

F.No. RT-11021/47/2014-MVL
Government of India
Ministry of Road Transport and Highways
(MVL Section)
Transport Bhawan, 1, Parliament Street, New Delhi-110001

June 10, 2021

To

The Principal Secretaries/ Secretaries, Departments of Transport,
Transport Commissioners of All States/UTs.

Subject: Compliance of Hon'ble Supreme Court's orders in the matter of W.P (C) No. 13029 of 1985, M.C. Mehta V/s Union of India with regard to registration of BS-IV vehicles in the country.

Sir/Madam,


Please refer to the Hon'ble Supreme Court's order orders issued from time to time with regards to the registration of BS-IV vehicles in the country. Further, the Hon'ble Supreme Court, during hearing of the aforesaid matter on 09.04.2021, has directed this Ministry to issue necessary directions to the licensing and registering authorities, so that orders of the Hon'ble Supreme Court passed from time to time, with regard to registration of CNG vehicles, BS-VI vehicles and BS-IV vehicles, which are purchased and registered on e-vahan prior to 31.03.2020, be followed by the licensing and registering authorities. In this connection it is inform that:-

- a. The Hon'ble Supreme Court vide order dated 24.10.2018 passed in WP (C) No. 13029 of 1985 has directed that no motor vehicle conforming to the emission standard Bharat Stage-IV shall be sold or registered in the entire country with effect from 01.04.2020 (copy enclosed).
- b. The Hon'ble Supreme Court vide order dated 13.08.2020 and 18.09.2020 has already issued detailed directions with regards to registration of BS-IV vehicles (copy enclosed).
- c. This Ministry has issued an advisory to all the states vide letter dated 19.08.2020 to enure compliance of the above directions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court w.r.t registration of BS IV vehicles (copy enclosed).

3. In view of above, the licensing and registering authorities be directed to follow the directions of Hon'ble Supreme Court w.r.t to registration of BS-IV vehicles.

Encl: As Above

Yours faithfully,



(Dr. Piyush Jain)
Director (MVL)

Ph.:- 011-23714974

Email:- director-morth@gov.in

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPEAL NOS.4908-4909 OF 2019

NORTH DELHI MUNICIPAL CORPORATION

...APPELLANT(S)

VERSUS

GNCTD

...RESPONDENT(S)

WITH

CIVIL APPEAL NOS. 4906-4907 OF 2019

ORDER

1. These appeals are by the North Delhi Municipal Corporation challenging a common order passed by the National Green Tribunal in two original applications seeking a direction to the Transport Department to permit the registration of water tankers.
2. By the Order impugned in these appeals, the National Green Tribunal dismissed the original applications on the short ground that an application by the Municipal Corporation is not maintainable in view of the scope of the jurisdiction of the Tribunal under Sections 14 and 15 of the National Green Tribunal Act, 2020.
3. Without going into niceties, it should be pointed out that the occasion for the Municipal Corporation to approach the National

Green Tribunal was a series of orders passed by this Court in **Writ Petition (C) No.13029 of 1985 (M.C. Mehta vs. Union of India & Ors.)** Therefore, during the pendency of the above appeals, certain directions were issued and an order came to be passed on 18.9.2020. The relevant portion of the order dated 18.9.2020 reads as follows:-

“Insofar as vehicles purchased upto 31.03.2020 which are BS-IV compliant are concerned, they must have been registered with the EVahan Portal before the cut-off date to establish the date of purchase. If the purchase had been made on or before 31.03.2020 and these vehicles are BS-IV compliant, such vehicles necessary for the Municipal Corporation to carry essential public utility services should also be registered. But such cases shall be scrutinized by the Environment Pollution Control Authority (EPCA).

In order to avoid repeated applications being filed before this Court just for the purpose of getting registration, we direct that the EPCA shall scrutiny the pending cases and submit a report to this Court so that a common order could be passed without the necessity for several interlocutory applications.”

Pursuant to the aforesaid order, the Environment Pollution Control Authority has examined the matter and submitted a report No.116 dated 28.9.2020. In the said report EPCA has recommended the registration of the vehicles in respect of which the North Delhi Municipal Corporation approached the National Green Tribunal and suffered the order impugned in these appeals.

In the light of the recommendation made by EPCA in its Report dated 28.9.2020, the present appeals are allowed and a direction is issued to the concerned authority for the registration of the vehicles,

for which EPCA has given clearance. The question of law raised by the National Green Tribunal in its impugned order is left open.

.....CJI
(S.A. BOBDE)

.....J.
(A.S. BOPANNA)

.....J.
(V. RAMASUBRAMANIAN)

New Delhi
April 09, 2021

ITEM NO.14 Court 1 (Video Conferencing) SECTION XVII

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Civil Appeal No(s). 4908-4909/2019

NORTH DELHI MUNICIPAL CORPORATION

Appellant(s)

VERSUS

GNCTD

Respondent(s)

WITH

C.A. No. 4906-4907/2019 (XVII)

(IA No. 58284/2019 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT)

Date : 09-04-2021 These appeals were called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.S. BOPANNA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V. RAMASUBRAMANIAN

For Appellant(s) Mr. Sanjiv Sen, Sr. Adv.
 Mr. Praveen Swarup, Adv.
 Ms. Pareena Swarup, Adv.
 Mr. Ameet Singh, Adv.
 Mr. Kanishk Chaudhary, Adv.
 Ms. Sadiya Shakeel, Adv.

