



2025:KER:61185

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE C. JAYACHANDRAN

MONDAY, THE 18TH DAY OF AUGUST 2025 / 27TH SRAVANA, 1947

WP(C) NO. 20083 OF 2023

PETITIONERS:

- 1 BHARGAVAN PILLAI,
 AGED 60 YEARS
 S/O KRISHNA KURUP, PADINJAREVEETIL, KIZHAKETHIL,
 KURUMPALA (S) POST, PANDALAM, PATHANAMTHITTA DISTRICT,
 PIN - 689501
- 2 REGHU KUMAR G,
 AGED 60 YEARS
 S/O GOPALAN ACHARY, CHAITHRAM HOUSE, KURAMPALA (S)
 POST, PANDALAM, PATHANAMTHITTA DISTRICT, PIN - 689501
- 3 MURALEEDHARAN K,
 AGED 59 YEARS
 S/O KOCHU KUNJU, VALUTHUNDIL, KURAMPALA (S) POST,
 PANDALAM, PATHANAMTHITTA DISTRICT, PIN - 689501

BY ADVS.
SRI.P.M.RAFEEK
SRI.U.NIDHIN
SMT.GIA MATHAI KANDATHIL
SMT.SARA JOHN

RESPONDENTS:

- 1 DISTRICT GEOLOGIST,
 DEPARTMENT OF MINING AND GEOLOGY, DISTRICT OFFICE,
 PATHANAMTHITTA DISTRICT, PIN - 689533
- 2 STATE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT AUTHORITY-SEIAA,
 REP. BY ITS MEMBER SECRETARY, 4TH FLOOR, KSRTC BUS
 TERMINAL COMPLEX, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN - 695001



- 3 NATIONAL HIGHWAYS AUTHORITY OF INDIA - NHAI,
G-586, SECTOR-10, DWARAKA P.O, NEW DELHI, REP.
BY ITS CHAIRMAN, PIN - 110075
- 4 CHAIRPERSON (DISTRICT COLLECTOR) ,
DISTRICT DISASTER MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY, 2ND
FLOOR, DISTRICT COLLECTORATE, PATHANAMTHITTA,
KERALA, PIN - 689645
- 5 PANDALAM MUNICIPALITY,
PANDALAM, PATHANAMTHITTA,
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY, PIN - 689501
- 6 SECRETARY,
PANDALAM MUNICIPALITY, PANDALAM,
PATHANAMTHITTA DIST., PIN - 689501
- 7 VISWASAMUDRA ENGINEERING PVT. LTD,
RAHEJAN BUILDING, HAMEED KUNJU NAGAR, PADA
NORTH,KARUNAGAPALLY, KOLLAM,REP. BY ITS
AUTHORIZED SIGNATORY, PIN - 690518

BY ADVS.

SHRI.LEJO JOSEPH GEORGE - FOR R3

SRI.K.R.ARUN KRISHNAN

SRI.E.C.KURIAKOSE

SRI.S.SREEKUMAR (SR.)

SMT.DEEPA K.RADHAKRISHNAN

SHRI.SANAL C.S

SHRI.VISHAK K.V.

SMT.DEVISHRI.R - GOVERNMENT PLEADER

SRI.M.P.SREEKRISHNAN - STANDING COUNSEL

SMT.T.S.MAYA - PANDALAM MUNICIPALITY

SRI.B.G.BIDAN CHANDRAN - STANDING COUNSEL (NHAI)

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN CAME UP FOR
HEARING ON 29.07.2025, THE COURT ON 18.08.2025 DELIVERED
THE FOLLOWING:



“C.R.”

J U D G M E N T

Dated this the 18th day of August, 2025

The petitioners, 3 in number, are residing in and around 'Erichurili Mala', a hillock at Kurumbala Village, Pathanamthitta. They are apprehensive of the large scale excavation of earth from the said hillock by the 7th respondent, who purchased that land recently. The excavation apprehended is in connection with the construction of Kottukulangara to Kollam highway bypass. Ext.P1 is a mass petition given to the Director of Mining. Ext.P2 is the quarrying permit issued to the 7th respondent permitting excavation and removal of ordinary earth from 43.20 Ares of land in Erichurili Mala. Although environmental clearance is mandatory, the 2nd respondent State Environmental Impact Assessment Authority ('SEIAA', for short) had issued Ext.P3 expressing no objection to grant exemption from obtaining environmental clearance for sourcing or borrowing of earth for the construction of the



