

BEFORE THE NATIONAL GREEN TRIBUNAL
WESTERN ZONE BENCH, PUNE

APPEAL NO. 37 OF 2025 (WZ)

BOOK NO. — 04 —
PAGE NO. — 161 —
SR. NO. — 545 —
DATE 04/11/2025

NILESH R. PANDYA
NOTARY
GOVT. OF INDIA

IN THE MATTER OF:

AJAYSINH BHUPATSINH SURATIA

... APPELLANT 4 NOV 2025

VERSUS

STATE ENVIRONMENT IMPACT
ASSESSMENT AUTHORITY & ANR.

... RESPONDENT

**REPORT ON BEHALF OF STATE ENVIRONMENT IMPACT
ASSESSMENT AUTHORITY - RESPONDENT NO. 1**

I, Dipali Tank, adult, having my office at Paryavaran Bhavan, Sector 10A, Gandhinagar 382010 in the State of Gujarat, do hereby solemnly affirm and state on oath as under:

1. I am presently serving as Member Secretary, Gujarat State Environment Impact Assessment Authority - the respondent no. 1 in the present appeal. I am authorized to swear the present report being filed by way of an affidavit on behalf of the Gujarat State Environment Impact Assessment Authority and am otherwise competent to make the present affidavit.

2. State Environment Impact Assessment Authority (SEIAA / respondent authority) reappraised the Environment Clearance bearing No. DEIAA/KHEDA/EC/1(a)/0007/2016 dated 04/10/2016 granted by District Environment Impact Assessment Authority (DEIAA), KHEDA to the appellant in terms of the directions issued by this Hon'ble Tribunal in its order dated 7.12.2022 passed in Original Application No. 142 of 2022 [Jayant Kumar vs. Ministry of Environment,

82

Forest and Climate Change] and in light of the check points contained in the Office Memorandum dated 28.04.2023 issued by the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, Government of India. SEIAA found that the environment clearance granted by DEIAA ignores the restriction put on conducting mining activity involving blasting in river bed beyond depth of 01 meter and the guidelines prescribing minimum distance criteria from river or water body, the District Survey Report and the many orders passed by the Constitutional Courts as well as this Tribunal on subject of strict adherence to environmental norms and compliance of environmental laws. Accordingly, SEIAA did not approve and instead rejected the environmental clearance granted by DEIAA.

3. Aggrieved by the decision of SEIAA in not approving the environment clearance, a statutory appeal has been preferred by the appellant before this Hon'ble Tribunal. In the appeal, this Hon'ble Tribunal after hearing the parties passed an order on 28.07.2025 containing the following direction:

"7. There are several other grounds mentioned in the affidavit-reply of respondent No.1 - SEIAA, but the learned counsel for SEIAA made a statement in open court that respondent No.1 - SEIAA is ready to give an opportunity of hearing to the appellants in order to provide an opportunity to demonstrate that the impugned order passed by the SEIAA suffers from any infirmity, if at all and the same may be considered at their end.

8. In view of the aforesaid statement made by learned counsel Mr. Maulik Nanavati, appearing for respondent No.1 - SEIAA, we deem it appropriate to keep these appeals pending and direct the appellants to approach respondent No.1 - SEIAA within fifteen days from the date of uploading of this order and place their grievances before the SEIAA, which shall be considered extensively by the SEIAA after giving an appropriate opportunity of hearing and thereafter, a communication shall be made to us as to what was the outcome of the hearing given to the appellants and thereafter, we will pass the appropriate orders giving an opportunity of hearing to the parties."

Ab



In terms of the aforesaid directive of this Hon'ble Tribunal, the appellant in the present appeal as well as the appellant of other appeals, which involve similar challenge and which are being heard together, appeared before SEIAA and made oral submissions and later gave written submissions.

4. SEIAA has carefully examined the oral and written submissions made before it on behalf of the appellant(s) of the respective appeals, but does not find any infirmity in its original decision of not approving the environmental clearance granted by DEIAA. SEIAA maintains that environmental clearance previously granted by DEIAA is not in conformity with the District Survey Report prepared for the concerned district which delineates the no-mining zones, offends the distance criteria fixed in the State of Gujarat for conducting any mining activity with or without blasting, and conflicts with the decisions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court as well as this Hon'ble Tribunal highlighting the need for strict adherence to environmental norms.
5. At the hearing granted to the appellant(s) and in their written submission, the appellant(s) raised several issues to demonstrate that the initial decision of SEIAA is erroneous. Every point argued by the appellant(s) in support of their request for reconsideration of the decision has been considered by SEIAA, but is not found worthy to warrant reconsideration of the decision of not approving the environmental clearance granted by DEIAA.
6. The submissions made by the appellant(s) and the reasoning of SEIAA for not accepting the said submission are detailed hereinbelow for examination and scrutiny by this Hon'ble Tribunal:
- 6A. Order dated 21.07.2020 made by National Green Tribunal, Principal Bench, Delhi in Original Application No. 304 of 2019 approving the distance criteria for mining from river or riverbed suggested by Central Pollution Control Board has been set aside by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, and the application is ordered to be heard afresh by the Tribunal after giving an opportunity of hearing to all parties. Therefore, no



reliance can be placed upon the order dated 21.07.2020 of the Tribunal passed in Original Application No. 304 of 2019. Further, the suggested distance criteria by the Central Pollution Control Board cannot be said to have been approved and hence does not partake the status of “guidelines”. Consequently, the same is not binding law.

6A.1 The aforesaid submission of the appellant(s) is fallacious and suffers from an improper and rather erroneous understanding of the facts and the law.

