

M.B. RAMESH (D) BY LRS. A

v.

K.M. VEERAJE URS (D) BY LRS. & ORS. A
(Civil Appeal No.1071 of 2006)

MAY 03, 2013 B

[H.L. GOKHALE AND RANJANA PRAKASH DESAI, JJ.]

Evidence Act, 1872 – ss. 68 and 71 – Proof of execution of Will – Suit on the basis of a Will – Trial court and first appellate court dismissed the suit holding that the Will was not proved as it did not fulfill the requirement of s.63(c) of Succession Act – High Court in second appeal decreed the suit – Held: In the facts of the case, the ‘Will’ can be said to have been proved with the aid of other evidence of attendant circumstances which is permissible u/s.71 – Suit decreed – Succession Act, 1925 – s.63(c). C D

Will:

Examination of Will – Role of court – Held: Role of the court is limited to examining whether the instrument propounded as the last Will of the deceased is or is not that by the testator, and whether it is product of free and sound disposing mind. E

Proof of Will – Standard of evidence – Held: A Will has to be proved like any other document, except that the evidence should additionally satisfy the requirements of s.63 of Succession Act and of s.68 of Evidence Act – Succession Act, 1925 – s.63 – Evidence Act, 1872 – s.68. F

Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 – s.100 – Second appeal – Scope of – Held: Second appeal can be entertained even on the question of fact – Whether a particular question is a substantial question of law, depends on facts and G

573 H

A *circumstances of each case – Construction of a document of title or the document which is foundation of the rights of parties, raises a question of law.*

B **The respondents-plaintiffs filed suit, on the strength of the Will executed by the testatrix and prayed for declaration of their title to the property and for permanent injunction, restraining the appellants-defendants from interfering with their possession thereof. The trial court as well as the first appellate court held that the plaintiffs failed to prove the Will, as the requirement of s.63(c) of Succession Act, 1925 was not fulfilled and dismissed the suit. High Court, in second appeal framed question of law as to whether the concurrent findings that plaintiffs have not proved the Will was bad in law and the finding in that regard was perverse and contrary to the evidence on record? Deciding the question of law in favour of the plaintiffs, the High Court decreed the suit.** C D

E **The questions for consideration in the present appeal were whether the Will of the testatrix was validly executed and duly proved by the plaintiffs; and whether the High Court was right in interfering in exercise of power u/s.100 CPC, into the concurrent findings of facts.**

Dismissing the appeal, the Court

F **HELD: 1.1. A Will, has to be executed in the manner required by s.63 of the Succession Act, 1925. Section 68 of the Evidence Act requires the Will to be proved by examining at least one attesting witness. Section 71 of the Evidence Act is another connected section “which is permissive and an enabling section permitting a party to lead other evidence in certain circumstances”, and in a way reduces the rigour of the mandatory provision of Section 68. Section 71 is meant to lend assistance and come to the rescue of a party who had done his best, but would otherwise be let down if oth** G H

due execution by other evidence are not permitted. At the same time, the section cannot be read to absolve a party of his obligation under Section 68 of the Evidence Act read with Section 63 of the Succession Act to present in evidence a witness, though alive and available. [Para 16] [587-F-H; 588-A-B]

Janki Narayan Bhoir vs. Narayan Namdeo Kadam 2003 (2) SCC 91: 2002 (5) Suppl. SCR 175 – referred to.

1.2. In the present case, the requirement of Section 68 of the Evidence Act is satisfied, since one attesting witness i.e. PW-2 was called for the purpose of proving the execution of the Will, and he has deposed to that effect. PW-2 has stated that he has signed the Will in the presence of the testatrix, and she has also signed the Will in his presence. However his evidence was silent on the issue as to whether the testatrix executed the Will in the presence of another attesting witness and whether he also signed as attesting witness in the presence of the testatrix. Section 63 (c) of the Succession Act very much lays down the requirement of a valid and enforceable Will that it shall be attested by two or more witnesses, each of whom has seen the testator sign or affix his mark to the Will, and each of the witnesses has signed the Will in the presence of the testator. A Will has to be proved like any other document except that evidence tendered in proof of a Will should additionally satisfy the requirement of Section 63 of the Succession Act, apart from the one under Section 68 of the Evidence Act. [Para 17] [589-C-G]

R. Venkatachala Iyengar vs. B N. Thimmajamma AIR 1959 SC 443: 1959 Suppl. SCR 426; *Smt. Jaswant Kaur vs. Smt Amrit Kaur* AIR 1977 SC 74: 1977 (1) SCR 925 – relied on.

1.3. In the present case, the fact that the second attesting witness was present at the time of execution of

A the Will was not contested by the defendants by putting the question to PW2 that the other attesting witness was not present when the Will was executed. Wherever the opponent declines to avail himself of the opportunity to put his essential and material case in cross-examination, B it must follow that he believed that the testimony given could not be disputed at all. It is a rule of essential justice. [Para 20] [593-F-H]

A.E.G. Carapiet vs. A.Y. Derderian AIR 1961 Calcutta 359 – referred to.

C 1.4. It is true that in the present case, there is no specific statement by PW2 that he had seen the other attesting witness sign the Will in the presence of the testatrix, but he has stated that the other attesting witness D had also signed the document. He has proved his signature, and on the top of it, he has also stated in the cross-examination that the other witness, the testatrix E himself and one 'S' and the writer of the Will were all present while writing the Will on 24.10.1943 which was F registered on the very next day. This statement by implication and inference will have to be held as proving the required attestation by the other witness. This statement alongwith the attendant circumstances placed on record would certainly constitute proving of the Will by other evidence as permitted by Section 71 of the Evidence Act. [Para 21] [594-E-G]

Mahalaxmi Bank Limited vs. Kamkhyalal Goenka AIR 1958 Assam 56 – referred to.

G 1.5. While arriving at the finding as to whether the Will was duly executed, the Court must satisfy its conscience having regard to the totality of circumstances. The Court's role in matters concerning the Wills is limited to examining whether the instrument propounded as the last Will of the deceased is or is not that by the testator, and whether it is the product of

disposing mind. [Para 24] [597-C-E]

A

R. Venkatachala Iyengar vs. B N. Thimmajamma AIR 1959 SC 443: 1959 Suppl. SCR 426; Smt. Jaswant Kaur vs. Smt Amrit Kaur AIR 1977 SC 74: 1977 (1) SCR 925; Gurdev Kaur vs. Kaki 2006 (1) SCC 546 – relied on.

B

Vishnu Ramkrishana vs. Nathu Vithal AIR 1949 Bombay 266 – referred to.

1.6. In the present matter, the issue with respect to the due execution of the Will was decided by the trial court, as well as by the first appellate court on the basis of an erroneous interpretation of the evidence on record regarding the circumstances attendant to the execution of the Will. The property mentioned in the Will is admittedly ancestral property of the testatrix. She had to face a litigation, initiated by her husband, to retain her title and possession over this property. Besides, she could get the amounts for her maintenance from her husband only after a court battle, and thereafter also she had to enter into a correspondence with the appellant to get those amounts from time to time. The appellant is her stepson whereas the respondents are sons of her cousin. She would definitely desire that her ancestral property protected by her in a litigation with her husband does not go to a stepson, but would rather go to the relatives on her side. This context cannot be ignored, while examining the validity of the Will. [Para 24] [597-E-H; 598-A]

C

D

E

F

G

H

A terms of Section 63 (c) of the Succession Act read with Section 68 of the Evidence Act. [Para 15] [587-C-E]

Bharpur Singh vs. Shamsher Singh 2009 (3) SCC 687: 2008 (17) SCR 517 – relied on.

B

1.8. Thus, the plaintiffs/respondents have proved that the testatrix had duly executed a Will on 24.10.1943 in favour of the plaintiffs, and bequeathed the suit properties to them. She got the Will registered on the very next day. The High Court was right in holding that the findings of the trial and appellate court, though concurrent, were bad in law and perverse and contrary to the evidence on record. The suit filed by the respondents would stand decreed. They are hereby granted a declaration of their title to the suit property, and for a permanent injunction restraining the defendants from interfering with their possession thereof. In case their possession has been in any way disturbed, they will be entitled to recover the possession of the concerned property, with future mesne profits. [Para 25] [598-B-E]

C

D

E

F

G

H

2. Whether a particular question is a substantial question of law or not, depends on the facts and circumstances of each case. The construction of a document of title or of a document which is the foundation of the rights of parties, necessarily raises a question of law. In the present case, when the execution of the Will and construction thereof was the subject matter of consideration, the framing of the question of law cannot be faulted. There is no prohibition to entertain a second appeal even on question of fact, provided the court is satisfied that the findings of the courts below were vitiated by non-consideration of relevant evidence or by showing erroneous approach to the matter and findings recorded in the court below are perverse. [Para 14] [586-F-H; 587-A, B-C]

Chunilal Mehta vs. Century Spinning and Manufacturing Company AIR 1962 SC: 1962 Suppl. SCR 549 – followed. A

Santosh Hazari vs. Purushottam Tiwari 2001 (3) SCC 179: 2001 (1) SCR 948; *Union of India vs. Ibrahim Uddin* 2012 (8) SCC 148: 2012 (8) SCR 35 – relied on. B

Narayanan Rajendran vs. Lekshmy Sarojini 2009 (5) SCC 264: 2009 (2) SCR 71 – referred to.

Case Law Reference:

2009 (2) SCR 71	referred to	Para 13	C
1962 Suppl. SCR 549	followed	Para 14	
2001 (1) SCR 948	relied on	Para 14	
2012 (8) SCR 35	relied on	Para 14	D
2008 (17) SCR 517	relied on	Para 15	
2002 (5) Suppl. SCR 175	referred to	Para 16	
1959 Suppl. SCR 426	relied on	Para 17	
1977 (1) SCR 925	relied on	Para 18	E
AIR 1961 Calcutta 359	referred to	Para 20	
AIR 1958 Assam 56	referred to	Para 22	
AIR 1949 Bombay 266	referred to	Para 23	F
1959 Suppl. SCR 426	relied on	Para 24	
1977 (1) SCR 925	relied on	Para 24	
2006 (1) SCC 546	relied on	Para 24	G

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION : Civil Appeal No. 1071 of 2006.

From the Judgment & Order dated 23.01.2004 of the High Court of Karnataka at Bangalore in R.S.A. No. 546 of 1996. H

A Basava Prabhu S. Patil, B. Subrahmanya Prasad, Anirudh Sanganerla for the Appellants.

Anand Sanjay M. Nuli, L.K. Sharma, V.N. Raghupathy for the Respondents.

B The Judgment of the Court was delivered by

H.L. GOKHALE J. 1. This Civil Appeal raises the question as to whether the will of one Smt. Nagammanni was validly executed, and whether the same was duly proved by the respondent no.1 and another (original plaintiffs). There is one more connected issue raised in this appeal as to whether a learned Judge of the High Court of Karnataka was right in interfering in Second Appeal, into the concurrent findings of the Trial Court and the Lower Appellate Court in exercise of High Court's powers under Section 100 of Code of Civil Procedure. D

Facts leading to this Civil Appeal are as follows:-

2. The respondent no.1 and another, the original plaintiffs are the sons of a cousin of one Smt. Nagammanni who died on 21.11.1970. It is claimed by them that she left behind a will executed way back on 24.10.1943, and registered with the Sub-Registrar at Mysore, on 25.10.1943. The original plaintiffs claimed that through the said will she has bequeathed her property in their favour. The property referred in the will is her ancestral property. The property of late Smt. Nagammanni consisted of 11 parcels of dry land situated in village Mallinathpuram, and 2 parcels of wet land situated in village Kaggalli, both in taluk Mallavalli in district Mandya, State of Karnataka. Out of these 11 parcels of dry land those at Sl. Nos.2, 5 and 10 (from the list referred in the plaint) were not covered in the will. G

3. It was the case of the original plaintiffs that they were in possession of these parcels of land, and their possession was sought to be disturbed by the appeal. H

defendant no.1 and others). Smt. Nagammanni is the widow of one C. Basavaraje Urs, whereas the appellant is the son of this C. Basavaraje Urs from his second wife. After the death of Smt. Nagammanni, the plaintiffs, as well as the defendants, applied for entering their names in the revenue records as the owners of the concerned lands. The Mutation Registrar however passed an order on 29.3.1971, in favour of the defendants. The plaintiffs preferred an appeal against the same to the Assistant Commissioner Mandya. However, when they found that taking advantage of the said order the defendant No 1 was trying to disturb their possession over the suit properties, they were required to file a suit, on the basis of the will, which they filed in the Court of Principal Civil Judge at Mandya, and which was numbered as Suit No.32 of 1975. They prayed for a declaration of their title to the suit property, and for a permanent injunction restraining the defendants from interfering with their possession thereof. Alternatively, they prayed that in case it is held that they were not in possession, a decree be granted for recovery of possession of the property with future mesne profits.

4. The suit was contested by the defendants, the appellant herein, by contending that Smt. Nagammanni was not the owner of the suit property, and in any case the will relied upon by the respondents was not a valid one. It was additionally submitted that the relations of Smt. Nagammanni and the appellant were cordial, and the claimed will must have been revoked, which revocation was being suppressed by the respondents.

5. The learned trial judge raised in all ten issues. The first out of these issues was whether the plaintiffs proved that the suit property rightly belonged to Smt. Nagammanni, and the learned Judge answered it in the affirmative. This finding has not been disturbed by the first appellate court, nor seriously contested in the present Civil Appeal also. It is the second issue framed by the trial judge which is the crucial one, namely, whether the plaintiffs prove that Smt. Nagammanni executed a

A registered will dated 24.10.1943 in favour of the plaintiffs, and bequeathed the suit properties to them.

B 6. The plaintiff no.1 (PW-1) examined himself in support of his case. He examined three more witnesses in support, out of whom the second witness P. Basavaraje Urs (PW-2) is the most relevant one. The defendants examined three witnesses though nothing much turns on their evidence. Documentary evidence was also produced by both the parties, which has been considered by the courts below. The respondent no.1/ plaintiff identified the signatures made by Smt. Nagammanni at two different places on the will (exhibit P-3). Those signatures were marked as P-3 (a) and P-3(d). While cross-examining him, the appellant produced two inland letters written by Smt. Nagammanni to claim that their relations had become cordial, but it must also be noted that therein she had claimed her maintenance amount from the appellant. The respondent no.1 identified the signatures of Smt. Nagammanni on those two letters, and they were marked as Exhibits D4 and D5. These signatures were clearly comparable with her signatures on the will. This was accepted by the learned trial judge by observing that "on a comparison of the signatures I find there is some force in this contention. The signatures tally". This finding of the trial judge is neither disturbed by the first appellate court nor by the High Court.

F 7. The next witness on behalf of the respondent no.1/ plaintiff was one P. Basavaraje Urs (PW-2). He was working as a Patel (Village Officer) at village Mallinathpuram, in district Mandya, at the relevant time. He is an attesting witness to the will. He produced land revenue receipts containing his signatures, which were marked as Exhibits P7 to P14 and P19. He proved his own signature on the will by comparing it with his signatures on these Exhibits P7 to P14 and P19. He stated in his cross-examination that, apart from him, two other persons were attesting witnesses, namely, M. Mallaraje Urs and Sampat Iyanger. However, by the time

A recorded in November 1978, both of them had passed away. He stated that he could identify the hand writing and signature of M. Mallaraje Urs. The signature of M. Mallaraje Urs on the will was marked as Exhibit P3 (h). He also identified the signatures of Smt. Nagammanni on the will i.e. P3 (a) and P3 (d). He stated that she signed the will in his presence and he also signed the same in her presence. This part of the evidence of PW1 and PW-2 has remained undisturbed. Thus, it can be safely said that Smt. Nagammanni has executed the will (Exhibit P3) which also bears the signatures of PW-2 P. Basavaraje Urs, and one M. Mallaraje Urs.

8. The appellants tried to dispute the validity of the will by drawing attention of the Court to various circumstances. They disputed the presence of P. Basavaraje Urs at the time of signing of the will by asking him questions as to when did he come down to Mysore on that day from Mallinathpuram, and what did he do on that date. The learned trial judge, as well as the judge of the first appellate court, has been impressed by some of the discrepancies in this behalf appearing in his statement, and which were highlighted by the appellant. The fact, however, remains that PW-2 was giving his deposition some 35 years subsequent to the execution of the will, and therefore not much credence can be given to such discrepancies in his evidence. It was also submitted on behalf of the appellant that it was not clear as to how and when the will was discovered by the respondents/plaintiffs herein. Further, much emphasis was laid on the fact that when the will was made by Smt. Nagammanni, she was just about 40 years of age, and still described herself in the will as old and infirm. It was also contended that it was surprising that though the will was made some 35 years ago, the respondents/plaintiffs did not know anything about it until the death of Smt. Nagammanni. As far as the writing of the will is concerned, certain doubts were raised by pointing out that the writing was not so very continuous, and the signatures thereon appeared to have been adjusted. The evidence of PW-2 was also sought to be assailed

A by contending that he was an interested witness. It was pointed out, for that purpose, that in an earlier suit, arising out of a mortgage of a property of Smt. Nagammanni, he had feigned ignorance about the place where the will was written or the persons who were present at that time.

B 9. As far as this objection is concerned, it must be stated and cannot be denied that in the earlier suit, PW2 had very much deposed that he was an attesting witness to the will. Similarly, about Smt. Nagammanni describing herself as an old person, it must be noted that what she had stated was that she was getting old. Such a statement by a person will always depend upon the perception of the person concerned about the condition of his or her health. It appears that, in view of her strained relations with her husband, she wanted her property to be protected, and wanted to make a provision that it should devolve on her relatives. It is another matter that she lived long, thereafter. Similarly, there is no substance in the plea of the defendant No 1 that his relations with Smt. Nagammanni had become cordial and she must have revoked the will. If that was so, he would have surely produced such a document of revocation. Similarly, no issue can be made out of the production and reliance on the will, some 35 years subsequent to its execution. There is no dispute about Smt. Nagammanni's signature on the will, and her wishes are clear. It is only when the properties bequeathed under the will had to be protected, that the will was required to be produced and relied upon. A will is required to be acted upon, only after the testator passes away, and in the instant case immediately when the occasion arose, the will was produced and relied upon. In the circumstances, we do not find much force in any of these objections.

10. As against these discrepancies in the evidence of PW-2, it was emphasized on behalf of the respondent no.1/plaintiff that C. Basavaraje Urs, the husband of Smt. Nagammanni had earlier filed a suit against her, claiming

as his own properties and that suit came to be dismissed, which finding was confirmed in appeal. It was also pointed out that the appellant was the son of C. Basavaraje Urs from his second wife, and was required to pay maintenance to Smt. Nagammanni, as required by a Court order. It was also submitted by the plaintiffs that the will was a document which was more than 30 years old, and under Section 90 of Evidence Act, the Court is expected to presume that the signature in every part of the document is in the hand writing of the person concerned, and that the document was duly executed.

11. The trial court accepted the submissions on behalf of the appellant herein, and held that the plaintiffs had failed to prove the will since it had not come in the evidence of PW-2 that Smt. Nagammanni had executed the will in the presence of the second witness M. Mallaraje Urs, or that this M. Mallaraje Urs had also signed the will in her presence. Thus, the requirement of Section 63 (c) of the Indian Succession Act, 1925 ('Succession Act' for short) was not fulfilled viz. that two or more witnesses have to see the testator sign or affix his mark to the will, and each of the witnesses have also to sign the will in the presence of the testator. The Court, therefore, decided issue no.2 against the plaintiffs and dismissed the suit. The first appellate Court also took the same view in Regular Appeal No. 30 of 1989, and dismissed the appeal filed by the respondents herein.

12. The respondent/plaintiff thereafter filed a second appeal bearing R.S.A No. 546 of 1996, wherein, a learned Single Judge of the High Court framed the question of law in the following words:-

"Whether the concurrent findings of the Appellate Court that the plaintiff have not proved the will is bad in law and the finding in that regard is perverse and contrary to the evidence on record?"

The learned Single Judge decided the said question of law in

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H

A favour of the respondents-original plaintiffs by his impugned judgment and order dated 23.1.2004, which has led to the present appeal by special leave. When the special leave petition came up for consideration on 11.10.2004, this court issued notice and directed that the status-quo as then obtaining be maintained. Leave to appeal was granted thereafter on 6.2.2006. We may note that an attempt was made to settle the dispute by referring it to mediation, but that has not succeeded.

Consideration of the submissions of the rival parties:

C 13. The first submission on behalf of the appellant has been that the learned judge of the high Court has erred by framing the question of law, in the manner in which he has. It was submitted that when the trial court and the first appellate court have given a concurrent finding about the invalidity of the will, it was a finding of fact, and the High Court could not have disturbed the finding of fact by framing a question of law as to whether the finding was bad in law, and perverse or contrary to the evidence on record. Reliance was placed, in this behalf, on the observations of this Court in *Narayanan Rajendran Vs. Lekshmy Sarojini* reported in 2009 (5) SCC 264. That apart, it was submitted that in any case, the findings of the Courts below could not in any way be categorized as perverse, since they were not contrary to the evidence on record.

F 14. We may, however, note in this behalf that as held by a Constitution bench of this Court in *Chunilal Mehta Vs. Century Spinning and Manufacturing Company* reported in AIR 1962 SC 1314, it is well settled that the construction of a document of title or of a document which is the foundation of the rights of parties, necessarily raises a question of law. That apart, as held by a bench of three judges in *Santosh Hazari Vs. Purushottam Tiwari* reported in 2001 (3) SCC 179, whether a particular question is a substantial question of law or not, depends on the facts and circumstances of each case. When the execution of the will of Smt. Nagammanni and construction thereof in the subject matter of consideration, the fram

law cannot be faulted. Recently, in *Union of India Vs. Ibrahim Uddin* reported in 2012 (8) SCC 148, this Court referred to various previous judgments in this behalf and clarified the legal position in the following words:-

“67. There is no prohibition to entertain a second appeal even on question of fact, provided the Court is satisfied that the findings of the courts below were vitiated by non-consideration of relevant evidence or by showing erroneous approach to the matter and findings recorded in the court below are perverse.”

15. At the same time we cannot accept the submission on behalf of the respondents as well that merely because the will was more than 30 years old, a presumption under Section 90 of the Indian Evidence Act, 1872 ('Evidence Act' for short) ought to be drawn that the document has been duly executed and attested by the persons by whom it purports to have been executed and attested. As held by this Court in *Bharpur Singh Vs. Shamsher Singh* reported in 2009 (3) SCC 687, a presumption regarding documents 30 years old does not apply to a will. A will has to be proved in terms of Section 63 (c) of the Succession Act read with Section 68 of the Evidence Act.

16. That takes us to the crucial issue involved in the present case, viz. with respect to the validity and proving of the concerned will. A Will, has to be executed in the manner required by S 63 of the Succession Act. Section 68 of the Evidence Act requires the will to be proved by examining at least one attesting witness. Section 71 of the Evidence Act is another connected section "which is permissive and an enabling section permitting a party to lead other evidence in certain circumstances", as observed by this Court in paragraph 11 of *Janki Narayan Bhoir Vs. Narayan Namdeo Kadam* reported in 2003 (2) SCC 91 and in a way reduces the rigour of the mandatory provision of Section 68. As held in that judgment Section 71 is meant to lend assistance and come to the rescue of a party who had done his best, but would otherwise be let

down if other means of proving due execution by other evidence are not permitted. At the same time, as held in that very judgment the section cannot be read to absolve a party of his obligation under Section 68 of the Evidence Act read with Section 63 of the Succession Act to present in evidence a witness, though alive and available. The relevant provisions of these three sections read as follows:

"Section 63 of the Succession Act

"63. Execution of unprivileged wills.- Every testator, not being a soldier employed in an expedition or engaged in actual warfare, or an airman so employed or engaged, or a mariner at sea, shall execute his will according to the following rules:-

(a)

(b)

(c) The will shall be attested by two or more witnesses, each of whom has seen the testator sign or affix his mark to the will or has seen some other person sign the will, in the presence and by the direction of the testator, or has received from the testator a personal acknowledgement of his signature or mark, or of the signature of such other person; and each of the witnesses shall sign the will in the presence of the testator, but it shall not be necessary that more than one witness be present at the same time, and no particular form of attestation shall be necessary."

Section 68 of the Evidence Act

"68. Proof of execution of document required by law to be attested.- If a document is required by law to be attested, it shall not be used as evidence until one attesting witness at least has been called for the purpose of proving its execution, if there be an attesting witness alive, and subject to the process of

of giving evidence..."

A

Section 71 of the Evidence Act

*"71. Proof when attesting witness denies the execution.-
If the attesting witness denies or does not recollect the
execution of the document, its execution may be proved
by other evidence."*

B

17. In the present matter, there is no dispute that the requirement of Section 68 of the Evidence Act is satisfied, since one attesting witness i.e. PW-2 was called for the purpose of proving the execution of the will, and he has deposed to that effect. The question, however, arises as to whether the will itself could be said to have been executed in the manner required by law, namely, as per Section 63 (c) of the Succession Act. PW-2 has stated that he has signed the will in the presence of Smt. Nagammanni, and she has also signed the will in his presence. It is however contended that his evidence is silent on the issue as to whether Smt. Nagammanni executed the will in the presence of M. Mallaraje Urs, and whether M. Mallaraje Urs also signed as attesting witness in the presence of Smt. Nagammanni. Section 63 (c) of the Succession Act very much lays down the requirement of a valid and enforceable will that it shall be attested by two or more witnesses, each of whom has seen the testator sign or affix his mark to the will, and each of the witnesses has signed the will in the presence of the testator. As held by a bench of three judges of this Court (per Gajendragadkar J, as he then was) way back in *R. Venkatachala Iyengar Vs. B N. Thimmajamma* reported in AIR 1959 SC 443, that a will has to be proved like any other document except that evidence tendered in proof of a will should additionally satisfy the requirement of Section 63 of the Succession Act, apart from the one under Section 68 of the Evidence Act.

C

D

E

F

G

18. The propositions laid down in *Venkatachala Iyengar* (supra) have been followed and explained in another judgment

H

A of a bench of three Judges in *Smt. Jaswant Kaur Vs. Smt Amrit Kaur*, reported in AIR 1977 SC 74, wherein the law has been crystallized by Y.V. Chandrachud J (as he then was), into the following propositions:-

B

C

D

E

F

G

H

"10. There is a long line of decisions bearing on the nature and standard of evidence required to prove a will. Those decisions have been reviewed in an elaborate judgment of this Court in R. Venkatachala Iyengar v. B.N. Thirumajamma and Ors. [1959] Su. 1 S.C.R. 426. The Court, speaking through Gajendragadkar J., laid down in that case the following propositions :-

1. Stated generally, a will has to be proved like any other document, the test to be applied being the usual test of the satisfaction of the prudent mind in such matters. As in the case of proof of other documents, so in the case of proof of wills, one cannot insist on proof with mathematical certainty.

2. Since Section 63 of the Succession Act requires a will to be attested, it cannot be used as evidence until, as required by Section 63 of the Evidence Act, one attesting witness at least has been called for the purpose of proving its execution, if there be an attesting witness alive and subject to the process of the court and capable of giving evidence.

3. Unlike other documents, the will speaks from the death of the testator and therefore the maker of the will is never available for deposing as to the circumstances in which the will came to be executed. This aspect introduces an element of solemnity in the decision of the question whether the document propounded is proved to be the last will and testament of the t

onus which lies on the propounder can be taken to be discharged on proof of the essential facts which go into the making of the will.

A

4. Cases in which the execution of the will is surrounded by suspicious circumstances stand on a different footing. A shaky signature, a feeble mind, an unfair and unjust disposition of property, the propounder himself taking a leading part in the making of the will under which he receives a substantial benefit and such other circumstances raise suspicion about the execution of the will. That suspicion cannot be removed by the mere assertion of the propounder that the will bears the signature of the testator or that the testator was in a sound and disposing state of mind and memory at the time when the will was made, or that those like the wife and children of the testator who would normally receive their due share in his estate were disinherited because the testator might have had his own reasons for excluding them. The presence of suspicious circumstances makes the initial onus heavier and therefore, in cases where the circumstances attendant upon the execution of the will excite the suspicion of the court, the propounder must remove all legitimate suspicions before the document can be accepted as the last will of the testator.

B

C

D

E

F

5. It is in connection with wills, the execution of which is surrounded by suspicious circumstance that the test of satisfaction of the judicial conscience has been evolved. That test emphasises that in determining the question as to whether an instrument produced before the court is the last will of the testator, the court is called upon to decide a solemn question and by reason

H

A

of suspicious circumstances the court has to be satisfied fully that the will has been validly executed by the testator.

B

6. If a caveator alleges fraud, undue influence, coercion etc. in regard to the execution of the will, such pleas have to be proved by him, but even in the absence of such pleas, the very circumstances surrounding the execution of the will may raise a doubt as to whether the testator was acting of his own free will. And then it is a part of the initial onus of the propounder to remove all reasonable doubts in the matter.”

C

D

E

19. In *Janki Narayan Bhoir* (supra), this Court has explained the inter-relation between Section 63 (c) of the Succession Act, 1925 and Section 68 and 71 of the Evidence Act, 1872. In that matter only one attesting witness to the will was examined to prove the will, but he had not stated in his deposition that the other attesting witness had attested the will in his presence. The other attesting witness, though alive and available, was not examined. The Court noted the relevant facts in para 5 of the judgment (as reported in SCC) as follows:-

F

“Prabhakar Sinkar, the attesting witness, in his deposition stated that he did not know whether the other attesting witness Ramkrishna Wagle was present in the house of the respondent at the time of execution of the will. He also stated that he did not remember as to whether himself and Raikar were present when he put his signature. He did not see the witness Wagle at that time; he did not identify the person who had put the thumb impression on the will. The scribe Raikar in his evidence stated that he wrote the will and he also stated that he signed on the will deed as a scribe. He further stated that the attesting witnesses, namely, Wagle and Prabhakar Sinkar are alive.”

H

On this background, the Court held at the end of the para 6 of the judgment that “it is true that although a will is required to be attested by two witnesses it could be proved by examining one of the attesting witnesses as per Section 68 of the Indian Evidence Act”, but it also noted in paragraph 9 that “that one of the requirements of due execution of a will is its attestation by two or more witnesses, which is mandatory.” In paragraphs 11 and 12 of the judgment, the Court noted the relevance of Section 71 of the Evidence Act by stating that “aid of Section 71 can be taken only when the attesting witnesses who have been called, deny or fail to recollect the execution of the document to prove it by other evidence.” “Section 71 has no application when the one attesting witness, who alone has been summoned, has failed to prove the execution of the will and the other attesting witness though available has not been examined.” In the facts of the case, therefore, the Court held that attestation of the will as required by Section 63 of the Succession Act was not established which was equally necessary.

20. In the present case, we may note that in para 21 of his cross examination, P. Basavaraje Urs has in terms stated, “Mr. Mallaraje Urs and Smt. Nagammanni, myself and one Sampat Iyanger were present while writing the will.” One Mr. Narayanmurti was also present. In para 22 he has stated that Narayanmurti had written Exhibit 3 (will) in his own handwriting continuously. The fact that M.Mallaraje Urs was present at the time of execution of the will is not contested by the defendants by putting it to PW2 that M. Mallaraje Urs was not present when the will was executed. As held by a Division Bench of the Calcutta High Court in a matter concerning a will, in para 10 of *A.E.G. Carapiet Vs. A.Y. Derderian* reported in [AIR 1961 Calcutta 359],....”*Wherever the opponent has declined to avail himself of the opportunity to put his essential and material case in cross-examination, it must follow that he believed that the testimony given could not be disputed at all.* It is a rule of essential justice”. As noted earlier the will was executed on

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H

A 24.10.1943 in the office of the advocate Shri Subha Rao situated at Mysore, and was registered on the very next day at Mysore. The fact that the will is signed by Smt. Nagammanni in the presence of PW2 on 24.10.1943 has been proved, that PW2 signed in her presence has also been proved. Can the signing of the will by Smt. Nagammanni in the presence of M. Mallaraje Urs and his signing in her presence as well not be inferred from the above facts on record? In our view, in the facts of the present case, the omission on the part of PW2 to specifically state that the signature of M. Mallaraje Urs on the will (which he identified) was placed in the presence of Smt. Nagammanni, and that her signature (which he identified) was also placed in the presence of M. Mallaraje Urs, can be said to be a facet of not recollecting about the same. This deficiency can be taken care of by looking to the other evidence of attendant circumstances placed on record, which is permissible under Section 71 of the Evidence Act.

21. The issue of validity of the will in the present case will have to be considered in the context of these facts. It is true that in the case at hand, there is no specific statement by PW2 that he had seen the other attesting witness sign the will in the presence of the testator, but he has stated that the other witness had also signed the document. He has proved his signature, and on the top of it he has also stated in the Cross examination that the other witness (Mr. Mallaraje Urs), Smt. Nagammanni, himself and one Sampat Iyanger and the writer of the will were all present while writing the will on 24.10.1943 which was registered on the very next day. This statement by implication and inference will have to be held as proving the required attestation by the other witness. This statement alongwith the attendant circumstances placed on record would certainly constitute proving of the will by other evidence as permitted by Section 71 of the Evidence Act.

22. While drawing the appropriate inference in a matter like this, a Court cannot disregard the ev

H

circumstances brought on record. In this context, we may profitably refer to the observations of a Division Bench of the Assam High Court in *Mahalaxmi Bank Limited Vs. Kamkhyalal Goenka* reported in [AIR 1958 Assam 56], which was a case concerning the claim of the appellant bank for certain amounts based on the execution of a mortgage deed. The execution thereof was being disputed by the respondents, amongst other pleas, by contending that the same was by a purdahnashin lady, and the same was not done in the presence of witnesses. Though the evidence of the plaintiff was not so categorical, looking to the totality of the evidence on record, the Court held that the execution of the mortgage had been duly proved. While arriving at that inference, the Division Bench observed:-

“11.....It was, therefore, incumbent on the plaintiff to prove its execution and attestation according to law. It must be conceded that the witnesses required to prove attestation has (sic) not categorically stated that he and the other attesting witnesses put their signatures (after having seen the execution of the document) in the presence of the executants. Nevertheless, the fact that they actually did so can be easily gathered from the circumstances disclosed in the evidence. It appears that the execution and registration of the document all took place at about the same time in the house of the defendants. The witnesses not only saw the executants put their signatures on the document, but that they also saw the document being explained to the lady by the husband as also by the registering officer.

They also saw the executants admit receipt of the consideration, which was paid in their presence. As all this happened at the same time, it can be legitimately inferred that the witnesses also put their signatures in the presence of the executants after having seen them signing the instrument.....

.....There is no suggestion here that the execution and attestation was not done at the same sitting. In fact, the definite evidence here is that the execution and registration took place at the same time. It is, therefore, almost certain that the witnesses must have signed the document in the presence of the executants.....”

23. The approach to be adopted in matters concerning wills has been elucidated in a decision on a first appeal by a Division Bench of Bombay High Court in *Vishnu Ramkrishana Vs. Nathu Vithal* reported in [AIR 1949 Bombay 266]. In that matter, the respondent Nathu was the beneficiary of the will. The appellant filed a suit claiming possession of the property which was bequeathed in favour of Nathu, by the testatrix Gangabai. The suit was defended on the basis of the will, and it came to be dismissed, as the will was held to be duly proved. In appeal it was submitted that the dismissal of the suit was erroneous, because the will was not proved to have been executed in the manner in which it is required to be, under Section 63 of Indian Succession Act. The High Court was of the view that if at all there was any deficiency, it was because of not examining more than one witness, though it was not convinced that the testatrix Gangabai had not executed the will. The Court remanded the matter for additional evidence under its powers under Order 41 Rule 27 CPC. The observations of Chagla C.J., sitting in the Division Bench with Gajendragadkar J. (as he then was in Bombay High Court) in paragraph 15 of the judgment are relevant for our purpose:-

“15..... We are dealing with the case of a will and we must approach the problem as a Court of Conscience. It is for us to be satisfied whether the document put forward is the last will and testament of Gangabai. If we find that the wishes of the testatrix are likely to be defeated or thwarted merely by reason of want of some technicality, we as a Court of Conscience would not permit such a thing to happen. We have not he

other point; but assuming that Gangabai had a sound and disposing mind and that she wanted to dispose of her property as she in fact has done, the mere fact that the propounders of the will were negligent – and grossly negligent in not complying with the requirements of S.63 and proving the will as they ought to have should not deter us from calling for the necessary evidence in order to satisfy ourselves whether the will was duly executed or not.....”

(emphasis supplied)

24. As stated by this Court also in *R. Venkatachala Iyengar and Smt. Jaswant Kaur* (both supra), while arriving at the finding as to whether the will was duly executed, the Court must satisfy its conscience having regard to the totality of the circumstances. The Court’s role in matters concerning the wills is limited to examining whether the instrument propounded as the last will of the deceased is or is not that by the testator, and whether it is the product of the free and sound disposing mind [as observed by this Court in paragraph 77 of *Gurdev Kaur Vs. Kaki* reported in 2006 (1) SCC 546]. In the present matter, there is no dispute about these factors. The issue raised in the present matter was with respect to the due execution of the will, and what we find is that the same was decided by the trial Court, as well as by the first appellate Court on the basis of an erroneous interpretation of the evidence on record regarding the circumstances attendant to the execution of the will. The property mentioned in the will is admittedly ancestral property of Smt. Nagammanni. She had to face a litigation, initiated by her husband, to retain her title and possession over this property. Besides, she could get the amounts for her maintenance from her husband only after a court battle, and thereafter also she had to enter into a correspondence with the appellant to get those amounts from time to time. The appellant is her stepson whereas the respondents are sons of her cousin. She would definitely desire that her ancestral property protected

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H

A by her in a litigation with her husband does not go to a stepson, but would rather go to the relatives on her side. We cannot ignore this context while examining the validity of the will.

25. In view of the above factual and legal position, we do hold that the plaintiffs/respondents had proved that Smt. Nagammanni had duly executed a will on 24.10.1943 in favour of the plaintiffs, and bequeathed the suit properties to them. She got the will registered on the very next day. The finding of the Trial Court as well as the First Appellate Court on issue no.2 was clearly erroneous. The learned Judge of the High Court was right in holding that the findings of the Trial and Appellate Court, though concurrent, were bad in law and perverse and contrary to the evidence on record. The second appeal was, therefore, rightly allowed by him. Accordingly, we dismiss the present civil appeal. The Suit No.32 of 1975 filed by the respondents in the Court of Principal Civil Judge at Mandya in Karnataka will stand decreed. They are hereby granted a declaration of their title to the suit property, and for a permanent injunction restraining the defendants from interfering with their possession thereof. In case their possession has been in any way disturbed, they will be entitled to recover the possession of the concerned property, with future mesne profits. In the facts of the present case, however, we do not order any costs.

K.K.T. Appeal dismissed.

RAJ KUMAR SINGH @ RAJU @ BATYA
v.
STATE OF RAJASTHAN
(Criminal Appeal Nos. 931-932 of 2009)

MAY 6, 2013

[DR. B.S. CHAUHAN AND FAKKIR MOHAMED
IBRAHIM KALIFULLA, JJ.]

Penal Code, 1860 – ss.302, 376 and 201 – Prosecution under – For murder and rape of 4 years old girl – Circumstantial evidence – Conviction by Courts below – On appeal, held: Prosecution evidence is shaky and chain of links connecting the accused with the crime is inconclusive – Prosecution failed to prove its case beyond reasonable doubt – Accused entitled to benefit of doubt – Hence acquitted.

Evidence:

Circumstantial evidence – In a case of circumstantial evidence, judgment remains essentially inferential, drawn from the established facts as the circumstances lead to – Hence, all the circumstances, so established must be conclusive, and consistent only with the hypothesis of the guilt of the accused.

Quality and credibility of evidence – In criminal case – Suspicion and conjectures vis-à-vis proof – Held: Mere suspicion or conjectures cannot take the place of legal proof.

Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 – s.313 – Statement under – Evidentiary value of – The purpose of the provision is to meet the requirement of principles of natural justice audi alteram partem – It is not a substantive piece of evidence – It cannot be a substitute for prosecution evidence – It cannot be treated as an evidence within the meaning of s.3 of

599

A

B

C

D

E

F

G

H

A *Evidence Act – The statement under the provision cannot be made basis for conviction – Evidence Act, 1872 – s.3.*

B **Appellant-accused was prosecuted for having committed rape and murder of a 4 years old girl. Trial Court convicted him for the offences punishable under sections 302, 376 and 201 IPC, relying on the circumstances, viz. conduct of the appellant; evidence relating to injuries on the person of the deceased; false explanation given by the appellant; and evidence relating to injuries on the appellant. Appellant was sentenced to life imprisonment. High Court confirmed his conviction and sentence.**

D **In appeal to this Court, appellant inter alia contended that depositions of PWs 1, 2, 3 and 4 are not reliable as also they are self contradictory; and that the circumstances of the case do not provide complete chain required to prove the guilt of the appellant.**

E **Allowing the appeal, the Court**

F **HELD: 1. The prosecution failed to prove the case against the appellant beyond reasonable doubt and thus, he becomes entitled for benefit of doubt. The conviction and sentence imposed on the appellant are set aside. [Para 40] [629-G-H; 630-A]**

G **2.1. While appreciating the evidence of a witness, minor discrepancies on trivial matters, which do not affect the core of the case of the prosecution, must not prompt the court to reject the evidence thus provided, in its entirety. The irrelevant details which do not in any way corrode the credibility of a witness, cannot be labeled as omissions or contradictions. Therefore, the courts must be cautious and very particular, in their exercise of appreciating evidence. The approach**

H

A the evidence of a witness is read in its entirety, and the same appears to have in it, a ring of truth, then it may become necessary for the court to scrutinize the evidence more particularly, keeping in mind the deficiencies, drawbacks and infirmities pointed out in the said evidence as a whole, and evaluate them separately, to determine whether the same are completely against the nature of the evidence provided by the witnesses, and whether the validity of such evidence is shaken by virtue of such evaluation, rendering it unworthy of belief. “Exaggerations per se do not render the evidence brittle. But it can be one of the factors to test the credibility of the prosecution version, when the entire evidence is put in a crucible for being tested on the touchstone of credibility.” It is in fact, the entirety of the situation which must be taken into consideration. While appreciating the evidence, the court must not attach undue importance to minor discrepancies, rather must consider broad spectrum of the prosecution version. The discrepancies may be due to normal errors of perception or observation or due to lapse of memory or due to faulty or stereotype investigation. After exercising such care and caution, and sifting through the evidence to separate truth from untruth, embellishments and improvements, the court must determine whether the residuary evidence is sufficient to convict the accused. [Para 38] [628-C-H; 629-A-B]

Bihari Nath Goswami v. Shiv Kumar Singh and Ors. (2004) 9 SCC 186: 2004 (2) SCR 623; *Vijay @ Chinee v. State of Madhya Pradesh* (2010) 8 SCC 191: 2010 (8) SCR 1150; *Sampath Kumar v. Inspector of Police, Krishnagiri* AIR 2012 SC 1249: 2012 (2) SCR 289 – referred to.

2.2. In the instant case, there have been major contradictions/ improvements/embellishments in the deposition of witnesses which cannot be ignored when

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H

A they are examined in the correct perspective. The chain of links connecting the appellant with the crime appears inconclusive. Evidence produced by the prosecution had been very shaky and the chain of links connecting the appellant with the crime appears inconclusive. The circumstantial evidence is completely wanting in this respect. To accept the description of the evidence collected as flimsy, or no evidence would be too short for convicting the appellant for the offence, as many issues/ circumstances virtually remained unexplained. [Paras 38 and 40] [628-B-C; 629-E-G]

Kehar Singh and Ors. v. State (Delhi Admn.) AIR 1988 SC 1883: 1988 (2) Suppl. SCR 24; *Subhash v. State of Haryana* AIR 2011 SC 349: 2010 (14) SCR 1067 – relied on.

D 3. In a case of circumstantial evidence, the judgment remains essentially inferential. The inference is drawn from the established facts as the circumstances lead to particular inferences. The Court has to draw an inference with respect to whether the chain of circumstances is complete, and when the circumstances therein are collectively considered, the same must lead only to the irresistible conclusion, that the accused alone is the perpetrator of the crime in question. All the circumstances so established must be of a conclusive nature, and consistent only with the hypothesis of the guilt of the accused. [Para 23] [619-A-C]

Kali Ram v. State of Himachal Pradesh AIR 1973 SC 2773: 1974 (1) SCR 722; *Krishnan v. State Represented by Inspector of Police* (2008) 15 SCC 430; *Pawan v. State of Uttaranchal etc. etc.* (2009) 15 SCC 259: 2009 (3) SCR 468; *State of Maharashtra v. Mangilal* (2009) 15 SCC 418: 2009 (4) SCR 49; *M.G. Agarwal v. State of Maharashtra* AIR 1963 SC 200: 1963 SCR 405 – relied on.

H *Babu v. State of Kerala* (2010)

SCR 1039 – referred to.

R. v. Hodge 168 ER 1163 – referred to.

“An Essay on the Principles of Circumstantial Evidence by William Wills” by T. & J.W. Johnson & Co. 1872 – referred to.

4. Suspicion, however grave it may be, cannot take the place of proof, and there is a large difference between something that ‘may be’ proved and ‘will be proved’. In a criminal trial, suspicion no matter how strong, cannot and must not be permitted to take place of proof. This is for the reason, that the mental distance between ‘may be’ and ‘must be’ is quite large and divides vague conjectures from sure conclusions. In a criminal case, the court has a duty to ensure that mere conjectures or suspicion do not take the place of legal proof. The large distance between ‘may be’ true and ‘must be’ true, must be covered by way of clear, cogent and unimpeachable evidence produced by the prosecution, before an accused is condemned as a convict, and the basic and golden rule must be applied. In such cases, while keeping in mind the distance between ‘may be’ true and ‘must be’ true, the court must maintain the vital distance between conjectures and sure conclusions to be arrived at, on the touchstone of dispassionate judicial scrutiny based upon a complete and comprehensive appreciation of all features of the case, as well as the quality and credibility of the evidence brought on record. The court must ensure, that miscarriage of justice is avoided and if the facts and circumstances of a case so demand, then the benefit of doubt must be given to the accused, keeping in mind that a reasonable doubt is not an imaginary, trivial or a merely probable doubt, but a fair doubt that is based upon reason and common sense. [Para 17] [615-C-H; 616-A]

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H

A *Hanumant Govind Nargundkar and Anr. v. State of M.P.* AIR 1952 SC 343: 1952 SCR 1091; *Shivaji Sahabrao Bobade and Anr. v. State of Maharashtra* AIR 1973 SC 2622: 1974 (1) SCR 489; *Sharad Birdhichand Sarda v. State of Maharashtra* AIR 1984 SC 1622: 1985 (1) SCR 88; *Subhash Chand v. State of Rajasthan* (2002) 1 SCC 702: 2001 (4) Suppl. SCR 163; *Ashish Batham v. State of M.P.* AIR 2002 SC 3206 : 2002 (2) Suppl. SCR 146; *Narendra Singh and Anr. v. State of M.P.* AIR 2004 SC 3249: 2004 (3) SCR 1148; *State through CBI v. Mahender Singh Dahiya* AIR 2011 SC 1017: 2011 (1) SCR 1104 and *Ramesh Harijan v. State of U.P.* AIR 2012 SC 1979: 2012 (6) SCR 688 – relied on.

5.1. In a criminal trial, the purpose of examining the accused person under Section 313 Cr.P.C., is to meet the requirement of the principles of natural justice i.e. audi alteram partem. This means that the accused may be asked to furnish some explanation as regards the incriminating circumstances associated with him, and the court must take note of such explanation. In a case of circumstantial evidence, the same is essential to decide whether or not the chain of circumstances is complete. No matter how weak the evidence of the prosecution may be, it is the duty of the court to examine the accused, and to seek his explanation as regards the incriminating material that has surfaced against him. The circumstances which are not put to the accused in his examination under Section 313 Cr.P.C., cannot be used against him and have to be excluded from consideration. [Para 25] [620-C-E]

G *State of Maharashtra v. Sukhdev Singh* AIR 1992 SC 2100: 1992 (3) SCR 480; *Mohan Singh v. Prem Singh and Anr.* AIR 2002 SC 3582: 2002 (3) Suppl. SCR 5; *Dehal Singh v. State of H.P.* AIR 2010 SC 3594: 2010 (10) SCR 598; *State of M.P. v. Ramesh* (2011) 4 SCC 786: 2011 (5) SCR 1; *Rafiq Ahmed @ Rafi v. State of U.P.* AIR 2011 SC 3114: 2011 (11) SCR 907; *Dharn*

and Ors. (2010) 7 SCC 759; 2010 (8) SCR 173; Ramnaresh and Ors. v. State of Chhattisgarh AIR 2012 SC 1357: 2012 (3) SCR 630; Munish Mubar v. State of Haryana AIR 2013 SC 912: 2012 (9) SCR 193 and Brajendrasingh v. State of M.P. AIR 2012 SC 1552: 2012 (3) SCR 599 – relied on.

5.2. Statement under Section 313 Cr.P.C. cannot be made a basis for his conviction. Answers to the questions put to the accused under Section 313 Cr.P.C. cannot be used to fill up the gaps left by the prosecution witnesses in their depositions. Thus, the statement of the accused is not a substantive piece of evidence and therefore, it can be used only for appreciating the evidence led by the prosecution, though it cannot be a substitute for the evidence of the prosecution. In case the prosecution's evidence is not found sufficient to sustain conviction of the accused, the inculpatory part of his statement cannot be made the sole basis of his conviction. The statement under Section 313 Cr.P.C. is not recorded after administering oath to the accused. Therefore, it cannot be treated as an evidence within the meaning of Section 3 of the Evidence Act, though the accused has a right if he chooses to be a witness, and once he makes that option, he can be administered oath and examined as a witness in defence as required under Section 315 Cr.P.C. An adverse inference can be taken against the accused only and only if the incriminating material stood fully established and the accused is not able to furnish any explanation for the same. However, the accused has a right to remain silent as he cannot be forced to become witness against himself. [Para 36] [624-G-H; 625-A-E]

Case Law Reference:

1952 SCR 1091 relied on Para 17
 1974 (1) SCR 489 relied on Para 17

A	A	1985 (1) SCR 88	relied on	Para 17
		2001 (4) Suppl. SCR 63	relied on	Para 17
		2002 (2) Suppl. SCR 146	relied on	Para 17
		2004 (3) SCR 1148	relied on	Para 17
B	B	2011 (1) SCR 1104	relied on	Para 17
		2012 (6) SCR 688	relied on	Para 17
		1974 (1) SCR 722	relied on	Para 18
C	C	168 ER 1163	referred to	Para 19
		(2008) 15 SCC 430	relied on	Para 20
		2009 (3) SCR 468	relied on	Para 20
D	D	2009 (4) SCR 49	relied on	Para 20
		1963 SCR 405	relied on	Para 21
		2010 (9) SCR 1039	referred to	Para 24
		1992 (3) SCR 480	relied on	Para 26
E	E	2002 (3) Suppl. SCR 5	relied on	Para 27
		2010 (10) SCR 598	relied on	Para 28
		2011 (5) SCR 1	relied on	Para 29
F	F	2011 (11) SCR 907	relied on	Para 30
		2010 (8) SCR 173	relied on	Para 31
		2012 (3) SCR 630	relied on	Para 32
		2012 (9) SCR 193	relied on	Para 33
G	G	2012 (3) SCR 599	relied on	Para 35
		2004 (2) SCR 623	referred to	Para 38
		2010 (8) SCR 1150	referred to	Para 38
H	H	2012 (2) SCR 289	refer	

1988 (2) Suppl. SCR 24 relied on Para 38 A

2010 (14) SCR 1067 relied on Para 39

CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION : Criminal Appeal No. 931-932 of 2009.

From the Judgment & Order dated 04.01.2008 of the High Court of Rajasthan, bench at Jaipur in Crl. Jail Appeal No. 1759 of 2003.

Vibha Datta Makhija (A.C.) for the Appellant.

Pragati Neekhra, Suryanaryana Singh for the Respondent.

The Judgment of the Court was delivered by

DR. B.S. CHAUHAN, J. 1. These appeals have been preferred against the impugned judgment and order dated 4.1.2008, passed by the High Court of Rajasthan (Jaipur Bench) in D.B. Crl.A. Nos. 1250 and 1749 of 2003 by way of which, the High Court has dismissed the aforesaid appeals and affirmed the judgment and order dated 5.8.2003 of the learned Additional Sessions Judge (Fast Track) No. 1, Jaipur District in Sessions Case No. 19 of 2002 by way of which, the appellant stood convicted for the offences punishable under Sections 302, 376 and 201 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, (hereinafter referred to as 'the IPC'), and was awarded a sentence of life imprisonment alongwith a fine of Rs.1,000/- under Section 302 IPC; 10 years rigorous imprisonment alongwith a fine of Rs.1,000/- under Section 376 IPC, and rigorous imprisonment of 5 years alongwith a fine of Rs.500/- under Section 201 IPC, and in default of depositing such fine, to further suffer rigorous imprisonment for a period of six months. The substantive sentences, however, were ordered to run concurrently.