National Highway. Ext.P4 is a Circular issued by the Government of Kerala exempting the requirement of environmental clearance to borrow ordinary earth for highway related works and for construction of village roads and other government sponsored schemes. The petitioners would maintain that Ext.P4 Circular is illegal. Ext.P5 is a notification issued by the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change (MoEF & CC) dated 28.03.2020, granting exemption for certain cases from the requirement of environmental clearance, which was brought in by virtue of amendment to Appendix-IX of the EIA notification, 2006. Serial no. 6 therein is extraction or sourcing or borrowing of ordinary earth for the linear projects such as roads, pipelines etc. The exemption granted vide Ext.P5 was challenged before the National Green Tribunal by filing Original Application nos. 190/2020 and 68/2020. The National Green Tribunal observed that grant of blanket exemption for excavation of earth is against the norms of sustainable development. Ext.P6 is an O.M issued by the MoEF & CC, which is a clarification



issued on the applicability of EIA notification, 2006, for excavation of ordinary earth from borrow area for linear projects. After deliberation by the Expert Appraisal Committee (EAC) and based on its recommendations, and also in view of the direction of the National Green Tribunal, the Ministry decided that exemption from E.C for extraction or sourcing or borrowing of ordinary earth for linear projects shall be subject to Standard Operating Procedure enclosed to the Office Memorandum. The petitioner would maintain that the linear project of Kottukulangara to Kollam highway bypass is a project, which requires separate E.C for excavating earth. Ext.P7 is a letter issued by the 2nd petitioner to the 1st respondent pointing out the illegality in issuing Ext.P2 quarrying permit to the 7th respondent. Ext.P8 is a similar letter issued by the 2nd petitioner to the 2nd respondent pointing out the illegality in grant of Ext.P3 'No Objection'. Ext.P9 is an Order whereby the 4th respondent, Chairperson of the District Disaster Management Authority, has evacuated residents near to



Athiramala due to heavy rainfall, which is produced to point out that the topography and landscape of 'Erichurili Mala' are similar to those of Athiramala. By Ext.P10 representation, the 2nd petitioner requested the 4th respondent Chairperson/District Collector, to take steps to stop the excavation of earth from 'Erichurili Mala'. Ext. P11 is a resolution passed by the 5th respondent to obtain a 'Non-Objection Certificate' for carrying out quarrying operations. By Ext. P12 representation, the 2nd petitioner requested the 6th respondent to issue a stop memo to the 7th respondent, preventing the latter from making preparations for excavating earth from 'Erichurili Mala' without obtaining a permit from the 5th respondent. The petitioners would maintain that Exts.P2 and P3 are illegal and liable to be quashed. It is highlighted by the petitioners that an environmental clearance from the 2nd respondent is a mandatory pre-condition for quarrying the subject site and Ext.P2 quarrying permit issued, in the absence of the same, is illegal. On such premise, the petitioners seek Exts.P2 and P3 to be quashed, besides



issuance of a Writ of Mandamus directing respondent nos. 4 and 5 to take steps to stop excavation of earth from 'Erichurili Mala' by the 7th respondent.

2. The contesting 7th respondent filed counter affidavit *inter alia* contending as follows:

The 7th respondent is the selected bidder of the National Highway Authority of India (the 3rd respondent) for the work of National Highway (six-lane) from Kottukulangara to Kollam bypass, which requires huge amount of ordinary earth. Accordingly, the 7th respondent purchased land in Pathanamthitta. 7th respondent made application under the Kerala Minor Mineral Concession Rules, 2015, seeking permission to excavate ordinary earth. Accordingly, permission was issued and the 7th respondent company paid the royalty. A revised mining plan was filed by the 7th respondent company as per the guidelines issued by the MoEF & CC, produced with Ext.R7(a). By Ext.R7(b), the revised mining plan was approved by the 1st respondent Geologist. A clarification was sought to the Judgment of



the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Noble M. Paikada v. Union of India* [2024 SCC Online SC 369] and by Order dated 15.05.2024, the Hon'ble Supreme Court clarified that work orders which were issued prior to 21.03.2024 will not be affected by the Judgment in *Noble M. Paikada* (supra). The subject work order was issued to the 7th respondent company on 06.08.2021, wherefore respondent no. 7 is entitled to the exemption granted by virtue of the clarificatory Order. The 3rd respondent/NHAI by Ext.R7(c) letter brought the above matter to the notice of the Geologist. On such premise, the 7th respondent seeks the Writ Petition to be dismissed.