For Respondent(s) Mr. Aishwarya Bhati, ASG.
 Mr. Wasim Qadri, Sr. Adv.
 Ms. Ruchira Gupta, Adv.
 Mr. Merusagar Samantaray, Adv.
 Mr. J.P. Parida, Adv.
 Mr. G.S. Makker, AOR
 Mr. Arvind K. Sharma, AOR
 Mr. B. V. Balaram Das, AOR

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

The appeals are allowed in terms of the signed order.

Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed
of.

(MADHU BALA)
AR-CUM-PS
(Signed order is placed on the file)

(INDU KUMARI POKHRIYAL)
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

ITEM NO.801

Court No.1 (Video Conferencing)

SECTION PIL-W

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

IA Nos.49035/2021 and 49036/2021 in Writ Petition(s)(Civil) No(s).
13029/1985

M.C. MEHTA

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

Respondent(s)

Date : 09-04-2021 These applications were mentioned today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.S. BOPANNA

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V. RAMASUBRAMANIAN

For Petitioner(s)/ Dr. Abhishek Manu Singhvi, Sr. Adv.
Applicant(s) Mr. Sidharth Sethi, AOR (mentioned by)

For Respondent(s)

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

As prayed for, list the instant applications next week.

(SANJAY KUMAR-II)
ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS

(INDU KUMARI POKHRIYAL)
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

REPORTABLE

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL ORIGINAL JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) NO. 13029 OF 1985

M. C. MEHTA

...PETITIONER(S)

Versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

...RESPONDENT(S)

(IN RE : RECOMMENDATION NOS. 2.2.1 AND 2.2.2 OF REPORT
NOS. 71 AND 78 SUBMITTED BY EPCA)

J U D G M E N T

Deepak Gupta, J.

1. The seminal issue to be decided is whether Bharat Stage IV (for short BS-IV) compliant vehicles should be permitted to be sold in India after 31.03.2020.

2. In an earlier judgment dated 13.04.2017, we have given detailed reasons for the order dated 29.03.2017 whereby this Court had directed that on and from 01.04.2017, vehicles which

are not BS-IV compliant, shall not be sold by any manufacturer or dealer or motor vehicle company whether such vehicle is a two wheeler, three wheeler, four wheeler or commercial vehicle etc.. We had also by the said order prohibited registration of non- BS-IV vehicles from 01.04.2017 except if such vehicles were sold on or before 31.03.2017. Since in the judgment dated 13.04.2017, we have set out in detail the history leading to implementation of the Bharat Stage compliant fuels, it is not necessary to repeat the same here. However, a short recap of the same would be apposite to understand the issues in hand.

3. In 2003, the Government of India announced the National Auto Policy based on the recommendations of the Mashelkar Committee constituted in 2001. BS-IV compliant vehicles were made compulsory for four wheelers in different parts of the country on different dates starting from 01.04.2005, from which date registration of only BS-IV compliant vehicles were permitted in the metropolises of Delhi, Ahmedabad, Bengaluru, Mumbai, Pune and Kolkata. Thereafter, it was made compulsory to have BS-IV compliant vehicles in some other cities from 01.04.2010. More cities were added on 21.05.2010 and on 14.07.2015.

Finally, by amendment dated 19.08.2015 it was mandated that BS-IV norms would come into force throughout the country w.e.f. 01.04.2017.

4. As far as two and three wheelers are concerned, they were made subject to BS-III norms on and with effect from 01.04.2010 by insertion of sub-rule 16 in Rule 115 of the Central Motor Vehicle Rules, 1989 hereinafter referred to as 'the Rules'. With effect from 04.07.2014, it was mandated that on and from 01.04.2016 all two wheeler vehicles will comply with BS-IV emission norms and all existing models will shift to BS-IV emission norms from 01.04.2017. Similarly, Rule 17 was inserted in Rule 115 of the Rules on 12.06.2015 in respect of three wheelers wherein BS-IV standard would be applicable to new models on or after 01.04.2016. Resultantly, only those vehicles which were BS-IV compliant would be sold after 01.04.2017.

5. An issue was raised by the manufacturers of motor vehicles that they should be given reasonable and sufficient time for sale of stocks of those vehicles which are not BS-IV compliant vehicles

but manufactured up to 31.03.2017. This Court did not accept the submission of the manufacturers and issued the direction referred to hereinabove. It would be interesting to note that though some of the manufacturers of two wheelers and three wheelers took a stand before this Court that great technological changes are required to make the vehicles BS-IV compliant, one of the largest manufacturers of two wheelers and three wheelers in India i.e. Bajaj Auto, filed an application in this Court praying that it was already manufacturing BS-IV compliant vehicles and that the vehicles not complying to BS-IV norms should not be registered after 2017.

