

**MINUTES OF THE 163<sup>rd</sup> MEETING OF THE STATE LEVEL ENVIRONMENT  
IMPACT ASSESSMENT AUTHORITY (SEIAA) KERALA, HELD ON 12<sup>th</sup> & 13<sup>th</sup>  
MARCH, 2026 (HYBRID MODE)**

**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 163<sup>rd</sup> meeting of the State Environment Impact Assessment Authority (SEIAA), Kerala, was convened on 12<sup>th</sup> & 13<sup>th</sup> March, 2026 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 163<sup>rd</sup> meeting and adopted the following decisions:

**PHYSICAL FILES**

**Item No.163.01**                      **Minutes of the 162<sup>nd</sup> SEIAA meeting held on 07<sup>th</sup> February, 2026 was placed for Information.**

Noted and confirmed the Minutes.

**Item No.163.02**                      **Environmental Clearance issued to the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. T.O Johnson, Director, M/s Vysali Resorts Pvt Ltd for an area of 0.7540 Ha at Block No. 10, Re-Sy Nos. 509/11, 509/11-2, 509/12 in Vengoor West Village, Kunnathunad Taluk, Ernakulam – Reply to the Show Cause Notice issued – Hearing.**  
**(File No.2270/EC3/2023/SEIAA)**

The Authority considered the matter relating to the Environmental Clearance issued to the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. T.O. Johnson, Director, M/s Vysali Resorts

Pvt. Ltd., along with the reply furnished by the Project Proponent to the Show Cause Notice issued by the Authority.

As intimated by the Authority, the Project Proponent Sri. T.O. Johnson, Director, M/s Vysali Resorts Pvt. Ltd., was present and heard. The Project Proponent was heard in detail, and the documents and submissions placed on record were perused.

The Authority, after detailed deliberations, observed that there were instances of illegal extraction of minerals, including mining from the buffer zone and outside the permitted area. It was noted that the quarrying permit was executed on 01.07.2024 and, accordingly, the EC is valid up to 30.06.2026. The Authority further observed as per the report of the District Geologist, the Project Proponent extracted 141,873.635 MT of material within the permit area; 34,006.013 MT of material from buffer area; 4,169.120 MT of material from outside permit area and 10,928.610 MT of topsoil and overburden were removed from mined-out area. Accordingly, the total quantity of Granite Building Stone (GBS) extracted amounts to 166,388.005 MT.

It was also noted that the Mining & Geology Department had issued permit for a production of 125,000 MT, whereas the Project Proponent has exceeded the permitted quantity. The Project Proponent has remitted an amount of ₹1,05,28,629/- towards penalty for excess mining.

The Authority also observed that the Project Proponent had revised the Mining Plan on 07.03.2024 in accordance with Specific Condition No. 3 of the EC; however, the same was not intimated to the Authority, which is in violation of the provisions of the EIA Notification, 2006. As per the modified Mining Plan, the mineable reserve is 202,428 MT.

In view of the above violations, including excess extraction, mining in buffer and outside permit area, and non-compliance with procedural requirements, **the Authority decided to entrust the SEAC to verify the violations and assess the environmental damage caused due to such violations and submit a detailed report to the Authority for further action.**

**Item No.163.03      **Revalidation of Environmental Clearance issued by DEIAA, Kozhikode, for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. T.P. Linej for an area of 1.6285 Ha at Sy Nos. 2416 & 2417 (Un Survey - Not Final) in Koodaranji Village, Thamarassery Taluk, Kozhikode - Order dated 27.03.2025 in WP(C ) No. 12829/2025 – Hearing**  
**(SIA/KL/MIN/497295/2024)****

The Authority considered the matter relating to the revalidation of Environmental Clearance issued by DEIAA, Kozhikode, in the light of the reply submitted by the Project Proponent to the Show Cause Notice and the directions of the Hon'ble High Court. As intimated by the Authority, the Project Proponent, Sri. T. P. Linej and his Consultants were present and heard. The Project Proponent was heard in detail, and the submissions made, both verbal and written, were duly examined.

The Authority took note of the preliminary objection raised by the Project Proponent that the Show Cause Notice is *ab initio void and nonest in the eye of law*, on the ground that the Administrator issued the same on behalf of the Member Secretary, SEIAA, after the expiry of SEIAA, Kerala. Upon detailed consideration, the Authority held that the said contention is devoid of legal merit and unsustainable, for the reason that the competent Authority, i.e., SEIAA, had already taken a conscious decision to initiate Show Cause proceedings before the expiry of its tenure. The subsequent issuance of the notice by the Administrator/Member Secretary is only a ministerial and procedural act carried out in furtherance of the said decision.

During the course of the hearing, the Project Proponent admitted that an amount of ₹1.8 crore has been remitted towards the penalty imposed by the Mining & Geology Department for illegal/over extraction of 138,489.21 MT of mineral. It was further admitted that extraction of 19,373.85 MT from the buffer zone and 3,535.23 MT from outside the lease area had taken place. The Authority observed that the said acts constitute clear violations of the EC conditions, approved Mining Plan, and applicable statutory provisions, attracting action under the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986 and the EIA Notification, 2006.

The Authority further noted that, as of the date, there is no application pending before SEIAA in the PARIVESH portal, and that applications which have already been rejected cannot be retrieved or processed further within the existing framework of the portal.

In the above factual and legal circumstances, and without prejudice to the ongoing Show Cause proceedings, **the Authority resolved as follows:**

- 1. As the Project Proponent has violated the conditions of the Environmental Clearance, the EC issued by DEIAA is hereby cancelled with immediate effect.**
- 2. The Kerala State Pollution Control Board (KSPCB) and the Mining & Geology Department shall be intimated to immediately stop all mining activities at the project site in view of the cancellation of the Environmental Clearance.**
- 3. The Project Proponent shall assess the environmental damage caused due to the violation of EC conditions through a NABET-accredited EIA Consultant/Agency, quantifying the extent of environmental degradation and proposing appropriate remediation and mitigation measures.**
- 4. Upon receipt of the damage assessment report, the SEAC shall evaluate the violations, the extent of environmental damage, and the proposed remedial measures, and shall make its recommendations to SEIAA.**
- 5. Upon completion of the above procedures, the Project Proponent shall submit a fresh application for revalidation/reappraisal of the EC issued by DEIAA through the PARIVESH portal, in accordance with the prevailing statutory framework and applicable Office Memoranda.**

**Item No.163.04**      **Reappraisal of Environmental Clearance issued by 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 in Koodaranji Village, Koodaranji Panchayat, Thamarassery Taluk, Kozhikode - Judgment dated 05.11.2024 in WP(C) No. 33674/2024 & Interim order dated 26.11.2024 in WP(C) No.41663/2024 & Interim order dated 24.03.2025 in WP(C) No. 11213/2025 - Hearing (SIA/KL/MIN/510005/2025)**

The Authority considered the reappraisal of Environmental Clearance issued from DEIAA, Kozhikode, in compliance with the directions of the Hon'ble High Court and the subsequent proceedings. The Authority noted that the matter was listed for hearing. However, the Project Proponent, vide email dated 10.03.2026, requested the adjournment of the hearing citing the demise of his father. Considering the request and the circumstances stated therein, **the Authority decided to defer the hearing to the next meeting. The SEIAA Secretariat shall issue necessary intimation to the Project Proponent regarding the rescheduled hearing date.**

**Item No.163.05**      **Environment Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry project of Sri. Antony S. Alukkal, M/s Minering Aggregates Pvt Ltd, for an area of 4.7998 Ha at Re-Sy Block No: 01, Re-Sy Nos: 23/1 pt427, 23/1 pt426, 23/1 pt424 & 23/1 pt375, in Kolathur Village, Kasaragod Taluk, Kasaragod - NGT Order in Appeal No. 60 of 2024 (SZ) dated 25.02.2026 (SIA/KL/MIN/277481/2022, 2118/EC2/2022/SEIAA)**

The Authority considered the matter regarding the Environmental Clearance application for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Antony S. Alukkal, M/s Minering Aggregates Private Limited, in compliance with the directions of the Hon'ble National Green Tribunal in Appeal No. 60 of 2024 (SZ) dated 27.02.2026.

As invited by the Authority, Sri. Sany Antony, son of the Project Proponent, attended the hearing and presented the case. The Authority examined the submissions made during the hearing along with the documents placed on record.

The Authority noted that the Project Proponent has submitted a detailed hearing note, addressing various technical and environmental aspects, including scientific slope stability

and soil piping analysis, water management measures, and ecological safeguards proposed for the project. Upon consideration of the submissions and in view of the directions of the Hon'ble Tribunal, the Authority was of the view that the matter requires a detailed technical appraisal.

In the above circumstances, **the Authority decided to refer the proposal to the SEAC for detailed appraisal. The SEAC is also directed to afford an opportunity of hearing to the Project Proponent for any further clarifications, if required, before making its recommendation to the Authority in accordance with law. The SEAC shall also have the liberty to call for any additional or more detailed studies/reports, if found necessary during the appraisal process.**

**Item No.163.06 Environmental Clearance issued to Sri. Nitheesh Babu B.S for an area of 1.3552 Ha at Block No. 29, Re-Sy Nos. 119/1, 119/2, 120/1, 120/2, 120/3, 120/11, 120/12 in Manickal Village, Nedumangad Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram, Kerala – Order dated 12.02.2026 in WP (C) No. 10381/2024 filed by Manickal Grama Panchayath and Others – Hearing (2638/EC3/2024/SEIAA)**

The Authority considered the matter regarding the Environmental Clearance issued to Sri. Nitheesh Babu B.S., in compliance with the directions of the Hon'ble High Court in WP (C) No. 10381/2024. The matter was taken up for hearing as directed by the Hon'ble High Court vide order dated 12.02.2026.

As intimated by the Authority, Sri. Nitheesh Babu B.S., Project Proponent was present for the hearing. On behalf of the Manickal Grama Panchayat, Adv. Anil, Vice President (representing the Panchayat President) and Sri. Suresh Kumar, Assistant Secretary, were also present.

During the hearing, the representatives of the Panchayat raised the following main allegations:

- The quarry operated by the Project Proponent and another project (reported to be of M/s Adani) are functioning in close proximity, resulting in a cluster situation;

- The statutory buffer distance is not being maintained, and in certain locations it is alleged to be less than 10 meters;
- The quarry is stated to be located in assigned (patta) land, which was originally allotted for specific purposes, raising concerns regarding the permissibility of mining activities in such land.

In response, the Project Proponent submitted that the land was purchased through valid transactions, and that he was not aware of the assigned nature/status of the land at the time of purchase. The Project Proponent further stated that the project is being operated in compliance with all statutory requirements and conditions stipulated in the Environmental Clearance.

The Authority, after hearing both parties and considering the submissions, observed that the issues raised require factual verification by the competent authorities. In these circumstances, the Authority decided as follows:

- 1. The averments and submissions made by the Panchayat shall be furnished to the Project Proponent for submitting a detailed remarks.**
- 2. The Tahsildar concerned shall be directed to verify and report on the status and nature of the land, particularly with respect to its classification as assigned land and the permissibility of quarrying activities therein.**
- 3. The SEAC shall conduct a site inspection to verify the cluster situation, inter-se distance between quarries, compliance with buffer distance requirements, and overall compliance with EC conditions, and submit a report to the Authority.**
- 4. The compliance with the directions of the Hon'ble High Court shall be intimated to the Standing Counsel.**

**The matter will be considered further upon receipt of the above reports and clarifications.**

**Item No.163.07      Representation of Quarry EC Holders’ Association on reappraisal of DEIAA issued ECs – Concerns on the decision of 162<sup>nd</sup> SEIAA meeting – Request for Hearing**

As intimated by the Authority, Sri. U. Saeed (Working President), Sri. Sainudheen Pathiripala (General Secretary), Sri. Akkavila Satheek (Vice President), Sri. Jaijal K. Tom (Secretary) and Sri. Bibin Thomas (Head – Technical Cell) attended the hearing on behalf of the Quarry EC Holders’ Association.

The representation dated 04.03.2026 submitted by the Association regarding the decision taken in the 162<sup>nd</sup> SEIAA meeting on the reappraisal of ECs issued by the erstwhile DEIAAs was examined in detail with reference to the EIA Notification, 2006, Notification S.O.1807(E) dated 12.04.2022, relevant Office Memoranda of MoEF&CC, the SoP dated 15.01.2024, earlier decisions of SEIAA, and applicable judicial pronouncements.

The principal issues raised by the Association included: (i) interpretation of the O.M. dated 28.04.2023, particularly regarding the validity of ECs and the applicability of “life of mine”; (ii) processing of reappraisal applications through Form-2 vis-à-vis Form-1; (iii) requirement of documents such as CCR, cluster certificate and ToR; and (iv) reconsideration of applications rejected in earlier meetings.

The Authority observed that the O.M. dated 28.04.2023 explicitly refers to “*valid ECs*”, and the SOP dated 15.01.2024 mandates that the SEIAA shall first verify the validity of the EC based on the EC document uploaded in PARIVESH by the District Collectors, before initiating reappraisal. Thus, only subsisting ECs are eligible for reappraisal, and this interpretation is consistent with the regulatory framework.

It was further observed that, as per the SOP, the Member Secretary, SEIAA, is required to record the validity of the EC in the PARIVESH portal, based on the EC document. In all cases, DEIAA-issued ECs specify a validity period of five years, and the approved mining plan or related documents are not uploaded in the PARIVESH Portal at the initial stage to independently determine the life of the mine by the MS, SEIAA. This has created practical difficulties in processing reappraisal applications. In addition, it is also understood that a few details, such as, location of the project, contact details including the phone number and email, etc., are prerequisites in the PARIVESH Portal to generate the intimation number, which are lacking with SEIAA.

The Authority also noted that the erstwhile SEIAA, in its 127<sup>th</sup> meeting, had decided that the provisions of Notification S.O.1807(E) shall not be applicable to DEIAA-issued ECs prior to reappraisal, as such ECs are required to undergo reappraisal under the O.M. dated 28.04.2023. However, upon completion of reappraisal and issuance of fresh ECs by SEIAA, the provisions of S.O.1807 (E) are being applied, and ECs are now being issued for the project life as per the approved mining plan, subject to appraisal.

The Authority further noted that in several cases, mining plans have been revised after issuance of the original EC, resulting in variation in mine life, production capacity and reserve estimation, and therefore, the original mine life cannot be adopted without verification.

The Authority also noted that by considering the life of the mine, the Ministry had issued intimation numbers for certain proposals during June and July 2025, during the period when SEIAA was not reconstituted in the State.

Upon deliberations, considering the practical difficulties faced by Project Proponents and to facilitate the reappraisal process, the Authority decided that, on a provisional basis, the life of mine as per the original mining plan may be considered as the validity of the EC, subject to verification during detailed appraisal.

The representatives of the Association agreed to collect and furnish all necessary details and documents, including mining plan details, reserve position and other relevant information, to enable proper appraisal.

In the above circumstances, the Authority decided as follows:

1. **Submission of Required Details:** The Project Proponents shall furnish all necessary details, including contact details, a copy of the approved mining plan, and other supporting documents, to the SEIAA Secretariat at the earliest to generate the intimation number.
2. **Reconsideration of Rejected Proposals:** In view of judicial directions, Project Proponents whose applications were previously rejected may submit fresh reappraisal applications along with all mandatory documents. However, incomplete applications shall not be entertained.

3. **Violation Cases / Excess Mining:** In cases involving excess mining, mining beyond permitted limits, or extraction from buffer/outside lease area, the Project Proponent shall submit a reappraisal application with a Damage Assessment Report prepared by a NABET-accredited agency for consideration.
4. **Transfer of Lease Cases:** In cases where the lease has been transferred without the transfer of EC, the reappraisal application shall be submitted by the original EC holder. Upon completion of reappraisal and issuance of a fresh EC, the same may be transferred to the new lease holder, subject to submission of valid documents. Otherwise, such cases shall be treated as fresh proposals.
5. **Cluster Conditions and EIA Requirement:** The Authority decided to follow the existing statutory framework for cluster situations. As per the OM dated 28.04.2023, submission of a cluster certificate is mandatory, and where cluster conditions are attracted, the Project Proponent shall obtain Terms of Reference (ToR) and conduct an EIA study and public consultation in accordance with the EIA Notification, 2006.

**Item No.163.08      Environmental Clearance issued to the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. K. P. Muhammed Basheer for an area of 0.7874 Ha at Survey No. 276/1 in Oorakam Village, Thirurangadi Taluk, Malappuram – Complaint filed by Sri. Velayudhan Athippara – Joint Field Inspection Report Received (1068/EC1/2025/SEIAA)**

The Authority considered the matter regarding the Environmental Clearance issued to the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. K.P. Muhammed Basheer and the Joint Field Inspection Report submitted by the Committee comprising officials of KSPCB, Mining & Geology Department, and SEIAA/SEAC representative, based on the complaints received.

The Authority examined the findings of the Joint Field Inspection Report in detail and also verified the video footage of the quarry site submitted by the inspection team. The Authority noted several serious violations, including deviation from the approved mining plan, illegal mining in the buffer zone, absence of environmental safeguards, unscientific mining practices, and lack of compliance with Environmental Clearance conditions.

