

FOREST CASE UPDATE

Issue 45, May 2008

CONTENTS

1. Overview of the Godavarman Hearings in May 2008
2. Some Orders of the Godavarman Hearings in May 2008
3. Extracts of the Central Empowered Committee report on mining in Niyamgiri Hills

Overview of the Godavarman Hearings in May 2008

In the last year and half one of the most contentious issue before the Supreme Court in the forest matter has been that related to the issue of the composition of the non official members of the Forest Advisory Committee (FAC). The FAC has an extremely crucial role in the process of examining proposals for diversion of forest land. Last year had seen heated exchanges between the Ministry of Environment and Forests and the Amicus curiae on who should be members of the FAC. The Supreme Court had directed that till final disposal of the issue, the FAC would function in terms of the composition as proposed by the MoEF. However, decisions of the FAC had to be placed before the Central Empowered Committee (CEC) and Supreme Court. The impasse over the composition of FAC seems to have been overcome with all the parties i.e. the CEC, Amicus curiae and MoEF agreeing to the nomination of Dr Ullhas Karanth, Prof Madhav Gadgil and Mahesh Rangarajan as members of the FAC. However, the review powers of the CEC as well as the Supreme Court have been retained with respect to approval granted by the FAC. Most importantly, the final decision of the Supreme Court is still awaited. The Order dated 2nd May 2008 is included further in the Update (Also see: <http://www.indiatogether.org/2008/jun/env-faccec.htm>).

The Niyamgiri mining issue again gained spotlight in view of the Report of the CEC which has made interesting suggestions on how mining could lead to inclusive growth. A proposal which could ensure that minerals are not made available at a pittance to mining companies saw opposition from both Sterlite as well as the Orissa Mining Corporation. The matter is now fixed for hearing on the 18th of July. In this issue we have included some of the extracts of the CEC report.

On a positive note, the Supreme Court has refused to approve for the time being the Human Dam project proposed to be located in Chandrapur District of Maharashtra. The Supreme Court reasoned that the project would involve felling of large number of trees and will have environmental repercussions. It is a significant decision even if the same is for 'time being' since the project would have led to disastrous impact on the wildlife of Tadoba Andheri Tiger Reserve. The Bombay Natural History (BNHS) Society had filed an Application before the CEC about four years back after the MoEF granted approval to the project. The decision is also significant since the Wildlife Institute of India

had in its study recommended for approval of the project in view of its positive impact on wildlife (Also see Forest Case Updates Issues 1, 3, 11 and 14 at www.forestcaseindia.org).

The Supreme Court is on vacation from mid May till the First week of July. The CEC is however is holding hearings on some crucial cases with over 30 matters to be heard during the month of June.

We will keep you updated!

Some Orders of the Godavarman Hearings in March and April 2008

There were six hearings in the Godavarman case during the first half of May 2008 before the courts went on vacation; however detailed discussions took place only in two of these hearings.

Some of the substantive orders of these two hearings (2nd and 9th May) are presented below, critical ones including the reconstitution of the Forest Advisory Committee (FAC) and related reports of the Central Empowered Committee (CEC) on pending forest clearances of project of Suzlon Energy, Human Irrigation Project, Tata Steel and so on. The order are also related to saw mills in Uttarkhand; construction by National Highways Authority of India (NHAI) through the Balaram-Ambaji sanctuary for the construction of Palanpur-Swaroopganj section of a highway in Gujarat; construction of the Siri Fort Complex for the Commonwealth Games, New Delhi; mining near Narayan Sarovar sanctuary, Gujarat and a transmission line to Peechi Vazani Wild Life Sanctuary, Kerala.

Along with the orders we have also included some weblinks that will point to additional facts of the cases and analysis therein.

Orders Dated 2-5-2008

- I.A.NO.208-209 (*Regarding wood based industries in Uttarakhand*)

In the State of Uttarkhand there are 27 saw mills and 27 ply-wood units.

CEC has suggested that these 27 ply-wood units have to pay penalty as given in para 5 of the supplementary report submitted. The owners of these ply-wood units accept the CEC Report and they are allowed to start units subject to fulfilling the conditions. These units are given six weeks time to pay penalty. These units can function only after depositing of these penalties.

I.As. are allowed as regards these ply-wood units.

As regard 27 saw mills, four are relocated in Jaspur and two in Rishikesh. There are problem regarding re-location of these six mills. Except these six saw mills rest of 21 saw mills have agreed to pay penalty as indicated in para 9 of the supplementary report.

