LEX LOCALIS-JOURNAL OF LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT
ISSN:1581-5374 E-ISSN:1855-363X
VOL. 24, NO. S1 (2026)

POLLUTER PAYS, BUT WHO ACTUALLY PAYS? A CRITICAL STUDY OF ENVIRONMENTAL COMPENSATION, RECOVERY AND RESTORATION IN INDIA

Rani Dewangan[1], Dr. Savyasachi Panday[2]

[1]Research Scholar, [2]Professor

[1,2]Department of Law, Kalinga University, Naya Raipur (C.G.), India.

Abstract
The Polluter Pays Principle occupies a central place in Indian environmental jurisprudence. Its doctrinal recognition, however, does not by itself ensure restoration of damaged environments or recovery of the costs imposed by pollution. This paper examines the narrower but significant gap between the legal imposition of environmental liability and its implementation after adjudication. Drawing strictly from the doctrinal findings and documented case material contained in the underlying thesis summary, the paper argues that the central weakness is not the absence of environmental norms but the weakness of the institutional chain through which liability must be assessed, recovered, monitored and applied to restoration. The experience of the Bichhri litigation, the long-delayed remediation associated with the Bhopal site and the institutional difficulties attributed to pollution control authorities and the National Green Tribunal demonstrate that a principle may be firmly recognised in law yet remain only partially effective in practice. The paper distinguishes punishment from restoration, compensation from recovery and adjudication from compliance. It further argues that environmental liability should be evaluated through an implementation framework that asks four sequential questions: whether liability is correctly assessed, whether the amount is actually recovered, whether the recovered amount is applied to environmental restoration and whether compliance is independently monitored. On this basis, the paper proposes a more coherent enforcement architecture centred on transparent compensation methodology, time-bound recovery, dedicated restoration use, stronger monitoring and institutional accountability. The study therefore reframes the Polluter Pays Principle from a question of doctrinal recognition to one of institutional execution.

Keywords: Polluter Pays Principle; Environmental Compensation; Environmental Restoration; National Green Tribunal; Environmental Enforcement; Article 21; Pollution Control Boards.

I. Introduction

Indian environmental law presents a striking contradiction. The legal framework is extensive, the constitutional jurisprudence is comparatively developed and specialised regulatory institutions exist. Yet the underlying thesis summary identifies a persistent gap between legal recognition and actual environmental outcomes. The right to a pollution-free and healthy environment has been developed through the judicial interpretation of Article 21, while statutes such as the Water (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act 1974, the Air (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act 1981, the Environment (Protection) Act 1986 and the National Green Tribunal Act 2010 provide the principal regulatory structure. The thesis nevertheless concludes that the central difficulty lies in weak enforcement, institutional limitations and the failure to translate legal declarations into effective results.

Within that broader enforcement problem, the Polluter Pays Principle offers a particularly useful lens. In doctrinal terms, the principle is well established in the environmental jurisprudence described in the thesis. The Vellore Citizens' Welfare Forum decision is presented as an important point at which sustainable development, the precautionary principle and the Polluter Pays Principle were integrated into Indian law. The National Green Tribunal Act 2010 further gives statutory relevance to these environmental principles

through section 20. The difficulty therefore is not primarily whether Indian law recognises the principle. The more difficult question is what happens after liability is recognised or compensation is imposed.

This paper addresses that implementation stage. Its central argument is that the effectiveness of the Polluter Pays Principle depends upon an institutional chain that extends beyond adjudication. A legally correct order does not restore an environment unless the liability is quantified on a coherent basis, the amount is actually recovered, the money is directed towards remediation and compliance is monitored until restoration occurs. Failure at any one of these stages may weaken the practical content of the principle. The thesis summary itself provides evidence of precisely this problem through the Bichhri matter, the Bhopal remediation experience and the identified difficulties in the functioning of environmental institutions.