The Authority also noticed that the field inspection report recommended immediate suspension of mining operations and the termination of EC; assessment of illegal mining and over extraction; environmental compensation and damage assessment; and penal action. The Authority observed that the violations are of a serious nature, causing environmental degradation and warranting immediate regulatory intervention.

In view of the above, **the Authority decided as follows:**

- 1. To suspend the Environmental Clearance issued to the project with immediate effect.**
- 2. To issue a Show Cause Notice to the Project Proponent as to why the Environmental Clearance should not be cancelled, for the violations of EC conditions, illegal mining, and non-compliance with statutory requirements.**
- 3. To intimate the Kerala State Pollution Control Board (KSPCB) and the Mining & Geology Department to immediately stop all mining activities in the project site, in view of the suspension of the Environmental Clearance.**

**The matter will be considered further based on the reply to the Show Cause Notice and subsequent proceedings.**

**Item No.163.09 Environmental Clearance issued to the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Sebastian K. J for an area of 0.8758 Ha at Survey No. 56/1 (p) in Oorakam Village, Thirurangadi Taluk, Malappuram – Complaint filed by Ooragam Mala Samrakshana Samithi – Joint Field Inspection Report Received  
(File No. 1099/EC1/2025/SEIAA)**

The Authority considered the matter regarding the Environmental Clearance issued to the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Sebastian K. J and the Joint Field Inspection Report submitted by the Committee comprising officials of KSPCB, Mining & Geology Department, and SEIAA/SEAC representative, based on the complaints received.

The Authority examined the findings of the Joint Field Inspection Report in detail and also verified the video footage of the quarry site submitted by the inspection team. The Authority noted serious violations, including illegal mining outside the permitted area and

within the buffer zone, non-compliance with the approved mining plan, absence of environmental safeguards, improper overburden management, and unscientific mining practices.

The Authority also noticed that the field inspection report recommended immediate suspension of mining operations and the termination of EC; assessment of illegal mining and over extraction; environmental compensation and damage assessment; and penal action. The Authority observed that the violations are grave in nature, leading to environmental degradation and posing potential risks to the surrounding area, thereby necessitating immediate regulatory action.

In view of the above, **the Authority decided as follows:**

- 1. To suspend the Environmental Clearance issued to the project with immediate effect.**
- 2. To issue a Show Cause Notice to the Project Proponent as to why the Environmental Clearance should not be cancelled, for the violations of EC conditions, illegal mining, and non-compliance with statutory requirements.**
- 3. To intimate the Kerala State Pollution Control Board (KSPCB) and the Mining & Geology Department to immediately stop all mining activities in the project site, in view of the suspension of the Environmental Clearance.**

**The matter will be considered further based on the reply to the Show Cause Notice and subsequent proceedings.**

**Item No.163.10 Environmental Clearance issued to Sri. Abdul Majeed P., Managing Partner & Authorized Signatory, M/s. Manjeri Blue Metals for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project, for an area of 0.4988 Ha at Survey Nos. 310/14, 311/2 in Kavanur Village, Ernad Taluk, Malappuram – Complaint filed by Kongamala Samrakshana Samithi – *Joint Field Inspection Received.*  
(1924/EC6/2021/SEIAA)**

The Authority considered the matter regarding the Environmental Clearance issued to the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Abdul Majeed P., Managing Partner &

Authorized Signatory, M/s Manjeri Blue Metals, the Joint Field Inspection Report submitted by the Committee comprising officials of KSPCB, Mining & Geology Department, and SEIAA/SEAC representative, based on the complaints received, and the WP(C) No. 17850 of 2025 filed by Sri. Veerankutty and ors.

The Authority examined the Joint Field Inspection Report in detail, including the observations of the SEIAA representative, findings of the Mining & Geology Department, and the Kerala State Pollution Control Board. The Authority also took note of the complaints received regarding alleged environmental damage, safety concerns, and landslide vulnerability in the project area.

The Authority observed that the issues highlighted in the Field Inspection Report, particularly the need for slope assessment, reworking of OB dump and storm water drainage plan, and vibration study, require detailed technical verification and scientific evaluation. In view of the above, **the Authority decided to refer the matter to the SEAC for detailed verification of the concerns raised in the Joint Field Inspection Report, including examination of ground realities, compliance status, and technical aspects involved, and to conduct a site inspection, if required, and submit its report/recommendation to the Authority.**

**Further, the action taken report along with the Field Inspection Report (FIR) shall be furnished to the Standing Counsel in connection with the Writ Petition pending before the Hon'ble High Court.**

**The matter will be considered further upon receipt of the report from SEAC.**

**Item No.163.11 Environmental Clearance issued to Sri. Sreejith S. S., Managing Partner, M/s. VSC Villaments for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project for an area of 2.700 Ha at Block No. 47, Re-Sy Nos. 319/7, 318/13, 322/5, 320/1-1, 320/4-2, 320/1-3, 320/1-4, 320/1-6 in Aryanad Village, Nedumangad Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram – Judgment dated 10.02.2026 in WP (C) No. 42600/2025 filed by M/s. VSC Villaments (2261/EC1/2023/SEIAA)**

The Authority considered the matter regarding the Environmental Clearance issued to Sri. Sreejith S.S., Managing Partner, M/s VSC Villaments, in compliance with the directions of the Hon'ble High Court in WP (C) No. 42600 of 2025.

The Authority noted that the Hon'ble High Court, vide judgment dated 10.02.2026 in WP (C) No. 42600 of 2025, has directed the Project Proponent to produce the study conducted by NIT, Surathkal before SEIAA, and further directed SEIAA to consider the impact of the said study on Condition No. 4 of the Environmental Clearance and pass appropriate orders in accordance with law within the stipulated time.

The Authority further observed that, as per the directions of the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in WP(C) No. 30737 of 2022 and 4655 of 2024 dated 19.04.2024, read with the circular dated 19.11.2024 issued by the Chief Engineer, Irrigation Department, the Project Proponent is required to obtain No Objection Certificate (NOC) from the Irrigation Officer of the Irrigation Department, in compliance with Section 40(2) of the Kerala Irrigation and Water Conservation Act, 2003. It was also noted that the affidavit earlier submitted by the Project Proponent from the Kerala Water Authority (KWA) has expired and is no longer valid.

In view of the above, **the Authority decided the following:**

- 1. The Specific Condition No. 4 as specified in the original EC is modified as “A buffer distance of 100m should be maintained between the overhead water tank and the project boundary, and the mineable resources shall be reworked, if necessary, by the Mining and Geology Department while approving the Scheme of Mining / issuing the lease or permit”.**

2. **The Project Proponent shall obtain a fresh No Objection Certificate (NOC) from the Irrigation Officer, in compliance with the statutory provisions and the directions of the Hon'ble High Court.**
3. **The District Geologist is hereby directed to ensure strict compliance with the above condition before permitting any mining activity.**

**The SEIAA Secretariat shall issue necessary addendum to the above extent.**

**Item No.163.12 Environmental Clearance issued to the Building Stone Quarry project of Sri. Rajeevan Nambiar, Managing Director, M/s Kokkallur Granite Pvt Ltd, for an area of 2.9150 Ha at Re-Sy Block No. 1, Re-Sy No. 49/1B, 85, 86 in Balussery Village, Koyilandy Taluk, Kozhikode - Interim order dated 03.12.2024 in WP(C) No. 37162/2024 - Complaint received (1262/EC1/2019/SEIAA)**

The Authority considered the matter regarding the Environmental Clearance issued to the Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Rajeevan Nambiar, Managing Director, M/s Kokkallur Granite Private Limited, along with the Field Inspection Report submitted by the SEAC Sub-Committee and the complaints vide letter dated 20.01.2025 received from Janakiya Samrakshana Samithi.

The Authority noted the sequence of actions taken in the matter, including the complaints received alleging illegal mining and environmental violations, the directions issued in earlier SEIAA meetings, and the subsequent field inspection conducted by the SEAC Sub-Committee on 07.11.2025. The Authority also noted that the Mining & Geology Department had imposed a penalty of Rs. 1,22,10,321/- for over extraction, which has been remitted by the Project Proponent. As per the report, the total quantity excavated comprises 119,554.6 m<sup>3</sup> from the mining area, 3,901.12 m<sup>3</sup> from the buffer zone, and 1,070.44 m<sup>3</sup> from outside the lease area.

The Authority observed that partial compliance with Environmental Clearance conditions and approved mining plan; inadequate implementation of environmental safeguards such as garland drains, silt traps, and overburden management; deficiencies in bench formation and operational practices; incomplete compliance with green belt

development, CER activities, and other stipulated conditions; issues relating to approach road width and overall environmental management measures.

The Authority also took note of the recommendations of the Field Inspection Report, which inter alia include:

- To direct the Project Proponent to comply with all non-compliances related to the specific and general conditions within a stipulated time and submit a detailed compliance report with supporting evidence;
- To direct the Project Proponent to submit an Environmental Damage Assessment Report, along with mitigation measures for the violations of EC conditions, prepared by a NABET-accredited EIA consultant.

In view of the above, **the Authority decided as follows:**

- 1. To issue a Show Cause Notice to the Project Proponent seeking clarification on the violations and deficiencies observed in the Field Inspection Report, and the Project Proponent shall submit the reply within 15 days from the date of receipt of the notice.**
- 2. To direct the Project Proponent to comply with all the observations and recommendations of the Field Inspection Report, including submission of the Environmental Damage Assessment Report prepared by a NABET-accredited consultant and compliance status report within a period of 6 months, along with documentary evidence. A copy of the Field Inspection Report (FIR) shall be provided to the Project Proponent for necessary action and compliance.**

**The matter will be considered further based on the reply to the Show Cause Notice and the compliance report submitted by the Project Proponent.**

**Item No.163.13**

**Environmental Clearance issued to the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Anshad. E.P., Managing Partner, M/s Seas Rock Products, for an area of 1.5163 Ha, at Re-Sy Nos. 426/3, 426/4, 426/5 in Neyyassery Village, Thodupuzha Taluk, Idukki - Complaint received from Sri. Manoj Kokkattu  
(File No.1641/EC3/2020/SEIAA)**

The Authority considered the matter regarding the Environmental Clearance issued to the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Anshad E.P., Managing Partner, M/s Seas Rock Products, and the Field Inspection Report submitted by the SEAC Sub-Committee pursuant to complaints forwarded by the Kerala Legislative Assembly Committee on Environment.

The Authority noted the sequence of actions taken in the matter, including receipt of complaints from the public and representations before the Committee on Environment, Kerala Legislative Assembly, and the directions issued in earlier SEIAA meetings to conduct field inspection. Pursuant to the same, the SEAC Sub-Committee conducted a field inspection on 03.12.2025 and submitted its report. It was also noted that reports from the District Collector, Idukki, the District Geologist, Idukki and the Environmental Engineer, KSPCB are still awaited.

The Authority examined the Field Inspection Report in detail and observed that the Project Proponent had conducted excess extraction of mineral beyond the permitted quantity; improper and unscientific stacking and management of topsoil and overburden; serious violations in bench geometry; absence of garland drain and inadequate drainage management measures, etc. The Authority also took note of the recommendations of the Field Inspection Report, which include:

- Submission of a report from the Mining & Geology Department quantifying violations and illegal extraction;
- Initiation of action against the Project Proponent for violations of Environmental Clearance conditions.

In view of the above, **the Authority decided as follows:**

- 1. To issue a Show Cause Notice to the Project Proponent seeking clarification on the violations and deficiencies observed in the Field Inspection Report,**

**and the Project Proponent shall submit the reply within 15 days from the date of receipt of the notice. A copy of the Field Inspection Report (FIR) shall be provided to the Project Proponent for necessary action and compliance.**

- 2. To direct the District Geologist, Mining & Geology Department, to submit a detailed report regarding violations and/or over-exploitation of mineral resources, including quantification of excess extraction, if any.**
- 3. The Action Taken Report (ATR) in the matter shall be furnished to the Committee on Environment, Kerala Legislative Assembly, in compliance with the directions issued earlier.**

**The matter will be considered further based on the reply to the Show Cause Notice and the compliance report submitted by the Project Proponent.**

**Item No.163.14 Environmental Clearance issued to the Granite Building Stone Quarry project of Sri. M. P. Balan, for an area of 0.9928 Ha at Re-Sy. No. 29/3 in Meppayur Village, Koyilandy Taluk, Kozhikkode – Order dated 22.10.2025 in WP(C) No. 9338/2025 filed by Sri. Prajeesh and others, and the interim order dated 29.10.2025 in WP(C) No. 10719/2025 filed by Sri. M.P. Balan (1885/EC4/2021/SEIAA)**

The Authority considered the matter regarding the Environmental Clearance issued to the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. M.P. Balan for an area of 0.9928 Ha in Meppayur Village, Koyilandy Taluk, Kozhikode, along with the complaints received, directions of the Hon'ble High Court, and the Field Inspection Report submitted by the SEAC Sub-Committee and recommendations of the 195<sup>th</sup> SEAC.

The Authority noted that the Environmental Clearance was issued vide proceedings dated 03.03.2023. Subsequently, complaints were received from local residents and stakeholders alleging suppression of material facts, ecological sensitivity of the area, and biodiversity concerns. The matter was placed before the Hon'ble High Court, which vide order dated 22.10.2025 in WP(C) No.9338/2025, directed SEIAA to consider the representation expeditiously, giving due weight to the Rapid Biodiversity Assessment (RBA) and other materials;

Based on the directions of the Hon'ble High Court and earlier SEIAA decisions, the matter was referred to SEAC, which in its 185<sup>th</sup> meeting entrusted a Sub-Committee to conduct field inspection. The SEAC Sub-Committee conducted field inspection on 22.12.2025 and submitted the report. The proposal was subsequently considered in the 195<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting, wherein the Field Inspection Report and submissions were examined in detail.

The Authority examined the Field Inspection Report and noted that the quarry site is located in the lower portion of Purakkamala hill, characterized by thin soil cover and predominantly exposed rock, supporting only limited floral diversity, mainly comprising common and invasive species. However, the broader Purakkamala hill system and adjoining valley areas were found to possess rich biodiversity, including diverse flora, fauna, migratory birds, and species of conservation importance, as indicated in the Rapid Biodiversity Assessment (RBA). The valley and wetland areas in the vicinity were identified as ecologically sensitive zones, supporting paddy cultivation and natural drainage systems. No mining activity has commenced at the site so far, and the site is not located within any notified hazard-prone zone, and no residential structures were found within 50 m of the quarry boundary. The Committee emphasized that potential environmental and biodiversity impacts are largely dependent on the effective implementation of environmental safeguards, including drainage management and silt control measures.

The Authority also took note of the recommendations of the SEAC in its 195<sup>th</sup> meeting, wherein it was recommended to uphold the Environmental Clearance subject to additional specific conditions, including routine biodiversity monitoring and strengthening of access/haulage infrastructure.

**In view of the above, the Authority decided to uphold the Environmental Clearance issued to the project, subject to strict compliance with the additional specific conditions recommended by the 195<sup>th</sup> SEAC, in addition to the existing EC conditions.**

**The Project Proponent is directed to ensure full compliance of all Environmental Clearance conditions, including the additional conditions, within a period of six (6) months, and to submit a comprehensive compliance report supported with geo-tagged photographs and video evidence before the Authority.**

**Item No.163.15 Environmental Clearance issued to the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of M/s Megha Engineering & Infrastructures Ltd. at Re-Sy. Nos. 74/772, 74/151, 74/154, 74/152, 74/1D in Kuttur Village, Payyannur Taluk, Kannur. (SIA/KL/MIN/269091/2022; 1975/EC4/2022/SEIAA)**

The Authority considered the matter regarding the Environmental Clearance issued to the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of M/s Megha Engineering & Infrastructures Ltd., along with complaints received, proceedings of various SEIAA/SEAC meetings, reports of the Mining & Geology Department, and the Field Inspection Report submitted by the SEAC Sub-Committee.

The Authority noted that the Environmental Clearance was issued on 24.03.2023 for the extraction of granite building stone. Subsequently, several complaints were received alleging illegal extraction of laterite and overburden and violation of Environmental Clearance conditions. The District Geologist reported that the offence relating to illegal extraction of laterite was compounded under the Kerala Minor Mineral Concession Rules, 2015, and an amount of ₹4,66,420/- towards royalty, price, and compounding fee was recovered from the landowner.

Based on these findings, the Authority, in its 140<sup>th</sup> meeting, suspended the Environmental Clearance and issued a Show Cause Notice. However, the Project Proponent denied the allegations and requested a joint inspection. The matter was subsequently placed in the 147<sup>th</sup> and 150<sup>th</sup> SEIAA meetings, wherein field inspection by SEAC was directed. Accordingly, the SEAC Sub-Committee conducted a field inspection on 09.11.2025 and submitted its report.

The matter was further deliberated in the 195<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting, along with the submissions of the Project Proponent and previous decisions of the Authority. The Authority examined the Field Inspection Report and related records in detail and observed violations of Environmental Clearance conditions, including illegal extraction of laterite building stone without obtaining separate Environmental Clearance for laterite, which is a distinct minor mineral, as well as deficiencies in handling and management of excavated materials and non-adherence to regulatory procedures.