6A.2 Central Pollution Control Board has suggested minimal distance standard for permitting stone quarrying by the State Pollution Control Boards, and the same is reproduced hereinbelow:

“6.0 Conclusion: In view of available information, following minimum distance criteria may be considered for permitting stone quarrying by SPCBs:

Mining Type		Minimum Distance	Locations
A	When Blasting is not involved	100 m	Residential/Public buildings, Inhabited sites, Protected monuments, Heritage sites, National / State Highway, District roads, Public roads, Railway line/area, Ropeway or Ropeway trestle or station, Bridges, Dams, Reservoirs, River, Canals, Lakes or Tanks, or any other locations to be considered by States.
B	When Blasting is involved	200 m	

Note: The regulations for danger zone (500 m) prescribed by Directorate General of Mines Safety also have to be complied compulsorily and necessary measures should be taken to minimise the impact on environment.

However, if any states is already having stringent criteria than the above for minor mineral mining (i.e. more prescribed distances than the above), the same shall be applicable.”

6A.3 A copy of this suggested criteria was communicated to the State Pollution Control Board by letter dated 21.05.2020.

81


6A.4 The suggestion was also placed before the Tribunal in Original Application No. 304 of 2019. The Tribunal accepted the minimal standards suggested by the Central Pollution Control Board. This order of the Tribunal became a subject matter of challenge before the High Court of Kerala and even eventually before the Supreme Court of India. The Hon'ble Supreme Court ordered the Tribunal to pass a fresh order after hearing the parties.

6A.5 The appellant(s) are right in contending that the judicial approval given to the minimal distance criteria suggested by the Central Pollution Control Board possibly stands effaced since the matter has been remanded back to the Tribunal for passing fresh order after granting an opportunity of hearing to all the parties. Therefore, it is arguable that as on date there is no judicial sanctification of the distance criteria suggested by the Central Pollution Control Board.



6A.6 SEIAA, however, maintains that lack of judicial endorsement of the minimal standard suggested by the Central Pollution Control Board does not render the proposed or recommended parameters to be legally invalid and inoperative in law. Absence of judicial sanction only means that the suggested standards do not stand elevated to the status of binding criterion and become compulsorily applicable or obligatory, as being the declared law. Judicial imprimatur is not a precondition or a *sine qua non* for existence, recognition and acceptance of the standards suggested by an expert body. Sans judicial nod or support, the suggested standards do not become non-existent or invalid or unworthy, either in fact or in law. The suggested standards continue to remain recommendatory, and in that sense optional. Any State Pollution Control Board can elect to adopt the proposed norm as a benchmark and apply it at its discretion. Alternatively, they continue to retain the character of being a lodestar and provide inspiration or guidance to the State Pollution Control Board to charter and prescribe own standards by taking the suggested standards as a base. There is and cannot be any legal bar to voluntary adoption or placement of reliance by the State Pollution Control Board of any metric or measure

or



suggested or recommended by Central Pollution Control Board. As held in a series of decisions, both of the Constitutional Courts as also this Tribunal, State Pollution Control Board cannot relax the standards prescribed by the Central Pollution Control Board but can always make them more stringent in their applicability to curb possible pollution in the State. State of Gujarat has chosen not to dilute the suggested standards, but has opted to adopt the recommended criterion. If the standard suggested by the Central Pollution Control Board is accepted as it is tomorrow by the Tribunal or any other Court of Law then also the fixation by the State Pollution Control Board of similar benchmark, without dilution, will not render the criteria adopted and fixed by the State Pollution Control Board to be bad in law. If the suggested criteria is not judicially accepted or is accepted with dilution then also it is always open for a State Pollution Control Board or the local regulatory authority to fix stringent standards. Thus, on every count the decision of the regulatory authorities in the State of Gujarat to prescribe distance criteria of 200 meters from river for mining with blasting and 100 meters from river without blasting is within jurisdictional competence and otherwise reasonable and in consonance with law. The determined policy of the regulatory authorities and its applicability to the facts of the present case is not arbitrary or whimsical, and cannot be said to be unreasonable, capricious or otherwise bad in law.

- 6A.7 The District Survey Reports prepared by the District Geologist for every district and approved by SEIAA also contains the same distance norm. No objection was raised at the relevant time by the appellant(s) to the prescription of this benchmark or standard in the District Survey Report. Post approval of the District Survey Report, there has been no challenge to the approved District Survey Report on account of lack of competence or arbitrary fixation of distance criteria by the appellant(s) before this Hon'ble Tribunal. The District Survey Report containing the distance criteria is therefore operative and binding, and is required to be enforced strictly.
- 

6A.8 For each of the above reasons, the contention of the appellant(s) about the order dated 21.07.2020 passed by the Principal Bench of this Tribunal in Original Application No. 304 of 2019 being erased by order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court and therefore not having any existence or efficacy in the eyes of law stand reduced to insignificance, both on facts and in law. The order dated 21.07.2020 passed by the Principal Bench of this Tribunal, or its non-existence today, will have no bearing, direct or indirect, on the applicability of the distance criteria which has been voluntarily fixed for the State of Gujarat and which also finds mention in the District Survey Report for all districts across the State of Gujarat. It is reiterated that even without there being judicial blessing to the distance criteria recommended by the Central Pollution Control Board, it always remained open for the State regulatory authority to elect / adopt any norm suggested by the Central Pollution Control Board, including by making such norm stricter, and apply it uniformly to all cases. This has been done in the State of Gujarat. No fault can be found with the fixation of distance criteria, which determination is otherwise within the competence of the regulatory authorities of the State, on any legally sustainable count, and consequently its applicability to the facts of the present case cannot be complained or faulted in law.

6B. District Survey Report should not be taken into consideration and the environment clearance granted by DEIAA should be reappraised on the basis of legal position as it existed at the time of grant of such clearance.