3. Heard Sri.P.M.Rafeek, learned counsel the petitioners; Smt.Devishri R., the learned Government Pleader on behalf of respondents 1 and 4; Sri.M.P.Sreekrishnan, the learned Standing Counsel for the 2nd respondent SEIAA; Sri.B.G Bidan Chandran, learned Standing Counsel for the 3rd respondent NHAI; Smt.T.S.Maya, for the 5th respondent Municipality and



learned Senior Counsel Sri.S.Sreekumar, duly instructed by Advocate K.R.Arun Krishnan, on behalf of the contesting 7th respondent. Perused the Records.

4. From the arguments raised by the learned counsel for the respective parties, the issue centers around the Judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Noble M. Paikada*** (supra), as also, the clarificatory Order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court to that Judgment, which is produced along with Ext.R7(c) by the 7th respondent. The impact of this clarificatory Order dated 15.5.2024 has already been considered by, as many as, four learned single judges of this Court. The first is the Order dated 11.11.2024 in I.A No. 1/2024 and W.P(C)No.32704/2024, produced at Ext.P19 rendered in a similar fact situation, wherein the 8th respondent/concessionaire claimed the benefit of the clarificatory Order obtained by the National Highway Authority of India to the Judgment in ***Noble M. Paikada*** (supra). In that case also, the issue involved was the excavation of a large hill, on the premise that the 8th



respondent therein was the contractor appointed by the NHAI to execute a work, which falls under the exemption granted by the clarificatory Order above referred. The learned Single Judge took stock of the fact that the 8th respondent therein had not obtained any E.C for conducting mining/excavation activities. The work order referred to in Ext.R8 A in that case does not mention about sourcing or borrowing of ordinary earth from the site in question. The work order only refers to a linear project. The exemption from E.C was granted only by virtue of the amendment to the EIA notification (produced as Ext.P5 in the present Writ Petition), which was struck down by the Supreme Court in the Judgment in **Noble M. Paikada** (supra). Thus, the exemption from obtaining E.C, a mandatory requirement for extraction, would not survive any more and that the clarification issued by the Supreme Court was only for projects, for which work orders were issued before the cut off date, that is, 21.03.2024. The learned Single Judge found that the excavation of ordinary earth by the 8th respondent therein (the contractor of the NHAI



in the project in question) cannot be brought within the scope of the exemption granted under the clarificatory Order and therefore, the requirement of an environmental clearance cannot be dispensed with. Accordingly, the request for vacating the interim order, which directed prevention of excavation was dismissed. Although the said Order is passed in I.A, the matter is exhaustively seen dealt with.

5. The next judgment is the one produced at Ext.P20, wherein a police protection was sought for, on the premise that the work in question stood accepted by the clarificatory Order of the Supreme Court. There, the issue is seen considered by the learned Single Judge at length and found in paragraph no.10 that, although the work order was issued prior to the cut off date, the permit was issued thereafter and as on the date of issuance of the permit, the exemption provided for extraction of earth for linear projects was not in existence. Accordingly, the police protection sought for was dismissed.



6. The third judgment to be taken note of is the one produced at Ext.P25 in W.P.(C)No.2090/2025, wherein a Grama Panchayat sought for quashing a quarrying permit. There also, *Noble M. Paikada* (supra) and the clarificatory Order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court dated 15.05.2024 have been considered by the learned Single Judge. After taking stock of Ext.P20 judgment of the learned Single Judge, as also the judgment of the Division Bench in W.A.No.1877/2024 (which took stock of the fact that Ext.P20 judgment was rendered in a Writ Petition seeking police protection and hence the findings would not preclude the petitioner therein from seeking substantive relief and declaration), the learned Single Judge held himself in complete agreement with the interpretation made in Ext.P20 judgment. That apart, the learned Single Judge also took stock of the precautionary principle and the judgments on the point, ultimately to hold that the quarrying operations cannot be continued without a prior E.C. It could thus be seen that the benefit of the



clarificatory Order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Noble M. Paikada*** (supra) was not considered in favour of the project proponent therein.