The Authority observed that the violations committed by the Project Proponent are serious in nature, involving unauthorized extraction of minerals and non-compliance with statutory and environmental conditions. In view of the above, **the Authority decided as follows:**

- 1. To issue a Show Cause Notice to the Project Proponent as to why the Environmental Clearance should not be cancelled, for the violations observed, and the Project Proponent shall submit the reply within 15 days from the date of receipt of the notice.**
- 2. To direct the District Geologist, Mining & Geology Department, to submit a detailed report on violations, including the status of the quarry operation and quantity of overburden.**
- 3. To direct the Project Proponent to submit an Environmental Damage Assessment Report, along with mitigation measures for the violations of Environmental Clearance conditions, prepared by a NABET-accredited EIA consultant, within a stipulated time.**

**Item No.163.16 Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Joseph Varkey, for an area of 0.9407 Ha at Block No: 70, Sy. Nos. 23/1, 23/2, in Poonjar Village, Meenachil Taluk, Kottayam.**  
**(SIA/KL/MIN/407901/2022, 1812/EC3/2020/SEIAA)**

The Authority considered the matter regarding the Environmental Clearance issued to the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Joseph Varkey, for an area of 0.9407 Ha in Poonjar Village, Meenachil Taluk, Kottayam, along with the complaints received and related proceedings.

The Authority noted that the complainants alleged that the Environmental Clearance was obtained based on fraudulent documents, forged signatures, and suppression of material facts. The complainant also raised concerns regarding validity of consent and ownership-related documents. An FIR has been registered before the Police Station, Erattupetta, in connection with the alleged forgery and fake consent. The Project Proponent has submitted clarifications and supporting documents in response to the allegations.

The Authority observed that the allegations primarily relate to forgery of documents and related criminal proceedings, which are presently under consideration before the competent law enforcement authority. In view of the above, **the Authority decided to note the matter and defer further consideration, as no regulatory action can be taken at this stage pending the outcome of the investigation into the alleged forgery of documents before the local police authorities. The matter will be taken up for further consideration based on the outcome of the police investigation and subsequent developments.**

**Item No.163.17 Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Shaji K. J., for an area of 0.9927 Ha at Block No. 084, Re-Sy Nos. 1/3089, 1/5699, 1/3095, 1/5700, 1/5710, 1/3093, 1/3096, 1/5701 in Payyavoor Village, Thaliparambu Taluk, Kannur (SIA/KL/MIN/451445/2023)**

The Authority considered the matter regarding the Environmental Clearance application for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Shaji K. J., for an area of 0.9927 Ha in Payyavoor Village, Thaliparambu Taluk, Kannur, along with the request of the Project Proponent for reconsideration of the rejected proposal.

The Authority noted that the initial proposal of the Project Proponent was recommended for rejection by 160<sup>th</sup> SEAC, citing environmental sensitivity, ecological vulnerability, and submission of incorrect/misleading information regarding land use and elevation. The 148<sup>th</sup> SEIAA accepted the recommendation of SEAC, noting that the project site falls in an ecologically sensitive and vulnerable area, with cluster situation exceeding 5 Ha, requiring application of the precautionary principle.

The Authority further noted that the Project Proponent has now submitted a reconsideration request, stating that there exists another quarry within the vicinity operating with statutory clearances and no major environmental issues have been reported from the existing quarry. It is also requested that the Project Proponent may be permitted to conduct a detailed EIA study to establish the environmental status of the proposed site.

The Authority examined the request and the previous decisions and observed that the earlier rejection was based on environmental sensitivity, cluster condition, and application of the precautionary principle, which remain valid. In view of the above, **the Authority decided**

to note the earlier decisions of SEAC and SEIAA and resolved that the Project Proponent is at liberty to undertake a detailed EIA study and submit a fresh application at his own risk.

Upon receipt of such application, the SEAC shall examine and appraise the proposal in accordance with the provisions of the EIA Notification, 2006 and other applicable regulations.

**Item No.163.18**      **Revalidation of Environmental Clearance issued to the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of M/s. Majestic Granites for an area of 3.9509 Ha at Survey Nos. 147/2 (pt), 149/1(pt), 149/2 (pt), 150/1, 150/3(pt), 151/1(pt) & 151/2(pt) in Urangattiri Village, Ernad Taluk, Malappuram – Rejection Order issued - Reconsideration Request from the Project Proponent**  
**(Old File No. 1021/EC1/001/SEIAA/2016)**  
**(New Proposal No. SIA/KL/MIN/496969/2024)**

The Authority considered the item regarding the revalidation of Environmental Clearance issued to the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of M/s Majestic Granites in Urangattiri Village, Ernad Taluk, Malappuram, along with the reconsideration request submitted by the Project Proponent.

The Authority noted that the Environmental Clearance was originally issued on 29.05.2017, which expired on 28.05.2023 (including COVID relaxation). Pursuant to the judgment of the Hon'ble High Court in WP(C) No.14366/2021, the matter was considered for revalidation, and the proposal was placed before SEAC and SEIAA on multiple occasions. SEAC, in its 174<sup>th</sup> meeting, recommended revalidation subject to certain conditions, including submission of NOCs from the Irrigation Department and District Level Crisis Management Committee.

However, the Authority in its 151<sup>st</sup> SEIAA meeting observed the presence of cluster situation and medium landslide susceptibility of the area, and directed that an EIA study is imperative, referring the proposal back to SEAC. Subsequently, SEAC in its 179<sup>th</sup> meeting recommended rejection of the revalidation proposal, directing the Project Proponent to apply for Terms of Reference (ToR) for conducting EIA study and public consultation. The

Authority, in its 154<sup>th</sup> SEIAA meeting, accepted the recommendation and rejected the application, with a direction to apply afresh with ToR.

The Authority further noted that the Project Proponent has submitted a reconsideration request, inter alia stating that the project may be exempted from fresh EIA requirements, citing earlier EC and similar cases. A neighbouring project M/s Malabar Building Materials Pvt. Ltd., within the cluster has already conducted a combined EIA and Public Hearing, and therefore a separate study may not be necessary. The Project Proponent has also submitted the required NOCs from competent authorities.

The Authority examined the request, previous decisions, and the prevailing legal position, including the directions of the Hon'ble High Court in similar cases and the applicability of the EIA Notification, 2006. The Authority observed that the earlier rejection was based on cluster condition and environmental sensitivity, and to date, no application is pending before SEIAA, and the rejected application cannot be retrieved in the PARIVESH portal.

The Authority further observed that, considering the principles of natural justice and the observations of the Hon'ble Court, the Project Proponent may be allowed to pursue the proposal afresh in accordance with law. In view of the above, **the Authority decided as follows:**

- 1. The Project Proponent shall submit a fresh application for modification/extension of EC through the PARIVESH portal, as there is no provision to retrieve the rejected application.**
- 2. The Project Proponent shall submit all necessary documents along with the application, including Certified Compliance Report (CCR), HYCRs, and all other statutory licenses/clearances, as applicable.**
- 3. Upon receipt of the application, the SEAC shall appraise the proposal in accordance with the provisions of the EIA Notification, 2006, and in compliance with the directions of the Hon'ble Court.**

**Item No.163.19 Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Habeebu Rahiman P. M., for an area of 2.9110 Ha at Sy. No. 78/2A Pt in Kumaranellur Village, Karassery Panchayath, Kozhikode Taluk, Kozhikode – Rejected – Request for reconsideration  
(SIA/KL/MIN/165825/2020, 646/EC4/4949/2014/SEIAA)**

The Authority considered the matter regarding the rejection of revalidation application of Environmental Clearance issued to the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Habeebu Rahiman P.M., for an area of 2.9110 Ha in Kumaranellur Village, Karassery Panchayath, Kozhikode, along with the reconsideration request submitted by the Project Proponent.

The Authority noted that the Environmental Clearance was originally issued vide proceedings dated 03.02.2016 and the Project Proponent submitted the proposal for revalidation. The validity extension/revalidation proposal was considered in various SEAC and SEIAA meetings, wherein it was observed that cluster situation exists, with multiple quarries within 500 m radius exceeding 5 Ha, thereby necessitating EIA study and public consultation. Accordingly, SEAC recommended that the Project Proponent shall apply for Terms of Reference (ToR). The Authority, in its 134<sup>th</sup> SEIAA meeting, rejected the proposal for EC validity extension and directed the Project Proponent to apply for ToR for conducting EIA study and rejection order was issued on 28.12.2023.

The Authority further noted that the Project Proponent has submitted a reconsideration request, inter alia stating that in a similar case (Item No. 06 of 161<sup>st</sup> SEIAA meeting – M/s Calicut Granites), the Authority had taken a view that EC validity shall be treated as extension based on project life. Based on the said decision and the observations of the Hon'ble High Court, similar benefit may be extended to the present case.

The Authority examined the request, earlier decisions of SEAC and SEIAA, and also took note of the observations of the Hon'ble High Court in the case of M/s Calicut Granites. The Authority observed that the earlier rejection was based on cluster condition and requirement of EIA study, and that as on date, no application is pending before SEIAA, and the rejected application cannot be retrieved in the PARIVESH portal. The Authority further observed that, considering the principles of natural justice and judicial observations, the

Project Proponent may be granted an opportunity to pursue the proposal afresh in accordance with the law. In view of the above, the Authority decided as follows:

- 1. The Project Proponent shall submit a fresh application for modification/extension of EC through the PARIVESH portal, as there is no provision to retrieve the rejected application.**
- 2. The Project Proponent shall submit all necessary documents along with the application, including Certified Compliance Report (CCR), HYCRs, and all other statutory licenses/clearances, as applicable.**
- 3. Upon receipt of the application, the SEAC shall appraise the proposal in accordance with the provisions of the EIA Notification, 2006, and in compliance with the directions of the Hon'ble Court.**

**Item No.163.20      Reappraisal of EC issued by DEIAA, Kozhikode to the Granite Building Stone Quarry of M/s Matha Industries for an area of 3.5367 Ha at Field No 2436 (un surveyed) in Koodaranji Village, Thamarassery Taluk, Kozhikode – Rejected – Request for Reconsideration  
(SIA/KL/MIN/450873/2023)**

The Authority considered the matter regarding the reconsideration of the rejected application for reappraisal of Environmental Clearance issued by DEIAA, Kozhikode to the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of M/s Matha Industries, for an area of 3.5367 Ha in Koodaranji Village, Thamarassery Taluk, Kozhikode, along with the request submitted by the Project Proponent.

The Authority noted that the Environmental Clearance was originally issued by DEIAA, Kozhikode on 23.09.2017, and the validity expired on 22.09.2023 (including COVID relaxation). The proposal for reappraisal was considered in various SEIAA and SEAC meetings. The SEAC, in its 180<sup>th</sup> meeting, observed that the project falls under cluster situation, with more than 5 Ha of mining area within 500 m radius, and recommended rejection of the proposal, directing the Project Proponent to apply for Terms of Reference (ToR) for conducting EIA study and public consultation;

The Authority, in its 156<sup>th</sup> SEIAA meeting, accepted the recommendation of SEAC and rejected the application, with liberty to apply for ToR. The Authority further noted that the Project Proponent has submitted a request for reconsideration, citing procedural issues in the PARIVESH portal and seeking continuation of the reappraisal process.

The Authority examined the request, previous decisions of SEAC and SEIAA, and the applicable statutory provisions. The Authority observed that as per the Office Memorandum dated 28.04.2023, all Environmental Clearances issued by DEIAA are required to be reappraised, and submission of requisite documents, including the Cluster Certificate, is mandatory. The Authority further observed that where cluster conditions are attracted, the Project Proponent is required to obtain Terms of Reference (ToR) and conduct an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) study and Public Consultation in accordance with the provisions of the EIA Notification, 2006.

**In view of the above, the Authority decided to adhere to the provisions of the Office Memorandum dated 28.04.2023 and the applicable statutory framework governing reappraisal of DEIAA issued Environmental Clearances. It is reiterate that submission of Cluster Certificate is mandatory, and where cluster conditions are applicable, the Project Proponent shall apply for Terms of Reference (ToR) for conducting EIA study and Public Consultation in accordance with the EIA Notification, 2006. The Project Proponent may submit a fresh ToR application in PARIVESH portal, complying with all statutory requirements, for consideration in accordance with law.**

**Item No.163.21      Revalidation of Environmental Clearance issued to 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. 223pt, 223/2, 223/6pt, 118/14 pt, & 118/15 in Vandazhi - I Village, Alathur Taluk, Palakkad - Request of the PP to reconsider the rejected revalidation application based on the order dated 22.05.2024 in WP (C) No. 18197/2024  
(Old Pro. No. SIA/KL/MIN/308007/2024; 664/SEIAA/EC1/5179/2014)  
(Proposal No. SIA/KL/MIN/482844/2024; 2195/EC3/2025/SEIAA)**

The Authority considered the matter regarding the request for reconsideration of the rejected revalidation application for Environmental Clearance issued to the Granite Building

Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Vinu Mani, Managing Partner, M/s Paramount Granites, for an area of 3.8669 Ha in Vandazhi-I Village, Alathur Taluk, Palakkad.

The Authority noted that the Environmental Clearance was originally issued on 18.08.2017 and the proposal for revalidation was considered in various SEAC meetings, wherein the Committee initially recommended grant of EC for a specified period subject to conditions. However, upon verification of the Cluster Certificate, it was observed that multiple quarries exist within a 500 m radius, and the total area exceeds 5 Ha, thereby attracting cluster condition, necessitating EIA study and public consultation. Accordingly, the Authority directed the Project Proponent to apply for Terms of Reference (ToR) as per the provisions of the EIA Notification, 2006, and rejected the application in its 154<sup>th</sup> SEIAA meeting.

The Authority further noted that the Project Proponent has now submitted a reconsideration request, inter alia stating that in a similar case (M/s Calicut Granites), the Authority had granted revalidation of Environmental Clearance based on judicial observations and the benefit of the said decision may be extended to the present case. It is also noted that the matter is also pending before the Hon'ble High Court in WP(C) No. 7011/2026 filed by the Project Proponent.

The Authority examined the request, earlier decisions of SEAC and SEIAA, and also took note of the observations of the Hon'ble High Court in the case of M/s Calicut Granites. The Authority observed that the earlier rejection was based on cluster condition and statutory requirement of EIA study, and that no valid application is presently pending before SEIAA, and the rejected application cannot be retrieved through the PARIVESH portal.

The Authority further observed that, considering the principles of natural justice and judicial observations, the Project Proponent may be granted an opportunity to pursue the proposal afresh, strictly in accordance with the statutory framework. In view of the above, **the Authority decided as follows:**

- 1. The Project Proponent shall submit a fresh application for modification/extension of EC through the PARIVESH portal, as there is no provision to retrieve the rejected application.**

2. **The Project Proponent shall submit all necessary documents along with the application, including Certified Compliance Report (CCR), HYCRs, and all other statutory licenses/clearances, as applicable.**
3. **Upon receipt of the application, the SEAC shall appraise the proposal in accordance with the provisions of the EIA Notification, 2006, and in compliance with the directions of the Hon'ble Court.**
4. **Since the matter is sub-judice, the action taken by the Authority shall be intimated to the Hon'ble Court in WP(C) No. 7011/2026 filed by the Project Proponent.**

**Item No.163.22 Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. K. J. Thomaskutty, Managing Partner, M/s Mary Matha Granites for an area of 2.0778 Ha at Block No. 25, Re-Sy Nos. 110/1, 110/2, 112/2 & 112/3 in Akathethara Village, Palakkad Taluk, Palakkad – Rejection order issued – *Judgment dated 20.11.2024 in WP(C) No. 6920/2024- Reconsideration (SIA/KL/MIN/444012/2023, 2447/EC3/2023/SEIAA)***

The Authority considered the matter regarding the Environmental Clearance application for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. K.J. Thomaskutty, Managing Partner, M/s Mary Matha Granites, for an area of 2.0778 Ha in Akathethara Village, Palakkad Taluk, Palakkad, along with the reconsideration request submitted by the Project Proponent, previous decisions of SEIAA/SEAC, and the relevant judicial pronouncements.

The Authority noted that the proposal was initially considered based on the finding that the project area forms part of a cluster exceeding 5 Ha, thereby attracting the requirement of Terms of Reference (ToR), EIA study, and public consultation under the EIA Notification, 2006. Subsequently, proceedings before the National Green Tribunal (O.A. No.124/2021 and I.A. No.18/2022) raised issues relating to illegal mining and non-compliance with environmental safeguards. Based on the NGT order dated 20.12.2023, the Authority, in its 140<sup>th</sup> SEIAA meeting, directed the Project Proponent to comply with the said order and

submit a ToR application. As the Project Proponent failed to comply, the Authority rejected the Environmental Clearance application vide order dated 18.05.2024.

The Project Proponent challenged the NGT order before the Hon'ble High Court in WP(C) No. 6920/2024, and the Hon'ble Court, vide judgment dated 20.11.2024, clarified that the directions in the NGT judgment shall be read subject to the observations in the judgment dated 12.04.2024 in WP(C) No. 29474/2023.

