

**MINUTES OF THE 156th MEETING OF THE STATE
LEVEL ENVIRONMENT IMPACT ASSESSMENT AUTHORITY (SEIAA)
KERALA, HELD ON 01st MARCH, 2025 THROUGH ONLINE MODE**

Present:

- 1. Dr H. Nagesh Prabhu IFS (Retd), Chairman, SEIAA Kerala**
- 2. Sri. K. Krishna Panicker, Expert Member, SEIAA Kerala**
- 3. Sri. Mir Mohammed Ali IAS, Member Secretary, SEIAA Kerala**

The 156th meeting of SEIAA, Kerala, was held on 01st March 2025. The meeting commenced at 02:00 P.M. and was chaired by Dr. H. Nagesh Prabhu, Chairman, SEIAA Kerala, Sri. Mir Mohammed Ali IAS, Member Secretary, SEIAA, and Sri K. Krishna Panicker, Expert Member, SEIAA, attended the meeting. The Authority reviewed the agenda for the 156th meeting and took the following decisions:

PARIVESH (VER-2)

PART-1

Item No.01

**Reappraisal of Environmental Clearance issued from DEIAA, Malappuram for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. K. Mohammed, Managing Partner, M/s Blue Stone Crusher for an area of 4.9649 Ha at Sy Nos. 300/1 (pt), 300/2 (pt), 300/3(pt) in Oorakam Village, Tirurangadi Taluk, Malappuram
(SIA/KL/MIN/453464/2023)**

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decision of 180th SEAC meeting. The project was issued EC by the DEIAA, Malappuram dated 08.06.2017 for 5 years and lease was executed on 10.01.2018 for 12 years. As per the direction of the 146th SEIAA, the SEAC verified the EIA report submitted by Sri. Mohammed Ali for his project (File No. SIA/KL/460888/2024) and noted that EIA report has not addressed the impacts and activities of the proposed Project. As per the field inspection report conducted on 24.08.2022, the quarry area falls in the medium hazard zone and higher turbulences in water flow is anticipated, especially during monsoon seasons, due to the steepness and terrain characteristics of the site. The EIA report of the adjacent quarry does not address any of these concerns. In addition to this, the designated person of the M/s Blue Stone Crusher has not signed the MoU for blasting patterns and timing within the cluster. The Environment

Management Cell proposed as per the EIA report for monitoring doesn't over see any of the cumulative impacts and does not have a representative from M/s Blue Stone Crusher. Besides, the Environment Management Plan included in the EIA report does not address any of the activities of M/s Blue Stone Crusher. Further, Project Proponent has not submitted as per the checklist of documents to be provided as per OM dated 28.04.2023 required for reappraisal DEIAA issued ECs.

In these circumstances, the Authority accepted SEAC's recommendation and decided to reject the present application. The Project Proponent is free to apply for ToR for conducting EIA study. Rejection order shall be issued to the Project Proponent, stating all the reasons for rejection.

Item No.02 Reappraisal of Environmental Clearance issued from DEIAA, Malappuram for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Hasim Malik. K, M/s. JSS Granites for an area of 4.9960 Ha at Block No. 63, Re-Sy No. 231pt in Elankur Village, Ernad Taluk, Malappuram
(SIA/KL/MIN/501463/2025)

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decision of 180th SEAC meeting. The EC from DEIAA, Malappuram was granted vide EC No. DEIAA/MAL/EC/048/2017 dated 09.02.2018 for 5 years. The mine lease deed was executed for 12 years from 10.05.2019 to 09.05.2031. As per Scheme of Mining submitted, an excess quantity of 2,27,574.8 MT has been extracted for which a Demand Notice for the payment of royalty and compounding fee was issued. As per the Cluster Certificate dated 25.04.2024, there are no operational quarries within 500m radius. But, as per the Google imagery, the project of Sri. Sainudheen C. K, M/s Yesco Granites LLP for an area of 0.9460 Ha, is located adjacent to the project site, having valid EC, which indicates cluster condition. Considering the cluster condition, the SEAC in its 180th meeting recommended rejection of the application, considering the necessity of an EIA study and Public Consultation as per norms of the EIA Notification 2006. The SEAC also recommended the assessment of environmental damages due to illegal mining. Further, Project Proponent has not submitted as per the checklist of documents to be provided as per OM dated 28.04.2023 required for reappraisal DEIAA issued ECs.

The Authority observed that through illegal/over extraction of the resources, the project proponent violated the EC conditions also, which caused severe damage to the environment that necessitates action for violation as per the EP Act, 1986. As per S.O 637 (E) dated 28th February 2014, the Central government in exercise of powers conferred by section 23 of the Environment (Protection) Act 1986 had delegated the powers vested in it under section 5 of the said act to all State and Union Territory Environment Impact Assessment Authorities constituted by the Central Government under sub-section (3) of section 3 of Environment (Protection) Act 1986, to issue show cause notice to the Project Proponents in case of violation of the conditions of the environmental clearances issued by the said authorities and to issue directions to the said project proponents for keeping such environmental clearances in abeyance or withdrawing it if required.

Considering all these, Authority decided the following:

1. Accept the recommendations of the 180th SEAC meeting to reject the application. The rejection order should detail all the observations of the Authority and SEAC, including the violation of environmental conditions.
2. In exercise of powers conferred as per S.O 637(E) dated 28.02.2014 issued by the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, the Authority decided to issue Show Cause Notice as to why the EC given should not be cancelled, for the violation of the EC conditions. Project proponent is allowed 15days time to submit the explanation.
3. The KSPCB shall assess the environmental damages due to the violation of EC conditions through a Joint Committee constituted for these kind of purposes already and submit a report to SEIAA for necessary further action.
4. The project proponent is free to submit the ToR application, after the completion of the violation procedures.

Item No.03

Reappraisal Environmental Clearance issued from DEIAA, Malappuram for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. K.P Aboobacker, M/s Puthenveettil Associates for an area of 1.4603 Ha at Sy Nos. 137/4 in Valambur Village, Perinthalmanna Taluk, Malappuram.

(SIA/KL/MIN/503716/2025)

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decision of the 180th SEAC meeting. The EC from DEIAA, Malappuram was granted for a period of 5 years vide No. DEIAA/MAL/EC/044/2017 dated 09.02.2018. The SEAC noted that as per the Scheme of Mining approved dated 07.12.2022, the Project Proponent carried out excess mining of 55,700 MT, hence the balance reserve is 3,32,380 MT. On verification of Google imagery, the SEAC observed that there is no lateral space for further mining and vertical expansion is not possible considering the depth to water table. In addition, the Committee also observed that the environmental fragility of the project area is very high. Therefore, the SEAC in its 180th meeting recommended rejection of the application and damage assessment for violation.

The authority on verification observed that the buffer area in the northeastern direction of the proposed site has been encroached upon by excessive mining, leaving no prospects for lateral expansion. The Authority observed that through illegal/over extraction of the resources, the project proponent violated the EC conditions also, which caused severe damage to the environment that necessitates action for violation as per the EP Act, 1986.

As per S.O 637 (E) dated 28th February 2014, the Central government in exercise of powers conferred by section 23 of the Environment (Protection) Act 1986 had delegated the powers vested in it under section 5 of the said act to all State and Union Territory Environment Impact Assessment Authorities constituted by the Central Government under sub-section (3) of section 3 of Environment (Protection) Act 1986, to issue show cause notice to the Project Proponents in case of violation of the conditions of the environmental clearances issued by the said authorities and to issue directions to the said project proponents for keeping such environmental clearances in abeyance or withdrawing it if required. Further, Project Proponent has not submitted as per the checklist of documents to be provided as per OM dated 28.04.2023 required for reappraisal DEIAA issued ECs.

Considering all these, the Authority decided the following:

1. Accept the recommendations of the 180th SEAC meeting to reject the application. The rejection order should detail all the observations of the Authority and SEAC, including the violation of environmental conditions.
2. In exercise of powers conferred as per S.O 637(E) dated 28.02.2014 issued by the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, the Authority decided to issue Show Cause Notice as to why the EC given should not be cancelled, for the violation of the EC conditions. Project proponent is allowed 15days time to submit the explanation.
3. The KSPCB shall assess the environmental damages due to the violation of EC conditions through a Joint Committee constituted for these kind of purposes already and submit a report to SEIAA for necessary further action.

Item No. 04

Reappraisal of Environmental Clearance issued from DEIAA, Malappuram for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. K.P Aboobacker, Managing Partner, M/s Puthenveettil Associates for an area of 1.6762 Ha at Sy Nos. 64/1, 64/2 & 65 in Mnakada Village, Perinthalmanna Taluk, Malappuram.

(SIA/KL/MIN/504642/2025)

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decision of 180th SEAC meeting. The EC from DEIAA, Malappuram was granted for 5 years vide EC No. DEIAA/MAL/EC/028/2017 dated 01.12.2017. As per the Mining Plan approved dated 21.06.2017, the mineable reserve is estimated as 7,21,560 MT for a mine life of 12 years. The mine lease was executed for 12 years from 18.04.2018. The Scheme of Mining, approved dated 12.06.2023 indicates excess extraction of 62,500 MT of resources from the lease area, and a quantity of 29,500 MT was over-extracted from outside of the lease area. Hence, the balance reserve is reported as 4,11,460 MT. The SEAC in its 180th meeting recommended conditional environmental clearance for 12 years from the applicable date subject to submission of NOC from the Irrigation Department.

However, the Authority noticed that the Scheme of Mining indicates over extraction from both inside and outside the lease area. Through illegal/over extraction of the resources, the project proponent violated the EC conditions also, which caused severe damage to the environment that necessitates action for violation as per the EP Act, 1986. Further, Project Proponent has not submitted as per the checklist of documents to be provided as per OM dated 28.04.2023 required for reappraisal DEIAA issued ECs.

As per S.O 637 (E) dated 28th February 2014, the Central government in exercise of powers conferred by section 23 of the Environment (Protection) Act 1986 had delegated the powers vested in it under section 5 of the said act to all State and Union Territory Environment Impact Assessment Authorities constituted by the Central Government under sub-section (3) of section 3 of Environment (Protection) Act 1986, to issue show cause notice to the Project Proponents in case of violation of the conditions of the environmental clearances issued by the said authorities and to issue directions to the said project proponents for keeping such environmental clearances in abeyance or withdrawing it if required.

Considering all these, the Authority decided the following:

1. To reject application for violation of environmental conditions
2. In exercise of powers conferred as per S.O 637(E) dated 28.02.2014 issued by the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, the Authority decided to issue Show Cause Notice as to why the EC given should not be cancelled, for the violation of the EC conditions. Project proponent is allowed 15 days time to submit the explanation.
3. The KSPCB shall assess the environmental damages due to the violation of EC conditions through a Joint Committee constituted for these kind of purposes already and submit a report to SEIAA for necessary further action.
4. The project proponent is free to submit fresh application, after the completion of the violation procedures.

Item No.05

Reappraisal of Environmental Clearance issued from DEIAA, Malappuram for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. K.V Moideen Koya, Managing Partner, M/s New Pannippara Bricks & Metals for an area of 4.4542 Ha at Sy Nos. 12/1(Pt), 12/1/1(Pt), 12/1/2(Pt), 12/1/3(Pt), 16/1(Pt), 13/1/1(Pt) in Perakamanna Village, Ernad Taluk, Malappuram.

(SIA/KL/MIN/506281/2025)

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decision of the 180th SEAC meeting. The SEAC noted that EC from DEIAA, Malappuram was granted vide No. DEIAA/MAL/EC/003/2017 dated 18.11.2017 for 5 years. The mine lease was executed for 12 years from 12.04.2018 to 11.04.2030. As per the mining plan approved dated 01.01.2016, the targeted production was given as 2,00,000 MTA for a mine life of 24 years. But the production plan is estimated only for 17 years. As per Google Imagery, the resource availability is not commensurable with the production plan. The Scheme of Mining, has reported excess mining of 56,000 MT from the outside as well as from the lease area. The Authority also noticed the complaint forwarded by the Hon'ble MLA, Sri. P.K Basheer, vide letter dated 28.01.2025 against the illegal mining activities and over exploitation executed by the Project Proponent. The complaint also alleged that the quarrying affected the nearby water tanks. The SEAC in its 180th meeting sought clarification from the Mining and Geology Department regarding the discrepancies in the production plan and life of mine; (ii) a report from the District Collector in response to the complaint received dated 28.01.2025 and (iii) environmental damage assessment report for the violation of the EC conditions.

