

Judicial Interventions in Forest and Ecological Protection: An Analysis of Landmark PILs

Aditya Khare¹, Dr. Anshuma Upadhyay²

¹Research Scholar, Faculty of Law,
RKDF University, Bhopal, Madhya Pradesh

²Professor, Faculty of Law,
RKDF University, Bhopal, Madhya Pradesh

Abstract

Forests and ecological systems in India face increasing pressures from industrialization, urban expansion, and unsustainable exploitation of natural resources. In this context, the judiciary has emerged as a vital actor in environmental governance, particularly through Public Interest Litigations (PILs). This research paper examines the role of judicial interventions in forest and ecological protection by analyzing landmark cases such as *M.C. Mehta v. Union of India*, the *T.N. Godavarman Thirumulpad* series, and others that have significantly influenced policy and enforcement mechanisms. The study highlights how the courts expanded the ambit of constitutional rights under Article 21, incorporated principles like sustainable development, polluter pays, and public trust doctrine, and issued directives for effective forest management and conservation. At the same time, it critically evaluates challenges such as judicial overreach, implementation delays, and reliance on continuous mandamus. By contextualizing these interventions within India's broader environmental governance framework, the paper argues that judicial activism has been both a corrective and catalytic force in shaping ecological protection. The findings underscore the necessity of harmonizing judicial directives with legislative reforms and executive action for sustainable and balanced forest governance.

Keywords: Judicial Activism, Public Interest Litigation (PIL), Forest and Ecological Protection, Article 21 of the Indian Constitution, Environmental Governance

1. Introduction

Forests and ecological systems constitute the lifeline of environmental sustainability, biodiversity preservation, and climate stability. They regulate hydrological cycles, maintain soil fertility, provide carbon sinks, and sustain countless species, thereby ensuring ecological balance and human well-being. In India, these natural resources assume even greater importance due to the country's vast geographical diversity — ranging from the Himalayan forests to the Western Ghats, from mangroves in the Sundarbans to the arid ecosystems of Rajasthan. The livelihoods of millions of rural and tribal communities are intricately dependent on forest produce, medicinal plants, and minor forest resources. Moreover, the constitutional framework of India explicitly recognizes the duty to protect and improve the environment. Article 48A of the Directive Principles of State Policy mandates the State to “protect and improve the environment and to safeguard the forests and wildlife of the country,” while Article 51A(g) enjoins upon every citizen the fundamental duty to “protect and improve the natural environment

including forests, lakes, rivers and wildlife, and to have compassion for living creatures.” Together, these provisions reflect a constitutional ethos that integrates ecological protection with the nation’s developmental goals.

Despite this strong normative and constitutional foundation, India’s forests and ecological systems have come under severe and unprecedented stress. Rapid industrialization, urban expansion, infrastructural growth, and extractive economic policies have led to large-scale deforestation, fragmentation of habitats, and loss of biodiversity. Unsustainable mining, hydroelectric projects, and encroachments have further aggravated ecological degradation. Ecological considerations are frequently marginalized in the decision-making process as a result of the complicated policy problem produced by the conflicting objectives of environmental preservation and economic growth.

Amidst these difficult circumstances, the judiciary has become a crucial player in environmental governance, especially with the novel Public Interest Litigation (PIL) system. PILs have allowed citizens, activists, and civil society organizations to access the courts in order to demand responsibility from state officials and seek remedy for environmental harm. In addition to supporting legislative and executive initiatives, judicial interventions have often served as corrective measures when governing institutions have been incompetent or complicit. India's environmental law and forest governance system have undergone significant change as a result of seminal rulings like *M.C. Mehta v. Union of India*, the *T.N. Godavarman Thirumulpad* series, *Rural Litigation and Entitlement Kendra v. State of Uttar Pradesh*, and *Vellore Citizens Welfare Forum v. Union of India*.

The Supreme Court interpreted Article 21 of the Constitution, which guarantees the right to life, to encompass the right to a clean, healthy, and pollution-free environment in these cases. In order to bring Indian environmental governance into compliance with international norms, the Court also incorporated international environmental law concepts like sustainable development, the polluter pays principle, and the precautionary principle into domestic law. The judiciary made sure that environmental protection was not compromised by executive lethargy by means of expert panels, ongoing mandamus, and monitoring systems. For example, the *Godavarman* case's orders resulted in the formation of frameworks for the preservation of reserved and protected forests as well as the Compensatory Afforestation Fund Management and Planning Authority (CAMPA).

