

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS



Open Access, Refereed Journal Multi-Disciplinary
Peer Reviewed

www.ijlra.com

DISCLAIMER

No part of this publication may be reproduced or copied in any form by any means without prior written permission of Managing Editor of IJLRA. The views expressed in this publication are purely personal opinions of the authors and do not reflect the views of the Editorial Team of IJLRA.

Though every effort has been made to ensure that the information in Volume II Issue 7 is accurate and appropriately cited/referenced, neither the Editorial Board nor IJLRA shall be held liable or responsible in any manner what sever for any consequences for any action taken by anyone on the basis of information in the Journal.

Copyright © International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis

EDITORIALTEAM

EDITORS

Dr. Samrat Datta

Dr. Samrat Datta Seedling School of Law and Governance, Jaipur National University, Jaipur. Dr. Samrat Datta is currently associated with Seedling School of Law and Governance, Jaipur National University, Jaipur. Dr. Datta has completed his graduation i.e., B.A.LL.B. from Law College Dehradun, Hemvati Nandan Bahuguna Garhwal University, Srinagar, Uttarakhand. He is an alumnus of KIIT University, Bhubaneswar where he pursued his post-graduation (LL.M.) in Criminal Law and subsequently completed his Ph.D. in Police Law and Information Technology from the Pacific Academy of Higher Education and Research University, Udaipur in 2020. His area of interest and research is Criminal and Police Law. Dr. Datta has a teaching experience of 7 years in various law schools across North India and has held administrative positions like Academic Coordinator, Centre Superintendent for Examinations, Deputy Controller of Examinations, Member of the Proctorial Board



Dr. Namita Jain



Head & Associate Professor

School of Law, JECRC University, Jaipur Ph.D. (Commercial Law) LL.M., UGC-NET Post Graduation Diploma in Taxation law and Practice, Bachelor of Commerce.

Teaching Experience: 12 years, AWARDS AND RECOGNITION of Dr. Namita Jain are - ICF Global Excellence Award 2020 in the category of educationalist by I Can Foundation, India. India Women Empowerment Award in the category of "Emerging Excellence in Academics by Prime Time & Utkrish Bharat Foundation, New Delhi. (2020). Conferred in FL Book of Top 21 Record Holders in the category of education by Fashion Lifestyle Magazine, New Delhi. (2020). Certificate of Appreciation for organizing and managing the Professional Development Training Program on IPR in Collaboration with Trade Innovations Services, Jaipur on March 14th, 2019

Mrs.S.Kalpana

Assistant professor of Law

Mrs.S.Kalpana, presently Assistant professor of Law, VelTech Rangarajan Dr.Sagunthala R & D Institute of Science and Technology, Avadi. Formerly Assistant professor of Law,Vels University in the year 2019 to 2020, Worked as Guest Faculty, Chennai Dr.Ambedkar Law College, Pudupakkam. Published one book. Published 8Articles in various reputed Law Journals. Conducted 1Moot court competition and participated in nearly 80 National and International seminars and webinars conducted on various subjects of Law. Did ML in Criminal Law and Criminal Justice Administration.10 paper presentations in various National and International seminars. Attended more than 10 FDP programs. Ph.D. in Law pursuing.



Avinash Kumar



Avinash Kumar has completed his Ph.D. in International Investment Law from the Dept. of Law & Governance, Central University of South Bihar. His research work is on "International Investment Agreement and State's right to regulate Foreign Investment." He qualified UGC-NET and has been selected for the prestigious ICSSR Doctoral Fellowship. He is an alumnus of the Faculty of Law, University of Delhi. Formerly he has been elected as Students Union President of Law Centre-1, University of Delhi. Moreover, he completed his LL.M. from the University of Delhi (2014-16), dissertation on "Cross-border Merger & Acquisition"; LL.B. from the University of Delhi (2011-14), and B.A. (Hons.) from Maharaja Agrasen College, University of Delhi. He has also obtained P.G. Diploma in IPR from the Indian Society of International Law, New Delhi. He has qualified UGC – NET examination and has been awarded ICSSR – Doctoral Fellowship. He has published six-plus articles and presented 9 plus papers in national and international seminars/conferences. He participated in several workshops on research methodology and teaching and learning.