6. The issue before us is somewhat similar. Mr. Ranjit Kumar, learned senior counsel and Mr. Sandeep Narain, learned counsel appearing for the Society of Indian Automobile Manufacturers (for short 'SIAM'), have submitted that though they are not averse to manufacturing BS-VI compliant vehicles, they should be given some time to sell the stocks of non-BS-VI compliant vehicles manufactured upto 31.03.2020. In this regard, they have made reference to the notification dated 20.02.2018 whereby sub-rule

21 has been inserted in Rule 115 of the Rules, which reads as follows:

“In the Central Motor Vehicle Rules, 1989, in rule 115, after sub-rule (20), the following sub-rule shall be inserted namely:-

“(21) New motor vehicles conforming to Emission Standard Bharat Stage-IV, manufactured before the 1st April, 2020 shall not be registered after the 30th June, 2020:

Provided that the new motor vehicles of categories M and N conforming to Emission Standard Bharat Stage-IV, manufactured before the 1st April, 2020 and sold in the form of drive away chassis, shall not be registered after the 30th September, 2020.”

7. It is submitted that the Government of India while balancing the need for a cleaner environment with the practical difficulties faced by the manufacturers has given a three months' window to the automobile manufacturers to dispose of the vehicles conforming to BS-IV norms. In respect of certain categories of commercial vehicles in which only a chassis is sold and a body has to be built thereupon, the period of registration has been extended up to 30.09.2020.

8. It has been contended on behalf of SIAM that in Europe the normal practice is that about one year's time is given to the

manufacturers of vehicles when a higher quality of fuel is introduced and the fuel is introduced much earlier and thereafter an outer limit is fixed for sale of compliant vehicles. According to SIAM, BS-VI fuel will be available in the entire country only with effect from 01.04.2020 and manufacturers are, therefore, forced to stop production after 31.03.2020. Therefore, it is not feasible for the manufacturers to switch over to BS-VI compliant vehicles overnight. They have to be given some reasonable time for sale of the accumulated stocks of non-BS-VI (i.e. BS-IV) compliant vehicles. It is further submitted that six to nine months' time is required to shift the assembly line to make BS-VI compliant vehicles and if the request of the manufacturers is not accepted, they will have to start manufacturing BS-VI compliant vehicles well before 31.03.2020 and at least three to six months' prior to the said date. It has also been contended that earlier BS-VI fuel was to be introduced with effect from 01.04.2024, which was pre-poned to 01.04.2023 and it was then pre-poned to 01.04.2021 and finally the date was advanced to 01.04.2020. It was decided to leapfrog from BS-IV fuel to BS-VI fuel without shifting to BS-V fuel. According to SIAM, this is creating a lot of difficulties for the manufacturers.

9. Mr. Gopal Subaramaniam, learned senior counsel appearing for one of the manufacturers, submits that his clients are already manufacturing vehicles which are both BS-IV and BS-VI fuel compliant and they are on the road already. Mr. A.N.S. Nadkarni, learned Additional Solicitor General submits that keeping in view the difficulties faced by the manufacturers and balancing the need to have a cleaner environment, three months' period given to the manufacturers is reasonable. He also urges that the Rules have not been challenged by any party and, therefore, this Court should not go into the validity of the Rules.

10. On the other hand, Ms. Aparajita Singh, learned amicus curiae, has made a passionate plea that no non-BS-VI compliant vehicle should be permitted to be sold in the entire country after 01.04.2020. She has drawn our attention to the Report of the Parliamentary Standing Committee (for short 'the Committee') dated 07.08.2018. This Report mainly deals with National Capital Region (NCR) of Delhi but there are some references to the entire country. Some of the observations made by the Committee need to be considered and taken note of. The

Committee in Para 5.15 notes that the problem of air pollution is affecting all human beings and any leniency on the part of the Government in tackling it will have a cascading effect on the health of the citizens. These observations have been made with specific reference to vehicular pollution and the need to ensure compliance of BS-VI norms with effect from 01.04.2020. There can be no two views that air pollution is hazardous to health. We may, also take note of certain observations of the Report of the Committee which show that one out of three children in Delhi suffers from respiratory problems. This is almost twice as high as compared to the city of Kolkata or rural areas. We may note that the World Health Organisation's (WHO) database of more than 4,300 cities showed Indian cities of Gwalior, Allahabad, Raipur, Delhi, Ludhiana, Khanna, Varanasi and Patna as being among the most polluted in the world¹. Our attention has been drawn to various other documents which clearly show the deleterious effects of pollution on health. The hazards of pollution and its ill effect on the health of the citizens especially children are not limited to the city of Delhi or the NCR of Delhi but affect all the citizens of the country.

1 "World's Most Polluted Cities", World Economic Forum, 03.05.2018

11. The Union Government has spent about Rs.30,000 crores to manufacture BS-IV compliant fuel. We have been informed that another Rs. 30,000/- crores of the taxpayers' money have been expended by the Union to ensure that the fuel available in the country is BS-VI compliant. It is heartening to note that the Union, being concerned with the health of the citizens and also taking note of the urgent need for a clean environment, has taken steps to manufacture cleaner fuel. This fuel has already been made available in the National Capital Territory (NCT) of Delhi from 01.04.2018 and we have been informed that barring a few places, it shall be available in the entire NCR from 01.04.2019. It will probably be available in many parts of the country prior to 01.04.2020 and the entire country will shift to BS-VI fuel from 01.04.2020. Obviously, the manufacture of clean fuel is being done in a phased manner because all the refineries cannot simultaneously start manufacturing clean fuel. It is not as if on 01.04.2020 just by waving a magic wand the entire country will change to BS-VI compliant norms. If all the refineries and manufacturers by taking note of the requirement to bring in BS-

VI fuel, have introduced such fuel from 2018 and are introducing it in a phased manner in the entire country by 31.03.2020, we see no reason why manufacturers of automobiles, two wheelers, three wheelers etc. cannot also do so.

