

**BEFORE THE HON'BLE NATIONAL GREEN
TRIBUNAL (SZ) CHENNAI**

IN APPLICATION NO 41 OF 2017

In the matter of:

K. Maheshwaran

...

Applicant

v.

State of Kerala & Ors


...

Respondents

**INDEX TO STATUTORY DOCUMENTS AND CASE LAWS FILED BY THE FIFTH
RESPONDENT**

NO	PARTICULARS	PAGE
1.	Notification 804(E) dated 17/03/2017	1-7
2.	OM dated 08/01/2019: Standardization of conditions for non coal mining sector	8-19
3.	OM dated 16/01/2020: Additional environmental clearance condition for mining projects	20-21
4.	OM dated 07/07/2021: Standard operating procedure for identification and handling of violation cases under EIA Notification 2006	22-30
5.	Electrosteels Steels Ltd v. UOI (SC) – Decision of the Supreme Court of India dated 09/12/2021	31-68
6.	OM dated 28/01/2022: Clarification regarding handling of violation cases under EIA Notification 2006	69
7.	Pahwa Plastics Pvt Ltd v. Dastak NGO & Ors (SC) – Decision of the Supreme Court of India dated 25/03/2022	70 -101
8.	Proof of service	102

Certified as True Copies


Counsel for Respondent No 5



भारत का राजपत्र The Gazette of India

असाधारण

EXTRAORDINARY

भाग II—खण्ड 3—उप-खण्ड (ii)

PART II—Section 3—Sub-section (ii)

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

सं. 723]

नई दिल्ली, मंगलवार, मार्च 14, 2017/फाल्गुन 23, 1938

No. 723]

NEW DELHI, TUESDAY, MARCH 14, 2017/PHALGUNA 23, 1938

पर्यावरण, वन और जलवायु परिवर्तन मंत्रालय

अधिसूचना

नई दिल्ली, 14 मार्च, 2017

का.आ. 804(अ).—पर्यावरण (संरक्षण) नियम 1986 के नियम 5 के उपनियम (3) की अपेक्षानुसार, पर्यावरण (संरक्षण) अधिनियम 1986 (1986 का 29) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) और उपधारा (2) के खंड (v) के अधीन भारत के राजपत्र, असाधारण, भाग II, खंड 3, उपखंड (ii) में अधिसूचना सं. का.आ. 1705(अ) तारीख 10 मई, 2016, पर्यावरणीय अनापत्ति के निदेश निबंधनों को अनुदत्त करने के लिए परियोजनाओं के मूल्यांकन की प्रक्रिया को पूरा करने के लिए, जिनमें स्थल पर कार्य आरंभ कर दिया है, पर्यावरणीय अनापत्ति की सीमा से परे उत्पादन का विस्तार किया है या पर्यावरण संघात अधिसूचना 2006 के अधीन पूर्व पर्यावरण अनापत्ति अभिप्राप्त किए बिना उत्पाद मिश्रण में परिवर्तन किया है, द्वारा उन सभी व्यक्तियों से, जिनके उससे प्रभावित होने की संभावना थी, उस तारीख से जिसको उस राजपत्र की प्रतियां, जिसमें यह अधिसूचना अंतर्विष्ट है, उपलब्ध करा दी जाती हैं, साठ दिन की अवधि के भीतर आक्षेप और सुझाव आमंत्रित करते हुए एक प्रारूप अधिसूचना प्रकाशित की गई थी ;

2. और उक्त राजपत्र की प्रतियां जनता को 10 मई, 2016 को उपलब्ध करा दी गई थीं ;

3. और पूर्वोक्त वर्णित प्रारूप अधिसूचना पर प्राप्त सभी सुझावों या आक्षेपों पर केंद्रीय सरकार द्वारा सम्यक्तः विचार कर लिया गया है ;

4. पर्यावरण (संरक्षण) अधिनियम, 1986 के उपबंधों के अध्याधीन, अधिनियम की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन केंद्रीय सरकार को ऐसे सभी उपाय करने की शक्ति है, जो वह पर्यावरण की क्वालिटी के संरक्षण और सुधार तथा पर्यावरण प्रदूषण को रोकने, नियंत्रित करने और समाप्त करने के प्रयोजनों के लिए आवश्यक और समीचीन समझती है ;

5. पर्यावरण (संरक्षण) अधिनियम, 1986 की धारा 5 केंद्रीय सरकार को निदेश देने के लिए सशक्त करती है, जो इस प्रकार है "केंद्रीय सरकार किसी अन्य विधि में किसी बात के होते हुए भी, किन्तु इस अधिनियम के उपबंधों के अधीन रहते हुए इस अधिनियम के अधीन अपनी शक्तियों के प्रयोग और अपने कृत्यों के निर्वहन में किसी व्यक्ति, अधिकारी या प्राधिकरण को लिखित निदेश दे सकेगी और ऐसा व्यक्ति, अधिकारी या प्राधिकरण ऐसे निदेशों का अनुपालन करने के लिए आवद्ध होगा ;

6. पर्यावरण, वन और जलवायु परिवर्तन मंत्रालय ने उल्लंघन के मामलों में पर्यावरणीय अनापत्ति अनुदत्त करने के लिए प्रक्रिया स्थापित करने के लिए तारीख 12.12.2012 और तारीख 27.06.2013 को एक कार्यालय ज्ञापन जारी किया है ;

7. हिन्दुस्तान कापर लिमिटेड बनाम भारत संघ के मामले में 2014 की रिट याचिका (सिविल) सं0 2364 में माननीय झारखंड उच्च न्यायालय के तारीख 28 नवंबर, 2014 के आदेश के अनुसरण में माननीय न्यायालय ने यह अभिनिर्धारित किया कि तारीख 12 दिसंबर, 2012 के कार्यालय ज्ञापन के अधीन पैरा सं0 5(i) और पैरा सं0 5(ii) की शर्तें अवैध और असंवैधानिक थीं और न्यायालय ने यह और अभिनिर्धारित किया कि अभिकथित अतिक्रमण की कार्रवाई स्वतंत्र कार्यवाही और पृथक् कार्यवाही होगी और इसलिए पर्यावरण अनापत्ति के लिए प्रस्ताव पर विचार करने के लिए परियोजना प्रस्तावक के विरुद्ध कार्रवाई आरंभ करने की प्रतीक्षा नहीं की जा सकती। माननीय न्यायालय ने यह व्यवस्था और दी कि पर्यावरण अनापत्ति के प्रस्ताव की परीक्षा इसके गुणागुण, पर्यावरण विधियों के अभिकथित अतिक्रमण के लिए किसी प्रस्तावित कार्रवाई से मुक्त आधार पर की जानी चाहिए ;

8. और राष्ट्रीय हरित अधिकरण की प्रधान न्यायपीठ ने 2015 के मूल आवेदन सं0 37 तथा 2015 के मूल आवेदन सं0 213 में तारीख 7 जुलाई, 2015 के अपने आदेश द्वारा यह अभिनिर्धारित किया कि पर्यावरण (संरक्षण) अधिनियम, 1986 या पर्यावरण समाघात निर्धारण अधिसूचना, 2006 तथा तटीय विनियमन जोन अधिसूचना, 2011 के अतिक्रमणों वाले निर्देश के निबंधनों या पर्यावरण अनापत्ति या तटीय विनियमन जोन अनापत्ति के प्रस्तावों पर विचार के विषय पर तारीख 12 दिसंबर, 2012 और 24 जून, 2013 के कार्यालय ज्ञापन पर्यावरण समाघात निर्धारण अधिसूचना, 2006 के उपबंधों को परिवर्तित या संशोधित नहीं कर सकते थे और अधिकरण ने उसे अपास्त कर दिया था ;

9. और पर्यावरण, वन और जलवायु परिवर्तन मंत्रालय तथा राज्य पर्यावरण समाघात निर्धारण प्राधिकरण को कतिपय प्रस्ताव, निर्देशों के निबंधनों और पर्यावरणीय अनापत्ति के लिए पर्यावरण समाघात निर्धारण अधिसूचना, 2006 के अधीन ऐसी परियोजनाओं के लिए प्राप्त हो रहे हैं, जिन्होंने स्थल पर कार्य आरंभ कर दिया है, पर्यावरणीय अनापत्ति की सीमा से परे उत्पादन का विस्तार किया है या पूर्व पर्यावरणीय अनापत्ति को प्राप्त किए बिना उत्पाद मिश्रण में परिवर्तन कर दिया है ;

10. पर्यावरण, वन और जलवायु परिवर्तन मंत्रालय ने पर्यावरण की क्वालिटी के संरक्षण और उसमें सुधार के प्रयोजन के लिए और पर्यावरणीय प्रदूषण का उपशमन करने के लिए यह आवश्यक समझा कि वह सभी निकाय, जो पर्यावरण संघात निर्धारण अधिसूचना, 2006 के अधीन पर्यावरण विनियम का अनुपालन नहीं कर रहे हैं, को समीचीन रीति में पर्यावरणीय विधियों की अनुपालना के लिए उसके अंतर्गत लाया जाए ;

11. और पर्यावरण, वन और जलवायु परिवर्तन मंत्रालय ऐसी परियोजनाओं और क्रियाकलापों को शीघ्रतम पर्यावरणीय विधियों की अनुपालना के अधीन लाना आवश्यक समझता है न कि उन्हें अविनियमित और बिना किसी जांच के छोड़ना, जो पर्यावरण के लिए अधिक नुकसानदायक होगा तथा इस उद्देश्य को अग्रसर करने के लिए भारत सरकार ऐसी सत्ताओं को, जो अननुपालक थे, अनुपालक बनाने के लिए समुचित रक्षोपायों के साथ पर्यावरणीय अनापत्ति प्रदान करना आवश्यक समझती है, प्रक्रिया ऐसी होनी चाहिए, जो पर्यावरण समाघात निर्धारण अधिसूचना, 2006 के उपबंधों के उल्लंघन पर रोक लगाए, जिससे अननुपालना और अननुपालना के धनीय लाभ भयोपरित हों तथा पर्यावरण के नुकसान के लिए समुचित रूप से प्रतिकर हो ;

12. और माननीय उच्चतम न्यायालय ने इंडियन काउंसिल फार एन्वायरो-लीगल एक्शन बनाम भारत संघ (बिछड़ी गांव औद्योगिक प्रदूषण का मामला) में 13 फरवरी, 1996 को निर्णय देते समय विधि के सभी सुसंगत उपबंधों का विश्लेषण किया और यह निष्कर्ष दिया कि पर्यावरण (संरक्षण) अधिनियम, 1986 के अधीन नुकसानी की वसूली की जा सकती है (1996(3) एससीसी 212)। माननीय न्यायालय ने यह संप्रेक्षित किया कि पर्यावरण (संरक्षण) अधिनियम, 1986 की धारा 3 केंद्रीय सरकार (या, यथास्थिति, उसके प्रतिनिधि) को "ऐसे सभी उपाय करने, जो वह पर्यावरण की क्वालिटी के संरक्षण और सुधार के प्रयोजन के लिए आवश्यक या समीचीन समझे....." अभिव्यक्त रूप से सशक्त करती है। धारा 5 केंद्रीय सरकार (या उसके प्रतिनिधि) को अधिनियम के उद्देश्यों को प्राप्त करने के लिए निदेश जारी करने की शक्ति प्रदान करती है। धारा 2(क), धारा 3 और धारा 5 में "पर्यावरण" की विस्तृत परिभाषा के अनुसार केंद्रीय सरकार को ऐसी सभी शक्तियां हैं, जो "पर्यावरण की क्वालिटी के संरक्षण और सुधार के प्रयोजन के लिए आवश्यक या समीचीन" हैं। केंद्रीय सरकार, ऐसे सभी उपाय करने और ऐसे सभी निदेश जारी करने के लिए सशक्त है, जो पूर्वोक्त प्रयोजन के लिए आवश्यक हो। इस मामले में उक्त शक्तियों के अंतर्गत गाढे कीचड़ को हटाने, उपचारिक उपाय करने और उपचारिक उपाय करने की लागत को उल्लंघन करने वाले उद्योग पर अधिरोपित करने की शक्ति भी है तथा इस प्रकार वसूल की गई रकम का, उपचारिक उपायों को कार्यान्वित करने के लिए उपयोग करना भी है। माननीय न्यायालय ने यह और संप्रेक्षित किया है कि उपचारिक उपायों को कार्यान्वित करने के लिए अपेक्षित लागत का उद्धरण धारा 3 और धारा 5 में अंतर्निहित है, जिसे अत्यधिक विस्तृत और व्यापक भाषा में व्यक्त किया गया है। पर्यावरण (संरक्षण) अधिनियम, 1986 की धारा 3 और धारा 5 जल और वायु अधिनियमों के अन्य उपबंधों के अतिरिक्त सरकार को ऐसे सभी निदेश करने के लिए और ऐसे सभी उपाय करने के लिए सशक्त करते हैं, जो "पर्यावरण" के संरक्षण और संवर्धन के लिए आवश्यक या समीचीन हों, जिस अभिव्यक्ति को पर्यावरण (संरक्षण) अधिनियम, 1986 की धारा 2(क) में अत्यधिक विस्तृत और व्यापक शब्दों में परिभाषित किया गया है। इस शक्ति के अंतर्गत किसी उद्योग कि निकट किसी क्रियाकलाप को प्रतिषिद्ध करने, उपचारिक उपायों को कार्यान्वित करने का निदेश देने और जहां कहीं आवश्यक हो, उल्लंघन करने वाले उद्योग पर उपचारिक उपायों

की लागत अधिरोपित करने की शक्ति भी है। प्रत्यर्थियों के उपचारिक उपायों की लागत की अदायगी के दायित्व का प्रश्न दूसरे दृष्टिकोण से भी देखा जा सकता है, जिसे अब सार्वभौमिक रूप से ठोस सिद्धांत के रूप में स्वीकार किया गया है, जैसे “प्रदूषणकर्ता संदाय करता है” का सिद्धांत। “प्रदूषणकर्ता संदाय करता है, सिद्धांत की यह मांग है कि प्रदूषण द्वारा कारित नुकसान को रोकने या उसका उपचार करने की वित्तीय लागत इस वचनबंध, कि जो प्रदूषण कारित करता है या ऐसे माल का उत्पादन करता है, जो प्रदूषण कारित करता है, के साथ होती है।”

13. (1) इसलिए अब, केंद्रीय सरकार, पर्यावरण (संरक्षण) नियम, 1986 के नियम 5 के उपनियम (3) के खंड (घ) के साथ पठित पर्यावरण (संरक्षण) अधिनियम, 1986 की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) और उपधारा (2) के खंड (i) के उपखंड (क) और खंड (v) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए निदेश देती है कि परियोजना या क्रियाकलाप या विद्यमान परियोजनाओं का विस्तार या आधुनिकीकरण या क्रियाकलाप, जिनके द्वारा पर्यावरण संघात निर्धारण अधिसूचना, 2006 के अधीन पूर्व पर्यावरणीय अनापत्ति अपेक्षित है भारत के किसी भाग में, यथास्थिति, केंद्रीय सरकार द्वारा उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 3 की उपधारा (3) के अधीन गठित केंद्रीय सरकार या राज्य स्तरीय पर्यावरण संघात निर्धारण प्राधिकरण से पूर्व पर्यावरणीय अनापत्ति प्राप्त किए बिना, जिसमें प्रक्रिया या प्रौद्योगिकी में परिवर्तन के साथ क्षमता में वर्धन या दोनों को शामिल किया गया है, को पर्यावरण संघात निर्धारण अधिसूचना, 2006 के उल्लंघन का मामला माना जाएगा और उससे निम्नलिखित रीति में विनिर्दिष्ट प्रक्रिया के अनुसार व्यौहार किया जाएगा ;

(2) उस दशा में, जब पर्यावरण समाघात निर्धारण अधिसूचना, 2006 के अधीन संबंधित विनियामक प्राधिकरण से पूर्व पर्यावरणीय अनापत्ति की अपेक्षा वाली परियोजनाएं या क्रियाकलाप संनिर्माण कार्य आरंभ करने के पश्चात् पर्यावरणीय अनापत्ति के लिए लायी जाती हैं या जिन्होंने पूर्व पर्यावरणीय अनापत्ति के बिना विस्तार, आधुनिकीकरण और उत्पाद मिश्रण में परिवर्तन किया है, उन परियोजनाओं को अतिक्रमण के मामले के रूप में समझा जाएगा और ऐसे मामलों में यहां तक कि प्रवर्ग ख की परियोजनाएं, जिन्हें पर्यावरण (संरक्षण) अधिनियम, 1986 की धारा 3 की उपधारा (3) के अधीन गठित राज्य पर्यावरण संघात निर्धारण प्राधिकरण द्वारा पर्यावरणीय अनापत्ति अनुदत्त की गई है, का पर्यावरणीय अनापत्ति अनुदत्त करने के लिए विशेषज्ञ मूल्यांकन समिति द्वारा ही मूल्यांकन किया जाएगा और पर्यावरणीय अनापत्ति केंद्रीय स्तर पर अनुदत्त की जाएगी।

(3) उल्लंघन के मामलों में पर्यावरण (संरक्षण) अधिनियम, 1986 की धारा 19 के उपबंधों के अधीन संबंधित राज्य या राज्य प्रदूषण नियंत्रण बोर्ड द्वारा परियोजना प्रस्तावक के विरुद्ध कार्रवाई की जाएगी और इसके अतिरिक्त परियोजना को पर्यावरण अनापत्ति अनुदत्त किए जाने तक प्रचालन करने के लिए या अधिभोग प्रमाणपत्र जारी किए जाने के लिए अनुमति नहीं दी जाएगी।

(4) पर्यावरण (संरक्षण) अधिनियम, 1986 की धारा 3 की उपधारा (3) के अधीन गठित संबंधित क्षेत्र विशेषज्ञ मूल्यांकन समिति द्वारा उल्लंघन के मामलों का यह मूल्यांकन करने के लिए निर्धारण किया जाएगा कि परियोजना का ऐसे स्थल पर संनिर्माण किया गया है जो लागू विधियों के अधीन अनुज्ञेय है और विस्तार किया गया है, जिसको पर्याप्त पर्यावरणीय सुरक्षोपायों के साथ पर्यावरणीय मानकों की अनुपालना के अधीन भरणीय रूप से चलाया जा सकता है ; और उस दशा में जहां विशेषज्ञ मूल्यांकन समिति का निष्कर्ष नकारात्मक है, विधि के अधीन अन्य कार्रवाईयों के साथ परियोजना को बंद करने की सिफारिश की जाएगी।

(5) उस दशा में जहां पूर्वोक्त उप पैरा (4) के बिन्दु पर विशेषज्ञ मूल्यांकन समिति के निष्कर्ष सकारात्मक हैं, इस प्रवर्ग के अधीन परियोजनाओं को पर्यावरण संघात निर्धारण करने और पर्यावरणीय प्रबंधन योजना तैयार करने के लिए समुचित निदेश निबंधनों के साथ विहित किया जाएगा। इसके अतिरिक्त विशेषज्ञ मूल्यांकन समिति पारिस्थितिकीय नुकसान, सुधारकारी योजना और प्राकृतिक तथा सामुदायिक संसाधन आवर्धन योजना के निर्धारण पर परियोजना के विशिष्ट निदेश निबंधनों को विहित करेगी और उनको प्रत्यायित परामर्शदाताओं द्वारा पर्यावरण संघात निर्धारण रिपोर्ट में एक स्वतंत्र अध्याय के रूप में तैयार किया जाएगा। पारिस्थितिकीय नुकसान, सुधारकारी योजना तैयार करने और प्राकृतिक तथा सामुदायिक संसाधन आवर्धन योजना के निर्धारण के लिए डाटा का संग्रहण और विश्लेषण, पर्यावरण (संरक्षण) अधिनियम, 1986 के अधीन सम्यक्ता अधिसूचित प्रयोगशाला या राष्ट्रीय जांच और अशांकन प्रत्यायन बोर्ड द्वारा प्रत्यायित प्रयोगशाला या वैज्ञानिक और औद्योगिक अनुसंधान परिषद् की पर्यावरण के क्षेत्र में कार्य कर रही प्रयोगशाला द्वारा किया जाएगा।

(6) विशेषज्ञ मूल्यांकन समिति, पर्यावरणीय प्रबंधन योजना, सुधारकारी योजना और प्राकृतिक तथा सामुदायिक संसाधन आवर्धन योजना से मिलकर बनने वाली पर्यावरणीय प्रबंधन योजना को उपदर्शित करेगी, जो कि मूल्यांकन किए गए पर्यावरणीय नुकसान और पर्यावरणीय अनापत्ति की शर्त के उल्लंघन के कारण उदभूत आर्थिक फायदे की तत्स्थानी होगी।

(7) परियोजना प्रस्तावक से सुधारकारी योजना और प्राकृतिक तथा सामुदायिक संसाधन आवर्धन योजना की रकम के समतुल्य बैंक प्रत्याभूति को राज्य प्रदूषण नियंत्रण बोर्ड के पास प्रस्तुत करने की अपेक्षा होगी और मात्रा की सिफारिश विशेषज्ञ मूल्यांकन समिति द्वारा की जाएगी और इसको विनियामक प्राधिकरण द्वारा अंतिम रूप दिया जाएगा तथा बैंक प्रत्याभूति को पर्यावरणीय अनापत्ति अनुदत्त करने

से पूर्व जमा किया जाएगा और उसे मंत्रालय के प्रादेशिक कार्यालय, विशेषज्ञ मूल्यांकन समिति तथा विनियामक प्राधिकरण के अनुमोदन के पश्चात् सुधारकारी योजना और प्राकृतिक तथा सामुदायिक संसाधन आवर्धन योजना के सफलतापूर्वक कार्यान्वयन के पश्चात् निर्मुक्त किया जाएगा।

14. ऐसी परियोजनाएं और क्रियाकलाप, जो इस अधिसूचना की तारीख को उल्लंघनकारी हैं, इस अधिसूचना के अधीन पर्यावरणीय अनापत्ति के लिए आवेदन करने के पात्र होंगे और परियोजना प्रस्तावक इस अधिसूचना के अधीन पर्यावरणीय अनापत्ति के लिए केवल इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से छह मास के भीतर ही आवेदन कर सकते हैं।

[फा. सं. 22-116/2015-आईए-III]

मनोज कुमार सिंह, संयुक्त सचिव

**MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT, FOREST AND CLIMATE CHANGE
NOTIFICATION**

New Delhi, the 14th March, 2017

S.O. 804(E).—Whereas, a draft notification under sub-section (1), and clause (v) of sub-section (2) of Section 3 of the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986 (29 of 1986) was published in the Gazette of India, Extraordinary, Part II, Section 3, sub-section (ii), *vide* number S.O. 1705(E), dated the 10th May, 2016, as required by sub-rule (3) of rule 5 of the Environment (Protection) Rules, 1986, for finalising the process for appraisal of projects for grant of Terms of Reference and Environmental Clearance, which have started the work on site, expanded the production beyond the limit of environmental clearance or changed the product mix without obtaining prior environmental clearance under the Environment Impact Assessment Notification, 2006 inviting objections and suggestions from all persons likely to be affected thereby within a period of sixty days from the date on which copies of Gazette containing the said notification were made available to the public;

2. And whereas, copies of the said notification were made available to the public on the 10th May, 2016;

3. And whereas, all objections and suggestions received in response to the above mentioned draft notification have been duly considered by the Central Government.

