

"Mining Industry & Environmental Damage: Legal Challenges and Corporate Responsibility in Developing Countries"

Chandradeep Singh
Researcher (Law)
Dr. L.P. Singh, Professor
Department of Law
Shri Krishna University, Chhatarpur (M.P.)

ABSTRACT

The mining industry is a key driver of economic development in many developing countries, providing employment opportunities and essential raw materials for industrial growth. However, its operations often lead to severe environmental consequences, including deforestation, water and soil pollution, biodiversity loss, and displacement of local communities. This research paper examines the environmental impact of mining activities through case studies of Vedanta in India and Glencore in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC). It explores the legal frameworks governing mining operations, highlighting gaps in enforcement and corporate accountability.

The study finds that while India has witnessed judicial activism and community-led resistance against mining-related environmental damage, the DRC struggles with weak regulatory oversight and ineffective legal mechanisms. The role of international conventions, national environmental laws, and corporate social responsibility initiatives is analyzed to assess the effectiveness of current regulatory frameworks. Furthermore, the paper emphasizes the need for policy reforms, corporate best practices, and stronger community participation to ensure sustainable mining practices.

The findings underscore the urgent need for stricter environmental laws, enhanced corporate accountability, and global cooperation to mitigate the negative effects of mining. By strengthening regulatory mechanisms and promoting sustainable business practices, developing countries can achieve a balance between economic growth and environmental protection. This paper contributes to the broader discourse on environmental law and corporate responsibility, offering recommendations for improving mining governance and safeguarding ecological integrity in resource-rich regions.

KEYWORDS

Mining industry, environmental law, corporate responsibility, sustainable mining, legal frameworks, Vedanta, Glencore, developing countries, environmental degradation, corporate accountability, judicial activism, regulatory enforcement, community resistance, sustainable development.

INTRODUCTION

Mining stands as a cornerstone of economic growth in many developing nations, fueling industrialization and providing essential raw materials for global markets. Yet, beneath this veneer of economic progress lies a more troubling reality: the environmental degradation that often accompanies mining operations. From deforestation and water contamination to adverse health effects on local communities, the environmental footprint of mining can be both extensive and long-lasting. This dichotomy between economic benefit and ecological harm raises critical questions about the sustainability of mining practices in regions already vulnerable due to limited regulatory resources.

Despite the presence of international environmental treaties and national laws designed to safeguard natural resources, mining companies frequently exploit legal ambiguities and weak enforcement mechanisms to sidestep accountability. This paper focuses on examining these legal and environmental challenges within the mining industry, drawing on case studies from two significant examples in developing countries: the operations of Vedanta in India and Glencore in the Democratic Republic of Congo. These case studies provide a lens through which to view the complex interplay of corporate behavior, regulatory shortcomings, and community activism that defines the contemporary mining landscape.

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES AND KEY QUESTIONS

The research seeks to address key questions: What legal loopholes and enforcement challenges allow mining operations to continue causing substantial environmental damage? How effective have judicial interventions been in holding these corporations accountable? And what policy reforms are necessary to reconcile the imperatives of economic development with environmental stewardship? By critically analyzing legal frameworks, corporate practices, and environmental outcomes, this paper aims to contribute to a deeper understanding of the mechanisms needed to foster greater corporate responsibility and sustainable mining practices in developing countries.

Ultimately, this study underscores the urgency of reforming environmental law and corporate policies in the mining sector. It argues for a balanced approach that not only promotes economic growth but also prioritizes the protection of the environment and the health and well-being of affected communities.

LEGAL FRAMEWORKS FOR ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION IN MINING

The mining industry, while essential for economic development, poses significant environmental risks. To mitigate these impacts, various international and national legal frameworks have been established to regulate corporate activities and enforce environmental responsibility. However,

despite these legal provisions, gaps in enforcement and corporate accountability persist, allowing mining companies to continue operations that harm the environment and local communities.