7. The fourth one is by yet another learned Single Judge in ***Wilson K John and Others v. Joint Secretary, Industries Department and Others*** [W.P.(C)No.12684/2024 and connected matters]. A common judgment was rendered in three Writ Petitions. The main issue involved in those cases was, whether an environmental clearance has to be obtained by the concessionaires, who have undertaken the work on behalf of the NHAI for quarrying earth to be used for the development of the Highway, the precise issue which was fallen for consideration in the subject Writ Petition as well. After taking stock of ***Noble M. Paikada*** (supra) and the clarificatory Order, the learned Single Judge toed in line with the law laid down by the learned Single Judge in ***M/s Oriental Structural Engineers Private Limited v. The Circle Inspector of Police and Others*** [W.P.(C)No.34959/2024 - Ext.P20], the Division Bench



judgment rendered in appeal therefrom [W.A.No.1877/2024], and the judgment of the learned Single Judge in ***Nedukunnam Grama Panchayath v. The State of Kerala and Others*** [W.P.(C)No.2090/2025]. Ultimately, the learned Single Judge held that the benefit of the clarificatory Order is sought by the concessionaire, whereas, the Order only safeguards the work orders for linear projects. It has been held that every person who undertakes the work of such linear projects are not entitled to exception. The benefit of the clarificatory Order is only for the work orders issued by the NHAI, which cannot be extended to the concessionaire. The obligation of the concessionaire to extract, source or borrow ordinary earth has to be met by undertaking the work of mining or by procuring ordinary earth from suppliers. For excavation of ordinary earth, the suppliers will have to obtain the environmental clearance. To say that the concessionaire requires no EC for excavating soil would be extending the clarification issued by the Hon'ble Supreme Court beyond its scope and intent. Thus, the claim of the concessionaire/contractor



was negated in that case as well. An appeal was carried before the Division Bench from the above-referred judgment of the learned Single Judge in Writ Appeal No.497/2025 and connected cases. Although appellants pressed for an interim order, the same was refused vide Order dated 11.04.2025, produced at Ext.P24, finding that there is no *prima facie* reason to stay the impugned judgment, so as to permit the appellants to remove the ordinary earth.

8. With these input, I will now consider the issue at hand, for the correct appreciation of which, this Court will have to start from Ext.P5 notification dated 28.03.2020. That notification, by virtue of the amendment brought into Appendix-IX to the EIA Notification, 2006, granted exemption to certain cases from the requirement of environmental clearance. Serial No.6 to the amended Appendix-IX is '*extraction or sourcing or borrowing of ordinary earth for the linear projects such as roads, pipelines etc.*'. This exemption granted vide Ext.P5 was put to challenge, which was ultimately decided by the



Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Noble M. Paikada* (supra). The Hon'ble Supreme Court struck down the above serial no.6 of the amended Appendix-IX of the EIA notification and quashed the same. Thereupon, the NHAI preferred an interim application seeking clarification of the above judgment. It is in that application, Ext.R7(c) Order has been passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court on 15.05.2024.

9. Before analyzing the scope of the clarificatory Order, this Court has directed the 3rd respondent to produce the interim application filed before the Hon'ble Supreme Court, so as to understand the context in which that application was filed, as also, its scope. From a perusal of paragraph no.6 of that application, the applicant-NHAI would espouse the magnitude of the adverse impact which will be faced by NHAI. The same is seen espoused in paragraph no.12 as well. In paragraph no.14, it is specifically averred that, to discharge the statutory functions of the NHAI, it is empowered to award infrastructural contracts to private companies,



contractors/concessionaires etc., for construction, development, maintenance and operations of National Highways. The requirement of ordinary earth in connection with the project is seen espoused in paragraph no.15, wherein the inbuilt mechanism to ensure environmental protection is also seen referred to. Paragraph no.32 refers to about 485 infrastructural road projects in progress at different parts of the country, which are in different stages of completion. Annexure-P3 to the petition is a list of all the ongoing projects of the National Highway. Paragraph no.34 again specifically refers to the implications on the contractor/concessionaire of the judgment in ***Noble M. Paikada*** (supra). The plight of the concessionaires/contractors that they may not be able to absorb the overhead costs arising out of the delay etc., are also seen espoused. Ultimately, the prayer sought for was to recall the judgment in ***Noble M. Paikada*** (supra) or in the alternative, to allow the applicant/NHAI to complete the NH projects, which are mentioned in Annexure-P3 to the petition.