2. As per the case of the prosecution, the necessary facts related to the present case are as under:

A. Pooja, a 4 year old girl, went missing on 22.5.2001. Her

A family members searched for her relentlessly and also reported the matter to the police. She was eventually found lying dead on the roof of a lonely house on 24.5.2001. Rohtash (PW.1), father of the deceased, submitted a written report (Ex.P-1) of the incident at Police Station, Kotputli and upon the receipt of such report, a case under Sections 302 and 201 IPC was registered, and investigation pertaining to the same also commenced. Thereafter, postmortem was performed on the dead body, necessary memos were drawn, and statements of witnesses were recorded. The appellant was arrested on 27.5.2001 and upon completion of the investigation, chargesheet was filed.

B. The trial court concluded the trial and convicted the appellant under Sections 302, 376 and 201 IPC, vide impugned judgment and order dated 5.8.2003 and awarded the sentence as referred to hereinabove .

C. Aggrieved, the appellant filed an appeal in the High Court which was dismissed vide impugned judgment and order dated 4.1.2008.

E Hence, these appeals.

3. Ms. Vibha Datta Makhija, learned Amicus Curiae, has submitted that the circumstances relied upon by the prosecution have not been satisfactorily established, and that additionally, the circumstances said to have been established against the appellant do not provide a complete chain that is required to prove the guilt of the appellant. There are material contradictions in the depositions of Rohtash (PW.1), Indira (PW.2), Kalawati (PW.3) and Naurang (PW.4), who are father, mother, grandmother and grandfather of the deceased, respectively. Their depositions have wrongly been relied upon by the courts below, as no reliance can be placed on their evidence. Moreover, the statements of the witnesses are self contradictory, and the standard of proof required to convict a person in a case of circumstantial evidence

either. The law requires, that the circumstances relied upon in support of the conviction must be fully established, and that the chain of evidence furnished by those circumstances must be so complete, so as not to leave any reasonable doubt for a conclusion, consistent with the innocence of the accused. The circumstances from which the conclusion of guilt is to be drawn, must not only be fully established, but also be of a conclusive nature and consistent only with the hypothesis of the guilt of the accused. They must not be capable of being explained by way of any other hypothesis except the guilt of the accused, and when all the said circumstances are collectively considered, the same must lead only to the irresistible conclusion that the accused alone is the perpetrator of the crime in question. Thus, the appeals deserve to be allowed.

4. Per contra Ms. Pragati Neekhara, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State, has opposed the appeals, contending that the judgments of the courts below do not warrant any interference. The circumstances relied upon by the courts below stand fully established, the chain of circumstances is complete, and every link in the said chain indicates that the appellant alone, could be the accused. The discrepancies in the evidence of the witnesses are so minor, that none of the same go to the root of the case and disturb such a conclusion as mentioned hereinabove. The medical evidence also fully supports the ocular evidence, and there is no contradiction between the two. The appellant had approached the family of the victim and asked them to pay to him, a sum of Rs.2,000/-, as he would bring Pooja back to them. The injuries found on the person of the deceased and the appellant-accused correlate him to the evidence relating to the recoveries, clearly indicating that the appellant alone is guilty of the offence. Thus, the appeal is liable to be dismissed.

5. We have considered the rival submissions made by the learned counsel and perused the record.

A There is no ocular version of the incident and the entire case of the prosecution is based on circumstantial evidence.

6. The courts below have found the following circumstances forming an incriminating chain against the appellant:

- I. Conduct of the appellant.
- II. False explanation given by the appellant.
- III. Evidence relating to injuries on the person of the deceased.
- IV. Evidence relating to injuries on the appellant.

7. The depositions with respect to the conduct of the appellant have been considered by the courts below, and 4 witnesses (family members of the deceased) have been examined in this respect. All 4 have deposed that the appellant had approached them and had asked them for the payment of a sum of Rs.2,000/-, to bring Pooja home, and this circumstance has thus been held to have been proved against him.

8. We have also been taken through the evidence of the witnesses on this aspect.

Rohtash (PW.1), the father of the deceased, has deposed that they had reported the case to the police in the morning at around 8 O' Clock as Pooja was found to be missing. The appellant had thereafter arrived at around 4 O'Clock in the evening, and had asked Rohtash (PW.1), to pay to him, a sum of Rs.2,000/-, stating that he would bring Pooja back. They had informed the police about this fact while lodging the FIR. In his cross examination, Rohtash (PW.1) admitted that the issue of the appellant asking for a sum of Rs.2,000/- had not been mentioned in the FIR. Then the witness himself voluntarily deposed, that the sum of Rs.2,000/- was asked for after the said report had already been written. H

he had never seen the appellant before he had asked him for the said amount of Rs.2,000/-. The witness also deposed that the police had not made any inquiry from him in this regard, and then made a statement to the contrary alleging that the police had questioned him vigorously. It may also be pertinent to mention that in his deposition, Rohtash (PW.1) was unable to mention the particular date on which the appellant had approached his family, and had asked for a sum of Rs.2,000/-.

9. Indira (PW.2), the mother of the deceased, Kalawati (PW.3), grandmother and Naurang (PW.4), grandfather of Pooja (deceased) had deposed that Rohtash (PW.1) had registered a report in the police station at 8 O'Clock about the fact that their daughter Pooja had gone missing and further deposed that, at about 4 O'Clock in the evening, on the same day, one boy had come to her and had asked her to pay to him a sum of Rs.2,000/-, as in return for the same he would bring back her daughter. Indira (PW.2) identified the appellant in court as the person who had asked to pay the said sum of Rs.2,000/-. All of them have further deposed that he had been caught by them and had been handed over to the police. In her cross-examination, she has admitted that the appellant had also been beaten up by them, and thereafter, had been handed over to the police on the same day.

If the evidence of the 4 witnesses on this very issue is carefully examined, it becomes evident that material contradictions exist therein, and that further, not only do such material contradictions exist, but embellishments and improvements have also been made to the version of events. In the event that the appellant had come to them and asked them for money, and they had caught hold of him and called the police, and the police had arrested him, there exists no rational explanation as regards why such a pertinent fact has been excluded from the FIR. Secondly, in case the witnesses i.e. the family members of the deceased had caught hold of the

A appellant, why has PW.4, grandfather of the deceased, deposed that the appellant was shown to them immediately after his arrest, if the witnesses had in fact caught hold of him, and had themselves handed him over to the police, the question of the police showing the appellant to them could not arise.

B 10. All recoveries were made on 24.5.2001, and the appellant was identified as the accused only on the ground that four witnesses i.e. PWs. 1 to 4, had deposed to the effect that he had asked them for a sum of Rs.2,000/- to bring back their child. No one has explained how the appellant was actually arrested. PWs.1 to 4 have made categorical statements to the effect that when the appellant had asked them for money to bring back the girl, they had caught hold of him and handed him over to the police on 24.5.2001 itself. However, Gopi Singh (PW.14), the Investigating Officer has made it clear that the appellant had been arrested on 27.5.2001 by Ext. P-14, and that there was no independent witness for the said arrest. An FIR was lodged on 24.5.2001 without naming any person, as the FIR itself reveals that some one had killed Pooja and had dumped her in the abandoned dharamshala.

E Naurang (PW.4), grandfather of Pooja has deposed that the police had shown the accused to them as soon as he was arrested. Therefore, there exists a material contradiction as regards the issue of the arrest of the appellant.

F We have examined the original documents/records. There is over-writing on the arrest memo and Gopi Singh (PW.14), the Investigating Officer has admitted in his cross-examination that there did in fact exist some over-writing underneath the signatures in Ext. D-1, and that the same, i.e., the over-writing, did not bear his initials.

G 11. So far as the recovery of the clothes of the accused which were recovered with blood and semen stains is concerned, there are numerous contradictions. Hari Singh (PW.9), the constable who made the

A deposed that on 27.5.2001, he had made the recovery of a light
brown shirt, a white coloured vest on which there were blood
like stains, one cream coloured underwear on which blood like
stains and semen stains were found. The same were recovered
from the appellant. Therefore, it is clear that the recoveries of
the clothes of the appellant were made on 27.5.2001, and not
on 24.5.2001. If the appellant had in fact been arrested as per
the version of events narrated by PWs.1 to 4 on 24.5.2001,
there would be no occasion for the police to make the recovery
of his clothes on 27.5.2001. The statement of Rohtash (PW.1)
was recorded on 27.5.2001, though the same was shown as
recorded on 24.5.2001, and the statement of all other witnesses
was recorded on 27.5.2001. It is thus, difficult to understand how
such a material discrepancy in the evidence has been ignored
by the courts below while convicting the appellant. Exts.P-23
to P-39 are the relevant photographs. They do not bear the
signature of any person and therefore, it is difficult to
comprehend how these material exhibits were sent for FSL
report.

The High Court has doubted and in fact disbelieved the
recovery of clothes at the instance of the appellant, and has
remarked that the evidence of such recovery was fabricated and
false.

12. The postmortem report (Ex.P-21) revealed the following
anti-mortem injuries on her body:

“Body swollen, Abdomen distended, eyes protruded, lips
swollen, no maggots over body, skin peeled off here and
there, mouth semi opened, bleeding from both nostrils and
Lt. ear, PM rigidly absent due to second stage of relaxer,
PM lividity present over dependent parts of body, back of
chest presents and both buttocks blush black, labia majora
swollen and teared, hymen teared, vaginal walls teared.
Rectum protruding through posterior vagina wall, posterior
fornix ruptured.

A In the opinion of Medical Board the cause of death
was neurogenic shock, coma due to head injury.”

13. As already described, the dead body of Pooja was
subjected to an autopsy by the Medical Board. Dr. Laxman
Singh (PW.12) deposed that the body was swollen, abdomen
distended, eyes protruding, lips swollen, no maggots over
body, skin peeled off here and there, mouth semi opened,
bleeding from both nostrils and left ear. PM rigidly absent due
to second stage of relaxation, PM lividity present over
dependent parts of body, back of chest present and both
buttocks bluish black. Labia majora swollen and hymen torn.
Vaginal walls torn. Rectum protruding through posterior vaginal
wall, posterior fornix ruptured. The cause of death was
neurogenic shock, coma due to head injury. The testimony of
Dr. Laxman Singh clearly reveals that the innocent helpless soul
Pooja was first subjected to monstrous sexual assault, and was
then mercilessly killed by inflicting injuries on her head so that
there remains no direct evidence against culprit.

14. The appellant after his arrest on 27.5.2001 was
medically examined by Dr. Laxman Singh (PW.12) on May 28,
2001 and vide his medical examination report (Ext. P-22), an
abrasion of the size of 0.2 x 0.2 cm on the corona penis was
found. The body of the penis and glands therein were swollen
and tenderness and inflammation was present. There was
nothing to suggest that the appellant was incapable of indulging
in intercourse.

15. The evidence of Daulat Ram (PW.7), the driver had
been to the extent that on 22.5.2001, the appellant had travelled
with him to certain places and had slept in his jeep that night
and did not go to his house, and the appellant could not furnish
any explanation as to why he had slept in the jeep and did not
go to his house. Therefore, his conduct was suggestive of the
fact that the offence had been committed by him.

H The trial court also doubted the co

for the reason that he had slept in the jeep though he was neither the driver of a jeep nor the servant of Daulat Ram (PW.7), the driver. The High Court had taken note of the appellant's statement under Section 313 of Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, (hereinafter referred to as `Cr.P.C.'), wherein the appellant had replied that the aforesaid deposition was wrong, and held that explanation furnished by him was false.

A
B

16. The courts below have proceeded on the basis that there was no evidence of enmity against any of the witnesses which may lead to the presumption that the appellant has been falsely implicated in the case.

C

17. Suspicion, however grave it may be, cannot take the place of proof, and there is a large difference between something that `may be' proved and `will be proved'. In a criminal trial, suspicion no matter how strong, cannot and must not be permitted to take place of proof. This is for the reason, that the mental distance between `may be' and `must be' is quite large and divides vague conjectures from sure conclusions. In a criminal case, the court has a duty to ensure that mere conjectures or suspicion do not take the place of legal proof. The large distance between `may be' true and `must be' true, must be covered by way of clear, cogent and unimpeachable evidence produced by the prosecution, before an accused is condemned as a convict, and the basic and golden rule must be applied. In such cases, while keeping in mind the distance between `may be' true and `must be' true, the court must maintain the vital distance between conjectures and sure conclusions to be arrived at, on the touchstone of dispassionate judicial scrutiny based upon a complete and comprehensive appreciation of all features of the case, as well as the quality and credibility of the evidence brought on record. The court must ensure, that miscarriage of justice is avoided and if the facts and circumstances of a case so demand, then the benefit of doubt must be given to the accused, keeping in mind that a reasonable doubt is not an imaginary, trivial or a

D
E
F
G
H

A merely probable doubt, but a fair doubt that is based upon reason and common sense. (Vide: *Hanumant Govind Nargundkar & Anr. v. State of M.P.*, AIR 1952 SC 343; *Shivaji Sahabrao Bobade & Anr. v. State of Maharashtra*, AIR 1973 SC 2622; *Sharad Birdhichand Sarda v. State of Maharashtra*, AIR 1984 SC 1622; *Subhash Chand v. State of Rajasthan*, (2002) 1 SCC 702; *Ashish Batham v. State of M.P.*, AIR 2002 SC 3206; *Narendra Singh & Anr. v. State of M.P.*, AIR 2004 SC 3249; *State through CBI v. Mahender Singh Dahiya*, AIR 2011 SC 1017; and *Ramesh Harijan v. State of U.P.*, AIR 2012 SC 1979)

C

18. In *Kali Ram v. State of Himachal Pradesh*, AIR 1973 SC 2773, this Court observed as under:

D
E

"Another golden thread which runs through the web of the administration of justice in criminal cases is that if two views are possible on the evidence adduced in the case one pointing to the guilt of the accused and the other to his innocence, the view which is favourable to the accused should be adopted. This principle has a special relevance in cases where in the guilt of the accused is sought to be established by circumstantial evidence."

19. In *R. v. Hodge* 168 ER 1163, the court held that before a person is convicted entirely on circumstantial evidence, the court must be satisfied not only that those circumstances were consistent with his having committed the act, but also that the facts were such, so as to be inconsistent with any other rational conclusion other than the one that the accused is the guilty person.

F

20. In *Sharad Birdhichand Sarda* (Supra), this Court held as under:

G

"The facts so established should be consistent only with the hypothesis of the ?guilt of the accused. There should not be explainable on any other

H

A *the accused is guilty. The circumstances should be of a*
B *conclusive nature and tendency. There must be a chain*
C *of evidence so complete as not to leave any reasonable*
D *ground for the conclusion consistent with the innocence*
E *of the accused and must show that in all human*
F *probability the act must have been done by the accused."*

A similar view has been reiterated in *Krishnan v. State Represented by Inspector of Police*, (2008) 15 SCC 430; *Pawan v. State of Uttaranchal, etc. etc.* (2009) 15 SCC 259; and *State of Maharashtra v. Mangilal*, (2009) 15 SCC 418.

21. In *M.G. Agarwal v. State of Maharashtra*, AIR 1963 SC 200, this Court held, that if the circumstances proved in a case are consistent either with the innocence of the accused, or with his guilt, then the accused is entitled to the benefit of doubt. When it is held that a certain fact has been proved, then the question that arises is whether such a fact leads to the inference of guilt on the part of the accused person or not, and in dealing with this aspect of the problem, benefit of doubt must be given to the accused and a final inference of guilt against him must be drawn only if the proved fact is wholly inconsistent with the innocence of the accused, and is entirely consistent with his guilt.

Similarly, in *Sharad Birdhichand Sarda* (Supra), this Court held as under:

F *"Graver the crime, greater should be the standard*
G *of proof. An accused may appear to be guilty on the*
H *basis of suspicion but that cannot amount to legal proof.*
When on the evidence two possibilities are available or
open, one which goes in the favour of the prosecution and
the other benefits an accused, the accused is
undoubtedly entitled to the benefit of doubt. The principle
has special relevance where the guilt or the accused is
sought to be established by circumstantial evidence.

A 22. In an Essay on the Principles of Circumstantial
Evidence by William Wills by T. & J.W. Johnson & Co. 1872, it
has been explained as under:

B *"In matters of direct testimony, if credence be given to the*
C *relators, the act of hearing and the act of belief, though*
D *really not so, seem to be contemporaneous. But the case*
E *is very different when we have to determine upon*
F *circumstantial evidence, the judgment in respect of which*
G *is essentially inferential. There is no apparent necessary*
H *connection between the facts and the inference; the facts*
may be true, and the inference erroneous, and it is only
by comparison with the results of observation in similar
or analogous circumstances, that we acquire confidence
in the accuracy of our conclusions. ?

D *The term PRESUMPTIVE is frequently used as*
E *synonymous with CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE; but it*
F *is not so used with strict accuracy, The word"*
G *presumption," ex vi termini, imports an inference from*
H *facts; and the adjunct "presumptive," as applied to*
evidentiary facts, implies the certainty of some relation
between the facts and the inference. Circumstances
generally, but not necessarily, lead to particular
inferences; for the facts may be indisputable, and yet their
relation to the principal fact may be only apparent, and
not real; and even when the connection is real, the
deduction may be erroneous. Circumstantial and
presumptive evidence differ, therefore, as genus and
species.

G *The force and effect of circumstantial evidence*
H *depend upon its incompatibility with, and incapability of,*
explanation or solution upon any other supposition than
that of the truth of the fact which it is adduced to prove;
the mode of argument resembling the method of
demonstration by the reductio ad absurdum."

23. Thus, in view of the above, the Court must consider a case of circumstantial evidence in light of the aforesaid settled legal propositions. In a case of circumstantial evidence, the judgment remains essentially inferential. The inference is drawn from the established facts as the circumstances lead to particular inferences. The Court has to draw an inference with respect to whether the chain of circumstances is complete, and when the circumstances therein are collectively considered, the same must lead only to the irresistible conclusion, that the accused alone is the perpetrator of the crime in question. All the circumstances so established must be of a conclusive nature, and consistent only with the hypothesis of the guilt of the accused.

24. This Court in *Babu v. State of Kerala*, (2010) 9 SCC 189 has dealt with the doctrine of innocence elaborately and held as under:

“27. Every accused is presumed to be innocent unless the guilt is proved. The presumption of innocence is a human right. However, subject to the statutory exceptions, the said principle forms the basis of criminal jurisprudence. For this purpose, the nature of the offence, its seriousness and gravity thereof has to be taken into consideration. The courts must be on guard to see that merely on the application of the presumption, the same may not lead to any injustice or mistaken conviction. Statutes like the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881; the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988; and the Terrorist and Disruptive Activities (Prevention) Act, 1987, provide for presumption of guilt if the circumstances provided in those statutes are found to be fulfilled and shift the burden of proof of innocence on the accused. However, such a presumption can also be raised only when certain foundational facts are established by the prosecution. There may be difficulty in proving a negative fact.

28. However, in cases where the statute does not

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H

provide for the burden of proof on the accused, it always lies on the prosecution. It is only in exceptional circumstances, such as those of statutes as referred to hereinabove, that the burden of proof is on the accused. The statutory provision even for a presumption of guilt of the accused under a particular statute must meet the tests of reasonableness and liberty enshrined in Articles 14 and 21 of the Constitution.”

25. In a criminal trial, the purpose of examining the accused person under Section 313 Cr.P.C., is to meet the requirement of the principles of natural justice i.e. audi alterum partem. This means that the accused may be asked to furnish some explanation as regards the incriminating circumstances associated with him, and the court must take note of such explanation. In a case of circumstantial evidence, the same is essential to decide whether or not the chain of circumstances is complete. No matter how weak the evidence of the prosecution may be, it is the duty of the court to examine the accused, and to seek his explanation as regards the incriminating material that has surfaced against him. The circumstances which are not put to the accused in his examination under Section 313 Cr.P.C., cannot be used against him and have to be excluded from consideration.

26. In *State of Maharashtra v. Sukhdev Singh*, AIR 1992 SC 2100, this Court observed as under:

“...if there is no evidence or circumstance appearing in the prosecution evidence implicating the accused with the commission of the crime with which he is charged, there is nothing for the accused to explain and hence his examination under Section 313 of the Code would be wholly unnecessary and improper. In such a situation the accused cannot be questioned and his answers cannot be used to supply the gaps left by witnesses in their evidence.”

H

27. In *Mohan Singh v. Prem Singh & Anr.*, AIR 2002 SC 3582, this Court held:

“The statement of the accused under Section 313 CrPC is not a substantive piece of evidence. It can be used for appreciating evidence led by the prosecution to accept or reject it. It is, however, not a substitute for the evidence of the prosecution. If the exculpatory part of his statement is found to be false and the evidence led by the prosecution is reliable, the inculpatory part of his statement can be taken aid of to lend assurance to the evidence of the prosecution. If the prosecution evidence does not inspire confidence to sustain the conviction of the accused, the inculpatory part of his statement under Section 313 CrPC cannot be made the sole basis of his conviction.”

28. In *Dehal Singh v. State of H.P.*, AIR 2010 SC 3594, this Court observed:

“Statement under Section 313 of the Code of Criminal Procedure is taken into consideration to appreciate the truthfulness or otherwise of the case of the prosecution and it is not an evidence. Statement of an accused under Section 313 of the Code of Criminal Procedure is recorded without administering oath and, therefore, the said statement cannot be treated as evidence within the meaning of Section 3 of the Evidence Act. The appellants have not chosen to examine any other witness to support this plea and in case none was available they were free to examine themselves in terms of Section 315 of the Code of Criminal Procedure which, inter- alia, provides that a person accused of an offence is a competent witness of the defence and may give evidence on oath in disproof of the charges. There is reason not to treat the statement under Section 313 of the Code of Criminal Procedure as evidence as the accused cannot be cross-examined with reference to those

statements. However, when an accused appears as a witness in defence to disprove the charge, his version can be tested by his cross-examination.”

29. In *State of M.P. v. Ramesh*, (2011) 4 SCC 786, this Court held as under:

*“The statement of the accused made under Section 313 CrPC can be taken into consideration to appreciate the truthfulness or otherwise of the prosecution case. However, as such a statement is not recorded after administration of oath and the accused cannot be cross-examined. his statement so recorded under Section 313 CrPC cannot be treated to be evidence within the meaning of Section 3 of the Evidence Act. 1872. **Section 315 CrPC enables an accused to give evidence on his own behalf to disprove the charges made against him. However, for such a course, the accused has to offer in writing to give his evidence in defence. Thus, the accused becomes ready to enter into the witness box, to take oath and to be cross-examined on behalf of the prosecution and/or of the accomplice, if it is so required.”***

30. In *Rafiq Ahmed @ Rafi v. State of U.P.*, AIR 2011 SC 3114, this Court observed as under:

“It is true that the statement under Section 313 CrPC cannot be the sole basis for conviction of the accused but certainly it can be a relevant consideration for the courts to examine, particularly when the prosecution has otherwise been able to establish the chain of events....”

31. In *Dharnidhar v. State of U.P. & Ors.*, (2010) 7 SCC 759, this Court held:

“The proper methodology to be adopted by the Court while recording the statement of the accused under Section 313 CrPC is to invite the a

A to the circumstances and substantial evidence in relation
to the offence, for which he has been charged and invite
his explanation. In other words, it provides an opportunity
to an accused to state before the court as to what is the
truth and what is his defence, in accordance with law. It
was for the accused to avail that opportunity and if he fails
to do so then it is for the court to examine the case of
the prosecution on its evidence with reference to the
statement made by the accused under Section 313
CrPC.”

C 32. In *Ramnaresh & Ors. v. State of Chhattisgarh*, AIR
2012 SC 1357, this Court held as under:

D “It is a settled principle of law that the obligation to
put material evidence to the accused under Section 313
CrPC is upon the court. One of the main objects of
recording of a statement under this provision of CrPC is
to give an opportunity to the accused to explain the
circumstances appearing against him as well as to put
forward his defence, if the accused so desires. But once
he does not avail this opportunity, then consequences in
law must follow. Where the accused takes benefit of this
opportunity, then his statement made under Section 313
CrPC, insofar as it supports the case of the prosecution,
can be used against him for rendering conviction. Even
under the latter, he faces the consequences in law.”

G 33. In *Munish Mubar v. State of Haryana*, AIR 2013 SC
912, this Court, while dealing with the issue of the examination
of the accused under Section 313 Cr.P.C. held, that the
accused has a duty to furnish an explanation in his statement
under Section 313 Cr.P.C. as regards any incriminating
material that has been produced against him. Such a view was
taken in light of the fact that there existed evidence to show that
the accused had parked his car at the Delhi Airport, and that
the same had remained there for several hours on the date of
commission of the crime in question. Thus, in light of the fact

A that such a fact had been established, and that such
circumstances also simultaneously existed, the accused was
expected to explain the reason for which he had gone to the
airport, and why the car had remained parked there for several
hours.

B 34. In *Ramnaresh* (Supra), this Court had taken the view
that if an accused is given the freedom to remain silent during
the investigation, as well as before the Court, then the accused
may choose to maintain silence or even remain in complete
denial, even at the time when his statement under Section 313
C Cr.P.C. is being recorded. However, in such an event, the Court
would be entitled to draw an inference, including such adverse
inference against the accused, as may be permissible in
accordance with law. While such an observation has been
made, this part of the judgment must be read alongwith the
D subsequent observation of the court stating that if he keeps
silent or furnishes an explanation, in both cases, the same can
be used against him for rendering a conviction, in so far as it
supports the case of the prosecution.

E 35. In *Brajendrasingh v. State of M.P.*, AIR 2012 SC 1552,
this Court held, that it is equally true that a statement under
Section 313 Cr.P.C., simpliciter cannot normally be made the
basis for convicting the accused. But where the statement of
the accused under Section 313 Cr.P.C. is in line with the case
F of the prosecution, then the heavy onus of providing adequate
proof on the prosecution, that is placed is to some extent,
reduced.

G 36. In view of the above, the law on the issue can be
summarised to the effect that statement under Section 313
Cr.P.C. is recorded to meet the requirement of the principles
of natural justice as it requires that an accused may be given
an opportunity to furnish explanation of the incriminating
material which had come against him in the trial. However, his
statement cannot be made a basis for his conviction. His
H answers to the questions put to him under

cannot be used to fill up the gaps left by the prosecution witnesses in their depositions. Thus, the statement of the accused is not a substantive piece of evidence and therefore, it can be used only for appreciating the evidence led by the prosecution, though it cannot be a substitute for the evidence of the prosecution. In case the prosecution's evidence is not found sufficient to sustain conviction of the accused, the inculpatory part of his statement cannot be made the sole basis of his conviction. The statement under Section 313 Cr.P.C. is not recorded after administering oath to the accused. Therefore, it cannot be treated as an evidence within the meaning of Section 3 of the Evidence Act, though the accused has a right if he chooses to be a witness, and once he makes that option, he can be administered oath and examined as a witness in defence as required under Section 315 Cr.P.C.

An adverse inference can be taken against the accused only and only if the incriminating material stood fully established and the accused is not able to furnish any explanation for the same. However, the accused has a right to remain silent as he cannot be forced to become witness against himself.

37. We have considered the case in the light of the aforesaid settled legal propositions and reached the following inescapable inferences:

- I. Kalawati (PW.3), grandmother of the deceased Pooja, has stated that Indira (PW.2), mother of the deceased Pooja, had removed her silver Kada and had placed it near Pooja. The said Kada has however, not been seized from either the place of occurrence, from their cart, or from the appellant.
- II. Witnesses PW.1 to PW.4 have submitted, that the pant, shirt, vest, brief and shoes of the appellant were found lying near the dead body of Pooja. This statement has been disbelieved in its entirety by the High Court, and to such extent, it has been held all

the witnesses have given a false statement.

- III. There has been an evidence in respect of recovery of blood stained clothes of the appellant which stand falsified by the deposition of Daulatram (PW.7) who had categorically deposed that when he woke him up while sleeping in the jeep, his clothes did not have any blood stained. Hari Singh (PW.9) admitted in his deposition that in Arrest Memo, Ex.P-14 there was no mention that there was any blood on the body of the accused or his clothes.
- IV. As per the evidence of PWs.1 to 4, the appellant was apprehended by them when he came and made a demand of Rs.2,000/- to bring Pooja back on 23.5.2001 and was handed over to the police. There could be no explanation by the Investigating Officer as how his arrest had been shown on 27.5.2001.
- V. Naurang (PW.4) has categorically deposed that the appellant was shown to such witnesses immediately after his arrest by the police.
- VI. The High Court has taken the view that the appellant has also furnished a false explanation. Daulatram (PW.7) was a prosecution witness and the appellant has submitted that he has deposed falsely. Such a statement made by the appellant could not be held to be a false explanation.
- VII. The discovery of the body of Pooja by Kalawati (PW.3) is also grossly suspect, owing to the fact that it is neither natural to defecate on the roof of a house, nor to go to the roof of a vacant building in the wee hours of the morning.
- VIII. Even if the missing report was filed at 9 O'Clock in the morning of 23.5.2001

- approached the witnesses to pay to him a sum of Rs.2,000/-, to bring Pooja back the very same day, there is no reason why the said fact is found to be missing in the FIR that was lodged on 24.5.2001. A
- IX. In their statements recorded under Section 161 Cr.P.C., witnesses PW.1 to PW.4 have expressed the doubt that they had with respect to the appellant. It is pertinent to note however, that all the statements were recorded on 27.5.2001 and there is no explanation for why such a statement is missing in the FIR lodged on 24.5.2001. B C
- X. Statement of Rohtash (PW.1) was shown to have been recorded on 27.5.2001 though the same was recorded on 24.5.2001 as is evident from the overwriting in the original record. D
- XI. The recoveries are also highly unbelievable as Daulatram (PW.7) and another witness Ummaid (PW.8), who had been declared hostile, have deposed in the court stating that they had been asked to sign on blank papers. In such circumstances, why was Daulatram (PW.7) also not declared hostile by the prosecution? E
- XII. Doctor Laxman Singh (PW.12), has deposed before the court, stating that the appellant had on his person, several injuries and that some of the said injuries that were on his right leg, could have been caused by a blunt weapon. No explanation was furnished by the prosecution with respect to such injuries. Moreover, even if some injuries were found on the private parts of the appellant, the same does not conclusively connect him to the crime. F G
- XIII. Gopi Singh (PW.14), the investigating officer, has deposed in court, that a white semen like H

A substance was seized from the spot. Such a statement is not possible to be taken as true for the reason that the colour of the semen is said to have remained white even after the lapse of several hours.

B 38. In the instant case, there have been major contradictions/ improvements/embellishments in the deposition of witnesses which cannot be ignored when they are examined in the correct perspective. The chain of links connecting the appellant with the crime appears inconclusive. It is a settled legal proposition that, while appreciating the evidence of a witness, minor discrepancies on trivial matters, which do not affect the core of the case of the prosecution, must not prompt the court to reject the evidence thus provided, in its entirety. The irrelevant details which do not in any way corrode the credibility of a witness, cannot be labeled as omissions or contradictions. Therefore, the courts must be cautious and very particular, in their exercise of appreciating evidence. The approach to be adopted is, if the evidence of a witness is read in its entirety, and the same appears to have in it, a ring of truth, then it may become necessary for the court to scrutinize the evidence more particularly, keeping in mind the deficiencies, drawbacks and infirmities pointed out in the said evidence as a whole, and evaluate them separately, to determine whether the same are completely against the nature of the evidence provided by the witnesses, and whether the validity of such evidence is shaken by virtue of such evaluation, rendering it unworthy of belief. "Exaggerations per se do not render the evidence brittle. But it can be one of the factors to test the credibility of the prosecution version, when the entire evidence is put in a crucible for being tested on the touchstone of credibility." It is in fact, the entirety of the situation which must be taken into consideration. While appreciating the evidence, the court must not attach undue importance to minor discrepancies, rather must consider broad spectrum of the prosecution version. The discrepancies may be due to normal e

observation or due to lapse of memory or due to faulty or stereo-type investigation. After exercising such care and caution, and sifting through the evidence to separate truth from untruth, embellishments and improvements, the court must determine whether the residuary evidence is sufficient to convict the accused. (Vide: *Bihari Nath Goswami v. Shiv Kumar Singh & Ors.*, (2004) 9 SCC 186; *Vijay @ Chinee v. State of Madhya Pradesh*, (2010) 8 SCC 191; and *Sampath Kumar v. Inspector of Police, Krishnagiri*, AIR 2012 SC 1249).

A

A aside. The appellant be released forthwith unless wanted in some other case.

B

B Before parting with the case, we record our appreciation to Ms. Vibha Datta Makhija, Advocate who rendered invaluable service as Amicus Curiae in disposal of these appeals.

K.K.T.

Appeal allowed.

In *Kehar Singh & Ors. v. State (Delhi Admn.)*, AIR 1988 SC 1883, this Court has held that if the discrepancies are material it would be safer to err in acquitting than in convicting the accused.

C

39. In *Subhash v. State of Haryana*, AIR 2011 SC 349, this Court has held that a significant omission in the statement of a witness recorded under Section 161 Cr.P.C. may amount to a major contradiction. However, it may depend upon the facts of case and in case of a material contradiction the accused becomes entitled for benefit of doubt and thus acquittal.

D

E

40. Thus, we find force in the submissions advanced by Ms. Makhija, learned Amicus Curiae, that evidence produced by the prosecution had been very shaky and the chain of links connecting the appellant with the crime appears inconclusive. The circumstantial evidence is completely wanting in this respect. To accept the description of the evidence collected as flimsy, or no evidence would be too short for convicting the appellant for the offence, as many issues/circumstances virtually remained unexplained.

F

G

In view of the above, we have no hesitation in holding that the prosecution failed to prove the case against the appellant beyond reasonable doubt and thus, he becomes entitled for benefit of doubt. Thus, the appeals succeed and are allowed. The conviction and sentence imposed on the appellant are set

H

G. SUNDARRAJAN
 v.
 UNION OF INDIA AND ORS.
 (Civil Appeal No. 4440 of 2013)

MAY 6, 2013

[K.S. RADHAKRISHNAN AND DIPAK MISRA, JJ.]

Atomic Energy Act, 1962 – Nuclear Power Plant – Safeguarding of plants, radioactive materials and ensuring its physical security – Requirement of protecting life and property of people including the environment – Balance to be struck between developmental needs and environmental degradation – Decision taken by the Government of India, Nuclear Power Corporation of India (NPCIL) etc. for setting up of KKNPP- a nuclear power plant (NPP) at Kudankulam, Tamil Nadu – Challenge to – Held: Nuclear energy is an important element in India’s energy mix – KKNPP was set up as part of India’s National Policy so as to develop, control and use of atomic energy for welfare of the people of India – For setting up the project, the project proponent has taken all safety requirements in site and off site and followed the code of practices laid down by AERB, based on nationally and internationally recognized safety methods – Disaster Management Plan (DMP) is already in place, so also the emergency preparedness plan, off site and on site and all programmes under Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) progressing in the right direction with co-operation and assistance of the District Administration – NPCIL, also received necessary environmental clearance from MoEF, TNPCB, etc for Units 1 to 6 – No violation of Coastal Regulation Zone (CRZ) noticed – Desalination Plant established after following rules and regulations – Experts of the view that there will be no impact on the marine eco-system and that radiation impact on the eco-system is within the

A
 B
 C
 D
 E
 F
 G
 H

A *standard set by AERB, MoEF, Expert Appraisal Committee (EAC), Pollution Control Board etc. – All expert teams unanimous in their opinion of the safety and security of the KKNPP both to life and property of the people and the environment which includes marine life – Justification for establishing KKNPP at Kudankulam, therefore, vindicated – Apprehension, however, legitimate, cannot override justification of the project – However, directions given by Supreme Court in regard to safety of the plant, impact on environment, quality of various components and systems in the NPP plant – Atomic Energy (Safe Disposal of Radioactive Wastes) Rules 1987 – The Hazardous Waste Management and Handling Rules 1989 – Environmental (Protection) Act, 1986 – Disaster Management Act, 2005 – Water (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1974 – Air (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1981.*

Government Policy – Nuclear Policy – Judicial review – Scope – Held: It is not for Courts to determine whether a particular policy or a particular decision taken in fulfillment of a policy, is fair – Unless the policy framed is absolutely capricious, unreasonable and arbitrary and based on mere ipse dixit of the executive authority or is invalid in constitutional or statutory mandate, court’s interference is not called for – Courts to respect national nuclear policy of the country reflected in the Atomic Energy Act and the same to be given effect to, for welfare of the people and the country’s economic growth – Atomic Energy Act, 1962.

Civil Liability for Nuclear Damage Act, 2010 (Nuclear Liability Act) – Purpose and object of – Held: Is to provide civil liability for nuclear damage and prompt compensation to victims of a nuclear accident through No-Fault Liability to the operators.

In the instant appeals, an issue of considerable national and international importance pertaining to the setting up of KKNPP- a nuclear p



Kudankulam, Tamil Nadu arose for consideration. There was large-scale agitation and emotional reaction to the setting up of KKNPP and its commissioning, with the nature of potential adverse effect of ionizing radiation, adding to fears and unrest.

It was inter alia alleged that keeping in view the earlier accidents at the Three Mile Island (USA), Chernobyl in Russia and Fukushima in Japan etc., safety of the people and the environment is of paramount importance and if the units were allowed to be commissioned before making sufficient safeguards on the basis of the recommendations made by the Task Force of Nuclear Power Corporation of India (NPCIL), it may lead to serious consequences which could not be remedied. It was further submitted unless the seventeen recommendations made by the Task Force appointed by NPCIL were implemented before commissioning the plant, serious consequences may follow; and that the Atomic Energy Regulatory Board (AERB) and NPCIL are legally obliged to implement the recommendations and this Court sitting in this jurisdiction is bound to safeguard the life and property of the people residing in and near Kudankulam which is a fundamental right guaranteed to them under Article 21 of the Constitution of India. It was further alleged that sufficient safeguards had not been taken for safe disposal of the radioactive waste and no site had been identified for the safe handling of radioactive waste, failing which it may cause serious health hazard; and that even, at the plant site, there was no proper facility for storage of spent fuel and high level radioactive waste. It was contended that no adequate measures were taken to safeguard the life and property of the people in case of any potential disaster, in accordance with the Disaster Management Plan.

Disposing of the appeals with directions, the Court

A Per Radhakrishnan, J.

HELD:1.1. India's National Policy has been clearly and unequivocally expressed by the legislature in the Atomic Energy Act. National and International policy of the country is to develop control and use of atomic energy for the welfare of the people and for other peaceful purposes. NPP has been set up at Kudankulam as part of the national policy which is discernible from the Preamble of the Act and the provisions contained therein. It is not for Courts to determine whether a particular policy or a particular decision taken in fulfillment of a policy, is fair. It is not the province of a court to scan the wisdom or reasonableness of the policy behind the Statute. Unless the policy framed is absolutely capricious, unreasonable and arbitrary and based on mere ipse dixit of the executive authority or is invalid in constitutional or statutory mandate, court's interference is not called for. [Paras 11, 13] [664-G-H; 665-A-B, F-G]

1.2. This Court cannot sit in judgment over the decision taken by the Government of India, Nuclear Power Corporation of India (NPCIL) etc. for setting up of KKNPP at Kudankulam in view of the Indo-Russia agreement. The Courts also cannot stand in the way of the Union of India honouring its Inter-Governmental Agreement entered into between India and Russia. This Court may, however, focus attention on various other issues raised in these appeals in the light of the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act, Rules and Regulations framed thereunder, International conventions, covenants entered into by India with other countries, Atomic Energy Regulatory Board (AERB) Code of Practices and Safety Guides, Expert's opinion, Environmental and other related laws. This Court is deeply concerned with the safety and security of the people of this country, its environ

fauna, its marine life, ecology, bio-diversity and so on which the policy makers cannot be on the guise of national policy, mutilate or rob of, in such an event the courts can unveil the mask and find out the truth for the safety, security and welfare of the people and the mother earth. [Paras 13, 14 and 23] [665-H; 666-A-C; 670-B-C]

M.P. Oil Extraction and Anr. v. State of M.P. and Ors. (1997) 7 SCC 592: 1997 (1) Suppl. SCR 671 – relied on.

M/s. Ugar Sugar Works Ltd. v. Delhi Administration & Ors. (2001) 3 SCC 635: 2001 (2) SCR 630; *Dhampur Sugar (Kashipur) Ltd. v. State of Uttaranchal and Ors.* (2007) 8 SCC 418: 2007 (10) SCR 199 and *Delhi Bar Association v. Union of India and Ors.* (2008) 13 SCC 628: 2008 (3) SCR 898 – referred to.

Vacher & Sons v. London Society of Compositors, (1913) AC107(118)HL; *CCSU v. Min.* (1984) 3 All ER 935 (954) HL – referred to.

2.1. Safety and security of the people and the nation are of paramount importance when a nuclear plant is being set up and it is vital to have in place all safety standards in which public can have full confidence to safeguard them against risks which they fear and to avoid serious long term or irreversible environmental consequences. [Para 24] [670-D-E]

2.2. Various codes and safety standards issued by the AERB, mainly deal with siting, design, construction, operation, quality assurance, decommissioning etc. Safety codes and safety standards are formulated on the basis of nationally and internationally accepted safety criteria for design, construction and operation of specific equipment, systems, structures and components of nuclear and radiation facilities. Further, India has also entered into various bilateral treaties and is also a party

to various international conventions on nuclear safety, physical protection of nuclear material, nuclear accident, radiological emergency and so on. India is also governed by the safety and security standards laid down by International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). [Para 34] [679-B-D]

2.3. India is not a signatory to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). India is, however, party to various international conventions. Though, India is not a party to any of the Liability Conventions, specifically, IAEA Vienna Convention on Civil Liability for Nuclear Damage, India has enacted the Civil Liability for Nuclear Damage Act, 2010 (Nuclear Liability Act) which aims to provide a civil liability for nuclear damage and prompt compensation to the victims of a nuclear accident through No-Fault Liability to the operators. [Paras 35, 42] [679-E-F; 681-E-F]

2.4. The effective functions of the nuclear power plants are sensitive in nature. Various Codes of Practice, safety guidelines and the decision taken in various international conventions and the guidelines laid down by various international agencies followed by India are meant to protect the life and property of people including the environment, guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution of India. [Para 46] [683-G-H; 684-A]

People's Union for Civil Liberties and Another v. Union of India and Others, (2004) 2 SCC 476 – relied on.

3. The Government of India, following its national nuclear policy, decided to set up a NPP in the southern part of the country. DAE, for that purpose constituted a Site Selection Committee (SSC) for selecting a suitable site in the coromandel coast of Tamil Nadu. The Committee, after surveying various sites, selected Kudankulam in the Tirunelveli Distr

the most suitable place for locating NPP. NPCIL also made a detailed study of the selected site in the light of the Code of Practice framed by AERB regarding safety in NPP Siting. The SSC had taken care of all aspects before making its recommendations to the Government. NPCIL, Union of India and other statutory authorities had taken care to follow the practice laid down by AERB on safety in NPP site. [Paras 47, 48] [684-B-D; 685-G-H]

4.1. Radioactive wastes is generated during operation, maintenance and decommissioning of nuclear and radiation facilities. The waste generated needs to be managed in a safe manner to ensure protection of human health and the environment from the undue effects of ionizing radiation now and in future without imposing undue burden on future generations. Radioactive waste is to be managed in a manner that ensures compliance with the fundamental principles of radiation protection and environmental safety. Monitoring and surveillance programme helps to ensure radiation protection of the occupational workers, public and the environment. [Para 50] [686-G-H; 687-A-B]

4.2. The SNF (Spent Nuclear Fuel) from NPPs, after an adequate storage period, is transported to reprocessing facilities located within the country, following the International and AERB guidelines and standards. NPCIL, DAE and MoEF have maintained the stand that they are aware of the importance of safety and security and have taken care to ensure that the management and transportation of spent fuel is carried out safely following the international recognized norms and regulations and the same is being done under the observation of AERB and the Government of India. [Para 57] [694-D-F]

4.3. The AERB Safety Code on “Management of Radioactive Waste” of 2007 does not deal with the requirements for Deep Geological Repository (DGR). The

A

B

C

D

E

F

G

H

A problem of this nature is being faced by all the nuclear plant operating countries, including India. Research is on to handle SNF in DGR which, in the near future, may be a reality, but that shall not deter in holding up of such a project which has been established at KKNPP in implementation of the India’s Nuclear Policy. [Para 65] [697-F-G]

4.4. However, it is of utmost importance that the Union of India, NPCIL etc. should find out a place for a permanent DGR. Storing of SNF at NPP site will, in the long run, pose a dangerous, long term health and environmental risk. NPCIL and the Union of India is bound to look at the probabilities of potentially harmful events and the consequences in future. Noticeably, NPCIL does not seem to have a long term plan, other than, stating and hoping that in the near future, it would establishes a DGR. The Atomic Energy Act, especially Section 17, envisages present and future safety of our NPPs and the lives and environment around. NPCIL and the Union of India must have a hard look at the environmental consequences of its action of setting up of NPPs, hence a permanent DGR is of utmost importance, which they should plan now. [Paras 65, 66] [697-G-H; 698-A-C]

F *Human Rights (Environmental Pollution in Baluchistan) PLD 1994 SC 102 and State of New York, ETAL v. NRC and USA dated 8-6-2012 [Judgment of the US Court of Appeals] – referred to.*

G 5.1. The Prime Minister of India ordered a fresh review of all safety of NPPs, on 11.3.2011, immediately after the accident at Fukushima NPP, Japan with respect to external events. NPCIL, the operating agency, constituted separate task forces to review safety of NPPs depending on types of reactor designs and their vintages in India. H The task force found that KK

incorporated all safety standards, including passive systems to ensure reactor shutdown. The AERB, in pursuance of the direction of Prime Minister, constituted a high level committee (AERBSC-EE) to review safety of NPPs against external events of natural origin (post Fukushima accident) with national level experts in the areas of (i) design, safety analysis and NPP operation and (ii) external events in the field of seismology, hydrology and earthquake engineering to carry out a comprehensive review of capability of NPPs to deal with external events within and beyond design basis. AERBSC-EE submitted its report on 31.08.2011. The expert committee of AERB, LWR in its final report dated 31.8.2011 gave 17 safety measures by way of abundant caution. A comparative chart giving the status and implementation of Post Fukushima AERB Recommendations has been filed by NPCIL in its affidavit dated 3.12.2012, which indicate that twelve recommendations have already been complied with. [Paras 68, 69, 70 and 72] [699-C-E; 700-C-E, H; 701-E-G]

5.2. This Court is convinced that KKNPP design incorporates advanced safety features complying with the current standards of redundancy, reliability, independence and prevention of common cause failures in its safety systems. The design also takes care of Anticipated Operational Occurrences (AOO), Design Basis Accidents (DBA) and Beyond Design Basis Accidents (BDBA) like Station Black Out (SBO), Anticipated Transients Without Scram (ATWS), Metal Water reaction in the water core and provision of core catcher to take care of core degradation. The design also includes the provisions for withstanding external events like earthquake, tsunami/storm, tidal waves, cyclones, shock waves, aircraft impact on main buildings and fire. The possibility of tsunami hitting at Kudakulam, as the one that hit Fukushima, seems to be very remote. [Para 73] [704-G-H; 705-A-C]

5.3. The Government of India, in order to allay various apprehensions raised by the people's movement against the production of nuclear energy as well as against commissioning of KKNPP, constituted a 15 Member Expert Group to provide clarifications on the issue raised by the agitators by interacting with the forum provided by State Government comprising of 2 State Government nominees and 4 representatives of the people. Public hearing was held and views and suggestions made for and against the project were heard. The Committee specifically examined the safety features of KKNPP in the wake of the accidents occurred at TMI, Chernobyl, Fukushima etc. [Para 74] [705-D-F]

5.4. The Government of Tamil Nadu also appointed an Expert Committee headed by Former President of the AEC along with three other experts. The Committee submitted its report after assessing that the project has a unique passive safety feature which provides cooling to the nuclear fuel without the need for operator action or power supply, namely a Passive Heat Removal System, which is a novel safety feature. In addition to the various reports, the Russian Nuclear Safety Authority also known as GosAtomNadzor (GAN) reviewed and cleared the Safety Analysis Report of KKNPP Units 1 and 2, which forms the basis of the licensing safety review. [Para 77] [707-E-G]

6.1. Developing modern sources for energy through NPPs carry the problem of potential damage, which might flow from a nuclear catastrophe. Several Nuclear Energy Generating countries have adopted their own Legislation on the issue of Civil and Criminal Liability. Few of such legislations followed the basic principle of imposing legal liability on a strict liability basis on the operator of a nuclear installation coupled with the limitation on liability. [Para 78] [707-H; 708-A-C]

6.2. Currently, there are two main conventions on third-party liability in the field of nuclear energy. The first is the Paris Convention of 1960, which was supplemented by the Brussels Supplementary Convention Act, 1963. IAEA's Vienna Convention on Civil Liability for Nuclear Damage, 1963 is yet another convention. India's Civil Liability for Nuclear Damage Act, 2010 or the Nuclear Liability Act mainly rests on the above Conventions, though India is not a signatory to those conventions. India's Nuclear Liability Act aims to provide a civil liability for nuclear damage and prompt compensation to victims of a nuclear incident through a No Fault Liability to the operator, appointment of Claims Commissioner, establishment of Nuclear Damage Claims Commission, Nuclear Liability Fund and other matters connected therewith. [Para 79] [708-C-F]

M. C. Mehta v. Union of India AIR 1987 SC 1086: 1987 (1) SCR 819; *Indian Council for Enviro-Legal Action v. Union of India* (1996) 3 SCC 212: 1996 (2) SCR 503; *Vellore Citizens Welfare Forum v. Union of India* (1996) 5 SCC 647: 1996 (5) Suppl. SCR 241; *Union Carbide Corporation v. Union of India* (1989) 2 SCC 40; *Union Carbide Corporation v. Union of India* AIR 1992 SC 248: 1991 (1) Suppl. SCR 251 – referred to.

Duke Power Company v. Carolina Environmental Study Group 438 US 59 (1978) – referred to.

7. Disaster Management Plan (DMP) is of paramount importance. After the accidents in Three Mile Island, Chernobyl and Fukushima, there has been an uproar all over the world including India for adopting sufficient safety measures for handling nuclear/radiological emergencies which may likely to occur in various NPPs situated in the country. Any radiation incident resulting in or having a potential to result in exposure and/or contamination in excess of the respective permissible

limits can lead to a nuclear/radiological emergency. Situations are, of course, not bound to occur quite often, but one must be prepared to face nuclear/radiological emergencies because of high population density in a country like India. Nuclear/radiological emergencies can occur due to factors beyond the control of the operating agencies, for example, human error, system failure, sabotage, earthquake, cyclone, flood etc. [Paras 86, 87] [711-C, D-G]

8. Sustainable Development and Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) are inseparable twins, integrated into the principles of Inter and Intra-Generational Equity, not merely human-centric, but eco-centric. CSR is much more when the Project proponent sets up NPPs, thermal power plants, since every step taken for generation of energy from such hazardous substances, is bound to have some impact on human beings and environment, even though it is marginal. The Department of Public Enterprises (DPE), recently, issued a Comprehensive Guidelines on CSR for Central Public Sector Enterprises, which includes NPCIL, to create, through the Board Resolution, a CSR budget as a specific percentage of net profit of the previous year. CSR is envisaged as a commitment to meet its social obligations by playing an active role to improve the quality of life to the communities and stake-holders on a sustainable basis, preferably, in the project area where it is operating. NPCIL has allocated funds for providing health, education, infrastructural development under CSR at Kudankulam. [Paras 104, 105] [727-B-E, H]

Banwasi Seva Ashram v. State of U.P. AIR 1987 SC 374: 1987 (1) SCR 336 – referred to.

9. Public opinion, national policy, economic growth, sustainable development, energy security are all intrinsically interlinked. One cannot be divorced from other, all the same, a balance has to be struck. Nuclear energy is considered to be a viable

it is necessary to increase country's economic growth. India cannot afford to be a nuclear isolated nation, when most of the developed countries consider it as a major source of energy for their economic growth. [Para 109] [729-E-G]

10.1. With regard to the location of KKNPP within the prescribed 500 mtr. within the Coastal Regulation Zone (CRZ), an exemption had already granted as per the then existing norms even prior to 1991 by the then Prime Minister of India by the communication dated 19.4.1989. Over and above, paragraph 2(1) of 1991 CRZ Notification as amended by Notification dated 12.4.2011, exempted projects of Department of Atomic Energy. A cumulative reading of the permission dated 19.04.1989 accorded by the then existing norms read with paragraph 2(1) of 1991 Notification, as amended by Notification dated 12.4.2011, makes it clear that the KKNPP Units 1 and 2 have not violated the 1991 CRZ Notification. [Para 132] [751-B-D]

10.2. Environmental clearance or NOC was granted to KKNPP units 1 and 2 as early as 26.12.1988 though the TNPCB had granted 'consent to establish' under Section 25 of the Air (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1981 on 25.02.2004 and 'consent to operate' under the Water (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1974 on 28.08.2012. The "environmental clearance" or "No Objection Certificate" cannot be equated to "consent to establish" under Section 25 of the Air Act and "consent to operate" under Section 21 of the Water Act, which were granted on 25.2.2004 and 28.8.2012 respectively. NPCIL had undertaken various activities with respect to KKNPP subsequent to the environment clearance granted by TNSEC on 26.12.1988, subsequently modified on 13.2.1989. TNSEC had on 15.12.1988 had already cleared the project, which tantamount to No Object Certificate (NOC). Only after clearance or NOC, the question of 'establishing' or 'operating' a plant arises.

