygen. The filthy air would also be full of airborne particles and</p>
--	--	---

	<p>Item No. 11</p> <p>September 11, 2018 dv</p>	<p>pollutants like Carbon monoxide, Sulfur dioxide and Nitrogen dioxide. Cutting of trees on large number will dry the atmosphere and arid conditions will surface. Trees regulate and anchor the dirt by releasing water. In short they maintain the ecological balance.</p> <p>3. Reply has been filed on behalf of the State of Uttar Pradesh, defending the impugned Notification. According to the State, the impugned Notification will result in plantation of more and more trees and increase of green cover in the State. The exemption will encourage planting of trees which can be cut without any regulatory regime. The existing regulatory regime discourages the farmers from planting more trees. It is stated that national goal is to have 33% of the geographical area under the forest and tree cover (as per National Forest Policy, 1988). National Agro Forestry Policy, 2014 provides for liberalization of restrictive regulation particularly with regard to agro forestry species. The Regulatory bottlenecks have also been identified in Arun Kumar Bansal Committee Report in the year 2011. The Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change (MoEF&CC) has issued guidelines for Liberalization Felling and Transit Regime for Tree Species Grown on Non-Forest/Private Land on 18.11.2014. Restrictions should only be on felling and transit of timber species and not to agro forestry tree species like Eucalyptus and Poplar. The joint working group of Niti Ayog and the Government of Uttar Pradesh prepared an action plan to promote forestry on private land.</p> <p>4. Agro Forestry Operational Guidelines, 2016 provide subsidy for growing trees by the farmers on their fields.</p>
--	--	--

	<p>Item No. 11</p> <p>September 11, 2018 dv</p>	<p>The State of Uttar Pradesh has only 8.9% forest cover as against goal of 33%. The guidelines by the Central Government dated 11.11.2016 and 11.09.2017 have been issued in pursuance of order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court dated 05.10.2015 in '<i>T.N. Godavarman Thirumalpad vs. Union of India & Ors.</i>' in I.A. No. 1137 with 1319 in WP (c) No. 202/1995 (2016) 13 SCC 586 and the impugned Notification is consistent with the said guidelines.</p> <p>5. The MoEF&CC in its reply has responded only with regard to the averments concerning the said Ministry. It is stated that the forest cover in the country is 24.16% of the geographical area as against target of 33%. Nine percent forest cover is required outside the forests in the government and private land. Species under agro forestry by farmers should be exempted from transit, permit and felling regulations.</p> <p>6. We have heard the learned Counsel for the parties and perused the record.</p> <p>7. Main contention raised on behalf of the applicant is that the impugned Notification has no nexus to the increase of the forest cover. There is no material to support that the impugned Notification dated 31.10.2017 will have any positive impact on increase of forest cover. The exemption applies even to twenty years old trees and not mere to agro forestry trees. Uncontrolled felling of trees will be highly detrimental to the environment. The object is not to promote agro forestry as claimed but to promote wood based industries. Plea of benefiting the farmers for object of increasing the forest cover are only camouflage and smokescreen to cover up the real object of</p>
--	--	--

	<p>Item No. 11</p> <p>September 11, 2018 dv</p>	<p>promoting wood based industries at the cost of environment. The Notification is contrary to the legislative mandate under the Act.</p> <p>8. Learned Counsel for the State of Uttar Pradesh, supported the stand in the affidavit of the State. He submitted that this Tribunal has no jurisdiction to go into the merits as the 'Trees Act' is not in the Schedule to the National Green Tribunal Act, 2010.</p> <p>9. Question for consideration is whether the Tribunal can go into the question and whether the impugned Notification can be sustained as being consistent with the object of the environment protection and the legislative policy underlying the Trees Protection Act.</p> <p>10. As regards the jurisdiction of this Tribunal, it may be noted that the Tribunal is a special forum for effective and expeditious disposal of civil cases relating to environmental protection and conservation of forest and other natural resources. The National Green Tribunal Act, 2010 has been enacted in the wake of UN Conference on the Human Environment held at Stockholm in June, 1972 to which India is a party and the UN Conference on Environment and Development held at <i>Rio de Janeiro</i> in June, 1992 to which also India is a party. This objective is clearly reflected in the statement of objects and reasons of the Act. The long title of the Act states that the object of establishment of National Green Tribunal is for effective and expeditious disposal of cases relating to environment protection. Once there is a nexus of an issue to the environment protection, it is difficult to understand why this Tribunal will not have a jurisdiction in the matter.</p>
--	--	---

	<p>Item No. 11</p> <p>September 11, 2018 dv</p>	<p>The definition of 'environment' under Section 2(c) of the NGT Act is wide enough to include the issue of cutting of trees. The Schedule to the Act include Forest (Conservation) Act, 1980. The State Act needs to be read with law declared by the Supreme Court in T. N Godavarman vs. U.O.I (1997) 2 SCC 267 and directions issued against cutting of any trees. Thus, cutting of trees is an issue open to be gone into by the Tribunal even if the State Act is not in the Schedule. Reference may also be made to further directions in the said case, including in (2006) 1 SCC 1 laying down procedure required to be followed for diverting any forest for any other purpose.</p> <p>11. As regards the merits, we are unable to find any nexus in the object of encouraging agro forestry to exempting the cutting of all the trees, except few, from the purview of the regulatory regime under the UP Trees Protection Act. It is well known that naturally growing trees cannot be termed as 'agro forestry' which refers to the trees grown by the agriculturists. There may certainly be need to encourage agro forestry and relax regulatory regime for such species. Such species have to be so specified. Omnibus exemption of all species, except few, can hardly be said to be promotion of agro forestry. Reference to the provisions of UP Trees Protection Act shows that no tree is allowed to be felled except a tree which is completely dead or which has fallen without aid of human agency or unless permission is granted in accordance with the provisions of the said Act which has the safeguards of requiring planting of more trees wherever cutting of a tree, becomes necessary for any</p>
--	--	---

	<p>Item No. 11</p> <p>September 11, 2018 dv</p>	<p>valid reason. Even without the Uttar Pradesh Trees Protection Act, 1976 felling of trees indiscriminately is not permitted as it violates Article 21 of the Constitution.</p> <p>12. It is well settled that an exemption provision has to be applied to an exceptional situation. General exemption without creating defined category of exception results in defeating the main statute, by arbitrary exercise of power. The legislative mandate is to provide strict regulatory regime with regard to the subject matter covered by the statute. In fact, the agro forestry is not even shown to be covered by the regulatory regime. The definition of tree under Section 3(xi) of the Act is as follows:</p> <p><i>“3(xi) “tree” means any woody plant whose branches spring from and are supported upon an trunk or body and whose trunk or body is not less than five centimeter in diameter at a height of thirty centimeters from the ground level and is not less than one metre in height from the ground level, and the expressions “timber trees” and “fruit trees” means respectively the trees of the species specified in Schedule I and Schedule III, respectively.”</i></p> <p>13. In any case, the agro forestry could be specifically defined in the exemption granted for the purpose. Omnibus exemption from the Act requiring regulation of cutting of trees, with regard to every species of trees, except few, cannot be held to be advancing the need of environment. The impugned notification does not merely restrict the exemption to agro forestry and goes much beyond.</p> <p>14. Though reference has been made to certain figures to buttress the argument that there is increase in the forest cover, the figures do not support such an argument. The Notification is of October 2017. The same has</p>
--	--	---

	<p>Item No. 11</p> <p>September 11, 2018 dv</p>	<p>remained stayed. If at all there is any increase in the forest cover, as claimed, it cannot be said to be result of the impugned Notification. There is no safeguard in the impugned Notification against destruction of naturally grown trees, outside the forest area.</p> <p>15. There is no impact assessment with regard to the impact of exemption of species of trees covered by the impugned Notification which was a must before such Notification was issued. If the exemption is granted in respect of all the trees in the non-forest areas, it is obvious that the forest cover will get reduced. The plea that impugned Notification will result in increasing the forest cover is without any basis and is an argument only in air.</p> <p>16. Thus, following points emerge from the discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Unregulated cutting of trees without limitation of specific species of agro forestry is in violation of Forest Conservation Act read with the law laid down in T.N Godavarman (supra). (ii) The Tribunal has jurisdiction to consider challenge to un-regulated cutting of trees. (iii) The impugned notification is not merely restricted to agro forestry, as claimed. (iv) The State of UP has no power to permit unregulated cutting of trees, in violation of law laid down by Hon'ble Supreme Court. (v) Even while permitting agro forestry by exercise of power to exempt regulatory regime against cutting of trees, impact on environment including ground water level must be taken into account. (vi) In the present case, impugned notification is
--	---	--