These saw mills have agreed to pay the penalty as stated in the report. On payment of these penalties as stated in this report these units may be allowed to function. As regards saw mills at Jaspur and Rishikesh re-location, matter shall be listed later.

I.As. are allowed as regards 21 units.

I.As. as regards remaining six units may be posted later

- *I.A.No.2164 and 2167, 2168,2169,2170 in I.A.Nos.1413, 1414, 1426, 1428, 1454, 1459,1460,1662-1663, 1675, 1778, 2005-2006, 2121-2125,2127-2128, 2129,2130-2132, 2133, 2216,2217-2218, 2222, 2232-2233, in 1413 IN W.P.(C)No.202/1995 (Regarding reconstitution of Forest Advisory Committee and Reports of the CEC on forest clearance of projects)*

Learned Solicitor General made a statement that the existing FAC would be re-constituted and Prof. Madhav Gadgil, Dr. Ullhas Karanth and Mr. Mahesh Rangarajan would be included in the FAC in place of existing non-official members and further steps would be taken in that direction and it would be brought to the notice of CEC. Pending finalization of the new FAC, this Court had passed an order dated

27.4.2007 on the larger question indicated hereinbelow:

(a) The F.A.C. as it stands today will give priority to Project which need immediate clearance. In this regard, it may be stated that fresh cases may be cleared Project-wise by the F.A.C. and thereafter such clearance shall be placed before this Court for approval. We make it clear that pending the decision of the larger question, all clearances by the F.A.C. of fresh cases shall be subject to approval by this Court. Before giving approval, we would like to have responses from CEC in respect of each clearance. In order to avoid delay, we direct the concerned Ministry to give a copy of the clearance to CEC so that CEC would give its response expeditiously. We will examine each clearance and decide whether to grant or not to grant the approval thereto. Once the approval is granted by this Court, the matter may be placed before the Central Government for disposal in accordance with law.

The above clause (a) would be deleted for future projects after reconstitution.

FOURTH REPORT

(i) Six proposals for grant of TWP: (Section IV of The Report):

There are six proposals for grant of Temporary Work Permits (TWP). This Court by order dated 25.4.2008 in I.A.No.2177-84 had directed MoEF to take a decision in respect of four TWP proposals subject to compliance of six conditions. The four proposals have been cleared.

Subject to fulfillment of the conditions, the balance two TWP proposals may also be permitted to be decided by the MoEF in terms of the said order.

I.As. are disposed of as regards six proposals for grant of TWP.

(ii) Ten proposals for grant of the prospecting licence: (Section III of the Report):

This is an application submitted by TATA Steel Limited for prospecting Licence.

Learned counsel appearing for TATA Steel Ltd. has submitted that there is no diversion of forest land for non-forest purpose as contemplated in the Forest Act. It is submitted that for Prospecting Licence Drilling of Bore-Holes and clarification in (iii) of 1.3 of Chapter 1 Application of Forest (Conservation) Act, 1980, have been misconstrued.

In Clause (v) of Chapter 1 - Application of Forest (Conservation) Act, 1980, it is stated that prospecting of any mineral, done under prospecting license granted under MMDR Act which requires collection/removal of samples from the forest land, would be a stae between survey & investigation and grant of mining lease and as such permission under Forest (Conservation) Act 1980 would be required. However, Test drilling upto 10 bore holes of maximum 4" diameter per 100 sq. km. for prospecting, exploration or reconnaissance operations, without felling of trees, shall not attract the provisions of the Act. In all other cases involving more than 10 hectares of bore holes, prior permission of the Central Government under the Act would be required.

Subject to the above, these applications are allowed. MoEF may pass appropriate orders as it is not diversion of forest land for non forest purpose, except for the limited purpose noted above. It is clarified accordingly.

In view of nine other applications pending for prospecting licences, MoEF may consider these applications. The DGFA will re-consider these problems personally in the light of observations made by CEC and pass appropriate orders within a period of six weeks. I.As. are allowed as regards.

(iii) 4 Irrigation Projects of Maharashtra: (Section V and VII of the Report):

Four irrigation projects were pending for clearance. As regards Human River Project-it is noticed that it involved felling of very large number of trees and have serious environmental repercussions therefore for the time being this project as proposed is not cleared. One of these projects, Rajiv Sagar (Bawanthadi) Project may be cleared and implemented. In regard to two projects i.e. Lower Penganga Major Irrigation Project and Jigaon Major Irrigation Project MoEF may consider and pass appropriate orders. State may go ahead of these three projects after getting approval from MoEF. I.A. in regard to three projects is allowed.

