

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.Kalpna

Assistant professor of Law

Mrs.S.Kalpna, 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.

**MUNICIPAL COUNCIL, RATLAM V. SHRI
VARDICHAND C OTHERS (1980) 4 SCC 162 COURT:
SUPREME COURT OF INDIA**

AUTHORED BY – SNEKA & THIRISHA

1. Introduction

The case of Municipal Council, Ratlam v. Shri Vardichand C Others is one of the most remarkable judgments in the field of environmental law and public nuisance in India.

It is a landmark decision where the Supreme Court emphasized that the right to live in a clean and healthy environment is an essential part of the Right to Life under Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

This case reflected judicial activism in ensuring social justice and public welfare, especially for the weaker sections of society who suffered due to the inaction of local authorities.

2. Citation

Citation: (1980) 4 SCC 162; AIR 1980 SC 1622

Case Name: Municipal Council, Ratlam v. Shri Vardichand C Others Date: 29 July 1980

Court: Supreme Court of India

3. Cause Title

Long Cause Title:

> Municipal Council, Ratlam — Appellant vs. Shri Vardichand and Others — Respondents Short

Cause Title:

> Ratlam Municipality Case or Ratlam v. Vardichand (1980)

4. Judges Detail C Dissenting Opinion Bench Composition:

Justice V.R. Krishna Iyer Justice A.D. Koshal

Opinion:

The judgment was unanimous. There was no dissenting opinion.

Justice Krishna Iyer delivered the leading judgment, famous for his activist approach and social welfare interpretation of law.

5. Summary of Facts

1. The residents of Ratlam town (Madhya Pradesh) filed a complaint under Section 133 of the Criminal Procedure Code, 1973 before the Sub-Divisional Magistrate.
2. The complaint stated that: The streets were full of filth and bad smell due to lack of sanitation. There were liquor shops in the area, causing disturbances and nuisance.
3. The Magistrate directed the Municipal Council to construct proper drains and remove the public nuisance.
4. The Municipal Council of Ratlam appealed against the order, arguing that it had no sufficient funds to carry out such work.
5. The case reached the Supreme Court after being dismissed by the Sessions Court and the High Court.

6. Judgment

The Supreme Court dismissed the appeal of the Ratlam Municipal Council and upheld the orders of the lower courts.

Key Points from the Judgment:

1. Duty of Municipality:

The Municipal Council has a statutory obligation under the Madhya Pradesh Municipalities Act, 1961 to maintain public health and sanitation.

2. Lack of Funds Not an Excuse:

Justice Krishna Iyer stated that financial inability cannot be a defense for failing to perform a statutory duty.

The municipality must find ways to fulfill its responsibility to the citizens.

3. Judicial Activism:

The Court took an activist approach, emphasizing that courts must compel performance of public duties when citizens' rights are affected.

4. Public Nuisance and Article 21:

The Court linked the concept of public nuisance with the Right to Life under Article 21 of the Constitution.

A clean environment is part of a dignified life.

5. Directions Issued:

The municipality was directed to: Construct proper drains within six months. Prevent discharge of waste into streets.

Maintain cleanliness and sanitation in the area.

7. Relevancy

This case is highly relevant in multiple legal areas:

Legal Area Relevance

Environmental Law Foundation for environmental protection and public health. Administrative Law Defines accountability of local bodies.

Criminal Law (Section 133 CrPC) Demonstrates how CrPC provisions can be used for public welfare.

Constitutional Law (Article 21) Expands “Right to Life” to include the right to live in a clean environment.

8. Theories Involved in the Case

1. Social Justice Theory:

Justice should ensure equality and dignity for all, especially the weaker sections who suffer due to neglect by authority.

2. Welfare State Principle:
The State and its organs (like municipalities) have a duty to provide basic civic amenities such as sanitation, water, and clean surroundings.

3. Judicial Activism:

The judiciary can intervene to enforce legal duties and protect fundamental rights when the executive fails.

4. Environmental Jurisprudence:

This case laid the foundation for the development of environmental law in India, leading to future cases like *M.C. Mehta v. Union of India*.

9. Leading Precedent Cases / Overruled Cases Followed / Relied On:

M.C. Mehta v. Union of India (Ganga Pollution Case, 1988) *Subhash Kumar v. State of Bihar* (1991)

Indian Council for Enviro-Legal Action v. Union of India (1996) Overruled Case:

None.

This case itself became a precedent for future environmental and public welfare litigations.

10. Conclusion

The judgment in *Municipal Council, Ratlam v. Shri Vardichand* is a milestone in Indian legal history.

It reflects the transformative power of the judiciary in ensuring social and environmental justice.

The case established that:

Municipal authorities cannot escape their responsibilities on the ground of lack of funds. Every citizen has the right to live in a pollution-free and healthy environment.

Courts can use Section 133 CrPC effectively to protect community welfare.

