APPLICATION OF JUDICIAL ACTIVISM IN PROTECTING THE ENVIRONMENT: AN ANALYSIS

- *Parag Singhal*
2nd Year, BBA LLB
National Law University, Odisha, Cuttack

I. ABSTRACT

This article talks about and dissects the Judicial Activism and its application in ensuring environment, and steps taken by judiciary to accelerate this goal. The main objective behind this research is to distinguish the contemporary picture and study the nature and degree of till date developments in different environmental statuses through judicial system. It additionally analyzes the role of judiciary, recent advancement and change of environment assurance. It further perspectives upon the constitutional aspects and the new patterns in judicial methodology in environmental protection. The proposed study will prompt a more enlightening and exhaustive comprehension of environment law and the approach alongside the part of Supreme in today's context to the new emerging threat which should be combat adequately.

Keywords: Judicial Activism, environment, role of judiciary, recent development, sustainable development, precautionary principles, and polluter pays.

II. INTRODUCTION

Legislative and administrative reactions to environmental issues have been received in India-particularly in the Bhopal tragedy which is plainly the world's worst industrial disaster.[1] But the legal ways to deal with the environmental issues which have additionally followed, have been particularly fascinating in India for an assortment of reasons, which are pertinent to the difficulties confronting courts today, in developing and developed countries alike.

In India, the legal procedure has tended to compel respondent improvement venture powers to expand environment related spending (e.g., on environmental effect evaluation, pollution abatement etc.) in appreciation of the development project up to more practical levels than the power concerned would somehow embraced. It proposes that the Judiciary can assume

[1] *Union Carbide Corporation v Union of India* AIR 1992 SC 248

critical steady parts, once in a while imperative synergist and initiative parts in the definition and requirement of environmental policies and laws. But it can never assert an imposing business model or selectiveness in appreciation thereof.

This essay will seek to undertake a critical evaluation of judicial activism in the development and enforcement of environmental law in India.

III. DISCUSSION

1. DEVELOPING THE JURIDICAL BASES FOR ENVIRONMENTAL LAW IN INDIA

Environmental law in India has its modest sources in ideas of 'nuisance' under tort law and 'public nuisance' under criminal law. From such humble beginnings in India, environmental claims, damages and wrongs have continued to a judicially settled in the idea of rights and of human rights. In *Gobind Singh v. Shanti Sarup*[2], a baker who amplified his chimney towards a public road was discovered blameworthy of disturbance under both common and criminal law. The court requested the chimney not be relit before it was devastated, and requested demolishment of the chimney.

The criminal law idea of public nuisance has been seized upon by the courts to act against environmental contamination. Subsequently, the courts have held that public health imperilled by public nuisance is a public nuisance violative of Section 133 of the Indian Penal Code. Public nuisance can't be imperilled by private business.[3] Similarly, the private business is finishing social objectives also (e.g., producing glucose saline), if the outcome is contamination in a neighbourhood it will be controlled by the court.[4]

Courts in India have conjured their forces under Section 133 of the IPC to impose criminal liability for 'public nuisance' upon both private and public sector organizations that have been liable of environmental debasement.[5] Thus, the courts avoided attesting such criminal purview and permitted a car repair and painting workshop to proceed with its air contaminating exercises.[6] The courts also refrained where tea wastes were being discharged

[2] AIR 1979 SC 143.
[3] *Smt. Ajeet Mehta v State of Rajasthan*, 1990, CRI.LJ. 1596.
[4] *Krishna Gopal v State of MP*, 1986, CRI.LJ. 396.
[5] *Indian Council for Enviro Legal Action v. Union of India* (1996) 3 SCC 212.
[6] *Madhavi v Thilakan*, 1989, CRI.L.J. 499

into the river[7] also, chemical, air and water contamination asserted to have prompted the demise of animals and children was permitted to continue.[8]

The Supreme Court has expanded the meaning of 'life', 'liberty', 'livelihood', 'health' and 'education' to include environmental questions.[9] The right to a 'wholesome environment' has been read into the Right to Life under Article 21.[10]

The Indian courts have supplemented civil and criminal jurisdiction on grounds of nuisance and public nuisance respectively in two critical ways:

(i) Environmental prosecution can be based upon wide 'human rights' cases (as got from the fundamental rights part of the Indian Constitution).