		<p>arbitrary exercise of power, adversely impacting the environment.</p> <p>17. We may note that while issuing the impugned Notification was stayed on 15.12.2017 and the stay has been operative till date.</p> <p>18. Accordingly, we allow this application and quash the impugned Notification dated 31.10.2017. However, we leave it open to the State of Uttar Pradesh to carry out a proper impact assessment and thereafter grant any exemption after making inventory of all the agro-forestry produces specifying species of agro forestry. This may be consistent with the requirements of Forest Conservation Act as interpreted in <i>T.N. Godavarman Thirumalpad vs. Union of India & Ors. (supra)</i></p> <p>....., CP (Adarsh Kumar Goel)</p> <p>....., JM (Dr. Jawad Rahim)</p> <p>....., JM (S.P. Wangdi)</p> <p>....., EM (Dr. Nagin Nanda)</p> <p style="text-align: right;">11.09.2018</p>
--	--	---

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G SWRIT PETITION(S)(CIVIL) NO(S). 13381/1984

M.C. MEHTA

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

Respondent(s)

[TO BE TAKEN UP AT 3.00 P.M.] IN RE: TAJ TRAPEZIUM ZONE (1) IA NO. 116768/2018 (APPLN. FOR DIRECTION ON B/O GANGA GLASS INDUSTRIES AND ORS.) (2) IA NO. 237739 AND 237765/2024 (APPLN. FOR IMPLEADMENT AND DIRECTIONS ON B/O RAM AUTAR) (3) IA D NO. 262456 AND 262458/2024 (APPLN. FOR INTERVENTION AND O.T. EXEMPTION ON B/O DR. SHARD GUPTA) (4) IA NO. 99054 AND 99055/2024 (APPLNS. FOR PERMISSION AND EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T. ON B/O UPSIDA) (5) IA NO. 31946/2024 (APPLN. FOR PERMISSION ON B/O OF NORTH CENTRAL RAILWAY, AGRA) (6) IA NOS. 104091, 104097/2018 AND 112177/2019 (APPLNS. FOR INTERVENTION, DIRECTIONS AND PERMISSION TO FILE ADDL. DOCUMENTS ON BEHALF OF AGRA DEVELOPMENT FOUNDATION) (7) CEC REPORT NO. 17 AND CEC REPORT NO. 34 OF 2024 IN CEC REPORT NO. 17 "ONLY" IN W.P. (C) NO. 13381/1984 ARE LISTED. "ONLY" NAMES OF THE FOLLOWING ADVOCATES MAY BE TREATED TO HAVE BEEN SHOWN IN THE LIST. PETITIONER-IN-PERSON MR. A.D.N. RAO, SR. ADVOCATE (A.C.) MR. LIZ MATHEW, SR. ADV. (A.C.) MR. SIDDHARTHA CHOWDHURY, ADV. (A.C.) MS. AAKSHI LODHA, AOR MR. AMRISH KUMAR, MR. M.K. MARORIA, MR. G.S. MAKKER, MR. VIJAY PANJWANI, MR. ANKIT GOEL, KAMLENDRA MISHRA, MR. E.C. AGRAWALA, MR. SHISHIR DESHPANDE, MR. AMRISH KUMAR, MS. SUPRIYA JUNEJA, MR. N. L. GANAPATHI, MR. AJIT SHARMA, ADVOCATES

Date : 25-03-2025 This petition was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ABHAY S. OKA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE UJJAL BHUYANMr. A.D.N. Rao, Sr. Adv. (A.C.)
Mr. Liz Mathew, Sr. Adv. (A.C.)
Mr. Siddhartha Chowdhury, Adv. (A.C.)For Applicant(s): Mr. Kishan Chand Jain, Adv.
Mr. Ashwini Kumar, Adv.
Mr. Rajesh Kumar, Adv.
Mr. E. C. Agrawala, AORMr. Ajit Kumar Sinha, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Vaibhav Agnihotri, Adv.
Mr. Arpit Sharma, Adv.
Mr. Naveen Soni, Adv.

Mr. Deborah Serto, Adv.
 Mr. Ankit Visen Singh, Adv.
 Ms. Supriya Juneja, AOR

Mr. Mukul Rohatgi, Sr. Adv.
 Mr. Arjun Nanda, AOR
 Mr. Sarthak Chaturvedi, Adv.
 Mr. Rahul Kumar, Adv.
 Ms. Pritee Singh, Adv.
 Ms. Dimple Sirohi, Adv.

Mr. Ajit Sharma, AOR
 Mr. Kanchan Kumar, Adv.
 Mr. Yuvaraj Sinh Solanki, Adv.
 Mr. Lareb Habib Ansari, Adv.

Mr. A.N.S. Nadkarni, Sr. Adv.
 Ms. Ruchira Gupta, Adv.
 Mr. Shishir Deshpande, AOR
 Ms. Pooja Tripathi, Adv.
 Mr. Amit Kumar, Adv.
 Mr. Abhishek Verma, Adv.

Mrs. Aishwarya Bhati, A.S.G.
 Mrs. Ruchi Kohli, Sr. Adv.
 Mr. Shivika Mehra, Adv.
 Mr. Adit Khorana, Adv.
 Mr. Sarthak Karol, Adv.
 Mr. T.S. Sabarish, Adv.
 Mr. Sudarshan Lamba, Adv.
 Mr. Amrish Kumar, AOR

Mr. Anshul Gupta, AOR
 Ms. Kirti Dua, Adv.
 Mr. Rishabh Darira, Adv.
 Mr. Aditya Tainguriya, Adv.

For Petitioner(s): Petitioner-in-person

Applicant-in-person, AOR

Mr. Atishi Dipankar, AOR

For Respondent(s): Mrs. Aishwarya Bhati, A.S.G.
 Mrs. Ruchi Kohli, Sr. Adv.
 Mr. Shivika Mehra, Adv.
 Mr. Adit Khorana, Adv.
 Mr. Sarthak Karol, Adv.
 Mr. T.S. Sabarish, Adv.
 Mr. Sudarshan Lamba, Adv.
 Mr. Amrish Kumar, AOR

Mr. Sudeep Kumar, AOR

Mr. Ankur Prakash, AOR

Mr. Gurmeet Singh Makker, AOR

M/S. Lawyer S Knit & Co, AOR

Mrs. Rachana Joshi Issar, AOR

Mr. Krishna Kumar, Adv.
Ms. Nandani Gupta, Adv.
Dr. Mrs. Vipin Gupta, AOR

Mr. Prashant Kumar, AOR

Mr. Rajiv Tyagi, AOR

Mr. Ajay K. Agrawal, AOR

Mr. Shiv Prakash Pandey, AOR

Mr. Sudhir Kulshreshtha, AOR

Mr. P. K. Manohar, AOR

Mr. Pradeep Misra, AOR
Mr. Daleep Dhyani, Adv.
Mr. Suraj Singh, Adv.

Mr. P. Parmeswaran, AOR

Mr. P. Narasimhan, AOR

M/S. Manoj Swarup And Co., AOR

Dr. Sumant Bharadwaj, Adv.
Ms. Mridula Ray Bharadwaj, AOR
Mr. Vedant Bharadwaj, Adv.
Mr. D.M. Sharma, Adv.

Mr. Badri Prasad Singh, AOR

Mr. S. Wasim A. Qadri, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Saeed Qadri, Adv.
Mr. Saahil Gupta, Adv.
Mr. Danish Ali, Adv.
Mr. Lakshmi Raman Singh, AOR

M/S. Meharia & Company, AOR

Mr. Ankit Goel, AOR

Mr. Gurmeet Singh Makker, AOR

Mr. Arvind Gupta, AOR

Mr. Shantanu Bansal, AOR

Mr. Jogy Scaria, AOR

Mr. Guntur Pramod Kumar, AOR

Ms. Perna Singh, Adv.

