Page 1591 – 1599 **DOI:** *https://doij.org/10.10000/IJLMH.1111648*

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LAW MANAGEMENT & HUMANITIES

[ISSN 2581-5369]

Volume 9 | Issue 2

2026

The Green Gavel: Judicial Activism and Environmental Jurisprudence in India

DR. M. ARAVIND KUMAR[1] AND DR. M. ARUL SIMI[2]

ABSTRACT

This article examines the transformative role of the judiciary as a critical sentinel in environmental governance, transitioning from a passive arbiter to an active protector of ecological integrity. In nations like India, the courts have pioneered revolutionary mechanisms such as Public Interest Litigation (PIL), the Doctrine of Public Trust, and the expansive interpretation of the "Right to Life" to include a clean environment. By analyzing landmark cases ranging from the preservation of the Taj Mahal to contemporary Dutch climate litigation (Urgenda) the text highlights how judges enforce the Precautionary Principle and the Polluter Pays Principle. However, the judiciary faces significant hurdles, including technical complexity, implementation deficits, and the delicate balancing act between economic development and sustainability. The emergence of Specialized Green Tribunals and the legal recognition of the Rights of Nature represent the new frontiers of this legal evolution. Ultimately, the article argues that while the judiciary is not a panacea, it serves as the essential "conscience of the state," ensuring that short-term progress does not compromise the fundamental rights of future generations.

Keywords: *Public Interest Litigation (PIL), Public Trust Doctrine, Sustainable Development, Right to Life (Article 21), Precautionary Principle*

I. INTRODUCTION

In the modern era, the environment stands as a silent, vulnerable defendant in the courtroom of progress. It cannot speak, it cannot vote, and it cannot hire a lawyer. Yet, its health is inextricably linked to the fundamental rights of every citizen: the right to life, health, and dignity. As the executive branch pursues economic development and the legislative branch drafts frameworks of environmental law, it is often the judiciary the third pillar of democracy that acts as the ultimate sentinel. Through judicial review, public interest litigation, and the creative interpretation of constitutional rights, courts worldwide have transformed from passive arbiters into active agents of environmental governance. This article explores the multifaceted role of the judiciary in protecting the environment, analyzing its powers, landmark

[1] Author is an Assistant Professor at Government Law College, Coimbatore, India.
[2] Author is an Assistant Professor at Government Law College, Coimbatore, India.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

interventions, and the delicate balance it must strike between development and ecological survival.

II. THE EVOLUTION OF ENVIRONMENTAL JURISPRUDENCE

Historically, environmental protection was viewed through a narrow lens of property law and nuisance. If a factory's smoke damaged a neighbor's crops, the court would provide a remedy. But the idea of protecting a forest, a river, or the air for its own sake or for the sake of future generations was legally alien. The paradigm shifted dramatically in the latter half of the 20th century, driven by growing scientific evidence of ecological collapse and a philosophical evolution in legal thinking. The watershed moment came with the 1972 United Nations Conference on the Human Environment in Stockholm, which declared that people have a "fundamental right to freedom, equality and adequate conditions of life, in an environment of a quality that permits a life of dignity and well-being."[3] This declaration catalyzed a global movement, and judiciaries began to recognize that procedural rights (right to sue, right to a fair hearing) were insufficient without substantive environmental rights. The judiciary's role expanded from *locus standi* (the right to bring an action) to *parens patriae* (the state as a parent to those who cannot protect themselves).[4] Courts began treating the environment as a public trust a resource owned by the people, to be protected by the state, and enforced by the judges.

III. KEY MECHANISMS OF JUDICIAL INTERVENTION

The judiciary employs several powerful tools to safeguard the environment. These mechanisms vary by legal system but share a common purpose: to hold power accountable.

A. Public Interest Litigation (PIL)

Perhaps the most revolutionary tool is PIL[5], pioneered most effectively in India and Pakistan, and adapted in Bangladesh, Nepal, and South Africa. Traditionally, only an "aggrieved party" could file a lawsuit. However, environmental degradation affects millions indirectly. PIL relaxes standing requirements, allowing any public-spirited citizen or NGO to approach the court on behalf of the environment. In India, the Supreme Court transformed PIL into a weapon of mass protection. Letters written to judges were treated as writ petitions. Slum dwellers,

[3] Declaration of the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, Principle 1, UN Doc. A/CONF.48/14/Rev.1 (1972); 11 ILM 1416 (1972).

[4] Alfred L. Snapp & Son, Inc. v. Puerto Rico ex rel. Barez, 458 U.S. 592 (1982) - This is the definitive US Supreme Court case establishing that a state has "quasi-sovereign interests" in the health and well-being both physical and economic of its residents. It allows the state (and by extension, the courts) to act as a "parent" to protect public resources that individuals cannot defend alone.

