

**MINUTES OF THE 159th MEETING OF THE STATE
LEVEL ENVIRONMENT IMPACT ASSESSMENT AUTHORITY (SEIAA)
KERALA, HELD ON 18TH NOVEMBER, 2025**

Present:

- 1. Sri. P.H. Kurian IAS (Retd), Chairman, SEIAA Kerala.**
- 2. Sri. Raveendran T., Expert Member, SEIAA Kerala**
- 3. Sri. Seeram Sambasiva Rao, IAS, Member Secretary, SEIAA Kerala**

The 159th meeting of the State Environment Impact Assessment Authority (SEIAA), Kerala, was convened on 18th November 2025 at 10:30 a.m. under the Chairmanship of Sri. P.H. Kurian, IAS (Retd). The meeting was attended by Sri. Seeram Sambasiva Rao, IAS, Member Secretary, SEIAA, and Sri. Raveendran Thekkeparambil, Expert Member, SEIAA. The Authority reviewed the agenda items of the 159th meeting and adopted the following decisions:

PHYSICAL FILES

Item No.159.01 **Minutes of the 157th SEIAA meeting held on 19th September, 2025 and the 158th held on 09th October 2025.**

Noted and Approved.

Item No.159.02 **Rejection order issued to the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Haridasan T. for an area of 7.7085 Ha at Sy. Nos. 488 in Vettathur Village, Perinthalmanna Taluk, Malappuram – Reconsideration request from the Project Proponent
(SIA/KL/MIN/50013/2019; 1318/EC2/2019/SEIAA)**

The Authority considered the request from the project proponent for reconsideration of the previously rejected application. As per the earlier proceedings and the field inspection reports, it was found that the proposed site is highly vulnerable to landslides and the project area is ecologically sensitive. Repeated representations have been received with supporting studies from the Project Proponent, including those from reputed institutions; these have already been examined in detail in prior meetings.

The Authority also took note that the proposal had undergone extensive appraisal by the SEAC in its various meetings, during which the Committee had conducted two field inspections, examined the slope stability aspects in detail, heard the Project Proponent and the RQP, and recorded several site-specific concerns relating to steep slopes, significant soil depth, geological structures, high rainfall, biodiversity richness, past landslide records, and the overall high land fragility of the area. The then-Authority also noted that the reduction of the project area or revision of the mining plan does not sufficiently address the core environmental and geological concerns raised by SEAC and reaffirmed in prior decisions.

The Authority also observed that the Project Proponent had already been heard in detail by the SEAC, and that the issues raised in the present request do not provide any new substantive grounds to reconsider the rejected application. **After careful consideration of all relevant records, submissions of the Project Proponent, the detailed appraisal and field observations of the SEAC, and the inherent environmental and topographical sensitivities of the area, the Authority decided to adhere to its earlier decision rejecting the application for Environmental Clearance.**

However, the Authority clarified that this decision does not preclude the Project Proponent from submitting a fresh application in accordance with the provisions of the EIA Notification, 2006, including any revised proposal with reduced area or modified mining plan, which may be appraised afresh as per the applicable procedure.

Item No.159.03 **Environmental Clearance issued to the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Shans Paul, Managing Director, M/s Hanna Rock Products for an area of 7.2855 Ha at Survey Nos 79/2, 80/1A-02, 80/1A-03, 80/1A-04, 80/1A-05, 80/1A-06, 80/1A-07, 80/1A-08, 80/1A-09, 80/1A-10, 80/1A-11, 80/1A-12, 80/1A-13, 80/1A-14, 80/1A-15, 80/1A-16, 80/1A-17, 80/1A-18, 80/1A-19, 80/1A-20, 80/1A-21 in Arakuzha Village, Muvattupuzha Taluk, Ernakulam – Complaint filed by Sri. Shinaj Ali, Environment Protection Forum – Report from the District Collector**
(File No. 1378/EC1/2025/SEIAA)

The Authority noted that Environmental Clearance (EC) was issued to Sri. Shans Paul, Managing Director, M/s Hanna Rock Products, for a Granite Building Stone Quarry

over an extent of 7.2855 Ha in Arakuzha Village, Muvattupuzha Taluk, Ernakulam District, vide proceedings dated 17.03.2018, valid for five years. Considering COVID relaxations, the validity of the EC expired on 16.03.2024.

A complaint dated 13.05.2025 was received from Sri. Shinaj Ali, alleging large-scale illegal extraction of granite beyond the permitted quantity. The complaint was forwarded to the District Collector, District Geologist, and the Project Proponent for remarks.

The Project Proponent, vide letter dated 11.07.2025, stated that the total production between 2018 and 2023 was 4,00,000 MT, and that the CCR issued by the IRO, MoEF&CC, Bengaluru, was satisfactory.

The District Collector, Ernakulam, vide letter dated 08.10.2025, furnished a report stating that a DRONE–LIDAR survey carried out on 10.06.2025 confirmed illegal extraction of 61,636.525 MT of granite. An amount of Rs. 1,52,92,766 was recovered on 09.09.2025 toward royalty, price, and fine for the illegal extraction. The District Geologist also reported that quarry operations were ongoing.

The Authority further noted that mining operations had continued after EC expiry by availing the benefit of S.O. 1807(E); however, the said notification has been struck down by the Hon'ble High Court vide judgment dated 26.08.2025, rendering continuation of mining under its benefit legally invalid.

Upon deliberation, **the Authority decided as follows:**

- 1. A Show Cause Notice shall be issued to the Project Proponent, based on the findings of the District Collector regarding the illegal extraction of 61,636.525 MT, continuation of mining after EC expiry, and violation of EC conditions and the KMMC Rules, directing him to explain within 15 days, why action shall not be taken under the provisions of the EIA Notification, 2006, and the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986..**
- 2. Since S.O. 1807(E) has been struck down by the Hon'ble High Court, the Project Proponent shall renew the Environmental Clearance in accordance with applicable provisions if he intends to continue quarrying operations.**

3. **The Kerala State Pollution Control Board (KSPCB) shall be directed to constitute a Joint Committee for environmental damage assessment and to submit a detailed report to SEIAA.**
4. **The Department of Mining & Geology shall be instructed not to issue any transit passes to the Project Proponent based on S.O. 1807(E) or cancel the passes if any issued to the Project Proponent.**

Item No.159.04 Complaint filed by Sri. K Mani against the unauthorized quarries in Noorkkad, Erumappara, Badampadi areas in Ooragm Village, Thirurangadi Taluk, Malappuram – Report of District Collector. (2227/EC1/SEIAA/2025)

The Authority considered the complaint alleging the continued operation of unauthorized granite quarries in the Oorakam Hill region, causing severe environmental damage. The complainant alleged that more than 28 unauthorized quarries have been operating on steep slopes in a region classified as an Orange Zone by the Kerala State Disaster Management Authority.

The District Collector's report confirmed that over 28 illegal quarries were investigated, stop memos were issued to violators, and directions given for urgent legal and revenue recovery actions as per the Kerala Minor Mineral Concession Rules, 2015.

The Authority deliberated on the report and observed that multiple illegal quarries are operating, and enforcement actions have been initiated by the District administration. The large number of abandoned and active quarries warrant a comprehensive assessment to determine long-term environmental feasibility of mining in the area. Upon deliberation, **the Authority decided as follows:**

1. **The Kerala State Pollution Control Board (KSPCB) shall be directed to initiate action against all violators operating unauthorized quarries in the Oorakam region under the relevant provisions of the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986.**
2. **The Environment Department shall be directed to undertake a comprehensive Carrying Capacity Study of the Oorakam region,**

considering the concentration of quarries, slope characteristics, environmental sensitivity, and the earlier recommendation of the SEAC in this regard.

Item No.159.05 **Environmental Clearance issued by MoEFCC to the Construction of Twin Tube Unidirectional Tunnel Road (2+2 Lane) with Four Lane Approach (from existing roads) for providing direct connectivity between Anakkampoyil-Kalladi - Meppadi in Kozhikode and Wayanad – Approval of Revised EMP and CER (SIA/KL/INFRA1/458848/2024)**

The Authority noted that Environmental Clearance was issued by the MoEFCC to the project with specific conditions, including submission of a revised EMP and CER (Condition 1.33) and compliance monitoring of EC conditions by SEAC (Condition 1.57). The revised EMP and CER were submitted by the project proponent on 12.09.2025 and appraised by SEAC in its 184th meeting on 14.10.2025. SEAC found the proposed activities and financial provisions for EMP and CER satisfactory and recommended approval. The Authority also took note of pending litigation (WP (PIL) No. 90/2025) regarding the EC.

Upon deliberation, **the Authority decided as follows:**

- **The Authority accepts the recommendation of SEAC and approves the revised EMP and CER submitted by the Project Proponent vide letter dated 12.09.2025, in compliance with Specific Condition No. 1.33 of the EC issued by MoEF&CC.**
- **The Project Proponent shall submit the mandatory Half-Yearly Compliance Reports (HYCRs) with all documentary evidence as required under the EC.**
- **The SEAC-3 shall review the compliance of EC conditions every six months in accordance with Specific Condition No. 1.57 of the EC and submit the report to SEIAA.**

Item No.159.06

Environmental Clearance issued to the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Ramakrishnan C., Managing Director, M/s Thiruvambadi Rocks Pvt Ltd., for an area of 0.9800 Ha at Un Survey area, in Thiruvambady Village, Thamarassery Taluk, Kozhikode – Complaint received.

(SIA/KL/MIN/129967/2019, 1861(A)/EC4/2019/SEIAA)

The Authority noted the complaint submitted by Sri. Bose Jacob, Member, Kodencherry Division, District Panchayat, Kozhikode, vide letter dated 07.05.2025. The complainant alleged that the project site is located in a densely populated hilly area in Thumbakode Mala, which is prone to natural hazards, including landslides, soil erosion, and flash floods. It was also stated that Thiruvambady Village is an ESA village as per the Directions issued by MoEFCC on 13.11.2013. The Authority observed that the EC was granted on 03.03.2024 for a project life of five years, and that the issues raised in the complaint relate to hazard vulnerability, and population density within the vicinity of the proposed quarry site. Upon deliberation, **the Authority decided as follows:**

- 1. The matter shall be referred to SEAC-3, which shall conduct a hearing of both the complainant and the Project Proponent.**
- 2. The SEAC shall examine all relevant aspects, including the ESA status of Thiruvambady Village, field conditions, hazard vulnerability, and issues raised in the complaint, and submit a detailed report with specific recommendations to SEIAA for further decision.**

Item No.159.07

Request for renewal of the licenses and permit of the quarry of Sri. M.K. Babu for an area of 0.7440 Ha at Re - Sy. No. 41 in Nadapuram Village, Vadakara Taluk, Kozhikode – Judgment dated 24.01.2025 in WP(C) No.45668/2024- Hearing (File No.3240/EC2/2024/SEIAA)

The Authority noted that the Hon'ble High Court, vide judgment dated 24.01.2025 in WP(C) No. 45668/2024, directed respondents 2, 4, and 6 to consider and pass orders on Ext. P15 representation after hearing the petitioner within two months. As decided in the 157th meeting, the Authority issued a hearing intimation to the Project Proponent on 27.09.2025. In the 158th SEIAA meeting, the Authority observed that the Project Proponent did not attend

the hearing and communicated his inability to attend. Accordingly, the Authority resolved to provide one final opportunity to present his case, with a clear indication that no further opportunity would be granted.

The Authority also observed that the validity of the EC had expired, that no reappraisal application had been submitted through the PARIVESH portal, and that the benefit of S.O. 1807(E), under which certain extensions could have been claimed, had been set aside by the Hon'ble High Court vide judgment dated 26.08.2025.

Despite being provided repeated opportunities, the Project Proponent did not attend the hearing. Upon deliberation, **the Authority decided as follows:**

- 1. Since the Project Proponent did not attend the hearing despite being provided sufficient opportunities, the Authority presumes that the Project Proponent has no subsisting grievance requiring consideration by SEIAA.**
- 2. The Project Proponent has not submitted any reappraisal application for the EC through the PARIVESH portal as required under the O.M. dated 28.04.2023. In the absence of such an application, and in view of the expiry of the EC validity, no further action lies before SEIAA at this stage.**
- 3. The Standing Counsel shall be informed accordingly for appropriate submission before the Hon'ble High Court in compliance with the Court's directions.**

Item No.159.08 **Revalidation 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 (Un survey-Not Final) Koodaranji Village, Thamarassery Taluk, Kozhikode - Order dated 27.03.2025 in WP(C) No. 12829/2025 - Reply to the show cause notice received (SIA/KL/MIN/497295/2024)**

The Authority deliberated on the matter and noted the decisions of the 156th SEIAA meeting, the reply dated 19.04.2025 of the Project Proponent to the show cause notice and the

interim order of the Hon'ble High Court dated 27.03.2025 and 21.10.2025 in WP(C) No. 12829 of 2025. The Authority observed that the Hon'ble High Court, vide order dated 27.03.2025, directed the Standing Counsel to file a counter affidavit addressing the contention that, if SEIAA disagrees with SEAC's recommendation, the matter has to be remitted back to SEAC under Paragraph 8 of the EIA Notification, 2006. The Court granted an interim stay of Decision No. 1 (rejection of application) in Item No. 12 of Ext. P14 (minutes of the 156th SEIAA) for two weeks. The interim order was extended until 17.11.2025.

The Authority also noted that the validity of the DEIAA-issued EC has expired, that reappraisal under the O.M. dated 28.04.2023 has not been completed, and that the benefit of S.O. 1807(E) is unavailable pursuant to the judgment of the Hon'ble High Court dated 26.08.2025. Upon deliberation, **the Authority decided as follows:**

- 1. As only the rejection order has been stayed by the Hon'ble High Court, and since the Project Proponent has already submitted a reply to the Show Cause Notice, the Authority shall hear the Project Proponent in the next SEIAA meeting before taking further action in the Show Cause proceedings. Hearing intimation shall be issued to the Project Proponent well in advance.**
- 2. The Standing Counsel shall be apprised that SEIAA is proceeding with the Show Cause process, which the Hon'ble High Court has not stayed.**

Item No.159.09 **Reappraisal of Environmental Clearance issued from DEIAA, Kozhikode to the quarry project of Sri. Shahil A. M, Director, M/s Thekkinchuvadu Granites (P) Ltd for an area of 4.9919 Ha in Unsurvey field No. 2442 at Koodaranji Village, Koodaranji Panchayt, 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 & Interim order dated 24.03.2025 in WP(C) No. 11213/2025 - Reply to the show cause notice received**
(SIA/KL/MIN/510005/2025)

The Authority deliberated on the matter and noted the decisions of the 156th SEIAA meeting, the reply dated 30.04.2025 of the Project Proponent to the show cause notice and the

interim order of the Hon'ble High Court dated 24.03.2025 in WP(C) No. 11213 of 2025 and interim order dated 28.03.2025 in WP(C) No. 41663 of 2025 filed by the Project Proponent. The Authority observed that the Hon'ble High Court, vide order dated 24.03.2025 in WP(C) No. 11213 of 2025, granted an interim stay of Decision No. 1 (rejection of application) in Item No. 15 of Ext. P13 (minutes of the 156th SEIAA). Vide interim order dated 28.03.2025 in WP(C) No. 41663 of 2025, the Hon'ble High Court extended the interim stay on the 149th SEIAA decision to issue stop memo for the project.

The Authority also noted that the validity of the DEIAA-issued EC has expired, that reappraisal under the O.M. dated 28.04.2023 has not been completed, and that the benefit of S.O. 1807(E) is unavailable pursuant to the judgment of the Hon'ble High Court dated 26.08.2025. Upon deliberation, **the Authority decided as follows:**

- 1. As only the rejection order has been stayed by the Hon'ble High Court, and since the Project Proponent has already submitted a reply to the Show Cause Notice, the Authority shall hear the Project Proponent in the next SEIAA meeting before taking further action in the Show Cause proceedings. Hearing intimation shall be issued to the Project Proponent well in advance.**
- 2. The Standing Counsel shall be apprised that SEIAA is proceeding with the Show Cause process, which the Hon'ble High Court has not stayed.**

Item No.159.10 **Reappraisal of Environmental Clearance issued by DEIAA, Palakkad for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Joshy P.J, M/s Penta Granites, for an area of 4.1371 Ha at Re-Survey Nos. 278/21, 278/31 PT, 278/33 PT, 278/35 & 278/PT in Kizhakkancheri -2 Village, Alathur Taluk, Palakkad District. - WP (C) No. 42789 of 2024 filed by M/s Penta Granites before the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala (SIA/KL/MIN/458118/2024)**

The Authority deliberated on the matter and noted that the Environmental Clearance (EC) issued by DEIAA to M/s Penta Granites had been reappraised, recommended by SEAC, and subsequently issued by SEIAA on 13.03.2025. The Project Proponent has challenged certain EC conditions before the Hon'ble High Court in WP(C) No. 42789/2024, specifically

the requirement to maintain a 50 m buffer from the crusher unit and the requirement to obtain SCNBWL wildlife clearance owing to its proximity to PA within 10km from the project area.