The Authority observed that the mining scheme indicates over-extraction both within and outside the lease area. Through illegal/over extraction of the resources, the project proponent violated the EC conditions also, which caused severe damage to the environment that necessitates action for violation as per the EP Act, 1986. Further, Project Proponent has not submitted as per the checklist of documents to be provided as per OM dated 28.04.2023 required for reappraisal DEIAA issued ECs.

As per S.O 637 (E) dated 28th February 2014, the Central government in exercise of powers conferred by section 23 of the Environment (Protection) Act 1986 had delegated the powers vested in it under section 5 of the said act to all State and Union Territory Environment Impact Assessment Authorities constituted by the Central Government under sub-section (3) of section 3 of Environment (Protection) Act 1986, to issue show cause

notice to the Project Proponents in case of violation of the conditions of the environmental clearances issued by the said authorities and to issue directions to the said project proponents for keeping such environmental clearances in abeyance or withdrawing it if required.

Under the circumstances the Authority decided the following:

1. The application of the project proponent is rejected due to violation of environmental conditions. The rejection order should include all the details including the violation.
2. In exercise of powers conferred as per S.O 637(E) dated 28.02.2014 issued by the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, the Authority decided to issue Show Cause Notice as to why the EC given should not be cancelled, for the violation of the EC conditions. Project proponent is allowed 15days time to submit the explanation.
3. The KSPCB shall assess the environmental damages due to the violation of EC conditions through a Joint Committee constituted for these kind of purposes already and submit a report to SEIAA for necessary further action.
4. The complaint of Hon'ble MLA, Sri. P.K Basheer shall be forwarded to the Mining and Geology Department, for action and report. The SEIAA Secretariat shall forward the reply to the Hon'ble MLA regarding the action taken on the complaint.

Item No.06

Reappraisal of Environmental Clearance issued from DEIAA, Malappuram for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Shahanas Edathola Kottassery for an area of 1.7063 Ha at Block No. 002, Re Sy No. 104/2B in Kannamangalam Village, Thirurangadi Taluk, Malappuram.

(SIA/KL/MIN/508351/2025)

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decision of the 180th SEAC meeting. The Project Proponent obtained EC from DEIAA, Malappuram vide No. DEIAA/MAL/EC/056/2017 dated 13.04.2018 for a period of 5 years. The mine lease was executed for a period of 10 years from 31.10.2018. As per the Cluster Certificate dated

18.11.2024, the following authorised quarries are located within 500m radius of the proposed project site, indicates cluster condition.

1. Quarry of Sri. Abdul Hameed for an area of 3.1479 Ha.
2. Quarry of Sri. V. Moitheen for an area of 1.5195 Ha.
3. Quarry of Sri. Abdussalam P for an area of 3.7352 Ha.

Therefore, the SEAC in its 180th meeting recommended rejection of the proposal considering the requirement of EIA study and public consultation as per the EIA Notification 2006.

The Authority noticed that as per the Scheme of Mining Approved on 12.03.2024, the project proponent has mined excess quantity of 64,932.28 MT from the permit area and from the buffer zone (1,320 MT). Through illegal/over extraction of the resources, the project proponent violated the EC conditions also, which caused severe damage to the environment that necessitates action for violation as per the EP Act, 1986.

As per S.O 637 (E) dated 28th February 2014, the Central government in exercise of powers conferred by section 23 of the Environment (Protection) Act 1986 had delegated the powers vested in it under section 5 of the said act to all State and Union Territory Environment Impact Assessment Authorities constituted by the Central Government under sub-section (3) of section 3 of Environment (Protection) Act 1986, to issue show cause notice to the Project Proponents in case of violation of the conditions of the environmental clearances issued by the said authorities and to issue directions to the said project proponents for keeping such environmental clearances in abeyance or withdrawing it if required.

Considering all these, the Authority decided the following:

1. The application of the project proponent is rejected due to the cluster situation and violation of environmental conditions. The rejection order should include all the details including the violation.
2. In exercise of powers conferred as per S.O 637(E) dated 28.02.2014 issued by the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, the Authority decided to issue Show Cause Notice as to why the EC given should not be cancelled, for the violation of the EC conditions. Project proponent is allowed 15days time to submit the explanation.

3. The KSPCB shall assess the environmental damages due to the violation of EC conditions through a Joint Committee constituted for these kinds of purposes already and submit a report to SEIAA for necessary further action.
4. The project proponent is free to submit ToR application, after the completion of the violation procedures.

Item No.07

Reappraisal of Environmental Clearance issued DEIAA, Malappuram for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. E. K Shahul Hameed for an area of 3.5426 Ha at Re-Sy No. 1 in Kannamangalam Village, Thirurangadi Taluk, Malappuram.

(SIA/KL/MIN/508539/2025)

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decision of 180th SEAC meeting. The Project Proponent obtained EC from DEIAA vide No. DEIAA/MAL/EC/055/2017 dated 13.04.2018 for a period of 5 years. The quarrying lease was executed for a period of 10 years from 26.11.2018 and ending on 25.11.2028. As per the cluster certificate dated 23.11.2024, the following authorised quarries are located within 500m radius of the proposed site indicates cluster condition.

1. Quarry of Sri. Sakariya Pullat for an area of 1.1995 Ha.
2. Quarry of Sri. C.K Abdul Azeez for an area of 4.8240 Ha.
3. Quarry of M/s Super sands for an area of 4.9072 Ha.

The Authority noticed that as per the Scheme of Mining dated 11.03.2024, the project proponent has conducted excess mining of 99,650.5 MT from the lease area and 4,123.9 MT from the buffer area. Through illegal/over extraction of the resources, the project proponent violated the EC conditions also, which caused severe damage to the environment that necessitates action for violation as per the EP Act, 1986. Further, Project Proponent has not submitted as per the checklist of documents to be provided as per OM dated 28.04.2023 required for reappraisal DEIAA issued ECs.

As per S.O 637 (E) dated 28th February 2014, the Central government in exercise of powers conferred by section 23 of the Environment (Protection) Act 1986 had delegated the

powers vested in it under section 5 of the said act to all State and Union Territory Environment Impact Assessment Authorities constituted by the Central Government under sub-section (3) of section 3 of Environment (Protection) Act 1986, to issue show cause notice to the Project Proponents in case of violation of the conditions of the environmental clearances issued by the said authorities and to issue directions to the said project proponents for keeping such environmental clearances in abeyance or withdrawing it if required.

Considering all these, the Authority decided the following:

1. The application of the project proponent is rejected due to the cluster situation and violation of environmental conditions. The rejection order should include all the details including the violation.
2. In exercise of powers conferred as per S.O 637(E) dated 28.02.2014 issued by the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, the Authority decided to issue Show Cause Notice as to why the EC given should not be cancelled, for the violation of the EC conditions. Project proponent is allowed 15days time to submit the explanation.
3. The KSPCB shall assess the environmental damages due to the violation of EC conditions through a Joint Committee constituted for these kinds of purposes already and submit a report to SEIAA for necessary further action.
4. The project proponent is free to submit ToR application, after the completion of the violation procedures.

Item No.08

Reappraisal of Environmental Clearance issued DEIAA, Malappuram for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri K. V. Mohammed Ali, Proprietor, M/s Ernad Granite Industries for an area of 1.6902 Ha at Survey Nos. 387/1 in Panthallur Village, Ernad Taluk, Malappuram.

(SIA/KL/MIN/508897/2025)

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decision of 180th SEAC meeting. The EC from DEIAA, Malappuram was granted vide No. DEIAA/MAL/EC/011/2016 dated 19.06.2017 for 5 years. As per the approved Mining Plan dated 17.02.2017, the life of mine is

given as 10 years with a mineable reserve of 6,33,750 MT. The mine lease was executed for a period of 10 years from 21.08.2017 and ending on 20.08.2027. The Scheme of Mining dated 19.02.2024, reported a quantity of 45,936 MT as excess mining and the remaining mineable reserve is given as 3,86,790 MT. The SEAC in its 180th meeting recommended conditional environmental clearance for 10 years from the applicable date subject to submission of NOC from the Irrigation Department.

However, the Authority noticed that the Scheme of Mining indicates over extraction. Through illegal/over extraction of the resources, the project proponent violated the EC conditions also, which caused severe damage to the environment that necessitates action for violation as per the EP Act, 1986.

As per S.O 637 (E) dated 28th February 2014, the Central government in exercise of powers conferred by section 23 of the Environment (Protection) Act 1986 had delegated the powers vested in it under section 5 of the said act to all State and Union Territory Environment Impact Assessment Authorities constituted by the Central Government under sub-section (3) of section 3 of Environment (Protection) Act 1986, to issue show cause notice to the Project Proponents in case of violation of the conditions of the environmental clearances issued by the said authorities and to issue directions to the said project proponents for keeping such environmental clearances in abeyance or withdrawing it if required.

Considering all these, the Authority decided the following:

1. The application of the project proponent is rejected due to violation of environmental conditions. . The rejection order should include all the details including the violation.
2. In exercise of powers conferred as per S.O 637(E) dated 28.02.2014 issued by the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, the Authority decided to issue Show Cause Notice as to why the EC given should not be cancelled, for the violation of the EC conditions. Project proponent is allowed 15days time to submit the explanation.
3. The KSPCB shall assess the environmental damages due to the violation of EC conditions through a Joint Committee constituted for these kinds of purposes already and submit a report to SEIAA for necessary further action.
4. The project proponent is free to submit fresh application, after the completion of the violation procedures.

Item No.09

Reappraisal of Environmental Clearance issued DEIAA, Ernakulam for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Sajeev Mathew, Managing Partner, M/s United Metals for an area of 3.5588 Ha at Sy Nos. 469/8-5,469/8-1 in Palakuzha Village and 12/1B, 12/1A & 12/1C Arakuzha Village, Muvattupuzha Taluk, Ernakulam.

(SIA/KL/MIN/509191/2024)

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decision of SEAC/SEIAA meeting held on different dates. The EC from DEIAA, Ernakulam was granted vide No. DIA/KL/MIN/7848/2017 dated 23.01.2018 for a period of 5 years. The mine lease was executed for a period of 8 years from 24.04.2018 and ending on 23.04.2026. The SEAC found that the Project Proponent has not submitted the recent Cluster Certificate and the re-grassing proposal, which are mandatory for re-appraisal as per the checklist of OM dated 28.04.2023. As per the Google imagery, the SEAC noticed that, there is no space for lateral mining and the project proponent has encroached mining beyond the permit area. The 151st SEIAA meeting also considered the complaint filed by All Kerala Anti-Corruption & Human Rights Protection Council vide letter dated 10.11.2024. The Complaint alleged that the Project Proponent conducted mining beyond the approved limits and the mining was continued after date of expiry of the EC. Considering all these, the SEAC in its 180th SEAC meeting recommended the rejection of the proposal.

The Authority noticed that the Project Proponent intimated that the quarrying lease was executed on 24.04.2018 by the Mining & Geology Department and by virtue of MoEF Notification No. S. O. 1807(E) dated 12.04.2022, the validity of EC commences from the date of execution of the quarrying lease and hence having a valid EC.

Considering the non-submission of essential documents required for reappraisal of DEIAA issued ECs, and no scope for further lateral expansion as per the observation of SEAC, the Authority accepted the recommendations of the 180th SEAC meeting to reject the proposal. The rejection order shall be issued to the Project Proponent, stating all the reasons for rejection.

The complaint shall be forwarded to the Mining and Geology Department to verify whether the project proponent has conducted over extraction from the project area and or outside the project area.

Item No.10

Reappraisal of Environmental Clearance issued DEIAA, Malappuram for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Ayoob Khan K for an area of 1.3760 Ha at Sy No. 40 pt in Edapatta Village, Perinthalmanna Taluk, Malappuram.

(SIA/KL/MIN/513495/2024)

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decision of 180th SEAC meeting. The EC from DEIAA, Malappuram was granted vide No. DEIAA/MAL/EC/022/2017 dated 01.12.2017 for a period of 5 years. The mine lease was executed for a period of 10 years from 12.02.2018 and ending on the 11.02.2028. As per the scheme of mining, the Project Proponent carried out illegal mining for a quantity of 60,154.25 MT outside the lease area beyond the buffer zone and imposed a penalty of Rs.43,56,106/- as royalty. Furthermore, the Project Proponent has extracted excess quantity and remitted a fine amount of Rs. 99,21,181.00. The Project Proponent has not submitted the proof of application for Wildlife Clearance since the Silent Valley National Park is located within 10km radius from the project area. The original mining plan submitted is not legible. The Committee also noted that the Project Proponent has not submitted the recent Cluster Certificate, Common Cause affidavit and the re-grassing proposal as per the checklist of OM dated 28.04.2023 for the reappraisal. Considering the non-submission of documents, the SEAC in its 180th meeting recommended rejection of the application.