[5] S.P. Gupta v. Union of India, AIR 1982 SC 149 *(Known as the "First Judges Case")* Justice P.N. Bhagwati ruled: *"Any member of the public having sufficient interest can maintain an action for judicial redress for public injury arising from breach of public duty or from violation of some provision of the Constitution or the law."*

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

fisherfolk, and activists gained a direct line to the highest court.[6] This bypassed the slow, often corrupt, administrative machinery and allowed judges to order the closure of polluting industries, the restoration of lakes, and the eviction of illegal encroachments from forest lands.

B. Judicial Review of Legislation and Executive Action

Courts have the power to strike down laws or executive orders that violate constitutional environmental rights. For example, if a government issues a permit for a coal mine in a protected forest, the judiciary can review that decision for "reasonableness," "proportionality," or violation of a higher legal principle. This serves as a critical check on the executive's tendency to prioritize short-term economic gains over long term ecological stability.

C. The Doctrine of Public Trust

This ancient Roman law doctrine, revived by modern courts, holds that certain resources air, sea, rivers, forests are so vital to the public welfare that they cannot be privatized or commodified. The government holds them in trust for the people. The judiciary ensures that the trustee (the state) does not alienate or degrade the trust property. In the landmark case of *M.C. Mehta v. Kamal Nath*[7], the Indian Supreme Court ruled that the state cannot lease ecologically fragile land to private hoteliers, as it violates the public trust doctrine.

D. Constitutional Interpretation of the Right to Life

The most elegant legal innovation has been reading environmental rights into existing fundamental rights. Article 21 of the Indian Constitution guarantees the "right to life." Courts have repeatedly held that life does not mean mere animal existence; it means a life of dignity[8], which is impossible without clean air, potable water, and a pollution-free environment.[9] Similarly, the Constitution of South Africa explicitly includes "an environment that is not harmful to their health or well-being" as a right in its Bill of Rights (Section 24).[10] Where explicit constitutional provisions are absent, judges have creatively interpreted liberty and property rights to include environmental protection.

---

[6] Bandhua Mukti Morcha v. Union of India, AIR 1984 SC 802 The Court held that where the disadvantaged are unable to approach the court, the court can act upon a letter or a telegram, bypassing traditional formal procedures to protect fundamental rights.

[7] (1997) 1 SCC 388

[8] Francis Coralie Mullin v. Administrator, Union Territory of Delhi, (1981) 1 SCC 608 - Justice Bhagwati famously ruled: *"The right to life includes the right to live with human dignity and all that goes along with it... [it] cannot be restricted to mere animal existence."*

[9] Subhash Kumar v. State of Bihar, (1991) 1 SCC 598 - The Supreme Court explicitly held that: *"Right to live is a fundamental right under Article 21 of the Constitution and it includes the right of enjoyment of pollution-free water and air for full enjoyment of life."*

[10] Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996, Section 24.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

IV. LANDMARK JUDGMENTS: THE SWORD OF SCALES

To understand the judiciary's power, one must look at specific cases where courts reshaped policy, halted industry, and protected ecosystems.

A. The Taj Mahal Case (India)[11]

In the 1980s and 1990s, the white marble of the Taj Mahal was turning yellow due to sulfur dioxide emissions from a nearby oil refinery and foundries. The Indian Supreme Court, in *M.C. Mehta v. Union of India*, did not merely issue a fine. It ordered the closure of 212 industries, mandated the installation of pollution control devices, and created a 10,400-square-kilometer "Taj Trapezium Zone" where only clean fuels (natural gas) could be used. The court acted as a super-administrator, dictating industrial policy to save a cultural and environmental monument.

B. The Minamata Disease Cases (Japan)[12]

While often cited as a failure of initial regulation, the Japanese judiciary eventually played a crucial role. After decades of mercury poisoning from Chisso Corporation's factory, victims sued. In 1973, the Kumamoto District Court found the company guilty of negligence, establishing the principle that corporations bear strict liability for environmental harm. This judgment spurred a nationwide shift in environmental consciousness and led to stricter laws, proving that judicial accountability can force industrial reform.

C. The Urgenda Case (Netherlands)[13]

In a landmark for climate litigation, the Dutch Supreme Court in 2019 upheld a ruling that the government must reduce greenhouse gas emissions by at least 25% from 1990 levels by the end of 2020. The court based its decision on the European Convention on Human Rights, specifically Articles 2 and 8 (right to life and private/family life). For the first time, a court ordered a state to change its climate policy based on human rights law. This judgment opened the floodgates for similar cases in Germany, France, Belgium, and even before the European Court of Human Rights.

