

**IN THE HON'BLE NATIONAL GREEN TRIBUNAL
(PRINCIPAL BENCH AT NEW DELHI)**

IN O.A. No. 739 of 2023

Environment Protection Society (Regd.) and Anr.
...Applicants.

Versus

Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, Govt. of
India & Ors.
...Respondents.

Written submissions in brief:

1. The main issue for adjudication before this hon'ble NGT is evaluating the value of live full grown green trees.
2. The respondent no. 5 (DFO) has equated the live full grown green tree to a dead and dried tree.
3. The evaluation of value of live full grown green tree is at page no. 206 of the paperbook including the valuation as evaluated by ICFRE (Govt. of India). Certain services rendered by the live full grown green tree have not been included by various authorities as per comparative chart at page 206.
4. Point No. 6(iii) at page 312 is important for consideration of hon'ble tribunal. We strongly oppose the widening of roads by 1.5 feet of metalled portion as it will result in genocide of at least 30,000 live fully grown trees
5. It was observed by Hon'ble Supreme Court in its Order dated 25.03.2025 in Writ Petition (Civil) No. 13381/1984 titled as M.C. Mehta Versus Union of India & ors. in para

no. 15 that:

“It will take a minimum of 100 years to again re-generate or recreate the green cover created by 454 trees which were brazenly cut without permission of this Court.”

6. Sir, your lordship had raised one query on the last date of hearing that if cost of a piece of land is Rs.20 lakhs and one tree which is standing on that piece of land whose cost is Rs.1 crore then for how much that land would be sold.

To this query, I have the following submissions:

The cost of land on which live trees are standing will increase manifold than barren land. GMADA has paid Rs.137 crore as compensation by showing plantation of guava trees on land by increasing the value of land manifold. The case is before the hon'ble courts as allegedly the guava trees were not standing on that land.

Note: I tender unconditional apology for mentioning it in my submissions as this issue is separate from adjudication matter.

7. FIRSTLY, our main submission is that it is not appropriate to consider only wood value of a fully grown green live tree but its environmental value has to be taken into consideration. SECONDLY, the money must be deposited in green fund which has to be used for re-

plantation in the same area from where trees have been cut. It is not a penalty but a fund to maintain and protect environmental balance in that area.

8. It is further being pointed out that for carving out new sectors, plantation is done by the authorities in new sectors as part of their development. But Respondent No. 6, i.e. GMADA has claimed in point no. 10 at page 83-84 that they have already planted trees in the vicinity of axed trees. This claim is totally false because the claimed plantation was part of development of new sectors. Moreover, Urban Forest (Sector 97) is part of previous plans. **But GMADA has falsely claimed that plantations have been done in lieu of axed trees in their vicinity.**

Place: Mohali
Date: 14.07.2025

Submitted by



**(SHRI KANT RATTAN)
ADVOCATE
COUNSEL FOR THE APPLICANTS**

SHRI KANT RATTAN
Advocate
Punjab & Haryana High Court, Chd.