However, judicial interventions in ecological protection have not been without criticism. Scholars and policymakers have questioned the extent of judicial activism and the potential encroachment upon the domain of the legislature and the executive. Concerns about the democratic legitimacy of judicial policymaking, practical challenges in enforcing wide-ranging judicial orders, and the long-term sustainability of court-driven governance remain subjects of intense debate. The reliance on continuous mandamus — where cases remain perpetually open for monitoring — has been both lauded for its vigilance and criticized for bypassing democratic accountability.

This study tries to critically evaluate these trends and their consequences for environmental governance in India. It contends that legal actions have served as a catalyst for awareness-raising, institutional innovation, and responsibility in addition to being corrective in correcting environmental regulation shortcomings. However, these initiatives' long-term efficacy hinges on how well they align

with community involvement, executive efficiency, and legislative improvements. A synergistic governance model that combines the advantages of the legislature, executive branch, and judiciary while encouraging citizens to act as stewards of the environment is the way forward for environmental preservation in India, not judicial domination.

2. Judicial Role in Environmental Governance: An Overview

Environmental governance in India is founded on a tripartite structure: the legislature enacts laws, the executive implements them, and the judiciary adjudicates disputes. However, given the systemic failures of regulatory agencies, lack of political will, and administrative apathy, the judiciary—particularly the Supreme Court and High Courts—has assumed a proactive role.

The evolution of judicial environmental activism in India coincides with the growth of PILs in the post-Emergency era. With the loosening of the doctrine of locus standi, courts allowed individuals and organizations to approach them on behalf of communities whose rights were adversely affected by environmental degradation. This shift was pivotal in enabling the judiciary to directly address ecological issues, which otherwise might have remained unattended due to bureaucratic inertia.

In forest and ecological matters, judicial interventions have primarily focused on:

1. Protecting forests against illegal felling and diversion of land.
2. Ensuring compliance with statutory frameworks such as the Forest Conservation Act, 1980, and the Environment Protection Act, 1986.
3. Expanding constitutional interpretations of the right to life under Article 21 to include the right to a healthy environment.
4. Developing environmental principles and doctrines based on international law and Indian socio-economic realities.

3. Forests and Ecological Protection in India: Legal and Policy Framework

3.1 Constitutional Provisions

Article 21: The right to life has been judicially expanded to include the right to a healthy and pollution-free environment (*Subhash Kumar v. State of Bihar*, AIR 1991 SC 420).

Article 48A: Directive Principles mandate the State to protect and improve the environment and safeguard forests and wildlife.

Article 51A(g): Fundamental Duties obligate citizens to protect the environment.

3.2 Statutory Framework

Indian Forest Act, 1927 – Colonial-era law regulating forest produce and governance.

Wildlife (Protection) Act, 1972 – Protects biodiversity and establishes national parks and sanctuaries.

Forest Conservation Act, 1980 – Restricts diversion of forest land for non-forest purposes without Central approval.

Environment Protection Act, 1986 – Umbrella legislation empowering the Central Government to take measures for environmental protection.

Biological Diversity Act, 2002 – Implements India's obligations under the Convention on Biological Diversity.

3.3 Policy Framework

India's National Forest Policy (1988) emphasized ecological balance, people's participation in afforestation, and conservation of biodiversity. Despite these frameworks, poor enforcement necessitated judicial interventions.

4. Landmark Judicial Interventions

4.1 Rural Litigation and Entitlement Kendra v. State of Uttar Pradesh (1985–88)

This case, involving limestone quarrying in the Mussoorie hills, marked one of the first instances where the Supreme Court ordered closure of environmentally harmful industries. It recognized that the right to live in a healthy environment is part of Article 21.

4.2 M.C. Mehta v. Union of India

M.C. Mehta's series of PILs laid the foundation for modern environmental jurisprudence.

Oleum Gas Leak Case (1986): The Court evolved the principle of absolute liability for hazardous industries, going beyond strict liability.