(ii) Environmental case can be construct upon dependence in light of restricted lawfulness bases and also 'abuse of power', 'excess of power' or jurisdictional contentions too.

2. ***FROM LOCUS STANDI TO PROMINENT ACCESS: ANOTHER TRIUMPH FOR INDIAN JUDICIAL ACTIVISM ON THE ENVIRONMENT***

Those influenced by environmental pollution or harm have dependably had two principle methods of access to the Courts: civil and criminal. As appeared over, the Courts have practiced their jurisdiction and normally allowed help, when approached. Subsequently, numerous offended parties with real grumblings about environmental pollution can't profit themselves of common cures. Correspondingly, criminal protestations likewise require much from the complainant who needs to keep catching up on the objection to get a torpid police and prosecutor to move. Criminal cases as well, are inclined to experience a few rounds of appeals. Indian courts, perceiving these issues, have reacted in two primary ways. first, they have articulated through judicial decision a restricted right to legitimate guide and noticeable judges like Justice Krishna Iyer and Justice P. N. Bhagwati have driven a campaign outside the Courts (in administrative Advisory groups on Legal Aid) to put set up now far reaching national and state-wide legal aid schemes.[11]

---

[7] *Tata Tea Ltd v State of Kerala*, K.L.T. 645.
[8] *Ryland's v. Fletcher* (1868) LR 3 HL 330.
[9] *Attakoya Thangal v Union of India*, 1990 (t), KLT 580.
[10] *Subhah kumar v State of Bihar*, AIR 1991 SC 420.
[11] Ibid.

Another real commitment of the courts has been to considerably adjust the conventional tenet of remaining by allowing poor people and abused to be spoken to by volunteers-concerned nationals, NGO's and other expert gatherings who themselves may not be straightforwardly influenced by the grumbled activity. This rule of 'representative standing' has secured the arrival of fortified work and enhanced the conditions for those ladies who are living in a defensive home.[12]

Social action litigation in admiration of infringement of fundamental rights turned out to be imperative to environment law cases subsequent to, the courts have received a methodology of basing (wherever conceivable)environmental claims upon fundamental rights. Social action litigation brought an assortment of environment issues before the courts: deforestation and contamination by mining, industrialisation and its effluents, environmental aspects of dams and other vast scale development ventures, gas leaks, issues regarding hazardous substances, pollution of rivers, overuse of ground-water, air pollution by vehicles, urban planning, and protection of parks and sanctuaries.[13]

3. ***JUDICIAL ACTIVISM: FILLING NORMATIVE AND ENFORCEMENT GAPS IN ENVIRONMENTAL LAW***

The surge of cases related to environment before the courts through social action litigation have given the courts a chance to mediate from numerous points of view:

(i) They can recognize procedural gaps and flaws in the execution/requirement systems by judicial decision help fill those crevices and remedy such imperfections.

(ii) They can fill regulating gaps in existing enactment through the procedure of judicial law-making.

(iii) They can correct abuses of power or authority through executing offices through the writ of prohibition.

(iv) They can allow directives to secure the status quo.

(v) They can arrange prompt, break alleviation or other suitable solutions for the casualties of environmental pollution or debasement.

---

[12] Government of India, Ministry of Law, Justice & Company Affairs, *Report on National Juridicare; Equal Justice-Social Justice*, 6I (1977).

[13] R. Dhavan & R. Pant, *Environmental Compromises and the Law-Indian Institutions*, Legal Support & Research Centre, New Delhi.

Below, we look at the record of the courts on various diverse environment issues.

