

**MINUTES OF THE 160th MEETING OF THE STATE
LEVEL ENVIRONMENT IMPACT ASSESSMENT AUTHORITY (SEIAA)
KERALA, HELD ON 30TH DECEMBER, 2025**

Present:

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

The 160th meeting of the State Environment Impact Assessment Authority (SEIAA), Kerala, was convened on 30th December 2025 at 10:30 a.m. under the Chairmanship of Sri. P.H. Kurian, IAS (Retd). The meeting was attended by Sri. Seeram Sambasiva Rao, IAS, Member Secretary, SEIAA, and Sri. Raveendran Thekkeparambil, Expert Member, SEIAA. The Authority reviewed the agenda items of the 160th meeting and adopted the following decisions:

PHYSICAL FILES

Item No.160.01 Minutes of the 158th SEIAA meeting held on 09th October, 2025 and Minutes of the 159th SEIAA meeting 18th November, 2025 was placed for Information.

Noted and confirmed the Minutes.

Item No.160.02 Environmental Clearance for Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. K.V Joy for an area of 1.4062 Ha at Re- Sy. Block No. 19, Re-Sy. Nos. 8/33, 8/34 in Kalpetta Village, Vythiri Taluk, Wayanad – Rejection Order Issued - Judgment dated 25.09.2025 in WP(C) No. 40566/2023 filed by Sri. K.V Joy.
(SIA/KL/MIN/141622/2020, 1916/EC2/SEIAA/2021)

The Authority considered the request submitted by the Project Proponent dated 19.10.2025, the Judgment of the Hon'ble High Court dated 25.09.2025 in WP(C) No. 40566 of 2023, and the decision taken in the 185th meeting of the SEAC. The Authority noted that,

in compliance with the aforesaid Judgment, the SEAC in its 185th meeting provided an opportunity of hearing to the Project Proponent and the RQP.

Upon examination of the records and the deliberations of the SEAC, the Authority observed that the Project Proponent, while seeking reconsideration, continued to confine the submissions primarily to the proposed project site, without adequately addressing the broader regional environmental setting of the region. The Authority concurred with the SEAC's assessment that the erstwhile observations regarding the regional ecological context, including the presence of inhabited hill slopes and the susceptibility of the surrounding highland terrain to landslides, remain valid and relevant. The Authority further noted that the SEAC had specifically recorded that any additional disturbance in such a fragile highland ecosystem would result in cumulative and irreversible environmental degradation.

The Authority also took note of the SEAC's finding that the clarifications and documents submitted by the Project Proponent did not bring forth any new scientific data, technical justification, or legally tenable material capable of addressing or mitigating the core ecological, climatological, geomorphological, and environmental concerns that formed the basis of the earlier recommendations. Accordingly, the Authority agreed with the SEAC's conclusion that the proposed mining activity is environmentally unsuitable in the sensitive highland ecosystem and that the application of the Precautionary Principle is warranted.

After detailed deliberation, the Authority resolved that, in view of the established ecological fragility of the region, the proximity to landslide-prone areas, and the high risk of irreversible environmental impacts, no grounds exist for reconsideration of the earlier decision. Accordingly, the Authority, concurring with the observations and recommendations of the SEAC, decided to uphold its earlier decision and accept the recommendation of the SEAC to reject the Environmental Clearance (EC) application.

Item No.160.03

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, Kunnamkulam Taluk, Ernakulam – Complaint filed by Adv. Jerin J. and Smt. Sajani O.V – Report from KSPCB

File No. 2270/EC3/2023/SEIAA

The Authority reviewed the item and noted that Environmental Clearance for the Quarry Project (Proposal No. SIA/KL/MIN/425832/2023) was granted on 03.03.2024, valid for a period of two years up to 02.03.2026. The Authority noted that, as per the KOMPAS portal, the quarry is presently operational.

The Authority took note of the complaints submitted by Adv. Jerin J. and Smt. Sajani O.V., alleging violations of Environmental Clearance conditions and the approved mining plan, and raising concerns regarding the proximity of the quarry to the Periyar Valley Branch Canal and a public water tank of 1 lakh litre capacity. The Authority further noted that the complaints were forwarded to the concerned line departments for verification. The Authority also took note of subsequent complaints submitted by Adv. Jerin J. vide letter dated 25.11.2025 and email dated 23.12.2025, alleging over-extraction of granite beyond the lease boundary and buffer zone, non-maintenance of the buffer zone, lack of proper fencing, and non-implementation of specific EC conditions such as installation of solar panels, rainwater harvesting systems, blasting mats, and compensatory afforestation. The complainant further contested the levy of royalty amounting to ₹1,05,28,629.20, contending that it was imposed without proper measurement.

The Authority examined the report submitted by the Environmental Engineer, Kerala State Pollution Control Board (KSPCB), District Office, Ernakulam, based on the site inspection conducted on 26.08.2025. The report confirmed that, at the time of inspection, there was no discharge of wastewater into the canal. However, several non-compliances were observed, including the absence of a gully canal, silt traps, siltation pond, and overflow channel, as well as non-functional water sprinklers for dust suppression. The Authority noted that KSPCB had already issued directions to the Project Proponent to rectify the identified deficiencies and ensure compliance with the stipulated environmental safeguards.

The Authority also observed that the Half-Yearly Compliance Reports (HYCRs) for the project have not been submitted so far, despite reminders issued to the Project Proponent,

and that the report from the District Geologist is still awaited. After detailed deliberation and considering the seriousness of the allegations, the inspection findings of KSPCB, and the confirmation of illegal mining by the Mining & Geology Department, **the Authority decided as follows:**

- 1. Issue a show-cause notice to the Project Proponent (PP) calling upon them to explain why the Environmental Clearance granted vide proceedings dated 03.03.2024 should not be cancelled for alleged violations of EC conditions, deviations from the approved mining plan, illegal mining beyond the lease and buffer zones and non-submission of Half-Yearly Compliance Reports. The Show Cause Notice shall specifically refer to the reports of the Kerala State Pollution Control Board and the Mining & Geology Department. The SEIAA Secretariat shall furnish copies of the complaints and averments submitted by Adv. Jerin J. to the Project Proponent to enable a comprehensive reply.**
- 2. To afford an opportunity of personal hearing to the Project Proponent in the next meeting of the Authority, after receipt of the written reply to the Show Cause Notice, for examining the allegations, the compliance status, and the factual and legal aspects of the case, before taking any further decision in the matter.**

Item No.160.04

Environmental Clearance for the Sree Ayyappa Medical College & Research Foundation project submitted by Dr. P. Suyambu Nadar, Managing Trustee, M/s PSN Educational & Charitable Trust at Sy Nos. 453, 453/1, 453/17, 453/9, 453/20, 453/10, 453/14-1 at Vadasserkkara Village, Ranni Taluk, Pathanamthitta – Rejection Order issued - Judgment dated 25.08.2025 in WP (C) No. 35065/2017

(File No. 1083/EC4/SEIAA/2016)

The Authority reviewed the matter and noted the request letter dated 04.12.2025 submitted by the Project Proponent and the judgment of Hon'ble High Court dated 25.08.2025 in WP (C) No. 35065/2017. The Authority noticed that the Hon'ble High Court set aside the prior rejection of the application for Environmental Clearance (EC) and ordered a fresh reconsideration on the application for environmental clearance, based on facts and

materials submitted and after affording an opportunity to the Petitioner to be heard, within a period of 3 months.

The Authority noted that the project area is in Vadasserkkara Village, notified as an Ecologically Sensitive Area (ESA) village and that, as per the directions issued by the MoEF&CC under Section 5 of the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986, dated 13.11.2013, all new and/or expansion of building and construction projects of 20000 sq. m of area and above in ESA villages are prohibited, subject to the finalisation of the ESA notification. The Authority further noted that the final ESA notification is yet to be issued by the Ministry.

The Authority also took note of the interim orders of the Hon'ble High Court dated 21.11.2025 and 12.12.2025 in WP(C) No. 2785 of 2025, regarding the ESA matter, wherein the Hon'ble Court has suo moto impleaded the Secretary, MoEF&CC and the Secretary, Kerala Forest Department and directed them to take action for the finalisation of the issues relating to ESA.

Further, the Authority observed that the Project Proponent has admittedly carried out substantial construction activities without obtaining prior Environmental Clearance, thereby attracting the provisions relating to violation of the EIA Notification, 2006. The Authority noted that the legal position relating to ex post facto Environmental Clearance is presently unsettled, in view of the judgments of the Hon'ble Supreme Court striking down ex post facto ECs, and that the issue is pending consideration before the Hon'ble Apex Court in connected matters. Hence, the processing of violation-category applications remains sub judice and legally constrained at this stage.

In view of the statutory restrictions applicable to ESA villages, the binding judicial pronouncements, the admitted violation of the EIA Notification, and the present legal and procedural uncertainty regarding violation cases, the Authority was of the considered view that the proposal cannot be processed at this juncture.

Accordingly, after detailed deliberation, **the Authority decided as follows:**

- 1. To defer consideration of the item till the finalisation and issuance of the Ecologically Sensitive Area (ESA) Notification by the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change.**

2. To inform the Project Proponent and the Standing Counsel of the Hon'ble High Court regarding the decision to defer the matter, with specific reference to the Section 5 directions of the Ministry dated 13.11.2013, the interim orders in WP(C) No.2785 of 2025, the absence of a valid application on the PARIVESH Portal, and the present legal and procedural uncertainty regarding violation cases.

Item No.160.05

Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry project of Sri. Kuttiamu Haji P M for an area of 0.6425 Ha at Survey Nos: 28/1, 28/2-1, 28/2-2 in Pulikkal Village, Kondotty Taluk, Malappuram – Rejection Order Issued - Seeking Clarification from Mining & Geology Department

(SIA/KL/MIN/400899/2022, 2333/EC6/2023/SEIAA)

The Authority considered the matter relating to the rejection order issued to the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Kuttiamu Haji P.M. and the subsequent request of the Project Proponent seeking reconsideration of the Environmental Clearance application on the ground that no cluster condition exists.

The Authority noted that the proposal was earlier directed to be processed under the cluster category based on the assessment that multiple quarries, including working quarries, quarries without approved mine closure certificates, and quarries issued with Letters of Intent (LoI), exist within a radius of 500 m from the project boundary. The Authority further noted that the Project Proponent had submitted conflicting Cluster Certificates issued by the Mining and Geology Department on different dates, leading to ambiguity regarding the existence and extent of the cluster condition.

The Authority examined the recommendations of the SEAC, which, after detailed deliberation, had concluded that clarification from the Mining and Geology Department is essential to conclusively ascertain the cluster condition by considering all quarries within the 500m radius, including operational quarries, quarries without mine closure certificates, and quarries issued with Letters of Intent.

After careful consideration, the Authority agreed with the recommendation of the SEAC and observed that the determination of the cluster condition is fundamental to deciding

the requirement of Terms of Reference (ToR) for an EIA study and further appraisal of the proposal. The Authority also noted that, under sub-section (3) of Section 3 of the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986, the SEIAA shall have the authority to issue directions for the purpose of protecting and improving the quality of the environment, and such directions are binding on all departments and agencies concerned. Accordingly, clarification sought from the Mining and Geology Department on cluster conditions shall be treated as essential input for environmental appraisal under the said statutory mandate.

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

- 1. Seek a comprehensive clarification from the Mining and Geology Department regarding the existence of cluster condition within a radius of 500 m from the project site, by considering all working quarries, quarries without approved mine closure certificates, and quarries issued with Letters of Intent (LoI).**
- 2. To place the matter before the SEAC for further appraisal and recommendation, upon receipt of the clarification from the Mining and Geology Department.**

Item No.160.06

Environmental Clearance issued to the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Eldho Kuruvilla, for an area of 8.7668 Ha at Re-Survey Nos. 283, 282/3-1, 282/3- 3pt in Mazhuvannoor Village & Block No. 28 Re Survey Nos. 284/1-2, 284/1-3, 284/2-2Pt., 284/2- 3pt., 285/4, 283/2-5-2, 283/2-3-2, 282/1-3-1-2 in Arackappady Village, Kunnathunad Taluk, Ernakulam - Request for modification of CER activities.

**(SIA/KL/MIN/144152/2020, Old File No.1392/EC2/2019/SEIAA)
(New File No. 2972/EC1/2024/SEIAA)**

The Authority considered the request dated 02.07.2025 submitted by the Project Proponent, Sri. Eldho Kuruvilla, for revision of the approved CER activities in respect of the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project for an area of 8.7668 Ha in Mazhuvannoor and Arackappady Villages, Kunnathunad Taluk, Ernakulam District, for which Environmental Clearance was issued vide proceedings dated 11.10.2022, for a period of 10 years.

The Authority noted that the original CER commitments of Rs. 40 Lakh included

revival of Cheenikuzhy Pond, rainwater harvesting and well recharge activities, and installation of solar lighting systems in the concerned Grama Panchayats. The Authority further noted that a portion of the approved CER activities has already been implemented by the Project Proponent and that the Mazhuvannoor Grama Panchayat subsequently requested reallocation of the remaining CER funds towards alternative community-oriented projects, citing sufficiency of solar lighting facilities within the Panchayat.

The Authority examined the recommendation of the SEAC, which, after detailed deliberation in its 186th SEAC-1 meeting, accepted the revised CER proposal submitted by the Project Proponent, providing for allocation of ₹10 lakh towards the establishment of an eco-friendly happiness park in Ward No. 6 of Mazhuvannoor Grama Panchayat and ₹2 lakh towards setting up plastic and paper waste collection booths. The SEAC also recommended granting an additional one-year extension for the implementation of the revised CER activities.