The Authority observed that the Hon'ble High Court, through its interim order dated 30.01.2025, directed SEIAA to consider the petitioner's representations relating to the judgments concerning wildlife clearance. The Authority further noted the judgments of the Hon'ble Supreme Court dated 26.04.2023, 29.05.2025, and 23.07.2025, the judgment dated 07.08.2025 in WP(C) No. 9795/2023, and the recent judgment dated 14.10.2025 in WP(C) Nos. 35885/2025 and 35708/2025, wherein the Hon'ble High Court held that SCNBWL clearance is not required, as there is no appeal from the Union Ministry.

The Authority further noted the legal opinion dated 08.10.2025, wherein the Standing Counsel opined that there is scope for appeal regarding the implementation of O.M. dated 17.05.2022, but also highlighted inconsistencies in the application of wildlife clearance conditions in ECs issued after 17.05.2022.

The Authority deliberated on the matter and is of the opinion that, since the requirement relates to obtaining SCNBWL clearance under O.M. dated 17.05.2022 and the judgments of the Hon'ble High Court have not been challenged by the Ministry, the Authority is bound to follow the directions of the Hon'ble High Court. The Authority also observed that no clarification has been received from MoEF&CC regarding the applicability of SCNBWL clearance in such cases, despite earlier communications from SEIAA. In light of the above, the opinion of the Standing Counsel to file an appeal is not being considered, as the issue squarely relates to forest and wildlife matters, on which the Ministry is the competent authority to take appropriate action.

Upon consideration of the legal position and the directions of the Hon'ble High Court, **the Authority decided as follows:**

- 1. The condition requiring SCNBWL clearance shall be removed, in compliance with the judgments of the Hon'ble High Court and in the absence of any contrary clarification from MoEF&CC.**
- 2. The condition requiring a 50 m setback from the crusher unit shall be deleted. However, the Project Proponent shall ensure that adequate precautionary and safety measures are implemented during blasting operations to prevent any accidents, injuries, or adverse impacts on workers or the surrounding areas.**

3. **All other EC conditions remain unchanged. The Authority reserves the right to reinstate such stipulations should there be a change in the legal or regulatory position.**

In view of the judgment, the Authority has taken the following general decision to be applied in similar cases where Environmental Clearance (EC) has already been issued, as well as for the appraisal of all future applications.

1. **For the existing EC holders:** The Project Proponent shall apply for amendment of the EC via PARIVESH, along with a valid certificate issued by the Wildlife Warden of the respective Protected Area. The certificate must clearly state that the project area does not fall within the proposed ESZ or within 1 km of the boundary of the Protected Area, and must specify the exact distance of the project site from the Protected Area boundary.
2. **For the applications under appraisal and fresh applications:** If the project area lies within 10 km of the boundary of any Protected Area, the Project Proponent shall furnish a valid certificate issued by the Wildlife Warden of the respective Protected Area along with the EC application. The certificate must clearly state that the project area does not fall within the proposed ESZ or within 1 km of the Protected Area boundary and must specify the exact distance of the project site from the Protected Area boundary.
3. The SEIAA Secretariat shall take necessary action to inform SEAC of this decision and shall also publish the Authority's decision on the website for public information.

Item No.159.11

Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry, for an area of 4.8171 Ha at Re-Sy. Nos. KPD 833, KPD 836, KPD 1148, KPD 838 in Kelakam Village, Iritty Taluk, Kannur, Kerala - Rejected Proposal - WP(C) No. 31732 of 2023, filed by Sri. M. M. Thomas, Managing Director, M/s Kottiyoor Metals - (SIA/KL/MIN/152389/2020; 1738/EC4/2020/SEIAA)

The Authority deliberated on the matter and noted the decisions of the 140th SEIAA meeting, the judgment of the Hon'ble High Court dated 17.06.2025 in WP(C) No. 22463 of

2024, and the modified judgment dated 09.10.2025 in I.A. No. 1/2025 in WP(C) No. 22463 of 2024(I).

The Authority observed that the Hon'ble High Court, vide order dated 09.10.2025, modified paragraph No. 10 of the original judgment, directing that all references to the Expert Appraisal Committee (EAC) shall be read as SEIAA, and that all directions therein shall apply to SEIAA for compliance. The Authority further noted that the time period for compliance stands extended for a further three months from 09.10.2025. To comply with the Hon'ble Court's direction, **the Authority decided as follows:**

- 1. The Project Proponent shall be heard in the next SEIAA meeting in compliance with the modified directions of the Hon'ble High Court. The SEIAA Secretariat shall issue the necessary hearing intimation to the Project Proponent and all concerned.**
- 2. The Standing Counsel shall be informed of the decision and the steps taken for appropriate submission before the Hon'ble High Court.**

Item No.159.12

Environmental Clearance issued to the Granite building Stone Quarry project of Sri. Shibin William Varghese for an area of 0.9988 Ha at Survey No. 221 in Mundakkayam village, Kanjirapally Taluk, Kottayam.

(SIA/KL/MIN/265597/2022; 2434/EC2 /2019/SEIAA)

The Authority deliberated on the matter and noted the decision of the 149th SEIAA meeting, the Village Officer's letter dated 23.01.2025, and the clarification dated 23.05.2025 submitted by the Project Proponent. The Authority noticed that the Village Officer's letter clarified that the incident reported on 16.08.2024 was a soil-erosion event that had occurred in another area during heavy rainfall, that water overflowed into nearby houses, and that no landslide had occurred at the project site. It was also reported that the quarry is located about 1 km away from the affected location and that the mining licence had been cancelled by the Panchayat. The Authority also noted that the Project Proponent, in the clarification dated 23.05.2025, denied the allegations raised by the Panchayat Secretary and maintained that the incident was not connected to the quarry operations.

The Authority further verified the project area using the latest GSI Landslide Susceptibility Map and found that the project area lies within low and medium hazard zones, and that the nearest high-hazard zone is approximately 87 m away from the project boundary. In view of the above observations, the Authority **decided that no further action is required.**

The Authority also perused the complaint dated 29.09.2025 submitted by Smt. Jossy Jose, President, Nirmalaram Welfare Association. It was noted that the complaint does not contain any actionable points warranting a review of the Environmental Clearance, and the Village Officer has already clarified the matter. Accordingly, no further action is required. The SEIAA Secretariat shall issue a suitable reply to the Complainant.

Item No.159.13 **Complaint received from Sri. Benny Mathew and Sri. George Mathew-WP (C) No. 38448/2018 and IA No. 1/2024, filed by Sri. George Mathew**
(File No: 2682/EC4/2024/SEIAA)

The Authority deliberated on the matter and noted the complaints submitted by Sri. Benny Mathew and Sri. George Mathew against the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry project at Block No. 7, Sy. Nos. 70/5 and 70/6, Monippally Village, and also noted the reference to WP(C) No. 38448 of 2018 filed before the Hon'ble High Court.

The Authority noted that, in the 151st SEIAA meeting, it was observed that no EC application or project details were available with SEIAA. The Authority also noted the hearing note submitted by Sri. Raju Cyriac (10th Respondent) stated that necessary documents will be obtained from competent authorities for future quarrying activities, and the written submission of Sri. George Mathew (2nd Petitioner) is raising concerns regarding two Panchayat drinking water tanks located approximately 180 m and 250 m from the quarry boundary.

The Authority noticed that no EC application is pending before SEIAA, and that the Project Proponent has not submitted any EC application at all for consideration. In the absence of an application, the allegations raised in the complaints and written submissions cannot be substantively examined by SEIAA at this stage.

The Authority decided that the averments of the petitioners and the details contained in their hearing notes shall be taken into account by SEAC during appraisal, as and when an EC application is submitted by the Project Proponent.

**Item No.159.14 Environmental Clearance, for the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. R. Mohandas, for an area of 3.7390 Ha at Re-Sy Nos. 1293/1623, 1293/1621, 1293/1622, 1293/2870, 1293/2872, 1293/2793, 1293/2794 & 1293/1624 in Ayyankunnu Village, Iritty Taluk, Kannur - EC Rejected – Request for Reconsideration.
(SIA/KL/MIN/428391/2023, 2283/EC4/2023/SEIAA)**

The Authority deliberated on the matter and noted the earlier decisions of SEAC and SEIAA, including the subsequent confirmation by SEAC in its 168th meeting that no additional scientific or technical grounds had been submitted by the Project Proponent to warrant a review of the rejection and the rejection of the proposal based on the Precautionary Principle as recorded in the 138th and 147th SEIAA meetings.

The Authority also noted the scientific reports now submitted by the Project Proponent, including the report prepared by NIIT, Calicut, and the representation seeking reconsideration of the rejected application. The Authority further noted the letter dated 13.03.2023 issued by the Deputy Conservator of Forests, Wildlife Division, Madikeri, confirming that the proposed project area lies outside the Eco-Sensitive Zone (ESZ) of the Brahmagiri Wildlife Sanctuary, based on site inspection and official records.

In view of the scientific report submitted by NIIT, Calicut, and the letter dated 13.03.2023 from the Deputy Conservator of Forests, Wildlife Division, Madikeri, **the Authority decided to:**

- 1. Refer the proposal back to SEAC for reconsideration in light of the newly submitted scientific report and the Forest Department's clarification regarding ESZ boundaries.**
- 2. SEAC shall examine the additional materials, reassess whether they address the environmental sensitivity and land-fragility concerns that led to the earlier rejection, and submit a fresh recommendation to SEIAA.**

3. The SEIAA Secretariat shall forward all relevant documents to SEAC and issue necessary communications to the Project Proponent.

Item No.159.15 **Environmental Clearance issued to the proposed Building Stone Quarry project of Dr. Abraham Sebastian, Proprietor, M/s Nayampadam Granites at Re-Sy. Nos. 85/2, 86/1, 86/2 in Keralasseri Village, Palakkad Taluk, Palakkad – Judgment dated 10.02.25 in WP (C) No. 5283/2025 - Hearing (1406/EC2/2019/SEIAA)**

The Authority deliberated on the matter and noted the judgment of the Hon'ble High Court dated 06.03.2025 in WP(C) No. 5283/2025, which directed SEIAA to hear the petitioner and the Project Proponent and to pass orders on the complaint dated 03.02.2025. The Authority also noted the subsequent complaints received regarding dust, noise and environmental pollution, the Half-Yearly Compliance Report submitted by the Project Proponent on 15.03.2025, and the earlier decision taken in the 157th SEIAA meeting to hear both parties.

The Authority further noted that the Technical Wing of SEIAA conducted a field inspection on 05.11.2025, and has submitted the field inspection report. Hearing intimation was issued to both parties on 14.11.2025. Vide email dated 14.11.2025, the complainant informed that the Convener of the Action Council had met with an accident and requested postponement of the hearing. The Authority also noted that the Project Proponent, represented by Sri. Devan P.M. attended the scheduled hearing.

Since the complainant could not appear for the hearing and submitted a request for postponement, while the Project Proponent alone attended, **the Authority decided to provide one more opportunity for a hearing in the next SEIAA meeting. The field inspection report submitted by the Technical Wing will be considered along with the hearing in the next meeting. The SEIAA Secretariat shall issue a hearing intimation to both parties well in advance, enclosing copies of the complaints for their reference.**

Item No.159.16

**Environmental Clearance issued to the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Smt. Jayasree, Managing Partner, M/s Saroj Realtors and Builders at Block No: 25 Re-Survey Nos. 191/1-3, 192/1-4, 192/1-3, 192/2, 193/20, 193/20-1, 180/4, 180/3-1, 180/3-2 in Perumkadavila Village, Neyyattinkara Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram – Judgment dated 05.11.2025 in WP (C) No. 37197/2023
(1748/EC1/2020/SEIAA)**

The Authority deliberated on the matter and noted that Environmental Clearance was issued on 24.08.2023 to Smt. M.R. Jayasree, Managing Partner, M/s Saroj Realtors and Builders, for the quarry project in Block No. 25, Re-Survey Nos. 191/1-3, 192/1-4, 192/1-3, 192/2, 193/20, 193/20-1, 180/4, 180/3-1 and 180/3-2 in Perumkadavila Village, Neyyattinkara Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram.

The Authority took note of WP(C) No. 37197/2023 filed by the Missionary Society of St. Francis Xavier Trust, wherein allegations were raised that the land over which the EC was issued was obtained through fraudulent mutation and does not belong to the Project Proponent. The Petitioner sought cancellation of the EC and stoppage of quarry operations.

The Authority further noted the Judgment dated 05.11.2025 in WP(C) No. 37197/2023, whereby the Hon'ble High Court directed SEIAA to consider Ext. P21 (complaint dated 27.10.2023), treating it as a statutory appeal, and to pass orders in accordance with law within two months from receipt of the judgment.

In compliance with the directions of the Hon'ble High Court, **the Authority decided to hear both the petitioner and the Project Proponent in the next SEIAA meeting, for further decision.**

The SEIAA Secretariat shall issue hearing intimation to both parties along with copies of relevant documents.

Item No.159.17 **Consideration of the Documents submitted by DCs as per SOP dated 15.12.2023 through SOP. & Legal Opinion Reg on Reappraisal of DEIAA ECs – Deferred from 158th SEIAA.**

The Authority deliberated on the matter and reviewed the series of Office Memoranda issued by MoEF&CC regarding the reappraisal of Environmental Clearances (ECs) granted by DEIAAs between 15.01.2016 and 11.12.2018, including the O.M. dated 28.04.2023, and the subsequent clarifications issued on 03.11.2023, 15.01.2024, 15.03.2024, and 14.10.2024. The Authority also noted the judicial directions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Civil Appeal Nos. 3799–3800 of 2019, including orders dated 12.11.2024, 27.03.2025, and 31.07.2025, extending timelines for reappraisal only in respect of valid ECs, and requiring project proponents to apply for reappraisal within the time stipulated by the Court.

The Authority observed that, as per the Ministry's O.Ms dated 28.04.2023, 03.11.2023, and 15.03.2024, all DEIAA-issued ECs that were valid as on 28.04.2023 ceased to be valid on or before 27.10.2024, unless already lapsed earlier. It was also noted that several project proponents appear to have continued operations relying on S.O. 1807(E) dated 12.04.2022, which has been struck down by the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala vide judgment dated 26.08.2025.

The Authority further noted that about 78 proposals forwarded through the PARIVESH Portal by various District Collectors are pending scrutiny. However, all these applications were received after the Supreme Court's deadline of 03.12.2024, and in most cases, the corresponding DEIAA-issued ECs have already expired. The Authority also noted the detailed legal opinion of the Standing Counsel dated 27.08.2025, which clarified that once the EC validity is over and the proponent has not completed the reappraisal process in accordance with O.M. dated 28.04.2023, there is no valid EC in force, and mining operations cannot continue.

It is also noted that the elsewhere Authority on receipt of O.M dated 28.04.2023 directed all the project proponents to submit application through PARIVESH Portal for reappraisal and it was publicized through all possible means including newspapers and website.

In view of the conflicting timelines in the Ministry's O.Ms, the Supreme Court's directions, and operational constraints faced in implementing the SOP on PARIVESH 2.0

(including non-availability of District Collector login credentials during the relevant period), the Authority noted the need for definitive guidance from the Ministry.

The Authority decided to seek clarification from the MoEF&CC on the treatment of reappraisal applications submitted after the Supreme Court's prescribed deadline, and on the status of DEIAA-issued ECs whose validity has expired but whose reappraisal processes were initiated belatedly or remained incomplete due to procedural constraints.

The SEIAA Secretariat shall forward a detailed reference to MoEF&CC, enclosing the relevant O.Ms, judicial directions, legal opinion received, and the list of affected proposals, and request an explicit clarification on the future course of action, with respect to the DEIAA applications received.

**Item No.159.18 Proposal for enhancing the Processing Fee for EC application.
(File No. 428/2025/ASST-1/SEIAA)**

The Authority deliberated on the proposal for revision of processing fees for various categories of projects and examined the present and proposed fee structures for building, mining, and other projects under the Schedule of the EIA Notification, 2006. The Authority also noted the requirement to submit a proposal to the Government to make SEIAA an autonomous body, and to allow SEIAA to retain the processing fee, which is presently being remitted to the Government.

The Authority observed that the current fee structure has remained unchanged for several years, while the volume, complexity, and administrative cost of processing applications, particularly in the context of functioning of 3 SEACs, reappraisal procedures, legal compliances, field verifications, and technical evaluations, have significantly increased. The Authority also noted that several other States have revised and rationalised their fee structures and that the proposed revision aligns with the administrative requirements and workload involved and utilizes the fee collected for the functioning of the authorities.

The Authority further observed that operational autonomy, along with the ability to retain processing fees, would enhance the institutional capacity of SEIAA, enable faster

processing, strengthen technical and administrative resources, and support compliance with statutory timelines.

