Swami Vivekananda Advanced Journal for Research and Studies
Online Copy of Document Available on: www.svajrs.com

ISSN:2584-105X **Pg. 204-215**

Air, Water, and Soil Pollution under Indian Law: A Critical Study of Legislative and Judicial Responses the Smog: A Critical Legal Analysis of Air Pollution Regulation and Enforcement

Rajendra
Assistant Professor, Dayanand College of Law, Kanpur
Affiliated with Chatrapati Shahu Ji Maharaj University, Kanpur
Email: rajendralaw4249@gmail.com

Accepted: 22/07/2025
Published: 27/07/2025 ***DOI: http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18935370***

Abstract

This paper critically examines the architecture and performance of Indian pollution law, covering air, water, and soil (land) pollution, through an integrated reading of constitutional norms, principal statutes, delegated legislation, and judicial interventions up to 2020. It argues that the Indian model is best understood as a hybrid governance system: a predominantly command-and-control regulatory framework (standards, permits/consents, inspections, prosecutions) that has been progressively constitutionalized and "jurisprudentially densified" by judicially articulated principles (precautionary principle, polluter pays principle, sustainable development, and environmental rule of law), often operationalized through public interest litigation (PIL) and continuing mandamus.

On legislation, the core statutory pillars, the Water (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act 1974 (Water Act), the Air (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act 1981 (Air Act), and the Environment (Protection) Act 1986 (EPA 1986), establish standards-based regulation and institutional enforcement through pollution control boards, complemented by a wide ecology of rules on hazardous chemicals, toxic releases, and wastes that function as the principal legal proxies for "soil pollution" control. The Water Act is historically distinctive for its federal entry route, enacted via the Article 252 mechanism, while the Air Act and the EPA 1986 explicitly invoke implementation of decisions taken at the 1972 Stockholm Conference, underscoring the international law lineage of Indian environmental statutes.

On institutions, pollution control in practice rests on regulatory capacity and coordination among the central government, the Central Pollution Control Board (CPCB), State Pollution Control Boards (SPCBs), and sectoral/local bodies. Yet the enforcement chain is repeatedly stressed by documented deficits in planning, monitoring, infrastructure, and data transparency, most sharply evidenced in the water domain by performance audit findings that identify systemic gaps in inventorization, risk assessment, basin-level planning, and monitoring coverage.(n.1) These deficits are not only managerial; they shape administrative legality because standards and permit conditions require credible monitoring and sanctioning to be meaningful.

Judicially, the Supreme Court and High Courts, through PIL, have played a constitutive role in translating constitutional rights and duties into enforceable environmental obligations. Landmark decisions have (i)

embedded the right to pollution-free water and air within Article 21; (ii) imposed affirmative administrative duties on public authorities to abate public nuisance; (iii) crafted liability doctrines (including absolute liability for hazardous industries and "polluter pays" compensation logic); and (iv) structured compliance via committees, time-bound directives, and court-supervised implementation. However, this "judicial governance" model carries institutional trade-offs: risks of episodic compliance, dependency on court monitoring, and uneven sectoral prioritization.

The paper recommends reforms targeted at (a) closing the "soil pollution" governance gap through a clearer contaminated-land liability and remediation regime; (b) strengthening board autonomy and technical capacity; (c) improving standards-setting and transparency; (d) rebalancing criminal and administrative enforcement; and (e) restoring legitimacy of EIA/public participation as a front-end pollution-prevention mechanism.

Keywords: *"Soil pollution" in Indian law is rarely regulated under a single "Soil Act"; it is primarily addressed indirectly through "hazardous substances," waste management rules, fly ash utilization directions, and land-use restrictions under the EPA 1986 and delegated instruments.*

Introduction

Pollution law in India has evolved through a layered interaction of constitutionalism, sectoral statutes, delegated rule-making, and strongly interventionist environmental adjudication.[1]At the constitutional level, the interpretive expansion of Article 21 (right to life) alongside Directive Principles and Fundamental Duties has supplied normative justification for robust state obligations to prevent environmental harm.[2] At the statutory level, the Water Act and the Air Act institutionalized pollution control boards and introduced consent-based regulation (a licensing model) and standards enforcement, while the EPA 1986 created an overarching framework for environmental standard-setting, hazardous substance regulation, and centralized direction powers. The "problem of soil pollution" has been legally addressed mainly through the EPA 1986's broad conception of "environment" (which includes land) and through rules governing hazardous chemicals and diverse waste streams, solid, plastic, biomedical, electronic, demolition debris, where the key legal question is how to identify responsibility, control releases, and finance remediation.[3]