A Explanatory Note 8 to the Environment Notification dated 27.01.1994 speaks of exemption for projects already initiated that is land has been acquired and clearance of the State Government including NOC, from Pollution Control Board had been obtained before 27th January 1994, for which no fresh environmental clearance would be required from Impact Assessment Agency (IAA). KKNPP units 1 and 2 is, therefore, entitled to get the benefit of the Explanatory Note 8 to EIA notification dated 27.01.1994. [Para 148 and 149] [760-E-H; 761-A-C]

C 10.3. Also, there has been no expansion or modernization of units 1 and 2, which has resulted in increase of pollution load. Plant capacity remained the same i.e. 1000 MWs X2, till date and there is no substantial difference in plant model and the specifications envisaged in the 1988 agreement and 1998 supplement agreement. Plant model remains as V-412, consequently the 1994 EIA notification will not apply qua KKNPP units 1 and 2. [Para 150] [761-C-D]

E 10.4. The EIA for the expansion of KKNPP i.e. for setting up Units 3 to 6 included the environment impact on Units 1 and 2 and the cumulative effect of all the six units definitely formed the base line for the clearance granted by the MoEF on 23.9.2008 and 31.12.2009. The concern of the public regarding safety, livelihood, radiation, impact on marine life, rehabilitation, impact on the sea shore etc. were also considered and following that necessary clearance was granted. [Para 159] [769-H; 770-A-B]

G 10.5. On facts, it is seen that the KKNPP has been set up and is made functional on the touchstone of sustainable development and its impact on ecology has been taken care of following all national and international environmental principles. [Para 174] [776-B-C]

H 11. While balancing the benefit of establishing KKNPP Units 1 to 6, with right to I

the protection of environment including marine life, one has to strike a balance, since the production of nuclear energy is of extreme importance for the economic growth of our country, alleviate poverty, generate employment etc. While setting up a project of this nature, one has to have an overall view of larger public interest rather than smaller violation of right to life guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution. [Para 175] [776-D-F]

12. Problems highlighted, while setting up a nuclear plant, are not unique to this nation, because other countries are also grappling with those situations. Much hue and cry has been raised by some sections of the people about the possible impact of radiation from KKNPP Units 1 and 2, a point which has been addressed by the AERB, NPCIL, MoEF and all the Expert Committees constituted to go into the impact and effect of radiation from the units not only on humans but also on ecology. Experts Committees are of the unanimous opinion that there will not be any deleterious effects due to radiation from the operation of KKNPP, and that adequate safety measures have already been taken. NPCIL, while setting up the NPP at Kudankulam, have satisfied the environmental principle like sustainable development, corporate social responsibility, precautionary principle, inter - intra generational equity and so on to implement our National Policy to develop, control and use of atomic energy for the welfare of the people and for economic growth of the country. Larger public interest of the community should give way to individual apprehension of violation of human rights and right to life guaranteed under Article 21. [Para 176, 178 and 179] [776-F-G; 778-H; 779-A-B, E-G]

R. v. Inspectorate of Pollution, ex p Greenpeace Ltd (1994) ALL ER 321; R. v. The Secretary of State for the Environment, exp Greenpeace Ltd. (1994) 4 All England Reports 352; R. v. Secretary of State for Environment, Food

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H

and Rural Affairs, ex p Friends on the Earth Ltd (2002) Environmental Law Review 24; Marchiorii v. Environment Agency (2002) EWCA Civ 3; R. (Greenpeace Ltd) v. Secretary of State for Trade and Industry, (2007) Environmental Law Reports 29; S.V. France 3RUOH (1991) (decision by European Commission of Human Rights); Metropolitan Edison Co. v. People Against Nuclear Energy 460 US 766 (1983); Alberta Wilderness Association v. Express Pipelines Ltd. 137 DLR (4th) 177 (Canada); Inverhuron District Ratepayers' Assn v. Canada (Minister of the Environment) 2001 FCA 203 – referred to.

13. Public money running into crores and crores rupees have already been spent for the development, control and use of atomic energy for the welfare of the people and hence, one has to put up with such “minor inconveniences”, “minor radiological detriments” and minor environmental detriments” in our lives because the benefits from KKNPP are enormous since Nuclear energy remains as an important element in India’s energy mix which can replace a significant part of fossil fuels like coal, gas oil etc. [Para 180] [779-G-H; 780-A-B]

14. Justification for establishing KKNPP at Kudankulam has been vindicated and all safety and security measures have already been taken, necessary permissions and clearances have been obtained from all statutory authorities. Apprehension expressed by some sections of the public that if the units are commissioned or put into operation, it will have far reaching consequences, not only on the present generation, but also on the future generation, of the possible radioactive effects of the units has no basis. Few of them raised the apprehension that it might repeat accidents like the one that had happened at Three Miles Island, Chernobyl, Union Carbide and Fukushima etc. Apprehension, however, legitimate it may be, cannot override the justification of the project. Nobody

H



predict what would happen in future and to a larger extent we have to leave it to the destiny. But once the justification test is satisfied, the apprehension test is bound to fail. Apprehension is something we anticipate with anxiety or fear, a fearful anticipation, which may vary from person to person. [Para 181] [780-B-F]

15. Nuclear power plant is being established not to negate right to life but to protect the right to life guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution. The petitioner's contention that the establishment of nuclear power plant at Kudankulam will make an inroad into the right to live guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution, has no basis. On the other hand it will only protect the right to life guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution for achieving a larger public interest and will also achieve the object and purpose of Atomic Energy Act. [Para 184] [781-G-H; 782-A]

Chameli Singh and others v. State of U.P. and another (1996) 2 SCC 549: 1995 (6) Suppl. SCR 827 – referred to.

16. AEC, DAE, BARC, AERB, NPCIL, TNPCB the expert bodies, are all unanimous in their opinions that adequate safety and security measures have already taken at KKNPP which are to be given due weight that they deserve. Further, NPCIL Task Force Report on Security of all NPPs including KKNPP dated March 2011, 11.5.2011, AERB-EE Expert Opinion on Design Committee Safety dated 31.8.2011, 15 Member Expert Team Committee Report (post Fukushima) dated December 2011, Supplementary Report dated 31.2.2012 on the Grievances raised by some of the agitators, report submitted by Sri R. Srinivasan, Former President, Atomic Energy Commission appointed by the State of Tamil Nadu are all unanimous in their view on the safety and security of KKNPP. MoEF, EAC, TNPCB, Report of IOM, Anna University dated July 2008 on Impact of NPP on

A Marine Eco-system, Committee on Conservation of Sea-Shore of the State of Tamil Nadu, Report of Engineers India Limited with CHFRI dated August 2011, NEERI dated May 2002 and January 2003 on the Impact on Air, Water, Land, Eco-system etc. are all unanimous that the radiation as well as the discharge of water from NPP to the sea shore will not have serious impact on the marine ecology or on marine life. [Paras 185 and 186] [782-B-F]

17. Normally, Court should be slow to interfere with the opinion expressed by the Experts and it would normally be wise and safe for the courts to leave the decisions to experts who are more familiar with the problems which they face than the courts generally can be which has been the consistent view taken by this Court. The Court cannot sit in judgment on the views expressed by the Technical and Scientific Bodies in setting up of KKNPP plant at Kudankulam and on its safety and security. [Paras 187, 188] [782-G-H; 783-F]

University of Mysore v. C. D. Govinda Rao AIR 1965 SC 491: 1964 SCR 575 – followed.

State of Bihar v. Asis Kumar Mukherjee (Dr.) (1975) 3 SCC 602:1975 (2) SCR 894; *Dalpat Abasaheb Solunke v. B. S. Mahajan* (1990) 1 SCC 305; *Central Areca Nut & Cocoa Marketing & Processing Coop. Ltd. v. State of Karnataka* (1997) 8 SCC 31; *Dental Council of India v. Subharti K. K. B. Charitable Trust & Another* (2001) 5 SCC 486: 2001 (3) SCR 149; *Basavaiah (Dr.) v. Dr. H. L. Ramesh* (2010) 8 SCC 372: 2010 (9) SCR 227; *Avishek Goenka v. Union of India* (2012) 5 SCC 275: 2012 (5) SCR 547 – referred to.

Woon Tankan and Seven Others v. Asian Rare Earth Sdn. Ehd. CLJ (1992) 2 207 – referred to.

Conclusion

H 18. KKNPP has been set up as p

Policy so as to develop, control and use of atomic energy for the welfare of the people of India. Policy makers consider nuclear energy as an important element in India's energy mix for sustaining economic growth of natural and domestic use. For setting up the project, the project proponent has taken all safety requirements in site and off site and has followed the code of practices laid down by AERB, based on nationally and internationally recognized safety methods. Safeguarding the nuclear plants, radioactive materials and ensuring its physical security have become a central part of Nuclear Law. Adequate measures have, therefore, to be taken for storage of NSF at site, and also for the physical safety of stored NSF. Of the seventeen suggested safety measures, by AERB, LWR, twelve have already been implemented and the rest, in a phased manner have to be implemented which the experts say, are meant for extra security. Disaster Management Plan (DMP) is already in place, so also the emergency preparedness plan, off site and on site and all programmes under CSR are progressing in the right direction with the co-operation and assistance of the District Administration. NPCIL, has also received necessary environmental clearance from MoEF, TNPCB, etc for Units 1 to 6. No violation of CRZ is also noticed. Desalination Plant is also established after following rules and regulations and there is no violation of CRZ. Experts say that there will be no impact on the marine eco-system due to discharge of +7°C, CCW over and above the ambient temperature of the sea. Radiation impact on the eco-system is also within the standard set by AERB, MoEF, EAC, Pollution Control Board etc., so opined by the Experts. In other words, all the expert teams are unanimous in their opinion of the safety and security of the KKNPP both to life and property of the people and the environment which includes marine life. Court has to respect national nuclear policy of the country reflected in the Atomic

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H

A Energy Act and the same has to be given effect to for the welfare of the people and the country's economic growth and it is with these objectives in mind KKNPP has been set up. [Paras 189, 190] [783-G-H; 784-A-G]

B Per Dipak Misra, J. [Concurring]

C HELD: 1. The conception of the *parens patriae* theory is the obligation of the State to protect and it takes into custody the rights and the privileges of its citizens for discharging its obligation. The maxim *salus populi suprema lex* – regard for public welfare - is the highest law. Another maxim is *salus republicae suprema lex*, i.e., safety of the State is the supreme law and in case of any conflict, an individual must yield to the collective interest. But, it should not be done at the cost of safety. At all times and at all quarters, sincere efforts are to be made to maintain and sustain the safety of the people. True it is, there are exceptions, but the exceptions are to remain in the realm of exceptions only and should not be brought into play either at the whim or fancy of the executive. The purpose of saying is that the law has many a mansion and the mosaic of law covers many spectrums so that both the maxims, namely, *solus populi suprema lex* and *salus republicae suprema lex*, can harmoniously coexist. The present case is one where there is need for nuclear energy for the welfare of the public and for other welfare of the people of India and for peaceful purpose. Definitely, the interest of the economy and the interest of safety are to be the real concerns of a Welfare State. [Paras 211, 216] [799-D-E; 801-A-E]

G *Charan Lal Sahu v. Union of India* (1990) 1 SCC 613; 1989 (2) Suppl. SCR 597; *Union Carbide Corporation v. Union of India and others* (1989) 3 SCC 38; 1989 (3) SCR 128; *Pritam Pal v. High Court of Madhya Pradesh, Jabalpur through Registrar* 1993 Supp (1) SCC 529 and *State of Karnataka and others v. Dr. Praveen*

H

4 SCC 684: 2004 (3) SCR 652 – referred to.

Anderson v. Dunn, 19 U.S. (6 Wheat) 204 (1821) [decision of U.S. Supreme Court] – referred to.

2. The concept of welfare State is a facet of Article 38 of the Constitution of India. It is the obligation of the State to see that the welfare of the people is appositely promoted. The words used in the Preamble of the Atomic Energy Act, 1962 are “welfare for the people” and “peace”. There is a necessity for generation of electrical energy and regard being had to the hazards, there has to be guidance which the Acts, Rules and Notifications provide. The collective interests should not totally be thrown overboard for the development of the power sector. If the safety measures are adequately not taken and the apprehensions are not removed and the fear is not totally ostracized from the minds of the people of the locality, posterity may not recognize the same as a development or a progressive step. The conscientious and conscious policy decisions by the Government are to be taken with due care and consideration, keeping in mind the welfare of the people at large. [Para 217] [801-H; 802-A-D]

3. The safety of the people residing in Kudankulam and the areas in its vicinity and also the people who are likely to be affected because of radioactive generation has to be respected, for their human dignity is their divinity. This Court has not directed for closure of the plant on the basis of the asseverations made before this Court. But, it is the highest concern of this Court that a devastating disaster should be avoided at all costs by the people who are in-charge of looking after the safety measures. The statutory regulatory authority should responsibly keep the vigil and no one, who has the responsibility, should be complacent. The tragedy that has occurred at Fukushima shall remain as one of the

A

B

C

D

E

F

G

H

A darkest elements of history. The catastrophe of the Bhopal Gas Leak Disaster has not been erased or effaced from the minds of the public. The moan and mourns of the affected people of Bhopal who have been injured or lost their kith and kin are still heard and humane sensitivity would not permit one to ignore it. The nuclear scientists, the administrators and other authorities cannot remain oblivious or totally insensitive to the possible hazards when the nuclear plant operates. [Para 220] [806-E-H; 807-A]

C 4. When one thinks of safety in the context of establishment of a nuclear plant, the inevitable thought that gets into the depth of mind is security. Safety and security, in this context, are inseparably inter-twined commencing the planning, quality of construction, committed efforts to avoid operational jeopardy and monitoring and all are bound to remain in a singular chain. All endeavours are to be made to prevent, monitor and control. The concept of disaster management cannot be allowed to remain on paper. Taking care of the situation of the present alone is not the solution. All concerned with the same are required to look to the future because that elevates the real concern. The protection of the environment and the safety for the present generation in its connotative sense covers the posterity. [Para 221] [807-B-C, D, F-G]

G 5.1. Promotion of development and protection of environment are to be harmonized at the same time. What is required to be prescribed is the principle of sustainable development and find a balance between the developmental needs and the environmental degradation. [Para 222] [808-A-B]

H 5.2. This Court has emphasized on striking a balance between the ecology and environment on one hand and the projects of public utility on the

authorities is that a delicate balance has to be struck between the ecological impact and development. The other principle that has been ingrained is that if a project is beneficial for the larger public, inconvenience to smaller number of people is to be accepted. It has to be respectfully accepted as a proposition of law that individual interest or, for that matter, smaller public interest must yield to the larger public interest. Inconvenience of some should be bypassed for a larger interest or cause of the society. But, a pregnant one, the present case really does not fall within the four corners of that principle. It is not a case of the land oustees. It is not a case of “some inconvenience”. It is not comparable to the loss caused to property. Ouster from land or deprivation of some benefit of different nature relatively would come within the compartment of smaller public interest or certain inconveniences. But when it touches the very atom of life, which is the dearest and noblest possession of every person, it becomes the obligation of the constitutional courts to see how the delicate balance has been struck and can remain in a continuum in a sustained position. Unless adequate care, caution and monitoring at every stage is taken and there is constant vigil, life of “some” can be in danger. That will be totally shattering of the constitutional guarantee enshrined under Article 21 of the Constitution. It would be guillotining the human right, for when the candle of life gets extinguished, all rights of that person perish with it. Safety, security and life would constitute a pyramid within the sanctity of Article 21 and no jettisoning is permissible. Therefore, the delicate balance in other spheres may have some allowance but in the case of establishment of a nuclear plant, the safety measures would not tolerate any lapse. The grammar has to be totally different. However, the proportionality of risk may not be “zero” regard being had to the nature’s unpredictability. All efforts are to be made to avoid any

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H

A man-made disaster. Though the concept of delicate balance and the doctrine of proportionality of risk factor gets attracted, yet the same commands the highest degree of constant alertness, for it is disaster affecting the living. The life of some cannot be sacrificed for the purpose of the eventual larger good. [Para 228] [811-B-H; 812-A-D]

5.3. The AERB as the regulatory authority and the MoEF are obliged to perform their duty that safety measures are adequately taken before the plant commences its operation. That is the trust of the people in the authorities which they can ill afford to betray, and it shall not be an exaggeration to state that safety in a case of this nature in any one’s hand has to be placed on the pedestal of “Constitutional Trust”. [Para 229] [812-G-H]

Intellectuals Forum, Tirupathi v. State of A.P. and others (2006) 3 SCC 549: 2006 (2) SCR 419; *Bombay Dying & Mfg. Co. Ltd. (3) v. Bombay Environmental Action Group and others* (2006) 3 SCC 434: 2006 (2) SCR 920; *M.C. Mehta v. Union of India and others* (2004) 12 SCC 118: 2004 (3) SCR 128; *A.P. Pollution Control Board v. Prof. M.V. Nayudu* (1999) 2 SCC 718; *Tirupur Dyeing Factory Owners Association v. Noyyal River Ayacutdars Protection Association and others* (2009) 9 SCC 737: 2009 (14) SCR 1051; *T.N. Godavarman Thirumulpad (104) v. Union of India* (2008) 2 SCC 222: 2007 (12) SCR 447; *M.C. Mehta v. Union of India* (2009) 6 SCC 142; *T.N. Godavarman Thirumulpad (through K.M. Chinnappa) v. Union of India and others* (2002) 10 SCC 606: 2002 (3) Suppl. SCR 541; *Narmada Bachao Andolan v. Union of India and others* (2000) 10 SCC 664: 2000 (4) Suppl. SCR 94 – referred to.

D
E
F
G

Case Law Reference:

In the judgment of Radhakrishnan, J.

H (1913) AC 107 (118) HL ref

(1984) 3 All ER 935 (954) HL referred to Para 12 A
 1997 (1) Suppl. SCR 671 relied on Para 13
 2001 (2) SCR 630 referred to Para 13
 2007 (10) SCR 199 referred to Para 13 B
 2008 (3) SCR 898 referred to Para 13
 (2004) 2 SCC 476 relied on Para 46
 1994 SC 102 referred to Para 60
 438 US 59 (1978) referred to Para 82 C
 1987 (1) SCR 819 referred to Para 83
 1996 (2) SCR 503 referred to Para 83
 1996 (5) Suppl. SCR 241 referred to Para 83 D
 (1989) 2 SCC 40 referred to Para 84
 1991 (1) Suppl. SCR 251 referred to Para 84
 1987 (1) SCR 336 referred to Para 106 E
 (1994) ALL ER 321 referred to Para 176
 (1994) 4 All ER 352 referred to Para 176
 (2002) ELR 24 referred to Para 176 F
 (2002) EWCA Civ 3 referred to Para 176
 (2007) Environmental Law Reports 29 referred to Para 176
 3RUOH (1991) referred to Para 176 G
 460 US 766 (1983) referred to Para 176
 137 DLR (4th) 177 referred to Para 176
 2001 FCA 203 referred to Para 176 H

1995 (6) Suppl. SCR 827 referred to Para 177
 1964 SCR 575 followed Para 187
 1975 (2) SCR 894 referred to Para 187
 (1990) 1 SCC 305 referred to Para 187
 (1997) 8 SCC 31 referred to Para 187
 2001 (3) SCR 149 referred to Para 187
 2010 (9) SCR 227 referred to Para 187
 2012 (5) SCR 547 referred to Para 187
 CLJ (1992) 2 207 referred to Para 187

In the judgment of Dipak Misra, J.

1989 (2) Suppl. SCR 597 referred to Para 211
 1989 (3) SCR 128 referred to Para 213
 1993 Supp (1) SCC 529 referred to Para 215
 2004 (3) SCR 652 referred to Para 215
 2006 (2) SCR 419 referred to Para 222
 2006 (2) SCR 920 referred to Para 223
 2004 (3) SCR 128 referred to Para 224
 2009 (14) SCR 1051 referred to Para 225
 2007 (12) SCR 447 referred to Para 225
 (2009) 6 SCC 142 referred to Para 225
 2002 (3) Suppl. SCR 541 referred to Para 226
 2000 (4) Suppl. SCR 94 referred to Para 227

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION : Civil Appeal No. 4440 of 2013.

From the Judgment & Order dated 31/08/2012 of the High Court of Madras in WP No. 22253/2012.

WITH

C.A. Nos. 4441, 4442 and 4443 of 2013.

Mohan Parasaran, Gourab Banerji, ASG, Rakesh Diwedi, S. Guru Krishna Kumar, Subramonium Prasad, A.A.G., Prashant Bhushan, Pranav Sachdeva, N.L. Ganapathi, Sanjay Parikh, Rashmi Nandakumar, Bushra Parveen, A.N. Singh, Mamta Saxena, Anitha Shenoy, D.L. Chidananda, N. Meyyappan, D.S. Mahra, S.N. Terdal, Sameer Parekh, Faisal Sherwani, (for Parekh & Co.), Yogesh Kanna, A. Santha Kumaran, B. Balaji, A. Prasanna Venkat, D. Nagasalla, Gautam Narayan, Asmita Singh for the appearing parties.

The Judgment of the Court was delivered by

K.S. RADHAKRISHNAN, J. 1. Leave granted.

2. We are in these appeals concerned with an issue of considerable national and international importance, pertaining to the setting up of a nuclear power plant in the South-Eastern tip of India, at Kudankulam in the State of Tamil Nadu. The incidents occurred in Three Miles Island Power Plant USA, Chernobyl, Ukraine, USSR, Fukoshima, Japan, Union Carbide, Bhopal might be haunting the memory of the people living in and around Kudankulam, leading to large-scale agitation and emotional reaction to the setting up of the Nuclear Power Plant (NPP) and its commissioning. The nature of potential adverse effect of ionizing radiation, adds to fears and unrest which might not have even thought of by Enrico Fermi a noble laureate in physics in 1938, who was responsible for the setting up of the first Nuclear reactor in a Doubles quash Court at Slagg Field, at the Chicago University, USA. Since then, it is history, India has now 20 Nuclear Reactors, in place, and the world over about 439, but people still react emotionally, for more reasons than one, when a new one is being established.

3. People's concern was mooted, even in the Constituent Assembly when it deliberated the issue before constituting India into a Sovereign Democratic Republic and adopting and enacting the Constitution of India.

GENERAL

4. The Constituent Assembly discussed the formal legal framework to regulate atomic energy in the year 1948 and the legislation by the name Atomic Energy Act, 1948 (29 of 1948) was enacted. That Act envisaged the constitution of an Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) and a Department of Atomic Energy (DAE) and both were established in the year 1954. The AEC is the apex body of the Central Government for atomic energy that provides direction on policies related to atomic energy. It consists of eminent scientists and technocrats, secretaries to different ministries, senior officials from the office of the Prime Minister. The AEC has to report to the Prime Minister of India on various policies related to atomic energy. DAE deals with the development and implementation of nuclear power and related nuclear fuel cycle activities and research and development activities carried out in various units under it. Baba Atomic Research Centre (BARC), formerly AEE, was also established in the year 1954 and research reactors namely Apsara, Cirus and Dhruva were set up in the year 1956, 1960 and 1985 respectively. The control and development of atomic energy in the country and matters connected therewith were then regulated by Act 29 of 1948.

5. Parliament having taken note of the developments in the field of atomic energy and with a view to implement the future programme of expansion in the field, thought it necessary to have a comprehensive legislation dealing with Atomic Energy, consequently, Act 29 of 1948 was repealed and the Atomic Energy Act, 1962 (33 of 1962) (in short the Act) was enacted which came into force on 29.01.1962. The Act has been enacted to provide for the development, control and use of atomic energy for the welfare of the people.

A peaceful purposes. The Central Government, in exercise of the powers conferred under Section 27 of the Act, constituted the Atomic Energy Regulatory Board (AERB) vide notification dated 15.11.1983 to carry out certain regulatory and safety functions envisaged under Sections 16, 17 and 23 of the Act. The AERB have powers to lay down safety standards and frame rules and regulations in regard to the regulatory and safety requirements envisaged under the Act and have to report to AEC. The Act underwent amendment vide amending Acts 59 and 29 in the years 1986 and 1987 respectively. However, the major amendment was of the year 1987, vide Amending Act 29 of 1987, by which the Central Government was empowered to produce and supply electricity from atomic energy. For achieving the envisaged target of nuclear power generation, a nuclear power corporation or a Government company was also decided to be set up which would design, construct and operate nuclear power stations in India. Following that, a separate public sector company, namely, the Nuclear Power Corporation of India (NPCIL) with a view to design, build and operate nuclear reactors in the country was created in September 1987. NPCIL is a wholly owned by the Government of India undertaking which functions under the administrative control of DAE.

NATIONAL POLICY:

6. The Parliament in unequivocal terms has pronounced its national policy through the Act, that is to develop, control and use of atomic energy for the welfare of the people of India. The Central Government has also been entrusted with the power to provide for the control over radioactive substances or radiation generating plant and to provide for the production and supply of electricity from atomic energy etc. Central Government have also got the power to require any substance which contains uranium, plutonium or any of their isotopes and extract from that any substance which is essential to the atomic energy programme. The Act, though, provides the basic regulatory

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H

A framework for the regulation of nuclear related activity, we have other related laws which have to be applied and read in tandem like the Factories Act, 1948, the Indian Electricity Act, 2003, the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986, the Water (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1974, the Air (Prevention and Control Regulation) Act, 1981, the Water (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Cess Act, 1977, the Indian Explosives Act, 1884, the Disaster Management Act, 2005, the Atomic Energy (Radiation Protection) Rules, 2004, the Industrial Radiography (Radiation Surveillance) Procedure, 1980, the Atomic Energy (Factories) Rules, 1996, the Atomic Energy (Working of Mines, Minerals and Handling of Prescribed Substances) Rules 1984, the Atomic Energy (Safe Disposal of Radioactive Waste) Rules, 1987, the Radiation Surveillance Procedure for Medical Application of Radiation, 1989 and the Atomic Energy (Control and Irradiation of Food) Rules, 1996 and so on.

7. The Central Government, as per the Act, is legally obliged to develop a sound and adequate national policy in regard to atomic power and to coordinate such policy with the Central Electricity Authority (CEA) and the State Electricity Boards (SEBs) constituted under the Act for the generation of electricity in pursuance of such policy and to operate atomic power stations in the manner determined by it in consultation with the Boards or Corporations concerned. Section 22, which deals with the provisions for the generation of electricity, reads as follows:

“22. Special provision as to electricity.-

- (1) Notwithstanding anything contained in the Electricity (Supply) Act, 1948 (54 of 1948), the Central Government shall have authority—
 - (a) to develop a sound and adequate national policy in regard to atomic power, to co-ordinate such policy with the Central Electricity Authority a

H

Boards constituted under sections 3 and 5 respectively of that Act and other similar statutory corporations concerned with the control and utilisation of other power resources, to implement schemes for the generation of 1[either by itself or through any authority or corporation established by it or a Government company,] electricity in pursuance of such policy and to operate atomic power stations in the manner determined by it in consultation with the Boards or Corporations concerned, with whom it shall enter into agreement regarding the supply of electricity so produced;

(b) to fix rates for and regulate the supply of electricity from atomic power stations 2[, either by itself or through any authority or corporation established by it or a Government company, in consultation with] the Central Electricity Authority;

(c) to enter into arrangements with the Electricity Board of the State in which an atomic power station is situated, 1[either by itself or through any authority or corporation established by it or a Government company] for the transmission of electricity to any other State: Provided that in case there is difference of opinion between the Central Government 1[or such authority or corporation or Government company, as the case may be] and any State Electricity Board in regard to the construction of necessary transmission lines, the matter shall be referred to the Central Electricity Authority whose decision shall be binding on the parties concerned.

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H

(2) No provision of the Indian Electricity Act, 1910 (9 of 1910), or any rule made thereunder or of any instrument having effect by virtue of such law or rule shall have any effect so far as it is inconsistent with any of the provisions of this Act.

(3) Save as otherwise provided in this Act, the provisions of this Act shall be in addition to, and not in derogation of the Indian Electricity Act, 1910 (9 of 1910), and the Electricity (Supply) Act, 1948 (45 of 1948).”

8. As a sequel to that national policy, the Central Government, with the active cooperation of AEC, BARC, NPCIL, AERB etc., have already set up about twenty operating power reactors in the country with installed nuclear capacity of 4780 MWe, which have been commissioned over the last four decades from the year 1969 to 2011. Seven more units with a capacity of 5300 MWe are under construction (commissioning). The latest one to be commissioned is at Kudankulam in the State of Tamil Nadu. The first nuclear power plant (NPP) in the country Tarapur Atomic Power Station (TAPS) units 1 and 2, based on boiling water reactors (BWR), was supplied by General Electric USA and became operational in the year 1969. The Rajasthan Atomic Power Stations (RAPS) 1 and 2 with two 200 MWe were established in 1970s at Rawatbhata in Rajasthan with the technical cooperation of AECL (Canada). Later, in 1980s two 220 MWe Pressurized Heavy Water Reactors (PHWRs) Madras Atomic Power Station – 1 and 2 were constructed at Kalpakkam in Tamil Nadu. Later, India developed a standardized design of 220 MWe PHWRs. Four reactors of that standardized design were built, two each at Narora in Uttar Pradesh (Narora Atomic Power Station – 1 and 2) and Kakrapar in Gujarat (Kakrapar Atomic Power Project – 1 and 2). Those plants became operational in 1990s. Later eight more units of standardized 220 MWe PHWRs were built, four each at Kaiga in Karnataka (Kaig

units 1-4) and Rawatbhata in Rajasthan (RAPS Units 3-6). India in 1990s undertook the design and development of 540 MWe PHWR. Two reactors based on that design became operational in 2005-06 at Tarapur. India has also developed 700 MWe design with limited boiling in the coolant channels. The construction of four such units was almost completed at Kakrapar and Rawatbhata sites. Currently, 500 MWe Prototype Fast Breeder Reactor (PFBR) is under construction at Kalpakkam. PFBR is built with the design and technology developed at Indira Gandhi Centre for Atomic Research (IGCAR). Over and above, India has now set up two PHWRs of VVER based NPPs (2 X 1000 MWe) at Kudankulam in Tamil Nadu with the co-operation of Russian Federation which is the subject matter of this litigation.

9. India draws bulk of its electricity, above 64%, from thermal sources, especially coal. Hydro power comes second of 18% and then renewable sources provide small share at about 15%. We are informed that, at present, the share of nuclear energy is hardly three per cent of India's total electricity production, while France accounts for 74.6% as on 2008. NPPs provide about 6% of the world's energy and 13-14% of the world's electricity with U.S., France and Japan together accounting for about 50% of nuclear generated electricity. U.S.A. has 104 nuclear reactors and more than 100,000 MWe of electricity is produced by nuclear generation. International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) has reported that in the year 2007, there were 439 Nuclear Power Reactors in operation in the world operating in thirty one countries. The DAE, it is reported, plans to increase its nuclear energy production to 20000 MWe by 2020 and 63,000 by 2030. The Policy makers consider that the nuclear energy remains as an important element in India's energy mix for sustaining economic growth of natural and domestic use. One of the reasons for preferring nuclear energy as an alternative source of energy is that it is a clean, safe, reliable and competitive energy source which can replace a significant part of the fossil fuels like coal, oil, gas

A etc. Oil and natural gas resources might exhaust themselves. Coal is also not an effective substitution since forests are also no longer able to satisfy the energy requirements. Major source of electricity generation, about 66%, is still contributed by fossil thermal powers, like coal. To put into practice the national policy, India has already entered into various collaborations with most of the developed countries which have proved expertise and experience in the field of establishment and production of nuclear energy.

C 10. Economic growth and energy support have to go hand in hand, for the country's development for which India has entered into various collaboration agreements with U.S.A., Canada, Russia etc. and several NPPs have already been set up in the country. Government of India, in implementation of its national policy, had made a joint statement with U.S.A., called Indo-U.S. Joint Statement 2005, for a renewed global civil nuclear energy co-operation. A co-operation agreement called 2007 Co-operation Agreement was also entered into between India and U.S.A. for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. This was later followed by the Indo-France Joint Statement in September, 2008. A Joint Statement was made in February 2010 with United Kingdom. Above facts would indicate that in order to give effect to the National Policy for development, control and use of atomic energy, India has entered into various bilateral treaties and arrangements with countries which have considerable expertise and experience. For establishing the NPP at Kudankulam, India had entered into an inter-governmental agreement with the erstwhile USSR in November 1988 followed by a supplementary agreement on 21.06.1998 signed by India and Russia which is in tune with India's National Policy.

H 11. India's National Policy has been clearly and unequivocally expressed by the legislature in the Atomic Energy Act. National and International policy of the country is to develop control and use of atomic energy for the

A and for other peaceful purposes. NPP has been set up at Kudankulam as part of the national policy which is discernible from the Preamble of the Act and the provisions contained therein. It is not for Courts to determine whether a particular policy or a particular decision taken in fulfillment of a policy, is fair. Reason is obvious, it is not the province of a court to scan the wisdom or reasonableness of the policy behind the Statute. Lord Macnaughten in *Vacher & Sons v. London Society of Compositors*, (1913)AC107(118)HL has stated:

C “Some people think the policy of the Act unwise and even dangerous to the community.....But a Judicial tribunal has nothing to do with the policy of any Act which it may be called upon to interpret. That may be a matter for private judgment. The duty of the Court, and its only duty is to expand the language of the Act in accordance with the settled rules of construction.”

D
E 12. In *CCSU v. Min.* (1984) 3 All ER 935 (954) HL, it was held that it is not for the Courts to determine whether a particular policy or particular decision taken in fulfillment of that policy are fair. They are concerned only with the manner in which those decisions have been taken, if that manner is unfair, the decision will be tainted with that Lord Diplock labels as ‘procedural impropriety’.

F 13. This Court in *M.P. Oil Extraction and Anr. v. State of M.P. and Ors.*, (1997)7SCC 592 held that unless the policy framed is absolutely capricious, unreasonable and arbitrary and based on mere ipse dixit of the executive authority or is invalid in constitutional or statutory mandate, court’s interference is not called for. Reference may also be made in the judgment of this Court in *M/s. Ugar Sugar Works Ltd. v. Delhi Administration & Ors.*, (2001) 3 SCC 635; *Dhampur Sugar (Kashipur) Ltd. v. State of Uttranchal and Ors.* (2007) 8 SCC 418 and *Delhi Bar Association v. Union of India and Ors.*, (2008) 13 SCC 628. We are therefore firmly of the opinion that we cannot sit in judgment over the decision taken by the Government of India,

A NPCIL etc. for setting up of KKNPP at Kudankulam in view of the Indo-Russia agreement. Courts also cannot stand in the way of the Union of India honouring its Inter-Governmental Agreement entered into between India and Russia.

B 14. We may, however, focus our attention on various other issues raised in these appeals in the light of the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act, Rules and Regulations framed thereunder, International conventions, covenants entered into by India with other countries, AERB Code of Practices and Safety Guides, Expert’s opinion, Environmental and other related laws. C Part I of this judgment, we propose to deal with the safety and security of NPP, International Conventions and Treaties, KKNPP Project, NSF and its management and transportation, DGR, Civil Liabilities, DMA, CSR and other related issues and in Part II, we mainly focus on the environmental issues, CRZ, D Desalination Plant, Impact of Radiation on Eco-system, Experts opinions etc.

PART I

E 15. KKNPP has been set up by NPCIL based on the Indo-Russia Joint Agreement under the guidance and supervision of AEC, BARC, AERB, MoEF, TNPCB, Central and State Governments etc.

ARGUMENTS – FOR AND AGAINST

F 16. Shri Prashant Bhushan, learned counsel appearing for the appellant in SLP Nos. 27335 of 2012, submitted that having seen the experience at Three Mile Island (USA), Chernobyl in Russia and Fukushima in Japan etc., safety of the people and the environment are of paramount importance and if the units are allowed to be commissioned before making sufficient safeguards on the basis of the recommendations made by the Task Force of NPCIL, it may lead to serious consequences which could not be remedied. Learned counsel submitted unless the seventeen recommendatio

Force appointed by NPCIL are implemented before commissioning the plant, serious consequences may follow. Learned counsel submitted that AERB and NPCIL are legally obliged to implement the recommendations and this Court sitting in this jurisdiction is bound to safeguard the life and property of the people residing in and near Kudakulam which is a fundamental right guaranteed to them under Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

17. Mrs. Nagasaila, learned counsel appearing for the 8th respondent in SLP (C) No. 27813 of 2012, also pointed out that sufficient safeguards have not been taken for the safe disposal of the radioactive waste and no site has so far been identified for the safe handling of radioactive waste, failing which it may cause serious health hazard. Learned counsel also pointed out that even, at the plant site, there is no proper facility for storage of spent fuel and high level radioactive waste. Learned counsel also pointed out that no adequate measures have been taken to safeguard the life and property of the people in case of any potential disaster, in accordance with the Disaster Management Plan.

18. Learned Attorney General appearing for AERB submitted that the plant has been set up after following all the safety standards laid down by AERB. The design of KKNPP incorporates advance safety features complying with current standards of redundancy, reliability, independence and prevention of common cause failures in its safety system. Further, it was also pointed out that the design takes care of Anticipated Operational Occurrences (AOO), Design Basis Accidents (DBA) and Beyond Design Basis Accidents (BDBA) like Station Black Out (SBO), Anticipated Transients Without Scram (ATWS), Metal Water reaction etc. Further, it was pointed out that the Board of AERB met on 23.3.2011 and took stock of safety and NPPs in the light of Fukushima accident. AERB also constituted a High Level Committee of Specialists to review and recommend safety upgrades as required to

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H

A handle extreme external events of natural origin. Learned Attorney General also pointed out that KKNPP design also has several Advanced Safety Features, including those for ensuring safety against external events of natural origin and for management of design basis as well as beyond design basis accidents. Further, it was pointed out that, over and above, steps are being taken to implement the 17 recommendations made by the Task Force of NPCIL and that, amongst them, few recommendations have already been implemented.

19. Shri Rohinton Nariman, learned Solicitor General of India appearing for NPCIL, submitted that KKNPP is a 3+Generation NPP and its design incorporates advanced safety features complying with current standards of redundancy, reliability, independence and prevention of common cause failures in its safety systems. The design includes provisions for withstanding external events like earthquake, tsunami/storm, tidal waves, cyclones, shock waves, aircraft impact on main buildings and fire. KKNPP also incorporates various additional safety features like Quick Boron Injection System, Passive Heat Removal System, Second Stage Hydro Accumulators, Passive Hydrogen Re-combiners, Annulus Passive Filtering System (Passive System), Core Catcher etc. Details of further safety measure adopted have already been elaborately stated in the counter-affidavit filed by NPCIL on 26.9.2012. Learned Solicitor General submitted that KKNPP is absolutely safe even without the 17 recommendations made out of abundant caution by AERB. Learned Solicitor General submitted that the 17 recommendations of AERB would also be complied with in a phased manner, out of which 7 have already been implemented.

20. Shri Mohan Parasaran, learned Additional Solicitor General of India, appearing on behalf of respondent no. 1, while referring to the affidavit filed by the Union of India, submitted with regard to the process – “Re-processing and Disposal of Spent Fuel” - that most of the spent fuel

H

A being reused, the remaining 3% of the spent fuel consists of
various Fission Products (FPs) and Minor Actinides (MAs). All
B MAs have varying half-lives/decay periods, the dominant
amongst them have half-lives of the order of 1 lakh 70 thousand
years. Each NPP has a water storage pool for storage of spent
fuel, namely "Spent Fuel Storage Bay" (SFSB). Those pools
C are temporary storage facilities for recyclable fuel and are
essentially water filled concrete vaults with SS lining, having the
arrangement for storing spent fuel in racks. They are designed,
constructed and operated as per the AERB Guidelines and
requirements. It was also stated that AERB Safety Guide
D 'Design of fuel handling and storage systems for pressurized
heavy water reactors – AERB/SG/D-24" deals with the safety
in design of storage of spent fuel. Further, it was also pointed
out that the transportation of spent fuel is governed by the
Regulations specified by AERB in "Safety Code for the
E transport of radioactive materials – AERB/SC/TR-1' and
international requirements given in IAEA Regulation for safe
transport of radioactive material, 2005. Learned Additional
Solicitor General also submitted that the Department of Atomic
Energy is also aware of the importance of safety and security
and takes utmost care to ensure that the management and
transport is carried out safely, following the internationally
recognized norms and regulations and that the same is done
under the supervision of AERB and Government of India.

F 21. Government of India's decision to establish the NPP
at Kudankulam, as already stated, cannot be questioned before
this Court being part of a National Policy. Lot of scientific
literatures, experts opinions etc. have been produced before
us to show its dangers, harm it may cause to human health,
environment, marine life and so on not only on the present
G generation but on future generation as well. Further, it was also
pointed out that due to growing nuclear accidents and the
resultant ecological and other dangers, many countries have
started retreating from their forward nuclear programmes.

H

A 22. We have already indicated that these issues are to be
addressed to policy makers, not to courts because the destiny
of a nation is shaped by the people's representatives and not
by a handful of judges, unless there is an attempt to tamper with
the fundamental Constitutional principles or basic structure of
B the Constitution.

C 23. We are however deeply concerned with the safety and
security of the people of this country, its environment, its flora
and fauna, its marine life, ecology, bio-diversity and so on which
the policy makers cannot be on the guise of national policy,
D mutilate or rob of, in such an event the courts can unveil the
mask and find out the truth for the safety, security and welfare
of the people and the mother earth.

Safeguards and Security

D 24. Safety and security of the people and the nation are
of paramount importance when a nuclear plant is being set up
and it is vital to have in place all safety standards in which public
can have full confidence to safeguard them against risks which
they fear and to avoid serious long term or irreversible
E environmental consequences. It is, therefore, necessary to
examine at some length the safety standards already in place
to allay the fears expressed at some quarters.

F 25. Let us first examine whether the project proponent has
taken adequate safety requirements in site and off site of the
KKNPP and followed the Code of Practices laid down by
AERB and nationally and internationally recognized safety
methods. Before examining those issues, we have to first
examine the role of the AERB in the matter of setting up of
G nuclear plant and what are the codes and safety guides laid
down by the AERB for maintaining high safety standards for
setting up and for the functioning of nuclear plants in the country.

AERB Safety Codes

H 26. AERB, as already indicated, v

Central Government in exercise of powers conferred under Section 27 of the Act to carry out certain regulatory and safety functions envisaged under Sections 16, 17 and 23 of the Act vide notification dated 15.11.1983. The functions to be discharged by the Board have also been enumerated in the said notification which reads as follows:

- (i) Develop Safety Codes, Guides and Standards for siting, design, construction, commissioning, operation, and decommissioning of the different types of plants, keeping in view the international recommendations and local requirements and develop safety policies in both radiation and industrial safety areas.
- (ii) Ensure compliance by DAE and non-DAE installations of safety codes and standards during construction commissioning stages
- (iii) Advise AEC/DAE on technical matters that may specifically be referred to it in connection with the siting, design, construction, commissioning, operation, and decommissioning of the plants under DAE.
- (iv) Review from the safety angle requests for authorizing/commissioning/operation of DAE Projects/plants. Before authorization of commissioning / operation of the plant / project is granted, the AERB will be satisfied by appropriate review of:
 - (a) Final design Analysis Report prepared by the project plant;
 - (b) Commissioning reports and results thereof; and
 - (c) Proposed operating procedures and operational limits and conditions; that the plant/

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H

- project can be operated without undue risk to the operating personnel and the population. For this purpose, AERB may ask for relevant additional supporting information.
- (v) Review health and safety aspects of modifications in design/operation involving changes in the technical specification adopted in any of the DAE units.
 - (vi) Review operational experience in the light of the radiological and other safety criteria recommended by the International Commission on Radiological Protection, International Atomic Energy Agency and such other international bodies and adapted to suit Indian conditions, and I thereby evolve major safety policies.
 - (vii) Prescribe acceptable limits of radiation exposure to occupational workers and members of the public and approve acceptable limits of environmental release of radioactive substances. (In the DAE units, the AERB shall also prescribe limits for environmental release of conventional pollutants).
 - (viii) Review the emergency preparedness plans prepared by the different DAE units, similar plans for non-DAE installations and during transport of large radioactive sources (eg. Irradiated fuel kilo/ mega curie sources, fissile materials).
 - (ix) Promote research and development efforts for fulfilling the above functions and responsibilities.
 - (x) Review the training programme, qualifications and licensing policies for personnel by the project/plants.
 - (xi) Prescribe the syllabi for tra

safety aspects at all levels.

A

(xii) Enforce rules and regulations promulgated under the Atomic Energy Act, 1962 for radiation safety in the country and under the Factories Act, 1948 for industrial safety in the units under the control of DAE.

B

(xiii) Maintain liaison with statutory bodies in the country as well as abroad regarding safety matters.

(xiv) Take such steps as necessary to keep the public informed on major issues of radiological safety significance.

C

(xv) Perform such other functions as may be assigned to it by the Atomic Energy Commission.

D

(xvi) Send reports periodically to Chairman, AEC on safety status including observance of safety regulations and standards and implementation of the recommendations in all DAE and non DAE units. It will also submit an Annual Report of its activities to Chairman, AEC.

E

27. The notification clearly states that the Board shall be assisted by the DAE SRC and DRP BARC in the performance of its functions at (ii), (iv), (v) and (xii) mentioned above. The AERB has also been entrusted with the powers of the competent authority to enforce rules and regulations framed under the Act for radiation safety in the country. The powers have also been entrusted with the AERB to administer the provisions of the Factories Act 1948, the industrial safety for the units of DAE as per Section 23 of the Act. The AERB under its programme of developing Codes and Safety Guides issued four Codes of practice covering the following topics namely (i) Safety in Nuclear Power Plant Siting; (ii) Safety in Nuclear Power Plant Design; (iii) Safety in Nuclear Power Plant Operation; (iv) Quality Assurance for Safety in Nuclear Power

F

G

H

A Plants. Those Codes are intended to establish the objectives and to set the minimum requirements that have been fulfilled to provide assurance that nuclear power plants will be sited, designed, constructed and operated without undue risk to personnel, public and environment. The Code of Practice for

B Nuclear Power Plant Siting provides appropriate criteria and outlines the procedures to be applied to assess the suitability of a site for the location of nuclear power plant taking into account, the operational requirements and accidental conditions. The same has to be prepared following the criteria

C laid down by DAE for selection of site and the relevant IAEA documents under the Nuclear Safety Standards (NUSS) programme specially the Code of Practice for Nuclear Power Plant Siting and similar documents from various leading countries. The Code of Practice on Safety in Nuclear Power

D Plant Siting was issued by the AERB on March 9, 1990. The Code encompasses site-related characteristics, natural events and man-induced events specific to the site which will have a bearing on the safety of the plant and the radiological impact on the environment and population due to the location of NPP at the site. The Code also lays down appropriate criteria and

E outlines the procedures for assessing the suitability of a site taking into account the operational requirements and accident conditions. The Code also indicates the extent of site-related information required to be obtained and also defines site-related design bases. Certain man-induced events like war, acts

F of sabotage which can cause large scale damage to the plant safety systems, however, are beyond the scope of 1990 Code, in other words, the Code prescribes minimum requirements in siting considerations for limiting the radiological impact. The main aim is protection of man and his environment. The Code

G outlined the requirements for limiting doses to man.

H 28. The AERB in October 1999 issued guidance for the Preparation of Off-Site Emergency Preparedness Plans for Nuclear Installations. This document has been issued as a lead document to facilitate preparation of sp

A the responsible organization for emergency response plans at each site to ensure their preparedness to meet any eventuality due to site emergency in order to mitigate its consequences on the health and safety of site personnel. The document also takes cognizance of an earlier AERB publication on the subject: “Safety Manual on Off-Site Emergency Plan for Nuclear Installations” issued in the year 1988. While drafting this document, reference has been also made to the documents of the IAEA and also the statutory requirements laid down in the Manufacture, Storage and Transport of Hazardous Chemicals Rules, 1989 as well as the amendments incorporated therein subsequently.

29. The purpose of these Safety Guidelines is to lay down the requirements of the Regulatory Body for the operating organization and state public authorities in preparing an emergency response plan for off-site emergency for the nuclear installation. Radiological emergencies at the nuclear installations are mainly categorized as Plant emergency alert; Plant emergency; Site emergency and Off-site emergency. The operating organization is responsible for handling the first three categories of emergencies, while the off-site emergencies involving radiation fallout in the public domain is handled by the state public authorities with the technical input and guidance from the operating organization and the Regulatory Body. The main objectives of this Safety Guidelines are stated hereunder:

- (i) To provide detailed guidelines for nuclear installations in the country on the essential components of off-site emergency preparedness and response plans at each installation taking into consideration any ongoing construction activities at the off-site.
- (ii) To elaborate various aspects of the response plan such as: Emergency Organisation, Emergency Equipment and Facilities needed outside the nuclear installation in order to protect the site

- A personnel from risks of undue radiation exposure.
- (iii) To advise on other aspects such as: enforcement of off-site emergency plans, conduct of periodic off-site emergency drills to ensure readiness of the nuclear installation for handling off-site emergencies.
- (iv) To indicate guidelines on off-site related factors, which may influence management of off-site emergencies.
- (v) To highlight the need for the operating organization/ plant management to establish and maintain communication lines between the site, the headquarters of the operating organization, Regulatory Body and the state public authorities for prompt and effective use in times of off-site emergency.

30. The AERB has also issued the document “Preparedness of the Operating Organization for handling Emergencies” at Nuclear Power Plants in March 2000. This document supplemented the Code of Practice on Safety in NPP Operation (AERB/SC/O). The purpose of this document is to prescribe guidelines for the development of a state of preparedness for response to emergencies at nuclear power plants. The main objectives of this safety guide are given as follows:

- (a) To highlight to plant management the various categories of emergencies that could rise at NPP;
- (b) To focus on the contents of the emergency manuals in respect of resources and procedures to help respond adequately to emergency situations;
- (c) To emphasize the responsibilities of plant management regarding per

emergency and responsibilities of the State Government in respect of off-site emergency and need for close liaison between Plant Management and Public Authorities;

A

(d) To bring out the importance of maintaining efficient and effective communication links among Plant Management, Operating Organisation, Responsible Organisation, Regulatory Body, State Authorities and the Department of Atomic Energy Crisis Management Group (DAE-CMG); and

B

(e) To develop the infrastructure including manpower and their training.

C

31. The AERB issued another safety code in August 2000 on "Regulation of Nuclear and Radiation Facilities". This document has been issued to spell out the minimum safety related requirements/obligations to meet by a nuclear or radiation facility to qualify for the issue of regulatory consent at every stage leading to eventual operation. The Code also elaborates on the regulatory inspection and enforcement to be carried out by the Regulatory Body on such facilities. This document has also been prepared by the AERB from the information contained in the relevant documents issued by IAEA under the NUSS programme especially the Code on "Governmental Organization for Regulation of Nuclear Power Plants" (50-C-G).

D

E

F

The main objectives of the Code are to ensure that:-

(a) Only such practices are permitted which are justified in terms of their societal and/or individual benefits,

G

(b) Radiation protection is duly optimized in all nuclear/radiation facilities,

(c) Radiation doses to the personnel in these facilities, and to the members of the public in their vicinity,

H

do not exceed the prescribed limits and

A

(d) The potential for accidental exposures from the facilities remains acceptably low.

B

C

D

E

F

G

H

32. The scope of the Code also covers the various facilities and activities like mining and processing of radioactive ores and minerals; uranium/thorium processing and fuel fabrication plants, heavy water plants, research reactors, experimental reactors and critical assemblies, nuclear power plants, fuel reprocessing plants, radioactive waste management facilities, industrial facilities related to nuclear fuel cycle activities, transport of radioactive materials, medical applications of radiation, industrial and agricultural applications of radiation, research applications of radiation, and all other practices involving the handling of radioactive sources.

33. The AERB also issued another safety guide on October 2002 on "Design of Fuel Handling and Storage Systems for Pressurized Heavy Water Reactors". The Code of Practice on Design for Safety in Pressurized Heavy Water Based Nuclear Power Plants (AERB/SC/D,1989) lays down the minimum requirements for ensuring adequate safety in plant design. The safety code issued in October 2002 is one of a series of guides. The objective of this safety guide is to specify the minimum requirements to be met in the design of fuel handling and storage system in PHWR. It is intended to be used by the designer to ensure safety of plant and personnel by providing adequate measures for prevention of accidents and mitigation of adverse consequences, should an accident occur, in other words, the scope of this guide includes the safety in design of equipment for handling and storage of new fuel, spent fuel and other irradiated core components, which are related to handling of fuel including handling and storage of failed or damaged fuel bundles. The guide also addresses the safety aspects in fuel handling control and instrumentation and auxiliary equipment related to the fuel handling system. Design provisions to facilitate inspection and

and storage systems are also covered in that guide. The same has been prepared following the safety standards laid down by IAEA. The Code has been prepared by specialists in the field drawn from the AERB, BARC, IGCAR and NPCIL.

