


**BEFORE THE HON'BLE NATIONAL GREEN  
TRIBUNAL, WESTERN ZONE BENCH AT PUNE**



Misc. Application No. 03 /2023 [WZ]  
in O.A. No. 478/2018

**BETWEEN:**

THE GOA FOUNDATION

...APPLICANT

**AND**

THE STATE OF GOA AND ORS.

...RESPONDENTS

**AFFIDAVIT IN REJOINER ON  
BEHALF OF THE APPLICANT**

I, Dr. Claude Alvares, Secretary of the Goa Foundation, the Applicant herein, aged 74 years, r/o Parra, Bardez, Goa, do hereby state on oath as under:

1. I say that I have read and understood the affidavit filed by the Respondent Nos. 1-3 dt. 13.12.22. I state that I am not replying to each and every statement and averment made in the affidavit filed by the Resp. Nos. 1-3, and nothing may be deemed to be admitted unless the same is specifically

admitted herein but should be treated as though the same has been set out seriatim and denied and disputed specifically.

2. At the outset of this rejoinder, I wish to state and submit that the Forest Department is now changing its goal posts. It is for the first time coming on record to claim, without any basis, that the Forest Department and the Goa govt have decided that the findings in the reports of the T&A Committees are not serious, and are to be discarded, due to their “unscientific methodology,” which is, their reliance on the “ocular” method for purposes of forest identification.
3. If this be the case, then the Review Committee II is not a review committee. It is a new committee with a fresh mandate. Whereas, as per the minutes of the third meeting of this committee, forest identified by the two (T&A) committees amounted to approximately 32 sq km, the Review Committee II has commenced its work with a potential forest identification of some 92 sq km. Therefore it is hardly meaningful to claim that this is a review committee reviewing what the previous review committee (Deepshika Sharma/RC-I) had not been able to complete for want of time.




4. The Department appears to have forgotten that all work done on private forest identification thus far in the state of Goa was mostly "ocular". The RC II uses the term "ocular" in a pejorative sense, which is hardly justified. In fact, it is a matter of record that the forest identification exercise (including demarcation) which the forest department carried out on the reports of the S&K committees was nothing but ocular. The principal findings of the Deepshika Committee did not review the "ocular" decisions of the forest department on which there was no dispute. It only sought to review some areas excluded by the Forest Department Committee, of which it confirmed that 4.7 sq km had to be included as forest. This Hon'ble Tribunal has upheld a mainly ocular report, as 41. sq km of forest earlier confirmed by the Forest Department was not questioned by Deepshika Review Committee and accepted as final.

5. It is also incorrect to say that the T&A Committees did not do scientific sampling of the plots examined by them. This is completely unfair to the heroic work done by these officers for a period in excess of 5 years. It is only the determination of these officers to identify each and every potential area (some of which involved major real estate firms) that led to the disbandment of these two committees before they completed their work.




6. Before one is willing to cast aspersions on the work of these two committees, it is important to reiterate that these committees were headed by senior forest officers who had served the forest department for decades. Forest officials are reckoned to be "experts in forestry." They have extensive knowledge of plants and trees and silvicultural practices. This is a technical department with technical expertise. The work of the T&A committees must therefore be looked at with respect, rather than being summarily flung out of the window on purely specious grounds, as the present dispensation seeks to do.
7. It is important to recall that after the S&K committees had submitted their reports, two committees were set up by the Goa govt prior to the T&A committees in 2010. These were the K.G. Sharma and P.V. Sawant Committees. Both committees were unable to complete their work satisfactorily and to submit reports. As a result, after they had put in their papers, the state govt appointed the T&A committees in 2012. If the state government was not satisfied with the work of the T&A committees, all it had to do was to notify two new committees. Calling the present committee a Review Committee which is then proclaiming that it had nothing to review as the



work of the T&A committees was worthless is hardly doing service to the cause of forest protection. It is a scandal that a small state like Goa cannot honestly complete identification of its forest areas despite a gap of 25 years!

8. The Forest Department's counter devotes several paragraphs to lobby the argument that the Application is affected by laches. This is a wholly groundless argument. The fact of the matter is all the 5 reports submitted are "interim" reports, whatever be the claim now being made on their behalf. Since the reports were labelled "interim", the public including the applicant, had to consider them as "interim". In fact, a better claim that perhaps could have been made is that the Application is premature, not late, as the final report is yet to be presented to this Tribunal for its approval, and this reality is still a safe two years away, if one goes by the pleadings in the counter. What has forced the Applicant to seek the intervention of this Hon'ble Tribunal is the fact that it has come to know that state authorities have been surreptitiously granting Conversion Sanads and Development permissions for some of the plots excluded from forest by the "interim" reports. This in the opinion of the Applicant cannot be done, as it is very clear that until and unless this Hon'ble Tribunal approves the consolidated report



as and when it is available and submitted for consideration, till such time none of the survey numbers can be divested of the status of “private forest”. As the judgment of this Tribunal dated 18.08.2020 approving the report of the Deepshika Committee /RC-I proves, the State Government may do anything, but the final view on forestry matters must come from this Hon’ble Tribunal. This Hon’ble Tribunal is the only true Review Committee. True to its calling, it had already rejected the findings of the D’Souza Committee as recorded in its judgment dated 18.08.2020 which was another doubtful review committee hastily appointed by the government to exclude plots belonging to lobbies.

9. With respect to paragraph 5 of the Reply:



- a) It is admitted that the Review Committee - I constituted vide order dt. 23.04.2018 [“RC-I”] was mandated to review the entire reports of the Thomas and Araujo Committees [“T & A Committees”], as well as the reports of the Sawant and Karapurkar Committees [“S & K Committees”], as this order notified in the gazette is a matter of record.
- b) Contrary to what is stated in para 5, the Review Committee-II was not given any power to re-


examine those survey numbers declared finally as forest by the two committees. In dealing with the Applicant's allegation that the RC-II has exceeded its mandate by reviewing even the finally identified areas identified by the T & A Committees; the Resp. Nos. 1-3 have justified this exercise relying on two grounds, i.e. that the final reports of the T & A Committees were not accepted by the State Govt, and that the RC-II was simply continuing the work of the RC-I of reviewing the entire T & A reports, which the RC-I was unable to complete owing to paucity of time.

- c) As far as the first reason as stated above is concerned, it is vehemently denied that the final reports of 10.12.2018 and 28.12.2018 of the T & A Committees were not accepted by the Government. The order dt. 23.04.2018 establishing the RC – I clearly states that the T & A committees are disbanded “as the work of identification of Private Forests is complete.” Neither this order nor any subsequent orders establishing the RC-II dt. 21.01.2020/ 18.06.2020 record even a whisper of the decision of the Government to reject the reports of the T & A committees, and as such this particular contention of the Resp. nos. 1-3 is denied as being contrary to the record. It is a



well settled principle of law that reasons or statements cannot be read into orders subsequently, when such reasons do not form part of the original order itself.

d) As far as the second reason is concerned, i.e., that the RC-II is simply completing the work left unfinished by the RC-I, it is submitted that while this argument of the Resp. Nos. 1-3 may appear to be logically sound, it is contrary to record and therefore denied. The order dt. 21.01.2020 establishing the current Review Committee, i.e. RC-II, defines the mandate of the RC-II as being the exercise of reviewing only the private forests provisionally identified by the T & A Committees. Anything beyond that, in the humble opinion of this applicant, is a breach.



e) The T & A Committees both explicitly identified 3.26 sq km and 5.3 sq km respectively after field survey and demarcation on ground, which was termed as the 'finally identified private forest area' in the T & A Committee Reports. In contradistinction, both the T & A Committees separately identified large extent of private forest provisionally but could not carry out final survey and demarcation of these areas, which areas were

termed as 'provisionally identified private forest areas'. Total area identified by both the T & A committees (final and provisional) amounted to 32 sq km.

- f) The order dt. 21.01.2020 establishing the RC-II consciously and explicitly defines the scope of work of the RC-II as being the review of only the provisionally identified private forest areas of the T & A Committees. In contrast, the order establishing the RC-I dt. 23.04.2018 does not limit the scope of the work of the RC-I only to provisionally identified private forest. As such, no amount of logical leaps of faith can overcome the fact that the RC-II has grossly exceeded its mandate in terms of the order dt. 21.01.2020.



10. With respect to paragraph 6 of the Reply, the Applicant submits that it could have had no objection to the advertisement inviting objections referred to this paragraph of the Reply, as said advertisements explicitly termed the Sy. Nos. mentioned as being part of the provisionally identified forest areas by the T & A Committees. In any case, even assuming the Applicant had any objections to such advertisements, the State would be the first to take up the defence that the Review exercise was ongoing and any grievance with the Review proceedings sans a final report

would not be justiciable. As such, there is therefore no question of the Applicant 'raising the matter more than 2 years towards end of review exercise'.

11. With respect to paragraph 7 of the Reply, the Applicant objects to and contests the mileage that the Resp. No. 1-3 is seeking to obtain throughout its Reply by relying on the ground that the work of the T & A committee was done on an "ocular basis". Firstly, the Applicant fails to understand how the State is now faulting the T & A Committees or criticizing its reports on the ground that the work was done on 'ocular basis', when the State has itself in the order constituting the T & A Committees explicitly asked them to judge private forests on ground 'ocularly in conformation with crop composition (75% or more of the trees to be of forest nature and canopy density (0.4 or more)).'



12. The Resp. Nos. 1-3 claim that the decision of the RC-II to review finalised Sy. Nos has been approved by the Government, however, no approval or order to this extent has been placed on record. This claim also contradicts their claim that the State Government has not accepted either of the two T & A reports. Hence this averment is denied as being contrary to record and unsubstantiated. In any event, even presuming such approval exists, the approval would not and cannot have the effect of overriding the mandate of

the RC-II as specified in the notified order dt. 21.01.2020, which clearly limits the role of the RC-II to only those private forest areas that were provisionally identified by the T & A committees. However, since all these Sy. Nos are considered incorrect or unacceptable by the RC-II, it has nothing to review!

13. With respect to paragraphs 9 and 10 of the Reply, I state that the first 3 reports were uploaded on 13.09.2022; the 4th report on 28th February 2022, and the 5th report on 29th April 2022. The Applicant submits that as its objections regarding the methodology adopted by the RC-II are common to all its reports, and the exercise of the RC-II is still ongoing even after 5 Interim Reports are submitted, it would not be correct to reckon the date of upload of the 1st 3 reports as the starting point for the purposes of computing the limitation period in terms of Section 14(3) of the NGT Act. The Applicant is not before this Tribunal challenging, for instance, a particular Sy. No. identified as forest in the first 3 reports. On the contrary, the Applicant is aggrieved by the methodology adopted by the RC-II in carrying out its present exercise of review of forest areas. In such circumstances, it is submitted that the cause of action initially arising on 13.09.2021 from the date of uploading of the first 3 Reports has been subsequently revived with each further Interim



Report by the RC-II by which it continues with the same methodology in excess of its prescribed mandate. As stated earlier, so long as these reports are called “interim” reports by the Forest Department and so long as the final report is not approved by this Hon’ble Tribunal, we have the equivalent of a continuing nuisance or violation. We have approached this Hon’ble Tribunal because without this Tribunal’s approval, no survey number can be divested of the status of “forest”.