Research questions. This paper is guided by four interlinked questions:

First, how do India's principal pollution statutes and delegated instruments distribute regulatory authority across the union-state institutional matrix, and how coherent is this distribution for integrated pollution control?[4]

Second, what are the operational strengths and limitations of the core enforcement mechanisms, standards, consents/permits, inspections, directions, and criminal prosecution, in delivering environmental compliance, particularly in infrastructure-dependent domains such as sewage and industrial effluents?[5]

Third, how have courts, especially the Supreme Court, shaped pollution governance through PIL, both substantively (rights and principles) and institutionally (compliance architecture, remedies, compensation, and liability)?

Fourth, what reform pathways best address persistent governance gaps, especially for land/soil contamination and waste-driven pollution, while respecting federalism, administrative capacity constraints, and due process?

Scope and limits. The coverage is limited to air, water, and soil pollution law in India up to 2020. It focuses on: (i) principal statutes and delegated legislation; (ii) core institutions (pollution control boards, central ministries, and environmental adjudicatory structures); and (iii) landmark Supreme Court and selected High Court jurisprudence. Climate change law and biodiversity/forest law are engaged only insofar as they intersect directly with pollution governance or institutional design (e.g., environmental courts/tribunals).

Methodology

This study adopts a doctrinal and analytical legal research methodology, supplemented by institutional and policy analysis.

Doctrinal analysis. Primary legal materials (constitutional text, statutes, rules/notifications, and reported judgments) are interpreted using standard tools of statutory construction and constitutional reasoning, with close attention to: (i) legal triggers (e.g., consent requirements, standards applicability); (ii) institutional powers and duties; and (iii) remedial structures (directions, penalties, compensation, procedural safeguards).[6]

Jurisprudential thematic coding. Landmark decisions are organized under thematic heads relevant to pollution governance: PIL standing and maintainability; rights and duties; principles (precaution, polluter pays, sustainable development); institutional remedies (committees,

[1] The Constitution of India (as amended up to the Constitution (104th Amendment) Act, 2019) (Government of India).

[2] *Subhash Kumar v State of Bihar & Ors* (1991) 1 SCC 598 (SC).

[3] The Environment (Protection) Act, 1986 (Act 29 of 1986) (India).

[4] The Water (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1974 (Act 6 of 1974) (India).

[5] The Environment (Protection) Rules, 1986 (S.O. 844(E), 19 November 1986) (India).

[6] Central Pollution Control Board, National Ambient Air Quality Standards Notification (18 November 2009) (India).

continuing mandamus); compensation and restoration; and criminal liability trajectories.[7] This is not an exhaustive digest; it is a curated set designed to represent doctrinal turning points and governance effects within the 1974-2020 period.

Institutional and performance evidence. The analysis incorporates authoritative government reports and program documents to evaluate institutional functioning and enforcement capacity. In particular, performance audit findings on water pollution governance are used as empirical evidence of structural gaps (planning, monitoring, project performance) that bear on legal enforceability and regulatory credibility.Similarly, program design features in the National Clean Air Programme (NCAP) are used to understand administrative responses to ambient air quality challenges and the shift toward multi-sector action planning.[8]

Limitations and transparency. Quantitative time-series data on enforcement actions (e.g., annual prosecutions/directions/closures across all boards) is not systematically available as a single standardized national dataset within the accessible primary sources. Where longitudinal enforcement metrics are not reliably disclosed in a comparable format, the paper avoids speculative quantification and instead uses: (i) documentary audit findings; (ii) statutory powers and legal design analysis; and (iii) selective reported indicators or illustrative monitoring datasets where clearly sourced.[9]

Historical and Statutory Overview

Indian pollution law is structured around three major legislative pillars and a widening corpus of delegated instruments aimed at specific pollutants, sectors, and waste streams.The evolution is best read in three phases: foundational institutionalization (1974-1986), delegated expansion and standards governance (late 1980s-2000s), and consolidation through specialized rules/programs and judicially shaped compliance regimes (2000s-2020).