The Authority noticed that the project proponent has conducted over extraction. Through illegal/over extraction of the resources, the project proponent violated the EC conditions also, which caused severe damage to the environment that necessitates action for violation as per the EP Act, 1986. Further, Project Proponent has not submitted as per the checklist of documents to be provided as per OM dated 28.04.2023 required for reappraisal DEIAA issued ECs.

As per S.O 637 (E) dated 28th February 2014, the Central government in exercise of powers conferred by section 23 of the Environment (Protection) Act 1986 had delegated the powers vested in it under section 5 of the said act to all State and Union Territory Environment Impact Assessment Authorities constituted by the Central Government under sub-section (3) of section 3 of Environment (Protection) Act 1986, to issue show cause notice to the Project Proponents in case of violation of the conditions of the environmental

clearances issued by the said authorities and to issue directions to the said project proponents for keeping such environmental clearances in abeyance or withdrawing it if required.

Considering all these, the Authority decided the following:

1. The application of the project proponent shall be rejected due to non-submission of documents and violation of environmental conditions. The rejection order should include all the details including the violation.
2. In exercise of powers conferred as per S.O 637(E) dated 28.02.2014 issued by the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, the Authority decided to issue Show Cause Notice as to why the EC given should not be cancelled, for the violation of the EC conditions. Project proponent is allowed 15days time to submit the explanation.
3. The KSPCB shall assess the environmental damages due to the violation of EC conditions through a Joint Committee constituted for these kind of purposes already and submit a report to SEIAA for necessary further action.
4. The project proponent is free to submit fresh application, after the completion of the violation procedures.

Item No.11

Reappraisal of Environmental Clearance issued DEIAA, Kozhikode for the Granite Building Stone Quarry of M/s Matha Industries at Field No 2436 (un surveyed) for an area of 3.5367 Ha at Koodaranji Village, Thamarassery Taluk, Kozhikode (SIA/KL/MIN/450873/2023)

The Authority perused the item and noticed that the proposal for revalidation of EC was considered in various SEAC/SEIAA meetings. The Sub-Committee of SEAC visited the site on 13.07.2021. The project proponent applied via PARIVESH portal for re-appraisal and the same was delisted since 10.11.2023, due to the non-submission of documents and later enlisted on 12.02.2025.

The 180th SEAC has examined the proposal and found that the dominant part of the site falls within the moderate hazard zone and the Project Proponent has not submitted the approval of the District Level Crisis Management Group. As per the Cluster Certificate dated 08.01.2025, there are 6

other quarries within 500m radius and the area altogether comes more than 5 Ha and hence there is a cluster condition. Therefore, the SEAC in its 180th meeting recommended rejection of the application to conduct EIA study and public consultation. The Authority also noticed the complaint submitted by Sri. Peter Punnachottee regarding the quarry project and the project proponents were heard in its 153rd SEIAA meeting.

Upon deliberation, the Authority accepted SEAC's recommendation to reject the present application. The Project Proponent is free to apply for ToR for conducting EIA study. Rejection order shall be issued to the Project Proponent, stating all the reasons for rejection.

Item No.12

**Reappraisal of Environmental Clearance issued from DEIAA, Kozhikode for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. T. P. Linej for an area of 1.6285 Ha at Survey No.2416 & 2417 Koodaranji Village, Thamarassery Taluk, Kozhikode.
(SIA/KL/MIN/497295/2024)**

The Authority perused the item and noticed that the proposal for revalidation of the EC was considered physically in various SEAC/SEIAA meetings. The Sub-Committee of SEAC visited the site on 25.04.2022. Subsequently, as per O.M. dated 28.04.2023, the project proponent submitted fresh reappraisal application the DEIAA issued EC through PARIVESH Portal along with necessary documents.

Accordingly, the 180th SEAC meeting heard the presentation of the proposal. The project proponent obtained EC from DEIAA vide No. 63/DEIAA/KL/MIN/7255/2017 dated 26.04.2018 for a period of 5 years. The mine lease for the proposed project was executed for 12 years from 12.03.2019 and ending on 11.03.2031. As per the Scheme of Mining approved dated 31.05.2024, the balance mineable reserve available is 2,74,400 MT and an excess quantity of 1,38,489.21 MT has been mined out from the buffer area and from outside of the permit area. The SEAC as per the Google imagery noticed that the resource availability for mining for 12 years is non-existent. The SEAC in its 180th meeting recommended conditional EC for 12 years subjected to submission of NOC from the Irrigation Department.

However, the Authority noticed that the Scheme of Mining indicates over extraction. Through illegal/over extraction of the resources from the buffer area and outside the permit

area, the project proponent violated the EC conditions also, which caused severe damage to the environment that necessitates action for violation as per the EP Act, 1986.

As per S.O 637 (E) dated 28th February 2014, the Central government in exercise of powers conferred by section 23 of the Environment (Protection) Act 1986 had delegated the powers vested in it under section 5 of the said act to all State and Union Territory Environment Impact Assessment Authorities constituted by the Central Government under sub-section (3) of section 3 of Environment (Protection) Act 1986, to issue show cause notice to the Project Proponents in case of violation of the conditions of the environmental clearances issued by the said authorities and to issue directions to the said project proponents for keeping such environmental clearances in abeyance or withdrawing it if required.

Considering all these, the Authority decided the following:

1. The application of the project proponent shall be rejected due violation. The rejection order should include all the details including the violation of environmental conditions.
2. In exercise of powers conferred as per S.O 637(E) dated 28.02.2014 issued by the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, the Authority decided to issue Show Cause Notice as to why the EC given should not be cancelled, for the violation of the EC conditions. Project proponent is allowed 15days time to submit the explanation.
3. The KSPCB shall assess the environmental damages due to the violation of EC conditions through a Joint Committee constituted for these kind of purposes already and submit a report to SEIAA for necessary further action.
4. The project proponent is free to submit fresh application, after the completion of the violation procedures.

Item No.13

Reappraisal of Environmental Clearance issued from DEIAA, Kozhikode for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Raveendran V. K. for an area of 1.2604 Ha at Re-Sy No. 262/15 in Maruthonkara Village, Vatakara Taluk, Kozhikode

(SIA/KL/MIN/502963/2024)

Sri. Raveendran V. K., Vattakandiyil (H), Chathankottu Nada P.O, Kavilumpara (via), Kozhikode-673513, submitted an application for reappraisal of Environmental Clearance issued by DEIAA, Kozhikode for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project for an area of 1.2604 Ha at Re- Sy No. 262/15 in Maruthonkara Village, Vatakara Taluk, Kozhikode.

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decisions of various SEAC meetings held on different dates. It is noted that the SEAC had appraised the proposal based on Form-2, Pre-Feasibility Report, Mining Plan, and the additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal. The 180th SEAC meeting heard the presentation of the proposal. During the presentation, the project proponent informed that the mining operation has not started since the quarrying lease was not executed till now. As per the approved mining plan dated 11.09.2017, the annual production is given as 43000 MTA for a mine life of 12 years. The project proponent has also submitted the proof for application submitted before the SCNBWL for Wildlife Clearance as the Malabar Wildlife Sanctuary is 4.88 km from the project area. The SEAC in its 180th SEAC meeting recommended EC for 12 years subject to certain specific conditions in addition to the general conditions after submission of NOC from the Irrigation Department.

The Authority noted that for the sustainable management of quarry operations, the approved mining plan is revised every five years till the project life of mine as per KMMC Rules, incorporating scheme of activities to be carried out for the next 5 years. Authority is of the opinion that it is essential to match these procedures and time lines followed in the department of Mining and Geology with the time lines ECs issued for the sustainable management of quarry operations and protection of environment in the project region.

In these circumstances, the Authority accepted the recommendations of 180th SEAC meeting and decided to issue Environmental Clearance initially for a period of 5 years from the date of execution of mine lease / permit and then to extend the EC period to cover the project life of 12 (Twelve) years, subject to the review by SEAC at the end

of every five years, to verify whether the Project Proponent has violated any of the EC conditions and thereby caused any damage to the Environment in the project region.

The EC is subject to General Conditions and the following Additional Specific Conditions.

1. *The Project Proponent shall carry out quarrying as per the approved Mining Plan and as per the Specific Conditions mentioned hereafter. The Project Proponent should strictly follow the Kerala Minor Mineral Concession Rules 2015 and amendments thereby.*
2. *The EC shall be valid from the date of execution of permit/lease from the Department of Mining and Geology. The copy of the permit / lease order should be provided to the SEIAA before commencing the mining activity.*
3. *The EC issued will be subject to a review by SEAC after every 5 years through field verification to ensure that mining is carried out sustainably as per the EC conditions.*
4. *The depth of mining should be limited to 73m above MSL to prevent intersection with ground water table and the mineable resources shall be reworked accordingly by the Mining and Geology Department while approving the Scheme of Mining / issuing the lease or permit.*
5. *A buffer of 50m is to be maintained from the built structures and project boundary.*
6. *The conditions stated in the NOC from Irrigation Department should be strictly complied with, if any.*
7. *Since the project area located within 10 km radius of Malabar Wild Life Sanctuary, the Project Proponent has to obtain Wildlife Clearance from the SCNBWL as per the OM dated 17.05.2022 of MoEF&CC as per the directions in the Hon'ble Supreme Court Judgement dated 26.04.2023 in IA 13177 of 2022 before the commencement of mining.*
8. *The Authority makes it amply clear that EC issued does not necessarily imply that Wildlife clearance shall be granted to the Project Proponent and that the*

proposal for Wildlife clearance will be considered by the respective Authorities on its merit and decision taken accordingly. The investment made in the project if any based on this EC in anticipation of clearance from Wildlife angle shall be entirely at the cost and risk of the Project Proponent and MoEF&CC and SEIAA shall not be responsible in this regard in any manner.

- 9. Copy of the EC shall be marked to IGF (WL), MoEF&CC, PCCF and Chief Wildlife Warden, Kerala, District Collector, Kozhikode and Department of Industries GoK, besides others for information and necessary further action.*
- 10. Copy of the EC shall be marked to the concerned Wildlife Warden and to the District Geologist. They are directed to ensure that Project Proponent will not commence the mining operations without clearance from SCNBWL.*
- 11. Development of green belt should be initiated prior to the commencement of mining using indigenous species. The suggested species are Phyllanthus emblica (Nelli), Syzygium cumini (Njaval), Writia tinctoria (Dhanthapala), Ficus bengalensis (Peral), Ficus racemosa (Atti), Bambusa bamboos (Mullumula), Dendrocalamus strictus (Kallan mula), Strychnos nux-vomica (Kanjiram), Terminalia cattappa (Thanni), Schleicheria oleosa (Poovam), Artocarpus hirsutus (Ayiniplavu) etc.*
- 12. Compensatory afforestation should be done prior to the commencement of mining, by planting local species of trees as proposed.*
- 13. Geotagged photographs of the progress of compensatory afforestation should be submitted along with HYCR.*
- 14. Adequate number of avenue trees of indigenous species should be planted along both sides of the haulage road.*
- 15. A temporary wall of 5m height should be erected at appropriate locations on the boundary to avoid disturbance and nuisance to the nearby residents.*
- 16. The haulage road should be provided with sprinkling facility to prevent dust pollution.*

17. *Drainage system incorporating garland canal, silt traps, siltation pond and outflow channel connecting to a natural drain should be provided prior to the commencement of mining.*
18. *Garland drain, silt-traps, siltation ponds and outflow channels should be desilted periodically and geo-tagged photographs of the process should be included in the half-yearly compliance report (HYCR).*
19. *Overflow water from the siltation pond should be discharged to the nearby natural drain after adequate filtration.*
20. *Drainage water should be monitored at different seasons by an NABL accredited lab and clear water should only be discharged into the natural stream. Geotagged photographs of the drainage and sampling site should be submitted along with HYCR.*
21. *Overburden should be stored at the designed place and gabion wall should be provided for the topsoil and overburden storage sites.*
22. *The impact of vibration due to blasting on the houses and other built structures within 200m distance from the project boundary should be monitored in terms of Peak Particle Velocity and amplitude for maximum charge per delay and included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report.*
23. *Implementation of CER Plan should be done during the first two years of the EC period itself and its operation and maintenance should be done till the completion of mine closure plan.*
24. *Transportation of mined material should not be done during the peak hours in the forenoon (8.00am to 10.00am) and afternoon (3.30pm to 5.00 pm).*
25. *Adequate sanitation, waste management and restroom facilities should be provided to the workers.*
26. *Adequate energy conservation measures should be implemented including solar power installations. At least 40% of the energy requirement shall be met from the solar power.*