34. Various codes and safety standards issued by the AERB, referred to above, mainly deal with siting, design, construction, operation, quality assurance, decommissioning etc. Safety codes and safety standards are formulated on the basis of nationally and internationally accepted safety criteria for design, construction and operation of specific equipment, systems, structures and components of nuclear and radiation facilities. Further, India has also entered into various bilateral treaties and is also a party to various international conventions on nuclear safety, physical protection of nuclear material, nuclear accident, radiological emergency and so on. India, as already stated, is also governed by the safety and security standards laid down by IAEA. A brief reference to those conventions, treaties and IAEA may be apposite.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTIONS, BILETERAL TREATIES ETC.:

35. India is not a signatory to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). India is, however, party to various international conventions, such as:

The Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, which was adopted on 26.10.1979 and was signed at Vienna and at New York on 3.3.1980. The Convention makes it legally binding for States parties to protect nuclear facilities and material for peaceful domestic use, storage as well transport. It also provides expanded cooperation between and among States regarding rapid measures to locate and recover stolen or smuggled nuclear material, mitigate any radiological consequences of sabotage and prevent and combat related offences.

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H

36. The Convention on Assistance in the Case of a Nuclear Accident or Radiological Emergency was adopted by the General Conference at its special session 24-26.9.1986 and was opened for signature at Vienna on 26.9.1986 and at New York on 6.10.1986.

37. The Convention on Nuclear Safety was adopted on 17.6.1994 by a Diplomatic Conference convened by IAEA at its Headquarters from 14-17.6.1994. The Convention was opened for signature on 20.9.1994.

38. The Joint Convention on the Safety of Spent Fuel Management and on the Safety of Radioactive Waste Management, the first legal instrument to directly address these issues on a global scale, was opened for signature on 29.9.1997 and entered into force on 18.6.2001.

39. The Convention on Early Notification of a Nuclear Accident establishes a notification system for nuclear accidents which have the potential for international trans-boundary release that could be of radiological safety significance for another State. Date of adoption is 26.9.1986.

40. India has also entered into various Bilateral Civil Nuclear Co-operations. India has entered into a cooperation agreement with France for the construction of ERR Power Plants (10,000 MWe) at Jethapur site in Maharashtra, which also comprises of cooperation in the areas of research, safety and security, waste management, education etc., followed by various other commercial contracts as well. India and Canada have finalized the terms for their nuclear deal paving the way for Canadian firms to export Uranium to India in the year 2010. Discussions are on for safe nuclear cooperation as well with Canada.

41. India has also signed civil nuclear deal with Mongolia for supply of uranium to India. MOUs on the Development of Co-operation on Peaceful Uses of Rad

A Nuclear Energy by senior officials of the Department of Atomic Energy of both the countries. India has also entered into agreements with Namibia including one on civil nuclear energy which allows for supply of uranium from Namibia. India-Namibian Agreement for Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy allows for supply of uranium for setting up of nuclear reactors. B India-Kazakhstan have also signed a pact on nuclear co-operation in April 2011 and agreed to have collaboration in nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. Discussions are on to execute a civil nuclear agreement with Argentina.

C 42. India-U.S. issued an Inter U.S. Joint Statement at Washington on 18.7.2005 which has located the final broad policy so as to actually facilitate and also outline the broad contours of a legally binding agreement. Some of the policy frameworks relate to preventing WMD Proliferation, goals of prompting nuclear power and achieving nuclear energy, D expeditious consideration of fuel steps for safeguarded nuclear reactors etc. Nuclear 2007 – an agreement for co-operation between India and U.S. concerning peaceful uses of nuclear energy (2007 Co-operation Agreement) laid down certain binding obligations between the two countries. Though, India E is not a party to any of the Liability Conventions, specifically, IAEA Vienna Convention on Civil Liability for Nuclear Damage, India has enacted the Civil Liability for Nuclear Damage Act, 2010 (Nuclear Liability Act) which aims to provide a civil liability F for nuclear damage and prompt compensation to the victims of a nuclear accident through No-Fault Liability to the operators.

International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)

G 43. IAEA is an independent international organization situated in Vienna, Austria is related to the United Nations system, its relationship with the United Nations is regulated by special agreement. The IAEA reports annually to the United Nations General Assembly and when appropriate, to the Security Council regarding non-compliance by States with their H safeguards obligations as well as on matters relating to

A international peace and security. The IAEA works with its member States and multiple partners worldwide to promote safe, secure and peaceful nuclear technologies. The IAEA has the responsibility to help member States to put in place the necessary infrastructure needed to develop nuclear energy B safely, securely and peacefully and it works with member States to coordinate research to design reactors that are economical, safe and proliferation-resistant.

C 44. The IAEA's object is to maximize the contributions from nuclear technologies to human well being while minimizing their risks. Few facts and trends highlighted in the report prepared by an independent commission at the request of the IAEA in May 2008 highlights the ten key facts and trends which frame the nuclear opportunities and challenges the world now faces. D The report highlights that to sustain rapid global economic growth, it is necessary to double the supply of energy and tripling supply of electricity by 2050. Further, it is stated billions of poor people need energy and other life saving and job creating technologies. The report also noticed that energy prices are increasing, a broader reliance on nuclear energy whose E prices are much less dependent on its fuel costs conceivably could help to ameliorate those tensions and risks. The report highlights that the world still dependent on burning coal, oil and natural gas for 80% of its energy supply surging energy use causes surging emissions of greenhouse gases disrupting the F climate with potentially catastrophic results. Nuclear energy, it is stated, is a readily expandable source of low-carbon baseload electricity and in the future might also help to meet other energy needs such as hydrogen production and water desalination.

G 45. The IAEA's International Project on Innovative Nuclear Reactor and Fuel Cycles (INPRO) brings many States together to consider approaches to safer, cheaper, more secure and more proliferation-resistant nuclear systems with effective H management of nuclear waste. India is

IAEA and has incorporated many of its directives in the code of practice framed by the AERB, hence there could be no compromise on safety and security of the NPPs in the country. We have elaborately discussed the Safety and Security Code of Practices laid down by AERB, IAEA and its supports so as to allay the apprehension or fears expressed from various quarters on the safety and security of KKNPP and its effect on human life, property and environment and we notice that adequate and effective protection measures are in place.

46. Parliament, as we have already indicated, is very much concerned with the safety and security of its people and its environment. The Preamble of the Act pronounces in an eloquent terms that it has been enacted for the development, control and use of atomic energy for the "welfare of the people of India". People's comfort, happiness, prosperity and the economic growth of the nation is always the concern of their representatives in the Parliament. Safety and security of people in that process have to be in the uppermost mind of the legislature. Keeping in mind that concern, special provisions have been incorporated for the safety and security. Reference has already been made to Section 17 of the Act which casts an obligation on the Central Government to ensure proper rules with regard to the safety, which we have already examined at length. We have also examined both nationally as well as internationally accepted guidelines for safety and security of the people of the Nation and notice that those are being followed. In *People's Union for Civil Liberties and Another v. Union of India and Others*, (2004) 2 SCC 476, the Court held that the Atomic Energy Act deals with a sensitive subject. Statutory scheme contained in the provisions of the Act, the Rules framed thereunder, composition of the AEC and AERB leave no manner of doubt that the effective functions of the nuclear power plants are sensitive in nature. Various Codes of Practice, safety guidelines, extensively discussed above and the decision taken in various international conventions and the guidelines laid down by various international agencies followed by India are

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H

A meant to protect the life and property of people including the environment, guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

KKNPP Project

B 47. The Government of India, following its national nuclear policy, decided to set up a NPP in the southern part of the country. DAE, for that purpose constituted a Site Selection Committee (SSC) for selecting a suitable site in the coramandel coast of Tamil Nadu. The Committee, after surveying various sites, selected Kudankulam in the Tirunelveli District of Tamil Nadu as the most suitable place for locating NPP. NPCIL also made a detailed study of the selected site in the light of the Code of Practice framed by AERB regarding safety in NPP Siting. Kudankulam, the site located, is situated on the Shore of Gulf of Mannar near the South-Eastern tip of India in the coastal track at an elevation of +3 to +45m above MSL forming the southern fringe of soil covered plains. Most of the rivers in the area are seasonal and there are no major lakes, dams or ponds existing within 20 km radius around project site. The climate in the area is arid and is similar to other coastal regions. As per IMD Station at Kanyakumari, the wind speed is in the range of 6 to 30 km/hr. The ambient temperature varies in the range of 21°C - 34°C, while the relative humidity ranges from 68% to 80%. Geologically, the site is made up of the Archean super group of crystalline rocks, sedimentary rocks of Precambrian origin and recent quaternary deposits. The geological profiles studied up to 80m depth indicates that the site comprises of highly metamorphosed rocks with granulated and amphibolites faces of charnokites belonging to the archean super group. NPP site is situated in the South of Pandian movable belt, the metamorphic rocks of which are the foundations of ancient platform.

48. The NPP site is situated in an area with expected earthquake intensity of up to V on the modified intensity scale. The site area falls within the seism

H

A moderately stable area as per Seismic Zoning Map (SZP) of India. The strongest earthquake near this area and within the Indian peninsula was Coimbatore earthquake of February 1900. The epicentre of this earthquake was situated at a radial distance of 300 km from the proposed NPP site. The site of the plant lies in zone II of the SZP of India, where shocks of intensity VI or magnitude 5 can occur. In the region, no shock of magnitude 5 is known to have occurred at less than 100 km distance from the plant site. Within the distance of 300 kms., some 27 earthquakes of intensity IV to VIII or a magnitude ranging between 4 to 5.7 are known to have occurred from 1341 to 1972. A detailed study was also conducted as to whether a site-plant interaction would reduce any radiological risk or others of an unacceptable magnitude. Radiological risk to nuclear plant due to external events should not exceed the range of radiological risk associated with accidents of internal origin and the possible radiological impact of a NPP on the environment should be acceptably low for normal operation and accident conditions and within the stipulated criteria for radiological safety. In evaluating the suitability of a site for locating a NPP, the effect of external events (natural and man-induced) on the plant; effect of plant on environment and population; and implementation of emergency procedures particularly protective counter-measures in the public domain, had to be addressed. SSC study also included the assessment of seismicity, location of faults, geology, foundation conditions, meteorology, potential of flooding (from tsunami, storm surge etc. at coastal sites and from rain, upstream dam break, etc. at inland sites), proximity to airports, military installations, facilities storing explosive and toxic substances etc. The environmental setting comprising of bio-diversity including flora and fauna, marine ecology etc. in the region was also evaluated. SSC had taken care of all those aspects before making its recommendations to the Government. NPCIL, Union of India and other statutory authorities had taken care to follow the practice laid down by AERB on safety in NPP site.

H

A 49. KKNPP consists of two VVER-1000 types of units having 1000 MWe rating each. VVER reactors being established at KKNPP belong to the family of Advance Pressurized Water Reactors (PWRs) and presently 439 nuclear reactors are under operation in the world and about 209 of them belong to PWR family, including 55 VVERs. The construction activities had started at the site on 31.3.2002 and two units are being implemented with the technical assistance of Russian Federation as per the Inter Government Agreement (IGA) between India and Russia. As per the agreement, design and supply of major equipments are done by Russian Federation, while construction, erection, commission and operation are being carried out by NPCIL. KKNPP is of a most modern design. PWR cooled and moderated by light, water and its core containing the nuclear fuel is located inside a pressure vessel. There are no pressurizing tubes, no graphite moderator and no boiling of water in the core. The reactor is located inside an air tight primary containment building which is surrounded by secondary containment. There are other design features in NPP which assure adequate core cooling under conceivable off-normal conditions including total loss of electric power. Even for the hypothetical case of a core melt down, a core catcher is provided where the molten core is retained and cooled and the double containment ensures that there will be no significant radiological impact in the public domain. NPP, has been divided into three stages, first stage comprises of building PHWR's and using natural uranium. The second stage includes setting up 'Fast Breeder Reactor's backed by reprocessing plants and plutonium based fuel fabrication plants. The third stage is based on the thorium-uranium-233 cycle.

G **Nuclear Spent Fuel (NSF)**

50. Radioactive wastes is generated during operation, maintenance and decommissioning of nuclear and radiation facilities. The waste generated needs to be managed in a safe manner to ensure protection of hu

H

environment from the undue effects of ionizing radiation now and in future without imposing undue burden on future generations. Radioactive waste is to be managed in a manner that ensures compliance with the fundamental principles of radiation protection and environmental safety. Monitoring and surveillance programme helps to ensure radiation protection of the occupational workers, public and the environment. The Central Government in exercise of powers conferred by sub-section (1) read with clause (i) of sub-section (2) of Section 30 and clause (b) of sub-section (1) of Section 17 of the Act framed the Atomic Energy (Safe Disposal of Radioactive Wastes) Rules 1987, which provide requirements for the safe disposal of radioactive wastes in the country. The disposal has to be done in accordance with terms and conditions specified in the authorization which include the process materials and equipments generating radioactive wastes in the installations, environment around the installation, safety devices and other equipments in the installation for conditioning, treatment and disposal of radioactive wastes, estimates of annual releases, discharges and leakages in normal conditions and its anticipated environment impact, potential accidents, design features and monitoring equipment to control the release of radio activity and procedure to be followed in the safe collection of radioactive wastes. The Hazardous Waste Management and Handling Rules 1989 provide that these rules will not apply to radioactive wastes (Rule 2e). The radioactive wastes are covered under the provisions of Atomic Energy Act, 1962 and rules framed thereunder. Further, Rules 2(b) and 3 of Manufacture, Storage and Import of Hazardous Chemical Rules 1989 under the Environmental (Protection) Act, 1986 has notified AERB as the authority to enforce directions and procedures as per the Atomic Energy Act, 1962 with respect to radioactive materials.

51. The AERB issued a code "Management of Radioactive Waste" on June 22, 2007, the objective of that is to establish the requirements, which shall be fulfilled for the safe

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H

A management of solid, liquid and gaseous radioactive waste from generation through disposal. The code specifies basic requirements for the safe management of radioactive waste from nuclear and radiation facilities such as mining and milling and processing of uranium and thorium ores; fuel fabrication; nuclear power plants; research/experimental reactors; fuel reprocessing; medical, industrial, agriculture and research facilities using radionuclides; and other facilities handling radioactive materials. The safety code also deals with the requirements for radiation protection aspects in design, construction and operation of waste management facilities and the responsibilities of different agencies involved. The code is also applicable to the management of radioactive waste containing chemically and biologically hazardous substances even though other specific requirements may additionally be applicable as per relevant standards. The specific requirements pertaining to management of radioactive waste from application of sealed/unsealed sources, mining and milling of uranium/thorium ores and site remediation are covered in Appendices A, B and C respectively of that code. Appendix D provides requirements of transportation/transfer for radioactive solid and liquid waste. Annexures I and II of the Code deals with the principles, philosophy and basic steps of management of radioactive waste. The code specifically states that deep geological disposal methodology of high level radioactive solid waste requiring long time isolation of thousands of years from biosphere is presently under development. Para 2.2 of the code specifically refers to Protection of Human Health and the Environment. The said para is of considerable importance, hence given below in detail:

G "2.2 Protection of Human Health and the Environment
2.2.1 Radioactive waste shall be managed within the dose constraints and other safety requirements prescribed by the regulatory body.

H

2.2.2 Radiation exposure to workers and the public from radioactive waste shall be kept as low as reasonably achievable, social and economic factors being taken into account. A well-defined radiation protection programme shall be established for radioactive waste management. Approved procedures and control measures shall be used for radiation protection.

A

2.2.3 Radiation exposures to workers and the members of public shall not exceed the limits prescribed by the regulatory body.

B

C

2.3 Effluent Release Criteria, Control and Monitoring

2.3.1 Radioactive waste shall be characterized, monitored segregated, treated and conditioned, as necessary, prior to disposal.

D

2.3.2 Radioactive discharges to the environment (aquatic, atmospheric and terrestrial route) shall not exceed the limits prescribed by the regulatory body.

2.3.3 At a given site, facility specific disposal schemes for radioactive solid, liquid and gaseous wastes to the environment shall be established and got approved by the regulatory body prior to the commencement of operation.

E

2.3.4 The facility shall assess the adequacy of controls on release of activity into the environment and demonstrate compliance with the regulatory requirements. The facility shall obtain approval from the regulatory body, if the discharges exceed the authorized limits.

F

2.3.5 For all non-radiological releases/discharges, the relevant clearances shall be obtained from respective statutory agencies and stipulations therein shall be complied with.

G

2.4 Environment Monitoring and Surveillance

H

A

2.4.1 The facility shall implement approved environmental monitoring and surveillance programme for the identified exposure pathways to meet the requirements set by the regulatory body. The programme shall include pre-operational, operational, closure, and post-closure monitoring and surveillance.

B

2.4.2 The facility shall implement approved quality assurance programme on sampling, monitoring and analysis to ensure a reliable data.

C

2.5 Safety Assessment

2.5.1 A Safety assessment report shall be prepared for waste management facilities including waste disposal facilities/repositories to demonstrate compliance with the regulatory requirements.

D

2.5.2 Assessments shall be made to identify various possible sequences of internal or external events that may lead to incidents or accidents and to evaluate their impact on workers, the public and the environment.

E

2.5.3 Assessments shall be made to identify, describe and analyse the potential non-radiological impact of releases from radioactive waste management facilities on human beings, the environment (soil, water, air, and non-human biota) and natural resources.

F

2.5.4 The safety assessments of the long-term performance of a waste disposal facility/repository shall take account of the radionuclide content, physico-chemical characteristics of the waste/waste form and the effectiveness of engineered / natural barriers."

52. Responsibilities associated with the Radioactive Waste Management are also dealt with in the Code. Safe management of radioactive waste requires clear allocation of responsibilities of the agencies involv

A transfer of the responsibility of the management of radioactive waste from one facility to another or to a different agency other than the one responsible for the operation of the facility. The continuity of responsibility required to be ensured through regulatory control by a licence or a sequence of licences according to the procedures laid down by the regulatory body. B The code provides that the waste generator / manager or both shall be responsible for identifying on an appropriate time-scale, a destination for the waste in accordance with the regulatory requirements and for seeking any necessary authorization. C The waste generator/manager shall dispose of the radioactive waste in an approved manner or transfer it in an authorized manner to another waste manager for processing, storage or disposal. Para 3.2.6 of the code specifically refers to the publication of the waste generator/manager.

D 53. Para 4 of the code specifically deals with predisposal measures to be taken by Predisposal Management of Radioactive Waste. E Para 5 of the code deals with near surface disposal of solid waste which says that solid waste disposal deals with emplacement of waste in approved facilities. Further, it also stated that disposal may be in a Near Surface Disposal facility (NSDF) or a Deep Geological Repository (DGR). The design, construction, operation and post-operation of the NSDF has to meet necessary safety requirements. F Appendix II of the code deals with the principles and philosophy of radioactive waste management.

NSF AND MANAGEMENT OF WASTE:

G 54. Serious apprehension has been voiced by the appellants that huge amounts of radioactive waste are generated with the use of nuclear energy which, unless handled, treated, transported, stored and disposed off safely without any leaks, can cause serious contamination of land, water, food, air and the ecosystems. H Further, it was also the case of the appellants that during the nuclear fission process, nuclear

A plants convert almost all of their fuel into radioactive waste with little reduction in mass and even re-processing creates its own high-level waste. Further, it was also pointed out that many of the repositories designed to be temporary ones are turning into permanent ones and the interim storage is by its very nature B storage for a small period, which can never be a substitute for permanent geologic repository. Appellants further pointed out that, as on today, no sustainable solution has been found or implemented worldwide so as to do away with nuclear waste. C Appellants also submitted that, under the earlier Agreement of 1988 with Russia, nuclear waste had to be shifted back to Russia and the site clearance and environment clearance are based on this factor. However, a new agreement was signed in the year 1998 under which nuclear waste had to be retained and stored in India.

D 55. Management of radioactive waste includes all types of radioactive waste generated from the entire fuel cycle right from mining uranium fuel fabrication through reactor operations, and whole re-processing spent fuel. A coherent, comprehensive and consistent set of principles by way of IAEA document titled E “Storage and Disposal of Spent Fuel and High Level Radioactive Waste”, AERB Safety Guide to AERB Management of Radioactive Waste Code 2007 are already in place. Further, the 15 member team in its report, in December 2011, has to say this on spent fuel management.

F “6.3 Spent Fuel Management:

First and foremost it should be remembered that Spent Fuel is not a waste in the Indian Nuclear Programme. A closed fuel cycle is followed, where the valuable fissile materials like Uranium and Plutonium which are present in the Spent Fuel are recovered to reuse.

- (1) Spent fuel is therefore an asset that needs to be preserved. At Kudankulam, Spent Fuel from the Reactors will be carefully st

which are always filled with pure, demineralised borated water which is constantly recirculated. These pools are high integrity concrete pools which are additionally lined with stainless steel sheets, to ensure effective containment for extended periods of time. The Department of Atomic Energy has long experience and expertise of a high order in the safe management of Spent Fuel.

A

B

C

D

E

F

G

H

(2) There is no plan to do the reprocessing of the Spent Fuel at Kudankulam site. As such the storage of Spent Fuel at Kudankulam is to be considered only as an interim measure till they are transported to a Reprocessing Facility.

(3) Adequate Technology and years of experience are available with Department of Atomic Energy for transporting Spent Fuel from one site to another through both Railways and by roadways, in a safe manner without any public hazard. This is done as per stipulations of AERB, regarding Transport Regulations that govern safety.”

56. NPCIL, MoEF and the Department of Atomic Energy (DAE) have filed a detailed counter affidavit on the various issues posed by the appellants. NPCIL, DAE submitted that even though, as per the earlier agreement of 1988 between India and USSR, spent fuel had to be transported to Russia, in a subsequent agreement in 1998 signed between two countries, Government of India had insisted that it should be allowed to retain the spent fuel in India, so that it could be recycled and used. Spent fuel, it is stated, discharged from the reactor contains materials suitable for recycling and hence could be reused to produce electricity. The spent fuel contains minerals, both uranium and plutonium, which constitutes about 96% and 1% of the spent fuel respectively. The remaining 3% contains other components that are normally not recyclable. Further, it has also been pointed out that KKNPP had adequate

A provisions for safe storage of spent fuel. In KKNPP, Spent Fuel Pool (SFP) is located inside the primary containment, adjacent to reactor cavity which has the capacity to store fuel equivalent to 7 years of full power operation of the plant plus one full core load. AERB Safety Guide “Design of fuel handling and storage systems for pressurized heavy water reactors – AERB/SG/D-24” deals with the safety in design of storage of spent fuel. NPCIL submitted that they are scrupulously following the safety guidelines issued by AERB. However, the Nuclear Recycle Group of the BARC has got an overall view of radioactive waste management in India and has developed certain guidelines for management of nuclear fuel.

B

C

D

E

F

G

H

NSF WASTE - TRANSPORTATION:

57. The SNF from NPPs, after an adequate storage period, is transported to reprocessing facilities located within the country, following the International and AERB guidelines and standards. NPCIL, DAE and MoEF have maintained the stand that they are aware of the importance of safety and security and have taken care to ensure that the management and transportation of spent fuel is carried out safely following the international recognized norms and regulations and the same is being done under the observation of AERB and the Government of India.

58. SNF poses a dangerous, long-term health and environmental risk and it is often said that it remains dangerous “for time spans seemingly beyond human comprehension.” Issue, needless to say, is of great concern. It may be noted, twenty years of work on establishing a ‘geologic repository’ at Yucca Mountain, USA, had to be abandoned when the Department of Energy decided to withdraw its licence application for the facility. NPCIL has maintained SNF is being kept at the site for re-processing or transported to a permanent repository and how safe it is, if not properly kept, as we have already indicated, can cause serious health hazard not only to the present generation but to the future

whom we owe a responsibility.

59. India has got the capability for re-processing SNF, experts say. Currently, India has three operating processing plants based on solvent extraction process – one each at Trombay, Tarapur and Kalpakkam. Trombay plant reprocesses the spent fuel from research reactors with the capacity of 60 tons per year. The plants at Tarapur and Kalpakkam process off-site fuels from PHWRs with operating capacity of 100 tons per year each. Additional re-processing facilities are being set up with the active participation of the Indian industry to accelerate the programme.

60. We notice that with the limited resources of uranium available in India, the indigenous achievable NP is estimated to be 10,000 MWe by PHWR, without re-processing. With the help of re-processing, the achievable capacity could go up to 63000 MWe imported LWR and recycling LWR fuel to 275,000 MWe, by 2052. NPCIL has, therefore, taken up the stand that re-processing of spent fuel is the key to the country's three stage nuclear power programme. 97% of the SNF is capable of being re-used, but what has to be done with regard to the remaining 3% SNF, is a moot question, since it is not re-useable, which consists of various fission products and minor actinides. This 3% waste comprises of minor actinides which have a long half-life of lakhs of years. Experts, however, say that if the minor actinides are "partitioned" or removed, the rest of the waste is dominated by FP's having a half-life of about 30 years and so in 10 half-lives (300 years) will have negligible activity and the partitioned minor actinides can then be "transmuted" or burnt by inducing fission in Fast Breeder Reactors or in Accelerator Driven Systems (ADS).

Facts mentioned above would indicate that certain percentage of SNF will have long life of lakhs of years and will have some impact on the environment, but how to contain that?

The Supreme Court of *Pakistan in Human Rights*

A

B

C

D

E

F

G

H

A (*Environmental Pollution in Baluchistan*) PLD 1994 SC 102, took suo moto notice of a paper report of dumping nuclear waste along the Coast of the province of Baluchistan. The Court directed that provisional Government to investigate the claim and ruled that such dumping of Nuclear Waste is in violation of the fundamental rights to life enshrined in Article 9 of the Constitution.

61. We may, in this connection, refer to the judgment of the US Court of Appeals in *State of New York, ETAL v. NRC and USA* dated 8.6.2012. In that case, the Court was dealing with the issue regarding temporary storage and permanent disposal of nuclear waste. The Court held that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's evaluation of the risks of spent nuclear fuel is deficient in two ways: First, in concluding that permanent storage will be available "when necessary," the Commission did not calculate the environmental effects of failing to secure permanent storage – a possibility that cannot be ignored. Second, in determining that spent fuel can safely be stored on site at nuclear plants for sixty years after the expiration of a plant's license, the Commission failed to properly examine future dangers and key consequences.

62. We notice that the above decision would not directly apply to the facts of the present case. United States is following "open fuel cycle" process where spent fuel is not reprocessed, but disposed of treating the same as waste but, in India, we follow "close fuel cycle" process, where reprocessing of SNF to obtain uranium and plutonium is an essential step.

63. AERB, way back in 1989, had recommended to have an Away from Reactor Storage (AFR) facility at KKNPP for prolonged storage of SNF while granting siting clearance. Design-Safety aspects of AFR, it is stated, would be reviewed by AERB, one such facility is already available at Tarapur, where it is reported that there has been no adverse impact on the environment issue of such storage. AERB, in subsequent reviews, made recommendations with re

In ACPSR 126th Meeting held on 15/16.9.2011, the issue related to AFR was reviewed and it was recommended that AFR should be finalized well before 5 years of operation.

DEEP GEOLOGICAL REPOSITORY (DGR):

64. Permanent DGR, India may require, after a few decades, states NPCIL. Research and development work, we are informed, are in progress over three decades in the field of in-situ experiments, natural barrier characterisation, numerical modelling, conceptual design and natural analogue of waste forms and repository processes. Keeping in line with the international developments, initial focus of work in 80's centred mainly on setting up of generic Underground Research Laboratory (URL), in one of the abandoned mines in India and resulted in the development of an underground chamber in Kolar goldmine located in South India. Current efforts within the Indian geological repository programme are directed towards granite based URL. The experts feel that setting up of a DGR is not much of a technological challenge, but as is the case internationally everywhere, the issue is more of a socio-political issue.

65. We are of the view that these issues have to be dealt with by the Experts in the field, evidently, without much delay. The AERB Safety Code on "Management of Redioactive Waste" of 2007 does not deal with the requirements for DGR. The problem of this nature is being faced by all the nuclear plant operating countries, including India. Research is on to handle SNF in DGR which, in the near future, let us hope, would be a reality, but that shall not deter us in holding up of such a project which has been established at KKNPP in implementation of the India's Nuclear Policy.

66. We may, however, caution that it is of utmost importance that the Union of India, NPCIL etc. should find out a place for a permanent DGR. Storing of SNF at NPP site will, in the long run, poses a dangerous, long term health and

A environmental risk. NPCIL and the Union of India is bound to look at the probabilities of potentially harmful events and the consequences in future. Noticeably, NPCIL does not seem to have a long term plan, other than, stating and hoping that in the near future, it would establishes a DGR. The Atomic Energy Act, especially Section 17, envisages present and future safety of our NPPs and the lives and environment around. NPCIL and the Union of India must have a hard look at the environmental consequences of its action of setting up of NPPs, hence a permanent DGR is of utmost importance, which they should plan now.

Radioactive material

67. We are all exposed to the naturally occurring radiation in our daily lives. Cosmic radiation from outside the solar system is also common phenomenon. Earth's crust is radioactive, so also above the earth's surface where we fly by aeroplane, we also get doses of radiation. Medical diagnostic treatment such as X-Ray, CT-Scan, angiography, angioplasty also radiates radioactive dose. However, the development of nuclear reactors which, for the first time, made possible the production of radioisotopes of many different elements, expanded the field of radioactive materials. Production and use of it, therefore, is bound to create a little bit of marginal radiation which seldom can be prevented. The Atomic Energy (Radiation Protection) Rules, (Radio Protection Rules now) were initially framed and revised in 2004. According to the Rules no person could handle radioactive material or operate any radiation generating equipment except in accordance with the terms and conditions of a licence. The Atomic Energy (Control of Irradiation of Food) Rules, 1990 (revised in 1996) seeks to regulate the irradiation of foods in the country. Provisions of the Act, statutory rules and regulations, various codes, safety standards etc. issued by the AERB buttressed by the technical assistance provided by IAEA, NEA, The World Association of Nuclear Operations (WANO) etc. are be

respect of 20 operating power reactors which are existing in this country. Safeguarding the nuclear plants, radioactive materials and ensuring its physical security have therefore become a central part of nuclear law. Risks arising from NPP, do affect not merely the country which choose to use that technology but can have catastrophic consequences to the neighboring countries as well. Non-proliferation, disarmament and peaceful use are stated to be the three pillars of all the international conventions. Nuclear technologies and techniques, it is well accepted, can offer vital benefits for improving human-well being, like health care, radio-therapy, food security, agricultural advantages to the present and generation.

68. The Prime Minister of India, as already indicated, ordered a fresh review of all safety of NPPs, on 11.3.2011, immediately after the accident at Fukushima NPP, Japan with respect to external events. The Prime Minister of India had emphasized that the safety of nuclear power plants was a matter of highest priority for the Government and called for safety audits of all the NPPs. NPCIL, the operating agency, constituted separate task forces to review safety of NPPs depending on types of reactor designs and their vintages in India. NPCIL constituted broad categories of Indian NPPs to make an assessment of :

- Boiling Water Reactors (BWR) (TAPS 1&2).
- Pressurized Heavy Water Reactors (PHWRs) at RAPS 1&2
- PHWRs at MAPS 1&2
- Standard PHWRs from NAPS onwards

69. The Task Forces reviewed safety of the NPPs with a postulated scenario of non-availability of off-site and on-site electric power and water supply sources. The reports of the task forces are summarized in a document titled "Safety Evaluation of Indian NPPs Post Fukushima Incident" to provide an

A integrated assessment of strength of Indian NPPs to withstand extreme external events. Report was submitted by the end of March 2011. Over and above, two more task forces were constituted for VVERs one of which was for the VVER, Pressurised Water Reactors (PWR), under construction at KKNPP, and another for 700 MWe PHWRs. NPCIL also constituted task forces on safety evaluation of the systems of KKNPP Post Fukushima which gave its interim report on 11.05.2011. The task force found that KKNPP had already incorporated all safety standards, including passive systems to ensure reactor shutdown.

70. The AERB, in pursuance of the direction of Prime Minister, constituted a high level committee (AERBSC-EE) to review safety of NPPs against external events of natural origin (post Fukushima accident) with national level experts in the areas of (i) design, safety analysis and NPP operation and (ii) external events in the field of seismology, hydrology and earthquake engineering to carry out a comprehensive review of capability of NPPs to deal with external events within and beyond design basis. The committee constituted specialist working groups and they reviewed the following major areas:

- External events in relation to the safety of NPPs
- Safety of electrical, control and instrumentation systems against external events
- Safety of NPPs under prolonged Station Black Out (SBO) and loss of Ultimate Heat Sink
- Safety of spent fuel storage facilities at NPPs against external events
- Severe Accident Management provisions and guidelines (SAMG)

AERBSC-EE submitted its report on 31.08.2011. The AERB has also taken cognizance of self-assessment

the NPCIL and the site specific focused regulatory inspections. The NPCIL and AERB report indicate that the overall assessment of safety of Indian NPPs following Fukushima Nuclear accident and the actions taken/planned based on the lessons learnt are enumerated in the report. The following aspects were addressed :

- (i) External Events
- (ii) Design
- (iii) Severe Accident Management and Recovery (Onsite)
- (iv) National Organisations
- (v) Emergency Preparedness and Response and Post-Accident Management (Offsite)
- (vi) International Cooperation

71. The Government of India also submitted a National report in May 2012 on the actions taken for Indian NPPs, subsequent to Fukushima Nuclear Accident to the Convention on Nuclear Safety in the Second Extraordinary Meeting of contracting parties, held in August 2012 at Vienna.

72. The expert committee of AERB, LWR in its final report dated 31.8.2011 gave 17 safety measures by way of abundant caution. We have directed NPCIL to file a status report with respect to the completion date of implementation of all the 17 recommendations made by AERB in Annexure-A of the Post Fukushima AERB Recommendations. A comparative chart giving the status and implementation of Post Fukushima AERB Recommendations has been filed as Annexure-A by NPCIL in its affidavit dated 3.12.2012, which will indicate that twelve recommendations have already been complied with, except the following:

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H

Sr. No.	Recommendations	Status	Completion Schedule
3.	Mobile self-powered pumping equipment for emergency use.	Two fire tenders with diesel operated pump is available at site. To augment the capacity, two additional fire tenders are being procured and made available. Chassis has been procured and fabrication of the fire tender is in progress.	April 2013
4.	Facility for monitoring safety parameters using portable power packs.	Present design of KKNPP envisages 24 hour battery bank for monitoring parameters and 2 hour battery bank for valve operation during an event of station blackout. In order to extent the duration of the monitoring for not less than 7 days, portable DG sets will be connected to the instruments for monitoring safety parameters. One portable DG set is readily available.	April 2013

		use at site. Portable measuring devices are also available at site for local monitoring.	
6.	Primary Containment to be assessed for Ultimate Load Bearing Capacity (ULBC).	Based on design margins available, it has been assessed that for primary containment, Ultimate Load Bearing Capacity (ULBC) is at least 1.5 times Design Basis Accident (DBA) value. Detailed analysis for Ultimate Load Bearing Capacity (ULBC) will be carried out progressively.	Long Term. Under progress.
8.	Ensuring that highly active water used for cooling the core catcher vessel under Beyond Design basis Accident (BDBA) is contained inside the primary containment.	The required analysis covering dose estimation, equipment qualification assessment of containing pressure is being carried out.	Long term. Under progress.
12.	Adequacy of instrumentation for monitoring plant status during Design basis Accident	All the important parameters of the reactor such as neutron flux, pressure above the	April 2013 (Adequacy of instrumentation ensured.

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H

	(BDBA)	core, containment pressure, Hydrogen concentration, reactor coolant level, radiation levels in containment, coolant temperatures in hot and cold legs level of fuel pool, and accumulators etc. will be monitored during Design basis Accident (BDBA). Please refer item – 4 also.	Provision to extend power supply to these instruments will be implemented under item 4 above.)
17.	Provision of additional backup power supply sources for performing essential safety functions, like air cooled Diesel Generator (DG) located at a high elevation, should be considered.	One portable DG set is readily available for use at site. Another mobile Diesel Generator (DG) set is being made available for redundancy.	April 2013.

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H

73. We are convinced that KKNPP design incorporates advanced safety features complying with the current standards of redundancy, reliability, independence and prevention of common cause failures in its safety systems. Design also takes care of Anticipated Operational Occurrences (AOO), Design Basis Accidents (DBA) and Beyond D

(BDBA) like Station Black Out (SBO), Anticipated Transients Without Scram (ATWS), Metal Water reaction in the water core and provision of core catcher to take care of core degradation. The design also includes the provisions for withstanding external events like earthquake, tsunami/storm, tidal waves, cyclones, shock waves, aircraft impact on main buildings and fire. The 17 recommendations were made after Fukushima accident the cause of which is natural phenomenon. The facts would indicate that Tsunami-genic zone along East Coast of India is more than 1300 km away from the nearest NPP site (Madras/Kalpakkam) and about 1000 km. away from Kudakulam. The possibility of hitting tsunami at Kudakulam, as the one that hit Fukushima, seems to be very remote.

Response to People’s Resistance:

74. The Government of India, in order to allay various apprehensions raised by the people’s movement against the production of nuclear energy as well as against commissioning of KKNPP, constituted a 15 Member Expert Group to provide clarifications on the issue raised by the agitators by interacting with the forum provided by State Government comprising of 2 State Government nominees and 4 representatives of the people. Public hearing was held and views and suggestions made for and against the project were heard. The Committee specifically examined the safety features of KKNPP in the wake of the accidents occurred at TMI, Chernobyl, Fukushima etc.

75. The radiation around the NPP and impact on the public health were also effectively addressed. The reactor design and safety of the plant was also examined. Principles and Practices taken for radioactive waste and spent fuel management were also examined. Ecological effects of the project in question on marine ecology and fish protection, impact on land, agriculture, livestock, and food, impact on flora and fauna were also examined. The effect of a possible, though remote, impact of earthquake and Tsunami was also examined. The committee concluded as follows:

A **“Conclusions:**

B EG observes that KKNPP is designed and engineered to the state of art of nuclear reactors in line with the current international safety requirements and principles. KK site related aspects such as seismic, tsunami, tropical storms are taken into consideration at design stage. More than 20 VVER-1000 are operating in Russian Federation and in other countries. While finalizing the contract for KKNPP, additional safety features were specified which have been incorporated and their functionality is being established during commissioning. The radiological releases during the plant operation are expected to be well below prescribed limits. This fact is borne out by the experience from operating NPPs in India and abroad. Based on the national and international studies and experience, such radiological releases have no adverse effects on public health, environment and plant personnel. Safety of KKNPP was examined in relation to the TMI, Chernobyl and Fukushima accidents. It is seen that based on the advanced design safety features, safe grade level and high elevation of safety related equipment and the fact that all key operating personnel are graduate engineers who also receive intensive training, it is not conceivable that any accident of these types can take place at KKNPP.

F EG also notes that clearances for various stages of the project are given by the Atomic Energy Regulatory Board after an elaborate and exhaustive safety review at each stage. Similarly, other statutory bodies have also conducted detailed and in depth reviews before according clearances pertaining to areas relevant to their purview. This clearly indicates that all applicable safety aspects of the project have been subjected to careful scrutiny by the concerned statutory bodies in the country.

H In particular, safety of KKNPP has been thoroughly evaluated against external events

earthquakes and possible flooding of the site from cyclonic storms and tsunamis. It is seen that the seismic design of its SSCs and location of safety related components provide high level of safety against such events. Possibility of volcanic eruptions in the vicinity of the site has also been examined and no active volcanism has been identified. The magnitude of any possible tsunami that can be generated from submarine landslides in the Gulf of Mannar has been found to be much smaller than tsunamis that may get generated from the submarine active seismic faults, which has already been taken into consideration.

In view of the above, the EG would like to conclude that the fears of the local population are unfounded and design of KKNPP meets the current safety standards.”

76. The Committee prepared a detailed report in December 2011. The report was later presented to Tamil Nadu Government nominees and people representatives. The Expert Group submitted another supplementary report dated 31.02.2012.

77. The Government of Tamil Nadu also appointed an Expert Committee headed by Former President of the AEC along with three other experts. The Committee submitted its report after assessing that the project has a unique passive safety feature which provides cooling to the nuclear fuel without the need for operator action or power supply, namely a Passive Heat Removal System, which is a novel safety feature. In addition to the various reports mentioned herein before, the Russian Nuclear Safety Authority also known as GosAtomNadzor (GAN) reviewed and cleared the Safety Analysis Report of KKNPP Units 1 and 2, which forms the basis of the licensing safety review.

CIVIL LIABILITY FOR NUCLEAR DAMAGE:

78. Developing modern sources for energy through NPPs

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H

A carry the problem of potential damage, which might flow from a nuclear catastrophe. Several Nuclear Energy Generating countries have adopted their own Legislation on the issue of Civil and Criminal Liability. The U.S. Price-Anderson Act, 1957, the German Atomic Energy Act (1959), the Swiss Federal Law on the Exploitation of Nuclear Energy for Peaceful Purposes and Protection from Radiation (1959) and the Japanese Law on the Compensation of Nuclear Damage (1961) are some of them. Few of such legislations followed the basic principle of imposing legal liability on a strict liability basis on the operator of a nuclear installation coupled with the limitation on liability.

79. Currently, there are two main conventions on third-party liability in the field of nuclear energy. The first is the Paris Convention of 1960, which was supplemented by the Brussels Supplementary Convention Act, 1963. IAEA’s Vienna Convention on Civil Liability for Nuclear Damage, 1963 is yet another convention. India’s Civil Liability for Nuclear Damage Act, 2010 or the Nuclear Liability Act mainly rests on the above Conventions, though India is not a signatory to those conventions. India’s Nuclear Liability Act aims to provide a civil liability for nuclear damage and prompt compensation to victims of a nuclear incident through a No Fault Liability to the operator, appointment of Claims Commissioner, establishment of Nuclear Damage Claims Commission, Nuclear Liability Fund and other matters connected therewith. The constitutional validity of the said Act is under challenge before this Court in Writ Petition (Civil) No. 464 of 2011. Various prayers have been made in the above mentioned writ petition, but this Court issued the notice only with regard to the prayer clause no. (e), i.e. to declare the act as unconstitutional and void ab initio.

80. NPCIL had undertaken the task of constructing the two IGW reactors of VVER-1000 Model in collaboration with Atomstroyexport, a wholly owned Russian Government Company. Safety features of the NPP as well the quality requirements for the plant equipment and

H



A specifications agreed between the vendor and the purchaser, and as per the Quality Assurance Plan. NPCIL, AERB also should ensure that there can be no compromise on the quality of plant equipment, components and other systems.

B 81. The India's Nuclear Liability Act states that the liability of the operator to the tune of Rs.1500 crores and the maximum liability to rupee equivalent of 300 millions SDR's, though the Act, speaks of no fault liability. It is unnecessary to examine the scope of various provisions contained in the Act, for our purpose, especially when the constitutional validity of the Act is under challenge.

C
D
E
F 82. We may, in this connection, point out that the constitutional validity of the Price-Anderson Act, 1957 of U.S. which was challenged in the year 1978 before the U.S. Supreme Court in *Duke Power Company v. Carolina Environmental Study Group* 438 US 59(1978). It was urged before the U.S. Supreme Court that the Act did not ensure adequate compensation for victims of accidents and it violated Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment by treating the nuclear accidents differently from other accidents etc. The U.S. Supreme Court upheld the validity of the Act holding that it was lawful, in that there was adequate justification for treating nuclear accidents different to other claims; that Act provides a reasonably just substitute for the common law or state tort law remedies it replaces and that it cannot be said that the Act encouraged irresponsibility in the matter of safety and environmental protection.

G
H 83. Strict Liability Principle has been examined by this Court in the environmental point of view in several judgments. In *M. C. Mehta v. Union of India* AIR 1987 SC 1086 (Oleum Gas Leakage case), this Court held that the industries which are engaged in hazardous or inherently dangerous activity, possess serious threat to health and safety of persons and have an absolute and non-delegable duty to ensure that no harm is caused to the life and safety of the people. In *Indian Council*

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
A for *Enviro-Legal Action v. Union of India* (1996) 3 SCC 212, this Court held that once the activity carried on in hazardous or inherently dangerous, the person carrying on such activity is liable to make good losses caused to any other person by his activity, irrespective of the fact that he took reasonable care while carrying on his activity. In *Vellore Citizens Welfare Forum v. Union of India* (1996) 5 SCC 647, this Court held that once the activity carried on is hazardous or potential hazardous, the person carrying on such activity is liable to make good the loss caused to any other person by his activity, irrespective of the fact that he took reasonable care. The absolute liability extends not only to compensate the victims of pollution, but also the cost of restoring environmental degradation. In *Vellore Citizens Welfare Forum* (supra), this Court reiterated the "polluter pays principles". It is unnecessary to multiply the authorities on the principle of strict liability, precautionary principle, polluter pays etc., which find their expression in Articles 21, 47, 48-A, 51-A(g) of the Constitution of India.

E
F
G
H 84. We have examined the above principles only to highlight the importance of the Act and the steps taken for its effective implementation. People in this country have not forgotten the incidents which had happened in the Union Carbide Pesticides Plant in Bhopal in the night of 24.12.1984. This Court in *Union Carbide Corporation v. Union of India* (1989) 2 SCC 40, based on an earlier settlement, directed the Union Carbide to pay US \$ 470 million to the Union of India in full and final settlement of all claims, rights and liabilities related to and arising out of Bhopal Gas Tragedy. Following that, it was ordered that all civil proceedings arising out of Bhopal Gas Disaster, shall stand concluded in terms of the settlement and all criminal proceedings related to and arising out of the disaster shall stand quashed, wherever they were pending. Later, this Court modified that order upholding the settlement except the condition of quashing criminal charges in *Union Carbide Corporation v. Union of India* AIR 1992 SC 248.

85. Considering India's population density and our National Policy for setting up various NPPs in the country, safety and security of the plants are of extreme importance, lest a nuclear accident can cause immense damage both in terms of human life as well as environmental destruction. Provisions have also to be made for remedying or compensating environmental damage caused by the accidents, without merely limiting it to personal injury and damage to property.

DISASTER MANAGEMENT PLAN:

86. Disaster Management Plan (DMP) is of paramount importance, since we are dealing with a substance which has huge potential of causing immense damage to human beings and to the environment, which may cross over generations after generations.

87. After the accidents in Three Mile Island, Chernobyl and Fukushima, there has been an uproar all over the world including India for adopting sufficient safety measures for handling nuclear/radiological emergencies which may likely to occur in various NPPs situated in the country. Any radiation incident resulting in or having a potential to result in exposure and/or contamination in excess of the respective permissible limits can lead to a nuclear/radiological emergency. Situations are, of course, not bound to occur quite often, but one must be prepared to face nuclear/radiological emergencies because of high population density in a country like India. Nuclear/radiological emergencies can occur due to factors beyond the control of the operating agencies, for example, human error, system failure, sabotage, earthquake, cyclone, flood etc. Noticing the above factors, the Central Government decided to enact a law on Disaster Management to provide for requisite institutional mechanisms for drawing up and monitoring the implementation of the disaster management plans, ensuring measure by various wings of Government for prevention and mitigating affects of disasters and for undertaking a holistic, coordinated and prompt response to any disaster situation.

88. The Parliament enacted the Disaster Management Act, 2005 (DM Act), following that, the National Disaster Management Authority (NDMA) was constituted with the Prime Minister as the Chairperson. Similar authorities have been created in various States with their Chief Ministers as the Chairpersons. NDMA has assumed the responsibility of strengthening the existing nuclear/radiological emergency management framework by involving all stake holders in a holistic approach through a series of mutually interactive, reciprocal and supplementary actions to be taken on the basis of a common thread – the National Guidelines. Following that, NDMA, after conducting a detailed discussion with all the stake holders, issued the National Disaster Management Guidelines, 2009, which has the concurrence of the DAE, AREB. The guidelines recommended a series of actions on the part of various stake holders at different levels of administration that would (i) mitigate the accident at source; (ii) prevent deterministic health effects in individuals and limit the probability of stochastic effects in the population; (iii) provide first aid and treatment of injuries; (iv) reduce the psychological impact on the population; and (v) protect the environment and property. The guidelines have been prepared to provide direction to the central Ministries/departments, State Governments and local authorities for preparing detailed action plans to ensure inbuilt capabilities to handle nuclear and radiological emergencies as part of an all-hazard Disaster Management plan in the public domain.

89. The National Guidelines consist of 10 chapters. Chapter 1 deals with the introduction which provides a brief of all possible scenarios of nuclear and radiological emergencies. These emergencies have been broadly classified into the following five categories:

- (i) An accident taking place in any nuclear facility of the nuclear fuel cycle including the nuclear reactor, or in a facility using radioac

a large-scale release of radioactivity in the environment. A

(ii) A 'criticality' accident in a nuclear fuel cycle facility where an uncontrolled nuclear chain reaction takes place inadvertently, leading to bursts of neutrons and gamma radiations. B

(iii) An accident during the transportation of radioactive material. C

(iv) The malevolent use of radioactive material as a Radiological Dispersal Device by terrorists for dispersing radioactive material in the environment. C

(v) A large-scale nuclear disaster, resulting from a nuclear weapon attack (as had happened at Hiroshima and Nagasaki) which would lead to mass casualties and destruction of large areas and property. D

90. Chapter 2 deals with the Approach to Nuclear and Radiological Emergency Management, which spells out a four-pronged strategy to be adopted for a holistic management of nuclear/radiological emergencies. Chapter 3 deals with the Present Status and Situation Analysis, which highlights some of the technical and administrative issues yet to be addressed in a holistic approach, besides analysing the present status. Chapter 4 deals with the Prevention of Nuclear/Radiological Emergencies, which enumerates how nuclear and radiological emergencies are prevented in nuclear facilities by adopting the defence-in-depth approach, where the safety systems are inbuilt with adequate redundancy and diverse working principles. Chapter 5 of the Guidelines deals with the Mitigation of Nuclear/Radiological Emergencies, which explains the various engineered safety features and accident management procedures that are in place in a nuclear plant as accident mitigation measures for minimising the impact of a nuclear H

A emergency by keeping the radioactivity release in the environment to levels as low as possible. Chapter 6 deals with the Preparedness for Nuclear/Radiological Emergencies and covers various aspects of preparedness. Chapter 7 deals with the Capacity Development for Nuclear/Radiological Emergencies and deals with the capacity development for coping with nuclear/radiological emergency situations. Chapter 8 deals with the Response to Nuclear/Radiological Emergencies and describes the action to be taken in nuclear/radiological emergencies. Chapter 9 deals with the Implementation of the Guidelines which spells out the preparation of action plans by various levels of stakeholders. Such plans should indicate the detailed work plan and milestones with recommended time-frame and suitable indicators to enable monitoring and review of the actual progress made. Chapter 10 deals with the Summary of Action Points and sums up the major recommendations that have been made in the text of the National Guidelines. D

91. NDMA, established under Section 3 of the DM Act, is responsible for each of the three phases of disaster management continuum with six major responsibilities, namely, pre-disaster (prevention, mitigation and preparedness), during disaster (rescue and relief) and post-disaster (rehabilitation and reconstruction) scenarios. NDMA will be assisted by the National Executive Committee, which is the executive arm of NDMA. The National Crisis Management Committee/National Executive Committee has to take on relief operations on a war footing. The District Management Authorities of the States/ Union Territories will be responsible for implementing the nuclear/radiological disaster risk management programmes in their respective areas and each State has to develop a detailed micro-level action plan in a mutually interactive and supplementary mode with its district level plans. G

92. DAE, as a nodal agency, has to provide the necessary technical inputs to the national or local authorities in response to any nuclear or radiological emergency. H

In the event of a nuclear/radiological emergency in the public domain, the basic regulatory framework for safety of all activities related to the atomic energy programme and the use of ionising radiation in India is derived from the Atomic Energy Act, 1962 (AE Act). Para 3.6 of the Guidelines dealing with Public Awareness is of some importance and the same is extracted hereunder for our easy reference:

“3.6 Public Awareness:

Public awareness plays a key role in the emergency preparedness and response plans for any type of emergency/disaster where the participation/role of the public is of prime importance. The fact that one cannot see, feel or smell the presence of radiation, coupled with a general lack of credible and authentic information to the public at large about radiation and radiation emergencies and the wide publicity given to any nuclear/radiation-related incident, has resulted in several erroneous perceptions about nuclear technology. Not surprisingly, most people perceive that any small nuclear/radiation-related incident will lead to a situation like Hiroshima or Nagasaki, or the Chernobyl accident.

To educate the people about the beneficial aspects of nuclear radiation and to remove their misgivings about it, the authorities of nuclear fuel cycle facilities in general, and that of nuclear power stations in particular, are actively involved in carrying out regular public awareness programmes for people living in the vicinity of these facilities. People are invited and taken on guided tours of the nuclear power stations, made conversant with the basics of radiation protection, safety limits, safety practices, and the dos and don'ts during a nuclear emergency. The station authorities also make visits to the surrounding villages and population centres to create awareness of the same. Good coordination is also maintained with the district officials. Prior to any off-site

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H

A emergency exercise, awareness programmes are specially conducted for the public officials, making them conversant with their responsibilities during any off-site emergency.”

B 93. NPCIL and the State of Tamil Nadu should take adequate steps to educate the public of the need for generation of power through NPP, since it is part of India's National Policy and also how to deal with nuclear/radiological emergencies. Para 3.9.1 of the Guidelines specifically refers to Education and Knowledge Management, which reads as follows:

C

“3.9 Institutions for Education, Knowledge Management, Public Awareness and Training:

3.9.1 Education and Knowledge Management:

D

At present, practically no education is imparted at any level on nuclear/radiological emergencies in the national educational system. It goes against one of the basic concepts of good emergency response, which envisages that the culture of preparedness has to be imbibed right from childhood in all sections of the society. The basics of radiation, radioactivity and the use of nuclear radiation in day-to-day life (with its beneficial aspects) should be taught in schools and colleges. Once people are sensitised about this subject, it will help in removing prejudices/misconceptions of the general public about nuclear radiation/programmes and they will treat a nuclear/radiological emergency like any other type of natural or man-made emergency.”