Mr. Dhruv Yadav, Adv.

Mr. Adarsh Tripathi , AOR

Mr. Sunny Choudhary, AOR

Mr. Saurabh Mishra, AOR

Mr. Shrimay Mishra, Adv.

Mr. Nirbhay Shankar Tiwari, Adv.

Mr. Ashutosh Dubey, AOR

Mrs. Rajshri Dubey, Adv.

Mr. Abhishek Chauhan, Adv.

Mr. H.B. Dubey, Adv.

Mr. Amit P. Shahi, Adv.

Mr. Amit Kumar, Adv.

Mr. Rahul Sethi, Adv.

Mr. Shashi Bhushan Nagar, Adv.

Mr. Manish Dhingra, Adv.

Mrs. Sona Khan, Adv.

Mr. Sumant Akram Khan, Adv.

Mr. Rajendra Anbhule, Adv.

Mr. Chitranshul A. Sinha, AOR

Ms. Pallavi, Adv.

Mr. Shivam Shorewala, Adv.

Ms. Rakshita Bhargava, Adv.

Ms. Liz Mathew, Sr. Adv.

Ms. Aakash Lodha, AOR

Ms. Omkar Hemanth, Adv.

Mr. Ankur Prakash, AOR

Ms. Rupali Panwar, Adv.

Mr. U M Tripathi, Adv.

Mr. Vivek Kumar Singh, Adv.

Mr. Vishal Arun Mishra, AOR

Mr. Vivek Narayan Sharma, AOR

Ms. Shruti Priya Mishra, Adv.

Ms. Mahima Bhardwaj Kaluch, Adv.

Mr. Saurabh Yadav, AOR

Mr. Gaurav Goel, AOR

Ms. Aishwarya Bhati, A.S.G.
Mr. Ajay Agarwal, A.A.G.
Mr. Rajeev Kumar Dubey, Adv.
Mr. Nitin Pavuluri, Adv.
Mr. Anirudh Singh, Adv.
Ms. Sonali Jain, Adv.
Mr. Ashwan Mishra, Adv.
Mr. Kamendra Mishra, AOR

Ms. Aishwarya Bhati, A.S.G.
Ms. Ruchi Kohli, Sr. Adv.
Ms. Shivika Mehra, Adv.
Ms. Aastha Singh, Adv.
Ms. Rajeshwari Shankar, Adv.
Mr. Sarthak Karol, Adv.
Mr. Shreekant Neelappa Terdal, AOR

Ms. Udit Singh, AOR

M/S. GSL Chambers, AOR

Ms. Aishwarya Bhati, A.S.G.
Ms. Neetika Sharma, Adv.
Ms. Saloni Jagga, Adv.
Mr. Tavinder Sidhu, Adv.
For M/S. M. V. Kini & Associates, AOR

Mr. Arvind Kumar Sharma, AOR

Mr. Gaurav Goel, AOR

Ms. Rajkumari Banju, AOR

Mr. Dr. Rajeev Sharma, AOR
Mr. Prashant Sharma, Adv.

Mr. Shantanu Krishna, AOR
Mr. Ankit Mishra, Adv.
Mr. Alok Kumar, Adv.
Mr. Ashish Kumar Singh, Adv.
Mr. Prabhat Ranjan Raj, Adv.

Mr. Saksham Maheshwari, AOR

Mr. Ajay Agarwal, A.A.G.
Mr. Pushkar Sharma, AOR
Ms. Nagma Bee, Adv.

Mr. Pinaki Misra, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Sumeer Sodhi, AOR

Mr. Nikhil Avana, Adv.
Mr. Vaibhav Maheshwari, Adv.
Mr. Mohit Chaturvedi, Adv.
Ms. Sandali Sharma, Adv.

Mr. Abhinav Agrawal, AOR

Mr. Seshatalpa Sai Bandaru, AOR

Mr. Gaurav Dhingra, AOR
Mr. Vikrant Yadav, Adv.
Mrs. Vikrant Yadav, Adv.

Mr. Praveen Swarup, AOR

Ms. Mayuri Raghuvanshi, AOR

Mr. Abhijit Banerjee, AOR

Mrs. Aishwarya Bhati, A.S.G.
Ms. Ruchi Kohli, Sr. Adv.
Ms. Shivika Mehra, Adv.
Mr. Aaditya Dixit, Adv.
Mr. Kartikeya Asthana, Adv.
Mr. Gaurang Bhushan, Adv.
Dr. N. Visakamurthy, AOR

Mr. Prashant , AOR
Mr. Anand Mishra, Adv.
Mr. Kshitij Singh, Adv.
Mrs. Nisha Rai, Adv.

Mr. Abhinav Shrivastava, AOR

Ms. Saroj Tripathi, AOR

Mr. Pradeep Rai, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Manoj K. Mishra, AOR
Ms. Rajshree Rai, Adv.
Mr. Vinay Rai, Adv.
Mr. Bheem Pratap Singh, Adv.
Mr. Umesh Dubey, Adv.
Ms. Madhulika, Adv.
Mr. Anand Kumar Rai, Adv.

Ms. Shweta Sharma, AOR

Mr. Abhishek Chaudhary, AOR

Mr. Syed Abdul Haseeb, AOR

Mr. Satya Kam Sharma , AOR

Mr. Shalen Bhardwaj, Adv.
Mr. Virender Kumar, Adv.
Ms. Garima Kumar, Adv.
Ms. Banisha Verma, Adv.
Ms. Lakshmi, Adv.
Mr. Ashok Kumar Panigrahi, Adv.
Mr. Nischal Kumar Neeraj, AOR

Mr. N. L. Ganapathi, AOR

Mr. Nipun Saxena, Adv.
Ms. Anju Thomas, AOR
Ms. Muskan Surana, Adv.
Mr. Tushar Srivastava, Adv.
Ms. Mehreen Garg, Adv.
Ms. Aadya Pandey, Adv.
Mr. Dharmesh Basedia, Adv.

Mr. Anurag Kishore, AOR

Mr. Rachit Mittal, AOR
Mr. Anup Kumar, Adv.
Mr. Parish Mishra, Adv.
Mr. Kanishk Raj, Adv.
Mr. Adarsh Srivastava, Adv.
Mr. Abhishek Sinha, Adv.

Mr. Dama Seshadri Naidu, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Nishit Agrawal, AOR
Ms. Kanishka Mittal, Adv.

Mrs. Aishwarya Bhati, A.S.G.
Ms. Ruchi Kohli, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Mukesh Kumar Maroria, AOR
Ms. Shivika Mehra, Adv.
Ms. Aastha Singh, Adv.
Mrs. Rajeshwari Shankar, Adv.
Mr. Sarthak Karol, Adv.
Mr. Jagdish Chandra Solanki, Adv.

Mr. Zoheb Hossain, AOR

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

IA NOS. 104091, 104097/2018 AND 112177/2019 (APPLNS. FOR INTERVENTION, DIRECTIONS AND PERMISSION TO FILE ADDL. DOCUMENTS ON BEHALF OF AGRA DEVELOPMENT FOUNDATION)

1. We have perused the order dated 5th March, 2025 by which we had issued notice to the applicant in IA Nos. 104091/2018, 104097/2018

and 112177/2019 calling upon the applicant to show cause as to why the order dated 11th December, 2019 passed in the aforementioned IAs should not be recalled. The order dated 11th December, 2019 passed on IA Nos. 104091/2018, 104097/2018 and 112177/2019 reads thus:

"IA NOS. 104091, 104097/2018 AND 112177/2019 (APPLNS. FOR INTERVENTION, DIRECTIONS AND PERMISSION TO FILE ADDL. DOCUMENTS ON BEHALF OF AGRA DEVELOPMENT FOUNDATION)"

"Application for intervention is allowed only for the purpose of the instant application for directions.