The 141<sup>st</sup> Authority noticed that in WP(C) No. 29474/2023 filed by M/s Petra Crushers, the Hon'ble High Court rejected the challenge against the Exts P3, P4 and P6, which prohibit the continuation of mining based on the lease obtained on 20.03.2012. However, the Hon'ble High Court vide its judgement (ii), declared that the findings of the Authority in Exts P3, P4 and P6, which states that the mining continued by the Project Proponent after 15.01.2016 without obtaining the EC are illegal for the want of environmental clearance is illegal and not sustainable in law. The Authority observed that the observations of the Hon'ble High Court are not as per existing OMs of MoEF&CC and are contradictory to the Order of the Hon'ble NGT on 13.01.2015 in O.A. No. 123/2014, O.A. No. 244 of 2017 (SZ) and the judgment dated 24.03.2023 of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in SLA No. 5563 of 2023. Therefore, the Authority, in its 141<sup>st</sup> SEIAA meeting, decided to file a Review Petition against the said judgment. The Authority had issued instructions to the Standing Counsel to file the Review Petition and subsequently sought the status of the same, which is yet to be received.

The Project Proponent has now submitted a reconsideration request, inter alia stating that the matter may be reconsidered in light of the judgment dated 20.11.2024 in WP(C) No. 6920/2024. The Authority, after detailed deliberation, observed that the matter involves interlinked judicial proceedings, including interpretation of the NGT order and subsequent High Court judgments. The Authority has already taken a decision to challenge the judgment in WP(C) No. 29474/2023 by filing a Review Petition. So, the status of the Review Petition and connected proceedings is crucial for determining the appropriate course of action. Any decision at this stage without clarity on the legal position may lead to inconsistency with judicial directions.

In view of the above, **the Authority decided as follows:**

- 1. To obtain a detailed legal opinion from the Standing Counsel regarding the implications of the judgments of the Hon'ble High Court and the appropriate course of action in the present matter.**
- 2. To ascertain the current status of the Review Petition and connected legal proceedings filed in respect of the judgments referred above.**

The matter is deferred for further consideration upon receipt of the legal opinion and status report from the Standing Counsel.

**Item No. 163.23      Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry project of Sri. Pious Antony, Managing Partner, M/s. P. J. Associates, for an area of 2.6465 Ha at Re-Survey Nos. 93/1, 94/1, 95/1, 95/1- 1, 95/2, 95/2-1, in Lalam Village, Meenachil Taluk, Kottayam – Judgement dated 06.02.2026 in WP(C) No. 20117/2025 filed by M/s P. J. Associates  
(SIA/KL/MIN/410881/2022, 2186/EC3/2023/SEIAA)**

The Authority considered the matter regarding the Environmental Clearance application for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of M/s P.J. Associates, Managing Partner, Sri. Pious Antony, in Lalam Village, Meenachil Taluk, Kottayam, along with the judgment dated 06.02.2026 of the Hon'ble High Court in WP(C) No. 20117 of 2025 and the previous decisions of SEIAA and SEAC.

The Authority noted that the Environmental Clearance application was earlier considered in the 148<sup>th</sup> SEIAA meeting, wherein, based on the cluster condition exceeding 5 Ha, the proposal was rejected, with a direction to the Project Proponent to apply for Terms of Reference (ToR) for conducting EIA study and public consultation. The rejection was based on findings that multiple quarrying activities existed within the 500 m radius, including overlapping permits and absence of approved closure plans for certain quarries, thereby necessitating cumulative impact assessment.

The Project Proponent subsequently submitted a revised cluster certificate, claiming that no operational quarries exist within 500 m, and that certain quarries have obtained mine closure approval. The matter was reconsidered in the 151<sup>st</sup> and 152<sup>nd</sup> SEIAA meetings, wherein the Authority observed that the mine closure plan for adjacent quarry was approved only after rejection of the EC application and there were apparent violations of KMMC

Rules, 2015, including delay in submission and implementation of closure plan. The area still constituted a cluster exceeding 5 Ha, requiring EIA study. Accordingly, the Authority upheld its earlier decision and reiterated the direction to apply for ToR.

The Authority further noted that the Project Proponent approached the Hon'ble High Court in WP(C) No. 20117/2025, and the Hon'ble Court, vide judgment dated 06.02.2026, directed that "SEIAA shall reconsider the petitioner's application for fresh issuance of Environmental Clearance, in accordance with law, expeditiously, within a period of three months from the date of receipt of the judgment."

The Authority further noted that, as of the date, there is no application pending before SEIAA in the PARIVESH portal, and that applications which have already been rejected cannot be retrieved or processed further within the existing framework of the portal.

The Authority examined the matter in detail and observed that the earlier rejection was based on cluster condition, absence of proper mine closure compliance, and requirement of EIA study. The Project Proponent has now produced a revised cluster certificate and mine closure details, which require independent verification. The actual status of quarry operations within the cluster area, including closure and compliance, needs to be verified through the competent authority. In view of the Hon'ble High Court direction, the matter requires fresh appraisal based on updated factual and technical inputs.

In view of the above, **the Authority decided as follows:**

- 1. The Project Proponent shall submit fresh EC application with all necessary documents, including Mine Closure Certificate(s) of the adjacent quarry/quarries, updated Cluster Certificate, and any other relevant supporting documents.**
- 2. Upon receipt of the EC application, the SEAC shall conduct a detailed appraisal including field inspection, if necessary, in accordance with the provisions of the EIA Notification, 2006 and the directions of the Hon'ble High Court.**
- 3. To direct the District Geologist, Mining & Geology Department, to submit a report on the current status of quarry operations within the cluster area,**

**including, functional and non-functional quarries, status of mine closure and compliance with KMMC Rules, 2015, and any violations or pending actions.**

**The matter will be considered further based on the recommendations of SEAC and the report of the District Geologist.**

**Item No.163.24 Environmental Clearance issued to the Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Ajas M. M., M/s Ponoorpoyil Granites, for an area of 4.6558 Ha, at Sy No. 83 (P) in Kumaranellur Village, Kozhikode Taluk, Kozhikode – Judgment 25.07.2024 in WP(C) 10088/2024 - Request for consideration of validity of EC from the date of execution of mine lease  
(File No.1229/EC2/2024/SEIAA)**

The Authority considered the request submitted by the Project Proponent, Sri. Ajas M.M., M/s Ponoorpoyil Granites, seeking to reckon the validity of the Environmental Clearance from the date of execution of a subsequent mining lease.

The Authority recorded that Environmental Clearance was originally granted on 10.08.2015 for an extent of 4.6558 Ha, based on an approved mining plan covering the entire project area as a single, integrated unit. The said EC was subsequently revalidated for a project life of 10 years from the date of issuance of the original EC, as per the decision of the 114<sup>th</sup> SEIAA meeting, and is presently valid up to 09.08.2026 (including applicable Covid-19 relaxations).

The Authority further noted the submissions of the Project Proponent that a mining lease for an extent of 2.6304 Ha (Lease No.1) was operational from 14.07.2008, renewed thereafter and presently valid up to 16.09.2027; and a subsequent mining lease for 1.7366 Ha (Lease No.2) was executed on 23.04.2025, valid up to 22.04.2030; and that the present request is to link the EC validity to the execution date of Lease No.2.

Upon detailed examination of the records, the Authority observed that the Environmental Clearance granted on 10.08.2015 pertains to the entire extent of 4.6558 Ha, based on a unified mining plan, and not to any segmented or lease-wise components of the project area. The Authority further recalled the observations of the 149<sup>th</sup> SEIAA meeting, wherein it was categorically held that any bifurcation of the EC-approved area into multiple

leases, for the purpose of altering or extending the validity of EC, is impermissible and contrary to the scheme and intent of the EIA Notification, 2006. The Authority also recorded the following findings:

- The lease executed on 23.04.2025 for 1.7366 Ha forms an integral part of the originally approved EC area and does not constitute an independent project warranting a separate or fresh reckoning of EC validity.
- The validity of Environmental Clearance is intrinsically linked to the date of grant of EC and the approved mining plan, and cannot be modified, shifted, or re-anchored based on subsequent administrative actions such as execution or renewal of mining leases.
- The Project Proponent has been undertaking mining operations under the EC since 10.08.2015 with a lease executed on 14.07.2008, and has availed the benefit of revalidation granted in accordance with applicable norms for the entire EC area.
- The grant or renewal of mining lease by the competent authority, extending beyond the validity of the EC, does not confer any legal right to undertake mining operations in the absence of a valid Environmental Clearance, and the statutory requirement of prior EC remains paramount.

The Authority, upon consideration of the applicable legal framework, including the provisions of the EIA Notification, 2006, and settled principles governing prior environmental clearance, concluded that there exists no provision under the EIA Notification, 2006, or any subsequent amendments or Office Memoranda, permitting re-computation or extension of EC validity based on the date of execution of a subsequent mining lease within an already appraised and approved project area. The request of the Project Proponent is, therefore, misconceived, devoid of legal merit, and contrary to the established regulatory framework.

In view of the above, **the Authority decided as follows:**

- 1. The request of the Project Proponent to reckon the validity of EC from 23.04.2025 is hereby rejected.**
- 2. The Project Proponent is directed to submit a fresh application for Environmental Clearance for the area of 1.7366 ha, if mineral resources**

remain to be extracted, along with an approved mining plan and the mine closure details other lease areas, in accordance with the provisions of the EIA Notification, 2006 and other applicable statutory requirements.

3. It is explicitly clarified that no mining operations shall be carried out beyond the validity of the existing Environmental Clearance, i.e., after 09.08.2026, unless and until a fresh Environmental Clearance is duly obtained from the competent authority.
4. Any mining activity undertaken without a valid Environmental Clearance shall be treated as violation of the EIA Notification, 2006, and shall attract appropriate action under applicable environmental laws.

**Item No.163.25**      **Environmental Clearance issued to the Housing Project (Sobha Rio Vista) of M/s Sobha Developers Ltd at Sy. No. 159/28B (p) in Feroke Village, Kozhikode Taluk, Kozhikode - Interim orders dated 08.12.2023 in WP (C) 33556/2017 & WP(C) 5550 of 2018 (Main File No. 371/SEIAA/EC4/2611/2014) – Request for Change in Company Name (SIA/KL/INFRA2/569889/2026)**

The Authority perused the matter regarding the request submitted by the Project Proponent, M/s Sobha Developers Ltd (now M/s Sobha Limited), for change in the company name in the Environmental Clearance (EC).

The Authority noted that Environmental Clearance was issued vide proceedings dated 20.03.2017 for a housing project (Sobha Rio Vista) at Feroke Village, Kozhikode, for a period of seven years. The Authority considered the present request of the Project Proponent vide letter dated 05.03.2026, seeking change in the company name in the Environmental Clearance from M/s Sobha Developers Limited to M/s Sobha Limited. The Project Proponent has submitted that the request pertains solely to change in company name, without any change in legal status of the entity and there is no change in ownership pattern, project configuration, built-up area, survey details, or EC conditions; and no construction activity has been commenced at the project site.

The Authority observed that the request is limited to a change in nomenclature of the company and does not involve any alteration in project scope, environmental parameters, or

conditions stipulated in the Environmental Clearance. The Authority further observed that such a change does not attract fresh appraisal under the provisions of the EIA Notification, 2006, provided that the legal identity of the entity remains unchanged and all EC conditions continue to be binding.

After detailed deliberation, the Authority found that the request of the Project Proponent is procedural in nature, legally tenable, and permissible under the prevailing regulatory framework, and does not result in any additional environmental implications. In view of the above, **the Authority decided as follows:**

- 1. The request of the Project Proponent for a change in the company name in the Environmental Clearance from M/s Sobha Developers Limited to M/s Sobha Limited is hereby accepted.**
- 2. The SEIAA Secretariat is directed to issue the necessary amendment to the Environmental Clearance, reflecting the change in company name, in accordance with applicable procedures.**
- 3. The amendment shall be limited strictly to the change in company name; there shall be no change in project parameters, approved configuration, or environmental safeguards; and all conditions stipulated in the original Environmental Clearance, including compliance with remediation measures and environmental compensation, shall remain unchanged and binding on the Project Proponent.**

**The Project Proponent shall continue to comply with all statutory requirements and submit compliance reports as directed by the Authority from time to time.**

**Item No.163.26      Environmental Clearance issued to the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Krishnadas M., for an area of 0.7916Ha at Block No: 33, Re-Sy Nos: 200/5, 200/7 & 201/3 in Puthukode Village, Alathur Taluk, Palakkad.  
(SIA/KL/MIN/488013/2024)**

The Authority perused the matter regarding the request submitted by the Project Proponent, Sri. Krishnadas M, in respect of the Environmental Clearance issued for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project. The Authority noted that Environmental Clearance

was granted on 13.03.2025 for an extent of 0.7916 Ha at Block No. 33, Re-Sy Nos. 200/5, 200/7 & 201/3 in Puthukode Village, Alathur Taluk, Palakkad, subject to specific and general conditions.

The Authority further noted the submission of the Project Proponent vide letter dated 20.02.2026, wherein it has been requested that, for facilitating quarry operations, a temporary road is required to be constructed, necessitating temporary modification of the buffer zone near BP5. The Project Proponent has undertaken that the modification of the buffer zone is purely temporary in nature. Upon completion of the intended activity, the buffer zone shall be restored to its original condition; and the restoration measures, including afforestation/plantation, shall be duly reported in the Half-Yearly Compliance Reports (HYCR). The Authority also noted that the Project Proponent has submitted an affidavit and supporting sketch, duly certified by the Village Officer, substantiating the extent and nature of the proposed temporary modification.

Upon examination of the request and supporting documents, the Authority observed that the proposal is limited to a temporary and reversible modification for operational convenience. The Project Proponent has provided a clear commitment for restoration and compliance monitoring; and the request does not involve any permanent alteration of project parameters or increase in environmental impacts, provided that restoration is carried out as proposed.

After detailed deliberation, the Authority found that the request of the Project Proponent is reasonable and can be considered, subject to strict compliance with environmental safeguards and restoration measures. In view of the above, **the Authority decided as follows:**

- 1. The request of the Project Proponent for temporary modification of the buffer zone for construction of a temporary access road is hereby accepted.**
- 2. The SEIAA Secretariat is directed to issue necessary orders, incorporating the approved temporary modification, subject to the following conditions:**
  - a) The modification shall be strictly temporary and limited to the extent proposed;**

- b) **The buffer zone shall be fully restored to its original condition immediately after completion of the intended activity;**
- c) **Plantation/afforestation measures shall be undertaken in the restored buffer area;**
- d) **The details of restoration shall be clearly documented and submitted in the Half-Yearly Compliance Reports (HYCR); and**
- e) **No permanent structures or activities shall be permitted within the buffer zone.**
- f) **All other conditions stipulated in the original Environmental Clearance shall remain unchanged and binding on the Project Proponent.**

**Item No.163.27**

**Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. K. Sadanandan at 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 in V-Kottayam Village, Konni Taluk, Pathanamthitta - Order dated 13.10.2023 in Appeal No 48 of 2022 (SZ) filed by Sri. Roy Thomas before the Hon'ble NGT, Judgment dated 21.02.2024 in WP(C) No.2976/2024 filed by Sri. K. Sadanandan & Judgment dated 05.02.2025 in WP(C) No. 37484/2024 & WP(C) No. 33412/2024; Interim order dated 26.08.2025 in WP(C) No. 21398/2025 – Consideration of the Revised Mining Plan – Rejected by SEAC (200/SEIAA/EC4/86/2014)**

The Authority considered the proposal on the Environmental Clearance granted to the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. K. Sadanandan, situated in V-Kottayam Village, Konni Taluk, Pathanamthitta District, along with all connected records and proceedings. The Authority also perused in detail the earlier decisions of the SEIAA and SEAC, the judgments of the Hon'ble High Court in WP(C) No. 33412/2024 and WP(C) No. 37484/2024, and other related matters, including the revised mining plan submitted by the Project Proponent, excluding assigned land.

The Authority noted that the original EC was issued on 10.08.2015 with validity up to 09.08.2020, which was subsequently revalidated, and that multiple complaints, legal proceedings, and regulatory actions have arisen concerning the project, including allegations of misrepresentation of land status, inclusion of assigned land, discrepancies in mining plans, and environmental violations.

The Authority observed that the Hon'ble High Court, in WP(C) No. 33412/2024 and WP(C) No. 37484/2024, had directed reconsideration of the matter after decisions of the Government and the Department of Mining and Geology. In compliance, the Government and the Mining and Geology Department, vide their respective orders, reiterated that a valid Environmental Clearance is a mandatory prerequisite for continuation of quarry operations. The Authority further noted that, pursuant to earlier directions, the Project Proponent submitted a revised mining plan excluding assigned land, as directed in the 158<sup>th</sup> SEIAA meeting.

The Authority further noted that the proposal, along with the revised mining plan, was appraised by the SEAC in its 194<sup>th</sup> meeting. The SEAC, after detailed examination, observed that certain portions of the project area fall within High Hazard Zones as per the hazard zonation map issued by the State Disaster Management Authority and the majority of the project area lies within Medium/Moderate Hazard Zones. There exist overlaps between survey numbers in the revised mining plan and a separate ToR application (Proposal No. SIA/KL/MIN/541804/2025), which had already rejected due to hazard susceptibility; and the presence of High Hazard Zones renders the area environmentally unsustainable for quarrying activities.