27. *The Environment Management Cell (EMC) should include one subject expert in environment management and local ward member. The proceedings of the monthly meeting of the EMC should be submitted along with the HYCR.*
28. *Adequate measures should be adopted to harvest the rainwater as per the guidelines issued by the Central Groundwater Authority.*
29. *Blasting mats should be used during rock blasting to contain the blast, prevent fly rocks and suppress dust.*
30. *In the wake of occurrence of large scale landslides in the state, as per the information provided by the Department of Mining & Geology, it is directed to use only NONEL (Non Electrical) technology for blasting to reduce the vibration of the ground, which is one of the causative factors that triggers landslides, formation of cracks in the surrounding buildings and disturbance to human and wildlife.*
31. *As per OM no F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30th September 2020, under Corporate Environmental Responsibility (CER) the Project Proponent should implement the Environment Management Plan (EMP)/CER as directed by SEAC during appraisal, covering the issues to address the environmental problems in the project region, from the beginning of the project, indicating both physical and financial targets year wise. The EMP/CER shall be implemented in consultation with Local Self Govt. Institutions. A copy of the approved EMP/CER shall be made available to the concerned Panchayat for information and implementation support. The indicated cost for implementation of CER activities shall be 2% of the project cost.*
32. *As per the directions contained in the OM F.No.22-34/2018-IA.III dated 16th January 2020 issued by MoEF&CC, in obedience to the directions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court the Project Proponent shall, undertake re-grassing the mining area and any other area which may have been disturbed due to his mining activities and restore the land to a condition which is fit for growth of fodder, flora, fauna etc. The compliance of this direction shall be included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report which will be monitored by SEAC at regular intervals.*

33. *The Project Proponent is directed to install a CCTV camera and take all other essential measures to ensure that mining site is not used by antisocial elements for nefarious antisocial activities which are detrimental for peaceful coexistence in the project region. In case if such complaints are received, the EC given is likely to be cancelled after a police verification.*
34. *Progressive closure of mined area shall be carried out as per the approved mining plan and closure activities carried out shall be mentioned in the HYCR for the relevant period.*
35. *The abandoned benches may be backfilled and suitable species including fodder grass and other species adapted to such conditions should be planted and maintained.*
36. *In the beginning of the last year of the EC period, the final closure plan has to be submitted and approved by the District Geologist within 6 months.*
37. *The final closure of the quarry shall be carried out during the last 6 months of mining period and a closure certificate shall be produced to the Authority. No ECs shall be given to Project Proponent for the subsequent mining projects unless the final mine closure certificate issued by the District Geologist is produced for the previous projects, if any.*
38. *The violation of EC condition may lead to cancellation of EC and action under The Environment (Protection) Act 1986.*

SEIAA Secretariat is directed to inform the Project Proponent to submit NOC from the Irrigation Officer of Irrigation Department as clarified in the circular dated 19.11.2024 of the Chief Engineer, Irrigation Department in compliance to Section 40(2) of the Kerala Irrigation and Water Conservation Act, 2003 as ordered by the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in WP(C) No. 30737 of 2022 and 4655 of 2024 dated 19.04. 2024.

The SEAC shall verify the compliance status of the EC within 6 months and submit a report to SEIAA for further amendment of the EC conditions, if required.

Item No.14

Reappraisal of Environmental Clearance issued from DEIAA, Kozhikode for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. V.P. Babu for an area of 3.1135 Ha at Re Sy. No. 262/15 in Maruthonkara Village, Vadakara Taluk, Kozhikode.

(SIA/KL/MIN/504464/2024)

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decision of the various SEAC meeting held on different dates. The 180th SEAC meeting heard the presentation of the proposal. After hearing the presentation, the SEAC recommended rejection of the application as there is no lateral space for further mining and the vertical expansion is not possible considering the depth to water table.

The Authority noticed that as per the mining plan approved dated 20.09.2017, the balance quantity available for mining is given as 8,18,475 MT. The mine lease was executed for a period of 12 years from 22.03.2023 and ending on 21.03.2034. The Malabar Wildlife Sanctuary is at a distance of 5.5 km from the project area.

Under these circumstances, the Authority decided the following.

1. Refer the proposal back to SEAC to relook its earlier decision by considering the above observations.
2. The Project Proponent is directed to submit proof of application submitted for Wildlife Clearance since the Malabar Wildlife Sanctuary is located within 10km radius of the proposed site.

Item No.15

Reappraisal of Environmental Clearance issued from DEIAA, Kozhikode for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Shahil. A.M, Director, M/s Thekkinchuvadu Granites (P) Ltd in Unsurvey Field No. 2442 at Koodaranji Village, Koodaranji Panchayat, Thamarassery Taluk, Kozhikode - Judgment dated 05.11.2024 in WP(C) No. 33674/2024 & Interim order dated 26.11.2024 in WP(C) No.41663/2024

(SIA/KL/MIN/510005/2025)

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decision of various SEAC/SEIAA meetings held on different dates. The 180th SEAC meeting heard the presentation of the proposal. The EC from DEIAA, Kozhikode was granted vide No.

03/DEIAA/KL/MIN/3295/2016 dated 07.08.2017 for a period of 5 years. The elevation of the area varies between 260m to 140 m AMSL. As per the scheme of mining dated 03.07.2024, the balance reserve is 25,89,935 MT and an excess quantity of 2,27,574.8 MT has been extracted for which demand notice for payment of royalty and compounding fee was also issued. The project area falls within the moderate hazard zone. According to the Cluster Certificate dated 4.09.2024, there are 2 other quarries within 500m radius and the area altogether comes more than 5 Ha, indicating Cluster Condition. Therefore, the SEAC in its 180th meeting recommended to reject the application to conduct EIA study and public consultation.

However, the Authority noticed that the Scheme of Mining indicates over extraction of resources. Through illegal/over extraction of the resources, the project proponent violated the EC conditions also, which caused severe damage to the environment that necessitates action for violation as per the EP Act, 1986. The SEAC also recommended the assessment of environmental damages due to illegal mining.

As per S.O 637 (E) dated 28th February 2014, the Central government in exercise of powers conferred by section 23 of the Environment (Protection) Act 1986 had delegated the powers vested in it under section 5 of the said act to all State and Union Territory Environment Impact Assessment Authorities constituted by the Central Government under sub-section (3) of section 3 of Environment (Protection) Act 1986, to issue show cause notice to the Project Proponents in case of violation of the conditions of the environmental clearances issued by the said authorities and to issue directions to the said project proponents for keeping such environmental clearances in abeyance or withdrawing it if required.

Considering all these, the Authority decided the following:

1. The application of the project proponent is rejected due to the cluster situation and violation of environmental conditions. The rejection order should include all the details including the violation.
2. In exercise of powers conferred as per S.O 637(E) dated 28.02.2014 issued by the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, the Authority decided to issue Show Cause Notice as to why the EC given should not be cancelled, for the violation of the EC conditions. Project proponent is allowed 15days time to submit the explanation.

3. The KSPCB shall assess the environmental damages due to the violation of EC conditions through a Joint Committee constituted for these kind of purposes already and submit a report to SEIAA for necessary further action
4. The project proponent is free to submit ToR application, after the completion of the violation procedures.

The Authority also decided to intimate action taken on the re-appraisal application to the Hon'ble High Court as part of the WP(C) No. 41663 of 2024 filed by M/s Thekkinchuvadu Granites (P) Ltd.

Item No.16 Reappraisal of Environmental Clearance issued from DEIAA, Thiruvananthapuram for the Granite Building Stone Quarry project of Sri. A Muhammed Basheer, for an area of 2.1504 Ha at Block No. 22, Re-Sy Nos. 91/3, 91/2-2, 91/2-1, 91/2-3, 91/2 in Pullampara Village, Nedumangadu Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram. (SIA/KL/MIN/464591/2024)

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decision of various SEAC meeting held on different dates. It is noted that the SEAC had appraised the proposal based on Form-1, Pre-Feasibility Report, Mining Plan, and the additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent. The 168th SEAC meeting heard the presentation of the proposal and the field Inspection was conducted on 29.09.2024. The EC from the DEIAA, Thiruvananthapuram was issued for a period of 5 years vide EC No. 37/18 dated 16.11.2018. The lease deed was executed for a period of 10 years from 23.01.2019. The approved mining plan, the life of mine is given as 10 years. As per the scheme of mining, the remaining quantity proposed for mining is 7,53,695.25 MT. The Mining and Geology Department has imposed a fine of Rs. 84,96,496/- for illegal mining. Subsequently, a second demand notice was issued by the Senior Geologist vide no DO/THI/DMG/2100/2023-M on 18.12.2023 for the illicit extraction for a quantity of 34,937.141 MT and directed to remit Rs. 88,84,914/-. The SEAC in its 180th SEAC meeting recommended EC for 10 years subject to certain specific conditions in addition to the general conditions after submission of NOC from the Irrigation Department.

However, the Authority noticed that the Scheme of Mining indicates over extraction. Through illegal/over extraction of the resources, the project proponent violated the EC conditions also, which caused severe damage to the environment that necessitates action for violation as per the EP Act, 1986.

As per S.O 637 (E) dated 28th February 2014, the Central government in exercise of powers conferred by section 23 of the Environment (Protection) Act 1986 had delegated the powers vested in it under section 5 of the said act to all State and Union Territory Environment Impact Assessment Authorities constituted by the Central Government under sub-section (3) of section 3 of Environment (Protection) Act 1986, to issue show cause notice to the Project Proponents in case of violation of the conditions of the environmental clearances issued by the said authorities and to issue directions to the said project proponents for keeping such environmental clearances in abeyance or withdrawing it if required.

Considering all these, the Authority decided the following:

1. The application of the project proponent is rejected due to violation of environmental conditions. The rejection order should include all the details of violation.
2. In exercise of powers conferred as per S.O 637(E) dated 28.02.2014 issued by the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, the Authority decided to issue Show Cause Notice as to why the EC given should not be cancelled, for the violation of the EC conditions. Project proponent is allowed 15 days time to submit the explanation.
3. The KSPCB shall assess the environmental damages due to the violation of EC conditions through a Joint Committee constituted for these kinds of purposes already and submit a report to SEIAA for necessary further action
4. The project proponent is free to submit fresh application, after the completion of the violation procedures.

Item No.17

Reappraisal of Environmental Clearance issued from DEIAA, Palakkad for the Granite Building Stone Quarry project of Sri. Sudhakaran C., for an area of 1.1932 Ha at Block No.71, Re-Sy No. 74/2 ,75 &76 in Karimpuzha I Village, Ottappalam Taluk, Palakkad.

(SIA/KL/MIN/467815/2024)

Sri. Sudhakaran C, Chenganakattil House, Mannarkkad (via), Kundurkunnu, Palakkad, Kerala - 678583 submitted an application for Reappraisal of Environmental Clearance issued from DEIAA, Palakkad for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project for an area of 1.1932 Ha at Block No. 71, Re- Sy No. 74/2, 75 &76 in Karimpuzha I Village, Ottappalam Taluk, Palakkad.

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decision of 180th SEAC meeting. It is noted that the SEAC had appraised the proposal based on Form-1, Pre-Feasibility Report, Mining Plan, and the details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal. As per the Mining Plan approved dated 12.11.2018, the mineable reserve is estimated as 3,09,174 MT for a mine life of 10 years. The quarrying lease for the proposed area was executed for a period of 8 years commencing from 22.02.2019 and ending on 21.02.2027. As per the Scheme of mine, the balance reserve is provided as 2,09,274 MT. The Project proponent also submitted a comprehensive EMP prepared by a NABET accredited consultancy and the CCR from IRO, MoEF& CC, Bangalore. As per the EMP, the water table of the area is 7m to 10m below ground level. The project cost is 120 lakhs. After due appraisal the SEAC in its 180th SEAC meeting recommended conditional EC for 10 years subject to certain specific conditions in addition to the general conditions after submission of NOC from the Irrigation Department.

The Authority noted that for the sustainable management of quarry operations, the approved mining plan is revised every five years till the project life of mine as per KMMC Rules, incorporating scheme of activities to be carried out for the next 5 years. The Authority is of the opinion that it is essential to match these procedures and time lines followed in the department of Mining and Geology with the time lines ECs issued for the sustainable management of quarry operations and protection of environment in the project region.

In these circumstances, the Authority accepted the recommendations of 180th SEAC meeting and decided to issue Environmental Clearance initially for a period of 5

years from the date of execution of mine lease and then to extend the EC period to cover the project life of 10 (Ten) years, subject to the review by SEAC at the end of every five years, to verify whether the Project Proponent has violated any of the EC conditions and thereby caused any damage to the Environment in the project region.