In the above circumstances, **the Authority decided to submit the revised fee structure to the Government for approval, as proposed.**

The Authority also decided to submit a proposal to the Government seeking financial autonomy for the functioning of SEIAA, including a request to permit SEIAA to collect processing fees and to utilize the same for meeting its operational and administrative requirements.

The SEIAA Secretariat shall prepare and forward the consolidated proposal to the Government to the above extent.

Item No.159.19 Representation from Kerala Mines Group Vocational Training Centre (KMGVTC) – Request to Incorporate Mandatory Statutory Vocational Training Requirements in Environmental Clearance for Quarrying Projects.
(File No. 440/2025/ASST-1/SEIAA)

The Authority deliberated on the representation submitted by the Kerala Mines Group Vocational Training Centre (KMGVTC), a DGMS-approved common training centre established under Rule 18 of the Mines Vocational Training Rules, 1966. The Authority noted that KMGVTC has highlighted gaps in compliance with statutory vocational training requirements under the Mines Act, 1952 and the Mines Vocational Training Rules, 1966, particularly in the case of small and medium quarrying units that do not maintain their own training facilities.

The Authority also took note of KMGVTC's request to incorporate a specific condition in the Terms of Reference or Environmental Clearance mandating that all workers employed in quarrying projects undergo statutory vocational training at a DGMS-approved centre, citing safety, environmental awareness, and regulatory compliance concerns.

Upon deliberation, **the Authority expressed its inability to consider the request, as there is no legal provision under the EIA Notification, 2006, or its subsequent amendments, enabling SEIAA to impose such a condition as part of the Environmental Clearance process.**

The Authority decided that the matter pertains to the statutory jurisdiction of DGMS and other labour-safety enforcement agencies, and therefore does not fall within the mandate of SEIAA.

Item No.159.20 Judgment dated 03.04.2025 in WP(C) No. 31592 of 2024 filed by Sri. Mujeeb Rahman against desiltation across the Bharathapuzha River in Kuttipuram Panchayat - RP 1263/2025 filed by KIIDC (File No. 2224/EC3/2024/SEIAA)

The Authority examined the subject matter in detail and took note of Review Petition No. 1263/2025 filed by the Kerala Irrigation Infrastructure Development Corporation Ltd., challenging the judgment dated 03.04.2025 in WP(C) No. 31592/2024. It was also noted that, as per the interim order dated 22.10.2025 of the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in the said Review Petition, SEIAA has been directed to file a reply within a period of three weeks, addressing the requirement of obtaining Environmental Clearance (EC) even for capital dredging, considering the additional materials placed on record in the Review Petition. The Authority further noted that the stipulated time for filing the reply expired on 11.11.2025.

After deliberation, the Authority resolved to refer the matter to SEAC 2 to examine and furnish a clear recommendation on the matter, taking into account the Review Petition No. 1263/2025 and judgment dated 03.04.2025 in WP(C) No. 31592/2024. The SEIAA Secretariat shall provide SEAC 2 with all relevant documents, including the Environmental Management Plan (EMP), the Detailed Project Report (DPR), petitions, and all associated exhibits, for a comprehensive evaluation.

The Authority decided that the reply to be filed before the Hon'ble High Court, as directed in the interim order, shall be finalised based on the recommendation of SEAC-II.

The Authority also directed the Law Officer, SEIAA, to file a petition for extension of time before the Hon'ble High Court, detailing the steps initiated by the Authority to comply with the interim directions.

PARIVESH FILES (Ver-1)

CONSIDERATION/RECONSIDERATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL CLEARANCE

PART-1

Item No.01 **Environmental Clearance for the Proposed City Side Developmental Project of M/s Adani Airport Holdings Limited at Pettah Village, Thiruvananthapuram Municipal Corporation, Taluk & District.**
(SIA/KL/INFRA2/404656/2022, 2140/EC1/2022/SEIAA)

The Authority deliberated on the matter and noted that M/s Adani Airport Holdings Limited submitted an application for Environmental Clearance on 05.11.2022 (Proposal No. SIA/KL/INFRA2/404656/2022) for the City Side Development Project at Pettah Village, Thiruvananthapuram. The Authority also recalled its earlier observations regarding the shallow groundwater table, the proposed deep excavation for two basement levels, and the associated environmental risks including saline water intrusion, flooding, and adverse impacts on soil and surrounding structures. The Authority further noted that the Project Proponent, instead of submitting the revised conceptual plan as directed, submitted only a justification dated 10.03.2025 for constructing two basements.

Importantly, the Authority observed that the Project Proponent approached the MoEF&CC during the period when the erstwhile SEIAA had expired, and the same application is now under processing at the EAC level in MoEF&CC, with Proposal No. IA/KL/INFRA2/530408/2025. In such circumstances, since the same project application is already under consideration by MoEF&CC, **the Authority decided that it is not in a position to entertain or process the present application further.**

The Project Proponent is therefore directed to remove/withdraw the application (Proposal No. SIA/KL/INFRA2/404656/2022) from the PARIVESH-1 portal. The SEIAA Secretariat shall issue the necessary intimation to the Project Proponent.

Item No.02

**Environmental Clearance for Commercial Complex Project including Hyper Market, Retail shops, Multiplex, Restaurant/food court, and amusement centre by M/s Lulu International Shopping Malls Pvt. Ltd. at Sy Nos. 409/2, 408/2, 407/2, 400/7, 407/3, 407/1, 410/2, 409/1, 405/4, 403/3, 403/2, 403/6, 406/2, 406/4, 406/6, 406/5, 405/2, 406/3, 405/3, 403/4, 403/5, 412/2 & 409/3 in Ayyanthole Village, Thrissur Municipal Corporation, Thrissur Taluk & Thrissur District.
(SIA/KL/INFRA2/452684/2023, 2477/EC3/2023/SEIAA)**

The Authority deliberated on the matter and noted that M/s Lulu International Shopping Malls Pvt. Ltd. submitted an application for Environmental Clearance on 19.11.2023 for the construction of a commercial complex in Thrissur, having a built-up area of 39,251.48 m² on 2.1772 ha of land.

The Authority took note of the appraisal carried out by SEAC in multiple meetings, including the 168th SEAC meeting, wherein EC was recommended for a period of 10 years, subject to FAR permissibility and specific conditions. SEAC had also noted that two writ petitions, WP(C) No. 38444 of 2022(E) and WP(C) No. 1045 of 2023(E), were pending before the Hon'ble High Court relating to the nature of the land (paddy land vs. converted land) under the Kerala Conservation of Paddy Land and Wetland Act, 2008.

The Authority also noted that the Hon'ble High Court, vide judgment dated 27.08.2025, quashed the earlier land-conversion orders of the RDO, and directed the RDO to consider the fresh application filed by the Project Proponent after obtaining mandatory reports from the Agricultural Officer and KSREC regarding the nature of land, and to pass fresh orders within four months after hearing petitioners from both writ petitions.

The Authority observed that the RDO's proceedings on the land-conversion application are crucial for determining the permissibility of the project under the Kerala Conservation of Paddy Land and Wetland Act, 2008, and that SEIAA must assess the project only after such proceedings are finalized.

The Authority also noted that the application submitted by M/s Lulu International Shopping Malls Pvt. Ltd. on 19.11.2023 has been pending with SEIAA in the PARIVESH-1 portal for a considerable period. The Authority also noted that the Ministry has now fully migrated to PARIVESH 2.0, and therefore, applications cannot continue to remain active or be processed through PARIVESH-1.

In view of the Court's **the Authority decided to seek clarification from the Project Proponent regarding the present status of the proceedings before the RDO pursuant to the Hon'ble High Court judgment dated 27.08.2025. The Project Proponent shall furnish copies of any orders, communications, or reports issued or received in relation to the land-conversion process.**

In addition, the Authority is of the opinion that, as the PARIVESH-1 is no longer functional, it may be convenient for the Project Proponent to submit a fresh application in PARIVESH-2.0 once the proceedings of the RDO are completed. If a fresh application is submitted with all required documents, including the outcome of the RDO proceedings, the proposal will be considered with due priority, as SEAC had already completed the appraisal and recommended the project earlier.

Item No.03

Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry project of Sri. Rajan Thomas, for an area of 4.9231 Ha. at Re-Sy Nos. 205/3, 205/5, 199/3, 199/8, 199/7, 199/7-1, 199/9, 199/6- 1, 198/1, 198/2, 197/1, 198/5, 198/5-6, 198/4, 207/1, 198/3, 206/2, 206, 206/4, 206/1, 206/3 in Kanjirappally Village & Panchayat, Kanjirappally Taluk, Kottayam.

(SIA/KL/MIN/164009/2020, 1372/EC2/2019/SEIAA)

The Authority deliberated on the matter and noted that the Project Proponent submitted an application for Environmental Clearance for a building stone quarry project over 4.9231 ha at Re-Sy Nos. 205/3, 205/5, 199/3, 199/8, 199/7, 199/7-1, 199/9, 199/6- 1, 198/1, 198/2, 197/1, 198/5, 198/5-6, 198/4, 207/1, 198/3, 206/2, 206, 206/4, 206/1, 206/3 in Kanjirappally Village, Kottayam. The Authority observed that SEAC, after detailed appraisal including field verification and examination of the EIA report, had recommended issuance of EC for 10 years in its 151st meeting, and again reaffirmed the recommendation in its 177th meeting, after hearing the complainants, the Project Proponent, and the consultant. SEAC recommended EC subject to specific conditions, general conditions, NOC from the Irrigation Department, and the outcome of any pending litigations.

The Authority noted that, in its 153rd meeting, clarification/explanation was sought from the Project Proponent on the issues raised in the representations and complaints received. The Project Proponent submitted a detailed explanation addressing all observations

and concerns on 27.09.2025, along with documentary evidence. The Authority also noted the submission of the NOC issued by the Executive Engineer, Irrigation Division, Kottayam, dated 25.10.2025.

The Authority noticed that, as per the S.O. 3611(E) dated 25.07.2018 issued by the MoEFCC, the District Survey Report (DSR) is a mandatory and foundational document for the identification of mining areas, preparation of project reports, and appraisal for EC for minor mineral projects. The notification requires that the DSR be prepared strictly in the prescribed format, finalised after stakeholder consultation, and updated every five years. EC appraisal cannot rely on a draft, outdated, or procedurally deficient DSR, as the validity of the DSR is integral to determining resource availability, environmental sensitivity, and site suitability.

The Supreme Court, through its order dated 10 November 2021 in Civil Appeal Nos. 3661–3662 of 2020, and further in its judgment dated 08 May 2025 in Civil Appeal No. 14170 of 2024 and connected matters, has reaffirmed that all administrative actions, including tendering, allocation, and grant of EC, must be premised on a valid and final DSR. The Apex Court directed States to prepare fresh DSRs wherever deficiencies existed and held that downstream decisions taken based on incomplete or invalid DSRs are legally unsustainable. In view of these binding directions, SEAC/SEIAA must ensure, as a pre-condition for appraisal, that the applicable DSR is final, approved, compliant with the 2018 guidelines, and within its validity period. Any appraisal or EC granted in the absence of a revised and legally compliant DSR would be vulnerable to judicial scrutiny and liable to be set aside.

Upon discussion, **the Authority decided that further consideration of the proposal shall be undertaken only after the finalisation of the revised DSR prepared in accordance with the guidelines issued by MoEF&CC dated 25.07.2018. Therefore, the Authority decided to refer the proposal back to SEAC for a fresh recommendation considering the revised DSR prepared and approved as per the Guidelines of the MoEF&CC S.O. 3611(E) dated 25.07.2018.**

Item No.04

Application for Environmental Clearance for the Removal of Ordinary Clay by Sri. Sebastian Thomas from an area of 0.2509 Ha at Sy.No. 528/Pt 1, Analloor Village, Chalakkudy Taluk, Thrissur.

(SIA/KL/MIN/251981/2022; 2048/EC6/2022/SEIAA)

The Authority deliberated on the matter and noted that Sri. Sebastian Thomas, Director, M/s Thomas Tiles (P) Ltd., submitted an application for Environmental Clearance on 16.06.2022 for mining ordinary clay from an area of 0.2509 ha in Analloor Village, Chalakkudy Taluk, Thrissur District.

The Authority noted that SEAC, after detailed verification, recommended EC for two years with Specific Conditions in its 132nd meeting. The Authority further noted its earlier observations in the 119th SEIAA meeting that the project site was classified as paddy land as per the land tax receipt, requiring an NOC under the Kerala Conservation of Paddy Land and Wetland Act, 2008. Now, the Project Proponent submitted a representation dated 13.02.2025, along with proof of remittance of ₹1,49,028/- as conversion fee for the *tharam mattam* of the land and requested dispensation from RDO's NOC.

The Authority observed that in its 157th meeting, it had already decided to grant EC with Specific and General Conditions. The EC could not be generated then due to the unavailability of the PARIVESH portal, and the matter was deferred for finalisation. Upon deliberation, **the Authority decided to adhere to the earlier decision of the 157th SEIAA meeting and issue the Environmental Clearance for the project for a period of 2 (Two) years, subject to the following Specific Conditions in addition to General Conditions.**

- 1. The Project Proponent shall carry out clay mining as per the approved Mining Plan, if any and 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 the 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 burrowing/excavation should be restricted to a maximum depth of 2m bgl.*
- 4. The excavation activity should not involve blasting.*

5. *The excavation activity should be restricted to 2m above the groundwater table at the site.*
6. *The excavation activity should not alter the natural drainage pattern of the area*
7. *The excavated pit should be restored by the Project Proponent for agriculture and other useful purposes.*
8. *Appropriate fencing all around the excavated pit should be made to prevent any mishap.*
9. *Measures should be taken to prevent dust emissions by covering excavated earth during transportation.*
10. *Safeguards should be adopted against health risks on account of the breeding of vectors in the water bodies created due to the excavation of earth.*
11. *Workers/laborers should be provided with facilities for drinking water and sanitation.*
12. *A berm should be left from the boundary of adjoining field having a width equal to at least half the depth of the proposed excavation.*
13. *A minimum distance of 50m from any civil structure should be kept from the periphery of the project area.*
14. *No water logging should be allowed in the mine pit. Appropriate drainage should be ensured from the project area prior to the commencement of mining.*
15. *The drain should be provided with silt traps and a siltation pond, and the overflow water should be clarified and drained to the nearest natural drain without any hindrance.*
16. *The drainage system should be cleaned and desilted periodically to facilitate unhindered drainage.*
17. *Measures incorporated in the CER should be implemented within 6 months from the date of EC.*
18. *Transportation of mined material should not be done during the peak hours in the forenoon (8.00 am to 10.00 am) and afternoon (3.30 pm to 5.00 pm)*

19. 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 the implementation of CER activities shall be 2% of the project cost.
20. The violation of EC conditions may lead to cancellation of EC and action under The Environment (Protection) Act 1986.

Item No.05

Environmental Clearance for the Proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Syam G Raj for an area of 3.4519 ha at Block no. 33, Re-survey Nos: 144/1, 144/2, 144/3, 144/4, 144/5, 144/7, 144/8, 144/9, 144/10, 144/11, 144/12, 143/1, 143/3-1, 143/3-2, 143/7, 143/15, 143/16, 145/4 in Pazhayakunnummel Village, Chirayinkeezhu Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram.
(SIA/KL/MIN/438519/2023, 2427/EC3/SEIAA/2023)

The Authority deliberated on the matter and noted the request of Sri. Bijulal D. dated 10.09.2025 and the opinion of the SEAC in its 182nd meeting. The Authority observed that the SEAC examined the representation submitted by Sri. Bijulal D. seeking a letter from SEIAA to be produced before the Department of Mining and Geology (DMG) for transfer of the Letter of Intent (LoI), consequent to the demise of the Project Proponent, Sri. Syam G. Raj on 15.04.2024.

SEAC had taken note of the proceedings No. 28/2025-26/DMG/3020/2022-M1 dated 28.04.2025 issued by the Department of Mining and Geology, wherein it was stated that the LoI granted to the late Project Proponent has become invalid following his death. SEAC concluded that, since the LoI has lapsed and stands cancelled, no valid LoI is supporting the pending EC application, and hence the proposal cannot be further appraised. SEAC also opined that no letter can be issued by SEIAA recommending the transfer of LoI, as such matters fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Department of Mining and Geology.

