



Pratidhwani the Echo

A Peer-Reviewed International Journal of Humanities & Social Science

ISSN: 2278-5264 (Online) 2321-9319 (Print)

Impact Factor: 6.28 (Index Copernicus International)

Volume-XII, Issue-IV, July 2024, Page No.282-292

Published by Dept. of Bengali, Karimganj College, Karimganj, Assam, India

Website: <http://www.thecho.in>

ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSES TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION IN INDIA: PROBLEMS AND OPPORTUNITIES

Sandip Samanta

*Ph.D. Research Scholar, Department of International Relations, Jadavpur University
Kolkata, West Bengal, India*

Abstract:

Protection of the environment is the main concern of the present world. The development of international environmental legal framework during 1970s laid to the foundation of environmental jurisprudence of many countries. India has enacted number of environmental legislations and policy formulation to protect environment and safeguard the interest of citizens. The role of the executive branch of the government of India is to implement these laws in society and to derive its true spirit. The Central Government and the State governments have their own ministries on environment for implementation of environmental laws and regulations. Central Pollution Control Board (CPCB) is the nodal agency for coordinating the environmental protection and regulatory mechanism throughout the country. Also, SPCBs are the authority for planning, monitoring, research and development, education and training in pollution control. But at various times it has been observed that the activities of this administration are influenced by political leaders or groups and adopt rules and regulations which result in degradation instead of environmental protection.

Keywords: Administration, Pollution Control Board, Environment, Pollution, Jurisprudence.

1. Introduction: The quest for economic development, technological advancement, industrialisation, globalisation and urbanisation has jeopardised the ecological balance of the globe and it strikes at the root of the existence of the life itself. It constrained the states to change its priorities and to devise policies for the protection of its environment. The development of international environmental legal framework during 1970s (Stockholm Conference) laid to the foundation of environmental jurisprudence of many countries i.e. India. The role of the executive branch of the government of India is to implement these laws in society and to derive its true spirit. The realisation of the objectives of environmental laws depends on the administrative process involved in the implementation of environmental legal system. The primary focus of this article is to analyse the role of administrative authorities in administration of environmental protection in India.

2. Administrative Authorities for Enforcement of Environmental Laws: India has enacted number of environmental legislations and policy formulation to protect environment and safeguard the interest of citizens. The objectives of these legislations, administrative authorities in different strata were constituted. The Central Government and the State governments have their own ministries on environment for enforcement of The Water (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1974, The Air (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1981 and The Environment (Protection) Act, 1986, CPCB and SPCBs were constituted. For the purpose of environmental clearance decision making, Ministry of Environment and Forests (For Category A Projects) and State Level Environment Impact Assessment Authorities (SEIAA) in the states (For Category B Projects) were empowered (The Environment Clearance Regulations, 2006: 2). The regulations also provide for the constitution of Expert Appraisal Committees (EAC) at the Centre as well as State or Union territory level Expert Appraisal Committees (SEAC) for advising on environmental clearance of projects. For Protection of forests, coastal zones and biological diversity separate authorities were constituted under the respective enactments.

In spite of these, enormous administrative structures in centre and states implementation of the environmental laws by the authorities are lagging behind the stated objectives. As Sahu said, “Despite a multitude of legislation, Constitutional Directives and Duties and the setting up of Pollution Control Board all over the country, the success in curbing environmental degradation has not been very encouraging because of failure in implementing environmental laws... While the country has adequate legal mandates to solve the environmental problems, the gaps in policy implementation mechanism indicate that the enforcement policy is rather weak and at times non-existent” (Sahu, 2006: 38). For example, India has lost nearly one-third of its natural wetlands to urbanisation, agricultural expansion and pollution over the last four decades. In India, has declined nearly 35% of natural Watland from 1970 to 2014 (see report MoEF, Watland Division in OA No 351, of 2019). A study by the Watland International South Asia (WISA) has found that, Mumbai has lost maximum Watland around 71% from 1970 to 2014. Other major cities that faced Watland loss include Ahmedabad 57%, Bengaluru 56%, Hyderabad 55%, Delhi 38% and Pune 37% (report by WISA, sec 35, 2019).