For the reasons stated, prayers (a), (b) and (c) made in the instant application are allowed.

The applications stand disposed of accordingly."

2. Prayer clauses (a) to (c) of the Application being IA No.104097/2018 read thus:

"a) Pass appropriate orders and directions etc. for promoting Agroforestry on the non-forest/private land situated in the Taj Trapezium Zone (TTZ) area to increase its green-cover to curb air pollution and improve ambient air quality;

b) Modify the order dated 8.5.2015, passed by this Hon'ble Court in IA No.527 (and also similar order dated 9.5.2018 in IA No.109556 of 2017) by doing away with the condition of first obtaining permission of this Hon'ble Court to fell trees on the non-forest/private lands within the TTZ area.

c) Issue necessary directions to the respondents to take effective steps for promoting Agro-farming in the TTZ area including providing technical guidance/assistance to the land owners."

3. Firstly, we find that there is no clarity on the meaning of agroforestry. Secondly, the Application is purported to be made for the purposes of promoting agroforestry. However, prayer clause (b) is for modification of the orders dated 8th May, 2015 and 9th May, 2018 passed by this Court which directed that no felling of

trees can be made in the TTZ Area without prior permission of this Court. The prayer is specifically for doing away with the requirement of obtaining permission of this Court before tree felling. It is pertinent to note that prayer clause (b) is not made limited to agroforestry. Thus, the applicant, who claims to represent the cause only of those who do agroforestry, mislead the Court by making a blanket prayer. Fortunately, for us, all the parties appearing before this Court stated on the last date that the orders dated 8th May, 2015 and 9th May, 2018 are being implemented consistently, notwithstanding the order dated 11th December, 2019. Every one proceeded on the footing that prayer (b) was limited to agroforestry.

4. In absence of any material on record to show what is the meaning and concept of agroforestry, we recall the order dated 11th December, 2019 passed in IA Nos. 104091/2018, 104097/2018 and 112177/2019. The said Applications are restored to their original numbers and the same shall be listed on 1st May, 2025 at 12:00 noon.

5. To enable us to decide the restored Applications, it will be appropriate if the Central Empowered Committee (CEC) submits a report clarifying the meaning and concept of agroforestry. In light of prayer clause (a) of IA No.104097/2018, the CEC may also make its recommendations. We grant time of one month from today to the CEC to submit its report.

6. The applicant and all other parties are free to forward necessary material in support of prayer clause (a) of IA No.104097/2018 to the CEC.

7. IA No.168401/2021 (Application for clarification/direction) shall be also heard along with IA No.104097/2018 on 1st May, 2025 at 12:00 noon.

IN RE: CEC REPORT NOS.17/2024

8. We have perused the recommendations in paragraph 8 of the Report No.17/2024 submitted by the CEC. As regards recommendation contained in clause (i) of paragraph 28, the same has already been implemented. As regards recommendation contained in clause (ii) of paragraph 28, out of 16 entities, only 3 entities have submitted compliance reports to the CEC. Shri A.D.N. Rao, learned Senior Advocate appointed as Amicus Curiae, submits that the CEC has received 5 further compliance reports which are being examined. The CEC will issue notice to the entities in remaining cases calling upon them to file the compliance reports. The CEC will submit a report on this aspect within a period of six weeks from today which will be considered on 13th May, 2025 at 12:00 noon.

9. As far as the recommendation clause (iii) of paragraph 28 is concerned, the same will have to be considered when IA No. 104097/2018 is considered. While we are dealing with recommendation clause (iii) of paragraph 28, Ms. Aishwarya Bhati, learned ASG, submitted that if an application is made for felling of trees up to total 49, the direction issued by this Court in order dated 19th December, 2024 in Writ Petition (C) No.4677/1985 can be made applicable so that for felling of trees up to 49, the applicants will not be required to approach this Court. While we consider this suggestion, we are of the view that the earlier order putting

a complete embargo on felling of trees without prior permission of this Court must continue as regards the lands abutting the Taj Mahal. We will hear the learned counsel for the parties on this aspect on 22nd April, 2025 at 12:00 noon. In the meanwhile, even the CEC is free to give its suggestions on this aspect.

10. Recommendation clause (iv) of paragraph 28 of the Report No.17/2024 of the CEC reads thus:

“iv. The demand of power corporations to prune, lop, or size the overgrown trees encroaching the electric poles, high tension lines and other electric installations is genuine and a corrective course of action as suggested in para 20 above may be considered.”

11. Our attention is invited to Section 68(5) of the Electricity Act, 2003 (for short, “the Electricity Act”) which confers power on an Executive Magistrate or authority specified by the Appropriate Government who may, on an application of the licensee, cause the tree, structure or object to be removed or otherwise dealt with as he or it thinks fit. As far as the felling of trees in the TTZ Area is concerned, it will be governed by the order dated 8th May, 2015 read with order dated 9th May, 2018. However, the question is whether for lopping or pruning of trees for the purposes of preventing encroachment on the electric poles, high tension lines and other electric installations, the applicant should approach this Court seeking permission for felling of trees. In paragraph 20 of the Report No.17/2024, the CEC has proposed as under:

“20. Presently such pruning is being done by the contractors without any permission of this Hon'ble Court. In this regard, it is therefore recommended that the permission for lopping/pruning of trees may be granted by the local Divisional Forest Officer subject to the following conditions

- a) Permission will be granted only after receipt of the application from the concerned.
- b) All the terms and conditions as are prevalent in the rest of the respective state.
- c) For every tree pruned, the cost of planting one tree as mandated in the U.P. Protection of Trees Act will be recovered in advance and shall be used for increasing green cover in the TTZ.
- d) The Respective Divisional Forest Officer will enter the details of permissions given, funds received, and plantation done in the proposed MIS module to be launched by the CEC.
- e) The details will be entered into the Management Information System (MIS) module as explained in para 15(e) above."

12. We, therefore, accept the recommendations made in paragraph 20 by the CEC, subject to the following riders:

- (i) An applicant shall apply to the local Divisional Forest Officer for lopping/pruning of overgrown trees encroaching upon the electric poles, high tension lines and other electric installations. Needless to add that permission for lopping/pruning of trees shall be granted in such a manner that the same should not lead to felling or destruction of any tree or permanent damage to any tree;
- (ii) The CEC shall monitor the implementation of the permission granted by the local Divisional Forest Officer with a view to ensure that the work done remains confined to lopping/pruning of the trees and that there is no permanent damage caused to the trees; and

(iii) We may also add here that the applicant who applies for permission for lopping/pruning of the tree, shall provide photographs of the trees to the Divisional Forest Officer and the CEC before lopping/pruning and after lopping/pruning is done in terms of the permission granted by the local Divisional Forest Officer. Both set of photographs shall be uploaded on the Management Information System module by the CEC.

IA NO. 116768/2018 (APPLN. FOR DIRECTION ON B/O GANGA GLASS INDUSTRIES AND ORS.)

13. The issue regarding giving effect to the Sectoral Guidelines for glass industries produced along with IA No.26755/2025 in IA No.116768/2018 will be considered on 3rd April at 3:00 p.m. One of the issues which we have flagged today is about the inclusion of expert members in the Industrial Area Technical Evaluation Committee (IATEC). Shri A.D.N. Rao, learned Amicus Curiae, seeks time to address the Court on the issue of inclusion of experts in the IATEC.

IA NO. 237739 AND 237765/2024 (APPLN. FOR IMPLEADMENT AND DIRECTIONS ON B/O RAM AUTAR)

REPORT NO.35/2024

14. Heard Shri Mukul Rohatgi, learned senior counsel appearing for the applicant - Shri Shiv Shankar Agarwal.

15. It is true that Shri Shiv Shankar Agarwal has filed an affidavit where he has accepted that he felled 454 trees without prior permission of this Court. We have perused three reports of the CEC. It will take a minimum of 100 years to again re-generate

or recreate the green cover created by 454 trees which were brazenly cut without permission of this Court. Notwithstanding the embargo put by this Court which is in force right from the year 2015, he has indulged in this illegality. Destruction of so many trees adversely affects the environment and lives of several human beings.