14. It is therefore the Applicant’s case that the cause of action which the present Application is concerned with is in the nature of a recurring cause of action, which has been accepted by this Hon’ble Tribunal in dealing with questions of limitation under S. 14(3). In Forward Foundation. vs. State of Karnataka and Ors., 2015 ALL (I) NGT Reporter (2) (Delhi) 81, the NGT explained this concept with reference to S. 14 in the following terms :

“A recurring cause of action is a distinct and completed occurrence made of a fact or blend of composite facts giving rise to a fresh legal injury, fresh right to sue and triggering a fresh lease of limitation. It would not materially alter the character of the proposition that it has a reference to an event which had occurred earlier and was a complete cause of action in itself. In that sense, recurring cause of



action which is complete in itself and satisfies the requisite ingredients would trigger a fresh period of limitation. To such composite and complete cause of action that has arisen subsequently, the phraseology of the 'cause of action first arose' would not effect in computing the period of limitation.”

As of the date of filing of this Application, the last Interim Report [*4th Report*] was uploaded on 28th February 2022 - and this Application [*in the form of O.A. 63/2022*] was filed on 06th April 2022: is therefore submitted that there has been no delay in the institution of this Application, and that the present Application has been filed within the prescribed limitation period. The decision in *Forward Foundation vs. State of Karnataka and Ors.* is enclosed as **Annexure 1.**



15. Notwithstanding the position taken by this Applicant in para 14 above regarding limitation, the Applicant submits that even assuming without admitting that the cause of action has to be reckoned only from 13.09.2021 onwards, the Applicant would still be covered by the benefit conferred by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in its order 10.01.2022, the relevant portion of which is reproduced hereunder:


“5. Taking into consideration the arguments advanced by learned counsel and the impact of the

surge of the virus on public health and adversities faced by litigants in the prevailing conditions, we deem it appropriate to dispose of the M.A. No. 21 of 2022 with the following directions:

I. The order dated 23.03.2020 is restored and in continuation of the subsequent orders dated 08.03.2021, 27.04.2021 and 23.09.2021, it is directed that the period from 15.03.2020 till 28.02.2022 shall stand excluded for the purposes of limitation as may be prescribed under any general or special laws in respect of all judicial or quasi judicial proceedings.


II. Consequently, the balance period of limitation remaining as on 03.10.2021, if any, shall become available with effect from 01.03.2022.

III. In cases where the limitation would have expired during the period between 15.03.2020 till 28.02.2022, notwithstanding the actual balance period of limitation remaining, all persons shall have a limitation period of 90 days from 01.03.2022. In the event the actual balance period of limitation remaining, with effect from 01.03.2022 is greater than 90 days, that longer period shall apply.”



Applying this order of the Hon'ble SC, the limitation period of 6 months would have to be computed from 01.03.2022. As such, this Application filed on 06.04.2022 is well within the limitation period prescribed by Section 14. Copy of the said order of the Hon'ble Apex Court dt. 10.01.22 is at Annexure 2.

16. In respect of the averments made in the counter in para 11, the respondent Nos.1-3 admit that it is the RC-II (and not the state government) that resolved to review all those survey numbers whose demarcation and plan were finalized by the T&A committees. It is submitted that the RC II has no such power to itself decide the scope and extent of the work to be undertaken, when such scope is clearly delineated in the order constituting the RC-II dt. 21.01.2020.



17. With respect to the averments made in para 12, I say that the Respondents Nos.1-3 are seeking to confound the issue. I say that the S&K reports were "ocular", and the report of the forest department's demarcation team was similarly based on "ocular" findings. The RC-I / Deepshikha Sharma Committee did not touch the 41.2 sq km identification by the State Demarcation team. The Sharma Committee merely added 4.91 sq km to the report of the state demarcation team. Likewise, the RC-II ought not to

have touched the findings of the T&A committees since they were final and demarcated on the ground.

18. With respect to the averments made in para 13, The RC II is reviewing both final and provisional areas of the T&A committees. This fact is also borne from the pleadings of the Resps. No. 1-3 in paragraph 11 of its affidavit. The exercise will be final only after it has been considered and approved by this Hon'ble Tribunal, and that decision on finality is neither with the RC II nor with the State Government.

19. With respect to the averments made in para 14, it is abundantly clear that the RC II was fully aware that several Sy Nos. had been demarcated with plans on the ground by the T&A committees.

20. With respect to the contents of paragraph 17, the Statement made that "as the committees were disbanded, the report submitted by them did not have any validity, hence the state government has not accepted it" stands in sharp contrast to the notification dated 23.04.2018 setting up RC II, "as the work of identification of Private Forests is complete." The Applicant reiterates the contents of paragraph 9(c) of this Affidavit in connection with this statement made by the Resp. No.s 1 - 3.



21. With respect to Para 21 of the Reply, the Resp. No.s 1-3 speak of the review work being in final stage of completion. It is denied that the work of the so-called RC-II is close to any completion. From the facts related in the reply at para 15, it is clear that of the 25 sq km identified by the RC-II as forest, only 3.32 sq km is complete in all respects. It is safe to assume that the balance of the 25 sq km, which is approximately 22 sq km, would take another two years to say the least, since scrutiny, hearing of affected persons and 100% enumeration in those cases where affected persons dispute 5% sampling is still to be done.

22. Further, the Applicant denies that the work of the committee carried out over two years since the committee was set up would be rendered infructuous if the arguments of the Applicant were to be accepted by this Tribunal. However, the deponent of the counter is willing to give short shrift to the extensive work over 5 years carried out by the two earlier T & A committees all stocked with competent persons and led by foresters, that too, following the methodology outlined in the order notifying them.

23. I state that the contents of paragraphs 1(p), 2(p), 3(p), 4(p), 5, 6(p), 7(p), 8 (p), 9(p), 10(p), 11(p), 12(p), 13(p), 16(p), 17(p), 18(p), 19(p), 20(p), 21(p), and 22(p) are in the nature of facts true to my own



knowledge, and that the contents of paras 1(p), 2(p), 3(p), 4(p), 6(p), 7(p), 8 (p), 9(p), 10(p), 11(p), 12(p), 13(p), 14, 15, 16(p), 17(p), 18(p), 19(p), 20(p), 21(p), and 22(p) are my submissions made on legal advice which I believe to be true and correct. No part of it is false and nothing material has been concealed therefrom, and the annexures enclosed are true copies of their originals.

Solemnly affirmed on the 11<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2023, at Mapusa, Goa



APPLICANT/DEPONENT

Dr. Claudio Alvares  
980/2022 11/03/2023

JANARDHAN S. PARSHEKAK  
NOTARY AT MAPUSA, BARDEZ - GOA  
STATE OF GOA INDIA

VERIFICATION

I hereby verify that the contents of paras 1 - 23 of my above affidavit are true to my knowledge and belief, and that no part of it is false and nothing material has been concealed therefrom.




Verified on the 11<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2023, at Mapusa, Goa



APPLICANT/DEPONENT

Dr. Claudio Alvares  
980/2022 11/03/2023

JANARDHAN S. PARSHEKAK  
NOTARY AT MAPUSA, BARDEZ - GOA  
STATE OF GOA INDIA



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

---

**ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 222 OF 2014**

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

1. The Forward Foundation  
A Charitable Trust  
Having its registered office at 24/B,  
Haralur Village, HSR Layout Post  
Bangalore 560102  
Through its Secretary
2. Praja RAAG,  
A Society registered under the Karnataka  
Societies Registration Act, 1960  
and having its Registered office at  
C-103, Mantri Classic, 4<sup>th</sup> Block,  
Koramangala, Bangalore 5600034  
Through its President
3. Bangalore Environment Trust,  
A registered office at A 1-Chartered  
Cottage, Langford Road,  
Bangalore 560025  
Through its Trustee

.....Applicants

Versus

1. State of Karnataka  
Vidhana Soudha  
Bangalore – 560001  
Through its Chief Secretary
2. Ministry of Environment and Forests Regional Office (SZ)  
Kendriya Sadan, IV Floor,  
E and F Wings, 17<sup>th</sup> Main Road,  
Koramangala II Block,  
Bangalore – 560034  
Through its Addl Principal Chief Conservator of Forests
3. State Level Environment Impact Assessment Authority  
Department of Ecology and Environment  
Room No. 709, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor,  
M S Building,  
Bangalore – 560001  
Through its Member Secretary

4. Karnataka State Pollution Control Board  
Parisara Bhavan,  
49, 4<sup>th</sup> & 5<sup>th</sup> Floor,  
Church Street, Bangalore – 560001  
Through its Chairman
5. Bangalore Water Supply and Sewerage Board  
Cauvery Bhavan,  
Bangalore – 560009  
Through its Chairman
6. Lake Development Authority  
Parisara Bhavan,  
49, Second Floor,  
Church Street, Bangalore–560001  
Through its Chief Executive Officer
7. Karnataka Industrial Areas Development Board  
14/3, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor,  
Rashthrothana Parishat Buildings,  
Nrupathunga Road,  
Bangalore – 560001  
Through its Chief Executive Officer
8. Bangalore Development Authority  
Chowdiah Road,  
Bangalore – 560020  
Through its Chairman/Commissioner
9. Mantri Techzone Private Limited  
(formerly called Manipal ETA P Ltd.)  
Having its registered office at  
Mantri House, No. 41, Vittal Mallya Road,  
Bangalore 560001  
Represented by its Managing Director
10. Core Mind Software and Services Private Limited  
4<sup>th</sup> Floor, Solarpuria Windsor,  
3, Ulsoor Road,  
Bangalore 560042  
Represented by its Managing Director
11. Namma Bengaluru Foundation  
A registered Public Charitable Trust,  
Having its registered office at No. 3J,  
NA Chambers, 7<sup>th</sup> 'C' Main 3<sup>rd</sup> Cross,  
3<sup>rd</sup> Block, Koramangala,  
Bangalore 560034  
Represented by its Director Mahalakshmi P.

## 12. Citizens' Action Forum

A Society registered under the provisions of the Karnataka Societies Registration Act, 1960 and having its registered office at 372, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor, MK Puttalingaiah Road, Padmanabhanagar, Bangalore 560070  
Represented by its authorized signatory Mr. Vijayan Menon

.....Respondents

**Counsel for Applicant:**

Mr. Raj Pajwani, Sr. Adv. Along with Ms. Megha Mehta Agrawal, Advocate

**Counsel for Respondents:**

Mr. Devraj Ashok, Advocate for Respondent No. 1, 3, 4 & 5  
Mr. B.R. Srinivasa G., Advocate for Respondent No. 7  
Mr. R. Venkatramani, Sr. Advocate, Mr. Shekhar G. Devasa, Mr. D. Mahesh, Advocates for respondent No. 9  
Mr. Raju Ramachandran, Mr. Devashish Bharuka, Mr. Vaibhav Niti and Mr. Suraj Govindraj, Advocates for Respondent No. 10  
Mr. Sajan Poovayya, Sr. Advocate and Mr. Sumit Attri, Advocate for Respondent Nos. 11 & 12

**JUDGMENT****PRESENT:**

**Hon'ble Mr. Justice Swatanter Kumar (Chairperson)**

**Hon'ble Mr. Justice U.D. Salvi (Judicial Member)**

**Hon'ble Dr. D.K. Agrawal (Expert Member)**

**Hon'ble Professor A.R. Yousuf (Expert Member)**

---

**Reserved on: 27<sup>th</sup> January, 2015**

**Pronounced on: 7<sup>th</sup> May, 2015**

---

1. Whether the judgment is allowed to be published on the net?
2. Whether the judgment is allowed to be published in the NGT Reporter?