The EC is subject to General Conditions and the following Additional Specific Conditions.

1. *The Project Proponent shall carry out quarrying as per the approved Mining Plan and as per the Specific Conditions mentioned hereafter. The Project Proponent should strictly follow the Kerala Minor Mineral Concession Rules 2015 and amendments thereby.*
2. *The EC shall be valid from the date of execution of permit/lease from the Department of Mining and Geology. The copy of the permit / lease order should be provided to the SEIAA before commencing the mining activity.*
3. *The EC issued will be subject to a review by SEAC after every 5 years through field verification to ensure that mining is carried out sustainably as per the EC conditions.*
4. ***The depth of mining should be limited to 95m above MSL to prevent intersection with ground water table and the mineable resources shall be reworked accordingly by the Mining and Geology Department while approving the Scheme of Mining / issuing the lease or permit.***
5. ***The conditions stated in the NOC from Irrigation Department should be strictly complied with, if any.***
6. *Development of green belt should be initiated prior to the commencement of mining using indigenous species. The suggested species are Phyllanthus emblica (Nelli), Syzygium cumini (Njaval), Wrightia tinctoria (Dhanthapala), Ficus bengalensis (Peral), Ficus racemosa (Atti), Bambusa bamboos (Mullumula), Dendrocalamus strictus (Kallan mula), Strychnos nux-vomica (Kanjiram), Terminalia cattappa (Thanni), Schleicheria oleosa (Poovam), Artocarpus hirsutus (Ayiniplavu) etc.*

7. *Compensatory afforestation should be done prior to the commencement of mining, by planting local species of trees as proposed.*
8. *Geotagged photographs of the progress of compensatory afforestation should be submitted along with HYCR.*
9. *Adequate number of avenue trees of indigenous species should be planted along both sides of the haulage road.*
10. *A temporary wall of 5m height should be erected at appropriate locations on the boundary to avoid disturbance and nuisance to the nearby residents.*
11. *The haulage road should be provided with sprinkling facility to prevent dust pollution.*
12. *Drainage system incorporating garland canal, silt traps, siltation pond and outflow channel connecting to a natural drain should be provided prior to the commencement of mining.*
13. *Garland drain, silt-traps, siltation ponds and outflow channels should be desilted periodically and geo-tagged photographs of the process should be included in the half-yearly compliance report (HYCR).*
14. *Overflow water from the siltation pond should be discharged to the nearby natural drain after adequate filtration.*
15. *Drainage water should be monitored at different seasons by an NABL accredited lab and clear water should only be discharged into the natural stream. Geotagged photographs of the drainage and sampling site should be submitted along with HYCR.*
16. *Overburden should be stored at the designed place and gabion wall should be provided for the topsoil and overburden storage sites.*
17. *The impact of vibration due to blasting on the houses and other built structures within 200m distance from the project boundary should be monitored in terms of Peak Particle Velocity and amplitude for maximum charge per delay and included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report.*

18. *Implementation of CER Plan should be done during the first two years of the EC period itself and its operation and maintenance should be done till the completion of mine closure plan.*
19. *Transportation of mined material should not be done during the peak hours in the forenoon (8.00am to 10.00am) and afternoon (3.30pm to 5.00 pm).*
20. *Adequate sanitation, waste management and restroom facilities should be provided to the workers.*
21. *Adequate energy conservation measures should be implemented including solar power installations. At least 40% of the energy requirement shall be met from the solar power.*
22. *The Environment Management Cell (EMC) should include one subject expert in environment management and local ward member. The proceedings of the monthly meeting of the EMC should be submitted along with the HYCR.*
23. *Adequate measures should be adopted to harvest the rainwater as per the guidelines issued by the Central Groundwater Authority.*
24. *Blasting mats should be used during rock blasting to contain the blast, prevent fly rocks and suppress dust.*
25. *In the wake of occurrence of large scale landslides in the state, as per the information provided by the Department of Mining & Geology, it is directed to use only NONEL (Non Electrical) technology for blasting to reduce the vibration of the ground, which is one of the causative factors that triggers landslides, formation of cracks in the surrounding buildings and disturbance to human and wildlife.*
26. *As per OM no F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30th September 2020, under Corporate Environmental Responsibility (CER) the Project Proponent should implement the Environment Management Plan (EMP)/CER as directed by SEAC during appraisal, covering the issues to address the environmental problems in the project region, from the beginning of the project, indicating both physical and financial targets year wise. The EMP/CER shall be implemented in consultation with Local Self Govt. Institutions. A copy of the approved EMP/CER shall be*

made available to the concerned Panchayat for information and implementation support. The indicated cost for implementation of CER activities shall be 2% of the project cost.

- 27. As per the directions contained in the OM F.No.22-34/2018-IA.III dated 16th January 2020 issued by MoEF&CC, in obedience to the directions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court the Project Proponent shall, undertake re-grassing the mining area and any other area which may have been disturbed due to his mining activities and restore the land to a condition which is fit for growth of fodder, flora, fauna etc. The compliance of this direction shall be included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report which will be monitored by SEAC at regular intervals.*
- 28. The Project Proponent is directed to install a CCTV camera and take all other essential measures to ensure that mining site is not used by antisocial elements for nefarious antisocial activities which are detrimental for peaceful coexistence in the project region. In case if such complaints are received, the EC given is likely to be cancelled after a police verification.*
- 29. Progressive closure of mined area shall be carried out as per the approved mining plan and closure activities carried out shall be mentioned in the HYCR for the relevant period.*
- 30. The abandoned benches may be backfilled and suitable species including fodder grass and other species adapted to such conditions should be planted and maintained.*
- 31. In the beginning of the last year of the EC period, the final closure plan has to be submitted and approved by the District Geologist within 6 months.*
- 32. The final closure of the quarry shall be carried out during the last 6 months of mining period and a closure certificate shall be produced to the Authority. No ECs shall be given to Project Proponent for the subsequent mining projects unless the final mine closure certificate issued by the District Geologist is produced for the previous projects, if any.*
- 33. The violation of EC condition may lead to cancellation of EC and action under The Environment (Protection) Act 1986.*

The project proponent shall submit the following documents within 1 month, otherwise, the EC shall be cancelled.

1. Detailed CER proposal as per the guidelines uploaded on the SEIAA website
2. NOC from the Irrigation Department in compliance with Section 40(2) of the Kerala Irrigation and Water Conservation Act, 2003
3. Compliance of Hon'ble Supreme Court judgment dated 02.08.2017 passed in Common Cause vs Union of India Writ Petition (C) 114 of 2014
4. Proposal of re-grassing the mining area and any other area which may have been disturbed due to their mining activities and restore the land in compliance to the direction dated 8th January, 2020 of Hon'ble Supreme Court in Writ Petition(s) Civil No. 114/2014, Common Cause vs Union of India & Ors

The SEAC shall verify the compliance status of the EC within 6 months and submit a report to SEIAA for necessary further action.

Item No.18 **Reappraisal of Environmental Clearance issued by DEIAA, Thiruvananthapuram for the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Adarsh S. Babu, for an area of 1.8504 Ha at Sy. Nos. 114/4, 114/14, 114/16pt, 113/1-1, 113/1-3, 113/1-3-1, 113/2-1, 113/2-2, 113/15, 113/3 in Nellanad Village Nedumangad Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram**
(SIA/KL/MIN/508938/2024).

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decision of 180th SEAC meeting. The Project Proponent obtained EC from DEIAA, Thiruvananthapuram vide No. DIA/KL/MIN/12943/2018 dated 19.05.2018 for a period of 5 years. The quarrying lease was executed for a period of 6 years from 29.08.2019 to 28.08.2025. The SEAC noted that the Project Proponent has not submitted all the documents as per the checklist of OM dated 28.04.2023 for reappraisal including the cluster certificate. Therefore, the SEAC in its 180th meeting recommended rejection of the application.

Upon deliberation, the Authority accepted SEAC's recommendation and decided to reject the present application considering the non-submission of documents as per

OM dated 28.04.2023. The Project Proponent may apply afresh with all documents required for reappraisal as per the O.M dated 28.04.2023. The Project Proponent shall also provide the Scheme of Mine along with the fresh application. The rejection order shall be issued to the Project Proponent, stating all the reasons for rejection.

Item No.19

**Reappraisal of Environmental Clearance issued from DEIAA, Palakkad for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. K. P. Moosakutty Haji, Managing Partner M/s K.P.M Granites Industries for an area of 1.7486 Ha at Survey Nos.: 296 & 297 in Cherpulassery Village, Ottappalam Taluk, Palakkad.
(SIA/KL/MIN/509018/2025)**

The Authority perused the proposal and noted that the 180th SEAC meeting heard the presentation of the proposal. The Project Proponent obtained EC from DEIAA, Palakkad vide No. DIA/KL/PL/17/2017 dated 31.01.2018. During presentation, the project proponent intimated that he had paid an amount of around 83 lakh for over extraction. As per the drone video shown during presentation, the Committee observed there is no lateral space for further mining and the vertical expansion is not possible considering the depth to water table. Therefore, the SEAC in its 180th meeting recommended rejection of the application.

The Authority noticed illegal extraction for a quantity of 1,16,150.4 MT as per the Scheme of Mining approved dated 07.07.2023. Through illegal/over extraction of the resources, the project proponent violated the EC conditions also, which caused severe damage to the environment that necessitates action for violation as per the EP Act, 1986. The SEAC also recommended the assessment of environmental damages due to illegal mining. Further, Project Proponent has not submitted as per the checklist of documents to be provided as per OM dated 28.04.2023 required for reappraisal DEIAA issued ECs.

As per S.O 637 (E) dated 28th February 2014, the Central government in exercise of powers conferred by section 23 of the Environment (Protection) Act 1986 had delegated the powers vested in it under section 5 of the said act to all State and Union Territory Environment Impact Assessment Authorities constituted by the Central Government under sub-section (3) of section 3 of Environment (Protection) Act 1986, to issue show cause notice to the Project Proponents in case of violation of the conditions of the environmental

clearances issued by the said authorities and to issue directions to the said project proponents for keeping such environmental clearances in abeyance or withdrawing it if required.

Considering all these, the Authority decided the following:

1. The application of the project proponent shall be rejected due to the violation of environmental conditions and there is no further scope of mining in the area. The rejection order should include all the details of violation.
2. In exercise of powers conferred as per S.O 637(E) dated 28.02.2014 issued by the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, the Authority decided to issue Show Cause Notice as to why the EC given should not be cancelled, for the violation of the EC conditions. Project proponent is allowed 15days time to submit the explanation.
3. The KSPCB shall assess the environmental damages due to the violation of EC conditions through a Joint Committee constituted for these kind of purposes already and submit a report to SEIAA for necessary further action.
4. The project proponent is free to submit fresh application, after the completion of the violation procedures.

Item No.20

Reappraisal of Environmental Clearance issued from DEIAA, Palakkad for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sajeew Mathew, Managing Director, M/s. Oriental Rock Products Pvt. Ltd for an area of 4.2523 Ha at Sy Nos. 96/1 in Thirumittakode II Village, 532/3 in Nagalassery Village, Pattambi Taluk, Palakkad (SIA/KL/MIN/509190/2024)

The Authority perused the proposal and noted that the 180th SEAC meeting appraised the proposal based on Form-1, Pre-Feasibility Report, Mining Plan, and the details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal. The Project Proponent obtained EC from DEIAA, Palakkad vide. No. DIA/KL/PL/16/2018 dated 31.08.2018. The 180th SEAC meeting heard the presentation of the proposal. As per the approved Mining Plan dated 28.03.2018, the life mine is 10 years. The mine lease for the proposal was executed on 20.07.2022 for 10 years. As per the revised mining plan, the

mineable reserve is given as 25,43,085 MT. After due appraisal the SEAC in its 180th SEAC meeting recommended conditional EC for 10 years subject to certain specific conditions in addition to the general conditions after submission of NOC from the Irrigation Department.

The Authority noted that for the sustainable management of quarry operations, the approved mining plan is revised every five years till the project life of mine as per KMMC Rules, incorporating scheme of activities to be carried out for the next 5 years. Authority is of the opinion that it is essential to match these procedures and time lines followed in the department of Mining and Geology with the time lines ECs issued for the sustainable management of quarry operations and protection of environment in the project region.

The Authority noticed as per the approved mining plan dated 28.03.2018 the elevation of the area varies between 58m AMSL to 133m AMSL. The geological reserve is provided as 52,05,950 MT and the mineable reserve is 32,39,600 MT. Considering the elevation difference of the area, the Authority is of the opinion that the proposed minable reserve seems exaggerated and the scientific mining is not practicable.