The paper is deliberately narrow. It does not attempt to restate the entire jurisprudence of environmental rights in India. Nor does it undertake a general review of all environmental legislation. Instead, it asks whether the Polluter Pays Principle, as reflected in the thesis summary, has an adequate post-adjudication enforcement structure. This narrower focus permits a distinction between three concepts that are often collapsed into one another: imposing liability, recovering liability and achieving restoration. The paper argues that Indian environmental enforcement must be assessed across all three stages rather than at the point of judgment alone.

II. The Doctrinal Position: Recognition Is Not the Principal Deficit

The thesis summary places the Polluter Pays Principle within the wider development of environmental constitutionalism in India. The right to clean water and air was progressively read into Article 21, while judicial decisions also developed related principles of absolute liability, public trust, sustainable development and inter-generational equity. In this doctrinal setting, the Polluter Pays Principle performs an important corrective function. It links environmental harm with the obligation of the polluting actor to bear the financial burden generated by that harm, rather than shifting the cost to affected communities or the public exchequer.

The thesis further notes that section 20 of the National Green Tribunal Act requires the Tribunal to apply sustainable development, the precautionary principle and the Polluter Pays Principle while passing orders, decisions or awards. This is significant because the principle is not left merely as a judicial phrase. It forms part of the statutory decisional framework of the specialised environmental tribunal. At the same time, the thesis identifies serious institutional constraints within the Tribunal system, including vacancies, inadequate benches, an unclear methodology for assessing compensation and the absence of an effective mechanism for monitoring compliance with orders.

These findings change the research question. If the principle is recognised both judicially and statutorily, the core problem cannot be described simply as a doctrinal vacuum. The problem lies in the transition from norm to execution. An environmental order can declare liability, but declaration alone does not ensure recovery. Recovery can occur, but recovery alone does not ensure that the amount is applied to the environmental area that suffered harm. Even restoration expenditure does not necessarily prove that the environmental damage has been adequately addressed. The legal analysis must therefore follow the principle beyond the courtroom.

III. The Research Gap: From Liability to Recovery and Restoration

The thesis summary observes that Indian environmental scholarship has extensively examined constitutional provisions, statutory frameworks and judicial decisions, while fewer studies integrate these dimensions with actual implementation. The narrower gap addressed here emerges from that broader finding. The Polluter Pays Principle is frequently discussed at the level of legal recognition, but its effectiveness depends on a post-adjudicatory process that is institutionally more complex than the statement of the principle itself.

Four distinct questions arise. First, how is environmental compensation assessed? Second, after compensation or restoration liability is imposed, is the amount recovered within a reasonable period? Third,

when an amount is recovered, is it used for restoration of the affected environment rather than absorbed into a general administrative pool? Fourth, who monitors whether the restoration ordered or financed has actually been completed? These questions are analytically separate. A system may perform well at one stage and fail at another.

This distinction is important because the expression 'Polluter Pays' can conceal several different forms of liability. A monetary penalty may serve a punitive or deterrent function. Environmental compensation may seek to internalise environmental cost. Restoration liability may be directed specifically at repairing ecological damage. These functions overlap, but they are not identical. If they are treated as interchangeable, the legal system risks assuming that payment of any monetary amount satisfies the principle. The thesis material suggests the opposite: the principle becomes meaningful only when the burden of environmental harm is actually transferred from the public to the responsible polluter and when environmental repair follows in practice.

The research gap can therefore be stated precisely: Indian environmental law has developed a substantial doctrinal basis for the Polluter Pays Principle, but the institutional pathway connecting assessment, recovery, utilisation and restoration remains insufficiently coherent. The cases and institutional problems identified in the thesis show why this implementation pathway deserves examination as an independent legal problem rather than as a subsidiary aspect of environmental adjudication.