**JUSTICE SWATANTER KUMAR, (CHAIRPERSON)**

All the three applicants have approached the Tribunal under the provisions of the National Green Tribunal Act, 2010 (for short 'the NGT Act'), with a common prayer that a direction be issued to respondent no. 1, the State of Karnataka to take cognizance of the

Reports dated 12<sup>th</sup> June, 2013 and 14<sup>th</sup> August, 2013 prepared by respondent nos. 6 and 2 respectively, and take coercive and punitive action including restoration of the ecologically sensitive land. Further the applicants also prayed for issuance of a direction that the valley land is to be maintained as a sensitive area, without developments of any sort, so that the ecological balance of the area is not disturbed. Besides this, they even prayed for issuance of such other order or directions as the Tribunal may deem fit in the circumstances of the case and render justice.

The three applicants are either a registered charitable trust and/or a Society, registered under the relevant laws in force. They claim to be keenly interested in protecting the environment and ecology, particularly, in the State of Karnataka. Their principal grievance is in relation to certain commercial projects that are being developed by respondent nos. 9 & 10 in a large-sized, mixed use development project/building complex, including setting up of a SEZ park, Hotels, Residential Apartments and a Mall, covering approximately 80 acres on the valley land immediately abutting the Agara Lake and more particularly identified as lying between Agara and Bellandur Lakes, exposing the entire eco system to severe threat of environmental degradation and consequential damage. According to them, it is of alarming significance that the Project has encroached an Ecologically Sensitive Area, namely, the valley and the catchment area and *Rajakaluves* (Storm Water Drains) which drains rain water into the Bellandur Lake. Thus, in the interest of

environment and ecology, they have approached the Tribunal with the above prayers.

2. Shorn of any unnecessary details, the precise facts leading to the filing of this application are that, according to these applicants, the ecologically sensitive land was allotted by the Karnataka Industrial Area Development Board (for short the 'KIADB'), respondent no. 7 herein, to respondent nos. 9 & 10 vide Notifications dated 23<sup>rd</sup> April, 2004 and 7<sup>th</sup> May, 2004, respectively. This land was allotted for setting up of Software Technology Park, Commercial and Residential complex, hotel and Multi Level Car Parks. The Master Plan formulated by the Bangalore Development Authority (for short the 'BDA'), respondent no. 8, identifies the allotted land as 'Residential Sensitive', though the same land was identified in the draft Master Plan as 'Protected Zone'. It is stated by the applicant that the Revenue Map in respect of properties as referred in the land lease Agreements has multiple *Rajakaluves*. The development projects in question sit right on the catchment and wetland areas which feeds the *Rajakaluves*, which in turn drain rain water into Bellandur Lake. The project will thus encroach two *Rajakaluves* of 1.38 acres and 1.23 acres each. The satellite digital images of the area from year 2000 to 2012 clearly show encroachment upon these *Rajakaluves*, as well as, the manner in which they are covered by this construction. The State Level Expert Appraisal Committee (for short the 'SEAC'), which was to assist State Level Environment Impact Assessment Authority (for short the 'SEIAA'), held its meetings on various dates to examine

the project. It had required respondent no. 9 to submit a revised NOC from the Bangalore Water Supply and Sewerage Board (for short the 'BWSSB'), respondent no. 5 herein, for the project in question. It was also observed that the project lies between the above stated two lakes. Respondent no. 9 was also directed to take protective measures to spare the buffer zone around Rajakaluves and also to commit that no construction would be carried out in the buffer zone. In the meeting of 11<sup>th</sup> November, 2011, it was recorded that the project proposes car parking facility for 14,438 cars in that environmentally sensitive area.

3. It is the case of respondent no. 5 that such NOC was issued but it covers only an area of 17,404 sq mtr, whereas the total built-up area as noted by the SEAC is 13,50,454.98 sq mtr. It is alleged by the applicants that respondent no. 9 obtained NOC from respondent no. 5 by concealing material facts and by misrepresenting that NOC is required only for residential units, which forms a very minuscule part of the total project. Respondent no. 9 had approached the Karnataka State Pollution Control Board (for short the 'KSPCB'), respondent no. 4 herein, for obtaining clearance which was granted on 4<sup>th</sup> September, 2012, subject to the fulfillment of the conditions stated in the consent order which included leaving the buffer zone all along the valley and towards the lake. The applicant contends that the grant of consent by the KSPCB to respondent no. 9 also contained a condition with regard to obtaining Environmental Clearance from the Competent

Authority and no construction was to commence until such clearance was granted.

4. According to the applicants, respondent no. 9 violated the conditions and commenced construction of the project. There was also violation of the stipulations stated in the approval of the SEAC, in relation to buffer zone and construction over *Rajakaluves*. The construction has been commenced over the ecologically sensitive area of the Lake Catchment area and valley, with utter disregard to the statutory compliances. Referring to these blatant irregularities the applicant submits that the conversion of land from 'Protected Zone' to 'Residential Sensitive' area is violative of the law. The Project is right in the midst of a fragile wetland area which ought not to have been disturbed by the development activity. The fragile environment of the catchment area has been exposed to grave and irreparable damage. It has severely disturbed and damaged the *Rajakaluves*. It is also alleged that respondent nos. 9 & 10 have started to level the land by filling it with debris, thus causing damage to the drains. It is further stated that the conditions with regard to no-disturbance to the Storm Water Drains, natural valleys and buffer area in and around the *Rajakaluves* have been violated. This has in turn, affected the ground water table and bore wells which are the only source of water for thousands of households. Fishing and agriculture which depends on Bellandur Lake are also severely affected. The construction over the wetland between the two lakes is also in violation of Rule 4 of Wetlands (Conservation and Management) Rules, 2010 (for short Rules of 2010). It is

submitted that SEIAA in its meeting dated 29<sup>th</sup> September, 2012, decided to close the file pertaining to respondent nos. 10 due to non-submission of requisite information and the application therefore was rejected in November, 2012. Despite the rejection, respondent no. 10 commenced construction on the project in full swing.

5. The applicants have also relied on the findings of the Joint Legislative Committee, constituted under the chairmanship of Sh. A. T. Ramaswamy in the month of July, 2005, which stated that there were 262 water bodies in Bangalore city in 1961, which drastically came down because of trespass and encroachments. It was also affirmed that about 840 Kms of *Rajakaluves* have been encroached upon in several places and have become sewage channels.

6. The Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka in *Environment Support Group and Another v. State of Karnataka, Writ Petition No. 817/2008* appointed a Committee under the Chairmanship of Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.K. Patil to suggest immediate remedial action in order to remove encroachments on the lake area and the *Rajakaluves* and preservation of the lakes in and around Bangalore city. Other Expert Committees, including Lakshman Rau Expert Committee had also submitted proposals for Preservation, Restoration or otherwise of the existing tanks in Bangalore Metropolitan Area, 1986 which recommended to maintain good water surface in Bellandur tank and to ensure that the water in the tanks is not polluted. The findings of the Environmental

Information System (ENVIS), Centre for Ecological Science, Indian Institute of Sciences, Bangalore, in May 2013 on the Conservation of the Bellandur Wetlands obligation of Decision Makers is ensure Intergenerational Equity recommended restoration of wetlands and cessation of plan to set up the SEZ in the area. Even the Central Government in August 2013 had issued an advisory on conservation and restoration of water bodies in the urban areas.

7. The applicants claim to have obtained the monitoring report of the project by respondent no. 2 through RTI on 21<sup>st</sup> August, 2013. The report dated 14<sup>th</sup> August, 2013 revealed that the Project Proponents are in clear breach of their undertaking to carry out all precautionary measures to ensure that the Bellandur lake is not affected by the construction or operational phase of the project. This breach is particularly with regard to the major alteration in natural sloping pattern of the project site and natural hydrology of the area.

8. The Lake Development Authority (for short 'the LDA'), respondent no. 6 herein, had initiated an inspection in the catchment area of the Bellandur Lake. The report dated 12<sup>th</sup> June, 2013 confirms that the project will have disastrous impact, including deleterious effect on the Bellandur Lake. This report was brought to the notice of respondent no. 7 vide letter dated 7<sup>th</sup> July, 2013. Respondent no. 6 has also opined that the land should be classified and maintained as Sensitive Area. Respondent no. 7 in furtherance thereto had called upon respondent no. 9 to comply with rules of Ecology and Environment Department and to obtain

necessary approval from respondent nos. 6 and 4. It is alleged that a vague reply had been submitted by respondent no. 9 making certain misrepresentations. Despite all this, respondent nos. 9 and 10 have continued with their illegal constructions and have caused damage to the ecology and the environment by irreparably jeopardizing the ecological balance in this sensitive area. The applicants also rely upon the fact that the revised Master Plan, 2013 issued by Respondent no. 8 specifically provides that 30 meters buffer zone is to be created around the lakes and 50 meters buffer zone to be created on either side of the *Rajakaluves*. It is also the case pleaded by the applicant that Respondent no. 9 had obtained the NOC from Respondent no. 5 only with regard to residential units and not for the entire project and that the Environmental Clearance obtained by the Respondent no.9 is based upon the said partial NOC issued by Respondent no. 5 which itself is a misrepresentation. The applicants have pleaded that the projects are bound to create water scarcity as the requirement of project of Respondent no. 9 alone is approximately 4.5 million liters per day, i.e. 135 million liters per month, which is more than what Respondent no. 5 supplies to the entire Agaram Ward. It is stated by the applicants that the construction of respective projects by respondents no.9 and 10 respectively, besides having commenced without permission from the authorities and being in violation of the conditions imposed for grant of permission/consent, is bound to damage the environment, resulting in change in topography of the area, posing potential threat of extinction of the Bellandur lake,

causing traffic congestion, shortening and wiping out the wetlands, extinction of Rajakaluves and causing serious and potential threat of flooding and massive scarcity of water in the city of Bangalore, particularly the areas located near the water bodies.

The applicants have stated that they have filed the application against threat posed to the ecological balance from the ongoing commercial constructions project near Agara Lake and Bellandur Lake, and the same is continuing every day in violation of the law. With these allegations, the three applicants have instituted this application with prayers afore-noticed.