INTERNATIONAL LEGAL FRAMEWORKS

Several international conventions and agreements aim to regulate the environmental impact of industrial activities, including mining. Among the most notable are:

- **The Rio Declaration on Environment and Development (1992):** This declaration outlines principles for sustainable development, emphasizing the precautionary approach and the polluter-pays principle. It calls on states to enact effective environmental legislation and ensure that corporations adhere to sustainable practices.
- **The UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights (2011):** These principles establish a framework for corporate responsibility, urging companies to respect human rights and mitigate environmental harm in their operations.
- **The Basel Convention (1989):** This treaty regulates the transboundary movement of hazardous waste, which is relevant to mining due to the toxic byproducts often generated by extraction processes.
- **The Minamata Convention on Mercury (2013):** Given the extensive use of mercury in small-scale and illegal mining, this convention seeks to reduce mercury emissions and protect communities from its harmful effects.¹

While these international agreements provide guidelines for environmental governance, their implementation at the national level varies significantly, leading to inconsistencies in enforcement.

National Legal Frameworks in Developing Countries

India

India has established various environmental laws to regulate mining activities, including:

- **The Environment (Protection) Act, 1986:** A comprehensive framework empowering the government to regulate industrial pollution, including that from mining.
- **The Forest Conservation Act, 1980:** Restricts deforestation for industrial purposes, including mining projects.
- **The Mines and Minerals (Development and Regulation) Act, 1957 (MMDR Act):** Governs mineral exploration and extraction while mandating environmental clearances.
- **The National Green Tribunal (NGT) Act, 2010:** Establishes a specialized environmental court to hear cases related to environmental damage, including mining violations².

Despite these laws, enforcement remains a challenge due to political influence, bureaucratic inefficiencies, and corporate lobbying. Cases such as Vedanta's mining operations in Odisha highlight the loopholes that allow corporations to operate despite legal restrictions.

Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC)

The DRC is one of the world's largest producers of minerals, yet its weak regulatory structure has resulted in significant environmental and human rights violations. Key legal frameworks include:

- **The Mining Code (2002, revised in 2018):** Sets out environmental obligations for mining companies, including waste management and land rehabilitation.
- **The Environmental Protection Law:** Requires environmental impact assessments (EIAs) before project approvals.
- **The Water Code:** Regulates pollution of water resources caused by industrial activities, including mining.

However, corruption, inadequate enforcement, and the presence of powerful multinational corporations have undermined the effectiveness of these laws³. The case of Glencore's operations in the DRC demonstrates how regulatory failures allow corporations to evade responsibility for environmental damage.

Gaps in Legal Enforcement and Corporate Accountability

Despite the existence of both international and national laws, several gaps hinder effective environmental protection in the mining sector:

- **Weak Enforcement Mechanisms:** Regulatory agencies in many developing countries lack the resources and political independence to hold large corporations accountable.
- **Corporate Influence and Corruption:** Many mining companies exert significant influence over policymakers, weakening regulatory oversight and environmental compliance.
- **Lack of Community Involvement:** Indigenous and local communities affected by mining often have limited access to legal remedies and decision-making processes.
- **Judicial Delays and Inefficiencies:** Courts in many developing countries struggle with case backlogs, allowing corporations to operate without immediate legal consequences.

While international conventions and national laws provide a legal basis for environmental protection in the mining sector, enforcement challenges continue to undermine their effectiveness⁴. The cases of Vedanta in India and Glencore in the DRC illustrate how legal loopholes and weak governance structures enable environmental degradation. Strengthening regulatory frameworks, improving judicial efficiency, and enhancing community participation are critical steps toward ensuring corporate accountability in mining operations.

CASE STUDIES

The environmental impact of mining is particularly severe in developing countries where regulatory frameworks are weak, and corporate accountability mechanisms are often ineffective. This section examines two major case studies: Vedanta's mining operations in India and Glencore's activities in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC). These cases highlight the legal, environmental, and social challenges associated with mining, as well as the role of judicial interventions and community resistance in demanding corporate responsibility.

VEDANTA (INDIA)

Environmental Violations in the Niyamgiri Hills and Sterlite Copper Plant Case

Vedanta Resources, a UK-based multinational mining corporation, has faced multiple allegations of environmental damage and human rights violations in India. Two major controversies illustrate the environmental and legal challenges posed by the company's operations:

1. The Niyamgiri Hills Mining Controversy:

- Vedanta sought to extract bauxite from the Niyamgiri Hills in Odisha, a region considered sacred by the indigenous Dongria Kondh tribe.
- The proposed mining project posed a significant threat to biodiversity, water sources, and the traditional livelihoods of local communities.
- Environmental impact assessments (EIAs) raised concerns about deforestation, water pollution, and the destruction of fragile ecosystems.