The failure in implementation of environmental laws by the administrative authorities can be attributed to a number of reasons like drawbacks in the environmental administrative systems, lack of commitment of officials, political pressures, corruption, gaps in the environmental legal system etc. According to Geetanjoy Sahu, “implementation of environmental law continues to be a failure, largely because of lack of commitment by the executive and the officials of pollution control boards and other environmental regulatory bodies, which are susceptible to political pressures and corruption” (Sahu, 2014).

Judicial review of administrative decisions and judicial activism in environmental decision making have made significant stride in rejuvenating the administrative authorities towards their stated objectives. Within its limited jurisdictional scope, the court has made

substantial contributions to the administration of environmental justice by paving the way for the implementation of environmental laws and concepts without usurping the core areas of administrative process. But still the executive branch of the government is the only organ which can carry out the objectives of environmental legal system to its full potential.

2.1. Central Pollution Control Board (CPCB): Environmental governance in India is around the central government because the environmental regulatory regime was developed at a time when centralised political regime held a dominant position. The Environment (Protection) Act, 1986 empowered the Central Government to take all such measures as it deems necessary or expedient for the purpose of protecting and improving the quality of the environment and preventing, controlling and abating environmental protection. Centralised environmental regulatory mechanism may help to formulate and implement a national environmental policy. The most important regulatory mechanism constituted for environmental protection in India is the Pollution Control Boards. It is a two-tier system with CPCB at the centre and SPCBs at the state level.

Central Pollution Control Board (CPCB) is the nodal agency for coordinating the environmental protection and regulatory mechanism throughout the country. CPCB which was originally conceived as a Water Board to prevent water pollution under the Water Act, 1974, was later on renamed and burdened with the functions of prevention of air pollution and environmental protection under the respective laws. The appraisal of the PCBs legal framework points out a number of lacunas in the system. Lack of an independent regulatory agency in environmental administration is the most important lacuna in environmental protection. Regulatory agencies including CPCB are dependent on the Central government. Central government exercises direct as well as indirect control on the exercise of powers of CPCB through its administrative and financial tools. The members of the board are appointed by the Central government. PCBs are also bound by the directions issued by the central government. The drawback of these controls on the functions of CPCB is that the decision making by the board may be modelled on the basis of the governmental requirements which may not be appropriate for the protection and improvement of environment. These controls also prevent the PCBs from taking decisions against the government authorities for environmental protection. Hence “such agency should, (i) have full functional freedom: (ii) not be filled with men amenable to political influence: (iii) not be compelled to dance to the tune of any other authority, including the government.” But unfortunately, the PCBs are still under the superintendence of the concerned governments.

Another important problem faced by the PCBs, especially SPCBs, is the deficiency in funding by the concerned government. Even for the day-to-day expenses, PCBs are dependent on the fees and cess collected from the industrialists and local authorities. This will create situations which increase the possibility that PCBs may issue consent subject to conditions that favour the industries rather than protect the environment in the country (Prasad, 2006). Lack of adequate funding affects the independent functioning of PCBs and its consequence on environment may be drastic in the long term.

2.2. State Pollution Control Boards (SPCB): The state governments are also not free from the drawbacks of the administration of environmental laws by the central government. In addition, the administration of environment, the state government is also affected by the local and regional interests of the concerned state. State Pollution Control Boards are the regulatory agency to carry out the functions entrusted to it under the Water Act, Air Act and EPA. SPCBs were empowered by the CPCB to carry out the functions delegated to it. SPCB is a statutory authority for planning, monitoring, research and development, education and training in pollution control. The state boards also perform functions as may be prescribed by the CPCB. For example, The Haryana Pollution Control Board has notified the ambient Air Quality Standards by its notifications dated 11-4-1994. The notification fixed limiting standards of pollution in respect of sensitive areas, industrial areas and the residential areas. the standards for sensitive areas are stringent than the standards prescribed for industrial and residential areas. The Board has recommended that the areas of 5Kms around the periphery of a centre of tourism be notified as "sensitive area". This notification came in view to control pollution and save environment in the vicinity of Badk.hal and Suraj Kund lakes (Annual Report, 1993-94; 65).