9. Different respondents in the application have filed independent replies as already noticed. Respondent nos. 9 and 10 are the Project Proponents against whom the applicant has raised the principal grievance. Thus, first we may notice the case advanced by respondent nos. 9 and 10. In its replies, respondent no. 9 has submitted that the said respondent corporation was incorporated with the objective of establishing an Information Technology Park and R&D Centre with facilities such as residential complexes, parks, education centres and other allied infrastructure within a single compound. This respondent had submitted the proposal to establish such Information Technology Park and other facilities to the State Government and requested for allotment of land for the project. Proposal of respondent no. 9 was considered in 78<sup>th</sup> High Level Committee meeting held on 21<sup>st</sup> June, 2000 and after examining the proposal, the same was approved by the government on 06<sup>th</sup> July, 2000. Before the State High Level Committee, the

Respondent had mentioned that it would require 110 acres of land, 25MW of power from the Karnataka Power Transmission Corporation Limited (for short the 'KPTCL'), and 4 lakh litres of water per day from respondent no. 5. The lands for the project were initially notified by the BDA. However, later the lands were de-notified vide notification dated 10<sup>th</sup> February, 2004. Subsequently, the lands were allotted to the replying respondent vide letter dated 28<sup>th</sup> June, 2007 for which lease-cum-sale agreement was signed on 30<sup>th</sup> June, 2007. Considering the overall development of the State of Bangalore, the said Respondent proposed a Mixed Use Development Project consisting of an Information Technology Park, residential apartments, retail, hotel and office buildings with a total built up area of 13,50,454.98 sq mtr. The Project was conceived as a zero waste discharge project. According to this Respondent, the project is located one and a half kilometres away from the southern-side of the Bellandur Lake. Towards the North adjacent to the Project site, lie vast stretches of lands belonging to the Defence, and towards the East, which is completely developed lies the Project of Respondent no. 10 and that another developer is also developing a project on the western side. Respondent no. 9 has submitted that it has obtained sanction plan on 4<sup>th</sup> July, 2007 which was being renewed from time to time. The Respondent also claims that it has obtained No Objection Certificate from Airport Authority of India on 9<sup>th</sup> April, 2010, certificate dated 15<sup>th</sup> April, 2010 from Dr. Ambedkar Institute of Technology and that the Bharat Sanchar Nigam Ltd, vide its communication dated 16<sup>th</sup> April, 2010, granted clearance for the

project construction. BWSSB, respondent no. 5 herein vide its communication dated 26<sup>th</sup> April, 2011 issued No Objection Certificate for portion of the proposed construction to be built. Bangalore Electricity Supply Company Limited also granted No Objection Certificate for arranging power supply to the proposed residential and commercial building in favour of the Respondent no. 10. Environmental Clearance was granted by SEIAA vide communication dated 17<sup>th</sup> February, 2012. Director General of Police issued No Objection Certificate and KSPCB vide order dated 4<sup>th</sup> September, 2012 accorded its consent for construction of the said project site subject to the conditions stated therein.

Respondent no. 9 further states that after grant of the Environmental Clearance on 17<sup>th</sup> February, 2012, the same was published in the leading newspapers “Kannada Prabha” and the “Indian Express” on 12<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> March, 2012 respectively.

11. Respondent no. 9 later modified the building plan and the same was approved by Respondent no. 7 vide its letter dated 30<sup>th</sup> August, 2012, which was valid up to 10<sup>th</sup> August, 2014. It is further claimed that they started the construction of the project in November, 2012, taking all precautions as per terms and conditions of the orders issued by the competent authorities. The respondent further submitted that he has raised the constructions in accordance with the plans and conditions of the Environmental Clearance and consent orders. According to him, he has not violated any of the conditions and has not caused any adverse impact on the ecology and environment of the area. The allegation

with regard to the covering and blocking the Rajakaluves (Storm Water Drains) drying the wetland and raising of the construction thereupon adversely affecting the lake, are specifically disputed and denied. The Respondent claims that it has already spent a sum of Rs 306.73 crores on the project towards procurement of men and materials, machinery, infrastructure, medical and sanitary facilities etc., that it has availed financial assistance from various banks and financial institutions towards the construction and proper execution of the project and that various contracts have been signed with third parties.

12. It is specifically stated by this Respondent that certain print media had published articles stating that construction was unauthorized, illegal and that it was prejudicial to the environmental and ecological interest of that area. Not only this, Namma Bengaluru Foundation, Citizen's Action Forum, Koramangala Residents Association and others, on the basis of a report prepared by Professor T. V. Ramachandra, filed a Public Interest Litigation in the High Court of Karnataka (Writ Petition No. 36567-36574/2013). Besides making the above allegation, it was also alleged in those petitions that the project would adversely affect the Bellandur Lake and prayed for stay of the construction activity. The Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka after hearing the parties issued notice, however, denied to pass any interim order of stay as prayed by the petitioners. The said petition is stated to be pending before the Hon'ble High Court.

In the meanwhile, Bruhat Bengaluru Mahanagara Palike (for short the 'BMP') issued a stop work notice to the said respondent in regard to illegal and unauthorized construction as well as its adverse impacts on the lake. Aggrieved from the stop work notice dated 23<sup>rd</sup> December, 2013, Respondent no. 9 filed a Writ Petition before the Hon'ble High Court being Writ Petition No. 366-367 of 2014 and 530-625/2014 in which the Hon'ble High Court vide its order dated 21<sup>st</sup> January, 2014 stayed the operation of the stop work notice dated 23<sup>rd</sup> December, 2013. Another notice was also issued by respondent no. 7 directing stoppage of work on 2<sup>nd</sup> January, 2014, which was again challenged by the respondent no. 9 in Writ Petition No. 792 of 2014 before the same High Court and vide its order dated 7<sup>th</sup> January, 2014 the operation of the stay order was also stayed by the Hon'ble High Court. Replying respondent has taken up specific pleas with regard to the present application being barred by time because the Environmental Clearance was granted on 17<sup>th</sup> February, 2012 and even article in the newspapers were published on 3<sup>rd</sup> June, 2013 as such the present petition has been filed beyond the prescribed period of limitation and the Tribunal has no power to condone the delay which in fact has not even been prayed by the Applicant. According to respondent no. 9, this Tribunal has no jurisdiction to entertain and decide this application in the form and content in which it has been filed, as no question or substantial question of environment has been raised in relation to the Scheduled Acts under the NGT Act, 2010. Another objection raised by respondent no. 9 is that the

applicants are guilty of suppression and misrepresentation of material facts and have not approached the Tribunal with clean hands and also that the proceedings before the Tribunal ought to be dismissed in face of the proceedings pending before the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka in the Writ Petitions afore-referred. If the dates as stated by the applicant are taken to be correct, even then the application should have been filed within 30 days of the constitution of the Tribunal i.e. 18<sup>th</sup> October, 2010 and in any case within 60 days thereafter, by showing that they were prevented by sufficient cause. Since the application has been filed much beyond the prescribed period, it is barred by time and suffers from the defect of laches.

13. Respondent no. 10 besides raising the same preliminary objection with regard to the maintainability of the application and jurisdiction of the Tribunal, as raised by respondent no. 9, has also stated that application of applicant is hit by the Principle of *Falsus in Uno, Falsus in Omnibus*. It is also averred that the present application is a cut-paste of the Public Interest Litigation filed before the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka and that the allegations made therein and in the present application are similar. On merits it is contended that averments made in the application are factually incorrect.

According to respondent no. 10, crux of the dispute is with regard to the allocation of the land and its conversion from 'Protected Zone' to 'Residential Sensitive' in the Master Plan, without giving any reason, which does not fall within the

jurisdiction of the Tribunal. The applicants have raised multifarious proceedings against respondent no. 10 which is an abuse of the process of law and are *mala fide*. The applicant has not only stated identical facts in their application before the Tribunal, but have even submitted the same set of documents as were filed before the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka, which clearly shows that the application before the Tribunal lacks *bona fides* and there is suppression and misrepresentation of material facts.

14. On merits respondent no. 10 has stated that the State of Karnataka has formulated a policy to invite investment in Karnataka and for that purpose the Karnataka Industries (Facilitation) Act, 2002 had been promulgated. Under this Act, State Level Single Window Clearance Committee and State High Level Clearance Committee were created to examine and clear the projects. All investment projects submitted to Karnataka Udyoga Mitra were forwarded to Single Window Agency, if it was less than the value of Rs 50.00 crores for necessary processing and clearance and for value above Rs 50.00 crores, is placed before the State High Level Clearance Committee for processing and approval. Respondent no. 10 had submitted a proposal for developing of a Software Technology Park with an investment of 48.75 crores in 25 acres of land along the outer ring road in Bangalore to which the clearance certificate dated 27<sup>th</sup> March, 2004 was issued. Respondent no. 10 submitted a revised proposal in respect of the same project and to obtain fresh clearance on 31<sup>st</sup> August, 2007 and revised proposal was with the investment of Rs 179.22 crores.

The State High Level Committee had cleared the project which was communicated to Respondent no. 10 on 25<sup>th</sup> January, 2008. According to Respondent no. 10, properties are located in between Bellandur Lake and Agara Lake but there are no primary storm water drain and secondary storm water drains that exist in the above properties. The application by respondent no. 10 seeking sanction of development and building plan in respect of the above properties into a Software Technology Park, Hospitality, Commercial and Residential Complex was also allowed and as per the directive of respondent no. 7, respondent no. 10 has deposited a sum of Rs 1,28,56,830. Respondent no. 10 had also taken clearance from various authorities including Environmental Clearance and consent for establishment. The details of the same are as follows:

Sl. No	Date	Document No.	Nature of Document	Issued by	Annexure
1	17.3.2011	ASC/CM(AO)/181/HAL: BG:58/2011	No Objection Certificate	Airport Services Centre, Hindustan Aeronautics Limited, Bangalore Complex	'R22'
2	30.07.2011	AGM(TP)/S:6/IX/2010-11	No Objection Certificate	Bharat Shanchar Nigal Ltd, CGM, Telecom, KTK Circle, Bangalore	'R23'
3	22.05.2012	CEE(P&C)/SEE/(Plg)/EEE(plg)/K CO-95/F-46611/2012-13/R-50 (75)	No Objection Certificate	Karnataka Power Transmission Corporation Ltd, Chief Engineer, Electric City, Cauvery Bhavan, Bangalore	'R24'
4	03.08.2012	GBC(1)478/2011	No Objection Certificate	Office of Director General,	'R25'

				Karnataka State Fire & Emergency Services	
5	04.04.2013	BWSSB/EIC/ACE ® /DCE(M)-II/TA(M)-II/137/2012-13	No Objection Certificate	Bangalore Water Supply & Sewerage Board, Cauvery Bhavan, Bangalore	'R26'
6	03.06.2013	PCB/136/CNP/12/H321	No Objection Certificate	Karnataka State Pollution Control Board, Church Street, Bangalore	'R27'
7	30.09.2013	SEIAA:37:CON:2012	No Objection Certificate	State Level Environment Impact Assessment Authority, Karnataka	'R28'

