

**MINUTES OF THE 158th MEETING OF THE STATE
LEVEL ENVIRONMENT IMPACT ASSESSMENT AUTHORITY (SEIAA) KERALA,
HELD ON 09TH OCTOBER, 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 158th meeting of the State Environment Impact Assessment Authority (SEIAA), Kerala, was convened on 09th September 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 158th meeting and adopted the following decisions:

PHYSICAL FILES

Item No.158.01 **Environmental Clearance issued to the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. K.V. Mathew, M/s Kachanathu Minerals and Metals Pvt. Ltd at Block 27, Sy Nos. 135/2-3, 135/7, 135/7-1,135/6, 135/2-2, 135/2, 135/2-1, 167/1, 167/1-1, 167/5, 167/2-2, 167/2-13 in Ezhumattoor Village, Mallappally Taluk, Pathanamthitta – Complaint and Judgment dated 30.06.2025 in WP(C) No.22130/2025- Hearing the PP.**

(File No. 765/SEIAA/EC4/505/2015)

As intimated by the Authority, the Project Proponent, Sri. Kachanathu Varkey Abraham, along with the Consultant, Sri. Arun Kumar, and the Recognised Qualified Person (RQP), Sri. Jayachandra Panicker, attended the hearing. The Project Proponent submitted that the Environmental Clearance (EC) had expired on 15.01.2023, and mining operations were continued by invoking the provisions of S.O. 1807(E) until the said notification was struck down by the Hon'ble High Court vide judgment dated 26.08.2025. The Authority observed that, in connection with the revalidation of the EC, the Sub-Committee had reported violations of EC conditions, pursuant to which a Stop Memo was issued on 12.02.2025 as per the decision taken in the 151st SEIAA meeting. However, the Project Proponent continued mining operations even

after the issuance of the Stop Memo. The Authority further noted that the 151st SEIAA had directed the District Geologist, Pathanamthitta, to submit a detailed report on the alleged illegal mining activities and the extent of over-extraction to the Joint Committee constituted by the KSPCB to assess the environmental damages.

The Authority also observed that the Project Proponent has not submitted an online application for EC renewal/ extension, or reappraisal through the PARIVESH Portal as mandated under the prevailing norms. Upon deliberation, the Project Proponent agreed to submit the requisite application with all supporting documents through the PARIVESH Portal. The Authority directed the Project Proponent to refrain from continuing any mining operations, as the validity of the EC has expired and S.O. 1807(E) has been declared unconstitutional by the Hon'ble High Court. The decision of the Authority shall be communicated to the concerned departments for necessary enforcement action.

Item No.158.02 **Environmental Clearance issued to the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Thomas O. D for an area of 1.3307 Ha at Re-Sy Nos. 234/1, 234/2 & 234/5 in Muppayinad Village, Vythiri Taluk, Wayanad – Hearing**
(File No. 1291/EC2/2019/SEIAA)

As intimated by the Authority, the Project Proponent, Sri. O.D. Thomas, along with the Consultant, Sri. Deep Das, attended the hearing. The Project Proponent refuted the observations of the 179th SEAC and contended that the findings regarding the distance between the project site and the Wayanad landslide hotspot were factually incorrect. It was submitted that minor landslides are common occurrences in Wayanad during the monsoon season, and that the project site is situated more than 7 km away from the Pucharimattom landslide hotspot. The Project Proponent further stated that several other quarries operate within the same panchayat in proximity to the landslide-affected area, and that there are no residential structures within a 50-metre radius of the project site.

He further submitted that although the Environmental Clearance (EC) was granted in 2020, the mining lease was executed only in 2022, and quarrying operations commenced in 2023. However, due to public protests and obstruction by the panchayat authorities, the operations could not be continued. It was also informed that multiple criminal cases and Writ Petitions filed by the public, the panchayat, against the Project Proponent are presently pending

before various forums. Following the landslide incident, the functioning of the quarry was halted by the State Disaster Management Authority (SDMA). After hearing the submissions, the Authority directed the Project Proponent to submit a detailed hearing note along with all supporting documents substantiating his claims within seven days. The Authority then resolved to place the matter on the agenda for the next meeting following the receipt of the hearing note.

Item No.158.03 **Re-appraisal of the Environmental Clearance issued to the Granite Building Stone Quarry project of Sri. Haris Charattiadan, M/s Malabar Sand & Stones Pvt. Ltd, for an area of 4.9005 Ha. at Re-Sy No. 1pt, in Udayagiri Village, Taliparamba Taluk, Kannur – Orders dated 6.08.2025 in WA No. 2403/2018, against judgment dated 16.01.2018 in WP(C) 4022/2017 filed by M/s. Malabar Sand and Stones Pvt. Ltd.**
(SIA/KL/MIN/521270/2025)

As intimated by the Authority, the Project Proponents, Sri. Anzar, Sri. Anvar, and Sri. Haris, attended the hearing. The Project Proponents stated that in its 156th meeting, SEIAA, while considering the interim order dated 28.01.2025 in WA No. 2403 of 2018 filed by the Project Proponent, had referred the reappraisal application back to SEAC for reconsideration, taking into account the report of the SDMA. The Project Proponents further informed that they have submitted the reappraisal application in Form 1, which may be considered as a fresh application, and expressed their readiness to furnish any additional documents that may be required during the appraisal process.