4. Whereas, subject to the provisions of the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986, under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Act, the Central Government has the power to take all such measures as it deems necessary or expedient for the purpose of protecting and improving the quality of the environment and preventing, controlling, and abating environment pollution;

5. Whereas, section 5 of the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986 empowers the Central Government to give directions which reads as “Notwithstanding anything contained in any other law but subject to the provisions of this Act, the Central Government may, in the exercise of its powers and performance of its functions under this Act, issue directions in writing to any person, officer or any authority and such person, officer or authority shall be bound to comply with such directions;

6. Whereas the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change issued Office Memoranda dated 12.12.2012 and 27.06.2013 to establish a process for grant of environmental clearance to cases of violation.

7. Whereas, the Hon’ble High Court of Jharkhand had passed an order dated the 28th November, 2014 in W.P. (C) No. 2364 of 2014 in the matter of Hindustan Copper Limited *Versus* Union of India in which the High Court held that the conditions laid down under Office Memorandum dated 12th December, 2012 in paragraph No. 5 (i) and 5 (ii) were illegal and unconstitutional and had further held that action for alleged violation would be an independent and separate proceeding and therefore, consideration of proposal for environment clearance could not await initiation of action against the project proponent. The Hon’ble Court further ruled that the proposal for environment clearance must be examined on its merits, independent of any proposed action for alleged violation of the environmental laws;

8. And whereas, Hon'ble National Green Tribunal, Principal Bench *vide* its order dated 7th July, 2015 in Original Application No. 37 of 2015 and Original Application No. 213 of 2015 had also held that the Office Memoranda dated 12th December, 2012 and 24th June, 2013 on the subject of consideration of proposals for Terms of Reference or Environment Clearance or Coastal Regulation Zone Clearance involving violations of the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986 or Environment Impact Assessment Notification, 2006 Coastal Regulation Zone Notification, 2011 could not alter or amend the provisions of the Environment Impact Assessment notification, 2006 and had quashed the same;

9. And whereas, the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change and State Environment Impact Assessment Authorities have been receiving certain proposals under the Environment Impact Assessment Notification, 2006 for grant of Terms of References and Environmental Clearance for projects which have started the work on site, expanded the production beyond the limit of environmental clearance or changed the product mix without obtaining prior environmental clearance;

10. Whereas, the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change deems it necessary for the purpose of protecting and improving the quality of the environment and abating environmental pollution that all entities not complying with environmental regulation under Environment Impact Assessment Notification, 2006 be brought under compliance with in the environmental laws in expedient manner;

11. And whereas, the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change deems it necessary to bring such projects and activities in compliance with the environmental laws at the earliest point of time, rather than leaving them unregulated and unchecked, which will be more damaging to the environment and in furtherance of this objective, the Government of India deems it essential to establish a process for appraisal of such cases of violation for prescribing adequate environmental safeguards to entities and the process should be such that it deters violation of provisions of Environment Impact Assessment Notification, 2006 and the pecuniary benefit of violation and damage to environment is adequately compensated for;

12. And whereas, Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Indian Council for Enviro-Legal Action Vs. Union of India* (the Bichhri village industrial pollution case), while delivering its judgment on 13th. February, 1996, analyzed all the relevant provisions of law and concluded that damages may be recovered under the provisions of the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986 (1996 [3] SCC 212). The Hon'ble Court observed that section 3 of the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986 expressly empowers the Central Government [or its delegate, as the case may be] to "take all such measures as it deems necessary or expedient for the purpose of protecting and improving the quality of environment.....". Section 5 clothes the Central Government [or its delegate] with the power to issue directions for achieving the objects of the Act. Read with the wide definition of "environment" in Section 2 (a), Sections 3 and 5 clothe the Central Government with all such powers as are "necessary or expedient for the purpose of protecting and improving the quality of the environment". The Central Government is empowered to take all measures and issue all such directions as are called for the above purpose. In the present case, the said powers will include giving directions for the removal of sludge, for undertaking remedial measures and also the power to impose the cost of remedial measures on the offending industry and utilize the amount so recovered for carrying out remedial measures..... Hon'ble Court has further observed that levy of costs required for carrying out remedial measures is implicit in Sections 3 and 5 which are couched in very wide and expansive language. Sections 3 and 5 of the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986, apart from other provisions of Water and Air Acts, empower the Government to make all such directions and take all such measures as are necessary or expedient for protecting and promoting the 'environment', which expression has been defined in very wide and expansive terms in Section 2 (a) of the Environment (Protection) Act. This power includes the power to prohibit an activity, close an industry, direct to carry out remedial measures, and wherever necessary impose the cost of remedial measures upon the offending industry. The question of liability of the respondents to defray the costs of remedial measures can also be

looked into from another angle, which has now come to be accepted universally as a sound principle, viz., the "Polluter Pays" Principle. "The polluter pays principle demands that the financial costs of preventing or remedying damage caused by pollution should lie with the undertakings which cause the pollution, or produce the goods which cause the pollution".

13 (1). Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) and sub clause (a) of clause (i) and clause (v) of sub-section (2) of section 3 of the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986, read with clause (d) of sub-rule (3) of rule 5 of the Environment (Protection) Rules, 1986; the Central Government hereby directs that the projects or activities or the expansion or modernisation of existing projects or activities requiring prior environmental clearance under the Environment Impact Assessment Notification, 2006 entailing capacity addition with change in process or technology or both undertaken in any part of India without obtaining prior environmental clearance from the Central Government or by the State Level Environment Impact Assessment Authority, as the case may be, duly constituted by the Central Government under sub-section (3) of Section 3 of the said Act, shall be considered a case of violation of the Environment Impact Assessment Notification, 2006 and will be dealt strictly as per the procedure specified in the following manner:-

(2) In case the projects or activities requiring prior environmental clearance under Environment Impact Assessment Notification, 2006 from the concerned Regulatory Authority are brought for environmental clearance after starting the construction work, or have undertaken expansion, modernization, and change in product- mix without prior environmental clearance, these projects shall be treated as cases of violations and in such cases, even Category B projects which are granted environmental clearance by the State Environment Impact Assessment Authority constituted under sub-section (3) Section 3 of the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986 shall be appraised for grant of environmental clearance only by the Expert Appraisal Committee and environmental clearance will be granted at the Central level.

(3) In cases of violation, action will be taken against the project proponent by the respective State or State Pollution Control Board under the provisions of section 19 of the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986 and further, no consent to operate or occupancy certificate will be issued till the project is granted the environmental clearance.

(4) The cases of violation will be appraised by respective sector Expert Appraisal Committees constituted under sub-section (3) of Section 3 of the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986 with a view to assess that the project has been constructed at a site which under prevailing laws is permissible and expansion has been done which can be run sustainably under compliance of environmental norms with adequate environmental safeguards; and in case, where the finding of the Expert Appraisal Committee is negative, closure of the project will be recommended along with other actions under the law.

(5) In case, where the findings of the Expert Appraisal Committee on point at sub-para (4) above are affirmative, the projects under this category will be prescribed the appropriate Terms of Reference for undertaking Environment Impact Assessment and preparation of Environment Management Plan. Further, the Expert Appraisal Committee will prescribe a specific Terms of Reference for the project on assessment of ecological damage, remediation plan and natural and community resource augmentation plan and it shall be prepared as an independent chapter in the environment impact assessment report by the accredited consultants. The collection and analysis of data for assessment of ecological damage, preparation of remediation plan and natural and community resource augmentation plan shall be done by an environmental laboratory duly notified under Environment (Protection) Act, 1986, or a environmental laboratory accredited by National Accreditation Board for Testing and Calibration Laboratories, or a laboratory of a Council of Scientific and Industrial Research institution working in the field of environment.

(6) The Expert Appraisal Committee shall stipulate the implementation of Environmental Management Plan, comprising remediation plan and natural and community resource augmentation plan corresponding to the ecological damage assessed and economic benefit derived due to violation as a condition of environmental clearance.

(7) The project proponent will be required to submit a bank guarantee equivalent to the amount of remediation plan and Natural and Community Resource Augmentation Plan with the State Pollution Control Board and the quantification will be recommended by Expert Appraisal Committee and finalized by Regulatory Authority and the bank guarantee shall be deposited prior to the grant of environmental clearance and will be released after successful implementation of the remediation plan and Natural and Community Resource Augmentation Plan, and after the recommendation by regional office of the Ministry, Expert Appraisal Committee and approval of the Regulatory Authority.

14. The projects or activities which are in violation as on date of this notification only will be eligible to apply for environmental clearance under this notification and the project proponents can apply for environmental clearance under this notification only within six months from the date of this notification.

[F. No. 22-116/2015-IA-III]

MANOJ KUMAR SINGH, Jt. Secy.

F. No. 22-34/2018-IA.III

Government of India

Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change

(Impact Assessment Division)

Indira Paryavaran Bhawan
Jor Bagh Road, Aliganj,
New Delhi – 110003

E-mail: sharath.kr@gov.in
Tel: 011-24695319

Dated: 8th January, 2019

OFFICE MEMORANDUM**Sub.: Standardization of Environment Clearance conditions for Non-Coal mining sector – reg.**

The Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change has notified the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Notification, 2006 under the provisions of the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986, which regulates development and their expansion/modernization of 39 sectors/activities listed in the Schedule to the EIA Notification, 2006. There are two Category of projects viz. Category 'A' projects that are handled at the level of MoEF&CC and Category 'B' projects that are handled by the respective State Environment Impact Assessment Authority (SEIAA) following the procedure prescribed under the EIA Notification, 2006.

2. All projects or activities included as Category 'A' in the Schedule, including expansion and modernization of existing projects or activities and change in product mix, shall require prior environmental clearance from the Central Government in the Ministry of Environment and Forest and Climate Change (MoEF&CC) on the recommendations of an Expert Appraisal Committee (EAC) constituted by the Central Government for the purposes of this notification.
3. The Standard Environmental Clearance conditions have been prepared for expediting the process of Environmental Clearance without compromising environmental norms and the rigor of environment impact assessment.
4. The standard Environment Clearance conditions shall be considered by the concerned EAC with due diligence while recommending the Environmental Clearance. The expert appraisal committee can modify, prescribe additional conditions based on the project specific requirements.

ok
sharath
10/1/2019

5. The recommended conditions by the EAC shall be brought in the minutes of the meeting of the EAC.

6. In continuation to the OMs no. F. No. 22-34/2018-IA.III dated 9th August 2018 and 4th January 2019, the standard Environment Clearance conditions for Mining, extraction of natural resources (Non-coal mining) covered under schedule 1(a) of the EIA Notification 2006 are herewith issued

7. This issues with the approval of competent authority.

Sharath Kumar Pallerla
8/11/19

(Sharath Kumar Pallerla)
Director (IA-III-Policy)

To

1. Chairman, Central Pollution Control Board (CPCB).
2. Chairman of all the Expert Appraisal Committees
3. Chairperson/Member Secretaries of all the SEIAAs/SEACs
4. All the Officers of I.A. Division
5. Chairpersons/Member Secretaries of all SPCBs/UTPCCs

Copy for information to:

1. PS to Hon'ble Minister for Environment, Forest and Climate Change
2. PS to Hon'ble MoS (EF&CC)
3. PPS to Secretary(EF&CC)
4. PPS to AS(AKJ) / AS (AKM)
5. PS to JS (RSP)/ JS(JT)/JS(GM)
6. Website, MoEF&CC
7. Guard file.

Sharath Kumar Pallerla
8/11/19

(Sharath Kumar Pallerla)
Director (IA-III-Policy)

Standard EC conditions for Non-coal mining sector

I. Statutory compliance

- i. This Environmental Clearance (EC) is subject to orders/ judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, Hon'ble High Court, Hon'ble NGT and any other Court of Law, Common Cause Conditions as may be applicable.
- ii. The Project proponent complies with all the statutory requirements and judgement of Hon'ble Supreme Court dated 2nd August, 2017 in Writ Petition (Civil) No. 114 of 2014 in matter of Common Cause versus Union of India & Ors before commencing the mining operations.
- iii. The State Government concerned shall ensure that mining operation shall not be commenced till the entire compensation levied, if any, for illegal mining paid by the Project Proponent through their respective Department of Mining & Geology in strict compliance of Judgement of Hon'ble Supreme Court dated 2nd August, 2017 in Writ Petition (Civil) No. 114 of 2014 in matter of Common Cause versus Union of India & Ors.
- iv. This Environmental Clearance shall become operational only after receiving formal NBWL Clearance from MoEF&CC subsequent to the recommendations of the Standing Committee of National Board for Wildlife, if applicable to the Project.
- v. This Environmental Clearance shall become operational only after receiving formal Forest Clearance (FC) under the provision of Forest Conservation Act, 1980, if applicable to the Project.
- vi. Project Proponent (PP) shall obtain Consent to Operate after grant of EC and effectively implement all the conditions stipulated therein. The mining activity shall not commence prior to obtaining Consent to Establish / Consent to Operate from the concerned State Pollution Control Board/Committee.
- vii. The PP shall adhere to the provision of the Mines Act, 1952, Mines and Mineral (Development & Regulation), Act, 2015 and rules & regulations made there under. PP shall adhere to various circulars issued by Directorate General Mines Safety (DGMS) and Indian Bureau of Mines from time to time.
- viii. The Project Proponent shall obtain consents from all the concerned land owners, before start of mining operations, as per the provisions of MMDR Act, 1957 and rules made there under in respect of lands which are not owned by it.
- ix. The Project Proponent shall follow the mitigation measures provided in MoEFCC's Office Memorandum No. Z-11013/57/2014-IA.II (M), dated 29th October, 2014, titled "Impact of mining activities on Habitations-Issues related to the mining Projects wherein Habitations and villages are the part of mine lease areas or Habitations and villages are surrounded by the mine lease area".
- x. The Project Proponent shall obtain necessary prior permission of the competent authorities for drawl of requisite quantity of surface water and from CGWA for withdrawal of ground water for the project.

- xii. A copy of EC letter will be marked to concerned Panchayat / local NGO etc. if any, from whom suggestion / representation has been received while processing the proposal.
- xiii. State Pollution Control Board/Committee shall be responsible for display of this EC letter at its Regional office, District Industries Centre and Collector's office/ Tehsildar's Office for 30 days.
- xiv. The Project Authorities should widely advertise about the grant of this EC letter by printing the same in at least two local newspapers, one of which shall be in vernacular language of the concerned area. The advertisement shall be done within 7 days of the issue of the clearance letter mentioning that the instant project has been accorded EC and copy of the EC letter is available with the State Pollution Control Board/Committee and web site of the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change (www.environmentclearance.nic.in). A copy of the advertisement may be forwarded to the concerned MoEFCC Regional Office for compliance and record.
- xv. The Project Proponent shall inform the MoEF&CC for any change in ownership of the mining lease. In case there is any change in ownership or mining lease is transferred than mining operation shall only be carried out after transfer of EC as per provisions of the para 11 of EIA Notification, 2006 as amended from time to time.

II. Air quality monitoring and preservation

- i. The Project Proponent shall install a minimum of 3 (three) online Ambient Air Quality Monitoring Stations with 1 (one) in upwind and 2 (two) in downwind direction based on long term climatological data about wind direction such that an angle of 120° is made between the monitoring locations to monitor critical parameters, relevant for mining operations, of air pollution viz. PM10, PM2.5, NO2; CO and SO2 etc. as per the methodology mentioned in NAAQS Notification No. B-29016/20/90/PCI/I, dated 18.11.2009 covering the aspects of transportation and use of heavy machinery in the impact zone. The ambient air quality shall also be monitored at prominent places like office building, canteen etc. as per the site condition to ascertain the exposure characteristics at specific places. The above data shall be digitally displayed within 03 months in front of the main Gate of the mine site.
- ii. Effective safeguard measures for prevention of dust generation and subsequent suppression (like regular water sprinkling, metalled road construction etc.) shall be carried out in areas prone to air pollution wherein high levels of PM10 and PM2.5 are evident such as haul road, loading and unloading point and transfer points. The Fugitive dust emissions from all sources shall be regularly controlled by installation of required equipments/ machineries and preventive maintenance. Use of suitable water-soluble chemical dust suppressing agents may be explored for better effectiveness of dust control system. It shall be ensured that air pollution level conform to the standards prescribed by the MoEFCC/ Central Pollution Control Board.

III. Water quality monitoring and preservation

- i. In case, immediate mining scheme envisages intersection of ground water table, then Environmental Clearance shall become operational only after receiving formal clearance from CGWA. In case, mining operation involves intersection of ground water table at a later stage, then PP shall ensure that prior approval from CGWA and MoEFCC is in place before such mining operations. The permission for intersection of ground water table shall essentially be based on detailed hydro-geological study of the area.
- ii. Regular monitoring of the flow rate of the springs and perennial nallahs flowing in and around the mine lease shall be carried out and records maintain. The natural water bodies and or streams which are flowing in an around the village, should not be disturbed. The Water Table should be nurtured so as not to go down below the pre-mining period. In case of any water scarcity in the area, the Project Proponent has to provide water to the villagers for their use. A provision for regular monitoring of water table in open dug well located in village should be incorporated to ascertain the impact of mining over ground water table. The Report on changes in Ground water level and quality shall be submitted on six-monthly basis to the Regional Office of the Ministry, CGWA and State Groundwater Department / State Pollution Control Board.
- iii. Project Proponent shall regularly monitor and maintain records w.r.t. ground water level and quality in and around the mine lease by establishing a network of existing wells as well as new piezo-meter installations during the mining operation in consultation with Central Ground Water Authority/ State Ground Water Department. The Report on changes in Ground water level and quality shall be submitted on six-monthly basis to the Regional Office of the Ministry, CGWA and State Groundwater Department / State Pollution Control Board.
- iv. The Project Proponent shall undertake regular monitoring of natural water course/ water resources/ springs and perennial nallahs existing/ flowing in and around the mine lease and maintain its records. The project proponent shall undertake regular monitoring of water quality upstream and downstream of water bodies passing within and nearby/ adjacent to the mine lease and maintain its records. Sufficient number of gullies shall be provided at appropriate places within the lease for management of water. PP shall carryout regular monitoring w.r.t. pH and included the same in monitoring plan. The parameters to be monitored shall include their water quality vis-à-vis suitability for usage as per CPCB criteria and flow rate. It shall be ensured that no obstruction and/ or alteration be made to water bodies during mining operations without justification and prior approval of MoEFCC. The monitoring of water courses/ bodies existing in lease area shall be carried out four times in a year viz. pre- monsoon (April-May), monsoon (August), post-monsoon (November) and winter (January) and the record of monitored data may be sent regularly to Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change and its Regional Office, Central Ground Water Authority and Regional Director, Central Ground Water Board, State

Pollution Control Board and Central Pollution Control Board. Clearly showing the trend analysis on six-monthly basis.

- v. Quality of polluted water generated from mining operations which include Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) in mines run-off; acid mine drainage and metal contamination in runoff shall be monitored along with Total Suspended Solids (TDS), Dissolved Oxygen (DO), pH and Total Suspended Solids (TSS). The monitored data shall be uploaded on the website of the company as well as displayed at the project site in public domain, on a display board, at a suitable location near the main gate of the Company. The circular No. J- 20012/1/2006-IA.II (M) dated 27.05.2009 issued by Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change may also be referred in this regard.
- vi. Project Proponent shall plan, develop and implement rainwater harvesting measures on long term basis to augment ground water resources in the area in consultation with Central Ground Water Board/ State Groundwater Department. A report on amount of water recharged needs to be submitted to Regional Office MoEFCC annually.
- vii. Industrial waste water (workshop and waste water from the mine) should be properly collected and treated so as to conform to the notified standards prescribed from time to time. The standards shall be prescribed through Consent to Operate (CTO) issued by concerned State Pollution Control Board (SPCB). The workshop effluent shall be treated after its initial passage through Oil and grease trap.
- viii. The water balance/water auditing shall be carried out and measure for reducing the consumption of water shall be taken up and reported to the Regional Office of the MoEF&CC and State Pollution Control Board/Committee.

