

**Noble M. Paikada**

v.

**Union of India**

(Civil Appeal Nos. 1628-1629 of 2021)

21 March 2024

**[Abhay S. Oka\* and Sanjay Karol, JJ.]**

**Issue for Consideration**

Item 6 in the impugned notification which granted exemption from requirement of prior Environmental Clearance (EC) for extraction or sourcing or borrowing of ordinary earth for the linear projects such as roads, pipelines, etc., if provided a blanket exemption which was arbitrary and violative of Article 14 of the Constitution of India.

**Headnotes**

**Environment (Protection) Act, 1986 – Environment (Protection) Rules, 1986 – r.5(4) – Constitution of India – Articles 14, 21**  
– First EC notification provided that certain projects falling under categories set out in the Schedule thereto would require prior EC from the concerned Regulatory Authority – Second EC notification was issued adding Appendix-IX to the first EC notification, providing for exemption to specific categories of projects from the requirement of obtaining EC – Impugned notification substituted Appendix-IX which provided that prior EC will not be required *inter alia* for item 6 i.e. for extraction or sourcing or borrowing of ordinary earth for the linear projects such as roads, pipelines, etc. – Challenge to – NGT held that the exemption u/item 6 should strike a balance and directed Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change to revisit the impugned notification – Review theragainst also dismissed:

**Held:** Before the issue of the second EC notification by which Appendix-IX was incorporated, the procedure of inviting objections to the draft notification was followed, and the objections were considered – There was no reason to dispense with this important requirement before publishing the impugned notification – Article 21 guarantees right to live in a pollution-free environment – Citizens have a fundamental duty to protect and improve the

\* Author

**Digital Supreme Court Reports**

environment – Therefore, the participation of the citizens is very important and is taken care of by allowing them to raise objections to the proposed notification – Citizens being major stakeholders in environmental matters, their participation cannot be prevented by casually exercising the power under sub-rule (4) of r.5 – No document recording the satisfaction of the competent authority about the existence of public interest and the nature of the public interest was produced by the Ministry – The drastic decision to invoke sub-rule (4) of r.5 was made without any application of the mind – Hence, the decision-making process was vitiated – Impugned notification was issued two days after the nationwide lockdown was imposed due to the COVID-19 pandemic – At that time, the work of linear projects, such as roads, pipelines, etc., had come to a grinding halt – So, there was no tearing hurry to modify the EC notifications – Inclusion of item 6 of the substituted Appendix-IX illegal – Further, there was no specification about the quantum of ordinary earth which can be extracted on the basis of the exemption – “Linear projects” were not defined – Without the definition, it is difficult to imagine which projects will be termed linear projects – The term “linear projects” is very vague – The process to be adopted for excavation was also not set out – Thus, item 6 is a case of completely unguided and blanket exemption, which is *per se*, arbitrary and violative of Article 14 – There is no provision for setting up an authority which will decide whether a particular linear project is covered by item 6 – No steps taken to revisit item 6 of the impugned notification, as directed – Notwithstanding the specific directions issued in the impugned judgment, no safeguards were provided, such as laying down processes, the mode and the manner of excavation and quantum – Item 6 of the substituted Appendix-IX forming part of the impugned notification and item 6 of the amended impugned notification (issued during the pendency of the present appeals), struck down and quashed. [Paras 22-25, 28, 31, 32]

**Environment (Protection) Act, 1986 – s.3 – Power of Central Government to take measures to protect and improve environment – Environment (Protection) Rules, 1986 – r.5 – Prohibition and Restriction on the location of industries and the carrying on processes and operations in different areas:**

**Held:** s.3 of the EP Act must be read with r.5 of the EP Rules – r.5 has been enacted to give effect to clause (v) of sub-section

## Noble M. Paikada v. Union of India

(2) of s.3 of the EP Act, which empowers the Central Government to put restrictions on the areas in which industries, operations or processes shall not be carried out or shall be carried out subject to certain safeguards – Further, Sub-rule (4) of r.5 empowers the Central Government to dispense with the requirement of publication of notice under sub-rule (3) of r.5 when it appears to the Central Government that it is in the public interest to do so – Thus, sub-rule (4) of r.5 is an exception to sub-rule (3) – The exception can be invoked only on the grounds of public interest. [Paras 15, 19]

### Case Law Cited

*Deepak Kumar & Ors. v. State of Haryana & Ors.* [\[2012\]](#)

[4 SCR 819](#) : (2012) 4 SCC 629; *Hanuman Laxman*

*Aroskar v. Union of India* [\[2019\]](#) 5 SCR 916 : (2019)

15 SCC 401 – referred to.

### List of Acts

Environment (Protection) Act, 1986; Constitution of India; Mines and Minerals (Development and Regulation) Act, 1957.

### List of Keywords

Environmental Clearance; Prior Environmental Clearance; Environmental Clearance notification; Blanket exemption; Regulatory Authority; Linear projects.