12. We may note that whereas in this Court SIAM has been canvassing that the shift to BS-VI compliant vehicles is a long drawn out process requiring huge changes in technology, the very same manufacturers are selling and exporting BS-VI compliant vehicles to Europe and other countries. With regard to two wheelers it has been specifically urged that the technological changes are immense. To counter this argument the learned amicus curiae has drawn our attention to a Press Release issued by M/s. Hero MotoCorp., which is one of the largest motor manufacturers of two wheelers in the country. In this Press Release issued in July 2017 it has been stated that M/s. Hero MotoCorp. has begun developing BS-VI compliant models and it aims to introduce such products much before the timeline of 2020. The company has also stated that it will manufacture only BS-VI fuel compliant vehicles well before the date stipulated by

the authorities. If one manufacturer can do this, we see no reason why other manufacturers of two wheelers cannot do so.

13. With regard to trucks and buses, from a news item published in the Financial Express dated 06.07.2018, it is apparent that Eicher is already manufacturing trucks and buses which are not only BS-VI compliant but BS-VI CNG compliant. Another manufacturer of heavy vehicles i.e. Ashok Leyland had, in August, 2018 through its subsidiary Optare obtained an order to manufacture the world's first electric double decker buses. The technology needed to manufacture such electric buses is much more advanced and difficult as compared to the technological changes required to manufacture petrol and diesel vehicles which are BS-VI compliant. Similarly, TVS Motors on 07.08.2018 has issued a press note that it will be manufacturing BS-VI compliant vehicles much ahead of the deadline of 2020. Many members of SIAM in the Auto Expo held in February, 2018 have exhibited vehicles which are technologically much more advanced than BS-VI compliant vehicles. These manufacturers have not only asserted that they can manufacture electric

vehicles but also asserted that they are developing hydrogen cell fuel vehicles along with hybrid, electric and CNG vehicles.

14. We have mentioned these facts only to highlight that some of the manufacturers are not willing to comply with the 31.03.2020 deadline not because they do not have the technology but because the use of technology will lead to increase in the cost of the vehicles which may lead to reduction in sales of the vehicles and ultimately their profit. There can be no compromise with the health of the citizens and if one has to choose between health and wealth, keeping in view the expanded scope of Article 21 of the Constitution, health of the teeming millions of this country will have to take precedence over the greed of a few automobile manufacturers. The automobile manufacturers must behave responsibly. We expected that keeping in view our earlier order, they would have themselves volunteered to be BS-VI compliant by 31.03.2020. Unfortunately, this has not been the case with some of the manufacturers and they want to stretch on the timeline by a few days or months for no other reason but to make a little more money.

15. When we compare BS-VI fuel with BS-IV fuel, there is a massive improvement in environmental terms. Once BS-VI emission norms are enforced, there will be a 68% improvement in $PM_{2.5}$. This is not a small change. It is a vast improvement and the faster it is brought, the better it is. The amicus curiae has strenuously urged that, at least, in the NCR of Delhi, the BS-VI norms be applied for sale of vehicles from 01.04.2019. We feel that it may not be practical to introduce BS-VI compliant vehicles region-wise or city-wise. In our view, the BS-IV experiment in this regard was not very successful. BS-VI compliant vehicles are going to be more expensive than BS-IV compliant vehicles. People have a tendency to buy cheaper vehicle(s) even from a neighbouring city. We also strongly feel that the problem of pollution is not limited to the NCR of Delhi but it is a problem which has engulfed the entire country especially the major cities. India has the dubious distinction of having 15 out of the 20 most polluted cities in the world. The pollution in Gwalior, Raipur & Allahabad is worse than Delhi. The situation is alarming and critical. It brooks no delay.

16. It is an established principle of law that the right to life, as envisaged under Article 21 of the Constitution of India includes the right to a decent environment². It includes within its ambit the right of a citizen to live in a clean environment³. With regard to vehicular traffic, this Court has issued a number of directions to ensure a clean environment and reduce pollution⁴. It has been held that the right to clean environment is a fundamental right⁵. The right to live in an environment free from smoke and pollution follows from the “quality” of life which is an inherent part of Article 21 of the Constitution. The right to live with human dignity becomes illusory in the absence of a healthy environment⁶. The right to life not only means leading a life with dignity but includes within its ambit the right to lead a healthy, robust life in a clean atmosphere free from pollution. Obviously, such rights are not absolute and have to co-exist with