Foundational statutes and institutionalization. The Water Act created the core organizational architecture (central and state boards), a consent-based regime for effluent discharges, and offences for contraventions; its constitutional route, Article 252, reflects early environmental federalism design, enabling Parliament to legislate for states adopting a resolution. The Air Act extended this model to air pollution, expressly linking its purpose to obligations assumed and decisions taken at the 1972 Stockholm conference.[10]The EPA 1986 then supplied an umbrella framework empowering the central government to take measures for protecting and improving environmental quality, set environmental standards, regulate hazardous substances, conduct inspections, and issue binding directions (including closure and utility stoppage). The Environment (Protection) Rules 1986 operationalized this through standards schedules and rule-based procedures for directions, while also conceptually acknowledging land/soil as part of the "recipient system.

Delegated legislation and "soil pollution" proxies. Unlike air and water, "soil pollution" is largely mediated through the EPA 1986 and detailed rules governing hazardous chemicals and waste streams. Key instruments include the Manufacture, Storage and Import of Hazardous Chemical Rules 1989 and the Chemical Accidents (Emergency Planning, Preparedness and Response) Rules 1996 (industrial accident preparedness), the Fly Ash utilization directions 1999 (soil conservation and land protection), and modernized waste management rules (2000 and 2016) regulating solid waste and specialized wastes (plastic, biomedical, e-waste, hazardous/other wastes, construction and demolition debris). These rules convert diffuse "land contamination" issues into legally manageable obligations: segregation and handling duties, authorization/consent requirements, extended producer responsibility-like structures (in some streams), reporting, and liability mechanisms,

[7] *Municipal Council, Ratlam v Shri Vardhichand & Ors* (1980) 4 SCC 162 (SC).

[8] Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, National Clean Air Programme (NCAP) (Government of India, 2019).

[9] Ministry of Environment and Forests, Fly Ash Utilization Directions (S.O. 763(E), 14 September 1999) (India).

[10] The Air (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1981 (Act 14 of 1981) (India).

though not always with an explicit remediation finance architecture.[11]

Policy layer and program responses. The National Environment Policy 2006 sought to consolidate and extend environmental governance goals, framing environmental protection as aligned with sustainable development and emphasizing capacity building and implementation review.[12]By 2019, NCAP represented a programmatic response to national air quality challenges, emphasizing monitoring networks, non-attainment city planning, sectoral interventions, and multi-tier review mechanisms. While not a statute, NCAP is legally relevant because it operationalizes statutory duties under the Air Act/EPA framework through administrative planning and standardized actions.

Comparative statutory table

Instrument	Primary Domain	Key Tools	Institutional Locus	Enforcement
Water Act, 1974	Water pollution control	Consent system; water quality monitoring; prosecution	CPCB / SPCBs	Consent conditions; directions; criminal offences
Air Act, 1981	Air pollution control	Consent in control areas; emission standards; monitoring	CPCB / SPCBs	Emission limits; consent conditions; criminal offences
EPA, 1986 & EP Rules, 1986	Cross-media environmental regulation	Central standards; inspections; regulatory directions	Central Government and agencies	Binding directions; penalties
EIA Notification, 2006	Environmental clearance for projects	Screening; appraisal; public consultation; EC conditions	Central / State authorities	Prior environmental clearance; compliance reporting
Waste Management Rules (2000/2016)	Waste and land pollution	Segregation; authorization; disposal standards	Local bodies; SPCBs; central agencies	Authorizations; compliance monitoring; penalties

Enforcement Mechanisms and Regulatory Architecture

The enforceability of pollution law depends less on the mere presence of statutory prohibitions and more on the integrity of the "regulatory chain": standard-setting → permitting/consent → monitoring and data → inspection and directions → sanctions (administrative and criminal) → remediation/compensation.[13] This chain is institutionally shared among the central government, the pollution control boards, and (particularly for waste-related pollution) local bodies and specialized agencies. The paper highlights five interdependent components.

Regulatory agencies and federal design

The primary agencies are the Central Pollution Control Board and State Pollution Control Boards, operating under the Water and Air Acts and

[11] Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, Solid Waste Management Rules, 2016 (S.O. 1357(E), 8 April 2016) (India).

[12] Ministry of Environment and Forests, National Environment Policy, 2006 (Government of India, 2006).