2. The Sterlite Copper Plant Case (Tuticorin, Tamil Nadu):

- Vedanta's Sterlite copper smelting plant in Tuticorin was accused of causing severe air and water pollution.
- Residents reported increased cases of respiratory diseases, contaminated groundwater, and toxic emissions.
- In 2018, widespread protests against the plant's expansion led to violent clashes, resulting in police firing that killed 13 protesters⁵.

Legal Battles, Supreme Court Rulings, and Community Resistance

• Niyamgiri Case:

- The Supreme Court of India, in a landmark 2013 ruling, upheld the rights of the Dongria Kondh tribe and ruled that mining in the Niyamgiri Hills could proceed only with the consent of the local community.
- In a rare exercise of participatory democracy, village councils (Gram Sabhas) unanimously rejected Vedanta's proposal, leading to the project's cancellation.

• Sterlite Copper Case:

- Following the violent protests in Tuticorin, the Tamil Nadu government ordered the closure of the Sterlite plant.

- Vedanta challenged the decision in court, arguing that the plant complied with environmental regulations.
- The National Green Tribunal (NGT) initially ruled in Vedanta's favor, but the Supreme Court later upheld the state government's decision to shut down the facility due to environmental concerns.

Key Takeaways from Vedanta's Cases

- **Judicial Activism:** The Supreme Court's interventions played a crucial role in upholding environmental rights and indigenous protections.
- **Community Mobilization:** Grassroots resistance demonstrated the power of local communities in influencing environmental policy.
- **Regulatory Challenges:** Despite existing environmental laws, corporate lobbying and political influence often weaken enforcement.

Glencore (Democratic Republic of Congo)

Water and Soil Pollution, Health Impacts on Local Communities

Glencore, a Swiss multinational mining and commodity trading company, operates large-scale copper and cobalt mines in the DRC. The company has been repeatedly accused of environmental mismanagement and human rights violations, particularly in relation to water and soil pollution.

- **Pollution and Environmental Damage:**
 - Investigations have revealed that waste from Glencore's mines has contaminated local water sources with heavy metals, including cobalt, copper, and uranium.
 - The release of toxic substances into rivers has resulted in the destruction of aquatic life and the contamination of drinking water for nearby communities.
- **Health and Social Impacts:**
 - Prolonged exposure to heavy metals has led to severe health issues among local populations, including respiratory diseases, birth defects, and neurological disorders.
 - Child labor in unsafe conditions has also been reported in Glencore's supply chain, raising human rights concerns⁶.

Regulatory Challenges and Corporate Liability

- **Weak Enforcement of Environmental Laws:**
 - The DRC's mining laws require companies to conduct Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) and implement remediation plans, but enforcement is inconsistent.

- Corruption and political interference allow mining companies to bypass regulations with minimal consequences.
- **Legal Cases and International Scrutiny:**
 - Glencore has faced lawsuits in international courts over allegations of environmental degradation and human rights abuses.
 - Despite multiple legal actions, financial settlements and out-of-court agreements have allowed the company to continue operations with little substantial change.

Key Takeaways from Glencore's Case

- **Regulatory Loopholes:** Weak governance and corruption enable corporations to evade responsibility.
- **Environmental Injustice:** The burden of pollution falls disproportionately on marginalized communities.
- **Global Supply Chain Ethics:** The demand for minerals like cobalt, essential for technology industries, complicates efforts to regulate corporate behavior.

The cases of Vedanta in India and Glencore in the DRC illustrate the severe environmental and social consequences of unchecked mining operations. While India has witnessed some success in judicial interventions and community-driven resistance, enforcement remains a challenge. In the DRC, weak governance and regulatory gaps allow corporations to operate with limited accountability.⁷ Strengthening legal frameworks, ensuring independent regulatory oversight, and increasing corporate transparency are essential steps toward balancing economic development with environmental sustainability in the mining sector.

Comparative Analysis & Key Issues

The case studies of Vedanta in India and Glencore in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) illustrate the severe environmental and social consequences of mining operations in developing countries. Despite differences in legal systems, governance structures, and socio-political contexts, several common trends emerge in how mining corporations operate and how environmental damage is addressed. This section presents a comparative analysis of these cases, highlighting key issues related to environmental degradation, the role of the judiciary and regulatory bodies, and the impact of community resistance and legal activism.