The Authority observed that the application, along with the SDMA report, is currently with SEAC for appraisal and further decision. In view of the above, the Authority requested the concerned SEAC to examine the SDMA report and submit its findings to the Government on an urgent basis. Further, SEAC shall appraise the application as a fresh proposal in accordance with the EIA Notification, its subsequent amendments, and relevant Office Memoranda.

Item No.158.04

**Revalidation of Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry project, Sri. P. K. Abdulla Koya, M/s Beta Granites for an area of 4.5466 Ha at Re-Sy No. 266/2 (pt) in Cherukavu Village, Kondotty Taluk, Malappuram – Judgment dated 10.02.2025 in WP(C) No. 31651/2024 filed by M/s Beta Granites – Hearing
Old File No.216/SEIAA/EC1/274/2014
New File No. 2223/EC1/2024/SEIAA**

As intimated by the Authority, the Project Proponent, Sri. Abdulla Koya, along with Sri. Ramesh, the Project Manager, attended the hearing online. During the hearing, the Project Proponent requested revalidation of the Environmental Clearance (EC) without conducting a public hearing. This request was made in reference to Notification No. S.O. 1807(E) dated 12.04.2022 and the stay order in WP(C) No. 33286/2022 passed by the Hon'ble High Court. The Proponent, holding a quarry lease valid until 24.08.2029, contended that a public hearing is not required, citing the MoEFCC Notification permitting extension of mining project ECs for up to 30 years or the project life, whichever is earlier.

Upon deliberation, the Authority observed that, as per the Cluster Certificate dated 26.03.2021, the total area amounts to 19.241 ha, which includes the Proponent's own quarry of 4.54 ha. Further, the Project Proponent has not submitted the revised Scheme of Mining despite repeated directions from SEIAA/SEACs. It was also noted that the Proponent was acting under the provisions of S.O. 1807(E) until the Notification was struck down by the Hon'ble High Court vide judgment dated 26.08.2025.

The Authority noted that it does not have the provision to exempt the Project Proponent from conducting an EIA study and public hearing, nor to extend the EC under the provisions of S.O. 1807(E), as such exemption would contravene existing norms and be ultra vires. In view of the above, the Authority decided to direct the Project Proponent to submit a ToR application for conducting the EIA study. The Authority directed the Project Proponent to refrain from continuing any mining operations, as the validity of the EC has expired and S.O. 1807(E) has been declared unconstitutional by the Hon'ble High Court. The decision of the Authority shall be communicated to the concerned departments for necessary enforcement action.

Item No.158.05 **Rejection Order issued to the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. K.V. Moideenkoya, M/s Kallarattikkal Granites at Block No.22, Sy No. 163, 2/2-2, 2/4-3, 2/4-2, 3/1-2, 2/3, 2/2-3, 2/4-4, 2/4-5 (Block No.27) in Urangattiri Village, Ernad Taluk, Malappuram – Judgment dated 07.11.2024 in WP(C) No. 10825/2023 filed by M/s Kallarattikkal Granites – Hearing**
(File No. 1230/EC2/2019/SEIAA)

As intimated by the Authority, the Project Proponent Sri. Abdul Kalam Kelath and Sri. Muhammad Rashid in person, and the Scientist, Sri. Sreevalsa via online, attended the hearing. The Authority observed that the Hon'ble High Court, vide its judgment dated 07.11.2024 in WP(C) No. 10825/2023, disposed of the petition with a direction to SEAC to reconsider: (i) the influence of rock joints in the stability analysis, and (ii) the adequacy of the DEM used for slope analysis, in the presence of both the Scientist and the Petitioner.

In view of the above, the Authority requested the SEAC to hear the Project Proponent and the Scientist in its next meeting and to take a final decision after duly considering the two aspects specified in the Court order.

Item No.158.06 **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)

As decided in its 157th meeting, the Authority issued a hearing intimation to the Project Proponent via email dated 27.09.2025. The Authority noted that the Hon'ble Court, in its judgment dated 24.01.2025 in WP(C) No. 45668/2024, directed Respondents 2, 4, and 6 to consider Ext.P15 representation after hearing the petitioner within two months of receipt of the judgment. Despite prior intimation, the Project Proponent did not attend the hearing nor communicate any inability to do so. The Authority resolved to provide one final opportunity to the Project Proponent to present their case in the next SEIAA meeting, with a clear intimation that no further opportunity shall be granted thereafter. Further, the Authority decided to inform the Standing Counsel of the Project Proponent's willful absence, which has impeded compliance with the Court's directions.