One of the important sources of income for the state government is the exploitation of natural resources and forest wealth. Shyam Divan and Armin Rosencranz rightly pointed out that "there was a tussle for control over natural resources such as forests and fisheries which were important economic subjects" (Divan and Rosencranz, 2002: 43). In many of the states, least priority is given to the protection and improvement of environment in consideration of the economic development and financial stability of the government. The promotion of polluting industries, tourism, mining, power plants and hazardous industries without considering has been caused serious repercussions on the environment. The role of state governments and local authorities were subjected to severe criticism by the Apex Court.

The Supreme Court of India severely criticised the irresponsible attitude of the central and state governments in implementing the provision of the Coastal Regulation Zone notification 1991. The Supreme Court observed that the lack of commitment on the part of these States and administrations, towards the protection and regulation of the coastal stretches, is evident from their inaction in complying with the aforesaid statutory directive requiring the preparation of Management Plans within the specified period... The State of Orissa had only partly complied with this Court's order dated 3-4-1995 inasmuch as the plans submitted by it were only for a small part of a coast. The State of West Bengal only submitted a preliminary concept while the States of Andhra Pradesh, Gujarat, Karnataka and Kerala did not care to submit any plans at all. The judicial process has successfully brought to the limelight the woeful administration of environment by the administrative authorities. The control of administrative authorities through judicial review of administrative action has created an element of accountability in the system, which helped in the streamlining of administrative process. But the lack of an independent regulatory

mechanism to administer environmental laws has an adverse impact on the administration of environment.

3. Environmental Protection by Administrative Authorities: Administrative powers of the administrative authorities are very wide in a welfare state and the same can be easily misused or used in an improper or unreasonable manner or used on the basis of irrelevant grounds or without taking into account the relevant grounds or in a malafides manner. One of the recent examples of misuse of the powers by the administrative authorities had been unearthed by the National Green Tribunal in *S P Muthuraman v Union of India*. The Environment Clearance Regulations of 2006 issued under sub-S. (1) of the Environmental Protection Act, 1986 provides for prior environmental clearance for certain projects. As per the provisions of the Notification of 2006, the project or activities require prior permission from the Central Government while project and require prior permission from the State Environment Impact Assessment Authority. But a number of projects were initiated or commenced without prior environmental clearance and in gross violation of the notification. The Ministry of Environment and Forest issued three office memorandums in 2010, 2012 and 2013 (<http://www.moef.nic.in/sites/default/files/om>) to consider and regularise these illegal projects through subsequent environmental clearance which is against the spirit of policy of the Environment Clearance Regulations of 2006. These office memorandums were challenged in this case. The NGT had categorically denied the validity of these office memorandums which were issued to buy pass the requirement of prior environment clearance. It was held that the Notification of 2006 being a statutory law cannot be diluted, varied and frustrated in the name of supplying of gaps and/or framing the policy in interest of a group of people. The decision brings to light the misuse of administrative powers by the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change in India (MoEF) for protecting the interest of those project proponents who committed a gross violation of the provisions of Environmental Protection Act and 2006 Notification through issue of office memorandums.

4. Role of Administrative Authorities in creating Environmental Awareness and Education: Environmental awareness and education will enable the public to access and appraise environmental information for the purpose of active participation in the environmental decision-making process. It will promote the public scrutiny of environmental pollution and environmental issues which will contribute to the development of self-regulation. Proper environmental education and awareness will enlighten the public to fulfil their duties towards the environment.