After careful consideration of the SEAC's recommendation, the compliance status of the previously approved CER activities, and the justification furnished by the Project Proponent and the Grama Panchayat, **the Authority concurred with the findings of the SEAC and decided to revise the CER activities as proposed by the Project Proponent and to grant an additional period of one year for the implementation of the revised CER activities. The Project Proponent is directed to complete the newly proposed activities within the stipulated timeframe and submit the proof of implementation in the Half-Yearly Compliance Report (HYCR).**

Item No.160.07

Environmental Clearance issued to the Residential cum Commercial Building and Construction project of Kerala State Housing Board at Sy Nos 1176/1-2, 1176/2-2 & 2498 in Marine Drive, Ernakulam Village, Kochi Municipal Corporation, Kanayannur Taluk, Ernakulam – Request for Corrigendum by removing the Specific Condition w.r.t the Wildlife Clearance from the SCNBWL – Letter from the ACF
(SIA/KL/INFRA2/491168/2024)

The Authority considered the request letter dated 19.09.2025 submitted by the Project Proponent, Kerala State Housing Board, seeking issuance of a corrigendum to the Environmental Clearance granted for the Residential-cum-Commercial Building and Construction Project at Survey Nos. 1176/1-2, 1176/2-2, and 2498 in Marine Drive, Ernakulam Village, Kochi Municipal Corporation, Kanayannur Taluk, Ernakulam District, vide proceedings dated 02.03.2025.

The Authority noted that the Environmental Clearance was issued with Specific Condition No. 1.5, stipulating that the Project Proponent shall obtain Wildlife Clearance from the Standing Committee of the National Board for Wildlife (SCNBWL), as the project site was considered to be located within a 10 km radius of the Mangalavanam Bird Sanctuary.

The Authority further noted that the SEIAA, in its 159th meeting, examined the issue relating to the requirement of Wildlife Clearance from the SCNBWL in the light of interim orders and judgments of the Hon'ble High Court and the Hon'ble Supreme Court, and had decided that existing EC holders seeking amendment of conditions relating to wildlife clearance shall apply for amendment of the Environmental Clearance through the PARIKESH Portal, along with a valid certificate issued by the Wildlife Warden of the concerned Protected Area. The said certificate shall clearly certify that the project area does not fall within the proposed Eco-Sensitive Zone (ESZ) or within 1 km from the boundary of the Protected Area and shall also specify the exact distance of the project site from the Protected Area boundary.

The Project Proponent vide letter dated 03.12.2025 submitted a certificate dated 01.12.2025 from the Assistant Conservator of Forests/ Wildlife Warden, Mangalavanam Bird Sanctuary, wherein it was clarified that the project site is located outside the draft Eco-Sensitive Zone (ESZ) of the Sanctuary, though it lies within an aerial distance of approximately 0.22 km from the boundary of the protected area. The Authority also noted

that the said communication does not mandate Wildlife Clearance from the SCNBWL for projects located outside the ESZ, in light of the prevailing legal position.

After examining the letter of the Wildlife Warden, the relevant judicial pronouncements, and the earlier deliberations of the Authority, it was observed that the requirement of obtaining Wildlife Clearance from the SCNBWL does not apply to the present project, as the project area is located outside the draft ESZ of the Mangalavanam Bird Sanctuary. Accordingly, after detailed deliberation, **the Authority decided as follows:**

- 1. To remove Specific Condition No. 1.5 relating to the requirement of obtaining Wildlife Clearance from the SCNBWL from the Environmental Clearance issued vide proceedings dated 02.03.2025.**
- 2. To direct the SEIAA Secretariat to issue the necessary corrigendum to the Environmental Clearance in this regard, incorporating the above modification.**

The Authority resolved that all other terms and conditions stipulated in the Environmental Clearance shall remain unchanged and shall be complied with by the Project Proponent.

Item No. 160.08 **Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. L Syju, M/s K. Lekshmanan Company Infrastructures & Industries Pvt. Ltd., for an area of 1.4754 Ha at Block No. 40, Re-Sy Nos. 28/4pt (Govt. Land), 28/8 & 28/3-1 (Pvt. Land) in Nilamel Village, Kottarakkara Taluk, Kollam – Rejection Order Issued – Request of the Project Proponent.**
(SIA/KL/MIN/463911/2024)

The Authority perused the item and noted the request of the Project Proponent, Sri. L. Syju, M/s K. Lekshmanan Company Infrastructures & Industries Pvt. Ltd., for reconsideration of the rejection of Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project, and the recommendations of the 186th SEAC meeting.

The Authority noted that the SEAC, in its 169th meeting, after appraisal and field inspection, had recommended rejection of the proposal invoking the Precautionary Principle, primarily citing the location of the project on the summit of a hill with steep slopes,

proximity of residential houses on the downslope side, high rainfall intensity, and the resultant environmental and safety risks.

Further, the Project Proponent was heard by SEAC in its 179th meeting to discuss their request for reconsideration of rejection. The 189th SEAC had considered the hearing note and observed that the Project Proponent's explanation was unsatisfactory; consequently, the SEAC upheld its 169th meeting decision to reject the proposal based on the precautionary principle.

Upon careful examination of the records, the Authority observed that while the concerns raised by the SEAC regarding slope, terrain characteristics, and environmental sensitivity are relevant, the recommendation to reject the proposal requires to be supported by more detailed and quantifiable scientific data and analysis. In particular, the Authority noted the need for specific scientific facts and figures relating to slope stability, soil thickness, geomorphological characteristics, and overall environmental fragility of the project area, so as to ensure that the recommendation is robust, evidence-based, and legally defensible.

The Authority was of the considered view that a more comprehensive scientific assessment would aid in arriving at a reasoned conclusion on the environmental suitability or otherwise of the proposed activity. Accordingly, after detailed deliberation, **the Authority decided as follows:**

- 1. To refer the proposal back to the SEAC for reappraisal, with a direction to undertake a more comprehensive scientific assessment of the project area, supported by specific facts, figures, and technical analysis on slope stability, soil thickness, terrain characteristics, and environmental fragility, and to submit a fresh recommendation to the Authority based on such assessment.**
- 2. SEAC may call for and obtain detailed scientific study reports on any relevant environmental aspects from the Project Proponent, as deemed necessary, and to take a final view on the proposal strictly on its merits.**

Item No. 160.09

Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Venesh S., for an area of 2.0110 Ha. in Block No. 66, at Re Survey Nos. 292/1194, 292/6358, 292/2642, 292/6357, 292/5700, 292/4163, 292/3209, 292/3455, 292/1619, 292/159, 292/3513, 292/1612, 292/747 in New Naduvil Village, Thaliparamba Taluk, Kannur - Modification of EC Conditions

(SIA/KL/MIN/407136/2022, 2156/EC4/2022/SEIAA)

The Authority perused the request letter dated 15.03.2025 submitted by the Project Proponent, Sri. Venesh S., for modification of Specific Condition No. 4 of the Environmental Clearance issued to the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project for an area of 2.0110 Ha at Block No.66, Re-Survey Nos. 292/1194, 292/6358, 292/2642, 292/6357, 292/5700, 292/4163, 292/3209, 292/3455, 292/1619, 292/159, 292/3513, 292/1612, and 292/747 in New Naduvil Village, Thaliparamba Taluk, Kannur District, vide proceedings dated 15.03.2025

The Authority noted that the matter was referred to the SEAC for its technical examination and recommendations. The Authority further noted that the SEAC 3, in its 185th meeting, examined the request along with the schematic representation submitted by the Project Proponent and assessed the technical feasibility and safety aspects of the proposed modification.

The Authority took note of the SEAC's recommendation to revise Specific Condition No. 4 of the Environmental Clearance by permitting a reduced buffer of 17.5 m on the northern side of the project site as a non-mining area, subject to adherence to bench dimensions and slope stability measures, and revision of mineable reserves accordingly.

After careful consideration of the technical merits of the proposal and the recommendation of the SEAC, the Authority concurred with the findings of the SEAC. Accordingly, after detailed deliberation, **the Authority decided as follows:**

- 1. To accept the recommendation of the SEAC for revision of the Environmental Clearance conditions as proposed.**
- 2. The SEIAA Secretariat is directed to issue the necessary corrigendum to the Environmental Clearance, incorporating the revised Specific Condition No. 4, as recommended by the SEAC.**

The Authority further resolved that all other terms and conditions stipulated in the Environmental Clearance shall remain unchanged and shall continue to be complied with by the Project Proponent.

Item No.160.10

Environmental Clearance issued to Sri. Abdul Rahman Nazarudeen, Managing Director, Kerala Medicity Medical Services Pvt. Ltd for the proposed Super Speciality Hospital Project at Sy. Nos. 402/5-2, 6, 6-1, 7, 17-1-1, 403/1, 11, 12-1, 404/1-1, 4-1, 5-1, 6-1, 405/8-1, 9-1-1, 11-2, 13, 13-1, 14-1-1, 14-2, 15 in Mel Thonakkal Village, Thiruvananthapuram Taluk & District – Request for Extension of EC

(1295/EC3/2025/SEIAA)

The Authority considered the request letter dated 29.04.2025 submitted by Sri. Abdul Rahman Nazarudeen, Managing Director, Kerala Medicity Medical Services Pvt. Ltd., seeking extension of validity of the Environmental Clearance granted for the proposed Super Speciality Hospital Project at Mel Thonakkal Village, Thiruvananthapuram Taluk and District, originally issued on 05.02.2018.

The Authority noted that the validity of the Environmental Clearance had expired on 04.02.2025 and that the Project Proponent had sought extension of validity by invoking S.O. 1807(E) dated 12.04.2022, read with the subsequent Office Memorandum dated 13.12.2022, which provides for automatic extension of validity of Environmental Clearance for projects other than river valley, nuclear and mining projects.

The Authority further took note of the judgment of the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala dated 26.08.2025 in WP(C) No. 23150 of 2023 and connected cases, wherein Notification S.O. 1807(E) dated 12.04.2022 and the Office Memorandum dated 13.12.2022 were struck down only insofar as they relate to mines and mining projects. The Authority observed that the present project is a hospital / building construction project, which does not fall under the mining category, and therefore, the benefit of S.O. 1807(E) continues to be applicable to the present case.

The Authority also noted the submission of the Project Proponent that no major construction activities have been undertaken so far, except for the construction of a compound wall, and that the project squarely falls under the category of projects eligible for extension of EC validity as per the said notification. However, it is also noted that there is a serious lapse on the part of the Project Proponent in submitting the Half-Yearly Compliance Reports (HYCR).

After detailed deliberation and considering the nature of the project, the applicable statutory provisions, and the judicial pronouncements, the Authority was of the considered view that the Project Proponent is eligible for extension of the Environmental Clearance by extending the benefit of S.O. 1807(E) dated 12.04.2022. Accordingly, **the Authority decided as follows:**

- 1. To extend the validity of the Environmental Clearance issued to the Super Speciality Hospital Project of Kerala Medicity Medical Services Pvt. Ltd. for a period of 10 years, by extending the benefit of S.O. 1807(E) dated 12.04.2022, as applicable to non-mining projects.**
- 2. To direct the SEIAA Secretariat to issue the necessary corrigendum to the Environmental Clearance, reflecting the extended validity, in accordance with the above decision.**

The Authority further resolved that all other terms and conditions stipulated in the Environmental Clearance shall remain unchanged and shall be complied with by the Project Proponent, including the timely submission of HYCRs. Non-submission of HYCRs shall lead to the cancellation of the Environmental Clearance.

Item No.160.11 **Environmental Clearance for the Residential Construction Project “VKL Garden” of Sri. Shaji. K. Mathew, Director, M/s K V Apartments Pvt. Ltd. in Sy No. 415/21 at Chellanmangalam Uliyazhathura, Kariyam Villages, Thiruvananthapuram Taluk & District – Violation – Clarification sought by KSPCB (2888/EC3/2025/SEIAA)**

The Authority perused the letter received from the Environment Department Government of Kerala, based on the communication of the Kerala State Pollution Control Board (KSPCB), seeking clarification as to whether the complaint filed under the provisions of the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986 may be disposed of under the provisions of the Jan Vishwas (Amendment) Act, 2023, instead of invoking Rule 19 of the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986

The Authority examined the matter in detail and noted that the issue raised by the KSPCB essentially seeks a legal interpretation and opinion on the applicability of the Jan

Vishwas (Amendment) Act, 2023, vis-à-vis the provisions of the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986 and the EIA Notification, 2006. The Authority observed that rendering legal opinions or interpretations on statutory provisions does not fall within the mandate or jurisdiction of the SEIAA.

The Authority further noted that its statutory role is confined to appraisal of Environmental Clearance applications and monitoring of compliance with EC conditions, and that it is not vested with the authority to adjudicate or advise on the legal course of action to be adopted by enforcement agencies such as the State Pollution Control Board. In view of the above, after due deliberation, **the Authority decided that the Authority cannot consider or act upon the letter submitted by the Kerala State Pollution Control Board seeking clarification on the applicability of the Jan Vishwas (Amendment) Act, 2023, as the matter pertains to legal interpretation beyond the mandate of the Authority. Accordingly, the State Government may be informed suitably.**

Item No.160.12

Environmental Clearance issued to the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Shine Mathew for an area of 1.0336 Ha at Block No. 13, Re-Sy. No. 541/2, Purappuzha Village, Thodupuzha Taluk, Idukki.

(SIA/KL/MIN/136876/2020; 1687/EC3/2020/SEIAA)

The Authority perused the matter and noted that multiple complaints were received from the residents of Kuninji village in connection with the Environmental Clearance issued to the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Shine Mathew, at Block No.13, Re-Sy. No.541/2, Purappuzha Village, Thodupuzha Taluk, Idukki District, for an area of 1.0336 Ha, vide EC No.160/Q/2022 dated 11.10.2022.