### Case Arising From

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION: Civil Appeal Nos.1628-1629 of 2021

From the Judgment and Order dated 28.10.2020 of the National Green Tribunal, New Delhi in OA No. 190 of 2020

### Appearances for Parties

Ms. Anitha Shenoy, Sr. Adv., Ms. Nishtha Kumar, Vanshdeep Dalmia, Ms. Ayushma Awasthi, Ms. Namrata Sarah Caleb, Ms. Pariksha, Advs. for the Appellant.

Ms. Aishwarya Bhati, A.S.G., Gurmeet Singh Makker, Ms. Swarupama Chaturvedi, Ms. Ruchi Kohli, Ms. Shradha Deshmukh, Madhav Sinhal, Advs. for the Respondent.

**Digital Supreme Court Reports****Judgment / Order of the Supreme Court****Judgment**

**Abhay S. Oka, J.**

**FACTUAL ASPECTS**

1. These appeals take exception to the judgment and order dated 28<sup>th</sup> October 2020 (for short, 'the impugned judgment') passed by the National Green Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi (for short, 'the NGT'). There is also a challenge to the order dated 24<sup>th</sup> December 2020, by which, the NGT rejected the review petition filed by the appellant for seeking review of the impugned judgment.
2. A notification was issued on 14<sup>th</sup> September 2006 (for short, 'the first EC notification') by the Ministry of Environment and Forests (for short, 'MoEF') in exercise of powers under sub-section (1) and clause (v) of sub-section (2) of Section 3 of the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986 (for short, 'the EP Act') read with clause (d) of sub-rule (3) of Rule 5 of the Environment (Protection) Rules, 1986 (for short, 'the EP Rules'). Clause 2 of the first EC notification is material, which reads thus:

**"2. Requirements of prior Environmental Clearance (EC):-**

**(EC):-** The following projects or activities shall require prior environmental clearance from the concerned regulatory authority, which shall hereinafter referred to be as the Central Government in the Ministry of Environment and Forests for matters falling under Category 'A' in the Schedule and at State level the State Environment Impact Assessment Authority (SEIAA) for matters falling under Category 'B' in the said Schedule, before any construction work, or preparation of land by the project management except for securing the land, is started on the project or activity:

- (i) All new projects or activities listed in the Schedule to this notification;
- ii) Expansion and modernization of existing projects or activities listed in the Schedule to this notification with addition of capacity beyond the limits specified for the concerned sector, that is, projects or activities which

**Noble M. Paikada v. Union of India**

- cross the threshold limits given in the Schedule, after expansion or modernization;
- (iii) Any change in product – mix in an existing manufacturing unit included in Schedule beyond the specified range.”
3. The notification provided that the projects falling under categories A and B set out in the Schedule to the notification will require prior Environmental Clearance (EC) from the concerned Regulatory Authority. The Regulatory Authorities for different projects have been named in clause (2) of the first EC notification. For the A category, the Central Government in the MoEF was named as the Regulatory Authority. For projects in the B category, the State Environment Impact Assessment Authority (for short, ‘SEIAA’) was named as the Regulatory Authority. Various procedural aspects regarding applying for a grant of EC, its processing, etc., have been incorporated in the first EC notification. There were subsequent modifications to the first EC notification. Another notification was issued on 15<sup>th</sup> January 2016 (for short, ‘the second EC notification’), by which the first EC notification was partly modified. Clause 7B and Appendix-IX were added to the first EC notification, providing for an exemption to specific categories of projects from the requirement of obtaining EC. Item 6 in the said Appendix-IX reads thus:

**“Appendix-IX**

**Exemption of certain cases from requirement of Environmental Clearance**

The following cases shall not require prior environmental clearance, namely:

- .....  
.....  
.....
6. Dredging and de-silting of dams, reservoirs, weirs, barrages, river, and canals for the purpose of their maintenance, upkeep and disaster management.
- ”

Though the NGT struck down a part of the second EC notification, Appendix-IX was not touched.

**Digital Supreme Court Reports**

4. In the Original Application subject matter of these appeals, the challenge before the NGT was to the notification dated 28<sup>th</sup> March 2020 (for short, ‘the impugned notification’), which modified earlier EC notifications. Appendix IX to the second EC notification provided for exempting certain cases from the requirement of obtaining EC. By the impugned notification, Appendix-IX was substituted. The substituted Appendix-IX provided that the prior EC will not be required in the thirteen cases set out therein. We are concerned with items 6 and 7 of the substituted Appendix-IX, which read thus:

**“Appendix-IX**

**Exemption of certain cases from requirement of Environmental Clearance:** The following cases shall not require Prior Environmental Clearance, namely:-

.....

.....

6. Extraction or sourcing or borrowing of ordinary earth for the linear projects such as roads, pipelines, etc.

7. Dredging and de-silting of dams, reservoirs, weirs, barrages, river and canals for the purpose of their maintenance, upkeep and disaster management.

.....”

Thus, item 6 in Appendix IX of the second EC notification was maintained but was renumbered as item 7. Item 6 was newly added.

5. Before we go into the challenge to the impugned notification, we must note here that items 6 and 7 were substituted by further notification dated 30<sup>th</sup> August 2023 (for short, ‘amended impugned notification’) issued during the pendency of these appeals. Substituted items 6 and 7 in the amended impugned notification read thus:

“6. Extraction or sourcing or borrowing of ordinary earth for the linear projects such as roads, pipelines, etc. shall be subject to the compliance of standard operating procedures and environmental safeguards issued in this regard from time to time.