This case marked the beginning of environmental consciousness in Indian jurisprudence and inspired later Public Interest Litigations (PILs) that shaped environmental and human rights law.---

2. Vaamika island vs union of India

1. Introduction

The Vaamika Island case is a landmark environmental decision emphasizing the strict enforcement of the Coastal Regulation Zone (CRZ) Notification, 1991 and 2011 under the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986. The case dealt with illegal construction by a private resort on an ecologically sensitive island in the Vembanad backwaters of Kerala. The Supreme Court reaffirmed that development projects in fragile ecosystems must comply with environmental norms and that the right to property cannot override ecological protection.

2. Citation

M/s. Vaamika Island (Green Lagoon Resort) v. Union of India C Others, (2013) 8 SCC 760, SLP (Civil) Nos. 24390–24391 of 2013, Decided on: 8 August 2013, Bench: Justice K.S. Radhakrishnan and Justice A.K. Sikri.

3. Cause Title

(a) Long Cause Title: M/s. Vaamika Island (Green Lagoon Resort), represented by its Managing Director, Petitioner, versus Union of India, Ministry of Environment and Forests, Kerala Coastal Zone Management Authority, and Others, Respondents.

(b) Short Cause Title:

Vaamika Island v. Union of India (2013)

4. Judges' Details and Dissenting Opinion

Bench: Justice K.S. Radhakrishnan and Justice A.K. Sikri Dissent: None. The judgment was unanimous.

5. Summary of Facts

The petitioner, M/s. Vaamika Island (Green Lagoon Resort), owned about 5.21 acres of land on Vettala Thuruthu, an island in the Vembanad Lake, Kerala.

The Coastal Zone Management Plan (CZMP) of 1995, approved by the Ministry of Environment and Forests (MoEF), classified this area as a Filtration Pond (FP) under CRZ-I, a category where new constructions are strictly prohibited.

Despite this classification, the petitioner built a luxury resort with villas, pathways, and other structures without proper environmental clearance.

The Kerala Coastal Zone Management Authority (KCZMA) and local officials found the construction illegal and ordered its demolition.

The petitioner challenged the decision before the Kerala High Court, arguing that the classification under CRZ-I was incorrect and that the CZMP map was unscientific.

The High Court dismissed the plea. The petitioner then appealed to the Supreme Court through a Special Leave Petition (SLP).

6. Judgment

The Supreme Court of India dismissed the appeal, upholding the High Court's decision. Key findings:

1. **Validity of Classification:** The CZMP was prepared scientifically based on the Survey of India and cadastral maps; therefore, classifying the island under CRZ-I was valid.
2. **Environmental Sensitivity:** The Vembanad Lake is a Ramsar Site (a wetland of international importance). Any construction here violates both the CRZ Notification and the Wetland Conservation Guidelines.
3. **Illegal Construction:** All structures built without CRZ clearance were declared illegal and ordered to be demolished.
4. **Government's Role:** The Court directed the State and Union governments to ensure strict enforcement of CRZ regulations.
5. **Development vs. Environment:** The judgment reiterated that economic interests and tourism cannot override ecological protection.

7. Relevancy of the Case

The case is significant in Indian environmental jurisprudence for reinforcing the doctrine of sustainable development and precautionary principle.

It ensures that wetlands and coastal areas, especially Ramsar sites, receive the highest level environmental protection.

It strengthened the power of Coastal Zone Management Authorities to prevent and remove illegal constructions.

The case serves as a warning to developers violating CRZ norms.

8. Theories Involved in the Case

1. Precautionary Principle – Prevent environmental harm even when there is a lack of full scientific certainty.
2. Public Trust Doctrine – Natural resources like lakes, rivers, and coastal areas are held by the State in trust for the public.
3. Sustainable Development – Development must balance economic progress with ecological preservation.
4. Right to Healthy Environment under Article 21 – Environmental protection is part of the right to life.

9. Leading Precedent Cases / Overruled Cases Leading Precedents Cited:

Indian Council for Enviro-Legal Action v. Union of India (1996) 3 SCC 212

M.C. Mehta v. Union of India (Taj Trapezium Case, 1997)

Goa Foundation v. Diksha Holdings Pvt. Ltd. (2001) 2 SCC 97

Bombay Environmental Action Group v. State of Maharashtra (2005) AIR Bom 367

The Vaamika Island judgment did not overrule any case, but rather reaffirmed earlier environmental protection precedents.

10. Conclusion

The Vaamika Island v. Union of India case is a landmark in reinforcing environmental accountability. The Supreme Court's decision reflected India's commitment to international environmental obligations under the Ramsar Convention and domestic constitutional duties under Articles 48A and 51A(g). It clearly stated that no individual or enterprise can claim ownership or development rights in violation of ecological norms. The case thus stands as a guiding precedent ensuring that the coastal and wetland ecosystems remain protected for future generations.