Common Trends in Environmental Damage

Although Vedanta and Glencore operate in different regions, their mining activities have resulted in similar patterns of environmental harm:

- **Deforestation and Land Degradation:**
 - Both companies have been responsible for large-scale deforestation and destruction of natural habitats.

- In India, Vedanta's proposed bauxite mining in the Niyamgiri Hills threatened fragile ecosystems and endangered wildlife.
- In the DRC, Glencore's mining operations have contributed to land degradation and soil contamination.
- **Water Pollution and Toxic Waste Disposal:**
 - Mining operations in both cases have led to contamination of water sources, affecting both biodiversity and human health.
 - Vedanta's Sterlite Copper Plant was found to have released hazardous pollutants into groundwater, while Glencore's mines have been linked to heavy metal contamination in local rivers.
- **Health Hazards to Local Communities:**
 - Prolonged exposure to pollution has resulted in respiratory illnesses, skin diseases, and other health complications among nearby populations.
 - In the DRC, toxic mining waste has led to birth defects and neurological disorders, particularly among children.

Despite national and international environmental regulations, both corporations have continued their operations with minimal accountability, underscoring the weaknesses in enforcement mechanisms.

Role of Judiciary and Regulatory Bodies

The legal responses in India and the DRC highlight significant differences in the effectiveness of regulatory oversight and judicial interventions:

- **Judicial Activism in India:**
 - The Indian judiciary, particularly the Supreme Court and the National Green Tribunal (NGT), has played a crucial role in holding corporations accountable.
 - In the Niyamgiri case, the Supreme Court upheld indigenous rights and environmental protections by ruling that local communities had the final say in approving mining projects.
 - The Tamil Nadu government shut down Vedanta's Sterlite Copper Plant following legal battles and public protests, demonstrating the potential of strong regulatory action.⁸
- **Weak Regulatory Oversight in the DRC:**
 - In contrast, the DRC's judiciary and regulatory agencies have been largely ineffective in curbing environmental violations.
 - While the country's Mining Code mandates environmental protection measures, enforcement remains weak due to corruption and political interference.
 - Glencore has faced several lawsuits and international investigations, but these legal challenges have not significantly altered its operations.

Key Differences

- India's legal system, despite challenges, has shown greater judicial independence and willingness to intervene in corporate environmental violations.
- The DRC's judiciary lacks the institutional strength to enforce laws, allowing multinational corporations to operate with impunity.

Community Resistance and Legal Activism

One of the most significant factors influencing environmental justice in both cases has been the role of community activism and grassroots movements.

- **Strong Community Resistance in India:**
 - The Dongria Kondh tribe in Odisha successfully mobilized against Vedanta's proposed mining project, leveraging legal avenues and international advocacy.
 - Protests against the Sterlite Copper Plant in Tamil Nadu gained nationwide attention, ultimately forcing the government to shut it down.
- **Challenges in Community Resistance in the DRC:**
 - While local communities and civil society groups in the DRC have voiced concerns over Glencore's operations, their efforts have been less effective due to repression, lack of legal resources, and political instability.⁹
 - Many activists face threats and violence, limiting their ability to challenge corporate misconduct.

Comparative Insights

- In India, legal activism, media attention, and grassroots mobilization have played a crucial role in challenging corporate environmental violations.
- In the DRC, community resistance is weaker due to socio-political instability, lack of legal empowerment, and state complicity with multinational corporations.

The comparative analysis of Vedanta and Glencore underscores recurring issues in the mining industry: environmental destruction, weak regulatory frameworks, and corporate evasion of accountability. While India has witnessed stronger judicial interventions and grassroots activism, the DRC's challenges highlight the difficulties of enforcing environmental laws in politically fragile states¹⁰. Strengthening legal institutions, ensuring corporate transparency, and empowering local communities are critical steps toward achieving sustainable and responsible mining practices in developing countries.

Recommendations

The mining industry plays a crucial role in the economic development of many developing countries, yet its environmental and social costs cannot be overlooked. The cases of Vedanta in India and Glencore in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) illustrate how weak regulatory

frameworks, corporate negligence, and inadequate enforcement mechanisms contribute to widespread environmental degradation. While judicial interventions and community activism have led to some positive outcomes, significant gaps remain in ensuring corporate accountability and environmental justice.