7. Dredging and de-silting of dams, reservoirs, weirs, barrages, river and canals for the purpose of their

**Noble M. Paikada v. Union of India**

maintenance, upkeep and disaster management shall be subject to the compliance of environmental safeguards issued in this regard from time to time.”

6. The impugned notification was challenged on several grounds before the NGT by filing the Original Application subject matter of these appeals. Apart from other grounds, it was contended that the impugned notification violated the directions issued by this Court in the case of *Deepak Kumar & Ors. v. State of Haryana & Ors*<sup>1</sup>. Even the ground that the impugned notification was arbitrary and violative of Article 14 of the Constitution of India was invoked. We must note that in the Original Application, the specific challenge was only to item 6 of the impugned notification.
7. By the impugned judgment, it was held that the exemption under item 6 should strike a balance. The finding recorded on this aspect in paragraph 8 of the impugned judgment reads thus:

“8. The second issue is exemption from requirement of EC for extraction or sourcing or borrowing of ordinary earth for the linear projects such as roads, pipelines, etc and for dredging and de-silting of dams, reservoirs, weirs, barrages, river and canals for the purpose of their maintenance, upkeep and disaster management. **It is possible to take a view that the EC can be exempted for these situations on account of assessment already made or for extraction of earth for linear project but such blanket exemption must be balanced by sustainable development concept. The exemption should strike balance and instead of being blanket exemption, it needs to be hedged by appropriate safeguards such as the process of excavation and quantum. Similarly, in respect of item 7, safeguards are required to be incorporated in terms of disposal of dredged material. These aspects are not shown to have been considered and the reply does not provide any explanation thereon.** Learned counsel for the MoEFCC is also unable to provide any justification why these aspects be not addressed and incorporated in the

1 [2012] 4 SCR 819 : (2012) 4 SCC 629

**Digital Supreme Court Reports**

notification for ensuring sustainable development concept which is required to be enforced by this Tribunal under section 20 read with section 15 of the NGT Act, 2010.”

(emphasis added)

Accordingly, the Original Application was disposed of by directing the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change (for short, ‘MoEF&CC’) to revisit the impugned notification within three months. An application for review was filed, which was dismissed by the second impugned order dated 24<sup>th</sup> December 2020.

8. Notice was ordered to be issued on 13<sup>th</sup> December 2021 on the appeals. On 10<sup>th</sup> August 2023, submissions were heard, and the judgment was reserved. After the judgment was reserved, the respondent-Union of India filed an affidavit of Dr Sujit Kumar Bajpayee, Joint Secretary, MoEF&CC, dated 12<sup>th</sup> September 2023. Along with the affidavit, two documents were also filed on record. The first document was the Office Memorandum dated 21<sup>st</sup> August 2023 issued by the MoEF&CC, purportedly laying down the enforcement mechanism for items 6 and 7 in the impugned notification. The second document brought on record was the amended impugned notification. In view of the issuance of the amended impugned notification, even after the verdict was reserved, the parties were permitted to make further submissions on the legality and validity of the amended impugned notification.

**SUBMISSIONS**

9. The learned senior counsel appearing for the appellant submitted that the object of the EP Act is to provide for the protection and improvement of the environment. She invited our attention to Section 3 of the EP Act, which confers a power on the Central Government to take such measures as it deems necessary or expedient for protecting and improving the quality of the environment and preventing and abating environmental pollution. She pointed out that the first EC notification was issued in the exercise of powers conferred under sub-section (1) and clause (v) of sub-section (2) of Section 3 of the EP Act. Clause (v) empowers the Central Government to take measures for restrictions of the areas, in which any industries, operations or processes or class of industries, operations or processes shall not be carried out or shall be carried out subject to certain safeguards. She

**Noble M. Paikada v. Union of India**

also invited our attention to the EP Rules and, in particular, Rule 5 thereof. It lays down that the Central Government may consider the factors set out in sub-rule (1) while prohibiting or restricting the location of industries and carrying out operations and processes in different areas. She pointed out that before issuing the first EC notification, the process laid down in sub-rule (3) of Rule 5 was followed.

10. The learned senior counsel invited our attention to a decision of this Court in the case of *Hanuman Laxman Aroskar v. Union of India*<sup>2</sup>. She also relied upon a decision of this Court in the case of *Deepak Kumar*<sup>1</sup>. She pointed out that as a result of item 6, there will not be any regulation of the extraction of ordinary earth for utilisation in linear projects, such as, roads, pipelines, etc. She submitted that such a blanket exemption will defeat the very object of enacting the EP Act and, in particular, Section 3 thereof. She submitted that the decision of this Court in the case of *Deepak Kumar*<sup>1</sup> and subsequent decisions mandated that there must be a requirement to obtain EC for the minor minerals pertaining to materials used for linear projects. The learned senior counsel submitted that allowing the extraction of the earth in such an indiscriminate manner is wholly arbitrary and violative of Article 14 of the Constitution of India.
11. Inviting our attention to the amended impugned notification, the learned senior counsel pointed out that the substituted item 6 provides that extraction of ordinary earth for linear projects shall be subject to compliance with the Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) and safeguards issued in this regard from time to time. Thus, the exemption remains. However, an SOP will be laid down to avail the exemption. She urged that the substituted item 6 is more arbitrary.
12. The learned senior counsel also pointed out that the whole issue was directed to be reconsidered under the impugned judgment. But nothing has been placed on record to show that the Central Government made reconsideration in true letter and spirit.
13. The learned senior counsel pointed out that the decision of this Court in the case of *Deepak Kumar*<sup>1</sup> still holds the field, which directs that the leases of minor minerals, including their renewal for an area less than 5 hectares, shall be granted by the States/