IV. Bichhri: The Cost of Delayed Enforcement

The Bichhri litigation, as summarised in the thesis, illustrates how delay can undermine the practical force of environmental liability. The Supreme Court applied the Polluter Pays Principle and directed restoration, yet the polluting units repeatedly used interim applications and the actual implementation remained stalled for approximately fifteen years. In 2011, the Court responded to this prolonged delay by imposing twelve per cent compound interest.

The significance of this episode is not merely that litigation continued for a long time. The deeper problem is that a restoration order loses environmental value when implementation is deferred. Environmental harm may continue, the cost of remediation may increase and affected communities may bear the consequences during the period in which legal liability remains unrealised. Delay therefore creates an asymmetry: the polluter retains the benefit of postponement while the environment and the public bear the continuing cost.

Bichhri demonstrates that post-judgment procedure is part of substantive environmental justice. If repeated applications can postpone remediation for years, the legal system may formally uphold the Polluter Pays Principle while functionally weakening it. The answer cannot be to prevent legitimate procedural remedies. Rather, environmental adjudication requires a sharper approach to applications that operate principally as instruments of delay. The thesis accordingly recommends actual costs and interest against parties that benefit from prolonged non-compliance. This recommendation follows directly from the logic of the case: where delay creates an economic advantage, the enforcement mechanism must neutralise that advantage.

V. Bhopal: When the Public Bears the Cost of Remediation

The thesis summary's discussion of the Bhopal site presents an even clearer illustration of the gap between environmental responsibility and financial burden. It records that 337 metric tonnes of toxic waste remained at the plant site for approximately four decades and that surrounding groundwater was affected. Following strong judicial criticism of administrative inaction in December 2024, the waste was transported to Pithampur in January 2025 and incineration was completed by June 2025. The thesis further states that approximately Rs. 126 crore of public funds, rather than money recovered from the polluter, financed the process.

For the present argument, the important point is institutional rather than rhetorical. The Polluter Pays Principle seeks to prevent precisely this externalisation of environmental cost. Where the State ultimately finances remediation from the public exchequer, the immediate environmental objective may still be served

if hazardous waste is removed. Yet the allocation of responsibility remains incomplete. The environmental harm is socialised even though the underlying principle requires the responsible polluter to bear the cost.
This distinction matters because environmental restoration and polluter liability are related but separate questions. The State may have to intervene urgently where delay would deepen environmental harm. Public expenditure can therefore be justified as an immediate remedial measure. But such expenditure should not extinguish the polluter's financial responsibility. A coherent system should permit rapid public remediation where necessary while preserving a legally enforceable mechanism for subsequent recovery from the responsible entity. Otherwise, emergency state action can unintentionally convert the Polluter Pays Principle into a system in which the public pays first and may never be reimbursed.
The Bhopal example therefore supports a broader proposition: environmental law requires a recovery architecture, not merely a liability doctrine. Orders must be linked to identifiable recovery authorities, clear timelines and enforceable consequences for default. Without these features, liability can become declaratory while remediation is financed through public resources.

VI. Institutional Weakness and the Compliance Deficit

The thesis attributes environmental enforcement failures partly to institutional structure. Pollution control boards are described as suffering from vacancies in scientific and technical posts, dependence on government for appointments and finance and historically limited direct penal authority. The National Green Tribunal is likewise described as facing vacancies, inadequate benches, uncertainty in compensation assessment and inadequate monitoring of compliance. These weaknesses are directly relevant to the Polluter Pays Principle because the principle requires both technical and legal capacity.
Environmental compensation cannot be assessed coherently without reliable scientific evidence concerning the nature, duration, scale and consequence of pollution. A tribunal may determine legal responsibility, but quantification often depends on technical information generated or verified by regulatory agencies. Weak scientific staffing therefore affects not only inspection but also the quality of remedial liability. Similarly, delayed or uncertain recovery can result when no institution bears clear responsibility for pursuing payment after an order is made.
The compliance deficit is especially important. Conventional adjudication often treats judgment as the endpoint of the dispute. Environmental adjudication cannot always do so. Restoration may require continuing acts over months or years, technical verification and periodic measurement. A one-time order is therefore insufficient where the environmental obligation is inherently continuing. The thesis recommendation for a permanent compliance cell within the National Green Tribunal responds to this structural feature. Such a mechanism would not alter the substantive rule. It would provide the institutional bridge between the order and the environmental outcome.
The same logic supports the thesis recommendation that recovered environmental compensation should be used for restoration in the affected area. If compensation is collected but its destination is opaque, the connection between polluter liability and environmental repair becomes weak. Transparency in utilisation is therefore not merely an accounting concern. It is part of the substantive operation of the Polluter Pays Principle.