The Authority accepted the recommendations of 180th SEAC meeting and decided to issue Environmental Clearance initially for 5 years from the date of execution of mine lease/permit and then to extend the EC period to cover the project life of 10 (Ten) years, subject to the review by SEAC at the end of every five years, to verify whether the Project Proponent has violated any of the EC conditions and thereby caused any damage to the Environment in the project region.

However, it is also decided to get a report from Mining and Geology Department regarding the actual minable reserve considering the steep slope and estimated geological reserve prior to the issuance of the EC. The EC is subject to General Conditions and the following Additional Specific Conditions.

- 1. The Project Proponent shall carry out quarrying as per the approved Mining Plan and as per the Specific Conditions mentioned hereafter. The Project Proponent should strictly follow the Kerala Minor Mineral Concession Rules 2015 and amendments thereby.*
- 2. The EC shall be valid from the date of execution of permit/lease from the Department of Mining and Geology. The copy of the permit / lease order should be provided to the SEIAA before commencing the mining activity.*

3. *The EC issued will be subject to a review by SEAC after every 5 years through field verification to ensure that mining is carried out sustainably as per the EC conditions.*
4. ***The depth of mining should be limited to 58m above MSL to prevent intersection with ground water table and the mineable resources shall be reworked accordingly by the Mining and Geology Department while approving the Scheme of Mining / issuing the lease or permit.***
5. *Development of green belt should be initiated prior to the commencement of mining using indigenous species. The suggested species are Phyllanthus emblica (Nelli), Syzygium cumini (Njaval), Writia tinctoria (Dhanthapala), Ficus bengalensis (Peral), Ficus racemosa (Atti), Bambusa bamboos (Mullumula), Dendrocalamus strictus (Kallan mula), Strychnos nux-vomica (Kanjiram), Terminalia cattappa (Thanni), Schleicheria oleosa (Poovam), Artocarpus hirsutus (Ayiniplavu) etc.*
6. *Compensatory afforestation should be done prior to the commencement of mining, by planting local species of trees as proposed.*
7. *Geotagged photographs of the progress of compensatory afforestation should be submitted along with HYCR.*
8. *Adequate number of avenue trees of indigenous species should be planted along both sides of the haulage road.*
9. *A temporary wall of 5m height should be erected at appropriate locations on the boundary to avoid disturbance and nuisance to the nearby residents.*
10. *The haulage road should be provided with sprinkling facility to prevent dust pollution.*
11. *Drainage system incorporating garland canal, silt traps, siltation pond and outflow channel connecting to a natural drain should be provided prior to the commencement of mining.*
12. *Garland drain, silt-traps, siltation ponds and outflow channels should be desilted periodically and geo-tagged photographs of the process should be included in the half-yearly compliance report (HYCR).*
13. *Overflow water from the siltation pond should be discharged to the nearby natural drain after adequate filtration.*

14. *Drainage water should be monitored at different seasons by an NABL accredited lab and clear water should only be discharged into the natural stream. Geotagged photographs of the drainage and sampling site should be submitted along with HYCR.*
15. *Overburden should be stored at the designed place and gabion wall should be provided for the topsoil and overburden storage sites.*
16. *The impact of vibration due to blasting on the houses and other built structures within 200m distance from the project boundary should be monitored in terms of Peak Particle Velocity and amplitude for maximum charge per delay and included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report.*
17. *Implementation of CER Plan should be done during the first two years of the EC period itself and its operation and maintenance should be done till the completion of mine closure plan.*
18. *Transportation of mined material should not be done during the peak hours in the forenoon (8.00am to 10.00am) and afternoon (3.30pm to 5.00 pm).*
19. *Adequate sanitation, waste management and restroom facilities should be provided to the workers.*
20. *Adequate energy conservation measures should be implemented including solar power installations. At least 40% of the energy requirement shall be met from the solar power.*
21. *The Environment Management Cell (EMC) should include one subject expert in environment management and local ward member. The proceedings of the monthly meeting of the EMC should be submitted along with the HYCR.*
22. *Adequate measures should be adopted to harvest the rainwater as per the guidelines issued by the Central Groundwater Authority.*
23. *Blasting mats should be used during rock blasting to contain the blast, prevent fly rocks and suppress dust.*
24. *In the wake of occurrence of large scale landslides in the state, as per the information provided by the Department of Mining & Geology, it is directed to use only NONEL (Non Electrical) technology for blasting to reduce the vibration of the ground, which is*

one of the causative factors that triggers landslides, formation of cracks in the surrounding buildings and disturbance to human and wildlife.

- 25. As per OM no F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30th September 2020, under Corporate Environmental Responsibility (CER) the Project Proponent should implement the Environment Management Plan (EMP)/CER as directed by SEAC during appraisal, covering the issues to address the environmental problems in the project region, from the beginning of the project, indicating both physical and financial targets year wise. The EMP/CER shall be implemented in consultation with Local Self Govt. Institutions. A copy of the approved EMP/CER shall be made available to the concerned Panchayat for information and implementation support. The indicated cost for implementation of CER activities shall be 2% of the project cost.*
- 26. As per the directions contained in the OM F.No.22-34/2018-IA.III dated 16th January 2020 issued by MoEF&CC, in obedience to the directions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court the Project Proponent shall, undertake re-grassing the mining area and any other area which may have been disturbed due to his mining activities and restore the land to a condition which is fit for growth of fodder, flora, fauna etc. The compliance of this direction shall be included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report which will be monitored by SEAC at regular intervals.*
- 27. The Project Proponent is directed to install a CCTV camera and take all other essential measures to ensure that mining site is not used by antisocial elements for nefarious antisocial activities which are detrimental for peaceful coexistence in the project region. In case if such complaints are received, the EC given is likely to be cancelled after a police verification.*
- 28. Progressive closure of mined area shall be carried out as per the approved mining plan and closure activities carried out shall be mentioned in the HYCR for the relevant period.*
- 29. The abandoned benches may be backfilled and suitable species including fodder grass and other species adapted to such conditions should be planted and maintained.*
- 30. In the beginning of the last year of the EC period, the final closure plan has to be submitted and approved by the District Geologist within 6 months.*

31. *The final closure of the quarry shall be carried out during the last 6 months of mining period and a closure certificate shall be produced to the Authority. No ECs shall be given to Project Proponent for the subsequent mining projects unless the final mine closure certificate issued by the District Geologist is produced for the previous projects, if any.*

32. *The violation of EC condition may lead to cancellation of EC and action under The Environment (Protection) Act 1986.*

SEIAA Secretariat is directed to inform the Project Proponent to submit NOC from the Irrigation Officer of Irrigation Department as clarified in the circular dated 19.11.2024 of the Chief Engineer, Irrigation Department in compliance to Section 40(2) of the Kerala Irrigation and Water Conservation Act, 2003 as ordered by the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in WP(C) No. 30737 of 2022 and 4655 of 2024 dated 19.04. 2024.

The SEAC shall verify the compliance status of the EC within 6 months and submit a report to SEIAA for necessary further action.

Item No.21 Reappraisal of Environmental Clearance issued from DEIAA, Thiruvananthapuram for the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Sakeer Hussain, for an area of 0.9783 Ha at Sy Nos. 190/2-1, 2-1-1, 2-2, 191/4, 191/5, 5-1, 5-2, 198/11- 1-2, 198/11-1 in Panavoor Village, Nedumangad Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram.
(SIA/KL/MIN/512304/2024)

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decision of 180th SEAC meeting. The lease holder conducted illicit mining from the buffer zone and the Mining and Geology Department imposed a penalty of Rs. 24,38,084/-. From the Demand Notice dated 30.10.2023 of Mining and Geology, it is also noticed that the project proponent was directed to pay a penalty of Rs. 1,40,97,305. The project proponent revised the mining plan on 01.04.2024. Considering the original mining plan, the life of the mine is 5 years, and the mine life is already exceeded. Hence the proposal does not qualify for reappraisal of EC issued by DEIAA. As per the Cluster Certificate dated 04.12.2024, there is an abandoned quarry pit with a total extent of 4.4930 Ha belongs to M/s Adani Ports Pvt Ltd, which indicates that there is Cluster Condition. Considering the Cluster Condition the SEAC in its 180th meeting recommended rejection of the application.

The Authority observed that through illegal/over extraction of the resources, the project proponent violated the EC conditions also, which caused severe damage to the environment that necessitates action for violation as per the EP Act, 1986. The SEAC also recommends the assessment of Environmental damage due to illegal mining. Further, Project Proponent has not submitted as per the checklist of documents to be provided as per OM dated 28.04.2023 required for reappraisal DEIAA issued ECs.

As per S.O 637 (E) dated 28th February 2014, the Central government in exercise of powers conferred by section 23 of the Environment (Protection) Act 1986 had delegated the powers vested in it under section 5 of the said act to all State and Union Territory Environment Impact Assessment Authorities constituted by the Central Government under sub-section (3) of section 3 of Environment (Protection) Act 1986, to issue show cause notice to the Project Proponents in case of violation of the conditions of the environmental clearances issued by the said authorities and to issue directions to the said project proponents for keeping such environmental clearances in abeyance or withdrawing it if required.

Considering all these, the Authority decided the following:

1. The application of the project proponent is rejected due to the cluster situation and violation of environmental conditions. The rejection order should include all the details including the violation.
2. In exercise of powers conferred as per S.O 637(E) dated 28.02.2014 issued by the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, the Authority decided to issue Show Cause Notice as to why the EC given should not be cancelled, for the violation of the EC conditions. Project proponent is allowed 15days time to submit the explanation.
3. The KSPCB shall assess the environmental damages due to the violation of EC conditions through a Joint Committee constituted for these kind of purposes already and submit a report to SEIAA for necessary further action
4. The project proponent is free to submit the ToR application, after the completion of the violation procedures.

Item No.22

Reappraisal of Environmental Clearance issued from DEIAA, Kasaragod for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Alex Thomas, M/s. NJT Granites, for an area of 2.8855 Ha at Sy. No. 16/pt of West Eleri Village, Vellarikundu Taluk, Kasaragod. (SIA/KL/MIN/456225/2024)

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decision of 180th SEAC meeting. It is noted that the SEAC had appraised the proposal based on Form-1, Pre-Feasibility Report, Mining Plan, and the details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal. The 175th SEAC meeting heard the presentation of the proposal and the field inspection was conducted on 04.02.2025. The DEIAA, Kasaragod issued the EC on 20.10.2017. As per the Scheme of Mining, an excess quantity of 14,091.8 MT was mined and the balance reserve is 5,33,560 MT. The medium hazard zone is located 0.13 km from the project site. As per the presentation, the Talakaveri Wildlife Sanctuary is located within 9.47 km from the proposed site and the proof of application for Wildlife Clearance is not seen submitted. The SEAC in its 180th SEAC meeting recommended conditional EC for 12 years subject to certain specific conditions in addition to the general conditions. The SEAC had also recommended the assessment of Environmental damage due to illegal mining damage.

The Authority observed that through illegal/over extraction of the resources, the project proponent violated the EC conditions also, which caused severe damage to the environment that necessitates action for violation as per the EP Act, 1986.

As per S.O 637 (E) dated 28th February 2014, the Central government in exercise of powers conferred by section 23 of the Environment (Protection) Act 1986 had delegated the powers vested in it under section 5 of the said act to all State and Union Territory Environment Impact Assessment Authorities constituted by the Central Government under sub-section (3) of section 3 of Environment (Protection) Act 1986, to issue show cause notice to the Project Proponents in case of violation of the conditions of the environmental clearances issued by the said authorities and to issue directions to the said project proponents for keeping such environmental clearances in abeyance or withdrawing it if required.

Considering all these, the Authority decided the following:

1. The application of the project proponent is rejected due violation of environmental conditions. The rejection order should include all the details of violation.

2. In exercise of powers conferred as per S.O 637(E) dated 28.02.2014 issued by the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, the Authority decided to issue Show Cause Notice as to why the EC given should not be cancelled, for the violation of the EC conditions. Project proponent is allowed 15 days time to submit the explanation.
3. The KSPCB shall assess the environmental damages due to the violation of EC conditions through a Joint Committee constituted for these kind of purposes already and submit a report to SEIAA for necessary further action
4. The project proponent is free to submit the fresh application after completing the violation procedures.

Item No.23

**Reappraisal of Environmental Clearance issued from DEIAA, Kannur for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project, of Sri. Jovin George, for an area of 3.7556 Ha at Re-Sy No. 275/1A, in Thripangottur Village, Thalassery Taluk, Kannur
(SIA/KL/MIN/508406/2024)**

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decision of 180th SEAC meeting. As per the Cluster Certificate dated 29.08.2024, the following quarry proposals are located within 500m radius of the proposed site.