The Authority noted that the complaints alleged landslide susceptibility, public safety concerns, and concealment of material facts, and that the matter was earlier examined by the Authority, which had directed technical officials of SEIAA to conduct a field inspection. The field inspection was carried out on 23.01.2025, and the matter was subsequently placed before the SEAC for detailed technical examination.

The Authority took note of the observations of the SEAC recorded in its 187th meeting. The Committee observed that the project area is located within a Moderate Landslide Hazard Zone, with proximity to a High Hazard Zone as per Geological Survey of

India (GSI) hazard maps. It was further noted that the quarry is situated on a steep slope exceeding 45 degrees, that a landslide scar exists at a distance of approximately 150 m from the project site, and that the quarry is located close to the Kuninji–Nellappara public road . The SEAC also recorded that the terrain is under rubber plantation on a steep slope and that blasting operations may pose risks of boulder roll-down.

After examining the SEAC's observations and the factual matrix placed before it, the Authority concurred with the Committee that the existing information is insufficient to conclusively assess landslide susceptibility and slope stability of the project area and that a detailed, site-specific scientific study is essential in the interest of public safety and environmental protection. Accordingly, after detailed deliberation, **the Authority decided as follows:**

- 1. The Project Proponent is directed to conduct a site-specific Landslide Zonation / Landslide Stability Study, through the Geological Survey of India (GSI) or any other competent and accredited scientific agency. The study shall comprehensively address landslide susceptibility, slope stability, and terrain vulnerability, and shall explicitly incorporate soil thickness, subsurface soil and rock profile, slope geometry, lithology, and other relevant geotechnical and geomorphological parameters, taking into account the prior landslide incidence in the region and surrounding features.**
- 2. The Project Proponent shall submit the study report within a period of six (6) months from the date of communication of this decision. Failure to submit the study report within the stipulated period of six months shall render the Environmental Clearance liable for cancellation, without prejudice to any other action permissible under law.**
- 3. Upon submission of the study report, the proposal shall be placed before the SEAC for further appraisal, for examination and recommendation on merits.**

PARIVESH FILES (Ver-1)

CONSIDERATION/RECONSIDERATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL CLEARANCE
PART-1

Item No.01

Environmental Clearance for the construction project - Valley view apartment by M/s NBCC (I) Ltd at Block No. 39, Re-Survey No. 93/9 in Ward No.-II, Puthencruz Village, Kunnathunad Taluk, Ernakulam – Judgment dated 18.11.2025 in the Review Petition filed by the Confederation of Real Estate Developers' Association of India (CREDAI) and others

(SIA/KL/INFRA2/407333/2022, 1993/EC3/2022/SEIAA)

The Authority considered the letter dated 27.11.2025 and email dated 23.12.2025 relating to the issuance of Environmental Clearance for the Valley View Apartments Project, which has been pending before the Authority in the context of violation of the provisions of the EIA Notification, 2006.

The Authority noted that the Project Proponent had commenced construction activities without obtaining prior Environmental Clearance, although the project falls under the category of activities mandatorily requiring prior EC under the EIA Notification, 2006, thereby constituting a violation case. The Authority further noted that the matter was earlier examined in detail, and in the 137th meeting of SEIAA, the proposal, as recommended by the SEAC, was considered under the violation category. The recommendation included a remediation plan and natural and community resource augmentation plan for Rs. 90 Lakh to be furnished by way of a bank guarantee and imposition of an environmental compensation of Rs. 87.91 Lakh to be paid to the Environment Benefit Fund.

However, the Authority observed that, subsequent to the said recommendation, the Hon'ble Supreme Court, vide judgment dated 02.01.2024 in WP(C) No.1394 of 2023, stayed the operation of the Office Memoranda issued by the MoEFCC in July 2021 and January 2022, which govern the procedure for dealing with violation cases under the EIA Notification, 2006. As the appraisal of the present project under the violation category was premised on the said Office Memoranda, the Authority had earlier decided to delist the project, pending further orders from the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

The Authority also took note of the subsequent submission of the Project Proponent vide letter dated 27.11.2025, wherein it was intimated that the Hon'ble Supreme Court, vide order dated 18.11.2025, had recalled its earlier judgment dated 16.05.2025 in Vanashakti v.

Union of India, and that, according to the Project Proponent, the Hon'ble Court has not imposed any express stay on the issuance of Environmental Clearances.

The Authority also noted the letter dated 23.12.2025 submitted by the Project Proponent, wherein it was stated that the remittance of the penalty amount and submission of the bank guarantee were not effected, as the project had been delisted by the SEIAA pursuant to judicial developments. The Project Proponent, however, expressed willingness to comply with all orders and directions of the SEIAA once the project is re-enlisted.

The Authority examined the above submissions in detail and observed that, notwithstanding the contentions raised by the Project Proponent, the legal position relating to ex post facto Environmental Clearance remains unsettled, and that the procedural framework for processing violation-category applications continues to be uncertain and legally constrained. Additionally, the MoEFCC has not issued any directions/guidelines to address the violation cases considering the Apex Court decisions. Besides, the project proponent has not submitted the requisite proof of bank guarantee and the remittance of the penalty. In view of the above circumstances, the Authority was of the considered view that the proposal cannot be appraised or considered on merits at present.

Accordingly, after detailed deliberation, **the Authority decided as follows:**

- 1. To obtain a detailed legal opinion from the Standing Counsel on the permissibility and procedure for processing violation-category applications in the present legal scenario.**
- 2. To seek clarification from the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change regarding the processing of violation cases, particularly in view of the inoperability of the violation ToR provision in the PARIVESH Portal and the pending adjudication before the Hon'ble Supreme Court.**
- 3. To defer consideration of the proposal, in view of the legal position that ex post facto Environmental Clearance is impermissible and the matter relating to violation cases is presently sub judice.**

Item No.02

Environmental Clearance for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry project of Sri. Sajid Ayoli for an area of 0.9642 Ha at Re-Sy No. 291 in Oorakam village, Thirurangadi Taluk, Malappuram. (SIA/KL/MIN/167408/2020, 1946/EC6/2022/SEIAA)

The Authority considered the proposal for the Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Sajid Ayoli, along with the recommendations of the 187th SEAC.

The Authority examined the appraisal history of the proposal and noted that the SEAC had arrived at its observations to reject the EC application based on the documents available on record and the technical assessment carried out during the appraisal process. However, the Authority observed that the Project Proponent had not been afforded an opportunity of being heard before arriving at a final recommendation on the proposal.

The Authority took note of the Office Memorandum dated 30.10.2025 issued by the MoEFCC, which, inter alia, emphasizes that principles of natural justice shall be adhered to in the appraisal process, and that where adverse observations are proposed to be relied upon for rejection or for taking a decision prejudicial to the Project Proponent, an opportunity of personal hearing shall be provided before finalizing the recommendation.

The Authority further took note of the judgment of the Hon'ble High Court dated 25th September 2025 in WP(C) No. 40566 of 2023, wherein, by relying on the decision in Kottiyoor Metals Pvt. Ltd. v. SEIAA (2025 KLT Online 2298), the Hon'ble Court emphasized that the purpose of hearing contemplated under Clause 7(i), Stage IV(4) of the EIA Notification, 2006 is of substantial significance. The Hon'ble Court observed that the object of such hearing is to enable the Project Proponent to offer explanations to the defects, deficiencies, or adverse aspects noted in the application for Environmental Clearance, so as to permit the authorities concerned to assess the feasibility of granting EC based on such inputs. The Hon'ble Court further held that denial of such an opportunity would amount to violation of the principles of natural justice and, accordingly, directed the SEAC to hear the petitioner, particularly on the factors found adverse, and thereafter to take a final decision.

In view of the above judicial pronouncement, the statutory requirement under the EIA Notification, 2006, and the directions contained in the Office Memorandum dated 30.10.2025, the Authority was of the considered opinion that the proposal requires

reconsideration by the SEAC after affording a proper opportunity of hearing to the Project Proponent.

Accordingly, after detailed deliberation, **the Authority decided as follows:**

- 1. To direct the SEAC to afford a personal hearing to the Project Proponent, specifically on the aspects and factors recorded to reject the proposal.**
- 2. The SEAC to re-examine the proposal and submit its final recommendation to the Authority, after hearing the Project Proponent and considering any additional submissions or clarifications made during the hearing, strictly in accordance with the provisions of the EIA Notification, 2006 and the Office Memorandum dated 30.10.2025.**

Item No.03

Environmental Clearance for the Building Stone Quarry project of Sri. Faisal, Managing Partner, M/s Star Granites for an area of 2.5065 Ha at Re-Sy. Block No. 5, Re-Sy. No. 2/1B, in Kedavoor Village, Thamarassery Taluk, Kozhikode.

SIA/KL/MIN/154284/2020, 1736/EC4/2020/SEIAA

The Authority reviewed the matter and noted the request letter dated 13.12.2025 submitted by the Project Proponent, along with the recommendation of the 185th meeting of the SEAC. The Authority observed that the SEAC, in its 185th meeting, had recommended rejection of the proposal, on the ground that the project area is located in Kedavoor Village, which is identified as an Ecologically Sensitive Area (ESA) village.

The Authority noted that the project area is situated in Kedavoor Village, notified as an ESA village, and that, as per the directions issued by the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change (MoEF&CC) under Section 5 of the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986, vide order dated 13.11.2013, mining activities in ESA villages are prohibited, subject to the finalisation of the ESA notification. The Authority further noted that the final ESA notification is yet to be issued and that, pending such finalisation, the statutory directions governing ESA villages continue to remain in force.

The Authority also took note of the interim orders of the Hon'ble High Court dated 21.11.2025 and 12.12.2025 in WP(C) No. 2785 of 2025, relating to the ESA matter, wherein

the Hon'ble Court has suo motu impleaded the Secretary, MoEF&CC and the Secretary, Kerala Forest Department, and has directed them to take appropriate action for the expeditious finalisation of issues relating to ESA.

In view of the statutory restrictions applicable to ESA villages, the binding judicial orders, and the fact that the matter is sub judice, the Authority was of the considered view that the proposal cannot be processed at this stage.

Accordingly, after detailed deliberation, the Authority decided to return the application, in its present form, to the Project Proponent, to be reconsidered only after the finalisation and issuance of the Ecologically Sensitive Area (ESA) Notification by the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change.

Item No.04 **Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Raghulan Pillai, for an area of 1.9000 Ha at Re-Sy Nos. 354/1-305 & 354/1-305-236 Pt, in Karavalur Village, Punalur Taluk, Kollam District.**

(SIA/KL/MIN/43381/2019, 1580/EC2/2019/SEIAA)

The Authority considered the Environmental Clearance application for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Raghulan Pillai, for an area of 1.9000 Ha at Re-Survey Nos. 354/1-305 and 354/1-305-236 (Pt.) in Karavalur Village, Punalur Taluk, Kollam District, placed before the Authority along with the recommendations of the 186th SEAC meeting.

The Authority noted that the proposal has undergone appraisal in multiple SEAC meetings over an extended period and that the appraisal history includes issues relating to revenue disputes, pendency of court proceedings, non-submission of additional documents sought by the SEAC, and discrepancies in the data submitted by the Project Proponent. The Authority further noted that, upon re-enlistment of the proposal and subsequent appraisal, the SEAC conducted a detailed technical examination, including consideration of hazard zonation and terrain characteristics.

The Authority observed that the 186th SEAC-1 meeting, after examining the proposal, recorded that the general slope within the project area ranges from 18° to 34°, the entire project area falls within the hazard zonation, with approximately 30% of the area located in

the High Hazard Zone, as per the Hazard Zonation Map published by the Geological Survey of India (GSI) through the Kerala State Disaster Management Authority, and the mining activity is prohibited in High Hazard Zones, owing to the risk of landslides, slope instability, and irreversible environmental damage.

In view of the above, the SEAC, had recommended rejection of the proposal, considering the environmental fragility of the site, the documented hazard profile. After detailed deliberation, the Authority concurred with the Committee's assessment. The Authority observed that the recommendation is based on scientific hazard assessment, statutory prohibitions applicable to High Hazard Zones, and well-established principles of environmental protection, and that no valid grounds exist to differ from the same.

Accordingly, the Authority decided to accept the recommendation of the SEAC and reject the Environmental Clearance application for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Raghulan Pillai. The Authority resolved that the decision shall be communicated to the Project Proponent and that no further action shall be taken on the proposal.

Item No.05

Re-appraisal of EC issued by DEIAA, Idukki, to the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Shiju Thomas for an area of 4.3049 Ha at Survey Nos. 294/1pt, 294/2 pt, 295/5, 295/6 pt, 296/2 pt and 356/1-1 pt in Alakkode Village, Thodupuzha Taluk, Idukki - Interim order dated 11.02.2025 in WP(C) 5545/2025 filed by Sri. Shiju Thomas

(SIA/KL/MIN/435329/2023, 2385/EC2/2023/SEIAA)

The Authority considered the re-appraisal of the Environmental Clearance issued to the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Shiju Thomas, placed before it along with the recommendations and observations of the 187th meeting of the SEAC. The Authority noted that the proposal has been examined in multiple meetings of the SEAC and the SEIAA and that the matter had earlier been referred back to the SEAC for reconsideration, *inter alia*, for submission of additional documents, including the Ground Water NOC, in compliance with the directions of the Hon'ble High Court.

The Authority further noted that the SEAC, in its 187th meeting, recommended grant of Environmental Clearance for a project life of seven (7) years, subject to certain specific conditions in addition to the general conditions.