**Digital Supreme Court Reports**

Union territories only after getting EC. She submitted that the impugned notification and the amended impugned notification, insofar as item 6 is concerned, are completely contrary to the directions issued by this Court in *Deepak Kumar*<sup>1</sup>. She also urged that before publishing the draft of the impugned notification, objections to the draft notification were not invited. She submits that this action contravenes the provisions of sub-rule (3) of Rule 5 of the EP Rules.

14. The learned Additional Solicitor General appearing on behalf of the respondent – Union of India, submitted that in view of the insertion of Section 8B in the Mines and Minerals (Development and Regulation) Act, 1957 (for short, ‘the MMDR Act’), the amendment to the first EC notification was required to be made. Our attention was invited to Section 8B, incorporated on 13<sup>th</sup> March 2020 and amended Section 8B, effective from 28<sup>th</sup> March 2021. She submits that the provisions of the first EC notification must conform with the amended provisions of the MMDR Act, and therefore, the amendments were necessitated. She also pointed out that in terms of the impugned order, the matter was placed before the Expert Appraisal Committee (EAC), non-coal mining and EAC, MoEF&CC and others in a meeting. Thereafter, the issue was deliberated in the meeting convened on 30<sup>th</sup> June 2022 under the chairmanship of the Joint Secretary of the concerned department. She invited our attention to the minutes of the said meeting held on 30<sup>th</sup> June 2022. She submitted that the ultimate endeavour is to uphold the principles of sustainable development. Relying upon the amended impugned notification, she submitted that now the exemption granted by items 6 and 7 cannot be said to be arbitrary, and it will be subject to compliance with the SOP issued on this behalf from time to time. Therefore, safeguards have been introduced, and the exemption is not blanket. She also pointed out that the Office Memorandum dated 21<sup>st</sup> August 2023 takes care of the safeguards. It was also submitted that the grant of exemption from the first EC notification is a matter of policy for the Central Government and no interference be called for with policy matters.

**CONSIDERATION OF SUBMISSIONS**

15. We have carefully considered the submissions. The EP Act was brought into force on 19<sup>th</sup> November 1986. The statement of objects and reasons of the EP Act specifically refers to the

**Noble M. Paikada v. Union of India**

substantive decline in environmental quality due to increasing pollution, loss of vegetal cover, etc. It also notes the growing risk of environmental accidents and threats to life support systems. It refers to the decisions taken at the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment held in Stockholm in June 1972. In the said Conference, the world communities resolved to protect and enhance the environmental quality. Clause (3) of the statement of objects and reasons reads thus:

**"(3) In view of what has been stated above, there is urgent need for the enactment of a general legislation on environmental protection which inter alia, should enable co-ordination of activities of the various regulatory agencies, creation of an authority or authorities with advocate powers for environmental protection, regulation of discharge of environmental pollutants and handling of hazardous substances, speedy response in the event of accidents threatening environment and deterrent punishment to those who endanger human environment, safety and health."**

(emphasis added)

Even from the preamble of the EP Act, it is apparent that the object is to provide protection to the environment and to improve the environment. Section 3 of the EP Act confers power on the Central Government to take measures to protect and improve the environment. Sub-sections (1) and (2) of Section 3 read thus:

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

- (1) Subject to the provisions of this Act, the Central Government, shall have the power to take all such measures as it deems necessary or expedient for the purpose of protecting and improving the quality of the environment and preventing controlling and abating environmental pollution.**
- (2) In particular, and without prejudice to the generality of the provisions of sub-section (1), such measures may include measures with**

**Digital Supreme Court Reports**

**respect to all or any of the following matters,  
namely:--**

- (i) co-ordination of actions by the State Governments, officers and other authorities--
  - (a) under this Act, or the rules made thereunder, or
  - (b) under any other law for the time being in force which is relatable to the objects of this Act;
- (ii) planning and execution of a nation-wide programme for the prevention, control and abatement of environmental pollution;
- (iii) laying down standards for the quality of environment in its various aspects;
- (iv) laying down standards for emission or discharge of environmental pollutants from various sources whatsoever: Provided that different standards for emission or discharge may be laid down under this clause from different sources having regard to the quality or composition of the emission or discharge of environmental pollutants from such sources;
- (v) **restriction of areas in which any industries, operations or processes or class of industries, operations or processes shall not be carried out or shall be carried out subject to certain safeguards;**
- (vi) laying down procedures and safeguards for the prevention of accidents which may cause environmental pollution and remedial measures for such accidents;
- (vii) laying down procedures and safeguards for the handling of hazardous substances;
- (viii) examination of such manufacturing processes, materials and substances as are likely to cause environmental pollution;