6B.1 This submission of the appellant(s) is fundamentally erroneous and without legal merit as it overlooks and calls for ignoring the intent behind passing of the order dated 7.12.2022 by the Principal Bench of this Hon'ble Tribunal in Original Application No. 142 of 2022, the express language of Office Memorandum dated 28.04.2023 issued by the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, Government of India and the decisions of this Hon'ble Tribunal as well as the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, particularly in the case of State of Uttar Pradesh & Anr. vs. Gaurav Kumar & Ors., reported as 2025 SCC Online SC 1069

81

and Union Territory of Jammu and Kashmir vs. Raja Muzaffar Bhat, reported as 2025 SCC Online SC 1789.

6B.2 It is now an established position of law that preparation of District Survey Report for every district is compulsory and that approved District Survey Report is a condition precedent to carry mining activity. It has been judicially ordained that District Survey Report should be the basis for consideration of grant of environmental clearance and that no clearance for conducting mining activity can be granted in conflict with the District Survey Report.



6B.3 Appellant(s) have contended that this position of law will apply to cases of fresh grant of environmental clearance and cannot be applied to cases of reappraisal. There is an inherent fallacy in the submission. The dictionary meaning of the term 'reappraisal' is "the act of examining something again to see if it needs to be changed". The examination has to be undertaken pragmatically and in accordance with the extant law. Any suggestion to restrict the scrutiny by SEIAA to the availability and sufficiency of requisite documents before DEIAA at the time of evaluation and consideration of application for grant of environmental clearance on the basis of law as it prevailed at the relevant time would be a retrograde step and render the purport and intent behind undertaking the reappraisal of the environmental clearances granted by SEIAA a mere clerical exercise and that too in futility. Such contention, as put forward by the appellant(s), would also run counter to the observations made by the Tribunal while pronouncing need for reappraisal and the check list points prescribed by the Ministry of Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, Government of India. It will also compel the regulatory authority to ignore the advancement in law and the declaration of law made by the Constitutional Courts, which ordinarily applies retrospectively. Additionally, it will militate against the objective of revisiting and re-examining the environmental clearances to ascertain whether they can be sustained in the backdrop of the current position of law.

81

6B.4 The Office Memorandum dated 28.04.2023 issued by the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, Government of India specifies District Survey Report as one of the aspect or factors to be taken into consideration by SEIAA at the time of reappraisal of environmental clearances granted by DEIAA. There is no challenge, either in this appeal or otherwise, to the Office Memorandum dated 28.04.2023 to the extent that it prescribes consideration of the District Survey Report while conducting reappraisal of the environmental clearance granted by DEIAA. The Office Memorandum continues to remain legally valid and operative, and its contents are therefore required to be considered by SEIAA at the time of performing reappraisal of the environmental clearances granted by DEIAA. It will also not be open for this Bench of the Hon'ble Tribunal to direct exclusion of the District Survey Report from consideration at the time of reappraisal of the environmental clearance granted by DEIAA, else it will have the effect of rendering the Office Memorandum dated 28.04.2023 issued by the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, Government of India otiose and blatantly disregard the decisions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of State of Uttar Pradesh & Anr. vs. Gaurav Kumar & Ors., reported as 2025 SCC Online SC 1069 and Union Territory of Jammu and Kashmir vs. Raja Muzaffar Bhat, reported as 2025 SCC Online SC 1789. SEIAA has taken note of the fact that till date there is no challenge to the Office Memorandum dated 28.04.2023 issued by the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, Government of India and there is no direction by this Hon'ble Tribunal to ignore the said Office Memorandum dated 28.04.2023.

6B.5 Even otherwise, the contention is meritless as it calls upon SEIAA, a regulatory authority, to act contrary to the law and in flagrant defiance of the judicial decisions delivered by this Hon'ble Tribunal as well as the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India declaring District Survey Report to be of seminal importance and obligating its primary consideration for grant or otherwise of environmental clearance for carrying out mining activity.



6C. District Survey Report does not officially demarcate or delineate 'No Mining Zone'. Lease area of the appellant(s) do not fall within any such defined or outlined 'no go zone' in the report. Without therefore being any formal inclusion and designation of lease of the appellant(s) in the prohibited or restricted area in the District Survey Report, the rejection of environmental clearance is bad.

6C.1 The submission of the appellant(s) is mischievous and misleading and in any case is without any factual or legal merit.

6C.2 The District Survey Report, prepared by the District Geologist, for every district has marked certain area in the district map as being prohibited or restricted areas, where no mining activity is permitted. The Report also specifies the distance criteria from landmarks – be it installations, bridges, roads, water bodies, rivers, monuments, etc. up to which mining activity is not permissible. There is no challenge to the legality and correctness of the District Survey Report in this appeal or otherwise.

6C.3 Every appellant(s) is fully aware of the geographical location of his respective lease. The geographical coordinates – latitude and longitude, of the lease area are available with the appellant(s). They also find mention in the approved mining plan possessed by and available with each appellant(s), having been obtained at the relevant point of time for grant of environmental clearance from DEIAA. These geographical coordinates, without any alteration, have been specified by the appellant(s) at the time of making application for reappraisal of their environmental clearance granted by DEIAA on PARIVESH portal. The geographical coordinates and KML (Keyhole Markup Language) file furnished by the appellant(s) superimposes their lease area on the district map available on PARIVESH portal and delivers the precise geographical location of the lease area against the backdrop of clear or restricted area for mining activity. In each case, the geographical coordinates of the lease area provided by the appellant(s) has shown

or

overlapping or impermissible proximity of the lease area to the prohibited or restricted zone marked in the District Survey Report.