10. It is in the above state of affairs as pleaded in the petition and as noticed above, that Ext.R7(c) Order has been passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, clarifying that the projects, for which work orders were issued by the applicant/NHAI prior to 21.03.2024, will remain unaffected by the judgment in **Noble M. Paikkada** (supra). By virtue of the clarification Order, NHAI was directed to file an affidavit giving a list of the projects for which work orders have been issued prior to 21.03.2024 and also to produce the copies of the work orders and other relevant documents showing service of the work order on contractors within a period of one month from the date of the clarificatory Order. It could thus be seen that the Supreme Court was fully aware of the fact that the work orders are being executed through contractors/ concessionaires. It was again clarified that the work orders which were issued prior to 28.03.2020 require environmental clearance, and therefore the benefit of the clarificatory Order will not be available to such work orders.



11. It could thus be seen that the Hon'ble Supreme Court has clarified that in respect of projects of NHAI, of which the work orders were issued prior to 21.03.2024, but after 28.03.2020, will remain unaffected by the judgment in *Noble M. Paikada* (supra). In other words, the declaration of law made by the Supreme Court, insofar as Ext.P5 notification amending Appendix-IX to the EIA notification, 2006, and quashing the same, has been rendered inapplicable to those works which are specified above. This would be the impact of the clarificatory Order issued by the Supreme Court.

12. Now, the moot question is whether a contractor who is executing the work of NHAI, which stands exempted by virtue of the clarificatory Order dated 15.05.2024, can claim the benefit of that Order. I am of the opinion that he is, provided the extraction, sourcing or borrowing of ordinary earth is exclusively for the linear projects. An



interpretation otherwise would defeat the precious right secured by the NHA I by seeking a clarification to the judgment and obtaining the same by Order dated 15.05.2024. It goes without saying that the scope of an Order has to be addressed and interpreted on the strength of the pleadings placed before the Court and the arguments addressed. As already taken note of, the specific pleading which was before the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the clarification petition preferred by NHA I was the difficulties which they would face on account of the judgment in **Noble M. Paikada** (supra), in respect of on-going projects. The fact that the works of NHA I are got implemented by engaging contractors/concessionaires is very much pleaded in that interim application. Besides, the impact of the judgment in **Noble M. Paikada** (supra) on such contractors is also pleaded. Thus, Ext.R7(c) clarificatory Order passed, taking stock of such pleadings, has to be read and interpreted meaningfully, so as to give effect to that Order; and not in a manner circumventing the benefit obtained by NHA I. This is all



the more so, when Ext.R7(c) clarificatory Order specifically refers to provide proof regarding service of work orders on the contractors. Thus, if the contractor is specifically confining his activity to the work of the NHAI and if his quarrying permits also reflect such limitation of confining to the exempted work of the NHAI, then to deny the benefit of the clarificatory Order only for the reason it is sought for by the contractor would defeat the very purpose of the clarificatory Order. Ideally, it is for the NHAI to seek the benefit of the clarificatory Order. However, if a Writ Petition is filed challenging the authority of the contractor to indulge in quarrying activity, though enabled by a permit or license, it would quite be open for the NHAI to point out that the work which is undertaken by the contractor pertains to the exempted works of the NHAI only. However, this has to be done either by NHAI or by the contractor/concessionaire by producing adequate and sufficient documents, in support thereof.



