BLOGS

MCQs on Landmark Environmental Law Judgments for CLAT PG

Shruti chauhan · 27 Oct 2026

Here are few important MCQs on Landmark Environmental Law Judgments for CLAT PG.

Q1. Which of the following judgements established the right to pollution-free air and water as a fundamental right under Article 21 for the first time?

a. Narmada Bachao Andolan v. Union of India

b. Subhash Kumar v. State of Bihar

c. M.C. Mehta v. Kamalnath

d. Goa Foundation v. Union of India

Q2. The case which is popularly known as the "Oleum Gas Leak Case" is:

a. A.P. Pollution Control Board v. Prof. M.V. Nayudu

b. M.C. Mehta v. Kamalnath

c. M.C. Mehta v. Union of India (1987)

d. Vellore Citizens Welfare Forum v. Union of India

Q3. The Supreme Court elaborated which of the following principles in *Lafarge Umiam Mining Pvt. Ltd. v. Union of India*?

a. Precautionary Principle

b. Absolute liability

c. Polluter Pays Principle

d. Environmental clearance and sustainable development

Q4. In which case did the Supreme Court hold that sustainable development must be pursued and that economic development cannot be permitted at the expense of the environment?

a. Vellore Citizens Welfare Forum v. Union of India

b. A.P. Pollution Control Board v. Prof. M.V. Nayudu

c. T.N. Godavarman Thirumulpad v. Union of India

d. Goa Foundation v. Union of India

Q5. In which of the following cases did the Supreme Court emphasise that the burden of proof lies on the person who causes environmental harm?

a. T.N. Godavarman Thirumulpad v. Union of India

b. M.C. Mehta v. Kamalnath

c. Vellore Citizens Welfare Forum v. Union of India

d. Banwasi Seva Ashram v. State of U.P.

Q6. The Supreme Court restrained the respondent in *M.C. Mehta v. Kamal Nath* mainly based on which of the following principles?

a. Inter-generational equity

b. Absolute Liability

c. Precautionary Principle

d. Public Trust Doctrine

Q7. In which case did the Supreme Court rule that the State has a constitutional duty to protect the environment under Articles 48A and 51A(g)?

a. Banwasi Seva Ashram v. State of U.P.

b. M.C. Mehta v. Kamalnath

c. Vellore Citizens Welfare Forum v. Union of India

d. T.N. Godavarman Thirumulpad v. Union of India

Q8. The concept that the state holds natural resources in trust for the general public was reiterated in:

a. A.P. Pollution Control Board v. Prof. M.V. Nayudu

b. M.C. Mehta v. Kamalnath

c. Goa Foundation v. Union of India

d. T.N. Godavarman Thirumulpad v. Union of India

Q9. Which of the following cases resulted in the recognition of environmental democracy and community involvement in decision-making?

a. Lafarge Umiam Mining Pvt. Ltd. v. Union of India

b. Subhash Kumar v. State of Bihar

c. T.N. Godavarman Thirumulpad v. Union of India

d. M.C. Mehta v. Kamalnath

Q10. Which case relates to the closure of tanneries that pollute the waterbodies?

a. Goa Foundation v. Union of India

b. Subhash Kumar v. State of Bihar

c. Narmada Bachao Andolan v. Union of India

d. Vellore Citizens Welfare Forum v. Union of India

Q11. The Supreme Court formally implemented the Public Trust Doctrine in which of the following cases?

a. M.C. Mehta v. Kamalnath

b. Vellore Citizens Welfare Forum v. Union of India

c. Narmada Bachao Andolan v. Union of India

d. Goa Foundation v. Union of India

Q12. In which of the following cases did the Supreme Court quash unauthorised municipal development invoking the public trust doctrine?

a. M.I Builders Pvt. Ltd. v. Radhey Shyam Sahu And Others

b. T.N. Godavarman Thirumulpad v. Union of India

c. A.P. Pollution Control Board v. Prof. M.V. Nayudu

d. Narmada Bachao Andolan v. Union of India

Q13. According to which of the following cases, the court prohibits the conversion of forest land for non-forest uses without the Central Government's prior consent under the Forest (Conservation) Act, 1980?

a. T.N. Godavarman Thirumulpad v. Union of India

b. Lafarge Umiam Mining Pvt. Ltd. v. Union of India

c. Vellore Citizens Welfare Forum v. Union of India

d. Narmada Bachao Andolan v. Union of India

Q14. Inter-generational equity was acknowledged by the Supreme Court as an aspect of Indian environmental law in:

a. Lafarge Umiam Mining Pvt. Ltd. v. Union of India

b. Vellore Citizens Welfare Forum v. Union of India

c. Goa Foundation v. Union of India

d. Subhash Kumar v. State of Bihar

Q15. The key issue addressed by the Supreme Court in *Banwasi Seva Ashram v. State of U.P.* is:

a. Illegal mining in forests that are protected

b. The rights of those displaced due to dams

c. Pollution from industry on forest land

d. Rehabilitation and tribal rights in forest regions

Answers

1. (B) In the case of Subhash Kumar v. State of Bihar (1991), the court established a fundamental right to a healthy environment by ruling that the Right to Life under Article 21 of the Constitution includes the right to pollution-free air and water. However, the court also issued a warning against pointless Public Interest Litigations (PILs). Subhash Kumar filed a Public Interest Litigation (PIL) against Tata Iron & Steel Co. (TISCO) for contaminating the Bokaro River with industrial slurry, which affected agricultural and public health. The court highlighted the legitimate public interest in such petitions.
2. (C) The Oleum Gas Leak Case (M.C. Mehta v. Union of India) started after activist M.C. Mehta filed a PIL in response to an oleum gas leak from Shriram Foods and Fertilisers Industries in Delhi in 1985. The case had a substantial impact on Indian environmental law and polluter pays principles by establishing the concept of “absolute liability,” which holds hazardous companies firmly accountable for harm caused, even in the absence of negligence, and requiring substantial compensation and safety measures for victims.
3. (D) In Lafarge Umiam Mining Pvt. Ltd. v. Union of India (2011), the court struck a balance between environmental protection and economic development (mining). It validated Lafarge’s Meghalaya mining operations’ conditional environmental clearance while establishing stringent guidelines for future projects, stressing the need for a national environmental regulator, transparent procedures, and equitable public participation.
4. (A)
5. (C) In Vellore Citizens Welfare Forum v. Union of India, the court held that the actor or the developer/industrialist has the “Onus of Proof” to demonstrate that his actions are environmentally friendly. According to the Court, the country’s environmental law includes the precautionary principle and the polluter pays principle.
6. (D)

7. (C)
8. (B) The Supreme Court applied the Public Trust Doctrine in M.C. Mehta v. Kamlanath.
9. (A) The decision made in Lafarge Umiam Mining (P) Ltd. v. Union of India by the Supreme Court is evidence of the fine line that must be drawn between promoting economic development and guaranteeing environmental stewardship. This ruling emphasises the importance of open communication, thorough evaluation, and sincere public involvement in environmental decision-making. It also emphasises the judiciary's function in maintaining legal systems that support sustainable development.
10. (D) The Vellore Citizens Welfare Forum, a non-governmental organisation, launched a public interest lawsuit (PIL) in Vellore Citizens Welfare Forum v. Union of India because they were concerned about the state of Tamil Nadu's pervasive pollution, which was mostly caused by the leather tanning industry. The court acknowledged the significance of the leather industry, but they made it plain that environmental preservation and public health should not be sacrificed in the name of economic expansion.
11. (A)
12. (A) The Supreme Court's decision in M.I. Builders Pvt. Ltd. v. Radhey Shyam Sahu And Others (1999 INSC 288) is a landmark ruling that upholds the integrity of statutory processes and the idea of public trust in municipal governments. This issue concerns M.I. Builders Pvt. Ltd.'s unapproved building of an underground commercial complex and parking facility in Jhandewala Park, a historically and environmentally significant location in Lucknow, with approval from the Lucknow Nagar Mahapalika ("Mahapalika").
13. (A) Concerned about the devastation of the Sandalwood Forest and the endangerment of the Sandalwood species, T.N. Godavarman Thirumulpad (known as "the green man" for his conservation litigation efforts) filed a writ petition before the Supreme Court of India in 1995 to stop illegal timber operations in the area. Section 2 of the Forest Conservation Act, which states that no state government or other authority may use forest land for any non-forestry activities without first obtaining authorisation from the Central Government, was allegedly breached by the timber operations. The case examined whether sandalwood could be designated as a "specified plant" and proclaimed an endangered species.
14. (C) The Supreme Court of India decided in Goa Foundation v. Union of India and Others that the Constitution's right to life includes four principles: intergenerational equality, sustainable development, the precautionary principle, and the polluter pays concept. Additionally, it has

decided that the state is a trustee for the people, particularly for future generations, and that the public trust doctrine applies to all natural resources. When it comes to the preservation of limited resources like minerals, the Supreme Court has acknowledged the intergenerational justice concept, which states that future generations must inherit at least as much as the present.

15. (D) Banwasi Seva Ashram v. State of U.P. refers to an important, protracted case (beginning with a 1982 letter) concerning Adivasi (tribal) land rights in the Mirzapur District, Uttar Pradesh, specifically regarding land designated as reserved forest and development projects like the National Thermal Power Corporation (NTPC) plant. The case resulted in comprehensive court orders for demarcation, compensation, rehabilitation, and supervision to strike a balance between development and tribal rights. In order to guarantee equitable treatment and rehabilitation for the impacted tribal groups, the Supreme Court issued numerous directions over the course of several years. The case involves complicated problems of forest regulations, land acquisition, and constitutional rights.