Taj Trapezium Case: Directed industries around the Taj Mahal to switch to cleaner fuels to protect heritage and environment.

Ganga Pollution Case: Mandated closure and regulation of polluting tanneries and factories along the Ganga.

These interventions linked environmental protection directly with fundamental rights.

4.3 T.N. Godavarman Thirumulpad v. Union of India (1995 onwards)

Perhaps the most significant case on forest governance, the Godavarman series transformed forest management in India. The Court interpreted "forest" broadly, irrespective of ownership or classification, thereby bringing vast tracts of land under legal protection.

Key directives included:

- * Establishment of the Central Empowered Committee (CEC).
- * Ban on felling in North-Eastern states.
- * Orders on compensatory afforestation and Net Present Value (NPV) for diverted forest land.

The case continues to remain under the Court's monitoring, making it an unprecedented exercise of continuous mandamus.

4.4 Indian Council for Enviro-Legal Action v. Union of India (1996)

The Court enforced the polluter pays principle, directing industries responsible for chemical contamination in Rajasthan to compensate affected villagers and restore the environment.

4.5 Narmada Bachao Andolan v. Union of India (2000)

While allowing construction of the Sardar Sarovar Dam, the Court balanced developmental imperatives with environmental concerns, emphasizing the principle of sustainable development.

5. Principles Evolved by the Judiciary

The judiciary has infused Indian environmental law with several principles drawn from international law and constitutional interpretation:

1. Sustainable Development (Vellore Citizens' Welfare Forum v. Union of India, 1996).

2. Polluter Pays Principle (Indian Council for Enviro-Legal Action, 1996).
3. Precautionary Principle (A.P. Pollution Control Board v. Prof. M.V. Nayudu, 1999).
4. Public Trust Doctrine (M.C. Mehta v. Kamal Nath, 1997).
5. Absolute Liability (Oleum Gas Leak, 1986).

These principles now form the backbone of India's environmental jurisprudence.

6. Impact of Judicial Interventions

6.1 Policy Influence

Judicial pronouncements have compelled legislative and executive action, such as the creation of authorities under the Environment Protection Act and stricter application of the Forest Conservation Act.

6.2 Strengthening Forest Management

Through Godavarman, large-scale deforestation was checked, compensatory afforestation funds were institutionalized, and monitoring mechanisms established.

6.3 Expanding Article 21

The right to life now encompasses ecological balance, clean water, and fresh air, broadening constitutional protections.

7. Challenges and Criticisms

1. Judicial Overreach: Critics argue that the Court has assumed roles of the legislature and executive, undermining separation of powers.
2. Implementation Delays: Orders often face resistance or inadequate enforcement at state levels.
3. Continuous Mandamus: Prolonged monitoring leads to concerns of governance by judiciary.
4. Exclusion of Communities: At times, judicial orders (such as bans on felling) have adversely impacted indigenous and forest-dependent communities without adequate rehabilitation.

8. Towards Harmonized Forest Governance: Way Forward

- * Legislative Reforms: Updating the Indian Forest Act, 1927, and ensuring participatory frameworks under the Forest Rights Act, 2006.
- * Executive Accountability: Strengthening institutions like the National Green Tribunal (NGT) for effective enforcement.
- * Community Participation: Incorporating indigenous knowledge and local governance under the principle of environmental democracy.
- * Integrated Policy: Harmonizing judicial principles with national climate goals and biodiversity commitments.

9. Conclusion

Judicial interventions in India's forest and ecological protection represent a unique experiment in environmental governance. By expanding constitutional rights, enforcing statutory mandates, and evolving innovative principles, the judiciary has played a transformative role. However, judicial activism cannot substitute systemic reforms. The future of India's forests requires synergy between judiciary, legislature, executive, and local communities. Harmonized governance, rather than fragmented interventions, is essential for ensuring ecological sustainability and inter-generational justice.