Upon detailed examination of the records and the recommendations of the SEAC, the Authority observed that there are significant inconsistencies with respect to the mineable reserves and the corresponding project life, as reflected in various statutory documents and submissions. The Authority noted that the initial approved Mining Plan dated 06.10.2016 provided for a mine life of 14.4 years with a total mineable quantity of 2,151,050 MT up to a depth of 52 m. Subsequently, the modified Mining Plan dated 08.01.2021 indicated a mine life of 12 years with a mineable quantity of 1,264,645 MT up to a depth of 60 m. Further, the Scheme of Mining dated 09.01.2022 indicated a balance mineable quantity of 1,043,341 MT for a period of seven years, from 01.04.2022 to 31.03.2029. However, as per the information furnished by the Department of Mining and Geology vide letter dated 19.02.2024, the balance mineable quantity during appraisal was stated to be only 632,046 MT. These variations indicate a lack of reconciliation between the quantities already extracted, the remaining mineable reserves, and the corresponding mine life.

The Authority further observed that, as per the No Objection Certificate issued by the State Ground Water Board dated 20.02.2025, the depth of mining is restricted to 65 m AMSL, which may further constrain the depth of excavation and consequently reduce the balance mineable reserves available for extraction.

In view of the above, the Authority was of the considered opinion that, in the absence of a clear, consistent, and reconciled assessment of the balance mineable resources vis-à-vis the proposed remaining period of mining, it would not be appropriate to take a final decision on the proposal at this stage. The Authority emphasized that any further consideration of the proposal must be founded on a definitive determination of the quantity already extracted, the balance mineable reserves available, and the precise duration for which mining operations are proposed to continue, duly aligned with all statutory approvals and conditions.

Accordingly, after detailed deliberation, **the Authority decided to refer the proposal back to the SEAC for fresh appraisal and recommendation. The SEAC shall specifically examine and clearly record the total quantity of mineral already extracted, the balance mineable reserves available, taking into account all applicable restrictions, including the Ground Water NOC, and the exact remaining period of mining operations,**

commensurate with the verified balance quantity, based on the approved Mining Plan(s) and other relevant statutory permissions.

Item No.06 Environmental Clearance for Development of proposed Outer Ring Road- Northern Ring: Navaikulam to Thekkada, Trivandrum (SIA/KL/INFRA1/437969/2023, 1933/EC1/2023/SEIAA)

The Authority considered the proposal submitted for Environmental Clearance for the Outer Ring Road Project, Thiruvananthapuram, along with the recommendations of the 186th SEAC meeting. The Authority noticed that the SEAC recommended Environmental Clearance for the proposed Outer Ring Road Project.

The Authority noted that the Ministry of Road Transport and Highways (MoRTH), Government of India, vide S.O. 927(E) dated 28th February 2023, has declared the proposed stretch of the Outer Ring Road – from its junction with NH-66 near Navaikulam, connecting Thekkada, and terminating at its junction with NH-66 near Vizhinjam, including the spur road starting from Thekkada and terminating at its junction with NH-66 near Mangalapuram – as a new National Highway, NH-866.

The Authority further noted that the application for Environmental Clearance was submitted on 24.08.2023 by the user agency in the name of Capital Region Development Project (CRDP), after the issuance of the above notification, without disclosing the fact that the proposed project had already been declared as a National Highway. The Authority observed that this amounts to suppression of a material fact, as the nature and categorisation of the project had undergone a statutory change before submission of the application.

The Authority observed that, as per the provisions of the EIA Notification, 2006, new National Highway projects fall under Category 'A', and such projects are required to be considered at the Central level by the MoEF&CC. The Authority categorically noted that the State Environment Impact Assessment Authority does not have the jurisdiction to appraise Category 'A' projects or to grant Environmental Clearance for National Highway projects.

The Authority further noted that, notwithstanding the above statutory position, the SEAC, in its 186th meeting, had recommended grant of Environmental Clearance for the project. The Authority observed that this recommendation was made as the notification

declaring the project road as a National Highway, and the Project Proponent had not been disclosed at the time of appraisal.

In view of the above facts, the Authority was of the considered view that the proposal is not maintainable before the SEIAA, Kerala. Accordingly, after detailed deliberation, **the Authority decided to suggest Project Proponent to discuss with NHAI and decide on appropriate course of action, as the project is a Category 'A' National Highway project falling outside the jurisdiction of the State Authority.**

The Authority resolved that the decision shall be communicated to the applicant and that the Project Proponent, if so advised, may approach the competent authority at the Central level, strictly in accordance with the provisions of the EIA Notification, 2006.

PARIVESH FILES (Ver 2)

Item No.01

**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 - Judgment of Vanashakti v. Union of India in WP (C) No. 50009/2023 dated 16.05.2025
(SIA/KL/INFRA2/479309/2024)**

The Authority considered the Environmental Clearance proposal on the Hospital-cum-Medical College Campus of M/s Malankara Orthodox Syrian Church, along with the observations recorded in various meetings of the SEAC and the interim order dated 02.12.2025 of the Hon'ble High Court in WP(C) No.23603 of 2025.

The Authority noted that a Sub-Committee of the SEAC conducted a field inspection on 23.01.2025 and reported that the application has been submitted for obtaining prior Environmental Clearance for a built-up area of 1,29,376.34 sq. m, comprising constructions carried out after 2006 and the proposed expansion. The Authority further noted that, as per

the approved master plan, the total built-up area of the project, including existing buildings proposed to be retained and new constructions, is 2,37,861.71 sq. m.

Upon examination of the documents on record and the field inspection report, the Authority observed that the Project Proponent has commenced and carried out construction activities without obtaining prior Environmental Clearance, notwithstanding the fact that the project falls under the category of activities mandatorily requiring prior EC under the EIA Notification, 2006. The Authority observed that such commencement of construction without prior clearance constitutes a violation case. The Authority also noted that the 186th SEAC, while examining the matter, recorded that the explanatory note submitted by the Project Proponent seeking exemption from EC for constructions prior to 2004 was not acceptable, having regard to the provisions of the EIA Notifications and their subsequent amendments.

The Authority further noted that, as per Notification S.O. 60(E) dated 27.01.1994, as amended from time to time, all new construction projects falling under Entry 31 of Schedule I, including townships, industrial townships, settlement colonies, commercial complexes, hotel complexes, hospitals, and office complexes accommodating more than 1,000 persons, or discharging sewage exceeding 50,000 litres per day, or involving an investment exceeding ₹50 crore, require prior Environmental Clearance. It was also noted that construction projects undertaken without obtaining the required clearance and which had not reached plinth level as on 07.07.2004 are required to obtain clearance under the said notification.

The Authority further observed that, in terms of the EIA Notification, 2006, only building construction projects that were existing as on 14.09.2006 are eligible to be treated as “existing projects”, and that prior Environmental Clearance is mandatory for any expansion of such projects if the expansion results in crossing the prescribed threshold limits. The Authority noted that all constructions carried out in phases after 14.09.2006 are to be treated as expansion, and that prior Environmental Clearance is required where the total built-up area exceeds 20,000 sq. m.

The Authority observed that the Project Proponent has admittedly carried out substantial construction activities after 2004, resulting in the total built-up area exceeding the threshold limit of 20,000 sq. m, without obtaining prior Environmental Clearance, thereby attracting the provisions relating to violation of the EIA Notifications. The Authority further noted that the legal position relating to ex post facto Environmental Clearance remains unsettled in view of the judgments of the Hon’ble Supreme Court, and that the issue is

presently pending consideration before the Hon'ble Apex Court in connected matters. Consequently, the processing of violation-category applications is legally constrained and remains sub judice. Accordingly, the present expansion proposal cannot be processed under the procedure prescribed in the EIA Notification, 2006.

The Authority also noted that, as per the Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) issued by the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, cases involving violations require submission of an application for Terms of Reference (ToR) under the violation category. However, it was observed that, pursuant to the observations and directions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court on ex post facto Environmental Clearance, the violation-category ToR module in the PARIVESH Portal is presently inactive, rendering it technically impossible for the Project Proponent to comply with the prescribed procedural requirements.

In view of the admitted violation of the EIA Notification, 2006, the absence of a procedurally valid application on the PARIVESH Portal, and the prevailing legal and procedural uncertainty relating to violation cases, the Authority was of the considered view that the proposal cannot be processed at this stage. Accordingly, after detailed deliberation, the Authority decided as follows:

1. To defer consideration of the proposal, in view of the prevailing judicial position that ex post facto Environmental Clearance is impermissible and that the procedure for dealing with violation cases is presently sub judice.
2. To inform the Project Proponent and the Standing Counsel of the Hon'ble High Court regarding the decision to defer the matter, with specific reference to the existing legal and procedural uncertainty governing violation cases.
3. To record that the proposal is procedurally not maintainable at present, as no application for Terms of Reference under the violation category has been submitted through the PARIVESH Portal, which is mandatory for appraisal of violation cases.
4. To obtain a detailed legal opinion from the Standing Counsel on the permissibility and procedure for processing violation-category applications in the present legal scenario.

5. To seek clarification from the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change regarding the processing of violation cases, particularly in view of the inoperability of the violation ToR module in the PARIKESH Portal and the pending adjudication before the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

The Authority resolved that no further action shall be taken on the proposal until the legal position is clarified and a legally sustainable procedural mechanism for appraisal of violation-category applications is restored.

Item No.02

Reappraisal of Environmental Clearance issued from DEIAA Kozhikode to the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Muneer P M, for an area of 1.6468 Ha at Re- Sy No. 104/1, 104/5, 104/6 in Kayakkodi Village, Vadakara Taluk, Kozhikode
(SIA/KL/MIN/458517/2024)

The Authority considered the reappraisal application of the Environmental Clearance issued to the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Muneer P.M, along with the observations and recommendations of the 185th meeting of the SEAC.

The Authority noted that the SEAC, during its 185th meeting, observed grave violations of the conditions stipulated in the Environmental Clearance. It was specifically recorded that quarrying activities had been carried out beyond the approved lease boundary and within the prescribed buffer zone, in contravention of the EC conditions. The Authority further noted that, during the presentation before the SEAC, the Project Proponent admitted to such violations and confirmed that a demand notice had been issued by the Mining and Geology Department, pursuant to which an amount of approximately ₹2.8 lakh was remitted as penalty for extraction carried out outside the approved lease area.

The Authority observed that payment of penalty for illegal extraction does not absolve the Project Proponent of liability under environmental laws, nor does it substitute the requirement for assessment of environmental damage arising from such unscientific and unsustainable mining activities undertaken in violation of the EC conditions.

After examining the recommendations of the SEAC and considering the admitted instances of illegal extraction, the Authority was of the considered view that quantification of the extent of illegal mining and assessment of the resultant environmental damage are

essential before any further appraisal of the proposal. Accordingly, after detailed deliberation, the Authority decided as follows:

1. To direct the District Geologist, Kozhikode, to submit a detailed report quantifying the illegal mining activities, including the exact volume of mineral extracted beyond the approved lease area and within the buffer zone, to the Kerala State Pollution Control Board (KSPCB) for the purpose of environmental damage assessment.
2. To direct the Kerala State Pollution Control Board (KSPCB) to constitute the Joint Committee as instructed earlier and assess the environmental damage caused due to the unscientific and unsustainable illegal mining carried out in violation of the Environmental Clearance conditions, based on the report of the District Geologist and other relevant materials.
3. To permit the SEAC to continue the appraisal process of the proposal only after completion of the violation proceedings, including assessment of environmental damage and compliance with any directions issued by the competent authorities.

The Authority resolved that no final decision on the proposal shall be taken until the above directions are complied with and the matter is placed before the SEAC with the outcome of the violation proceedings.

Item No.03

Re-appraisal of Environmental Clearance issued from DEIAA, Kozhikode, to the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Smile M Anto for an area of 1.0320 Ha, at Re-Survey No. 424/3, 425/1 in Maruthonkara village, Vatakara Taluk, Kozhikode – WP (C) No. 2607/2025 filed by Sri. Saji T. K.

(SIA/KL/MIN/463823/2024)

The Authority considered the re-appraisal application of Environmental Clearance issued by the DEIAA, Kozhikode, to the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Smile M. Anto, for an area of 1.0320 ha at Re-Sy Nos. 424/3 and 425/1 in Maruthonkara Village, Vatakara Taluk, Kozhikode along with the decisions of the 185th SEAC meeting.

The Authority noted the appraisal history of the proposal, including the earlier field inspection conducted on 04.06.2022, the directions issued for rectification of deficiencies, the

subsequent complaints received from local residents alleging illegal quarrying operations, and the report of the District Collector based on inspection by the District Geologist, Kozhikode, which indicated that statutory licences were valid and that no violations were detected during inspection.

The Authority further noted the observations of the SEAC made in its 185th meeting, wherein, based on the presentation of the Project Proponent and review of current Google imagery, the Committee observed indications suggestive of extraction beyond the approved mining area, warranting environmental damage assessment, and also noted that a portion of the project area falls within a High Hazard Zone as per the recent hazard zonation mapping. The SEAC, therefore, sought clarification from the Authority on whether appraisal of the existing application could be continued in such circumstances. The Authority also noticed that, as per the old landslide susceptibility map, the project area was in a medium hazard zone.

The Authority further took note of the correspondence received from the KSDMA and the subsequent inter-departmental discussion held on 24.12.2025 with the Environment, SDMA and Department of Mining & Geology, wherein issues relating to the applicability, scope, and legal implications of the recent GIS-based landslide hazard zonation mapping, particularly in the context of re-appraisal of DEIAA-issued Environmental Clearances, were deliberated in detail.