D. The Pakhtunkhwa Forest Case (Pakistan)[14]

In 2018, the Peshawar High Court declared the provincial government's inaction on illegal logging a violation of citizens' constitutional rights. The court appointed a forest ombudsman

[11] M.C. Mehta v. Union of India, (1996) 8 SCC 212
[12] The First Trial (Niigata Minamata Case) Niigata District Court, September 29, 1971.
[13] State of the Netherlands v. Urgenda Foundation, ECLI:NL:HR:2019:2006 (Supreme Court of the Netherlands, 20 December 2019).
[14] Mehar Badshah v. Govt. of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, PLD 2025 Supreme Court 36 *(Also cited as 2024 SCP 372 or PLR 2025 SC 5).*

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

and ordered a mass afforestation drive. More radically, it recognized the rights of nature, ruling that the forest has a "right to exist, flourish, and naturally evolve." While difficult to enforce, such judgments signal a profound shift toward ecocentric jurisprudence.

V. THE JUDICIAL BALANCING ACT: DEVELOPMENT VS. ECOLOGY

The most persistent criticism of judicial environmental activism is that judges are unelected, unaccountable, and lack technical expertise. When a judge orders the closure of a factory, thousands of workers may lose their jobs. When a court blocks a hydroelectric dam, a region may face power shortages. The judiciary must walk a tightrope between two compelling public interests: economic development and ecological protection.

The Principle of Sustainable Development

Courts have widely adopted the concept of "sustainable development" meeting present needs without compromising future generations' ability to meet their own. This translates into several operational principles:

a. **The Precautionary Principle[15]:** Where there are threats of serious or irreversible environmental damage, lack of full scientific certainty shall not be used as a reason for postponing cost-effective measures. In other words, when in doubt, protect the environment first.

b. **The Polluter Pays Principle:** The party responsible for pollution must bear the cost of remediation, not the taxpayer. The judiciary has used this to levy massive fines on industries and municipalities.

c. **Proportionality[16]:** The court's remedy must be proportionate to the harm. A complete shutdown may be justified for a toxic chemical plant, but a graduated schedule of fines and technology upgrades may suffice for a smaller infraction.

The challenge lies in implementation. In developing nations, courts have sometimes issued sweeping orders (e.g., "ban all diesel vehicles over 10 years old") without conducting a socio-economic impact assessment, leading to chaos and hardship. However, the alternative judicial timidity is worse. Without an assertive judiciary, polluters would externalize their costs onto

[15] Rio Declaration on Environment and Development, UN Doc. A/CONF.151/26 (vol. I), 31 ILM 874 (1992), Principle 15. *"In order to protect the environment, the precautionary approach shall be widely applied by States according to their capabilities. Where there are threats of serious or irreversible damage, lack of full scientific certainty shall not be used as a reason for postponing cost-effective measures to prevent environmental degradation."*

[16] M.C. Mehta v. Union of India (1996) 8 SCC 212 (The Taj Trapezium Case) - The Court famously applied proportionality by giving industries a choice: switch to natural gas (technology upgrade) or relocate (shutdown). It did not mandate an immediate, unconditional closure for all, recognizing the economic impact on workers.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

the public indefinitely.

VI. EMERGING FRONTIERS: CLIMATE LITIGATION AND RIGHTS OF NATURE

The role of the judiciary is expanding into two novel domains.

A. Climate Litigation

Citizens are increasingly suing governments for failing to act on climate change. These cases rely on human rights, tort law, and public trust doctrines. In 2021, a German court ruled that the government's climate targets were insufficient because they pushed too much of the burden of emissions reduction onto future generations (youth plaintiffs argued their fundamental rights were violated). The court ordered the government to clarify its post-2030 targets.[17] Similarly, in Montana, USA, a state court ruled in 2023 that the state's pro-fossil fuel policies violated the plaintiffs' constitutional right to a "clean and healthful environment."[18]

B. Rights of Nature (Ecocentrism)

A radical shift is underway: treating natural entities as legal persons with rights. Courts in Ecuador (which amended its constitution to grant rights to nature), Colombia (which recognized the Atrato River as a legal entity)[19], and New Zealand (which granted personhood to the Whanganui River)[20] are pioneering this approach. While anthropocentric (human-centered) law protects nature only insofar as it serves humans, ecocentric law protects nature for its own sake. The judiciary's role here becomes quasi-spiritual: interpreting the "best interests" of a river or a forest. This is legally messy but conceptually powerful.

VII. CHALLENGES AND CRITICISMS

Despite its proactive stance, the judiciary faces several systemic challenges that hinder its effectiveness in environmental protection. A primary obstacle is the implementation deficit, as courts lack the independent enforcement machinery, such as a police force or treasury, to ensure their orders are not ignored by the executive branch. This is compounded by the technical complexity of ecological issues, where generalist judges must rely on potentially biased or slow expert committees to navigate specialized sciences.