In view of the above facts, **the Authority, after detailed deliberation, resolved to accept the recommendation of the SEAC and reject the request of the Project Proponent for grant/continuation of Environmental Clearance based on the revised mining plan. The Authority further recorded that this decision is taken in due compliance with the directions of the Hon'ble High Court in WP(C) No. 37484/2024 and other connected matters. The SEIAA Secretariat is directed to issue necessary orders accordingly.**

**Item No.163.28      Consideration of Fresh Violation Cases Identified – Pending EC Applications for want of Violation ToR under the provisions of SoP - Submitting for Decision.**

The Authority considered the agenda item regarding pending Environmental Clearance applications as on 02.01.2024, which were categorised as violation cases during appraisal that could not be processed further due to the non-availability of provisions for submission of Violation Terms of Reference (ToR) applications in the PARIVESH portal, in light of the prevailing legal and procedural framework.

The Authority noted that, pursuant to the directions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court on ex post facto Environmental Clearance, the MoEF&CC, vide Office Memorandum dated 20.01.2026, has clarified that violation cases pending under the Standard Operating Procedure (SoP) dated 07.07.2021 as on 02.01.2024 may be processed; however, final approval orders shall not be issued until further orders of the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

The Authority further observed that a number of construction projects identified as violation cases prior to 02.01.2024, are presently pending either with SEIAA or with the Project Proponents, primarily due to the inability to submit Violation ToR applications, as the relevant provision in the PARIVESH portal remains inactive. Consequently, such proposals are unable to proceed through the appraisal process as mandated under the SoP dated 07.07.2021.

In these circumstances, the Authority concluded that a uniform and legally sustainable approach is required to process such pending violation cases. Therefore, **the Authority resolved to refer the matter to the MoEF&CC seeking clarification and guidance on the appropriate course of action and procedural framework for handling pending violation cases, including issues related to submission and processing of Violation ToR applications and further appraisal of such proposals.**

**The SEIAA Secretary shall take necessary action in this regard and place the response of MoEF&CC before the Authority for further consideration.**

**PARIVESH FILES (Ver-1)**

**CONSIDERATION/RECONSIDERATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL CLEARANCE**

**Item No.01**

**Environmental Clearance for the Expansion of the existing residential Building Construction project (Condor Cyber Gardens) M/s Condor Builders Pvt. Ltd at Sy. Nos. 172/9, 156/12, 171/5, 171/15, 171/12, 171/14, 171/17, 171/19, 171/20, 171/7, 157/33-1, 157/9 -1, 170/11, 170/2, 170/21-1, 171/11, 171/13, 171/18, 171/16, 171/3, 171/4, 171/6-1, 176/11-1, 176/12, 176/12-1, 176/7-1, 171/1, 170/1, 170/1-2, 170/1-1, 172/6, 172/8, 172/8-1, 171/2, 169/13-2, 157/6, 157/5, 171/6-2, 156/20-0, 157/20-0, 171/9-1, 172/4-0, 172/7-0, 172/2 in Attipra Village, Thiruvananthapuram Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram.**

**(SIA/KL/INFRA2/443950/2023, 2420/EC3/2023/SEIAA)**

The Authority considered the proposal in detail and took note of the minutes of the 194<sup>th</sup> meeting of the SEAC. The Authority further noted that, vide communication dated 27.11.2025, the Project Proponent had requested permission to withdraw the application on the ground that Environmental Clearance for the project had already been granted by the MoEF&CC on 07.11.2025. In view of the above, **the Authority, after due deliberation, resolved to accept the Project Proponent's request and approved the withdrawal of the application.**

**Item No.02**

**Environmental Clearance 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 Nos. 430/1pt116, 430/1pt607, 430/1pt66, 430/1pt841, 430/1pt473, 430/1pt842, 430/1pt701, 430/1pt843 in Thayanoor Village, Vellarikundu Taluk, Kasaragod**

**(SIA/KL/MIN/438095/2023, 2033/EC2/2022/SEIAA)**

The Authority considered the proposal in detail and took note of the recommendations of the 195<sup>th</sup> meeting of the SEAC, wherein EC was recommended for a period of 12 years, subject to certain specific conditions in addition to the general conditions, based on the District Survey Report (DSR) of 2016, which has since lapsed and become obsolete.

The Authority observed that, as per Notification S.O. 3611(E) dated 25.07.2018 issued by the MoEF&CC, the DSR is a mandatory and foundational document for the identification of mining areas, preparation of project reports, and appraisal for grant of EC for minor mineral projects. The Authority further noted that the Hon'ble Supreme Court, in its order dated 10.11.2021 in Civil Appeal Nos. 3661–3662 of 2020, and in its judgment dated 08.05.2025 in Civil Appeal No. 14170 of 2024 and connected matters, has categorically reaffirmed that all administrative actions, including tendering, allocation, and grant of EC, must be based on a valid and final DSR. It was also underscored that EC appraisal cannot be undertaken on the basis of a draft, outdated, or procedurally deficient DSR, as the validity of the DSR is integral to assessing resource availability, environmental sensitivity, and site suitability.

In view of the above and after due deliberation, **the Authority resolved to refer the proposal back to the SEAC for fresh appraisal and recommendation, based on a revised and duly approved DSR prepared in accordance with the guidelines issued by the MoEF&CC vide S.O. 3611(E) dated 25.07.2018.**

## **PARIVESH FILES (VER-2)**

**Item No.01 - 37      Environmental Clearances recommended by SEAC-1 and SEAC-3 for the Granite and Laterite Building Stone Quarry Projects in the 194<sup>th</sup> and 195<sup>th</sup> meetings based on the 2016 approved DSR**

The Authority noted that a total of 37 project proposals on Granite and Laterite Building Stone were recommended for grant of Environmental Clearance (EC) based on the District Survey Report (DSR) of 2016, which has since lapsed and become obsolete.

The Authority observed that, as per Notification S.O. 3611(E) dated 25.07.2018 issued by the MoEF&CC, the DSR constitutes a mandatory and foundational document for the identification of mining areas, the preparation of project reports, and the appraisal for the grant of EC for minor mineral projects. The Authority further noted that the Hon'ble Supreme Court, in its order dated 10.11.2021 in Civil Appeal Nos. 3661–3662 of 2020, and in its judgment dated 08.05.2025 in Civil Appeal No. 14170 of 2024 and connected matters, has unequivocally reaffirmed that all administrative actions, including tendering, allocation, and grant of EC, must be premised on a valid and final DSR. It was also emphasized that EC appraisal cannot be undertaken on the basis of a draft, outdated, or procedurally deficient DSR, as the validity of the DSR is integral to the assessment of resource availability, environmental sensitivity, and site suitability.

In view of the above and after due deliberation, the Authority resolved to refer all the 37 proposals back to the SEAC for fresh appraisal and recommendation, based on a revised and duly approved DSR prepared strictly in accordance with the guidelines issued by the MoEF&CC vide Notification S.O. 3611(E) dated 25.07.2018. The list of proposals is as follows:

<b>Zone - 1</b>		
<b>Sl No.</b>	<b>Project Details</b>	<b>Decision of SEIAA</b>
1.	Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Binumon T. G., Managing Partner, M/s Megan Rocks, for an area of 1.3210 Ha at Block No. 9, Re- Sy No. 505/2 in Pazhavangadi Village, Ranni Taluk, Pathanamthitta. (SIA/KL/MIN/476101/2024)	<b>Refer Back to SEAC</b>
2.	Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Gurudeeksha L, M/s. Chaprayil Granites Pvt. Ltd., for an area of 4.9500 Ha at Block No. 39, ReSy Nos. 173/4-7, 173/4-16, 176/1, 176/1-3, 177/1, 177/1-2, 177/1-3, 177/1-4, 177/1-5, 177/1-6, 177/1-7, 177/3, 177/5, 177/6, 177/6-2, 178/3, 178/3-2, 178/4 & 178/5 in Chadayamangalam Village, Kottarakkara Taluk, Kollam (SIA/KL/MIN/460718/2024)	<b>Refer Back to SEAC</b>
3.	Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Raju I Punam for an area of 0.0755 Ha at Block No.27, Re-Survey no. 245/4 Kaipattoor Village, Kanayannoor Taluk, Ernakulam –Reg (SIA/KL/MIN/555688/2025)	<b>Refer Back to SEAC</b>
4.	Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project of Smt. Molly Raju for an area of 0.0975 Ha at Block No.26, Re-Survey no. 301/1 Edakkattuvayal Village, Kanayannoor Taluk, Ernakulam (SIA/KL/MIN/555684/2025)	<b>Refer Back to SEAC</b>
5.	Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Joby George, M/s. Rocky Aggregates, for an area of 2.1774 Ha at, Re- Sy No. 56/4, 58/3, 59/1, 59/2 in Bharananganam Village, Meenachil Taluk, Kottayam (SIA/KL/MIN/484455/2024)	<b>Refer Back to SEAC</b>
6.	Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Aneesh Peter for an area of 0.9936 Ha at Survey No.711/1-2-6, 714/1, 711/1-2-12, 711/1-2-4-2, 714/1- 5-2, 714/1-5, 714/1-4 in Neriamangalam Village, Kothamangalam Taluk, Ernakulam (SIA/KL/MIN/504004/2024)	<b>Refer Back to SEAC</b>
7.	Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. P.J Jose for an area of 2.7057 Ha at 492/4/1, 574/1A/9/9/19, 574/1A/9/9/20, 574/1A/11/11/6 in Pindimana Village, Kothamangalam Taluk, Ernakulam (SIA/KL/MIN/502028/2024)	<b>Refer Back to SEAC</b>
8.	Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. B. Sreekandan, for an area of 10.4881 Ha at Block No. 38, Re- Sy No. 227/1, 227/1-1, 227/1-2, 227/7, 227/18, 228/3, 228/4, 228/5, 228/6, 228/7, 228/10, 228/12, 228/13, 228/14, 228/17, 228/18, 228/19, 228/20, 228/21, 229/4, 229/16, 229/17, 264/3, 264/6, 264/6-1, 264/8, 264/9, 264/9-1, 264/10, 264/10-1, 264/11-1, 265/3, 265/4, 265/8, 265/9 in Anavoor Village, Neyyattinkara Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram. (SIA/KL/MIN/461000/2024)	<b>Refer Back to SEAC</b>

9.	Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. R Sreedharan Nair, Managing Director, M/s Mallelil Industries Pvt. Ltd., for an area of 1.6100 Ha at Survey No. 615/52-26, 615/52-6, 615/130, 615/54-7-29, 615/54-1- 32-1, 615/54-28, 615/61, 615/1-128, 615/54-4-2, 615/54-4-1, 615/54-1-43-1, 615/54-16, 615/54-3-22, 615/54-3-2, 615/53-1-8-2- 4, 615/53-1-8-2, 615/47-4, 615/47-3, 615/53-1-8-2-2, 615/54-1-219- 1, 615/47-10 in Konni Thazham Village, Konni Taluk, Pathanamthitta (SIA/KL/MIN/517689/2025)	<b>Refer Back to SEAC</b>
<b>Zone 3</b>		
10.	Environmental Clearance for the proposed Laterite building stone quarry of Smt. Fathimath Suhara, for an area of 0.4430 Ha, at Re-Sy Nos. 19/721,19/720, 19/64,19/613, 19/612, 19/611,19/723 in Koodathai Village, Thamarassery Taluk, Kozhikode (SIA/KL/MIN/515008/2025)	<b>Refer Back to SEAC</b>
11.	Environmental Clearance for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Ajayakumar M., for an area of 0.3884 Ha at Block No: 48, Re-Sy No. 145/1185 in Payam Village, Iritty Taluk, Kannur (SIA/KL/MIN/543163/2025)	<b>Refer Back to SEAC</b>
12.	Environmental Clearance for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Pavithran K V., President, Kannur Building Materials Co-Op Society Ltd., for an area of 0.9990 Ha at Block No: 28, Re-Sy No. 337, 337/101, 338/101 in Kankol Village, Payyannur Taluk, Kannur (SIA/KL/MIN/543457/2025)	<b>Refer Back to SEAC</b>
13.	Environmental Clearance for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Suresh K., for an area of 0.5908 Ha at Block No: 30, Re-Sy No. 679 in Eramam Village, Payyannur Taluk, Kannur (SIA/KL/MIN/552530/2025)	<b>Refer Back to SEAC</b>
14.	Environmental Clearance for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. K. M. Lazer., for an area of 0.0971 Ha at Block No. 166, Re-Sy No. 163/2 in Sreekandapuram Village, Taliparamba Taluk, Kannur (SIA/KL/MIN/552543/2025)	<b>Refer Back to SEAC</b>
15.	Environmental Clearance for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. George P V., for an area of 0.3884 Ha at Block No:146, Re-Sy No. 256/911 in Kadannappally Village, Payyannur Taluk, Kannur (SIA/KL/MIN/552600/2025)	<b>Refer Back to SEAC</b>
16.	Environmental Clearance for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. P. Babu., for an area of 0.4732 Ha at Block No. 38, Re-Sy No. 173/101 in Vellora Village, Payyannur Taluk, Kannur	<b>Refer Back to SEAC</b>

	(SIA/KL/MIN/552619/2025)	
17.	Environmental Clearance for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. P. P. Ismail., for an area of 0.2038 Ha at Block No:24, Re-Sy No. 59/2 in Alappadamba Village, Payyannur Taluk, Kannur (SIA/KL/MIN/552738/2025)	<b>Refer Back to SEAC</b>
18.	Environmental Clearance for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Siyad Valappinakath for an area of 0.2914 Ha at Block No: 91, Re-Sy No. 46/666 in Kaliyad Village, Iritty Taluk, Kannur (SIA/KL/MIN/552767/2025)	<b>Refer Back to SEAC</b>
19.	Environmental Clearance for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Shinu Vargeese, for an area of 0.1822 Ha at Block No:24, Re-Sy No.12/1 in Alappadamba Village, Payyannur Taluk, Kannur (SIA/KL/MIN/552768/2025)	<b>Refer Back to SEAC</b>
20.	Environmental Clearance for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Sarith V., for an area of 0.4452 Ha at Block No:91, Re-Sy No. 46/761 in Kalliyad Village, Iritty Taluk, Kannur (SIA/KL/MIN/552792/2025)	<b>Refer Back to SEAC</b>
21.	Environmental Clearance for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. M P Manoharan, for an area of 0.3885 Ha at Block No: 004, Re-Sy No. 3/614 in Koodali Village, Thalassery Taluk, Kannur (SIA/KL/MIN/552897/2025)	<b>Refer Back to SEAC</b>
22.	Environmental Clearance for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Sunil Kumar Kakkamani., for an area of 0.1942 Ha at Block No:13, Re-Sy No. 105/2 in Korome Village, Payyannur Taluk, Kannur (SIA/KL/MIN/552901/2025)	<b>Refer Back to SEAC</b>
23.	Environmental Clearance for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Vivek P for an area of 0.2023 Ha at Block No:23, Re-Sy No. 395/102 in Alappadamba Village, Payyannur Taluk, Kannur (SIA/KL/MIN/552953/2025)	<b>Refer Back to SEAC</b>
24.	Environmental Clearance for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Abdurahiman P, for an area of 0.3641 Ha at Block no:91, Re-Sy Nos. 3/926, 3/927 in Kalliyad Village, Iritty Taluk, Kannur (SIA/KL/MIN/552957/2025)	<b>Refer Back to SEAC</b>
25.	Environmental Clearance for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. T. Lal, for an area of 0.8093 Ha at Block No:30, Re-Sy No.679 in Eramam Village, Payyannur Taluk, Kannur (SIA/KL/MIN/553040/2025)	<b>Refer Back to SEAC</b>
26.	Environmental Clearance for the Laterite Building Stone	<b>Refer Back to</b>