16. Ms. Aishwarya Bhati, learned ASG, submitted that before making any construction on the property on which the trees were in existence, the permission of the TTZ Authority is required. There is an order dated 23rd October, 2024 passed by the Vice Chairman of the Mathura Vrindavan Development Authority directing that no map of the site in question shall be approved till the case is resolved by the National Green Tribunal.

17. An appeal is made by the learned senior counsel appearing for Shri Shiv Shankar Agarwal that the minimum penalty of Rs.1,00,000/- (Rupees One Lakh) be reduced. His second contention is that the requirement of compensatory plantation should be modified by permitting compensatory plantation at some other property. There is no reason to show any leniency to a person who has caused huge damage to the environment.

18. We accept the recommendations in paragraph 14 of the Report No.35/2024 which read thus:

"14. After examination of all documents and the information gathered during the site visit it is recommended that:

a) A penalty of a minimum of Rs. 1,00,000/- (Rs. One lakh only) per tree felled and removed without the prior permission of this Hon'ble Court shall be imposed on the land owner. Hence for 454 trees felled and removed without the prior permission of

this Hon'ble Court a minimum penalty of Rs.4,54,00,000/- (Rs Four Crores Fifty-four lakh only) shall be imposed on the land owners. The amount shall be deposited with the Forest Department for taking up new plantations at suitable places in TTZ.

b) The Forest Department shall also recover the requisite penalty due under the provisions of the UP Protection of Trees Act, 1976 for this illegal felling.

c) The Forest Department should take punitive action against the land owners for felling 32 trees that were standing in the Protected Forest as per the provisions under the Indian Forest Act 1972.

d) An entry path to the extant private land has been constructed through the protected forest. Hence Forest Department shall initiate action under the Forest Conservation Act 1980 for illegal breaking of land without prior permission of the Central Government.

e) The area be restored by planting 422 trees on the private land and 32 trees in the protected forest area at the cost of the land owner.

f) The Forest Department shall plant and maintain 4540 saplings of Indigenous species (ten times the number of trees felled as per norms applicable for compensatory plantation in TTZ) and another 4540 as penal compensatory plantation (ten times the number of trees felled without the prior permission of this Hon'ble Court) i.e. a total of 9080 saplings at the cost of the land owners, at any nearby place to be provided by land owner which is suitable for plantation. This land shall also be declared as the Protected Forest by the State Government.

g) The entire timber illegally felled shall be confiscated by the Forest Department and disposed of as per the norms of the UP Forest Department.

h) The Mathura Vrindavan Development Authority should ensure that no construction of any sort takes place at that part of the extent site where the Forest Department will do the Plantation.

i) The Chairman, TTZ authority shall ensure compliance of all the conditions/penalties that may be imposed by this Hon'ble Court. The Chairman, TTZ authority shall intimate such compliance to the CEC

on a quarterly basis till all conditions imposed by this Hon'ble Court are complied with.

j) This Hon'ble Court may consider imposing any other penalty for the contempt of this Hon'ble Court committed by the land owners by felling the trees without seeking prior permission of this Hon'ble Court."

19. We also direct that even if permissions are granted to Shri Shiv Shankar Agarwal to make any construction on the land in question or any change in relation to the land in question, the permission shall not be acted upon without the leave of this Court, as this Court will have to be fully satisfied regarding the compliances made by Shri Shiv Shankar Agarwal with the directions of this Court in terms of the recommendations which are quoted above.

20. The Report Nos. 29/2024, 35/2024 and 4/2025 are disposed of on the above terms.

21. The contempt notice issued to Shri Shiv Shankar Agarwal will remain pending till a compliance affidavit is filed by him before this Court and till the CEC certifies that all the conditions which are mentioned above are fulfilled by him.

IA NO. 99054 AND 99055/2024 (APPLNS. FOR PERMISSION AND EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T. ON B/O UPSIDA) AND IA NO. 31946/2024 (APPLN. FOR PERMISSION ON B/O OF NORTH CENTRAL RAILWAY, AGRA)

22. Time of six weeks is granted to the CEC to submit its report.

List on 13th May, 2025 at 12:00 noon.

IA D NO. 262456 AND 262458/2024 (APPLN. FOR INTERVENTION AND O.T. EXEMPTION ON B/O DR. SHARD GUPTA)

23. To be listed on 3rd April, 2025 at 3:00 p.m.

REPORT NO.3/2025

24. To be listed on 3rd April, 2025 at 3:00 p.m.

(ASHISH KONDLE)
ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS

(AVGV RAMU)
COURT MASTER (NSH)

ITEM NO.9

COURT NO.4

SECTION PIL-W

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

Writ Petition (Civil) No.13381/1984

M.C. MEHTA

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

Respondent(s)

[TO BE TAKEN UP AT 12.00 NOON]
 IN RE: TAJ TRAPEZIUM ZONE(1) IA NOS.
 171142/2019 AND 74770, 74771/2024 (APPLNS. FOR DIRECTIONS,
 PERMISSION TO FILE REJOINDER AND EXEMPTION FOR O.T. ON B/O
 AGRA DEVELOPMENT FOUNDATION) (2) IA NO. 176773/2024 (APPLN.
 FOR INTERVENTION ON B/O UTTAR PRADESH JAL NIGAM) WITH IA
 NO. 60618 OF 2025 (APPLN. FOR DIRECTION ON BEHALF OF U.P.
 JAL NIGAM) (3) IA NOS. 104091, 104097/2018 AND 112177/2019
 (APPLNS. FOR INTERVENTION, DIRECTIONS AND PERMISSION TO
 FILE ADDL. DOCUMENTS ON BEHALF OF AGRA DEVELOPMENT
 FOUNDATION) (4) IA NO. 168401/2021 (APPLN. FOR CLARIFICAION
 OF THE ORDER DT. 08.05.2015 ON BEHALF OF STATE OF U.P.) (5)
 CEC REPORT NO. 17 OF 2024 AND CEC REPORT NO. 34 OF 2024 IN
 CEC REPORT NO. 17 (6) CEC REPORT NO. 3 OF 2025 "ONLY" IN
 W.P. (C) NO. 13381/1984 ARE LISTED. "ONLY" NAMES OF THE
 FOLLOWING ADVOCATES MAY BE TREATED TO HAVE BEEN SHOWN IN
 THE LIST. PETITIONER-IN-PERSON MR. A.D.N. RAO, SR. ADVOCATE
 (A.C.) MR. AMRISH KUMAR, MR. M.K. MARORIA, MR. G.S. MAKKER,
 MR. VIJAY PANJWANI, MR. ANKIT GOEL, KAMLENDRA MISHRA,
 ADVOCATES (1) MR. E. C. AGRAWALA, MR. N. VISAKAMURTHY, MR.
 PUSHKAR SHARMA]

Date : 01-05-2025 This petition was called on for hearing
 today.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ABHAY S. OKA
 HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE UJJAL BHUYAN

Mr. A.D.N. Rao, Sr. Adv. (Amicus Curiae)
 Ms. Liz Mathew, Sr. Adv. (Amicus Curiae)
 Mr. Siddhartha Chowdhury, AOR
 Mr. Rahul Mishra, Adv.
 Ms. Aakashi Lodha, AOR
 Ms. Mallika Agrawal, Adv.

For the parties: Mrs. Aishwarya Bhati, A.S.G.
Ms. Ruchi Kohli, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Mukesh Kumar Maroria, AOR
Ms. Shivika Mehra, Adv.
Ms. Aastha Singh, Adv.
Mrs. Rajeshwari Shankar, Adv.
Mr. Sarthak Karol, Adv.
Mr. Jagdish Chandra Solanki, Adv.

Mr. Atishi Dipankar, AOR

Mr. Ankur Prakash, AOR

Mr. Gurmeet Singh Makker, AOR

Ms. Garima Prashad, Sr. A.A.G.
Mr. Sudeep Kumar, AOR
Ms. Manisha, Adv.

Mr. Badri Prasad Singh, AOR
Ms. Jasmine Sahni, Adv.

Mr. Lakshmi Raman Singh, AOR

Mr. Ajit Sharma, AOR
Mr. Kanchan Kumar, Adv.