6C.4 It has not been the case of any appellant(s), set up either during the hearing before SEIAA or in the pleadings before this Hon'ble Tribunal, that there has been a mistake in identification of the actual geographical location of their lease or that there is an error in superimposition of their lease area over the map on the PARIVESH portal. No material, much less credible material, has been placed by any appellant(s) demonstrating that the position of their lease superimposed on the district map available on the PARIVESH portal is incorrect and/or that their lease is situated at a different geographical location. Under the circumstances, the non-demarcation of individual lease area in the District Survey Report is of no relevance and does not in any manner help or assist the appellant(s) in contending that their lease area does not fall within or is not within impermissible proximity to the identified and delineated prohibited or restricted area in the District Survey Report. Similarly, the request of the appellant(s) for physical site inspection is also meaningless as it is the location of the lease that is determinative for the purpose of grant or non-grant of environmental clearance on account of violation of distance criteria prescribed in the District Survey Report and not the actual situation obtaining on and around the leased area.

6D. Gujarat Minor Mineral Concession Rules, 2017 will prevail for determining the distance criteria and Rule 18(6) thereof prescribes no distance limitation from river.

6D.1 This contention of the appellant(s) is also fallacious and suffers from a complete non-understanding of the position of law.

6D.2 Gujarat Minor Mineral Concession Rules, 2017 have been framed by the State Government in exercise of power under Section 15 of the Mines and Minerals (Development and Regulation) Act, 1957. The Mines and Minerals (Development and Regulation) Act, 1957 provides for

“development and regulation of mines and minerals”. Rule 15 of the Act confers power on the State Governments to make rules in respect of minor minerals. The said section reads as under:

“15. Power of State Governments to make rules in respect of minor minerals.

(1) The State Government may, by notification in the Official Gazette, make rules for, regulating the grant of quarry leases, mining leases or other mineral concessions in respect of minor minerals and for purposes connected therewith.

(1A) In particular and without prejudice to the generality of the foregoing power, such rules may provide for all or any of the following matters, namely:

- (a) the person by whom and the manner in which, applications for quarry leases, mining leases or other mineral concessions may be made and the fees to be paid therefor;
- (b) the time within which, and the form in which, acknowledgement of the receipt of any such applications may be sent;
- (c) the matters which may be considered where applications in respect of the same land are received within the same day;
- (d) the terms on which, and the conditions subject to which and the authority by which quarry leases, mining leases or other mineral concessions may be granted or renewed;
- (e) the procedure for obtaining quarry leases, mining leases or other mineral concessions;
- (f) the facilities to be afforded by holders of quarry leases, mining leases or other mineral concessions to persons deputed by the Government for the purpose of undertaking research or training in matters relating to mining operations;
- (g) the fixing and collection of rent, royalty, fees, dead rent, fines or other charges and the time within which and the manner in which these shall be payable;
- (h) the manner in which rights of third parties may be protected (whether by way of payment of compensation or otherwise) in cases where any such party is prejudicially affected by reason of any prospecting or mining operations;
- (i) the manner in which rehabilitation of flora and other vegetation such as trees, shrubs and the like destroyed by reason of any quarrying or mining operations shall be made in the same area or in any

other area selected by the State Government (whether by way of reimbursement of the cost of rehabilitation or otherwise) by the person holding the quarrying or mining lease;

- (j) the manner in which and the conditions subject to which, a quarry lease, mining lease or other mineral concession may be transferred;
 - (k) the construction, maintenance and use of roads power transmission lines, tramways, railways, serial rope ways, pipelines and the making of passage for water for mining purposes on any land comprised in a quarry or mining lease or other mineral concession;
 - (l) the form of registers to be maintained under this Act;
 - (m) the reports and statements to be submitted by holders of quarry or mining leases or other mineral concessions and the authority to which such reports and statements shall be submitted;
 - (n) the period within which and the manner in which and the authority to which applications for revision of any order passed by any authority under these rules may be made, the fees to be paid therefore, and the powers of the revisional authority; and
 - (o) any other matter which is to be, or may be, prescribed.
- (2) Until rules are made under sub-section (1), any rules made by a state Government regulating the grant of quarry leases, mining leases or other mineral concessions in respect of minor minerals which are in force immediately before the commencement of these Act shall continue in force.
- (3) The holder of a mining lease or any other mineral concession granted under any rule made under sub-section (1) shall pay royalty or dead rent, whichever is more] in respect of minor minerals removed or consumed by him or by his agent, manager, employee, contractor or sub-lessee at the rate prescribed for the time being in the rules framed by the State Government in respect of minor minerals.
- Provided that the State Government shall not enhance the rate of royalty or dead rent in respect of any minor mineral for more than once during any period of three years.
- (4) Without prejudice to sub-sections (1), (2) and sub-section (3), the State Government may, by notification, make rules for regulating the provisions of this Act for the following, namely:

87

- (a) the manner in which the District Mineral Foundation shall work for the interest and benefit of persons and areas affected by mining under sub-section (2) of section 9B;
- (b) the composition and functions of the District Mineral Foundation under sub-section (3) of section 9B; and
- (c) the amount of payment to be made to the District Mineral Foundation by concession holders of minor minerals under section 15A."

A plain reading of the above quoted section makes it abundantly clear that the power conferred upon the State Government to make rules is limited to minor minerals and restricted to "regulating the grant of quarry leases, mining leases or other mineral concessions in respect of minor minerals and for purposes connected therewith". The said rule making power confines the legislative competence of the State Government to framing rules only for the purpose of grant of mining leases. The Act and the Rules framed thereunder do not confer any power to the Central or State Government to determine or regulate mining activity in the context of environmental protection and compliance with environmental laws. This distinct aspect is governed by environmental laws, particularly the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986 and the notifications issued by the Central Government under the said Act.