The central and state governments and education boards to introduce environmental education in their curriculum. After that University Grants Commission (UGC) take immediate steps to introduce environmental education in the higher education. Now most of the Governments provide environmental education to the students.

Realising the importance of environmental education and awareness in the protection and improvement of environment, administrative authorities in India have introduced a number of programmes for the purpose. Such as, 'Environmental Education, Awareness and

Training' is a flagship scheme of the Ministry of Environment and Forest to enhance the understanding of people at all levels about the relationship between human beings and the environment and to develop capabilities/skills to improve and protect the environment. The scheme was launched in 1983 – 84 with specific objectives of environmental education and awareness. A number of Programmes like National Green Crops (NGC), National Environment Awareness Campaign (NEAC) were initiated. Seminars, Symposia, workshops and conferences were conducted by the Ministry for environmental knowledge dissemination. The Ministry also initiated a number of environmental awareness programmes throughout the country. The centre as well as state governments are required to formulate a comprehensive policy for environmental education and awareness to raise the conscience of the people to the level of responsible environmental citizens.

5. Role of Administrative Authorities in Dissemination of Environmental Information:

The right to information (RTI) derived from the right to know as under the fundamental right to freedom of speech and expression ensures the participation of citizens in the management and protection of the environment. It also enables the citizens to fulfil their duties towards the environment. Availability of necessary information and the free access to it enables the people to protect their environmental rights. Access to information is a source empowerment.

Lack of transparency in the environmental decision making is important drawback of PCBs. Dissemination of information to the public brings transparency and accountability to environmental decision making. But in the case of PCBs even the information that they are required to circulate is not made available to the public often in the name of confidentiality, secrecy or preventing panic. Environmental legislations in India have not specifically recognised the right to environmental information as an important corollary of the administration of environment protection. Under the existing special environmental enactments, the concerned citizens have no right to information. Even when the government authorities undertake investigation on a complaint by the concerned activists, the activists do not have the right to the investigate reports.

The introduction of RTI Act has made dramatic changes in removing the obstacles in accessing environmental information from the concerned authorities. But the lack of awareness among the common man deprives him of his right to information. The Central Information Commission (CIC) constituted under the RTI Act has also made substantial contributions in the protection of right to information in environmental matters.

6. Role of Administrative Authorities in Public consultations: Public consultations through public hearings and written submissions are an important part of Environmental Impact Assessment of specified projects. Public scrutiny of the proposed projects will aid in internalising the concerns of the affected parties and it facilitates an objective administrative decision making in environmental matters. "Active participation is necessary to ensure that policies reflect public preferences and procedural and substantive justice is necessary to foster public acceptance of government decision" (Sairam Bhat, 2010: 418).

The Environment Clearance Regulations, 2006 provides for public consultation to grant environmental clearances for specified projects. But the realisation of the objectives of public consultation in administration of environment is still a mirage. For instance, in the environmental clearance process the decision making is done mainly on the basis of the inputs derived from the information provided by the government authorities and project proponent. The role of the affected parties in aiding the administrative environmental decision making is almost negligible. Only in respect of some designated projects public consultation is made mandatory. But the same, in most cases, is conducted as a formality and the true object of public consultation is not achieved. The regulations even empowered the concerned authority to escape the burden of public hearing on the ground of local problems. Participatory decision making must be the constituent aspect of environmental governance in the true sense of the term. Mere observance of the forms of participation without the substance will result in the negation of the fundamental human rights.

Apart from these piece meal provisions, there is no opportunity for the public to actively and constructively participate in environmental legislations, administrative environmental legislations, policy formulations and administration of environmental regulations. Public participation in environmental management may guarantee environmental rights to all the stake holders.

7. Environmental protection and performances of the States: The World Bank released Environment Performance Index (EPI) in 2022. India is bottom rank among 180 countries with a score of 18.9. Even Bangladesh, Myanmar, Pakistan, and Vietnam have ranked better than India. As per the Environment Performance Index 2020, The deterioration of India is huge, it was ranked 168th out of 180 countries with a score of 27.6. According to the report, deteriorating air quality and rapidly increasing Green House Gas (GHG) emissions are the primary reasons behind India's low score and need urgent attention. Another reason is India have prioritisation of economic growth over sustainability.