**Noble M. Paikada v. Union of India**

- (ix) carrying out and sponsoring investigations and research relating to problems of environmental pollution;
- (x) inspection of any premises, plant, equipment, machinery, manufacturing or other processes, materials or substances and giving, by order, of such directions to such authorities, officers or persons as it may consider necessary to take steps for the prevention, control and abatement of environmental pollution;
- (xi) establishment or recognition of environmental laboratories and institutes to carry out the functions entrusted to such environmental laboratories and institutes under this Act;
- (xii) collection and dissemination of information in respect of matters relating to environmental pollution;
- (xiii) preparation of manuals, codes or guides relating to the prevention, control and abatement of environmental pollution;
- (xiv) such other matters as the Central Government deems necessary or expedient for the purpose of securing the effective implementation of the provisions of this Act.”

(emphasis added)

Section 3 of the EP Act must be read with Rule 5 of the EP Rules. Rule 5 has been enacted to give effect to clause (v) of sub-section (2) of Section 3 of the EP Act, which empowers the Central Government to put restrictions on the areas in which industries, operations or processes shall not be carried out or shall be carried out subject to certain safeguards. Rule 5 of the EP Rules reads thus:

**“5. Prohibition and Restriction on the location of industries and the carrying on processes and operations in different areas.**

- (1) The Central government may take into consideration the following factors while prohibiting or restricting the

**Digital Supreme Court Reports**

location of industries and carrying on of processes and operations in different areas-

- (i) Standards for quality of environment in its various aspects laid down for an area.
  - (ii) The maximum allowable limits of concentration of various environmental pollutants (including noise) for an area.
  - (iii) The likely emission or discharge of environmental pollutants from an industry, process or operation proposed to be prohibited or restricted.
  - (iv) The topographic and climatic features of an area.
  - (v) The biological diversity of the area which, in the opinion of the Central Government needs to be preserved.
  - (vi) Environmentally compatible land use.
  - (vii) Net adverse environmental impact likely to be caused by an industry, process or operation proposed to be prohibited or restricted.
  - (viii) Proximity to a protected area under the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Sites and Remains Act, 1958 or a sanctuary, National Park, game reserve or closed area notified as such under the Wild Life (Protection) Act, 1972 or places protected under any treaty, agreement or convention with any other country or countries or in pursuance of any decision made in any international conference, association or other body.
  - (ix) Proximity to human settlements.
  - (x) Any other factor as may be considered by the Central Government to be relevant to the protection of the environment in an area.
- (2) While prohibiting or restricting the location of industries and carrying on of processes and operations in an area, the Central Government shall follow the procedure hereinafter laid down.**

**Noble M. Paikada v. Union of India**

- (3) (a) Whenever it appears to the Central Government that it is expedient to impose prohibition or restrictions on the locations of an industry or the carrying on of processes and operations in an area, it may by notification in the Official Gazette and in such other manner as the Central Government may deem necessary from time to time, give notice of its intention to do so.
- (b) Every notification under clause (a) shall give a brief description of the area, the industries, operations, processes in that area about which such notification pertains and also specify the reasons for the imposition of prohibition or restrictions on the locations of the industries and carrying on of process or operations in that area.
- (c) Any person interested in filing an objection against the imposition of prohibition or restrictions on carrying on of processes or operations as notified under clause (a) may do so in writing to the Central Government within sixty days from the date of publication of the notification in the Official Gazette.
- (d) The Central Government shall within a period of one hundred and twenty days from the date of publication of the notification in the Official Gazette consider all the objections received against such notification and may within 1 [three hundred and sixty-five days] from such day of publication] impose prohibition or restrictions on location of such industries and the carrying on of any process or operation in an area.
- (4) Notwithstanding anything contained in sub-rule (3), whenever it appears to the Central Government that it is in public interest to do so, it may dispense with the requirement of notice under clause (a) of sub-rule (3)."

(emphasis added)

**Digital Supreme Court Reports****SCOPE OF ADJUDICATION**

**16.** As far as the scope of adjudication in these appeals is concerned, it is necessary to refer to the Original Application no.190 of 2020 filed by the appellant. There were three prayers made in the said Original Application, which read thus:

- "(a) Pass an Order quashing newly inserted Clause 6 of the Impugned Notification dated 28.03.2020 as being violative of Article 14 and 21 of the Constitution of India, ultra vires the provisions of the EPA Act, 1986, the EIA Notification dated 14.09.2006, and in further violation of the Judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the [Deepak Kumar](#) case (supra);
- (b) Pass an appropriate Order quashing the Impugned Notification dated 28.03.2020 as being violative of the principles of Polluter Pay, Non-regression, sustainable development and Precautionary Principle;
- (c) Pass an appropriate Order directing the Respondent not to allow any mining of ordinary earth without a prior environmental clearance."