3.1 Water Pollution

When the Water (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act was established in 1974, polluters started to contend that the specific provisions of the Act uprooted the general power under Section 133 of the IPC. The courts decided that 'the Water Act was particularly instituted to avoid water contamination; subsequently it must be developed generously'.[14]

The courts have mediated in cases where release of untreated effluents by tanneries into the Ganges River was bringing about a grave water contamination issue,[15] where the discharge of untreated waste and sewage by municipal authorities into the river was similarly jeopardising health[16] and where a distillery and chemical company was discharging effluents into the water.[17]

The Supreme Court while perceiving that 'the right to a wholesome environment' as a component of the right to life, declined to intercede when the vast organization included Tata Iron and Steel Organization was releasing slurry and sludge into the Bokaro waterway and blamed the applicant for recording a PIL to subserve private interests.'[18] It appears that the Supreme Court, when confronted similarly with an industrial giant, did not consider it fit to attempt such adjusting of concerns.

3.2 Air Pollution

The Air Pollution Act deals with industrial pollution, vehicular pollution and with the control of noxious emissions.[19] In a landmark case[20] resulting because of the leak of Oleum gas from a chlorine creating plant in the city of Delhi characterized three noteworthy commitments.

Directions: Rather of just administering on the case, the Court chose to hold purview over the Corporation (Shriram) and issued a progression of bearings, requiring Shriram to deposit noteworthy wholes of cash, both to guarantee consistence and to fund the Courts'

---

[14] Section 58, Water (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1974.
[15] *MC Mehta v Union of India*, AIR 1988 SC 1037.
[16] *MC Mehta v Union of India*, AIR 1988 SC 1115
[17] *Narmada Bachao Andolan v Union of India & ors*, (2000) 10 SCC 664
[18] *Subhash kumar v State of Bihar*, AIR 1991, SC 420.
[19] *Charan Lal Sahu v Union Of India* AIR 1990 SC 1480
[20] *MC Mehta v Union of India*, AIR 1987 SC 982

activity of apparently official and legislative functions 'during the time spent showing evidence in the case'.

Deep-Pockets Theory: The Supreme Court decided that damages must serve as an obstruction. It consequently articulated the hypothesis that the quantum of damages to be granted by the Court are to be comparable with the tort-feasers' capacity to pay.

Absolute Liability: The Court, here, set up another standard of Absolute Liability (embracing a 'no deficiency' approach) for damages coming about because of the demonstrations of an enterprise included in 'ultra hazardous movement for benefit'. It denies any barriers at all (even those which have allowed under a 'strict liability)' standard, for example, defence of Act of God.[21]

3.3 Mining

The courts have been careful in surveying the environmental outcomes resulting from mining exercises. They have decided that no person has a personal stake in reestablishment of a mining rent merely that the proprietor has put vigorously in the mining operation.[22] If the renewal raised environmental considerations, specific authorization would be required from the Central government for every lease renewal.[23] More recently, the courts, once again on the premise of the report of its own Committee of specialists, requested stoppage of mining operations of a particular classification of limestone mines where damage to vegetation and environment was resulting from their operations.[24]

Subsequently, the court has no alternative however to close the mines following the Executive, accused of the obligation of doing as such was in desolation of its obligation; 'Accused of the appointment of actualizing the laws of lands, the official is yet neglecting to do its obligation by law and by the people.[25] The courts' part in appreciation of mining cases has been to secure the right of citizens to live in a safe and healthy environment, to guarantee that the official releases its obligations in executing the laws, and to strike down act of inborn or express illicitness.

---

[21] *Rylands v Fletcher* (1868) LR 3HL 330.
[22] *Kinkri Devi And Another v State Of Himachal Pradesh And Others,* AIR 1988 HP 4.
[23] *B. V Joshi v State of Andhra Pradesh & Others,* AIR 1989 AP 122. 53.
[24] *General Public of Saproon Valley & Others etc. v State of Himachal Pradesh*, AIR 1993 HP 52.
[25] *Tarun Bharat Sangh Alwar v Union of India and Others*, JT 1993 (3) S.C. I.