2 Shantistar Builders v. Narayan Khimalal Totame AIR 1990 SC 630;(1990) 1 SCC 520.

3 Bhavani River - Sakthi Sugars Ltd., In re, (1998) 2 SCC 601

4 M.C. Mehta v. Union of India, (1998) 6 SCC 60, M.C. Mehta v. Union of India, (1998) 6 SCC 63, M.C. Mehta v. Union of India (Matter regarding emission standard for vehicles), (1999) 6 SCC 12, M.C. Mehta v. Union of India, (2002) 10 SCC 191, M.C. Mehta v. Union of India, 2017 SCC Online SC 394

5 N.D. Jayal v. Union of India, (2004) 9 SCC 362.

6 Shantistar Builders vs Narayan Khimalal Gotame & Ors. Etc, AIR 1990 SC 630, M.C. Mehta v. Union of India,(2004) 12 SCC 118, State of M.P. v. Kedia Leather & Liquor Ltd., (2003) 7 SCC 389.

sustainable development. Therefore, if there is a conflict between health and wealth, obviously, health will have to be given precedence. When we are concerned with the health of not one citizen but the entire citizenry including the future citizens of the country, the larger public interest has to outweigh the much smaller pecuniary interest of the industry, in this case the automobile industry, especially when the entire wherewithal to introduce the cleaner technology exists.

17. It is therefore necessary to ensure that BS-VI compliance is uniform throughout the country so that even those areas of the country which fortunately have not suffered the ills of extreme pollution are safe in the future. The sale of automobiles and other vehicles is rising exponentially and the number of vehicles on the road is increasing day by day. Therefore, even a day's delay in enforcing BS-VI norms is going to harm the health of the people. We are dealing here with a situation where children and unborn children suffer from pollution and issues of inter-generational equity are involved. Do we as a society or as manufacturers of automobiles have a right to manufacture more polluting vehicles when we have the technology to manufacture

less polluting vehicles? The answer is obviously a big NO. If we were to factor only economics even then it makes no economic sense to have more polluting vehicles on the roads. The effect of pollution on the environment and health is so huge that it cannot be compensated in the marginal extra profits that the manufacturers might make. The amount spent on countering the ills of pollution such as polluted air, damaged lungs and the cost of healthcare far outweigh the profits earned.

18. It was urged on behalf of the manufacturers that there are multiple sources of pollution and vehicles only contribute to 2% of the pollution. We are not in agreement with this submission because the Report of the Committee to which we have adverted hereinabove states that contribution of vehicles to ambient $PM_{2.5}$ concentration during winter season is 25% and in the summer season it contributes 9%. Even if we were to accept the figures submitted by SIAM, we are of the view that no step is too small when it comes to fighting pollution. Small steps to reduce pollution when taken together will lead to large scale reduction in pollution which will result in much cleaner air, which eventually

will result in a cleaner and better environment, healthier citizens and most importantly a healthier generation to come.

19. In view of the fact that these proceedings have been pending in court for a long time and also in view of the fact that it is because of orders of this Court that BS-IV and now BS-VI norms have been introduced from the dates which were not even thought of by the Government, we feel that we have to take suo moto notice of the Rules. At the outset, we may notice that sub-rule 21 of Rule 115 is very vague. It does not talk of sale of vehicles. It only mentions registration of vehicles and permits registration of vehicles conforming to BS-IV norms up to 30.06.2020 and in case of categories M & N, up to 30.09.2020. This rule, in our view, is violative of Article 21 of the Constitution in as much as it extends time for registration of vehicles beyond 31.03.2020 and must be accordingly read down. Any extension of time in introducing the new norms which is not absolutely necessary adversely impacts the health of the citizens and is, therefore, violative of Article 21 of the Constitution of India. This Rule goes against the spirit of all the orders passed earlier by this Court. In the month of March, 2017 we were dealing with a

situation when BS-VI norms were to be made effective throughout the country with effect from 01.04.2020 and this Court had directed that non- BS-IV compliant vehicles shall not be registered on or after 01.04.2017. The situation in the present case is totally different. 31.03.2020 is almost 1 ½ years away. There is sufficient time for the manufacturers to change over to the new system and, therefore, we see no reason why they should be given a window of three or six months for sale of accumulated vehicles. Every vehicle sold after the cut-off date of 01.04.2020 is bound to cause more pollution and, therefore, the manufacturers, in our considered view, cannot be permitted to sell any non-BS-VI compliant vehicle on or after 01.04.2020. On the one hand, the Government has been pro-active in spending huge amounts of money to move to the BS-VI technology, but on the other hand, the automobile industry is coming up with a variety of untenable excuses just to delay the introduction of BS-VI compliant vehicles by a few months. We, in our judgment dated 13.04.2017, had clearly held “when the health of millions of our countrymen is involved, notification relating to commercial activities ought not to be interpreted in a literal manner.” We have to give a purposive interpretation to notifications specially

those dealing with public health issues and even more so, when health not only of the citizens at present but also the citizens in the future is involved. There is more than sufficient time for the manufacturers to manufacture BS-VI compliant vehicles. They already have the technology to do so. The automobile industry must show the will, responsibility and urgency in this regard.

