



सत्यमेव जयते

File No: 11424
Government of India
Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change
(Issued by the State Environment Impact Assessment Authority(SEIAA),
TAMIL NADU)



Dated 27/12/2024



To,

Thiru.MADHU SRINIVASAN
MADHU SRINIVASAN
S/o. Srinivasan, D No. 12 EDEN Garden, Thally Road, Hosur, Krishnagiri, Shoolagiri, KRISHNAGIRI,
TAMIL NADU, 635109
madhuquarry@gmail.com

Sub: Rejection of Terms of Reference (ToR) to the proposed Project under the EIA Notification 2006-and as amended thereof -regarding.

Sir,

This is in reference to your application submitted to Ministry vide proposal number SIA/TN/MIN/503850/2024 dated 26/12/2024 for Terms of Reference (ToR) to the project under the provision of the EIA Notification 2006- and as amended thereof.

The particulars of the proposal are as below :

(i) TOR Identification No.	TO24B0108TN5476475N
(ii) File No.	11424
(iii) Clearance Type	Fresh ToR
(iv) Category	B1
(v) Project/Activity Included Schedule No.	1(a) Mining of minerals,1(a) Mining of minerals
(vi) Name of Project	Kamandoddi Village Rough Stone Mining Lease
(vii) Name of Company/Organization	MADHU SRINIVASAN
(viii) Location of Project (District, State)	KRISHNAGIRI, TAMIL NADU
(ix) Issuing Authority	SEIAA
(xi) Applicability of General Conditions	no

SEAC REMARKS:

The proposal was placed in the 516th meeting of SEAC held on 06.12.2024. The details of the project furnished by the proponent are available in the website (parivesh.nic.in).

The SEAC noted the following:

1. The Project Proponent, Mr.S.Madhu has applied for Terms of Reference for the proposed rough stone quarry lease over an extent 1.27.0Ha at S.F.Nos. 1151, 1155, 1212 to 1219, 1222, 1225 & 1226/A(Part-5) of Kamandoddi Village,

Shoolagiri Taluk, Krishnagiri District, Tamil Nadu.

2. The project/activity is covered under Category “B1” of Item 1(a) “Mining of Minerals Projects” of the Schedule to the EIA Notification, 2006.

3. Earlier, the proponent has obtained EC from DEIAA vide Lr.No.03/DEIAA-KGI/EC.No.80/2018 dated.27.08.2018.

Based on the presentation & documents submitted by the project proponent, the Committee noted the following:

- i) The proponent has already quarried upto a depth of 26m (15m AGL + 11m BGL) without proper benches.
- ii) The proposed area is a hillock in which mining operations are already being carried out.
- iii) As per the 500m cluster letter dated.17.10.2024, issued by the Dept. of Geology & Mining, there are already 6 quarry leases (excluding the current proposal) carrying out the mining operations on the hillock.
- iv) The PP has quarried out earlier mining operations in an unsystematic & unscientific manner without forming any benches.

Hon^{ble} Supreme Court of India in a judgment in IA No.1000 of 2003 dated 3rd June 2022 has underlined the necessity for following the Precautionary Principle. The judgment states that

“...a situation may arise where there may be irreparable damage to environment after an activity is allowed to go ahead and if it is stopped, there may be irreparable damage to economic interest....”

The Hon^{ble} Court held that in case of a doubt, protection of environment would have precedence over economic interest. It was further held that precautionary principle requires anticipatory action to be taken to prevent harm and that harm can be prevented even on reasonable suspicion. Further, the Hon^{ble} Court emphasizes in the said judgment that it is not always necessary that there should be direct evidence of harm to the environment.

The mine area is environmentally fragile as part of it fall in the hazard zone and therefore, compliance of Mining Plan and EC conditions are of utmost important. Therefore, the Committee do not find any reason other than avoiding the over exploitation of the hillock, to protect the natural resource & to ensure sustainable mining, the Committee decided to not to give permission to any quarrying operations in the hillock further. Hence, the Committee decided not to recommend this proposal for grant of Environmental Clearance.

SEIAA REMARKS:

The subject was placed in the 780th authority meeting held on 18.12.2024 & 19.12.2024. The authority noted that the subject was appraised in the 516th SEAC meeting held on 06.12.2024. Based on the presentation & documents submitted by the project proponent, the Committee noted the following:

- i) The proponent has already quarried upto a depth of 26m (15m AGL + 11m BGL) without proper benches.
- ii) The proposed area is a hillock in which mining operations are already being carried out.
- iii) As per the 500m cluster letter dated.17.10.2024, issued by the Dept. of Geology & Mining, there are already 6 quarry leases (excluding the current proposal) carrying out the mining operations on the hillock.
- iv) The PP has quarried out earlier mining operations in an unsystematic & unscientific manner without forming any benches.

Hon^{ble} Supreme Court of India in a judgment in IA No.1000 of 2003 dated 3rd June 2022 has underlined the necessity for following the Precautionary Principle. The judgment states that

“...a situation may arise where there may be irreparable damage to environment after an activity is allowed to go ahead and if it is stopped, there may be irreparable damage to economic interest....”

The Hon^{ble} Court held that in case of a doubt, protection of environment would have precedence over economic interest. It was further held that precautionary principle requires anticipatory action to be taken to prevent harm and that harm can be prevented even on reasonable suspicion. Further, the Hon^{ble} Court emphasizes in the said judgment that it is not always necessary that there should be direct evidence of harm to the environment.

The mine area is environmentally fragile as part of it fall in the hazard zone and therefore, compliance of Mining Plan and EC conditions are of utmost important. Therefore, the Committee do not find any reason other than avoiding the over exploitation of the hillock, to protect the natural resource & to ensure sustainable mining, the Committee decided to not to give permission to any quarrying operations in the hillock further. Hence, the Committee decided not to recommend this proposal for grant of Environmental Clearance.

The Authority, after discussions, **accepted the decision of SEAC, rejected the proposal** and decided to request Member Secretary, SEIAA-TN to grant rejection letter to proponent as per the 516th SEAC minutes. Further, Authority decided to **close and record this proposal.**

Additional Terms of Reference

N/A

Annexure 1

Send Approval Copy To (In case of multiple use comma as separator)