1. Quarry of Sri. Jovin George for an area of 4.5180 Ha.
2. Quarry of Sri. MP Abdulla for an area of 1.6442 Ha

Considering the Cluster Condition, the SEAC, in its 180th meeting, recommended rejecting the application, citing the necessity of an EIA study and public consultation as per the norms of the EIA Notification, 2006. Further, Project Proponent has not submitted as per the checklist of documents to be provided as per OM dated 28.04.2023 required for reappraisal DEIAA issued ECs.

Upon deliberation, the Authority accepted SEAC's recommendation and decided to reject the present application. The Project Proponent may apply afresh for ToR for conducting EIA study. The rejection order should detail all the observations of the Authority and SEAC.

Item No.24

Reappraisal of EC issued from DEIAA, Kannur for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Sunny Cyriac, for an area of 1.1330 Ha at Re-Sy No. 28/1A2 in Vayathur village, Iritty taluk, Kannur.

(SIA/KL/MIN/513740/2024)

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decision of 180th SEAC meeting. It is noticed that the area falls within the medium hazard zone, in continuation to high hazard zone. After detailed evaluation, the SEAC had observed that there is no lateral space for further mining and the vertical expansion. In addition to this, the environmental fragility of the project area is very high. Therefore, the SEAC in its 180th meeting recommended rejection of the application.

The Authority noticed that the scheme of mining dated 06.08.2022 reported an excess extraction of 33,535.5 MT from the project site and its surroundings. Considering the illegal/over extraction of the resources, the project proponent has violated the EC conditions also, which caused severe damage to the environment that necessitates action for violation as per the EP Act, 1986.

As per S.O 637 (E) dated 28th February 2014, the Central government in exercise of powers conferred by section 23 of the Environment (Protection) Act 1986 had delegated the powers vested in it under section 5 of the said act to all State and Union Territory Environment Impact Assessment Authorities constituted by the Central Government under sub-section (3) of section 3 of Environment (Protection) Act 1986, to issue show cause notice to the Project Proponents in case of violation of the conditions of the environmental clearances issued by the said authorities and to issue directions to the said project proponents for keeping such environmental clearances in abeyance or withdrawing it if required.

Considering all these, the Authority decided the following:

1. Reject the application considering the recommendations of SEAC and violation of environmental conditions. The rejection order should detail all the observations of the Authority and SEAC, including the violation.
2. In exercise of powers conferred as per S.O 637(E) dated 28.02.2014 issued by the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, the Authority decided to issue

Show Cause Notice as to why the EC given should not be cancelled, for the violation of the EC conditions. Project proponent is allowed 15days time to submit the explanation.

3. The KSPCB shall assess the environmental damages due to the violation of EC conditions through a Joint Committee constituted for these kind of purposes already and submit a report to SEIAA for necessary further action.
4. The project proponent is free to submit the fresh application after completing the violation procedures.

Item No.25

Reappraisal of Environmental Clearance issued from DEIAA, Kannur for the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Shafir. P, for an area of 1.1030 Ha at Sy No. 46/4 in Kalliad Village, Iritty Taluk, Kannur

(SIA/KL/MIN/513794/2025)

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decision of 180th SEAC meeting. It is noted that the SEAC had appraised the proposal based on Form-2, Pre-Feasibility Report, Mining Plan, and the details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal. The 180th SEAC heard the presentation of the proposal. As per the mining plan approved dated 17.04.2018 the life of mine is 6 years and the mineable reserve is given as 2,63,305 T. The balance reserve proposed is 1,70,555 MT. After due appraisal, the SEAC in its 180th SEAC meeting recommended conditional EC for 6 years subject to certain specific conditions in addition to the general conditions after submission of NOC from the Irrigation Department.

The Authority noticed that the project proponent has not submitted the EMP prepared by the NABET accredited agency to issue EC as recommended by the SEAC. Under these circumstances, the Authority decided to direct the Project Proponent to submit the EMP prepared by NABET Accredited Agency along with other documents required for reappraisal DEIAA issued ECs as per OM dated 28.04.2023.

Item No.26

Reappraisal of EC issued from DEIAA, Kannur for the Granite Building Stone Quarry pProject of Sri. T. P. Abdul Basheer, for an area 1.5860 Ha at Sy No. 431 in Vayakara Village, Taliparamba Taluk, Kannur

(SIA/KL/MIN/519172/2025)

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decision of 180th SEAC meeting. As per the PFR, the soil thickness of the area is very deep. The proposed area falls within the medium hazard zone in continuation with the high hazard zone. On detailed verification, the Committee observed that the project proponent has not submitted the recent Cluster Certificate and Schedule-1 tree details as per the checklist of OM dated 28.04.2023 for reappraisal. Therefore, the SEAC in its 180th meeting recommended rejection of the application.

The Authority noticed that the scheme of mining dated 03.01.2024, a quantity of 7,672 MT was reported as excess mining from the buffer side. In addition to this, the Mining and Geology Department has levied a fine of Rs. 71,76,498/- for excess mining. The Authority also noticed that a complaint was registered against the project before the Legislature Committee of Environment and a report on the compliance status was also under the consideration of the Legislature Committee of Environment as sought.

As per S.O 637 (E) dated 28th February 2014, the Central government in exercise of powers conferred by section 23 of the Environment (Protection) Act 1986 had delegated the powers vested in it under section 5 of the said act to all State and Union Territory Environment Impact Assessment Authorities constituted by the Central Government under sub-section (3) of section 3 of Environment (Protection) Act 1986, to issue show cause notice to the Project Proponents in case of violation of the conditions of the environmental clearances issued by the said authorities and to issue directions to the said project proponents for keeping such environmental clearances in abeyance or withdrawing it if required.

Considering all these, the Authority decided the following:

1. Reject the application considering the recommendations of SEAC and the violation of environmental conditions. The rejection order should detail all the observations of the Authority and SEAC, including the violation and the fragility of the area.

2. In exercise of powers conferred as per S.O 637(E) dated 28.02.2014 issued by the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, the Authority decided to issue Show Cause Notice as to why the EC given should not be cancelled, for the violation of the EC conditions. Project proponent is allowed 15days time to submit the explanation.
3. The KSPCB shall assess the environmental damages due to the violation of EC conditions through a Joint Committee constituted for these kinds of purposes already and submit a report to SEIAA for necessary further action

Item No.27

Reappraisal of Environmental Clearance issued from DEIAA, Kannur for the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Haris Charattiadan, Authorized Signatory, M/s Malabar Sand & Stones Pvt. Ltd, for an area of 4.9005 Ha at Re-Sy No. 1pt, Udayagiri Village, Taliparamba Taluk, Kannur.

(SIA/KL/MIN/521270/2025)

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decision of 180th SEAC meeting. The EC from DEIAA, Kannur was granted vide EC No. 01/KNR/2016DEIAA dated 27.04.2017 for 5 years. The SEAC had observed that the Project Proponent has not submitted the Cluster Certificate as per the checklist of OM dated 28.04.2023 for reappraisal of the DEIAA issued EC. It is also observed that the site and the surrounding area is highly fragile from the environmental point of view, as it is located on top of a hill with steep side slopes. In addition to this the site falls in the high hazard zone. Therefore, the SEAC in its 180th meeting recommend rejection of the application due to the non-submission of the documents required for reappraisal and also by invoking the Precautionary Principle.

The Authority noticed that SEIAA in its 153rd SEIAA meeting considered the interim order dated 28.01.2025 in WA No. 2403 of 2018 filed by the project proponent, and noted that the report specified in the interim order has not been available with the Authority. Later, as per the request, the Disaster Management Department provided the report and the Authority referred the report of the SDMA, including the study report of the NIIT Surathkal to SEAC. Further, Project Proponent has not submitted as per the checklist of documents to be provided as per OM dated 28.04.2023 required for reappraisal DEIAA issued ECs.

In these circumstances, the Authority decided the following:

1. The proposal shall be referred back to SEAC to re-examine also by considering the report of the SDMA. The SEAC has the liberty to re-appraise the application.
2. The SEIAA, Secretariat shall provide the report specified in the WA No. 2403 to SEAC for remarks.

Item No.28

**Reappraisal of Environmental Clearance issued from DEIAA, Kasaragod for the Granite Building Stone quarry project of Sri. Mukesh Varkey, for an area of 4.5107 Ha in Re-Sy Nos. 587/2-A of West Eleri Village, Vellarikundu Taluk. Kasaragod
(SIA/KL/MIN/489129/2024)**

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decision of 180th SEAC meeting. The SEAC observed that there are recent reports of earth tremors from this region. As per modified Mining Plan, 43,021 MT excess/illegal quarrying of 6743.5 MT was done from the mining area, 24847.5 MT from the buffer Zone and 11430 MT from outside lease area. The area falls in high hazard zone and environmentally fragility of the area is very high. Therefore, the Committee recommended rejection of the proposal by invoking Precautionary principle. The SEAC had also recommends the assessment of Environmental damage due to illegal mining damage.

The Authority observed that through illegal/over extraction of the resources, the project proponent violated the EC conditions also, which caused severe damage to the environment that necessitates action for violation as per the EP Act, 1986. Further, Project Proponent has not submitted as per the checklist of documents to be provided as per OM dated 28.04.2023 required for reappraisal DEIAA issued ECs.

As per S.O 637 (E) dated 28th February 2014, the Central government in exercise of powers conferred by section 23 of the Environment (Protection) Act 1986 had delegated the powers vested in it under section 5 of the said act to all State and Union Territory Environment Impact Assessment Authorities constituted by the Central Government under sub-section (3) of section 3 of Environment (Protection) Act 1986, to issue show cause notice to the Project Proponents in case of violation of the conditions of the environmental

clearances issued by the said authorities and to issue directions to the said project proponents for keeping such environmental clearances in abeyance or withdrawing it if required.

Considering all these, the Authority decided the following:

1. The application of the project proponent shall be rejected as per the recommendation of the SEAC and also for violation. The rejection order should detail all the observations of the Authority and SEAC, including the violation.
2. In exercise of powers conferred as per S.O 637(E) dated 28.02.2014 issued by the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, the Authority decided to issue Show Cause Notice as to why the EC given should not be cancelled, for the violation of the EC conditions. Project proponent is allowed 15 days time to submit the explanation.
3. The KSPCB shall assess the environmental damages due to the violation of EC conditions through a Joint Committee constituted for these kind of purposes already and submit a report to SEIAA for necessary further action

Item No.29

**Reappraisal of Environmental Clearance issued from DEIAA, Kollam for the Granite Building Stone Quarry project of Sri. Dileesh Kumar V. for an area of 1.4383 Ha at Block No. 9, Re-Sy. Nos. 427/11, 428/3-2-2, 428/3-2-3, 427/4, 427/2, 427/1 in Neduvathoor Village, Kottarakkara Taluk, Kollam
(SIA/KL/MIN/504867/2024)**

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decisions of various SEAC meetings held on different dates. The EC from DEIAA, Kollam was issued on 16.06.2018 and the validity was expired on 15.06.2024. The mine lease was executed on 31.08.2019 for a period of 10 years valid up to 30.08.2028. The 180th SEAC heard the presentation of the proposal. As per the original mining plan dated 24.03.2018 the mineable reserve is 5,08,850 MT. The life of mine is 10 years. As per the Scheme of Mining the balance quantity proposed for mining is 2,12,412 MT. As per the Scheme of Mine, the lessee has paid penalty for the total quantity of 73,085.5 MT for illegal extraction from lease area, buffer zone and outside lease area. The SEAC in its 180th SEAC meeting recommended conditional EC for 10 years subject to certain specific conditions in addition to the general conditions after submission of

NOC from the Irrigation Department. The SEAC had also recommends the assessment of Environmental damage due to illegal mining damage.

The Authority observed that through illegal/over extraction of the resources, the project proponent violated the EC conditions also, which caused severe damage to the environment that necessitates action for violation as per the EP Act, 1986.

As per S.O 637 (E) dated 28th February 2014, the Central government in exercise of powers conferred by section 23 of the Environment (Protection) Act 1986 had delegated the powers vested in it under section 5 of the said act to all State and Union Territory Environment Impact Assessment Authorities constituted by the Central Government under sub-section (3) of section 3 of Environment (Protection) Act 1986, to issue show cause notice to the Project Proponents in case of violation of the conditions of the environmental clearances issued by the said authorities and to issue directions to the said project proponents for keeping such environmental clearances in abeyance or withdrawing it if required.