20. The Government has developed a policy of phasing out polluting vehicles and discouraging the manufacture of polluting vehicles. This has been done in a gradual manner. Europe introduced Euro-IV fuel in the year 2009 and Euro-VI standards in 2015. We are already many years behind them. We cannot afford to fall back further even by a single day. The need of the hour is to move to a cleaner fuel as early as possible.

21. Therefore, in exercise of the power vested in this Court under Article 142 of the Constitution, we read down sub-rule 21 of Rule 115 and direct that sub-rule 21 of Rule 115 shall be interpreted and understood to read that no motor vehicle conforming to the emission standard Bharat Stage-IV shall be

sold or registered in the entire country with effect from
01.04.2020.

.....J.
(MADAN B. LOKUR)

.....J.
(S. ABDUL NAZEER)

.....J.
(DEEPAK GUPTA)

New Delhi
October 24, 2018

ITEM NO.19 Court 3 (Video Conferencing) SECTION PIL-W

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Writ Petition(s)(Civil) No(s). 13029/1985

M.C. MEHTA

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

Respondent(s)

((1) IN RE: REGISTRATION OF BS IV VEHICLES (i) I.A. NOS. 56015, 56017 AND 56018/2020 (APPLNS. FOR IMPEADMENT, DIRECTIONS AND EXEMPTION FROM FILING ATTESTED AFFIDAVIT ON B/O NORTH EAST PLANTATION AND COMMERCIAL PVT. LTD.)(ii) IA D. NOS. 59206 AND 59207//2020 (APPLNS. FOR INTERVENTION AND PERMISISON TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENT ON B/O GOPAL SPEED WORLD)(iii) IA NOS. 58758, 58761 AND 59871/2020 (APPLNS. FOR IMPEADMENT, DIRECTION AND SEEKING EXEMPTION FROM FILING NOTARIZED AFFIDAVIT ON B/O ELICO LTD.)(iv) I.A. NOS. 59514, 59519 AND 59516, 59522/2020 (APPLNS. FOR IMPEADMENT, AND DIRECTIONS ON B/O KAPIL AGGARWAL)(v) I.A. NO. 64524/2020 (APPLN. FOR DIRECTIONS ON B/O DY. COMMISSIONER OF POLICE)(vi) I.A. NO. 69588/2020 (APPLN. FOR DIRECTIONS ON B/O DY. COMMISSIONER OF POLICE)(vii) IA NOS. 71261 AND 71265/2020 (APPLNS. FOR IMPEADMENT AND DIRECTIONS ON BEHALF OF G.K. MOTORS PVT. LTD. AND ORS.)(viii) IA NOS. 69089 AND 69091/2020 (APPLNS. FOR IMPEADMENT, DIRECTIONS ON BEHALF OF DRN INFRASTRUCTURE PVT. LTD.) (ix) IA NOS. 74788 AND 74791/2020 (APPLNS. FOR IMPEADMENT AND EXEMPTION FROM FILING ATTESTED AFFIDAVIT ON BEHALF OF MR. RAJEEV KUMAR SINGH)(2) IN RE: COLOUR-CODED STICKERS(i) REPORT NO. 103 SUBMITTED BY EPCA (SPECIAL REPORT: DELAY IN IMPLEMENTATION OF COLOUR-CODED STICKERS ON VEHICLES)(ii) IA NOS. 61299, 61328)

WITH

C.A. No. 8187/2019 (XVII)
(IA No.162347/2019-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT)

Diary No(s). 36562/2019 (XVII)
(IA No.161186/2019-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING and IA No.161189/2019-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT)

Date : 13-08-2020 These matters were called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MISHRA
 HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE B.R. GAVAI
 HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KRISHNA MURARI

**Counsel for the
parties**

**Mr. Harish N. Salve, Sr. Advocate (A.C.)
[NOT PRESENT]**

Ms. Aparajita Singh, Sr. Advocate (A.C.)

Mr. A.D.N. Rao, Advocate (A.C.)

Mr. Siddhartha Chowdhury, Advocate (A.C.)

Mr. Tushar Mehta, Solicitor General

Mr. K. M. Nataraj, ASG

Ms. Aishwarya Bhati, ASG

Mr. W.A. Qadri, Sr. Adv.

Ms. Suhasini Sen, Advocate

Mr. Rajesh Kumar Singh, Adv.

Mr. S.S. Rebello, Adv.

Mr. Kanu Agarwal, Adv.

Mr. Vibhu Shankar Mishra, Adv.

Mr. Raj Bahadur Yadav, Adv.

Mr. Vibhas Kumar Jha, Adv.

Mr. D.L. Chidananda, Advocate

Mr. B. K. Prasad, Adv.

Mr. Rajat Nair, Adv.

Ms. Snidha Mehra, Adv.

Mr. B.V. Balram Das, Adv.

Mr. Rajesh Kumar Singh, Adv.

Mr. G.S. Makker, Adv.

Mr. Nishesh Sharma, Adv.

Mr. Ranjan Kr Chourasia, Adv.

Mr. Tushar Mehta, SG

Mr. Anil Grover, Sr. AAG/Haryana

Ms. Noopur Singhal, Adv.

Mr. Rahul Khurana, Adv.

MR. SANJAY KR. VISEN, Adv.

Mr. Tushar Mehta, SG

Mr. V. Shekhar, Sr. Adv.