ABOUT US

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH & ANALYSIS ISSN- 2582-6433 is an Online Journal is Monthly, Peer Review, Academic Journal, Published online, that seeks to provide an interactive platform for the publication of Short Articles, Long Articles, Book Review, Case Comments, Research Papers, Essay in the field of Law & Multidisciplinary issue. Our aim is to upgrade the level of interaction and discourse about contemporary issues of law. We are eager to become a highly cited academic publication, through quality contributions from students, academics, professionals from the industry, the bar and the bench. INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH & ANALYSIS ISSN 2582-6433 welcomes contributions from all legal branches, as long as the work is original, unpublished and is in consonance with the submission guidelines.

VELLORE CITIZENS WELFARE FORUM V/S UNION OF INDIA (1996)

AUTHORED BY - VAISHNAVI M

INTRODUCTION:

The case of **Vellore Citizens Welfare Forum v. Union of India (1996) 5 SCC 647** is a landmark judgment delivered by the **Supreme Court of India**, which laid the foundation for the application of the “**Precautionary Principle**” and the “**Polluter Pays Principle**” within Indian environmental jurisprudence.

The case arose when the **Vellore Citizens Welfare Forum**, a non-governmental organization, filed a **Public Interest Litigation (PIL)** under **Article 32 of the Constitution**, highlighting the severe pollution caused by tanneries and other industries in the **State of Tamil Nadu**, particularly in the **Vellore district**. These industries were discharging untreated effluents into nearby rivers and agricultural lands, leading to the contamination of water, soil degradation, and adverse health effects on local residents.

The Supreme Court, recognizing the environmental and public health hazards, held the industries liable for environmental degradation. It emphasized that sustainable development must balance **economic growth** with **ecological preservation**. The judgment firmly integrated international environmental principles into Indian law, marking a significant step toward strengthening **environmental governance** and **citizen participation** in environmental protection.

BACKGROUND OF THE CASE

During the late 1980s and early 1990s, the leather tanning industry in Tamil Nadu, particularly in Vellore, North Arcot, and Erode districts, experienced rapid growth. While this industry contributed significantly to India’s export earnings and employment, it also became a major source of environmental pollution.

The tanneries were discharging large quantities of untreated or partially treated effluents containing harmful chemicals such as chromium, lime, and acids directly into the Palar River,

open lands, and agricultural fields. This caused severe contamination of surface and groundwater, loss of soil fertility, destruction of crops, and serious health problems among local residents.

The Vellore Citizens Welfare Forum (VCWF), a local non-governmental organization, took notice of the worsening environmental conditions and the authorities' failure to take effective action against the polluting industries. Consequently, the Forum filed a Public Interest Litigation (PIL) under Article 32 of the Indian Constitution before the Supreme Court of India, seeking appropriate directions against the tanneries and the state authorities to prevent further pollution and to restore the damaged environment.

The case thus brought into focus the conflict between industrial development and environmental protection, prompting the Supreme Court to define a framework for sustainable development and to enforce accountability among industries causing ecological harm.

1 Vellore Citizens Welfare Forum v. Union of India (1996)

FACTS OF THE CASE

The **Vellore Citizens Welfare Forum (VCWF)** filed a **Public Interest Litigation (PIL)** under **Article 32 of the Constitution** before the **Supreme Court of India**. The Forum alleged that numerous **tanneries and other industries** in and around **Vellore district** were discharging **untreated toxic effluents** into nearby water bodies, open lands, and agricultural fields.