India, rely heavily on coal to support economic growth as their population growth. Large scale fossil fuel combustion adds to the poor air quality. India is home to 21 of the 30 most polluted cities in the world and has an air quality rated one of the poorest in the world. Over 16 lakh people in India die from air pollution every year (report EPI, 2021). It also identifies household fuel combustion at the largest contributor to the country's particulate matter emissions. Air quality is a direct measure of the impact of air pollution on human health. Seven indicators – PM2.5 exposure, household solid fuels, ozone exposure, nitrogen oxides exposure, sulphur dioxide exposure and volatile organic compound exposure are major sources of the air pollution in India.

According to United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), India have been identified as one of the top generators of marine plastic waste in the world, while China has managed to decrease its ocean plastic pollution. Ocean plastic pollution is measured as an absolute quantity of the amount plastic released by a country into the ocean annually. Indonesia, India, the U.S., Brazil and Thailand are the top five producers of ocean

plastic pollution and are responsible for 43 per cent of the global total (report by UNFCCC, 2015). India generates around 1.2 million tonnes of ocean plastic each year, 13 per cent of the world total. The annual plastic generation in India has been rising, but it is important to note that India has announced a ban on single use plastic from 1st July 2022 (announced by Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate change). Although, in climate change mitigation, India performed marginally better than its overall ranking 165 out of 180.

a. Forest Cover: Forest cover is the amount of land area that is covered by forest. It may be measured as relative (in percent) or absolute (in square kilometres/square miles). Around a third of the world's surface is covered with forest, with closed-canopy forest accounting for 4 - 5 billion hectares of land (<https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/earth-and-planetary-sciences/forest-cover>). According to the UN Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), a forest is defined as land spanning more than 0.5 hectares (1.2 acres) with trees higher than 5 metres (16 ft) and a canopy cover of more than 10%, or trees able to reach these thresholds in situ. It does not include land that is predominantly under agricultural or urban land use. Forest cover is one category of terrestrial land cover. ... [it] is defined as 25% or greater canopy closure at the Landsat pixel scale (30-m × 30-m spatial resolution) for trees >5 m in height (Hansen et al., 2010).

Forest Survey of India (FSI) initiated assessment of forest cover of the country for the first time in year 1987 and since then wall-to-wall Forest Cover Mapping (FCM) of country is carried out. 17th Forest Survey report released in 2021; the total forest and tree cover in India is 80.9 million hectares, which is 24.62% of the geographical area of the country. In 2011 total forest cover is 69.2 million, which is 21.05% of the geographical area of the country (<https://www.fsi.nic.in>). As compared to the assessment of 2019, there is an increase of 2,261 sq. km in the total forest and tree cover of the country in 2021. Out of this, the increase in the forest cover has been observed as 1,540 sq. km and that in tree cover is 721 sq. km. Area-wise Madhya Pradesh has the largest forest cover in the country that is 77,493sq.km, but maximum increase in forest cover witnessed in Andhra Pradesh 647 sq. km (2.22% sq. km.) and total forest cover is 29,784 sq. km. which is 18.28% of the geographical area of the state, followed by Telangana 632 sq. km (total forest cover 21,214 sq. km), and Odisha 537 sq. km (total cover of forest 52,156 sq. km). The total forest and tree cover in West Bengal is 6,744 sq. km and no significant change between 2019 and 2021. In terms of forest cover as percentage of total geographical area, the top five States are Mizoram (84.53%), Arunachal Pradesh (79.33%), Meghalaya (76.00%), Manipur (74.34%) and Nagaland (73.90%). 17 states/UT's have above 33 percent of the geographical area under forest cover. Out of these states and UT's, five states/UTs namely Lakshadweep, Mizoram, Andaman & Nicobar Islands, Arunachal Pradesh and Meghalaya have more than 75 percent forest cover while 12 states/UTs namely Manipur, Nagaland, Tripura, Goa, Kerala, Sikkim, Uttarakhand, Chhattisgarh, Dadra & Nagar Haveli and Daman & Diu, Assam, Odisha, have forest cover between 33 percent to 75 percent. Total mangrove cover in the country is 4,992 sq. km. An increase of 17 sq. Km in mangrove cover has been observed as compared to the previous assessment of 2019. Top three states