6D.3 Separately, Rule 18 of the Gujarat Minor Gujarat Minor Mineral Concession Rules, 2017 does not begin with a *non obstante* clause. There is no statutory provision contained in the Gujarat Minor Gujarat Minor Mineral Concession Rules, 2017 giving it primacy or supremacy over other enactments or statutory provisions. In fact, even the Mines and Minerals (Development and Regulation) Act, 1957 does not contain any provision giving overriding effect to the provisions of the Act and thereby the actions taken under the Act. On the contrary, Rule 59 provides that "mining operations will be undertaken only pursuant to a valid environmental clearance in accordance with the provisions of the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986 and the rules and notifications issued thereunder, including the Environment Impact Assessment Notification, 2006", thereby indicating that the conducting of mining

01

activity shall actually be regulated and governed by the provisions of the Environment (Protection) Act and the notifications issued under the said Act.

6D.4 The contention of the appellant(s) that the distance criteria must be as per the provisions of the Gujarat Minor Gujarat Minor Mineral Concession Rules, 2017 is thoroughly misconceived and not tenable in the eyes of the law.

7. A lot of appellant(s) of the group appeals have made a request for grant of revised environmental clearance, by deducting the area of lease which falls within the prohibited or restricted zone and over which area no mining activity is permitted as per the distance criteria adopted and fixed for the State of Gujarat and specified in the District Survey Report for the concerned district. All the appellants have been informed by SEIAA that it does not have jurisdictional competence while undertaking reappraisal of the environmental clearance granted by DEIAA to revise the environmental clearance. At the same time, SEIAA has educated all the appellant(s) that it would be open for each project proponent to individually make a fresh application for grant of environmental clearance for a reduced area along with the requisite documents, including a fresh mining plan for such reduced area. Such application has to be made on PARIVESH portal. As and when such application is made, the same shall be duly considered by SEIAA in accordance with law.

8. I submit that no other submissions, either orally or in writing, have been made by the appellant(s) at the time of hearing or thereafter before SEIAA. For the record, a copy of the written submissions made by the Association for and on behalf of its members, which is reiteration of the oral submissions made at the hearing is annexed herewith and marked as Annexure R-1.

9. I submit that the environment clearance granted by DEIAA to the appellant(s) permitted appellant(s) to undertake mining activity in an

81/

area which is delineated as prohibited or restricted zone in the District Survey Report and over an area which violates the distance criteria fixed by the regulatory authority. Any continuance of the environmental clearance granted by DEIAA would amount to perpetuating an illegality, which is impermissible in law. That apart, sustaining and retaining the environmental clearance granted by DEIAA would result in barefaced and wanton violation of the District Survey Report and thereby the law declared by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India holding the District Survey Report to be of seminal importance and commanding strict compliance with the District Survey Report.


10. For each of these reasons, the decision of SEIAA in not approving the environmental clearance granted by DEIAA is just and proper and does not call for any interference by this Hon'ble Tribunal. The appeal assailing the decision of SEIAA in rejecting the environmental clearance granted by DEIAA is meritless and the same does not deserve acceptance by this Hon'ble Tribunal. It is therefore humbly prayed that the Hon'ble Tribunal may be pleased to dismiss the appeal.

Dipali Tank
DEPONENT


VERIFICATION

Verified at Gandhinagar on this 04th day of November, 2025 that the contents of the above affidavit are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and information derived from records, that nothing stated therein is false and that nothing material has been concealed therefrom.

Dipali Tank
DEPONENT



IDENTIFIED BY ME SOLEMNLY AFFIRMED
BEFORE ME
ADVOCATE/PERSON
NAME: *Gandhinagar* NILESH R. PANDYA
D. *04/11/25* NOTARY
E: *04/11/25* GOVT. OF INDIA
- 4 NOV 2025 - 4 NOV 2025



213

51

A - 37/2025

Date :- 13/08/2025

From :

AJAYSINH BHUPATSINH SURTIYA

Village:-Anklav, Ta:- Thasra, Dist:- Kheda

Mo: - 8320171744

Email:-pruthvistoneindustries@gmail.com

To

The Member Secretary

State Environment Impact Assessment Authority (SEIAA),

Gujarat

Subject: Hearing for Re-Appraisal of EC Application Rejected by SEIAA

Reference: EC Re-Appraisal Application – Proposal No. SIA/GJ/ MIN/497336/2024

Respected Sir,


Our Quarry Environmental Clearance (EC) was originally granted by the DEIAA. In accordance with the MoEF&CC Office Memorandum dated 28.04.2023, we submitted our Re-Appraisal application. However, SEIAA rejected it on the following

"Lease is not complying with the distance criteria prescribed by:

Hon'ble NGT (Principal Bench) in OA No. 85/2019 (WZ) dated 30.09.2020; Sustainable Sand Mining Guidelines of MoEF&CC, 2016; (which is not applicable to us) Enforcement & Monitoring Guidelines for Sand Mining, January 2020; MoEF&CC letter no. 6-60/2020 WLP(1) dated 16.07.2020; MoEF&CC OM no. 22-43/2018-IA.III dated 08.08.2019 in line with the Hon'ble Supreme Court order dated 04.08.2006 in W.P.(C) No. 202/1995 (T.N. Godavarman Thirumulpad Vs. UOI); Amended CRZ Notification, 2011; MoEF&CC Notification no. S.O. 1599(E) dated 25.06.2014, etc." EC rejection Order is attached as Annexure-1

The said rejection order has been challenged by us before the Hon'ble National Green Tribunal (NGT) through Appeal No. 14/2025. This case, along with Interlocutory Application No. 230/2025, was heard by the Hon'ble NGT, which passed an order on 28/07/2025 (copy enclosed as Annexure-2). Pursuant to the opportunity for personal hearing granted under this order, we hereby submit this representation to SEIAA for reconsideration on the following points.