Considering the complexity of the issues involved, the potential legal and environmental implications, and the need for a harmonised and well-considered approach, the Authority was of the view that the matter requires further detailed examination and consultation before arriving at a final decision. Accordingly, after due deliberation, **the Authority resolved to defer consideration of the re-appraisal application.**

Item No.04

Environmental Clearance for the proposed Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Subair P for an area of 0.2300 Ha at Survey Nos. 9/2-7, 9/1-14, 32/1-25 in Kodur Village, Perinthalmanna Taluk, Malappuram – Request from project proponent to withdraw the proposal

(SIA/KL/MIN/520143/2025)

The Authority examined the proposal and noted that the 187th meeting of the SEAC had considered the request of the Project Proponent seeking withdrawal of the application. The SEAC, after due deliberation, recommended acceptance of the withdrawal, taking into account the submission of the Project Proponent that the project could not be pursued further owing to financial constraints.

After considering the recommendation of the SEAC, the Authority resolved to permit the withdrawal of the application submitted on 25.01.2025.

Item No.05

Reappraisal of Environmental Clearance issued by DEIAA, Palakkad for the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Tony Nirmal, Managing Director, M/s Rockshell Granites and Sand (Pvt) Ltd for an area of 1.2144 Ha at Survey No. 189/1 in Vaniyamkulam II Village, Ottapalam Taluk, Palakkad District.

(SIA/KL/MIN/465843/2024)

The Authority examined the proposal and noted the recommendation of the SEAC made in its 187th meeting to permit the Project Proponent to withdraw the application, in view of the expiry of the quarry lease. The Authority further noted the submission of the Project Proponent that the Final Mine Closure Plan has been duly submitted to the District Office of Mining and Geology in accordance with the applicable statutory requirements, and that the Project Proponent does not intend to pursue the application any further.

After due consideration of the above and the recommendation of the SEAC, the Authority resolved to permit the withdrawal of the application submitted on 10.05.2024.

Item No.06

**Environmental Clearance for the Construction of Hospital of Sri Chandrasenan A., Partner, "RACHIS MULTI-SPECIALITY HOSPITAL at Survey Nos. 115/5APT 12, 115/5APT 47, 115/5APT 49, 115/5APT 15, I I5/5APT 13, 115/5BPT 56, 115/5BPT 14 in Adkathbail Village, Kasaragod Taluk & District
(SIA/KL/INFRA2/495694/2024)**

Sri. Chandrasenan A., Partner, Rachis Multi-Speciality Hospital, submitted an application for Environmental Clearance for the proposed construction of a hospital "Rachis Multi-Speciality Hospital" at Survey Nos 115/5APT 12, 115/5APT 47, 115/5APT 49, 115/5APT 15, I I5/5APT 13, 115/5BPT 56, 115/5BPT 14 of Adkathbail Village, Kasaragod Taluk, Kasaragod.

The Authority reviewed the item and observed the decision of various SEAC meetings held on different dates. The SEAC had apprised the project based on the Form-1 and the additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal. The 185th SEAC meeting heard the presentation of the proposal. As per the application, the total built-up area is reported as 31,195 sq. m, with a plot area of 7,621 sq. m. The project cost is ₹81.02 crore. As per the excavation details, the total quantity of ordinary earth excavation is 39,234 cu. m, of which 611 cu. m will be reused onsite for landscaping and levelling. The CER commitment proposed is for ₹162 lakhs. After due appraisal, the SEAC in its 185th meeting recommended EC for a period of 7 years subject to certain Specific in addition to the General Conditions.

Under the these circumstances, the Authority accepted the recommendation of the 185th SEAC meeting and decided to issue Environmental Clearance for the proposed construction of Hospital 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. Excavation of ordinary earth should be limited to 39,234 cu. m, and about 611 cu.m shall be reused onsite for landscaping and levelling as proposed in the application. The remaining quantity shall be used for refilling abandoned laterite mining projects in the surrounding areas and the activity should not affect the nearby waterbodies.*

2. A consent shall be obtained from NHAI for storm water diversion to the drains before commencement of work.
3. Green belt shall be maintained with suitable indigenous species at a minimum rate of 1 tree per every 80 sq. m as stated in Appendix XIV of EIA Notification 2006 (SO 3099 (E) dated 09.12.2016).
4. A common provision for the EV charging facility shall be provided.
5. Adequate sources for water to meet the requirements during the construction and operational phase are to be ensured, and details should be given in HYCR.
6. The 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.
7. 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.
8. The Project Proponent must ensure that only filtered overland drain is discharged to the nearby natural drain or public sewer system.
9. 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).
10. 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.
11. Exposed roof area and covered parking should be covered with material having a high solar reflective index.
12. 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.
13. Design of the building should comply with the Energy Building Code as applicable.

14. Energy conservation measures as proposed in the application should be adopted in total.
15. 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.
16. Construction work should be carried out during day daytime only.
17. All vehicles, including those carrying construction material of any kind, should be cleaned and wheels washed.
18. All vehicles carrying construction materials should be fully covered and protected.
19. All construction material of any kind should not be dumped on public roads or pavements or near the existing facilities outside the project site.
20. Grinding & cutting of building materials should not be done in open areas. Water jets should be used in grinding and stone cutting.
21. Occupational health and safety measures for the workers should be adopted during the construction.
22. 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.
23. 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.
24. Adequate measures should be adopted to harvest the rainwater.
25. 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.
26. Open space shall be provided as per the building norms without being utilized for any other constructions.
27. 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.
28. As per OM No F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30th 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.

29. *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.*
30. *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.*
31. *The violation of EC condition may lead to cancellation of EC and penal action under The Environment (Protection) Act 1986.*

Item No.07

Application for Extension of validity of EC issued for the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. C. Krishna Pillai for an area of 0.9705 Ha at Block No - 27, Re-Survey Nos. 283/1pt, 283/2pt, 283/4, 296/3pt in Ezhumattoor Village, Mallapally Taluk, Pathanamthitta – Appeal No. 41 of 2024 (SZ) filed by Smt. Ushakumari. K. before the Hon’ble NGT.

SIA/KL/MIN/554719/2025

The Authority considered the application for extension of validity of Environmental Clearance (EC) issued to the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. C. Krishna Pillai, for an area of 0.9705 ha in Ezhumattoor Village, Mallapally Taluk, Pathanamthitta District. The Authority took note of the detailed appraisal history, the directions of the Hon’ble National Green Tribunal in Appeal No. 41 of 2024 (SZ), and the recommendation of the SEAC made in its 186th meeting.

The Authority noted that the SEAC, after examining the circumstances under which quarry operations were suspended and subsequently resumed, and considering that the third-year quarrying operations could not be commenced due to regulatory and judicial interventions, recommended extension of the validity of the Environmental Clearance for a further period of one year from the date of execution of a valid mining lease/permit issued by the Department of Mining and Geology, subject to strict compliance with all the General and Specific conditions stipulated in the original EC.

After due deliberation, **the Authority resolved to accept the recommendation of the SEAC and accord extension of the validity of the Environmental Clearance for one more year from the date of execution of a valid mining lease/permit, subject to continued compliance with all EC conditions and applicable statutory provisions.**

The Authority further directed the SEIAA Technical Member to expedite the preparation and submission of the environmental damage assessment report, as entrusted earlier pursuant to the orders of the Hon'ble National Green Tribunal, and to place the same before the Authority at the earliest for further consideration.

Item No.08

ToR Application for the Proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Niyas Ali. A for an area of 0.9985 Ha at Block No. 4, Re-Sy Nos: 1/16, 1/15 in Mankada Village, Perinthalmanna Taluk, Malappuram.

SIA/KL/MIN/523166/2025

The Authority considered the application for the grant of Terms of Reference (ToR) for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Niyas Ali A., for an area of 0.9985 ha at Block No. 4, Re-Survey Nos. 1/16 and 1/15 in Mankada Village, Perinthalmanna Taluk, Malappuram District. The Authority took note of the appraisal and recommendation of the SEAC in its 187th meeting.

The Authority noted that the SEAC had examined the proposal in detail, including the mining plan, cluster certificate indicating the presence of adjacent quarry proposals within a 500 m radius, mineable reserves, mine life, and topographical features of the project area. The SEAC, after due deliberation, recommended issuance of Standard Terms of Reference under Category 1(a) – Mining of Minerals, 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 of the application and the recommendation of the SEAC, the Authority resolved to accept the recommendation 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 applicable provisions of the EIA Notification, 2006 and its amendments, and other relevant statutory requirements. The Project Proponent shall ensure that the Comprehensive Environmental Management Plan, duly incorporating

cumulative impact assessment of all nearby and adjoining quarry operations, is prepared and submitted as an integral component of the EIA/EMP report.

Item No.09

ToR Application for the Proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Raveendran M, Managing Partner, SKR Granites for an area of 0.9873 Ha at Block No. 63, Re-Survey No. 201/2 in Elamkur Village, Ernad Taluk, Malappuram.

(SIA/KL/MIN/524259/2025)

The Authority considered the application for the grant of Terms of Reference (ToR) for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Raveendran M., Managing Partner, M/s SKR Granites, for an area of 0.9873 ha at Block No. 63, Re-Sy No. 201/2 in Elamkur Village, Ernad Taluk, Malappuram District.

The Authority noted that the SEAC, in its 187th 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 (EMP), incorporating cumulative impact assessment of all adjacent quarry operations, as part of the EIA/EMP report.

Item No.10

ToR Application for the Proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Mansoorali for an area of 1.5517 Ha at Block No. 37, Re-Sy No. 35 in Oorakam Village, Thirurangadi Taluk, Malappuram.

SIA/KL/MIN/554837/2025

The Authority considered the application for the grant of Terms of Reference for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Mansoor Ali, for an area of 1.5517 ha at Block No. 37, Re-Survey No. 35 in Oorakam Village, Thirurangadi Taluk, Malappuram District.

The Authority noted that the SEAC, in its 187th meeting, after examining the mining plan, cluster certificate, mineable reserves, and the highly exploited nature of the area, recommended issuance of Standard Terms of Reference under Category 1(a) – Mining of Minerals, 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 (EMP), incorporating cumulative impact assessment of all adjacent quarry operations, as part of the EIA/EMP report.

Item No.11

ToR Application for the Expansion of the Existing Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. P.K Abdulla Koya (Managing Director), M/s Beta Granite Pvt Ltd, for an area of 9.0070 Ha at Re-Survey No. 266/2 (Pt) in Cherukavu Village, Kondotty Taluk, Malappuram.

SIA/KL/MIN/556091/2025

The Authority considered the application for the grant of Terms of Reference for the expansion of the existing Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of M/s Beta Granite Private Limited, for an area of 9.0070 ha at Re-Survey No. 266/2 (Pt) in Cherukavu Village, Kondotty Taluk, Malappuram District.

The Authority noted that the SEAC, in its 187th meeting, after examining the mining plan, cluster certificate and mineable reserves, recommended issuance of Standard Terms of Reference under Category 1(a) – Mining of Minerals, 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 report.

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, incorporating cumulative impact assessment of all adjacent quarry operations and the CCR from IRO, Bangalore as part of the EIA/EMP report.

Item No.12

ToR Application for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of M/s. Elanji Rocks Pvt Ltd for an area of 13.0100 Ha at Block No. 1, Sy Nos: 414/2-3, 414/2-7, 414/2-11, 418/4-A-3, 418/4A, 418/4-A-4, 418/4-A-5, 418/4A-2, 418/4-A-7, 418/4-A-6, 418/4B, 418/4-B-2, 418/4-B-3, 419/1-A, 419/1-A-3, 419/1-A-2, 419/1- B-5, 419/1-B-3, 419/1-B-2, 419/1-B-4, 419/1B-4, 419/2-A-3, 419/2-A2, 419/2B, 419/2-B-2, 419/3-3, 421/1-B-2-2-2, 421/1B-5-2, 421/2-A7, 421/2-A-4, 421/2-A-3, 421/2-A-5, 421/2-A-6, 421/2-A, 421/2B-3, 421/2-B-5, 421/2-B-4, 421/2-B-2, 421/3-3, 422/1-A-4, 422/1-B, 422/2- 2-3, 422/2- 9, 422/2-7, 422/2-12, 422/2-15, 422/2-14, 422/2-11, 422/2- 10, 422/2- 13, 422/2, 422/4-A-3, 422/4-A-1, 422/4-B-3 & 422/4-B-1 in Elanji Village, Muvattupuzha Taluk, Ernakulam.

(SIA/KL/MIN/557138/2025)

The Authority considered the application for the grant of Terms of Reference for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of M/s Elanji Rocks Private Limited, for an area of 13.0100 ha at Block No. 1, Sy Nos: 414/2-3, 414/2-7, 414/2-11, 418/4-A-3, 418/4A, 418/4-A-4, 418/4-A-5, 418/4A-2, 418/4-A-7, 418/4-A-6, 418/4B, 418/4-B-2, 418/4-B-3, 419/1-A, 419/1-A-3, 419/1-A-2, 419/1- B-5, 419/1-B-3, 419/1-B-2, 419/1-B-4, 419/1B-4, 419/2-A-3, 419/2-A2, 419/2B, 419/2-B-2, 419/3-3, 421/1-B-2-2-2, 421/1B-5-2, 421/2-A7, 421/2-A-4, 421/2-A-3, 421/2-A-5, 421/2-A-6, 421/2-A, 421/2B-3, 421/2-B-5, 421/2-B-4, 421/2-B-2, 421/3-3, 422/1-A-4, 422/1-B, 422/2- 2-3, 422/2- 9, 422/2-7, 422/2-12, 422/2-15, 422/2-14, 422/2-11, 422/2- 10, 422/2- 13, 422/2, 422/4-A-3, 422/4-A-1, 422/4-B-3 & 422/4-B-1 in Elanji Village, Muvattupuzha Taluk, Ernakulam.

422/2-14, 422/2-11, 422/2- 10, 422/2-13, 422/2, 422/4-A-3, 422/4-A-1, 422/4-B-3 & 422/4-B-1 in Elanji Village, Muvattupuzha Taluk, Ernakulam District.