Mr. Rajeev Kumar Dubey, Adv.

Mr. Kamendra Mishra, Adv.

Mr. K. V. Vishwanathan, Sr. Adv.

Mr. Ragenth Basant, Adv.

Mr. Hrishikesh Chitale, Adv.

Mr. Chandra Prakash, Adv.

Mr. Sanjay Jain, ASG

Mr. Adarsh Tripathi, Advocate

Mr. Anish Gupta, Advocate

Mr. Nikhil Kandpal, Advocate

Mr. Gaurav Srivastava, AOR

Mr. Sanjiv Sen, Sr. Adv.
 Mr. Tavinder Sidhu, Adv.
 Mr. Abhay Itagi, Adv.
 Ms. Aditi Sharma, Adv.
 For Ms. M.V. Kini & Associates

Mr. A.N.S. Nadkarni, Sr. Adv.
 Mr. Sameer Shrivastava, Adv.

Mr. P. S. Narshimha, Senior Advocate
 Ms. Uttara Babbar, Advocate
 Ms. Bhavana Duhoon, Advocate
 Mr. Manan Bansal, Advocate
 Ms. Sindoor VNL, Advocate
 Ms. Aditi Tripathi, Adv.
 Ms. Kanti, Adv.

Mr. Dhruv Mehta, Sr. Adv.
 Mr. Alok Yadav, Adv.
 Mr. Ayush Sharma, Adv.

Mr. Dhruv Mehta, Sr. Adv.
 Ms. Ranjana Roy Gawai, Adv.
 Ms. Vasudha Sen, Adv.
 Ms. Prachi Golechha, Adv.
 Ms. Ananya Chug, Adv.
 Ms. Divya Roy, Adv.

Mr. Dinesh Dwivedi, Sr. Adv.
 Ms. Jyoti Mendiratta, Adv.
 Mr. Chirag M. Shroff, Adv.
 Ms. Sanjana Nangia, Adv.
 Ms. Abhilasha Bharti, Adv.
 Mr. Sanjeev Khirwar, Adv.

Mr. S. Prabakaran, Sr. Adv.
 Mr. R. Balasubramanian, Sr. Adv.
 Mr. Ram Sankar, Adv.
 Mr. G. Chitrakala, Adv.
 Ms. Sujatha Bagadhi, Adv.
 Mr. Ashish Upadhyaya, Adv.
 Ms. Divya, Adv.
 for Ram Sankar & Co.

Mr. R. C. Mishra, Sr. Adv.
 Mr. Sanjay Kumar Dubey, Adv.
 Ms. Ananya Mishra, Adv.
 Mr. Llin Saraswat, Adv.
 Dr. Charu Mathur, Adv.

Mr. Mohit Chaudhary, Adv.
 Ms. Puja Sharma, Adv.

Mr. Kunal Sachdeva, Adv.
 Mr. Shyam Singh Yadav, Adv.
 Mr. Imran Ali, Adv.
 Mr. Balwinder Singh Suri, Adv.
 Mr. Parveen Kumar, Adv.
 Mr. Garima Sharma, Adv.
 For Kings & Alliance LLP, AOR

Mr. Anip Sachthey, Sr. Adv.
 Mr. Deepak Bashta, Adv.
 Mr. Kunal Mehta, Adv.
 Ms. Shagun Matta, Adv.

Mr. Matrugupta Mishra, Adv.
 Mr. Samyak Mishra, Adv.
 Ms. Divya Roy, Adv.

Mr. S. Udaya Kumar Sagar, Adv.
 Ms. Swati Bhardwaj, Adv.

Mr. Chirag M. Shroff, Adv.
 Ms. Sanjana Nangia, Adv.
 Ms. Abhilasha Bharti, Adv.

Mr. Sanjiv Sen, Sr. Adv.
 Mr. Wasim Qadri, Sr. Adv.
 Mr. Praveen Swarup, Adv.
 Mr. Amit Singh, Adv.
 Mr. Kanishk Chaudhary, Adv.
 Mr. Dev Roy, Adv.

Mr. Sanjay Hegde, Sr. Adv.
 Mr. Anas Tanwir, Adv.
 Ms. Sushma Mathur, Adv.

Ms. Vibha Datta Makhija, Sr. Adv.
 Ms. Aswathi M.K., Advocates

Mr. Nalin Kohli, Sr. Adv.
 Mr. Anil Kumar, Adv.
 Mr. Ankit Roy, Adv.
 Mr. Debojit Borkakati, Aor

Dr. Manish Singhvi, Sr. Advocate
 Mr. Sandeep Kr. Jha, Adv.

Mr. C.N. Sreekumar, Sr. Adv.
 Ms. Anupama Kumar, Adv.
 Mr. Arjun Dewan, Adv.
 Mr. Prakash Ranjan Nayak, Adv.

Mr. Vikas Mahajan, AAG, H.P.
 Mr. Vinod Sharma, Aor

Mr. Anil Kumar, Adv.

Mr. Gopal Sankaranarayanan, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Senthil Jagdeesan, Adv.

Mr. Vibhu Tiwari, Adv.
Mr. Aakarshan Aditya, Adv.
Mr. Sumit R. Sharma, Adv.