Item No.158.07

ToR application for the China Clay Project of M/s EICL Limited in Sy Nos. 177, 178, 179, 180, 241, 242, 181/21, 181/10, 182/3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 11, 12, 17, 183, 184, 240/2, 12, 13, 14, 229/14-1 (existing mine lease area of 14.5129 ha) and Sy Nos. 196/7, 10-5, 10, 10-2, 10-3, 245/1, 1-2, 1-3, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 16, 17 (proposed mine lease area of 1.0910 ha) in Veiloor Village, Thiruvananthapuram Taluk – Judgement dated 16.04.2024 in WP(C) No. 11630/2022 and WM No. 111030/2022 filed before the Hon’ble High Court of Madras and judgment dated 27.03.2025 in WP(C) No. 41621/2024 filed before Hon’ble High Court of Kerala - Hearing of PP and Complainants (SIA/KL/MIN/67030/2021; 1926/EC1/2021/SEIAA)

As intimated by the Authority, in compliance with the judgment dated 27.03.2025 in W.P.(C) No. 41621 of 2024, the Project Proponent, Sri. Manoj Pillai, and the Complainants, Sri. Maheswaran, Sri. Krishnan, Sri. Murali, and Sri. Nizamudeen, attended the hearing.

The Complainants submitted that the judgment dated 04.10.2018 in W.A. No. 1761 of 2018 continues to hold the field, and therefore, the judgment of the Hon’ble Single Bench dated 27.03.2025 in W.P.(C) No. 41621 of 2024 does not have overriding legal effect. They further contended that the Division Bench, in the aforesaid Writ Appeal, had specifically observed that the mining operations in the area were conducted without obtaining prior Environmental Clearance (EC), amounting to a violation under the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986, and had directed initiation of prosecution against the concerned officials.

It was further stated that the area proposed in the present EC application includes the previously mined extent of 14.5129 Ha, wherein illegal mining activities were allegedly carried out by M/s. EICL. The Complainants alleged that such activities have caused significant environmental, hydrological, and public health impacts in the surrounding locality, including depletion of groundwater levels and respiratory ailments among residents due to air pollution. Accordingly, they requested that the EC application of M/s. EICL not be considered by the Authority.

The Project Proponent, in response, submitted that a penalty of more than ₹1 crore had already been remitted for the earlier violations, and that the Joint Committee constituted by the Hon’ble National Green Tribunal (NGT) had assessed environmental damage to the tune of ₹12 crore. It was also contended that the present application before SEIAA is maintainable and that the directions of the Hon’ble Supreme Court, setting aside the grant of ex post facto EC and the

Violation SoP, are not applicable to this case. Hence, the Project Proponent requested that the EC application be considered on merits.

The Authority observed that the Hon'ble Supreme Court, in its judgment, has set aside the concept of ex post facto Environmental Clearance and the applicability of the Violation SoP. It was also noted that, instead of an EC application, the Project Proponent had submitted a ToR (Terms of Reference) application, on which the erstwhile SEAC had subsequently withdrawn its earlier recommendation for ToR. The Authority further noted that the area included in the ToR application encompasses the previously violated extent of 14.5129 Ha.

In view of the above, the Authority decided to obtain the hearing notes and supporting documentary evidence from both parties. Upon receipt of the same, a legal opinion from the Standing Counsel shall be sought to determine the further course of action in accordance with law.

Item No.158.08 **Environmental Clearance application for Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. J. Madhusoodhanan for an area of 2.1449 Ha at Block No. 35, Re-Sy Nos. 352/7, 353/1, 353/2, 353/2-1, 353/3, 353/4, 353/8, 353/9, & 354/2 in Nedumangad Village, Nedumangad Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram – Action on Damage Assessment Report (SIA/KL/MIN/401155/2022, 2123/EC1/2022/SEIAA)**

As intimated by the Authority, the Project Proponent, Sri. J. Madhusoodhanan, along with his Consultant, Sri. S. Mamallan, attended the hearing. The Project Proponent accepted the Environmental Damage Assessment Report and agreed to remit an amount of ₹71.52 lakh as assessed. However, vide letter dated 09.10.2025, the Project Proponent requested permission to remit the amount in instalments.

Upon deliberation, the Authority agreed to the request and decided to permit payment of ₹21.52 lakh as the first instalment and the balance amount of ₹50 lakh in four equal instalments. The entire amount shall be remitted to the Environmental Benefit Fund prior to the commencement of mining operations.