E

F

G

94. The necessity for Enhancing Public Awareness about Nuclear/Radiation Hazards has also been dealt with in para 3.9.2, which reads as follows:

H

“3.9.2 Enhancing Public Awareness about Nuclear/Radiation Hazards:

In general, there is very limited public awareness about radiation emergencies. Even the intelligentsia have misconceptions about nuclear energy in general. Ever since the reactor accidents at Three Mile Island and Chernobyl, any news of a clear/radiological emergency has always been of great interest that generates misconceptions in the minds of the public. The sensationalisation of such news by the media has also erroneously caused a perception that any radiation or nuclear emergency will result in cancer or death.

Such lack of public awareness is a major constraint in handling and objectively responding to these emergencies. To overcome this, sincere and concerted efforts are needed to create awareness amongst the general public with the target audience of school and college students, teachers, technocrats and government officials.

The fear in the minds of the public that even a small accident in nuclear facilities will lead to a situation like Hiroshima/Nagasaki, can be removed only through proper awareness generation and training programmes (Appendix 1)."

95. The necessity to accord proper training to the personnel involved in the management of radiation emergencies, which includes education of senior public functionaries like the district or state-level officials who would manage a radiation emergency as well as the first responders, needs special emphasis. This would also include RSOs, civil defence personnel and home guards, police and fire and emergency services personnel and medical professionals. The guidelines also highlight the necessity of a proper network of roads and transport system. An off-site emergency situation, the emergency response plans envisage evacuation of the public from the affected zone which requires well-defined routes and evacuation strategies. The availability of both adequate

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H

A transport and good roads, which would provide the evacuation routes, is of paramount importance. Further, certain radiation emergency scenarios envisage a sheltering requirement for a large number of people. Normally, community centres, schools, colleges, religious places, marriage halls, etc. are chosen for this purpose. SDMAs/DDMAs should identify those places during a non-emergency period, with assistance from DAE/DRDO.

96. It is also highly necessary to identify alternate sources of food, water and hygiene facilities. Because of the assembly of a large number of persons at the emergency shelters, poor hygiene facilities may lead to the spread of diseases, including epidemics. In addition to providing good hygiene facilities, good medical care with adequate stock of medicines, should be made available in all areas of possible nuclear emergencies/disasters.

97. Major highlights indicated in para 3.20 of the Guidelines are of prime importance. Para 3.20 is extracted hereunder for easy reference:

E **"3.20 Highlights:**

Some of the highlights of this chapter are given below:

F (i) In the event of any nuclear/radiological emergency in the public domain, CMG is immediately activated and it coordinates with the local authority in the affected area and all the concerned authorities at the centre (NCCM/NEC/NDMA) to ensure that the necessary technical/administrative inputs are available to respond to the nuclear/radiological emergency.

G (ii) The AERB, which oversees nuclear and radiological safety in the country, has been playing a very crucial role in the prevention of nuclear/radiological emergency.

H

A ensuring that proper safety design features and operating procedures in all nuclear and radiation facilities are in place. The AERB has the power to not only licence the operation of a facility but also to order the partial or full shutdown of any facility that violates its guidelines.

B (iii) As per statutory requirements, the local district administration is responsible for drawing up and rehearsing the off-site emergency plan in coordination with the facility operator.

C (iv) It is also mandatory for the power plant operators to periodically rehearse various emergency preparedness plans by way of exercises, and based on the feedback and experience, take corrective measures. As the first stage of the trigger mechanism, CMG, DAE and the resource agencies are alerted even when a plant or site emergency exercise is conducted.

D (v) The basic training for NDRF teams, 'first responders' and TOT is being imparted by BARC in addition to training of QRTs of the paramilitary forces and defence CBRN officers.

E (vi) Emergency preparedness exists at all nuclear and radiation facilities to respond to any on-site or off-site emergency in their areas. A network of 18 units of ERCs has been established by BARC to handle radiological emergencies arising from a transport accident or the movement/handling of 'orphan sources' or any malevolent act like the explosion of an RDD, RED or IND at any time or anywhere in the country.

F (vii) The fact that one cannot see, feel or smell the presence of radiation, coupled with a general lack of credible and authentic information to the public at large about radiation and radiation emergencies and the wide publicity given to any nuclear/radiation related incident, has resulted in

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H

A several erroneous perceptions about nuclear radiation/ technology. Not surprisingly, most people perceive that any small nuclear/radiation related incident will lead to a situation like Hiroshima/Nagasaki or the Chernobyl accident.

B To remove such misgivings, the authorities of nuclear fuel cycle facilities in general, and that of nuclear power stations in particular, are actively involved in carrying out regular public awareness programmes for people living in the vicinity of these facilities.

C (viii) The AERB, the national regulatory authority, has been regulating the nuclear and radiation facilities in the country very effectively and has, over the years, issued a large number of codes, standards and guides.

D (ix) In the event of the private sector getting involved in the nuclear power programme, it might be required for the regulatory authority to ensure that the necessary knowledge base does exist in the concerned private industry for building and operating the nuclear facility as per the stipulated safety standards of the AERB.

E (x) In case of a nuclear/radiological emergency, the rescue and relief measures will be highly demanding in terms of availability of adequate trained manpower as well as advanced instruments/equipment. In this case, the nature of relief measures would be different in many ways from those carried out in natural disasters like fire, floods, earthquakes, etc. (where there is very little detrimental effect to the health of the personnel involved in the relief work). In a nuclear emergency/disaster, however, the persons carrying out the relief work are also likely to be exposed to both high doses of radiation and/or high levels of contamination which, if not controlled, may affect their health including their potential to carry out the relief work effectively.

H

(xi) Several major metros and other vulnerable locations will need to have ERCs established in their areas. Local civil defence, police, fire brigade, hospitals and other agencies also need to develop liaison with these ERCs.

A

(xii) Facilities using radioactive sources need to strengthen their physical protection systems along with proper inventory and control procedures of the radiation sources.

B

(xiii) In the current security threat scenario, there is a need for enhancing the security of the sources at radiation facilities and during their transportation, to ensure that they do not go 'out of control' by any deliberate acts of theft and/or sabotage and become a potential radiation hazard to the public.

C

(xiv) In the context of large-scale radiation disasters, the involvement of civil defence personnel and home guards is usually considered highly desirable.

D

(xv) Because of their preoccupation in defending the country from the enemy, the armed forces are normally not always available to respond to a nuclear disaster scenario. However, for any major nuclear accident where the situation is beyond the coping capability of the civil administration, the services of the armed forces may be called for to take over several critical operations related to response (i.e., rescue and relief), rehabilitation (i.e., evacuation and sheltering) and reconstruction activities, including the immediate restoration of essential infrastructures like communication, electrical power, transportation, etc. Civil-military coordination will be developed for such purposes so that specially trained and rehearsed teams of the Army can be inducted to assist the civil administration, as and when called for and are available.

E

F

G

H

A

(xvi) To start with, the SDMAs, SECs and DDMAs concerned will aim to cover all cities with a population of 20 lakh or more, that may be affected by a major nuclear/radiological emergency in respect of the preparedness for response to a nuclear/radiological emergency. This cover will be progressively extended to other cities.

B

(xvii) Presently, there is no network of hospitals in the country which can handle radiation induced injuries on a large scale. The establishment of such a network is essential for handling nuclear emergencies/disasters. This will also include the establishment of a nationwide capability for utilisation of the services of a large number of RSOs for managing both RDD-related scenarios and largescale nuclear disasters on priority. There will also be a dedicated and reliable communication facility among hospitals so that, whenever required, they can pool their resources.

C

D

E

F

G

H

(xviii) There can always be a possibility of some radioactive sources going 'out of control' in some country and from there, entering into our country inadvertently or deliberately. Such unnoticed entry has the potential of the end products of steel mills being contaminated or, in the worst scenario, the source being used in an RDD. Hence the strengthening of border controls will need to be addressed on priority by MHA.

(xix) In an off-site emergency situation in a nuclear facility, emergency response plans envisage the evacuation of the public from the affected zone. This requires well-defined routes and evacuation strategies, taking into account the topology of the site. Problems related to the availability of well-defined routes, transport facilities, food, drinking water, shelters, etc. also need to be addressed by the concerned DDMAs/SDMAs as part of the preparedness/response programme in an all-hazards approach.

(xx) In the emerging security threat scenario, there is a possibility of 'orphan' sources (stolen or misplaced sources that may go out of regulatory control of the AERB) falling into the wrong hands and being used for malevolent purposes through an RDD (also called a 'dirty bomb').

At present, there is no mobile monitoring system available with law and order authorities which can warn them of any significant/abnormal rise in background radiation levels in the public domain. The establishment/strengthening of monitoring and detection systems of such sources on priority is considered highly desirable, to detect any unauthorised presence or movement of radioactive material in the public domain.

(xxi) With the increasing incidences of terrorists activities and impending threat of RDD, it is imperative that the police, which in all probability will be the first to reach the site of an explosion, should have some simple portable monitoring instruments (at each police station within the areas with radiological threat perception) which will warn them as they approach the radiation source (from, say, a blast of RDD).

(xxii) The values of the radiation dose levels at which intervention is required for various actions (like sheltering, iodine prophylaxis, evacuation, etc.) and the action levels that will be needed to control the consumption of contaminated food items in the affected areas are presently not available either for any RDD or nuclear emergency/disaster and are needed to be generated because these are essential in respect of both (i) the members of the relief and rescue teams and (ii) the public.

(xxiii) The lack of public awareness is a major constraint in handling and objectively responding to nuclear and radiological emergencies. Further, presently there is no mechanism for maintaining a knowledge base or case

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H

A studies in the public domain on the events of previous emergencies and their consequences. As a result, the lessons that should have been learnt from the handling of those emergencies have been lost sight of. To overcome this, sincere and concerted efforts are needed to create awareness amongst the general public with the target audience of school and college students, teachers, technocrats and government officials."

B
C 98. 2009 Guidelines issued by AERB are very exhaustive which have to be implemented and attended to forthwith. AERB, in the Code of Practice on Safety in NPP Siting, also has dealt with the term "Exclusion Zone". Para 5.5.3 and 5.5.4 are relevant and extracted below:

D "5.5.3. An exclusion area of appropriate size (at least 1.5 km radius from the reactor centre) shall be established around the reactor and entry to this is to be restricted to authorised personnel only.

E 5.5.4. A sterilised area up to 5 km around the plant shall be established by administrative measures where the growth of population will be restricted for effective implementation of emergency measures. National growth, however, is allowed in this zone."

F 99. Facts presented indicate that there is no population in the "Exclusion Zone" of KKNPP. "Exclusion Zone" is under the exclusive control of the plant operator NPCIL, guarded by CISF, where no public habitation is permitted. The property wall at a distance of 2 km from the reactor buildings existing at KKNPP, which encloses the exclusion zone, and no people reside permanently inside the property wall. A sterilised area around the exclusion area covering an area of up to 5 km radius from the plant has also been established. As per AERB Citing Code, the desirable population within the sterilised zone is about 20000. As per the documents available, 3 villages are within SZ of KKNPP, namely, Kuda

(Idinthikarai) and Irrukkandurai. As per 2001 census, the population residing with SZ consisting of these three villages is approximately 23960, which has been taken care of while preparation of the Emergency Preparedness Plan (EPP) of KKNPP.

100. NPCIL, after due concurrence with AERB, as already indicated, has prepared the Emergency Preparedness Plan Vol. V for off-site emergency at KKNPP. The EPP has listed the composition of Off-Site Emergency Response Co-ordination Committee (OERCC) comprising of 14 district administration officials for implementing counter measures in public domain in case of an emergency. The District Collector, Tirunelveli is the Off-Site Emergency Director and the members are District Revenue Office, Site Director, KKNPP, Superintendent of Police, District Forest Officer, Joint Director (Fisheries), Deputy Controller (Civil Defence), Divisional Fire Officer, Executive Engineer (Irrigation), Joint Director (Agriculture), Deputy Director (Animal Husbandry), District Supply Officer, Regional Transport Officer, Deputy Director (Health Services). The overall responsibility of OERCC and individual responsibilities of the members of the Committee have been chartered in the Emergency Preparedness Plan for effective implementation of counter measures. Eleven Emergency response teams such as warning and advise Team, Emergency Response Teams, Traffic Control Team, Prophylactics Distribution Team, Evacuation Advice Team, Convoy Team, Decontamination Team, Rallying Post Team, Patrolling Team, Information Team and Services Support Team have also been formed and are in place as well.

EMERGENCY EXERCISE – ON AND OFF-SITE

101. KKNPP site comprises of two units along with their auxiliary facilities. In the Plant or the Site, an unplanned event at a particular unit may result in an emergency situation which may affect either the offending unit alone (Plant Emergency) or the other facilities as well within the site Exclusion Zone of the

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H

A KKNPP (Site Emergency). Site emergency may result in off-site emergency which may affect the public personnel living beyond 1.6 km radius of the plant boundary. NPCIL, therefore, prepared an Emergency Preparedness Plan for KKNPP. Vol. 1 contains the on-site emergency plan and Vol. 2 contains the off-site emergency plan. The off-site emergency preparedness procedures was issued in July 2010 after incorporating the comments and instructions made by NPSD and AERB. Final revised plain was incorporated on recommendations made by OPSD and SARCOP. We have gone through the Emergency Preparedness Plan Vol. II (off-site Emergency Plan) which is very comprehensive and deals with almost all eventualities.

102. The Off-Site Emergency Exercise was carried out as per the requirements of AERB Safety Guide on Consenting Process for NPPs. Off-Site Emergency Exercise is required to be carried out once in two years and that NPCIL and State Authorities would conduct such exercises in other nearby villages frequently. Such mock-drills are conducted to educate the public not to scare them away, but make them understand that the Project is part of the National Policy, participatory in nature, and hence we cannot remain as a nuclear isolated Nation. We have to find out a substitute for other sources of energy. Such exercise was carried out annually to assess whether plant management and the local authorities, including the communication and infrastructure facilities, are geared up for tackling with a real emergency situation, in case it arises.

103. We heard Shri Rakesh Diwedi, learned senior counsel appearing for the State of Tamil Nadu, who gave an overall view of the steps taken by the State Government and the District Collector, Tirunelveli for implementing the Neighbourhood Development Scheme relating to housing, steps taken for off-site emergencies, awareness programme, other infrastructural facilities. We have also gone through the detailed affidavit filed by the District Collector, Tirunelveli District on December 2012 and noticed the ste

H

Administration and the State to meet the Off-Site emergencies, awareness programmes and the other steps taken to provide infrastructural facilities like up-gradation of Primary Health Centres, opening of New Primary Health Centres, setting up of Desalinate place at Uvari, solar energy lighting system etc.

CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY (CSR):

104. Sustainable Development and CSR are inseparable twins, integrated into the principles of Inter and Intra-Generational Equity, not merely human-centric, but eco-centric. CSR is much more when the Project proponent sets up NPPs, thermal power plants, since every step taken for generation of energy from such hazardous substances, is bound to have some impact on human beings and environment, even though it is marginal. The Department of Public Enterprises (DPE), recently, issued a Comprehensive Guidelines on CSR for Central Public Sector Enterprises, which includes NPCIL, to create, through the Board Resolution, a CSR budget as a specific percentage of net profit of the previous year. CSR is envisaged as a commitment to meet its social obligations by playing an active role to improve the quality of life to the communities and stake-holders on a sustainable basis, preferably, in the project area where it is operating. CSR strategy has to be put in practice in line with the millennium development goals as lodged by United Nations and adopted by the Government of India in the 11th Five Year Plan i.e. 2007-2012, which could cover the areas of education, health, drinking water/sanitation, environment, solar lighting system, infrastructure for backward areas, community development and social empowerment, promotion of sports and traditional forms of arts and culture, generation of employment opportunities and livelihood to be a part of the National/Local initiatives to provide reliefs/rehabilitation in terms of natural disaster, calamities etc.

105. NPCIL has allocated funds for providing health, education, infrastructural development under CSR at Kudankulam. The allocation and utilization of funds by NPCIL

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H

A during the last three years and the current year are enumerated below:

Financial Year	Funds Allocated (rupees in lakhs)	Funds Utilized (rupees in lakhs)
2009-10	14.50	14.47
2010-11	120.00	45.20
2011-12	160.00	18.67
2012-13	800.00	13.91 (up to July 2012)

B
C
D
E
F
G
H

We notice that, apart from the above, Rs.500 crores has been allocated for Neighbourhood Development Programme (NDP) around the nuclear plant at Kudankulam, which would be utilized for taking up various development works like setting up of cold storage and fishing marketing area, Public board motor works, housing facilities, levelling of roads, upgradation of health services, grownes and drinking water etc. The Chief Secretary of Tamil Nadu convened a meeting on 15.5.2012 following CSR, in which it was decided to set up a fund of Rs.300 crores for the housing scheme for a projected period from 2012 to 2015. The proposal is to construct 10000 houses in the housing project with a unit cost of Rs.3,00,000/- per house with a plinth area of 300 sq. Feet under NDS. Various other development activities are also being undertaken as part of CSR, like upgradation of public health centres, establishment of new public health centres etc.

G
H

106. This Court in *Banwasi Seva Ashram v. State of U.P.* AIR 1987 SC 374 allowed the construction of NPP in a displaced forest area, but ordered inter alia that every family of forest dwellers be provided with a housing plot of specified dimensions elsewhere, that health, education, sanitation services and the like, be provided there, as part of CSR.

H 107. NPCIL in association with

Tirunelveli should take effective steps to discharge their CSR in accordance with the DPE Guidelines. Needless to say, there must be an effective and proper monitoring and supervision of the various projects undertaken under CSR, to the fullest benefit of the people who are residing in and around the NPP.

A

PART II

B

108. Environmental impact on setting up of a nuclear plant anywhere in the world is bound to generate some apprehension, at least in the minds of the ordinary people, of its possible impact on environment, life and property, flora and fauna, marine life, radiation, nuclear waste and its disposal and other related issues.

C

“Royal Commission on Environmental Pollution, Sixth Report, ‘Nuclear Power and the Environment.’

D

There are few subjects in the field of environmental pollution to which people react so emotionally as they do to radioactivity.”

(Cmnd 6618 1976 para 5)

E

109. Public opinion, national policy, economic growth, sustainable development, energy security are all intrinsically interlinked. One cannot be divorced from other, all the same, a balance has to be struck. National policy of this country, as already stated, is that atomic energy has a unique position in the emerging economics in India. Nuclear energy is, therefore, considered to be a viable source of energy and it is necessary to increase country’s economic growth. Nuclear energy is now considered in India as a sustainable source of energy and India cannot afford to be a nuclear isolated nation, when most of the developed countries consider it as a major source of energy for their economic growth. Renewed momentum against the setting up of NPPs picked up fast after accidents at the Three Miles Island Power Plant in USA, Chernobyl in Ukraine and Fukushima in Japan. Primary reason for such opposition

F

G

H

A seems to be on the issues of the impact of nuclear installations on life and property, environment, flora and fauna, marine life, nuclear waste disposal, health, displacement of people etc. which has a direct link with Article 21 of the Constitution of India and the environmental laws of the country.

B

C

D

E

F

G

H

110. Learned counsel appearing for the appellants mainly contended so far as this project is concerned, the Regulatory Authorities have consistently legalized the fait accompli violations presented by the project proponent. Further, it was alleged that the plant standards had been relaxed, statutory violations such as construction without permission, unauthorized setting up and commissioning of discharge outlets had not only merely been condoned but justified by the TNPCB, MoEF etc. Learned counsel also submitted that the environment clearance granted by the MoEF on 9.5.1989 was not only vague but with imprecise conditions and that no environmental impact study or public hearing was conducted. Further it was stated that no construction was started after getting the above clearance, but only in the year 2002, by the time 1994 EIA Notification came into force, consequently, fresh environmental clearance had to be obtained. Reference was made to a circular dated 27.3.1998 issued by the MoEF, which stated that the environmental clearance issued prior to 1994 would not be valid in the case of projects which did not commence work before 1.8.1998. Referring to explanation 8 to the EIA Notification of 1994, it was submitted that the project did not obtain all clearances including NOC from the State Pollution Control Board, which was required under the Water Act of 1974 and Air Act of 1981. Project, therefore, did not have NOC, from the Pollution Control Board, when 1994 Notification came into effect. No fresh environmental clearance was obtained from MoEF as per the 1994 Notification and even if obtained, the same would be valid only for five years of the construction or operation of the project. Further, it is also pointed out that the environmental clearance granted on 9.5.1989 was revalidated by a letter dated 6.9.2001, when EIA N

in force.

111. Appellants pointed out that the refusal of Russia in accepting the spent-Fuel also brought about complete change in the project, since it expanded the activities of transportation of spent fuel for reprocessing, reprocessing of spent fuel, generation, storage and disposal of nuclear waste. These changes, according to the appellants would amount to expansion and modernization of the project, which required fresh environmental clearance and revalidation of 1989 clearance, according to the appellants, was impermissible in law. Learned counsel, therefore, pointed out that all those factors would indicate that KKNPP Units 1 and 2 required fresh environmental clearance which the project proponent did not obtain. KKNPP, it was submitted, is located within 500 metres of HTL and therefore was a prohibited activity under CRZ notification 1991. It was pointed out that the project of NPCIL is not a project of DAE and that only those construction activities are allowed for which foreshore facilities are essential. Construction of KKNPP is therefore not allowed under CRZ notification. Further, it was pointed out that no environmental clearance was obtained from MoEF before setting up the desalination plant and the same is also situated in the CRZ zone. NPCIL, it was submitted, had not followed the CRZ Notifications dated 21.5.2002, 19.10.2002 etc. which have got serious impact on marine life and also on the coastal area. The discharge of water from the plant into the sea also causes serious environment impact, especially on the marine life. Appellants submitted that all those factors were not taken into consideration when the environmental clearance was granted by the TNPCB as well as the MoEF. The appellants submitted that the discharge of radioactive liquid from the two units if not adequately treated and will affect the quality of marine life and bio-diversity of flora and fauna and marine resources found in the Marine National Park and the wedge bank of Gulf of Mannar. Further, it was contended that as per the stipulation of MoEF of the year 1980 temperature of the

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H

A coolant water should not exceed 5°C. However, NEERI has unilaterally increased it to 7°C which will have serious effect on marine life apart from changes in salinity levels.

B 112. NPCIL, AERB, MoEF as well as TNPCB have filed detailed counter affidavits and explained the steps they have taken for getting environmental clearance for the project at various levels. Counter affidavits state that comprehensive studies have been conducted on all issues by environmental experts and scientists and permissions have been granted taking into consideration of all safety measures under the Environmental Protection Act, Notifications issued thereunder and also following/taking into consideration guidelines laid down by well-known International organizations.

D 113. NPCIL submits that it had submitted its application for grant of environmental clearance for the project on 12.12.1988. Clearance for installation of NPP was granted by the Department of Environment and Forests, Government of Department of Tamil Nadu on 26.12.1988. The Department of Environment and Forest, Government of Tamil Nadu also accorded amended clearance to the project vide letter dated 13.2.1989 with certain stipulations. The MoEF also accorded its approval to Unit 1 and 2 subject to certain conditions stated therein on 9.5.1989. After the receipt of Government clearance, process of land acquisition was initiated and land acquisition was completed during the period 1991 to 1993. Pre-project activities like construction of boundary wall, roads and some buildings were also initiated and completed during the said period. AERB on 10.11.1989 granted clearance for locating the plant at Kudankulam after the evaluation of the site by the Site Selection Committee. Environment Impact Assessment (EIA) Notification came into force on 27.1.1994 which provided an exception for the project which had commenced the pre-project stage activities vide exception clause 8. Notification of 1994, therefore, it was pointed, would not apply to Units 1 and 2 for which environmental clearance was

H

9.5.1989. Further, it was pointed out that the environmental clearance dated 9.5.1989 stipulated that temperature of the Coolant Water should not exceed 5°C, however, in the light of paragraph 5 of the clearance dated 9.5.1989 and the amendment of Rule 84 of the Environmental (Protection) Rules, 1986 and Notification dated 22.12.1988 stipulation of 5°C contained in the clearance can be varied. Further, it was stated that since the discharge from Units 3 to 6 is essentially in the same area, the temperature of discharge from Units 1 and 2 can also be limited to 7°C, which according to NPCIL, will have no impact on marine life.

114. NPCIL, further pointed out that the report of the studies conducted by the Institute of Ocean Management (IOM), Anna University, would indicate that there would be no impact on marine ecosystem due to such discharge and opined that the temperature differential of the discharged water with respect to the receiving water should not exceed 7°C. The environmental clearance was accorded to Units 3 to 6 on the same design as Units 1 and 2 which stipulated the Condenser Cooling Water Discharge limit as 7°C. Further it was also pointed out that during the appraisal of CRZ clearance for Units 3 to 6 before the grant of CRZ clearance on 25.7.2012 the Expert Appraisal Committee (EAC) considered the marine impact assessment and opined that there would be no impact on water qualities due to the proposed discharge. Further, the TNPCB has also accorded consent to operate on 28.8.2012 for Units 1 and 2 stipulating the condenser cooling water discharge limit as 7°C. NPCIL, also submitted that the EIA of units 3 to 6 includes the impact of units 1 and 2 as a baseline for computing the additional impact of units 3 to 6. The concern of the public, it was submitted, regarding safety, livelihood, radiation etc. have been adequately addressed during the public hearings on units 3-4 and 5-6 which was granted on 23.09.2008 and 31.12.2009 respectively. Procedure required to be followed under the EIA notification, 2006 had also been strictly followed. Further, it was also pointed out that no

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H

A environmental clearance is required for establishing the desalination plant since the same has not been included in the schedule to either 1994 notification or 2006 notification and there is no prohibition in establishing the plant in the CRZ area.

B 115. MoEF has filed detailed counter affidavits and also submitted their written submissions on various aspects. MoEF submitted that at the relevant point of time, when KKNPP Units 1 & 2 were sought to be established, there was no regulatory requirement of Coastal Zone Regulations (except 500 meter norm). Everything was based on the letter written by the then Prime Minister in November, 1981 to the Chief Ministers of coastal States regarding necessity to keep clear of all activities at least up to 500 metres from the water at the Maximum High Tide (MHT). Further, it was also urged that pollution from industrial and town wastes should also be avoided totally.

D Following the letter of the then Prime Minister, a working group was constituted which formulated some environmental guidelines for the development of beaches in the year 1983. The permission for location of NPP at Kudankulam was granted on 25.02.1988 by the Committee on Conservation of Seashore, State of Tamil Nadu. Later, the Tamil Nadu State Environmental Committee (TNSEC) also met on 15.12.1988 and cleared the KKNPP project subject to further monitoring by a Special Committee. The decision was communicated vide letter dated 26.12.1988 which was later modified by the Committee on 13.02.1989 subject to certain conditions mentioned therein. MoEF had also stated that the DAE, Government of India had sought for relaxation in respect of the project from 500 metres. On 19.04.1989, the Prime Minister approved an exemption of 500 metres norm especially for the Kudankulam project subject to the MoEF prescribing and ensuring sufficient safeguards for preserving the ecology, for which MoEF accorded approval to KKNPP Units 1 & 2 subject to the conditions stipulated therein.

H 116. MoEF issued the CRZ Notification on 19.02.1991 imposing restrictions on the setting

A industries, operation or processes etc. in the coastal zone. This
notification, it was pointed out, did not prohibit the project
already in operation, granted clearance prior to the date of the
issue of Notification. Later, by an amendment dated
12.04.2001, S.O.329(C) amended paragraph 2 on “prohibited
activities” of the Notification dated 19.02.1991 by substituting
a new clause which exempted the projects of DAE. EIA came
into force on 27.10.1994 but MoEF issued a Circular dated
23.07.1998 conveying its decision that the environmental
clearances granted prior to 1994 would be valid in the case of
projects where work had commenced before 01.08.1998. On
31.08.2001, the Director of MoEF visited the Kudankulam plant
site and found that the land acquisition was completed and
construction of Township, Environment and Health Research
Centre and RO plant was in progress.

D 117. MoEF took up the stand that 1994 notification would
not apply qua Units 1 & 2 in view of the fact that the
environmental clearance was already granted in the year 1989.
Further, it was also submitted that subsequently while granting
the environmental clearance for Units 3 to 6, public hearing was
conducted as per EIA Notification, 2006. Consequently, it was
submitted that the EIA for the expansion of KKNPP i.e. for
setting up of Units 3 to 6 included the environmental impact on
account of Units 1 & 2. Environmental clearance, it was pointed
out, for the Units 3-4 and 5-6 was granted on 23.09.2008 and
31.12.2012 respectively after following due procedures required
under EIA Notification, 2006.

G 118. MoEF also maintained the stand that prior
environmental clearance is required only for those activities
which are listed in Schedule to the EIA Notification dated
27.01.1994 or the subsequent Notification dated 14.09.2006,
which superseded the notification dated 27.01.1994.
Desalination plant, it was submitted, did not find a place in the
above mentioned notifications, hence prior environmental
clearance for establishment of a desalination plant was not

A required. Further, it was pointed out that the same would not
preclude MoEF from considering the issue of desalination plant
from the CRZ point of view. Referring to CRZ amended
notification dated 19.02.1991, it was submitted that the
desalination plant could be established within CRZ area except
B CRZ-I(i)-i.e. eco-sensitive areas viz. mangroves, sand dunes
reserve forests etc. Reference was also made to CRZ
notification dated 06.01.2011, which superseded the CRZ
Notification dated 19.02.1991. MoEF therefore, maintained the
stand that in view of the legal position desalination plant could
C be established within the CRZ area. However, it was pointed
out that even though the desalination plant is a permissible
activity within the CRZ area, MoEF would again take into
account the establishment of the desalination plant from the
CRZ point of view and ensure that it would continue to function
D to the full satisfaction of MoEF.

D 119. MoEF has also in the affidavit dealt with the issue of
change in the temperature limit of condenser cooling water
discharge and its impact on marine environment. It was pointed
out that at the time of grant of environmental clearance on
E 09.05.1989, the standard temperature difference between the
inlet and outlet of condensed cooling water for discharge for
temperature was fixed at 5oC. However, vide notification dated
22.12.1998, Environment (Protection) Rules, 1986 were
amended. Rule 84 dealing with the thermal power plant, the limit
F prescribed therein would equally apply to NPPs as the
technology for condenser cooling in both thermal as well as
NPPs are the same. The environmental impact on the marine
ecosystem due to +7oC Condenser Cooling Water (CCW) has
been considered by MoEF through the EAC before giving the
environmental clearances for the units 3-4 and 5-6 by stipulating
G that the temperature differential of the discharged water with
respect to the receiving water would not exceed 7oC. MoEF
therefore concluded that during the appraisal of the CRZ
clearance for units 3-6 of KKNPP before grant of CRZ
clearance on 25.07.2012, the EAC c

A impact assessment, thermal dispersion modeling studies conducted for condenser cooling water discharge considering the CCW discharge from all the 6 units i.e. KKNPP 1-6. Further, it was also pointed out that TNPCB has also accorded consent to operate on 28.08.2012 for KKNPP units 1 & 2 by stipulating the CCW discharge limit as 7oC as per the amended Environmental Protection Rules. MoEF also maintained the stand that it will continue to monitor the environmental standards of KKNPP and periodically inspect as to examine whether KKNPP units conform to the safety of environment set by MoEF.

C 120. Shri Guru Krishna Kumar, learned senior counsel appearing for TNPCB submitted that it had vide its letter dated 21.06.2001 requested the DAE to apply and obtain a fresh environmental clearance from the MoEF. MoEF, at that time, maintained the stand that NPCIL had already taken steps to implement the project and hence there was no necessity of a fresh environmental clearance. TNPCB's officials then inspected the site of KKNPP on 19.09.2001 and found that it had started construction of the NPP without valid consent for establishment as required under the Water (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1974 and the Air (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1981, consequently, show cause notices vide proceedings No. DEE/TNPCB/TNV/F.NPP-RDF/W/2001 dated 11.10.2001 and DEE/TNPCB/TNV/F.NPP-RDF/A/2001 dated 11.10.2001 were issued calling for explanation. NPCIL later filed applications dated 20.12.2001 for consent of the TNPCB for the NPP of capacity 2X1000 MW. The TNPCB issued consent for Establishment vide proceeding dated 25.02.2004. NPCIL had a proposal to use sea water for cooling, Pechiparai reservoir for fresh water and ground water for construction. Later, they applied for revised consent which included additional facilities for desalination plant using sea water as an input, in place of water supply from Pechiparai dam. The TNPCB later issued Consent to Operate vide proceedings dated 23.07.2012 with tolerance limits prescribed for trade effluent discharge, as per Board Proceeding dated 21.02.1984, which

A included the tolerance limit for temperature as 45oC at the point of discharge. Later, TNPCB vide proceedings dated 22.08.2012 altered the condition to be read as "not to exceed 7oC over and above the ambient temperature of sea for trade effluents".

B 121. Appellants filed detailed common rejoinder affidavit traversing the various statements made by AERB, NPCIL, MoEF.

C 122. Appellants urged that all facilities related to nuclear fuel and nuclear waste required an environment clearance under the EIA notifications of 1994 and 2006. Further, it is pointed out that when the supplemental agreement with Russia was entered into in the year 1998 that envisaged this critical change and hence NPCIL ought to have applied for a fresh clearance from the MoEF. But MoEF had consistently condoned such violations of law. Desalination plant, it was pointed, is bound to cause serious environmental implications and significant impact on marine life. It was pointed out that plant has been constructed without mandatory previous "Consent to Establish" from the TNPCB under the Water Act. The TNPCB consent to establish was given in the year 2004 while the desalination plant was envisaged only in the year 2006 and the construction of the plant has also violated in provisions of the Water Act since any activity that discharges anything in water required PCB clearance. Fresh environmental clearance was therefore not just required for the desalination plant, but for the nuclear plant as a whole because the desalination plant introduced a significantly different dimension to pollution, especially given the fact that highly concentrated salty water is being released into the eco-sensitive Gulf of Mannar Biosphere Reserve. Further, without any legal sanction, NPCIL has unilaterally increased the temperature from 5oC to 7oC. The appellant, therefore maintained the stand that unless and until the plant conforms to the environmental protection laws, the same shall not be allowed to be com

A threat to the life and property of the people who are staying in and around the plant and it will have adverse effect on the environment as well as marine life.

Judicial evaluation

B 123. We will first examine the question whether NPCIL, the project proponent while establishing the KKNPP, had obtained all necessary environmental clearance and other requisite permission from the authorities. No plant specifically the one dealing with radioactive materials can be allowed to function or commission even if it has been cleared by AEC, AERB, NPCIL etc. unless it strictly conforms to the standards set by the statutory authorities like MoEF, TNPCB etc. and follow the environmental laws. Most of the issues referred to hereinbefore, as already indicated, are inter-related and inter-connected, therefore, there are bound to be some overlapping while examining the same. Before examining various legal issues raised before us, let us first examine the factual foundation on which they rest.

E 124. The Government of India after due deliberation with AEC, AERB, NPCIL and other organizations decided, in principle, to set up a NPP, for which Site Selection Committee of DAE was constituted and the Committee examined various sites in the Coramandel Coast of Tamil Nadu and selected the site at Kudankulam as the most ideal for setting up of NPP on scientific, technical, safety, security and environmental point of view. No regulatory requirement of CZR (except 500 metres norm) at the sea coast was in force at that time. The Prime Minister of India had written a letter in November 1981 to all the Chief Ministers of Coastal States in which it was stated as under:

H “The degradation and misutilization of beaches in the coastal states is worrying as the beaches have aesthetic and environmental value as well as other values. They have to be kept clear of all activities at least up to 500 metres

A from the water at the maximum high tide. If the area is vulnerable to erosion, suitable trees and plants have to be planted on the beaches without marring their beauty. Beaches must be kept free from all kinds of artificial development. Pollution from industrial and town wastes must also be avoided totally.”

B 125. Following the letter of the Prime Minister, a nine Member Working Group comprising experts in the fields of marine biology, nature conservation, tourism, pollution control and human settlements was constituted to formulate guidelines for the development of beaches. The Committee formulated the environment guidelines for development of beaches in July 1983. Before selecting the site at Kudankulam, a detailed study was conducted as to the suitability of the site, safety, radiological impact and its assessment, external natural events, foundation conditions, water availability and various other factors. Following that, an application was submitted in the year 1988 by the NPCIL before the State of Tamil Nadu for location of NPP at Kudankulam. The application was considered by the Committee on conservation of seashore of Government of Tamil Nadu since the plant had to be set up at the sea shore. The committee after considering the proposal accorded clearance for the location of the plant at Kudankulam which is reflected in the letter dated 25.02.1988 sent by the Secretary to the Government, State of Tamil Nadu.

F 126. NPCIL later submitted its application to the Government of Tamil Nadu for grant of environmental clearance vide its application dated 12.12.1988. As per the then existing practice, applications for environmental clearance of a project like NPP had to be placed before TNSEC which consisted of high ranking officials including the Chairman and Secretary of TNPCB etc. Application was placed before the Committee which met on 15.12.1988 and discussed various issues. The Executive Director of the project NPCIL explained the project in detail to the Committee with particu

measures. It was also pointed out that a disaster management plan had already been prepared and submitted by them to the Government of India and that no rehabilitation of the people around the site would be necessary. Some of the Members expressed the apprehension that cyclone condition might affect nuclear plant, which was allayed by the Executive Director, NPCIL stating that the proximity of Srilanka would deactivate the cyclone. The Additional Director (Public Health and Preventive Medicines) expressed the apprehension that the project might pollute the sea water thereby affecting the fish and the consumers. The Executive Director, NPCIL had assured that an Environmental Survey Laboratory (ESL) would be set up 30 km away from Kudankulam and samples of water and fish would be analysed to find out the amount of radioactivity on the flora and fauna. Safety issues were also discussed in that meeting. After detailed discussions on various aspects, the Committee decided to clear the project subject to the monitoring by a Special Committee, which Committee, it was stated, would go into the details of safety and rehabilitation measures proposed in the areas communicated in the project report.

127. The decision of the TNSEC dated 15.12.1988 was communicated to NPCIL vide letter dated 26.12.1988 followed by another letter dated 30.12.1988. On 13.02.1989, TNSEC modified the environmental clearance contained in its letter dated 26.12.1988 and decided that environmental clearance accorded for the installation of KKNPP would be subject to the thirty one conditions specified in the annexure to the letter dated 13.02.1989.

128. The DAE, Government of India sought relaxation in respect of proposed KKNPP of the guidelines that the coastal beaches should be kept clear from all building activities upto 500 metres from the HTL. At that point of time only the Environment Protection Act, 1986 was in force and the letter of the Prime Minister of 1981 and 1983 Environmental

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H

A Guidelines for Development of Beaches. On 19.04.1989, the then Prime Minister approved an exemption of 500 metre norm specifically for KKNPP project subject to the MoEF prescribing and ensuring sufficient safeguards for preserving the ecology of the beach. The MoEF vide its Office Memorandum dated 09.05.1989 accorded approval to KKNPP –Units 1 & 2 (2x1000 MW) subject to following conditions which are given below:

“2. Approval of this Ministry from environmental angle is accorded subject to the following conditions:-

(i) Special exemption from the present ban on undertaking any construction within 500 metres from high tide line (HTL) is accorded to this project subject to the condition that:

(a) In such area only the plant and essential associated structures may be put up and nothing else should come up in this area;

(b) Attempts should be made to keep such construction within 500 metres of high tide line as far way from high tide line as possible;

(c) Adequate measures and environmental safeguards will be taken for ensuring preservation of the ecology of the beach;

(d) Since this area has been declared as a biosphere reserve, the project authorities should take special precautions to avoid any damage to the coral reefs or changes in the water quality near the shore; and

(e) At Environmental Management Plant (EMP) for the area upto 500 metres from HTL should be submitted to the Ministry for review.

C
D
E
F
G
H

- | | | | | |
|--------|--|---|---|---|
| (ii) | The temperature of the condenser water should not exceed 50C over and above the ambient temperature of the water at the point of discharge in the sea. | A | A | in transportation of radioactive fuel/ spent fuel/ radioactive wastes, in/out of the country. |
| (iii) | The liquid effluents emanating from the different plants of the power station should be treated to conform to the standards stipulated by Central/ State Pollution Control Board and International Commission for Radiological Protection (ICRP)/ AERB. Steps should be taken to prevent ground water pollution. Adequate number of coastal water quality monitoring stations should be setup. | B | B | (x) Periodical environmental surveillance and monitoring for radioactive emissions should be undertaken for measuring radioactivity and record maintained. |
| (iv) | Radio-active wastes (solids and semi-solids) generated during various operations, both low level and high level, should be properly treated and disposed of after proper containment to fix the radio-activity as per the standards/guidelines prescribed by ICRP/AERB. | C | C | (xi) Necessary steps may be taken for educating local people about the project to allay their apprehension due to the proposed power station. |
| (v) | No radio-active emissions, fugitive or otherwise, will be permitted beyond the safety standards prescribed by AERB. | D | D | (xii) All the vacant lands within the project zone should be afforested with a tree density of 1000 per acre. The type of tree species should be so selected that they will be able to give maximum density of canopy. |
| (vi) | The location/alignment of the off-shore berth/jetty should be selected in such a way that no damage is caused to the coral reefs. Such construction should be kept at the minimum. | E | E | (xiii) From the initial stages of the project the environmental surveillance and monitoring of this particular area including the health status of the population around the power station location should be carried out and records maintained. This activity should continue in future also. |
| (vii) | The route of the pipeline from Pechiprai reservoir to the power station should preferably be so selected that it does not affect forest areas. | F | F | (xiv) On-site and Off-site Disaster Management Plan (DMP) should be prepared as per the guidelines stipulated by ICRP/AERB and approved by the National Emergency Response Committee (NERC) of Department of Atomic Energy, Government of India. |
| (viii) | Efforts should be made to avoid forest areas to be affected due to the proposed transmission corridors and power evacuation system. | G | G | (xv) Necessary approval under the Forest (Conservation) Act, 1980 and the Wildlife (Protection) Act, 1972 will be obtained, when applicable. |
| (ix) | Adequate precautionary measures should be taken | H | H | (xvi) A committee will be set up by the Department of Atomic Energy consisting of |

Department of Atomic Energy, Additional Secretary, Ministry of Environment and Forests, Project Director, Kudankulam Atomic Power Project, representative of AERB, Director NEERI, representative of Government of Tamil Nadu and two prominent public persons for review of the rehabilitation programmes, environmental protection measures and public awareness concerning the project.

A

B

C

D

E

F

G

H

(xvii) A detailed rehabilitation plan should be prepared covering the affected persons within a radius of 2 kms exclusion zone. It will also be necessary to provide for some package of benefits for the people residing in the sterilized zone as there will be some restriction on the activities of this area. These should be submitted to this Ministry for review after examination by the Committee.

3. There should be an environmental cell with suitable personnel and a laboratory in the project.

4. Adequate financial provisions should be made for implementation of the above conditions.

5. Conditions may be varied or new conditions imposed in the interest of environmental protection.

6. The stipulations will be implemented among others, under the Water (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1974, the Air (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1981 and the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986.”

129. MoEF has a duty to see that the above-mentioned conditions are fully complied; which has also dealt with the exemption from the ban which was at that point of time only a norm prohibiting any construction within 500 metres of the HTL. Permission granted also dealt with the temperature of the condenser and also with radioactive rays, solid and semisolid

A generated during various operations including proper containment to fix the radio activity as per the standards / guidelines prescribed by ICRB / AERB. Condition for periodical environmental surveillance was also stipulated so also the necessity of educating the people, monitoring the health and also the provisions for onsite and offsite disaster management plan and the need for framing a detailed rehabilitation plan. After the receipt of the nuclear clearance, the process of land acquisition was initiated and the land acquisition was completed during the period 1991-1993. Project activities like construction of boundary was initiated and completed during the said period. AERB on 10.11.1989 granted clearance for locating nuclear power plant at Kudankulam after evaluation of the site by the Site Selection Committee of DAE with stipulations given in the Annexure alongwith that letter. Following are the stipulations laid down by AERB:

C

D

E

F

G

H

1. Stipulations made by various State and Central authorities in giving clearance, should be met. In addition, plantation in the area under control of the project should be taken up along with site development. Studies to assess thermal pollution by making appropriate models should be carried out.

2. An exclusion zone of 1.6 km radius from the NPP stack should be established with access control. The Dose limits specified by AERB will be complied with at this boundary.

3. The Board noted that Vairavikinaru quarry, Idinthikarai and Kudankulam settlements are beyond 2 km distance but within sterilized zone. Suitable legislative and administrative control measures should be taken through state authorities to prevent increase in population within the sterilized zone beyond r

- | | | | | |
|--|---|---|-----|--|
| arrangements must be made to terminate the lease of the lime stone quarry in 1994. | A | A | 8. | Site related design considerations such as seismic aspects etc. are to be established before submission of PSAR. Design should be engineered to meet site related design basis events. |
| 4. Facility to store at site adequate quantities of water should be provided to meet the make up requirements of uninterrupted cooling of core and other safety related systems on a long term basis. Facilities engineered at site should meet the requirements even in the event of possible disruption of piped water supply from Pechiparai Dam. Ground water sources in the site area should be surveyed and developed to serve as an additional back up source to meet the safety needs of the plant, if water supply from the Pechiparai dam is interrupted due to any contingency. | B | B | 9. | The Board noted that as per the estimate of Health Physics Division, Maximum Flood Level (MFL) should be +7.5 m after considering a return period of 1000 years for the maximum storm. This was reviewed against the estimated figure of 5.9 m given by the CWPRS. The Board suggested that MFL must be re-evaluated by CWPRS conforming with the requirements of IAEA Safety Guide 50-SG-S10B on "Flooding on Coastal Sites". Revised Report of CWPRS should be submitted to Design Safety Committee. |
| 5. The Board requires that the safety of the long pipeline from Pechiparai dam should be ensured by appropriate security arrangement. | C | C | 10. | Bore-hole investigations are to be carried out at the proposed location of various buildings and structures. The report should be forwarded to design group for taking into account at the time of actual design. |
| 6. NPCIL should take up the water management schemes with the state government so that water supply to NPP is ensured all the time. The intake well at the dam should be provided at lower elevation than the minimum draw down level of the reservoir. | D | D | 11. | Radiological impact should be assessed with proper source terms, consideration of topography and relevant dispersion characteristics of the site. Dose limits prescribed should be met at a distance of 1.6 km by incorporating design features in the plant. The radioactivity releases should be maintained in line with ALARA principle. |
| The Board desires that the structure stability of the Pechiparai dam should be assessed taking into account the recent work of strengthening the dam. | E | E | 12. | The typical radioactivity emission rates used in evaluation of the site should be compared with the releases from similar reactors and should be suitably adjusted taking into consideration acceptable failed fuel rates during evaluation by the design safety committee. |
| 7. In the unlikely event of the breach of the dam alternative sources of water supply should be available for the site within a reasonable time. NPCIL should conceptualize schemes at the Detailed Project Report (DPR) stage for utilization of the water from upper Kodiyar storage reservoir for such eventuality. | F | F | | |
| | G | G | | |
| | H | H | | |

13. The Board desires that the adequacy of stack height of 100 m should be confirmed by NPC at the design stage, specifically in view of the change in the ground level of about 40 m on the north side of the plant. A
14. Environmental Survey Laboratory should be set up at site and instruments are to be installed at site to collect meteorological data and background radiation. B
15. Two independent reliable sources of start up power connected to two points in the electrical network located in different regions of the grid should be made available. Availability of a dedicated source of reliable start up power should be examined. C
16. Power evacuation studies particularly that influence the plant-grid interaction should be pursued. Feasibility of operation on islanding mode may be studied in collaboration with CEA. D
17. Studies on Biofouling and Jelly-fish etc. that may affect the water supply should be taken up. E
18. Studies on accretion/erosion rate around the plant site should be carried out. If required, proper protection should be provided. F
19. At least two evacuation routes from plant site during an emergency should be provided.
20. The Board recommends that NPCIL shall consider the possibility of providing an additional facility for spent fuel storage in future (Away from Reactor Storage AFR). The site for this should be reserved after considering the transportation and handling requirement of spent fuel. G

H

- A 21. Over Dimension Consignment (ODC) committee of NPCIL should evaluate suitability of transportation of ODC at design stage.
- B 22. Analysis for the quality of construction water is to be carried out.
- C 23. This approval is given only for the location of two units of VVER of 1000 MWe capacity each at the proposed site. Other detailed investigations are necessary and NPCIL will have to apply and obtain permission of AERB before construction at the site begins.

Coastal Regulation Zone (CRZ)

D 130. India is a gifted country which has coastal seas, bays, estuaries, creeks, rivers, backwaters. Critical importance of sea coast in a country like India need not be over emphasized, the protection of the same calls for scientific care and diligence and following Tsunami, Cyclone, earthquake etc., the protection of the sea coast has assumed added importance.

E 131. MoEF in exercise of powers conferred under Section 3(i) and 3(2)(v) of the Environmental (Protection) Act, 1986 and Rule 5(3)(d) of the Environmental (Protection) Rules, 1986 issued a Notification dated 19.2.1991 declaring coastal stretches as Coastal stretches of seas, backwaters, creeks, rivers and backwaters which are influenced by tidal action (in the landward side) upto 500 Mtrs. from the HTL and the land between the low tide line (LTL) and the HTL are called coastal regulation zone and regulating activities in the CRZ, both prohibited and permitted activities. However, it did not prohibit the project already in operation and granted clearance prior to the date of the issue of notification. Later by an amendment dated 12.4.2001 S.O.329(C) amended paragraph 2 on "prohibited activities" and the notification dated 19.2.1991 by substituting clause (1) to the following e

H

industries and expansion of existing industries except (a) those directly related to water front or directly needing foreshore facilities (b) projects of Department of Atomic Energy”.

132. We find with regard to the location of KKNPP within the prescribed 500 mtr. within the CRZ an exemption had already granted as per the then existing norms even prior to 1991 by the then Prime Minister of India by the communication dated 19.4.1989. Over and above, paragraph 2(1) of 1991 CRZ Notification as amended by Notification dated 12.4.2011, exempted projects of Department of Atomic Energy. A cumulative reading of the permission dated 19.04.1989 accorded by the then existing norms read with paragraph 2(1) of 1991 Notification, as amended by Notification dated 12.4.2011, we are of the view the KKNPP Units 1 and 2 have not violated the 1991 CRZ Notification.

EIA Notification 1994 and Environmental clearance:

133. MoEF in exercise of powers conferred under sub-section (1) and clause (v) of sub-section (2) of Section 3 of the Environment (Protection) Rules, 1986 read with clause (d) of sub-rule(3) of Rule 5 of the Environment (Protection) Rules, 1986, issued a Notification dated 27.1.1994 directing that on and from the date of publication of that notification in the Official Gazette expansion or modernization of any activity (without pollution load is to exceed the existing one) or a new project listed in Schedule 1 of that Notification shall not be undertaken in any part of India unless it has been accorded environmental clearance by the Central Government in accordance with the procedure specified in the Notification. The Notification contains an explanatory note regarding the impact of the assessment Notification dated 27.1.1994. Relevant portions of the notification are given below for easy reference:

Expansion and modernization of existing projects:

“A project proponent is required to seek

A environmental clearance for a proposed expansion/modernization activity if the resultant pollution load is to exceed the existing levels. The words ‘pollution load” will in this context cover emission, liquid effluents and solid or semi-solid wastes generated. A project proponent may approach the concerned State Pollution Control Board (SPCB) for certifying whether the proposed modernization/expansion activity as listed in Schedule-I to the notification is likely to exceed the existing pollution load or not. If it is certified that no increase is likely to occur in the existing pollution load due to the proposed expansion or modernization, the project proponent will not be required to seek environmental clearance, but a copy of such certificate issued by the SPCB will have to be submitted to the Impact Assessment Agency (IAA) for information. The IAA will, however, reserve the right to review such cases in the public interest if material facts justifying the need for such review come to light.”

134. The Note also deals with exemption for project already initiated under the explanatory Note 8 which reads as follows:

8. Exemption for projects already initiated:

“For projects listed in Schedule-I to the notification in respect of which the required land has been acquired and all relevant clearances of the State Government including NOC from the respective State Pollution Control Boards have been obtained before 27th January, 1994, a project proponent will not be required to seek environmental clearance from the IAA. However, those units who have not as yet commenced production will inform the IAA.”

135. Schedule 1 of the Notification refers to Nuclear power project and related projects such as heavy water plants, nuclear fuel complex, rare earths etc. and the same also deals with Thermal Power Plant as well.