Thus, the judgement uncovers a judiciary in disorder- a Judiciary altogether different from the one that improved so strikingly and inventively from the mid-seventies to the mid-eighties to ensure and advance the human rights of poor people and mistreated and to secure environment.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

The judiciary is reacting to the worldwide call for protection of environment. With the reception of new arrangements of laws and rules and the lawful administration the way things are today sounds more dynamic and delicate. The accompanying suggestions may increase the value of keep the environment free from pollution through judicial activism:

1. Besides the general court procedure, alternative dispute settlement mechanism ought to be started for better security of environment.

2. Mindfulness and specialized education system identifying with the environment law and its insurance can be taken to improve its solid base.

3. A solid and extensive administrative system ought to be made in ensuring the environment.

4. The non-governmental association is required to take part more in the approach making and making the legislators mindful of the escape clauses in the environment; and an environmental law reform body ought to be made for analyzing the environmental laws.

5. Open awareness and successful public cooperation ought to be guaranteed through various government and non-government association.

6. A check and balance system ought to be presented between the judiciary and the environmental activists.

V. CONCLUSION

No evaluation of the judiciary in India can be attempted without tending to the 'potentially disastrous secret' of the Indian Supreme Court-the choices identifying with the Bhopal tragedy. In that judgement[26] the Court made the following rulings:

[26] *Union Carbide Corporation etc. v Union of India,* AIR 1992, SC 248.

1. The powers of the Supreme Court are not depleted by Article 139A of the Constitution which is not proposed to whittle down powers under Articles 136 and 142 of the Constitution. The Court accordingly attested for itself full powers to do equity under the Constitution.
2. In an agent suit, for example, this one, a trade off went into without notification to every single intrigued party is not void.
3. The quashing of criminal arraignments was legitimate. Statutory procurement despite what might be expected the Supreme Court has the ability to quash criminal procedures.
4. The Bhopal Gas Disaster (Processing of Claims) Act, 1985 does not conceive or compel reasonableness hearings before going into a settlement which will tie even those who have not agreed to thereto and no decency hearing is essential.
5. The Indian Constitution'' requires that 'natural justice' be taken after. Oversight of a 'opportunity to be heard' when in doubt violates any decision.

Rather one needs to not get sidetracked by debate about what came about because of unreasonable judicial activism. Yet rather one needs to attempt to comprehend, from institutional perspectives, what turned out badly with an Indian judiciary that had guaranteed so much and why. Mainstream view of what had happened in the Bhopal case has seriously dissolved the validity and adequacy of the judiciary in India for the future.

'An effective utilization of law won't save the environment. But, joined with social action, it may help stem the tide and give a more demanding order than the present one, (of charge and control regulation) which is displayed for need of social will to authorize it'.

VI. REFERENCES

Books

1. S. Shanthakumar, *Environmental Law an Introduction*, pp. 122, 123, Chennai: Surya Publication, (2001).
2. Dr. Jai Jai Ram Upadhyay, *Environmental Law*, p.2, Allahabad: Central Law Agency, (2005).
3. R.M. Lodha, *Environmental Ruin: The Crises Of Survival*, P.364 .New Delhi: Indus Publishing Company, (1993).

4. MC Mehta, *Growth of Environmental Jurisprudence in India*, p.71, (1999).

Journals

1. Mhajan Niyati, *Judicial Activism for Environment Protection in India*, International Research Journal of Social Sciences, Vol. 4(4), 7-14, April (2015).
2. Bharat H. Desai, *Enforcement of the Right to Environment Protection through Public Interest Litigation in India*, Indian Journal of International Law, Vol. 331993, p.39.

Reports

1. R. Dhavan & R. Pant, *Environmental Compromises and the Law-Indian Institutions*, Legal Support & Research Centre, New Delhi.
2. Government of India, Ministry of Law, Justice & Company Affairs, *Report on National Juridicare; Equal Justice-Social Justice*, 6I (1977).

Statutes

1. Water (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1974.
2. The Constitution of India, 1950.
3. Indian Penal Code, 1860.
4. Bhopal Gas Disaster (Processing of Claims) Act, 1985.
5. Environmental (Protection) Act, 1986.