Item No.158.09

**Revalidation proceedings issued for the Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. K. Sadanandan in Sy. Nos. 143/2, 143/4, 144/1, 144/2, 144/3, 146/1, 146/2, 146/3, 147/1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10, 148, 149/4, 152/4, 152/5, 152/6, 152/7, 152/8, 152/9, 152/10, 152/11, 152/12, 152/13, 152/14, 152/15 at V-Kottayam Village, Konni Taluk, Pathanamthitta - Judgment dated 05.02.2025 in WP(C) No. 37484/2024 and 33412 of 2024; Order dated 19.06.2025 in WP(C) No. 21398/2025
(File No. 200/SEIAA/EC4/86/2014)**

As intimated by the Authority, the Project Proponent, Sri. K. Sadanandan, along with his Consultant, Sri. Arun Kumar, and RQP, Sri. Jayachandra Panicker, attended the hearing. The Project Proponent stated that he had commenced mining operations pursuant to the interim order of the Hon'ble High Court staying the decision of the 135th SEIAA meeting. He further informed that the area pertaining to the assigned land has been demarcated, and a revised mining plan has been prepared and approved by the Department of Mining and Geology and the same is yet to be submitted to the Authority.

The Authority noted that, as per the interim order dated 19.06.2025 in WP(C) No. 21398 of 2025 filed by Sri. K. Sadanandan, there is a stay of Ext. P9 proceedings (the minutes of the 135th SEIAA meeting) and Ext. P11 (Stop Memo) in its entirety. It was further observed that the existing mining plan was prepared for a total extent of 15.3829 ha, comprising 11.1004 ha of Government land and 4.2825 ha of private land. The mining lease, however, was granted for an extent of 6.0980 ha, of which 4.3980 ha is Government land, and the remaining area constitutes assigned land situated in Survey Nos. 147/3, 147/5, 147/8, and 147/9.

The Authority, in its 149th meeting, directed the Project Proponent to submit the approved revised mining plan with a feasible production plan to continue the mining. However, the revised mining plan has not yet been submitted to the Authority. In the above circumstances, the Authority decided as follows:

1. The Project Proponent shall submit the approved revised mining plan incorporating a feasible production plan.
2. The SEAC shall assess the feasibility of mining operations based on the revised mining plan, taking into consideration the exclusion of assigned land within the project area.

3. The KSPCB shall be intimated to provide the Environmental Damage Assessment Report at the earliest.

By hearing the Project Proponent and taking the above decisions, the Authority has complied with the directions of the Hon'ble High Court dated 05.02.2025 in WP(C) No. 37484 of 2024. However, for the Authority to proceed towards a final decision, the Project Proponent shall submit the revised mining plan. The compliance status shall be intimated to the Standing Counsel for the High Court.

Item No.158.10 **Environmental Clearance issued to the Granite Building Stone Quarry project of Sri. Sabu Kuriakose at Block No. 14, Re-Sy Nos. 357/1, 357/2 & 357/3 in Karimkunnam Village, Thodupuzha Taluk, Idukki - Orders dated 12.08.2025 and 15.09.2025 in WP(C) No. 22797/2025 filed by Sri. Sabu Kuriakose (SIA/KL/MIN/239769/2021, 2062/EC3/2022/SEIAA)**

As intimated by the Authority, in compliance with the directions of the Hon'ble High Court dated 15.09.2025 in WP(C) No. 22797 of 2025, the Project Proponent, Sri. Sabu Kurikose, along with his Advocate, Sri. James Abraham; the Petitioner, Sri. Augustine Thomas; and Advocate Abraham Thomas representing Smt. Mini Varghese, attended the hearing.

The Advocate for the Complainant submitted that the project area is situated only about 40 m from the boundary of his client's property and alleged that the mining activity has led to water scarcity in the locality and poses a risk of landslides due to uncontrolled electronic detonator (ED) blasting. The Complainant, Sri. Augustine Thomas, further stated that fly rocks and stormwater from the project site are entering his property, causing damage to his crops and house. He also contended that the project area falls within an orange zone with a steep slope and that the overburden area lies close to his plot.

In response, the Project Proponent denied all the above allegations and clarified that the project site is located more than 100 metres from the nearest residential buildings and that he owns property beyond the buffer area adjoining the complainants' lands. He further informed that, due to the absence of power supply, electronic detonators are not being used for blasting and that mining operations are being carried out with properly maintained benches, as evidenced by the report of the District Geologist.

After considering the submissions of all parties, and upon deliberation, the Authority decided to entrust the SEAC with the task of conducting a field inspection of the project site, with prior intimation to all concerned parties, and to submit a report with specific recommendations. The Authority further directed the Law Officer to file an interlocutory application (IA) before the Hon'ble High Court, apprising the Court of the action taken pursuant to the interim order.

Item No.158.11 **Environmental Clearance application for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Sukumaran E., M/s. Perattur Rocks N Sands, for an area of 4.6189 Ha at Re - Sy No. 430/1pt116, 430/1pt607, 430/1pt66, 430/1pt841, 430/1pt473, 430/1pt842, 430/1pt701, 430/1pt843 in Thayanoor Village, Vellarikundu Taluk, Kasaragod- Hearing as per the decision of 154th and 157th SEIAA meetings (SIA/KL/MIN/438095/2023, 2033/EC2/2022/SEIAA)**

As intimated by the Authority, the Project Proponent, Sri. E. Sukumaran, along with his Consultant, Sri. Arun Kumar, and RQP, Sri. Jayachandran Panicker, attended the hearing. The Project Proponent informed that he would furnish the necessary documents to substantiate his claim regarding the proposed mineable reserve of 33,16,864 MT from an area of 4.6189 ha.