(iv) The proposal for extension of mining lease in favour of MP SMCL, the State has already withdrawn the project. No orders are required. I.A. is disposed of accordingly.

(v) Already cleared.

(vi) 11 proposals (Section IX,X,XII to XIX AND XXII of the Report)

The MoEF may take decision in the light of the observations made by the CEC in Section IX,X,XII to XIX AND XXII of the 4th Report.

(vii) Section XI and XXI of the Report:

Adjourned. Await report of Lok Ayukt, Karnataka.

(viii) Prospecting licence to M/s. Jindal Power:

List on 9.5.2008.

(ix) Remaining six proposals (Section VI, XXII & XXIV of the Report:

CEC has already filed Report. The MoEF is requested to give its response.

Therefore, it is adjourned.

FIFTH REPORT

i) Wind power project in favour of M/S. Suzlon Energy Ltd.

The MoEF to take fresh decision in the Wind power project in the light of the observations made by the CEC.

ii) *Four proposals of mining projects:*

CEC has given its Report and the matter is now pending with the FAC. As soon as FAC give response, the MoEF will consider and take appropriate decision and give response.

I.A.NO.2126 (RE:Timblo mine, Goa - 6th & 7th Report)

CEC has already approved the proposal for mining activities. It is pointed out that there is a transfer of mining lease and MoEF may take appropriate decision having regard to the transfer effected by the lease-holder. We are told that the NPV has already paid. All other conditions imposed by this Court's Order dated 4.1.2008 should be complied with. The Ministry of Mines have to take appropriate decision relating to right to continue with the mining activities.

I.A. is disposed of accordingly.

Also see: <http://www.indianexpress.com/story/20258.html>;
<http://www.thehindu.com/2007/01/06/stories/2007010617691700.htm>;
<http://www.thehindubusinessline.com/2007/12/12/stories/2007121251071200.htm>;
<http://in.ibtimes.com/articles/20080104/goa-iron-ore-mines-supreme-court.htm>

Orders Dated 2-5-2008

- I.A.Nos.826 in 566 with 955 in 566, 958, 985, 1001-1001A, 1013-1014, 1016-1018, 1019, 1046, 1047, 1164, 1180-1181, 1182-1183, 1196, 1208-1209, 1229, 1248-1249, 1253, 1301-1302, 1303-1304, 1313, 1314, 1318, 1319 in 1137, 1325, 1364, 1365-1366, 1370-1370A, 1371, 1384, 1435-1437, 1441 with 1634, 1475-1476, 1579, 1513, 1573, 1664, 1676, 1707, 1721, 1779 in 1164 in 566, 1785-1786 in IA 1441, 1980-1981, 1993, 2013, 2074-2076, 2077-2078 in 1441,2230-2231, 2240-2241 in 1164, 2147-2148, 2149-2150 & 2153-2154 (Regarding the payment of Net Present Value for the diversion of forest land for non forest use)

List the Public Utility Project matters, Hydel and Irrigation Projects matters, Construction of road on acquired land matter, transmission lines matters, Hydro Electric Power Projects matters, Mining in the same sequence on 18.7.2008.

The order dated 28.3.2008 is corrected as recorded separately.

- I.A.Nos.2145-46 (Regarding construction by National Highway Authority of India through Balaram-Ambaji Wildlife Sanctuary, Gujarat)

These applications have been filed by the National Highway Authority of India seeking permission for use of 4.924 ha. of forest land falling in Balaram-Ambaji Wildlife Sanctuary for the widening of NH-14 on Palanpur-Swaroopganj Section in the State of Gujarat. The C.E.C. has examined the project and recommended the same subject to acceptance of the following conditions :

1. the conditions imposed by the Chief Wildlife Warden and the Standing Committee of the National Board of Wildlife will be strictly complied with;

2. 5% of the project cost of the Palanpur-Swaroopganj Section i.e. Rs. 8.255 crores, will be provided for conservation and protection measures in the sanctuary. This will include the amount required to be spent on mitigative measures proposed by the Chief Wildlife Warden/Standing Committee of the NBWL;

3. no labour camps will be established within the sanctuary;

4. no construction material will be left in the sanctuary;

5. the material for the construction will be obtained from non-forest area falling outside the sanctuary; and

6. for use of forest land, approval under the F.C. Act will be obtained.