M/S. Lawyer S Knit & Co, AOR

Mrs. Rachana Joshi Issar, AOR

Mr. Kishan Chand Jain, Adv.
Mr. Ashwini Kumar, Adv.
Mr. Rajesh Kumar, Adv.
Mr. E. C. Agrawala, AOR

Ms. Nandani Gupta, Adv.
Mr. Krishna Kumar, Adv.
Dr. Mrs. Vipin Gupta, AOR

Mr. Prashant Kumar, AOR

Mr. Rajiv Tyagi, AOR

Mr. Ajay K. Agrawal, AOR

Mr. Shiv Prakash Pandey, AOR

Mr. Sudhir Kulshreshtha, AOR

Mr. P. K. Manohar, AOR

Mr. Pradeep Misra, AOR

Mr. Daleep Dhyani, Adv.

Mr. Anupam Misra, Adv.

Mr. Suraj Singh, Adv.

Mr. P. Parmeswaran, AOR

Mr. P. Narasimhan, AOR

M/S. Manoj Swarup And Co., AOR

Dr. Sumant Bharadwaj, Adv.

Mr. Vedant Bharadwaj, Adv.

Ms. Mridula Ray Bharadwaj, AOR

Mrs. Pooja Gupta, Adv.

Mr. D.M.sharma, Adv.

Mr. Anshu Singh, Adv.

M/S. Meharia & Company, AOR

Mr. Ankit Goel, AOR

Mr. Anurag Kishore, AOR

Mr. Rachit Mittal, AOR

Mr. Nishit Agrawal, AOR

Mr. Zoheb Hossain, AOR

Mr. Shishir Deshpande, AOR

Mr. Gurmeet Singh Makker, AOR

Mr. Arvind Gupta, AOR

Mr. Shantanu Bansal, AOR

Mr. Jogy Scaria, AOR

Mr. Guntur Pramod Kumar, AOR
Mr. Keshav Singh, Adv.
Mr. Bp Naidu, Adv.

Mr. Rajeev Kumar Dubey, AOR
Mr. Pankaj Sharma, Adv.
Mr. Yatinder Choudhary, Adv.
Ms. Deveshi Chand, Adv.

Mrs. Aishwarya Bhati, A.S.G.
Mr. Amrish Kumar, AOR
Mr. Shivika Mehra, Adv.
Mr. Sarthak Karol, Adv.
Mr. T.S. Sabarish, Adv.
Mrs. Ruchi Kohli, Adv.
Mr. Chitvan Singhal, Adv.
Mr. Sudarshan Lamba, AOR

Mr. Adarsh Tripathi, AOR

Mr. Sunny Choudhary, AOR

Mr. Siddhartha Chowdhury, AOR

Mr. Adnrao, Sr. Adv.
Ms. Liz Mathew, Sr. Adv.
Ms. Akashi Lodha, Adv.

Mr. Saurabh Mishra, AOR
Mr. Shrimay Mishra, Adv.
Mr. Nirbhaya Shankar Tiwari, Adv.

Mr. Ashutosh Dubey, AOR
Ms. Chanda Trikha, Adv.
Mr. Ashutosh Dubey, Adv.
Mrs. Rajshri Dubey, Adv.
Mr. Abhishek Chauhan, Adv.
Mr. H.b. Dubey, Adv.
Mr. Amit P. Shahi, Adv.
Mr. Amit Kumar, Adv.
Mr. Rahul Sethi, Adv.
Mr. Shashi Bhushan Nagar, Adv.

Mr. Manish Dhingra, Adv.
Mrs. Sona Khan, Adv.
Mr. Sumant Akram Khan, Adv.
Mr. Rajendra Anbhule, Adv.

Mr. Chitranshul A. Sinha, AOR

Ms. Liz Mathew, Sr. Adv.
Ms. Aakashii Lodha, AOR
Ms. Bagvathy, Adv.

Mr. Ankur Prakash, AOR

Ms. Rupali Panwar, Adv.
Mr. Shubham Gupta, Adv.
Mr. Khushhal Aggarwal, Adv.
Mr. U M Tripathi, Adv.
Mr. Vivek Kumar Singh, Adv.
Mr. Vishal Arun Mishra, AOR

Mr. Vivek Narayan Sharma, AOR
Mr. Saurabh Yadav, AOR
Mr. Gaurav Goel, AOR

Ms. Aishwarya Bhati, A.S.G.
Mr. Rajeev Kumar Dubey, Adv.
Mr. Ashiwan Mishra, Adv.
Mr. Kamendra Mishra, AOR

Ms. Aishwarya Bhati, A.S.G.
Ms. Ruchi Kohli, Adv.
Ms. Shivika Mehra, Adv.
Ms. Aastha Singh, Adv.
Ms. Rajeshwari Shankar, Adv.
Mr. Sarthak Karol, Adv.
Mr. Shreekant Neelappa Terdal, AOR

Mr. S. Wasim A. Qadri, Sr. Adv.
Ms. Uditia Singh, AOR
Mr. Saeed Qadri, Adv.
Mr. Saahil Gupta, Adv.
Mr. Danish Ali, Adv.

M/S. Gsl Chambers, AOR

Mr. Arjun Nanda, AOR

Mr. Arvind Kumar Sharma, AOR

Mr. Gaurav Goel, AOR

Ms. Rajkumari Banju, AOR

Mr. Dr. Rajeev Sharma, AOR

M/S. M. V. Kini & Associates, AOR

Mr. Shantanu Krishna, AOR

Mr. Ankit Mishra, Adv.

Mr. Alok Kumar, Adv.

Mr. Ashish Kumar Singh, Adv.

Mr. Saksham Maheshwari, AOR

Mr. Km Natraj, A.S.G.

Mr. Pushkar Sharma, AOR

Mr. Vatsal Joshi, Adv.

Ms. Nagma Bee, Adv.

Mr. Vinod Kumar, Adv.

Mr. Sumeer Sodhi, AOR

Ms. Sandali Sharma, Adv.

Mr. Abhinav Agrawal, AOR

Mr. Sanjeev Kumar Choudhary, Adv.

Mrs. Sharda Choudhary, Adv.

Mr. Seshatalpa Sai Bandaru, AOR

Mr. Gaurav Dhingra, AOR

Mr. Shashank Singh, Adv.

Mr. Surendra Gautam, Adv.

Mr. Vivek Pathak, Adv.

Mr. Devesh Maurya, Adv.

Mr. Ravi Kumar, Adv.

Mr. Sukhamrit Singh, Adv.

Mr. Praveen Swarup, AOR

Ms. Mayuri Raghuvanshi, AOR

Mr. Abhijit Banerjee, AOR

Mrs. Aishwarya Bhati, A.S.G.

Ms. Ruchi Kohli, Adv.

Ms. Shivika Mehra, Adv.

Mr. Aaditya Dixit, Adv.

Mr. Kartikeya Asthana, Adv.

Mr. Gaurang Bhushan, Adv.

Dr. N. Visakamurthy, AOR

Mr. Prashant, AOR

Mr. Abhinav Shrivastava, AOR

Ms. Saroj Tripathi, AOR

Mr. Pradeep Rai, Sr. Adv.

Mr. Manoj K. Mishra, AOR

Mrs. Rajshree Rai, Adv.

Mr. Vinay Rai, Adv.

Mr. Umesh Dubey, Adv.

Ms. Madhulika, Adv.

Mr. Anand Kumar Rai, Adv.

Ms. Shweta Sharma, AOR

Mr. Abhishek Chaudhary, AOR

Mr. Syed Abdul Haseeb, AOR

Mr. Anshul Gupta, AOR

Mr. Rishabh Darira, Adv.

Mr. Aditya Tainguriya, Adv.

Mr. Sanjay Upadhyay, Sr. Adv.

Mr. Satya Kam Sharma, AOR

Mr. Akshay Dev, Adv.

Mr. Mansi Bachani, Adv.

Ms. Gitanjali Sanyal, Adv.

Mr. Shubham Upadhyay, Adv.

Mr. Rishabh Rana, Adv.

Mr. Shobhit Dwivedi, Adv.