From the prayers mentioned above in clauses (a) to (c), it is apparent that the specific challenge was to item 6. Regarding clause (b), perhaps the only ground of challenge taken in the application was that no public interest was involved in exercising the power under sub-rule (4) of Rule 5 of the EP Rules for dispensing with public notice.

**17.** After perusal of the impugned judgment, we find that the submissions made by the learned counsel appearing for the appellant before the NGT were not recorded therein. The order dated 29<sup>th</sup> June 2021 passed by this Court in the present appeals is relevant, which reads thus:

"X(name masked), learned senior counsel appearing for the appellant, submits that the learned counsel appearing for the appellant before the National Green Tribunal argued that exemption could not have been granted by the Notification of the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change which has not been considered by the Tribunal. Y(name masked), learned counsel who appeared

**Noble M. Paikada v. Union of India**

before the Tribunal, is directed to file an affidavit that he, in fact, raised this point before the Tribunal during the course of hearing.

List the matter after two weeks.”

The advocate filed an affidavit dated 11<sup>th</sup> December 2021. In paragraph 5(a) of the affidavit, he stated thus:

“5. . . . . . . . . . . .

(a) That the OA No. 190/2020 was listed for hearing before the Hon’ble Tribunal by way of video conferencing on 28.10.2020. On that day the Deponent appeared before the Hon’ble Tribunal and was granted a hearing. **During the course of the hearing the Deponent raised his submissions inter-alia including the fact that the Ministry of Environment and Forests did not have the power to exempt the removal of ordinary earth from the purview of the EIA Notification and that the exemption as granted for the removal of ordinary earth was illegal and ultra vires the Environment Protection Act as well as the judgment of this Hon’ble Court in Deepak Kumar’s Judgment.** It is submitted that the aforesaid point was raised, however the Hon’ble Tribunal did not find merit in the said submission as is evident from the judgment dated 28.10.2020.”

(emphasis added)

Thus, the Advocate-on-Record stated in the affidavit that what was argued before the NGT was the challenge to the exemption granted for the removal of ordinary earth for linear projects. We may note here that item 7 in the substituted Appendix-IX brought on record by the impugned notification was already there as item 6 in Appendix-IX to the second EC notification dated 15<sup>th</sup> January 2016. The appellant did not challenge the notification dated 15th January 2016. Even if we set aside or strike down item 7 regarding dredging/desilting in the impugned notification, it will continue to exist as item 6 in the second EC notification. The second EC notification is not under challenge. Therefore, we restrict the challenge to item 6 in the substituted Appendix-IX to the impugned notification.

**Digital Supreme Court Reports****CHALLENGE TO ITEM 6 IN THE IMPUGNED NOTIFICATION**  
**Failure to follow the procedure prescribed by sub-rule (3) of Rule 5**

18. We have already quoted Rule 5 of the EP Rules. There is no dispute that the first EC notification, the second EC notification and the impugned notification were issued in the exercise of powers under sub-rule (1) of Rule 5 of the EP Rules. Sub-rule (2) of Rule 5 provides that while passing an order prohibiting or restricting the location of industries and carrying on processes and operations, the Central Government shall follow the procedure laid down in Rule 5. Sub-rule (3) of Rule 5 requires the Central Government to publish a notice of its intention to do so in the official Gazette and in such other manner as the Central Government deems fit. Any person interested is entitled to file objections against the proposed prohibition or restriction. The Central Government is required to consider the objections before issuing the final notification. The said procedure was followed before publishing the first EC notification.
19. Sub-rule (4) of Rule 5 empowers the Central Government to dispense with the requirement of publication of notice under sub-rule (3) of Rule 5 when it appears to the Central Government that it is in the public interest to do so. Thus, sub-rule (4) of Rule 5 is an exception to sub-rule (3). The exception can be invoked only on the grounds of public interest.
20. Now, we turn to the impugned notification dated 28<sup>th</sup> March 2020. The recitals of the said notification are important, which read thus:

**“S.O. 1224(E).—WHEREAS**, vide the Mineral Laws (Amendment) Act, 2020 (2 of 2020), the Mines and Minerals (Development and Regulation) Act, 1957 (67 of 1957) (hereinafter referred to as MMDR Act) has been amended with effect from the 10th day of January, 2020 and, inter alia, new section 8B relating to the provisions for transfer of statutory clearances has been inserted;

AND WHEREAS, sub-section (2) of section 8B of the MMDR Act provides that notwithstanding anything contained in this Act or any other law for the time being in force, the successful bidder of mining leases expiring under the provisions of sub-sections (5) and (6) of section 8A and selected through auction as per the procedure provided under this Act and the rules made thereunder,

## **Noble M. Paikada v. Union of India**

shall be deemed to have acquired all valid rights, approvals, clearances, licences and the like vested with the previous lessee for a period of two years;

AND WHEREAS, sub-section (3) of section 8B of the MMDR Act provides that notwithstanding anything contained in any other law for the time being in force, it shall be lawful for the new lessee to continue mining operations on the land, in which mining operations were being carried out by the previous lessee, for a period of two years from the date of commencement of the new lease;

AND WHEREAS, in pursuance of the aforesaid amendment to the MMDR Act, the Central Government deems it necessary to align the relevant provisions of the notification of the Government of India in the erstwhile Ministry of Environment and Forests number S.O. 1533 (E), dated the 14th September, 2006 (hereinafter referred to as the EIA Notification, 2006);