Accordingly, the Authority decided to refer the proposal back to the SEAC for a clear and specific recommendation to enable the Authority to take a final decision on the EC application. The SEAC shall have the liberty to obtain any additional documents or clarifications required from the Project Proponent for the appraisal. The Project Proponent shall be directed to reassess the mineable reserves, and in the event of any variation, shall submit a revised mining plan to the SEAC for expeditious appraisal and further recommendation.

Item No.158.12

Environmental Clearance issued to the Residential cum Commercial Building and Construction project of Kerala State Housing Board at Sy Nos: 1176/1-2, 1176/2-2 & 2498 in Marine Drive, Ernakulam Village, Kochi Municipal Corporation, Kanayannur Taluk, Ernakulam – Request from the PP to issue Corrigendum by removing the Specific Condition w.r.t the Wildlife Clearance from the SCNBWL.

(SIA/KL/INFRA2/491168/2024)

The Authority deliberated the letter of the Project Proponent dated 19.05.2025, the judgment of the Hon'ble High Court dated 07.08.2025 in WP(C) No. 9795 of 2023, and various other judgments of Hon'ble Courts, including the Apex Court, regarding the requirement of Wildlife Clearance from the SCNBWL. The Project Proponent, vide letter dated 19.09.2025, requested the issuance of a corrigendum to remove Specific Condition No. 1.5 pertaining to Wildlife Clearance from the SCNBWL in the issued Environmental Clearance, in light of the Hon'ble Supreme Court's order dated 29.05.2025.

The Authority noted that the Standing Counsel, in his legal opinion, advised filing an appeal against the Hon'ble High Court's decision to set aside the requirement of Wildlife Clearance from the SCNBWL for projects located within 10 km of the boundary of a Protected Area considering the Apex Court decisions. In view of the above, the Authority decided as follows:

1. The Project Proponent shall submit a certificate from the Wildlife Warden of the respective Protected Area, indicating whether the project area falls within the draft Eco-Sensitive Zone (ESZ) and specifying the distance from the boundary of the Protected Area to the project area.
2. As the matter pertains to wildlife, the legal opinion of the Standing Counsel of SEIAA shall be forwarded to the Chief Conservator of Forests (Wildlife) for clarification on whether the Forest Department intends to file an appeal.

Item No.158.13 **Environmental Clearance issued to the Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Ajikumar N. for an area of 0.6661 Ha at Sy No. 270/3 in Malayalappuzha Village, Konni Taluk, Pathanamthitta – Compliance with OA No. 162/2025 of NGT(SZ) filed by President, Malayalappuzha Grama Panchayat**
SIA/KL/MIN/242348/2021, 1497(A)/EC1/2019/SEIAA

The Authority deliberated on the item and noted the order of the Hon'ble NGT dated 29.08.2025 in O.A. No. 162 of 2025. The Hon'ble NGT directed a physical inspection of the property and the submission of a detailed report on the existence of the road, specifically to determine whether the Project Proponent had withheld this information while securing the Environmental Clearance, after duly issuing notice to both the Applicant and the 4th Respondent (the Project Proponent).

Upon deliberation, the Authority decided to entrust the Environmental Scientist and Environmental Officer (EO1) to visit the site and submit a factual report regarding the existence of the road. The Panchayat shall be given prior notice to be present at the site with proof of ownership of the road. The Village Officer shall be informed well in advance and shall accompany the inspection team, providing a detailed report on the revenue status of the alleged road, along with supporting documents, sketches, and relevant land records.

Item No.158.14 **Revalidation of Environmental Clearance issued by SEIAA for the Granite Building Stone quarry project of Sri. Vinu Mani, Managing Partner, M/s. Paramount Granites for an area of 3.8669ha at Sy. Nos. 223 pt, 223/2, 223/6 pt, 118/14 pt, & 118/15 in Vandazhi - I Village, Alathur Taluk, Palakkad - Request of the PP to either cancel the direction to submit ToR application or to allow to work for one year**
(Old Proposal No. SIA/KL/MIN/308007/2024, 664/SEIAA/EC1/5179/2014)
(Rejected Proposal No. SIA/KL/MIN/482844/2024)
[2195/EC3/2025/SEIAA]

The Authority deliberated on the item and noted the request of the Project Proponent dated 11.09.2025, seeking reconsideration of his revalidation application, either for granting Environmental Clearance without requiring an EIA study and public hearing, or to permit him to continue operations for one year pending the EIA study and public hearing.

Upon deliberation, the Authority observed that there is no provision under the EIA Notification to allow interim relaxation for extending the EC in a cluster situation without conducting an EIA study and public hearing. Accordingly, the Authority decided to direct the Project Proponent to submit a ToR application for conducting the EIA study.