[13] Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, Construction and Demolition Waste Management Rules, 2016 (G.S.R. 317(E), 29 March 2016) (India).

referenced within the EPA/EP Rules framework.Their functions include advising governments, setting or coordinating standards, conducting monitoring, collecting samples, and enforcing compliance through directions and prosecutions. The federal design is asymmetric: the Water Act's Article 252 route implies adoption dynamics by states, while the EPA 1986 is a central umbrella with broad delegation authority. The result is a multi-level administrative law structure where central standards and policy often interface with state-level permitting and enforcement, creating coordination problems when technical capacity and political will diverge across jurisdictions.[14]

Standards and the problem of credibility

Indian pollution law relies heavily on quantitative standards: ambient standards (e.g., NAAQS) and emission/discharge standards for industries and processes.The EP Rules provide that standards for emissions/discharges must be complied with, and they allow boards to prescribe more stringent standards based on local conditions and the quality of the recipient system, including soil/water/air, suggesting a legal framework for differentiated standards where ecological sensitivity demands it.NAAQS (2009) notably expanded the regulatory scope to include PM2.5 with an annual limit of 40 µg/m³ and a 24-hour limit of 60 µg/m³, creating a benchmark for both preventive planning and enforcement-oriented interventions.

However, standards are only as legally meaningful as the monitoring systems that verify them. NCAP explicitly frames monitoring network expansion and data augmentation as core components, indicating that the state itself recognizes "measurement capacity" as a central constraint on enforceability.[23] The legal difficulty is that when monitoring is sparse, compliance becomes contestable, enforcement arbitrary, or both, undermining rule-of-law values and encouraging either non-compliance or selective enforcement.

Permitting: consents and authorizations

A central enforcement mechanism is the consent/permit system under the Water and Air frameworks, commonly operationalized as "Consent to Establish" and "Consent to Operate." (n.2) This licensing model allows regulators to impose site- and process-specific conditions, making it a flexible instrument compared with purely general prohibitions. The consent architecture is conceptually strong because it can translate standards into tailored compliance pathways (e.g., effluent treatment design, stack parameters, monitoring requirements). Yet its effectiveness depends on: (i) credible baseline data, (ii) inspection capacity, (iii) enforcement follow-through (including closure powers), and (iv) insulation from regulatory capture.

Delegated waste rules add "authorization" regimes: for example, hazardous waste rules regulate management and transboundary movement through scheduled classifications and obligations tied to the EPA 1986.[15] Similarly, sectoral rules for biomedical waste and e-waste impose duties on generators and processors, implying a compliance system that is more complex than traditional point-source industrial regulation because it involves dispersed actors and supply-chain tracking.[16]

(n.2) ***Practice note:*** "Consent to Establish/Operate" are administrative categories; the statutes typically speak of "consent" for specified activities, later refined by regulatory practice and board procedures into staged approvals.

EIA and environmental clearance as upstream pollution prevention

The EIA Notification 2006 establishes prior environmental clearance (EC) as a precondition for specified new projects and expansions, structured around staged evaluation: screening (Category B), scoping, public consultation, and appraisal. It institutionalizes State Environment Impact Assessment Authorities and committees, and it assigns SPCBs/UTPCCs an operational role in public hearing logistics (receiving draft EIA, public

[14] Ministry of Environment and Forests, Chemical Accidents (Emergency Planning, Preparedness and Response) Rules, 1996 (G.S.R. 347(E), 1 August 1996) (India).

[15] Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, Hazardous and Other Wastes (Management and Transboundary Movement) Rules, 2016 (G.S.R. 395(E), 4 April 2016) (India).

[16] Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, Bio-Medical Waste Management Rules, 2016 (G.S.R. 343(E), 28 March 2016) (India).

notice, conduct of hearing, and forwarding proceedings).[17] In theory, EIA is an integrated tool for cross-media pollution prevention because it can impose conditions on emissions, effluents, waste management, and land-use prior to project

commencement.

The critical challenge is implementation fidelity. If EIA becomes a documentation exercise with insufficient baseline assessment or limited incorporation of public consultation outcomes, its ex ante preventive value is weakened and downstream enforcement burdens increase.,The legal significance is that pollution law then becomes disproportionately reliant on ex post judicial and administrative sanctioning rather than lawful preventive decision-making.