showing mangrove cover increase are Odisha (8 sq. km) followed by Maharashtra (4 sq. km) and Karnataka (3 sq. km). Not only increase of forest cover but also loss in some states like Arunachal Pradesh 257 sq. km, Manipur 249 sq. km, Nagaland 235 sq. km, Mizoram 186 sq. km and Meghalaya 73 sq. km. Causes of the decrease of the forest cover is shifting cultivation, felling of trees, natural calamities, anthropogenic pressure and development activities.

b. CO₂ Emissions: Global warming is basically caused by the emission of greenhouse gases. Further, 72.4 per cent of the totally emitted greenhouse gases are carbon dioxide (CO₂). The remaining are Methane 7.2 per cent and Nitrous oxide (NO) 19 per cent and Chlorofluorocarbon (CFC) and other miscellaneous gases 1.4 per cent (Holtz and Selden, 1995). Thus, Carbon dioxide emission seems to be the cardinal factor of this largely discussed issue of present days the environmentalists are interested in. CO₂ is inevitably created by burning fossil fuels like oil, natural gas, diesel, organic-diesel, petrol, organic-petrol, ethanol and coal. Extent of CO₂ emissions of a region is therefore based on consumption of two broad categories of fuels, coal, the solid fuel and petroleum products except cement production and gas flaring.

In India 71.12 per cent of total CO₂ emissions of this country are caused by consumption of solid fuel¹ (such as coal, wood etc.). The remaining part is due to combustion of liquid fuel (20.40 per cent), gas fuel (3.29 per cent), cement production (5.07 per cent) and gas flaring (0.12 per cent). The state level estimates for CO₂ emissions in 2008, Madhya Pradesh is top of the CO₂ emissions in India (76159.89 metric tons) followed by Uttar Pradesh (54350.83 metric tons) and Maharashtra (44576.08 metric tons). Jammu & Kashmir (782.20 metric tons), Himachal Pradesh (1047.80 metric tons) and Goa (812.97 metric tons) are the bottom 3 emitters in this period. West Bengal (35042.07 metric tons) is 6 positions among 28 States.

Per capita CO₂ emission had gone up in 2008 (Table-1) in the southern states like Kerala (1 metric ton) and Tamil Nadu (2 metric tons) and for the industrialized state like Maharashtra (3 metric tons). Interestingly, Gujarat and Orissa, the top two states in terms of per capita emission in 1980 had been able to reduce its level in 2008 and stood at 6th and 13th position respectively in 2008.

Table-1

Per capita CO ₂ Emissions for the major Indian States						
State	Per Capita Emission (M.T. of C)				Rank	
	1980	1990	2000	2008	1980	2008
Madhya Pradesh	0.03	0.06	0.07	0.06	17	18
Uttar Pradesh	0.02	0.06	0.11	0.10	19	16
Maharashtra	0.14	0.33	0.45	0.40	8	3
Andhra Pradesh	0.10	0.20	0.26	0.22	10	11
Bihar	0.09	0.18	0.27	0.22	11	11
West Bengal	0.05	0.10	0.16	0.14	14	15
Gujarat	0.46	0.55	0.44	0.35	1	6
Orissa	0.24	0.24	0.22	0.19	2	13
Tamil Nadu	0.14	0.27	0.44	0.41	8	2
Punjab	0.21	0.23	0.29	0.27	5	9
Rajasthan	0.03	0.07	0.04	0.04	17	19
Karnataka	0.22	0.37	0.37	0.32	4	8
Delhi	0.17	0.29	0.37	0.33	7	7
Haryana	0.23	0.38	0.44	0.40	3	3
Kerala	0.19	0.40	0.49	0.42	6	1
Assam	0.09	0.24	0.40	0.36	11	5
Goa	0.04	0.10	0.17	0.16	15	14
Himachal Pradesh	0.04	0.06	0.10	0.09	15	17
Jammu & Kashmir	0.09	0.18	0.28	0.26	11	10