- The mining lease is not in consonance from the distance criteria prescribed by the Hon'ble NGT in terms of OA No.85/2019(WZ) dated 30/09/2020 along with OA No.304 of 2019 dated 21/07/2020.
- The said OA No.85/2019(WZ) dated 30/09/2020 relies upon the order of the Principal Bench dated 21/07/2020 which is relied upon the report of the CPCB filed in OA No.304 of 2019. It is submitted that the said report is pertaining to the case before the Tribunal and not any guidelines issued by them. Thus, they are not guidelines and not the final binding law.
- Moreover, the OA No.85/2019(WZ) dated 30/09/2020 along with OA No.304 of 2019 dated 21/07/2020 has been set aside by the Hon'ble Supreme Court. Therefore, the final adjudication of the CPCB's report is still pending, and until such adjudication is complete, it cannot be treated as binding law.



- In view of the above, SEIAA is required to follow the **Gujarat Minor Mineral Concession Rules, 2017 (GMMCR-2017)**, which were applied at the time of EC grant by DEIAA. It may be noted that under the **Gujarat Minor Mineral Concession Rules (GMMCR), 2017, there is no specific provision stating that mining from the riverbed is prohibited.** Rule 18(6) of GMMCR-2017 stated as below:

(a) fifty metres from any road (excluding a village road or other district road), notified reservoirs, canal, national highway, state highway, boundary of any railway line, public works, cities, towns, villages and other approved continuous habitations, if no blasting is involved; or

(b) two hundred metres from any road, notified reservoirs, canal, national highway, state highway, boundary of any railway line, public works, cities, towns, villages and other approved continuous habitations, if blasting is involved.

- **Rule 18(6) of GMMCR-2017 in does not mention anything about rivers or river-bank criteria.**
- Our lease is an active quarry lease, on the basis of which we have established a crushing unit with substantial investment, loans, and long-term commitments. In such circumstances, it is not justified to stop mining.
- We further submit that, in the proceedings pursuant to your rejection order, you have primarily relied upon satellite imagery, which, in our opinion, has resulted in the Committee remaining unaware of the true and correct facts. Therefore, in all such important matters, due reliance should be placed on the site inspection carried out by the District Geologist. This aspect has also been noted by the Hon'ble NGT, and on that basis, we respectfully request that a well-considered decision be taken.
- We would like to state that our Environmental Clearance (EC) was first given by the DEIAA as per the rules that were in force at that time. Therefore, SEIAA should review our Re-Appraisal application using the same rules that applied when the EC was granted.

In view of the above, during the personal hearing, we shall present additional supporting evidence and make submissions before SEIAA in accordance with our legal rights.

In view of the above facts and legal position, we humbly request SEIAA to reconsider our application and grant one opportunity for approval under the provisions of GMMCR-2017.

Yours faithfully,

Ajaysinh Bhupatsinh Suratia



Proprietor

*Enclosed, Annexure-1: Re-Appraisal of EC Rejection Order
Annexure-2: Hon'ble NGT order dated 28/07/2025*

Copy to 1. Commissioner of Geology and mining department, Gandhinagar

2. District Geologist



GUJARAT BLACKSTONE QUARRY INDUSTRIES ASSOCIATION

Reg. No. : Guj.391/F.607 NAV

President : **Hitendrabhai S. Upadhyay**
(Kalubhai Karpet)

Near Hari Hareshwar Temple, N.H.No. 06, VYARA, Dist. Tapi.

Mo. : 98251 46249, Phone : 02626-220302, Fax. : 223335.

E-mail : blackstoneassociation@gmail.com

Ref. No.

Date : / /202

Ref.No-03/25-26

DATE-10-09-2025

To,
The Chairman
State Environmental Impact Assessment Authority (SEIAA), Gujarat

Subject: Representation Regarding Rejection of Environmental Clearance (EC) Application

Introduction

This representation is submitted on behalf of **Applicants** concerning the application for Environmental Clearance (EC) for the Mine, which was rejected by the State Environmental Impact Assessment Authority (SEIAA), Gujarat. The rejection was based on two grounds: the mine's location within a "no-go zone" and its non-compliance with the distance criteria established by a National Green Tribunal (NGT) order. This representation aims to clarify these points, demonstrating that the rejection was based on an outdated NGT order and a non-existent demarcation of a "no-go zone."

Analysis of Grounds for Rejection

The SEIAA's decision to reject the EC application was founded on two primary issues:

1. The "No-Go Zone"

The SEIAA cited the mine's location within a "no-go zone" as a reason for rejection. However, a review of the District Survey Report (DSR) for the relevant area confirms that there is no official demarcation or declaration of a "no-go zone" where the mine is located. The concept of a "no-go zone" is typically based on specific geographical or environmental restrictions, and without a formal designation in the DSR, this ground for rejection is unsubstantiated. The applicant has taken all necessary precautions and ensured the proposed mining activities are outside any sensitive or restricted areas as defined in the DSR.

2. The NGT Distance Criteria

The rejection letter refers to the distance criteria prescribed in the National Green Tribunal's (NGT) order. The NGT, in an order dated July 21, 2020, had directed that a minimum distance of 200 meters from inhabited sites, public roads, and other specified locations should be maintained for quarries where blasting is involved. The said order was



GUJARAT BLACKSTONE QUARRY INDUSTRIES ASSOCIATION

Reg. No. : Guj.391/F.607 NAV

President : **Hitendrabhai S. Upadhyay**
(Kalubhai Karpet)

Near Hari Maheshwar Temple, N.H.No. 08, VYARA, Dist. Tapi.

Mo. : 98251 46249, Phone : 02626-220302, Fax. : 223335.

E-mail : blackstoneassociation@gmail.com

Ref. No.