Item No.158.15 **Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Venesh S., M/s Naduthala Construction Pvt Ltd, for an area of 2.0110 Ha in Block No. 66, at Re-Sy Nos. 292/1194, 292/6358, 292/2642, 292/6357, 292/5700, 292/4163, 292/3209, 292/3455, 292/1619, 292/159, 292/3513, 292/1612, 292/747 in New Naduvil Village, Thaliparamba Taluk, Kannur - Request to modify the buffer to 17.5m.**
(SIA/KL/MIN/407136/2022, 2156/EC4/2022/SEIAA)

The Authority deliberated on the item and noted the request of the Project Proponent dated 15.03.2025. The Project Proponent requested that, instead of maintaining a buffer of 57.5m as stipulated in the Environmental Clearance, a reduced buffer of 17.5 m within the proposed project area may be permitted. The Project Proponent also submitted a schematic representation in support of the request.

After consideration, the Authority decided to refer the matter to the SEAC for its remarks and recommendations.

Item No.158.16 **Environmental Clearance 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/INFRA2/431555/2023, 2302/EC4/2023/SEIAA

The Authority deliberated on the matter and noted that the Project Proponent, vide letter dated 06.10.2025, requested an amendment to the Environmental Clearance (EC) already issued for the project. The Authority observed that the request pertains to a change in the name of the firm to M/s Tekton Realty and Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd., revision of the Survey Numbers due to a change in land ownership, and modification of Specific Condition No. 4 to permit the transportation of 33,000 cu. m of excavated earth to an approved external location.

The Authority further noted that the proposed changes are substantial in nature and that the Project Proponent has not submitted an application for EC amendment through the PARIVESH Portal. In view of the above, the Authority decided to direct the Project Proponent to submit an application for amendment of EC (Form 4) through the PARIVESH Portal, along with all necessary supporting documents. As a considerable delay has occurred in the implementation of the project, resulting in financial loss to the Project Proponent, the SEIAA/SEAC shall consider the application on priority basis.

Item No.158.17 **Consideration of the Documents submitted by DCs as per SOP dated 15.12.2023 through SOP**

The Authority perused the item and deferred for detailed discussion in the next meeting.

PARIVESH FILES (Ver-1)

Item No.01

Environmental Clearance application for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Sukumaran E., M/s. Perattur Rocks N Sands, for an area of 4.6189 Ha at Re-Sy No. 430/1pt116, 430/1pt607, 430/1pt66, 430/1pt841, 430/1pt473, 430/1pt842, 430/1pt701, 430/1pt843 in Thayanoor Village, Vellarikundu Taluk, Kasaragod - Hearing as per the decision of 154th and 157th SEIAA meetings (SIA/KL/MIN/438095/2023, 2033/EC2/2022/SEIAA)

Same as that of the decision in Item No. 158.11, as it was considered physically for hearing.

Item No.02

Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Muhammed Ibrahim Palakkan, M/s Rox Silicon Pvt. Ltd., for an area of 4.5070 Ha at Sy No. 1065 & 1065 pt in Melmuri Village, Malappuram Municipality, Ernad Taluk, Malappuram – ADS – Judgment dated 25.09.2025 in WP(C) No.14950/2024 filed by Sri. Muhammed Ibrahim Palakkan – ADS – Final decision on the EC application. (SIA/KL/MIN/46597/2019, 1575/EC3/2019/SEIAA)

Sri. Muhammed Ibrahim Palakkan, M/s. Rox Silicon Pvt. Ltd, 1/276 B, Melmuri – 27, Melmuri P.O, Malappuram submitted an Environmental Clearance application for the Granite Building Stone Quarry project for an area of 4.5070 Ha at Sy. No. 1065 & 1065 pt in Melmuri Village, Malappuram Municipality, Ernad Taluk, Malappuram.

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-2, Pre-Feasibility Report, Mining Plan, Field Inspection Report conducted on 02.06.2023, EIA report, and the additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal. The public hearing of the proposed project was carried out on 23.09.2021. The Project Proponent submitted a revised mining plan by excluding the area that falls under the Medium Hazard Zone, and the mineable reserve is revised as 11,55,816 MT for a mine life of 12 years. After due appraisal, SEAC, in its 172nd meeting, recommended EC for a period of 12 years, subject to the submission of the following documents.

The Authority noticed that, considering the environmental fragility, overall slope and soil thickness of the area with considerable number of quarries in the surroundings, the 150th SEIAA sought a few additional documents including the NOC from the District Level Crisis Management Group and the NOC from the Irrigation Officer. Now, the project proponent submitted the NOC dated 05.11.2024 from the Executive Engineer, Irrigation division (Major), Malappuram with 11 conditions, NOC from the District Level Crisis Management Committee date 21.09.2025 along with other documents and found satisfactory.