	Quarry Project of Sri. Shibin. K., for an area of 0.0971 Ha at Block No:139, Re-Sy No. 325/105 in Chuzhali Village, Taliparamba Taluk, Kannur (SIA/KL/MIN/553068/2025)	<b>SEAC</b>
27.	Environmental Clearance for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Vipin T T., for an area of 0.0876 Ha at Block No: 137, Re-Sy Nos. 30/1771, in Chuzhali Village, Taliparamba Taluk, Kannur (SIA/KL/MIN/553102/2025)	<b>Refer Back to SEAC</b>
28.	Environmental Clearance for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. A. Balagopalan., for an area of 0.2914Ha at Block No: 90, Re-Sy No. 11/267 in Kalliyad Village, Iritty Taluk, Kannur (SIA/KL/MIN/553196/2025)	<b>Refer Back to SEAC</b>
29.	Environmental Clearance for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Anoop T.P., for an area of 0.4047 Ha at Block No: 90, Re-Sy Nos. 11/103 in Kalliyad Village, Iritty Taluk, Kannur (SIA/KL/MIN/553213/2025)	<b>Refer Back to SEAC</b>
30.	Environmental Clearance for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. K. P. Karunakaran., for an area of 0.2428 Ha at Block No: 40, Re-Sy Nos. 18/275, in Kadannappally Village, Payyannur Taluk, Kannur (SIA/KL/MIN/553238/2025)	<b>Refer Back to SEAC</b>
31.	Environmental Clearance for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Jithu C. J., for an area of 0.1942 Ha at Block No. 24, Re-Sy No. 271/102,271/103 in Alappadamba Village, Payyannur Taluk, Kannur (SIA/KL/MIN/553243/2025)	<b>Refer Back to SEAC</b>
32.	Environmental Clearance for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. A. Pradeepan, for an area of 0.4047 Ha. at Block no:90, Re-Sy Nos. 11/124,11/162 in Kalliyad Village, Iritty Taluk, Kannur (SIA/KL/MIN/553310/2025)	<b>Refer Back to SEAC</b>
33.	Environmental Clearance for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. A Pradeepan, for an area of 0.4047 Ha at Block No:90, Re-Sy No. 11/162 in Kalliyad Village, Iritty Taluk, Kannur (SIA/KL/MIN/553339/2025)	<b>Refer Back to SEAC</b>
34.	Environmental Clearance for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Jacob K J, for an area of 0.1942 Ha at Block no: 065, Re-Sy Nos. 13/163 in Kolayad Village, Thalassery Taluk, Kannur (SIA/KL/MIN/553376/2025)	<b>Refer Back to SEAC</b>
35.	Environmental Clearance for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Kuthirummal Rajeevan, for an area of 0.4047 Ha at Block no:30, Re-Sy Nos. 248/102 in Eramam Village, Payyannur Taluk, Kannur	<b>Refer Back to SEAC</b>

	(SIA/KL/MIN/553851/2025)	
36.	Environmental Clearance for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Aneesh Mathew, for an area of 0.1857 Ha. at Block No. 53, Re-Sy No. 37/1386 in Vellarvalli Village, Iritty Taluk, Kannur (SIA/KL/MIN/556039/2025)	<b>Refer Back to SEAC</b>
37.	Environmental Clearance for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Mohammed Sulaiman, for an area of 0.1456 Ha at Block No. 210, Re-Sy No. 4/103 in Padiyoor Village, Iritty Taluk, Kannur (SIA/KL/MIN/552591/2025)	<b>Refer Back to SEAC</b>

**Item No.38**

**Environmental Clearance for the proposed Expansion of the existing Residential Building Construction project of Sri. Thankachan Thomas V., M/s Westend Avenue LLP at Block No. 4, T.S. No. 150 Part 1-4, 155 (New Sy. Nos. 155/2, 150/9) in Puthiyangadi Village, Kozhikode Taluk, Kozhikode  
(SIA/KL/INFRA2/462908/2024)**

The Environmental Clearance (EC) was granted to Sri. E.T. Firoz on March 16, 2018, for the construction of a residential building project with a total built-up area of 142,152.70 sq. m. on a 2.6612 Ha plot. Subsequently, the legal standing and responsibilities under this EC were transferred to M/s Westend Avenue LLP. Following this, Sri. Thankachan Thomas V, M/s Westend Avenue LLP, The Workvilla, Kamala Arcade, New No. 306, Anna Salai, Thousand Lights, Chennai, Tamilandu-600001 submitted an application for the expansion of Residential Building construction Project at T.S. No. 150 Part 1- 4, 155, (New Sy No. 155/2, 150/9) Beach Road, Puthiyangadi Village, Kozhikode Municipal Corporation, Kozhikode Taluk & District, Kerala.

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 application and the additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal. The 168<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting heard the presentation of the proposal. As per the application, that the Project Proponent is intended to increase the number of dwelling units from 496 to 530 units (addition of 34 dwelling units) within the same FAR area and built-up area by reducing size of some of the units. The FAR is @3.98. After due appraisal the SEAC in its 168<sup>th</sup>

meeting recommended EC for a period of 10 years, subject to certain specific conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

During its 147<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Authority sought clarification from the District Town Planner (DTP) of Kozhikode regarding variations in dwelling units, the number of towers, the Sewage Treatment Plant (STP), parking facilities, water requirements, and common area allocations all within the same built-up area and FAR. On 10.02.2026 the District Town Planner indicate that layout approval was previously granted to Sri. E.T. Firoz under order number TCPKZD/1670/2020-C1 dated 25.11.2020. This approved layout specifies a residential complex with a total built-up area of 142,151.79 sq. meters, consisting of 4 towers and 530 units.

Considering the above clarification, **the Authority accepted the recommendation of the 168<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting and decided to issue Combined CRZ and Environmental Clearance for the expansion of the Residential Building Construction Project for a period of 10 (Ten) 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 the FAR of the project is within the permissible limit.*
2. *Necessary consents shall be obtained from the Competent Authorities for discharging storm water into the nearby irrigation channel or public drains.*
3. *A copy of the EC for the proposed expansion or modification of the project shall be intimated to the KCZMA.*
4. *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).*
5. *A common provision for the EV charging facility shall be provided.*
6. *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.*
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 or public sewer system.*
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, should be adopted in practice. The guidelines for green rating and green building certification of 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 those 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 an acoustic enclosure and adequate stack height, and regular maintenance should be carried out before and after the construction phase.*
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 30<sup>th</sup> September 2020, the follow-up action on implementation of the approved EMP and CER by the Authority 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 conditions may lead to cancellation of EC and penal action under The Environment (Protection) Act 1986.*

**Item No.39**

**Environmental Clearance for the Expansion of the existing Hospital cum Medical College campus (Medical College, Nursing College, Multispecialty Hospital with Tertiary care Centre) project of Sri. Joy. P. Jacob, Secretary, M/s The Malankara Orthodox Syrian Church at Sy. Nos. 129/6-2, 129/10, 129/11-2, 135/2, 135/3, 135/3-2, 135/4, 134/1-5, 134/1-6, 134/1-7, 135/5 in Aikarnad North Village and Sy. Nos. 24/1-2-9, 24/1-2-10, 24/5-1-2 in Aikarnad Grama Panchayat, Aikarnad South Village, Kunnathunad Taluk, Ernakulam  
(SIA/KL/INFRA2/479309/2024)**

The Authority reviewed the item and noted the request from the Secretary of the Orthodox Syrian Malankara Church Medical Mission, Kozhencherry, for a personal hearing before the SEAC to provide necessary clarifications to comprehend their submissions. **Consequently, the Authority decided to refer the proposal back to the SEAC for a hearing and further appraisal in accordance with the EIA Notification, 2006, and in compliance with the judicial directions of the Hon'ble NGT and the Hon'ble Supreme Court.**

**Item No.40**

**Re-appraisal application for the Environmental Clearance of 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 W A No. 2403/2018, against judgment dated 16.1.2018 in WP(C) 4022/2017 filed by M/s. Malabar Sand and Stones Pvt. Ltd before the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala.  
(SIA/KL/MIN/521270/2025)**

The Authority perused the records of deliberations of the 195<sup>th</sup> SEAC, the field inspection report, and other materials placed before it, including the report of the KSDMA and proceedings related to the matter.

The Authority noted that portions of the project area fall within Medium and High Hazard Zones as identified in the SDMA report. It was further observed that the SEAC Sub-Committee had conducted a site inspection and submitted its findings based on field verification and verification of SDMA report. While the field inspection report and SDMA findings indicate certain site-specific considerations, the Authority is of the considered view that such reports require independent technical scrutiny during appraisal.

The Authority also observed that the Project Proponent has not submitted all mandatory documents as required under the applicable Office Memorandum dated 28.04.2023 for re-appraisal of DEIAA-issued Environmental Clearances, which are essential for a comprehensive and legally tenable appraisal of the proposal. In view of the above, after detailed deliberations, **the Authority decided as follows:**

- 1. The Project Proponent shall be directed to submit all requisite and mandatory documents, as prescribed under the Office Memorandum dated 28.04.2023 and other applicable regulatory provisions, within a stipulated time frame for enabling proper appraisal of the Environmental Clearance application.**
- 2. The SEAC shall undertake a detailed and independent assessment of the proposal, including site-specific environmental and geotechnical considerations, and shall not rely solely on the findings or recommendations of the SDMA report. The SDMA report may be treated as one of the inputs for appraisal.**
- 3. Upon receipt of the complete set of documents from the Project Proponent, the proposal shall be re-appraised by SEAC in accordance with the provisions of the EIA Notification, 2006, as amended, and relevant Office Memoranda, taking into account all applicable environmental safeguards, hazard zonation aspects, and field-level observations.**

**Item No.41**

**Environmental Clearance for the Expansion of the Building & Construction Project of M/s Adlux Medicity & Convention Centre Pvt. Ltd, at Block - 3, Re-Sy No. : 35/2 in Karukutty Village, Aluva Taluk, Ernakulam.**

**(Older EC issued File No. 1186/A2/2018/SEIAA)**

**(Expansion Project Proposal No: SIA/KL/MIS/273775/2022;  
2109/EC3/2022/SEIAA)**

**(New Proposal No. SIA/KL/INFRA2/549283/2025)**

Environmental Clearance was issued to the M/s Adlux Medicity as per the File No. 1186/A2/2018/SEIAA, E.C. No. 28/2020 dated 27-02-2020 for a period of 7 years under the violation category. Subsequently, Dr. Sujith Sudheesan, Director, Adlux Medicity & Convention Centre Pvt. Ltd Adlux Junction Karukutty P.O, Angamaly Ernakulam District

submitted an Environmental Clearance application for the proposed expansion of existing Hospital building, construction of Ayurveda Research Centre, Nursing College, Gents Hostel, Hotel (Revised proposal) and New Residential Quarters at Block - 3 , Re - Survey No. : 35/2 in Karukutty Village, Aluva Taluk, Ernakulam.

The Authority reviewed the item and observed the decision of various SEAC/SEIAA meetings held on different dates. SEAC had appraised the project based on the application and the additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal. The 168<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting heard the proposal. As per the application, the built-up area of the proposed expansion is 45,219.34 m<sup>2</sup>, and the total built-up area after the proposed expansion is 1,18,599.02 m<sup>2</sup>, in a total plot area of 1,70,597.00 m<sup>2</sup>. The total project cost is ₹10,200 lakh, with an EMP budget of ₹365 lakh (non-recurring) and ₹13.87 lakh per annum (recurring). During the 194<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting, the Committee reviewed the proposal and accepted a revised Remediation Plan of ₹104.92 lakh. Additionally, it approved the revised Corporate Environment Responsibility (CER) activities at Govt. High School, Palissery, for an amount of ₹76.50 lakhs. After due appraisal, the SEAC, in its 194<sup>th</sup> meeting, recommended EC for a period of 10 years, subject to the conditions in the original EC.

**In view of the above, the Authority accepted the recommendation of the 194<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting and decided to issue Environmental Clearance for the expansion of the existing Building Construction Project for a period of 10 (Ten) 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 conditions stipulated in the previous Environmental Clearance (EC) issued on 27.02.2020 must be strictly complied with.*
- 3. The comments and stipulations furnished by the State Pollution Control Board (SPCB), in pursuance of the Ministry's Notification dated 12.11.2024 and Office Memorandum dated 14.01.2025, shall be strictly adhered to and complied with in toto by the Project Proponent.*
- 4. The remediation plan activities presently under implementation shall be completed within a period of one (1) year. The Project Proponent shall furnish verifiable documentary evidence of completion of the said activities, which shall be submitted along with the Half-Yearly Compliance Reports (HYCR) to the Authority.*

5. *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).*
6. *A common provision for the EV charging facility shall be provided.*
7. *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.*
8. *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.*
9. *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.*
10. *The Project Proponent must ensure that only filtered overland drain is discharged to the nearby natural drain or public sewer system.*
11. *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).*
12. *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.*
13. *Exposed roof area and covered parking should be covered with material having a high solar reflective index.*
14. *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.*
15. *Design of the building should comply with the Energy Building Code as applicable.*
16. *Energy conservation measures as proposed in the application should be adopted in total.*

17. *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.*
18. *Construction work should be carried out during day daytime only.*
19. *All vehicles, including those carrying construction material of any kind, should be cleaned and wheels washed.*
20. *All vehicles carrying construction materials should be fully covered and protected.*
21. *All construction material of any kind should not be dumped on public roads or pavements or near the existing facilities outside the project site.*
22. *Grinding & cutting of building materials should not be done in open areas. Water jets should be used in grinding and stone cutting.*
23. *Occupational health and safety measures for the workers should be adopted during the construction.*
24. *D.G. set should be provided with an acoustic enclosure and adequate stack height, and regular maintenance should be carried out before and after the construction phase.*
25. *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.*
26. *Adequate measures should be adopted to harvest the rainwater.*
27. *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.*
28. *Open space shall be provided as per the building norms without being utilized for any other constructions.*
29. *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.*
30. *As per OM No F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30<sup>th</sup> September 2020, the follow-up action on implementation of the approved EMP and CER by the Authority 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.*

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

**Item No.42**

**Environmental Clearance for the proposed Commercial Complex Building Construction Project of Sri. Ameer Ahamed P.M, Managing Director, M/s Teejan Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd at Block 58, Re-Sy. Nos. 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 66, 70 in Perumbavoor Village, Kunnathunad Taluk, Ernakulam.  
(SIA/KL/INFRA2/556012/2025)**

Sri. Ameer Ahamed P.M, Managing Director, M/s Teejan Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd, Door No. 41/3434, Babu's Estate, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, Madhava Pharmacy Junction, Banerji Road, Ernakulam - 682018 submitted an Environmental Clearance application for the proposed Construction of Commercial Complex Building Project at Block 58, Re-Sy Nos: 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 66, 70 in Perumbavoor Village, Kunnathunad Taluk, Ernakulam.

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 application and the additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal. The 194<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting heard the presentation of the proposal. As per the application, the total built up area proposed is 35,743.44 sq. m. in a plot area of 1.0118 Ha. The FAR proposed is 22,646.18 sq. m. (@2.24). The total project cost is Rs. 130.43 Crore, of which Rs. 6.94 Crore is allocated for the Environmental Management Plan (EMP). Additionally, Rs. 1.965 Crore has been designated for Corporate Environmental Responsibility (CER) activities. After due appraisal, the SEAC in its 194<sup>th</sup> meeting recommended EC for a period of 10 years subject to certain Specific in addition to the General Conditions.

**In view of the above, the Authority accepted the recommendation of the 194<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting and decided to issue Environmental Clearance for the Construction of the proposed Commercial Complex Building Construction Project for a period of 10 (Ten) 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 the FAR of the project is within the permissible limit.*
- 2. The comments and stipulations furnished by the State Pollution Control Board (SPCB), in pursuance of the Ministry's Notification dated 12.11.2024 and Office Memorandum dated 14.01.2025, shall be strictly adhered to and complied with in toto by the Project Proponent.*
- 3. During the construction phase, a minimum 10 m height protective wall should be constructed to avoid polluting the natural stream on the west side of the project area.*
- 4. The electrical line passing through the project area should be considered for relocation in view of the safety concerns.*
- 5. From the excavated ordinary earth of 39,234 cu.m, 611 cu.m shall be reused onsite for landscaping and levelling, and the remaining quantity shall be used for refilling abandoned laterite mining projects in the surrounding areas.*
- 6. A consent shall be obtained from NHAI for stormwater diversion to the drains before commencement of work.*
- 7. 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).*
- 8. A common provision for the EV charging facility shall be provided.*
- 9. 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.*
- 10. 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.*
- 11. 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.*

- 12. The Project Proponent must ensure that only filtered overland drain is discharged to the nearby natural drain or public sewer system.*
- 13. 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).*
- 14. 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.*
- 15. Exposed roof area and covered parking should be covered with material having a high solar reflective index.*
- 16. 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.*
- 17. Design of the building should comply with the Energy Building Code as applicable.*
- 18. Energy conservation measures as proposed in the application should be adopted in total.*
- 19. 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.*
- 20. Construction work should be carried out during daytime only.*
- 21. All vehicles, including those carrying construction material of any kind, should be cleaned and wheels washed.*
- 22. All vehicles carrying construction materials should be fully covered and protected.*
- 23. All construction material of any kind should not be dumped on public roads or pavements or near the existing facilities outside the project site.*

24. *Grinding & cutting of building materials should not be done in open areas. Water jets should be used in grinding and stone cutting.*
25. *Occupational health and safety measures for the workers should be adopted during the construction.*
26. *D.G. set should be provided with an acoustic enclosure and adequate stack height, and regular maintenance should be carried out before and after the construction phase.*
27. *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.*
28. *Adequate measures should be adopted to harvest the rainwater.*
29. *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.*
30. *Open space shall be provided as per the building norms without being utilized for any other constructions.*
31. *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.*
32. *As per OM No F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30<sup>th</sup> September 2020, the follow-up action on implementation of the approved EMP and CER by the Authority 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.*
33. *The Project Proponent shall obtain all necessary clearances/ licenses/ permissions from all the statutory authorities issuing clearances/ licenses/ The Project Proponent is directed to install a CCTV camera and take all other essential measures to ensure that the project 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.*
34. *The violation of EC conditions may lead to cancellation of EC and penal action under the Environment (Protection) Act 1986.*

**Item No.43****Environmental Clearance for the Expansion of the Common Bio Medical Waste Treatment Facility of M/s Kerala Enviro Infrastructure Ltd at Block No. 37, Survey No. 205 in Puthenkruz village, Kunnathunad Taluk, Ernakulam.****(SIA/KL/INFRA2/554395/2025)**

Dr N. K. Pillai, CEO, M/s Kerala Enviro Infrastructure Ltd, Inside FACT-CD Campus, Ambalamedu, Ernakulam, submitted an Environmental Clearance application for the Expansion of the Common Bio Medical Waste Treatment Facility at Block No.37, Survey No. 205 in Puthenkruz Village, Kunnathunad Taluk, Ernakulam. The EC for the project was issued by SEIAA vide proceedings dated 29.11.2017 for a period of 5 years.