Furthermore, chronic delays and backlogs in the legal system often mean that final judgments arrive only after irreversible environmental damage, such as species extinction, has already

[17] Neubauer et al. v. Germany, BVerfG, Order of the First Senate of 24 March 2021 - 1 BvR 2656/18.
[18] Held v. State of Montana, No. CDV-2020-307 (Mont. 1st Dist. Ct. Aug. 14, 2023).
[19] Center for Social Justice Studies et al. v. Presidency of the Republic et al. (Atrato River Case), T-622/16 (Constitutional Court of Colombia, 2016).
[20] Te Awa Tupua (Whanganui River Claims Settlement) Act 2017 (Public Act 2017 No 7).

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

occurred. This assertive role also sparks debates over judicial overreach, with critics questioning the democratic legitimacy of unelected judges who set policy and emission targets. Finally, an access to justice gap remains, as the high cost and intimidating nature of litigation often prevent the most vulnerable communities those most impacted by pollution from utilizing the legal system effectively.

VIII. THE WAY FORWARD: A COLLABORATIVE FRAMEWORK

The judiciary's ability to safeguard the environment is not a solitary endeavor but rather depends on a symbiotic relationship with the executive, the legislature, and civil society. To bolster this effectiveness, many nations have established specialized environmental courts, such as India's National Green Tribunal, which integrate scientific expertise with judicial oversight to accelerate dispute resolution.[21] This institutional shift must be supported by continuous judicial education in ecology and international law an initiative actively championed by the UNEP[22] to ensure judges can navigate complex technical data. Furthermore, strengthening compliance requires a collaborative framework where courts appoint independent monitoring committees and engage with citizen science groups to verify the enforcement of their orders. Ultimately, the most robust foundation for these efforts is constitutional entrenchment, where embedding the right to a healthy environment within a nation's supreme law provides an unassailable mandate for long term judicial action.

IX. CONCLUSION

The judiciary is not a panacea for the environmental crisis. It is reactive, slow, and institutionally limited. Yet, in a world where legislatures are often captured by industrial lobbies and executives are beholden to short-term electoral cycles, the courts remain the last redoubt of the public interest. They are the institution that can say “no” to a profitable but polluting project. They are the voice of the voiceless the unborn child, the dying river, the last tiger. From the gavels of the Indian Supreme Court protecting the Taj Mahal to the Dutch judges forcing climate action, the role of the judiciary is clear: to interpret the law not as a static set of rules, but as a living charter for survival. By enforcing the principles of public trust, precaution, and intergenerational equity, the judiciary ensures that the pursuit of prosperity does not devour the planet.

The green robes of judges may not be as visible as the protests of activists or the policies of

[21] The National Green Tribunal Act, 2010 (Act No. 19 of 2010).
[22] UNEP, *Environmental Rule of Law: First Global Report* (2019) - This landmark report explicitly calls for "continuous judicial education" and the strengthening of environmental courts to bridge the implementation gap.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

ministers, but in the long arc of environmental history, their judgments are the bedrock upon which a sustainable future will be built. As Justice P.N. Bhagwati of the Indian Supreme Court once observed, *"We have to evolve a new jurisprudence… to ensure that the environment is not polluted and the quality of life is not damaged."*[23] That evolution is underway, and the judiciary is its chief architect. The question is not whether courts have a role they do. The question is whether society will empower them, listen to them, and, most importantly, obey them. The answer will determine the health of our planet for centuries to come.

*****

[23] M.C. Mehta v. Union of India (Oleum Gas Leak Case), AIR 1987 SC 1086.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

X. REFERENCES

- Shyam Divan and Armin Rosencranz, *Environmental Law and Policy in India: Cases, Materials and Statutes* (Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 3rd edn., 2022).
- P. Leelakrishnan, *Environmental Law in India* (LexisNexis, New Delhi, 6th edn., 2021).
- S.C. Shastri, *Environmental Law* (Eastern Book Company, Lucknow, 7th edn., 2023).
- Gitanjali Nain Gill, *Environmental Justice in India: The National Green Tribunal* (Routledge, London, 1st edn., 2017).
- P.S. Jaswal and Nishtha Jaswal, *Environmental Law* (Allahabad Law Agency, Faridabad, 5th edn., 2021).
- Nawneet Vibhaw, *Environmental Law* (LexisNexis, New Delhi, 1st edn., 2020).
- S. Shantakumar, *Introduction to Environmental Law* (Wadhwa & Co., Nagpur, 2nd edn., 2005).
- Kailash Thakur, *Environmental Protection: Law and Policy in India* (Deep & Deep Publications, New Delhi, 2nd edn., 2007).
- Madhav Gadgil and Ramachandra Guha, *Ecology and Equity: The Use and Abuse of Nature in Contemporary India* (Routledge, New Delhi, 1st edn., 1995).
- Nomita Aggarwal, *Public Interest Litigation in India* (Allahabad Law Agency, Faridabad, 1st edn., 2014).

*****

 [ISSN 2581-5369]