1. These effluents contained **high levels of harmful chemicals**, including **chromium, sulphides, and lime**, which severely polluted the **Palar River**—the main source of drinking water for several towns and villages in the region.
2. The pollution caused by the tanneries led to **contamination of groundwater, destruction of agricultural land, and adverse health effects** among the local population, such as skin diseases and respiratory issues.
3. Despite the existence of environmental laws like the **Water (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1974**, and the **Environment (Protection) Act, 1986**, the **Tamil Nadu Pollution Control Board (TNPCB)** failed to take adequate action to control or prevent the pollution.
4. The petitioner (VCWF) requested the Court to:
 - Direct the closure of polluting tanneries;

- Order the payment of **compensation** to affected individuals;
 - Ensure the setting up of **Common Effluent Treatment Plants (CETPs)**; and
 - Enforce proper **monitoring and regulation** of industrial pollution.
5. The respondents included the **Union of India**, the **State of Tamil Nadu**, the **Tamil Nadu Pollution Control Board**, and several **tannery owners**, who argued that the leather industry was vital to the economy and provided employment to thousands of people.
6. The case thus presented a conflict between **economic development and environmental protection**, requiring the Court to determine how to balance these competing interests while safeguarding the right to a **clean and healthy environment** under **Article 21** of the Constitution.

Issues of the Case

The Supreme Court considered several important legal and environmental questions in this case. The main issues before the Court were:

1. Whether the tanneries and other industries in Vellore district were responsible for causing environmental pollution by discharging untreated effluents into the water bodies and surrounding lands.
2. Whether such industrial pollution violated the fundamental rights of citizens under Article 21 of the Constitution of India, which guarantees the right to life, including the right to a clean and healthy environment.
3. Whether the “Precautionary Principle” and the “Polluter Pays Principle”—recognized in international environmental law—should be accepted as part of Indian law and applied in this case.
4. Whether the State Government and the Tamil Nadu Pollution Control Board (TNPCB) failed in their constitutional and statutory duties to prevent and control pollution caused by the industries.
5. What directions and remedies should be issued by the Court to ensure environmental protection, accountability of industries, and restoration of the damaged environment while maintaining sustainable development.

Arguments

Arguments by the Petitioner

1. The petitioner argued that the tanneries and other industries in the Vellore district were discharging untreated toxic effluents into water bodies, agricultural fields, and open lands, leading to severe pollution of the Palar River and surrounding areas.
2. The pollution had caused serious health problems, loss of soil fertility, and scarcity of clean drinking water, thereby violating the right to life guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution.
3. It was contended that the Tamil Nadu Pollution Control Board (TNPCB) and the State Government had failed to perform their statutory duties under the Water (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1974 and the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986.
4. The petitioner urged the Court to apply the “Polluter Pays Principle” and the “Precautionary Principle”, holding industries strictly liable for the environmental damage caused.
5. **The petitioner requested directions for:**
 - Closure of polluting industries until they installed proper treatment systems.
 - Compensation to the affected residents.
 - Establishment of Common Effluent Treatment Plants (CETPs).
 - Restoration of the degraded environment.

Arguments by the Respondents

1. The respondents acknowledged the presence of pollution but argued that the tanning industry was a major source of employment and foreign exchange, and its closure would cause serious economic hardship.
2. They claimed that efforts were being made to install Effluent Treatment Plants (ETPs) and Common Effluent Treatment Plants (CETPs), though progress was slow due to financial and technical constraints.
3. The State Government and TNPCB contended that they had taken several steps to regulate and monitor the industries but needed more time and resources to achieve complete compliance.
4. The tanneries also requested the Court to allow them to continue operations while they worked toward setting up proper waste treatment systems.
5. The respondents emphasized the need to balance economic development with environmental protection, suggesting that both could coexist under proper regulation.

Here’s a clear and well-organized section on the Related Provisions in Vellore Citizens Welfare Forum v. Union of India (1996) — listing the key constitutional and statutory

provisions that were relevant to the case:

Related Provisions

1. Constitutional Provisions

1. Article 21 – Right to Life:

Guarantees the fundamental right to life and personal liberty. The Supreme Court has interpreted this to include the right to a clean and healthy environment as an essential part of the right to life.

2. Article 48A – Directive Principles of State Policy:

Directs the State to protect and improve the environment and to safeguard forests and wildlife of the country.

3. Article 51A(g) – Fundamental Duties:

Imposes a duty on every citizen to protect and improve the natural environment, including forests, lakes, rivers, and wildlife, and to have compassion for living creatures.