Source: www.rff.org

Thus, growth in CO₂ emission for India was caused by emission growth in Madhya Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, Maharashtra, Rajasthan, Orissa, Karnataka and Andhra Pradesh. Low-income states, steel producing states and highly industrially developed states are causing emission growth in this country. So, economics at its initial stage of development and at its way towards industrialization are causing pollution in this country.

Conclusion: The performance of the states in environmental protection has been briefly analysed in this chapter. The role of administrative authorities in implementing environmental laws and its impact on the different issues of environment has also been discussed. But at various times it has been observed that the activities of this administration are influenced by political leaders or groups and adopt rules and regulations which result in degradation instead of environmental protection, which is a cause for considerable concern in countries like India. So, the Supreme Court and the State High Courts at different times did not shy away from criticizing the various activities of the administration and both the courts have given various directions and suggestions to the administration at different times to prevent environmental degradation, which is the responsibility of the administration to implement. The CPCB and SPCBs are responsible authority to enforce the notified

standards and the provisions of various environmental laws, but have not been able to effectively exercise their powers because of capacity constraints. CPCB and SPCBs are the main instruments for standard setting, Research and Development (R&D) and compliance and enforcement. Given the range of responsibilities entrusted to them, they are grossly understaffed and face resource crunch in many states. There is also a lot of political interference in the appointment of the chairman of the pollution control boards which harms the functioning of the boards.

To be noted is that thousands of environmental cases are pending in various courts across the country. This litigation is increasing due to heightened public awareness, greater pressures on environment and emerging environmental challenges. In the States, environment is still low priority. This is reflected in the negligible share of plan budget being allocated for environmental managements. Many State Pollution Control Boards (SPCB) receive almost no financial support from the state governments and are totally dependent on cess. Currently, the percentage of GDP spent on environment in India is 0.012, whereas it is 1.0 in Japan, 0.4 in USA and 0.3 in Netherlands. The administration is not equipped with infrastructural facilities. There is also a lack of coordination among the various agencies of enforcement. The strong centralization in the decision-making processes leaves the SPCBs feeling helpless against the fiats of the central government and CPCB.

References:

- 1) Chatterjee, Benimadhab (2002), *Environmental Laws: Implementation Problems and Perspectives*, New Delhi: Deep and Deep Publications Private Limited.
- 2) Deshpande, V. S. (1992), "Environment, Law and Public Interest Litigation", in P. Diwan & P. Diwan (eds.) *Environment Administration, Law and Judicial Attitude*, New Delhi: Deep & Deep Publications.
- 3) Dhar, Bharat B. (2000), *Mining and Environment*, New Delhi: A.P.H. Publishing Corporation.
- 4) Edmunds, Stahrl and John Letey (1973), *Environmental Administration*, New York: McGraw-Hill.
- 5) Elliot, L. (1956), 'Global Environmental Governance'. In *Global Governance: Critical Perspectives*, London: Routledge.
- 6) Guha, R (1989), *The Unquiet Woods: Ecological Change and Peasant Resistance in the Himalaya*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- 7) Mathur, M. (1996), *Legal Control of Environmental Pollution: Jurisprudence and Laws Applicable to Environmental Violation and Prevention*, New Delhi: Deep and Deep Publication.
- 8) Sahu, Geetanjay (2014), *Environmental Jurisprudence and the Supreme Court*, New Delhi: Orient Black Swan.