Considering all these, the Authority decided the following:

1. The application of the project proponent shall be rejected due to violation of the EC conditions. The rejection order should include details regarding the violation.
2. In exercise of powers conferred as per S.O 637(E) dated 28.02.2014 issued by the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, the Authority decided to issue Show Cause Notice as to why the EC given should not be cancelled, for the violation of the EC conditions. Project proponent is allowed 15 days time to submit the explanation.
3. The KSPCB shall assess the environmental damages due to the violation of EC conditions through a Joint Committee constituted-for these kinds of purposes already and submit a report to SEIAA for necessary further action
4. The project proponent is free to submit the fresh application after completing the violation procedures.

Item No.30

Reappraisal of Environmental Clearance issued from DEIAA, Kollam for the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. R. Krishnamoorthy, for an area of 3.9342 Ha at Sy Nos. 166/2, 166/3, 166/4 & 166/6pt in Pattazhy Village, Pathanapuram Taluk, Kollam (SIA/KL/MIN/519739/2025).

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decision of 180th SEAC meetings. The EC from DEIAA for the project was granted vide EC No. B/DEIAA/23743/17 dated 20.02.2018. As per the Scheme of Mining the lessee has paid a penalty for illegal extraction for a total quantity of 1,35,217 MT. As per the Scheme, 11.05.2023, the reserve estimated for further mining is 10,49,300 MT. The SEAC in its 180th SEAC meeting recommended conditional EC for 10 years subject to certain specific conditions in addition to the general conditions after submission of NOC from the Irrigation Department. The SEAC had also recommends the assessment of Environmental damage due to illegal mining damage.

The Authority observed that through illegal/over extraction of the resources, the project proponent violated the EC conditions also, which caused severe damage to the environment that necessitates action for violation as per the EP Act, 1986.

As per S.O 637 (E) dated 28th February 2014, the Central government in exercise of powers conferred by section 23 of the Environment (Protection) Act 1986 had delegated the powers vested in it under section 5 of the said act to all State and Union Territory Environment Impact Assessment Authorities constituted by the Central Government under sub-section (3) of section 3 of Environment (Protection) Act 1986, to issue show cause notice to the Project Proponents in case of violation of the conditions of the environmental clearances issued by the said authorities and to issue directions to the said project proponents for keeping such environmental clearances in abeyance or withdrawing it if required.

Considering all these, the Authority decided the following:

1. Considering the illegal mining and the violation of EC conditions the Authority decided to reject the application. The rejection order should detail all the observations of the Authority, including the violation.
2. In exercise of powers conferred as per S.O 637(E) dated 28.02.2014 issued by the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, the Authority decided to issue Show Cause Notice as to why the EC given should not be cancelled, for the

violation of the EC conditions. Project proponent is allowed 15days time to submit the explanation.

3. The KSPCB shall assess the environmental damages due to the violation of EC conditions through a Joint Committee constituted—for these kinds of purposes already and submit a report to SEIAA for necessary further action
4. The project proponent is free to submit the fresh application after completing the violation procedures.

Item No.31

Reappraisal of Environmental Clearance issued by DEIAA, for the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Sasidharan V, Managing Partner, Deepam Granites for an area of 2.2663 Ha at Sy Nos. 444/1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 in Erimayur -II Village Alathur Taluk, Palakkad.

(SIA/KL/MIN/512315/2024)

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decision of 180th SEAC meetings. It is noticed that as per the Google imagery there is another quarry of Sri. Anil Kumar, Managing director, Macadam Granites (SIA/KL/MIN/458530/2024), for an area of 3.9811Ha, is located within a 500m radius, indicating cluster condition. In addition, as per the google imagery, there is no lateral space for further mining and the vertical expansion is not possible considering the depth to water table. Therefore, the SEAC in its 180th meeting recommended rejection of the application.

The Authority noticed that as per the scheme of mining submitted, the project proponent has carried out illicit mining from the buffer zone as well as from its environs. An amount of Rs. 11,95,000/- (16,250 MT) and 10,38,760/- (14,080 MT) was assessed as penalty for illegal mining. Additionally, a quantity of 90,042 MT was mined from the lease area including the buffer zone. Hence, the project proponent violated the EC conditions also, which caused severe damage to the environment that necessitates action for violation as per the EP Act, 1986. .

As per S.O 637 (E) dated 28th February 2014, the Central government in exercise of powers conferred by section 23 of the Environment (Protection) Act 1986 had delegated the powers vested in it under section 5 of the said act to all State and Union Territory Environment Impact Assessment Authorities constituted by the Central Government under

sub-section (3) of section 3 of Environment (Protection) Act 1986, to issue show cause notice to the Project Proponents in case of violation of the conditions of the environmental clearances issued by the said authorities and to issue directions to the said project proponents for keeping such environmental clearances in abeyance or withdrawing it if required.

Considering all these, the Authority decided the following:

1. The application shall be cancelled as per the recommendation of the SEAC and for the violation of environmental conditions. The rejection order should detail all the observations of the Authority and SEAC, including the violation.
2. In exercise of powers conferred as per S.O 637(E) dated 28.02.2014 issued by the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, the Authority decided to issue Show Cause Notice as to why the EC given should not be cancelled, for the violation of the EC conditions. Project proponent is allowed 15days time to submit the explanation.
3. The KSPCB shall assess the environmental damages due to the violation of EC conditions through a Joint Committee constituted for these kinds of purposes already and submit a report to SEIAA for necessary further action
4. The project proponent is free to submit the ToR application, after the completion of the violation procedures, if there is resource for mining.

Additional Agenda

Item No.01

**Re-appraisal of EC issued by DEIAA, Kasaragod for the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Prakashan P., Managing Director, M/s. Kayyar Aggregates Pvt Ltd for an area of 2.4767 Ha at Sy Nos. 242/3A(pt), 242/3A,3B, 242/3B(pt), 243/2(pt) in Kayyar Village, Manjeshwaram Taluk, Kasaragod
(SIA/KL/MIN/459541/2024)**

Sri. Prakashan P, M/s Kayyar Aggregates Pvt. Ltd, Kayyar P.O, Manjeshwaram Taluk, Kasaragod District submitted an application for reappraisal of EC issued by DEIAA, Kasaragod for an area of 2.4767 Ha at Sy Nos. 242/3A(pt), 242/3A,3B, 242/3B(pt), 243/2(pt) in Kayyar Village, Manjeshwaram Taluk, Kasaragod.

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decisions of various SEIAA/SEAC meetings held on different dates. As per the scheme of mining approved on 06.11.2021, the mineable reserve is given as 7,50,510 MT for a mine life 6 years. The SEAC in its 177th meeting, recommended EC for the mine life of 6 years from the date of approval of scheme of mine (06.11.2021), subject to certain specific and general conditions after obtaining the NOC from the Irrigation Department. The project proponent has submitted the NOC dated 05.12.2024 on 18.12.2024. The Authority in its 153rd meeting accepted the recommendation of SEAC and decided to issue the EC for a period of 6 years from the date of execution of mine lease / permit.

Now the project proponent intimated that as the lease was executed on 06.11.2017 for a period of 10 years and as per the decision of the Authority to issue EC for 6 years from the date of execution mine lease / permit shall not worth for mining. Hence, it was requested to issue the EC as per the recommendation of the SEAC i.e., from the date of approval of scheme of mining.

Upon deliberation, the Authority decided to modify the decision of 153rd SEIAA meeting on this item as

“The EC shall be issued initially for a period of 5 years from the date of approval of scheme of mining i.e., 06.11.2021 and then to extend the EC period to cover the project life of 6 (Six) years, subject to the review by SEAC at the end of every five years, to verify whether the Project Proponent has violated any of the EC conditions and thereby caused any damage to the Environment in the project region”.

General Decisions

1. Reporting of violation of KMMC Rules to the SEIAA

During the reappraisal of the DEIAA-issued ECs, the Authority observed that a significant number of projects have violated the KMMC Rules and carried out illicit mining resulting in imposition of substantial fines. Since the ECs are issued with the condition that mining must be carried out in accordance with the approved mining plan, these violations also constitute breaches of EC conditions. These kinds of mining, violating EC conditions cause substantial damage to the Environment in the Project region. In few cases Hon'ble

NGT had viewed such violations seriously and imposed heavy penalties. All such cases warrant an environmental damage assessment under the EP Act, 1986.

Authority noticed that such violations are neither reported to the Authority by the Mining & Geology Department for initiating action under Environmental Protection Act 1986 nor they take action through KSPCB to assess the environmental damages due to the violation of EC conditions as per laid down norms.

It is only a chance factor that many such violations are brought to the notice of Authority during the reappraisal of DEIAA issued ECs and authority has taken appropriate action against such violations.

Under the circumstances Authority decided to request the Secretary, Environment Department to address the Secretary, Industries Department to instruct the Director of Mining and Geology Department to report all violation cases to the Authority immediately on detection of such violations for necessary action under Environmental Protection Act 1986. Director of Mining and Geology Department in turn shall give necessary directions to the District Geologists for further action in this regard.

2. Appreciation of services of Dr. Jude Emmanuel, Environmental Scientist and Smt Sreeja Raj S R, Environmental Officer, working in the Secretariat of State Environment Impact Assessment Authority (SEIAA) and recognizing their services through Good Service Entry

As the SEIAA secretariat lacks technical expertise, the Director of Environment and Climate Change (DoE&CC) made available the services of Dr. Jude Emmanuel, Environmental Scientist and Smt Sreeja Raj S R, Environmental Officer for the smooth functioning of the State Environment Impact Assessment Authority. Authority took note of the fact that Dr Jude Emmanuel, Environmental Scientist and Smt Sreeja Raj S R, Environmental Officer are working in SEIAA Secretariat from March 2022 to till date on working arrangement basis from DoE&CC. They are well qualified, experienced and knew their job in SEIAA very well. They are well versed in EIA Notification 2006 and all the OMs issued by MoEF&CC, Govt. of India, at different points of time, under Environmental Protection Act 1986. A deep updated knowledge of all these is highly essential for the efficient functioning of SEIAA leading to sustainable development in the state. Out of their

sheer interest in the subject, followed by zeal to learn and update their knowledge, have made them competent officers and Authority had full confidence and faith in them. Authority appreciates their knowledge level and their curiosity to learn new things on continuous basis amidst their tight schedule of work.

It is to be noted that the State Level Expert Appraisal Committee (SEAC) meets 2-3 times a month and SEIAA meets once in a month. In each SEAC meeting there will be around 90 to 100 Agenda items and 80 to 90 Agenda items in each monthly meeting of SEIAA, covering varieties of subjects listed under EIA notification 2006. Both Dr Jude Emmanuel and Smt. Sreeja Raj S R are involved in coordination between SEIAA and SEAC, preparation of Agenda notes, drafting minutes, uploading the minutes of both SEAC and SEIAA meetings in time and finally issue of ECs. All these procedures require deep knowledge of subject and timely action to keep pace with PARIVESH portal maintained by MoEF&CC.

The Authority also noticed that they trained and provided excellent leadership to the team of technical staff in handling applications for environmental clearances and related matters on PARIVESH Portal of MoEF&CC, which requires lots of commitment to understand the portal and handle it efficiently. Further these two officers were also involved in defending all delicate cases in the Hon'ble High court of Kerala, Hon'ble NGT and Hon'ble Supreme Court, with their active involvement in preparation of Statement of Facts scientifically and liaising with Standing Counsels in respective courts for the successful conduct of the cases. It is to be appreciated that to perform all these timely tasks they have to put hard work even after office hours on almost all working days. They had even worked on holidays sacrificing their personal family priorities respecting the call of the duty.

These two officers are really assets to any organization in which they work and Authority sincerely appreciates their dedicated hard work for the betterment of the origination, the State of Kerala and the common man. Dr. Jude Emmanuel, Environmental Scientist and Smt Sreeja Raj S R, Environmental Officer performed their duties much beyond expectations of all of us in SEIAA and SEAC and the Authority whole heartedly appreciate all their good works and wish them a bright career ahead.

In recognition of their hard work and to motivate them further, Authority decided to recommend to the Principle Secretary, Dept. of Environment to award “**Good Service Entry**” to Dr. Jude Emmanuel, Environmental Scientist and Smt. Sreeja Raj S R,

Environmental Officer, in honour of their meritorious services. Authority also recommends for a nominal prize money Rs 10000 each in recognition of their voluntary hard work even after office hours and even on holidays to achieve the goals of the Authority.

Sd/-
Dr H Nagesh Prabhu IFS (Retd)
Chairman, SEIAA

Sd/-
Sri K Krishna Panicker
Expert Member, SEIAA

Sd/-
Sri. Mir Mohammed Ali IAS,
Member Secretary, SEIAA