136. The Central Government, later in exercise of the powers conferred under Section 23 of Environment Protection Act, 1986 issued a Notification S.O.318(E) dated 10.4.1997, whereby inter alia introduced Schedule IV into the 1994 Notification prescribing the procedure for public hearing. MoEF later issued Circular dated 23.7.1998 after reviewing the progress of cases which were accorded environmental clearance prior to 27.1.1994 Notification and it had been observed that a large number of projects had not commenced constructions or other operations due to various reasons like non-availability of financial resources, non-availability of forestry clearance, inter-State water disputes and non-availability of essential infrastructure like land, electricity, road etc. Further it was also noticed that certain projects which were environmentally appraised even as early as 1980 had not commenced construction activities. MoEF felt there might have been significant changes during those years which would have implications to the environment and ecology of the area. MoEF issued the above Circular pointing out that the environment clearance issued prior to 1994 would not be valid in the cases, where work did not commence before 1.8.1998. Further it was also clarified in all such cases fresh environmental clearance would be required, if those come in the 29 categories listed in the EIA Notification. Further it was also clarified that projects which were not listed in Schedule 1 in EIA Notification would not require environmental clearance.

137. MoEF later inspected the site of the plant on 31.8.2001 and found that land acquisition had been completed and the construction work on various components such as township, Environmental and Health Research Centre and RO plant was in progress. Further, it was noticed that afforestation programme was undertaken by M.S. Swaminathan Research Foundation and that till August 2001, Rs.377.30 crore was spent for KKNPP on various activities.

138. MoEF, noticing the above facts, vide its letter dated

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H

6.9.2001 clarified that environmental clearance granted on 9.5.1989 stands valid and that there is no need to conduct public hearing and seek fresh environmental clearance. A chart giving the details of land acquisition and compensation amount paid reads as follows:

B

LAND ACQUISITION DETAILS OF KKNPP

S.No.	Name of Village	Private land (in hectares)	Puramboke land (in hectares)	Total (in hectares)
For Plant site				
1	Kudankulam	862.775	112.945	975.720
2	Irukkundarai	--	2.675	2.675
3	Vijayapathi	66.750	1.815	68.565
	Sub Total	929.525	117.435	1046.960
For Township				
1	Chettikulam	153.905	24.300	178.205
Total Land acquired				1225.165 Hectares
Land and Acquisition completed and awards pronounced				1991-1993
Number of displaced persons				Nil
Type of acquired land				Dry

D

E

F

Compensation details

S.No.	Village	Amount paid (Rs.)
	Kudankulam	62,02,332.00
	Irukkundarai	31,09,727.00
	Vijayapathi	6,09,834.00
	Total	99,21,893.00

G

H

139. We are of the view that the EIA Notification of 1994 would not apply to KKNPP Units 1 and 2 for which environmental clearance was granted

A notification, in our view, would be operative only prospectively except in the case of expansion and modernization of any activity (if the pollution load is to exceed the existing one) as on the date of publication of that notification or a new project listed in Schedule 1 for which environmental clearance is necessary as per the notification dated 27.01.1994. So far as KKNPP units 1 and 2 are concerned, they had the relevant clearance from the State Government including the NOC from the State Pollution Control Board. Facts stated above would indicate that the land acquisition process for the plant site and township had commenced during the year 1990-1991 and awards were pronounced during the period 1991-1993 by the Land Acquisition Officer and Special Tehsildars (Land Acquisition) Government of Tamil Nadu. Annexure R-15 produced along with the affidavit filed by the MoEF dated 18.10.2012 indicates the details of total land acquired, the awards pronounced and the details of the compensation paid. Further sites surveys, infrastructure design, construction of boundary wall, roads and some buildings etc. had been completed between 1989 to 1994. The Committee on Conservation of Seashore of Government of Tamil Nadu had also granted clearance on 25.2.1988 and the TNSEC had also granted clearance on 15.12.1988, modified on 13.2.1989. Above facts clearly indicate that the EIA Notification dated 27.1.1994 would not apply to KKNPP Units 1 and 2 since these units stood exempted from the Notification and the Explanatory Note 8 to the Notification and also the Circular issued by the MoEF on 23.7.1998 make it more explicit.

140. We may now examine whether there has been any expansion or modernization of units 1 and 2 resulting in increase in pollution loads. Plant capacity, we have noticed, always remained 1000 MWs X2, and the plant model V-412 remained to be as envisaged in 1988 Agreement and 1998 supplementary agreement of 1988. Further, for the purpose of cooling the steam generated in the steam generator sea water is required which goes through the steam turbine which runs

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H

A the electrical generator to produce electricity. Sea water consumption is 2,40,000 m³/Hr and the water is to be drawn from the sea and pass through the condenser for both Units 1 and 2 and once the cooling process is over, it is to be released to the sea, a process, which has undergone no change from what was envisaged before obtaining clearance from MoEF in 9th May, 1989 till date and hence we find no necessity for a fresh clearance.

Desalination Plant

C 141. We may now examine whether prior environmental clearance is a pre-requisite for the establishment of a desalination plant in terms of EIA Notification dated 27.1.1994 or in terms of the subsequent Notification dated 14.9.2006 which superseded the Notification dated 27.1.1994. Further we D may also examine whether establishment of desalination plant is permissible in CRZ. We have already indicated that prior environmental clearance is required only for those activities which are listed in Schedule 1 to the EIA Notification dated 27.1.1994 or the subsequent Notification dated 14.9.2006 E which superseded earlier Notification dated 27.1.1994. Desalination plant is not seen listed under the above-mentioned notifications. The decision to establish desalination plant for the purpose of domestic water requirement was taken by the NPCIL in the year 2004. Earlier when environmental clearance was granted on 9.5.1989 the proposal was to take fresh water from the Pachipari Dam, situated at about 65KM away from the plant site. The same had to be given up in view of the involvement of forest land as well as the apprehensions expressed by the local villagers that the withdrawal of water from the Dam would deplete the scarce natural resource, especially at the time of drought. Desalination plant functions on distillation (Mechanical Vapour Compression) principle. Sea water would be drawn and would be fed to the plant which consists of four streams each having capacity of 106.66 cubic mtr. p.h. Cumulative feed flow of all three streams is 670 cubic.mtr p.h. and cumulative reject

ph., balance 320 cubic mtr. p.h. is purified water. Facts would indicate that there is no generation of air emission, solid waste and effluent are flowing from the desalination process except rejects (which also called brine) which is nothing but concentrated sea water which remains after desalination process and does not contains external elements. The rejects will have concentration of 69000 parts per million which would be mixed with the sea water 1,20,000 cubic mtr. p.h. and discharged through the outlet channel into the sea which would give dilution 343 times and reduce the reject to the ambient sea water concentration of 35000 parts per million. Experts say the process would not cause any increase in pollution load due to desalination.

142. CRZ Notification of 1991, though prohibited, the setting up of new industries as well as expansion within CRZ, it had permitted the laying of pipeline and conveying system. 1991 Notification was amended on 21.05.2002 and it was provided that the desalination plants could be established in the notified special economic zone, for non-polluting industries within CRZ. On 19.10.2002, it was again amended and it was provided that the desalination plants could be established within CRZ except CRZ – 1(i) – i.e. eco-sensitive areas viz. mangroves, sand dunes, reserve forests etc. MoEF later issued another notification dated 06.01.2011 superseding 1991 notification, as per that para 3(i)(c) and as per para 4(ii)(h) (of 06.01.2011 notification) makes provisions for the establishment of desalination plants within CRZ area except CRZ – 1(i).

143. NPCIL informed TNPCB for the inclusion of desalination facility which was not earlier included in the original application for 'Consent to Operate'. TNPCB considered the request and accorded "Consent to Operate" on 20.08.2012 which included desalination plant. The establishment of desalination plant, therefore, would not require any fresh environmental clearance, especially when the same has not been included in the Schedule 1 to the EIA Notification dated

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H

A 27.1.1994 or in the subsequent Notifications dated 14.9.2006, 06.01.2011 etc. except within CRZ – 1(i).

Change in Temperature Limit

B 144. We may now examine whether, in the light of paragraph 5 of the clearance dated 9.5.1989 and the amendment to Rule 84 of the Environment (Protection) Rules 1986 by Notification dated 22.12.1988, the stipulation of 5°C contained in the clearance can be varied. Environment (Protection) Rules, 1986 was amended vide notification dated 22.12.1988 as Environment (Protection) Second Amendment Rules, 1988. Rule 84 deals with the temperature limit for discharge of condensed cooling water which reads as follows:

"84. Temperature limit for Discharge of Condenser Cooling Water from Thermal Power Plant:

- D
- A. New thermal power plants, which will be using water from rivers/lakes/reservoirs, shall install cooling towers irrespective of location and capacity. Thermal power plants which will use sea water for cooling purposes, the condition below will apply.
- E
- B. New projects in coastal areas using sea water:
- F
- The thermal power plants using sea water should adopt suitable system to reduce water temperature at the final discharge point so that the resultant rise in the temperature of receiving water does not exceed 7°C over and above the ambient temperature of the receiving water bodies.
- G
- C. Existing thermal power plants:
- H
- Rise in temperature of condenser cooling water from inlet to the outlet of condenser shall not be more than 10°C.

D. Guidelines for discharge point: A

The discharge point shall preferably be located at the bottom of the water body at mid-term for proper dispersion of thermal discharge.

In case of discharge of cooling water into sea, proper marine outfall shall be designed to achieve the prescribed standards. The point of discharge may be selected in consultation with concerned State Authorities/NIO. B

No cooling water discharge shall be permitted in estuaries or near ecologically sensitive areas such as mangroves, coral reefs/spawning and breeding grounds of aquatic flora and fauna.” C

145. Rule 84, of course, deals with the Thermal Power Plant, which states that the resultant rise in temperature of receiving water shall not exceed 7°C over and above the ambient temperature of the receiving water body. Facts indicate that the limit prescribed under Rule 84 will equally be applicable to Nuclear Power Plant as well since the technology for condenser cooling in both, thermal as well as Nuclear Power Plant is the same. In both systems condenser is cooled by using water, therefore, the limit on temperature of discharged water will have to be the same. D

146. Let us also examine whether there will be any impact on the marine eco-system due to +7°C CCW water, for which detailed study was conducted by the Institute of Ocean Management, Anna University, which has submitted its report in July 2008 and the Engineers India Ltd. along with CHFRI submitted its report in August 2011. Environmental Impact was analysed in desalination and the experts are unanimous in their views, that there would be no impact on the marine ecosystem. Reports were also considered by the MoEF through the EAC before giving environmental clearance for the units 3 to 6 on E

F

G

H

A 23.09.2008 and 31.12.2009 and the CRZ clearance on 25.07.2012. TNPCB has also accorded consent to operate on 28.08.2012 for KKNPP Units 1 and 2 by stipulating that condenser cooling water discharge limit as 7°C as per the amended Environmental Protection Rules. Therefore, the contention raised by the appellants that the rise in temperature of receiving water due to rise in temperature of condenser cooling water would affect marine eco-system and cannot be sustained. B

C 147. Appellants have also raised a contention under the EIA Notification of 1994 that those projects where “all clearances” including “NOC” from State “PCBs” had not been obtained required fresh environmental clearance from MoEF in accordance with the said notification. Reference was made to Explanation 8 of the EIA Notification of 1994. Further it was pointed out that all projects having environmental implications “required previous consent” to establish and “to operate” under the Water Act, 1974 and Air Act, 1981 from the State Pollution Control Board and unless those consents are existing, plant cannot said to have “all clearances from the State PCBs as required by the Explanation 8 of the EIA Notification of 1994”. D

E 148. We are of the view that the “environmental clearance” or “No Objection Certificate” cannot be equated to “consent to establish” under Section 25 of the Air Act and “consent to operate” under Section 21 of the Water Act, which were granted on 25.2.2004 and 28.8.2012 respectively. NPCIL had undertaken various activities with respect to KKNPP subsequent to the environment clearance granted by TNSEC on 26.12.1988, subsequently modified on 13.2.1989. F

G 149. TNSEC had on 15.12.1988 had already cleared the project, which tantamount to No Object Certificate (NOC). Only after clearance or NOC, the question of ‘establishing’ or ‘operating’ a plant arises. Environmental clearance or NOC was granted to KKNPP units 1 and 2 as early as 26.12.1988 though the TNPCB had granted ‘consent to es H

25 of the Air Act on 25.02.2004 and 'consent to operate' under the Water Act on 28.08.2012. Explanatory Note 8 to the Environment Notification dated 27.01.1994 speaks of exemption for projects already initiated that is land has been acquired and clearance of the State Government including NOC, from Pollution Control Board had been obtained before 27th January 1994, for which no fresh environmental clearance would be required from Impact Assessment Agency (IAA). KKNPP units 1 and 2 is, therefore, entitled to get the benefit of the Explanatory Note 8 to EIA notification dated 27.01.1994.

150. We also notice that there has been no expansion or modernization of units 1 and 2, which has resulted in increase of pollution load. Plant capacity remained the same i.e. 1000 MWs X2, till date and there is no substantial difference in plant model and the specifications envisaged in the 1988 agreement and 1998 supplement agreement. Plant model remains as V-412, consequently the 1994 EIA notification will not apply qua KKNPP units 1 and 2.

151. NPCIL, as part of the continuous process to ensure safety of environment made a Rapid Environmental Impact Assessment (REIA) of KKNPP Units 1 and 2 in the year 2001. The National Environmental Engineering Research Institute (NEERI) retained by NPCIL for conducting their assessment. REIA report of NEERI examined the baseline data collected during summer season 2001 within the impact zone for air, noise, water, land, biological and socio economic environment including data on radiological parameters which has formed the basis for predicting, evaluating the potential impact due to proposed two units of KKNPP at Kudankulam. NEERI submitted its report in May 2002. In the year 2003 there was yet another comprehensive EIA by NEERI of KKNPP units 1 and 2 which took into account the entire season i.e. 12 months. Assessments were made as part of the continuous process to monitor the safety of the environment as well as to establish an existing base-line status with respect to various

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H

A environmental points like air, noise, water, land, biological and socio-economic for identifying, predicting and evaluating the environmental potential impact as also to formulate an effective Environmental Management Plan (EMP). Report was submitted in January 2003 which was later implemented under the expert guidance of MS Swaminathan Research Foundation.

Environmental Clearance for KKNPP Units 3 to 6

152. NPCIL consent letter dated 18.2.2007, for grant of environmental clearance for expansion of the then existing Nuclear Project (2 x 1000 MW, by adding 2x1000 MW Units 3 & 4), pointed out that the land acquired for locating the proposed units was already available within the NPP Complex and no additional land would be required for expansion of the project. Further it was stated that water for condenser cooling system would be drawn from the sea and sweet water requirement would be met from the desalination plant. Further it was pointed out that no forest land was involved in the project. The Gulf of Mannar Marine National Park is about 87 KM from the site, though the Gulf of Mannar Biosphere Reserve Boundary is at a distance of about 20-50 mtr. Further it was pointed out that no displacement of population was envisaged. Project, it was stated, was to be located in the CRZ-III and that exemption from 500 mtr. norm in respect of CRZ for Units 1 and 2 was obtained from the Government of India as far as back in 1989. Further it was also stated that public consultation was held on 2.6.2007 and that the total cost of the project would be Rs.14,000 crores which included 307.50 crore for environmental protection measures.

153. MoEF considered the above-mentioned proposal in accordance with paragraph 12 of the EIA Notification 2006 read with paragraph 2.2 sub-clause 2.2.1 (i)(a) of Circular dated 13.10.2006 and MoEF accorded clearance vide communication dated 23.09.2008 under the provisions of EIA Notification of 2006 subject to the implementation of several conditions which read as follow:

H

- | | | | | | |
|--------|---|--------|--------|--------|---|
| (i) | On-line continuous monitoring of the temperature of the discharged cooling water shall be carried out at the discharged point. It shall be ensured that the temperature differential of the discharged water w.r.t. the receiving water does not exceed 7°C at any given point of time. | A
B | A
B | (ix) | Regular monitoring of ambient air quality shall be carried out in and around the power plant and records maintained. The location of the monitoring stations and frequency of monitoring shall be decided in consultation with SPCB. Periodic reports shall be submitted to the Regional Office of this Ministry. Besides air quality, water, food samples and soil shall also be monitored regularly for radioactive levels in the surrounding areas and records maintained. |
| (ii) | Necessary prior clearance under the provisions of CRZ Notification, 1991 for the activities to be located in CRZ shall be obtained from the Competent Authority. | C | C | (x) | A Disaster Management Plan and Emergency Preparedness Plan shall be prepared and put in place as per the norms of AERB. Regular mock drills shall be undertaken and based on the same, any modification required, if any, shall also be incorporated. |
| (iii) | No additional land shall be acquired for any activity/facility of project. | | | (xi) | The radioactive waste shall be managed as per the norms prescribed by AERB. |
| (iv) | AERB clearance for the site shall be obtained before starting any construction work and a copy of the same shall be provided to the Ministry of Environment & Forests. | D | D | (xii) | The non-radioactive waste water generated from the plant premises will be suitably treated in STP and the treated effluents shall be recycled and reused within the plant premises for greenbelt etc. |
| (v) | A scheme for rain water harvesting shall be prepared in consultation with an expert agency/State Ground Water Board and details furnished within 3 months of the issue of the environment clearance letter. | E | E | (xiii) | The radioactive liquid waste emanating from the plant will be treated and managed as per the guidelines of AERB/ICRD in this regard. |
| (vi) | Greenbelt shall be developed all around the project boundary covering an area of 180 ha preferably with local species. | F | F | (xiv) | Provision shall be made for the housing of construction labour within the site with all necessary infrastructure and facilities such as fuel for cooking, mobile toilets, mobile STP, safe drinking water, medical health care, crèche etc. The housing may be in the form of temporary structures to be removed after the completion of the project. |
| (vii) | Noise levels shall be limited to 75dBA. For people working in the high noise area, requisite personal protective equipment like earplugs/ear muffs etc. shall be provided. | G | G | (xv) | The project proponent shall |
| (viii) | Regular monitoring of conventional gaseous pollutants, radioactive pollutants in the air as well in the discharged water shall be monitored regularly as per AERB standards. | H | H | | |

local newspapers widely circulated in the region around the project, one of which shall be in the vernacular language of the locality concerned within seven days from the date of this clearance letter, informing that the project has been accorded environmental clearance and copies of clearance letter are available with the State Pollution Control Board/Committee and may also be seen at Website of the Ministry of Environment and Forest at <http://envfor.nic.in>

(xvi) A separate environment management cell with qualified staff shall be set up for implementation of the stipulated environment safeguards.

(xvii) Half yearly report on the status of implementation of the stipulated conditions and environmental safeguards shall be submitted to this Ministry/ Regional Office/CPCB/SPCB.

(xviii) Regional Office of the Ministry of Environment & Forests located at Bangalore will monitor the implementation of the stipulated conditions. A complete set of documents including Environmental Impact Assessment Report and Environment Management Plan along with the additional information submitted from time to time shall be forwarded to the Regional Office for their use during monitoring.

(xix) Separate funds shall be allocated for implementation of environmental protection measures along with item-wise break-up. These cost shall be included as part of the project cost.

(xx) Full cooperation shall be extended to the Scientists/ Officers from the Ministry /Regional Office of the Ministry at Chandigarh/the CPCB/ the SPCB who

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H

would be monitoring the compliance of environmental status.”

154. Notification also stated that the environmental clearance would be valid for a period of five years to start the operation of the power plant and that in case of any deviation or alteration in the project proposed and already submitted to the MoEF for clearance, a fresh reference should be made to the MoEF to assess the adequacy of the conditions imposed and to add additional protection measures required, if any. Further it was also pointed out that the above stipulations would be in force amongst others under the Water Act, 1974, The Air Act, 1981 and the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986 and the Rules thereunder, Hazardous Wastes (Management and Handling) Rules, 1989 and its Rules, the Public Liability Insurance Act, 1991 and its amendment.

155. NPCIL submitted yet another application dated 19.11.2009 for environmental clearance for KKNPP expansion Units 5 & 6 (2 x 1000MW). Environmental clearance was granted by the MoEF vide its communication dated 31.12.2009 incorporating all the conditions which were stipulated in respect of Units 3 and 4 in the Notification dated 23.9.2008 and also with additional conditions which reads as under:

- I. “Environmental clearance is subject to obtaining prior clearance from wildlife angle as applicable due to proximity of Gulf of Mannar Biosphere Reserve.
- II. The grant of environmental clearance does not necessarily implies that wildlife clearance shall be granted to the project and that their proposal for wildlife clearance will be considered by the respective authorities on their merits and decision taken. The investment made in the project, if any, based on environmental clearance so granted, in anticipation of the clearance

- be entirely at the cost and risk of the project proponent and Ministry of Environment and Forests shall not be responsible in this regard in any manner. A A
- III. Environmental clearance is subject to final order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the matter of Goa Foundation v. Union of India in Writ Petition (Civil) No.460 of 2004, as may be applicable to this project. B B
- IV. First aid and sanitation arrangements shall be made for the drivers and the contract workers during construction phase. C C
- V. A sewage treatment plant shall be provided and the treated sewage conforming to the prescribed standards shall be used for raising green belt/ plantation. D D
- VI. The proponent shall upload the status of compliance of the stipulated EC conditions, including results of monitored data on their website and shall update the same periodically. It shall simultaneously be sent to the Regional Office of MoEF, the respective Zonal Office of CPCB and the SPCB. The criteria pollutant levels (stack and ambient levels) indicated for the project shall be monitored and displayed at a convenient location near the main gate of the company in the public domain. E E
- VII. The project proponent shall also submit six monthly reports on the status of compliance of the stipulated EC conditions including results of monitored data (both in hard copies as well by e-mail) to the respective Regional Office of MoEF, the respective Zonal Office of CPCB and the SPCB. F F
- VIII. A copy of the clearance letter shall be sent by the H H
- proponent to concerned Panchayat, Zila Parishad/ Municipal Corporation, urban local Body and the Local NGO, if any, from whom suggestions/ representations, if any, were received while processing the proposal. The clearance letter shall also be put on the website of the Company by the proponent.
- IX. The Environment statement for each financial year ending 31st March in Form-V as is mandated to be submitted by the project proponent to the concerned State Pollution Control Board as prescribed under the Environment (Protection) Rules, 1986, as amended subsequently, shall also be put on the website of the company along with the status of compliance of EC conditions and shall also be sent to the respective Regional Offices of MoEF by e-mail.
- This issues with the approval of the Competent Authority.”
156. As provided under EIA 2006 Notification before applying for environmental clearance for Units 3 to 6 a comprehensive EIA study was conducted for Units 3 to 6 which included the impact of Units 1 and 2 aspect as a base-line for computing additional impacts of Units 3 to 6. Concern of the public regarding safety, livelihood, radiation etc. had been addressed during the public hearing on units 3 to 6 held on 2.6.2007. Issues raised in the public hearing were:
1. Use of water from Pachi Pari Dam
 2. Effect of temperature of discharge water on marine life
 3. Radiation emission
 4. Solid waste and fuel manag

- 5. Welfare activities of the nearby villagers A
- 6. Compliance with MoEF, IEA and AERB guidelines
- 7. Environmental impact and monitoring and
- 8. Site location criteria. B

157. It was discussed in the meeting that sea water intake structure would be located at a depth of 10 mtr. from the Main Sea Level (MSL) and at a distance of 1.2 Kms. off shore from the shore line. The temperature differential of cooling water at the discharge point would be limited to 7°C with respect to the ambient temperature. Discharge of all units, including the existing two units will be let off into a common discharge channel parallel to the shore bound and release at the two extreme ends of the channel. Gates will be provided on East and West side of the channel, which will be operated depending upon the ocean current direction in different season. The modeling was done for all the units of 1000MW each taking into consideration the futuristic plan of expansion at the proposed site. The impact zone was shown to be 5 KM.

158. The Environmental Appraisal Committee (EAC) after holding the public meeting on 02.06.2007 again met on 22.8.2008 and made its recommendations for environmental clearance for Units 3 and 4 subject to their obtaining CRZ clearance. We have already indicated that the proposal of EAC was approved by the MoEF on 23.9.2008 with respect to Units 3 and 4. Later after getting the administrative approval from the Competent Authority for Units 5 and 6, the same was also reported by NPCIL to the MoEF and MoEF vide its letter accorded clearance on 31.12.2009 for Units 5 and 6 as well.

159. Appellants, therefore, cannot contend that the procedure laid down under the 1994 and 2006 Notifications had not been followed. In our view, the EIA for the expansion of KKNPP i.e. for setting up Units 3 to 6 included the environment impact on Units 1 and 2 and the cumulative effect of all the six

A units definitely formed the base line for the clearance granted by the MoEF on 23.9.2008 and 31.12.2009. The concern of the public regarding safety, livelihood, radiation, impact on marine life, rehabilitation, impact on the sea shore etc. were also considered and following that necessary clearance was granted. B

160. KKNPP 3 to 6, after having got environmental clearance from MoEF in September 2008 and December 2009 entrusted the task of updation of EIA study to M/s Engineers India Ltd. (EIL), Gurgaon (a Govt. of India Undertaking). EIL, accordingly carried out the study along with the Central Marine Fisheries Research Institute (CMFRI) for the expansion of projects on air, water, land, noise, biological and socio-economic aspects within a radius of 10 km from the proposed location. Detailed study was conducted on the Reactor system of KKNPP 3 to 6, impact on environment existing environmental status, its prediction and on environmental management plan report was submitted in August 2011. The report has also analysed the environmental impact on the marine ecosystem due to +7oC CCW water and concluded that it will have no impact on the marine ecosystem. EIA was considered EAC, while granting CRZ clearance for the additional reactors 3 to 6 at KKNPP along with sea water intake and outfall facilities for cooling purpose. CRZ clearance was granted by MoEF on 25.07.2012 after following the procedure laid down in the CRZ notification of 2011. TNPCB, as already indicated, has also accorded consent to operate vide proceeding dated 28.08.2012 incorporating stringent standard of 7oC over and above the ambient temperature of sea for the discharge of effluents, through the cooling water and trade effluent and included permission for discharge of effluents from desalination plant. G

Sustainable Development and impact on eco-system

H 161. The Government of India, as already stated, constituted a fifteen member experts g



A technical, scientific, environment etc. to provide clarifications on the various issues raised by group of general public. Efforts were made by the group to have interaction with the agitators but met with little success. Group elaborately discussed apart from safety features of the plant, its ecological effects on environment and marine life and a Report was submitted to the Government of India on December 2011. The Government of Tamil Nadu also appointed an Expert Committee headed by the former President of AEC Prof. R. Srinivasan along with three other experts to review the safety features. There has been consensus among all the expert committee on safety and security of the plant as well as on the effect on marine ecology, high protection, impact on land, agriculture, livestock, food, impact on flora and fauna, biosphere, environmental clearance, CRZ clearance, fresh water supply, desalination plants, emergency preparedness etc. Detailed studies have been conducted on various occasions of the effect of the NPP on air, water, noise, land, environment and also on biological, marine and socio-economic environment; to allay the apprehension voiced by a section of the people and its worth.

E 162. Royal Commission on Environmental pollution (UK) in its very first report, 4(1971) stated as follows:

F “The problem we face is how to strike a balance between the benefits of rising standard of living and its costs in terms of deteriorations of the physical environment and the quality of life. In the past, the danger of polluting the air, water and land was not fully recognized, but now there is no doubt that it is a matter of great concern”.

G 163. Royal Commission had said so in the year 1971. Next year 1972, the international community convened the United Nations Conference on Human Environment at Stockholm (Stockholm Conference) of which India is a signatory.

H 164. Stockholm Conference not only brought into focus the human rights approach to the problem of environmental

A protection but also recognized the linkage between the development and environment from which the concept of “sustainable development” has emerged. The Conference noticed that while man is both creature and moulder of this environment, rapid advances in science and technology had invested man with the potent power to transform his environment in countless ways and on an unprecedented scale. The benefits of development and opportunity to enhance quality of life, if wrongly or carelessly used, man could do incalculable harm to human beings and to the environment. The responsibility of the people to protect and improve the environment for the present and the future generations was also recognized. Later the Nairobi Conference and Declaration 1982 re-stated the principles of Stockholm Conference and high-lighted the importance of intensifying the efforts at the global, regional and national levels to protect and improve environment. The United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) in October 1982 adopted “The World Charter For Nature” and laid down general principles of environmental protection, action plan and implementation of scheme which high-lighted the conservation principles. New Delhi hosted the Delhi International Conference on Environmental Education 1982 where the International Community called for massive programme of environmental research and monitoring. The Conference suggested that environmental education should start from childhood and it should be both formal and informal.

F 165. The United Nations General Assembly vide Resolution 38/161, in the year 1983 suggested the creation of “The World Commission on Environment and Development” for suggesting and recommending legal principles based on Stockholm Conference and Nairobi Conference and many other, then existing International Conventions and General Assembly Resolutions. The World Commission submitted its report in year 1987 which indicated that politicians, industrial leaders and environmental groups around the world had endorsed “sustainable development” i.e.

A the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. United Nations convened a conference in the year 1983 at Vienna for protection of Ozone layer which provided foundation for global multilateral undertakings to protect the environment and public health from the potential adverse effects of depletion of Stratospheric Ozone. B

C 166. United Nations Environmental Programme (UNEP) convened a Conference at Plenipotentiaries in Montreal in the year 1987, called the Montreal Protocol 1987, which high-lighted the necessity of limiting and reducing the use of chlorofluro carbons and other chemicals that deplete ozone. India has acceded to both the Vienna Convention 1985 and the related Montreal Protocol, 1987, in the year 1992.

D 167. Following the Stockholm Conference the second landmark on environmental protection and development was "United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED), 1992 (Rio Summit). The Conference was held at Rio (Brazil) in the year 1992 which addressed the twin problems of environment and development. Rio declaration sets out general non-binding commands for "sustainable development" i.e. "human beings who are at the centre of sustainable development concerns have to exercise their right to healthy and productive life in harmony with nature". The Rio Conference also high-lighted the principle of inter generational equity. Principles like "precautionary principle" so as to prevent the environmental degradation and the principle of "polluter pays" i.e. to bear the cost of pollution with due regard to public interest" were high-lighted. The Conference resulted in conclusion of a treaty on climate change with a general recognition of the importance of curbing emission of green house gases, another treaty on bio-diversity aiming at the preservation of flora and fauna was also concluded. The Rio Conference also adopted Agenda 21. Section II of that Agenda deals with topics like protection of the atmosphere, land

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H

A resources, deforestation, sustainable agriculture and rural development, conservation of biodiversity, protection of oceans, fresh water, toxic chemicals management, hazardous waste management, solid waste management and radioactive waste management.

B 168. An international instrument expressing international concern for the protection of global environment was the convention on the Climate Change (UNFCCC) 1992. The Convention high-lighted the necessity to reduce emissions of green-house gases believed to be contributing to global warming. Yet another, convention was The Biodiversity Convention, 1992 which sought to ensure that animals, plants and micro-organisms as well as genetic variety and ecosystem, water, land and air, in which they live are property protected. It obligates the countries to promote the protection of eco-systems, natural habitat and the maintenance of viable populations of species in natural surroundings. Following the Rio Summit a Special Session of UNFA held in June 1997 in New York to review the progress of Rio Earth Summit called "Earth Summit+5" which adopted a comprehensive document titled "Programme For Further Implementation of Agenda 21". The Conference noticed that since the Rio Conference, global environment had continued to deteriorate with rising level of polluting emissions, notably of green house gases, toxic substances and waste volumes and at operational levels, including the lowest administrative levels.

G 169. UN Millennium Declaration, 2000 articulated that prudence must be shown in the management of all living species and natural resources, based on the principle of "sustainable development" and that only then, can the immeasurable riches provided to us by the nature be preserved for posterity. Further it was declared that current unsustainable pattern of production and consumption must be changed in the interest of our future welfare and that of our descendants.

H 170. United Nations General Asser

A the Rio Declaration and Agenda 21 created a Commission on Sustainable Development under the United Nations Economic and Social Council to ensure the effective implementation at the local, national, regional and international levels of what had been agreed at the Rio Conference, to ensure follow up of Rio Summit, to enhance adequate international, scientific and technological cooperation to catalyse inter-governmental decision making capacity to ensure regular and effective reporting on the Agenda 21 and at the national, regional and global levels.

C 171. The Delhi Sustainable Development Summit (DSDS) held in February 2002 at New Delhi, examined and elaborated the dynamics of concept of sustainable development, with a view to make recommendations for consideration at the World Summit at sustainable development to be held in Johannesburg. Delhi Summit sought to focus on poverty alleviation as the overriding concern to achieve sustainable development.

E 172. The World Summit on Sustainable Development (Johannesburg Summit) 2002 convened under the auspices of commission of sustainable development recommended various steps for further implementation of Rio Principles and Agenda 21. The Summit recognized that the reduction of poverty is the greatest global challenge facing the world, for which the World Solidarity Fund was required to be established to eradicate poverty and to promote social and human development in various developing countries. Further, Conference also noticed that since oceans, seas, islands and coastal areas form an integrated and essential component of earth's ecosystem and are crucial for global food security and for sustaining economic prosperity and the well-being of many national economies, particularly, developing countries, it is necessary to ensure sustainable development of the oceans.

H 173. United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development, Rio +20 took place in Rio de Janeiro in June

A 2012, which also took forward looking decisions on a number of thematic areas including energy, food security, oceans, cities etc. Conference also focused its attention on green economy in the context of sustainable development, poverty eradication and an institutional framework for sustainable development.

B 174. We have already found on facts that the KKNPP has been set up and is made functional on the touchstone of sustainable development and its impact on ecology has been taken care of following all national and international environmental principles.

C **Public Interest and Human Rights**

D 175. We have to resolve the issue whether the establishment of NPP would have the effect of violating the right to life guaranteed under Article 21 to the persons who are residing in and around Kudankulam or by establishing the NPP, it will uphold the right to life in a larger sense. While balancing the benefit of establishing KKNPP Units 1 to 6, with right to life and property and the protection of environment including marine life, we have to strike a balance, since the production of nuclear energy is of extreme importance for the economic growth of our country, alleviate poverty, generate employment etc. While setting up a project of this nature, we have to have an overall view of larger public interest rather than smaller violation of right to life guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution.

F 176. Problems highlighted, while setting up a nuclear plant, are not unique to this nation, because other countries are also grappling with those situations. In R. v. Inspectorate of Pollution, ex p Greenpeace Ltd (1994) ALLER 321, the Court of Appeal in England had occasion to examine the correctness of the decision taken by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Pollution (HMIP) and Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food (MAFF) for allowing testing of new Thermal Oxide reprocessing plant THORP at Sellafield, HMIP and MAFF had concluded that the radiological impact of emissions from

A small, a plea which was accepted by the court. In *R. v. The Secretary of State for the Environment, ex p Greenpeace Ltd.* (1994) 4 All England Reports 352, the Greenpeace and Lancashire Country Council sought to quash the decision to grant authorization for the disposal of radioactive waste from THORP. Overall, Potts J. concluded that Minister had acted correctly in considering first the human issues related to acceptability of risk and then examining the wider issue of justification as if they were relevant even though Minister (incorrectly) believed that they were not relevant, they had, in fact, weighed the benefits and detriments and were entitled to reach the conclusion that balance came down on the side of justification. In *R. v. Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, ex p Friends on the Earth Ltd* (2002) Environmental Law Review 24, the Court of Appeal in England had to consider the application of the principle of justification to the substantive decision in October 2001 with the proposed practice by the British Nuclear Fuels Limited (BNFL) of manufacturing mixed oxide fuel (MOX) at Sellafield. Government's stand was that the "economic benefits" were sufficient to justify "the very minor radiological detriments" which would result from the manufacture of MOX. The Court of Appeal accepted the stand of the Government. In *Marchiorii v. Environment Agency* (2002) EWCA Civ 3, the Court of Appeal examined the validity of the authorization granted by the environment agency for the discharge of liquid wastes from the Atomic Weapons Establishment (AWE) on the basis of that they could not be justified having regard to the humanitarian and international law objections to the use of nuclear weapons. The environment agency took the stand that the practice of designing, constructing, maintaining and dismantling nuclear weapons at the AWE justified in the light of the government's defence policy. The Court of Appeal rejected the suggestion that the government decisions on matters such as the national nuclear deterrent should be subjected to review by the Courts on merits. However, in *R. (Greenpeace Ltd) v. Secretary of State for Trade and Industry* (2007) Environmental Law Reports 29,

A Sullivan J. high-lighted the importance of 'public participation in decision making and access to justice' in environmental matters and held that the government was obliged to honour the promise that it had made of the fullest public consultation, even if it had made no such promise which was difficult to see how anything less could have been consistent with the obligations to provide opportunities for public participation accepted by the Government under the United Nations Economic Commission of Europe (UNECE). In *S.V. France 3RUOH* (1991), the European Commission of Human Rights found that noise, night time illumination of the power plant, nuclear risk and changes in the micro climate while interfering with the applicant's private life had to be weighed with the general interests of the community.

D 177. The United States Supreme Court in *Metropolitan Edison Co. v. People Against Nuclear Energy* [460 US 766 (1983)] was called upon to determine whether psychological health damage flowing directly from the perceived risk of a nuclear accident, in the context of restarting the second reactor at Three Mile Island, following the accident affecting the other reactor fell within the scope of environmental impact assessment under the National Environmental Policy Act. The Court regarded the perceived risk of a nuclear accident as "a pervasive element of modern life" and held that such risk was not an effect on the physical environment. In *Alberta Wilderness Association v. Express Pipelines Ltd.* 137 DLR (4th) 177, in Canadian Court held that no information about probable future effects of a project can ever be complete or exclude all possible future outcomes. This principle has been endorsed by the Federal Court of Appeal, Canada in *Inverhuron District Ratepayers' Assn v. Canada (Minister of the Environment)* 2001 FCA 203 in a case involving a dry storage facility for used nuclear fuel.

H 178. Much hue and cry has been raised by some sections of the people about the possible imp

A KKNPP Units 1 and 2, a point which has been addressed by the AERB, NPCIL, MoEF and all the Expert Committees constituted to go into the impact and effect of radiation from the units not only on humans but also on ecology. Experts Committees are of the unanimous opinion that there will not be any deleterious effects due to radiation from the operation of KKNPP, and that adequate safety measures have already been taken. We cannot forget that there are many potential areas of radiation reflected in many uses of radioactive materials. Radioactive materials are used in hospitals, surgeries and so on. Mobile phone use, though minor, also causes radiation. In a report of the Department of Telecommunication "Mobile Communication – Radio Wave and Safety released in October 2012, it has been stated that a human body is exposed to more electromagnetic field radiation in case of a call from mobile phone in comparison to the radiation from a mobile tower.

179. We have, therefore, to balance "economic scientific benefits" with that of "minor radiological detriments" on the touchstone of our national nuclear policy. Economic benefit, we have already indicated has to be viewed on a larger canvas which not only augment our economic growth but alleviate poverty and generate more employment. NPCIL, while setting up the NPP at Kudankulam, have satisfied the environmental principle like sustainable development, corporate social responsibility, precautionary principle, inter - intra generational equity and so on to implement our National Policy to develop, control and use of atomic energy for the welfare of the people and for economic growth of the country. Larger public interest of the community should give way to individual apprehension of violation of human rights and right to life guaranteed under Article 21.

180. Public money running into crores and crores rupees have already been spent for the development, control and use of atomic energy for the welfare of the people and hence, we have to put up with such "minor inconveniences", "minor

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H

A radiological detriments" and minor environmental detriments" in our lives because the benefits we reap from KKNPP are enormous since Nuclear energy remains as an important element in India's energy mix which can replace a significant part of fossil fuels like coal, gas oil etc.

B 181. The necessity of establishing KKNPP at Kudankulam has elaborately been discussed in the earlier part of the judgment, hence not repeated. Justification for establishing KKNPP at Kudankulam, therefore has been vindicated and all safety and security measures have already been taken, necessary permissions and clearances have been obtained from all statutory authorities. Apprehension expressed by some sections of the public that if the units are commissioned or put into operation, it will have far reaching consequences, not only on the present generation, but also on the future generation, of the possible radioactive effects of the units, in our view has no basis. Few of them raised the apprehension that it might repeat accidents like the one that had happened at Three Miles Island, Chernobyl, Union Carbide and Fukushima etc. Apprehension, however, legitimate it may be, cannot override the justification of the project. Nobody on this earth can predict what would happen in future and to a larger extent we have to leave it to the destiny. But once the justification test is satisfied, the apprehension test is bound to fail. Apprehension is something we anticipate with anxiety or fear, a fearful anticipation, which may vary from person to person.

G 182. Power generation through a nuclear plant set up after following all safety standards, rules and regulations, is for the welfare of the people and for the economic growth of the country, which is the object and purpose of the Atomic Energy Act. Nuclear energy assumes as an important element in India's energy mix for sustaining economic growth of natural and domestic use which in future has to replace a significant part of fossil fuel like coal, oil, gas etc. Electricity is the heart and soul of modern life, a life meant not for

H

alone but also for the poor and down trodden. They should also have an adequate means of livelihood, job opportunities for which we have to set up Industries and commercial undertakings in the public as well as private sector and also have to invite foreign investment. Generation of electricity is of extreme importance for their establishment and functioning and also for domestic consumption. Power generation with the traditional means, through hydro, thermal electric project, coal etc are not effective substitution to the power generation through Nuclear Plant. India has a mammoth population unlike developed countries, and the consumption of electricity in domestic, industries, agricultural sector etc. is going up day-by-day. Most of the States are in the grip of power cut; day and night, for a number of hours, which has adverse effect on their economic and industrial growth. To sustain rapid economic growth, it is necessary to double the supply of energy. Energy tariff is also increasing, nuclear power in the long run will be much cheaper than other forms of energy.

183. This Court in *Chameli Singh and others v. State of U.P. and another* (1996) 2 SCC 549 held that an organized society right to live as a human being is not ensured by meeting only the animal needs of man, but secured only when he is assured of all facilities to develop himself and is freed from restrictions which inhibit his growth. Right to shelter includes adequate living space, safe and decent structure, clean and decent surroundings, sufficient light, pure air and water, electricity, sanitation and civil amenities like road etc. so as to have easy access to his daily avocation.

184. Nuclear power plant is being established not to negate right to life but to protect the right to life guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution. The petitioner's contention that the establishment of nuclear power plant at Kudankulam will make an inroad into the right to live guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution, is therefore has no basis. On the other hand it will only protect the right to life guaranteed under

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H

A Article 21 of the Constitution for achieving a larger public interest and will also achieve the object and purpose of Atomic Energy Act.

EXPERTS' VIEWS –TECHNICAL AND SCIENTIFIC

B 185. AEC, DAE, BARC, AERB, NPCIL, TNPCB the expert bodies, are all unanimous in their opinions that adequate safety and security measures have already taken at KKNPP which are to be given due weight that they deserve. Further, as already indicated NPCIL Task Force Report on Security of all NPPs including KKNPP dated March 2011, 11.5.2011, AERB-EE Expert Opinion on Design Committee Safety dated 31.8.2011, 15 Member Expert Team Committee Report (post Fukushima) dated December 2011, Supplementary Report dated 31.2.2012 on the Grievances raised by some of the agitators, D report submitted by Sri R. Srinivasan, Former President, Atomic Energy Commission appointed by the State of Tamil Nadu are all unanimous in their view on the safety and security of KKNPP.

E 186. MoEF, EAC, TNPCB, Report of IOM, Anna University dated July 2008 on Impact of NPP on Marine Eco-system, Committee on Conservation of Sea-Shore of the State of Tamil Nadu, Report of Engineers India Limited with CHFRI dated August 2011, NEERI dated May 2002 and January 2003 on the Impact on Air, Water, Land, Eco-system etc. are all unanimous that the radiation as well as the discharge of water from NPP to the sea shore will not have serious impact on the marine ecology or on marine life.

F 187. A Constitution Bench of this Court in *University of Mysore v. C. D. Govinda Rao* AIR 1965 SC 491, held that, G normally, Court should be slow to interfere with the opinion expressed by the Experts and it would normally be wise and safe for the courts to leave the decisions to experts who are more familiar with the problems which they face than the courts generally can be which has been the consistent view taken by H this Court. Reference may be made to

Court in *State of Bihar v. Asis Kumar Mukherjee (Dr.)* (1975) 3 SCC 602, *Dalpat Abasaheb Solunke v. B. S. Mahajan* (1990) 1 SCC 305, *Central Areca Nut & Cocoa Marketing & Processing Coop. Ltd. v. State of Karnataka* (1997) 8 SCC 31, *Dental Council of India v. Subharti K. K. B. Charitable Trust & Another* (2001) 5 SCC 486, *Basavaiah (Dr.) v. Dr. H. L. Ramesh* (2010) 8 SCC 372 and *Avishek Goenka v. Union of India* (2012) 5 SCC 275. In *Woon Tankan and Seven Others v. Asian Rare Earth Sdn. Ehd. CLJ* (1992) 2 207, the Supreme Court of Malaysia vide its judgment dated 23.12.1993 examined the effect of low-level radioactive waste on the health of the population. The Supreme Court upheld the plea of the company, placing reliance on the expert opinion expressed by the Atomic Energy Licensing Board (AELB) and took the view that since the company has been operating under license granted by AELB, an expert body, it will be taken that the expert body had the expertise to speak on the radiation level of the radioactive waste, on the health of the population.

188. We have noticed that, so far as this case is concerned, from the safety and security point of view of life and property, on environment and all that related aspects, all the Expert Bodies are unanimous in their opinion that KKNPP has fully satisfied all safety norms to safeguard the human life, property and environment which, we are sure, will allay the fears and apprehensions expressed by the people living in and around Kudankulam. The Court, in our view, cannot sit in judgment on the views expressed by the Technical and Scientific Bodies in setting up of KKNPP plant at Kudankulam and on its safety and security.

CONCLUSION

189.KKNPP has, therefore been set up as part of India's National Policy so as to develop, control and use of atomic energy for the welfare of the people of India. Policy makers consider nuclear energy as an important element in India's energy mix for sustaining economic growth of natural and

A domestic use. For setting up the project, the project proponent has taken all safety requirements in site and off site and has followed the code of practices laid down by AERB, based on nationally and internationally recognized safety methods. Safeguarding the nuclear plants, radioactive materials and ensuring its physical security have become a central part of Nuclear Law. Adequate measures have, therefore, to be taken for storage of NSF at site, and also for the physical safety of stored NSF. Of the seventeen suggested safety measures, by AERB, LWR, twelve have already been implemented and the rest, in a phased manner have to be implemented which the experts say, are meant for extra security. DMP is already in place, so also the emergency preparedness plan, off site and on site and all programmes under CSR are progressing in the right direction with the co-operation and assistance of the District Administration.

190. NPCIL, has also received necessary environmental clearance from MoEF, TNPCB, etc for Units 1 to 6. No violation of CRZ is also noticed. Desalination Plant is also established after following rules and regulations and there is no violation of CRZ. Experts say that there will be no impact on the marine eco-system due to discharge of +7°C, CCW over and above the ambient temperature of the sea. Radiation impact on the eco-system is also within the standard set by AERB, MoEF, EAC, Pollution Control Board etc., so opined by the Experts. In other words, all the expert teams are unanimous in their opinion of the safety and security of the KKNPP both to life and property of the people and the environment which includes marine life. Court has to respect national nuclear policy of the country reflected in the Atomic Energy Act and the same has to be given effect to for the welfare of the people and the country's economic growth and it is with these objectives in mind KKNPP has been set up.

Dipak Misra, J.

H 191. I have my respectful concurrence

conclusions expressed by my respected learned Brother Radhakrishnan on all aspects. However, I propose to add a few words in addition to what has been eruditely stated by my learned Brother.

Prologue

192. At the very inception, I may state that in the cases at hand, we are faced with a situation whether to interfere in the establishment, operation and functionalism of a nuclear plant coming up at Kudankulam and interdict its operation because of numerous grounds assiduously urged in voluminous pleadings encompassing the broad canvas, namely, statutory violations of the entire gamut of environmental law, exhibition of non-chalant attitude towards public opinion, show of total disrespect towards nature's inconsistencies, keeping at bay the constant apprehension and threat of the known and the unknown, absolute contempt for predictable danger that has surfaced on certain parts of the Globe and the unpredictable disaster that may be faced by the populace of the locality and, most importantly, the public safety in praesenti and in futuro, or take cognizance of the needs and necessities of the public at large, the concept of public policy and the scope of judicial review, the precautions already undertaken and further assured to be taken within a specific time span, the opinion of the experts, the impossible avoidance of certain facets of existence in today's world, the global phenomena of requirement of electricity as a source of energy and various innovative methods to meet the same, the safety measures carried out and the steps undertaken to manage the disaster in case it occurs and finally to march ahead with life allaying all apprehensions with a scientific mindset accepting the nature's unpredictability to survive on the planet earth on the bedrock of the doctrine – survival of the fittest.

The concern for safety under the Atomic Energy Act, 1948:

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H

A 193. Bearing in mind the broad scenario, few aspects are required to be harped upon. Independent India perceived the need and use of nuclear energy in this country. The Atomic Energy Act, 1948 conceived the constitution of the Atomic Energy Commission which came into being in 1954. After the repeal of the 1948 Act and coming into force of the Atomic Energy Act, 1962 (for brevity "the 1962 Act"), a larger field was covered. The 1962 Act was enacted to provide for the development, control and use of atomic energy for the welfare of the people of India and for other peaceful purposes and for matters connected therewith. The dictionary clause as contained in Section 2 takes into consideration many an aspect pertaining to equipment, substance, radiation and radioactive substance, etc.

D 194. Certain provisions of the 1962 Act may be usefully referred to. Section 3 of the 1962 Act deals with general powers of the Central Government. Sub-section (e) of Section 3 reads as follows:-

"3. General powers of the Central Government

E Subject to the provisions of this Act, Central Government shall have power –

F (e) to provide for control over radioactive substances or radiation generating plant in order to-

- F (i) prevent radiation hazards;
- G (ii) secure public safety and safety of persons handling radioactive substances or radiation generating plant; and
- G (iii) ensure safe disposal of radioactive wastes;"

[Emphasis supplied]

H 195. Section 17 deals with special

which reads as follows :-

Special provisions as to safety

(1) The Central Government may, as regards any class or description of premises or places, being premises or places, in which radioactive substances are manufactured, produced, mined, treated, stored or used or any radiation generating plant, equipment or appliance is used, make such provision by rules as appear to the Central Government to

be necessary —

- (a) to prevent injury being caused to the health of persons employed at such premises or places or other persons either by radiations, or by the ingestion of any radioactive substance;
- (b) to secure that any radioactive waste products resulting from such manufacture, production, mining, treatment, storage, or use as aforesaid are disposed of safely;
- (c) to prescribe qualifications of the persons for employment at such premises or places and the regulation of their hours of employment, minimum leave and periodical medical examination. and the rules may, in particular and without prejudice to the generality of this subsection provide for imposing requirements as to the erection or structural alterations of buildings or the carrying out of works.

(2) The Central Government may, as respects the transport of any radioactive substance or any prescribed substance specified by an order issued under this Act as being dangerous to health, make such rules as appear to be necessary to prevent injury being caused by such transport to the health of persons engaged therein and other

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H

persons.

(3) Rules made under this section may provide for imposing requirements, prohibitions and restrictions on employers, employed persons and other persons.

(4) Any person authorised by the Central Government under this section, may, on producing, if so required, a duly authenticated document showing his authority, enter at all reasonable hours any premises, or any vehicle, vessel or aircraft for the purpose of ascertaining whether there has been committed, or is being committed, in or in connection with the premises, vehicle, vessel or aircraft, any contravention of the rules made under this section.

(5) In the event of any contravention of the rules made under this section, the Central Government shall have the right to take such measures as it may deem necessary to prevent further injury to persons or damage to property arising from radiation or contamination by radioactive substances including, without prejudice to the generality of the foregoing provisions, and to the right to take further action for the enforcement of penalties under section 24, the sealing of premises, vehicle, vessel, or aircraft, and the seizure of radioactive substances and contaminated equipment.”

[Emphasis added]

196. I have referred to the aforesaid provisions to highlight the emphasis laid on the public safety and safety of persons handling radioactive substances and to control the repercussions by the legislature. Before I dwell upon in detail with regard to the necessity of safety, the measures taken and the constant vigil for future, it is apt to scan the anatomy of the Preamble, which has already been referred to. The preamble can be segregated into three parts namely, (i) development, control and use of atomic energy, (ii)

A people of India and (iii) for other peaceful purposes. Thus, on
one hand, the need was felt to get into the global arena for
producing nuclear energy and, on the other, which is as
important as the first one, for the welfare of the people. The
necessity to generate energy from various sources in India was
and still is a felt necessity. It has been submitted by the learned
counsel for the appellant with immense emphasis that apart
from violation of the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986 and the
notifications framed thereunder, the study would reflect that
there would be multiple ecological problems and further the
safety of the local people would be absolutely in peril. My
learned brother has already dealt in detail with regard to the
submissions pertaining to the violations of the statutory
provisions, the Rules and the Notifications relating to various
environmental issues. I do not intend to add anything in that
regard. My deliberation shall be on the concept of welfare and
safety relating to the use of nuclear energy for the purpose of
development. Needless to say, it has to be totally guided by
the conception of public safety and welfare of the citizens. The
term 'welfare' is always related to the living generation and
generations to come. It has been contended before us by the
learned counsel for the appellant that the basic care has not
been taken to make the nuclear plant at Kudankulam a safe
one and further when the entire globe has been shaken by the
Fukushima tragedy, the Government of India, without taking
recourse to the participative process of public hearing and
showing scant respect for public safety, has plunged into such
an activity. That apart, it is highlighted that the radioactive
substances have the real potentiality to gravely affect the
present generation and that, in turn, will usher in immense
disaster and suffering for the future generations. Per contra,
learned counsel for the respondents would urge that the plant
is based and founded on sophisticated technology and there
are more than three layers of protection for safety which is not
available in other nuclear plants in other parts of the world. In
essence, it is submitted that all possible measures have been
taken to avoid any kind of calamity.