The Authority also noted that the Environmental Clearance process under the EIA Notification, 2006, requires a subsisting LoI as a mandatory preliminary document, and in the absence of such a valid enabling document, the EC application cannot be processed. Upon deliberation, **the Authority decided as follows:**

- 1. The Authority concurs with the view of SEAC that, since the Letter of Intent (LoI) issued to the late Sri. Syam G. Raj has become invalid as per the proceedings of the Department of Mining and Geology dated 28.04.2025; the Environmental Clearance application cannot be pursued further. Therefore, the observations of the SEAC are accepted.**
- 2. The Authority clarified that SEIAA has no statutory mandate to issue any communication recommending transfer or continuation of a LoI, particularly when the LoI itself stands cancelled by the competent authority.**
- 3. The EC application stands closed, as there is no valid LoI enabling further appraisal under the EIA Notification, 2006.**

Item No.06

Environmental Clearance for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry project of Sri. Yunus Mayakkara for an area of 4.5246 Ha at Block No. 35, Re-Sy Nos. 8/1-3, 8/1-4 in Nediyruppu Village, Kondotty Taluk, Malappuram – Expert Opinion Received (SIA/KL/MIN/438697/2023, 2396/EC1/2023/SEIAA)

The Authority deliberated on the matter and noted that SEAC, after detailed appraisal including field inspection and multiple rounds of scrutiny, had recommended Environmental Clearance for 12 years in its 166th meeting. The Authority further noted the SEIAA in its subsequent meetings, wherein serious concerns were raised regarding the geological reserve estimation, mining depth, scientific validity of bench formation, and the risk of over-extraction. The Authority also noted the expert opinion submitted by the External Expert, vide email dated 28.04.2025. The Authority noted that the expert opinion raises substantial scientific concerns that materially affect the feasibility and environmental sustainability of the proposed mining operations. Upon deliberation, **the Authority decided as follows:**

- 1. Refer the proposal back to SEAC for reappraisal in light of the detailed observations of the External Expert, particularly regarding reserve calculation methodology, accuracy of mining plan, bench configuration, and mineable reserve estimation.**
- 2. SEAC shall critically evaluate the revised mining plan and all technical aspects flagged by the expert, including the need for additional profiles, justification for proposed benches, and compliance with DMG-approved mining plan requirements.**
- 3. The Project Proponent shall be directed to submit any additional documents, revised calculations, or clarifications sought by SEAC during reappraisal.**

Item No.07

Re-appraisal of Environmental Clearance, for the mining of Granite Building Stone Quarry project of Sri. Biju Thomas, for an area of 1.6540 Ha at Sy No. 146/1 in Kallar Village, Vellarikundu Taluk, Kasaragod.

(SIA/KL/MIN/452003/2023, 2511/EC4/2024/SEIAA)

The Authority deliberated on the matter and noted that SEAC, after multiple rounds of appraisal including document scrutiny, presentation and field inspection, had recommended Environmental Clearance for 12 years (from the date of original EC, i.e., 20.10.2017) in its 179th meeting, subject to submission of NOC from the Irrigation Department as mandated under Section 40(2) of the Kerala Irrigation and Water Conservation Act, 2003 and in compliance with the judgment of the Hon'ble High Court dated 19.04.2024 in WP(C) No. 30737 of 2022 and WP(C) No. 4655 of 2024.

The Authority further noted that in the 154th SEIAA meeting, a significant discrepancy was identified in the balance mineable resource figures in the scheme of mining and the report of the District Geologist. Accordingly, the Authority had directed the Project Proponent to submit clarifications along with the ROM data as per KOMPAS as of 31.01.2025. The Authority noted that the Project Proponent has now submitted the clarification and supporting documents through the PARIVESH Portal.

The project proponent clarified that as per the original Mining Plan (07.07.2017), the mineable reserve for the 12-year life was 6,44,268 tonnes. The reserve was revised in the Scheme of Mining approved on 25.05.2022 wherein the mine life was updated to 7 years and the mineable reserve recalculated as 3,64,330 tonnes, which is stated to be the current valid reserve estimate. The PP confirmed that the updated reserve is consistent with the approved Scheme of Mining and forms the basis of reappraisal.

The Authority examined the clarification and noted that the discrepancy earlier pointed out stands satisfactorily explained with reference to the approved Scheme of Mining. The Authority further observed that the present proposal pertains to the reappraisal of the EC originally issued by the DEIAA. The reappraisal was conducted based on the then-submitted Mining Plan, EMP, PFR, and DSR. Accordingly, **the Authority resolved to reappraise the EC granted on 20.10.2017, and issue a fresh EC valid for a period of 7 years from the date of approval of the Scheme of Mining (i.e., 25.05.2022) in accordance with the Scheme of Mining as endorsed by the 179th meeting of the SEAC. This reappraised EC shall be subject to the following Specific Conditions, in addition to the applicable General Conditions.**

- 1. The Project Proponent shall carry out quarrying as per the Scheme of mining approved on 25.05.2022 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 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.*
- 3. The depth of mining should be limited to 365m above MSL to prevent formation of mine pit in the sloping terrain and also taking into consideration, the depth to water table.*
- 4. 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.

5. *Compensatory afforestation should be done prior to the commencement of mining, by planting local species of trees as proposed.*
6. *Geotagged photographs of the progress of compensatory afforestation should be submitted along with HYCR.*
7. *Adequate number of avenue trees of indigenous species should be planted along both sides of the haulage road.*
8. *A temporary wall of 5m height should be erected at appropriate locations on the boundary to avoid disturbance and nuisance to the nearby residents.*
9. *The haulage road should be provided with sprinkling facility to prevent dust pollution.*
10. *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.*
11. *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).*
12. *Overflow water from the siltation pond should be discharged to the nearby natural drain after adequate filtration.*
13. *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.*
14. *Overburden should be stored at the designed place, and a gabion wall should be provided for the topsoil and overburden storage sites.*
15. *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.

- 16. Implementation of the 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 the mine closure plan.*
- 17. Transportation of mined material should not be done during the peak hours in the forenoon (8.00 am to 10.00 am) and afternoon (3.30 pm to 5.00 pm).*
- 18. Adequate sanitation, waste management and restroom facilities should be provided to the workers.*
- 19. Adequate energy conservation measures should be implemented, including solar power installations. At least 40% of the energy requirement shall be met from solar power.*
- 20. 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.*
- 21. Adequate measures should be adopted to harvest the rainwater as per the guidelines issued by the Central Groundwater Authority.*
- 22. Blasting mats should be used during rock blasting to contain the blast, prevent fly rocks and suppress dust.*
- 23. 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.*
- 24. 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.

- 25. 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.*
- 26. 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.*
- 27. The violation of EC condition may lead to cancellation of EC and action under The Environment (Protection) Act 1986.*
- 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. At 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 the mining period, and a closure certificate shall be produced to the Authority. No*

ECs shall be given to the 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.

Item No.08

**Environmental Clearance for the proposed Granite Building Stone quarry project of Sri. M.D George, M/s Ernad Associates for an area of 3.5950 Ha at Re Sy Block No.27, Re-Sy Nos. 37/8, 39/11-3, 39/11-2, 39/11, 43/1-2, 43/2, 42/4-5, 43/1 in Urangattiri Village, Ernad Taluk, Malappuram.
(SIA/KL/MIN/53095/2020, 1668/EC6/2020/SEIAA)**

The Authority deliberated the matter and observed that the 178th SEAC meeting had recommended Environmental Clearance for the project for a period of 10 years after the production of NOC from the District Level Crisis Management Group. Subsequently, the 153rd SEIAA sought the same, and the Project Proponent obtained an acceptable NOC from District Crisis Management Group, Malappuram dated 21.09.2025. The Authority also took note of a complaint, dated 10.03.2025, from Sri. Nasir Parambadan, which requested that the EC not be issued due to the proposed location in a steeply sloped area vulnerable to landslides.

Upon verification, it is found that the Mining plan of the project was approved vide letter No. DOZ/M794/2020 dated 03/03/2020, after the guidelines issued by MoEF&CC dated 25.07.2018. The Authority noticed that, as per the S.O. 3611(E) dated 25.07.2018 issued by the MoEFCC, the District Survey Report (DSR) is a mandatory and foundational document for the identification of mining areas, preparation of project reports, and appraisal for EC for minor mineral projects. The notification requires that the DSR be prepared strictly in the prescribed format, finalised after stakeholder consultation, and updated every five years. EC appraisal cannot rely on a draft, outdated, or procedurally deficient DSR, as the validity of the DSR is integral to determining resource availability, environmental sensitivity, and site suitability.

The Supreme Court, through its order dated 10 November 2021 in Civil Appeal Nos. 3661–3662 of 2020, and further in its judgment dated 08 May 2025 in Civil Appeal No. 14170 of 2024 and connected matters, has reaffirmed that all administrative actions, including tendering, allocation, and grant of EC, must be premised on a valid and final DSR.

The Apex Court directed States to prepare fresh DSRs wherever deficiencies existed and held that downstream decisions taken based on incomplete or invalid DSRs are legally unsustainable. In view of these binding directions, SEAC/SEIAA must ensure, as a pre-condition for appraisal, that the applicable DSR is final, approved, compliant with the 2018 guidelines, and within its validity period. Any appraisal or EC granted in the absence of a revised and legally compliant DSR would be vulnerable to judicial scrutiny and liable to be set aside.

Upon discussion, the Authority decided that further consideration of the project proposal shall be undertaken only after the finalisation of the revised DSR prepared in accordance with the guidelines issued by MoEF&CC dated 25.07.2018. Therefore, **the Authority decided to refer the proposal back to SEAC for a fresh recommendation as considering the revised DSR prepared and approved as per the Guidelines of the MoEF&CC S.O. 3611(E) dated 25.07.2018.**

Item No.09

**Environmental Clearance for the Mining and Mineral Separation of M/s. Kerala Minerals and Metals Ltd. in Mineral Block-III over an extent of 88.119 Ha at Panmana & Chavara Villages, Karunagapally Taluk, Kollam.
(SIA/KL/MIN/54836/2019, 1796/EC2/2020/SEIAA)**

The Authority in its 157th meeting (as Item No. 157.28) reviewed the letter from the Project Proponent dated 25.08.2025 and the O.M. dated 08.09.2025 issued by MoEFCC. As per the O.M., all mining projects involving atomic minerals notified in Part B and critical and strategic minerals notified in Part D of the First Schedule of the MMDR Act are exempted from public consultation and shall be appraised at the Central Level, irrespective of the lease area involved in the proposal. In view of the above, **the Authority directed the Project Proponent to approach the EAC, MoEFCC, in accordance with the provisions of the O.M. The Authority then recorded this decision on the Parivesh-1 Portal to complete the online processing.**

Item No.10

Environmental Clearance for the Expansion of Apartment Project by Nest Realities Pvt. Ltd. of Sri. Rahul K R., Finance Manager for an area of 0.7355 Ha at Sy No. 323/7 in Keezhmad Village, Aluva Taluk, Ernakulam – Report from Chief Town Planner Received.

(SIA/KL/MIS/289728/2022, 2269/EC3/2023/SEIAA)

Sri. Rahul K.R, Finance Manager, Nest Realities India Pvt Ltd, Aluva, Ernakulam – 683101 submitted an application for Environmental Clearance for the expansion of Apartment Project in an area of 0.7355 Ha at Sy No. 323/7 in Keezhmad Village, Aluva Taluk, Ernakulam.

The Authority reviewed the item and observed the decision of various SEAC/SEIAA meetings held on different dates. The Authority noticed that the SEAC had appraised the project based on Form-1, Presentation, Field Inspection Report conducted on 20.01.2024 and the additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal. As per the application, the area proposed for expansion is 4934.52m² with a cumulative built up area of 24,925.10 m². After due appraisal, the SEAC, in its 164th meeting, recommended EC for 10 years, subject to the following specific conditions in addition to the general conditions.

However, the Authority sought clarification from MoEF&CC whether the project is eligible to consider as expansion of existing project or should be treated as a new project. In the light of clarification from MoEF&CC, the Authority in its 151st SEIAA meeting decided to defer the item for further examination on receipt of report from Chief Town Planner on the present built up area. Consequently, the Chief Town Planner vide letter no. LSGD/PD/3535/2025-TCPB2 dated 10.04.2025 furnished the report, confirming the present built-up area as 19990.58 sq. m, which was found acceptable.

In light of the report of the Chief Town Planner, **the Authority accepted the recommendation of the 164th SEAC and decided to issue Environmental Clearance for the Expansion of Apartment Project for 7 (Seven) years, subject to the following Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.**

- 1. The validity of EC is subject to the condition that the FAR of the project shall not exceed the permissible limit. The Chief Town Planner should ensure that FAR of the project is within the permissible limit.*

2. *All the mitigation measures proposed in the EMP, along with additional measures suggested, should be implemented during the construction and operational phase appropriately.*
3. *Green belt shall be maintained with suitable indigenous species at a minimum rate of 1 tree per every 80 sq. m as stated in Appendix XIV of EIA Notification 2006 (SO 3099 (E) dated 09.12.2016).*
4. *A common provision for the EV charging facility shall be provided.*
5. *Adequate sources for water to meet the requirements during the construction and operational phase are to be ensured, and details should be given in HYCR.*
6. *The excavation of earth for construction, if any, should be limited to a minimum, and the activity should not affect the water sources of the nearby houses.*
7. *The CER expenditure proposed and agreed by the Project Proponent should be expended through a separate bank account, and the account statement and the beneficiary list should be uploaded along with the Half-Yearly Compliance Report.*
8. *The existing STP with MBBR technology and Tertiary Treatment should enable and ensure the re-use /recycle of treated water to the maximum extent, and balance, if any, should be discharged through a series of soak pits for recharging the local groundwater.*
9. *The Project Proponent must ensure that only filtered overland drain is discharged to the nearby natural drain.*
10. *The Project Proponent should make provision for the housing of construction labour with all necessary infrastructure and facilities such as fuel for cooking, mobile toilets, mobile STP, safe drinking water, medical health care, crèche etc., as per the Building & Other Construction Workers (Regulation of Employment and Conditions of Service) Act, 1996. The housing may be in the form of temporary structures to be removed after the completion of the project (Circular No.J-11013/41/2006-IA.II (I) of GoI, MoEF, dt. 22.09.2008).*

11. *Climate-responsive design, as per the Green Building Guidelines in practice should be adopted. The guidelines for green rating and green building certification to buildings based on green standards issued by the Government of Kerala vide GO (MS) No. 39/2022/LSGD dated 25.2.2022 should be adhered to.*
12. *Exposed roof area and covered parking should be covered with material having a high solar reflective index.*
13. *Appropriate action should be taken to ensure that the excess rainwater runoff reaches the nearest main natural drain of the area, and if necessary, the carrying capacity of the natural drain should be enhanced to contain the peak flow.*
14. *Design of the building should comply with the Energy Building Code as applicable.*
15. *Energy conservation measures as proposed in the application should be adopted in total.*
16. *The project area should be barricaded with GI sheets of 6 m. (20 feet) height so as to avoid disturbance to other buildings nearby and the residents during construction.*
17. *Construction work should be carried out during day daytime only.*
18. *All vehicles, including the ones carrying construction material of any kind, should be cleaned and wheels washed.*
19. *All vehicles carrying construction materials should be fully covered and protected.*
20. *All construction material of any kind should not be dumped on public roads or pavements or near the existing facilities outside the project site.*
21. *Grinding & cutting of building materials should not be done in open areas. Water jets should be used in grinding and stone cutting.*
22. *Occupational health and safety measures for the workers should be adopted during the construction.*

23. *D.G. set should be provided with adequate stack height, and regular maintenance should be carried out before and after the construction phase, and would be provided with an acoustic enclosure.*
24. *Usage of energy saving 5 star rating equipment, such as BLDC fans and LED lamps, should be promoted as part of energy conservation. At least 20% of the energy requirement shall be met from solar power.*
25. *Adequate measures should be adopted to harvest the rainwater.*
26. *Adequate built-in composting facility should be set up for the treatment of biodegradable waste, as the capacity or the number of BIOBIN proposed is inadequate.*
27. *Open space shall be provided as per the building norms without being utilized for any other constructions.*
28. *Authority makes it clear that as per clause 8 (vi) of EIA notification 2006, deliberate concealment and/or submission of false or misleading information or data which is material to screening or scoping or appraisal or decision on the application shall make the application liable for rejection and cancellation of prior EC granted on that basis.*
29. *As per OM no F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30th September 2020, under Corporate Environmental Responsibility (CER) the Project Proponent shall prepare an Environment Management Plan (EMP) as directed by SEAC during appraisal, covering the issues to address the environmental problems in the project region, indicating both physical and financial targets year wise. The EMP shall be implemented in consultation with local self Govt. Institutions. The indicated cost for CER shall be 2% of the project cost depending upon the nature of activities proposed. The follow-up action on implementation of CER shall be included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report which will be subjected to field inspection at regular intervals. A copy of the approved EMP shall be made available to the concerned Panchayat for information and implementation support.*

30. *The Project Proponent shall obtain all necessary clearances/ licenses/ permissions from all the statutory authorities issuing clearances/ licenses/ permission for the construction projects of this nature.*
31. *The Project Proponent is directed to install a CCTV camera and take all other essential measures to ensure that project 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.*
32. *The violation of EC condition may lead to cancellation of EC and penal action under The Environment (Protection) Act 1986.*

PARIVESH FILES (Ver-2)

PART-1

Item No.01

**Environmental Clearance for manual dredging at Azhikkal Port limits for maintaining navigational channel depth and filtration of dredged sand Kadavus in Azhikode North village, Azhikode, Kannur - Judgment dated 11.03.2025 in WP (C) No. 1295 of 2025, filed by Sri. Santhan M.
(SIA/KL/INFRA1/501237/2024)**

The Chief Executive Officer, Kerala Maritime Board (KMB), Valiyathura, Vallakadavu PO, Thiruvananthapuram, submitted an Environmental Clearance application for manual dredging at Azhikkal Port limits to maintain the navigational channel depth and filtration of dredged sand in Kadavus in Azhikode North village, Azhikode, Kannur.