IV. Noise and vibration monitoring and prevention

- i. The peak particle velocity at 500m distance or within the nearest habitation, whichever is closer shall be monitored periodically as per applicable DGMS guidelines.
- ii. The illumination and sound at night at project sites disturb the villages in respect of both human and animal population. Consequent sleeping disorders and stress may affect the health in the villages located close to mining operations. Habitations have a right for darkness and minimal noise levels at night. PPs must ensure that the biological clock of the villages is not disturbed; by orienting the floodlights/ masks away from the villagers and keeping the noise levels well within the prescribed limits for day /night hours.
- iii. The Project Proponent shall take measures for control of noise levels below 85 dBA in the work environment. The workers engaged in operations of HEMM, etc. should be provided with ear plugs /muffs. All personnel including laborers working in dusty areas shall be provided with protective respiratory devices along with adequate training, awareness and information on safety and health aspects. The PP shall be held responsible in case it has been found that workers/ personals/ laborers are working without personal protective equipment.

V. Mining plan

- i. The Project Proponent shall adhere to the working parameters of mining plan which was submitted at the time of EC appraisal wherein year-wise plan was mentioned for total excavation i.e. quantum of mineral, waste, over burden, inter burden and top soil etc.. No change in basic mining proposal like mining technology, total excavation, mineral & waste production, lease area and scope of working (viz. method of mining, overburden & dump management, O.B & dump mining, mineral transportation mode, ultimate depth of mining etc.) shall not be carried out without prior approval of the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, which entail adverse environmental impacts, even if it is a part of approved mining plan modified after grant of EC or granted by State Govt. in the form to Short Term Permit (STP), Query license or any other name.
- ii. The Project Proponent shall get the Final Mine Closure Plan along with Financial Assurance approved from Indian Bureau of Mines/Department of Mining & Geology as required under the Provision of the MMDR Act, 1957 and Rules/ Guidelines made there under. A copy of approved final mine closure plan shall be submitted within 2 months of the approval of the same from the competent authority to the concerned Regional Office of the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change for record and verification.
- iii. The land-use of the mine lease area at various stages of mining scheme as well as at the end-of-life shall be governed as per the approved Mining Plan. The excavation vis-à-vis backfilling in the mine lease area and corresponding afforestation to be raised in the reclaimed area shall be governed as per approved mining plan. PP shall ensure the monitoring and management of rehabilitated areas until the vegetation becomes self-sustaining. The compliance status shall be submitted half-yearly to the MoEFCC and its concerned Regional Office.

VI. Land reclamation

- i. The Overburden (O.B.) generated during the mining operations shall be stacked at earmarked OB dump site(s) only and it should not be kept active for a long period of time. The physical parameters of the OB dumps like height, width and angle of slope shall be governed as per the approved Mining Plan as per the guidelines/circulars issued by D.G.M.S w.r.t. safety in mining operations shall be strictly adhered to maintain the stability of top soil/OB dumps. The topsoil shall be used for land reclamation and plantation.
- ii. The reject/waste generated during the mining operations shall be stacked at earmarked waste dump site(s) only. The physical parameters of the waste dumps like height, width and angle of slope shall be governed as per the approved Mining Plan as per the guidelines/circulars issued by DGMS w.r.t. safety in mining operations shall be strictly adhered to maintain the stability of waste dumps.
- iii. The reclamation of waste dump sites shall be done in scientific manner as per the Approved Mining Plan cum Progressive Mine Closure Plan.

- iv. The slope of dumps shall be vegetated in scientific manner with suitable native species to maintain the slope stability, prevent erosion and surface run off. The selection of local species regulates local climatic parameters and help in adaptation of plant species to the microclimate. The gullies formed on slopes should be adequately taken care of as it impacts the overall stability of dumps. The dump mass should be consolidated with the help of dozer/ compactors thereby ensuring proper filling/ leveling of dump mass. In critical areas, use of geo textiles/ geo-membranes / clay liners / Bentonite etc. shall be undertaken for stabilization of the dump.
- v. The Project Proponent shall carry out slope stability study in case the dump height is more than 30 meters. The slope stability report shall be submitted to concerned regional office of MoEF&CC.
- vi. Catch drains, settling tanks and siltation ponds of appropriate size shall be constructed around the mine working, mineral yards and Top Soil/OB/Waste dumps to prevent run off of water and flow of sediments directly into the water bodies (Nallah/ River/ Pond etc.). The collected water should be utilized for watering the mine area, roads, green belt development, plantation etc. The drains/ sedimentation sumps etc. shall be de-silted regularly, particularly after monsoon season, and maintained properly.
- vii. Check dams of appropriate size, gradient and length shall be constructed around mine pit and OB dumps to prevent storm run-off and sediment flow into adjoining water bodies. A safety margin of 50% shall be kept for designing of sump structures over and above peak rainfall (based on 50 years data) and maximum discharge in the mine and its adjoining area which shall also help in providing adequate retention time period thereby allowing proper settling of sediments/ silt material. The sedimentation pits/ sumps shall be constructed at the corners of the garland drains.
- viii. The top soil, if any, shall temporarily be stored at earmarked site(s) within the mine lease only and should not be kept unutilized for long. The physical parameters of the top soil dumps like height, width and angle of slope shall be governed as per the approved Mining Plan and as per the guidelines framed by DGMS w.r.t. safety in mining operations shall be strictly adhered to maintain the stability of dumps. The topsoil shall be used for land reclamation and plantation purpose.

VII. Transportation

- i. No Transportation of the minerals shall be allowed in case of roads passing through villages/ habitations. In such cases, PP shall construct a 'bypass' road for the purpose of transportation of the minerals leaving an adequate gap (say at least 200 meters) so that the adverse impact of sound and dust along with chances of accidents could be mitigated. All costs resulting from widening and strengthening of existing public road network shall be borne by the PP in consultation with nodal State Govt. Department. Transportation of minerals through road movement in case of existing village/ rural roads shall be allowed in consultation with nodal State Govt. Department only after required strengthening such

that the carrying capacity of roads is increased to handle the traffic load. The pollution due to transportation load on the environment will be effectively controlled and water sprinkling will also be done regularly. Vehicular emissions shall be kept under control and regularly monitored. Project should obtain Pollution Under Control (PUC) certificate for all the vehicles from authorized pollution testing centers.

- ii. The Main haulage road within the mine lease should be provided with a permanent water sprinkling arrangement for dust suppression. Other roads within the mine lease should be wetted regularly with tanker-mounted water sprinkling system. The other areas of dust generation like crushing zone, material transfer points, material yards etc. should invariably be provided with dust suppression arrangements. The air pollution control equipments like bag filters, vacuum suction hoods, dry fogging system etc. shall be installed at Crushers, belt-conveyors and other areas prone to air pollution. The belt conveyor should be fully covered to avoid generation of dust while transportation. PP shall take necessary measures to avoid generation of fugitive dust emissions.

VIII. Green Belt

- i. The Project Proponent shall develop greenbelt in 7.5m wide safety zone all along the mine lease boundary as per the guidelines of CPCB in order to arrest pollution emanating from mining operations within the lease. The whole Green belt shall be developed within first 5 years starting from windward side of the active mining area. The development of greenbelt shall be governed as per the EC granted by the Ministry irrespective of the stipulation made in approved mine plan.
- ii. The Project Proponent shall carryout plantation/ afforestation in backfilled and reclaimed area of mining lease, around water body, along the roadsides, in community areas etc. by planting the native species in consultation with the State Forest Department/ Agriculture Department/ Rural development department/ Tribal Welfare Department/ Gram Panchayat such that only those species be selected which are of use to the local people. The CPCB guidelines in this respect shall also be adhered. The density of the trees should be around 2500 saplings per Hectare. Adequate budgetary provision shall be made for protection and care of trees.
- iii. The Project Proponent shall make necessary alternative arrangements for livestock feed by developing grazing land with a view to compensate those areas which are coming within the mine lease. The development of such grazing land shall be done in consultation with the State Government. In this regard, Project Proponent should essentially implement the directions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court with regard to acquisition of grazing land. The sparse trees on such grazing ground, which provide mid-day shelter from the scorching sun, should be scrupulously guarded/ protected against felling and plantation of such trees should be promoted.
- iv. The Project Proponent shall undertake all precautionary measures for conservation and protection of endangered flora and fauna and Schedule-I species during mining operation.

A Wildlife Conservation Plan shall be prepared for the same clearly delineating action to be taken for conservation of flora and fauna. The Plan shall be approved by Chief Wild Life Warden of the State Govt.

- v. And implemented in consultation with the State Forest and Wildlife Department. A copy of Wildlife Conservation Plan and its implementation status (annual) shall be submitted to the Regional Office of the Ministry.

IX. Public hearing and human health issues

- i. The Project Proponent shall appoint an Occupational Health Specialist for Regular as well as Periodical medical examination of the workers engaged in the mining activities, as per the DGMS guidelines. The records shall be maintained properly. PP shall also carryout Occupational health check-ups in respect of workers which are having ailments like BP, diabetes, habitual smoking, etc. The check-ups shall be undertaken once in six months and necessary remedial/ preventive measures be taken. A status report on the same may be sent to MoEFCC Regional Office and DGMS on half-yearly basis.
- ii. The Project Proponent must demonstrate commitment to work towards 'Zero Harm' from their mining activities and carry out Health Risk Assessment (HRA) for identification workplace hazards and assess their potential risks to health and determine appropriate control measures to protect the health and wellbeing of workers and nearby community. The proponent shall maintain accurate and systematic records of the HRA. The HRA for neighborhood has to focus on Public Health Problems like Malaria, Tuberculosis, HIV, Anaemia, Diarrhoea in children under five, respiratory infections due to bio mass cooking. The proponent shall also create awareness and educate the nearby community and workers for Sanitation, Personal Hygiene, Hand washing, not to defecate in open, Women Health and Hygiene (Providing Sanitary Napkins), hazard of tobacco and alcohol use. The Proponent shall carryout base line HRA for all the category of workers and thereafter every five years.
- iii. The Proponent shall carry out Occupational health surveillance which be a part of HRA and include Biological Monitoring where practical and feasible, and the tests and investigations relevant to the exposure (e.g. for Dust a X-Ray chest; For Noise Audiometric; for Lead Exposure Blood Lead, For Welders Full Ophthalmologic Assessment; for Manganese Miners a complete Neurological Assessment by a Certified Neurologist, and Manganese (Mn) Estimation in Blood; For Inorganic Chromium-Fortnightly skin inspection of hands and forearms by a responsible person. Except routine tests all tests would be carried out in a Lab accredited by NABH. Records of Health Surveillance must be kept for 30 years, including the results of and the records of Physical examination and tests. The record of exposure due to materials like Asbestos, Hard Rock Mining, Silica, Gold, Kaolin, Aluminium, Iron, Manganese, Chromium, Lead, Uranium need to be handed over to the Mining Department of the State in case the life of the mine is less than 30 years. It would be obligatory for the State Mines Departments to make

arrangements for the safe and secure storage of the records including X-Ray. Only conventional X-Ray will be accepted for record purposes and not the digital one). X-Ray must meet ILO criteria (17 x14 inches and of good quality).

- iv. The Proponent shall maintained a record of performance indicators for workers which includes (a) there should not be a significant decline in their Body Mass Index and it should stay between 18.5 -24.9, (b) the Final Chest X-Ray compared with the base line X-Ray should not show any capacities ,(c) At the end of their leaving job there should be no Diminution in their Lung Functions Forced Expiratory Volume in one second (FEV1),Forced Vital Capacity (FVC), and the ratio) unless they are smokers which has to be adjusted, and the effect of age, (d) their hearing should not be affected. As a proof an Audiogram (first and last need to be presented), (e) they should not have developed any Persistent Back Pain, Neck Pain, and the movement of their Hip, Knee and other joints should have normal range of movement, (f) they should not have suffered loss of any body part. The record of the same should be submitted to the Regional Office, MoEFCC annually along with details of the relief and compensation paid to workers having above indications.
- v. The Project Proponent shall ensure that Personnel working in dusty areas should wear protective respiratory devices and they should also be provided with adequate training and information on safety and health aspects.
- vi. Project Proponent shall make provision for the housing for workers/labors or shall construct labor camps within/outside (company owned land) with necessary basic infrastructure/ facilities like fuel for cooking, mobile toilets, mobile STP, safe drinking water, medical health care, crèche for kids etc. The housing may be provided in the form of temporary structures which can be removed after the completion of the project related infrastructure. The domestic waste water should be treated with STP in order to avoid contamination of underground water.
- vii. The activities proposed in Action plan prepared for addressing the issues raised during the Public Hearing shall be completed as per the budgetary provisions mentioned in the Action Plan and within the stipulated time frame. The Status Report on implementation of Action Plan shall be submitted to the concerned Regional Office of the Ministry along with District Administration.

X. Corporate Environment Responsibility (CER)

- i. The activities and budget earmarked for Corporate Environmental Responsibility (CER) as per Ministry's O.M No 22-65/2017-IA. II (M) dated 01.05.2018 or as proposed by EAC should be kept in a separate bank account. The activities proposed for CER shall be implemented in a time bound manner and annual report of implementation of the same along with documentary proof viz. photographs, purchase documents, latitude & longitude of infrastructure developed & road constructed needs to be submitted to Regional Office MoEF&CC annually along with audited statement.

- ii. Project Proponent shall keep the funds earmarked for environmental protection measures in a separate account and refrain from diverting the same for other purposes. The Year wise expenditure of such funds should be reported to the MoEFCC and its concerned Regional Office.

XI. Miscellaneous

- i. The Project Proponent shall prepare digital map (land use & land cover) of the entire lease area once in five years purpose of monitoring land use pattern and submit a report to concerned Regional Office of the MoEFCC.
- ii. The Project Authorities should inform to the Regional Office regarding date of financial closures and final approval of the project by the concerned authorities and the date of start of land development work.
- iii. The Project Proponent shall submit six monthly compliance reports on the status of the implementation of the stipulated environmental safeguards to the MOEFCC & its concerned Regional Office, Central Pollution Control Board and State Pollution Control Board.
- iv. A separate 'Environmental Management Cell' with suitable qualified manpower should be set-up under the control of a Senior Executive. The Senior Executive shall directly report to Head of the Organization. Adequate number of qualified Environmental Scientists and Mining Engineers shall be appointed and submit a report to RO, MoEFCC.
- v. The concerned Regional Office of the MoEFCC shall randomly monitor compliance of the stipulated conditions. The project authorities should extend full cooperation to the MoEFCC officer(s) by furnishing the requisite data / information / monitoring reports.

F. No. 22-34/2018-IA.III

Government of India

Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change
(Impact Assessment Division)Indira Paryavaran Bhawan
Jor Bagh Road, Aliganj,
New Delhi-110003E-mail: sharath.kr@gov.in
Tel: 011-24695319Dated: 16th January, 2020**OFFICE MEMORANDUM****Sub.: Additional Environment Clearance condition for mining projects – reg.**

The Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change has issued the standard EC conditions for coal and non coal mining sectors vide OM no 22-34/2018-IA.III dated 9th August 2018 and 8th January 2019.


2. The Hon'ble Supreme Court vide order dated 08.01.2020 in W.P. (Civil) No.114/2014 in the matter of Common Cause vs. Union of India has directed that the area which has been mined should be restored so that grass and other vegetation including trees can grow in the mining area for the benefit of animals.

3. In view of the above, as directed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, an additional condition as stipulated in the order be included in all the Environmental Clearances already granted to mining projects and to be granted henceforth.

"The mining lease holders shall, after ceasing mining operations, undertake re-grassing the mining area and any other area which may have been disturbed due to their mining activities and restore the land to a condition which is fit for growth of fodder, flora, fauna etc."

3.1 Necessary communication may be issued to the project proponents under intimation to respective regulatory authorities.

4. This issues with the approval of competent authority.


(Sharath Kumar Pallerla)
Director (IA-Policy)

To

1. Chairman, Central Pollution Control Board (CPCB).
2. Chairman of all the Expert Appraisal Committees

3. Chairperson/Member Secretaries of all the SEIAAs/SEACs
4. All the Officers of I.A. Division
5. Chairpersons/Member Secretaries of all SPCBs/UTPCCs

Copy for information to:

1. PS to Hon'ble Minister for Environment, Forest and Climate Change
2. PS to Hon'ble MoS (EF&CC)
3. PPS to Secretary(EF&CC)
4. PPS to AS (RSP) / AS (RA)
5. PS to JS (GM)/ JS (AKN)/JS (SKB)
6. Website, MoEF&CC
7. Guard file.

Sharath
16/11/2020
(Sharath Kumar Pallerla)
Director (IA-Policy)

F. No. 22-21/2020-IA.III

Government of India
 Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change
 Impact Assessment Division

Indira ParyavaranBhawan
 Jor Bagh Road, Aliganj
 New Delhi – 110003
 sujit.baju@gov.in

Date: 7th July, 2021**Office Memorandum**

Subject: Standard Operating Procedure (SoP) for Identification and handling of violation cases under EIA Notification 2006 in compliance to order of Hon'ble National Green Tribunal in O.A. No.34/2020 WZ - Regarding.

The Ministry had issued a notification number S.O.804(E), dated the 14th March, 2017 detailing the process for grant of Terms of Reference and Environmental Clearance in respect of projects or activities which have started the work on site and/or expanded the production beyond the limit of Prior EC or changed the product mix without obtaining Prior EC under the EIA Notification, 2006.

2. This Notification was applicable for six months from the date of publication i.e. 14.03.2017 to 13.09.2017 and further based on court direction from 14.03.2018 to 13.04.2018.

3. Hon'ble NGT in Original Application No. 287 of 2020 in the matter of Dastak N.G.O. Vs Synochem Organics Pvt. Ltd. &Ors. and in applications pertaining to same subject matter in Original Application No. 298 of 2020 in Vineet Nagar Vs. Central Ground Water Authority &Ors., vide order dated 03.06.2021 held that "(...) **for past violations, the concerned authorities are free to take appropriate action in accordance with polluter pays principle, following due process**".

4. Further, the Hon'ble National Green Tribunal in O.A No. 34/2020 WZ in the matter of Tanaji B. Gambhire vs. Chief Secretary, Government of Maharashtra and ors., vide order dated 24.05.2021 has directed that "**...a proper SoP be laid down for grant of EC in such cases so as to address the gaps in binding law and practice being currently followed. The MoEF may also consider circulating such SoP to all SEIAAs in the country**".

5. Therefore, in compliance to the directions of the Hon'ble NGT a Standard Operating Procedure (SoP) for dealing with violation cases is required to be drawn. The Ministry is also seized of different categories of 'violation' cases which have been

pending for want of an approved structural/procedural framework based on 'Polluter Pays Principle' and 'Principle of Proportionality'. It is undoubtedly important that action under statutory provisions is taken against the defaulters/violators and a decision on the closure of the project or activity or otherwise is taken expeditiously.

6. In the light of the above directions of the Hon'ble Tribunal and the issues involved, the matter has accordingly been examined in detail in the Ministry. A detailed SoP has accordingly been framed and is outlined herein. The SoP is also guided by the observations / decisions of the Hon'ble Courts wherein principles of proportionality and polluters pay have been outlined.

7. Relevant Court Cases on the issue: It is noted that while deciding issues related to violations of the Environment Protection Act, 1986 on account of running the project/activity without prior environmental clearance or in excess of capacity allowed in such clearances, **the Hon'ble courts have, *inter-alia*, deliberated on various facets involving 'violation' cases and have enunciated principles of 'Proportionality' and 'Polluter Pays' in various decisions viz. Industrial Council for Enviro-Legal Action Vs Union of India (the Bichhri village industrial pollution case) (1996 SCC [3] 212); Alembic Pharmaceuticals Ltd. Vs Rohit Prajapati & Ors. (C.A. No. 1526 of 2016, order dated 1.4.2020) and Hindustan Copper Limited Vs Union of India in (W.P. (C) No. 2364 of 2014, order dated 28.11.2014).** The salient extracts of the judgements are as under:

Issue 1: Proposal for grant of Environmental Clearance in violation cases – to be considered on merits:

i. Hon'ble High Court of Jharkhand in the matter of Hindustan Copper Limited Vs Union of India in W.P. (C) No. 2364 of 2014, vide order dated 28.11.2014

Held: "(...) action for alleged violation would be an independent and separate proceeding and therefore, consideration of proposal for environment clearance cannot await initiation of action against the project proponent."

*"(...) the proposal of the petitioner company for **environmental clearance must be examined on its merits, independent of any proposed action for the alleged violation of the environmental laws.**"*

ii. Hon'ble Madras High Court in the matter of Puducherry Environment Protection Association Vs The Union of India in W.P. No. 11189 of 2017, vide order dated 13.10.2017

Held "27. The question is whether an establishment contributing to the economy of the country and providing livelihood to hundreds of people should be closed down only because of failure to obtain prior environmental clearance, even though the establishment may not otherwise be violating

SA

pollution laws or the pollution, if any, can conveniently and effectively be checked. **The answer necessarily has to be in the negative.**"

"29. It is reiterated that protection of environment and prevention of environmental pollution and degradation are non-negotiable. At the same time, the Court cannot altogether ignore the economy of the Nation and the need to protect the livelihood of hundreds of employees employed in projects, which as stated above, otherwise comply with or can be made to comply with norms."

Issue 2: Environmental Clearance – Prospective & not ex-post facto:

Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of Common Cause Vs Union of India in W.P. (C) No. 114 of 2014, vide order dated 2.8.2017

*Held: "(...) an EC will come into force **not earlier than the date of its grant.**"*

Issue 3: 'Principles of Proportionality' – to be applied:

Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of Alembic Pharmaceuticals Ltd. Vs Rohit Prajapati & Ors. in C.A. No. 1526 of 2016, vide order dated 1.4.2020

*Held: "(...) **this Court must take a balanced approach** which holds the industries to account for having operated without environmental clearances in the past without ordering a closure of operations. The directions of the NGT for the revocation of the ECs and for closure of the units do not accord **with the principle of proportionality**"*

**Issue 4: 'Polluter pays' principle &
&**

Issue 5: Costs for remedial measures implicit in Sections 3 & 5 of Environment (Protection) Act, 1986.

Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of Indian Council for Enviro- Legal Action Vs Union of India (the Bichhri village industrial pollution case) in (1996 SCC [3] 212)

Held:

a) The Central Government is empowered to take all measures and issue all such directions as are called for the above purpose. The said powers will **include giving directions ...** and also the power to **impose the cost of remedial measures** on the offending industry and utilize the amount so recovered for carrying out remedial measures.....

SA

b) **Levy of costs required for carrying out remedial measures is implicit in Sections 3 and 5** which are couched in very wide and expansive language. Sections 3 and 5 of the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986, apart from other provisions of Water and Air Acts, empower the Government to make all such directions and take all such measures as are necessary or expedient for protecting and promoting the 'environment', which expression has been defined in very wide and expansive terms in Section 2 (a) of the Environment (Protection) Act. This power includes the power to prohibit an activity, close an industry, direct to carry out remedial measures, and wherever necessary impose the cost of remedial measures upon the offending industry.

c) The question of liability of the respondents to defray the costs of remedial measures can also be looked into from accepted universally sound principle, viz., the "**Polluter Pays**" Principle. "The polluter pays principle demands that the financial costs of preventing or remedying damage caused by pollution should lie with the undertakings which cause the pollution, or produce the goods which cause the pollution".

8. Legal provisions:

i. The Environment (Protection) Act, 1986 mandates the Central Government to take all measures as it deems necessary or expedient for the purpose of protecting and improving the quality of the environment and preventing, controlling and abating environmental pollution (reference sub-section (1) of Section 3 of Environment (Protection) Act, 1986). Further, clause (xiv) of sub-section (2) of Section 3 of the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986 specifies that the measures stipulated under sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Environment (Protection) Act 1986 includes 'such other matters as the Central Government deems necessary or expedient for the purpose of securing effective implementation of the provisions of this Act'.

ii. Further, notwithstanding anything contained in any other law but subject to the provisions of the Environment Protection Act, 1986, Section 5 of the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986, provides that the Central Government may, in the exercise of powers and performance of Central Government functions under the said Act, issue directions in writing to any person, officer or any authority and such person, officer or authority shall be bound to comply with such directions.

9. Definition of Violation and Non-compliance:

The Standard Operating Procedure (SoP) considers 'Violation' & 'Non-compliance' from the following perspective:

SA

i. "Violation" means cases where projects have either started the construction work or installation or excavation, whichever is earlier, on site or have expanded the production capacity and / or project area beyond the limit specified in the Environmental Clearance (Prior-EC) without obtaining Prior-EC or change of scope without prior approval from the Ministry.

ii. "Non-compliance" means non-compliance of terms and conditions prescribed by the Regulatory Authority in the Prior Environment Clearance accorded to the project.

10. Standard Operating Procedure – Guiding Principles:

i. Without prejudice to any other consequences, **action has to be initiated under section 15 read with section 19** of The Environment (Protection) Act, 1986 **against all violations.**

ii. Projects not allowable/permissible, for grant of EC, as per extant regulations: **To be demolished.**

iii. Projects allowable/permissible, if prior EC had been taken as per extant regulations: **To be closed until EC is granted (if no prior EC has been taken) or to revert to permitted production level (in case prior EC has been granted).**

iv. **Polluter pays:** Violators to pay for violation period - proportionate to the scale of project and extent of commercial transaction.

v. Setting up a mechanism for reporting of violation to the regulatory authority(ies).

11. SOP for dealing with the violation cases:

Step 1: Closure or Revision

Sl no.	Status of EC	Actions
1	If no prior EC has been taken	Order to close its operation
2.	If prior EC is available for existing/old unit	Order to revert the activity/production to permissible limits.
3.	If prior EC was not required for earlier production level but is now required	Restrict the activity/production to the extent to which prior EC was not required.

Step 2: Action under Environment (Projection) Act, 1986

Action under section 15 read with section 19 of the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986 shall be initiated against the violators.

SA

Step: 3: Appraisal under EIA Notification, 2006

The permissibility of the project shall be examined from the perspective of whether such activity/project was at all eligible for the grant of prior EC.

A. If not permissible:

i. The project shall be **ordered for the demolition/closure after issuing show cause notice and providing an opportunity of hearing.**

*Ex. If a red industry is functioning in a CRZ-I area which means that the activity was, in the first place, not permitted at the time of commencement of project. Therefore, the activity is not permissible and therefore it shall be **closed & demolished.***

ii. Respective regulatory authorities shall issue directions under section 5 of the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986 for such closure & demolition of the project/activity.

B. If permissible:

i. As per extant regulations at the time of scoping, if it is viewed that the project activity is otherwise permissible, Terms of Reference (TOR) shall be issued with directions to complete the impact assessment studies & submit Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) report & Environmental Management Plan (EMP) in a time bound manner.

ii. Such cases of violation shall be subject to appropriate

(a) Damage Assessment

(b) Remedial Plan and

(c) Community Augmentation Plan by the Central level Sectoral Expert Appraisal Committees or State/Union Territory Level Expert Appraisal Committees, as the case may be.

iii. The Competent Authority shall issue directions to the project proponent, under section 5 of the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986 on case to case basis mandating payment of such amount (as may be determined based on Polluters Pay principle) and undertaking activities relating to Remedial Plan and Community Augmentation Plan (to restore environmental damage caused including its social aspects).

iv. Upon submission of the EIA & EMP report, the project shall be appraised by the Central Sectoral Expert Appraisal Committees or the State/Union Territory Level Expert Appraisal Committees, as the case may be, as if it was a new proposal. If, on examination of the EIA/EMP report, the project is considered permissible for operation as per extant regulations, the requisite Environmental Clearance shall be issued **which shall be effective from the date of issue.**

v. However, during appraisal after examination if it is found that even though the project may **be permissible but not environmentally sustainable in its present**

form/configuration/features then the project shall be directed to be **modified so that the project would be environmentally sustainable.**

vi. If, however, it is not considered appropriate to issue EC, the project shall be directed to be **demolished/ closed. If such proposal is a case of expansion, the project shall be directed to revert back to the extent of activity for which EC had been granted earlier or to revert back to the extent of activity for which EC was not required (as the case may be).**

vii. Central Sectoral Expert Appraisal Committees or the State/Union Territory Level Expert Appraisal Committees, as the case may be, may insist upon public hearing to be conducted for such categories of projects for which the EIA Notification 2006, as amended from time to time, requires the public hearing to be conducted.

viii. The project proponent will be required to **submit a bank guarantee equivalent to the amount of Remediation Plan and Natural & Community Resource Augmentation Plan with Central / the State Pollution Control Board (depending on whether it is appraised at Ministry or by SEIAA).** The quantification of such liability will be recommended by Expert Appraisal Committee and finalized by Regulatory Authority. The bank guarantee shall be deposited prior to the grant of environmental clearance and **will be released after successful implementation of the Remediation plan and Natural & Community Resource Augmentation Plan.**

Note - The activities, as per above clauses, shall be undertaken simultaneously wherever feasible. Environmental Clearance, if granted, to such projects or activities, after due appraisal of EIA/EMP report, **shall be effective only from the date of issuance of such clearance** and shall be subject to compliance of obligations towards Damage Assessment, Remedial Plan & Community Augmentation Plan, etc. finalized in each case.

12. Penalty provisions for Violation cases and applications:

a. For new projects:

- i. **Where operation has not commenced:** 1% of the total project cost incurred up to the date of filing of application along with EIA/EMP report; [Ex: Rs.1 lakh for project cost of Rs.1 Cr]
- ii. **Where operations have commenced without EC:** 1% of the total project cost incurred up to the date of filing of application along with EIA/EMP report **PLUS** 0.25% of the total turnover during the period of violation. [Ex: For Rs.100 Cr project cost and Rs.100 Cr total turnover, the penalty shall be Rs.1 Cr + Rs. 0.25 Cr = Rs.1.25 Cr]

SA

b. For expansion projects:

- i. **Where operation/production with expanded capacity has not commenced:**
1% of the project cost, attributable to the expansion, incurred up to the date of filing of application along with EIA/EMP report.
- ii. **Where operation/ production with expanded capacity have commenced:**
1% of the project cost (attributable to the expansion activity) incurred upto the date of filing of application along with EIA/EMP report PLUS 0.25% of the total turnover (attributable to the expanded activity/capacity) involved during the period of violation.

12.1. Without prejudice to obligation as per (a) & (b) above, where the project or activity is considered for appraisal as above & the project proponent fails to provide required information or requisite documents or complete the requisite study for the purpose of EIA/EMP reports or does not furnish such reports within such period, as specified by the appraisal committee, without reasonable cause, it shall be inferred that the project proponent is not serious enough and the project or activity shall be directed to be demolished / closed.

12.2. The percentage rates, as above, shall be halved if the project proponent *suo-moto* reports such violations without such violations coming to the knowledge of the Government either on inquiry or complaint.

12.3. The penalty, as above, shall be in addition to liability for carrying out various remedial measures which shall be worked out based on the damage assessment for quantifying the environmental damage caused due to unauthorized project activity [as per Step 3 enumerated above].

13. Identification of Violation cases:

With a view to protecting the environment and to expeditiously bring violators into a regulatory regime so as to prevent & control environment damage caused by such violation & to determine whether operation of such projects is permissible and to take action stipulated under Section 15 of the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986 for contravention of the provisions of the said Act, Rules, orders and directions, it is expedient to also identify the cases of violation, examine and appraise such projects so as to refrain them from causing further environmental damage and also to compensate for causing damage to the environment. Therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred under Section 5 of the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986, the Central Government hereby directs that:-

- i. State Pollution Control Boards & Union Territory Pollution Control Committees, before grant or renewal of Consents under Water(Prevention & Control of Pollution) Act, 1974 & Air (Prevention& Control of Pollution) Act, 1981, shall ensure that the project proponents applies for or possess valid Prior



Environmental Clearance in terms of extant EIA Notification and shall not grant or renew CTO (Consent to Operate) unless Environment Clearance (if applicable) has been obtained.

- ii. The Central Pollution Control Board, all State Pollution Control Boards and all Union Territory Pollution Control Committees shall identify cases of violation under their respective jurisdiction, report such cases to the Ministry or State/Union Territory Level Environmental Impact Assessment Authority, as the case may be and also revoke CTO, if granted to the unit after giving an opportunity of being heard.
- iii. The Central Pollution Control Board, all State Pollution Control Boards and all Union Territory Pollution Control Committees shall expeditiously examine the references, received from public and other bodies, relating to violations and take necessary steps as per (ii) above.

14. This is issued with the approval of the Competent Authority.


 (Dr. Sujit Kumar Bajpayee)
 Joint Secretary (IA)

To

1. Chairperson/Member Secretary of Central Pollution Control Board
2. Chairperson/Member Secretaries of all the SEIAAs/SEACs
3. Chairman/Members of all the Expert Appraisal Committees
4. Chairman/Members of all the State Pollution Control Boards and Union Territory Pollution Control Committees

Copy for information:

1. PS to Hon'ble Minister for Environment, Forest and Climate Change
2. PS to Hon'ble MoS for Environment, Forest and Climate Change
3. PPS to Secretary(EF&CC)
4. PPS to AS(RS) / AS (RA)/ AS (UD)/ JS(JT) / JS (MP)/ JS (NPG)
5. All the officers of IA Division
6. Website of MoEF&CC/PARIVESH/Guard file

Copy (by email) also forwarded to the Registrar, NGT, in compliance to instruction given in O.A No. 34/2020 WZ in the matter of Tanaji B. Gambhire vs. Chief Secretary, Government of Maharashtra and ors.(order dated 24.05.2021).

REPORTABLE**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION****CIVIL APPEAL NOS. 7576-7577 OF 2021**

[Arising out of SLP (C.) Nos. 11226-11227 of 2020]

Electrosteel Steels Limited

.....Petitioner (s)

Versus

Union of India and Ors. Etc.

....Respondent (s)

J U D G M E N T**Indira Banerjee, J.**

Leave granted.

2. These Appeals are against an order dated 16th September 2020 passed by a Single Bench of the High Court of Jharkhand in W.P. (C) No.1873 of 2018 and W.P. (C) No. 4850 of 2018, discontinuing the interim orders earlier passed by the High Court, allowing the Appellant to operate its unit under the supervisory regulatory control of the Respondent - Jharkhand State Pollution Control Board, hereinafter referred to as "JSPCB", which had been in force for over two years.

3. The Appellant owns and runs a 1.5 MTPA integrated steel plant in Bokaro District in Jharkhand. The said steel plant in Bokaro, which

employs 3,000 regular employees and 7000 contractual employees, produced steel worth Rs.4,200 crores in the financial year 2019-20.

4. The Appellant claims that about 30,000 persons other than those actually employed by the steel plant as regular or contractual employees depend on the steel plant for their livelihood.

5. Corporate Insolvency Resolution Process (CIRP) had commenced against the Appellant under the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code 2016. As successful Resolution Applicant, Vedanta Ltd. took over the Appellant on or about 4th June 2018 upon payment of Rs.5,320 crores for discharge of its debts.

6. Pollution and consequential deterioration of environment has been assuming alarming proportions, and has become a cause of universal concern. Fumes, smoke, emission of green house gases by use of motors and machines and operation of mills, factories and plants cause environmental degradation.

7. Under the aegis of the United Nations discussions and deliberations have been held to protect and improve environment and prevent pollution.

8. In 1972, the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment was convened in Stockholm to work out ways and means to protect and improve the environment. In course of deliberations, it was felt that there was need to enact law to tackle environmental pollution. India

participated in the conference and strongly voiced environmental concerns.

9. The Environment (Protection) Act, 1986, hereinafter referred to as "*the 1986 Act*", has been enacted as a consequence of decisions taken at the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment held in Stockholm in June, 1972.

10. The statement of objects and reasons for enactment of the 1986 Act declares that the Act has been prompted by concern over environment, that has grown the world over, since the sixties.

11. Sub-Section (1) of Section 3 of the 1986 Act empowers the Central Government to take all such measures as it might deem necessary or expedient for the purpose of protecting and improving the quality of the environment and preventing, controlling and abating environmental pollution.

12. Sub-section (2) of Section 3 of the 1986 Act enables the Central Government to take, *inter alia*, the following measures:

"(i) co-ordination of actions by the State Governments, officers and other authorities—

(a) under this Act, or the rules made thereunder; or

(b) under any other law for the time being in force which is relatable to the objects of this Act;

(ii) planning and execution of a nation-wide programme for the prevention, control and abatement of environmental pollution;

(iii) laying down standards for the quality of environment in its various aspects;

(iv) laying down standards for emission or discharge of

environmental pollutants from various sources whatsoever:

Provided that different standards for emission or discharge may be laid down under this clause from different sources having regard to the quality or composition of the emission or discharge of environmental pollutants from such sources;

(v) restriction of areas in which any industries, operations or processes or class of industries, operations or processes shall not be carried out or shall be carried out subject to certain safeguards;

(vi) laying down procedures and safeguards for the prevention of accidents which may cause environmental pollution and remedial measures for such accidents;

(vii) laying down procedures and safeguards for the handling of hazardous substances;

(viii) examination of such manufacturing processes, materials and substances as are likely to cause environmental pollution;

(ix) carrying out and sponsoring investigations and research relating to problems of environmental pollution;

(x) inspection of any premises, plant, equipment, machinery, manufacturing or other processes, materials or substances and giving, by order, of such directions to such authorities, officers or persons as it may consider necessary to take steps for the prevention, control and abatement of environmental pollution;

(xi) establishment or recognition of environmental laboratories and institutes to carry out the functions entrusted to such environmental laboratories and institutes under this Act;

(xii) collection and dissemination of information in respect of matters relating to environmental pollution;

(xiii) preparation of manuals, codes or guides relating to the prevention, control and abatement of environmental pollution;

(xiv) such other matters as the Central Government deems necessary or expedient for the purpose of securing the effective implementation of the provisions of this Act."

a

b

c

d

e

f

g

h

13. Sub-section (3) of Section 3 of the 1986 Act provides as follows: a

“The Central Government may, if it considers it necessary or expedient so to do for the purposes of this Act, by order, published in the Official Gazette, constitute an authority or authorities by such name or names as may be specified in the order for the purpose of exercising and performing such of the powers and functions (including the power to issue directions under Section 5) of the Central Government under this Act and for taking measures with respect to such of the matters referred to in sub-section (2) as may be mentioned in the order and subject to the supervision and control of the Central Government and the provisions of such order, such authority or authorities may exercise the powers or perform the functions or take the measures so mentioned in the order as if such authority or authorities had been empowered by this Act to exercise those powers or perform those functions or take such measures.” b c d

14. Subject to the provisions of the 1986 Act, the Central Government has power under sub-section (1) of section 3 to take all such measures as it deems necessary or expedient for the purpose of protecting and improving the quality of the environment and preventing, controlling and abating environmental pollution. e f

15. Section 5 of the 1986 Act provides that notwithstanding anything contained in any other law, but subject to the provisions of the 1986 Act, the Central Government may, in exercise of its powers and performance of its functions under the 1986 Act, issue directions in writing to any person, officer or any authority and such person, officer or authority shall be bound to comply with such directions. g h

a
b
c
d

16. In exercise of powers conferred by Sub-Section (1) and clause (v) of sub-section (2) of Section 3 of the 1986 Act read with Rule 5(3)(d) of the Environment (Protection) Rules, 1986 the Central Government issued the Environmental Impact Assessment Notification dated 27th January 1994 directing that on and from the date of publication of the said notification in the Official Gazette, expansion or modernisation of any activity or a new project listed in Schedule I of the Notification shall not be undertaken in any part of India, unless it has been accorded Environmental Clearance (EC) by the Central Government in accordance with the procedure specified in the Notification.

e
f
g
h

17. Under Clause (2)(I) of the said Notification, any person who desires to undertake any new project listed in Schedule I is required to submit an application to the Secretary, Ministry of Environment and Forests (MoEF), New Delhi in the pro forma specified in Schedule II, accompanied by a project report which is to include the EIA (Environmental Impact Assessment) Report /Environment Management Plan (EMP) prepared in accordance with the guidelines issued by MoEF. Another Environmental Impact Notification was issued in 2006, for grant of Terms and Environmental Clearance *inter alia* for projects which had started work on site.

18. The EIA Report submitted with the application of the project proponent is to be evaluated and assessed by the Impact Assessment Agency (IAA), that is MoEF, and if deemed necessary, it may consult a Committee of Experts constituted in the manner prescribed in Schedule III. The Committee of Experts shall have full right of entry and inspection of the site. The Impact Assessment Agency is to prepare a set of recommendations based on technical assessment of documents and data, furnished by the project proponent, supplemented by data collected during visits to sites, interaction with the affected population and environmental groups, if necessary. The summary of the reports, the recommendations and the conditions, subject to which EC is given shall, subject to public interest, be made available to the parties concerned or environmental groups on request. The IAA may solicit comments of the public within the specified period by arranging public hearings for that purpose. The public shall, subject to public interest, be provided access, to the summary of the EIA Report/Environment Management Plan (EMP). The clearance granted for commencement of the construction or operation of the plant, is to be valid for five years. Clause IV of the Environmental Impact Assessment Notification provides for the monitoring of the implementation of the conditions of EC and/or the recommendations and conditions laid down by IAA.

19. A minor amendment was made to the said Environmental Impact Assessment Notification dated 27th January 1994, by a Notification dated 10th April 1997, which prescribes a detailed procedure for public hearing.

20. By a notification being S.O. 327(E), dated 10th April 2001, published in the Gazette of India, Extra., Pt.II, Sec.3(ii), dated 12th April 2001, the Central Government has delegated the powers vested in it under Section 5 of the 1986 Act, to the Chairpersons of the respective State Pollution Control Boards/Committees to issue directions to any industry or any local or other authority for the violations of the standards and rules relating to biomedical waste, hazardous chemicals, industrial solid waste and municipal solid waste including plastic waste notified under the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986 subject to the condition that the Central Government may revoke such delegation of powers or may itself invoke the provisions of Section 5 of the said Act, if in the opinion of the Central Government such a course of action is necessary in the public interest.

21. On or about 8th January 2007, the Appellant applied to the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, Government of India, hereinafter referred to as "MoEF&CC" for grant of EC to establish 3 MTPA integrated steel plant at Mauza South Parbatpur of Chandankiyari Block of Bokaro District.

22. In its application, the Appellant stated that 1350 acres of land were required for establishing the said plant at the Mauza South Parbatpur of Chandankiyari Block of Bokaro District and that no forest land was involved in the project.

23. By a letter No. F.No.J-11011/137/2006-1A-II (i) dated 21st February 2008, the Appellant was granted EC. After obtaining EC, the Appellant applied to the JSPCB, for grant of 'Consent to Establish' (CTE) under the Air (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1981, hereinafter referred to as the Air Pollution Act, and Water (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act 1974, hereinafter referred to as the Water Pollution Act.

24. On 5th May 2008, the JSPCB granted CTE to the Appellant to establish the 3 MTPA integrated steel plant at Mauza South Parbatpur of Chandankiyari Block of Bokaro District. The CTE was granted on the basis of the EC granted by the MoEF&CC.

25. The CTE was extended from time to time till 4th May 2011. Even though CTE was granted to the Appellant to establish a steel plant at Mauza South Parbatpur of Chandankiyari Block of Bokaro District, the Appellant established steel plant in Mauza Bhagabandh in the Chas Block in Bokaro District, 5.3 Kms away from the site for which EC and CTE had been granted.