VII. Distinguishing Penalty, Compensation and Restoration

A clearer enforcement system also requires conceptual precision. The thesis discusses recent statutory changes that replace some forms of criminal punishment with monetary penalties and expresses concern that very low sanctions may be treated by large industrial units as an ordinary cost of operation. That concern should not, however, lead to the conclusion that every monetary amount imposed for an environmental violation serves the same legal purpose.
A penalty is primarily directed at the violation and may perform deterrent or punitive functions. Environmental compensation is directed more closely at the environmental and social cost generated by non-compliance. Restoration liability is directed at repairing or rehabilitating the affected environment.

Depending on the statutory context, one proceeding may involve more than one of these elements, but they should remain analytically distinct. A polluter who pays a statutory penalty should not automatically be treated as having discharged restoration liability if environmental damage remains unaddressed.

This distinction also explains why the amount of liability matters. The thesis recommends that monetary sanctions should be connected to the economic benefit obtained through pollution and should vary according to severity and repetition. The underlying rationale is sound: a fixed and low penalty may fail to deter a financially powerful entity if non-compliance produces a larger economic gain. The Polluter Pays Principle requires the law to prevent pollution from becoming financially advantageous. This does not mean that every environmental violation must attract criminal punishment. It means that the total liability structure should remove the economic benefit of unlawful pollution while ensuring that restoration costs do not fall on the public.

Accordingly, environmental enforcement should operate cumulatively where legally justified: a regulatory penalty may respond to breach; compensation may internalise environmental cost; and restoration measures may repair damage. Treating these as distinct avoids the mistaken assumption that payment of one amount necessarily resolves all consequences of pollution.

VIII. Towards an Implementation Framework for the Polluter Pays Principle

The thesis recommendations permit the construction of a practical implementation framework. The first requirement is a transparent and scientifically defensible method of assessing environmental compensation. The thesis identifies ambiguity in compensation assessment as a weakness in the existing institutional arrangement. A clearer methodology would reduce inconsistency and make orders more predictable, reviewable and enforceable.

The second requirement is time-bound recovery. An order imposing liability should identify the authority responsible for recovery, the period within which payment must be made, the consequence of default and the financial effect of delay. Bichhri demonstrates why interest and realistic costs may be necessary where delay allows a polluter to retain funds that should have been applied to restoration.

The third requirement is ring-fenced use of recovered compensation. The thesis recommends that environmental compensation should be used for restoration in the same affected area. This creates a direct link between the harm, the liability and the remedial outcome. It also permits affected communities and oversight institutions to determine whether compensation has produced tangible environmental benefit.

The fourth requirement is continuing compliance monitoring. Where an order requires remediation rather than a one-time payment, the responsible institution should verify completion against measurable environmental indicators. The thesis proposal for a permanent compliance cell within the National Green Tribunal is therefore particularly important. Such a body could maintain records of outstanding liabilities, recovery status, restoration expenditure and compliance with continuing directions.

The fifth requirement is institutional capacity. Pollution control boards require sufficient scientific and technical staffing, financial stability and operational independence if they are to support accurate assessment and effective enforcement. Strengthening the legal principle without strengthening the agencies that produce the evidence and execute the orders would reproduce the same implementation gap identified in the thesis.