**AND WHEREAS**, the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change is in the receipt of representations for waiver of requirement of prior environmental clearance for borrowing of ordinary earth for roads; and manual extraction of lime shells (dead shell), shrines, etc., within inter tidal zone by the traditional community;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) and clause (v) of sub-section (2) of section 3 of the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986 (29 of 1986), read with sub-rule (4) of rule 5 of the Environment (Protection) Rules, 1986, the Central Government, after having dispensed with the requirement of notice under clause (a) of sub-rule (3) of the rule 5 of the said rules, in public interest, and in supersession of the notification number S.O. 4307(E), dated the 29th November, 2019, hereby makes the following further amendments in the EIA Notification, 2006, namely:-

(emphasis added)

**Digital Supreme Court Reports**

By the impugned notification, after sub-paragraph (2) of paragraph 11 of the first EC notification, sub-paragraph (3) was inserted to give effect to Sections 8A and 8B of the MMDR Act. An entry has been made in the Schedule against Item 1(a) in column (5) for inserting a clause dealing with the evacuation or removal and transportation of already mined out material. Appendix IX, which contains the list of projects exempted from obtaining EC, was substituted by the impugned notification.

21. We have quoted above the recitals of the impugned notification. The first three recitals refer to the necessity of giving effect to Sections 8A and 8B of the MMDR Act. Thereafter, the last recital refers to the Ministry receiving representations for waiver of the requirement of prior EC for borrowing of ordinary earth for roads. After that, without giving any details, it is mentioned that in the public interest, the requirement of publication of notice under sub-rule (3) of Rule 5 was dispensed with. At this stage, we may refer to the relevant ground specifically taken in the Original Application filed by the appellant before the NGT. Ground J was specifically taken on this aspect, which reads thus:

“J. Because the Respondent has deliberately and ostensibly circumvented the requisite procedures before issuing the Impugned Notification, including evading previous publication, inviting public objections under Rule 5(3) of the EP Rules, 1986, and by wrongly exercising its powers under Rule 5(4) of the EP Rules under the garb of “public interest” during the Covid-19 national lockdown without offering even a shred of reasoning for its actions. It is most respectfully submitted that the amendments brought forth by the Impugned Notification serve and further the interest of private miners and contractors, and the actions of ratifying such illegal and mala fide acts of disregard and disobedience to environmental norms is in fact against public interest at large.”

22. We have carefully perused the counter affidavit filed by the MoEF&CC before the NGT. The said affidavit does not deal with Ground J at all. It does not specify or set out reasons for concluding that in the public interest, the requirement of publication of prior notice was needed to be dispensed with. It is pertinent to note that before the issue of the second EC notification by which Appendix-IX was incorporated, the

**Noble M. Paikada v. Union of India**

procedure of inviting objections to the draft notification was followed, and the objections were considered. There is no reason to dispense with this important requirement before publishing the impugned notification. Article 21 guarantees a right to live in a pollution-free environment. The citizens have a fundamental duty to protect and improve the environment. Therefore, the participation of the citizens is very important, and it is taken care of by allowing them to raise objections to the proposed notification. After all, citizens are major stakeholders in environmental matters. Their participation cannot be prevented by casually exercising the power under sub-rule (4) of Rule 5.

23. In the present appeals, the questions of law (e) and (f) have been incorporated regarding the illegal invocation of the power under sub-rule (4) of Rule 5 of the EP Rules. In the grounds of the challenge, ground EE has been taken explicitly on this aspect. We have perused the counter affidavit filed by the MoEF&CC in these appeals. We find from the counter affidavit that the contention raised regarding the illegal invocation of power under sub-rule (4) of Rule 5 has not been dealt with. We are not going into the question of whether it was necessary for the Central Government to specify reasons in the impugned notification itself why it came to the conclusion that in the public interest, the requirement of public notice should be dispensed with. However, the reasons for the said conclusion ought to have been set out in the counter affidavit filed before the NGT or, at least, in the counter affidavit filed before this Court. The document recording the satisfaction of the competent authority about the existence of public interest and the nature of the public interest ought to have been produced by the Ministry. But, no such document was produced. Only one conclusion can be drawn. The drastic decision to invoke sub-rule (4) of Rule 5 was made without any application of the mind. Hence, the decision-making process has been vitiated.
24. The impugned notification was issued two days after the nationwide lockdown was imposed due to the COVID-19 pandemic. At that time, the work of linear projects, such as roads, pipelines, etc., had come to a grinding halt. So, there was no tearing hurry to modify the EC notifications. Apart from the fact that no reasons have been assigned in the counter affidavit filed by the Central Government for coming to the conclusion that in the public interest, the requirement of prior publication of notice was required to be dispensed with, we fail to

**Digital Supreme Court Reports**

understand the undue haste shown by the Central Government in issuing the impugned notification during the nationwide lockdown. Therefore, the inclusion of item 6 of the substituted Appendix-IX will have to be held illegal. We have already given reasons for not dealing with the challenge to item 7 of the impugned notification.