26. A Circular No.J-11013/41/2006-1A.2(i) dated 22nd January, 2010 was issued by the Ministry of Environment and Forest (MoEF) of the Government of India which provided as follows:

"Instances have come to the notice of this Ministry wherein the project proponents have changed the project site after the said project has been granted environmental clearance or after the public hearing has been held. The project proponents have approached this Ministry to revalidate the environmental clearance so granted without undergoing afresh the procedure prescribed for obtaining environmental clearance. The matter has been considered in the ministry. The change in project site would lead to change in project affected people as well as the

change in study area and the impact zone. As such the Environment Impact Assessment Report and Public Hearing conducted for a particular location cannot be taken valid for the changed location.

Accordingly, it has been decided that any shift in project site location after holding of public hearing will be deemed to be a new proposal and will be appraised afresh as per the procedure prescribed under EIA Notification 2006 provided the respective Expert Appraisal Committee is satisfied that the shift is so minor as to have no change in EIA/EMP, duly recorded in the minutes and prior approval of advisor (In-charge)/SEIAA for Category 'A'/Category 'B' projects respectively is obtained for not holding the public hearing for the changed location afresh.

This issues with the approval of the Competent Authority."

27. By a communication being Reference No.1142 dated 4th May 2010, the District DFO (District Forest Officer) Bokaro requested JSPCB to take action against the Appellant for setting up its integrated steel plant on forest land in Mauza Bhagabandh of Chas Block of Bokaro District, in violation of the Forest Conservation Act 1980 and Indian Forest Act 1927. The DFO, Bokaro reported encroachment of 220.88 acres of notified forest land by the Appellant to JSPCB.

28. It appears that cases had been initiated against the officials of the Appellant under the Indian Forest Act, 1927, Forest Conservation Act, 1980 and the Bihar Public Land Encroachment Act, 1955 which have been quashed by the Jharkhand High Court, by an order dated 25th January 2011.

29. On or about 23rd September 2010 the Appellant applied for Consent to Operate (CTO) under the Air Pollution Act and the Water Pollution Act for its 350 m³ blast furnace. Later on 9th September 2011, the Appellant applied for CTO in respect of its entire plant.

30. By a letter dated 2nd December 2011, addressed to the Appellant, the MoEF confirmed that the lay out of the Appellant's 3 MTPA Integrated Steel Plant was well within the Environment Impact Area and that the affected people had the opportunity to participate in a public hearing.

31. By letter dated 18th May 2012, the JSPCB reported encroachment by the Appellant upon forest land and alleged violation by the Appellant of the Forest Conservation Act, 1980 to the MoEF&CC, New Delhi. The MoEF&CC was also informed of the unauthorized shifting of the integrated steel plant from Mauza South Parbatpur of Chandankiyari Block of Bokaro District to Mauza Bhagabandh of Chas Block of Bokaro District in violation of the conditions of Environment Clearance granted by the MoEC&CC.

32. Pursuant to the report of JSPCB, MoEF&CC issued a Show Cause Notice dated 6th June 2012 to the Appellant under Section 5 of the 1986 Act. The Appellant submitted its reply to the Show Cause Notice on 20th June 2012.

33. On 10th September 2012, the Appellant once again applied to JSPCB for CTO for one year under the Water Pollution Act and Air Pollution Act. According to the Appellant, several reminders were sent to MoEF&CC requesting MoEF&CC to intimate JSPCB of the outcome of the Show Cause

Notice issued to the Appellant. However, JSPCB has not been informed of the decision of MoEF&CC.

34. The Appellant filed a Writ Petition being W.P. No.2247/2012 in the Jharkhand High Court for orders on JSPCB to grant the Appellant CTO. The said writ petition was disposed of by an order dated 5th November 2012, the operative part whereof is set out hereinbelow:-

“Respondent 1& 2 to consider the petitioner’s application and as assured by them, if so required, give an opportunity of hearing to the petitioners and after taking into consideration the facts and provisions of law and the related decisions, shall dispose of the petitioner’s application within five weeks from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this order.”

35. On or about 27th November 2013, the application of the Appellant for CTO was rejected on the ground that the Appellant had shifted the site of its steel Plant and had encroached upon forest land in violation of the Forest Conservation Act, 1980. The operative part of the order dated 27th November 2013 reads:-

“at this stage subject to final outcome of the decision of MoEF&CC, New Delhi with respect to show cause notice dated 6.6.2012, we dispose the application for CTO in exercise of power conferred u/s 21(4) of Air (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1981 & u/s 25(4) of Water (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1974 by “refusing” the CTO to the unit for the reason aforesaid.”

36. The Appellant filed an application for contempt being Contempt Case (C) No.939 of 2013 in W.P.(C) No.2247 of 2012 in the Jharkhand High Court. Pursuant to an order dated 29th November 2013 in the Contempt Petition, the JSPCB disposed of the applications for grant of CTO to the Appellant.

37. By a letter dated 17th April 2013, the MoEF&CC had called for a status report from the State of Jharkhand in respect of forest land encroached by the Appellant. The Forest Department submitted a report to the MoEF&CC on 13th May, 2014.

38. Thereafter, by a letter dated 20th October 2014, the MoEF&CC, New Delhi directed the Department of Forest, Environment and Climate Change, Government of Jharkhand to take action against the Appellant for violating the provisions of Indian Forest Act, 1927 and Forest Conservation Act, 1980. In compliance with the aforesaid order, JSPCB directed the Appellant to close down its plant under Section 31(A) of the Air Pollution Act and Section 33(A) of Water Pollution Act.

39. By a Memo No.521 dated 6th February 2015, the Department of Forest, Environment and Climate Change, Government of Jharkhand directed the DGP, Jharkhand, Ranchi and the Deputy Commissioner, Bokaro to take action against the Appellant in the light of the letter dated 20th October, 2014 of the MoEF&CC, Government of India and to submit an action taken report.

40. The aforesaid order of JSPCB was challenged by the Appellant by filing a Writ Petition being WP(C) No.2033 of 2015 in the Jharkhand High Court. By an order dated 5th February 2016 the High Court set aside the order of the JSPCB holding that the same had been passed in violation of principles of natural justice. The High Court however, held that JSPCB

would be at liberty to pass an order in accordance with law after giving the Appellant an opportunity of hearing.

41. Thereafter, a show cause notice dated 25th April 2016, was issued to the Appellant. The Appellant replied to the show cause notice on 28th September 2016, contending that the Appellant had not set up its plant on any forest land and that all pollution control measures had been taken. However, the Principal Chief Conservator of Forests (PCCF), Jharkhand had by a communication No.2966 dated 8th August 2016 informed JSPCB that the Appellant had encroached forest land. Thereafter JSPCB once again called upon the Appellant to show cause in the light of information provided by the PCCF, Jharkhand. The Appellant by a letter dated 28th September 2016 reiterated that there was no forest land in the plant premises.

42. JSPCB passed an order No.B-319 dated 13th February 2017 disposing of the show cause notice in the light of the direction dated 5th February 2016 of the Jharkhand High Court and the applications for CTO. JSPCB granted CTO to the Appellant which was valid till 31st December, 2017.

43. The MoEF&CC and the State Environment Impact Assessment Authorities had, in the meanwhile been receiving proposals under the Environment Impact Assessment Notification, 2006 for grant of Terms of Reference and Environmental Clearance for projects which had started the work on site, expanded the production beyond the limit of

environmental clearance or changed the product mix without obtaining prior environmental clearance. a

44. The MoEF&CC deemed it necessary that all entities not complying with the environmental regulation under Environment Impact Assessment Notification, 2006, be brought to comply with the environmental laws in expedient manner, for the purpose of protecting and improving the quality of the environment and reducing environmental pollution. b c

45. The MoEF&CC deemed it necessary to bring such projects and activities in compliance with the environmental laws at the earliest point of time, rather than leaving them unregulated and unchecked, which would be more damaging to the environment. d

46. In furtherance of this objective, the Government of India deemed it essential to establish a process for appraisal of cases of violation of norms, and prescribing such adequate environmental safeguards that would deter violation of the provisions of Environment Impact Assessment Notification, 2006 and ensure that damage to environment was adequately compensated for. e f

47. In ***Indian Council for Enviro-Legal Action and Ors. v. Union of India and Ors.***¹, the Supreme Court analyzed relevant provisions of environmental laws and concluded that damages might be recovered under the provisions of the 1986 Act, inter alia, to implement measures that were necessary or expedient for protecting and promoting the
1. (1996) 3 SCC 212 g h

environment. This Court affirmed that the power of the Central Government under Section 3 of the 1986 Act was wide and included the power to prohibit an activity, close an industry, direct to carry out remedial measures, and wherever necessary impose the cost of remedial measures upon the offending industry. The question of liability of the respondents to defray the costs of remedial measures could also be looked into from the principle "polluter pays."

48. In exercise of power under Section 3(1) and Section 3(2)(v) of the 1986 Act read with Rule 5(3)(d) of the Environment (Protection) Rules, 1986, the Central Government has issued a Notification being S.O. 804(E) dated 14th March 2017 which provides for grant of ex post facto EC for project proponents who have commenced, continued or completed a project without obtaining EC under the 1986 Act or the EIA notification issued under it.

49. Paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of the said notification, read as follows :

"(3) In cases of violation, action will be taken against the project proponent by the respective State or State Pollution Control Board under the provisions of section 19 of the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986 and further, no consent to operate or occupancy certificate will be issued till the project is granted the environmental clearance.

(4) The cases of violation will be appraised by respective sector Expert Appraisal Committees constituted under sub-section (3) of Section 3 of the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986 with a view to assess that the project has been constructed at a site which under prevailing laws is permissible and expansion has been done which can be run sustainably under compliance of environmental norms with adequate environmental safeguards; and in case, where the finding of the Expert Appraisal Committee is negative, closure of the project will be recommended along with other actions under the law.

(5) In case, where the findings of the Expert Appraisal Committee on point at sub-para(4) above are affirmative, the projects under this category will be prescribed the appropriate Terms of Reference for undertaking Environment Impact Assessment and preparation of Environment Management Plan. Further, the Expert Appraisal Committee will prescribe a specific Terms of Reference for the project on assessment of ecological damage, remediation plan and natural and community resource augmentation plan and it shall be prepared as an independent chapter in the environment impact assessment report by the accredited consultants. The collection and analysis of data for assessment of ecological damage, preparation of remediation plan and natural and community resource augmentation plan shall be done by an environmental laboratory duly notified under Environment (Protection) Act, 1986, or a environmental laboratory accredited by National Accreditation Board for Testing and Calibration Laboratories or a laboratory of a Council of Scientific and Industrial Research institution working in the field of environment."

50. On or about 24th August 2017, the Appellant applied for CTO for five years. On 13th November 2017, JSPCB issued a Show Cause Notice to the Appellant pointing out alleged contraventions of the conditions of Consent to Operate (CTO) earlier granted to the Appellant. The Appellant was called upon to show cause whether conditions of the CTO had been contravened while the application of the Appellant for CTO for five year was pending.

51. On 23rd November 2017, the Appellant submitted its online reply to the Show Cause Notice showing compliance of the conditions of the CTO.

52. By a communication No.2105 dated 18th December 2017 JSPCB requested MoEF&CC to inform JSPCB of the decision on the show cause notice issued to the Appellant under Section 5 of the 1986 Act for

revocation of the EC for non compliance of the conditions for grant of EC for the integrated plant at Parbatpur, Jharkhand.

53. Aggrieved by the failure of JSPCB to issue/renew the CTO to the Appellant, pursuant to its application made on 24th August 2017, the Appellant filed a writ petition being W.P.(C) No. 1873 of 2018 in the Jharkhand High Court on or about 12th April 2018 seeking directions on the JSPCB to issue CTO to the Appellant.

54. By an order dated 16th July 2018, the High Court directed the JSPCB to take a final decision on the application of renewal/grant of CTO filed by the Appellant on 24th August 2017 within the time stipulated in the said order.

55. The High Court further passed an interim order directing that the Appellant be allowed to operate its unit under the supervisory and regulatory control of the JSPCB, who might carry out periodical check as to adherence by the Appellant of pollution control laws.

56. JSPCB passed an order dated 21st August, 2018, rejecting at that stage the request of the Appellant for CTO, subject to the decision of MoEF&CC on the show cause notice issued to the appellant. The operative part of the said order is set out hereinbelow:

“at this stage subject to final outcome of the decision of MoEF&CC, New Delhi with respect to show cause notice dated 6.6.2012, we dispose the application for CTO in exercise of power conferred u/s 21(4) of Air (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1981 & u/s 25(4) of Water (Prevention and Control of pollution) Act, 1974 by “refusing” the CTO to the unit for the reason aforesaid.”

57. The Appellant, thereafter approached the High Court with a prayer for amendment of Writ Petition No.1873 of 2018. By an order dated 25th August 2018, the High Court allowed the application for amendment of the Writ Petition and directed the respondent to file their response to the amended writ petition. The High Court further directed:-

“10. So far as interim relief is concerned, this court finds that the order passed by the respondent-Jharkhand State Pollution Control Board dated 23.08.2018 appears to be directly dependent on the final decision which is yet to be taken by the Ministry of Environment, Forest & Climate Change on the show cause issued to the petitioner as back as in the year 2012. As per the submission made by the counsel appearing on behalf of Union of India, they are shortly going to take a final decision in the matter after hearing the petitioner. Accordingly the operation, implementation and execution of the order dated 23.08.2018 passed by Jharkhand State Pollution Control Board is hereby stayed till 27.09.2018 and the interim order dated 16.07.2018 is hereby extended till 27.09.2018.

11. So far as decision of the Ministry of Environment, Forest & Climate Change are concerned, considering the fact that the unit of the petitioner is running unit and large number of employees are working in this unit of the petitioner, this court consider it appropriate that the issue regarding the environmental clearance of the petitioner should be decided at the earliest.

12. It is further observed that it is open to the petitioner to approach the Union of India with their proposal/ application for regularization of the alleged violation, without prejudice to their rights (including right, title, interest, possession and nature of property of the petitioner) and advance submissions before the respondent authority of Union of India pursuant to the show cause notice issued to them dated 6.6.2012 and the appropriate authority may, if possible, simultaneously consider the aforesaid application of the petitioner for regularization along with the show cause reply of the petitioner such that entire dispute is decided and the petitioner may also have a clarity about the fate of its unit. The decision which is to be taken by the Union of India be brought on record by either of the parties by filing supplementary affidavit latest by 25.09.2018.

13. I.A. No. 7610 of 2018 and I.A No. 7613 OF 2018 are hereby disposed of.

14.It is made clear that this court has not gone into the merits of the claim of the petitioner and it will be open to the respondent no 3 to take decision as per law.”

58. By the aforesaid order dated 25th August 2018, the High Court directed MoEF to take a decision on the application of the Appellant for EC as also a decision regarding violation by the Appellant of the provisions of EC by encroachment upon forest land by shifting the location of the plant.

59. On 31st August 2018, MoEF&CC issued a show cause notice No. F.No. J-11011/137/2006-1A Pt.II (i) dated 31st August 2018 to the Appellant for violating the provisions of the EC by shifting the location of its plant and encroaching upon forest land.

60. The Respondent No.1 was also accorded personal hearing on 10th September 2018. On 12th September 2018 Mr. Gyanesh Bharti who presided over the personal hearing was transferred from MoEF&CC.

61. On 20th September 2018 the Respondent No.1 issued an order bearing No.F.No.J-11011/137/2006-IA.II(I) revoking the EC of the Appellant on the ground that the Appellant had encroached upon 220 acres of forest land and had shifted the location of its plant from Parbatpur to Bhagabandh, violating the conditions stipulated in the EC.

62. The Appellant filed Writ petition being W.P. (C) No.4850 of 2018 in the Jharkhand High Court challenging the revocation of the EC granted to the Appellant.

63. On 27th September 2018 the High Court passed an interim order staying the operation, implementation and execution of the impugned order dated 20th September 2018. The Court prima facie found that the impugned order, passed in violation of principles of natural justice, had serious repercussions on the unit of the Appellant which was a running unit, and had caused prejudice to the Appellant.

64. On 4th October 2018, the Appellant applied for ex post facto Forest Clearance (FC) without prejudice to its rights and contentions. On 27th November 2019 the Appellant applied for a “revised” EC without prejudice to its rights and contentions. In the meanwhile, the Interim order passed by the High Court on 27th September 2018 was extended from time to time. Such extensions were granted on 10.10.2018, 5.11.2018, 11.12.2018, 8.1.2019, 23.1.2019, 16.5.2019, 25.7.2019 and 17.10.2019.

65. On 17th December 2019, MoEF&CC passed an order according ex post facto in principle approval for the forest diversion/clearance proposal of the Appellant. The operative part of the said order reads:-

“After careful examination of the proposal of the State Government and on the basis of the recommendations of the Forest Advisory Committee and approval of the same by the competent authority of the MoEF&CC, New Delhi, the Central Government hereby accords ex-post facto ‘in-principle’ approval under Section -2 of the Forest (Conservation) Act, 1980 for diversion of 184.23 ha of forest land (174.39 ha encroached (ex-post facto) and 9.84 ha virgin land) in favour of M/s Electrosteel Steels Limited in the State of Jharkhand subject to fulfilment of following conditions:-

(i) Legal status of the diverted forest land shall remain unchanged;...”

a
b
c
66. By an order dated 26th February 2020, the Jharkhand High Court directed that the pendency of W.P. (C) No. 4850 of 2018 and W.P. (C) No.1873 of 2018 would not come in the way of consideration by the MoEF&CC of grant or refusal of restoration of EC and it would be open to the Ministry to take appropriate decision in accordance with law. The interim orders in force were extended.

d
e
67. Thereafter by a letter dated 2nd March 2020, the Appellant requested MoEF&CC to consider the application of the Appellant for revised EC. In the meanwhile, the interim orders passed by the High Court were further extended. The interim orders were extended by orders passed on 26.2.2020, 7.4.2020 and 29.5.2020.

f
g
68. The Writ Petition was called for hearing on 19th June 2020 whereupon it was submitted on behalf of the Respondent No.1 that the revised EC application of the Appellant would be placed before the Expert Appraisal Committee (EAC) for consideration on merit and Violation Committee would decide on the action to be taken against the Appellant for violation of Environment (Protection) Act, 1986.

h
69. On 6th August 2020 and 7th August 2020, the case of the Appellant was placed before the EAC at its 35th meeting. The Appellant was invited to present its proposal online before the Committee.

70. After detailed deliberation, the EAC appraised the proposal on merits and recommended issuance of Standard Terms of Reference along with Specific Terms of Reference for undertaking Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and preparation of Environment Management Plan (EMP). The EAC noted that the plant was a running unit and the EC was subject to the conditions imposed in the Terms of Reference.

71. On 4th September 2020, the Jharkhand High Court extended the interim orders till 8th September 2020 while awaiting response from the Respondents. On 8th September 2020, the High Court reserved orders on the extension of interim orders dated 16th July 2018 and 27th September 2018 while listing the writ petitions for final hearing on 16th September 2020.

72. On 15th September 2020, the Respondent No.1 filed an affidavit stating that it had no objection to extension of the interim orders considering that the steel plant employed a large workforce. At the hearing on 16th September 2020 JSPCB also consented to extension of the interim order. However, the High Court passed the impugned order dated 16th September 2021 dis-continuing the earlier interim orders on, *inter alia*, the following grounds:

- (i) The Expert Appraisal Committee of the MoEF&CC had, after detailed deliberations, found that the Appellant had been in violation of the EIA Notification 2006 and general condition no. (ii) of the EC dated 21.02.2008.
- (ii) The MoEF&CC had while issuing ToR for grant of EC recommended action against the Appellant under Section 19 of

the 1986 Act for past violations. Extension of the interim orders would amount to staying action.

- (iii) In ***Alembic Pharmaceuticals Ltd. v. Rohit Prajapati and Others²***, this Court had deprecated ex post facto Ecs but passed certain directions in exercise of powers under Article 142 of the Constitution.

73. By an Office Memorandum, being F.No. 22-21/2020-1A III, dated 7th July 2021, the MoEF&CC issued Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) for Identification and Handing of violation cases under EIA Notification 2006.

74. The said Office Memorandum, *inter alia*, reads:

“The Ministry had issued a notification number S.O.804(E), dated the 14th March, 2017 detailing the process for grant of Terms of Reference and Environmental Clearance in respect of projects or activities which have started the work on site and/ or expanded the production beyond the limit of Prior EC or changed the product mix without obtaining Prior EC under the EIA Notification, 2006.

2. This Notification was applicable for six months from the date of publication i.e. 14.03.2017 to 13.09.2017 and further based on court direction from 14.03.2018 to 13.04.2018.

3. Hon'ble NGT in Original Application No. 287 of 2020 in the matter of Dastak N.G.O. Vs Synochem Organics Pvt. Ltd. &Ors. and in applications pertaining to same subject matter in Original Application No. 298 of 2020 in Vineet Nagar Vs. Central Ground Water Authority &Ors., vide order dated 03.06.2021 held that “(...) for past violations, the concerned authorities are

free to take appropriate action in accordance with polluter pays principle, following due process”.

4. Further, the Hon'ble National Green Tribunal in O.A No. 34/2020 WZ in the matter of Tanaji B. Gambhire vs. Chief Secretary, Government of Maharashtra and ors., vide order dated 24.05.2021 has directed that " ... **a proper SoP be laid down for grant of EC in such cases so as to address the gaps in binding law and practice being currently followed. The MoEF may also consider circulating such SoP to all SEIAAs in the country**".

5. Therefore, in compliance to the directions of the Hon'ble NGT a Standard Operating Procedure (SoP) for dealing with violation cases is required to be drawn. The Ministry is also seized of different categories of 'violation' cases which have been pending for want of an approved structural/procedural framework based on 'Polluter Pays Principle' and 'Principle of Proportionality'. It is undoubtedly important that action under statutory provisions is taken against the defaulters/violators and a decision on the closure of the project or activity or otherwise is taken expeditiously.