Polluter Pays Principle in regulatory practice

The polluter pays principle (PPP) operates on two levels: (i) as a liability and compensation doctrine in courts and (ii) as a policy logic embedded in delegated rules and administrative instruments. The Plastic Waste Management Rules 2016 explicitly invoke adoption of the "polluter's pay principle" for sustainability of waste management systems, signaling the internalization of costs as a regulatory objective rather than a purely judicial remedy.[18]Courts, most prominently, constitutionalized and operationalized PPP in landmark decisions, ordering polluters to compensate affected persons and bear the cost of restoring damaged ecology.[19] The practical issue is translation: while PPP is normatively clear, administrative systems to quantify ecological harm and recover restoration costs remain uneven, leading to ad hoc determinations and enforcement discontinuities.[20]

Comparative table: enforcement powers and institutional locus

Power Type	**Water/Air Acts (Boards)**	**EPA 1986 Framework**	**Delegated Waste Rules**	**Typical Compliance Risk**
Standard-setting	Coordinative role with standard-related duties	Central rule-making and standards under EP Rules	Rule-based standards and schedules	Measurement gaps and limited monitoring networks
Inspection & Sampling	Statutory inspection and sampling powers	Entry, inspection, and sampling powers	Enforcement via SPCBs and local bodies	Understaffing and dispersed pollution sources
Binding Directions / Closure	Board powers including closure directions	Section 5 binding directions	Compliance orders through authorizations	Due process issues and weak follow-through
Prosecution (Criminal)	Penalties for consent violations	Section 15 penalties and cognizance provisions	EPA penalties for rule violations	Slow trials and weak deterrence
Compensation / Restoration	Often court-driven remedies	Polluter Pays Principle applied judicially	Cost recovery provisions in some rules	Weak quantification and recovery mechanisms

[17] Ministry of Environment and Forests, Environmental Impact Assessment Notification, 2006 (S.O. 1533(E), 14 September 2006) (India).
[18] Ministry of Environment and Forests, Environmental Impact Assessment Notification, 2006 (S.O. 1533(E), 14 September 2006) (India).
[19] *Indian Council for Enviro-Legal Action & Ors v Union of India & Ors* (1996) 3 SCC 212 (SC).
[20] Law Commission of India, 186th Report: Proposal to Constitute Environment Courts (September 2003).

Judicial Responses

Indian environmental adjudication has performed not merely a dispute-resolution function but a governance function, particularly in pollution matters where chronic administrative failure, infrastructure deficit (STPs/ETPs), and collective-action problems render ordinary enforcement inadequate.[21]The judiciary's interventions can be understood through five themes.

PIL and constitutionalization of pollution control

The Supreme Court's articulation that the right to life under Article 21 includes the "right to enjoyment of pollution free water and air" is a cornerstone proposition that reorients pollution control from a statutory compliance issue into a constitutional entitlement. At the same time, the Court has also cautioned against abuse of PIL, rejecting petitions motivated by private interest under the guise of public interest, thereby acknowledging that legitimacy of judicial environmental governance depends on procedural good faith.

The public nuisance route in *Municipal Council, Ratlam* demonstrates the Court's willingness to impose affirmative obligations on local authorities to abate public health hazards, rejecting "scarcity of municipal funds" as a defence to statutory duties.[22] The doctrinal significance is that pollution control is framed as a non-discretionary duty when statutory conditions and public harm are established, an approach later amplified in Article 21 jurisprudence.

Judicial innovation: continuing mandamus and compliance architecture

In the Ganga pollution litigation initiated by M. C. Mehta, the Court adopted a continuing supervisory posture, focusing on municipal sewage and industrial effluent discharges and requiring implementation of treatment measures irrespective of financial inconvenience. This compliance-centric approach became a template: iterative orders, reporting requirements, and court-supervised timelines. In vehicular pollution matters, the Court explicitly linked administrative inertia to constitutional obligations and described its intervention as driven by "failure to discharge constitutional obligations" by government agencies, listing technology and fuel measures adopted through court pressure.[23]

The governance effect is double-edged. Judicial supervision can force inter-agency action and accelerate compliance in politically difficult areas; yet it can also externalize accountability from executive agencies to the court, risking fragile compliance when court monitoring recedes. NCAP's design, highlighting multi-tier review, monitoring networks, and city-specific action plans, can be read as an administrative attempt to institutionalize what courts had earlier compelled episodically: planning, measurement, and accountability mechanisms.

