

Supreme Court of India

M.C. Mehta vs Union Of India (Uoi) And Ors. on 18 November, 1997

Equivalent citations: (1998) 9 SCC 589

Bench: J Verma, B Kirpal, V Khare

ORDER

1. The urgency for protection and improvement of the environment etc. has not been doubted for a long time. After the Stockholm Conference, 1972, in India several legislative steps have been taken for implementation of the programme. In addition to Article 47 in Part IV of the Constitution which imposes a duty on the State to improve the public health mentioned as one of the primary duties. Article 48A was inserted by the Constitution (42nd Amendment) Act, 1976 with effect from 3-1-1977 expressly to the effect that "the State shall endeavour to protect and improve the environment and to safeguard the forests and wildlife of the country". Thereafter, the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986 (the Act) was enacted to provide for the protection and improvement of the environment and for matters connected therewith. The Statement of Objects and Reasons emphasises the world-wide concern over the decline in environmental quality and the urgency of steps required for the protection and improvement of the environment. It is clear that the possibility of any deterioration in the environmental quality was excluded and emphasis at the minimum was on protection with the endeavour to improve the then existing state of environmental quality. Any further decline in the environmental quality at least after the enactment of the Act is undoubtedly a failure to perform this obligation by the State, contrary to the constitutional scheme.

2. It cannot be disputed by anyone that there has been considerable further decline in the environmental quality even after enactment of the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986, notwithstanding the resolve to prevent which the constitutional amendment was given effect to by enactment of the statute.

3. Even a cursory perusal of the provisions of the enactment reveal the emphasis on the need for not mere protection but also improvement of the environmental quality. The definitions including that of "environment" in Section 2 of the Act, the extent of the powers of the Central Government in Section 3 and the further power to give directions in Section 5 are alone sufficient to indicate the high degree of duty imposed on the State for which large powers are given to enable discharge of that duty. We may refer in particular to Sub-section (3) of Section 3 which confers powers on the Central Government to constitute an authority or authorities considered necessary or expedient by it for the purposes of this Act and the further power to give directions under Section 5.

4. In spite of a number of matters, including this writ petition of 1985 having been brought in the Court as PIL, the required attention does not appear to have been paid by the authorities concerned to take the steps necessary for discharge of this duty imposed on the State by the provisions mentioned above except for the enactment of the said statute. The least which ought to have been done in this direction was to constitute a high-power committee at the national level of eminent persons and to ensure Constitution of similar authorities at the State level in exercise of the power given by Sub-section (3) of Section 3 of the Act to ensure that the object of the enactment was duly served. The several aspects of the environment which this Court is required to deal with in this writ

petition are all covered not merely by the general provisions in Sub-section (1) of Section 3 but also by the specific matters specified in Sub-section (2) thereof. It is only on account of the absence of the authority/authorities contemplated under Subsection (3) of Section 3 that this Court is required to deal with these matters in this writ petition and several other similar writ petitions pending in this Court, in addition to those which are pending in different High Courts. It is also a matter of concern that notwithstanding the pendency of these matters in this Court for so long no steps have been taken as yet by the Central Government for the Constitution of the authority/authorities contemplated by Sub-section (3) of Section 3 so that even now these matters can be taken care of by the authorities intended for the purpose.

5. It is undoubtedly a matter of universal concern that the quality of the environment continues to deteriorate even now. Any further delay in the performance of its duty by the Central Government cannot, therefore, be permitted. Suitable directions by the Court to require performance of its duty by the Central Government is mandated by the law and have, therefore, now to be given. We consider it appropriate that before issuing such directions, the Central Government should be given one more opportunity to indicate all the measures taken by it so far for discharge of the duty enjoined on it by the above provisions in Part IV of the Constitution and the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986.

6. It need hardly be added that the duty cast on the State under Articles 47 and 48A in particular of Part IV of the Constitution is to be read as conferring a corresponding right on the citizens and, therefore, the right under Article 21 at least must be read to include the same within its ambit. At this point of time, the effect of the quality of the environment on the life of the inhabitants is much too obvious to require any emphasis or elaboration.

7. We may also add that the Central Government in addition to stating all the steps taken so far, as indicated above, must also place before the Court the national policy, if any, drawn up in this behalf for the protection and improvement of the environment and the steps it proposes to take to restore the quality of the environment at least to the level at which it existed in 1977 together with the time-frame for the implementation of the programme. These particulars be furnished on the affidavit of the Secretary, Ministry of Environment and Forests, Government of India.