6. In the list of the above directions of the Hon'ble Tribunal and the issues involved, the matter has accordingly been examined in detail in the Ministry. A detailed SoP has accordingly been framed and is outlined herein. The SoP is also guided by the observations/decisions of the Hon'ble Courts wherein principles of proportionality and polluters pay have been outlined."

75. The Standard Operating Procedure formulated by the said Office Memorandum dated 7th July 2021 refers to and gives effect to various judicial pronouncements including the judgment of this Court in ***Alembic Pharmaceuticals*** (supra).

76. In terms of the Standard Operating Procedure, the proposal for grant of EC in cases of violation are to be considered on merits, with prospective effect, applying principles of proportionality and the principle that the polluter pays and is liable for costs of remedial measures.

77. By an interim order passed on 15th July 2021 in WP(MD) 11757 of 2021 in ***Fatima vs. Union of India***, the Madurai Bench of Madras High Court has stayed the operation of the Standard Operating Procedure.

78. By an order dated 25th August 2021, MoEF&CC rejected the application of the Appellant for the time being. The application has, in effect, been kept in abeyance.

79. The MoEF apparently did not take any decision on the application of the Appellant for EC, since the Standard Operating Procedure issued by it has been stayed by the Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, by the said order dated 15th July 2021, citing the judgment of this Court in ***Alembic Pharmaceuticals*** (supra).

80. The Appellant has filed an application being I.A No.125221 of 2021 in this appeal seeking directions on the Respondent No.1 to process the Appellant's application dated 5th August 2020 for revised EC.

81. There can be no doubt that the need to comply with the requirement to obtain Environment Clearance is non-negotiable. A project can be set up or allowed to expand subject to compliance of the requisite norms. Environmental clearance is granted on condition of the suitability of the site to set up the project from the environmental angle, and existence of necessary infrastructural facilities and equipment for compliance of environmental norms. To protect future generations, it is imperative that pollution laws be strictly enforced. Under no circumstances, can industries which pollute be allowed to operate unchecked and degrade the environment.

82. The question is whether an establishment contributing to the economy of the country and providing livelihood to hundreds of people should be closed down for the technical irregularity of shifting its site without prior environmental clearance, without opportunity to the establishment to regularize its operation by obtaining the requisite clearances and permissions, even though the establishment may not otherwise be violating pollution laws, or the pollution, if any, can conveniently and effectively be checked. The answer has to be in the negative.

83. The Central Government is well within the scope of its powers under Section 3 of the 1986 Act to issue directions to control and/or prevent pollution including directions for prior Environmental Clearance before a project is commenced. Such prior Environmental Clearance is necessarily granted upon examining the impact of the project on the

environment. Ex-Post facto Environmental Clearance should not ordinarily be granted, and certainly not for the asking. At the same time ex post facto clearances and/or approvals and/or removal of technical irregularities in terms of Notifications under the 1986 Act cannot be declined with pedantic rigidity, oblivious of the consequences of stopping the operation of a running steel plant.

84. The 1986 Act does not prohibit ex post facto Environmental Clearance. Some relaxations and even grant of ex post facto EC in accordance with law, in strict compliance with Rules, Regulations Notifications and/or applicable orders, in appropriate cases, where the projects are in compliance with, or can be made to comply with environment norms, is in over view not impermissible. The Court cannot be oblivious to the economy or the need to protect the livelihood of hundreds of employees and others employed in the project and others dependent on the project, if such projects comply with environmental norms.

85. As held by a three Judge Bench of this Court in *Lafarge Umiam Mining Private Limited v. Union of India*³ ("Lafarge") reported in (2011) 7 SCC 338:

"119. The time has come for us to apply the constitutional "doctrine of proportionality" to the matters concerning environment as a part of the process of judicial review in contradistinction to merit review. It cannot be gainsaid that utilization of the environment and its natural resources has to be in a way that is consistent with principles of sustainable development and intergenerational equity, but balancing of these equities may entail policy choices. In the circumstances, barring

3. (2011) 7 SCC 338

exceptions, decisions relating to utilization of natural resources have to be tested on the anvil of the well- recognized principles of judicial review. Have all the relevant factors been taken into account? Have any extraneous factors influenced the decision? Is the decision strictly in accordance with the legislative policy underlying the law (if any) that governs the field? Is the decision consistent with the principles of sustainable development in the sense that has the decision-maker taken into account the said principle and, on the basis of relevant considerations, arrived at a balanced decision? Thus, the Court should review the decision-making process to ensure that the decision of MoEF is fair and fully informed, based on the correct principles, and free from any bias or restraint. Once this is ensured, then the doctrine of "margin of appreciation" in favour of the decision-maker would come into play."

86. In **Alembic Pharmaceuticals** (supra) this Court observed:-

"27. The concept of an ex post facto EC is in derogation of the fundamental principles of environmental jurisprudence and is an anathema to the EIA notification dated 27 January 1994. It is, as the judgment in Common Cause holds, detrimental to the environment and could lead to irreparable degradation. The reason why a retrospective EC or an ex post facto clearance is alien to environmental jurisprudence is that before the issuance of an EC, the statutory notification warrants a careful application of mind, besides a study into the likely consequences of a proposed activity on the environment. An EC can be issued only after various stages of the decision-making process have been completed. Requirements such as conducting a public hearing, screening, scoping and appraisal are components of the decision-making process which ensure that the likely impacts of the industrial activity or the expansion of an existing industrial activity are considered in the decision-making calculus. Allowing for an ex post facto clearance would essentially condone the operation of industrial activities without the grant of an EC. In the absence of an EC, there would be no conditions that would safeguard the environment. Moreover, if the EC was to be ultimately refused, irreparable harm would have been caused to the environment. In either view of the matter, environment law cannot countenance the notion of an ex post facto clearance. This would be contrary to both the precautionary principle as well as the need for sustainable development.

87. In **Alembic Pharmaceuticals** (supra), this Court deprecated ex-post facto clearances, but this Court did not pass orders for closure of the three industries concerned, on consideration of the consequences of their closure. This court proceeded to observe and held:-

44. *The issue which must now concern the Court is the consequence which will emanate from the failure of the three industries to obtain their ECs until 14 May 2003 in the case of Alembic Pharmaceuticals Limited, 17 July 2003 in the case of United Phosphorous Limited, and 23 December 2002 in the case of Unique Chemicals Limited. The functioning of the factories of all three industries without a valid EC would have had an adverse impact on the environment, ecology and biodiversity in the area where they are located. The Comprehensive Environmental Pollution Index⁴ report issued by the Central Pollution Control Board for 2009-2010 describes the environmental quality at 88 locations across the country. Ankleshwar in the State of Gujarat, where the three industries are located showed critical levels of pollution⁵. In the Interim Assessment of CEPI for 2011, the report indicates similar critical figures⁶ of pollution in the Ankleshwar area. The CEPI scores for 2013⁷ and 2018⁸ were also significantly high. This is an indication that industrial units have been operating in an unregulated manner and in defiance of the law. Some of the environmental damage caused by the operation of the industrial units would be irreversible. However, to the extent possible some of the damage can be corrected by undertaking measures to protect and conserve the environment.*

45. *Even though it is not possible to individually determine the exact extent of the damage caused to the environment by the three industries, several circumstances must weigh with the Court in determining the appropriate measure of restitution. First, it is not in dispute that all the three industries did obtain ECs, though this was several years after the EIA notification of 1994 and the commencement of production. Second, subsequent to the grant of the ECs, the manufacturing units of all the three*

4. "CEPI"

5. CEPI score - 88.50

6. CEPI score - 85.75

7. CEPI score - 80.93

8. CEPI score - 80.21

industries have also obtained ECs for an expansion of capacity from time to time. Third, the MoEF had issued a circular on 5 November 1998 permitting applications for ECs to be filed by 31 March 1999, which was extended subsequently to 30 June 2001. On 14 May 2002, the deadline was extended until 31 March 2003 subject to a deposit commensurate to the investment made. The circulars issued by the MoEF extending time for obtaining ECs came to the notice of this Court in *Goa Foundation (I) v. Union of India*⁹. Fourth, though in the context of the facts of the case, this Court in *Lafarge Umiam Mining Private Limited v. Union of India*¹⁰ (“Lafarge”) has upheld the decision to grant *ex post facto* clearances with respect to limestone mining projects in the State of Meghalaya. In **Lafarge**, the Court dealt with the question of whether *ex post facto* clearances stood vitiated by alleged suppression of the nature of the land by the project proponent and whether there was non-application of mind by the MoEF while granting the clearances. While upholding the *ex post facto* clearances, the Court held that the native tribals were involved in the decision-making process and that the MoEF had adopted a due diligence approach in reassuring itself through reports regarding the environmental impact of the project. “

(Emphasis supplied)

46. After adverting to the decision in **Lafarge**, another Bench of three learned judges of this Court in *Electrotherm (India) Limited v. Patel Vipulkumar Ramjibhai*¹¹, dealt with the issue of whether an EC granted for expansion to the appellant without holding a public hearing was valid in law. Justice Uday Umesh Lalit speaking for the Bench held thus:

“19...the decision-making process in doing away with or in granting exemption from public consultation/public hearing, was not based on correct principles and as such the decision was invalid and improper.”

47. The Court while deciding the consequence of granting an EC without public hearing did not direct closure of the appellant's unit and instead held thus:

“20. At the same time, we cannot lose sight of the fact that in pursuance of environmental clearance dated 27-1-2010, the expansion of the project has been undertaken

9. (2005) 11 SCC 559

10. (2011) 7 SCC 338

11. (2016) 9 SCC 300

and as reported by CPCB in its affidavit filed on 7-7-2014, most of the recommendations made by CPCB are complied with. In our considered view, the interest of justice would be subserved if that part of the decision exempting public consultation/public hearing is set aside and the matter is relegated back to the authorities concerned to effectuate public consultation/public hearing. **However, since the expansion has been undertaken and the industry has been functioning, we do not deem it appropriate to order closure of the entire plant as directed by the High Court.** If the public consultation/public hearing results in a negative mandate against the expansion of the project, the authorities would do well to direct and ensure scaling down of the activities to the level that was permitted by environmental clearance dated 20-2-2008. If public consultation/public hearing reflects in favour of the expansion of the project, environmental clearance dated 27-1-2010 would hold good and be fully operative. **In other words, at this length of time when the expansion has already been undertaken, in the peculiar facts of this case and in order to meet ends of justice, we deem it appropriate to change the nature of requirement of public consultation/public hearing from pre-decisional to post-decisional. The public consultation/public hearing shall be organised by the authorities concerned in three months from today."**

(Emphasis supplied)

48. Guided by the precepts that emerge from the above decisions, this Court has taken note of the fact that though the three industries operated without an EC for several years after the EIA notification of 1994, each of them had subsequently received ECs including amended ECs for expansion of existing capacities. These ECs have been operational since 14 May 2003 (in the case of Alembic Pharmaceuticals Limited), 17 July 2003 (in the case of United Phosphorous Limited), and 23 December 2002 (in the case of Unique Chemicals Limited). In addition, all the three units have made infrastructural investments and employed significant numbers of workers in their industrial units.

49. *In this backdrop, this Court must take a balanced approach which holds the industries to account for having operated without environmental clearances in the past without ordering a closure of operations. The directions of the NGT for the revocation of the ECs and for closure of the units do not accord with the principle of proportionality. At the same time, the Court cannot be oblivious to the environmental degradation caused by all three industries units that operated without valid ECs. The three industries have evaded the legally binding regime of obtaining ECs. They cannot escape the liability incurred on account of such noncompliance. Penalties must be imposed for the disobedience with a binding legal regime. The breach by the industries cannot be left unattended by legal consequences. The amount should be used for the purpose of restitution and restoration of the environment. Instead and in place of the directions issued by the NGT, we are of the view that it would be in the interests of justice to direct the three industries to deposit compensation quantified at Rs. 10 crores each. The amount shall be deposited with GPCB and it shall be duly utilised for restoration and remedial measures to improve the quality of the environment in the industrial area in which the industries operate. Though we have come to the conclusion, for the reasons indicated, that the direction for the revocation of the ECs and the closure of the industries was not warranted, we have issued the order for payment of compensation as a facet of preserving the environment in accordance with the precautionary principle. These directions are issued under Article 142 of the Constitution. Alembic Pharmaceuticals Limited, United Phosphorous Limited and Unique Chemicals Limited shall deposit the amount of compensation with GPCB within a period of four months from the date of receipt of the certified copy of this judgment. This deposit shall be in addition to the amount directed by the NGT. Subject to the deposit of the aforesaid amount and for the reasons indicated, we allow the appeals and set aside the impugned judgment of the NGT dated 8 January 2016 in so far as it directed the revocation of the ECs and closure of the industries as well as the order in review dated 17 May 2016."*

a

b

c

d

e

f

g

h

87. The Notification being SO 804(E) dated 14th March, 2017 was not an issue in *Alembic Pharmaceuticals (supra)*. This Court was examining the propriety and/or legality of a 2002 circular which was inconsistent with the EIA Notification dated 27th January, 1994, which was statutory. Ex post facto environmental clearance should not however be granted routinely, but in exceptional circumstances taking into account all relevant environmental factors. Where the adverse consequences of ex post facto approval outweigh the consequences of regularization of operation of an industry by grant of ex post facto approval and the industry or establishment concerned otherwise conforms to the requisite pollution norms, ex post facto approval should be given in accordance with law, in strict conformity with the applicable Rules, Regulations and/or Notifications. Ex post facto approval should not be withheld only as a penal measure. The deviant industry may be penalised by an imposition of heavy penalty on the principle of 'polluter pays' and the cost of restoration of environment may be recovered from it.

88. We are of the view that the High Court erred in passing the impugned order, vacating interim orders which had been in force for two years. The impugned order is not in conformity with the principle of proportionality. This is not a case where the steel plant was started without environmental clearance or consent of JSPCB. The Appellant had applied for and obtained environmental clearance to set up an integrated steel plant (3MTPA) on 1350 acres of land at Mauza South Parbatpur, as observed above. Environmental Clearance had been granted on 21st

February 2008 and Consent to Operate had been granted by JSPCB on 5th May 2008.

89. The Appellant established its steel plant in Mauza Bhagaband, 5.3 kms away from the site for which EC and CTE had been granted. It is the contention of the Appellant that the shift is minor and makes no change in the EIA/EMP on the basis of which EC has been granted. The shift did not require fresh public hearing in terms of the Circular dated 22nd January 2010 of the MoEF.

90. As aforesaid, by a letter dated 2.12.2011 addressed to the Appellant, the MoEF confirmed that the steel plant of the Appellant was within the Environment Impact Area and the affected people had the opportunity to air their views in a public hearing. The question is whether the Petitioner was required to obtain fresh prior clearance for shifting or was covered by the exemption under the said Notification dated 22nd January 2010.

91. The Appellant has all along asserted that no part of the premises of the integrated steel plant is in any forest. As such there was no violation of the Indian Forest Act, 1927 or the Forest Conservation Act, 1980. The MoEF had also confirmed that the steel plant in question was well within the Environment Impact Area and the affected people had the opportunity in a public hearing. Be that as it may, whether the shifting of the site has really made any difference from the environmental impact angle requires consideration by the appropriate authority/forum.

92. In any case, the Appellant has duly applied for ex post facto forest clearance approval without prejudice to its rights and contentions that its steel plant is not on forest land and also applied for revised EC. On 17th December 2019, MoEF&CC accorded ex post facto in principle approval to the forest clearance proposal on the recommendations of the Forest Advisory Committee. The application for revised clearance is pending consideration. No final decision has however been taken, ostensibly in view of the interim order passed by the Madras High Court staying the operation of the Standard Operation Procedures issued vide Memorandum dated 7th July 2021.

93. The interim order passed by the Madras High Court appears to be misconceived. However, this Court is not hearing an appeal from that interim order. The interim stay passed by the Madras High Court can have no application to operation of the Standard Operating Procedure to projects in territories beyond the territorial jurisdiction of Madras High Court. Moreover, final decision may have been taken in accordance with the Orders/Rules prevailing prior to 7th July, 2021.

94. In passing the impugned order the High Court overlooked the consequences of closure of an integrated steel plant with a work force of 300 regular and 700 contractual workers. The High Court also failed to appreciate that the judgment of this Court in ***Alembic Pharmaceuticals*** (supra) was distinguishable on facts. Furthermore, continuance of the interim orders allowing operation of an industrial establishment or even the grant of revised EC to the industrial establishment cannot stand in

the way of action against that establishment for contraventions, including the imposition of penalty, on the principle 'polluter pays'. The scope and effect of Section 32A of the IBC is a different issue. This Court need not examine into the question of whether penal action can be initiated against the Appellant or, whether compensation can be recovered from the Appellant, at this stage. The issue may be decided by the appropriate authority at the appropriate stage when it adjudicates an action for penalization of the Appellant or recovery of compensation from the Appellant. The application of the Appellant for revised EC, CTO etc. shall be considered strictly in accordance with environmental norms.

95. The appeals are allowed. The impugned order is set aside. The Respondent No.1 shall take a decision on the application of the Appellant for revised EC in accordance with law, within three months from date. Pending such decision, the operation of the steel plant shall not be interfered with on the ground of want of EC, FC, CTE or CTO.

.....J.
[Indira Banerjee]

.....J.
[J.K. Maheshwari]

**New Delhi;
December 9, 2021**

a

This is a True Court Copy™ of the judgment as appearing on the Court website.
Publisher has only added the Page para for convenience in referencing.

b

c

d

e

f

g

h

F. No. 22-21/2020-IA.III [E 138949]
 Government of India
 Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change
 (Impact Assessment Division)

Indira Paryavaran Bhawan
 Aliganj, Jorbagh Road
 New Delhi-110 003

Dated 28th January, 2022

OFFICE MEMORANDUM

Sub.: Observation of Hon'ble Supreme Court with reference to the SoP dated 7th July 2021 for identification and handling of violation cases under EIA Notification 2006 – reg.

The Ministry issued a Standard Operating Procedure dated 7th July 2021 bearing the file number 22-21/2020-IA.III, for identification and handling of violation cases under EIA Notification 2006 in compliance to order of the Hon'ble National Green Tribunal in Appeal No. 34/2020 (WZ) titled Tanaji B. Gambhire Vs Chief Secretary, Government of Maharashtra. The copy of the SoP is enclosed for ready reference.

2. The SoP was challenged in the Madurai Bench of the High Court of Madras in the matter W.P.(MD) No. 11757 of 2021 titled Fatima Vs Union of India and was interim stayed vide order dated 15th July 2021.

3. Recently, in the Order dated 09th December 2021 in the matter of Civil Appeal Nos. 7576-7577 of 2021 in Electrosteel Steels Limited Vs Union of India and Ors., the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India has *inter-alia* observed the following:

"93. The interim order passed by the Madras High Court appears to be misconceived. However, this Court is not hearing an appeal from that interim order. The interim stay passed by the Madras High Court can have no application to operation of the Standard Operating Procedure to projects in territories beyond the territorial jurisdiction of Madras High Court. Moreover, final decision may have been taken in accordance with the Orders/Rules prevailing prior to 7th July, 2021."

4. The copy of the order which is self-explanatory is enclosed herewith for necessary action.

5. This is issued with the approval of the competent authority.


 (A K Agrawal)
 Director

Encl: As above.

To

1. Chairperson/ Member Secretaries of all Expert Appraisal Committees
2. Chairperson/Member Secretaries of all SEIAAs/SEACs
3. All Officers of IA Division

Copy for information to

1. PS to Hon'ble MEF&CC
2. PS to Hon'ble MoS, EF&CC
3. PPS to Secretary, EF&CC
4. PPS to AS (TK)/JS (SKB)
5. Website, MoEF&CC /Guard file

REPORTABLE

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
CIVIL APPEAL NO. 4795 OF 2021

M/S PAHWA PLASTICS PVT. LTD. AND ANR. Appellants

Versus

DASTAK NGO AND ORS. Respondents

J U D G M E N T

INDIRA BANERJEE, J.

This appeal under Section 22 of the National Green Tribunal Act, 2010, is against an order dated 3rd June 2021 passed by the Principal Bench of the National Green Tribunal (NGT) in O.A No.287/2020 at New Delhi, *inter alia*, holding that establishments such as the manufacturing units of the Appellants, which did not have prior Environmental Clearance (EC) could not be allowed to operate.

2. The question of law involved in this appeal is, whether an establishment employing about 8000 workers, which has been set up pursuant to Consent to Establish (CTE) and Consent to Operate (CTO) from the concerned statutory authority and has applied for *ex post facto* EC can be closed down pending issuance of EC, even though it

may not cause pollution and/or may be found to comply with the required pollution norms.

3. With increasing industrialization and the establishment of factories which emitted smoke and other pollutants, there was worldwide concern for protection of environment. In June 1972, the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment was held in Stockholm, where decisions were taken to take appropriate steps for preservation of the natural resources of the earth, which, among other things, included preservation of the quality of air and water by controlling pollution.

4. In 1974, Parliament enacted the Water (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1974, with a view to prevent and control water pollution and to maintain and restore wholesomeness of water.

5. In furtherance of the decisions taken at Stockholm, Parliament enacted the Air (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1981, hereinafter referred to as "the Air Pollution Act", to provide for prevention, control and abatement of air pollution.

6. The Air Pollution Act provides for the constitution of a Central Pollution Control Board (CPCB) and State Pollution Control Boards (SPCB) to deal with the problem of air pollution. Section 16 of the Air Pollution Act enables the Central Pollution Control Board to take steps to improve the quality of air and to prevent, control or abate air pollution in the country. Section 17 of the Air Pollution Act enables the State Pollution Control Boards to plan comprehensive programmes for

the prevention, control or abatement of air pollution, *inter alia*, by laying down standards for emission of air pollutants.

7. Section 18 of the Air Pollution Act enables the Central Government to give directions by which the CPCB is to be bound. Similarly, every SPCB is to be bound by directions in writing as might be given by the CPCB or the State Government.