Certain sections of the media had raised some queries to respondent no. 10 to furnish the copy of the Consent to Establish and Environmental Clearance certificate on 30<sup>th</sup> September, 2013. They had also expressed that the project had started without such clearances. However, upon issuance of Consent to Establish and Environmental Clearance dated 4<sup>th</sup> June, 2013 and 30<sup>th</sup> September, 2013 respectively, same were furnished to the reporter of newspaper 'The Hindu', vide letter dated 11<sup>th</sup> October, 2013. According to respondent no. 10, around this project, much development has already taken place, even around various lakes, but it has not caused any damage to the lakes and similarly, project of respondent no. 10 would also not cause any damage to the area and the lakes. Respondent no. 10 has also referred to the Writ Petition 36567-36574 of 2013, where relief of resumption of land from both the respondent nos. 9 and 10 was prayed. Notice dated

28<sup>th</sup> February, 2014 was issued by respondent no. 7 to respondent no. 10 containing direction to stop work/ construction activity against which respondent no. 10 had also filed a Writ Petition in the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka, being Writ Petition No. 18119 of 2014. The Writ Petition was pending and Interim Order was passed. This Respondent claims that they are entitled to develop the projects, having received all clearances. It is specifically stated that the Bellandur Lake does not support any fishing activity or forms a source of water for domestic purpose nor is the agricultural activity carried out at the said area. There are no wetlands and none of the functional aspects of the wetland exist on the site in question. It is also denied that the project carried out by respondent no. 10 on the property belonging to it has any adverse impact on environment. Respondent no. 10 further states that the ENVIS report relied upon by the applicant is prepared by persons interested in opposing his project. In any case, the said report dated 14<sup>th</sup> August, 2013 stood superseded by the Environmental Clearance dated 30<sup>th</sup> September, 2013, wherein, respondent no. 3 has accorded consent to the project after considering the actual facts, after due application of mind and by subjecting respondent no. 10 to strict terms and conditions as mentioned in the clearance dated 30<sup>th</sup> September, 2013. On these averments, respondent no. 10 prays that the application should be dismissed and no relief should be granted by the Tribunal to the applicants.

15. Respondent no. 7 has filed a short reply. He submits that after the possession of the land was handed over to respondent no.

9 and 10, one year time was granted to implement the project, which was extended from time to time. According to respondent no. 7, the building drawings were approved on 4<sup>th</sup> July, 2007, modified building drawings were approved on 26<sup>th</sup> April, 2011 and 30<sup>th</sup> August, 2012 with specific conditions. In the meeting of the KIADB held on 16<sup>th</sup> July, 2013, it was resolved to inform respondent no. 9 to fully comply with the Ecology and Environment rules as well as to obtain approvals from the respondent no. 6, LDA and respondent no. 4, KSPCB. Respondent no. 6, LDA vide its letter dated 24<sup>th</sup> September, 2013, had informed respondent no. 7 that the construction activity in the catchment area in the Bellandur Lake could drastically impact the Lake, with deleterious effects and asked the Respondent no. 7 to stop construction activity of respondent nos. 9 & 10, however, the validity of the building drawings was again extended up to 10<sup>th</sup> August, 2014. The Lokayukta on 17<sup>th</sup> December, 2013 had written a letter in respect of complaint filed by South East Forum for Sustainable Development where it had been averred that the decision had been taken by the Board on 21<sup>st</sup> December, 2013 to keep in abeyance the approval accorded and even the revalidations of plans. This was also informed to respondent no. 9. The Board took a decision which was communicated to respondent no. 9 on 2<sup>nd</sup> January, 2014, wherein it asked the said respondent no. 9 to stop all construction activities on the allotted lands. It is admitted that the said communication was challenged by respondent no. 9 and on the stop work notice, stay was granted by the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka. Stop

work notice issued by BBMP dated 23<sup>rd</sup> December, 2013 was also challenged before the Hon'ble High Court and operation of the said communication was stayed vide order dated 21<sup>st</sup> January, 2014. It is submitted by respondent no. 7 that the project of respondent nos. 9 and 10 had been approved by the Government. It is specifically submitted that the answering respondent had not acquired any 'Rajakaluves' and the land allotted by respondent no. 7 to respondent no. 10 does not consist of the same. Respondent no. 7 further states that the Storm Water Drains are not always flowing in strict or permanent path and are prone to flow in different paths from time to time. Respondent no. 7 further states that it had allotted 17 acres 33½ guntas of land in favour of respondent no. 10 for the purpose of establishing Software Technology Park, Hospitality, Commercial and Residential Complex and has executed lease-cum-sale agreement on 20<sup>th</sup> March, 2008.

16. Respondent no. 6 has taken a stand that it was not at all aware of the project initiated by respondent no. 7, KIADB. The said respondent claims it came to know about the entire project only when certain newspaper reports surfaced during the month of June, 2013 and till that time respondent no. 6 was in the dark. After the complaints, the said respondent immediately inspected the Bellandur Lake and the Agara Lake on 12<sup>th</sup> June, 2013 and prepared an inspection report. In the report, it was noticed that the large scale construction activities in the catchment area of Bellandur Lake was going on and there was a change in the land use which in turn has directly affected the catchment of Bellandur

Lake. The wetland area of Agara Lake had also shrunk which originally formed the irrigation area for the adjoining agricultural lands. Respondent no. 6, vide its letter dated 6<sup>th</sup> July, 2013, had questioned the decision of respondent no. 7 and even requested to stop the construction activity and to reclassify the land as non-SEZ area. It was thereafter on 31<sup>st</sup> August, 2013 that respondent no. 9 wrote a letter to respondent no. 6 for according approval for the proposed development projects. However, vide its letter dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September, 2013, respondent no. 6 informed respondent no. 7 that the replying respondent had no authority to grant or deny construction projects but at the same time it also communicated their objections to respondent no. 7, mentioning that construction activity would be in contravention to the directions of the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka as well as of the Hon'ble Supreme Court. Despite these warnings, respondent no. 7 granted approval to the extension of building drawings of the project in favour of respondents no. 9 & 10 on 11<sup>th</sup> October, 2013 and 3<sup>rd</sup> January, 2013 respectively, with certain conditions like ensuring that all natural valleys, valley zone, irrigation tanks and existing roads leading to villages in the said land should not be disturbed; further, that the natural sloping pattern of the project site shall remain unaltered and the lakes and other water bodies within and/or at the vicinity of the project area should be protected and conserved. Despite these objections by respondent no. 6, the plans were approved and approvals extended from time to time. Therefore, respondent no. 6 submits that these projects, as approved by

respondent no. 7 would have adverse impacts on Bellandur Lake and Agara Lake.

17. Respondent nos. 1, 3 and 5 though have filed separate replies but they have taken up the stand that the projects have been granted, No Objections Certificates and Environmental Clearance by SEIAA, subject to the conditions noticed above. According to these respondents, if there is any breach, the same would be dealt with in accordance with law. According to respondent nos. 1 & 3, the file of respondent no. 10 was closed by SEIAA, Karnataka on 16<sup>th</sup> November, 2012 for non-submission of the required information but was later revived in the meeting held on 27<sup>th</sup> June, 2013 and Environmental Clearance was granted on 30<sup>th</sup> September, 2013. Both the projects are ongoing projects. The proposals have been considered in accordance with law.

18. Vide order dated 25<sup>th</sup> July, 2014 of the Tribunal, respondent nos. 11 and 12 were impleaded on their applications. Both these respondents are registered as charitable trust or a society. Replies by both these respondents have been filed wherein they have raised specific objections with regard to allotment of land in Ecologically Sensitive Area in the catchments of the Bellandur Lake for the construction of IT Park and related infrastructure, in flagrant violation of the applicable rules and regulations. According to respondent nos. 11 and 12, the allotment of this land is in contravention of the directions laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of *Karnataka Industrial Areas Development Board vs. Sri. C. Kenchappa and Ors.*, (2006) 6 SCC 371. It is further

stated that the fact that these projects would essentially result in alteration of natural hydrology of the area and sloping pattern of the project site, clearly shows that there was no application of mind on the part of the concerned authority for granting approvals. The plans sanctioned in favour of respondent nos. 9 and 10 are replete with irregularities and illegalities and despite objections from respondent no. 6, the plans have been renewed contrary to law. For instance, respondent no. 9 had first represented that the project will have a built up area of 1.75 lakh sq. ft. while seeking approval from respondent no. 6, while in reality the built up area is 1.30 crore sq. ft./9.54 lakh sq. mtr., which is evidenced by respondent no. 9's own admission, and is not even disputed by him. The water requirement of the project would be nearly 135 million litres per month, which would exert excessive pressure over the wetland and would also lead to scarcity of water for the residents of the nearby areas. As already stated, the execution of the project will necessarily result in altering the hydrology of the area and the natural sloping pattern of the project site. Therefore, the conditions imposed in the Environmental Clearance are incapable of being complied with. According to these respondents, the Google satellite images that have been placed on record, reveal that the excavation work by respondent nos. 9 and 10 commenced much prior to obtaining approvals by them in 2012 & 2013 respectively, making the construction unauthorised and illegal. The matters before the Hon'ble High Court are stated to be restricted to the prayer for resumption of land and not connected with these proceedings

before the Tribunal. According to these respondents, the stop work orders for the construction of the project have been stayed in terms of the orders of the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka and are subject to the result of the Writ Petition and the Project Proponents are entitled to claim their equities in the event they failed before the Hon'ble High Court. The Hon'ble High Court had granted the interim order staying the stop work orders primarily on the ground that BBMP did not have jurisdiction to issue such order. According to respondent nos. 11 and 12, respondent no. 10 obtained the Environmental Clearance on 30<sup>th</sup> September, 2013, but it still does not have the mandated clearance from the BDA which was one of the conditions imposed by the State High Level Clearance Committee on 25<sup>th</sup> January, 2008. The project consists of residential block and commercial block, among other constructed areas. It is averred that as of present, a very small part of the project has been completed and if the construction of the project is permitted to be completed in all respects, the environment and ecology of the area would suffer and residents and public at large would have to face severe and fatal environmental consequences. These adverse consequences would not only be limited to flooding, water shortage, geological instability but would also affect the Bellandur Lake, which is one of the largest lakes in Bangalore, gathering an area of 338.28 hectares, with catchment area, of approximately 171.17 square kms.

As already noticed, respondent nos. 11 and 12 were ordered to be impleaded as respondents in this case on the condition that they

would withdraw the Public Interest Litigation filed by them before the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka. These Respondents had thus moved the Hon'ble High Court for withdrawal of the Writ Petitions. However, the Hon'ble High Court only permitted these two Respondents to withdraw themselves from the Writ Petitions in terms of the undertaking given by them before the Tribunal. The Petitioner before the Hon'ble High Court who had not given any undertaking before the Tribunal, their Writ Petitions are still continuing before the Hon'ble High Court. They have denied the allegation that any of them has committed violation of the order of the Tribunal or abused the process of law. It is also denied that the averments made and stand taken by them is false, incorrect and vexatious. Respondent no. 7 had first issued a letter dated 14<sup>th</sup> August, 2013 requiring respondent no. 9 to comply with the ecology and environmental rules and also to take necessary approval from the LDA, Bangalore and KSPCB before taking up any further activity of the project. Then, it issued the order dated 2<sup>nd</sup> January, 2014 informing the said respondent that the layout plan has been kept in abeyance and thus the Project Proponent should stop all construction activities in the allotted land until further orders. It is also the case of respondent nos. 11 and 12 that the report by Dr. T. V. Ramachandra is not a report by interested persons, but is part of scientist's social responsibility and the report published in May, 2013 gives the complete and correct position at site. It is their case that the cause of action has arisen on various dates, including first on 11<sup>th</sup> October, 2013 when respondent no. 7, despite objections

from various authorities, extended its approval of plan, on the conditions stated therein. They have, therefore, submitted that the application is neither barred by time nor can it be contended that it does not raise a specific question of environment within the ambit of the Scheduled Acts under the NGT Act, 2010.