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H

A 197. It is borne out from the material on record that two
aspects have weighed with many a nation while thinking of a
nuclear energy plant, namely, the caution and circumspection
at the time of operation and how to deal with radioactive waste.
We have been apprised how the re-use of radioactive waste
is done by a sophisticated method and the danger is kept at
bay. On one hand, there is requirement of energy and the need
of progress and development and, in a way, to compete with
the progressive phenomenon of the other countries in many a
sphere and, on the other, the likelihood of danger to be caused
to the people of the locality and the effect-potentiality to affect
the larger section of public because of disposal of radioactive
waste and transportation.

Certain Conventions pertaining to safety:

D 198. At this juncture, I may profitably refer to the
Convention on Nuclear Safety adopted on 17th June, 1994 in
the Conference convened by the International Atomic Energy
Agency at its Headquarters. India is a signatory to the said
Convention. The Preamble of the Treaty reads as follows: -

- E
F
G
H
- i. "Aware of the importance to the international community of ensuring that the use of nuclear energy is safe, well regulated and environmentally sound;
 - ii. Reaffirming the necessity of continuing to promote a high level of nuclear safety worldwide;
 - iii. Reaffirming that responsibility for nuclear safety rests with the State having jurisdiction over a nuclear installation;
 - iv. Desiring to promote an effective nuclear safety culture;
 - v. Aware that accidents at nuclear installations have the potential for transbound

- vi. Keeping in mind the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material (1979), the Convention on Early Notification of a Nuclear Accident (1986), and the Convention on Assistance in the Case of a Nuclear Accident or Radiological Emergency (1986);
- vii. Affirming the importance of international co-operation for the enhancement of nuclear safety through existing bilateral and multilateral mechanisms and the establishment of this incentive Convention;
- viii. Recognizing that this Convention entails a commitment to the application of fundamental safety principles for nuclear installations rather than of detailed safety standards and that there are internationally formulated safety guidelines which are updated from time to time and so can provide guidance on contemporary means of achieving a high level of safety;
- ix. Affirming the need to begin promptly the development of an international convention on the safety of radioactive waste management as soon as the ongoing process to develop waste management safety fundamentals has resulted in broad international agreement;
- x. Recognizing the usefulness of further technical work in connection with the safety of other parts of the nuclear fuel cycle, and that this work may, in time, facilitate the development of current or future international instruments;”

[Emphasis supplied]

199. Article 10 deals with priority to nuclear safety. It reads as follows: -

“Each Contracting Party shall take the appropriate steps

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H

to ensure that all organizations engaged in activities directly related to nuclear installations shall establish policies that give due priority to nuclear safety.”

[Emphasis added]

200. Article 14 provides for assessment and verification of safety. It is as under: -

“(i) comprehensive and systematic safety assessments are carried out before the construction and commissioning of a nuclear installation and throughout its life. Such assessments shall be well documented, subsequently updated in the light of operating experience and significant new safety information, and reviewed under the authority of the regulatory body;

(ii) verification by analysis, surveillance, testing and inspection is carried out to ensure that the physical state and the operation of a nuclear installation continue to be in accordance with its design, applicable national safety requirements, and operational limits and conditions.”

[Emphasis supplied]

201. Article 16 stipulates emergency preparedness. It reads as follows: -

“1. Each Contracting Party shall take the appropriate steps to ensure that there are on-site and off-site emergency plans that are routinely tested for nuclear installations and cover the activities to be carried out in the event of an emergency.

For any new nuclear installation, such plans shall be prepared and tested before it commences operation above a low power level agreed by the regulatory body.

2. Each Contracting Party shall take the appropriate steps to ensure that, insofar as they are likely to be affected by a radiological emergency, its own population and the competent authorities of the State

nuclear installation are provided with appropriate information for emergency planning and response. A

3. Contracting Parties which do not have a nuclear installation on their territory, insofar as they are likely to be affected in the event of a radiological emergency at a nuclear installation in the vicinity, shall take the appropriate steps for the preparation and testing of emergency plans for their territory that cover the activities to be carried out in the event of such an emergency.” B

202. Article 19 deals with operations. It is as follows: - C

“Each Contracting Party shall take the appropriate steps to ensure that: C

(i) the initial authorization to operate a nuclear installation is based upon an appropriate safety analysis and a commissioning programme demonstrating that the installation, as constructed, is consistent with design and safety requirements; D

(ii) operational limits and conditions derived from the safety analysis, tests and operational experience are defined and revised as necessary for identifying safe boundaries for operation; E

(iii) operation, maintenance, inspection and testing of a nuclear installation are conducted in accordance with approved procedures; F

(iv) procedures are established for responding to anticipated operational occurrences and to accidents; F

(v) necessary engineering and technical support in all safety-related fields is available throughout the lifetime of a nuclear installation; G

(vi) incidents significant to safety are reported in a timely manner by the holder of the relevant licence to the regulatory body; H

(vii) programmes to collect and analyse operating experience are established, the results obtained and the conclusions drawn are acted upon and that existing mechanisms are used to share important experience with international bodies and with other operating organizations and regulatory bodies; A B

(viii) the generation of radioactive waste resulting from the operation of a nuclear installation is kept to the minimum practicable for the process concerned, both in activity and in volume, and any necessary treatment and storage of spent fuel and waste directly related to the operation and on the same site as that of the nuclear installation take into consideration conditioning and disposal.” C

[Underlining is mine] D

203. The aforesaid Convention, as is demonstrable from the various Articles, lays down the priority to nuclear safety, comprehensive and systematic safety assessments at all stages including the life span of the plants, verification by analysis, surveillance, testing and inspection, regard being had to the safety requirements, emergency planning and preparedness to take care of the people in the vicinity of the nuclear installation, necessary engineering and technical support in all safety related fields available throughout the life time of the nuclear installation, constant reporting by the operator to the regulatory body pertaining to safety and the handling of radioactive waste resulting from the operation and the measures of safety carried thereon. E F

204. In this regard, I may refer with profit to another Convention, namely, the Joint Convention on the Safety of Spent Fuel Management and on the Safety of Radioactive Waste Management dated 5th September, 1997. I may hasten to add that India is not a signatory to the same but the said Convention is worth referring to in order to understand and appreciate the world-wide concern for public safety. G H

safety of spent fuel management, Chapter 3 deals with safety of Radioactive Waste Management and Chapter 4 deals with General safety provisions. Article 4 occurring in Chapter 2 deals with general safety requirements. Clauses (v) and (vii) read as follows: -

“Article 4. General Safety Requirements

Each Contracting Party shall take the appropriate steps to ensure that at all stages of spent fuel management, individuals, society and the environment are adequately protected against radiological hazards.

In so doing, each Contracting Party shall take the appropriate steps to:

(v) take into account the biological, chemical and other hazards that may be associated with spent fuel management;

(vii) aim to avoid imposing undue burdens on future generations.”

205. Article 11 in Chapter 3 pertains to General Safety Requirements. It is reproduced below: -

“Each contracting Party shall take the appropriate steps to ensure that at all stages of radioactive waste management individuals, society and the environment are adequately protected against radiological and other hazards.

In so doing, each Contracting party shall take the appropriate steps to:

(i) ensure that criticality and removal of residual heat generated during radioactive waste management are adequately addressed;

(ii) ensure that the generation of radioactive waste is kept to the minimum practicable;

(iii) take into account interdependencies among the

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H

- (iv) provide for effective protection of individuals, society and the environment, by applying at the national level suitable protective methods as approved by the regulatory body, in the framework of its national legislation which has due regard to internationally endorsed criteria and standards;
- (v) take into account the biological, chemical and other hazards that may be associated with radioactive waste management;
- (vi) strive to avoid actions that impose reasonable predictable impacts on future generations greater than those permitted for the current generation;
- (vii) aim to avoid imposing undue burdens on future generations.”

[Emphasis added]

206. Article 15 deals with Assessment of Safety of facilities. The relevant clauses are as under: -

“Each Contracting Party shall take the appropriate steps to ensure that:

- (i) before construction of a radioactive waste management facility, a systematic safety assessment and an environmental assessment appropriate to the hazard presented by the facility and covering its operating lifetime shall be carried out;
- (ii) in addition, before construction of a disposal facility, a systematic safety assessment and environmental assessment for the period following closure shall be carried out and the results evaluated against the criteria established by the regulatory body;

(iii) before the operation of a radioactive waste management facility, updated and detailed versions of the safety assessment and of the environmental assessment shall be prepared when deemed necessary to complement the assessments referred to in paragraph (i).”

A
B

207. Article 22 that occurs in Chapter 4 deals with Human and Financial Resources. It is apt to reproduce the same: -

“Each Contracting Party shall take the appropriate steps to ensure that:

C

(i) qualified staff are available as needed for safety-related activities during the operating lifetime of a spent fuel and a radioactive waste management facility;

D

(ii) adequate financial resources are available to support the safety of facilities for spent fuel and radioactive waste management during their lifetime and for decommissioning;

E

(iii) financial provision is made which will enable the appropriate institutional control and monitoring arrangements to be continued for the period deemed necessary following the closure of a disposal facility.”

208. Article 23 deals with quality assurance. It reads as follows:-

F

“Each Contracting Party shall take the necessary steps to ensure that all appropriate quality assurance programmes concerning the safety of spent fuel and radioactive waste management are established and implemented.”

G

209. The aforesaid Convention, as is seen, lays emphasis on ecological hazards, avoidance of undue burden on future generations, management of radioactive waste, adequate protection against radiological and other hazards, application

H

A of suitable protective methods approved by the regulatory body keeping in view the interest of the individual and the society, to avoid actions that impose reasonable predictable impact on future generations, the systematic safety assessment and environmental assessment appropriate to the hazards presented by the facility and covering its operating lifetime, the institutional control and mandatory arrangements and ensuring of appropriate quality assurance programmes concerning the safety from spent fuel and radioactive waste. I am absolutely conscious that India has not ratified the said Convention but the safety concern at any level is a fundamental human concern. I have referred to the same, to repeat at the cost of repetition, to show the concern of many countries, especially, relating to safety measures taken at all times. The 1962 Act and the Convention which has been ratified by India speak eloquently about that. The conception of public safety, at no stage, can be brushed aside or ignored. It has to be treated with paramount primacy and highest priority for the simple reason life delights every person and creates an innate desire to live.

C

D

E

Necessity of Electrical Energy by the State and Concept of Public Safety:

210. In *Anderson v. Dunn*¹, the U.S. Supreme Court, in a different context, long back had stated about the role of the State and the safety of the citizens: -

F

G

“No one is so visionary as to dispute the assertion, that the sole end and aim of all our institutions is the safety and happiness of the citizen. But the relation between the action and the end, is not always so direct and palpable as to strike the eye of every observer. The science of government is the most abstruse of all sciences; if, indeed, that can be called a science which has but few fixed principles, and practically consists in little more than the exercise of a sound discretion, applied to the exigencies

H

1. 19 U.S. [6 Wheat.] 204 (1821)].

of the state as they arise. It is the science of experiment." A

After so stating, the U.S. Supreme Court proceeded to observe as follows: -

"That 'the safety of the people is the supreme law', not only comforts with, but is indispensable to, the exercise of those powers in their public functionaries, without which that safety cannot be guarded." B

211. In *Charan Lal Sahu v. Union of India*², this Court, while dealing with the constitutional validity of the Bhopal Gas Leak Disaster (Processing of Claims) Act, 1985, observed that the said enactment was passed as a sequel to a grim tragedy that occurred on the night of December 2, 1984. This Court treated it to be the most tragic industrial disaster in recorded human history. While discussing the concept of *parens patriae*, the learned Chief Justice observed that the conception of the *parens patriae* theory is the obligation of the State to protect and it takes into custody the rights and the privileges of its citizens for discharging its obligation. While dealing with the said concept, it has been opined that the *maxim salus populi suprema lex* - regard for public welfare - is the highest law. C D E

212. I have referred to the said pronouncement solely to emphasize on the role of the State to act in the greater welfare of the collective and how the public welfare has been treated to be at the zenith of law.

213. In *Union Carbide Corporation v. Union of India and others*³, a Constitution Bench regarded the Bhopal Gas Leak Tragedy as a horrendous industrial mass disaster, unparalleled in its magnitude, and the devastation and remains a ghastly monument to the dehumanizing influence of inherently dangerous technologies. While dealing with the justness and reasonableness of the quantum of settlement, the Constitution Bench adverted to the problems emerging from the pursuit of such dangerous technologies for economic gains by

2. (1990) 1 SCC 613.

3. (1989) 3 SCC 38.

A multinationals, availability of cheap labour, captive markets and the facets of economic exploitation in developing countries where the matters of concern were propounded before the court and in that context, it has been observed as follows: -

B "32. These issues and certain cognate areas of even wider significance and the limits of the adjudicative disposition of some of their aspects are indeed questions of seminal importance. The culture of modern industrial technologies, which is sustained on processes of such pernicious potentialities, in the ultimate analysis, has thrown open vital and fundamental issues of technology options. Associated problems of the adequacy of legal protection against such exploitative and hazardous industrial adventurism, and whether the citizens of the country are assured the protection of a legal system which could be said to be adequate in a comprehensive sense in such contexts arise. These, indeed, are issues of vital importance and this tragedy, and the conditions that enabled it happen, are of particular concern." C D

E 214. Thereafter, the Court referred to the technology in agriculture that has given a big impetus to enterprises of chemical fertilizers and its serious problems. Thereafter, it has been stated thus: -

F "34. Indeed, there is also need to evolve a national policy to protect national interests from such ultra-hazardous pursuits of economic gains. Jurists, technologists and other experts in economics, environmentology, futurology, sociology and public health etc. should identify areas of common concern and help in evolving proper criteria which may receive judicial recognition and legal sanction." G

G 215. In *Pritam Pal v. High Court of Madhya Pradesh, Jabalpur through Registrar*⁴, the *maxim salus populi suprema lex*, i.e., welfare of the people is the supreme law, was again emphasised upon, though in a different context.

H 4. 1993 Supp (1) SCC 529.

216. At this juncture, I must also refer to the other maxim *salus republicae suprema lex*, i.e., safety of the State is the supreme law and in case of any conflict, an individual must yield to the collective interest. But, it should not be done at the cost of safety. At all times and at all quarters, sincere efforts are to be made to maintain and sustain the safety of the people. That has been spoken by the ancients when the Kings ruled and the same reigns supreme in a democratic set-up. True it is, there are exceptions, but the exceptions are to remain in the realm of exceptions only and should not be brought into play either at the whim or fancy of the executive. The purpose of saying is that the law has many a mansion and the mosaic of law covers many spectrums so that both the maxims, namely, *solus populi suprema lex* and *salus republicae suprema lex*, can harmoniously coexist. The present case is one where there is need for nuclear energy for the welfare of the public and for other welfare of the people of India and for peaceful purpose. Definitely, the interest of the economy and the interest of safety are to be the real concerns of a Welfare State. In this regard, I may usefully refer to the following observations made by this Court, though in a different context, in *State of Karnataka and others v. Dr. Praveen Bhai Thogadia*⁵:-

“Welfare of the people is the ultimate goal of all laws, and State action and above all the Constitution. They have one common object, that is to promote the well-being and larger interest of the society as a whole and not of any individual or particular groups carrying any brand names. It is inconceivable that there can be social well-being without communal harmony, love for each other and hatred for none. The core of religion based upon spiritual values, which the Vedas, Upanishads and Puranas were said to reveal to mankind seem to be: “Love others, serve others, help ever, hurt never” and “sarvae jana sukhino bhavantoo”.”

217. The concept of welfare State is a facet of Article 38

5. (2004) 4 SCC 684.

A of the Constitution of India. It is the obligation of the State to see that the welfare of the people is appositely promoted. It is the obligation passed by the Constitution of the State to establish a welfare State. The words used in the Preamble of the 1962 Act are “welfare for the people” and “peace”. There is a necessity for generation of electrical energy and regard being had to the hazards, there has to be guidance which the Acts, Rules and Notifications provide. The collective interests should not totally be thrown overboard for the development of the power sector. If the safety measures are adequately not taken and the apprehensions are not removed and the fear is not totally ostracized from the minds of the people of the locality, posterity may not recognize the same as a development or a progressive step. The conscientious and conscious policy decisions by the Government are to be taken with due care and consideration, keeping in mind the welfare of the people at large. True it is, when such policies are framed, especially for establishment of nuclear plants or such big projects, the safety measures become the primary concern and the same have to be adequately addressed to and taken care of. However, the Courts, in exercise of power of judicial review, cannot assume the role of approving authority for laying safety measures, but, a significant one, what the regulatory authorities have stated are to be regarded as the primary and principal concern.

AERB Report:

F 218. In this context, I may refer to the report of the AERB to review the safety of Indian Nuclear Power Plants against External Events of Natural Origin. For the sake of necessity and completeness, it is reproduced below: -

G “SAFETY ASSESSMENT OF KUDANKULAM NUCLEAR POWER PLANT UNITS-1&2 (KK NPP1&2) IN THE WAKE OF FUKUSHIMA ACCIDENT

H Two Units of VVER Pressurized Water Reactors (Model V-412) each of 1000 MW rating are being built at the Kudankulam Site in Tamil Nadu.

activities for Unit # 1 have started with AERB issuing clearance for “Hot-Run” on June 30, 2011. Construction of Unit # 2 is in an advanced stage of completion.

A

The design of KK NPP incorporates a number of engineered safety features (ESFs) for catering to design basis accident (DBAs) and beyond design basis accidents (BDBAs), and several other design safety features.

B

ESFs for catering to DBA.

- a. Emergency Core Cooling System (ECCS)
- b. Secondary circuit protection against over-pressurisation
- c. Emergency Gas Removal System
- d. Fission Products Removal and Control Systems
- e. Emergency Safety Boron Injection System
- f. Quick Boron Injection System (QBIS)

C

D

ESFs for catering to

E

BDBA

- * Passive Heat Removal System (PHRS)
- * Additional System for core passive flooding
- * Annuls passive filtering system (APFS)
- * System for retaining and cooling of molten core

F

Other salient design safety

Features

G

- * 4 x 100% active safety system trains and 4 x 33% passive safety system trains
- * Large water inventory in I and II stage ECCS hydro-accumulators

H

A

- * Automatic Reactor Scram on seismic signal
- * Battery banks with 24 hrs capacity
- * Sea water pumps located at more than 2.2m above design basis flood level (DBFL)
- * Safety related buildings and structures located at least 3.0m above DBFL
- * A shore protection rubble wall

B

Post-Fakushima safety Assessment

C

A Task Force (TF) constituted by NPCIL carried out safety assessment of KKNPP-1&2 in the light of Fakushipa accident and its findings were reviewed by the AERB’s Advisory committee on Project safety review of light water reactors (ACPSR-LWR) and the AERB Committee on safety review of Indian NPPs in the light of Fukushima accident. Salient points emerging from the assessment and its reviews are given below: -

D

- * Back up provisions from alternate sources should be made for

E

- Charging water to secondary side of SGs
- Make-up of borated water to spent fuel pools
- Injection of borated water in the reactor coolant system.

F

- * Sciesmic qualification of emergency water storage facility and augmentation of its storage capacity for core decay heat removal for a period of at least one week.

G

- * Mobile self powered pumping equipment for emergency use

H

- * Facility for monitoring safety parameters using portable power packs

- * Finalization of emergency operating procedures for BDBA conditions A
- * Primary Containment to be assessed for ultimate load bearing capacity.
- * Doors and barrels of airlocks to be qualified for proof test pressure. B
- * Ensuring that highly active water used for cooling the core catcher vessel under BDBA is contained inside the primary containment. C
- * Reconfirmation of design adequacy of hydrogen management system. C
- * Environmental qualification of core catcher temperature monitoring system
- * Adequacy of design provision for remote water addition to core catcher D
- * Adequacy of instrumentation for monitoring plant status during BDBA.
- * Details of margin available on location of various safety related SSCs above DBFL should be reviewed again, E
- * Need for design provision for containment venting, that has been deleted, should be re-examined. F
- * The backup sources for water injection to SG secondary side should be seismically qualified. F
- * Provisions for addition of water to core catcher require a detailed study, to ensure that there is no possibility of any steam explosion. G
- * Provision of additional backup power supply sources for performing essential safety functions, like air cooled DGs located at a high elevation, should be considered. H

A The recommendations are being examined and NPCIL's response would be reviewed in ACPSR-LWR before initial fuel loading in unit-1.

B 219. A status report has been filed by NPCIL. An affidavit has been filed on 3.12.2012 and it is asserted therein that most of the recommendations have already been complied with. It has been dealt with by my respected learned Brother that there is substantial compliance of the same and dates or fixed time frame has been given for compliance of certain recommendations which have not yet been complied. This Court has been apprised of the fact that the AERB and, in turn, the MoEF are in total control of things and scrutiny is made and the same shall be looked into from time to time and all possible measures shall be taken to avoid any kind of accident. As advised, at present, I have noted the categorical assurance of the Statutory Authority.

Nuclear Energy development and doctrine of balance and proportionality vis-à-vis safety:

E 220. It must be stated that the safety of the people residing in Kudankulam and the areas in its vicinity and also the people who are likely to be affected because of radioactive generation has to be respected, for their human dignity is their divinity. This Court has not directed for closure of the plant on the basis of the asseverations made before this Court. But, it is the highest concern of this Court that a devastating disaster should be avoided at all costs by the people who are in-charge of looking after the safety measures. The statutory regulatory authority should responsibly keep the vigil and no one, who has the responsibility, should be complacent. The tragedy that has occurred at Fukushima shall remain as one of the darkest elements of history. The catastrophe of the Bhopal Gas Leak Disaster has not been erased or effaced from the minds of the public. The moan and mourns of the affected people of Bhopal who have been injured or lost their kith and kin are still heard and humane sensitivity would not permit one to ignore it. The nuclear scientists, the administrators

cannot remain oblivious or totally insensitive to the possible hazards when the nuclear plant operates.

221. When one thinks of safety in the context of establishment of a nuclear plant, the inevitable thought that gets into the depth of mind is security. Safety and security, in this context, are inseparably inter-twined commencing the planning, quality of construction, committed efforts to avoid operational jeopardy and monitoring and all are bound to remain in a singular chain. All endeavours are to be made to prevent, monitor and control. The concept of disaster management cannot be allowed to remain on paper. Its procrastination itself rings the bell of peril. The administration has to be alive to the said situation and the awakening to manage the disaster in case of an unfortunate incident has to be founded on scientific and sophisticated methods. Taking care of the situation of the present alone is not the solution. All concerned with the same are required to look to the future because that elevates the real concern. The danger of the future should be seriously taken note of and should not be veiled in the guise of thought for the present. Not for nothing, it has been said that he who prepares for the future and remains prepared for the future has a good control over the present, and if one remains in a state of blindness thinking the future to be uncertain, he suffers the agony of the present and the anguish of the future. This is not only the truth in respect of an individual life but also the paramount truth for the collective of the present generation and the future generations. The present generation has no right to enjoy by eating away the time of the future generation. The protection of the environment and the safety for the present generation in its connotative sense covers the posterity.

222. I have already discussed about the signification of the safety needed in respect of nuclear plants. Generation of nuclear energy is a necessity in a progressive modern State. As has been stated earlier, there is an enactment and notifications governing the field in various aspects. A policy decision has been taken to establish the nuclear plant at

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H

A Kudankulam. Promotion of development and protection of environment are to be harmonized at the same time. In *Intellectuals Forum, Tirupathi v. State of A.P. and others*⁶, it has been held that merely asserting an intention for development will not be enough to sanction the destruction of local ecological resources. What is required to be prescribed is the principle of sustainable development and find a balance between the developmental needs and the environmental degradation.

223. In *Bombay Dying & Mfg. Co. Ltd. (3) v. Bombay Environmental Action Group and others*⁷, while dealing with the concept of sustainable development and planned development vis-à-vis Article 21 of the Constitution, a two-Judge Bench has opined thus: -

D
E
F
G
H
“It is often felt that in the process of encouraging development the environment gets sidelined. However, with major threats to the environment, such as climate change, depletion of natural resources, the eutrophication of water systems and biodiversity and global warming, the need to protect the environment has become a priority. At the same time, it is also necessary to promote development. The harmonisation of the two needs has led to the concept of sustainable development, so much so that it has become the most significant and focal point of environmental legislation and judicial decisions relating to the same. Sustainable development, simply put, is a process in which development can be sustained over generations. Brundtland Report defines “sustainable development” as development that meets the needs of the present generations without compromising the ability of the future generations to meet their own needs. Making the concept of sustainable development operational for public policies raises important challenges that involve complex synergies and trade offs.”

6. (2006) 3 SCC 549.

7. (2006) 3 SCC 434.

224. In *M.C. Mehta v. Union of India and others*⁸, while stating about sustainable development and the needs of the present without compromising the ability of the future generation to meet their own needs, this Court has expressed thus: -

“The definition of “sustainable development” which Brundtland gave more than 3 decades back still holds good. The phrase covers the development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of the future generation to meet their own needs. In *Narmada Bachao Andolan v. Union of India*⁹ this Court observed that sustainable development means the type or extent of development that can take place and which can be sustained by nature/ecology with or without mitigation. In these matters, the required standard now is that the risk of harm to the environment or to human health is to be decided in public interest, according to a “reasonable person's” test. [See Chairman Barton: The Status of the Precautionary Principle in Australia (Vol. 22, 1998, Harv. Env'tt. Law Review, p. 509 at p. 549-A) as referred to in para 28 in *A.P. Pollution Control Board v. Prof. M.V. Nayudu*¹⁰.]”

225. In *Tirupur Dyeing Factory Owners Association v. Noyyal River Ayacutdars Protection Association and others*¹¹, while dealing with the concept of sustainable development, the Court has observed as under: -

“The concept of “sustainable development” has been explained that it covers the development that meets the needs of the person without compromising the ability of the future generation to meet their own needs. It means the development, that can take place and which can be sustained by nature/ecology with or without mitigation.

8. (2004) 12 SCC 118.

9. (2000) 10 SCC 664.

10. (1999) 2 SCC 718.

11. (2009) 9 SCC 737.

Therefore, in such matters, the required standard is that the risk of harm to the environment or to human health is to be decided in public interest, according to a “reasonable person's” test. The development of the industries, irrigation resources and power projects are necessary to improve employment opportunities and generation of revenue, therefore, cannot be ignored. In such eventuality, a balance has to be struck for the reason that if the activity is allowed to go on, there may be irreparable damage to the environment and there may be irreparable damage to the economic interest. A similar view has been reiterated by this Court in *T.N. Godavarman Thirumulpad (104) v. Union of India*¹² and *M.C. Mehta v. Union of India*¹³.”

226. In *T.N. Godavarman Thirumulpad (through K.M. Chinnappa) v. Union of India and others*¹⁴, this Court observed that it cannot be disputed that no development is possible without some adverse effect on the ecology and environment, and the projects of public utility cannot be abandoned and it is necessary to adjust the interest of the people as well as the necessity to maintain the environment. A balance has to be struck between the two interests. Where the commercial venture or enterprise would bring in results which are far more useful for the people, difficulty of a small number of people has to be bypassed. The comparative hardships have to be balanced and the convenience and benefit to a larger section of the people has to get primacy over comparatively lesser hardship.

227. In *Narmada Bachao Andolan v. Union of India and others*¹⁵, a three-Judge Bench, while dealing with the public projects and policies, has opined that the court does not become the approving authority of such policies. Thereafter, the Bench observed thus: -

“Normally such decisions are taken by the Government

12. (2008) 2 SCC 222.

13. (2009) 6 SCC 142.

14. (2002) 10 SCC 606.

15. (2000) 10 SCC 664.

after due care and consideration. In a democracy welfare of the people at large, and not merely of a small section of the society, has to be the concern of a responsible Government.”

228. I have referred to the aforesaid pronouncements only to highlight that this Court has emphasized on striking a balance between the ecology and environment on one hand and the projects of public utility on the other. The trend of authorities is that a delicate balance has to be struck between the ecological impact and development. The other principle that has been ingrained is that if a project is beneficial for the larger public, inconvenience to smaller number of people is to be accepted. It has to be respectfully accepted as a proposition of law that individual interest or, for that matter, smaller public interest must yield to the larger public interest. Inconvenience of some should be bypassed for a larger interest or cause of the society. But, a pregnant one, the present case really does not fall within the four corners of that principle. It is not a case of the land oustees. It is not a case of “some inconvenience”. It is not comparable to the loss caused to property. I have already emphasized upon the concept of living with the borrowed time of the future generation which essentially means not to ignore the inter-generational interests. Needless to emphasize, the dire need of the present society has to be treated with urgency, but, the said urgency cannot be conferred with absolute supremacy over life. Ouster from land or deprivation of some benefit of different nature relatively would come within the compartment of smaller public interest or certain inconveniences. But when it touches the very atom of life, which is the dearest and noblest possession of every person, it becomes the obligation of the constitutional courts to see how the delicate balance has been struck and can remain in a continuum in a sustained position. To elaborate, unless adequate care, caution and monitoring at every stage is taken and there is constant vigil, life of “some” can be in danger. That will be totally shattering of the constitutional guarantee enshrined under Article 21 of the Constitution. It would be guillotining the

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H

A human right, for when the candle of life gets extinguished, all rights of that person perish with it. Safety, security and life would constitute a pyramid within the sanctity of Article 21 and no jettisoning is permissible. Therefore, I am obliged to think that the delicate balance in other spheres may have some allowance but in the case of establishment of a nuclear plant, the safety measures would not tolerate any lapse. The grammar has to be totally different. I may hasten to clarify that I have not discussed anything about the ecology and environment which has been propounded before us, but I may particularly put that the proportionality of risk may not be “zero” regard being had to the nature’s unpredictability. All efforts are to be made to avoid any man-made disaster. Though the concept of delicate balance and the doctrine of proportionality of risk factor gets attracted, yet the same commands the highest degree of constant alertness, for it is disaster affecting the living. The life of some cannot be sacrificed for the purpose of the eventual larger good.

229. Before proceeding to issue certain directions, it is required to be stated that the appellant, by this Public Interest Litigation, has, in a way, invoked and aroused the conscience/ concern of the court to such an issue. True it is, the prayer is for the total closure of the plant and the Court has not acceded to the said prayer but his noble effort is appreciated to put forth the grievance of the local people and the necessity of adequate safety measures as is perceived. When such cause comes up before this Court, it is the bounden duty to remind the authorities “Be alert, remain always alert and duty calls you to nurture constant and sustained vigilance and nation warns you not to be complacent and get into a mild slumber”. The AERB as the regulatory authority and the MoEF are obliged to perform their duty that safety measures are adequately taken before the plant commences its operation. That is the trust of the people in the authorities which they can ill afford to betray, and it shall not be an exaggeration to state that safety in a case of this nature in any one’s hand has to be placed on the pedestal of “Constitutional Trust”.

H

230. We, therefore, fully endorse the view taken by the Division Bench of the High Court, however, in the facts and circumstances of the case, we are inclined to give the following directions:

DIRECTIONS:

1. The plant should not be made operational unless AERB, NPCIL, DAE accord final clearance for commissioning of the plant ensuring the quality of various components and systems because their reliability is of vital importance.
2. MoEF should oversee and monitor whether the NPCIL is complying with the conditions laid down, while granting clearance vide its communication dated 23.9.2008 under the provisions of EIA Notification of 2006, so also the conditions laid down in the environmental clearance granted by the MoEF vide its communication dated 31.12.2009. AERB and MoEF will see that all the conditions stipulated by them are duly complied with before the plant is made operational.
3. Maintaining safety is an ongoing process not only at the design level, but also during the operation for the nuclear plant. Safeguarding NPP, radioactive materials, ensuring physical security of the NSF are of paramount importance. NPCIL, AERB, the regulatory authority, should maintain constant vigil and make periodical inspection of the plant at least once in three months and if any defect is noticed, the same has to be rectified forthwith.
4. NPCIL shall send periodical reports to AERB and the AERB shall take prompt action on those reports, if any fallacy is noticed in the reports.
5. SNF generated needs to be managed in a safe manner to ensure protection of human health and environment from the undue effect of ionizing

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H

- radiation now and future, for which sufficient surveillance and monitoring programme have to be evolved and implemented.
6. AERB should periodically review the design-safety aspects of AFR feasibly at KKNPP so that there will be no adverse impact on the environment due to such storage which may also allay the fears and apprehensions expressed by the people.
7. DGR has to be set up at the earliest so that SNF could be transported from the nuclear plant to DGR. NPCIL says the same would be done within a period of five years. Effective steps should be taken by the Union of India, NPCIL, AERB, AEC, DAE etc. to have a permanent DGR at the earliest so that apprehension voiced by the people of keeping the NSF at the site of Kudankulam NPP could be dispelled.
8. NPCIL should ensure that the radioactive discharges to the environmental aquatic atmosphere and terrestrial route shall not cross the limits prescribed by the Regulatory Body.
9. The Union of India, AERB and NPCIL should take steps at the earliest to comply with rest of the seventeen recommendations, within the time stipulated in the affidavit filed by the NPCIL on 3.12.2012.
10. SNF is not being re-processed at the site, which has to be transported to a Re-Processing facility. Therefore, the management and transportation of SNF be carried out strictly by the Code of Practices laid down by the AERB, following the norms and regulations laid down by IAEA.
11. NPCIL, AERB and State of Tamil Nadu should take adequate steps to implement the National Disaster Management Guidelines, 20

A the periodical emergency exercises on and off site, with the support of the concerned Ministries of the Government of India, Officials of the State Government and local authorities.

12. NPCIL, in association with the District Collector, Tirunelveli should take steps to discharge NPCIL Corporate Social Responsibilities in accordance with DPE Guidelines and there must be effective and proper monitoring and supervision of the various projects undertaken under CSR to the fullest benefit of the people who are residing in and around KKNPP. B C

13. NPCIL and the State of Tamil Nadu, based on the comprehensive emergency preparedness plan should conduct training courses on site and off site administer personnel, including the State Government officials and other stake holders, including police, fire service, medicos, emergency services etc. D

14. Endeavour should be made to withdraw all the criminal cases filed against the agitators so that peace and normalcy be restored at Kudankulam and nearby places and steps should be taken to educate the people of the necessity of the plant which is in the largest interest of the nation particularly the State of Tamil Nadu. E F

15. The AERB, NPCIL, MoEF and TNPCB would oversee each and every aspect of the matter, including the safety of the plant, impact on environment, quality of various components and systems in the plant before commissioning of the plant. A report to that effect be filed before this Court before commissioning of the plant. G

The appeals are accordingly disposed of without any order as to costs.

B.B.B. Appeals disposed of. H

A NI PRA CHANNABASAVA DESHIKENDRA SWAMIGALU
MATADHIPATHIGALU KANNADA MUTT

v.
C.P. KAVEERAMMA & ORS.
(Civil Appeal Nos. 4150-4163 of 2013)

B MAY 06, 2013

**[DR. B.S. CHAUHAN AND FAKKIR MOHAMED
IBRAHIM KALIFULLA, JJ.]**

C *Karnataka Land Reforms Act, 1961 – ss. 41 and 130 – Applicability of – Occupancy rights granted to inamdar after enforcement of Inams Abolition Act – In respect of the land mortgaged – Application under Land Reforms Act, seeking possession of the land and eviction of the mortgagee from unauthorised occupation of the land – Held: Possession of mortgagee, after grant of occupancy rights to the mortgagor/ Inamdar, should be construed as unauthorised – Hence resort to remedy under Land Reforms Act seeking eviction from illegal occupancy, is permissible – Karnataka Abolition of Certain Inams Act, 1977.* D E

The property in question, which belonged to the appellant, was mortgaged to the respondents by the predecessor-in-interest of the appellants in the years 1955 and 1967. After coming into force of Karnataka Certain Inams Abolition Act, 1977, all the Inams stood abolished and occupancy rights were given to the appellant in respect of the entire land on 11.2.1993. Claim of the respondents for occupancy rights based on the rights flowing from the mortgage deeds was rejected. The occupancy rights of appellants attained finality. F G

The appellants thereafter approached Tehsildar seeking possession of the land and eviction of the respondents therefrom u/s. 41 of Land Reforms Act.

Tehsildar directed eviction of the respondents. Consequent thereto appellant was put in possession by the Mahazar drawn by the Revenue Inspector.

Order of Tehsildar was challenged by the respondents by filing writ petitions. Single Judge of the High Court though upheld the jurisdiction of the Tehsildar to entertain the application of the appellants, but set aside the order on the ground that there were serious irregularities in passing the order and remitted the matter to Tehsildar and also directed re-delivery of possession pending final orders. In Writ Appeal, Division Bench of High Court, by its order dated 12.9.2007 held that Tehsildar had no jurisdiction to entertain the application and set aside the order of Tehsildar as well as the Single Judge.

Appeal against the order of Division Bench was allowed by Supreme Court by order dated 13.2.2009. The Court rejected the plea of the respondents as regards jurisdiction of Tehsildar based on s. 43 of Transfer of Property Act, by virtue of the mortgages of the years 1955 and 1967 and also rejected the plea based on s. 10 of 1977 Act. However, it remanded the case to Division Bench of High Court to address the issues other than the issue relating to applicability of s. 43.

Pursuant to remission of the matter, Division Bench of the High Court re-opened the issues, which were already set at rest by Supreme Court in its order dated 13.2.2009, and set aside the order of the Tehsildar. Hence the present appeals.

Allowing the appeals, the Court

HELD: 1. The continued possession of the respondents after the grant of occupancy rights in favour of the appellant in the order dated 11.2.1993, should be

A construed as unauthorized and there was every right in the appellant to invoke the protection of the Land Reforms Act for the purpose of working out its remedy by taking recourse to law for implementing the order dated 11.2.1993. [Para 15] [827-G-H; 828-A]

B 2. This Court by its order dated 13.2.2009 found that by virtue of Section 4(2)(b) of Karnataka Certain Inams Abolition Act, 1977 the submission based on Section 43 of the Transfer of Property Act, by relying upon the mortgages of the year 1955 and 1967, cannot survive.
C Even the submission based on Section 10 of the 1977 Act was rejected. After the remand, it is found that by framing the two issues in the order impugned in the present appeals, the Division Bench proceeded to reopen the very same questions, which were already dealt with in substratum in the earlier judgment of this Court dated 13.2.2009. When once this Court held that Section 43 of the Transfer of Property Act could not come to the aid of the respondents, any right based on the mortgages of the year 1955 and 1967, no longer survived for consideration.
E Since Section 10 of the 1977 Act was also held to be not applicable to the case of the respondents, the only other question which could have been examined in all probabilities was one relating to the manner in which the earlier order came to be passed by the Tehsildar, which was found to be not properly done as held by the Single Judge of the High Court in order dated 01.02.2005 in the Writ Petitions, which disclosed that there were certain serious irregularities or malpractices in the passing of the order by the Tehsildar dated 28.8.2004 and the consequential Mahazar dated 31.8.2004.[Para 14] [826-G-H; 827-A-F]

H 3. The impugned order is not sustainable in view of the order dated 13.2.2009 and the limited scope of consideration directed to be made thereby while remitting the matter back to the Division Bench

every jurisdiction to deal with application of the appellant for working out its remedy based on the grant of occupancy rights in its favour in the proceeding dated 11.2.1993, which has become final and conclusive. Since it was extensively pointed out by the Single Judge in the order dated 1.2.2005, as well as in the present impugned order highlighting the malpractices indulged in by the Tehsildar, while passing the order directing possession in favour of the appellant and while upholding the order of the Single Judge, the order of remand passed by the Single Judge stands restored. However, it is clarified that the only issue which can be examined by the Tehsildar can be with regard to the claim of the appellant for restoring possession based on the grant of occupancy rights in its favour, by the proceeding dated 11.2.1993. It is further made clear that this order of remand to the Tehsildar, shall not entitle the respondents to raise any issue relating to the jurisdiction of the Tehsildar, in particular, based on the mortgages of the year 1955 and 1967. [Para 18] [829-B-F]

Mohammad Swalleh and Ors. vs. Illrd Addl. District Judge, Meerut and Anr. AIR 1988 SC 94: 1988 (1) SCR 840 – referred to.

Case Law Reference:

1988 (1) SCR 840 referred to **Para 16**

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION : Civil Appeal Nos. 4150-4163 of 2013.

From the Judgment & Order dated 15.6.2009 of the High Court of Karnataka at Bangalore in Writ Appeal Nos. 1936-40, 1941-45, 1946-48 and 2202 of 2005.

S.M. Chandrashekhar, Nishanth Patil, Girish G.N., Nizam Pasha, S.K. Sabharwal for the Appellant.

A P. Vishwanatha Shetty, Sharan Devn Sing Thakur, A.S. Ponnanna, Vijaykumar Pardesi, V.N. Raghupathy, Lagnesh Mishra, Dr. Sushil Balwada, Sanjay R. Hegde for the Respondents.

B The Judgment of the Court was delivered by

C **FAKKIR MOHAMED IBRAHIM KALIFULLA, J. 1.** Unsuccessful appellant in the Writ Appeal before the Division Bench of the High Court of Karnataka at Bangalore is the appellant before us. This appeal is directed against the common judgment in W.A. Nos. 1936/2005 (LR) along with W.A. Nos. 1941/2005, 1946/2005 and 2202 of 2005(LR). The appellant is a religious Mutt called 'Kannada Mutt'. Land of 197 acres was granted as Jagir to the Mutt in Survey Nos. 9, 10, 12 and 13 of Bettegeri village, Ammathy Hobli, Virajpet Taluk, Coorg District in the year 1809 by the then Ruler of Kodagu, Sri Veerarajendra Wodeyar. By a mortgage deed dated 1.3.1955, the predecessor of present Mathadhipathi stated to have mortgaged possession of 175.60 acres out of 197 acres of lands in favour of the predecessor-in-title of the present contesting respondents. By yet another mortgage deed dated 5.4.1967, a second mortgage deed in favour of the very same parties in respect of 17 acres of land was stated to have been made. The mortgages were made for a period of 99 years.

F 2. Be that as it may, on 18.5.1978, Karnataka Certain Inams Abolition Act, 1977 (hereinafter called as the "1977 Act") came into force and the effective date was 01.03.1974. By virtue of Section 4(2)(b) of the 1977 Act all Inams that were existing on that date stood abolished with effect from 01.03.1974, namely, the effective date. After the coming into force of the 1977 Act, the Mutt filed an application on 25.6.1987 for grant of occupancy rights in respect of the entire lands. By order dated 11.02.1993, the appellant's application was allowed by the Land Tribunal. The respondents, based on the rights flowing from the mortgage deeds, also claimed occupancy rights on the ground that th

the land in question. Their application was rejected. There was a challenge at the instance of the respondents to the grant of occupancy rights in favour of the appellant, as well as, the rejection of their rights in W.P.No.6379/1993. The Writ petition was allowed by the learned Single Judge and the grant of occupancy rights in favour of the appellant was set aside. The appellant filed Writ Appeal No. 5689/1997 and the respondent also challenged the very same order by filing Writ Appeal No. 5816/1997.

3. The appeal filed by the appellant was allowed and the order of the Learned Single Judge was set aside and the order of the learned Tribunal granting occupancy rights in favour of the appellant was restored. The respondents' Writ Appeal was dismissed. It is relevant to note that the said order of the Division Bench was not challenged further by the respondents and, thereby, grant of occupancy rights in favour of the appellant was confirmed. Subsequently, Form No.2 - Certificate was also issued in favour of the appellant on 15.4.2000 representing the Mutt.

4. By virtue of Section 3(2) of the 1977 Act, the words and expressions used, but not defined in the 1977 Act, shall have the meaning assigned to them under the Act or the Karnataka Land Reforms Act, 1961. Under Section 11, the procedure for registration as an occupant has been set out, which states that every person entitled to be registered as an occupant under the 1977 Act, should make an application to the Tribunal constituted under the Karnataka Land Reforms Act, 1961 on or before 31st day of March, 1991 and that the said application should be disposed of by the Tribunal as if it is an application made under that Act. Under Section 41(2) of the Karnataka Land Reforms Act, 1961, the procedure has been prescribed as to how a landlord should obtain the possession of any land, dwelling house or site held by a tenant, except under the order of the Tehsildar by making application under the prescribed format. Under Section 126 of the 1961 Act, it is specified that

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H

A for the removal of doubts, it was declared that provisions of the 1961 Act, insofar as they confer any rights or impose obligations on tenants and landlords, shall be applicable to tenants holding lands in the Inam and other alienated villages or lands including tenants referred to in Section 8 of the Village offices' Abolition Act, 1961, subject to the provisions of the 1977 Act and to landlords and Inamdar holding in such villages or lands. Section 130 of the 1961 Act empowers the Tehsildar concerned to summarily evict any person unauthorizedly occupying or wrongfully in possession of any land and also to make such orders as regards to the disposal of such land, as it deems fit. Section 132 of the 1961 Act bars the jurisdiction of other Courts to settle, decide or deal with any question, which is by or under the 1961 Act required to be settled, decided or dealt with by the authorities concerned.

D 5. The appellant approached the Tehsildar of Virajpet Taluk alleging that the respondents were in unauthorised possession and having regard to the coming into force of 1977 Act w.e.f. 1.3.1974 and the order of the Land Tribunal dated 11.2.1993, they are liable to be evicted and the possession to be handed over to the appellant. By order dated 28.8.2004, the Tehsildar allowed the appellant's application and directed eviction of the respondents. Based on the said order, the appellant was put in possession by the Mahazar, drawn by Revenue Inspector of Ammathy Hobli on 31.8.2004. The handing over of the possession of the lands in question was effected in the presence of the Tehsildar Virajpet Taluk, Hosur circle and the Panchayatdars.

G 6. The respondents challenged the said order of the Tehsildar in Writ Petition No.36175/2004 & 36529-32/2004. The Single Judge among other issues, considered the question about the jurisdiction of the Tehsildar and held that the Tribunal under the Land Revenue Act had jurisdiction over the lands in question and that the Tehsildar was entitled to consider the application of the appellant filed in For

H

A Learned Judge found that there were serious irregularities in the matter of passing of the order by the Tehsildar and consequently, while setting aside the order of the Tehsildar, directed re-delivery of possession to the respondents pending final orders and further directed the Tehsildar to consider the case afresh on merits and take an independent decision in accordance with law after hearing the parties and pass orders within four months from the date of the order of the Learned Judge, which was dated 1.2.2005.

C 7. The appellant preferred appeals against the said order in Writ Appeal Nos.1946-48/2005, which were considered by the Division Bench along with Writ Appeal Nos.1936-40/2005 and 1941-45/2005. The Division Bench passed orders on 12.9.2007 holding that the provisions of the Land Reforms Act were not applicable to the case on hand and, therefore, exercise of jurisdiction by the Tehsildar under the provisions of Land Reforms Act, was bad in law and without jurisdiction. The order of the Tehsildar was set aside and consequently the order of the Learned Single Judge was also set aside. The appellant preferred Civil Appeal Nos.1040-53/2009 against the said common order of the Division Bench dated 12.9.2007. The Civil Appeals were allowed by this Court by order dated 13.2.2009.

F 8. In the said Civil Appeals, contentions were raised on behalf of the respondents by relying upon Section 43 of the Transfer of Property Act, apart from contending that the respondents were entitled to rely upon the mortgage executed in their favour in the year 1955 and 1967. It was also contended that by virtue of Section 10 of 1977 Act, the respondents were entitled to rely upon the mortgage granted in their favour by the appellant Mutt. While allowing the Civil Appeals and setting aside the order of the Division Bench, this Court considered all the above submissions raised on behalf of the respondents and rejected them. It was lastly pleaded before this Court that apart from Section 43 of the Transfer of Property Act and Section 4(2)(b) of the 1977 Act, there were other submissions

A made by the respondents, which were not considered by the High Court. Taking note of the above submissions made on behalf of the respondents, even while allowing the Civil Appeals and without expressing any opinion about the acceptability of any such stand, the judgment of the Division Bench was set aside and the matter was remitted back to the High Court for fresh consideration making it clear that the issue relating to the applicability of Section 43 stood closed by virtue of the judgment.

C 9. It is in the abovesaid background, the present impugned order of the Division Bench dated 15.6.2009, has been passed wherein, the Division Bench proceeded to examine the following two issues, namely:

- D “1. Whether an Inamdar who has been granted occupancy rights under the Inam Abolition Act can invoke Section 41 to recover possession from a person who is not a tenant of the land in question?
E 2. Whether the order passed by the Tahsildar is sustainable on merits?”

F 10. While dealing with the above issues, the Division Bench proceeded to hold that Section 41 of the Karnataka Land Reforms Act, which prescribed the procedure for taking possession, was not applicable, inasmuch as, the jural relationship of landlord and tenant between the appellant and respondents did not exist. While dealing with Section 126 of the Land Reforms Act, the Division Bench took the view that the said provision can have no application to a case where rights of a mortgagee in possession were prevailing. In the light of the above conclusion, the Division Bench held that Section 130 of the Land Reforms Act for summary eviction of any person in unauthorised occupation, cannot also be invoked. Ultimately, on Point No.2, the Division Bench taking note of the serious irregularities committed by the Tehsildar in passing the order took the view that such order can

Tehsildar by manipulating proceedings and, therefore, set aside the order of the Tehsildar and also held that no remand was called for. The appeals filed by the appellant were dismissed and the appeal filed by the respondent was allowed. The application of the appellant filed in Form No.5 under the Land Reforms Act, was rejected as not maintainable. The Division Bench also imposed costs to be paid by the Tehsildar in the sum of Rs. 10,000/- to the respondents.

11. We heard Mr. S.M. Chandrashekhar, learned senior counsel for the appellant and Mr. P. Vishwanatha Shetty, learned senior counsel for the respondents. We also perused the earlier orders passed by this Court by which the matter was remitted back to the Division Bench to consider some of the submissions other than what were earlier made and covered by the orders of this Court.

12. The main grievance of the appellant was that after securing occupancy rights under the provisions of the 1977 Act, since by virtue of Section 4(2)(b), all encumbrances created prior to coming into force of the Act having been extinguished statutorily, and the lands having been vested with the State, free from all encumbrances before the grant of occupancy rights in favour of the appellant, no further right could have existed in favour of the respondents, in order to make a claim based on the mortgages of the year 1955 and 1967. Apart from the said claim in all other respects, there was no right in the respondents since their claim for occupancy right was rejected as early as on 11.2.1993, when the said rights of the appellant came to be crystallized by the said date under the provisions of the 1977 Act. Though the said order was challenged by the respondents, the challenge was not accepted and thereby, the issue became concluded once and for all. Thereafter, the only other question to be considered was as to how the said crystallized rights of the appellant under the provisions of the 1977 Act, is to be worked out for restoring its possession in the lands in question. Though the appellant stated to have invoked Section 41 of the

A Land Reforms Act to work out its remedy for getting possession, when it came to the question of ascertaining the jurisdiction of the Tehsildar to examine the claim of the appellant for restoring possession, the respondents once again projected their claim based on the mortgages of the year 1955 and 1967 and further stated that the respondents were neither a tenant, nor can they be held to be in unauthorised possession, in order to invoke Section 130 of the Land Reforms Act.

13. In the earlier round of litigation, these very issues were examined by both the Learned Single Judge as well as by the Division Bench of the High Court. As noted by us earlier, the learned single Judge rejected the stand of the respondents about the lack of jurisdiction of the Tehsildar but nonetheless, set aside the order of the Tehsildar on the sole ground that there was serious malpractice in the passing of the ultimate order, directing handing over of the possession. The learned Judge, therefore, set aside that part of the order and remitted the matter back for passing fresh orders. However, the Division Bench proceeded to hold that the Tehsildar lacked jurisdiction since the rights of the respondents as mortgagee, prescribed a different status for the respondents and consequently the invocation of Section 41 or Section 130 of the Land Reforms Act, could not have been invoked. It was at that stage, the issue came to be considered by this Court in Civil Appeal Nos.1040-1053/2009 in the order dated 13.2.2009.

14. The substantial issues dealt with by the Division Bench in its earlier order dated 12.9.2007, which examined the question of jurisdiction of the Tehsildar, while considering the claim of the respondents based on Section 43 of the Transfer of Property Act; based on concept 'feeding the grant by estoppel', accepted the stand of the respondents. At that juncture, this Court found that by virtue of Section 4(2)(b) of the 1977 Act, the said submission based on Section 43 of the Transfer of Property Act, by relying upon the mortgages of the year 1955 and 1967, cannot survive.

based on Section 10 of the 1977 Act was also rejected. Though what exactly were the other submissions which were not considered by the Division Bench were not specifically noted, in our considered view, there could not have been any submission relating to the jurisdiction of the Tehsildar' for working out or implementing the grant of occupancy rights granted in favour of the appellant, by order dated 11.2.1993. In that context, the power of the Tehsildar to invoke Section 130 of the Land Reforms Act for granting the relief cannot be held to be not sustainable. Unfortunately, after the remand, we find that by framing the two issues in the order impugned in these appeals, which have been extracted in the earlier part of our order, the Division Bench proceeded to reopen the very same questions, which were already dealt with in substratum in the earlier judgment of this Court dated 13.2.2009. When once this Court held that Section 43 of the Transfer of Property Act could not come to the aid of the respondents, any right based on the mortgages of the year 1955 and 1967 no longer survived for consideration. Since Section 10 of the 1977 Act was also held to be not applicable to the case of the respondents, the only other question which could have been examined in all probabilities was one relating to the manner in which the earlier order came to be passed by the Tehsildar, which was found to be not properly done as held by the Learned Single Judge in order dated 01.02.2005 in the Writ Petitions, which disclosed that there were certain serious irregularities or malpractices in the passing of the order by the Tehsildar dated 28.8.2004 and the consequential Mahazar dated 31.8.2004. In fact, the Learned Single Judge rightly set aside the above orders of the Tehsildar on that ground and remitted the matter back to the Tehsildar for passing fresh orders in accordance with law.