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 application and the additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal. The EC to the existing CBWTF project has been granted by SEIAA, Kerala vide letter No. 1036(A)/SEIAA/EC3/502/2016 dated 29.11.2017. At present, the KEIL proposes to increase the capacity of the existing facility by 20% in the first year & another 20% in the subsequent year as per MoEF&CC Notification 7(ii) (a) dated 11.04.2022. The proposed expansion requires no additional land, as all modifications will take place within the existing 3.5 acre campus. The Authority noted that since, the public hearing for the original facility was held at the District Collectorate, Ernakulam, on 07.11.2016, a fresh public hearing is not required for the proposed expansion, as the expansion is within the permissible limits of the existing lease area without additional land acquisition, in accordance with the relevant MoEF&CC Office Memoranda, and the project is also located within a notified industrial area, which is exempt from public hearing requirements.

Financially, the expansion is estimated to cost ₹72 Lakhs for Phase 1 and ₹580 Lakhs for Phase 2. To mitigate environmental impacts, the Project Proponent has allocated a capital investment of ₹31.5 Lakhs for the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) with a recurring annual cost of ₹21.64 Lakhs, alongside ₹7.0 Lakhs earmarked for Corporate Environment Responsibility (CER) activities. The 194<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting heard the presentation of the proposal. After due appraisal the SEAC in its 194<sup>th</sup> meeting recommended EC for a period of 10 years, for the proposed 20% expansion of the Common Biomedical Waste Treatment Facility , subject to the conditions mentioned in the original EC.

The Authority also noted the comments furnished in the report by the Member Secretary, KSPCB, via letter dated 31.01.2026, which was based on a site inspection conducted on 24.11.2025.

**In the above circumstances, the Authority decided accept the recommendations of the SEAC and to issue Environmental Clearance for the proposed 20% expansion of the Common Biomedical Waste Treatment Facility, for period of 10 (Ten) years, subject to the following Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.**

1. *All conditions stipulated in the previous Environmental Clearance (EC) issued on 28.11.2022 must be strictly complied with.*
2. *The comments and stipulations furnished by the State Pollution Control Board (SPCB), in pursuance of the Ministry's Notification dated 12.11.2024 and Office Memorandum dated 14.01.2025, shall be strictly adhered to and complied with in toto by the Project Proponent.*
3. *The KSPCB and Project Proponent to ensure that the guidelines for CBWTF issued by CPCB are followed scrupulously with due care for ensuring proper treatment and disposal of biomedical waste.*
4. *A Local Monitoring Committee (LMC), under the chairmanship of the President of the Grama Panchayat and including the elected member of the GP from the locality, representative of the industrial park, official of the Pollution Control Board and the Project Proponent should be formed to monitor the activities of the proposed plant on a regular basis to ensure that all the safeguards are intact.*
5. *Green belt shall be maintained minimum at a rate of 1 tree per every 80 sq. m as stated in the Appendix XIV of EIA Notification 2006 (SO 3099 (E) dated 09.12.2016).*
6. *The measures proposed to ensure the prevention of any accidental spill of the waste/ leachate should be monitored on a daily basis and safeguards ensured.*
7. *Appropriate number of wells within 1 km radius of the project site towards downstream side of the site should be identified through the LMC and weekly monitoring of water quality should be carried out for six months, initially, and monthly monitoring should be carried out subsequently by a NABL accredited laboratory. The results should be placed in the LMC and should be made available at the gate of the plant for public to refer.*
8. *Monitoring well should be maintained as recommended in the hydrogeological study and the groundwater quality should be monitored periodically by engaging NABL accredited Lab.*

9. *Surface outflow and groundwater outflow from the project area should be monitored periodically by engaging NABL accredited Lab.*
10. *All the assurances and the mitigation measures committed by the Project Proponent as per the environmental management plan and suggested in response to the complaints raised should be complied with scrupulously.*
11. *All the measures recommended in the hydrological and hydrogeological study should be complied with and reported to the LMC*
12. *Rotary type of incinerator should be installed as it has better thermal efficiency, air mixing in the burning chamber and operational efficiency with improved emission quality.*
13. *The onsite storage facility for storage of ETP sludge, ash, and mercury waste should have adequate storage capacity and the Proponent should ensure weekly removal and disposal of this waste in the treatment, storage and disposal facility (TSDF) for Hazardous Waste, currently located at Amabalamedu, Ernakulam.*
14. *Project Proponent should install Ultra Filtration (UF)/RO facility in addition to Pressure Sand Filter and Pressure (PSF) and Pressure Carbon Filter (PCF) for enabling and ensuring recycling/reusing of tertiary treated wastewater to achieve zero discharge.*
15. *The recommendations of the engineering feasibility study and hydrological and hydrogeological study should be implemented strictly*
16. *The surface water drainage system comprising of drains, channels, catch drains, culverts etc. should be implemented prior to the commissioning of the plant and it should be maintained properly and periodically.*
17. *Harness maximum solar energy, to meet partial power requirement and providing post type, solar yard lighting system, within and adjoining areas.*
18. *Rain water falling on active tipping areas should be collected separately and it should be collected through the leachate collection drain and leachate collection sumps and finally lead to the leachate treatment for treatment and disposal/ reuse.*
19. *Green belt should be developed all around the compound using indigenous species of trees, herbs and climbers prior to the commissioning of the plant.*
20. *Compensatory afforestation plan should be implemented using indigenous species of plants, herbs and climbers prior to the commissioning of the plant and the progress of implementation of the plan and its maintenance should be submitted in the half-yearly compliance report along with geo-tagged photographs.*
21. *Disinfection and cleaning arrangements for the vehicles should be maintained at the entry and exit gates*

22. *The Corporate Environment Responsibility Plan should be implemented during the first two years of the project and it should be operated and maintained during the rest of the period of EC.*
23. *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 Half Yearly Compliance Report.*
24. *There should be regular vigil on the safeguard measures installed for possible accidental spillage of contaminants to the water body in the downstream area and the findings should be recorded in a log book which should be placed in the LMC on a regular basis.*
25. *Adequate sources for water to meet the requirement during construction and operational phase is to be ensured and details should be given in HYCR.*
26. *The excavation of earth for construction should be limited to minimum and the activity should not affect the water sources of the nearby houses.*
27. *Climate responsive design as per Green Building Guidelines in practice should be adopted.*
28. *The green building criteria notified in the GO (Ms) No. 39/2022/LSGD dated 25.2.2022 should be adopted.*
29. *Appropriate greening measures should be adopted on the ground as well as over built structure such as roofs, basements, podiums etc.to reduce the urban heat effect of civil structures.*
30. *Exposed roof area and covered parking should be covered with material having high solar reflective index.*
31. *Construction work should be carried out during day time only.*
32. *All vehicles, including the ones carrying construction material of any kind, should be cleaned and wheels washed.*
33. *All vehicles carrying construction / waste materials should be fully covered and protected.*
34. *All construction / waste materials of any kind should not be dumped on public roads or pavements or near the existing facilities outside the project site.*
35. *Occupational health safety measures for the workers should be adopted during the construction & operation phases.*
36. *All vehicles during the construction / operation phase should carry PUC certificate.*

37. *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.*
38. *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.*
39. *Adequate measures should be adopted to harvest the rainwater.*
40. *Adequate built-in composting facility should be set up for the treatment of biodegradable waste as the capacity of the local LSGD is inadequate.*
41. *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.*
42. *As per OM No F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30<sup>th</sup> September 2020, the follow-up action on implementation of the approved EMP and CER by the Authority 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.*
43. *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.*
44. *The Project Proponent is directed to install a CCTV camera and take all other essential measures to ensure that the project 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.*
45. *The violation of EC conditions may lead to cancellation of EC and penal action under the Environment (Protection) Act 1986.*

**Item No.44**

**Application for Validity Extension of Environmental Clearance issued to the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. M. K. Biju, M/s Vismaya Rocks Private Ltd., for an area of 15.8000 Ha, (39.0418Acres) at Block No. 50, Re-Sy. Nos. 472/3, 472/4, 473/7-2, 473/6, 473/4-2, 473/4, 473/7, 472/5, 470/2-2, 471/5, 471/2, 470/8, 470/5, 470/7, 470/3-2, 470/9, 470/4, 470/2, 468/3, 473/8, 470/6, 470/3, 473/5, 470/10, 470/10-2, 472/1, 468/2, 471/1, 471/8, 474/8, 473/8-2, 472/6, 468/1-2, 474/7-2 (Patta Land), 470/11, 470/1 & 474/2 (Government Land) in Kummil Village, Kottarakara Taluk, Kollam.**

**(SIA/KL/MIN/552797/2025; File No. 1205/EC1/2018/SEIAA)**

Sri. Biju M.K, Managing Director, M/s Vismaya Rocks Private Ltd, Karthika House, Kuttikkadu P O, Kadakkal, Kollam District, submitted an application for the validity extension of EC issued on 25.10.2019, for an area of 15.8000 Ha, (39.0418Acres) at Block No. 50, Re-Sy. Nos. 472/3, 472/4, 473/7-2, 473/6, 473/4-2, 473/4, 473/7, 472/5, 470/2-2, 471/5, 471/2, 470/8, 470/5, 470/7, 470/3-2, 470/9, 470/4, 470/2, 468/3, 473/8, 470/6, 470/3, 473/5, 470/10, 470/10-2, 472/1, 468/2, 471/1, 471/8, 474/8, 473/8-2, 472/6, 468/1-2, 474/7-2 (Patta Land), 470/11, 470/1 & 474/2 (Government Land) in Kummil Village, Kottarakara Taluk, Kollam.

The Authority reviewed the item and took note of the decisions of the various SEAC meetings held on different dates. The SEAC had appraised the project based on Form-6 and the additional details/documents submitted by the Project Proponent during the appraisal process. The proposal was also presented before the SEAC in its 194<sup>th</sup> meeting. As per the Modified Mining Plan and Scheme approved on 27.03.2024, the mineable reserve has been revised from 89,29,952 m<sup>3</sup> to 86,66,336 m<sup>3</sup> after accounting for overburden thickness and the presence of weathered rock. The remaining mineable reserve is 1,83,39,210 MT, with due consideration to the protection of the local groundwater regime. The Project Proponent has also engaged specialized agencies, namely CWRDM and NIT Surathkal, for conducting hydrogeological and vibration studies.

After due appraisal, the SEAC, in its 194<sup>th</sup> meeting, recommended extension of the validity of the Environmental Clearance for a period of 20 years from 01.10.2023 for a quantity of 1,83,39,210 MT, subject to the conditions stipulated in the original Environmental Clearance, in addition to the General Conditions applicable to granite mining projects.

**Under these circumstances, the Authority decided to accept the recommendation of the SEAC and to extend the validity of the Environmental Clearance for a period of 20 years from 01.10.2023, for extraction of 1,83,39,210 MT, subject to the Specific Conditions stipulated in the original Environmental Clearance, along with the applicable General Conditions for granite mining projects.**

**Item No.45                      Extension of Environmental Clearance issued for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Faris Kiliyamanni for an area of 0.1942Ha at Survey No. 307/14 in Anakkara Village, Pattambi Taluk, Palakkad  
(SIA/KL/MIN/558788/2025)**

Sri. Faris Kiliyamanni, Kiliyamannil House, South Pang P.O, Malappuram, Kerala, submitted an application for the validity extension for the Environmental Clearance issued on 03.03.2023 for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project for an area of 0.1942 Ha at Survey No: 307/1A in Anakkara Village, Pattambi Taluk, Palakkad, Kerala.

The Authority reviewed the item and took note of the decisions of the various SEAC meetings held on different dates. The SEAC had appraised the project based on Form-6, the field inspection report, and the additional details/documents submitted by the Project Proponent during the appraisal process. As per Form-6, the proposed quantity for mining is 6,797 MT per annum for a period of two years. The quarrying permit was issued on 27.03.2024 and was valid up to 26.03.2025. However, due to complaints, the Project Proponent could excavate only 45.160 MT during the said period. The balance mineable quantity available is 13,548.84 MT, and the Project Proponent has therefore requested an extension of the Environmental Clearance for a further period of two years.

Considering the request, the SEAC, in its 193<sup>rd</sup> meeting, recommended extension of the validity of the Environmental Clearance from the date of execution of the new quarrying permit, with a project life of two years for mining the balance quantity.

**Under these circumstances, the Authority decided to accept the recommendation of the SEAC and to extend the validity of the Environmental Clearance for a period of two years for extraction of the balance mineable quantity of 13,548.84 MT. The Project Proponent shall strictly carry out quarrying operations in accordance with the**

**production plan dated 25 June 2025 and shall not exceed the prescribed limits. This extension shall be subject to the additional conditions specified below, as well as the general and specific conditions stipulated in the original Environmental Clearance.**

- 1. Mining in the western part of the project area adjoining the road shall be carried out only after providing adequate berms and benches, each approximately 1.5 m × 1.5 m in size.*
- 2. The retaining wall along the length of the road shall be preserved and maintained at a height of 2 m.*
- 3. A proper drainage channel shall be constructed to prevent waterlogging in and around the project area.*
- 4. The project area shall be reclaimed promptly upon completion of mining activities.*

**Item No.46**

**Environmental Clearance for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Arun A. T., for an area of 0.3133 Ha at Block No. 86, Re-Sy Nos. 28/3308-3, 28/3309-3 of Vayathur Village, Iritty Taluk, Kannur (SIA/KL/MIN/553899/2025)**

The Authority reviewed the proposal and noted that the SEAC, in its 192nd meeting, had considered the representation submitted by the Project Proponent dated 03.01.2026. In the said representation, the Project Proponent expressed unwillingness to proceed with the project, stating that the site falls within a Moderate Hazard Zone. In view of the request for withdrawal and the inability of the Project Proponent to continue with the project, the SEAC recommended rejection of the proposal.

**Considering the above, the Authority decided to accept the recommendation of the SEAC and to reject the application. The SEIAA Secretariat shall issue the necessary rejection order, clearly specifying the grounds for rejection.**

**Item No.46**

**Environmental Clearance for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. K Sajeewan, for an area of 0.0949 Ha at Block No. 137 Re-survey no. 30/2744 in Chuzhali Village, Taliparamba Taluk, Kannur**

**(SIA/KL/MIN/555217/2025)**

The Authority reviewed the proposal and noted that the SEAC-1, in its 194<sup>th</sup> meeting, recommended rejection of the application on the grounds that the Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri K. Sajeewan does not fall within the jurisdiction of SEAC-1. Although the project area is located in Kannur District (falling under SEAC-3), the Project Proponent had erroneously submitted the application to SEAC-1 by selecting Thiruvananthapuram as the district.

**Accordingly, the Authority decided to accept the recommendation of the SEAC and to reject the application. The SEIAA Secretariat shall issue the necessary rejection order, clearly specifying the grounds for rejection. The Project Proponent is advised to submit a fresh application under SEAC Zone-3, and such application shall be accorded priority in processing upon receipt.**

**Item No.47**

**Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Eldho Jacob, for an area of 4.1957 Ha at Re-Block No. 22, Re-Survey Nos. 170/1, 170/2, 170/3 in Muthalamada I - Village, Chittur Taluk, Palakkad District.**

**(SIA/KL/MIN/489749/2024)**

The Authority reviewed the proposal and noted that the SEAC, in its 193<sup>rd</sup> meeting, had observed that the project site is located in Muthalamada-I, which is designated as an Eco-Sensitive Area (ESA) village under the draft ESA Notification, wherein mining activities are prohibited in accordance with the directions dated 13.11.2013. Accordingly, the SEAC recommended rejection of the application.

The Authority further noted that a writ petition, WP(C) No. 7153/2026, has been filed by Sri Eldho Jacob against the SEIAA and SEAC, inter alia, challenging the proceedings pursuant to Exhibit P2 (minutes of the 193<sup>rd</sup> SEAC meeting). The Hon'ble High Court, by order dated 19.03.2026, has directed that final action based on the recommendation of the

SEAC shall be kept in abeyance until the next posting. Vide interim order dated 19.03.2026, the direction further extended until the next posting on 01.06.2026.

