

BEFORE THE NATIONAL GREEN TRIBUNAL
WESTERN ZONE BENCH, PUNE

APPEAL NO. 318 OF 2025 (WZ)

BOOK NO. - 04 -
PAGE NO. - 163 -
SR. NO. - 553 -
DATE 04/11/2025


NILESH R. PANDYA
NOTARY
GOVT. OF INDIA
- 4 NOV 2025

IN THE MATTER OF:

USHA QUARRY WORKS -

PARTNER DINESHKUMAR JALAMBHAI CHAUDHARY

... APPELLANT

VERSUS

STATE ENVIRONMENT IMPACT
ASSESSMENT AUTHORITY & ANR.

... RESPONDENT

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

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/BANSKANTHA/EC/1(a)/B2/2018/2565 on dated 25/06/2018, granted by District Environment Impact Assessment Authority (DEIAA), BANASKANTHA 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, 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 near a public road, 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."

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

8



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 road or bridge or monument 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	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.

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

8/

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 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 road for mining with blasting and 100 meters from road 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

07

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 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

01

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.

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

82

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 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,

87

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 different distance limitation from public road.

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.

87

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

8

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.

6E. Road and Building Department, Government of Gujarat has given a certificate stating that the road is built primarily for ingress and egress to the mining area and/or that the road is a private road.

6E.1 Reliance has been placed by the appellants on some documents authored by the Roads and Building Department, Government of Gujarat which say that the road is constructed primarily for allowing entry and exit to the mining area. Each of these certificates bear a date which is subsequent to the order of rejection of the environmental clearance by the SEIAA. These certificates were not obtained and/or produced at the time of making the application for reappraisal. Be that as it may, SEIAA has examined these documents. Most of the certificates do not state, much less expressly, that the road is not a public road. The certificates do not declare the road to be a private road, built by the appellant(s) over their leased land. Without exception, each road taken into consideration by SEIAA travels beyond the boundary of the lease area. Furthermore, the road does not start at the mining pit and end at the stone crushing unit of the appellant(s) or any other person where the mined mineral is being transported by the appellant(s). The road covers larger distance and connects different places, most of which do not fall within the transport route and which otherwise do not concern the appellant(s). In some cases, the certificate mentions that the road is a private road; however, the appellant(s) has not been able to produce any documentary material to show or suggest the right acquired by him in the land of other persons over or through which the so-called private road passes. Also, no material is produced by the appellant(s) to establish, even *prima facie*, that the said road has been built by him with his own funds and that it is meant for and is actually used exclusively by the appellant(s) for accessing the mining area. On the contrary, there is plethora of material available indicating that the road is used by

members of the public freely and that no permission has been obtained or is required to be obtained from the appellant(s) for use of the said road. Most of these roads find mention in the village record as village roads or panchayat roads, which otherwise do not fall within the administrative purview of the Roads and Building Department, Government of Gujarat.

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 RR-1.
9. I submit that the environment clearance granted by DEIAA to the appellant(s) permitted appellant(s) to undertake mining activity in an 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 Tamb
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 Tamb
DEPONENT



IDENTIFIED BY ME


SOLEMNLY AFFIRMED BEFORE ME

ADVOCATE/PERSON
NAME: *Nilesh R. Pandya*
D.O.B.: *04/11/25*
DATE: *04/11/25*

Nilesh R. Pandya
NILESH R. PANDYA
NOTARY
GOVT. OF INDIA

- 4 NOV 2025

- 4 NOV 2025



APPEAL **258** NO. 318/2025

To,
The Member Secretary,
State Environment Impact Assessment Authority (SEIAA),
Gujarat Pollution Control Board,
"Paryavaran Bhavan", Sector-10 A,
Gandhinagar - 382010, Gujarat.

Subject: Representation pursuant to the Order dated 28.07.2025 passed by the Hon'ble National Green Tribunal, Western Zone Bench, Pune in the matter of M/s Dineshkumar Jalambhai Chaudhary Vs State Environment Impact Assessment Authority, Gujarat & Ors

Reference: Order dated 28.07.2025 passed by the Hon'ble National Green Tribunal, Western Zone Bench, Pune

Respected Sir/Madam,

This is to inform you that the Hon'ble National Green Tribunal, Western Zone Bench, Pune has heard the above-mentioned matter and passed an order dated 28.07.2025. In its order, the Hon'ble Tribunal has directed the State Environment Impact Assessment Authority (SEIAA), Gujarat to provide an opportunity of hearing to the lease holders.

In view of the above, we respectfully request you to grant us a personal hearing and kindly take on record all the documents submitted in relation to the matter.

We are enclosing herewith the list of appeals that were heard on 28.07.2025 for your ready reference.

We look forward to your kind cooperation and early action in the matter.

Thanking you,



Yours sincerely,



[Usha Quarry Works Partner Dineshkumar Jalambhai Chaudhary]

[Survey No. 61 Paiki, At – Jashvantgad, Ta – Danta, Dist – Banaskantha, 9427085912]

[Date – 01/09/2025, Email Id - ushaquarryworks@gmail.com]

Enclosure:

- NGT Court Order
- DEIAA EC
- SEIAA Rejection Letter
- New Mining Plan Submission Copy
- Approved DSR



8/19