15. We are convinced that in the light of our above conclusions, it will have to be held that the continued possession of the respondents after the grant of occupancy rights in favour of the appellant in the order dated 11.2.1993, should be construed as unauthorized and there was every right

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H

A in the appellant to invoke the protection of the Land Reforms Act for the purpose of working out its remedy by taking recourse to law for implementing the order dated 11.2.1993.

B 16. In this context, it will be worthwhile to refer to the decision of this Court reported in *Mohammad Swalleh & Ors. V. Illrd Addl. District Judge, Meerut & Anr.* -AIR 1988 SC 94. In paragraph 7 while dealing with a converse case, this court held as under:

C “7. It was contended before the High Court that no appeal lay from the decision of the Prescribed Authority to the District Judge. The High Court accepted this contention. The High Court finally held that though the appeal laid before the District Judge, the order of the Prescribed Authority was invalid and was rightly set aside by the District Judge. On that ground the High Court declined to interfere with the order of the learned District Judge. It is true that there has been some technical breach because if there is no appeal maintainable before the learned District Judge, in the appeal before the learned District Judge, the same could not be set aside. But the High Court was exercising its jurisdiction under Art.226 of the Constitution. The High Court had come to the conclusion that the order of the Prescribed Authority was invalid and improper. The High Court itself could have set it aside. Therefore, in the facts and circumstances of the case justice has been done though, as mentioned hereinbefore, technically the appellant had a point that the order of the District Judge was illegal and improper. If we reiterate the order of the High Court as it is setting aside the order of the Prescribed Authority in exercise of the jurisdiction under Art.226 of the Constitution then no exception can be taken. As mentioned hereinbefore, justice has been done and as the improper order of the Prescribed Authority has been set aside, no objection can be taken.”

H

17. Applying the above said principle, we are also convinced that the appellant by invoking the extraordinary jurisdiction of the High Court under Article 226 can seek for passing a justiciable order.

18. Having regard to our above conclusion based on the earlier order dated 13.2.2009 and the limited scope of consideration directed to be made, while remitting the matter back to the Division Bench, the present order of the Division Bench cannot be sustained. We also hold that the Tehsildar, had every jurisdiction to deal with application of the appellant for working out its remedy based on the grant of occupancy rights in its favour in the proceeding dated 11.2.1993, which has become final and conclusive. Since it was extensively pointed out by the learned Single Judge in the order dated 1.2.2005, as well as in the present impugned order highlighting the malpractices indulged in by the Tehsildar, while passing the order directing possession in favour of the appellant and while upholding the order of the learned Single Judge referred to above, the order of remand passed by the learned Single Judge stands restored. We, however, make it clear that the only issue which can be examined by the Tehsildar can be with regard to the claim of the appellant for restoring possession based on the grant of occupancy rights in its favour, by the proceeding dated 11.2.1993. It is further made clear that this order of remand to the Tehsildar, shall not entitle the respondents to raise any issue relating to the jurisdiction of the Tehsildar, in particular, based on the mortgages of the year 1955 and 1967.

19. The appeals stand allowed with the above directions. In light of the fact that the issue is pending for nearly two decades, we direct the Tehsildar to hear the parties and after giving due opportunity to put forth their submissions, pass final orders in accordance with law expeditiously, preferably within three months from the date of receipt of copy of this order.

K.K.T. Appeals allowed.

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H

CENTRAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
v.
V. VIJAY SAI REDDY
(Criminal Appeal No. 729 of 2013)

MAY 9, 2013

[P. SATHASIVAM AND M.Y. EQBAL, JJ.]

Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 – s. 437 – Bail – Charge-sheets against the accused – Bail application – Granted by courts below – Held: Bail was granted, taking into account irrelevant materials and keeping out relevant materials – In the facts of the case, bail liable to be cancelled – Accused free to renew his prayer for bail after investigation relating to remaining charge-sheets are complete and appropriate report is filed before the Court.

Bail – Grant of – Considerations – Discussed.

Bail – Cancellation of – Held: Power to cancel bail should always be exercised very sparingly by the court of law.

CBI, pursuant to the order of the High Court, registered case against 74 persons including respondent-accused u/s. 120-B r/w. ss. 409, 420 and 477-A IPC and s. 13(2) r/w. s. 13(1)(c) and (d) of Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988. After the investigation, few charge-sheets were filed by CBI against the accused persons including the respondent-accused. In the meantime Special Court granted bail to respondent-accused and the same was confirmed by High Court. Hence the present appeal by CBI, seeking cancellation of bail granted to the respondent-accused.

Allowing the appeal, the Court

HELD: 1. While granting bail, the court has to keep

A in mind the nature of accusations, the nature of evidence
in support thereof, the severity of the punishment which
conviction will entail, the character of the accused,
circumstances which are peculiar to the accused,
reasonable possibility of securing the presence of the
accused at the trial, reasonable apprehension of the
witnesses being tampered with, the larger interests of the
public/State and other similar considerations. It has also
to be kept in mind that for the purpose of granting bail,
the Legislature has used the words "reasonable grounds
for believing" instead of "the evidence" which means the
Court dealing with the grant of bail can only satisfy it as
to whether there is a genuine case against the accused
and that the prosecution will be able to produce prima
facie evidence in support of the charge. It is not expected,
at this stage, to have the evidence establishing the guilt
of the accused beyond reasonable doubt. [Para 28] [847-
A-D]

2. The Special Court took irrelevant materials for
consideration for grant of bail and the High Court having
arrived at definite conclusion that several findings of
Special court are unacceptable or irrelevant but ultimately
affirmed the very same order of the special Judge
granting bail, taking into account the irrelevant materials
and keeping out the relevant materials, which had to be
considered for the grant of bail. [Para 27 and 29] [846-G-
H; 847-D-E]

3. If irrelevant materials have been taken into account
or relevant materials have been kept out of consideration,
the order granting bail to the accused cannot be
sustained. In the same way, if there is specific allegation
by the prosecution that the accused in question was a
party to the criminal conspiracy, neither the Special Court
nor the High Court is justified in granting bail to the said
person. [Para 9] [838-C-D]

A *State of U.P. through CBI vs. Amarmani Tripathi (2005)*
8 SCC 21: 2005 (3) Suppl. SCR 454; *Dinesh M.N. (S.P.) vs.*
State of Gujarat (2008) 5 SCC 66: 2008 (6) SCR 1134;
Narendra K. Amin (Dr.) vs. State of Gujarat and Anr. (2008)
13 SCC 584: 2008 (6) SCR 1149; *State of Maharashtra and*
B *Ors. vs. Dhanendra Shriram Bhurle and Ors. (2009) 11 SCC*
541: 2009 (3) SCR 143; *Central Bureau of Investigation,*
Hyderabad vs. Subramani Gopalakrishnan and Anr. (2011)
5 SCC 296: 2011 (5) SCR 824 – relied on.

C 4. Cancellation of bail necessarily involves the review
of a decision already made, it should always be exercised
very sparingly by the court of law. In the light of the facts
of the case, the special Judge committed an error in
granting bail and the same was erroneously affirmed by
the High Court. Five charge sheets have been filed so far
and three more charge sheets are in the final stages and
are yet to be filed. In order to complete the investigation
in respect of three more charge sheets, the presence of
respondent (A-2) is required and cannot be ignored by
treating him as Chartered Accountant only. [Paras 16, 17,
D 30 and 31] [842-B-D; 847-E-F]

F 5. The respondent would be free to renew his prayer
for bail before the trial Court after the investigation
relating to the remaining three charge sheets are
complete and appropriate report before the trial court is
filed and if any such petition is filed, the trial Court is free
to consider the prayer for bail independently on its own
merits. [Para 32] [847-G-H; 848-A]

Case Law Reference:

G 2005 (3) Suppl. SCR 454 relied on Para 9
2008 (6) SCR 1134 relied on Para 9
2008 (6) SCR 1149 relied on Para 9
H 2009 (3) SCR 143 relied on

2011 (5) SCR 824 relied on Para 9 A

CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION : Criminal
Appeal No. 729 of 2013.

From the Judgment & Order dated 13.06.2012 of the High
Court of A.P. at Hyderabad in CRLP No. 4387 of 2012. B

Ashok Bhan, Mukul Gupta, S. Nanda Kumar, D.L.
Chhidanand, Anjali Chauhan, Arvind Kumar Sharma for the
Appellant.

Raju Ramachandran, Sushil Kumar, Gopal C
Sankaranarayanan, Niranjana Reddy, Subash Pothireddy,
Madhur Panjwani, Senthil Jagadeesan for the Respondent.

The Judgment of the Court was delivered by

P. SATHASIVAM, J. 1. Leave granted. D

2. This appeal is directed against the final judgment and
order dated 13.06.2012 passed by the High Court of
Judicature of Andhra Pradesh at Hyderabad in Criminal Petition
No. 4387 of 2012, whereby the High Court dismissed the
petition filed by the Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI)-the
appellant herein seeking cancellation of bail granted to the
respondent herein. E

Brief facts:

3. On the orders of the High Court of Andhra Pradesh in
Writ Petition Nos. 794, 6604 and 6979 of 2011 dated
10.08.2011, the CBI, Hyderabad, on 17.08.2011, registered a
case being R.C. No. 19(A)/2011-CBI-Hyderabad dated
17.05.2011 under Sections 120-B read with Sections 409, 420
and 477-A of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (in short 'IPC') and
Section 13(2) read with Section 13(1)(c) and (d) of the
Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 (in short "the PC Act")
against Y.S. Jaganmohan Reddy (A-1), Member of Parliament
and 73 others. G
H

A (b) V. Vijay Sai Reddy-the respondent herein was named
as an accused at Sl. No. 2 in the FIR dated 17.08.2011 (after
the chargesheet was framed, he was arrayed as A-2 and
hereinafter, he will be referred to as A-2). The respondent herein
was the founder Director of M/s Jagathi Publications and was
B the Financial Advisor for the group of companies of Y.S. Jagan
Mohan Reddy (A-1).

C (c) He was arrested on 02.01.2012 and was in police
custody from 04.01.2012 to 09.01.2012 and again from
11.01.2012 to 17.01.2012. On 27.01.2012, he filed an
application for grant of regular bail under Section 437 of the
Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (in short 'the Code') before
the Court of the Special Judge for CBI Cases at Hyderabad.
The Special Judge, by order dated 21.03.2012, dismissed his
application for bail. D

D (d) During investigation, it was revealed that M/s Jagathi
Publications Pvt. Ltd. was originally incorporated as a private
limited company on 14.11.2006 and later converted into a
public limited company on 12.01.2009. At the relevant time, the
E respondent herein was the founder Director of the Company
and Y.S. Jagan Mohan Reddy (A-1) was designated as the
Authorised Signatory to operate the Bank accounts of the
Company. He was appointed as a Director and Chairman with
effect from 21.06.2007. It is alleged that A-1 floated M/s Jagathi
F Publications Pvt. Ltd. with an objective of conducting media
business with the ill-gotten wealth. Most of the shareholders
were alleged to be the benamis of Y.S. Jagan Mohan Reddy
(A-1). Further, as a quid pro quo to these investments, the
benefits were received by various investors including the
G companies/individuals from the decisions of the State
Government in allotment of lands for Special Economic Zones
(SEZs), contracts for irrigation projects, special relaxations/
permissions for real estate ventures, mines etc. It is further
revealed that Y.S. Jaganmohan Reddy (A-1) laundered the bribe
money by routing it through various indi H

and getting investments made by them in his companies at a high premium. A

(e) After investigation, on 31.03.2012, the CBI filed first charge sheet against A-1 to A-13 including the respondent herein under Section 120-B read with Sections 409, 420 and 477-A of the IPC and Sections 13(2) read with Section 13(1)(c) and (d) of the PC Act in the Court of Special Judge for CBI Cases, Hyderabad. On 02.04.2012, A-2 filed another application for grant of bail before the Special Judge. By order dated 13.04.2012, the Special Judge granted bail to A-2. B

(f) Being aggrieved by the order dated 13.04.2012, the CBI filed Criminal Petition No. 3712 of 2012 before the High Court. The High Court, by order dated 20.04.2012, set aside the order dated 13.04.2012 and remanded the matter to the Court of Special Judge to consider the case of A-2 afresh. In the meantime, the Principal Special Judge for CBI Cases, Hyderabad took cognizance of the charge sheet dated 31.03.2012 against A-1 to A-13 which was numbered as CC No. 8 of 2012. On 30.04.2012, after hearing both the sides afresh in Criminal Misc. Petition No. 715 of 2012 for grant of bail, the very same Special Judge, who passed the earlier order dated 13.04.2012, granted bail to A-2. C

(g) Aggrieved by the order dated 30.04.2012, the CBI filed Criminal Petition No. 4387 of 2012 before the High Court for cancellation of bail granted to A-2. In the meantime, the CBI filed third chargesheet with respect to the investment made by M/s Ramky Group of Companies. On 29.05.2012 and 30.05.2012, the Principal Special Judge for CBI Cases took cognizance of second and third chargesheet(s) which were numbered as CC Nos. 9 and 10 of 2012 respectively. D

(h) The High Court, by order dated 13.06.2012, dismissed the petition filed by the CBI. E

(i) Being aggrieved by the order of the High Court, the CBI- F

A the appellant herein has preferred this appeal by way of special leave.

B 4. Heard Mr. Ashok Bhan, learned senior counsel for the appellant herein and Mr. Raju Ramachandran, learned senior counsel for the respondent herein.

B 5. It is useful to refer the order dated 10.08.2011 passed by the High Court ordering for CBI investigation wherein, in para 51, it is stated thus:

C “51. Prima facie, it emerges from the record forming part of the writ petitions including pleadings of the parties that from May, 2004 onwards, respondent No. 52 floated number of companies wherein quid pro quo investments have been made out of the benefits received by the investors/beneficiaries from the decisions of the State Government in various forms like SEZs, irrigation contracts, relaxation/permission for real estate ventures, mines etc. besides payment of huge premium amounts paid in the shares and invested in the companies by such beneficiaries and the money so paid is nothing but corrupt money attracting Section 3 of the Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002. The investigation by the Income Tax authorities with respect to assessment orders of M/s Jagathi Publications for the year 2008-09 shows huge unexplained cash credit. Similarly, huge escalated face value of shares to the extent of 35 times also was not accepted by the Income Tax authorities and respondent No. 52 is directly or indirectly connected with some of the companies which are showing phenomenal growth and these facts make it necessary to ascertain the role of individuals/firms/public servants in the group companies of respondent No. 52.” D

F 6. Based on the above directions, the CBI filed a charge sheet on 17.08.2011, initiated investigation and filed several charge-sheets and, according to learned G

A CBI, three more charge-sheets are yet to be filed. It is highlighted by learned senior counsel for the CBI that the present appellant (A-2) participated in the conspiracy and according to him, he is a key conspirator. He also highlighted that by threatening many businessmen, he made them close associates of Y.S. Jagan Mohan Reddy (A-1). He also highlighted that the present appellant intimidated many persons for investments in the concerns belonging to A-1. Finally, he submitted that by branding him as Y.S. Jagan Mohan Reddy's (A-1) man, he collected huge money by way of getting shares in the companies flouted by A-1. In addition to the same, Mr. Ashok Bhan submitted that out of eight charge-sheets, three charge-sheets are yet to be filed for which the CBI requires interrogation and collection of materials through him for which his bail has to be cancelled. By taking us through the reasoning of the Special Court for grant of bail and the affirmation order of the High Court, learned senior counsel for the CBI submitted that both the courts took note of irrelevant considerations, hence, both the orders are liable to be set aside.

7. As against the above contentions, Mr. Raju Ramachandran, learned senior counsel for the respondent, after taking us through the averments in the FIR, allegations in the charge-sheet(s) filed so far submitted that there is no material to show that the appellant has gained anything financially in the alleged transactions. He also pointed out that no investments were made in Jagathi Publications during the period when he was the Director. He further submitted that the State Government itself had passed various Government Orders to protect the Ministers and Secretaries who alleged to have been involved on the ground that everything was done in the course of normal business of the Government. When such is the position, according to him, the appellant being a Chartered Accountant, without any financial gain, the Special Judge was justified in granting him the bail. He also pointed out that even when the appellant was out, five charge-sheets have been filed and there is no impediment in finalizing the remaining three

A charge-sheets and he is willing to cooperate with the Agency by fulfilling all the conditions imposed by the Special Court and the High Court.

B 8. We have considered the rival contentions and perused all the relevant materials relied on by both the sides.

C 9. Let us consider the contentions put-forth by learned senior counsel for the CBI. It is settled by a series of decisions that if irrelevant materials have been taken into account or relevant materials have been kept out of consideration, the order granting bail to the accused cannot be sustained. In the same way, if there is specific allegation by the prosecution that the accused in question was a party to the criminal conspiracy, neither the Special Court nor the High Court is justified in granting bail to the said person. These principles have been reiterated vide *State of U.P. through CBI vs. Amarmani Tripathi*, (2005) 8 SCC 21, para 31, *Dinesh M.N. (S.P.) vs. State of Gujarat*, (2008) 5 SCC 66, para 27, *Narendra K. Amin (Dr.) vs. State of Gujarat and Another*, (2008) 13 SCC 584 para 27, *State of Maharashtra and Others vs. Dhanendra Shriram Bhurle and Others*, (2009) 11 SCC 541, para 8, *Central Bureau of Investigation, Hyderabad vs. Subramani Gopalakrishnan and Another*, (2011) 5 SCC 296, para 25.

F 10. Keeping those principles in mind, let us consider the role played by the present respondent – V. Vijay Sai Reddy (A-2) as projected by the CBI. In the first charge-sheet, it is alleged as under:

G (i) V. Vijay Sai Reddy (A-2) was the founder Director of M/s Jagathi Publications Pvt. Ltd. (A-12) and is the Financial Advisor for Group Companies of Y.S. Jagan Mohan Reddy (A-1).

H (ii) V. Vijay Sai Reddy (A-2) in conspiracy with Y.S. Jagan Mohan Reddy (A-1) to fix the premium of M/s Jagathi Publications Pvt.

- provided false and exaggerated information to M/s Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu India Pvt. Ltd. and M/s Jagadisan & Co. and got evaluated M/s Jagathi Publications Pvt. Ltd.. In furtherance of the said conspiracy, V. Vijay Sai Reddy (A-2) unilaterally fixed the premium of M/s Jagathi Publications at Rs. 350/- per share for the sole purpose of soliciting huge amounts as investments.
- (iii) V. Vijay Sai Reddy (A-2) and Y.S. Jagan Mohan Reddy (A-1) were fully aware of their factual financial position before starting the media company which takes 5 to 6 years for break even to claim profits. In spite of this fact, V. Vijay Sai Reddy (A-2) prevailed over M/s Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu India Pvt. Ltd. by providing false inputs to exaggeratedly evaluate the fiscal status of M/s Jagathi Publications Pvt. Ltd. and also to ante-date the valuation report to suit the stealthy requirements of the company. Thus, Vijaya Sai Reddy (A-2) was instrumental in soliciting the premium @ Rs. 350/- of M/s Jagathi Publications Pvt. Ltd. without any basis.
- (iv) V. Vijay Sai Reddy (A-2) in furtherance of the criminal conspiracy, played a vital role in soliciting investments in the form of bribes as a quid pro quo from the individuals related to the MD of M/s Aurobindo Pharma Ltd. and the companies M/s Hetero Group Companies (A-4) and M/s Trident Life Sciences Ltd. (A-5).
- (v) By the above mentioned overt acts V. Vijay Sai Reddy (A-2) in furtherance of criminal conspiracy with remaining accused, has committed the offences under Section 120-B read with Sections 409, 420 and 468 IPC and thereby facilitated Y.S. Jagan Mohan Reddy (A-1) to reap undue benefit in

A the form of investments in his company from the beneficiaries mentioned above as a quid pro quo.

B 11. It is brought to our notice that M/s Jagathi Publications Private Limited was incorporated on 14.11.2006 as a Private Limited Company and was converted into a Public Limited Company on 12.01.2009. M/s Jagathi Publications Private Limited represented by its the then Directors, Y.S. Jagan Mohan Reddy (A-1) and V. Vijay Sai Reddy (A-2) solicited investments from the general public although it was a private limited company in violation of the provisions of the Companies Act, 1956. It is contended by the CBI that the main intention of M/s Jagathi Publications Private Limited represented by the then Diectors A-1 and A-2 was to woo innocent investors to buy shares at high premiums by concealing the material facts. They cited several instances in the charge sheet.

D 12. In the second charge-sheet dated 23.04.2012, Y.S. Jagan Mohan Reddy (A-1), V. Vijay Sai Reddy (A-2) and M/s Jagathi Publications Private Limited are the main accused for the offences under Section 120-B read with Sections 420, 468 and 471 IPC and Section 9 of the PC Act. The third charge sheet was filed on 07.05.2012 regarding the investigation conducted in connection with the investments made by M/s Ramky Pharma City (I) Ltd. in M/s Jagathi Publications Private Limited. According to the CBI, investigation revealed that Y.S. Jagan Mohan Reddy (A-1) in conspiracy with V. Vijay Sai Reddy (A-2) ensured causing of wrongful gain to M/s RPCIL represented by Ayodhya Rami Reddy (A-4) in the matter of reducing the green belt area from 250 mtrs. to 50 mtrs. by prevailing upon his father late Dr. Y.S. Rajasekhara Reddy, the then Chief Minister to take a decision to that effect during the meeting held on 23.11.2005. Based on the said decision, G. Venkat Ram Reddy (A-5), the then Vice Chairman, VUDA accorded approval to the layout plan of M/s RPCIL (A-6) with reduced green belt area confining it to 50 mtrs. in contravention to the decision dated 20.06.2005 and t

30.06.2006 notifying the VUDA Master Plan 2021. In this way, A-6 obtained wrongful gain of 914 acres of land inside the Pharma City and by selling the land after dividing it into plots, A-6 obtained a wrongful gain of Rs. 133.74 crores. It is further pointed out that as a Financial Advisor and Founder Director of M/s Jagathi Publications Private Limited, the respondent herein played a very active role and as such he cannot be absolved himself from the conspiratorial role played by him in the affairs of M/s Jagathi Publications Private Limited and is liable for all the irregularities.

13. It is pointed out by the CBI that investigation is under progress regarding the transactions relating to Sandur Power Company which involved many foreign transactions and the present respondent V.Vijay Sai Reddy (A-2) was the main person who dealt with all the foreign transactions for which evidence is available. It is also highlighted that V.Vijay Sai Reddy (A-2) has played a main role in pumping crores of money to M/s Jagathi Publications Private Limited through several companies like Artillegence Bio-Innovations Ltd., Bay Inland Finance Pvt. Ltd., Bhaskar Fund Management Pvt. Ltd., and other individuals based in Kolkata and Mumbai. Likewise, VANPIC's grant of mining lease and permits to several group of companies, the investigation is under progress and custodial interrogation from the appellatant is required.

14. Mr. Ashok Bhan, learned senior counsel has pointed out that the Special Judge erroneously observed that the investigation has reached to a conclusion and based on such a wrong assumption enlarged him on bail.

15. According to the CBI, the investigation is still in progress in other separate and distinct offences. He also pointed out that the said conclusion is totally contrary to the record. By pointing out various facts and figures, he asserted that A-2 is an active member of the criminal conspiracy and releasing him at the stage of investigation would result in miscarriage of justice as the role played by him in the

A conspiracy is serious and grave in nature. The main grievance of the CBI is that when there was sufficient evidence on record and investigation is yet to be completed in many matters, grant of bail would defeat the proper investigation in the case.

16. Though we are not expressing any definite opinion about those allegations and it is for the trial Court to find out the acceptability or otherwise in the full fledged trial, we are of the view that in order to complete the investigation in respect of three more charge sheets, the presence of respondent (A-2) is required and cannot be ignored by treating him as Chartered Accountant only.

17. As mentioned earlier, five charge sheets have been filed so far and three more charge sheets are in the final stages and are yet to be filed. At the time of arguments, learned senior counsel for the CBI has brought to our notice that the last of the charge has been filed in the Dalmia Cements Ltd. issue on 08.04.2013 which is on the file of the Special Judge for the CBI Cases for taking cognizance. We have already noted the stand of the CBI insofar as the respondent herein is concerned, his relationship with the main accused Y.S. Jagan Mohan Reddy (A-1) his interest in M/s Jagathi Publications Private Limited etc. It is also seen and highlighted that respondent A-2 was engaged in Financial Consultant Company, namely M/s Deloitte Touche Tehmatsu India Private Limited and according to the CBI, he directed this Company to fudge and exaggerate fiscal status of M/s Jagathi Publications Private Limited. It is their claim that it is A-2 who was instrumental in soliciting the premium at Rs. 350 per share of M/s Jagathi publications Private Limited without any basis for actual share of Rs. 10 per share. It is pointed out that on the basis of this false rating of Jagathi Publications Private Limited of which A-2 was the Director, many more companies and individuals were made to invest their money by threat, intimidation, cheating and inducement. It is the specific stand of the CBI that these ratings were falsely projected by A-2.

18. It is also brought to our notice that investigation relating to M/s Sandur Power Company is in progress which involves investigation in foreign countries in which Y.S. Jaganmohan Reddy (A-1) was the Director. As per the investigation, respondent herein (A-2) was the main person, who facilitated formation of M/s Sandur Power Company Ltd.. There is also allegation that Sandur Power Company received huge amounts from two Mauritius based Companies and the source of those monies is being investigated speedily and efforts to trace the source are being done expeditiously. It is also brought to our notice that Letter of Rogatories have been sent to six foreign countries and they have furnished the status of LRs.

19. It is also the claim of the CBI that investigation is under progress regarding granting of mining lease of limestone to the extent of 2037.52 acres by the Government of Andhra Pradesh to Raghuram Cements. It is highlighted that during the period under review, the CBI has collected 400 documents running into thousands of pages from various departments/banks and so far about 40 persons have been examined.

20. It is also highlighted that the investigation disclosed that respondent A-2 was nominated as a part time non-executive Director of Oriental Bank of Commerce by the Ministry of Finance vide notification dated 14.12.2006 based on the recommendation of late Dr. Y.S. Rajasekhara Reddy, the then Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh and father of A-1. It is the assertion of the CBI that respondent A-2 was not only the direct beneficiary of the post of Director in a Nationalised Bank but was also a key conspirator and facilitated for fiddling with public money of the said bank. As the Director of the bank, he also facilitated a loan of Rs. 200 crores to A-1 without any security and was also appointed as a Member of Tirumala Tirupati Devasthanams.

21. It is pointed out that so far 110 witnesses have been examined and as many as 1382 documents running into several thousands of pages have been collected in respect of

A investment through paper companies based in Kolkata and Mumbai, popularly known as suit case companies. Even in the case of Indus Projects and Lepakshi Knowledge Hub Pvt. Ltd., according to the CBI, the role of respondent A-2 is being ascertained.

B 22. Finally, it is pointed out that the role of respondent (A-2) in matters of Raghuram Cements and Sandur Power are yet to be completed, hence, the presence of respondent herein (A-2), who is outside the judicial custody would definitely hamper the smooth investigation and blunt the due process of law through his deceptive and subtle manipulations to influence, intimidate and threaten the witnesses.

C 23. Though the CBI has annexed certain documents in support of the above claim, we are not looking into the same at this stage and if the charge sheet(s) is filed with reference to the same, it is for the Special Court to consider merit and demerits of the claim of the prosecution.

D 24. As pointed out by learned senior counsel for the CBI in para 25 of the impugned judgment, the High Court did not agree with the observation of the Special Judge that the investigation has reached to a conclusion. In fact, the High Court has concluded that the above finding is incorrect. In para 26 also, the High Court appreciated and accepted the stand of the CBI that it has been making investigation with regard to other distinct offences that are alleged in the FIR. Interestingly, the High Court has also not accepted the another reasoning of the Special Court for granting bail, namely, that the main accused A-1 and other beneficiaries have not been arrested by the investigating agency. In other words, the High Court has rightly concluded that the circumstance of not arresting the other accused itself cannot be a ground to grant bail. However, after finding fault with certain reasoning and conclusion of the Special Court in granting bail, the High Court has observed that the CBI has not placed any material before the Special Court to substantiate their stand. The Special Judge

A when respondent herein (A-2) was released on bail on
13.04.2012 and again surrendered before the Court on
23.04.2012, there is no allegation against him that during this
period, he tried to run away from the investigating agency or
made any attempt to influence the witnesses. In this regard,
learned senior counsel for the CBI has brought to our notice
the statement of one Gopalakrishnan Murali dated 20.06.2012.
In his statement, in the penultimate paragraph, it is noted that
on receipt of notice under Section 91 of the Code from CBI on
13.06.2012 the said deponent immediately contacted V. Vijay
Sai Reddy (A-2) for his instructions. According to him, A-2
directed him not to part with any document/information to CBI
and directed to approach the High Court of Andhra Pradesh
through their legal advisors. Admittedly, he had not brought any
information as required under the notice dated 13.06.2012 on
the advise of the respondent herein (A-2). As rightly pointed out,
there is no need to go to High Court to get specific direction
for each and every thing. When the Investigating Officer is in
need of certain documents/information for verification with
reference to the investigation it is but proper to place all the
materials under Section 91 of the Code. Likewise, further
statement of one Shri Sanjay S. Mitra dated 07.12.2012 was
pressed into service. When the attention was drawn to the said
person pointing out that his replies are intended to protect
directly the people involved in the above transactions including
his Managing Director Puneet Dalmia and Vijay Sai Reddy (A-
2), his answer was that he is an employee working with Dalmia
for salary and he has indications from his management and
indirectly from Vijay Sai Reddy (A-2) about not revealing the
above transactions and he also informed the things having
reservation about his future. These are a few samples pointed
out by the counsel for the CBI.

25. Another relevant aspect as pointed out by learned
senior counsel for the CBI that bail can be cancelled when lower
court granted bail on irrelevant considerations. The High Court
accepted the said proposition and observed that “though there

A appears to be some force in the contention of Shri Kesava
Rao, learned standing counsel for the CBI that the Special
Judge has taken into consideration certain factors which
appear to be not relevant such as not arresting A-1 and certain
other observations of learned Special Judge, such as
B investigation has been completed appear to be incorrect.”
Unfortunately, after arriving such conclusion, particularly,
criticizing the Special Judge, the High Court on an erroneous
ground concluded that “it cannot be said that they are totally
irrelevant circumstances, therefore, on that ground, I feel that
C the bail granted to the respondent cannot be cancelled”.

26. Finally, though it is claimed that respondent herein (A-
2) being only a C.A. had rendered his professional advise, in
the light of the various serious allegations against him, his
nexus with the main accused A-1, contacts with many investors
D all over India prima facie it cannot be claimed that he acted only
as a C.A. and nothing more. It is the assertion of the CBI that
the respondent herein (A-2) is the brain behind the alleged
economic offence of huge magnitude. The said assertion, in
the light of the materials relied on before the Special Court and
E the High Court and placed in the course of argument before
this Court, cannot be ignored lightly.

27. It is true that the Special Judge while granting bail
imposed certain conditions and the High Court has also added
some more additional conditions, however, taking note of few
instances in which how the respondent has acted, it cannot be
possible for the investigating agency to collect the remaining
materials for the remaining three charge sheets to be filed. In
such circumstances, we are satisfied firstly the Special Court
took irrelevant materials for consideration for grant of bail and
G secondly, the High Court having arrived definite conclusion that
several findings of Special court are unacceptable or irrelevant
but ultimately affirmed the very same order of the special Judge
granting bail.

28. While granting bail, the court has to keep in mind the nature of accusations, the nature of evidence in support thereof, the severity of the punishment which conviction will entail, the character of the accused, circumstances which are peculiar to the accused, reasonable possibility of securing the presence of the accused at the trial, reasonable apprehension of the witnesses being tampered with, the larger interests of the public/State and other similar considerations. It has also to be kept in mind that for the purpose of granting bail, the Legislature has used the words "reasonable grounds for believing" instead of "the evidence" which means the Court dealing with the grant of bail can only satisfy it as to whether there is a genuine case against the accused and that the prosecution will be able to produce prima facie evidence in support of the charge. It is not expected, at this stage, to have the evidence establishing the guilt of the accused beyond reasonable doubt.

A

B

C

D

29. We have highlighted the above aspects to show that the High Court has mistakenly taken into account the irrelevant materials and kept out the relevant materials, which had to be considered for the grant of bail.

E

30. Taking note of the fact that cancellation of bail necessarily involves the review of a decision already made, it should always be exercised very sparingly by the court of law.

F

31. In the light of the above discussion, we are of the view that the special Judge committed an error in granting bail and the same was erroneously affirmed by the High Court.

G

32. Taking note of all the aspects discussed above, without expressing any opinion on the merits, we set aside both the orders of the Special Judge and the High Court granting bail to A-2 and allow the appeal filed by the CBI with a direction to complete all the investigation relating to the remaining three charge sheets and file appropriate report before the trial Court within a period of four months from today. Thereafter, the respondent herein is free to renew his prayer for bail before

H

A the trial Court and if any such petition is filed, the trial Court is free to consider the prayer for bail independently on its own merits without being influenced by the present appeal. During the course of hearing, it is brought to our notice that the marriage of the daughter of the respondent has been fixed for 26.05.2013. Taking note of the said aspect, we direct the respondent herein to surrender on or before 5-6-2013 before the Special Court for being sent to the custody.

33. The appeal is allowed.
C K.K.T. Appeal allowed.

V.L.S. FINANCE LTD.
v.
UNION OF INDIA & ORS.
(Civil Appeal No.. 2102 of 2004)

MAY 10, 2013

**[CHANDRAMAULI KR. PRASAD AND
V. GOPALA GOWDA, JJ.]**

Companies Act, 1956 – ss. 621A(1) and (7) and 211(7) – Complaint for offence punishable u/s. 211(7) pending before criminal court – Compounding of the offence by Company Law Board – Permissibility – Held: In view of the nature of the offence, it can be compounded by Company Law Board before as well as after institution of prosecution – Company Law Board was not obliged to take permission of the Court before compounding the offence.

Interpretation of Statutes – Rules of interpretation – When the language of a provision is clear, it should be interpreted in its ordinary sense – Addition or alteration of words or expressions to be resorted to only in exceptional circumstances to achieve the purpose of the statute.

Practice and Procedure – New plea – Raising of – Before Supreme Court – Permissibility – Held: If the facts of the case give rise to pure question of law going to the root of the matter, Supreme Court has discretion to go into the new plea.

The questions for consideration in the present appeal was whether the Company Law Board had power to compound the offence punishable u/s. 211(7) of Companies Act, complaint whereof was pending for consideration before the criminal court; whether the Board was required to seek permission of the Court in scisin of the matter, before compounding the offence; and

A whether such plea having been raised for the first time before this Court, is maintainable .

Dismissing the appeal, the Court

B HELD: 1. In a case in which the facts pleaded give rise to a pure question of law going to the root of the matter, this Court possesses discretion to go into that. In the present case, it is an admitted position that the allegation made, exposed the Company and its Managing Director for punishment under Section 211(7) of the Companies Act which provides for imprisonment or fine or with both. In the face of the same, no fact needs to be adjudicated and the point being a pure question of law going to the root of the matter, same can be permitted to be raised before this Court for the first time. [Paras 10 and 11] [856-E, F-H]

E 2.1. It is evident from the provisions of s. 621A(1) of Companies Act that any offence punishable under the Act, not being an offence punishable with imprisonment only or with imprisonment and also with fine, may be compounded either before or after the institution of the prosecution by the Company Law Board and in case, the minimum amount of fine which may be imposed for such offence does not exceed Rs. 5000/-, by the Regional Director on payment of certain fine. The penal provisions of the Act provide for different kinds of punishments for variety of offences and can be categorised as (i) offences punishable with fine only; (ii) offences punishable with imprisonment only; (iii) offences punishable with fine and imprisonment, (iv) offences punishable with fine or imprisonment and (v) offences punishable with fine or imprisonment or both. [Para 12] [589-B-E]

H 2.2. Section 211(7) of the Act provides for punishment with imprisonment for a term which may extend to six months or with fine or

an accused charged with the offence under Section 211(7) of the Act has not necessarily to be visited with imprisonment or imprisonment and also fine but can be let off by imposition of fine only. Section 621A(1) excludes such offences which are punishable with imprisonment only or with imprisonment and also with fine. The nature of offence for which the accused has been charged, necessarily does not invite imprisonment or imprisonment and also fine. Hence, the nature of the offence is such that it was possible to be compounded by the Company Law Board. [Para 13] [859-F-H; 860-A]

2.3. An offence committed by an accused under the Act, not being an offence punishable with imprisonment only or imprisonment and also with fine, is permissible to be compounded by the Company Law Board either before or after the institution of any prosecution. In view of sub-section (7) of Section 621A, the criminal court also possesses similar power to compound an offence after institution of the prosecution. [Para 15] [861-B-C]

3.1. Company Law Board can compound the offence without permission of the Court. Ordinarily, the offence is compounded under the provisions of the Code of Criminal Procedure and the power to accord permission is conferred on the court excepting those offences for which the permission is not required. Both sub-section (1) and sub-section (7) of Section 621A of the Act start with a non-obstante clause. In view of the non-obstante clause, the power of composition can be exercised by the court or the Company Law Board. The legislature has conferred the same power to the Company Law Board which can exercise its power either before or after the institution of any prosecution whereas the criminal court has no power to accord permission for composition of an offence before the institution of the proceeding. The legislature in its wisdom has not put the rider of prior permission of the court before compounding the offence

by the Company Law Board and in case the contention of the appellant is accepted, same would amount to addition of the words “with the prior permission of the court” in the Act, which is not permissible. [Paras 16 and 17] [861-D, E-H; 862-A-B]

3.2. While interpreting the provisions of a statute, the court avoids rejection or addition of words and resort to that only in exceptional circumstances to achieve the purpose of Act or give purposeful meaning. It is also a cardinal rule of interpretation that words, phrases and sentences are to be given their natural, plain and clear meaning. When the language is clear and unambiguous, it must be interpreted in an ordinary sense and no addition or alteration of the words or expressions used is permissible. Section 621A was brought in view of the need of leniency in the administration of the Act because a large number of defaults are of technical nature and many defaults occurred because of the complex nature of the provision. [Para 18] [862-C-E]

3.3. The power under sub-section (1) and sub-section (7) of Section 621A are parallel powers to be exercised by the Company Law Board or the authorities mentioned therein and prior permission of Court is not necessary for compounding the offence, when power of compounding is exercised by the Company Law Board. [Para 19] [862-E-G]

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION : Civil Appeal No. 2102 of 2004.

From the Judgment & Order dated 5.11.2003 of the High Court of Delhi at New Delhi in Company Appeal (B) No. 1 of 2001.

R. Shankaranarayanan, Rakhi Ray, Ashok K. Sharma, Abhay Jena, Bina Gupta for the Appellant

Jayant Bhushan, Binu Tamta, P. Parmeswaran, Atul Sharma, Annam, D.N. Rao, Nitesh Jain for the Respondent.

The Judgment of the Court was delivered by

CHANDRAMAULI KR. PRASAD, J. 1. This appeal by special leave arises out of an order dated 5th of November, 2003 passed by the Company Judge, Delhi High Court in Company Appeal (B) No. 1 of 2001 whereby it has dismissed the appeal assailing the order of the Company Law Board allowing the compounding of offence under Section 211(7) of the Companies Act.

2. Short facts giving rise to the present appeal are that the Registrar of Companies, NCT of Delhi and Haryana laid complaint in the Court of Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, Tis Hazari, inter alia alleging that during the course of inspection it was noticed in the balance sheet of 1995-96 Schedule of the fixed assets included land worth Rs. 21 crores. According to the complaint, M/s. Sunair Hotels Ltd., for short ‘the Company’, had taken this land from New Delhi Municipal Corporation on licence and the Company only pays the yearly licence fee thereof. Thus, according to the complainant, without any right land has been shown as land in the Schedule of fixed assets, which is not a true and fair view and punishable under Section 211(7) of the Companies Act, hereinafter referred to as ‘the Act’. The Company and its Chairman-cum-Managing Director, S.P. Gupta were arrayed as accused.

3. However, before the court in seisin of the case could proceed with the complaint, the Company and its Managing Director jointly filed an application before the Company Law Board for compounding the offence. The Northern Region Bench of the Company Law Board, by its order dated 9th of August, 2000 acceded to the prayer and compounded the offence against the Managing Director on payment of Rs. 1000/- for each offence each year. While doing so, the Company Law Board has held as follows:

“...The exercise of powers by the Company Law Board under 621A(1) is independent of exercise of powers by the court under sub-section (7) and all offences other than those which are punishable with imprisonment only or with imprisonment and also fine, can be compounded by Company Law Board without any reference to sub-section (7), even in cases where prosecution is pending in a criminal court. Thus, it is clear that Company Law Board if so approached can compound offences and in such case no prior permission of the Court is necessary.”

4. Aggrieved by the same, appellant preferred Company Appeal before the High Court, inter alia, contending that the power of compounding could be exercised by the criminal court and not by the Company Law Board. Said submission has not found favour and the Company Judge, in this connection, observed as follows:

“18. In the light of the aforesaid discussions, it is held that the person seeking compounding of an offence in accordance with the procedure laid down in the Criminal Procedure Code can do so before the criminal Court with the permission of the Court under sub-section (7) of Section 621A of the Act, which normally cannot be done under the provisions of the Criminal Procedure Code. Such compounding of offence would always be relatable to the offence punishable with imprisonment or with fine or with both as is made clear under clauses (a) and (b) of sub-section (7). Under the aforesaid sub-section the offence punishable with imprisonment or with fine or both shall be compoundable with the permission of the Court and for such compounding the procedure laid down under the Criminal Procedure Code is to be followed in that regard provided the prosecution is pending in that Court. I also hold the Company Law Board can compound an offence of the nature prescribed under sub-section (1) either before the institution of the criminal proceeding or even after institution of the crimina

A said power is not subject to the provisions of sub-section (7). Both are parallel powers to be exercised by the prescribed authorities who have been empowered under the statute and one power is not dependent on the other.....”

B 5. Accordingly, the Company Judge dismissed the appeal.

6. That is how the appellant is before us.

C 7. We have heard Mr. R. Shankaranarayanan, for the appellant, Ms. Binu Tamta, for the respondent-Union of India and Mr. Jayant Bhushan, Senior Advocate for the Company and its Managing Director.

D 8. It is an admitted position that the allegations made exposed the accused to an offence punishable under Section 211(7) of the Act. The same reads as under:

“211. Form and contents of balance-sheet and profit and loss account.—

xxx xxx xxx

E (7) If any such person as is referred to in sub-section (6) of section 209 fails to take all reasonable steps to secure compliance by the company, as respects any accounts laid before the company in general meeting, with the provisions of this section and with the other requirements of this Act as to the matters to be stated in the accounts, he shall, in respect of each offence, be punishable with imprisonment for a term which may extend to six months, or with fine which may extend to ten thousand rupees, or with both:

G Provided that in any proceedings against a person in respect of an offence under this section, it shall be a defence to prove that a competent and reliable person was charged with the duty of seeing that the provisions of this section and the other requirements aforesaid were complied with and was in a position to discharge that duty:

H

A Provided further that no person shall be sentenced to imprisonment for any such offence unless it was committed wilfully.

xxx

xxx

xxx”

B 9. Thus, the offence alleged is punishable with imprisonment for a term which may extend to six months or with fine which may extend to Rs. 10,000/- or with both.

C 10. Mr. Shankaranarayanan has taken an extreme stand before this Court and contends that the Company Law Board has no jurisdiction to compound an offence punishable under Section 211(7) of the Act as the punishment provided is imprisonment also. Mr. Bhushan, however, submits that imprisonment is not mandatory punishment under Section 211(7) of the Act and, hence, the Company Law Board has the authority to compound the same. He also points out that this submission was not at all advanced before the Company Law Board and, therefore, the appellant cannot be permitted to raise this question for the first time before this Court. We are not in agreement with Mr. Bhushan in regard to his plea that this question cannot be gone into by this Court at the first instance. In our opinion, in a case in which the facts pleaded give rise to a pure question of law going to the root of the matter, this Court possesses discretion to go into that. The position would have been different had the appellant for the first time prayed before this Court for adjudication on an issue of fact and then to apply the law and hold that Company Law Board had no jurisdiction to compound the offence.

H 11. Here, it is an admitted position that the allegation made exposed the Company and its Managing Director for punishment under Section 211(7) of the Act which provides for imprisonment or fine or with both. In the face of the same, no fact needs to be adjudicated and the point being a pure question of law going to the root of the matter, same can be permitted to be raised before this Court for the first time. But that does not help the appellant as we

the submission of Mr. Bhushan on merit. Section 621A was inserted by the Companies Amendment Act, 1988 on the recommendation of the Sachar Committee. It was felt that leniency is required in the administration of the provisions of the Act particularly penalty provisions because a large number of defaults are of technical nature and arise out of ignorance on account of bewildering complexity of the provisions. Section 621A of the Act; as stood at the relevant time and relevant for our purpose reads as follows:

“621A. Composition of certain offences.- (1) Notwithstanding anything contained in the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (2 of 1974), any offence punishable under this Act whether committed by a company or any officer thereof, not being an offence punishable with imprisonment only, or with imprisonment and also with fine, may, either before or after the institution of any prosecution, be compounded by-

(a) the Company Law Board; or

(b) where the maximum amount of fine which may be imposed for such offence does not exceed five thousand rupees, by the Regional Director, on payment or credit, by the company or the officer, as the case may be, to the Central Government of such sum as that Board or the Regional Director, as the case may be, may specify:

Provided that the sum so specified shall not, in any case, exceed the maximum amount of the fine which may be imposed for the offence so compounded:

Provided further that in specifying the sum required to be paid or credited for the compounding of an offence under this sub-section, the sum, if any, paid by way of additional fee under Sub-section (2) of Section 611 shall be taken into account.

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H

xx xx xx

(4)(a) Every application for the compounding of an offence shall be made to the Registrar who shall forward the same, together with his comments thereon, to the Company Law Board or the Regional Director, as the case may be.

(b) Where any offence is compounded under this section, whether before or after the institution of any prosecution, an intimation thereof shall be given by the company to the Registrar within seven days from the date on which the offence is so compounded.

(c) Where any offence is compounded before the institution of any prosecution, no prosecution shall be instituted in relation to such offence, either by the Registrar or by any shareholder of the company or by any person authorised by the Central Government against the offender in relation to whom the offence is so compounded.

(d) Where the composition of any offence is made after the institution of any prosecution, such composition shall be brought by the Registrar in writing, to the notice of the Court in which the prosecution is pending and on such notice of the composition of the offence being given, the company or its officer in relation to whom the offence is so compounded shall be discharged.

xx xx xx

(7) Notwithstanding anything contained in the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973,-

(a) any offence which is punishable under this Act with imprisonment or with fine, or with both, shall be compoundable with the permission of the Court, in accordance with the procedure laid down in that Act for compounding of offence

(b) any offence which is punishable under this Act with imprisonment only or with imprisonment and also with fine shall not be compoundable. A

(8) No offence specified in this section shall be compounded except under and in accordance with the provisions of this section.” B

12. From a plain reading of Section 621A(1) it is evident that any offence punishable under the Act, not being an offence punishable with imprisonment only or with imprisonment and also with fine, may be compounded either before or after the institution of the prosecution by the Company Law Board and in case, the minimum amount of fine which may be imposed for such offence does not exceed Rs. 5000/-, by the Regional Director on payment of certain fine. The penal provisions of the Act provide for different kinds of punishments for variety of offences and can be categorised as follows: D

- (i) offences punishable with fine only,
- (ii) offences punishable with imprisonment only,
- (ii) offences punishable with fine and imprisonment, E
- (iv) offences punishable with fine or imprisonment,
- (v) offences punishable with fine or imprisonment or both.

13. Section 211(7) of the Act provides for punishment with imprisonment for a term which may extend to six months or with fine or with both. Therefore, an accused charged with the offence under Section 211(7) of the Act has not necessarily to be visited with imprisonment or imprisonment and also fine but can be let off by imposition of fine only. Therefore, the punishment provided under Section 211(7) of the Act comes under category (v) aforesaid. Section 621A(1) excludes such offences which are punishable with imprisonment only or with imprisonment and also with fine. As we have observed above, the nature of offence for which the accused has been charged necessarily does not invite imprisonment or imprisonment and H

A also fine. Hence, we are of the opinion that the nature of the offence is such that it was possible to be compounded by the Company Law Board.

14. Mr. Shankaranarayanan, then submits that sub-section (7) of Section 621A confers jurisdiction on the court to accord permission for compounding of the offence punishable with imprisonment or with fine or with both, the jurisdiction of the Company Law Board is excluded and, therefore, the Company Law Board erred in acceding to the request of the accused for compounding of the offence. Sub-section (1) of Section 621A and sub-section (7) thereof are differently worded but on their close reading it is evident that both cover such offences depending upon the nature of punishment. Sub-section (1) of Section 621A excludes offence punishable with imprisonment only or with imprisonment and also fine and includes the residue offences which will obviously include offence punishable with imprisonment or with fine or with both whereas sub-section (7) specifically include those and excludes, like sub-section (1), offences punishable with imprisonment only or with imprisonment and also fine. Therefore, both cover similar nature of offences. Hence, the power for compounding can be exercised in relation to the same nature of offences by the Company Law Board or the court in seisin of the matter with the difference that the Company Law Board can proceed to compound such offence either before or after the institution of any prosecution. In this connection, it shall be relevant to refer to Section 621A(4)b) of the Act, which provides that where any offence is compounded under this section, whether before or after the institution of any prosecution, an intimation thereof shall be given by the Company to the Registrar within 7 days from the date on which the offence is compounded. Section 621A(4)d) mandates that where the composition of any offence is made after the institution of any prosecution, such composition would be brought by the Registrar in writing to the notice of the court in which the prosecution is pending and on such notice of the composition of the o e

accused in relation to whom the offence is so compounded shall be discharged. A

15. From the conspectus of what we have observed above, it is more than clear that an offence committed by an accused under the Act, not being an offence punishable with imprisonment only or imprisonment and also with fine, is permissible to be compounded by the Company Law Board either before or after the institution of any prosecution. In view of sub-section (7) of Section 621A, the criminal court also possesses similar power to compound an offence after institution of the prosecution. B C

16. Now the question is whether in the aforesaid circumstances the Company Law Board can compound offence punishable with fine or imprisonment or both without permission of the court. It is pointed out that when the prosecution has been laid, it is the criminal court which is in seisin of the matter and it is only the magistrate or the court in seisin of the matter who can accord permission to compound the offence. In any view of the matter, according to the learned counsel, the Company Law Board has to seek permission of the court and it cannot compound the offence without such permission. This line of reasoning does not commend us. Both sub-section (1) and sub-section (7) of Section 621A of the Act start with a non-obstante clause. As is well known, a non-obstante clause is used as a legislative device to give the enacting part of the section, in case of conflict, an overriding effect over the provisions of the Act mentioned in the non-obstante clause. D E F

17. Ordinarily, the offence is compounded under the provisions of the Code of Criminal Procedure and the power to accord permission is conferred on the court excepting those offences for which the permission is not required. However, in view of the non-obstante clause, the power of composition can be exercised by the court or the Company Law Board. The legislature has conferred the same power to the Company Law Board which can exercise its power either before or after the G H

A institution of any prosecution whereas the criminal court has no power to accord permission for composition of an offence before the institution of the proceeding. The legislature in its wisdom has not put the rider of prior permission of the court before compounding the offence by the Company Law Board and in case the contention of the appellant is accepted, same would amount to addition of the words "with the prior permission of the court" in the Act, which is not permissible. B

18. As is well settled, while interpreting the provisions of a statute, the court avoids rejection or addition of words and resort to that only in exceptional circumstances to achieve the purpose of Act or give purposeful meaning. It is also a cardinal rule of interpretation that words, phrases and sentences are to be given their natural, plain and clear meaning. When the language is clear and unambiguous, it must be interpreted in an ordinary sense and no addition or alteration of the words or expressions used is permissible. As observed earlier, the aforesaid enactment was brought in view of the need of leniency in the administration of the Act because a large number of defaults are of technical nature and many defaults occurred because of the complex nature of the provision. C D E

19. From what we have observed above, we are of the opinion that the power under sub-section (1) and sub-section (7) of Section 621A are parallel powers to be exercised by the Company Law Board or the authorities mentioned therein and prior permission of Court is not necessary for compounding the offence, when power of compounding is exercised by the Company Law Board. In view of what we have observed above, the order impugned does not require any interference by this Court. F G

20. In the result, we do not find any merit in the appeal and it is dismissed accordingly but without any order as to costs.

K.K.T.

Appeal dismissed.