The Authority noted that the SEAC, in its 186th meeting, after examining the mining plan, cluster certificate and mineable reserves, recommended issuance of Standard Terms of Reference under Category 1(a) – Mining of Minerals.

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.

Item No. 13

ToR Application for the Expansion of the Existing Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Shri. George Kochuparambil for an area of 11.3509 Ha at Block No.11, Sy Nos. 350, 351/1-1, 351/1-2, 351/1-3, 351/1-4, 351/1-5, 351/1-6, 351/1-7, 352/1-3, 352/1-4, 352/1-5, 352/2-1, 352/4, 354/4, 354/5, 355/1, 355/1-1, 355/1-5, 355/1-6, 355/1-7, 355/1-2, 355/1-4, 355/1-3, 355/3, 355/3-1, 355/3-2, 355/3-3, 355/3-4, 355/4, 355/4-2, 355/4-3 in Manakkad Village, Thodupuzha Taluk, Idukki.

SIA/KL/MIN/553631/2025

The Authority considered the application for the grant of Terms of Reference for the expansion of the existing Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. George Kochuparambil, for an area of 11.3509 ha at Block No.11, Sy Nos. 350, 351/1-1, 351/1-2, 351/1-3, 351/1-4, 351/1-5, 351/1-6, 351/1-7, 352/1-3, 352/1-4, 352/1-5, 352/2-1, 352/4, 354/4, 354/5, 355/1, 355/1-1, 355/1-5, 355/1-6, 355/1-7, 355/1-2, 355/1-4, 355/1-3, 355/3, 355/3-1, 355/3-2, 355/3-3, 355/3-4, 355/4, 355/4-2, 355/4-3 in Manakkad Village, Thodupuzha Taluk, Idukki District..

The Authority noted that the SEAC, in its 187th meeting, after examining the mining plan, cluster certificate and mineable reserves, recommended issuance of Standard Terms of Reference under Category 1(a) – Mining of Minerals, with the specific requirement that a Comprehensive Environmental Management Plan (EMP), addressing the cumulative environmental impacts of all adjacent quarries and CCR from the IRO Bangalore, shall form an integral part of the EIA study report.

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, incorporating cumulative impact assessment of all adjacent quarry operations and the CCR from IRO, Bangalore, as part of the EIA/EMP report.

Item No.14

ToR Application for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Abdulla T. T. for an area of 2.9688 Ha at Re-Sy Nos. 186/290, 186/288, 186/289, 186/291, 186/580, 186/585 and 186/558 in Kadiyathur Village, Kozhikode Taluk, Kozhikode.
(SIA/KL/MIN/555645/2025)

The Authority considered the application for the grant of Terms of Reference for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Abdulla T. T. for an area of 2.9688 Ha at Re-Sy Nos. 186/290, 186/288, 186/289, 186/291, 186/580, 186/585 and 186/558 in Kadiyathur Village, Kozhikode Taluk, Kozhikode.

The Authority noted that the SEAC, in its 185th meeting, after examining the mining plan, cluster certificate and mineable reserves, recommended issuance of Standard Terms of Reference under Category 1(a) – Mining of Minerals.

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

Item No.15

ToR Application for the Proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Abdurahiman, Managing Director, M/s Marwa Granites Pvt Ltd for an area of 0.6030 Ha, at Re-Sy Nos: 172/1283, 172/1811 in Kodiyathur Village, Kozhikode Taluk, Kozhikode.
(SIA/KL/MIN/556242/2025)

The Authority considered the application for the grant of Terms of Reference for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Abdurahiman, Managing Director, M/s Marwa Granites Pvt Ltd for an area of 0.6030 Ha, at Re-Sy Nos: 172/1283, 172/1811 in Kodiyathur Village, Kozhikode Taluk, Kozhikode.

The Authority noted that the SEAC, in its 185th meeting, after examining the mining plan, cluster certificate and mineable reserves, recommended issuance of Standard Terms of Reference under Category 1(a) – Mining of Minerals.

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

Item No.16

ToR Application for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Surendran G. for an area of 0.8213 ha at Block No. 38, Re-Sy Nos: 261/13, 262/11-3, 268/1-2, 268/6, 268/7, 261/15 in Anavoor Village, Neyyatinkara Taluk. Thiruvananthapuram.
(SIA/KL/MIN/506291/2025)

The Authority considered the application for the grant of Terms of Reference for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Surendran G. for an area of 0.8213 ha at Block No. 38, Re-Sy Nos: 261/13, 262/11-3, 268/1-2, 268/6, 268/7, 261/15 in Anavoor Village, Neyyatinkara Taluk. Thiruvananthapuram.

The Authority noted that the SEAC, in its 186th meeting, after examining the mining plan, cluster certificate and mineable reserves, recommended issuance of Standard Terms of Reference under Category 1(a) – Mining of Minerals.

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

Item No.17

ToR Application for the Proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Sreenivasan T., Director, M/s Veettikkad Granites Pvt Ltd., for an area of 1.8714 Ha at Block No. 41, Re-Sy No: 85/25 in Cherpulassery Village, Ottappalam Taluk, Palakkad.

(SIA/KL/MIN/554389/2025)

The Authority considered the application for the grant of Terms of Reference for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Sreenivasan T., Director, M/s Veettikkad Granites Pvt Ltd., for an area of 1.8714 Ha at Block No. 41, Re-Survey No: 85/25 in Cherpulassery Village, Ottappalam Taluk, Palakkad.

The Authority noted that the SEAC, in its 187th meeting, after examining the mining plan, cluster certificate, mineable reserves, and recommended issuance of Standard Terms of Reference under Category 1(a) – Mining of Minerals with a Comprehensive EMP, considering all the adjacent quarries as part of the EIA study report.

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

Item No.18

ToR Application for the Proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Fahad P K, Designated Partner, M/s Karakkad Granites LLP for an area of 0.9958 Ha at Block No. 32, Re-Sy No. 220 in Ongallur-II Village, Pattambi Taluk, Palakkad.

(SIA/KL/MIN/556985/2025)

The Authority considered the application for the grant of Terms of Reference for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Fahad P. K., Designated Partner, M/s Karakkad Granites LLP for an area of 0.9958 Ha at Block No. 32, Re-Sy No. 220 in Ongallur-II Village, Pattambi Taluk, Palakkad.

The Authority noted that the SEAC, in its 187th meeting, after examining the mining plan, cluster certificate, mineable reserves, and recommended issuance of Standard Terms of Reference under Category 1(a) – Mining of Minerals with a Comprehensive EMP, considering all the adjacent quarries as part of the EIA study report.

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

Item No. 19

ToR Application for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Sunil Babu T.P., M/s Blue Sand, for an area of 0.9942 Ha at Re-Sy Nos. 275/423, 275/444 in Thrippingottur Village, Thalassery Taluk, Kannur.

(SIA/KL/MIN/556264/2025)

The Authority considered the application for the grant of Terms of Reference for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Sunil Babu T.P., M/s Blue Sand, for an area of 0.9942 Ha at Re-Sy Nos. 275/423, 275/444 in Thrippingottur Village, Thalassery Taluk, Kannur.

The Authority noted that the SEAC, in its 185th meeting, after examining the mining plan, cluster certificate, mineable reserves, and recommended issuance of Standard Terms of

Reference under Category 1(a) – Mining of Minerals with a Comprehensive EMP, considering all the adjacent quarries as part of the EIA study report.

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

Item No. 20

Environment Clearance for the Granite Building stone Quarry project of M/s New Shanio Metal Crusher Unit Pvt Ltd for an area of 0.9877 Ha in Sy. Nos. 193/5, 193/6, 193/7, 193/9-1, 160/6, 192/5, 193/8-1 at Thottappuzhessery Village, Thiruvalla Taluk, Pathanamthitta

(SIA/KL/MIN/493112/2024)

The Authority considered the proposal for the Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of M/s New Shanio Metal Crusher Unit Pvt Ltd., along with the recommendations of the 186th SEAC and the request letter dated 17.12.2025 of the Project Proponent to reconsider the decision of the 186th SEAC meeting. The project proponent also requested for site inspection and an opportunity for clarify the technical aspects recorded to reject the proposal.

The Authority examined the appraisal history of the proposal and noted that the SEAC had arrived at its observations to reject the EC application based on the documents available on record and the technical assessment carried out during the appraisal process. However, the Authority observed that the Project Proponent had not been afforded an opportunity of being heard before arriving at a final recommendation on the proposal.

The Authority took note of the Office Memorandum dated 30.10.2025 issued by the MoEFCC, which, inter alia, emphasizes that principles of natural justice shall be adhered to in the appraisal process, and that where adverse observations are proposed to be relied upon for rejection or for taking a decision prejudicial to the Project Proponent, an opportunity of personal hearing shall be provided before finalizing the recommendation.

The Authority further took note of the judgment of the Hon'ble High Court dated 25th September 2025 in WP(C) No. 40566 of 2023, wherein, by relying on the decision in Kottiyoor Metals Pvt. Ltd. v. SEIAA (2025 KLT Online 2298), the Hon'ble Court emphasized that the purpose of hearing contemplated under Clause 7(i), Stage IV(4) of the EIA Notification, 2006 is of substantial significance. The Hon'ble Court observed that the object of such hearing is to enable the Project Proponent to offer explanations to the defects, deficiencies, or adverse aspects noted in the application for Environmental Clearance, so as to permit the authorities concerned to assess the feasibility of granting EC based on such inputs. The Hon'ble Court further held that denial of such an opportunity would amount to violation of the principles of natural justice and, accordingly, directed the SEAC to hear the petitioner, particularly on the factors found adverse, and thereafter to take a final decision.

In view of the above judicial pronouncement, the statutory requirement under the EIA Notification, 2006, and the directions contained in the Office Memorandum dated 30.10.2025, the Authority was of the considered opinion that the proposal requires reconsideration by the SEAC after affording a proper opportunity of hearing to the Project Proponent.

Accordingly, after detailed deliberation, **the Authority decided as follows:**

- 1. To direct the SEAC to afford a personal hearing to the Project Proponent, specifically on the aspects and factors recorded to reject the proposal.**
- 2. The SEAC to re-examine the proposal and submit its final recommendation to the Authority, after hearing the Project Proponent and considering any additional submissions or clarifications made during the hearing, strictly in accordance with the provisions of the EIA Notification, 2006 and the Office Memorandum dated 30.10.2025.**

Item No.21

**Environmental Clearance for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Jayesh Thomas for an area of 0.8087 Ha, at Re-Sy Nos. 317/10, 317/11, 317/3, 317/12, 315/6-1, 317/4, 317/2, 315/5 in Vadasserkkara Village, Ranni Taluk, Pathanamthitta.
(SIA/KL/MIN/506573/2024)**

The Authority reviewed the matter and noted the recommendation of the 186th meeting of the SEAC. The Authority observed that the SEAC, in its 186th meeting, had

recommended rejection of the proposal, on the ground that the project area is located in Vadasserikkara village, which is identified as an Ecologically Sensitive Area (ESA) village.

The Authority noted that the project area is situated in Vadasserikkara Village, notified as an ESA village, and that, as per the directions issued by the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change (MoEF&CC) under Section 5 of the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986, vide order dated 13.11.2013, mining activities in ESA villages are prohibited, subject to the finalisation of the ESA notification. The Authority further noted that the final ESA notification is yet to be issued and that, pending such finalisation, the statutory directions governing ESA villages continue to remain in force.

The Authority also took note of the interim orders of the Hon'ble High Court dated 21.11.2025 and 12.12.2025 in WP(C) No.2785 of 2025, relating to the ESA matter, wherein the Hon'ble Court has suo motu impleaded the Secretary, MoEF&CC and the Secretary, Kerala Forest Department, and has directed them to take appropriate action for the expeditious finalisation of issues relating to ESA.

In view of the statutory restrictions applicable to ESA villages, the binding judicial orders, and the fact that the matter is sub judice, the Authority was of the considered view that the proposal cannot be processed at this stage.

Accordingly, after detailed deliberation, the Authority decided to return the application, in its present form, to the Project Proponent, to be reconsidered only after the finalisation and issuance of the Ecologically Sensitive Area (ESA) Notification by the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change.

Item No.22

Environmental Clearance for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. T. P. Abdul Rasheed, Managing Director, M/s Venad Rock and Sand Industries (P) Ltd, for an area of 4.9843 Ha, at Block No. 4, Survey No: 10/2A in Kedavoor Village, Thamarassery Taluk, Kozhikode.

(SIA/KL/MIN/514385/2024)

The Authority reviewed the matter and noted the recommendation of the 185th meeting of the SEAC. The Authority observed that the SEAC, in its 185th meeting, had

recommended rejection of the proposal, on the ground that the project area is located in Kedavoor Village, which is identified as an Ecologically Sensitive Area (ESA) village.

The Authority noted that the project area is situated in Kedavoor Village, notified as an ESA village, and that, as per the directions issued by the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change (MoEF&CC) under Section 5 of the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986, vide order dated 13.11.2013, mining activities in ESA villages are prohibited, subject to the finalisation of the ESA notification. The Authority further noted that the final ESA notification is yet to be issued and that, pending such finalisation, the statutory directions governing ESA villages continue to remain in force.

The Authority also took note of the interim orders of the Hon'ble High Court dated 21.11.2025 and 12.12.2025 in WP(C) No.2785 of 2025, relating to the ESA matter, wherein the Hon'ble Court has suo motu impleaded the Secretary, MoEF&CC and the Secretary, Kerala Forest Department, and has directed them to take appropriate action for the expeditious finalisation of issues relating to ESA.