8. Where a notification is issued under the Air Pollution Act, placing an area within the control area of air pollution, permission is necessary to set up and operate any factory or plant thereat. No person operating any factory or plant in any air pollution control area is to discharge or cause or permit to be discharged the emission of any air pollutants, in excess of the standards laid down by the SPCB under Clause (g) of sub-Section (1) of Section 17.

9. The Environment (Protection) Act, 1986, hereinafter referred to as "the EP Act" was also enacted pursuant to the decisions taken at the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, held in Stockholm in June, 1972. As per the Statement of Objects and Reasons for enactment of the EP Act, the said Act has been prompted by concern over the environment, that has grown all over the world since the 60s.

10. Sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the EP Act empowers the Central Government to take all such measures as it might deem necessary or expedient for the purpose of protecting and improving the quality of

the environment and preventing, controlling and reducing environmental pollution. a

11. Sub-section (2) of Section 3 of the EP Act enables the Central Government to take, *inter alia*, the following measures: b

“(i) co-ordination of actions by the State Governments, officers and other authorities—

(a) under this Act, or the rules made thereunder; or

(b) under any other law for the time being in force which is relatable to the objects of this Act; c

(ii) planning and execution of a nation-wide programme for the prevention, control and abatement of environmental pollution;

(iii) laying down standards for the quality of environment in its various aspects; d

(iv) laying down standards for emission or discharge of environmental pollutants from various sources whatsoever:

Provided that different standards for emission or discharge may be laid down under this clause from different sources having regard to the quality or composition of the emission or discharge of environmental pollutants from such sources; e

(v) restriction of areas in which any industries, operations or processes or class of industries, operations or processes shall not be carried out or shall be carried out subject to certain safeguards; f

(vi) laying down procedures and safeguards for the prevention of accidents which may cause environmental pollution and remedial measures for such accidents;

(vii) laying down procedures and safeguards for the handling of hazardous substances; g

(viii) examination of such manufacturing processes, materials and substances as are likely to cause environmental pollution;

(ix) carrying out and sponsoring investigations and research relating to problems of environmental pollution;

(x) inspection of any premises, plant, equipment, machinery, manufacturing or other processes, materials or substances and giving, by order, of such directions to such authorities, officers or h

persons as it may consider necessary to take steps for the prevention, control and abatement of environmental pollution;

(xi) establishment or recognition of environmental laboratories and institutes to carry out the functions entrusted to such environmental laboratories and institutes under this Act;

(xii) collection and dissemination of information in respect of matters relating to environmental pollution;

(xiii) preparation of manuals, codes or guides relating to the prevention, control and abatement of environmental pollution;

(xiv) such other matters as the Central Government deems necessary or expedient for the purpose of securing the effective implementation of the provisions of this Act."

12. Sub-section (3) of Section 3 of the EP Act provides as follows:

"3. Power of Central Government to take measures to protect and improve environment.—

...
 (3) The Central Government may, if it considers it necessary or expedient so to do for the purposes of this Act, by order, published in the Official Gazette, constitute an authority or authorities by such name or names as may be specified in the order for the purpose of exercising and performing such of the powers and functions (including the power to issue directions under Section 5) of the Central Government under this Act and for taking measures with respect to such of the matters referred to in sub-section (2) as may be mentioned in the order and subject to the supervision and control of the Central Government and the provisions of such order, such authority or authorities may exercise the powers or perform the functions or take the measures so mentioned in the order as if such authority or authorities had been empowered by this Act to exercise those powers or perform those functions or take such measures."

13. Subject to the provisions of the EP Act, the Central Government has power under sub-Section (1) of Section 3, to take all such measures, as it deems necessary or expedient, for the purpose of

protecting and improving the quality of environment and preventing, a
controlling or reducing environmental pollution.

14. Section 5 of the EP Act provides that notwithstanding anything b
contained in any other law, but subject to the provisions of the EP Act,
the Central Government may, in exercise of its powers and
performance of its functions under the EP Act, issue directions in c
writing to any person, officer or any authority and such person, officer
or authority shall be bound to comply with such directions.

15. In exercise of powers conferred by Sections 6 and 25 of the EP d
Act, the Central Government has made the Environment (Protection)
Rules, 1986, hereinafter referred to as "the EP Rules".

16. The Central Government issued an Environmental Impact e
Assessment Notification dated 27th January 1994 in exercise of powers
conferred by sub-section (1) and clause (v) of sub-section (2) of
Section 3 of the EP Act read with clause (d) of sub-rule (3) of Rule 5 of f
the EP Rules, directing that on and from the date of publication of the
said notification in the Official Gazette, expansion or modernization of
any activity or a new project listed in Schedule I to the said notification g
shall not be undertaken in any part of India, unless it has been
accorded EC by the Central Government in accordance with the
procedures specified in the said notification.

17. In exercise of powers conferred by sub-section (1) and clause (v) h
of sub-section (2) of Section 3 of the EP Act read with clause (d) of sub-
rule (3) of Rule 5 of the EP Rules and in supersession of notification

number S.O. 60 (E) dated 27th January 1994, except in respect of things done or omitted to be done before such supersession, the Central Government issued a notification dated 14th September 2006, being Notification S.O. 1533 (E) requiring prior environmental clearance from the Central Government or as the case may be, by the State-Level Environment Assessment Authority, duly constituted by the Central Government under sub-section (3) of Section 3 of the EP Act.

18. In terms of the said notification dated 14th September 2006, the process of environmental clearance for new projects was to comprise of a maximum of four stages, all of which might not apply to particular cases. The stages were (1) Screening, (2) Scoping, (3) Public Consultation and (4) Appraisal.

19. In the meanwhile, by a notification being S.O. 327 (E) dated 10th April 2001, published in the Gazette of India on 12th April 2001, the Central Government has delegated the powers vested in it under the EP Act, to the Chairpersons of the respective State Pollution Control Boards/Committees to issue directions to any industry or any local or other authority to prevent violation of the Rules.

20. The Appellants carry on business, *inter alia*, of manufacture and sale of basic organic chemicals, namely, Formaldehyde. The Appellant No.1, M/s Pahwa Plastics Private Limited has two manufacturing units, one at village Kharawar in Rohtak, hereinafter referred to as the "Rohtak Unit" and the other at village Jathlana, Jagadhri in Yamuna Nagar in Haryana, hereinafter referred to as the "Yamuna Nagar Unit".

The Appellant No.2 has a manufacturing unit at village Ghespur in Yamuna Nagar, Haryana which is hereinafter referred to as the “Yamuna Nagar Unit”. The manufacturing units established, run and operated by the respective Appellants fall in the category of Micro, Small and Medium Enterprise (MSME) as defined under the Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises Development Act, 2006, hereinafter referred to as “the MSME Act”.

21. On or about 31st March 2014, the Appellant No.1, M/s Pahwa Plastics Ltd. applied for Consent to Establish (CTE) its Yamuna Nagar unit for manufacture of Formaldehyde.

22. By a communication No. HSPCB/Consent/:2846616YAMCTE 3087415 dated 2nd June 2016, the Haryana State Pollution Control Board (HSPCB) granted Consent to Establish (CTE) to the Appellant No.1 M/s Pahwa Plastics Private Limited in respect of its Yamuna Nagar Unit. The CTE was to remain valid for 60 months from the date of its issue, to be extended for another year at the discretion of the Board or till the time the unit started its trial production, whichever was earlier.

23. Some of the terms and conditions on which CTE was granted are set out hereinbelow:-

“3. The officer/official of the Board shall have the right to access and inspection of the industry in connection with the various processes and the treatment facilities being provided simultaneously with the construction of building/machinery. The effluent should conform the effluent standards as applicable.

4. That necessary arrangement shall be made by the industry for the control of Air Pollution before commissioning the plant. The

emitted pollutants will meet the emission and other standards as laid/will be prescribed by the Board from time to time.

a

5. The applicant will obtain consent under section 25/26 of the Water (Prevention & Control of Pollution) Act, 1974 and under section 21/22 of the Air (Prevention & Control of Pollution) Act, 1981 as amended to-date-even before starting trial production.

6. The above Consent to Establish is further subject to the conditions that the unit complies with all the laws/rules/decisions and competent directions of the Board/Government and its functionaries in all respect before commissioning of the operation and during its actual working strictly.

b

8. The Electricity Department will give only temporary connection and permanent connection to the unit will be given after verifying the consent granted by the Board, both under Water Act and Air Act.

c

12. That there is no discharge directly or indirectly from the unit or the process into any interstate river or Yamuna River or River Ghaggar.

13. That the industry or the unit concerned is not sited within any prohibited distances according to the Environmental Laws and Rules, Notification, Orders and Policies of Central Pollution Control Board and Haryana State Pollution Control Board.

d

17. In case of change of name from previous Consent to Establish granted, fresh Consent to Establish fee shall be levied.

e

18. Industry should adopt water conservation measures to ensure minimum consumption of water in their Process. Ground water based proposals of new industries should get clearance from Central Ground Water Authority for scientific development of previous resources.

19. That the unit will take all other clearances from concerned agencies, whenever required.

f

20. That the unit will not change its process without the prior permission of the Board.

21. That the Consent to Establish so granted will be invalid, if the unit falls in Aravali Area or non conforming area.

g

22. That the unit will comply with the Hazardous Waste Management Rules and will also make the non-leachate pit for storage of Hazardous waste and will undertake not to dispose off the same except for pit in their own premises or with the authorized disposal authority.

h

23. That the unit will submit an undertaking that it will comply with all the specific and general conditions as imposed in the above

Consent to Establish within 30 days failing which Consent to Establish will be revoked."

24. By another communication No.HSPCB/Consent/: 2846618YAMCTO3098246 dated 26th March 2018, HSPCB granted consent to the Appellant No.1 to operate its Yamuna Nagar Unit from 8th February 2018 to 31st March 2022.

25. By an order No.HSPCB/YMN/2242, dated 31st March 2010, the Appellant No.2, M/s Apcolite Polymer Private Limited was granted CTE to establish its Yamuna Nagar Unit for manufacture of Formaldehyde with the manufacturing capacity of 80 tonnes per day.

26. By another communication Nos. HSPCB/Consent/: HSPCB/YMN/DLC/2011/4027 & HSPCB/YMN/DLC/2011/4029 dated 16th January 2012, HSPCB granted the Appellant No.2, M/s Apcolite Polymers Private Limited, Consent to Operate (CTO) its Yamuna Nagar Unit. The CTO has been extended from 1st April 2016 till 31st March 2026, by a letter dated 13th March 2016. The CTO is valid till March 2026.

27. By a communication No. HSPCB/Consent/: 2846616YAMCT OHWM2630357 dated 13th March 2016, HSPCB granted consent for emission of AIR to Appellant No.2, M/s Apcolite Polymers Private Limited in respect of its Yamuna Nagar Unit on, *inter alia*, the terms and conditions specified in the said letter, some of which are extracted hereinbelow:-

“10. The air pollution control equipment of such specification which shall keep the emissions within the emission standard as approved by the State Board from time to time shall be installed and operated in the premises where the industry is carrying on/proposed to carry on its business.

a

11. The existing air pollution control equipment if required shall be alerted or replaced in accordance with the direction on the Board.

b

12. All solid wastes arising in the factory premises shall be properly graded and disposed of by:-

(i) In case of Land fill material, care should be taken to ensure that the material does not give rise to leachate which may percolate in ground water or carried away with storm run off.

c

(ii) Composting in case of bio degradable materials.

(iii) If the method of incineration is used for the disposal of solid waste the consent application should be processed separately and it should be taken up which consent is granted.

d

13. The industry shall submit an undertaking to the effect that the above conditions shall be complied with by them.

14. The applicant shall submit its undertaking to the effect that the above conditions shall be complied with by them.

15. The applicant shall make an application for grant of fresh consent at least 90 days before the date of expiry of this consent.

e

18. There should not be any fugitive emission from the premises.

19. The liquid effluent arising out of the operation of the air pollution control equipment shall also be treated in a manner and to the standards stipulated in the consent granted under Water (Prevention & Control of Pollution) Act, 1974 by this Board.

f

21. If the industry fails to adhere to any of the condition of this consent order the consent so granted shall automatically lapse.

33. The industry shall submit Environment Audit report once in a year.

g

38. In case of by passing the emissions, the consent shall be deemed revoked.”

h

28. It is the case of the Appellants that at the time when CTE was granted to the Appellants, it was thought that EC was not required for units which manufactured Formaldehyde. Even HSPCB itself was not sure of whether EC was required for such units.

29. Mr. Gupta argued that the Appellants were *bona fide* under the impression that the Appellants were not required to obtain prior EC for setting up this establishment to manufacture Formaldehyde. On the basis of CTE granted by HSPCB, the Appellants set up their units taking huge loans from banks for which repayments have to be paid in installments.

30. In exercise of power under Section 3(1) and Section 3(2)(v) of the EP Act read with Rule 5(3)(d) of the EP Rules, the Central Government issued a notification being S.O. 804(E) dated 14th March 2017 which provides for grant of *ex post facto* EC for project proponents who had commenced, continued or completed a project without obtaining EC under the EP Act/ EP Rules or the Environmental Impact Notification issued thereunder. Paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of the said notification, read as hereunder:

“(3) In cases of violation, action will be taken against the project proponent by the respective State or State Pollution Control Board under the provisions of section 19 of the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986 and further, no consent to operate or occupancy certificate will be issued till the project is granted the environmental clearance.

(4) The cases of violation will be appraised by respective sector Expert Appraisal Committees constituted under sub-section (3) of Section 3 of the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986 with a view to assess that the project has been constructed at a site which under

prevailing laws is permissible and expansion has been done which can be run sustainably under compliance of environmental norms with adequate environmental safeguards; and in case, where the finding of the Expert Appraisal Committee is negative, closure of the project will be recommended along with other actions under the law.

(5) In case, where the findings of the Expert Appraisal Committee on point at sub-para(4) above are affirmative, the projects under this category will be prescribed the appropriate Terms of Reference for undertaking Environment Impact Assessment and preparation of Environment Management Plan. Further, the Expert Appraisal Committee will prescribe a specific Terms of Reference for the project on assessment of ecological damage, remediation plan and natural and community resource augmentation plan and it shall be prepared as an independent chapter in the environment impact assessment report by the accredited consultants. The collection and analysis of data for assessment of ecological damage, preparation of remediation plan and natural and community resource augmentation plan shall be done by an environmental laboratory duly notified under Environment (Protection) Act, 1986, or a environmental laboratory accredited by National Accreditation Board for Testing and Calibration Laboratories, or a laboratory of a Council of Scientific and Industrial Research institution working in the field of environment.”

31. The Notification of 2017 is a valid statutory notification issued by the Central Government in exercise of power under Sections 3(1) and 3(2)(v) of the EP Act read with Rule 5(3)(d) of the EP Rules in the same manner as the EIA Notification dated 27th January 1994 and the Notification dated 14th September 2006.

32. Section 21 of the General Clauses Act, 1897 provides that where any Central Act or Regulations confer a power to issue notifications, orders, rules or bye-laws, that power includes the power, exercisable in

like manner, and subject to like sanction and conditions, if any, to add to, amend, vary or rescind any notification, order, rule or bye-law so issued. The authority, which had the power to issue Notifications dated 27th January 1994 and 14th September 2006 undoubtedly had, and still has the power to rescind or modify or amend those notifications in like manner. As held by this Court in ***Shree Sidhballi Steels Ltd. & Others v. State of Uttar Pradesh & Others***¹, power under Section 21 to amend, vary or rescind notifications, orders, rules or bye-laws can be exercised from time to time having regard to the exigency.

33. Puducherry Environment Protection Association filed a Writ Petition being W.P. No.11189 of 2017 in the High Court of Madras assailing the said notification dated 14th March 2017. By a judgment and order dated 13th October 2017, a Division Bench of the High Court refused to interfere with the said notification, holding that the impugned notification did not compromise with the need to preserve environmental purity.

34. The Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change (MoEF &CC) issued a draft notification dated 23rd March 2020 which was duly published in the Gazette of India Extraordinary Part II. The Notification was proposed to be issued in exercise of powers conferred by sub-section (1) and clause (v) of sub-section (2) of Section 3 of the EP Act for dealing with cases of violation of the notification with regard to EC.

¹ (2011) 3 SCC 193

It was proposed that cases of violation would be appraised by the Appraisal Committee with a view to assess whether the project had been constructed or operated at a site which was permissible under prevailing laws and could be run sustainably on compliance of environmental norms with adequate environmental safeguards. Closure was to be recommended if the findings of the Appraisal Committee were in the negative. If the Appraisal Committee found that such unit had been running sustainably upon compliance of environmental norms with adequate environment safeguards, the unit would be prescribed appropriate Terms of Reference (TOR) after which the procedure for grant of EC would follow.

35. On 10th November 2020, the Department of Environment and Climate Change of the Government of Haryana issued an order which is extracted hereinbelow for convenience:

“Whereas the process of manufacturing of Formaldehyde is covered under the provisions of 5(f) of Schedule of Environment Impact Assessment Notification (EIA), 2006 of Government of India, and requires the prior Environmental Clearance (EC) from the competent authority State Environment Impact Assessment Authority (SEIAA)/Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, Government of India, before establishment and operation of such units, besides other mandatory clearance, as applicable;

Whereas, it has come to the notice of Government that around 15 such units have been permitted to establish/operate in the State of Haryana, without obtaining the necessary Prior Environmental Clearances, but with the Consent of the Haryana State Pollution Control Bureau (HSPCB), which misinterpreted the category of such units and on realising the requirement of EC in these cases, has revoked its consents issued earlier to these units recently;

Whereas, some of these units approached the Government explaining their hardship due to such sudden revocation of their consents and have sought time for obtaining the necessary EC from the competent authority as the process is likely to take a minimum of 6 months to one year period, and to allow them to operate with

all pollution control measures, following the pollution control norms applicable, and,

Whereas, the Government has carefully considered their request and the competent authority has decided that these units shall be allowed to continue their operations for a period of six months, without prejudice to any legal action taken against the violations committed by them, by the competent authorities, with the conditions that they will immediately apply for Environmental Clearance from the competent authority and provide the proof of such application within 60 days from the issuance of this communication to Environment and Climate Change Department and to Haryana State Pollution Control Board.

Therefore, it is ordered accordingly."

36. Referring to the Counter Affidavit filed by HSPCB before the NGT, Mr. Gupta pointed out that, since HSPCB itself was under the misconception that prior EC was not necessary for units such as the Yamunanagar units of the Appellants Nos. 1 and 2 respectively. HSPCB took a policy decision to allow the units which did not have prior EC to operate for six months, on condition that they would apply for EC within sixty days.

37. The Appellants duly applied for EC in respect of their manufacturing units. After scrutinizing their applications and after finding the units suitable for grant of EC in terms of the prevailing guidelines, the Expert Appraisal Committee constituted by the MoEF&CC conducted a public hearing to finalize the cases of the Appellants for issuance of Terms of Reference (TOR).

38. By an Office Memorandum, being F.No. 22-21/2020-1A III, dated 7th July 2021, the MoEF&CC issued Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) for identification and handling of violation cases under EIA Notification 2006.

39. The said Office Memorandum, *inter alia*, reads:

“The Ministry had issued a notification number S.O.804(E), dated the 14th March, 2017 detailing the process for grant of Terms of Reference and Environmental Clearance in respect of projects or activities which have started the work on site and/or expanded the production beyond the limit of Prior EC or changed the product mix without obtaining Prior EC under the EIA Notification, 2006.

2. This Notification was applicable for six months from the date of publication i.e. 14.03.2017 to 13.09.2017 and further based on court direction from 14.03.2018 to 13.04.2018.

3. Hon’ble NGT in Original Application No.287 of 2020 in the matter of Dastak N.G.O. Vs Synochem Organics Pvt. Ltd. & Ors. and in applications pertaining to same subject matter in Original Application No. 298 of 2020 in Vineet Nagar vs. Central Ground Water Authority & Ors., vide order dated 03.06.2021 held that “(...) for past violations, the concerned authorities are free to take appropriate action in accordance with polluter pays principle, following due process”.

*4. Further, the Hon’ble National Green Tribunal in O.A. No. 34/2020 WZ in the matter of Tanaji B. Gambhire vs. Chief Secretary, Government of Maharashtra and Ors., vide order dated 24.05.2021 has directed that “.... **a proper SoP be laid down for grant of EC in such cases so as to address the gaps in binding law and practice being currently followed. The MoEF may also consider circulating such SoP to all SEIAAs in the country**”.*

5. Therefore, in compliance to the directions of the Hon’ble NGT a Standard Operating Procedure (SoP) for dealing with violation cases is required to be drawn. The Ministry is also seized of different categories of ‘violation’ cases which have been pending for want of an approved structural/procedural framework based on ‘Polluter Pays Principle’ and ‘Principle of Proportionality’. It is undoubtedly important that action under statutory provisions is taken against the defaulters/violators and a decision on the closure of the project or activity or otherwise is taken expeditiously.

6. In the light of the above directions of the Hon’ble Tribunal and the issues involved, the matter has accordingly been examined in detail in the Ministry. A detailed SoP has accordingly been framed and is outlined herein. The SoP is also guided by the observations/decisions of the Hon’ble Courts wherein principles of proportionality and polluters pay have been outlined.”

40. The SOP formulated by the said Office Memorandum dated 7th July 2021 refers to and gives effect to various judicial pronouncements

including the judgment of this Court in ***Alembic Pharmaceuticals Ltd. v. Rohit Prajapati & Others***².

41. In terms of the SOP, the proposal for grant of EC in cases of violation are to be considered on merits, with prospective effect, applying principles of proportionality and the principle that the polluter pays and is liable for costs of remedial measures.