In the above circumstances, the Authority accepted the recommendation of the 172nd SEAC and decided to issue Environmental Clearance for the project life of 12 (Twelve) years, subject to the following Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

- 1. The Project Proponent shall carry out quarrying as per the approved Revised Mining Plan dated 10.03.2025 and as per the Specific Conditions mentioned hereafter. The Project Proponent should strictly follow the Kerala Minor Mineral Concession Rules 2015 and amendments thereby.*
- 2. The EC shall be valid from the date of execution of 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. All the assurances and the mitigation measures given by the project proponent as per the minutes of the public hearing should be complied with, and submit the report along with HYCR.*
- 4. All the conditions in the NOC of the Irrigation Department are to be scrupulously followed.*
- 5. A temporary wall of 5m height should be erected at the boundary where houses are located to avoid disturbance and nuisance to the nearby residents.*
- 6. Development of green belt should be initiated prior to the commencement of mining using indigenous species. The suggested species are Phyllanthus emblica (Nelli), Syzygium cumini (Njaval), Writia tinctoria (Dhanthapala), Ficus bengalensis (Peral), Ficus racemosa (Atti), Bambusa bamboos (Mullu mula), Dendrocalamus strictus (Kallan mula), Strychnos nuxvomica (Kanjiram), Terminalia cattappa (Thanni),*

Schleichera oleosa (Poovam), Artocarpus hirsutus (Ayiniplavu) etc.

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

18. *Transportation of mined material should not be done during the peak hours in the forenoon (8.00am to 10.00am) and afternoon (3.30pm to 5.00 pm).*
19. *Adequate sanitation, waste management and restroom facilities should be provided to the workers.*
20. *Adequate energy conservation measures should be implemented including solar power installations. At least 40% of the energy requirement shall be met from the solar power.*
21. *The Environment Management Cell (EMC) should include one subject expert in environment management. The proceedings of the monthly meeting of the EMC should be submitted along with the HYCR.*
22. *Adequate measures should be adopted to harvest the rainwater as per the guidelines issued by the Central Groundwater Authority.*
23. *Blasting mats should be used during rock blasting to contain the blast, prevent fly rocks and suppress dust.*
24. *In the wake of occurrence of large scale landslides in the state, as per the information provided by the Department of Mining & Geology, it is directed to use only NONEL (Non Electrical) technology for blasting to reduce the vibration of the ground, which is one of the causative factors that triggers landslides, formation of cracks in the surrounding buildings and disturbance to human and wildlife.*
25. *As per OM no F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30th September 2020, under Corporate Environmental Responsibility (CER) the Project Proponent should implement the Environment Management Plan (EMP)/CER as directed by SEAC during appraisal, covering the issues to address the environmental problems in the project region, from the beginning of the project, indicating both physical and financial targets year wise. The EMP/CER shall be implemented in consultation with Local Self Govt. Institutions. A copy of the approved EMP/CER shall be made available to the concerned Panchayat for information and implementation support. The indicated cost for implementation of CER activities shall be 2% of the project cost.*
26. *As per the directions contained in the OM F.No.22-34/2018-IA.III dated 16th January 2020 issued by MoEF&CC, in obedience to the directions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court the Project Proponent shall, undertake re-grassing the mining area and any other area*

which may have been disturbed due to his mining activities and restore the land to a condition which is fit for growth of fodder, flora, fauna etc. The compliance of this direction shall be included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report which will be monitored by SEAC at regular intervals.

- 27. The Project Proponent is directed to install a CCTV camera and take all other essential measures to ensure that mining site is not used by antisocial elements for nefarious antisocial activities which are detrimental for peaceful coexistence in the project region. In case if such complaints are received, the EC given is likely to be cancelled after a police verification.*
- 28. The violation of EC condition may lead to cancellation of EC and penal action under The Environment (Protection) Act 1986.*

PARIVESH FILES (Ver-2)

Item No.01 **Environmental Clearance for the Building and Construction project, M/s Oceanus Emerald Enclave of Sri. Thomas P. K. in an area of 0.4564 Ha at Sy Nos: 242/17, 244/2, 244/3, 244/4, 244/5, 244/6, 244/8, 244/8-1, 244/9, 250/1, 250/2-1, 250/2-2 in Attipra Village, Thiruvananthapuram Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram. (SIA/KL/INFRA2/469908/2024)**

Sri. Thomas P. K, Power of Attorney Holder & Authorized Signatory, Oceanus Dwellings Pvt. Ltd., Blue Square Building, TC-9/2956 -2 LNCP road, Karyavattom- PO Thiruvananthapuram- 695581 submitted an Environmental Clearance application for Proposed Residential Building Project of ‘Oceanus Emerald Enclave’ in an area of 0.4564 Ha at Sy No. 242/17, 244/2, 244/3, 244/4, 244/5, 244/6, 244/8, 244/8-1, 244/9, 250/1, 250/2-1, 250/2-2 in Attipra Village, Thiruvananthapuram Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram.