In view of the statutory restrictions applicable to ESA villages, the binding judicial orders, and the fact that the matter is sub judice, the Authority was of the considered view that the proposal cannot be processed at this stage.

Accordingly, after detailed deliberation, the Authority decided to return the application, in its present form, to the Project Proponent, to be reconsidered only after the finalisation and issuance of the Ecologically Sensitive Area (ESA) Notification by the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change.

Item No.23

**Environmental Clearance for the proposed Laterite building stone quarry of Sri. Muhammed Jaseem M K for an area of 0.9930 Hectare at Block No: 003, Re-Sy Nos. 1/126, 1/127, 1/130 in Kezhariyur Village, Koyilandi Taluk, Kozhikode
(SIA/KL/MIN/518025/2025)**

The Authority considered the proposal for grant of Environmental Clearance for the proposed Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Muhammed Jaseem M. K., Managing Partner, IBG Red Rocks, for an area of 0.9930 hectare at Block No. 003, Re-Survey Nos. 1/126, 1/127 and 1/130 in Kezhariyur Village, Koyilandi Taluk, Kozhikode District. The

Authority took note of the appraisal and recommendation of the SEAC made in its 185th meeting.

The Authority noted that the SEAC had examined the proposal in detail and that, during the presentation, the Committee observed the presence of a built-up concrete structure located at a distance of only 16 metres from the western boundary of the proposed project area. During appraisal, the SEAC discussed the matter with the Project Proponent and he had confirmed that the said structure is being used as a guest house with accommodation facilities, which qualifies as a residential building as per the National Building Code (NBC) Group A – Residential Occupancy classification.

The Authority further noted that, in view of the proximity of a residential building well within the prescribed mandatory distance norms, the SEAC concluded that the proposal is not in compliance with the applicable siting criteria and distance regulations, and accordingly recommended rejection of the proposal.

After due consideration of the agenda note and the recommendation of the SEAC, **the Authority resolved to accept the recommendation of the SEAC and reject the proposal for Environmental Clearance, as the mandatory distance norms prescribed under the applicable regulations are not satisfied, rendering the proposal ineligible for further consideration.**

Item No.24 **Environmental Clearance for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Jaison Jacob, Managing Director, M/s. VJJ Infrastructure Pvt Ltd., for an area of 0.9965 Ha at Block No. 30, Re-Sy. No. 429/1 in Kadanad Village, Meenachil Taluk, Kottayam.**
(SIA/KL/MIN/474394/2024)

The Authority considered the proposal for the Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Jaison Jacob, Managing Director, M/s. VJJ Infrastructure Pvt Ltd., along with the field inspection report of the Sub-Committee, SEAC and the recommendations of the 186th SEAC.

The Authority noted that the proposal had been examined by the SEAC in multiple meetings and that, based on site-specific conditions including environmental fragility, location within a moderate hazard zone, ridge-top geomorphology, proximity to habitations,

and the application of the Precautionary Principle, the SEAC had recommended rejection of the proposal. The Authority further noted that the SEAC had reaffirmed its recommendation even after conducting a detailed field inspection pursuant to the Project Proponent's request for reconsideration. However, the Authority observed that the Project Proponent had not been afforded an opportunity of being heard before arriving at a final recommendation on the proposal.

The Authority took note of the Office Memorandum dated 30.10.2025 issued by the MoEFCC, which, *inter alia*, emphasizes that principles of natural justice shall be adhered to in the appraisal process, and that where adverse observations are proposed to be relied upon for rejection or for taking a decision prejudicial to the Project Proponent, an opportunity of personal hearing shall be provided before finalizing the recommendation.

The Authority further took note of the judgment of the Hon'ble High Court dated 25th September 2025 in WP(C) No. 40566 of 2023, wherein, by relying on the decision in Kottiyoor Metals Pvt. Ltd. v. SEIAA (2025 KLT Online 2298), the Hon'ble Court emphasized that the purpose of hearing contemplated under Clause 7(i), Stage IV(4) of the EIA Notification, 2006 is of substantial significance. The Hon'ble Court observed that the object of such hearing is to enable the Project Proponent to offer explanations to the defects, deficiencies, or adverse aspects noted in the application for Environmental Clearance, so as to permit the authorities concerned to assess the feasibility of granting EC based on such inputs. The Hon'ble Court further held that denial of such an opportunity would amount to violation of the principles of natural justice and, accordingly, directed the SEAC to hear the petitioner, particularly on the factors found adverse, and thereafter to take a final decision.

In view of the above judicial pronouncement, the statutory requirement under the EIA Notification, 2006, and the directions contained in the Office Memorandum dated 30.10.2025, the Authority was of the considered opinion that the proposal requires reconsideration by the SEAC after affording a proper opportunity of hearing to the Project Proponent.

Accordingly, after detailed deliberation, **the Authority decided as follows:**

- 1. To direct the SEAC to afford a personal hearing to the Project Proponent, specifically on the aspects and factors recorded to reject the proposal.**

2. The SEAC to re-examine the proposal and submit its final recommendation to the Authority, after hearing the Project Proponent and considering any additional submissions or clarifications made during the hearing, strictly in accordance with the provisions of the EIA Notification, 2006 and the Office Memorandum dated 30.10.2025.

Item No.25

Environmental Clearance for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Antony S. Alukkal, M/s. Bell Mount Granite Aggregates Pvt Ltd., for an area of 3.6127 Ha at Block No. 20, Re-Survey Nos. 131/5, 131/11, 132/3, 132/3-1, 133/4-2, 133/7-1 & 139/3, in Manimala Village, Kanjirappally Taluk, Kottayam.

(SIA/KL/MIN/496038/2024)

The Authority considered the proposal for the Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Antony S. Alukkal, M/s. Bell Mount Granite Aggregates Pvt Ltd., along with the recommendations of the 186th SEAC and the request letter dated 16.12.2025 of the Project Proponent to reconsider the decision of the 186th SEAC meeting. The project proponent also submitted the finalized CER proposal and a detailed waste management plan.

The Authority examined the appraisal history of the proposal and noted that the SEAC had arrived at its observations to reject the EC application based on the documents available on record and the technical assessment carried out during the appraisal process. However, the Authority observed that the Project Proponent had not been afforded an opportunity of being heard before arriving at a final recommendation on the proposal.

The Authority took note of the Office Memorandum dated 30.10.2025 issued by the MoEFCC, which, inter alia, emphasizes that principles of natural justice shall be adhered to in the appraisal process, and that where adverse observations are proposed to be relied upon for rejection or for taking a decision prejudicial to the Project Proponent, an opportunity of personal hearing shall be provided before finalizing the recommendation.

The Authority further took note of the judgment of the Hon'ble High Court dated 25th September 2025 in WP(C) No. 40566 of 2023, wherein, by relying on the decision in Kottiyoor Metals Pvt. Ltd. v. SEIAA (2025 KLT Online 2298), the Hon'ble Court

emphasized that the purpose of hearing contemplated under Clause 7(i), Stage IV(4) of the EIA Notification, 2006 is of substantial significance. The Hon'ble Court observed that the object of such hearing is to enable the Project Proponent to offer explanations to the defects, deficiencies, or adverse aspects noted in the application for Environmental Clearance, so as to permit the authorities concerned to assess the feasibility of granting EC based on such inputs. The Hon'ble Court further held that denial of such an opportunity would amount to violation of the principles of natural justice and, accordingly, directed the SEAC to hear the petitioner, particularly on the factors found adverse, and thereafter to take a final decision.

In view of the above judicial pronouncement, the statutory requirement under the EIA Notification, 2006, and the directions contained in the Office Memorandum dated 30.10.2025, the Authority was of the considered opinion that the proposal requires reconsideration by the SEAC after affording a proper opportunity of hearing to the Project Proponent.

Accordingly, after detailed deliberation, **the Authority decided as follows:**

- 1. To direct the SEAC to afford a personal hearing to the Project Proponent, specifically on the aspects and factors recorded to reject the proposal.**
- 2. The SEAC to re-examine the proposal and submit its final recommendation to the Authority, after hearing the Project Proponent and considering any additional submissions or clarifications made during the hearing, strictly in accordance with the provisions of the EIA Notification, 2006 and the Office Memorandum dated 30.10.2025.**

Item No. 26

Environmental Clearance for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry project of Sri. K. J. Thomaskutty, M/s Shah Quarry for an area of 4.8894 ha at Block No. 41, Re-Sy Nos. 320/1, 320/1-2, 320/1-3, 320/1-4, 320/1-5, 320/1-2-2, 320/2-3, 320/2-4, 320/2-5, 320/2-6, 320/2-8, 320/2-10, 322/2-2, 322/2-3, 322/5, 326/2-2, 325/3, 324/5-1, 324/7, 324/5-1-2, 318/1-6, 320/3, 321/15, 321/28, 321/16, 322/7, 322/4 & 318/1-2 in Chadayamangalam Village, Kottarakkara Taluk, Kollam.

(SIA/KL/MIN/468799/2024)

The Authority considered the proposal for the Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. K. J. Thomaskutty, M/s Shah Quarry, along with the recommendations of the 186th SEAC and the request letter dated 23.12.2025 of the Project Proponent to reconsider the decision of the 186th SEAC meeting. The project proponent requested for an opportunity for hearing and to submit a comprehensive reply addressing the reasons for rejection.

The Authority examined the appraisal history of the proposal and noted that the SEAC had arrived at its observations to reject the EC application based on the documents available on record and the technical assessment carried out during the appraisal process. However, the Authority observed that the Project Proponent had not been afforded an opportunity of being heard before arriving at a final recommendation on the proposal.

The Authority took note of the Office Memorandum dated 30.10.2025 issued by the MoEFCC, which, *inter alia*, emphasizes that principles of natural justice shall be adhered to in the appraisal process, and that where adverse observations are proposed to be relied upon for rejection or for taking a decision prejudicial to the Project Proponent, an opportunity of personal hearing shall be provided before finalizing the recommendation.

The Authority further took note of the judgment of the Hon'ble High Court dated 25th September 2025 in WP(C) No. 40566 of 2023, wherein, by relying on the decision in Kottiyoor Metals Pvt. Ltd. v. SEIAA (2025 KLT Online 2298), the Hon'ble Court emphasized that the purpose of hearing contemplated under Clause 7(i), Stage IV(4) of the EIA Notification, 2006 is of substantial significance. The Hon'ble Court observed that the object of such hearing is to enable the Project Proponent to offer explanations to the defects, deficiencies, or adverse aspects noted in the application for Environmental Clearance, so as to permit the authorities concerned to assess the feasibility of granting EC based on such inputs.

The Hon'ble Court further held that denial of such an opportunity would amount to violation of the principles of natural justice and, accordingly, directed the SEAC to hear the petitioner, particularly on the factors found adverse, and thereafter to take a final decision.

In view of the above judicial pronouncement, the statutory requirement under the EIA Notification, 2006, and the directions contained in the Office Memorandum dated 30.10.2025, the Authority was of the considered opinion that the proposal requires reconsideration by the SEAC after affording a proper opportunity of hearing to the Project Proponent.

Accordingly, after detailed deliberation, **the Authority decided as follows:**

- 1. To direct the SEAC to afford a personal hearing to the Project Proponent, specifically on the aspects and factors recorded to reject the proposal.**
- 2. The SEAC to re-examine the proposal and submit its final recommendation to the Authority, after hearing the Project Proponent and considering any additional submissions or clarifications made during the hearing, strictly in accordance with the provisions of the EIA Notification, 2006 and the Office Memorandum dated 30.10.2025.**

Item No.27

Environmental Clearance for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry project of Sri. Syju Lekshman for an area of 4.998 ha at Block no. 41, Re-Sy Nos. 322/2-2-1, 322/1, 322/6, 323/3, 324/6, 324/9-2, 324/6-3, 324/5-2, 324/3-2, 324/3-3, 324/4 (Private land), 325/1, 322/3, 323/2, 323/6, 323/7 & 324/3 (Govt. land) in Chadayamangalam Village, Kottarakkara Taluk, Kollam.

(SIA/KL/MIN/469043/2024)

The Authority considered the proposal for the Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Syju Lekshman, along with the recommendations of the 186th SEAC and the request letter dated 25.11.2025 to reconsider the decision of the 186th SEAC meeting.

The Authority examined the appraisal history of the proposal and noted that the SEAC had arrived at its observations to reject the EC application based on the documents available on record and the technical assessment carried out during the appraisal process.

However, the Authority observed that the Project Proponent had not been afforded an opportunity of being heard before arriving at a final recommendation on the proposal.

The Authority took note of the Office Memorandum dated 30.10.2025 issued by the MoEFCC, which, *inter alia*, emphasizes that principles of natural justice shall be adhered to in the appraisal process, and that where adverse observations are proposed to be relied upon for rejection or for taking a decision prejudicial to the Project Proponent, an opportunity of personal hearing shall be provided before finalizing the recommendation.

The Authority further took note of the judgment of the Hon'ble High Court dated 25th September 2025 in WP(C) No. 40566 of 2023, wherein, by relying on the decision in Kottiyoor Metals Pvt. Ltd. v. SEIAA (2025 KLT Online 2298), the Hon'ble Court emphasized that the purpose of hearing contemplated under Clause 7(i), Stage IV(4) of the EIA Notification, 2006 is of substantial significance. The Hon'ble Court observed that the object of such hearing is to enable the Project Proponent to offer explanations to the defects, deficiencies, or adverse aspects noted in the application for Environmental Clearance, so as to permit the authorities concerned to assess the feasibility of granting EC based on such inputs. The Hon'ble Court further held that denial of such an opportunity would amount to violation of the principles of natural justice and, accordingly, directed the SEAC to hear the petitioner, particularly on the factors found adverse, and thereafter to take a final decision.