The Authority reviewed the item and observed the decision of various SEAC meetings held on different dates. The High Court of Kerala vide an order dated 4th March 2022, in WP(C) No.41341/2017, KMB was instructed to conduct an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) study for the project activities. The Project Proponent subsequently conducted the EIA study based on the Terms of Reference (ToR) issued under proposal No. SIA/KL/INFRA1/460508/2024. The SEAC had appraised the project based on Form-1, Presentation, EIA report and the additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal. After due, the SEAC, in its 184th meeting, recommended EC for 5 years from the date of issuance of EC, subject to certain specific conditions in addition to the general conditions.

Upon discussion, **the Authority accepted the recommendation of the 184th SEAC and decided to issue the Combined Environmental Clearance and CRZ Clearance for manual dredging at Azhikkal Port limits for a period of 5 (Five) years, subject to the following Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.**

- 1. The PP shall follow all safeguards as proposed in the National Framework for Sediment Management issued by the Ministry of Jal Shakti, Department of Water Resources, as enclosed to the Office Memorandum dated 12.07.2023.*

2. *Dredging shall be strictly limited to the approved navigational channel area within Azhikkal Port limits and to the quantity and depth specified in the approved Mining Plan ($\approx 3.5\text{--}4\text{ m}$ depth).*
3. *All conditions prescribed in the CRZ clearance shall form an integral part of this Environmental Clearance (EC), and the project proponent is required to ensure strict compliance with each of these conditions.*
4. *Dredged sand shall be filtered only at designated Kadavu sites approved by Kerala Maritime Board (KMB) and concerned local bodies.*
5. *Dredging is prohibited during monsoon/high turbidity/tidal periods and during identified peak fish breeding periods.*
6. *Manual dredging shall be done in a controlled manner; continuous dredging shall be avoided to allow turbidity to settle. Mechanised/motorised suction dredgers are not permitted within the approved kadavus/channel stretches.*
7. *Dumping of dredged waste, clay, or shells into the river or surrounding mangroves is strictly prohibited. Residual materials must be collected and disposed of at approved locations.*
8. *No dredging or filtration activity is allowed within identified critical habitats (mangroves, seagrass beds, coral patches) or in legally protected areas.*
9. *A detailed baseline bathymetric survey, nearshore topographic survey and sediment analysis for all proposed kadavus and navigational channel stretches within the Port limits shall be carried out and submitted along with HYCR.*
10. *Periodic Air, Sediment and Water quality analysis report shall be submitted along with the HYCR.*
11. *The biological and biophysical changes of the aquatic ecosystem shall be monitored periodically and submit the report along with the HYCR.*
12. *If the dredging activity affects the clam beds, measures shall be taken by the PP to relay the bed in appropriate sites. The details of the designated site along with its geo-coordinates shall be provided along with the HYCR.*

13. *Filtration/settling operations at Kadavus shall use closed or lined filtration/pond systems with overflow routed to the sea only after meeting turbidity and suspended solids limits as per the prescribed standards.*
14. *The filtrate water from sand washing at Kadavus shall be drained only after settlement; no untreated discharge into the river shall be allowed.*
15. *Dust suppression and green barricades (green net) shall be provided around Kadavus adjacent to public roads to prevent dust dispersion.*
16. *Manage vehicle/truck movement routes to minimize disruption in coastal hamlets and avoid beach access points used by fishers; provide wheel-wash and dust suppression at loading points.*
17. *Workers must use appropriate PPE, such as helmets, gloves, eye protection and life jackets during the operation phase of the project.*
18. *All dredging equipment, vessels, and platforms must undergo regular safety inspections and maintenance. Proper signage and safety features, like emergency shutdown systems, are also required.*
19. *The project must have a clear emergency response plan in place for incidents like equipment failure, spills, strong currents or medical emergencies. An Emergency Management Cell (EMC) shall be constituted before the operation phase towards better coordination and implementation of disaster management measures.*
20. *For safety, the dredging area must be properly marked with signage, buoys and lights.*
21. *Measures must be taken to mitigate harm to local livelihoods, such as local fishers who could be affected by the project implementation.*
22. *The Environment Management Cell (EMC) should include one subject expert in environment management. The proceedings of the monthly meeting of the EMC should be submitted along with the HYCR.*
23. *After completion of dredging, site-specific restoration (re-grading, re-vegetation of disturbed shorelines, if any, removal of temporary structures) must be*

completed and a post-project environmental compliance certificate issued by KCZMA/KSPCB after verification.

24. If any violations are found during the project, the project proponent will be liable to pay environmental compensation and carry out remedial actions as directed by KCZMA/SEIAA

Item No.02

**ToR Application for the proposed Capital Dredging and Wharf Construction at Beypore Port, Kozhikode by the Chief Executive Officer, Kerala Maritime Board.
(SIA/KL/INFRA1/552910/2025)**

Sri. Shine A. Haq, Chief Executive Officer, Kerala Maritime Board, TC XXII/1666 (4&5), 1st Floor, Mulamoottil Building, Pipinmoodu, Sasthamangalam, submitted a ToR application for the proposed capital dredging and wharf construction at Beypore Port, Kozhikode.

The Authority perused the ToR application and noted the decision of the 184th SEAC meeting. As per the DPR, the total quantity to be dredged is 20,21,315 m³ (soil quantity of 9,16,051.020 m³ and rock quantity of 11,05,263.70 m³). The total estimated cost is Rs. 647.39 Crore. After due appraisal, the SEAC in its 184th meeting recommended Standard ToR under Category 7(e) Ports, harbours, breakwaters, dredging.

Upon discussion, **the Authority decided to approve the Standard Terms of Reference under Category 7 (e) Ports, Harbors, Break Waters, Dredging.**

Item No.03

**ToR for the Construction of High-Rise Residential Building of Sri. K. C. Raju, Managing Director, M/s Kent Construction Pvt. Ltd at Survey Nos. 141/3, 141/4, 141/5 & 141/8 in Puthencruz Village, Kunnthunadu Taluk, Ernakulam.
(SIA/KL/INFRA2/447418/2023)**

The Authority reviewed the proposal and took note that the SEAC in its 184th meeting, recommended rejection of the application, primarily on the ground that the Hon'ble Supreme Court, vide judgment dated 16.05.2025, had set aside the Standard Operating

Procedure (SoP) for violation cases as well as the very concept of ex post facto Environmental Clearance, thereby rendering any such regularisation legally impermissible at that time.

The Authority further noted the subsequent development wherein the Hon'ble Supreme Court, vide judgment dated 18.11.2025 in the Review Petition filed by the Confederation of Real Estate Developers' Association of India (CREDAI) and others, revisited its earlier final judgment dated 16.05.2025 delivered in Vanashakti v. Union of India. Upon consideration, the Hon'ble Supreme Court allowed the Review Petition, recalled the Judgment dated 16.05.2025, and restored the original writ petitions and civil appeal for fresh adjudication.

In view of the above substantial change in the governing legal framework, the Authority is of the considered opinion that the proposal requires fresh technical evaluation by SEAC. The legal position that previously mandated rejection has now been fundamentally altered, thereby reopening the possibility of regularisation subject to compliance with applicable norms.

Accordingly, **the Authority decided to refer the proposal back to SEAC for fresh appraisal and recommendations in the light of the Hon'ble Supreme Court judgment dated 18.11.2025.**

Item No.04

Terms of Reference for Application for the construction of township 'Artech You'Niverse' of Sri. T S Asok, Managing Director & Authorized Signatory, Artech House at Sy. Nos. 174/11, 174/18, 175/1, 175/1-1, 175/12, 175/16, 175/16-1, 175/3-1, 175/6-1, 175/6-1-1, 175/6-1-2, 175/9, 176/16, 653/13, 653/3, 169/10-1, 170/4-1, 175/11, 175/13-1, 175/15, 652/1, 652/2-2, 653/10, 653/2, 653/2-1, 653/6, 177/12, 175/8, 175/10, 177/10, 177/8, 175/2, 653/11, 653/8, 653/9, 653/9-1, 169/12- 1, 169/8, 170/11, 170/12-1, 170/14, 170/15, 170/16, 170/2, 170/6, 170/7, 170/9, 174/12, 174/16, 174/19, 174/3-2, 175/14, 653/12, 653/4, 653/5, 175/7, 177/7, 653/7-1, 174/17, 174/6, 170/1, 170/2-1, 170/3, 170/5, 170/8, 169/4-1, 169/4-2, 169/5, 169/6, 175/4, 174/15, 653/15, 653/14, 653/14-1, 653/14-2, 653/14-3, 653/14-4, 653/14-5, 177/11, 177/6, 177/9, 177/9-1, 177/9-2, 177/9-3, 176/16-1, 176/17, 169/6, 170/10, 169/12, 169/7 in Cheruvakkal Village, Thiruvananthapuram Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram.
(SIA/KL/INFRA2/548618/2025)

Sri. T S Asok, Life Span Infrastructure India Pvt Ltd & Waves Residences Pvt Ltd., Artech House, TC 28/2128 Thycaud, Thiruvananthapuram submitted a ToR application for the Construction of Township 'Artech You'Niverse' at Sy. Nos. 174/11, 174/18, 175/1, 175/1-1, 175/12, 175/16, 175/16-1, 175/3-1, 175/6-1, 175/6-1-1, 175/6-1-2, 175/9, 176/16, 653/13, 653/3, 169/10-1, 170/4-1, 175/11, 175/13-1, 175/15, 652/1, 652/2-2, 653/10, 653/2, 653/2-1, 653/6, 177/12, 175/8, 175/10, 177/10, 177/8, 175/2, 653/11, 653/8, 653/9, 653/9-1, 169/12- 1, 169/8, 170/11, 170/12-1, 170/14, 170/15, 170/16, 170/2, 170/6, 170/7, 170/9, 174/12, 174/16, 174/19, 174/3-2, 175/14, 653/12, 653/4, 653/5, 175/7, 177/7, 653/7-1, 174/17, 174/6, 170/1, 170/2-1, 170/3, 170/5, 170/8, 169/4-1, 169/4-2, 169/5, 169/6, 175/4, 174/15, 653/15, 653/14, 653/14-1, 653/14-2, 653/14-3, 653/14-4, 653/14-5, 177/11, 177/6, 177/9, 177/9-1, 177/9-2, 177/9-3, 176/16-1, 176/17, 169/6, 170/10, 169/12, 169/7 in Cheruvakkal Village, Thiruvananthapuram Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram.

The Authority perused the ToR application and noted the decision of the 182th SEAC meeting. As per the Form-1, the built-up area is 2,95,300 m² with a plot area of 66,844.70 m². The maximum height of the building is proposed as 80.94 m. After due appraisal, the SEAC, in its 182nd meeting, recommended Standard ToR under Category 8 (b) Townships and Area Development projects.

Upon discussion, **the Authority decided to approve ToR under Category 8 (b) Townships and Area Development projects.**

Item No.05

Transfer of EC issued to the Residential project of M/s Tektoninfra India Pvt. Ltd at Re-Sy Nos. 121/7, 121/5, 121/6, 126/2 in Pantheerankavu Village, Olavanna Panchayat, Kozhikode Taluk, Kozhikode.

(SIA/KL/INFRA2/557443/2025)

The Authority deliberated on the matter and noted the transfer application submitted by the Project Proponent, the request to amend the Environmental Clearance conditions, and the request to update the survey numbers. The Authority observed that Environmental Clearance was originally issued to M/s Tektoninfra India Pvt. Ltd. on 27.08.2024, and that the project proponent had, vide letter dated 06.10.2025, sought modification of the EC, including permission to transport approximately 33,000 cu. m. of excavated earth to an approved external location.

The Authority reviewed the Transfer of EC application for the EC issued on 27.08.2024 in favour of Sri. Binoj C.K., Managing Director, M/s Tektoninfra India Pvt. Ltd. Currently, the Project has requested to transfer the said EC to M/s Tekton Realty and Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd. for the development of a residential Project along with an Agreement. As per the revised Form-1, the Survey Numbers are 121/14, 121/54, 121/95, 121/102, 126/124, 121/94, 121/19, 121/101, 121/87, 121/102, 121/85, 121/86, 121/84, 121/82, 121/83, 121/88, 121/89, 121/90, 121/9, 121/30, 121/106, 121/93, 121/105 and 121/91 in the Pantheerankavu Village, Olavanna Panchayat, Kozhikode Taluk, Kozhikode District, Kerala.

Upon discussion, the Authority decided to transfer the EC dated 27.08.2024 in favour of M/s Tekton Realty and Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd., along with the following amendments.

- 1. The survey number is to be changed as agreed upon in the affidavit and according to the revised Form-1 submitted.**
- 2. The excavation of soil shall not exceed 33,000 cu. m, and appropriate permission must be obtained from respective agencies for any off-site transportation.**

Item No.06

**Reappraisal of Environmental Clearance issued by DEIAA Palakkad for the Granite Building Stone Quarry project of Sri. Aniyam Mathew, Managing Partner, M/s Al Jouf Blue Metal for an area of 2.1676 Ha at Re-Sy Nos. 313/2, 313/1B, 314/1 in Anakkara Village, Pattambi Taluk, Palakkad.
(SIA/KL/MIN/420614/2024)**

Sri. Aniyam Mathew, Managing Partner, M/s Al Jouf Blue Metal, Cheror P.O., Thrissur, submitted an application for reappraisal of the EC issued by DEIAA, Palakkad, for a quarrying area of 2.1676 Ha in Re-Sy. Nos. 313/2, 313/1B and 314/1 of Anakkara Village, Pattambi Taluk, Palakkad District.

The Authority noted that the erstwhile SEAC, in its 179th meeting, had recommended a conditional revalidated EC for a mine life of five years from the date applicable to the original EC, subject to specific conditions. It was also noted that, in its 155th meeting, the Authority had sought four additional documents for completion of the appraisal process, and that the Project Proponent subsequently furnished the required clarifications.

The Authority further took note of the Interim Order dated 13.10.2025 in WP(C) No. 23894/2025, wherein the Hon'ble High Court observed that the Project Proponent had carried out illegal excavation from the buffer zone and bench-cutting areas, in clear violation of the approved mining plan, and that such violations cannot be extinguished through compounding. The Hon'ble Court held that mining within the buffer zone constitutes a serious environmental breach and directed that all quarrying operations shall remain stopped until the competent authorities complete the statutory processes under Rule 68(2) (restoration of the quarry conditions) and Rule 50 (consideration of lease cancellation) of the Kerala Minor Mineral Concession Rules, 2015.

The Authority also observed that the validity of the EC expired on 12.06.2024, inclusive of the COVID-19 relaxation period, and that S.O. 1807(E) dated 12.04.2022, under which if EC validity had been extended, was subsequently struck down by the Hon'ble High Court vide judgment dated 26.08.2025. However, from the Interim Order, it is evident that the Project Proponent continued mining activities up to 30.09.2025.

The Authority deliberated that the revalidation recommended by the erstwhile SEAC was issued prior to the above Interim Order dated 13.10.2025. In light of the subsequent judicial findings and the confirmed violations, the Authority decided as follows:

1. The proposal shall be referred back to SEAC for fresh appraisal, taking into account the illegal mining activities and consequent violation of EC conditions.
2. The Joint Committee, constituted to assess environmental damage arising from the violation of EC conditions by including a member of SEAC, shall conduct a detailed environmental damage assessment and provide the report to SEAC.
3. The SEAC shall furnish the final recommendation after considering the findings of the Joint Committee on the environmental damage and all other relevant statutory parameters.

Item No.07

Reappraisal of Environmental Clearance issued by DEIAA, Palakkad, for the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Saji Sebastian, Managing Director, M/s Matha Aggregates Private Limited, for an area of 2.3698 Ha at Sy Nos. 459/1B2B, 459/1B2C, 459/3(Pt), 459/5(Pt) in Nagalassery Village, Pattambi Taluk, Palakkad.

(SIA/KL/MIN/459175/2024)

Sri. Saji Sebastian, Managing Director, M/S. Matha Aggregates Pvt. Ltd., Madeckal House, Kizhakkambalam P O Ernakulam, Kerala, has submitted an application for Re-appraisal of EC issued by DEIAA, Palakkad, for the Granite Building Stone Quarry, for an area of 2.3698 Ha, at Survey Nos. 459/1B2B, 459/1B2C, 459/3(Pt), 459/5(Pt) in Nagalassery Village, Pattambi Taluk, Palakkad.