Date : / /202

initially challenged before the High Court of Kerala, which had an interim order passed on August 6, 2020. This interim order allowed valid and current quarrying permits/leases to maintain the distance criteria based on the Kerala Minor Mineral Concession Rules, 2015, but stipulated that new or renewal applications must comply with the new NGT criteria. The NGT's order of July 21, 2020, was eventually set aside by the High Court of Kerala on December 21, 2020.

The matter was subsequently brought before the Supreme Court of India. The Supreme Court, in its order dated October 25, 2021, reiterated that the NGT must provide an opportunity for affected parties to be heard before issuing any adverse directions, especially in cases initiated suo-motu. In this context, the Supreme Court deemed the NGT's ex-parte peremptory order(s) "effaced from the record".

The Supreme Court directed that all contentions raised by the appellants, including those related to the 100-meter and 200-meter distances, be heard afresh by the NGT. The NGT's order of August 7, 2025, in Original Application No. 304/2019, explicitly states that "in view of the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, in effect, the order of the Tribunal dated 21.07.2020 does not survive". The Tribunal is now considering the matter on its merits and has scheduled a fresh hearing.

Therefore, the distance criteria relied upon by the SEIAA to reject the application are no longer in effect as the NGT's original order has been set aside. The SEIAA's decision, based on a defunct order, is not legally valid.

3. Public Road issue

As per rule 18(6) of the Gujarat Minor Mineral Rules, 2017, no public road is defined and the village road criteria is exempted from 50-meter distance criteria. Hence you are requested to peruse the documents handed over by the Public Authorities and consider the same while reappraising the applications and grant us the EC

Request for Reconsideration

In light of the above, we respectfully request that SEIAA, Gujarat, reconsider the application for Environmental Clearance for the Mines. The basis for the rejection, specifically the "no-go zone" demarcation and the distance criteria, is no longer legally sustainable.

We urge the authority to proceed with the processing of the EC application in accordance with the current, valid regulations and guidelines. We are ready to provide any further information or clarification required to facilitate this process.

**GUJARAT BLACKSTONE QUARRY INDUSTRIES ASSOCIATION**

Reg. No. : Guj.391/F.607 NAV

President : Hitendrabhai S. Upadhyay
(Kalubhai Karpel)

Near Hari Hareshwar Temple, N.H.No. 06, VYARA, Dist. Tapi.

Mo. : 98251 46249, Phone : 02626-220302, Fax. : 223335.

E-mail : blackstoneassociation@gmail.com

Ref. No.

Date : / /202

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Yours Faith fully**Hitendra S. Upadhyay.**(President Gujarat Black Stone Quarry
Industries Association)



GUJARAT BLACKSTONE QUARRY INDUSTRIES ASSOCIATION

Reg. No. : Guj.391/F.607 NAV

President : **Hitendrabhai S. Upadhyay**
(Kalubhai Karpel)

Near Hari Hareshwar Temple, N.H.No. 06, VYARA, Dist. Tapi.

Mo. : 98251 46249, Phone : 02626-220302, Fax. : 223335.

E-mail : blackstoneassociation@gmail.com

Ref. No.

Date : / /202

AUTHORIZATION LETTER

Date: 08/09/2025

To,
The Member Secretary,
State Environment Impact Assessment Authority (SEIAA),
Sector-10/A, Paryavaran Bhavan,
Gandhinagar – 382010.

Subject: Authorization to Represent in SEIAA Hearing

Respected Sir/Madam,

We all Lease Holder / Project Proponent, hereby authorize our **Advocate Mr. Saurabh Kulkarni and Mr. Pransant Bhat**, and **Technical Adviser Mr. Zalak Savliya**, to remain present and represent on my behalf in the hearing scheduled before the Hon'ble Committee of SEIAA on **08.09.2025 at 15:00 hrs** at SEIAA office, Gandhinagar, in compliance with Hon'ble NGT Order dated 28.07.2025

They are fully authorized to provide clarifications, and represent me in all respects during the said hearing.

I request you to kindly permit them to appear and represent on my behalf.

Thanking you,

Yours faithfully,

Sr. No	Appel No.	Name Of Lease Holder	Proposal No	Sign
✓ 1.	74/2025	Simandhar Quarry Works	501621	<i>[Signature]</i>
✓ 2.	35/2025	Gurukrupa Quarry 3.0 Ha	496418	<i>[Signature]</i>
✓ 3.	33/2025	Gurukrupa Quarry 3.0 Ha	496584	<i>[Signature]</i>
✓ 4.	78/2025	Gurukrupa Quarry 1.0 Ha	496404	<i>[Signature]</i>
✓ 5.	77/2025	Gurukrupa Quarry 1.0 Ha	496392	<i>[Signature]</i>
✓ 6.	75/2025	Krishna Stone Quarry (C/o. Shri Rayjibhai Laxmanbhai Parmar)	497455	<i>[Signature]</i>
↑ 7.	71/2025	New Shiv Shakti Quarry Works	502186	<i>[Signature]</i>
✓ 8.	100/2025	Bhart quarry works (Shubhas J Patel)	500899	<i>[Signature]</i>
✓ 9.	73/2025	Devanandbhai Rambhai Kanderiya 3 Ha	500423	<i>[Signature]</i>
✓ 10.	89/2025	Ajaysinh Bhupatsinh Suratiya (3 Hac.)	497299	<i>[Signature]</i>
✓ 11.	37/2025	Ajaysinh Bhupatsinh Suratiya (1.82 Hac.)	497336	<i>[Signature]</i>
✓ 12.	41/2025	SRG Stone LLP	501614	<i>[Signature]</i>
✓ 13.	39/2025	Dharma Quarry Works (lease area 1.00.00 Ha)	501511	<i>[Signature]</i>
✓ 14.	38/2025	Dharma Quarry Works (Lease area 1.70.98 Ha)	501586	<i>[Signature]</i>
✓ 15.	40/2025	Dharma Quarry Works(Lease area 2.16.51 Ha)	501538	<i>[Signature]</i>
✓ 16.	42/2025	Rajnikantbhai Bhikhabhai Desai	501543	<i>[Signature]</i>
✓ 17.	47/2025	MUKESH QUARRY WORKS (Lease Area .	500581	<i>[Signature]</i>



GUJARAT BLACKSTONE QUARRY INDUSTRIES ASSOCIATION

Reg. No. : Guj.391/F.607 NAV

President : **Hitendrabhai S. Upadhyay**
(Kalubhai Karpet)

Near Hari Hareshwar Temple, N.H.No. 06, VYARA, Dist. Tapi.