Mr. Shalen Bhardwaj, Adv.
Mr. Virender Kumar, Adv.
Ms. Garima Kumar, Adv.
Ms. Banisha Verma, Adv.
Mr. Ashok Kumar Panigrahi, Adv.
Ms. Lakshmi, Adv.
Mr. Nischal Kumar Neeraj, AOR

Mr. N. L. Ganapathi, AOR

Ms. Anju Thomas, AOR
Ms. Muskan Surana, Adv.

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

IA Nos.171142/2019, 74770, 74771/2024, 176773/2024 and 60618/2025

We have perused the affidavits filed on behalf of the Municipal Corporation, Agra and U.P. Jal Nigam (Urban). Affidavit dated 11th April, 2025 filed by the Municipal Corporation, Agra indicates that the issue is about 61 untapped drains and 6 partially tapped drains. By way of interim measures, bio-remediation and phyto-remediation techniques are being used.

We are dealing with 61 untapped drains and 6 partially tapped drains. There is an affidavit filed by the Municipal Corporation, Agra dated 11th April, 2025 and an affidavit filed by the U.P. Jal Nigam dated 21st April, 2025. The work of tapping of 23 untapped drains was to be completed

by the end of April, 2025. However, compliance has not yet been reported. We direct that the work of tapping of 23 untapped drains shall be completed by 15th May, 2025 and compliance report shall be filed in this Court within one week thereafter. As regards rest of the 38 untapped drains, a proposal has been submitted by the National Mission for Clean Ganga (for short, 'NMG').

A report has been submitted by the learned ASG on behalf of the NMG. It is stated that now there is a revised Detailed Project Report (for short, 'the DPR') submitted by the U.P. Jal Nigam (Urban). We direct NMG to grant approval to the DPR in the immediate next Executive Committee meeting and ensure that the work of tapping of drains commences immediately.

We direct the UP Jal Nigam (Urban) to file an affidavit indicating timelines for completion of work of 38 untapped drains. The outer limit in any case cannot be more than three months from the date of approval of the DPR. An affidavit shall be filed within a period of one month from today laying down the timelines for completion of work. As regards interim measures, affidavit of Municipal Corporation, Agra indicates that bio-remediation and phyto-remediation technique is being used. However, affidavits of U.P. Jal Nigam (Rural) and the Municipal Corporation, Agra

are silent about the remaining 6 untapped drains. We are told across the Bar that the work will probably have to be done by U.P. Jal Nigam (Rural). However, such a stand has not been taken in the affidavit by U.P. Jal Nigam (Urban). In this scenario, we direct the State of U.P. to ensure that the work of tapping of these 6 partially tapped drains is completed within a period of four months from today.

It is for the State of U.P. to decide which agency completes the work. The applications shall remain pending until all compliances are reported.

REPORT No.20 of 2025 OF THE CEC

This Court by its order dated 8th May, 2015 restrained felling of trees in Taj Trapezium Zone (for short, 'TTZ') area without permission of this Court. An order was passed on 11th December, 2019 on IA Nos. 104091/2018, 104097/2018 and 112177/2019 which suggested that the earlier order dated 8th May, 2015 passed by this Court was recalled. Fortunately, none of the authorities proceeded on the footing that order dated 8th May, 2015 does not exist. By order dated 25th March, 2025, we recalled the said order dated 11th December, 2019 and kept the applications for hearing today.

In the meanwhile, we had called upon the CEC to submit

a report. The CEC has submitted a detailed report, i.e., Report No. 20 of 2025 dated 21st April, 2025. For the sake of convenience, we are reproducing the recommendations of the CEC as under:

"1. For areas that are located beyond an aerial distance of 5 km from the Taj Mahal, the following recommendations are made:

A: For Rural Areas in TTZ where the agroforestry crop is of Eucalyptus, Poplar, or Melia dubia

i. The concerned Divisional Forest Officer can be vested with the power to allow felling of 49 trees standing on an agricultural land under private ownership located in rural areas.

ii. For trees numbering 50 and above standing on agricultural land under private ownership, located in rural areas, the permission for felling will be granted by the Divisional Forest Officer only after approval of the CEC.

iii. Before granting permission for tree felling, the applicant shall be required to submit a duly notarised affidavit affirming that the felling is not intended to facilitate any change in land use from agricultural to non-agricultural purposes. If, at any stage, a change in land use is found either in official records or on the ground, the permission granted shall be deemed null and void, and the landholder shall be liable for action under provisions related to illegal tree felling.

iv. These provisions will not apply to lands classified under agricultural land use but being used for horticultural practices. This can be ascertained from the Khasra of that particular land.

v. If, after the Divisional Forest Officer has approved felling of trees in a particular area, a subsequent application for felling additional trees in the same area is received within one year, the Divisional Forest Officer

shall grant permission only if the combined total of trees approved earlier and those now applied for does not exceed 49. In case the cumulative number exceeds 49 trees, the Divisional Forest Officer shall be required to seek approval from the CEC before granting any further permissions.

B: For felling of trees in all other cases

The concerned Divisional Forest Officer may allow felling of 49 trees standing on a private land holding, after prior approval of the CEC. In cases where the number of trees is more than 50, the current practice of prior permission of this Hon'ble Court shall continue.

2. For lopping/pruning of trees/ removal of trees in emergencies:

The concerned Divisional Forest Officer may allow lopping/pruning of trees in exceptional cases where such actions are necessary to prevent property damage or mitigate threats to human life. Additionally, the officer may authorize the removal of fallen trees to ensure smooth traffic flow. In all cases, the concerned Divisional Forest Officer shall record the reasons and maintain such records duly countersigned by the concerned Conservator of Forests, and upload all the information on the MIS portal for TTZ maintained by the CEC.

3. In all other cases:

The current practice of prior permission of this Hon'ble Court shall continue.

4. All provisions of the Uttar Pradesh Protection of Trees Act, 1976 shall apply, in addition to any conditions that may be imposed by this Hon'ble Court or the Central Empowered Committee (CEC) in any given case."

The recommendations indicate that as far as areas located within an aerial distance of 5 kilometers from the Taj Mahal are concerned, the original order dated 8th May,

2015 will continue to operate. Ordered accordingly. In such cases, applications will have to be made to this Court seeking permission to fell trees irrespective of the number of trees to be felled, i.e., even if trees to be felled are less than 50, permission of this Court will be required. On such application being made, this Court will seek the recommendation of the CEC on such application and will thereafter consider the prayer for felling of trees. Therefore, order dated 8th May, 2015 will continue to operate subject to what is observed above in case of areas located within an aerial distance of 5 kilometers from the Taj Mahal. Therefore, as far as this area is concerned, no tree felling shall be permitted without prior permission of this Court.

The recommendations of the CEC in relation to the areas that are located beyond an aerial distance of 5 kilometers from the Taj Mahal deserve acceptance, except clause (iv) of the recommendation. We want to add the following riders in the accepted recommendations:

(a) While granting permission, the Divisional Forest Officer (for short, 'DFO') and CEC shall be bound by the provisions of Uttar Pradesh Protection of Trees Act, 1976.

(b) Unless there is a grave and immediate urgency for

felling the trees, while granting permission, the DFO and CEC shall impose a condition that unless compliance with all other conditions, including the condition of compulsorily afforestation is made, actual tree felling will not be permitted. DFO or CEC, as the case may be, will first verify whether the conditions imposed have been complied with. Only thereafter, actual permission for felling/lopping of trees shall be granted. We make it clear that an exception can be made only when there is a grave and immediate urgency to fell trees, in the sense that if felling of trees is not immediately undertaken, there will be real possibility of loss of human lives.

- (c) We also approve clause 2 of the recommendations regarding lopping/pruning of trees. However as far as felling of trees in an emergency is concerned, the direction issued above will apply.
- (d) We clarify that clause (v) of recommendation will also apply if multiple applications are made for felling of 50 or more trees in a particular area within a span of one year.
- (e) Whenever permissions are granted by the DFO and CEC, as the case may be, they shall submit a

detailed report before this Court within a period of 15 days from the date of grant of permission. We also make it clear that a fresh report shall be filed after compliance is made with the conditions imposed.