13. Coming to the instant facts, Ext.P2 is the quarrying permit issued to the 7th respondent/contractor for extraction of ordinary earth. The same is dated 21.03.2023, which has expired, by now, as submitted by the learned Senior Counsel for the 7th respondent. The area from which ordinary earth is permitted to be extracted has an extent of 43.20 ares in survey nos.391/2-1, 390/5 and 390/6 of Kurampala Village, Adoor. Ext.P3 is the No Objection issued by SEIAA for granting exemption from obtaining environmental clearance for sourcing or borrowing earth for the purpose of the works of the National Highway. Coming to Ext.R7(a), the same is a communication issued by the NHAI to the Geologist, indicating that the 7th respondent has been appointed by the NHAI for six laning of the existing NH-66 from Kottukulangara-Kollam Bypass. Apart from the extent of land above-referred, another extent of land having 0.8818 hectares of land situated in Enadimangalam Village is also seen referred to in Ext.R7(a). A perusal of the above as



well as other documents produced in this Writ Petition would only indicate that the quarrying permit issued to the 7th respondent is not confined to the exempted works of the NHAI. There is nothing to indicate that the proposed quarrying in terms of Ext.P2 is confined and limited to the exempted work of the NHAI by virtue of the clarificatory Order dated 15.05.2024. If that be so, the concessionaire/contractor cannot be brought in within the scope of the exemption from the judgment in ***Noble M. Paikada*** (supra) as clarified by Order dated 15.05.2024. There is every chance of misuse, if the contractor/concessionaire is also afforded with the benefit of the clarificatory Order in the above-referred state of affairs.

14. Yet another aspect which looms large is the absence of any material as to how much quantity of earth is required for the exempted linear project of the NHAI in question. This Court is at a loss to find that no material, or for that matter even a counter, has been



placed on record by the 3rd respondent/NHAI in the instant Writ Petition, despite the Writ Petition having been filed in the year 2023. Thus, there is absolutely no guarantee that the quarrying activity to be undertaken by the 7th respondent by virtue of Ext.P2 permit is confined only to the requirements of the NHAI for the exempted work. Therefore, the relief sought for in the Writ Petition can only be allowed.

15. Before parting with the judgment, this Court should address an argument raised by the learned Senior Counsel on the views taken by the learned Single Judges on the point that the work permits were issued only after the cut off date stipulated by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the clarificatory Order, though the work orders were issued before the cut off date. According to the learned Senior Counsel, when the Supreme Court has focused and emphasized on the date of issuance of work orders and called for the data of such works where orders have been issued before the cut off date, it is impermissible for this Court to



adopt a different yardstick to negate the benefit, on the premise that the permit has been issued after that cut off date. It may be that there is some force in that argument of the learned Senior Counsel. However, inasmuch as this Court is dis-inclined to accept the contentions of the 7th respondent, the said argument will be of no impact, insofar as the ultimate outcome of the Writ Petition is concerned.

16. In the circumstances, the Writ Petition succeeds, and it is declared that the 7th respondent cannot undertake quarrying activities for extracting ordinary earth on the strength of Ext.P2 quarrying permit. Respondents 1, 4 and 5 will take effective steps to ensure that no quarrying activity is conducted by the 7th respondent, on the strength of Ext.P2.

The Writ Petition (Civil) is disposed of as above.

Sd/-

C. JAYACHANDRAN
JUDGE



APPENDIX OF WP(C) 20083/2023

PETITIONER EXHIBITS

Exhibit P1	TRUE COPY OF THE MASS PETITION DATED 10/6/2022 GIVEN TO THE 1ST RESPONDENT.
Exhibit P2	TRUE COPY OF THE QUARRYING PERMIT ISSUED BY THE 1ST RESPONDENT TO THE 7TH RESPONDENT.
Exhibit P3	TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER DATED 22/2/2020 ISSUED BY THE 2ND RESPONDENT.
Exhibit P4	TRUE COPY OF THE SAID CIRCULAR NO. A3/117/2017/ENVT DATED 17/8/2017 FROM ENVIRONMENT (A) DEPARTMENT.
Exhibit P5	TRUE COPY OF THE NOTIFICATION DATED 28/03/2020 ISSUED BY THE MOEF AND CC.
Exhibit P6	TRUE COPY OF THE OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM DATED 8/8/2022 ISSUED BY THE MOEF AND CC
Exhibit P7	TRUE COPY OF THE SAID LETTER DATED 12/6/2023 ISSUED BY THE 2ND PETITIONER TO THE 1ST RESPONDENT.
Exhibit P8	TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER DATED 14/06/2023 ISSUED BY THE 2ND PETITIONER TO THE 2ND RESPONDENT.
Exhibit P9	TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER ISSUED BY THE 4TH RESPONDENT FOR EVACUATING PEOPLE NEAR 'ATHIRAMALA' DATED 19/10/2021.
Exhibit P10	TRUE COPY OF REPRESENTATION DATED 9/06/2023 ISSUED BY THE 2ND PETITIONER TO THE 4TH RESPONDENT.
Exhibit P11	TRUE COPY OF THE RESOLUTION PASSED BY THE 5TH RESPONDENT DATED 27/7/2022.
Exhibit P12	TRUE COPY OF THE SAID REPRESENTATION DATED 9/6/2023 ISSUED BY THE 2ND PETITIONER TO THE 6TH RESPONDENT.
Exhibit P13	PHOTOGRAPHS SHOWING THE PRESENT LIE AND NATURE OF 'ERICHURILI MALA'.
Exhibit P14	TRUE COPY OF THE INTERIM ORDER DATED