The Authority reviewed the item and observed the decision of various SEAC meetings held on different dates. The SEAC had apprised the project based on the Form-1, Field Inspection report, and additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal. The 168th SEAC meeting heard the presentation, and the field inspection was conducted on 21.09.2024. As per Form-1, the total built-up area is given as 26,116.47 m² with a plot area of 4,564 m². After due appraisal, the SEAC, in its 177th meeting, recommended EC for 10 years, subject to the following specific conditions in addition to the general conditions.

The 153rd SEIAA sought some additional clarifications regarding the elevation and lithology of the project area and plan for planting trees as per the Appendix XIV of EIA Notification 2006 (SO 3099 (E) dated 09.12.2016), etc. Now the Project Proponent submitted all documents sought by the Authority on 02.03.2025 and found satisfactory.

In the above circumstances, the Authority accepted the recommendation of the 177th SEAC and decided to issue Environmental Clearance for the construction of Residential Building Project for 10 (Ten) years (as per O.M. dated 13.12.2022), 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 proposed 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 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.*

Item No.02

Reappraisal of Environmental Clearance issued by DEIAA, Palakkad, for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Sajeew Mathew, Managing Director, M/s. Oriental Rock Products Pvt. Ltd, for a lease area of 4.9532 Ha at Sy Nos. 96/1 in Thirumittakode II Village , 532/3 in Nagalassery Village, Pattambi Taluk, Palakkad - the Certificate from the M&G Department. (SIA/KL/MIN/509190/2024).

The Authority deliberated on the matter and took note of the letter dated 21.05.2025 from the District Geologist, Palakkad, the complaint dated 25.03.2025 submitted by the National Social Justice and Environment Forum, and the No Objection Certificate (NOC) dated 26.03.2025 issued by the Irrigation Officer, Palakkad, which were furnished by the Project Proponent.

It was noted that the State Expert Appraisal Committee (SEAC), in its 180th meeting, had recommended the grant of Environmental Clearance (EC) for a period of ten (10) years based on the revised mining plan dated 23.08.2023. However, the District Geologist, in his above-mentioned communication, has intimated that as per the modified mining plan, the total life of the mine is nine (9) years, with a total mineable reserve of 25,43,085 MT, of which the maximum annual production is 3,55,736 MT (in the 3rd year), the minimum is 57,966 MT (in the 9th year), and for the remaining years, the production is proposed at 3,11,257 MT, with an average annual production of approximately 2,82,565 MT. The currently available resource as on 21.05.2025 has been reported as 22,19,026 MT.

The National Social Justice and Environment Forum, in its complaint, alleged that the Project Proponent had carried out mining operations beyond the permitted area and without maintaining adequate benches, thereby violating the provisions of the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986, the Kerala Minor Mineral Concession (KMMC) Rules, 2015, and other applicable regulations. The complainant further requested that the Environmental Clearance issued to the Project Proponent be cancelled. Upon verification of the Google Earth imagery, the Authority observed that there appears to be some prima facie merit in the allegations raised in the complaint.

In light of the above, the Authority decided to refer the proposal back to SEAC for a fresh appraisal and recommendation, after conducting a field inspection to ascertain the veracity of the allegations raised in the complaint and to re-examine the proposal in light of the mineable resources and the project life as per the revised mining plan.

Any other Items for Consideration:

The Authority, on detailed deliberation, decided the following:

1. A Stop Memo shall be issued to the Project Proponent on the date of the decision itself, initially through email and subsequently by Registered Post, with copies marked to all concerned authorities for necessary action. Copies of the Stop Memo shall be forwarded to the following authorities for necessary enforcement action:
 - a) The Station House Officer (SHO) of the concerned Police Station, to ensure immediate cessation of blasting and use of explosives.
 - b) The District Geologist, Department of Mining and Geology, to suspend the issuance of transit passes for the project.
 - c) The Kerala State Pollution Control Board (KSPCB), to suspend the Consent to Operate (CTO) granted to the project.
2. The SEIAA Secretariat shall make necessary arrangements to book train or air tickets for the Chairpersons and Members of SEAC and SEIAA well in advance, and shall also ensure provision of all logistical support required for their official

engagements, including hiring vehicles for travel, accommodation, and local conveyance, as required.

3. The SEIAA Secretariat shall initiate necessary procedures to notify and empanel qualified service providers for conducting drone surveys, in compliance with applicable Government guidelines and procurement procedures. The empanelment shall ensure that the service providers possess the requisite DGCA approvals and technical competence for undertaking aerial mapping and environmental monitoring activities.
4. The Authority decided to convene periodic meetings with Consultants, Recognised Qualified Persons (RQPs), and Project Proponents at regular intervals to streamline the appraisal procedures and expedite the disposal of applications, while ensuring compliance with applicable environmental laws and regulatory guidelines.
5. No Counter Affidavit shall be filed before the Hon'ble High Court or the Hon'ble National Green Tribunal (NGT) without obtaining prior approval of the Secretary or the Chairman, SEIAA.

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

Sd/-
Sri. Raveendran T.
Expert Member

Sd/-
Sri. Seeram Sambasiva Rao IAS
Member Secretary