To address these challenges, this section outlines key policy changes, corporate best practices, and future research directions to promote sustainable mining and strengthen environmental governance.

Policy Changes Needed for Stronger Enforcement

Effective environmental regulation requires both comprehensive legal frameworks and robust enforcement mechanisms. The following policy changes are essential to strengthen environmental protection in the mining sector:

- **Strengthening Environmental Laws and Penalties:**
 - Governments should impose stricter environmental regulations on mining companies, with harsher penalties for violations, including substantial fines, suspension of licenses, and mandatory environmental restoration.
 - In countries like the DRC, where legal enforcement is weak, international regulatory bodies should play a greater role in overseeing corporate environmental compliance.
- **Enhancing Regulatory Oversight and Transparency:**
 - Independent regulatory agencies should be empowered to monitor mining operations and ensure compliance with environmental standards.
 - Public disclosure of Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) should be mandatory, allowing affected communities and civil society organizations to hold companies accountable.
- **Strengthening Community Participation and Indigenous Rights:**
 - Governments must implement mechanisms that allow local communities to have a decisive say in approving mining projects, similar to the Gram Sabha (village council) consultations in India.
 - Mining laws should include provisions that require companies to obtain Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC) from indigenous groups before commencing operations.
- **Improving Judicial and Legal Mechanisms:**
 - Fast-tracking environmental litigation through specialized environmental courts can help address legal delays that allow corporations to evade responsibility.
 - International legal mechanisms, such as the International Criminal Court (ICC) or the United Nations Human Rights Council (UNHRC), should be leveraged to hold multinational corporations accountable for large-scale environmental crimes.

Corporate Best Practices for Sustainable Mining

Mining companies must adopt responsible business practices to minimize environmental harm and ensure sustainable resource extraction. The following best practices should be implemented:

- **Adoption of Green Mining Technologies:**
 - Companies should invest in eco-friendly mining techniques that reduce carbon emissions, water usage, and toxic waste generation.
 - The use of renewable energy sources in mining operations can significantly lower the industry's environmental footprint.
- **Commitment to Environmental Rehabilitation:**
 - Mining companies should be legally required to implement land reclamation and afforestation programs after the completion of mining activities.
 - A portion of corporate profits should be allocated to environmental restoration and community development initiatives.
- **Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) and Ethical Supply Chains:**
 - Companies must actively engage with local communities by funding healthcare, education, and infrastructure projects in mining-affected regions.
 - Ethical sourcing and third-party audits should be conducted to ensure that raw materials are extracted in compliance with environmental and human rights standards.
- **Transparency and Accountability Measures:**
 - Companies should publicly disclose their environmental impact reports and corporate sustainability initiatives.
 - Independent audits should be conducted regularly to assess compliance with environmental regulations.

Future Research Directions

While this study has explored the environmental and legal challenges of mining in developing countries, further research is needed to deepen understanding and develop effective solutions. Key areas for future research include:

- **Comparative Studies of Regulatory Frameworks:**
 - Analyzing mining regulations in different developing and developed countries to identify best practices that can be adopted globally.
- **Impact of Climate Change on Mining Operations:**
 - Investigating how climate change is affecting mineral extraction processes and the environmental risks associated with extreme weather events.
- **Role of International Financial Institutions:**

- Examining how institutions like the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) influence mining policies in developing countries and their environmental consequences.
- **Community-Based Environmental Monitoring:**
 - Assessing how local communities can be empowered to monitor mining activities and report environmental violations effectively.

CONCLUSION

The mining industry serves as a critical driver of economic growth in many developing countries, providing employment opportunities, foreign exchange earnings, and raw materials essential for industrialization. However, as evidenced by the cases of Vedanta in India and Glencore in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), the sector's rapid expansion has often come at the expense of environmental sustainability and human rights. The environmental damage caused by mining activities—including deforestation, water pollution, soil contamination, and displacement of indigenous communities—demonstrates the urgent need for a more balanced approach that prioritizes ecological preservation alongside economic development.