Learned counsel for the applicant stated that the conditions are acceptable. Subject to the fulfillment of the above conditions, this project is cleared.

I.A.s are disposed of accordingly.

- I.A.No.2272: (Regarding construction related to the Siri Fort Complex of the Commonwealth Games in Delhi)

Issue notice to all the respondents.

Commonwealth Games Authority/Committee be impleaded as a party respondent no.4.

Issue notice to newly impleaded respondent. Mr. Saharya, advocate accepts notice on behalf of the 4th respondent.

Parties on either side will file additional documents with copy to the other side.

Also See: <http://www.hindu.com/2008/05/04/stories/2008050451040500.htm>;
<http://www.thehindu.com/2008/05/10/stories/2008051059190300.htm>

- I.A.Nos.12,55 &58-59 in SLP(C)No.13658/1996 (Regarding mining activities near Narayan Sarovar Sanctuary)

These applications have been filed by the applicants to undertake mining activities in the State of Gujarat. An objection was raised to the effect that these are nearer to the sanctuary area of Narayan Sarovar sanctuary in the State of Gujarat. The applicants pointed out that it is beyond the 2.5 kms. of the boundary area of the sanctuary. The State Government will ascertain this fact and we grant permission only if it is beyond the 2.5 kms. of boundary area of the sanctuary. This direction regarding distance is subject to final orders to be passed later in the Buffer Zone matter.

I.A.s are disposed of accordingly.

List the connected I.A.s after 12 weeks.

Also see: <http://www.hinduonnet.com/thehindu/fline/fl1708/17080650.htm>

- I.A.No.2257 in I.A.No.1093 (Regarding 400 KV transmission line through Peechi Vazani Wildlife Sanctuary, Kerala by Power Grid Corporation of India)

Taken on board.

Recommendation of C.E.C. dated 5th May, 2008 be treated as I.A.

Learned senior counsel appearing for the Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd. (PGCIL) has submitted that 0.8694 ha. of forest land falling in the Peechi Vazani Wildlife Sanctuary, Kerala is required for relocation of one damaged tower of 400 KV double circuit Udumalpet- Trichur transmission line. The C.E.C. has examined the proposal and has recommended the same subject to the following conditions :

- 1. for use of forest land approval under the Forest (Conservation) Act, will be obtained;*
- 2. felling of trees will be kept to the minimum possible;*
- 3. the condition imposed by the Chief Wildlife Warden will be strictly complied; and*
- 4. the NPV at the prescribed rate for the forest land falling within the sanctuary as well as outside the sanctuary will be deposited by the user agency.*

Learned senior counsel appearing for the applicant submitted that these conditions are acceptable to them. Permission for the project is granted, subject to fulfillment of the above conditions.

I.A. is disposed of accordingly.

Extracts of the Central Empowered Committee Report on Mining in Niyamgiri Hills

REPORT OF THE CENTRAL EMPOWERED COMMITTEE IN I.A. NO. 2134 OF 2007 FILED BY M/S STERLITE INDUSTRIES (INDIA) LTD. REGARDING BAUXITE MINING ON THER NIYAMGIRI HILLS IN LANJIGARH DISTRICTS KALAHANDI AND RAYAGADA, ORISSA

I.A. No. 2134 of 2007 has been filed by M/s Sterlite Industries (India) Ltd. (M/s SIIL). with the following prayer:

- “(a) *Clear the forest diversion proposal submitted by Orissa Mining Corporation for diversion of 660.749 Ha of forest land to undertake bauxite mining on the Niyamgiri Hills in Lanjigarh and direct MoEF to give its approval in this regard.*
- (b) *Pass any such further orders as this Hon’ble Court may deem fit in light of the facts presented above.”*

This report is being filed pursuant to this Hon’ble Court’s order dated 15.2.2008 by which the CEC has been asked to file its report in the matter.

OBSERVATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

8. The CEC is of the view that the present scheme of things as proposed by M/s SILL, M/s OMC and the State of Orissa needs to be modified appropriately keeping in view the letter and spirit of this Hon'ble Court's order dated 23-11-2007. In this context, the CEC is of the view that:

- (i) the permission for mining of bauxite in the Niyamgiri Hill area, which is indisputably an eco sensitive area, calls for a delicate balance between conservation and development. On the one hand, public interest lies in industrialization which would lead to prosperity of the area, and in infrastructure development, creation of new job opportunities. This would help in bringing these underdeveloped area closer to the average rate of growth of GDP. On the other hand lies the need for conservation. The balance between these two would lie in permitting conservation not merely for private profit but in am manner that maximizes the public interest component in the activity;
- (ii) in order to ensure (i), it is necessary that the bauxite to be provided to Lanjigarh refinery project of M/s VAL is at a transfer price that fully reflects the value of the mineral without any direct/indirect subsidy;
- (iii) in order to achieve (i) and (ii), whereby an assured supply of raw material from dedicated mines is available to the user agency at a fair price, and there is certainty on both counts, it is necessary to establish a pre-determined mechanism for fixation of price, valid during the entire life of the mine; and
- (iv) considering the huge amounts involved, an institutionalized system of checks and balance for determining price of the mineral, a multi layer system for preparation, approval, implementation, audit of works is absolutely necessary;

The proposal of the User Agency needs to be modified accordingly.

9. In the light of this Hon'ble Court's order dated 23-11-2007 in I.A. No. 1324 and 1474 and after considering the issues raised in the present IA, details made available by M/s SILL and the State of Orissa, other relevant information, the following procedure/modality regarding Niyamgiri Bauxite Mines is submitted for consideration of this Hon'ble Court:

I. A Special Purpose Vehicle (SPV) may be got registered under Section 25 of the Companies Act, 1956 as a non-profit company with a nominal paid up capital of Rs. One Lakh with the Govt. of Orissa, the majority share holder (51%), M/s OMC and M/s SILL contributing the balance equity of 24.5% each;

II. The Board of Directors of M/s SPV could consist of the following:

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| <i>i) Chief Secretary,
Govt. Of Orissa</i> | <i>Chairman</i> |
| <i>ii) Principal Secretary
(Tribal Welfare)</i> | <i>Director</i> |
| <i>iii) Principal Chief Conservator
of Forests</i> | <i>Director</i> |
| <i>iv) Chairman, OMC</i> | <i>Director</i> |
| <i>v) Two representatives
of M/s SILL</i> | <i>Directors</i> |
| <i>vi) Two eminent experts in the
field of forest, wildlife,
tribal welfare and related fields</i> | <i>Independent
Directors</i> |

III. The operation of the SPV should be under the control and management of a CEO appointed by the Board, and the finances handled by a CFO appointed by the Board. These two should be professionals selected by a Search Committee set up the Board.

- IV. The Mining Lease of Niyamgiri bauxite mine may be then assigned to the SPV from the M/s OMC after obtaining requisite approvals. The SPV would work the mine in a businesslike manner, but its profit would be utilized not for distribution of dividend to the shareholders but for deployment on activities that would ensure benefits to the Tribals and local inhabitants of the area.
- V. The SPV would enter into an agreement with M/s SILL, appropriately drawn up after obtaining legal advice, for supply of its entire production from Niyamgiri bauxite Mine during the validity of the mining lease (including renewal(s)) at a price to be established from time to time in accordance to the prescribed formula.
- VI. The SPV may either take up the work of raising of ore on its own, or enter into a long term agreement, after wide publicity, for appointment of Raising Agent for the Niyamgiri Bauxite Mine.
- VII. The price of the Bauxite Ore in the market is not ascertainable since there is no market for this ore as such of significance, but its price can be ascertained by reducing the normative cost of conversion plus profit from the market price of Aluminium. The CEC also examined the feasibility of determining the price of the Ore by reducing the cost of conservation (plus profit) from the price of Alumina, but did not consider this an advisable option since the price of Alumina shows a great degree of variation from supplier to supplier (ANNEXURE R-6). This method of calculating price is in effect a mirror of image of the Cost plus Return basis adopted for determining tariff.
- VIII. For the purposes of price fixation, the price of Aluminium metal quoted at the London Metal Exchange (LME) is the best measure of the market price of Aluminium. The rate of royalty payable to Government on bauxite mineral is also determined on the basis of the LME Aluminium metal price (ANNEXURE R- 7).
- IX. As a thumb rule for refining bauxite into alumina, 2.5 tons of bauxite is used and producing one tonne of aluminum metal, two tonne of alumina is required. Thus as a thumb rule, for producing one tonne of aluminium metal 5 tonne of bauxite is consumed. A copy of details received from the Secretary General, federation of Indian Mineral Industries is enclosed at (ANNEXURE R- 8) to this report. The figure given by VAL at the time of seeking permission for its expansion also suggest that they would consume about 2.5 tones of bauxite to manufacture one ton of Alumina (refer Annexure R-4)
- X. The indicative figures of cost of production of aluminium (for 2004-06) for various producers indicate that NALCO with production cost of about US \$ 900 per ton of aluminium and HINDALCO with about US \$ 1060 per ton are the lowest cost producers of aluminium in the world (ANNEXURE R-9). These figures have to be adjusted in the Indian context for new units where power is an expensive input, for inflation and for changes in exchange rates.
- XI. On the basis of the above, after accounting for inflation etc. and taking into account the general trends as aforesaid, the CEC is of the view that it would be fair to compute the cost of bauxite/tonne at one percent of the aluminium metal price at LME. The price should thus be determined periodically- say on monthly basis- by the SPV. The contract should contain a suitable provision for this purpose.
- XII. The amount payable by M/s SILL in compliance of this Hon'ble Court's order dated 23-11-2007 in I.A. No. 1324 and 1474 may be deposited by M/s SILL with the SPV (and not with the CAMPA). This amount may be treated as premium payable by M/s SILL for getting assured supply of bauxite from a dedicated mine. This amount together with net receipts towards supply of mineral to M/s SILL or its nominee, after deducting the amount payable to the Govt. of Orissa towards the royalty of the mineral, should be invested in any Nationalized Bank/ RBI. This amount should be used for infrastructure development, tribal welfare, conservation and protection of wildlife, capacity building and other development works in Kalahandi and Rayagada Districts. A small percentage