Principles: precaution, polluter pays, and sustainable development

The consolidation of the precautionary principle and the polluter pays principle is most decisively articulated in *Vellore Citizens Welfare Forum*, a case involving leather industry effluents contaminating land and water systems.[24]The Court framed polluters as liable to compensate affected persons and to pay the costs of restoring damaged ecology, moving beyond compensation as private damage to include ecological restoration as a public claim.This is doctrinally significant for soil pollution because land degradation is often diffuse and long-term; the Court's framing authorizes restoration costs as part of the remedy rather than treating pollution as a narrow tort-like injury.

In the *Indian Council for Enviro-Legal Action* litigation concerning industrial pollution and toxic harms, the Court used a strong "polluter pays" logic by directing closure and emphasizing that environmental cleanup costs cannot be externalized to the public.[30] The broader jurisprudential implication is that PPP serves as a method of internalizing negative externalities, aligning with policy commitments in delegated waste rules explicitly referencing polluter pays for system sustainability.[25]

[21] *M.C. Mehta v Union of India* (Ganga pollution) (1987) 4 SCC 463 (SC).
[22] *M.C. Mehta v Union of India* (Oleum Gas Leak) (1986) (SC) (hazardous industry liability).
[23] *M.C. Mehta v Union of India & Ors* (vehicular pollution orders, including 1998-2002) (SC).
[24] Vellore Citizens Welfare Forum v Union of India & Ors (1996) 5 SCC 647 (SC).
[25] Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, Plastic Waste Management Rules, 2016 (G.S.R. 320(E), 18 March 2016) (India).

Science, expertise, and adjudicatory capacity

In *A.P. Pollution Control Board v Prof. M.V. Nayudu*, the Court emphasized the epistemic complexity of pollution adjudication and highlighted the need for scientific inputs.[34] This recognition is institutionally relevant: it indirectly justifies specialization (expert tribunals, technical committees) and underlines a structural limitation of generalist courts dealing with technical risk governance. The Law Commission's proposal to constitute environment courts was premised on similar concerns: the need for specialized adjudication to reduce burdens on constitutional courts and improve environmental disute resolution. The later establishment of the National Green Tribunal reflects this institutional trajectory in Indian environmental justice design, although detailed tribunal jurisprudence is outside the present scope.[26](n.3)

(n.3) *Institutional note:* The NGT's role is analytically relevant for pollution law because it provides a civil forum for environmental disputes and compensation within a specialized structure; however, consistent with the paper scope, this section focuses on Supreme Court and High Court jurisprudence up to 2020.

Remedies: closure, relocation, compensation, and criminal liability

The Supreme Court's remedial toolkit in pollution cases includes: closure of non-compliant units, mandatory adoption of cleaner fuels or technologies, relocation of industries from ecologically sensitive zones, and compensation directives. The Taj Trapezium litigation illustrates the Court's willingness to order structural economic adjustment, fuel switching/relocation/controls, to protect a national monument from air pollutants.This has two legal consequences: (i) environmental harm is treated as implicating cultural heritage and intergenerational public interest, and (ii) remedies can be framed as preventive rather than merely compensatory.[27]

On compensation and strictness, hazardous industry liability was strengthened through the Oleum gas leak litigation, which is widely treated as foundational for the doctrine of absolute liability for hazardous industries and for recognizing that traditional fault standards may be inadequate in modern industrial risk contexts.The Public Liability Insurance Act 1991 complements this by creating a statutory no-fault relief framework for accidents involving hazardous substances, requiring insurance and establishing a compensatory logic not dependent on proof of wrongful act or neglect.[28] Together, these instruments signal a transition: from conventional criminal prosecution alone to a mixed system including administrative directions, strict liability principles, and no-fault relief mechanisms.

Criminal liability remains formally central: the EPA 1986 provides penalties for contravention and sets conditions for cognizance; Water/Air compliance violations similarly carry penal consequences. Yet audits and program documents demonstrate that legal design alone is insufficient: the efficacy of criminal law depends on monitoring, evidence gathering, prosecution capacity, and timely adjudication.The resulting enforcement landscape is characterized by a gap between "law in books" deterrence and "law in action" capacity.

Table: landmark cases

Theme	Case	Court	Key Contribution
Public nuisance & municipal duty	*Municipal Council, Ratlam v. Vardhichand* (1980)	SC	Enforced abatement of public nuisance; rejected lack of funds as defence
Water pollution & continuing mandamus	*M.C. Mehta v. Union of India* (Ganga Pollution) (1987)	SC	Court-driven compliance for industrial effluents and municipal sewage

[26] *L.K. Koolwal v State of Rajasthan & Ors* (1988) (Rajasthan High Court).

