BLOGS

Manoj Mishra v. UOI: Enforcing the Right to a Clean Environment

Indrasish Majumder · 16 Apr 2025

Is the right to a clean environment a fundamental right under the Indian Constitution? Read this post to find out!

Facts of the Case

The Yamuna River, one of India's holiest and most vital rivers, flows through Delhi and provides water to millions. Over the decades, the river has suffered from intense pollution caused by domestic sewage, industrial effluents, illegal dumping of solid waste, and encroachment on floodplains.

Despite numerous cleanup initiatives such as the Yamuna Action Plan and Namami Gange, the condition of the river, particularly in Delhi, has shown little improvement.

Manoj Mishra, an environmental activist and former Indian Forest Service officer, filed a PIL in the Supreme Court, alleging gross failure by the state and its agencies in preventing the river's degradation.

The PIL sought concrete judicial directions to restore the ecological integrity of the Yamuna and to enforce the statutory and constitutional right to a clean environment. Mishra had also pursued the matter before the National Green Tribunal (NGT), but systemic non-compliance led to escalation to the apex court.

The petition emphasized the persistent pollution caused by untreated wastewater from unauthorized colonies, non-functional sewage treatment plants (STPs), and governmental inaction in enforcing environmental laws.

Mishra's legal intervention was backed by extensive data, field evidence, and community engagement, highlighting both ecological and public health emergencies.

Issues Raised

1. Is the right to a clean and pollution-free environment a fundamental right under Article 21 of the Constitution?

2. Does the failure of authorities to take effective action against the pollution of the Yamuna River violate statutory duties under the Water Act, 1974, and the Environment Protection Act, 1986?

3. Whether the principles of "polluter pays" and "precautionary principle" are enforceable through judicial intervention.

4. Can and should the Court direct the creation of institutional mechanisms to ensure inter-agency coordination and effective execution of environmental mandates?

Arguments of the Petitioner

The petitioner made the following submissions:

- The continued discharge of untreated sewage into the Yamuna had led to its ecological death, particularly in the Delhi stretch. The result constituted a gross violation of the right to life and dignity under Article 21.
- Existing statutory mechanisms had failed to control pollution due to a lack of coordination among multiple agencies like the Delhi Jal Board, Delhi Pollution Control Committee (DPCC), Central Pollution Control Board (CPCB), Municipal Corporation of Delhi (MCD), and the Ministry of Environment, Forest, and Climate Change (MoEFCC).
- The Water (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1974, and the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986, impose clear obligations on public authorities to prevent pollution and protect water bodies. Their non-compliance was actionable.
- Past judgments such as MC Mehta v. Union of India, Subhash Kumar v. State of Bihar, and Vellore Citizens Welfare Forum had established that the right to a clean environment is a part of Article 21 and environmental principles like polluter pays and the precautionary principle are binding.
- There was a need for the Court to create an empowered nodal body to coordinate efforts for Yamuna rejuvenation and to hold defaulting agencies accountable. The petitioner emphasized that public interest litigation was the only mechanism to ensure judicial supervision of state inaction.

Arguments of the Respondents

The Union of India, Delhi Government, and other respondent agencies submitted the following arguments:

- The Government had been actively pursuing river restoration through schemes like Namami Gange and the Yamuna Action Plan. Funds had been allocated, and several projects for STPs and drainage modernization were underway.
- Multiple efforts had been made to install real-time water quality monitoring stations and upgrade existing sewage infrastructure.
- Land acquisition problems, resistance from local communities, and logistical hurdles were delaying project execution.
- The judiciary should exercise restraint and allow the executive the discretion to implement environmental policies.
- Interference by the judiciary in technical or administrative matters could hamper the pace of reforms. The respondents pledged to address the court's concerns and requested additional time for implementation.

Judgment Given

The Supreme Court, in its comprehensive and progressive judgment, decisively upheld the right to a clean environment and issued strong directions to ensure accountability and action.

The Bench recognized the severity of the Yamuna's degradation and noted that past schemes had failed due to bureaucratic inertia and poor coordination.

Recognition of Environmental Rights Under Article 21

The Court held unequivocally that the right to a clean, safe, and sustainable environment is a fundamental right under Article 21. Citing Subhash Kumar, MC Mehta, and the Vellore Citizens Welfare Forum, the court observed that environmental degradation impairs health, quality of life, and human dignity.

Enforcement of Statutory Obligations

The Court held that the Water Act, 1974, and the Environment Protection Act, 1986, are not aspirational but binding laws. The failure to prevent the discharge of untreated waste into rivers constitutes statutory default. Public authorities cannot evade responsibility by citing inter-departmental challenges.

Polluter Pays and Precautionary Principle

The Court reaffirmed that the “polluter pays” and “precautionary principle” are part of Indian environmental jurisprudence. These principles are enforceable and can be used to impose liability and preventive duties on both public and private entities.

Public Trust Doctrine

The court reiterated the state’s role as a trustee of natural resources, stating that rivers are common assets meant for public use and ecological balance. Mismanagement or neglect of such resources violates the public trust doctrine and is subject to constitutional scrutiny.

Creation of an institutional mechanism

To overcome bureaucratic fragmentation, the court directed the formation of a Unified Yamuna Rejuvenation Committee (UYRC), consisting of:

– Officials from the Delhi Government

– Representatives from CPCB, MoEFCC

– Experts from premier institutions like IIT-Delhi

The Committee was tasked with preparing an action plan within 90 days and reporting quarterly to the Court. It was empowered to coordinate between agencies, recommend penalties, and monitor real-time compliance.

Monitoring and Future Course

The court directed the filing of regular compliance reports and warned that failure to do so would result in contempt proceedings, including personal liability for officers. It asked for a phased plan for STP construction, waste disposal management, and encroachment removal. The Court also left room for future directions based on the Committee’s feedback.

Conclusion

Manoj Mishra v. Union of India is a landmark verdict that blends constitutional ideals with environmental pragmatism. It exemplifies the judiciary's proactive approach to ensuring environmental justice and serves as a model for restoring degraded ecosystems through a rights-based framework. The judgment underscores that the right to clean environment is not an abstract concept but an enforceable legal right linked to right to life under Article 21 of the Indian Constitution.

In an era of escalating climate and ecological crises, this case reminds all stakeholders- citizens, administrators, and legislators, that environmental protection is a shared constitutional responsibility.

Read More: Right Against Climate Change Recognized As a Fundamental Right