- (f) We also clarify that the direction contained in clause (iii) of paragraph 12 of order dated 25th March, 2025 regarding uploading of photos before and after lopping/pruning will apply to lopping/pruning/removal of trees in terms of clause 2 of Report No. 20 of 2025.

We direct the CEC to file a fresh report indicating what restrictions on tree felling should be imposed for protecting the other two world heritage structures within the TTZ Area, namely Agra Fort and Fatehpur Sikri. CEC to file a report before this Court within a period of two months.

IA Nos.104091, 104097 OF 2018 and 112177 OF 2019

Heard Mr. Kishan Chand Jain, learned counsel appearing for the applicant. The applicant claims to be a charitable trust which has an object of helping to develop Agra as a modern city with sensitivity to its historical, religious, cultural, and social heritage. The prayer made in the

application is that the order of this Court dated 8th May, 2015 should be modified and that the condition of obtaining permission for felling of trees on non-forest private lands should be relaxed. The contention of Shri Jain is that if this is done, it will help in agro-farming in the TTZ area. His submission is that trees can be registered and felling of trees can also be registered.

Therefore, in substance, what the applicant wants is a blanket order permitting felling of trees on non-forest private land as a part of so called agro-farming. If we grant this relief, the orders which this Court has been passing from the year 1984 will be completely frustrated. This will give a license to people to fell fully grown trees without any permission. That will adversely affect the environment in the TTZ area. Therefore, the prayers sought in the applications are completely contrary to the object of development of Agra as a modern city. We do not think that by filing such applications, the applicant is helping the cause of development of Agra as a modern city. Therefore, the applications are rejected.

IA No.168401/2021

In view of the above order, I.A. No.168401/2021 filed by State of U.P. also stands disposed of.

IN RE: Central Empowered Committee REPORT NOS.17/2024

Report No.17 of 2024 shall be kept pending.

CEC REPORT NO.3 OF 2025

Learned counsel appearing for M/s Ganapati Infrastructure Development Company Limited states that as of today the company is only a bidder.

He seeks time to file a reply to Report No.3 of 2025.

We direct M/s Ganapati Infrastructure Development Company Limited and the Railway Land Development Authority to file a reply to the report. Reply to be filed by 10th May, 2025.

List on 13th May, 2025 at the end of the Board to consider the reply.

We make it clear that no construction activity shall be carried out on the land subject matter of tree felling and its status shall be maintained as of today.

IA Nos. 32568 and 33549 OF 2025

List these I.As. on 13th May, 2025 at the end of the Board.

I.A. Nos.64235 and 64237 of 2025

On mentioning by the learned ASG, IA Nos. 64235 and 64237 of 2025 are taken on board. We refer the same to the

CEC. We direct the CEC to submit the report before this Court within six weeks from today.

(KAVITA PAHUJA)
ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS

(AVGV RAMU)
COURT MASTER (NSH)

List of 131 Non-Attainment cities

State	S.No.	City
Andhra Pradesh (13)	1.	Guntur
	2.	Kurnool
	3.	Nellore
	4.	Vijayawada
	5.	Vishakhapatnam
	6.	Anantapur
	7.	Chittoor
	8.	Eluru
	9.	Kadapa
	10.	Ongole
	11.	Rajahmundry
	12.	Srikakulam
	13.	Vizianagaram
Assam (05)	14.	Guwahati
	15.	Nagaon
	16.	Nalbari
	17.	Sibsagar
	18.	Silchar
Bihar (03)	19.	Patna
	20.	Gaya
	21.	Muzaffarpur
Chandigarh (01)	22.	Chandigarh
Chhattisgarh (03)	23.	Bhilai
	24.	Korba
	25.	Raipur
Delhi (01)	26.	Delhi
Gujarat (04)	27.	Surat
	28.	Ahmedabad
	29.	Vadodara
	30.	Rajkot*
Himachal Pradesh (7)	31.	Baddi
	32.	Damtal
	33.	Kala Amb
	34.	Nalagarh
	35.	Paonta Sahib
	36.	Parwanoo
	37.	Sunder Nagar
Jammu & Kashmir (2)	38.	Jammu

	39.	Srinagar
Jharkhand (03)	40.	Dhanbad
	41.	Jamshedpur*
	42.	Ranchi*
Karnataka (04)	43.	Bangalore
	44.	Devanagere
	45.	Gulburga
	46.	Hubli-Dharwad
Madhya Pradesh (07)	47.	Bhopal
	48.	Dewas
	49.	Indore
	50.	Sagar
	51.	Ujjain
	52.	Gwalior
	53.	Jabalpur*
Maharashtra (19)	54.	Akola
	55.	Amravati
	56.	Aurangabad
	57.	Badlapur
	58.	Chandrapur
	59.	Jalgaon
	60.	Jalna
	61.	Kolhapur
	62.	Latur
	63.	Mumbai
	64.	Nagpur
	65.	Nashik
	66.	Navi Mumbai
	67.	Pune
	68.	Sangli
69.	Solapur	
70.	Ulhasnagar	
71.	Thane	
72.	Vasai-Virar*	
Meghalaya (01)	73.	Byrnihat
Nagaland (02)	74.	Dimapur

	75.	Kohima
Orissa (07)	76.	Angul
	77.	Balasore
	78.	Bhubaneswar
	79.	Cuttack
	80.	Rourkela
	81.	Talcher
	82.	Kalinga Nagar
Punjab (09)	83.	Dera Bassi
	84.	Gobindgarh
	85.	Jalandhar
	86.	Khanna
	87.	Ludhiana
	88.	Naya Nangal
	89.	Pathankot/Dera Baba
	90.	Patiala
	91.	Amritsar
Rajasthan (05)	92.	Alwar
	93.	Jaipur
	94.	Jodhpur
	95.	Kota
	96.	Udaipur
Tamilnadu (04)	97.	Thoothukudi
	98.	Trichy
	99.	Madurai
	100.	Chennai*
Telangana (04)	101.	Hyderabad
	102.	Nalgonda
	103.	Patancheruvu
	104.	Sangareddy
Uttar Pradesh (17)	105.	Agra
	106.	Allahabad
	107.	Anpara
	108.	Bareilly
	109.	Firozabad

	110.	Gajraula
	111.	Ghaziabad
	112.	Jhansi
	113.	Kanpur
	114.	Khurja
	115.	Lucknow
	116.	Moradabad
	117.	Noida
	118.	Raebareli
	119.	Varanasi
	120.	Gorakhpur
	121.	Meerut*
Uttarakhand (03)	122.	Kashipur
	123.	Rishikesh
	124.	Dehradun
West Bengal (07)	125.	Kolkata
	126.	Asansol & Raniganj
	127.	Barrackpore
	128.	Durgapur
	129.	Haldia
	130.	Howrah
Haryana (1)	131.	Faridabad*
*Million plus cities but not part of non-attainment cities		



229

Fwd: Advance Service of Additional Affidavit in I.A. Nos. 494-495/2024 in O.A. No. 820/2024

1 message

AKASH VASHISHTHA <akashvashishtha.official@gmail.com>

Fri, Sep 12, 2025 at 1:34 PM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **AKASH VASHISHTHA** <akashvashishtha.official@gmail.com>

Date: Fri, Sep 12, 2025 at 11:32 AM

Subject: Advance Service of Additional Affidavit in I.A. Nos. 494-495/2024 in O.A. No. 820/2024

To: bhanwar jadon <bhanwar09jadon@gmail.com>, <bhanwar09@gmail.com>, <gigicgeorge.adv42@yahoo.com>

Dear Sir,

Please find attached copy of the Additional Affidavit in I.A. Nos. 494-495/2024 in O.A. No. 820/2024, *News Item titled "22 साल सेबंद कं पनी मेंकाट ददए 1 हजार सेज्यादा पेड़, नोएडा मेंवन दवभाग नेजब्त दकया कटेपेड़ े े सेभरा टर क"* appearing in Navbharat Times dated 11.06.2024

Regards,

Akash Vashishtha

(Advocate)

Ph.: 9717006866

**Additional Affidavit.pdf**

1209K