2025:KER:61185

1/2/2023 IN WP© NO. 3549/2023.
Exhibit P15 TRUE COPY OF THE INTERIM ORDER DATED
9/3/2023 IN WP© NO. 3549/2023.
Exhibit P16 TRUE COPY OF THE INTERIM ORDER DATED
5/5/2023 IN WP©15258/2023.
Exhibit P17 TRUE COPY OF THE INTERIM ORDER DATED
6/6/2023 IN WP©15258/2023.

RESPONDENT EXHIBITS

Exhibit R7 (a) A TRUE COPY OF THE PLAN SUBMITTED BY
THE 7TH RESPONDENT WITH FORWARDING
LETTER OF NATIONAL HIGH WAY DATED
24.01.2024
Exhibit R7 (b) A TRUE COPY OF THE APPROVAL LETTER
ISSUED BY THE GEOLOGIST DATED
06.03.2024

PETITIONER EXHIBITS

Exhibit P18 A TRUE COPY OF THE INTERIM ORDER DATED
8/8/2024 IN W P (C) NO. 27562/2024

RESPONDENT EXHIBITS

Exhibit R7(a) A TRUE COPY OF THE PLAN SUBMITTED BY
THE 7TH RESPONDENT WITH FORWARDING
LETTER OF NATIONAL HIGH WAY DATED
24.01.2024
Exhibit R7(b) A TRUE COPY OF THE APPROVAL LETTER
ISSUED BY THE GEOLOGIST IS PRODUCED
HEREWITH AND MARKED AS DATED
06.03.2024
Exhibit R7(c) A TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER DATED
13.06.2024 ALONG WITH THE DOCUMENTS

PETITIONER EXHIBITS

Exhibit P19 A TRUE COPY OF THE INTERIM ORDER DATED
11.11.2024 PASSED BY THE HON'BLE
SINGLE JUDGE IN I.A NO.1/2024 IN W.P
©NO 32704 OF 2024
Exhibit P20 A TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGEMENT DATED
1/11/2024 IN W.P © NO. 34959 OF 2024



2025:KER:61185

Exhibit P21 A TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT DATED
21/3/2024 OF THE HON'BLE SUPREME COURT
OF INDIA IN CIVIL APPEAL NO.1628/2021
AND 1629/2021

Exhibit P22 A TRUE COPY OF THE INTERIM ORDER DATED
15/5/2024 OF THE HON'BLE SUPREME COURT
OF INDIA IN CIVIL APPEAL NO.1628/2021
AND 1629/2021

Exhibit P23 A TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT OF THE
SINGLE BENCH OF THIS HON'BLE COURT
DATED 10/3/2025 IN W.P.(C)
NO.12684/2024 AND A BATCH OF CONNECTED
CASES

Exhibit P24 A TRUE COPY OF THE INTERIM ORDER DATED
11/4/2025 OF THE HON'BLE DIVISION
BENCH OF THIS HON'BLE COURT IN W.A
NO.497/2025 AND CONNECTED APPEALS

Exhibit P25 A TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT DATED
10/2/2025 IN W.P.(C) NO. 2090/2025

RESPONDENT ANNEXURES

ANNEXURE R3(A) COPY OF THE APPLICATION DATED
07.05.2025 IN CIVIL APPEAL NO. 1628-
1629 OF 2021.