19. From the above pleaded case of the respective parties and the submissions advanced on their behalf, the following questions fall for consideration and determination of the Tribunal:

1. Whether the application filed by the applicants and supported by respondent nos. 11 and 12, is barred by time and thus, not maintainable?
2. Whether the petition as framed and reliefs claimed therein, disclose a cause of action over which this Tribunal has jurisdiction to entertain and decide the application, under the provisions of NGT Act, 2010?
3. Whether the present application is barred by the principle of *res judicata* and / or constructive *res judicata*?
4. Whether the application filed by the applicants should not be entertained or it is not maintainable before the Tribunal, in view of the pendency of the Writ Petition 36567-74 of 2013 before the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka?
5. What relief, if any, are the applicants entitled to? Should or not the Tribunal, in the interest of environment and ecology issue any directions and if so, to what effect?

**Discussion on Merits**

**1. Whether the application filed by the applicants and supported by respondent nos. 11 and 12, is barred by time and thus, not maintainable?**

20. According to respondent no. 9, it had submitted a proposal to establish Information Technology Park, R & D Centre, Residential Complex and other facilities and sought for allotment of lands for the project in the year 2000. On 15<sup>th</sup> January, 2001, the Government in exercise of powers conferred upon it under Section 3(1) of the Karnataka Industrial Area Development Act, 1966 declared the land in question as an Industrial Area. Preliminary notification for acquisition of land in question was issued on 15<sup>th</sup> January, 2001 by KIADB and final Notification for acquisition of the land was issued on 23<sup>rd</sup> April, 2004, which was preceded by a Global Investor meet held on 10<sup>th</sup> February, 2004. On 28<sup>th</sup> June, 2007, respondent no. 7 issued the letter of allotment to respondent no. 9 allotting 63 acres 37½ gunta in Agara and Jakkasandra village. The possession certificate in favour of respondent no. 9 was issued on 29<sup>th</sup> June, 2007 in furtherance to which said respondent had paid the amount and executed the lease-cum-sale agreement. Project lease was sanctioned on 4<sup>th</sup> July, 2007. Airport Authority issued the NOC on 9<sup>th</sup> April, 2010. Clearance for the project construction was issued by BSNL on 16<sup>th</sup> April, 2010. BWSSB issued NOC on 12<sup>th</sup> May, 2011. Bangalore Electricity Supply Company Ltd. issued NOC on 27<sup>th</sup> April, 2011. After meetings of the State Level Expert Appraisal Committee and SEIAA, proposal was

considered and Environmental Clearance was granted to respondent no. 9 on 17<sup>th</sup> February, 2012 for which notice was published in 'Kannada Prabha' and 'Indian Express' on 12<sup>th</sup> March, 2012 and 14<sup>th</sup> March, 2012 respectively. Modified building plan had been approved by respondent no. 7 on 30<sup>th</sup> August, 2012 which was valid up to 10<sup>th</sup> August, 2014. On 4<sup>th</sup> September, 2012, KSPCB issued consent for establishment under Water (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1974 and Air (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1981 as per conditions stated in the NOC. On 12<sup>th</sup> June, 2013, the LDA made a report stating that the KIADB has initiated a colossal mixed-use development project in the catchment area of Bellandur Lake. With reference to these dates and events, respondent no. 9 had advanced the plea that the application is barred by limitation. It is the contention of respondent no. 9, that all material events that would give rise to filing of an application under the provisions of NGT Act, 2010, had occurred on and prior to 17<sup>th</sup> February, 2012 and as the application was filed before the Southern Zone Bench of the Tribunal on 13<sup>th</sup> March, 2014, thus, same is hopelessly barred by time and is liable to be rejected on that short ground alone.

Similar events had taken place in regard to the project of respondent no. 10 who had been granted Environmental Clearance on 30<sup>th</sup> September, 2013. The contention raised by this respondent, which is, without prejudice to its other contentions, is that the grant of Environmental Clearance would put an end to all other challenges and even if the reports dated 12<sup>th</sup> June, 2013 and 14<sup>th</sup>

August, 2013 are taken into consideration, even then the application had to be filed within a period of 6 months from the date on which the 'cause of action for such dispute has first arisen' in terms of Section 14 of the NGT Act, 2010. Admittedly, present application has been filed in March, 2014 i.e. much beyond the prescribed period of limitation. Also, there is no application for condonation of delay accompanying the main application. Even otherwise, the period of 60 days beyond the prescribed period of limitation has long expired and as such the Tribunal will have no jurisdiction to condone the delay. The Applicants contend, which contention is also duly supported by respondent Nos. 11 and 12 that the present application is not an application simplicitor under Section 14 of the NGT Act. It is an application where a specific prayer has been made with reference to the reports dated 12<sup>th</sup> June, 2013 and 14<sup>th</sup> August, 2013 for restoration of the Ecologically Sensitive Land and for maintaining the sensitive area in its natural condition, so that ecological balance of the area is not disturbed. This being a petition under Section 15 of the NGT Act, it could be filed within five years from the date on which the cause for such compensation or relief 'first arose'. According to the applicants, the present application is even filed within the period of limitation as contemplated under Section 14 of the NGT Act, 2010, for the reason that with reference to the inspection reports dated 12<sup>th</sup> June, 2013 by respondent no. 6 and 14<sup>th</sup> August, 2013 by respondent no. 2, various actions had been taken by different authorities, fully substantiating the plea of the applicant that such huge

construction activity in the catchment area of the lakes is bound to have adverse impact on the environment and ecology. According to them, it is evident from the record that on 14<sup>th</sup> August, 2013, respondent no. 7 had issued a communication to respondent no. 9 to comply with Ecology and Environmental Rules, as well as to take approval from the LDA. Various letters were exchanged between different authorities and the Project Proponent about the progress of the project and its irregularities. A letter of stop work notice was issued by the BBMP on 23<sup>rd</sup> December, 2013. KIADB also issued a stop work notice to respondent no. 9 on 2<sup>nd</sup> January, 2014. According to these applicants, in light of these facts, it is the case of 'continuing and/or recurring' cause of action relatable to environmental issues. Thus, the application had been filed within the prescribed period of 6 months even in terms of Section 14 of the NGT Act and the limitation would trigger from each of these dates mentioned above.

21. Sections 14 and 15 of the NGT Act, 2010 to a large extent are self contained provisions. They deal with the remedies that an aggrieved person is entitled to invoke. The present application, if treated as an application under Section 15 of the NGT Act, viewed from any angle, is within the prescribed period of limitation. The Environmental Clearance was granted to respondent no. 9 vide order dated 17<sup>th</sup> February, 2012 and all events have occurred thereafter till institution of the petition. The applicant has prayed for relief and restoration of ecology particularly with reference to the catchment areas of Bellandur Lake & Agara Lake. The applicant

could not have availed of any remedy before the Tribunal, prior to 2<sup>nd</sup> June, 2010 and/or 18<sup>th</sup> October, 2010 respectively, i.e. the dates on which the Act came into force and the Tribunal was constituted. Thus, the period of limitation would start running at best from these dates. The present application for the purposes of Section 15 has been filed within 5 years there-from and thus, has to be treated as within time.

However, what needs to be deliberated upon is whether in terms of Section 14 of the NGT Act, 2010, the present application has been filed within the prescribed period of limitation or not. Section 14(3) mandates that no application for adjudication of dispute under Section 14(1) shall be entertained by the Tribunal unless it is made within the period of 6 months from the date on which the 'cause of action for such dispute first arose'. The jurisdiction of the Tribunal under Section 14 is over civil cases where a substantial question relating to environment, including enforcement of any legal right relating to environment, is involved and such questions arise out of the implementation of the enactments specified in Schedule I of the NGT Act. The dispute or questions that the Tribunal is required to settle must fall within the ambit and scope of Section 14(1) of the NGT Act. In other words, it must be a dispute raising a substantial question relating to environment.

22. The contesting respondents while relying upon the language of Section 14 read cumulatively, contend that the expression 'within the period of 6 months from the date of which the cause of action

for such dispute first arose' mandates that the period of limitation has to be reckoned when the cause of action for such dispute first arose and not thereafter. In the present case, the Environmental Clearance had been granted to respondent no. 9 on 17<sup>th</sup> February, 2012 and therefore it is their contention that the application could at best be filed by 16<sup>th</sup> August, 2012 and not thereafter.

23. 'Cause of Action' as understood in legal parlance is a bundle of essential facts, which it is necessary for the plaintiff to prove before he can succeed. It is the foundation of a suit or an action. 'Cause of Action' is stated to be entire set of facts that give rise to an enforceable claim; the phrase comprises every fact, which, if traversed, the plaintiff must prove in order to obtain judgment. In other words, it is a bundle of facts which when taken with the law applicable to them gives the plaintiff, the right to relief against defendants. It must contain facts or acts done by the defendants to prove 'cause of action'. While construing or understanding the cause of action, it must be kept in mind that the pleadings must be read as a whole to ascertain its true import. It is not permissible to cull out a sentence or passage and to read it out of the context, in isolation. Although, it is the substance and not merely the form that has to be looked into, the pleading has to be construed as it stands without addition or subtraction of words, or change of its apparent grammatical sense. The intention of the party concerned is to be gathered, from the pleading taken as a whole. [Ref. *Shri Udhav Singh v. Madhav Rao Scindia*, (1977) 1 SCC 511, *A.B.C Laminart Pvt Ltd. v. A.P. Agencies*, AIR 1989 SC 1239].

24. The expression 'cause of action' as normally understood in civil jurisprudence has to be examined with some distinction, while construing it in relation to the provisions of the NGT Act. Such 'cause of action' should essentially have nexus with the matters relating to environment. It should raise a substantial question of environment relating to the implementation of the statutes specified in Schedule I of the NGT Act. A 'cause of action' might arise during the chain of events, in establishment of a project but would not be construed as a 'cause of action' under the provisions of the Section 14 of the NGT Act, 2010 unless it has a direct nexus to environment or it gives rise to a substantial environmental dispute. For example, acquisition of land *simplicitor* or issuance of notification under the provisions of the land acquisition laws, would not be an event that would trigger the period of limitation under the provisions of the NGT Act, 'being cause of action first arose'. A dispute giving rise to a 'cause of action' must essentially be an environmental dispute and should relate to either one or more of the Acts stated in Schedule I to the NGT Act, 2010. If such dispute leading to 'cause of action' is alien to the question of environment or does not raise substantial question relating of environment, it would be incapable of triggering prescribed period of limitation under the NGT Act, 2010. [Ref: *Liverpool and London S.P. and I Asson. Ltd. v. M.V. Sea Success I and Anr.*, (2004) 9 SCC 512, *J. Mehta v. Union of India*, 2013 ALL (I) NGT REPORTER (2) Delhi, 106, *Kehar Singh v. State of Haryana*, 2013 ALL (I) NGT REPORTER (DELHI) 556, *Goa Foundation v. Union of India*, 2013 ALL (I) NGT REPORTER DELHI 234].