[27] *M.C. Mehta v Union of India & Ors* (Taj Trapezium) (1997) 2 SCC 353 (SC).

[28] The Public Liability Insurance Act, 1991 (India).

Article 21 environmental right	*Subhash Kumar v. State of Bihar* (1991)	SC	Recognized right to pollution-free water and air under Article 21
Polluter Pays Principle	*Indian Council for Enviro-Legal Action v. Union of India* (1996)	SC	Applied polluter-pays principle and mandated cleanup
Precautionary principle	*Vellore Citizens Welfare Forum v. Union of India* (1996)	SC	Consolidated precautionary and polluter-pays principles
Air pollution & heritage protection	*M.C. Mehta v. Union of India* (Taj Trapezium) (1996–97)	SC	Structural air-pollution controls including fuel shift and relocation
Vehicular pollution governance	*M.C. Mehta v. Union of India* (Vehicular Pollution Orders) (1998–2002)	SC	Court-supervised emission standards and fuel policy reforms
Scientific expertise in adjudication	*A.P. PCB v. Prof. M.V. Nayudu* (1999)	SC	Emphasized role of scientific expertise in environmental adjudication
Environmental rights (early HC)	*T. Damodhar Rao* (1987)	AP HC	Linked environmental protection with public interest in urban planning
Citizen standing & sanitation	*L.K. Koolwal* (1988)	Rajasthan HC	Recognized citizen standing to enforce sanitation duties

Gaps, Challenges, and Policy or Legal Reform Recommendations

The persistence of pollution crises despite a dense legal framework points to structural gaps in design, implementation, and accountability. This section identifies principal challenges and proposes reforms consistent with sources up to 2020.

Structural gaps and challenges

Implementation deficits and infrastructure dependency. Water pollution control illustrates "infrastructure dependency": legal prohibitions against discharge and statutory duties cannot be realized without functional sewage treatment and industrial effluent treatment capacity. The performance audit records systemic shortcomings in inventorization, identification/quantification of contaminants and activities impacting water, inadequate monitoring networks, and unsatisfactory project performance (delays and under-utilized assets), collectively suggesting that law is operating in a low-capacity implementation environment. These deficits compromise both standards enforcement and the legitimacy of permitting systems because legal rules cannot be applied credibly without measurement and follow-through.

Fragmentation of "soil pollution" governance. Land/soil pollution is governed through a patchwork of EPA 1986 rules and waste-specific regimes. While this allows targeted regulation, it also fragments responsibility across multiple supply chains and authorities (local bodies, SPCBs, sectoral regulators). The Fly Ash notification explicitly links land protection and soil conservation to regulatory directions (restricting topsoil excavation and land dumping), demonstrating that soil protection can be pursued through sectoral directives; yet a general, unified contaminated land remediation and liability framework remains underdeveloped.[29] (n.4)

(n.4) *Conceptual gap:* Indian law has strong controls on inputs and waste streams, but weaker articulation of (i) how to define a "contaminated

[29] Comptroller and Auditor General of India, Water Pollution in India: Report No. 21 of 2011-12 (Performance Audit) (Government of India, 2011).

site," (ii) who bears remediation duties across time (current owner vs historic polluter), and (iii) how to finance long-term cleanup for diffuse legacy contamination. The PPP doctrine provides a normative basis, but administrative translation remains uneven.

Regulatory capacity and independence. Pollution control boards face chronic capacity challenges (technical staff, laboratories, monitoring networks) and potential conflicts from institutional design where regulators may be subject to political and economic pressures. The Law Commission's concern for specialized environment courts (later materializing in tribunalization) is partly a response to these systemic enforcement and adjudication constraints.[38] Yet tribunals cannot substitute for regulator capacity; they mainly enhance dispute resolution and accountability ex post.

Criminal enforcement limits and deterrence gap. The legal framework provides penalties, including criminal sanctions under the EPA 1986 and offences under water/air statutes. But where detection is weak and prosecutions are slow, the deterrence effect is diluted. Courts have therefore resorted to closure orders and continuing mandamus to induce compliance, but this is not a scalable substitute for routine administrative enforcement.