Additionally, both case studies emphasize the power of community resistance in challenging corporate environmental violations. In India, grassroots activism and legal interventions have played a significant role in preventing mining projects from proceeding in ecologically sensitive areas. The Dongria Kondh tribe's resistance to Vedanta's bauxite mining project and the mass protests against the Sterlite Copper Plant exemplify how community-led movements can shape legal and policy outcomes. However, in the DRC, despite increasing awareness of mining-related environmental injustices, local communities often lack the legal resources and institutional support to effectively challenge corporate misconduct. This underscores the need for stronger legal protections for environmental defenders and whistleblowers in countries with weaker governance structures.

In conclusion, the mining sector's environmental challenges in developing countries require a multi-faceted response that combines legal reforms, corporate accountability, community empowerment, and international cooperation. Governments must enact and enforce stricter environmental regulations, judicial systems must remain independent and proactive in addressing corporate violations, and civil society must be strengthened to advocate for environmental justice. Without these critical interventions, mining activities will continue to degrade ecosystems, threaten public health, and undermine the long-term sustainability of natural resources. The future of mining must be one that aligns with the principles of sustainable

development—where economic benefits do not come at the cost of environmental and social well-being.

Works Cited

1. Amnesty International. *A Toxic Legacy: Pollution from Glencore’s Mining Operations in the DRC*. Amnesty International, 2021.
2. Banerjee, Subhabrata Bobby. *Corporate Social Responsibility: The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly*. Edward Elgar, 2007.
3. Bebbington, Anthony, et al. “Mining, Corporate Social Responsibility, and the Community: The Case of Rio Tinto, Madagascar.” *Journal of Business Ethics*, vol. 56, no. 3, 2008, pp. 385–402. SpringerLink, doi:10.1007/s10551-005-1330-7.
4. Centre for Science and Environment. *Environmental and Social Violations of Vedanta Resources*. CSE India, 2019.
5. Democratic Republic of Congo, Ministry of Mines. *Mining Code of the Democratic Republic of Congo*. Government of DRC, 2018.
6. Environmental Justice Atlas. “Vedanta’s Niyamgiri Bauxite Mining, India.” *EJAtlas*, 2020, <https://ejatlas.org/conflict/vedanta-niyamgiri-mining-india>.
7. Kahn, Joel S. *The Mining Industry and Environmental Governance in Developing Countries*. Routledge, 2015.
8. Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, Government of India. *The Environment (Protection) Act, 1986*. Government of India, 1986.
9. Mukherjee, Kriti. “Judicial Activism and Environmental Protection in India: The Role of the Supreme Court in Mining Regulations.” *Indian Journal of Environmental Law*, vol. 12, no. 2, 2022, pp. 90–110.
10. United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). *Environmental Rule of Law: First Global Report*. UNEP, 2019.

Bibliography

- Banerjee, Subhabrata Bobby. *Corporate Social Responsibility: The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly*. Edward Elgar, 2007.
- Bebbington, Anthony, et al. “Mining, Corporate Social Responsibility, and the Community: The Case of Rio Tinto, Madagascar.” *Journal of Business Ethics*, vol. 56, no. 3, 2008, pp. 385–402. SpringerLink, doi:10.1007/s10551-005-1330-7.
- Centre for Science and Environment. *Environmental and Social Violations of Vedanta Resources*. CSE India, 2019.
- Democratic Republic of Congo, Ministry of Mines. *Mining Code of the Democratic Republic of Congo*. Government of DRC, 2018.

- Environmental Justice Atlas. “Vedanta’s Niyamgiri Bauxite Mining, India.” *EJAtlas*, 2020, <https://ejatlas.org/conflict/vedanta-niyamgiri-mining-india>.
- Kahn, Joel S. *The Mining Industry and Environmental Governance in Developing Countries*. Routledge, 2015.
- Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, Government of India. *The Environment (Protection) Act, 1986*. Government of India, 1986.
- Mukherjee, Kriti. “Judicial Activism and Environmental Protection in India: The Role of the Supreme Court in Mining Regulations.” *Indian Journal of Environmental Law*, vol. 12, no. 2, 2022, pp. 90–110.
- United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). *Environmental Rule of Law: First Global Report*. UNEP, 2019.
- World Bank. *Extractive Industries and Sustainable Development: An Analysis of Global Practices*. World Bank Publications, 2020.