Finally, the framework must preserve a distinction between immediate remediation and ultimate liability. Where environmental harm requires urgent state intervention, the State should not be forced to wait for the completion of recovery proceedings before acting. However, public expenditure should be followed by a clear statutory or adjudicatory route for reimbursement from the responsible polluter wherever liability is established. This approach protects the environment without transferring the final cost to the public.

IX. Broader Implications for the Right to a Healthy Environment

The implementation deficit surrounding the Polluter Pays Principle has constitutional implications. The thesis treats the right to a pollution-free and healthy environment as part of Article 21 and identifies a

broader gap between legal recognition and practical effectiveness. The Polluter Pays Principle forms one mechanism through which that right can be made operational. If restoration costs are not recovered, orders are delayed, or compensation is not applied to repair the affected environment, the weakness is not merely financial. It affects the State's ability to convert constitutional environmental protection into material conditions of clean air, water and surroundings.

This perspective also clarifies the limits of judicial activism identified in the thesis. Courts and tribunals can articulate rights, impose liability and issue directions, but implementation ultimately depends upon administrative agencies, technical capacity and sustained monitoring. The constitutional right and the institutional machinery cannot therefore be studied in isolation. The right acquires practical content only when enforcement institutions are capable of carrying environmental orders through to completion.

The Polluter Pays Principle is thus a useful test of the broader thesis conclusion. India does not principally suffer from an absence of environmental norms. It suffers from weakness in the mechanisms that translate those norms into environmental outcomes. The principle may be doctrinally mature while remaining institutionally incomplete.

X. Conclusion

The Polluter Pays Principle is firmly embedded in the environmental legal framework described in the thesis summary, but its effectiveness cannot be measured by doctrinal recognition alone. The cases and institutional findings examined in this paper reveal a post-adjudication gap between the imposition of environmental liability and its actual execution. Bichhri demonstrates how prolonged delay can weaken restoration. The Bhopal remediation experience demonstrates the danger of shifting environmental costs to the public exchequer. The identified weaknesses of pollution control boards and the National Green Tribunal show why scientific capacity, compensation methodology, recovery mechanisms and compliance monitoring are essential to the operation of the principle.

The paper has therefore proposed a four-stage understanding of effective environmental liability: assessment, recovery, utilisation and verified restoration. Each stage performs a distinct legal function and failure at any stage may defeat the practical purpose of the Polluter Pays Principle. The law should further distinguish regulatory penalties from environmental compensation and restoration liability so that payment of a monetary sanction does not become a substitute for repairing environmental harm.

The central conclusion is narrow but important. India does not require another declaration that polluters should pay. It requires an institutional structure capable of determining what they must pay, recovering it without avoidable delay, directing the amount towards remediation and verifying that restoration actually occurs. Only then can the Polluter Pays Principle function not merely as a judicial doctrine, but as an effective mechanism of environmental accountability.

References

- Constitution of India, art. 21.
- Water (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1974.
- Air (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1981.
- Environment (Protection) Act, 1986.
- National Green Tribunal Act, 2010, s. 20.
- Vellore Citizens' Welfare Forum v. Union of India (1996) - relied upon in the thesis summary for sustainable development, precautionary principle and Polluter Pays Principle.
- Indian Council for Enviro-Legal Action / Bichhri environmental litigation - relied upon in the thesis summary for delayed implementation of restoration liability.
- Bhopal toxic-waste remediation proceedings and related judicial intervention - relied upon in the thesis summary as an illustration of prolonged remediation and public expenditure.

- M.C. Mehta environmental jurisprudence discussed in the thesis summary, including the Oleum Gas litigation and the development of absolute liability.
- Underlying doctoral thesis summary: 'Right to a Pollution-Free and Healthy Environment: A Critical Study in the Context of Indian Law' (Hindi summary supplied by the author).