EIA legitimacy and public participation. EIA Notification 2006 prescribes public consultation and procedural steps, reflecting an institutional commitment to participation and transparency.[8] Yet the persistence of litigation around project approvals and compliance indicates that the procedural legitimacy of EIA and the quality of appraisal remain contested. If EIA is weakened, pollution law shifts downstream to reactive enforcement and judicial crisis management, raising governance costs.

Reform recommendations

Codify a clearer land/soil contamination remediation framework. Building on the EPA 1986's inclusion of land within "environment," India should develop a dedicated contaminated land management regime, whether through rules under the EPA 1986 or a specialized statute, defining contaminated sites, allocating liability (including historic polluter liability where feasible), requiring remediation plans, and instituting a remediation fund for orphan sites. This would move "soil pollution" from fragmented waste rules toward a coherent remediation paradigm.

Strengthen board capacity, transparency, and data architecture. Given that standards enforcement depends on monitoring networks, legal reforms should prioritize: (i) statutory/administrative guarantees of technical staffing and laboratory capability; (ii) standardized data disclosure; and (iii) audit-linked performance targets for monitoring coverage. NCAP's focus on monitoring augmentation and action plans provides a governance template that could be extended to water and waste domains, including basin-level and city-level dashboards.

Rebalance enforcement: administrative penalties and restorative orders alongside criminal prosecution. While criminal law remains symbolically important, routine compliance may improve with calibrated administrative penalties and restorative directions that can be imposed efficiently with due process (analogous to the EPA direction procedures in EP Rules). This would not replace prosecutions for serious violations; it would provide a mid-level sanction ladder that is currently weak in practice.

Institutionalize PPP through standardized environmental damage assessment. Courts have affirmed that polluters must compensate and pay for restoration. The next step is administrative standardization: develop transparent methodologies for computing restoration costs, ecological damage, and compensation in a way that can be applied consistently across boards and tribunals. Such standardization should be anchored in procedural fairness and scientific methods as urged in *Nayudu*.[30]This would reduce ad hocism and enhance legitimacy of cost recovery.

Reform EIA implementation to restore preventive effectiveness. EIA should remain a key upstream instrument. Reforms should focus on: improving baseline data quality, strengthening public consultation responsiveness, and ensuring enforceable EC conditions with monitoring integration into consent systems. The EIA

[30] *A.P. Pollution Control Board v Prof. M.V. Nayudu (Retd.) & Ors* (1999) 2 SCC 718 (SC).

Notification's staged design, screening/scoping/public consultation/appraisal, already provides the blueprint; the reform problem is compliance and quality control.

Deepen inter-agency coordination and basin/city governance. The CAG audit indicates the deficiency of basin-level approaches and coherent planning for water pollution.Multi-level coordination, central standards and support, state enforcement, local infrastructure, must be institutionalized. NCAP's multi-tier review architecture suggests one possible model: structured review bodies, defined timelines, and cross-sector responsibilities.

Conclusion

By 2020, Indian pollution law had developed into a dense regulatory and adjudicatory field with strong constitutional framing, broad statutory coverage, and extensive delegated rule-making.Yet the enduring enforcement gap demonstrates a core lesson: the efficacy of pollution law is contingent on institutional capacity, monitoring credibility, and enforceable compliance systems, not only on legal prohibitions.Judicial interventions have been transformative, constitutionalizing environmental rights, embedding precaution and polluter pays principles, and engineering compliance through continuing mandamus and structural remedies. At the same time, reliance on judicial governance reflects, and cannot fully cure, administrative deficits.

India's next-stage reform agenda, consistent with the internal logic of its legal framework, should prioritize (i) coherent land/soil contamination governance and remediation finance; (ii) stronger regulatory capacity and transparency; (iii) more effective sanction ladders integrating restorative measures; and (iv) reinvigoration of EIA as a preventive instrument.[31] These reforms would align "law in books" with "law in action," advancing a rule-of-law environmental governance model capable of addressing cross-media pollution in an administratively and constitutionally legitimate manner.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The views, findings, conclusions, and opinions expressed in articles published in this journal are exclusively those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s). The publisher and/or editorial team neither endorse nor necessarily share these viewpoints. The publisher and/or editors assume no responsibility or liability for any damage, harm, loss, or injury, whether personal or otherwise, that might occur from the use, interpretation, or reliance upon the information, methods, instructions, or products discussed in the journal's content.

****

[31] International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), *Judges and the Rule of Law: Creating the Linkages* (Environmental Policy and Law Paper No. 60, 2007).