In view of the above judicial pronouncement, the statutory requirement under the EIA Notification, 2006, and the directions contained in the Office Memorandum dated 30.10.2025, the Authority was of the considered opinion that the proposal requires reconsideration by the SEAC after affording a proper opportunity of hearing to the Project Proponent.

Accordingly, after detailed deliberation, **the Authority decided as follows:**

- 1. To direct the SEAC to afford a personal hearing to the Project Proponent, specifically on the aspects and factors recorded to reject the proposal.**
- 2. The SEAC to re-examine the proposal and submit its final recommendation to the Authority, after hearing the Project Proponent and considering any additional submissions or clarifications made during the hearing, strictly in accordance with the provisions of the EIA Notification, 2006 and the Office Memorandum dated 30.10.2025.**

Item No.28

**Environmental Clearance for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of M/s True Stone Black Rock LLP for an area of 0.9046 Ha at Block No. 72, Re-Sy. No. 38/7 in Venganellur Village, Thalappilly Taluk, Thrissur.
(SIA/KL/MIN/496540/2024)**

The Authority considered the proposal for the Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of M/s True Stone Black Rock LLP., along with the recommendations of the 187th SEAC and the request letter dated 24.12.2025 of the Project Proponent to reconsider the decision of the 187th SEAC meeting. The project proponent also requested for site inspection and re-examining the proposal based on the site specific scientific datasets.

The Authority examined the appraisal history of the proposal and noted that the SEAC had arrived at its observations to reject the EC application based on the documents available on record and the technical assessment carried out during the appraisal process. However, the Authority observed that the Project Proponent had not been afforded an opportunity of being heard before arriving at a final recommendation on the proposal.

The Authority took note of the Office Memorandum dated 30.10.2025 issued by the MoEFCC, which, inter alia, emphasizes that principles of natural justice shall be adhered to in the appraisal process, and that where adverse observations are proposed to be relied upon for rejection or for taking a decision prejudicial to the Project Proponent, an opportunity of personal hearing shall be provided before finalizing the recommendation.

The Authority further took note of the judgment of the Hon'ble High Court dated 25th September 2025 in WP(C) No. 40566 of 2023, wherein, by relying on the decision in Kottiyoor Metals Pvt. Ltd. v. SEIAA (2025 KLT Online 2298), the Hon'ble Court emphasized that the purpose of hearing contemplated under Clause 7(i), Stage IV(4) of the EIA Notification, 2006 is of substantial significance. The Hon'ble Court observed that the object of such hearing is to enable the Project Proponent to offer explanations to the defects, deficiencies, or adverse aspects noted in the application for Environmental Clearance, so as to permit the authorities concerned to assess the feasibility of granting EC based on such inputs. The Hon'ble Court further held that denial of such an opportunity would amount to violation of the principles of natural justice and, accordingly, directed the SEAC to hear the petitioner, particularly on the factors found adverse, and thereafter to take a final decision.

In view of the above judicial pronouncement, the statutory requirement under the EIA Notification, 2006, and the directions contained in the Office Memorandum dated 30.10.2025, the Authority was of the considered opinion that the proposal requires reconsideration by the SEAC after affording a proper opportunity of hearing to the Project Proponent.

Accordingly, after detailed deliberation, **the Authority decided as follows:**

- 1. To direct the SEAC to afford a personal hearing to the Project Proponent, specifically on the aspects and factors recorded to reject the proposal.**
- 2. The SEAC to re-examine the proposal and submit its final recommendation to the Authority, after hearing the Project Proponent and considering any additional submissions or clarifications made during the hearing, strictly in accordance with the provisions of the EIA Notification, 2006 and the Office Memorandum dated 30.10.2025.**

Item No.29

Environmental Clearance for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of M/s True Stone Black Rock LLP, for an area of 0.9898 Ha at Block No. 72, Re-Sy. Nos. 38/7 & 38/8 in Venganellur Village, Thalappilly Taluk, Thrissur.

(SIA/KL/MIN/501213/2024)

The Authority considered the proposal for the Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of M/s True Stone Black Rock LLP., along with the recommendations of the 187th SEAC and the request letter dated 24.12.2025 of the Project Proponent to reconsider the decision of the 187th SEAC meeting. The project proponent also requested for site inspection and re-examining the proposal based on the site specific scientific datasets.

The Authority examined the appraisal history of the proposal and noted that the SEAC had arrived at its observations to reject the EC application based on the documents available on record and the technical assessment carried out during the appraisal process. However, the Authority observed that the Project Proponent had not been afforded an opportunity of being heard before arriving at a final recommendation on the proposal.

The Authority took note of the Office Memorandum dated 30.10.2025 issued by the MoEFCC, which, inter alia, emphasizes that principles of natural justice shall be adhered to in the appraisal process, and that where adverse observations are proposed to be relied upon for rejection or for taking a decision prejudicial to the Project Proponent, an opportunity of personal hearing shall be provided before finalizing the recommendation.

The Authority further took note of the judgment of the Hon'ble High Court dated 25th September 2025 in WP(C) No. 40566 of 2023, wherein, by relying on the decision in Kottiyoor Metals Pvt. Ltd. v. SEIAA (2025 KLT Online 2298), the Hon'ble Court emphasized that the purpose of hearing contemplated under Clause 7(i), Stage IV(4) of the EIA Notification, 2006 is of substantial significance. The Hon'ble Court observed that the object of such hearing is to enable the Project Proponent to offer explanations to the defects, deficiencies, or adverse aspects noted in the application for Environmental Clearance, so as to permit the authorities concerned to assess the feasibility of granting EC based on such inputs. The Hon'ble Court further held that denial of such an opportunity would amount to violation of the principles of natural justice and, accordingly, directed the SEAC to hear the petitioner, particularly on the factors found adverse, and thereafter to take a final decision.

In view of the above judicial pronouncement, the statutory requirement under the EIA Notification, 2006, and the directions contained in the Office Memorandum dated 30.10.2025, the Authority was of the considered opinion that the proposal requires reconsideration by the SEAC after affording a proper opportunity of hearing to the Project Proponent.

Accordingly, after detailed deliberation, **the Authority decided as follows:**

- 1. To direct the SEAC to afford a personal hearing to the Project Proponent, specifically on the aspects and factors recorded to reject the proposal.**
- 2. The SEAC to re-examine the proposal and submit its final recommendation to the Authority, after hearing the Project Proponent and considering any additional submissions or clarifications made during the hearing, strictly in accordance with the provisions of the EIA Notification, 2006 and the Office Memorandum dated 30.10.2025.**

General Decision

1. Streamlining Handling of Legal Matters and Court-Related Documentation

The Authority deliberated on the existing practice relating to the handling of legal matters, including the preparation of Statements of Facts (SoF), instructions to Standing Counsel, counter affidavits, and other court-related documents involving the Authority.

The Authority observed that the prevailing practice of assigning the drafting of legal documents to Technical Officers has led to a substantial diversion of technical manpower from their core statutory functions, including appraisal, field inspection, monitoring, and technical evaluation of proposals. The Authority further noted that a lion's share of the working time of the Technical Officers is presently being consumed in the preparation of Statements of Facts, instructions to Standing Counsel, counter affidavits, and other court-related documents. As a consequence, effective and timely scrutiny of applications is being adversely affected, mainstream technical functions have been sidelined, and a significant number of applications remain pending, thereby impairing the overall efficiency and functioning of the Authority. The Authority emphasized that Technical Officers are primarily required to provide technical inputs, expert opinions, factual clarifications, and supporting material relevant to the subject matter, and that the drafting of legal documents ought to be undertaken through a streamlined administrative mechanism within the SEIAA Secretariat.

In order to streamline the monitoring and compliance of court orders and judgments, it is decided that the Legal Officer, assisted by an Assistant from the Establishment Section, shall oversee the process. Upon receipt of any order or judgment from various judicial fora, the same shall be promptly placed before the SEIAA or SEAC, as applicable, to ensure timely compliance with the directions contained therein.

The Assistant shall act in accordance with the directions of the Legal Officer. Wherever any judgment or order is received in the office, the Tapal Section shall immediately hand over such orders or judgments to the designated Assistant, who shall place the same before the Legal Officer for appropriate instructions and further action.

The Assistant shall maintain a dedicated register of court orders and judgments and shall record the decisions, directions, and compliance actions taken by the Authority or the Committee when the file is returned, so as to ensure proper tracking and accountability..

After detailed deliberation, the Authority resolved to rationalize and streamline the procedure for handling legal matters and preparation of court-related documents, and decided as follows:

1. The SEIAA Secretariat shall issue a formal Work Order / Proceedings, designating one Assistant to assist the Legal Officer with the drafting of Statements of Facts, instructions to the Standing Counsel, counter-affidavits, and all other court-related pleadings or communications on behalf of the Authority.
2. The Technical Officers shall henceforth be responsible only for providing the requisite technical inputs, factual details, inspection findings, and expert clarifications relevant to the subject matter of the case, as and when sought by the Legal Wing of the Secretariat.
3. The existing practice of Technical Officers directly drafting Statements of Facts, instructions to Standing Counsel, counter-affidavits, or similar legal documents shall stand discontinued with immediate effect.
4. The technical inputs furnished by the Technical Officers shall be compiled and articulated by the concerned Assistant / Assistant Environmental Officers (AEO), and routed through the Environmental Officers (EOs) and the Environmental Scientist (ES), as applicable, for scrutiny and approval before being finalized and communicated to the Standing Counsel or filed before the competent court or tribunal.
5. The Legal Officer shall examine and vet all draft Statements of Facts, instructions to Standing Counsel, counter affidavits, and other pleadings from a legal standpoint, ensuring consistency with statutory provisions, policy decisions of the Authority, and relevant judicial pronouncements, before the same are finalized and approved.
6. Only after legal vetting by the Legal Officer and administrative scrutiny through the prescribed channel shall the documents be approved by the competent

authority and forwarded to the Standing Counsel or filed before the appropriate judicial forum.

7. This streamlined mechanism shall be followed uniformly for all ongoing and future legal matters, with a view to ensuring clarity of roles, legal robustness of pleadings, timely submission, and optimal utilization of technical expertise within the Authority.

The Authority directed the SEIAA Secretariat to take immediate steps to operationalize the above decision and ensure strict compliance hereafter.

2. Revamping of the SEIAA Website and Development of Digital Modules

The Authority deliberated on the need to strengthen and modernise the digital infrastructure of the Authority by revamping the official website, with a view to improving transparency, efficiency, regulatory compliance, and public service delivery. The Authority observed that the existing website infrastructure is limited in functionality and does not adequately support emerging administrative, compliance, and monitoring requirements.

The Authority noted that the introduction of dedicated digital modules would significantly streamline regulatory processes, improve tracking and monitoring of compliance by Project Proponents, and enhance institutional responsiveness to public grievances and legal matters.

After detailed deliberation, the Authority resolved to revamp the official website of the Authority and decided as follows:

1. **HYCR Submission Portal:** A dedicated online module shall be developed for submission of Half-Yearly Compliance Reports (HYCRs) by Project Proponents. The module shall enable structured data entry, uploading of supporting documents, automated acknowledgements, and tracking of submission status, thereby facilitating effective compliance monitoring by the Authority.
2. **Complaint and Grievance Redressal Portal:** An integrated online portal shall be established for receipt, registration, and tracking of complaints and grievances from the public and stakeholders. The portal shall provide mechanisms for

assignment, time-bound disposal, and communication of action taken, in accordance with applicable grievance redressal norms.

3. **Legal Case Management & Database Module:** A centralized digital database shall be created and maintained on the website to record and track all legal cases pertaining to the Authority, including matters before the Hon'ble High Court and the Hon'ble National Green Tribunal. The database shall capture case details, stage of proceedings, orders passed, compliance status, and timelines, to ensure effective legal monitoring and institutional memory.
4. **API Integration with KOMPAS Portal:** The Authority resolved to explore and establish an Application Programming Interface (API) linkage with the KOMPAS system maintained by the Department of Mining and Geology, Government of Kerala, to enable seamless access to relevant mining-related data for appraisal, compliance verification, and monitoring purposes, subject to technical feasibility and data security protocols.

The Authority decided to entrust the Member Secretary, SEIAA, with the responsibility to coordinate with the Department of Information Technology and the Department of Mining and Geology, Government of Kerala, for technical consultation, data integration, and implementation of the proposed website revamp and digital modules. The SEIAA Secretariat shall prepare a detailed proposal outlining technical specifications, timelines, financial requirements, and implementation modalities, and place the same before the Authority for approval.

The Authority directed the SEIAA Secretariat to initiate immediate action for revamping the website and to ensure phased implementation of the proposed digital modules, with a view to enhancing the overall efficiency, transparency, and effectiveness of the Authority's functioning.

3. Compilation and Periodic Review of Complaints and Action Taken

The Authority deliberated on the need to ensure systematic monitoring, transparency, and effective follow-up of complaints received against projects and activities falling under the purview of the Authority. The Authority observed that, at present, complaints are being

addressed on a case-to-case basis and that a consolidated mechanism for periodic review by the Authority would strengthen oversight, accountability, and institutional record-keeping. After detailed deliberation, the Authority resolved as follows:

1. The SEIAA Secretariat shall compile all complaints received against projects, Project Proponents, or activities within the jurisdiction of the Authority in a tabular format, along with the action taken by the SEIAA Secretariat, present status and remarks, if any
2. The compiled statement of complaints and the corresponding action taken shall be placed before the Authority in each meeting, or at such periodic intervals as decided by the Authority, for perusal and appropriate directions.

Sd/-

Sri. P.H. Kurian IAS (Retd)
Chairman

Sd/-

Sri. Raveendran T.
Expert Member

Sd/-

Sri. Seeram Sambasiva Rao IAS
Member Secretary