Furthermore, the 'cause of action' has to be complete. For a dispute to culminate into a cause of action, actionable under Section 14 of the NGT Act, 2010, it has to be a 'composite cause of action' meaning that, it must combine all the ingredients spelled out under Section 14(1) and (2) of the NGT Act, 2010. It must satisfy all the legal requirements i.e. there must be a dispute. There should be a substantial question relating to environment or enforcement of any legal right relating to environment and such question should arise out of the implementation of the enactments specified in Schedule I. Action before the Tribunal must be taken within the prescribed period of limitation triggering from the date when all such ingredients are satisfied along with other legal requirements. Accrual of 'cause of action' as afore-stated would have to be considered as to when it first arose.

25. In contradistinction to 'cause of action first arose', there could be 'continuing cause of action', 'recurring cause of action' or 'successive cause of action'. These diverse connotations with reference to cause of action are not synonymous. They certainly have a distinct and different meaning in law, 'Cause of action first arose' would refer to a definite point of time when requisite ingredients constituting that 'cause of action' were complete, providing applicant right to invoke the jurisdiction of the Court or the Tribunal. The 'Right to Sue' or 'right to take action' would be subsequent to an accrual of such right. The concept of continuing wrong which would be the foundation of continuous cause of action has been accepted by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of *Bal*

*Krishna Savalram Pujari & Ors. v. Sh. Dayaneshwar Maharaj Sansthan & Ors.*, AIR 1959 SC 798.

26. In the case of *State of Bihar v. Deokaran Nenshi and Anr.*, (1972) 2 SCC 890, Hon'ble Supreme Court was dealing with the provisions of Section 66 and 79 of the Mines Act, 1952. These provisions prescribed for a penalty to be imposed upon guilty, but provided that no Court shall take cognizance of an offence under Act unless a complaint thereof has been made within six months from the date on which the offence is alleged to have been committed or within six months from the date on which the alleged commission of the offence came to the knowledge of the Inspector, whichever is later. The Explanation to the provision specifically provided that if the offence in question is a continuing offence, the period of limitation shall be computed with reference to every point of time during which the said offence continues. The Hon'ble Supreme Court held as under:

“5. A continuing offence is one which is susceptible of continuance and is distinguishable from the one which is committed once and for all. It is one of those offences which arises out of a failure to obey or comply with a rule or its requirement and which involves a penalty, the liability for which continues until the rule or its requirement is obeyed or complied with. On every occasion that such disobedience or non-compliance occurs and recurs, there is the offence committed. The distinction between the two kinds of offences is between an act or omission which constitutes an offence once and for all and an act or omission which continues and therefore, constitutes a fresh offence every time or occasion on which it continues. In the case of a continuing offence, there is thus the ingredient of continuance of the offence which is absent in the case of an offence which takes place when an act or omission is committed once and for all.”

27. Whenever a wrong or offence is committed and ingredients are satisfied and repeated, it evidently would be a case of 'continuing wrong or offence'. For instance, using the factory without registration and licence was an offence committed every time the premises were used as a factory. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of *Maya Rani Punj v. Commissioner of Income Tax, Delhi*, (1986) 1 SCC 445, was considering, if not filing return within prescribed time and without reasonable cause, was a continuing wrong or not, the Court held that continued default is obviously on the footing that non-compliance with the obligation of making a return is an infraction as long as the default continued. The penalty is imposable as long as the default continues and as long as the assessee does not comply with the requirements of law he continues to be guilty of the infraction and exposes himself to the penalty provided by law. Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in the case of *Mahavir Spinning Mills Ltd. v. Hb Leasing And Finances Co. Ltd.*, 199 (2013) DLT 227, while explaining Section 22 of the Limitation Act took the view that in the case of a continuing breach, or of a continuing tort, a fresh period of limitation begins to run at every moment of time during which the breach or the tort, as the case may be, continues. Therefore, continuing the breach, act or wrong would culminate into the 'continuing cause of action' once all the ingredients are satisfied. Continuing cause of action thus, becomes relevant for even the determination of period of limitation with reference to the facts and circumstances of a given case. The very essence of continuous cause of action is continuing source of injury

which renders the doer of the act responsible and liable for consequence in law.

Thus, the expressions 'cause of action first arose', 'continuing cause of action' and 'recurring cause of action' are well accepted cannons of civil jurisprudence but they have to be understood and applied with reference to the facts and circumstances of a given case. It is not possible to lay down with absolute certainty or exactitude, their definitions or limitations. They would have to be construed with reference to the facts and circumstances of a given case. These are generic concepts of civil law which are to be applied with acceptable variations in law. In light of the above discussed position of law, we may revert to the facts of the case in hand.

28. The settled position of law is that in law of limitation, it is only the injury alone that is relevant and not the consequences of the injury. If the wrongful act causes the injury which is complete, there is no continuing wrong even though the damage resulting from the act may continue. In other words distinction must be made between continuance of legal injury and the continuance of its injurious effects. Where a wrongful act produces a state of affairs, every moment continuance of which is a new tort, a fresh cause of action for continuance lies. Wherever a suit is based on multiple cause of action, period of limitation will began to run from the date when the right to sue first accrues and successive violation of the right may not give rise to a fresh cause of action. [Ref: *Khatri Hotels Private Limited and Anr. v. Union of India (UOI) and Anr.*, (2011) 9 SCC 126, *Bal Krishna Savalram Pujari & Ors. v. Sh.*

*Dayaneshwar Maharaj Sansthan & Ors*, AIR 1959 SC 798, G.C. *Sharma v. Municipal Corporation of Delhi*, (1979) ILR 2 Delhi 771, *Kuchibotha Kanakamma and Anr. v Tadepalli Ptanga Rao and Ors.*, AIR 1957 AP 419].

29. A cause of action which is complete in all respects gives the applicant a right to sue. An applicant has a right to bring an action upon a single cause of action while claiming different reliefs. Rule 14 of the National Green Tribunal (Practise and Procedure) Rules, 2011, shows the clear intent of the framers of the Rules that multiple reliefs can be claimed in an application provided they are consequential to one another and are based upon a single cause of action. Different causes of action, thus, may result in institution of different applications and therefore, there is exclusion of the concept of the 'joinder of causes of action' under the Rules of 2011. The multiple cause of action again would be of two kinds. One, which arise simultaneously and other, which arise at a different or successive point of time. In first kind, cause of action accrues at the time of completion of the wrong or injury. In latter, it may give rise to cause of action or if the statutes so provide when the 'cause of action first arose' even if the wrong was repeated. Where the injury or wrong is complete at different times and may be of similar and different nature, then every subsequent wrong depending upon the facts of the case may gives rise to a fresh cause of action.

To this general rule, there could be exceptions. In particular such exceptions could be carved out by the legislature itself. In a statute, where framers of law use the phraseology like 'cause of

action first arose' in contradistinction to 'cause of action' simplicitor. Accrual of right to sue means accrual of cause of action for suit. The expressions 'when right to sue first arose' or 'cause of action first arose' connotes date when right to sue first accrued, although cause of action may have arisen even on subsequent occasions. Such expressions are noticed in Article 58 of the Limitation Act, 1963. We may illustrate this by giving an example with regard to the laws that we are dealing here. When an order granting or refusing Environmental Clearance is passed, right to bring an action accrues in favour of an aggrieved person. An aggrieved person may not challenge the order granting Environmental Clearance, however, if on subsequent event there is a breach or non-implementation of the terms and conditions of the Environmental Clearance order, it would give right to bring a fresh action and would be a complete and composite recurring cause of action providing a fresh period of limitation. It is also for the reason that the cause of action accruing from the breach of the conditions of the consent order is no way dependent upon the initial grant or refusal of the consent. Such an event would be a complete cause of action in itself giving rise to fresh right to sue. Thus, where the legislature specifically requires the action to be brought within the prescribed period of limitation computed from the date when the cause of action 'first arose', it would by necessary implication exclude the extension of limitation or fresh limitation being counted from every continuing wrong, so far, it relates to the same wrong or breach and necessarily not a recurring cause of action.

30. Now, we would deal with the concept of recurring cause of action. The word 'recurring' means, something happening again and again and not that which occurs only once. Such reoccurrence could be frequent or periodical. The recurring wrong could have new elements in addition to or in substitution of the first wrong or when 'cause of action first arose'. It could even have the same features but its reoccurrence is complete and composite. The recurring cause of action would not stand excluded by the expression 'cause of action first arose'. In some situation, it could even be a complete, distinct cause of action hardly having nexus to the first breach or wrong, thus, not inviting the implicit consequences of the expression 'cause of action first arose'. The Supreme Court clarified the distinction between continuing and recurring cause of action with some finesse in the case of *M. R. Gupta v. Union of India and others*, (1995) 5 SCC 628, the Court held that:

"The appellant's grievance that his pay fixation was not in accordance with the rules, was the assertion of a continuing wrong against him which gave rise to a recurring cause of action each time he was paid a salary which was not computed in accordance with the rules. So long as the appellant is in service, a fresh cause of action arises every month when he is paid his monthly salary on the basis of a wrong computation made contrary to rules. It is no doubt true that if the appellant's claim is found correct on merits. He would be entitled to be paid according to the properly fixed pay scale in the future and the question of limitation would arise for recovery of the arrears for the past period. In other words, the appellant's claim, if any, for recovery of arrears calculated on the basis of difference in the pay which has become time barred would not be recoverable, but he would be entitled to proper fixation of his pay in accordance with rules and to cessation of a continuing wrong if on merits his claim is justified. Similarly, any other consequential relief claimed by

him, such as, promotion etc. would also be subject to the defence of laches etc. to disentitle him to those reliefs. The pay fixation can be made only on the basis of the situation existing on 1.8.1978 without taking into account any other consequential relief which may be barred by his laches and the bar of limitation. It is to this limited extent of proper pay fixation the application cannot be treated as time barred since it is based on a recurring cause of action.

The Tribunal misdirected itself when it treated the appellant's claim as 'one time action' meaning thereby that it was not a continuing wrong based on a recurring cause of action. The claim to be paid the correct salary computed on the basis of proper pay fixation, is a right which subsists during the entire tenure of service and can be exercised at the time of each payment of the salary when the employee is entitled to salary computed correctly in accordance with the rules. This right of a Government servant to be paid the correct salary throughout his tenure according to computation made in accordance with rules, is akin to the right of redemption which is an incident of a subsisting mortgage and subsists so long as the mortgage itself subsists, unless the equity of redemption is extinguished. It is settled that the right of redemption is of this kind. (See *Thota China Subba Rao and Ors. v. Mattapalli, Raju and Ors.* AIR (1950) F C1.”