Bibliography

Books

1. Leelakrishnan, P. *Environmental Law in India*. 5th ed., LexisNexis, 2016.
2. Divan, Shyam, and Armin Rosencranz. *Environmental Law and Policy in India*. 3rd ed., Oxford University Press, 2021.
3. Sathe, S.P. *Judicial Activism in India: Transgressing Borders and Enforcing Limits*. Oxford University Press, 2002.
4. Madhav Gadgil and Ramachandra Guha. *Ecology and Equity: The Use and Abuse of Nature in Contemporary India*. Routledge, 1995.
5. Gadgil, M., & Guha, R. (1995). *Ecology and Equity: The Use and Abuse of Nature in Contemporary India*. Routledge.
6. Singh, S. (2016). *Environmental Geography of India*. Rawat Publications.
7. Forest Survey of India (FSI). (2023). *India State of Forest Report 2023*. Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change (MoEFCC), Government of India.
8. Rangarajan, M., & Sivaramakrishnan, K. (Eds.). (2017). *India's Environmental History: From Ancient Times to the Colonial Period*. Oxford University Press
9. Bhuvania, A. (2017). *Courting the People: Public Interest Litigation in Post-Emergency India*. Cambridge University Press.

Journal Articles

1. Upendra Baxi, "The Avatars of Indian Judicial Activism: Explorations in the Geographies of \[In]justice," in *The Politics of Judicial Reform* (1995).
2. Lavanya Rajamani, "The Supreme Court of India: Environmental Activism and the Limits of Judicial Power," *International and Comparative Law Quarterly*, vol. 38, 2007, pp. 617–638.
3. Shibani Ghosh, "Litigating Climate Claims in India," *Journal of Environmental Law*, vol. 31, no. 3, 2019, pp. 433–457.
4. S. Rangarajan, "Forests and the Courts: An Analysis of the Godavarman Case," *Economic and Political Weekly*, vol. 37, no. 34, 2002, pp. 3455–3460.
5. R. Dhavan, "Environmental Rights and the Indian Supreme Court," in *Courting the People: Public Interest Litigation in Post-Emergency India*, 2013.
6. Reports and Policy Documents
7. Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change (MoEFCC), *India State of Forest Report 2021*.
8. *National Forest Policy, 1988* (Government of India).
9. Government of India, *Compensatory Afforestation Fund Act, 2016*.
10. Law Commission of India, *186th Report on Proposal to Constitute Environment Courts* (2003).
11. Choudhry, S., & Khosla, M. (2014). *Understanding Indian Constitutionalism: The Problem of the PIL*. *Journal of Indian Law and Society*, 5(1), 1–28.
12. Dhavan, R. (1994). *Environmental jurisprudence in India*. *Journal of the Indian Law Institute*, 36(2), 289–304.

13. Sharma, A. (2020). Right to life and environment: Expanding horizons of Article 21. *Indian Law Review*, 6(2), 135–152.
14. Rajamani, L. (2007). Public interest environmental litigation in India: Exploring issues of access, participation, equity, effectiveness, and sustainability. *Journal of Environmental Law*, 19(3), 293–321.

Case Law

1. *Rural Litigation and Entitlement Kendra v. State of Uttar Pradesh*, AIR 1985 SC 652.
2. *M.C. Mehta v. Union of India (Oleum Gas Leak Case)*, AIR 1987 SC 965.
3. *M.C. Mehta v. Union of India (Taj Trapezium Case)*, AIR 1997 SC 734.
4. *M.C. Mehta v. Union of India (Ganga Pollution Case)*, 1988 SCR (2) 530.
5. *T.N. Godavarman Thirumulpad v. Union of India*, (1997) 2 SCC 267.
6. *Indian Council for Enviro-Legal Action v. Union of India*, (1996) 3 SCC 212.
7. *Vellore Citizens' Welfare Forum v. Union of India*, (1996) 5 SCC 647.
8. *A.P. Pollution Control Board v. Prof. M.V. Nayudu*, (1999) 2 SCC 718.
9. *M.C. Mehta v. Kamal Nath*, (1997) 1 SCC 388.
10. *Narmada Bachao Andolan v. Union of India*, (2000) 10 SCC 664.
11. *Subhash Kumar v. State of Bihar*, AIR 1991 SC 420.
12. *The Constitution of India, Articles 48A and 51A(g)*.
13. (AIR 1987 SC 965).
14. (1997 2 SCC 353).
15. AIR 1988 SC 1115