**ARBITRARINESS**

25. There is one more important ground for striking down item 6. But for item 6 in Appendix-IX to the impugned notification, for extraction, sourcing, or borrowing of ordinary earth for linear projects, prior EC would have been required in terms of the first EC notification. The very object of issuing the first EC notification incorporating the mandatory requirement of obtaining EC for projects was that the damage to the environment must be minimised while implementing projects. When an exception is sought to be carved out by incorporating Appendix-IX to the requirement of obtaining EC in the first EC notification, the exception must be specific. Item 6 grants exemption for "extraction or sourcing or borrowing of ordinary earth for linear projects, such as roads, pipelines, etc." There is no specification about the quantum of ordinary earth, which can be extracted on the basis of the exemption. There is no specification of the area which can be used to extract ordinary earth. It is also not provided that only that quantity of ordinary earth, which is required to implement the linear projects, is exempted. Importantly, "linear projects" have not been defined. Without the definition, it is difficult to imagine which projects will be termed linear projects. The term "linear projects" is very vague. The process to be adopted for excavation has not been set out. Thus, item 6 is a case of completely unguided and blanket exemption, which is, *per se*, arbitrary and violative of Article 14 of the Constitution of India. There is no provision for setting up an authority which will decide whether a particular linear project is covered by item 6.
26. As stated earlier, during the pendency of the appeals, an amendment was made to item 6 by the notification dated 30<sup>th</sup> August 2023. Even the amended impugned notification does not elaborate on the concept of linear projects. The only addition to item 6 is that the extraction, sourcing or borrowing shall be subject to compliance with SOP and environmental safeguards issued in this regard from time to time. The authority to issue the SOP and environmental safeguards has not been specified. No provision has been made

**Noble M. Paikada v. Union of India**

to enforce the SOP and environmental safeguards. No restriction is imposed on the quantum of ordinary earth, which can be extracted for linear projects. Therefore, even the amended item 6 continues to suffer from the same vice of arbitrariness, which Article 14 of the Constitution of India prohibits.

27. The learned Additional Solicitor General placed reliance on the Office Memorandum dated 21<sup>st</sup> August 2023. It provides that before carrying on activities mentioned in entry 6, the project proponents must notify the State Pollution Control Board/Pollution Control Committees. The State Pollution Control Boards are required to monitor the compliance status of the SOP/environmental safeguards. As entry 6 is arbitrary, the Office Memorandum is of no consequence. Hence, on account of the violation of Article 14, item 6 in the impugned notification, as well as the amended impugned notification, will have to be struck down. As noted earlier, the object of the EP Act is to protect and improve the environment. Apart from the illegality committed by non-compliance with sub-rule (3) of Rule 5 of the EP Rules, the exemption granted without incorporating any safeguards is completely unguided and arbitrary. Grant of such blanket exemption completely defeats the very object of the EP Act.

**NON-COMPLIANCE WITH THE DIRECTIONS OF THE NGT**

28. In paragraph 8 of the impugned order, which we have quoted earlier, the NGT observed that the blanket exemption needs to be hedged by appropriate safeguards, such as, the process of excavation and quantum. Therefore, in paragraph 9, a direction was issued to MoEF&CC to revisit the impugned notification in the light of the observations made in paragraph 8. Within the three months provided by the NGT to do so, no steps had been taken to revisit item 6 of the impugned notification.
29. The Ministry has filed an additional affidavit dated 18th July 2023, and reliance has been placed on the guidelines for sand mining. As far as item 6 is concerned, in the counter affidavit, reliance was placed on the Office Memorandum dated 8<sup>th</sup> August 2022, purportedly issued in terms of the directions issued in paragraph 9 of the impugned judgment. It records that item 6 shall be subject to the SOP attached to the said Office Memorandum. We have perused the said SOP. We find that the SOP creates no regulatory machinery to ensure the implementation of the terms of the SOP. The SOP does

**Digital Supreme Court Reports**

not refer to item 6 at all; it merely refers to the activities relating to the identification to borrow areas to obtain earth or soil materials. It does not refer to extracting ordinary earth for linear projects, such as roads, pipelines, etc. Therefore, the said SOP can hardly be said to be in terms of what the NGT ordered the Central Government to do in terms of paragraphs 8 and 9.

30. We are not entertaining a challenge to item 7 of the impugned notification. As none of the respondents have challenged the impugned notification, they will have to implement the directions issued in terms of paragraph 9 of the impugned judgment regarding item 7.
31. Thus, notwithstanding the specific directions issued in paragraph 8 read with paragraph 9 of the impugned judgment, no safeguards have been provided, such as laying down processes, the mode and the manner of excavation and quantum.
32. Therefore, we have no hesitation in striking down item 6 of the substituted Appendix-IX forming part of the impugned notification dated 28<sup>th</sup> March 2020 and item 6 of the amended impugned notification dated 30<sup>th</sup> August 2023. Accordingly, we quash item 6 in the two notifications above.
33. The appeals are, accordingly, partly allowed on above terms. There will be no order as to costs.

*Headnotes prepared by:* Divya Pandey

*Result of the case:*  
Appeals partly allowed.