**In compliance with the directions of the Hon'ble High Court to keep further action in abeyance, the Authority decided to defer a final decision on the proposal and await further orders of the Court.**

**Item No.49 Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of M/s. Therani Rocks Private Limited, Director, Sri. Mathew C Samuel for an area of 0.9855 Ha at Block No.38, Re-Survey 34/1, 34/2, 34/2-2, 34/5-1, 35/3, 35/6, 35/7, 35/8 & 35/19 in Anavoor Village, Neyyatinkara Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram District.  
(SIA/KL/MIN/494660/2024)**

The Authority reviewed the proposal and noted the minutes of the 194th SEAC meeting, along with the communication dated 11.03.2025 submitted by the Project Proponent, requesting withdrawal of the application in order to seek Environmental Clearance (EC) for a larger area. Upon examination of the request, the SEAC recommended permitting the withdrawal of the proposal. **Accordingly, the Authority decided to accept the recommendation of the SEAC and to permit withdrawal of the application.**

**Item No.50 ToR for the Proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. P.T.V Musthafa, M/s PTV Granites for an area of 2.170 Ha at Block no. 04, Re-survey no: 368/2A-44 in Arakkuparambu Village, Perinthalmanna Taluk, Malappuram.  
(SIA/KL/MIN/563837/2026)**

The Authority considered the application for the grant of Terms of Reference (ToR) for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. P.T.V Musthafa, M/s PTV Granites, for an area of 2.170 Ha at Block No. 04, Re-Survey No: 368/2A-44 in Arakkuparambu Village, Perinthalmanna Taluk, Malappuram.

The Authority noted that the SEAC, in its 193<sup>rd</sup> meeting, had appraised the proposal in detail and recommended issuance of Standard Terms of Reference under Category 1(a) – Mining of Minerals, taking into account the cluster condition and other relevant project particulars, with the specific requirement that a Comprehensive Environmental Management

Plan (EMP), addressing the cumulative environmental impacts of all adjacent quarries, shall form an integral part of the EIA study.

**After due consideration, the Authority resolved to accept the recommendation of the SEAC and accord approval for issuance of the Standard Terms of Reference for the proposed activity under Category 1(a) – Mining of Minerals, subject to compliance with the provisions of the EIA Notification, 2006 and its amendments. The Project Proponent shall submit a Comprehensive Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), incorporating cumulative impact assessment of all adjacent quarry operations, as part of the EIA/EMP report.**

**Item No.51**

**ToR for the Proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Sivasankaran M. P. for an area of 0.6930 Ha at Survey No. 64/2-3, 64/2-4, 64/2-11, 64/2-1, 64/2-5, 64/2-12 in Mankada Village, Perinthalmanna Taluk, Malappuram.  
(SIA/KL/MIN/527246/2025)**

The Authority considered the application for the grant of Terms of Reference (ToR) for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Sivasankaran M. P., for an area of 0.6930 Ha at Survey No. 64/2-3, 64/2-4, 64/2-11, 64/2-1, 64/2-5, 64/2-12 in Mankada Village, Perinthalmanna Taluk, Malappuram.

The Authority noted that the SEAC, in its 193<sup>rd</sup> meeting, had appraised the proposal in detail and recommended issuance of Standard Terms of Reference under Category 1(a) – Mining of Minerals, taking into account the cluster condition and other relevant project particulars, with the specific requirement that a Comprehensive Environmental Management Plan (EMP), addressing the cumulative environmental impacts of all adjacent quarries, shall form an integral part of the EIA study.

**After due consideration, the Authority resolved to accept the recommendation of the SEAC and accord approval for issuance of the Standard Terms of Reference for the proposed activity under Category 1(a) – Mining of Minerals, subject to compliance with the provisions of the EIA Notification, 2006 and its amendments. The Project Proponent shall submit a Comprehensive Environmental Management Plan (CEMP),**

**incorporating cumulative impact assessment of all adjacent quarry operations, as part of the EIA/EMP report.**

**Item No.52**

**ToR for the Granite Building Stone Quarry of 'M/s. Mariya Granites for an area of 4.9900 Ha at Block No: 42, Re-Sy Nos: 467/3-3, 467/8-1, 467/8- 2, 467/9, 467/10, 467/10-1, 467/11, 467/11-1, 467/11-2, 467/12, 467/12-1, 467/13, 467/15, 467/16, 467/17, 477/2-3, 477/2-4, 477/4 in Poovarany Village & Block No: 43, Re-Sy Nos: 101/1, 101/2, 101/3, 101/3-1, 101/3-2, 101/3-3, 101/3-5, 101/7, 101/8 in Kondoor village, Meenachil Taluk, Kottayam. (SIA/KL/MIN/564778/2026)**

The Authority considered the application for the grant of Terms of Reference (ToR) for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. John Jacob M, M/s. Mariya Granites for an area of 4.9900 Ha at Block No: 42, Re-Survey Nos: 467/3-3, 467/8-1, 467/8-2, 467/9, 467/10, 467/10-1, 467/11, 467/11-1, 467/11-2, 467/12, 467/12-1, 467/13, 467/15, 467/16, 467/17, 477/2-3, 477/2-4, 477/4 in Poovarany Village & Block No: 43, Re-Survey Nos: 101/1, 101/2, 101/3, 101/3-1, 101/3-2, 101/3-3, 101/3-5, 101/7, 101/8 in Kondoor village, Meenachil Taluk, Kottayam, Kerala.

The Authority noted that the SEAC, in its 194<sup>th</sup> meeting, had appraised the proposal in detail and recommended issuance of Standard Terms of Reference under Category 1(a) – Mining of Minerals, taking into account the cluster condition and other relevant project particulars, with the specific requirement of slope stability study, and the soil profile across and along the project area, considering the proximity to hazard zones.

**After due consideration, the Authority resolved to accept the recommendation of the SEAC and accord approval for issuance of the Standard Terms of Reference for the proposed activity under Category 1(a) – Mining of Minerals, subject to compliance with the provisions of the EIA Notification, 2006 and its amendments. The Project Proponent shall conduct slope stability study and the soil profile across and along the project area, considering the proximity to hazard zones and a Comprehensive Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), incorporating cumulative impact assessment of all adjacent quarry operations, as part of the EIA/EMP report.**

**Item No.53**

**ToR for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Abdul Majeed V., M/s Iritty Constructions, for an area 4.5449 Ha at Re-Sy Block No: 71, Re-Sy Nos: 1/396, 1/431, 1/432, 1/435 in Nedyenga Village, Taliparamba Taluk, Kannur  
(SIA/KL/MIN/562955/2026)**

The Authority considered the application for the grant of Terms of Reference (ToR) for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Abdul Majeed V., M/s Iritty Constructions, for an area of 4.5449 Ha at Re-Survey Block No: 71, Re-Survey Nos: 1/396, 1/431, 1/432, 1/435 in Nedyenga Village, Taliparamba Taluk, Kannur.

The Authority noted that the SEAC, in its 195<sup>th</sup> meeting, had appraised the proposal in detail and recommended issuance of Standard Terms of Reference under Category 1(a) – Mining of Minerals, taking into account the cluster condition and other relevant project particulars, with the specific requirement that a Comprehensive Environmental Management Plan (EMP), addressing the cumulative environmental impacts of all adjacent quarries, shall form an integral part of the EIA study.

**After due consideration, the Authority resolved to accept the recommendation of the SEAC and accord approval for issuance of the Standard Terms of Reference for the proposed activity under Category 1(a) – Mining of Minerals, subject to compliance with the provisions of the EIA Notification, 2006 and its amendments. The Project Proponent shall submit a Comprehensive Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), incorporating cumulative impact assessment of all adjacent quarry operations, as part of the EIA/EMP report.**

**Item No.54**

**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 noted that the physical application for transfer of Environmental Clearance was considered in the 162<sup>nd</sup> SEIAA meeting, wherein it was decided to approve the transfer of the Environmental Clearance in favour of Sri Fayaz Basheer, subject to the conditions and stipulations contained in the original Environmental Clearance. However, as

the decision was taken on a physical file, the necessary proceedings could not be processed through the PARIVESH Portal.

In view of the above, **the Authority decided to uphold the earlier decision to approve the transfer of the Environmental Clearance in favour of Sri Fayaz Basheer, subject to the conditions and stipulations contained in the original Environmental Clearance. The SEIAA Secretariat was directed to issue the necessary proceedings through the PARIVESH Portal, effecting the transfer of the Environmental Clearance and incorporating the credentials and details of the transferee, based on the consent and documents submitted by the Project Proponent.**

**Item No.55                      Transfer of DEIAA, Malappuram issued EC for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Sakkeer Hussain for an area of 3.2081 Ha at Re. Survey No 5/6 in Kuruvambalam Village and Re- Survey Nos. 1/1A & 14 in Pulamanthole Village, Perintalmanna Taluk, Malappuram  
(SIA/KL/MIN/570264/2026)**

The Authority considered the request submitted by Sri. Joji Joseph, Managing Director, M/s Nedungapra Realtors and Hospitality Private Limited, seeking transfer/name change of the Environmental Clearance originally issued by DEIAA, Malappuram in favour of Sri. Sakkeer Hussain for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project. The Authority noted that the said EC was issued vide proceedings dated 23.01.2018 and its validity expired on 22.01.2024 (after considering the Covid 19 relaxation). It was also observed that the original EC holder has expired and the legal heirs have submitted the Legal Heirship Certificate along with supporting documents. Further, the Authority noted that the re-appraisal application of the said EC under Proposal No. SIA/KL/MIN/450942/2023 is pending and presently under process.

Upon examination, the Authority observed that there is no valid and subsisting Environmental Clearance as on date, and therefore, the request for transfer/name change cannot be considered. The Authority is of the considered view that transfer of EC is permissible only in respect of a valid EC, and an expired EC cannot be transferred. The Authority further noted that the legal heirs of the deceased EC holder are entitled to pursue the re-appraisal application in accordance with the applicable provisions.

In view of the above, after detailed deliberations, **the Authority decided as follows:**

- 1. The request for transfer/name change of the DEIAA-issued Environmental Clearance is hereby rejected, as the EC has expired and is not valid.**
- 2. The legal heirs of the deceased EC holder may pursue the re-appraisal application under Proposal No. SIA/KL/MIN/450942/2023 by submitting all requisite documents as per applicable guidelines.**
- 3. Upon successful re-appraisal and issuance of a fresh Environmental Clearance, the request for transfer/name change may be considered by the Authority in accordance with prevailing rules and procedures.**

## **General Decisions**

### **1. Modification / Revision of Mining Plan post Environmental Clearance**

The Authority, upon examination of various cases, observed that after the issuance of Environmental Clearance, Project Proponents are undertaking revisions to the approved Mining Plan, particularly with respect to quantities of mineable resources, topsoil and overburden, on the ground that such quantities are initially based on estimations and may vary during actual quarry operations. While such revisions are being approved by the Department of Mining and Geology, it has been noted with concern that these modifications are not being duly intimated to the Authority, even though there is a condition in the EC to this extent.

The Authority is of the considered view that the Mining Plan constitutes a fundamental document forming the basis for appraisal and grant of Environmental Clearance. Any alteration thereto, without prior intimation and approval of the Authority, amounts to suppression of material facts and constitutes a violation of the conditions of Environmental Clearance as well as the provisions of the EIA Notification, 2006, particularly Clause 7(ii) relating to change in scope of the project.

The Authority also notes that such frequent revisions indicate inadequacies in the preparation of Mining Plans, including lack of proper field verification and scientific assessment. The concerned agencies and professionals involved in the preparation and

approval of Mining Plans shall ensure due diligence, accuracy, and site-specific validation to avoid such post-clearance modifications.

The Authority further observed that it is incumbent upon the Project Proponent to place any revised Mining Plan before the Authority and obtain necessary amendment/modification of the Environmental Clearance. It is also noted that an established mechanism exists for such modification through the PARIVESH portal, and the process is neither onerous nor time-consuming. In light of the above, **the Authority hereby decides as follows:**

- a) **All existing and future Environmental Clearance holders shall mandatorily submit any revised Mining Plan, approved by the competent authority, before SEIAA and obtain necessary modification of the Environmental Clearance before implementation of such changes.**
- b) **Any deviation from the approved Mining Plan without prior approval of SEIAA shall be treated as a violation of EC conditions and relevant provisions of the EIA Notification, 2006, and shall attract appropriate action as per law.**
- c) **The SEAC shall, upon receipt of such revised Mining Plans, undertake verification and appraisal of the same expeditiously, and shall specifically examine the implications of such revisions on the approved Environmental Management Plan (EMP), particularly with respect to topsoil and overburden management. SEAC shall recommend appropriate modifications, if any, to the EMP in a time-bound manner.**

The above directions shall be strictly complied with by all Project Proponents and concerned authorities.

## **2. Alteration of Buffer Zones**

The Authority, upon review of several cases, observed that approved Mining Plans uniformly provide for a statutory buffer zone of 7.5 metres along all boundaries; however, in practice, Project Proponents encounter operational constraints necessitating limited alterations for access for machineries and trucks, and other allied activities. It has been

noted that such alterations are often undertaken without prior approval, resulting in violations of Environmental Clearance conditions and regulatory provisions.

The Authority is of the considered view that while the buffer zone is a critical environmental safeguard and shall be maintained as a general rule, limited and justified modifications, if unavoidable, must be transparently assessed and duly approved in advance. In view of the above, **the Authority hereby decides as follows:**

- a) **In cases where alteration of the buffer zone is unavoidable due to operational requirements, the Project Proponent shall, prior to undertaking any such activity, submit either the original Mining Plan or a revised Mining Plan duly approved by the Department of Mining and Geology, clearly delineating the extent, location, and justification for the proposed modification, along with necessary environmental safeguards.**
- b) **The revised submission shall mandatorily include a detailed restoration and mitigation plan for the affected buffer area, including measures for environmental protection, slope stability, and post-mining rehabilitation.**
- c) **No quarrying or allied activity shall be carried out within the buffer zone without prior approval of the Authority. Any unauthorized alteration shall be treated as a violation of EC conditions and the provisions of the EIA Notification, 2006.**
- d) **It is clarified that this provision shall not be construed as a general relaxation permitting alteration of all buffer zones. Any such modification shall be considered only on a case-by-case basis, subject to technical appraisal and environmental safeguards.**

### **3. Validity of EC and Periodic Review by SEAC**

The Authority examined the provisions contained in several Environmental Clearances issued by SEIAA, wherein the EC was initially granted for a period of five (5) years from the date of execution of the mining lease/permit, with a provision to extend the validity to cover the entire project life, subject to periodic review by SEAC at intervals of five years to assess compliance with EC conditions and environmental safeguards.

The Authority noted that ambiguity persists among Project Proponents regarding the requirement of applying for extension or review after the initial five-year period. Upon deliberation, the Authority clarified that such ECs are deemed valid for the entire project life as specified in the Environmental Clearance, and no separate application for extension or review is required from the Project Proponent.

However, the Authority emphasized that the provision for periodic review by SEAC remains operative as a regulatory oversight mechanism.

In view of the above, **the Authority hereby decides as follows:**

- a) All such Environmental Clearances shall be treated as valid for the full project life as stipulated in the EC, subject to compliance with all conditions therein.**
- b) The Project Proponent is not required to submit any application for extension or for review by SEAC at the end of the initial five-year period.**
- c) The SEAC shall undertake periodic review of such projects suo motu, preferably at intervals of five years, including site inspection wherever necessary, to assess compliance with EC conditions and to evaluate any environmental impacts arising from project activities.**
- d) This decision shall apply to all existing Environmental Clearances containing such provisions, as well as to future Environmental Clearances issued by the Authority.**

#### **4. Validity of EC for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Projects in Assigned Lands**

The Authority considered the issue relating to Environmental Clearances granted to mining projects located in assigned lands, where operations were discontinued pursuant to Government-issued Stop Memos following directions of the Hon'ble High Court in connection with land assignment matters. It was observed that such stoppage of operations has resulted in prolonged non-operational periods, creating uncertainty regarding the validity of ECs and the ability of Project Proponents to resume mining activities. The Authority also noted that the Government has subsequently permitted

mining activities in assigned lands under revised regulatory provisions, and further took cognizance of the MoEF&CC Office Memorandum, which allows such non-operational periods to be treated as a “zero period” for the purpose of calculating EC validity. Upon deliberation, the Authority decided as follows:

1. **Validity of EC for SEIAA-issued Clearances:** In cases where EC has been issued by SEIAA, and the Project Proponent has subsequently obtained all mandatory statutory clearances/permissions from the competent authorities, the Project Proponent shall be permitted to commence mining operations by treating the existing EC as valid for the project life, as originally stipulated in the EC, after excluding the non-operational (zero) period. The Project Proponent shall also inform the Authority regarding the specific period claimed and availed as “zero period” for EC validity.
2. **Requirement in Case of Revision:** In cases where any revision to the original Mining Plan has occurred or is proposed, the Project Proponent shall submit the revised Mining Plan and obtain prior modification of the Environmental Clearance, in accordance with the provisions laid down in General Decision No. 163.1, before resuming or commencing operations.
3. **Exclusion for DEIAA-issued ECs:** This provision shall not apply to Environmental Clearances issued by DEIAA. Such cases shall mandatorily undergo re-appraisal in accordance with prevailing norms, guidelines, and applicable Office Memoranda before any further consideration.

The above directions shall be applicable to all eligible cases and shall be complied with strictly by the Project Proponents and concerned authorities.

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

**Sd/-**  
**Sri. Raveendran T.**  
**Expert Member**

**Sd/-**  
**Sri. Seeram Sambasiva Rao IAS**  
**Member Secretary**