The Authority reviewed the proposal and noted the decisions of various SEAC/SEIAA meetings held on different dates. The Authority noticed that the SEAC had appraised the project based on Form-1, Pre-Feasibility Report, Mining Plan, Scheme of mining and the additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal. After the due appraisal, the SEAC, in its 178th meeting, recommended a conditional EC subject to certain Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions. But the Authority, in its 153th meeting, sought clarification regarding the necessary orders for transferring EC in his name and the proposal for re-grassing.

The Project Proponent clarified that the present application was submitted based on the direction of the 129th SEIAA and has incorporated all details pertinent to the transfer of

EC. The Authority noticed that all the documents, including the lease, scheme of mining, explosive licence and other relevant land documents, are in favour of Sri. Saji Sebastian.

It is also noted that as per the Scheme of mining dated 07.06.2023, the balance reserve is provided as 5,01,093 MT for a period 10 years (60,000MT for the first 7 years, 30,000 MT for the 8th and 9th year and 21,093 for the 10th year). As per the Scheme of mining the elevation of the area is provided as 130m RL and 100m RL. The ultimate depth of mining is given as 60m RL. However, the Project Proponent has not submitted the NOC from the Irrigation Department, instead, provided a processing letter dated 24.10.2024 from the Assistant Engineer, Thrithala.

The Authority further observed that the present proposal pertains to the reappraisal of the EC originally issued by the DEIAA. The reappraisal was conducted based on the then-submitted Mining Plan, EMP, PFR, and DSR. Accordingly, **the Authority resolved to reappraise the EC granted on 09.01.2018, and issue a fresh EC valid for a period of 10 years from the date of approval of the Scheme of Mining (i.e., 07.06.2023) in accordance with the Scheme of Mining as endorsed by the 178th meeting of the SEAC. This reappraised EC shall be subject to the following Specific Conditions, in addition to the applicable General Conditions.**

1. *The Project Proponent shall carry out quarrying as per the Scheme of Mining approved on 07.06.2023 and as per the Specific Conditions mentioned hereafter. The Project Proponent should strictly follow the Kerala Minor Mineral Concession Rules 2015 and amendments thereof.*
2. *The EC shall be valid from the date of execution of the 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. *Mining should be conducted only by providing a 50m buffer between the project boundary and the crusher building.*
4. *Depth of mining should be limited to 82m above MSL, considering the depth to the water table, and the Mining and Geology Department should reassess the mineable resources accordingly.*

5. *Development of the 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 solar power.*
21. *The Environment Management Cell (EMC) should include one subject expert in environment management and a 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 with 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 the mining site is not used by antisocial elements for nefarious antisocial activities, which are detrimental to peaceful coexistence in the project region. In case such complaints are received, the EC given is likely to be cancelled after a police verification.*
28. *The violation of EC conditions 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.

Item No.08

Revalidation of the Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone quarry of Sri. K.M. Joy, M/s J.B. Granites for an area of 2.4169 Ha at Sy Nos. 217/2- 2, 217/2-3, 217/2-1, 218/3 in Parakkadavu Village, Aluva Taluk, Ernakulam.

Old Proposal No. SIA/KL/MIN/293383/2022

Old File No: 843/SEIAA/EC3/2805/2015)

(New Proposal No. SIA/KL/MIN/462178/2024)

The Authority deliberated on the matter and noted the recommendations of the 182nd SEAC-1 meeting and the status of the EC application submitted through the PARIVESH Portal. The Authority observed that SEAC had recommended rejection of the proposal on account of non-submission of mandatory documents, including a revised Mining Plan, a recent Cluster Certificate from the Department of Mining and Geology, and a comprehensive EMP for the project area.

The Authority noted that the Project Proponent submitted an affidavit stating that the Department of Mining and Geology declined to issue a Cluster Certificate due to the absence of a valid Letter of Intent (LoI), and further requested SEIAA to intervene and arrange issuance of the LoI. The Authority also took note of SEAC's observations that Google Earth imagery shows two water-filled abandoned pits within the project area and multiple abandoned quarry pits in the surrounding region, indicating possible cluster implications and significant changes since the 2015-approved Mining Plan. In such circumstances, a revised Mining Plan and a valid Cluster Certificate are indispensable for appraisal.

Upon deliberation, **the Authority decided as follows:**

- 1. Accepts the recommendation of SEAC that the application cannot be appraised further due to non-submission of essential documents mandated under the EIA Notification, 2006.**
- 2. The Authority reiterates that SEIAA functions strictly within the framework of the EIA Notification, 2006, and has no jurisdiction to direct State Government departments to issue LoIs or other statutory approvals on behalf of a Project Proponent. Therefore, the request of the Project Proponent cannot be acceded.**
- 3. In the absence of a valid LoI, a revised Mining Plan, a current Cluster Certificate, and other mandatory documents, the Authority is unable to**

consider the EC application and, accordingly, rejects the EC application. Necessary rejection proceedings shall be issued, clearly stating all the valid reasons for rejecting the application.

Item No.09

**Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry project of Sri. Sajeev Kumar, Managing Partner, M/s Bharatha Granite for an area of 0.9982 Ha at Sy No. 127 in Thrikkur Village, Mukundapuram Taluk, Thrissur.
(SIA/KL/MIN/466653/2024)**

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decisions of various SEAC/SEIAA meetings. The SEAC in its 175th meeting, recommended a conditional EC for the mine life of 4 years, subject to certain Conditions. The Authority in its 152nd meeting sought 3 additional documents – NOC from the Irrigation Department and the Comprehensive EMP prepared by a NABET Accredited Agency. The Project Proponent has submitted the documents on 27.09.202 and found satisfactory. As per the cluster certificate dated 17.02.2025, the Kallur Quarry located within 500 m of the proposed quarry is not operational for a long time, for which the quarrying permit was ended on 28.05.2023. Besides, the Project Proponent also submitted an EMP prepared by a NABET-accredited agency for the project. The Authority further noticed that the submitted the proof of application submitted for Wildlife Clearance vide Proposal No. WL/KL/MIN/QRY/487725/2024 dated 13.70.2024 as the Peechi Vazhani WLS is located within a 10 km radius.

The Authority noticed that, as per the S.O. 3611(E) dated 25.07.2018 issued by the MoEFCC, the District Survey Report (DSR) is a mandatory and foundational document for the identification of mining areas, preparation of project reports, and appraisal for EC for minor mineral projects. The notification requires that the DSR be prepared strictly in the prescribed format, finalised after stakeholder consultation, and updated every five years. EC appraisal cannot rely on a draft, outdated, or procedurally deficient DSR, as the validity of the DSR is integral to determining resource availability, environmental sensitivity, and site suitability.

The Supreme Court, through its order dated 10 November 2021 in Civil Appeal Nos. 3661–3662 of 2020, and further in its judgment dated 08 May 2025 in Civil Appeal No. 14170 of 2024 and connected matters, has reaffirmed that all administrative actions,

including tendering, allocation, and grant of EC, must be premised on a valid and final DSR. The Apex Court directed States to prepare fresh DSRs wherever deficiencies existed and held that downstream decisions taken based on incomplete or invalid DSRs are legally unsustainable. In view of these binding directions, SEAC/SEIAA must ensure, as a pre-condition for appraisal, that the applicable DSR is final, approved, compliant with the 2018 guidelines, and within its validity period. Any appraisal or EC granted in the absence of a revised and legally compliant DSR would be vulnerable to judicial scrutiny and liable to be set aside.

Upon discussion, **the Authority decided the following:**

- 1. Refer the proposal back to SEAC for the fresh recommendation as considering the revised DSR prepared and approved as per the Guidelines of the MoEF&CC, S.O. 3611(E) dated 25.07.2018.**
- 2. The Project Proponent shall furnish a valid certificate issued by the Wildlife Warden of the Peechi-Vazhani Wildlife Sanctuary. The certificate must clearly state that the project area does not fall within the proposed ESZ or within 1 km of the Protected Area boundary and must specify the exact distance of the project site from the Protected Area boundary..**

Item No.10

Environmental Clearance for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry project of Sri. M. M. Thomas, M/s Wayanad Metals for an area of 1.2552 Ha at Re-Sy Nos. 545/4, 546/14, 546/11, 546/5, 546/4, 546/2, 547/3 in Vengapally Village, Vythiri Taluk, Wayanad (SIA/KL/MIN/466738/2024)

The Authority noticed that the SEAC appraised the project based on Form-1, Pre-Feasibility Report, Mining Plan, DSR approved in 2016, and the additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal. The Field Inspection was conducted out on 18.01.2025, and the 173rd SEAC heard the presentation of the proposal. After the due appraisal, the SEAC, in its 183rd meeting, recommended EC for a period of 5 years, subject to certain Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

The Authority found that, as per the Mining Plan, the elevation of the area varies between 787m and 769.4 m AMSL. The ultimate pit level proposed is 750 m AMSL, but the

SEAC had recommended the depth mining as 765m AMSL, citing the groundwater regimes of the area. The Mining plan is approved on 08.01.2024, after the guidelines issued by MoEF&CC dated 25.07.2018.

The Authority noticed that, as per the S.O. 3611(E) dated 25.07.2018 issued by the MoEF&CC, the District Survey Report (DSR) is a mandatory and foundational document for the identification of mining areas, preparation of project reports, and appraisal for EC for minor mineral projects. The notification requires that the DSR be prepared strictly in the prescribed format, finalised after stakeholder consultation, and updated every five years. EC appraisal cannot rely on a draft, outdated, or procedurally deficient DSR, as the validity of the DSR is integral to determining resource availability, environmental sensitivity, and site suitability.

The Supreme Court, through its order dated 10th November 2021 in Civil Appeal Nos. 3661–3662 of 2020, and further in its judgment dated 08 May 2025 in Civil Appeal No. 14170 of 2024 and connected matters, has reaffirmed that all administrative actions, including tendering, allocation, and grant of EC, must be premised on a valid and final DSR. The Apex Court directed States to prepare fresh DSRs wherever deficiencies existed and held that downstream decisions taken based on incomplete or invalid DSRs are legally unsustainable. In view of these binding directions, SEAC/SEIAA must ensure, as a precondition for appraisal, that the applicable DSR is final, approved, compliant with the 2018 guidelines, and within its validity period. Any appraisal or EC granted in the absence of a revised and legally compliant DSR would be vulnerable to judicial scrutiny and liable to be set aside.

Upon discussion, **the Authority decided to refer the proposal back to SEAC for the fresh recommendation as considering the revised DSR prepared and approved as per the Guidelines of the MoEF&CC, S.O. 3611(E) dated 25.07.2018.**

Item No.11

Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Philip Tom, for an area of 3.9353 Ha at Re-Sy Nos. 684 (UnSurvey), 681/3 (UnSurvey), 681/2 (UnSurvey) in Thiruvambady Village, Thamarassery Taluk, Kozhikode. (SIA/KL/MIN/467823/2024)

The Authority noticed that the SEAC appraised the project based on Form-1, Pre-Feasibility Report, Mining Plan, and the additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal. The Field Inspection of the proposed project was carried out on 05.10.2024, and the 168th SEAC meeting heard the presentation of the proposal. After the due appraisal, the SEAC in its 184th meeting, recommended EC for a period of 12 years, subject to certain Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

The Authority noted that Thiruvambady Village is classified as an Ecologically Sensitive Area (ESA) village in the Directions dated 13.11.2013 issued by the MoEFCC. At its 147th meeting, in light of the catastrophic landslide at Vellarimala, also an ESA village in Wayanad, and in anticipation of the forthcoming final notification regarding ESA villages, the Authority, applying the precautionary principle, resolved to revisit its earlier decision taken in the 123rd SEIAA meeting and decided to return all the EC applications in its original form to the Project Proponents. Subsequently, at its 151st meeting, the Authority resolved that mining proposals situated in ESA villages shall not be considered until the issuance of the final ESA Notification, thereby superseding the decision of the 123rd SEIAA meeting. In view of the foregoing, **the Authority decided to refer the current proposal back to SEAC for fresh recommendations, taking into consideration the ESA status of the area.**

Item No.12

Environmental Clearance for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Purushothaman K., for an area of 0.1942 Ha at Block No. 109, Re-Survey No. 55/111 in Kandamkunnu Village, Thalassery Taluk, Kannur (SIA/KL/MIN/477387/2024)

The Authority reviewed the proposal and noted the decisions of various SEAC meetings held on different dates. The Authority noticed that the SEAC had appraised the project based on Form 2, Pre-Feasibility Report, Mining Plan, and the additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal. The presentation of the proposal was heard in the 168th SEAC meeting. After due appraisal the SEAC in its 184th

meeting recommended EC for 1 year subjected to certain specific conditions in addition to the general conditions.

The Authority noticed that, as per the S.O. 3611(E) dated 25.07.2018 issued by the MoEFCC, the District Survey Report (DSR) is a mandatory and foundational document for the identification of mining areas, preparation of project reports, and appraisal for EC for minor mineral projects. The notification requires that the DSR be prepared strictly in the prescribed format, finalised after stakeholder consultation, and updated every five years. EC appraisal cannot rely on a draft, outdated, or procedurally deficient DSR, as the validity of the DSR is integral to determining resource availability, environmental sensitivity, and site suitability.

The Supreme Court, through its order dated 10 November 2021 in Civil Appeal Nos. 3661–3662 of 2020, and further in its judgment dated 08 May 2025 in Civil Appeal No. 14170 of 2024 and connected matters, has reaffirmed that all administrative actions, including tendering, allocation, and grant of EC, must be premised on a valid and final DSR. The Apex Court directed States to prepare fresh DSRs wherever deficiencies existed and held that downstream decisions taken based on incomplete or invalid DSRs are legally unsustainable. In view of these binding directions, SEAC/SEIAA must ensure, as a pre-condition for appraisal, that the applicable DSR is final, approved, compliant with the 2018 guidelines, and within its validity period. Any appraisal or EC granted in the absence of a revised and legally compliant DSR would be vulnerable to judicial scrutiny and liable to be set aside.

Upon discussion, **the Authority decided to refer the proposal back to SEAC for the fresh recommendation as considering the revised DSR prepared and approved as per the Guidelines of the MoEF&CC, S.O. 3611(E) dated 25.07.2018.**

Item No.13

**Reappraisal of EC issued by DEIAA Kollam, for the Granite Building Stone Quarry project of Sri. L. Syju, Managing Partner, M/s. Akkavila Sajeenan Aggregates for an area of 2.6491 Ha at Sy Nos. 474/4, 474/16, 474/17, 474/5, 474/18, 474/6, 474/21, 474/20, 474/7, 474/24, 474/10, 476/8, 476/7, 476/6, 476/4, 475/23, 475/24, 475/9-1, 476/17, 474/19 & 476/20 in Veliyam Village, Kottarakkara Taluk, Kollam District – ADS, Complaints & Judgement dated 24.09.2025 in WP (C) No. 12375 of 2025
(SIA/KL/MIN/477635/2024)**

The Authority reviewed the proposal considering the direction of the Hon'ble High court in WP(C) 12375 of 2025 along with the additional documents submitted by the Project Proponent on 06.03.2025. It is noticed that the WP(C) 12375 of 2025 disposed of on 24.09.2025, had impleaded SEIAA as additional respondent with a direction to consider and pass order in the petitioner's application for reappraisal of the EC, within two months of receiving a copy of the judgment.

The Authority also noticed the Complaint received from Sri. Thulasidharan Nair by requesting the refusal of Environmental Clearance (EC) due to the unauthorized quarrying. The requested reliefs include immediate suspension of operations, denial of any EC, a joint inspection by authorities like KSPCB, initiation of prosecution/penalty proceedings, and the formulation of remedial/restoration measures. The Complainant also alleged that quarrying operation in densely populated areas violates the precautionary principle and the right to life under Article 21 of the Constitution of India. The authority also noticed that Department of Environment vide letter dated 23.09.2025 forwarded an enquiry report from the Director of the Vigilance and Anti-Corruption Bureau (VACB) concerning the complaint by Sri. Thulaseedharan Nair against the proposed quarry. The report explicitly stated that the allegations have surfaced indicating mining operations are currently active while the EC reappraisal is under the consideration of the SEAC. Furthermore, the Authority also noted that the Project Proponent had paid about ₹5 Crore fine to the Department of Mining and Geology for illegal mining.

The Authority also considered the additional documents submitted by the Project Proponent dated 06.03.2025, regarding the details of over extraction, penalty imposed and copies of documents, remarks on the complaint and essential documents for reappraisal.