31. The Continuing cause of action would refer to the same act or transaction or series of such acts or transactions. The recurring cause of action would have an element of fresh cause which by itself would provide the applicant the right to sue. It may have even be *de hors* the first cause of action or the first wrong by which the right to sue accrues. Commission of breach or infringement may give recurring and fresh cause of action with each of such infringement like infringement of a trademark. Every rejection of a right in law could be termed as a recurring cause of action. [Ref: *Ex. Sep. Roop Singh v. Union of India and Ors.*, 2006 (91) DRJ 324,

*M/s. Bengal Waterproof Limited v. M/s. Bombay Waterproof Manufacturing Company and Another*, (1997) 1 SCC 99].

32. The principle that emerges from the above discussion is that the 'cause of action' satisfying the ingredients for an action which might arise subsequently to an earlier event give result in accrual of fresh right to sue and hence reckoning of fresh period of limitation. A recurring or continuous cause of action may give rise to a fresh cause of action resulting in fresh accrual of right to sue. In such cases, a subsequent wrong or injury would be independent of the first wrong or injury and a subsequent, composite and complete cause of action would not be hit by the expression 'cause of action first arose' as it is independent accrual of right to sue. In other words, a recurring cause of action is a distinct and completed occurrence made of a fact or blend of composite facts giving rise to a fresh legal injury, fresh right to sue and triggering a fresh lease of limitation. It would not materially alter the character of the preposition that it has a reference to an event which had occurred earlier and was a complete cause of action in itself. In that sense, recurring cause of action which is complete in itself and satisfies the requisite ingredients would trigger a fresh period of limitation. To such composite and complete cause of action that has arisen subsequently, the phraseology of the 'cause of action first arose' would not effect in computing the period of limitation. The concept of cause of action first arose must essentially relate to the same event or series of events which have a direct linkage and arise from the same event. To put it simply, it would be act or series of acts

which arise from the same event, may be at different stages. This expression would not *de bar* a composite and complete cause of action that has arisen subsequently. To illustratively demonstrate, we may refer to the challenge to the grant of Environmental Clearance. When an appellant challenges the grant of Environmental Clearance, it cannot challenge its legality at one stage and its impacts at a subsequent stage. But, if the order granting Environmental Clearance is amended at a subsequent stage, then the appellant can challenge the subsequent amendments at a later stage, it being a complete and composite cause of action that has subsequently arisen and would not be hit by the concept of cause of action first arose.

33. The Environmental Clearance was granted to the project of Respondent no. 9 on 17<sup>th</sup> February, 2012 and to Respondent no. 10 on 30<sup>th</sup> September, 2013. Both these Environmental Clearances being appealable in terms of Section 16 of the NGT Act, 2010, their legality and correctness could be challenged within the prescribed period of limitation i.e. 30 days (or within the extended period of 60 days) which has not been done and as already noticed there is no challenge in this application to the grant of the Environmental Clearance. The applicants have primarily raised a challenge within the ambit and scope of Section 14 and 15 of the NGT Act. As already discussed, the application in so far as it prays for the relief of the restoration, it is within the period of limitation of 5 years. According to the applicants, the facts on record disclose violations of the condition of Environment Clearance and poses serious threat

to the environment and ecology because of the reckless construction in the catchment areas of the lakes. During the period of August, 2012 to January, 2014, various notices have been issued by different authorities in relation to the modification of building plans. These stop work notices/ orders and the inspection reports including report by LDA clearly demonstrates that the development project in the catchment area of Bellandur Lake as implemented would probably have adverse effect on the Bellandur Lake. The applicant may not challenge the grant of Environmental Clearance *per se* but upon commencement of the project and in view of their being definite documentary evidence supported by data, that the Project Proponent has committed breaches and implementation of the project is bound to have serious adverse impacts on ecology, environment and particularly the water bodies would give an independent 'cause of action' to him *de hors* the grant of Environmental Clearance. The averments in the application and the record fully satisfy the ingredients of Section 14 of the NGT Act. From those occurrences particularly of January, 2014, a fresh period of limitation has to be reckoned. The applicant may rely upon various reports, notices and orders in support of its claim. Whether the applicant succeeds on merits or not, is a different issue. However, for the purpose of limitation, the dates of these reports, stop work orders and notices would be relevant dates, which would provide the 'recurring cause of action' to the applicant and thus, the application will be within the prescribed period of limitation. In addition to this, the applicant has also prayed for

taking action in accordance with law on the basis of the report dated 14<sup>th</sup> August, 2013, communication letter of LDA dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September, 2013, communication dated 12<sup>th</sup> December, 2013 by LDA to Respondent No. 9, stop work notice dated 23<sup>rd</sup> December, 2013 issued by BBMP to Respondent No. 9 and stop work notice issued dated 2<sup>nd</sup> January, 2014 by KIADP to Respondent No. 9. Thus, the application having been instituted on 13<sup>th</sup> March, 2014 is well within the period of limitation under Section 14 of the NGT Act and for the reasons afore-recorded, we find no merit in the plea of limitation raised on behalf of the Respondents.

**2. Whether the petition as framed and reliefs claimed therein, disclose a cause of action over which this Tribunal has jurisdiction to entertain and decide the application, under the provisions of NGT Act, 2010?**

34. It is a settled principle that while determining whether the application discloses a cause of action, which would squarely fall within the ambit and scope of the provisions of the NGT Act, the petition has to be read as a whole by the Court or the Tribunal. Thus, we have to examine the cumulative effect of the averments made in the application, read in conjunction with the prayer clause. If upon reading of the entire application together, such cause of action is disclosed, that would fall within the jurisdiction of this Tribunal, the Tribunal would be obliged to entertain and decide such pleas. In the case in hand, the applicant has made reference to various activities in general and illegal and unauthorised activities of respondent nos. 9 and 10 in particular, which are

having adverse effect on the water bodies as well as the water supply to the city of Bangalore. It is alleged that the construction activity that is being carried on by respondent no. 9 is in violation of all the stipulations of the Environmental Clearance. Rampant construction work is being carried on in the buffer zone as well as over and around the Rajakaluves. While pointing out the blatant irregularities, it is also averred that the project is in the midst of fragile wetland area and is bound to severely disturb and damage the Rajakaluves. In terms of the Environmental Clearance, a condition has been imposed that the project proponent shall not disturb the storm water drains, natural valleys, etc. and buffer zone area around the Rajakaluves was to be maintained. However, according to the applicant, the project area is located between two lakes and therefore, the construction is in violation of Rule 4 of the Wetlands (Conservation and Management) Rules, 2010. There has been violation of maintaining the buffer zone in accordance with the revised Master Plan of 2015. There has to be 30 meter buffer zone created around the lakes and 50 meter buffer zone created on either side of the Rajakaluves. This has also not been adhered to. Further, the consent had been granted to respondent no. 9 for residential units and not for other activities.

35. While referring the water shortage, the averment is that the project requires 4.5 million litres of water per day i.e. 135 million litre water per month. Such requirement of the project would be beyond the capacity of respondent no. 5, as the quantity of water required for the project would still be more than the water supply

1

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA****CIVIL ORIGINAL JURISDICTION**

**MISCELLANEOUS APPLICATION NO. 21 OF 2022**  
**IN**  
**MISCELLANEOUS APPLICATION NO. 665 OF 2021**  
**IN**  
**SUO MOTU WRIT PETITION (C) NO. 3 OF 2020**

**IN RE: COGNIZANCE FOR EXTENSION OF LIMITATION****WITH**

**MISCELLANEOUS APPLICATION NO.29 OF 2022**  
**IN**  
**MISCELLANEOUS APPLICATION NO. 665 OF 2021**  
**IN**  
**SUO MOTU WRIT PETITION (C) NO. 3 OF 2020**

**Order**

1. In March, 2020, this Court took Suo Motu cognizance of the difficulties that might be faced by the litigants in filing petitions/ applications/ suits/ appeals/ all other quasi proceedings within the period of limitation prescribed under the general law of limitation or under any special laws (both Central and/or State) due to the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic.

2. On 23.03.2020, this Court directed extension of the period of limitation in all proceedings before Courts/Tribunals including this Court w.e.f. 15.03.2020 till further orders. On 08.03.2021, the order dated 23.03.2020 was brought to an end, permitting the relaxation of period of limitation between 15.03.2020 and 14.03.2021. While doing so, it was made clear that the period of limitation would start from 15.03.2021.
3. Thereafter, due to a second surge in COVID-19 cases, the Supreme Court Advocates on Record Association (SCAORA) intervened in the Suo Motu proceedings by filing Miscellaneous Application No. 665 of 2021 seeking restoration of the order dated 23.03.2020 relaxing limitation. The aforesaid Miscellaneous Application No.665 of 2021 was disposed of by this Court *vide* Order dated 23.09.2021, wherein this Court extended the period of limitation in all proceedings before the Courts/Tribunals including this Court w.e.f 15.03.2020 till 02.10.2021.
4. The present Miscellaneous Application has been filed by the Supreme Court Advocates-on-Record Association in the context of the spread of the new variant of the COVID-19 and the drastic surge in the number of COVID cases across the country.

Considering the prevailing conditions, the applicants are seeking the following:

- i. allow the present application by restoring the order dated 23.03.2020 passed by this Hon'ble Court in *Suo Motu Writ Petition (C) NO. 3 of 2020* ; and
  - ii. allow the present application by restoring the order dated 27.04.2021 passed by this Hon'ble Court in *M.A. no. 665 of 2021 in *Suo Motu Writ Petition (C) NO. 3 of 2020**; and
  - iii. pass such other order or orders as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper.
5. Taking into consideration the arguments advanced by learned counsel and the impact of the surge of the virus on public health and adversities faced by litigants in the prevailing conditions, we deem it appropriate to dispose of the *M.A. No. 21 of 2022* with the following directions:

- I. The order dated 23.03.2020 is restored and in continuation of the subsequent orders dated 08.03.2021, 27.04.2021 and 23.09.2021, it is directed that the period from 15.03.2020 till 28.02.2022 shall stand excluded for the purposes of limitation as may be prescribed under any general or special laws in respect of all judicial or quasi-judicial proceedings.

- II. Consequently, the balance period of limitation remaining as on 03.10.2021, if any, shall become available with effect from 01.03.2022.
- III. In cases where the limitation would have expired during the period between 15.03.2020 till 28.02.2022, notwithstanding the actual balance period of limitation remaining, all persons shall have a limitation period of 90 days from 01.03.2022. In the event the actual balance period of limitation remaining, with effect from 01.03.2022 is greater than 90 days, that longer period shall apply.
- IV. It is further clarified that the period from 15.03.2020 till 28.02.2022 shall also stand excluded in computing the periods prescribed under Sections 23 (4) and 29A of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, Section 12A of the Commercial Courts Act, 2015 and provisos (b) and (c) of Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 and any other laws, which prescribe period(s) of limitation for instituting proceedings, outer limits (within which the court or tribunal can condone delay) and termination of proceedings.

- 6. As prayed for by learned Senior Counsel, M.A. No. 29 of 2022 is dismissed as withdrawn.

.....CJI.  
(N.V. RAMANA)

.....J.  
(L. NAGESWARA RAO)

.....J.  
(SURYA KANT)

New Delhi  
**January 10, 2022**