of the income from interest may be used for meeting the expenditure on establishment and other day to day expenses of the SPV.

- XIII. The fundamental principle that the surpluses generated by the SPV out of its operations is to be used for the welfare of the community inhabiting the area, the tribals and for amelioration of the environment is recognized. The cash surpluses generated shall be deposited by the SPV on a quarterly basis, in a designated bank account. These funds are to be utilized only for the purposes of "Lanjigarh Development Schemes" described below. These schemes should spell out clearly the objects of the scheme, the target beneficiaries, the need for funds and the timing of such funds.
- XIV. Within three months, the State of Orissa be directed to draw up schemes for welfare of Tribals, for welfare of the local communities, for infrastructure development of the area, and for amelioration of the environment. A compliance report in this regard shall be filed before the Supreme Court.
- XV. The procedure and organizational set up laid down in the CAMPA Notification dated 23-04-2004 issued by the Ministry of Environment and Forests (ANNEXURE R-10) may be followed with appropriate changes for preparation and approval of the schemes, implementations of works, release of funds by the SPV, concurrent audit and monitoring. This will ensure appropriate checks and balances and multiplayer system wherein the SPV will be custodian of fund, the Steering Committee will be the authority to approve the schemes, the State Management Committee will be responsible for preparation of schemes, the field officers will be responsible for implementation of works, Auditor General will be responsible for auditing accounts so on.
- XVI. M/s SIIL has mentioned the category wise number of persons presently employed by the company, its contractors and estimated to be engaged in future. The number of persons should be treated as firm commitment by M/s SIIL for giving employment by it and the concerned contractors.
- XVII. The SPV may decide its own procedure and norms subject to the Hon'ble Court's order dated 23-11-2007 in IA No. 1324 and 1474.
11. The CEC is of the view that it is necessary to evolve norms for sustainable development of eco fragile areas and eco sensitive areas where the need for development activity at an environmental cost in such areas. Where such development is necessary in large public interest, the balance of sustainability lies in balancing the environmental cost with public good and not private profit. One way of ensuring public good is by making a scheme that accommodate a public private partnership that makes of efficient development of scarce resources, while utilizing the profits of such ventures for public good.

This Hon'ble Court may please consider the above report and may please pass appropriate orders in the matter.

Dated: 24-04-2008

M.K. Jiwrajka
Member Secretary

Also see: <http://www.indiatogether.org/2008/may/env-vedanta.htm>

Editors: Ritwick Dutta and Kanchi Kohli

For further information and clarifications please write to forestcase@yahoo.com

Coordinating addresses: E-180, Greater Kailash 2, New Delhi-110048 and
C-106, Sector 40, Noida, Uttar Pradesh

Visit the Forest Case Update Website for past issues and accessing the orders of the Supreme Court and Central Empowered Committee: www.forestcaseindia.org

A special thanks to Priyabrat Sathapathy for the reporting on the 7th March 2008 hearing.

We would like to acknowledge the support of Foundation for Ecological Security. The support for the procurement of the Supreme Court orders has been received from Rufford's Small Grants.