Considering the above the Authority decided the following:

- 1. Refer the proposal back to SEAC for a detailed evaluation of the additional documents submitted on 06.03.2025, including aspects relating to over-extraction, penalties, and the allegations raised in the complaints and VACB report. SEAC shall appraise the matter and furnish its recommendations to SEIAA.**
- 2. The Standing Counsel, SEIAA, shall be requested to seek an extension of the time limit before the Hon'ble High Court for complying with the judgment dated 24.09.2025 in WP(C) No. 12375 of 2025, in view of the need for SEAC's appraisal.**
- 3. The Department of Mining and Geology (DMG) shall be informed to examine the violations reported, including alleged unauthorized mining activities, and furnish a report to SEIAA**
- 4. The matter shall be placed before SEIAA for final decision after receipt of the SEAC recommendations and the violation report from DMG.**

Item No.14

**Environmental Clearance for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Ashraf C T, for an area of 0.8095 Ha at Block No. 24, Re- Sy No. 270/101,270/102,270/103,270/104 in Alapadamba Village, Payyannur Taluk, Kannur.
(SIA/KL/MIN/491971/2024)**

The Authority reviewed the proposal and noted the decisions of various SEAC meetings held on different dates. Authority noticed that the SEAC had appraised the project based on Form-1, Pre-Feasibility Report, Mining Plan, and the additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal. The presentation of the proposal was heard in the 172nd SEAC meeting. After due appraisal the SEAC in its 184th meeting recommended EC for 3 years subjected to certain specific conditions in addition to the general conditions. The Authority noticed that the mining plan of the proposed project was approved dated 27.06.2024, after the guidelines of MoEF&CC regarding the DSR.

The Authority noticed that, as per the S.O. 3611(E) dated 25.07.2018 issued by the MoEFCC, the District Survey Report (DSR) is a mandatory and foundational document for

the identification of mining areas, preparation of project reports, and appraisal for EC for minor mineral projects. The notification requires that the DSR be prepared strictly in the prescribed format, finalised after stakeholder consultation, and updated every five years. EC appraisal cannot rely on a draft, outdated, or procedurally deficient DSR, as the validity of the DSR is integral to determining resource availability, environmental sensitivity, and site suitability.

The Supreme Court, through its order dated 10 November 2021 in Civil Appeal Nos. 3661–3662 of 2020, and further in its judgment dated 08 May 2025 in Civil Appeal No. 14170 of 2024 and connected matters, has reaffirmed that all administrative actions, including tendering, allocation, and grant of EC, must be premised on a valid and final DSR. The Apex Court directed States to prepare fresh DSRs wherever deficiencies existed and held that downstream decisions taken based on incomplete or invalid DSRs are legally unsustainable. In view of these binding directions, SEAC/SEIAA must ensure, as a pre-condition for appraisal, that the applicable DSR is final, approved, compliant with the 2018 guidelines, and within its validity period. Any appraisal or EC granted in the absence of a revised and legally compliant DSR would be vulnerable to judicial scrutiny and liable to be set aside.

Upon discussion, **the Authority decided to refer the proposal back to SEAC for the fresh recommendation as considering the revised DSR prepared and approved as per the Guidelines of the MoEF&CC, S.O. 3611(E) dated 25.07.2018.**

Item No.15

Environmental Clearance for the proposed Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Subair P for an area of 0.7921 Ha at Block no: 18, Re-Survey Nos. 478/4-1-2, 478/4-1-3 in Vazhakkad Village, Kondotty Taluk, Malappuram – Request from Project Proponent (SIA/KL/MIN/494508/2024)

The Authority reviewed the proposal and noted the decisions of various SEAC/SEIAA meetings held on different dates. Authority noticed that the SEAC in its 184th meeting recommended EC for 3 years subjected to the production of NOC from the District Level Crisis Management Group. Consequently, the Authority in its 151st meeting decided to issue EC subjected to the production of NOC as the site falls within moderate hazard zone. However, the Project proponent vide letter dated 04.10.2025, informed that the latest

Landslide Susceptibility Map from the Geological Survey of India (GSI) shows the project area does not fall under any hazard zone. Consequently, the Project Proponent requested the SEIAA to reconsider the earlier objection and requested to proceed with the issuance of the EC. The Authority, found that the mining plan of the proposed project was approved dated 19.18.2024, after the guidelines of MoEF&CC regarding the DSR.

The Authority noticed that, as per the S.O. 3611(E) dated 25.07.2018 issued by the MoEFCC, the District Survey Report (DSR) is a mandatory and foundational document for the identification of mining areas, preparation of project reports, and appraisal for EC for minor mineral projects. The notification requires that the DSR be prepared strictly in the prescribed format, finalised after stakeholder consultation, and updated every five years. EC appraisal cannot rely on a draft, out-dated, or procedurally deficient DSR, as the validity of the DSR is integral to determining resource availability, environmental sensitivity, and site suitability.

The Supreme Court, through its order dated 10th November 2021 in Civil Appeal Nos. 3661–3662 of 2020, and further in its judgment dated 08 May 2025 in Civil Appeal No. 14170 of 2024 and connected matters, has reaffirmed that all administrative actions, including tendering, allocation, and grant of EC, must be premised on a valid and final DSR. The Apex Court directed States to prepare fresh DSRs wherever deficiencies existed and held that downstream decisions taken based on incomplete or invalid DSRs are legally unsustainable. In view of these binding directions, SEAC/SEIAA must ensure, as a pre-condition for appraisal, that the applicable DSR is final, approved, compliant with the 2018 guidelines, and within its validity period. Any appraisal or EC granted in the absence of a revised and legally compliant DSR would be vulnerable to judicial scrutiny and liable to be set aside.

Upon discussion, **the Authority decided to refer the proposal back to SEAC for the fresh recommendation as considering the revised DSR prepared and approved as per the Guidelines of the MoEF&CC, S.O. 3611(E) dated 25.07.2018.**

Item No.16

ToR Application for the Expansion of Granite Building Stone Quarry project of M/s Cochin Blue Metal Industries Pvt. Ltd. for area of 10.0552 Ha. at Block No. 26, Re-Survey Nos. 1/1, 1/2, 1/2-1, 1/3, 1/4, 1/5, 1/7, 2/1, 2/2, 2/3, 2/4, 2/5, 2/5-1, 2/6-1, 3/1, 3/7, 3/9-1, 4/2, 4/3-2, 4/11, 5/1, 5/2, 5/3, 5/4, 5/5, 8/2, 8/2-1, 8/3, 8/4, 9/1, 9/2, 9/3, 9/5, 9/7, 9/8, 9/9 in Ramapuram Village, Meenachil Taluk, Kottayam. (SIA/KL/MIN/499835/2025)

Sri. Clement K. Jose, M/s Cochin Blue Metal Industries Pvt. Ltd., Choozhikkara, Methiri P.O., Kottayam District, Kerala - 686576 submitted a ToR application for the Expansion of Granite Building Stone Quarry project for area of 10.0552 Ha. at Block No. 26, Re-Survey Nos. 1/1, 1/2, 1/2-1, 1/3, 1/4, 1/5, 1/7, 2/1, 2/2, 2/3, 2/4, 2/5, 2/5-1, 2/6-1, 3/1, 3/7, 3/9-1, 4/2, 4/3-2, 4/11, 5/1, 5/2, 5/3, 5/4, 5/5, 8/2, 8/2-1, 8/3, 8/4, 9/1, 9/2, 9/3, 9/5, 9/7, 9/8, 9/9 in Ramapuram Village, Meenachil Taluk, Kottayam.

The Authority perused the ToR application and noted the decision of the 182nd SEAC meeting. As per the application, the EC for 4.8910 Ha within the proposed area was issued vide order No. 67/SEIAA/KL/7904/2013 dated 23.05.2013. Furthermore, the validity of the EC was extended further five years vide dated 17.03.2018. At present, the Project Proponent has applied for the Expansion of the existing quarry by enhancing the area to 10.0552 Ha by embedding the older mine area. As per the application, the Mineable reserves provided are 32,61,571 MT for a mine life of 17 years. After due appraisal, the SEAC in its 182nd meeting recommended Standard ToR under category 1 (a) Mining of Minerals.

Upon discussion, **the Authority decided to approve standard ToR under category 1 (a) 'Mining of Minerals' and the Comprehensive EMP must be included in the EIA report, considering all the adjacent quarries within the Cluster as recommended by SEAC.**

Item No.17

Reappraisal of Environmental Clearance application for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Jovin George, for an area of 4.5180 Ha at Block No.199 Re-Survey No. 275/1A, Thripangottur Village, Thalassery Taluk, Kannur. (SIA/KL/MIN/507464/2025)

The Authority reviewed the proposal and took note of the deliberations and recommendations of the 184th SEAC meeting. SEAC confirmed that the Project Proponent

has submitted the present application in Form-2, purportedly seeking reappraisal of the Environmental Clearance (EC) earlier issued by DEIAA, Kannur vide Letter No. 154/ECA/KNR/2018/DEIAA dated 19.05.2018 for an area of 4.5180 ha, for which Terms of Reference (ToR) had already been issued by the Authority on 14.02.2025. However, instead of submitting the requisite EIA Report as mandated under the ToR, the Project Proponent has once again approached the Authority with an application for reappraisal of the DEIAA-issued EC. SEAC further observed that the application is incomplete and non-compliant with the requirements stipulated in the OM dated 28.04.2023 governing reappraisal.

Upon examination of Google Imagery, SEAC noted clear indications of deliberate project splitting, with quarries sharing a common boundary, in contravention of the principles laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Deepak Kumar v. State of Haryana. It was also observed that the Project Proponent had suppressed material facts, including the possession of valid ToRs for two quarries. In view of these deficiencies and non-compliances, SEAC, in its 184th meeting, recommended rejection of the application.

The Authority further noted the submission made by the Project Proponent dated 12.11.2025, wherein he has stated that he will undertake the EIA study and public hearing for both mine areas. The Authority observed that, in accordance with the norms of the PARIVESH Portal and the provisions of the EIA Notification, 2006, the present application submitted in Form-2 is not a valid mode for appraisal of an EIA Report or for consideration of an EC application. For such appraisal, a fresh application is mandatorily required to be submitted in Form-1, along with all requisite documents.

Accordingly, the Authority decided to accept the recommendation of SEAC and reject the present application. The Project Proponent shall submit a fresh application in Form-1, complete with the EIA Report and all other relevant documents, for further consideration.

Item No.18

**Application for Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry project of Sri. Rajesh K. S., for an area of 1.9942 Ha at Re-Sy Nos. 614, 615 & 628 in Perumbilavu Village, Kunnamkulam Taluk, Thrissur.
(SIA/KL/MIN/507495/2024)**

The Authority reviewed the proposal and took note of the deliberations and recommendations of the 183rd SEAC meeting. It was noted that SEAC had identified multiple factual errors, inconsistencies, and false statements, in addition to several typographical mistakes, in the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) prepared by Eco Tech Labs Pvt. Ltd. Further, as per the Cluster Certificate dated 06.07.2024, an adjacent working quarry operated by M/s Canon Granites is located within 500 metres of the project site; however, the certificate does not specify the extent of the said quarry area, thereby rendering it incomplete for regulatory scrutiny.

In view of the deficiencies in the EMP and the inadequacy of the Cluster Certificate submitted by the Project Proponent, the SEAC recommended that the application be returned in its present form. Accordingly, **the Authority decided to accept the SEAC recommendation and return the application, with directions to the Project Proponent to rectify the shortcomings and resubmit the proposal along with a revised, accurate, and scientifically supported EMP for further appraisal.**

Item No.19

**Reappraisal of EC issued by DEIAA for the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Shafir P, for an area of 1.1030 hectares at Sy No. 46/4 of Kalliad Village, Iritty Taluk, Kannur
(SIA/KL/MIN/513794/2025)**

The Authority reviewed the proposal and noted the decisions taken in the relevant SEIAA and SEAC meetings. It was observed that, in compliance with the directions of the 156th SEIAA, the Project Proponent has submitted an EMP prepared by a NABET-accredited agency, along with the other documents required for reappraisal of DEIAA-issued ECs in accordance with the OM dated 28.04.2023.

Upon deliberation, **the Authority decided to refer the proposal back to SEAC for fresh recommendations, taking into account the EMP and all additional documents furnished by the Project Proponent as mandated under the OM dated 28.04.2023.**

Item No.20

**ToR for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Mohammed Nishad P. P, Managing Partner, M/s Abas Mines for an area of 1.7283 Ha at Re-Sy Block No: P22, Re-Sy Nos. 1012/99, 1012/98, 1012/81 in Melmuri Village, Ernad Taluk, Malappuram.
(SIA/KL/MIN/522134/2025)**

Sri. Mohammed Nishad P.P, Managing Partner, M/s Abas Mines, Room No. 543/25, Masjid Noor Building, Konompara, Melmuri P.O, Malappuram - 676517 submitted a ToR application for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project for an area of 1.7283 Ha at Re-Sy Block No: P22, Re-Sy Nos. 1012/99, 1012/98, 1012/81 in Melmuri Village, Ernad Taluk, Malappuram.

The Authority perused the ToR application and noted the decision of the 183rd SEAC meeting. As per the Mining Plan, the elevation of the area varies between 270m AMSL to 350m AMSL. The total mineable reserve is estimated as 5,30,865 MT. The production plan is provided for period of 5 years with an annual production of 53,000 MT. After due appraisal, the SEAC in its 183rd meeting recommended Standard ToR under category 1 (a) Mining of Minerals.

Upon discussion, **the Authority decided to approve standard ToR under category 1 (a) ‘Mining of Minerals’ with the following additional studies:**

- 1. Study on 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.**
- 2. Comprehensive EMP considering all the adjacent quarries shall be a part of the EIA report.**

Item No.21

**ToR for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Manoj. K for an area of 0.6565 Ha at Survey No. 98/2-6 in Kannamangalam village, Thirurangadi Taluk Malappuram.
(SIA/KL/MIN/522351/2025)**

Sri. Manoj. K, S/o Ummer, Kuzhikkattil House, Mukkatta, Nilambur (RS) P.O, Malappuram - 679330 submitted a ToR application for the proposed Granite Building Stone

Quarry Project for an area of 0.6565 Ha at Survey No. 98/2-6 in Kannamangalam village, Thirurangadi Taluk Malappuram.

The Authority perused the ToR application and noted the decision of the 183rd SEAC meeting. As per the application, the mineable reserve is provided as 1,51,167.18 MT for a mine life of 3 years. The elevation of the area varies between 125m AMSL and 80m AMSL. The Cluster Certificate dated 30.07.2024 indicates the presence of quarries Sri. Abdul Hameed (3.1479 Ha), M/s. Super Sands (4.9072 Ha), Sri. V. Moitheen (4.9072 Ha) and Sri. Abdussalam. P (3.7352 Ha) within 500m radius. After due appraisal, the SEAC in its 183rd meeting recommended Standard ToR under category 1 (a) 'Mining of Minerals'.

Upon discussion, **the Authority decided to approve standard ToR under category 1 (a) 'Mining of Minerals' and the Comprehensive EMP must be included in the EIA report considering all the adjacent quarries within the Cluster as recommended by SEAC.**

Item No.22

**Amendment of the Environmental Clearance issued to the Granite Building Stone quarry project of Sri. Sainudheen C. K, M/s Yesco Granites LLP for an area of 0.9460 Ha at Survey No.202/2 in Elankur Village, Ernad Taluk, Malappuram.
(SIA/KL/MIN/523001/2025)**

Sri. Sainudheen C. K, Yesco Granites LLP Room No.29/162-A, J&J Tower, Muttippadi, Alathurpadi, Melmuri P.O, Malappuram District, Kerala - 676517 submitted an EC amendment application for the EC issued on 27.08.2024 for the Granite Building Stone quarry project in an area of 0.9460 Ha at Survey No. 202/2 in Elankur Village, Ernad Taluk, Malappuram.

The Authority reviewed the proposal and noted the deliberations of the 183rd SEAC meeting. It was observed that the Environmental Clearance (EC) for the project had originally been issued on the basis of the Mining Plan dated 24.10.2018, wherein the mineable reserves were estimated at 3,52,995 MT with an annual production capacity of 25,000 MT for the mine life of 5 years. Accordingly, the EC was granted for five years with a restriction limiting mining to elevations above 85 m AMSL, to avoid intersection with the groundwater table. It was also noted that quarrying operations have not commenced and that the quarrying permit has not yet been executed.

Now, the project proponent stated that with the amendment to the KMMCR, 2023, the maximum validity of a quarrying permit is restricted to three years. In compliance with this regulatory change, a modified Mining Plan and Post Mine Closure Plan dated 04.02.2025, approved by the Department of Mining and Geology, has now been submitted, restricting mining to elevations above 85m AMSL and limiting the mine life to three years. Consequently, the mineable reserves have been recalculated and reduced to 2,06,580 MT, with a proposed annual production of 80,000 MTA for three years. Based on the revised Mining Plan, SEAC, in its 183rd meeting, recommended the amendment of the EC issued on 27.08.2024, restricting the project life to three years.