Mo. : 98251 46249, Phone : 02626-220302, Fax. : 223335.

E-mail : blackstoneassociation@gmail.com

Ref. No.

Date : / /202

		1.88.18 HA)		
✓ 18.	46/2025	MUKESH QUARRY WORKS 1.44.68 Hect	501507	
✓ 19.	49/2025	MUKESH QUARRY WORKS (1.00.00 Ha) Survey No. 148/9	501598	
✓ 20.	48/2025	MUKESH QUARRY WORKS (1.00 HA) S.NO. 148 Lagu mahi river bed	501581	
✓ 21.	68/2025	MUKESH QUARRY WORKS 1.00.00Hect	501520	
✓ 22.	72/2025	mukesh quarry works (Lease Area : 3.00.00 Ha)	500605	
✓ 23.	70/2025	MUKESH QUARRY WORKS (2.00 Ha)	501548	
✓ 24.	34/2025	Jai Sainath Quarry Works (1 Hac.)	497494	
✓ 25.	36/2025	Jai Sainath Quarry Works (3.62.91 Hac.)	497519	
✓ 26.	92/2025	PARMAR RAYJIBHAI LAXMANBHAI	503139	
✓ 27.	93/2025	Vikrambhai B. Parmar & Shri Jitendrasinh B. Jadeja	504641	
✓ 28.	67/2025	UMIYA QUARRY WORKS (1.00.00 HAC.)	496671	
✓ 29.	97/2025	Thakor Gopalbhai Kalubhai	504384	
✓ 30.	83/2025	SHIVA QUARRY WORKS Area-00.65.56	497572	
✓ 31.	121/2025	HIMANSHU RAMNIKLAL SHAH (2.56.00 Ha)	501104	
✓ 32.	120/2025	Himanshu Ramniklal Shah (3.00.00 Hac.)	501173	
✓ 33.	98/2025	Rajnikant Amrutlal Patel Lease Area- 01.00.00Hect	504088	
✓ 34.	96/2025	Vishnubhai A Patel	502925	
✓ 35.	95/2025	Rajnikant Amrutlal Patel 0.75 Ha	503702	
✓ 36.	94/2025	Parsotamdas Devsibhai Patel	503114	



GUJARAT BLACKSTONE QUARRY INDUSTRIES ASSOCIATION

Reg. No. : Guj.391/F.607 NAV

President : **Hitendrabhai S. Upadhyay**
(Kalubhai Karpel)

Near Hari Hareshwar Temple, N.H.No. 06, VYARA, Dist. Tapi.

Mo. : 98251 46249, Phone : 02626-220302, Fax. : 223335.

E-mail : blackstoneassociation@gmail.com

Ref. No.

Date : / /202

AUTHORIZATION LETTER

Date: 08/09/2025

9

To,
The Member Secretary,
State Environment Impact Assessment Authority (SEIAA),
Sector-10/A, Paryavaran Bhavan,
Gandhinagar – 382010.

Subject: Authorization to Represent in SEIAA Hearing

Respected Sir/Madam,

We all Lease Holder / Project Proponent, hereby authorize our **Advocate Mr. Saurabh Kulkarni and Mr. Prasant Bhat**, and **Technical Adviser Mr. Zalak Savliya**, to remain present and represent on my behalf in the hearing scheduled before the Hon'ble Committee of SEIAA on **09.09.2025 at 15:00 hrs** at SEIAA office, Gandhinagar, in compliance with Hon'ble NGT Order dated 28.07.2025

They are fully authorized to provide clarifications, and represent me in all respects during the said hearing.

I request you to kindly permit them to appear and represent on my behalf.

Thanking you,

Yours faithfully,

Sr. No	Appel No.	Name Of Lease Holder	Proposal No	Sign
1.	88/2025	Shreysh quarry works 0.60.00 Ha	502220	
2.	94/2025	Parsetamdas Devsibhai Patel	503114	
3.	87/2025	SHIVA QUARRY WORKS Area-1.00.00	497577	
4.	85/2025	SHIVA QUARRY WORKS Area-4.00.00	497586	
5.	84/2025	Ekta Metals	498821	
6.	69/2025	Shree Ram Quarry.C/O Kiransinh Natvarsinh	498662	
7.	86/2025	Kashyap Quarry Works Area-1.00.00	497605	
8.	90/2025	kashyap Quarry 2.0 Ha	497625	
9.	43/2025	Hasmukhlal M shah (1. 00 Ha)	505097	



GUJARAT BLACKSTONE QUARRY INDUSTRIES ASSOCIATION

Reg. No. : Guj.391/F.607 NAV

President : **Hitendrabhai S. Upadhyay**
(Kalubhai Karpet)

Near Hari Hareshwar Temple, N.H.No. 06, VYARA, Dist. Taol.

Mo. : 98251 46249, Phone : 02626-220302, Fax. : 223335.

E-mail : blackstoneassociation@gmail.com

Ref. No.

Date : / /202

10.	101/2025	M/s. Sainath Stone Quarry	501412	
11.	103/2025	M/s. Jay Jalaram Stone Quarry	501402	