4. Article 32 – Right to Constitutional Remedies:

Empowers citizens to directly approach the Supreme Court for the enforcement of fundamental rights. The Vellore Citizens Welfare Forum filed this case under Article 32 as a Public Interest Litigation

2. Statutory Provisions

1. The Water (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1974:

Enacted to prevent and control water pollution and to maintain or restore the wholesomeness of water. It established the Central and State Pollution Control Boards with powers to take action against polluting industries.

2. The Environment (Protection) Act, 1986:

A comprehensive law enacted after the Bhopal Gas Tragedy to provide for the protection and improvement of the environment. It empowers the Central Government to take measures to regulate industries and control pollution.

3. The Air (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1981:

Although primarily related to air pollution, it was cited to show the broader framework of environmental protection laws in India.

4. International Principles Referred

1. Precautionary Principle:

States that where there are threats of serious environmental damage, lack of full scientific certainty should not be used as a reason for postponing measures to prevent environmental degradation.

2. Polluter Pays Principle:

The principle that the polluter should bear the cost of preventing and remedying the damage caused to the environment.

3. Sustainable Development:

Development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs

1. Vellore Citizens Welfare Forum v. Union of India, (1996) 5 SCC 647.
2. Article 21, Constitution of India
3. Article 48A, Constitution of India,
4. Article 51A(g), Constitution of India
5. Water (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1974
6. Environment (Protection) Act, 1986,
7. Air (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1981.
8. Principle of Polluter Pays

Judgment of the Case

The Supreme Court delivered a landmark judgment in favor of the Vellore Citizens Welfare Forum (VCWF), holding both the industries and the State authorities accountable for environmental pollution. The key points of the judgment are as follows:

1. Violation of Fundamental Rights:

The Court held that the discharge of untreated effluents by tanneries into rivers and agricultural lands violated Article 21 of the Constitution, as the right to life includes the right to a healthy environment.

2. Polluter Pays Principle:

The Supreme Court applied the Polluter Pays Principle, stating that industries causing environmental damage must bear the cost of remedial measures. The tanneries were made liable to pay compensation to the affected people and for the restoration of the environment.

3. Precautionary Principle:

The Court adopted the Precautionary Principle, emphasizing that lack of scientific certainty should not prevent preventive measures when there is a risk of serious

environmental harm. Industries must anticipate, prevent, and mitigate environmental damage.

4. Sustainable Development:

The judgment reinforced the principle of sustainable development, balancing economic growth with environmental protection. The Court highlighted that industrial development cannot take precedence over ecological preservation.

5. Directions to Industries and Authorities:

Tanneries were directed to install effluent treatment plants (ETPs) or connect to Common Effluent Treatment Plants (CETPs).

The Tamil Nadu Pollution Control Board (TNPCB) and the State Government were instructed to monitor compliance and ensure strict enforcement of environmental laws. Industries failing to comply with environmental norms would face strict action, including closure.

6. Recognition of International Environmental Principles:

The Court recognized global environmental principles, such as the Precautionary Principle and Polluter Pays Principle, as part of Indian law and binding on industries and the State.

7. Overall Impact:

The case set a precedent for environmental accountability in India. It established that: Environmental protection is a fundamental obligation of both the State and private actors.

Economic development must proceed within the limits of environmental sustainability

Conclusion

The Vellore Citizens Welfare Forum v. Union of India case is a landmark judgment in the history of Indian environmental law. It reinforced the idea that protection of the environment is integral to the right to life under Article 21 of the Constitution. By adopting the Precautionary Principle and the Polluter Pays Principle, the Supreme Court established that industries cannot prioritize profit over environmental protection and public health.

The judgment also emphasized the importance of sustainable development, highlighting that economic growth must be balanced with ecological preservation. Furthermore, it held both the State authorities and polluting industries accountable for preventing environmental degradation, setting a precedent for strict enforcement of environmental laws in India.

Overall, this case strengthened the framework for environmental governance, promoted citizen participation through PILs, and integrated international environmental principles into Indian jurisprudence, ensuring that future development is responsible, equitable, and sustainable.