Upon deliberation, **the Authority decided to accept the recommendation of SEAC and to amend the EC for a project life of three years, in alignment with the production plan contained in the revised Mining Plan dated 04.02.2025, subject to all Specific and General Conditions stipulated in the earlier EC.**

Item No.23

**Reappraisal of Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Joseph T. T., for an area of 1.0831 Ha at Block No. 70, Survey No. 25/1A in Nediya Village, Taliparamba Taluk, Kannur
(SIA/KL/MIN/524190/2025)**

The Authority deliberated on the matter and noted the recommendations of the 184th SEAC meeting, wherein the Committee, taking cognizance of the directions issued in the 147th SEIAA meeting, observed grave violations of EC conditions as per the SEAC field inspection report dated 21.11.2022. The Authority also noted that the Environmental Clearance was originally issued by the DEIAA with a validity of five years from 07.11.2017, which expired on 16.11.2023 after accounting for COVID-19 relaxation.

The Authority further observed that, as per the Cluster Certificate dated 09.12.2024, three quarries lie within a 500m radius of the project area, thereby attracting the Cluster Condition, necessitating an EIA study in accordance with the EIA Notification, 2006. The Authority also noted that SEAC recommended rejection of the present reappraisal application for want of an EIA study and advised the proponent to submit a fresh EC application seeking ToR for conducting EIA. The Authority also took note of the SEAC's recommendation to

direct the Joint Committee, KSPCB, to assess environmental damages arising from non-compliance with EC conditions and to propose penal and remedial measures.

In the above circumstances, **the Authority decided to accept the recommendation of SEAC and reject the EC application. The Project Proponent is at liberty to submit a ToR application for conducting the EIA study, if so desired. The KSPCB is directed to constitute a Joint Committee to assess the environmental damages arising from non-compliance with the EC conditions.**

Item No.24

**ToR Application for the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Vinay James Kynadi, Managing Director, M/s Highland Silver Sands Pvt Ltd, for an area of 4.3100 Ha, at Re-Sy No. 2/1(P) in Raroth Village, Thamarassery Taluk, Kozhikode.
(SIA/KL/MIN/525266/2025)**

Sri. Vinay James Kynadi, M/s Highland Silver Sands Pvt Ltd 27/97, FCC Building Mavoor Road, Kozhikode, Kerala, submitted a ToR application for the reappraisal of EC issued by DEIAA for the Granite Building Stone Quarry for an area of 4.3100 Ha, at Re-Sy No. 2/1(P) in Raroth Village, Thamarassery Taluk, Kozhikode.

The Authority reviewed the proposal and noted the decisions of various SEAC/SEIAA meeting held on different dates. The 152nd SEIAA had previously heard the Project Proponents in the cluster and approved standard ToR for conducting EIA subject to the condition that the study will consider cumulative impact of three quarries and carrying capacity of public roads. After due appraisal the SEAC in its 184th meeting recommended Standard ToR under category 1 (a) Mining of Minerals.

Upon discussion, **the Authority decided to approve standard ToR under category 1 (a) ‘Mining of Minerals’ and the study will consider cumulative impact of three quarries and carrying capacity of public roads.**

Item No.25

**ToR application for the Re-appraisal of EC issued by DEIAA, Thrissur, for the Granite Building Stone Quarry project, M/s Prestige Rock Products Pvt Ltd, for an area of 1.9783 ha at Re-Sy Nos. 1800, 1801, 1805 & 1806 in Pazhayannur Village, Thalappilly Taluk, Thrissur
(SIA/KL/MIN/525847/2025)**

Sri. Muneer Nalakathu, Director, M/s Prestige Rock Products Pvt Ltd., Pazhayannur, Thrissur, submitted a ToR application for the reappraisal of granite building stone quarry in an area of 1.9783 ha at Re-Sy Nos. 1800, 1801, 1805 & 1806 in Pazhayannur Village, Thalappilly Taluk, Thrissur.

The Authority reviewed the proposal and noted the decision of 183rd SEAC meeting. As per the application, the EC dated 29.05.2018 was obtained from DEIAA, Thrissur for a period of 5 years. The Authority also noted the complaints received regarding the cluster's quarries and decided that complainants should present their concerns during public hearing. After due appraisal the SEAC in its 183th meeting recommended Standard ToR under category 1 (a) Mining of Minerals with certain additional studies and documents.

Upon discussion, the Authority decided to approve standard ToR under category 1 (a) 'Mining of Minerals' with following additional studies.

- 1. Study on 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.**
- 2. Comprehensive EMP considering all the adjacent quarries shall be a part of the EIA report.**
- 3. The CCR from the IRO, MoEF&CC, Bangalore shall be submitted along with the EIA report**

Item No.26

**ToR application for re-appraisal of EC issued by DEIAA, Thrissur, for the Granite Building Stone Quarry project of Sri. Shinto Abraham, for an area of 3.8717 Ha at Block No. 67, Sy Nos. 1799/2, 1804/2, 1807, 1808/1, 1809/2 & 1810/1 in Pazhayannur Village, Thalappilly Taluk, Thrissur.
(SIA/KL/MIN/525932/2025)**

Sri. Shinto Abraham, B2, Indira Nagar, Devalogam, Kottayam, submitted a ToR application for the reappraisal of Granite Building Stone Quarry Project for an area 3.8717 Ha at Block No. 67, Sy Nos. 1799/2, 1804/2, 1807, 1808/1, 1809/2 & 1810/1 in Pazhayannur Village, Thalappilly Taluk, Thrissur.

The Authority reviewed the proposal and noted the decision of 183rd SEAC meeting. As per the application, the EC form DEIAA, Thrissur was issued vide order No. B1-17435/2017/DEIAA/TSR dated 29/05/2018. The Authority also noted the complaints received regarding the cluster's quarries along with the report of the Secretary, Pazhayannur Grama Panchayat and determined that complainants should present their concerns during public hearing. After due appraisal, the SEAC in its 183th meeting recommended Standard ToR under category 1 (a) Mining of Minerals with certain additional studies and documents.

Upon discussion, the Authority decided to approve standard ToR under category 1 (a) 'Mining of Minerals' with following additional studies.

- 1. Study on 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.**
- 2. Comprehensive EMP considering all the adjacent quarries shall be a part of the EIA report.**
- 3. The CCR from the IRO, MoEF&CC, Bangalore shall be submitted along with the EIA report.**

Item No.27

**ToR application for the Granite Building Stone Quarry project of Sri. Sajeew Sreedharan, for an area of 4.1792 Ha at Block No. 8; Sy. Nos. 302/152, 302/1/157, 302/1/158, 302/1/161, 302/1/159, 302/1/46/378, 302/1/46, 302/1/46/330/384 & 302/1/46/330 in Vilakkudy Village, Pathanapuram Taluk, Kollam.
(SIA/KL/MIN/531567/2025)**

The Authority reviewed the proposal and noted the decision of the 182nd SEAC meeting. As per the revised Cluster certificate, one of the projects located within a 500 m radius, with an area of 0.819 ha, has been closed in accordance with the approved Mine Closure Plan dated 08.06.2024. After due appraisal, the SEAC recommended to accept the withdrawal request of the ToR, considering the non-cluster condition and the request of the Project Proponent. Subsequently, the Project Proponent vide letter dated 13.10.2025 has requested to consider the project proposal under Category B2 for appraisal.

Upon deliberation, the Authority decided to accept the recommendation of SEAC to withdraw the application. As the present submission pertains to a request for Terms of Reference (ToR) for conducting an EIA study, the Project Proponent's request to consider the proposal under Category B2 is not admissible and therefore shall not be entertained.

Item No.28

**Transfer of Environmental Clearance No. 46/Q/2022 issued to Sri. Ziyad A. L for an area of 0.9162 Ha at Re-Sy Nos. 468/4, 468/5, 468/7, 468/10, 468/12, 468/13, 472/1 in Kilimanoor Village, Chirayinkeezhu Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram.
(SIA/KL/MIN/533790/2025)**

The Authority reviewed in detail the application submitted by the Project Proponent for transfer of Environmental Clearance (EC). The original EC had been issued to Sri. Ziyad A.L. vide Proposal No. SIA/KL/MIN/125990/2019 dated 23.07.2022 for a validity period of five years. The Project Proponent has now provided consent to transfer the said EC in favour of Mr. Fayaz Basheer, Fayaz Manzil, Madanthapacha, PC Mukku P.O., Kallambalam, Thiruvananthapuram, Kerala-695605.

However, upon verification, the Authority observed that the undertaking/No Objection Certificate (NOC) submitted does not specify the reason for seeking the transfer of EC, which is essential for completing the transfer process. **Accordingly, the Project**

Proponent is directed to furnish the specific reason for the proposed transfer to enable further processing of the application.

Item No.29

**ToR for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Kunhalavi. N, Managing Director, M/s. Noorakkad Granite Pvt Ltd. for an area of 2.1232 Ha at Block No: 37, Re-Sy Nos. 307/3, 307/5-7, 307/5, 307/5-4, 307/5-6, 307/5-2, 307/5-3 & 256/1-1 in Oorakam Village, Thirurangadi Taluk, Malappuram.
(SIA/KL/MIN/543158/2025)**

Sri. Kunhalavi. N, Managing Director, M/s. Noorakkad Granite Private Limited, 8/338 B, Poolappees road, Ooragam, Malappuram - 676 519 submitted ToR application for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project for an area of 2.1232 Ha at Block No: 37, Re-Sy Nos. 307/3, 307/5-7, 307/5, 307/5-4, 307/5-6, 307/5-2, 307/5-3 & 256/1-1 in Oorakam Village, Thirurangadi Taluk, Malappuram.

The Authority reviewed the proposal and took note of the deliberations and recommendations of the 183rd SEAC meeting. As per the Cluster Certificate dated 06.06.2025, the quarry operated by M/s Black Diamond Metals (4.2799 ha) and the quarry of Sri. Ilyas M. (0.9173 ha) are located within a 500-metre radius of the project site. The Authority also noted that, in its 177th meeting, SEAC had observed that Oorakam Village is a highly exploited mining cluster, and therefore, an Environmental Carrying Capacity Study is essential to guide future EC decisions and to facilitate comprehensive ecological restoration. After due appraisal, the SEAC in its 183rd meeting recommended Standard ToR under category 1 (a) Mining of Minerals.

Upon discussion, **the Authority decided to approve standard ToR under category 1 (a) ‘Mining of Minerals’ and the Comprehensive EMP must be included in the EIA report considering all the adjacent quarries within the Cluster as recommended by SEAC.**

Item No.30

ToR Application for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri Ganeswara Industries Private Limited for an area of 4.9506 ha at Block No: 38 Re-Sy No: 272/3, 272/4, 272/6, 272/13, 272/20, 273/7, 273/14, 273/14-1, 275/1, 275/2, 275/5, 275/5-1, 275/6, 275/6-1, 275/7, 275/8, 275/21, 275/22- 1, 275/23, 275/24, 276/3, 276/4, 276/5, 276/23, 272/5, 272/8, 272/12- 1, 272/14, 272/18, 273/4-1, 273/5, 275/4, 275/20, 272/11, 272/13-1, 273/4, 273/6, 273/6-1, 273/12, 273/24, 275/3, 275/13-1, 275/15-1, 275/16, 275/18, 275/19-1, 275/19-2, 275/14, 275/14-1, 275/14-2, 275/27, 275/27-1, 275/27-2, in Anavoor Village, Neyyattinkara Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram (SIA/KL/MIN/552547/2025)

Sri Ganeswara Industries Pvt. Ltd., represented by its Managing Director Sri. . V. Sudhakaran, T.C.52/248(1), VSC Mansion, Kaimanam Junction, Pappanamcode P. O., Thiruvananthapuram, Kerala – 695018 submitted a ToR application for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry for an area of 4.9506 ha at Block No: 38 Re-Sy No: 272/3, 272/4, 272/6, 272/13, 272/20, 273/7, 273/14, 273/14-1, 275/1, 275/2, 275/5, 275/5-1, 275/6, 275/6-1, 275/7, 275/8, 275/21, 275/22- 1, 275/23, 275/24, 276/3, 276/4, 276/5, 276/23, 272/5, 272/8, 272/12- 1, 272/14, 272/18, 273/4-1, 273/5, 275/4, 275/20, 272/11, 272/13-1, 273/4, 273/6, 273/6-1, 273/12, 273/24, 275/3, 275/13-1, 275/15-1, 275/16, 275/18, 275/19-1, 275/19-2, 275/14, 275/14-1, 275/14-2, 275/27, 275/27-1, 275/27-2, in Anavoor Village, Neyyattinkara Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram.

The Authority reviewed the proposal and noted the decision of 182nd SEAC meeting. As per the application, the total mineable reserve is provided as 20,00,450 MT for a mine life of 10 years. The highest elevation of the lease area is 150m AMSL and the lowest is 90m AMSL. As per the Cluster Certificate dated 20.06.2025, the total area under cluster is more than 13 Ha. After due appraisal, the SEAC in its 182nd meeting recommended Standard ToR under category 1 (a) Mining of Minerals with certain additional studies and documents.

The Authority also considered the request of the Project Proponent to modify the ToR condition, allowing the vibration study to be performed during the operational phase after quarrying begins, since the site is new and does not yet store or use explosives. However, the Authority maintained the view that the vibration study should be conducted as recommended by the SEAC by taking appropriate permission from the concerned department.

Upon discussion, the Authority decided to approve standard ToR under category 1 (a) ‘Mining of Minerals’ with following additional studies.

1. Study on 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.
2. Comprehensive EMP considering all the adjacent quarries shall be a part of the EIA report.

Item No.31

ToR Application for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Sabarinathan S. for an area of 1.2302 ha at Block No: 37 Re-Sy Nos: 4/2, 4/3, 4/4, 3/7, 3/8, 6/5, in Nagaroor Village, Chirayinkeezhu Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram (SIA/KL/MIN/552603/2025)

Sri. Sabarinathan. S, Kizhakkumkara Veedu, Karavaram P.O, Kallambalam Thiruvananthapuram - 695605 submitted a ToR application for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry for an area of 1.2302 ha at Block No: 37 Re-Sy Nos: 4/2, 4/3, 4/4, 3/7, 3/8, 6/5, in Nagaroor Village, Chirayinkeezhu Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram.

The Authority reviewed the proposal and noted the decision of the 182nd SEAC meeting. As per the Mining Plan, the mineable reserve is provided as 3,35,465 MT, for a mine life of 5 years. The nearest house is located 56m from the project boundary. The elevation of the area varies between 110m AMSL to 85m AMSL. As per the Cluster Certificate dated 12.03.2025, the total area under the cluster is more than 7Ha. After due appraisal, the SEAC, in its 182nd meeting, recommended the Standard ToR under category 1 (a) Mining of Minerals.

Upon discussion, the Authority decided to approve standard ToR under category 1 (a) 'Mining of Minerals' and the Comprehensive EMP must be included in the EIA report considering all the adjacent quarries within the Cluster as recommended by SEAC.

Item No.32

ToR Application for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Jimmy Jose, Managing Partner, M/s Global Granites for an area of 2.1220 ha at Block no. 39, Re-Survey no 397/3, Kizhakkanchery II Village, Alathur Taluk, Palakkad (SIA/KL/MIN/553304/2025)

M/s Global Granites, represented by its Managing Partner, Sri. Jimmy Jose 101/15, Kunnukara, Attupuram, Ayoor, Ernakulam– 683579 submitted a ToR application for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry for an area of 2.1220 ha at Block no. 39, Re-Survey no 397/3, Kizhakkanchery II Village, Alathur Taluk, Palakkad.

The Authority reviewed the proposal and noted the decision of the 183rd SEAC meeting. As per the application, the project cost is provided as Rs. 2.50 crore. The mineable reserve is provided as 6,68,182.5 MT for a period of 7 years. The elevation of the area varies between 80m AMSL and 125m AMSL. As per the Cluster Certificate dated 17.05.2025, the quarry of M/s. Penta Granites for an area of 4.1371 Ha is located within 500m radius. As per the hazard zonation map of GSI about 50% of the proposed area is in the Medium hazard zone. The High Hazard Zone is at a distance of about 24m from the project boundary. After due appraisal, the SEAC, in its 183rd meeting, recommended Standard ToR under category 1 (a) Mining of Minerals with certain additional studies and documents.

Upon discussion, the Authority decided to approve standard ToR under category 1 (a) ‘Mining of Minerals’ with following additional studies.

- 1. Study on 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.**
- 2. Comprehensive EMP considering all the adjacent quarries shall be a part of the EIA report.**

General Decision

The Authority, upon deliberation, decided that strengthening the technical capacity of SEIAA is essential for ensuring timely and scientifically robust appraisal of proposals. Accordingly, the Authority approved the creation of three technical assistants, including that

of a Spatial Analyst, to enhance the technical support available for evaluation, monitoring, and compliance activities.

The SEIAA Secretariat is directed to submit a proposal to the Government for the creation of the above posts as approved. In the meantime, the Secretariat shall initiate and complete all necessary procedural steps required for the interim engagement/appointment of the said technical personnel, in accordance with applicable rules and guidelines.

Sd/-
Sri. P.H. Kurian IAS (Retd)
Chairman

Sd/-
Sri. Raveendran T.
Expert Member

Sd/-
Sri. Seeram Sambasiva Rao IAS
Member Secretary