42. By an order dated 9th July 2021, the MoEF&CC confirmed the minutes of an earlier meeting of the Expert Appraisal Committee and recommended issuance of terms of reference to the Appellant No.1, M/s Pahwa Plastics Private Limited for expansion of its Formaldehyde Manufacturing unit from 60 TPD to 150 TPD.

43. In the meanwhile, on or about 26th November 2020, the Respondent No.1, a Non-Governmental Organisation (NGO) hereinafter referred to as "Dastak" filed an application being O.A. No./287/2020 before the NGT praying that the order dated 10th November 2020 passed by the State of Haryana be quashed and units which were operating without EC be closed. The NGT disposed of the said application of Dastak by the impugned order dated 3rd June 2021.

44. A Public Interest Litigation being W.P. (MD) No. 11757 of 2021 (***Fatima v. Union of India***) was filed before the Madurai Bench of the Madras High Court challenging the said Memorandum dated 7th July 2021. By an interim order dated 15th July 2021 a Division Bench of the

² 2020 SCC Online SC 347

Madras High Court admitted the Writ Petition and stayed the said memorandum.

45. The Madurai Bench of the Madras High Court observed and held:-

"This writ petition has been filed as a public interest litigation challenging the validity of the office memorandum dated 07.07.2021, issued by the respondent.

2. We have heard Mr.A.Yogeshwaran, learned counsel appearing for the writ petitioner and Mr.L.Victoria Gowri, learned Assistant Solicitor General of India, accepts notice for the respondent.

3. The impugned office memorandum is challenged as being wholly without jurisdiction, contrary to the Environment Impact Assessment Notification, 2006, ultra vires the powers of the respondent under the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986 and violative of the various principles enunciated by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, while interpreting Article 21 and Article 48-A of the Constitution of India.

4. Further, it is submitted that the impugned notification is in gross violation of the undertaking given before the Hon'ble Full Bench of this Court in W.P.No.11189 of 2017, wherein, the Court took note of the submissions made on behalf of the Government of India, that the notification impugned therein is only a one-time measure. Further, it is submitted that the respondent failed to see that concept of ex-post facto approval is alien to environment jurisprudence and it is anathema to the Environment Impact Assessment Notification, 2006.

*5. Further, it is submitted that the impugned notification is in gross violation of the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Alembic Pharmaceuticals Ltd. vs Rohit Prajapati**, 2020 SCC Online SC 347 and the orders passed by the National Green Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi, in the case of **S.P.Muthuraman vs. Union of India & Another**, 2015 SCC Online NGT 169.*

6. Identical grounds were considered by us in a challenge to an office memorandum dated 19.02.2021, which provided a procedure for granting post facto clearance under Coastal Regulation Zone (CRZ) Notification 2011, on the ground that despite no such provisions in the notification and being contrary to the earlier judgments and undertaking. The said writ petition in W.P(MD).No.8866 of 2021 was admitted and by order dated 30.04.2021, the said office memorandum dated 19.02.2021 has been stayed.

7. The core issue in this writ petition is whether the Government of India could have issued the office memorandum and brought about the Standard Operating Procedure for dealing with violators, who failed to comply with the mandatory

condition of obtaining prior environment clearance under the Environment Impact Assessment Notification 2006, read with the provisions of Environment (Protection) Act, 1986. This issue was considered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Alembic Pharmaceuticals Ltd** (cited supra), and it was held that such office memorandum in the nature of circular is without jurisdiction. The operative portion of the judgment reads as follows:

"...What is sought to be achieved by the administrative circular dated 14 May 2002 is contrary to the statutory notification dated 27 January 1994. The circular dated 14 May 2002 does not stipulate how the detrimental effects on the environment would be taken care of if the project proponent is granted an ex post facto EC. The EIA notification of 1994 mandates a prior environmental clearance. The circular substantially amends or alters the application of the EIA notification of 1994. The mandate of not commencing a new project or expanding or modernising an existing one unless an environmental clearance has been obtained stands diluted and is rendered ineffective by the issuance of the administrative circular dated 14 May 2002. This discussion leads us to the conclusion that the administrative circular is not a measure protected by Section 3. Hence there was no jurisdictional bar on the NGT to enquire into its legitimacy or vires. Moreover, the administrative circular is contrary to the EIA Notification 1994 which has a statutory character. The circular is unsustainable in law."

8. Despite the above decision, once again the Government of India, Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change have chosen to adopt the route of issuing the office memorandum and virtually setting at naught the provisions of the Environment Impact Assessment Notification and the Environment (Protection) Act.

9. Before the Hon'ble First Bench, a public interest litigation was filed by the Puducherry Environment Protection Association, challenging the notification dated 14.03.2017, on identical grounds and the Hon'ble First Bench by judgment dated 13.10.2017, recorded the submissions of the learned Assistant Solicitor General of India that the said notification was a one-time measure and accordingly, disposed of the writ petition.

10. Once again, the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change have issued the impugned office memorandum. Thus, from what we have noted above, we are of the clear view that the petitioner has made out a prima facie case for entertaining the writ petition. Accordingly, the writ petition is **admitted** and there shall be an order of interim stay."

46. It is true that in the case of ***Puducherry Environment Protection Association v. Union of India***³, the Division Bench of Madras High Court took note of and recorded the submission made on behalf of the Union of India that the relaxation was a one time relaxation. In view of such submission, this Court held that a one time relaxation was permissible.

47. It is, however, well settled that words and phrases and/or sentences in a judgment cannot be read in the manner of a statute, and that too out of context. The observation of the Division Bench that a one time relaxation was permissible, is not to be construed as a finding that relaxation cannot be made more than once. If power to amend or modify or relax a notification and/or order exists, the notification and/or order may be amended and/or modified as many times, as may be necessary. A statement made by counsel in Court would not prevent the authority concerned from making amendments and/or modifications provided such amendments and/or modifications were as per the procedure prescribed by law.

48. The Division Bench of Madras High Court fell in error in staying the said office memorandum, by relying on observations made by this Court in ***Alembic Pharmaceuticals Ltd.*** (supra), in the context of a circular which was contrary to the statutory Environment Impact Notification of 1994. The attention of the High Court was perhaps not drawn to the fact that the notification of 7th July 2021 was in pursuance of the statutory notification of 2017 which was valid. The judgment of

³ 2017 SCC OnLine Mad 7056

this Court in ***Alembic Pharmaceuticals Ltd.*** (*supra*), was clearly distinguishable and could have no application to the office memorandum dated 7th July 2021 which was issued pursuant to the notification dated 14th March 2017.

49. The Appellants have already applied for EC. The Expert Appraisal Committee of the MoEF&CC has, after scrutinizing the application of the Appellants and finding them eligible for grant of EC, recommended their cases for grant of Terms of Reference (ToR). ToR was granted to the Appellants and a public hearing had also been conducted. Only last procedural step of issuance of EC is left.

50. It is claimed that the units of the Appellants are totally non-polluting units having "Zero Trade discharge". They have been in operation for many years. In the reply affidavit filed by the State before the NGT, it was mentioned that the units were operating in good faith with valid CTOs granted by the HSPCB. It was stated that the units were not causing pollution hazards. The only thing against the units was the procedural lapse of not obtaining EC.

51. By a communication No. F. No. IA-J-110011/185/2020-IA-II(I) dated 20th July 2021 issued to the Appellant No.1, the MoEF&CC rejected the proposal for terms of reference on the purported ground that the activity of the Appellant No.1 was covered under category "A" of item 5(f) "Synthetic Organic Chemicals" of the Schedule to the EIA Notification, 2006. A similar communication was issued in respect of M/s Apcolite Polymers Pvt. Ltd. Significantly, by an order dated 9th July 2021, the MoEF&CC had confirmed the minutes of an earlier meeting of the Expert

Appraisal Committee and recommended issuance of ToR to the Appellant No.1, as observed above. The proposal for Terms of Reference has obviously been rejected at the final stage after the public hearing, by reason of the impugned order dated 3rd June 2021 passed by the NGT on the application of Dastak, which is under appeal.

52. This appeal was listed for admission on 30th September 2021, along with an application for interim relief being I.A. No.110064 of 2021 praying for orders permitting the Appellants to operate their units during the pendency of the appeal. The appeal was heard at length at the admission stage and reserved for judgment along with the interim application by an order dated 30th September 2021.

53. After receiving the communication dated 20th July 2021 rejecting the proposal for Terms of Reference, the Appellants requested HSPCB to forward to the Appellants the proceedings of public hearing in respect of the manufacturing units of the Appellants. By a communication No. HSPCB/YR/2021/2830 dated 15th February 2022, HSPCB forwarded proceedings of the public hearing in respect of the Yamuna Nagar unit of the Appellant No.1. By another Communication No. HSPCB/YR/29021/2829 dated 15th February 2022 the HSPCB forwarded to the Appellant No.2 the proceedings of the public hearing held on 3rd February 2022 in connection with the Yamuna Nagar Unit of the Appellant No.2.

54. The manufacturing units of the Appellants appoint about 8,000 employees and have a huge annual turnover. An establishment contributing to the economy of the country and providing livelihood ought

not to be closed down only on the ground of the technical irregularity of not obtaining prior Environmental Clearance irrespective of whether or not the unit actually causes pollution.

55. In ***Electrosteel Steels Limited v. Union of India***⁴, this Court held:-

“82. The question is whether an establishment contributing to the economy of the country and providing livelihood to hundreds of people should be closed down for the technical irregularity of shifting its site without prior environmental clearance, without opportunity to the establishment to regularize its operation by obtaining the requisite clearances and permissions, even though the establishment may not otherwise be violating pollution laws, or the pollution, if any, can conveniently and effectively be checked. The answer has to be in the negative.

83. The Central Government is well within the scope of its powers under Section 3 of the 1986 Act to issue directions to control and/or prevent pollution including directions for prior Environmental Clearance before a project is commenced. Such prior Environmental Clearance is necessarily granted upon examining the impact of the project on the environment. Ex-Post facto Environmental Clearance should not ordinarily be granted, and certainly not for the asking. At the same time ex post facto clearances and/or approvals and/or removal of technical irregularities in terms of Notifications under the 1986 Act cannot be declined with pedantic rigidity, oblivious of the consequences of stopping the operation of a running steel plant.

84. The 1986 Act does not prohibit ex post facto Environmental Clearance. Some relaxations and even grant of ex post facto EC in accordance with law, in strict compliance with Rules, Regulations Notifications and/or applicable orders, in appropriate cases, where the projects are in compliance with, or can be made to comply with environment norms, is in over view not impermissible. The Court cannot be oblivious to the economy or the need to protect the livelihood of hundreds of employees and others employed in the project and others dependent on the project, if such projects comply with environmental norms.

88. The Notification being SO 804(E) dated 14th March, 2017 was not an issue in Alembic Pharmaceuticals (supra). This Court was examining the propriety and/or legality of a 2002 circular which was inconsistent with the EIA Notification dated 27th January, 1994, which was statutory. Ex post facto

⁴ 2021 SCC online SC 1247

*environmental clearance should not however be granted routinely, but in exceptional circumstances taking into account all relevant environmental factors. Where the adverse consequences of ex post facto approval outweigh the consequences of regularization of operation of an industry by grant of ex post facto approval and the industry or establishment concerned otherwise conforms to the requisite pollution norms, ex post facto approval should be given in accordance with law, in strict conformity with the applicable Rules, Regulations and/or Notifications. **Ex post facto approval should not be withheld only as a penal measure.** The deviant industry may be penalised by an imposition of heavy penalty on the principle of 'polluter pays' and the cost of restoration of environment may be recovered from it.*

96. The appeals are allowed. The impugned order is set aside. The Respondent No. 1 shall take a decision on the application of the Appellant for revised EC in accordance with law, within three months from date. Pending such decision, the operation of the steel plant shall not be interfered with on the ground of want of EC, FC, CTE or CTO."

56. As held by this Court in **Electrosteel Steels Limited** (supra) *ex post facto* Environmental Clearance should not ordinarily be granted, and certainly not for the asking. At the same time *ex post facto* clearances and/or approvals and/or removal of technical irregularities in terms of a Notification under the EP Act cannot be declined with pedantic rigidity, oblivious of the consequences of stopping the operation of mines, running factories and plants.

57. The 1986 Act does not prohibit *ex post facto* Environmental Clearance. Grant of *ex post facto* EC in accordance with law, in strict compliance with Rules, Regulations, Notifications and/or applicable orders, in appropriate cases, where the projects are in compliance with, or can be made to comply with environment norms, is in our view not impermissible. The Court cannot be oblivious to the economy or

the need to protect the livelihood of hundreds of employees and others employed in the project and others dependent on the project, if such projects comply with environmental norms.

58. As held by a three Judge Bench of this Court in **Lafarge Umiam Mining Private Limited v. Union of India**⁵:-

“119. The time has come for us to apply the constitutional “doctrine of proportionality” to the matters concerning environment as a part of the process of judicial review in contradistinction to merit review. It cannot be gainsaid that utilization of the environment and its natural resources has to be in a way that is consistent with principles of sustainable development and intergenerational equity, but balancing of these equities may entail policy choices. In the circumstances, barring exceptions, decisions relating to utilisation of natural resources have to be tested on the anvil of the well-recognized principles of judicial review. Have all the relevant factors been taken into account? Have any extraneous factors influenced the decision? Is the decision strictly in accordance with the legislative policy underlying the law (if any) that governs the field? Is the decision consistent with the principles of sustainable development in the sense that has the decision-maker taken into account the said principle and, on the basis of relevant considerations, arrived at a balanced decision? Thus, the Court should review the decision-making process to ensure that the decision of MoEF is fair and fully informed, based on the correct principles, and free from any bias or restraint. Once this is ensured, then the doctrine of “margin of appreciation” in favour of the decision-maker would come into play.”

59. In **Alembic Pharmaceuticals Ltd.**(supra), this Court observed:-

“27. The concept of an ex post facto EC is in derogation of the fundamental principles of environmental jurisprudence and is an anathema to the EIA notification dated 27 January 1994. It is, as the judgment in Common Cause holds, detrimental to the environment and could lead to irreparable degradation. The reason why a retrospective EC or an ex post facto clearance is alien to environmental jurisprudence is that before the issuance of an EC, the statutory notification warrants a careful application of mind, besides a study into the likely consequences of a proposed activity on the environment. An EC can be issued only after various stages of the decision-

⁵ (2011) 7 SCC 338

making process have been completed. Requirements such as conducting a public hearing, screening, scoping and appraisal are components of the decision-making process which ensure that the likely impacts of the industrial activity or the expansion of an existing industrial activity are considered in the decision-making calculus. Allowing for an ex post facto clearance would essentially condone the operation of industrial activities without the grant of an EC. In the absence of an EC, there would be no conditions that would safeguard the environment. Moreover, if the EC was to be ultimately refused, irreparable harm would have been caused to the environment. In either view of the matter, environment law cannot countenance the notion of an ex post facto clearance. This would be contrary to both the precautionary principle as well as the need for sustainable development."

60. Even though this Court deprecated *ex post facto* clearances, in ***Alembic Pharmaceuticals Ltd.*** (*supra*), this Court did not direct closure of the units concerned but explored measures to control the damage caused by the industrial units. This Court held:-

"However, since the expansion has been undertaken and the industry has been functioning, we do not deem it appropriate to order closure of the entire plant as directed by the High Court."

61. The Notification being SO. 804(E) dated 14th March 2017 was not in issue in ***Alembic Pharmaceuticals Ltd.*** (*supra*). In ***Alembic Pharmaceuticals Ltd.*** (*supra*) this Court was examining the propriety and/or legality of a 2002 circular which was inconsistent with the EIA Notification dated 27th January 1994, which was statutory. The EIA Notification dated 27th January 1994 has, as stated above, been superseded by the Notification dated 14th September 2006.

62. There can be no doubt that the need to comply with the requirement to obtain EC is non-negotiable. A unit can be set up or allowed to expand subject to compliance of the requisite

environmental norms. EC is granted on condition of the suitability of the site to set up the unit, from the environmental angle, and also existence of necessary infrastructural facilities and equipment for compliance of environmental norms. To protect future generations and to ensure sustainable development, it is imperative that pollution laws be strictly enforced. Under no circumstances can industries, which pollute, be allowed to operate unchecked and degrade the environment.

63. *Ex post facto* environmental clearance should not be granted routinely, but in exceptional circumstances taking into account all relevant environmental factors. Where the adverse consequences of denial of *ex post facto* approval outweigh the consequences of regularization of operations by grant of *ex post facto* approval, and the establishment concerned otherwise conforms to the requisite pollution norms, *ex post facto* approval should be given in accordance with law, in strict conformity with the applicable Rules, Regulations and/or Notifications. The deviant industry may be penalised by an imposition of heavy penalty on the principle of 'polluter pays' and the cost of restoration of environment may be recovered from it.

64. The question in this case is, whether a unit contributing to the economy of the country and providing livelihood to hundreds of people, which has been set up pursuant to requisite approvals from the concerned statutory authorities, and has applied for *ex post facto* EC, should be closed down for the technical irregularity of want of prior

environmental clearance, pending the issuance of EC, even though it may not cause pollution and/or may be found to comply with the required norms. The answer to the aforesaid question has to be in the negative, more so when the HSPCB was itself under the misconception that no environment clearance was required for the units in question. HSPCB has in its counter affidavit before the NGT clearly stated that a decision was taken to regularize units such as the Apcolite Yamuna Nagar and Pahwa Yamuna Nagar Units, since requisite approvals had been granted to those units, by the concerned authorities on the misconception that no EC was required.

65. It is reiterated that the 1986 Act does not prohibit *ex post facto* EC. Some relaxations and even grant of *ex post facto* EC in accordance with law, in strict compliance with Rules, Regulations, Notifications and/or applicable orders, in appropriate cases, where the projects are in compliance with environment norms, is not impermissible. As observed by this Court in ***Electrosteel Steels Limited*** (supra), this Court cannot be oblivious to the economy or the need to protect the livelihood of hundreds of employees and others employed in the units and dependent on the units in their survival.

66. *Ex post facto* EC should not ordinarily be granted, and certainly not for the asking. At the same time *ex post facto* clearances and/or approvals cannot be declined with pedantic rigidity, regardless of the consequences of stopping the operations. This Court is of the view

that the NGT erred in law in directing that the units cannot be allowed to function till compliance of the statutory mandate.

67. Accordingly, the appeal is allowed. The impugned order is set aside in so far as the same is applicable to the units of the Appellants established and operated pursuant to CTE and CTO from the HSPCB in respect of which applications for *ex post facto* EC have been filed. The Respondent shall take a decision on the applications of the Appellants for EC in accordance with law within one month from date. Pending decision, the operation of the Pahwa Yamuna Nagar Unit and the Apcolite Yamuna Nagar Unit, in respect of which consents have been granted and even public hearing held in connection with grant of EC, shall not be interfered with.

68. The Appellants will be allowed to operate the units. Electricity, if disconnected, shall be restored subject to payment of charges, if any. If the application for EC is rejected on the ground of any contravention on the part of the Appellants, it will be open to the Respondents to disconnect the supply of electricity.

69. The Union of India had proceeded with the application for EC and even public hearing had been held. Counsel appearing on behalf of the Union of India contended that the Appellant had not submitted its final application for EC, after public hearing. It is not clear what more was required of the Appellants. Be that as it may, the Union of India shall, within three working days from the date of receipt of a copy of this judgment and order, inform the Appellants in writing of whether

anything further is required to be done by the Appellants, and if so what is required to be done. The Appellants shall, within a week thereafter do the needful. The final decision on the application of the Appellants for EC shall be taken within three weeks thereafter.

70. The application being I.A. No.110064/2021 and other pending applications, if any, in this appeal are disposed of accordingly.

.....J.
[INDIRA BANERJEE]

.....J.
[J.K. MAHESHWARI]

NEW DELHI
MARCH 25, 2022

a

This is a True Court Copy™ of the judgment as appearing on the Court website.
Publisher has only added the Page para for convenience in referencing.

b

c

d

e

f

g

h

Subject: Application No.41 of 2017 – K. Maheswaran –Vs- State of Kerala, represented by its Secretary Department of Industries & Commerce. & 4 Others on the file of National Green Tribunal (SZ), Chennai – Reg.

"Rajnish Pathiyil Advocate"<rajnishadvocate@rediffmail.com>

Sent: Mon, 16 Sep 2024 17:26:00 GMT+0530

To: <ekkumaresan@hotmail.com>, <prabhu.ijs@gmail.com>, <legalfriend@gmail.com>, <vidyalakshmij@wialegal.com>, <remasmrithivk@gmail.com>

(1) Attachment: [statutory_documents_and_citation_compressed__1_.pdf \[7200.62 KB\]](#)

Sir/Madam,

Please find attached Statutory documents and case laws filed by the Fifth Respondent pertaining to the subject case for your perusal.

Thanks and regards,

From the Desk of:

RAJNISH PATHIYIL

Advocate

No.16, (Old NO. 27)

Arundale Beach Road,

Kalakshetra Colony,

Besant Nagar,

Chennai - 600 090, INDIA

Work: 91 - 44 - 4351 - 1222 |

Note:

This message and any attachments (the "message") is/are intended solely for the addressees and is/are confidential.

If you receive this message in error, please delete it and immediately notify the sender. Any use not in accord with its purpose, any dissemination or disclosure, either whole or partial, is prohibited except by formal approval. The Internet cannot guarantee the integrity of this message.

RAJNISH PATHIYIL, Advocate and his associates and shall (will) not therefore be liable for the message if modified

**BEFORE THE HON'BLE
NATIONAL GREEN TRIBUNAL
SZ, CHENNAI**

APPLICATION NO 41 OF 2017

**INDEX TO
STATUTORY DOCUMENTS
AND
CASE LAWS
FILED BY THE
FIFTH RESPONDENT**

M/S. RAJNISH PATHIYIL
S. GEETHA

COUNSEL FOR THE FIFTH RESPONDENTS

rajnishadvocate@refiffmail.com

9840087838