Mr. Abhishek, Adv.

Mr. Animesh Kumar, Adv.
Mr. Murari Kumar, Adv.
Mr. Neeraj Shekhar, Adv.

Mr. D.N. Goburdhun, Adv.
Mr. Alok Gupta, Adv.

Ms. Ruchi Kohli, Adv.
Mr. Yash Mishra, Adv.
Ms. Nidhi Jaswal, Adv.
Ms. Srishti Mishra, Adv.
Ms. Manyaa Chandok, Adv.

Ms. Minakshi Arora, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Sakshi Kakkar, Adv.
Mr. Shakti Singh, Adv.

Mr. Pukhrambam Ramesh Kumar, Adv.
Ms. Anupama Ngangom, Adv.
Mr. Karun Sharma, Adv.
Mr. Shresth Sharma, Adv.

M/S Khaitan And Co., AOR

Mr. Kumar Anurag Singh, Advocate
Mr. Nishant Piyush, Advocate
Ms. Tulika Mukherjee, Adv.

Mr. Anurag Kishore, Adv.
Mr. Anurag Sharma, Adv.

Mr. Santosh Kumar, Adv.

Mr. Jogy Scaria, Adv.
Ms. Beena Victor, Adv.

Ms. Garima Prashad, Aor
Mr. G. S. Oberoi, Adv.

Mr. Rahul Narayan, Adv.

Mr. Tapes K. Singh, Adv.
Mr. Aditya Pratap Singh, Advocate

Mr. Shuvodeep Roy, Adv.

Ms. Aparna Rohatgi Jain, Adv.
Mr. Mahesh Kasana, Adv.
Ms. Shefali Mitra, Adv.
For Mr. S. K. Dhingra, Adv. (Late)

Mr. Raghvendra Kumar, Adv.
Mr. Anand Dubey, Adv.
Mr. Narendra Kumar, AOR

Mr. Anil Grover, AAG
Dr. Monika Gusain, AOR

Mr. Sanjay Jain, ASG
Mr. Anil Grover, Adv.
Mr. Yoginder Handoo, AOR

Mr. Anilendra Pandey, Adv.
Mr. Charanpal Singh Bahri, Adv.
Mr. Gurjeet Kaur Adv.

Mr. Narendra Kumar, Adv.

Mr. V.G. Pragasam, Adv.
Mr. S. Prabu Ramasubramanian, Adv.

Mr. M. Shoeb Alam, Adv.

Mr. V.N. Raghupathy, Adv.

Mr. M. Yogesh Kanna, Adv.

Mr. Yogesh Tiwari, Adv.
Mr. Vikrant Singh Bais, Adv.

Mr. Ashutosh Dubey, Adv.
Mr. Abshishek Chauhan, Adv.
Ms. Rajshri Dubey, Adv.
Mr. V. S. Rawat, Adv.

Mr. Jatinder Kumar Bhatia, Adv.
Mr. Ashutosh Kumar Sharma, Adv.

Mr. Sarad Kumar Sunny, Adv
Ms. Nidhi Mohan Parashar, AOR

Mr. Shovan Mishra, Adv.

Mr. Vinay Garg, Adv.
Mr. Upendra Mishra, Adv.

Mr. Vinod Sharma, Adv.

Mr. R.C. Kohli, Adv.

Ms. K. Enatoli Sema, Adv.
Mr. Amit Kumar Singh, Adv.

Mr. Vipin Nair, Adv.
Mr. Anshuman Bahadur, Advocate
Mr. PB Suresh, Advocate

Mr. Siddhesh Kotwal, Adv.
Mr. Divyansh Tiwari, Adv.
Ms. Astha Sharma, Adv.

Ms. Madhumita Bhattacharjee, Adv.

Mr. Anuj Bhandari, Adv.

Mr. K.V. Jagdishvaran, Adv.
Ms. Rangoli Seth, Adv.
Ms. G. Indira, Adv.

Mr. Mukesh Verma, Adv.
Mr. Yash Pal Dhingra, Adv.

Mr. Keshav Mohan, Adv.
Mr. R.K. Awasthi, Adv.
Mr. Prashant Kumar, Adv.
Mr. Piyush Vatsa, Adv.
Mr. Santosh Kumar - I, Aor

Mr. Yoginder Handoo, Adv.

Mr. Subhro Sanyal, Adv.

Mr. Preetpal Singh, Adv.
Mr. Ranjay Dubey, Adv.
Ms. Yati Sharma, Adv.
Ms. Priya Puri, Aor

Mr. Gaurav Sharma, Aor
Mr. Dhawal Mohan, Adv
Mr. Prateek Bhatia, Adv.

Mr. Gaurav Srivastava, Adv.

Mr. Mahfooz Ahsan Nazki, Adv.
Mr. Polanki Gowtham, Adv.

Mr. Amitabh Sinha, Adv.

Mr. Amitabh Chaturvedi, Adv.

Mr. Navneet Panwar, Adv.

Mr. Sandeep Narain, Adv.

M/s S. Narain & Co.

Mr. Sunil Fernandes, Adv.

Mr. Shariq Ahmed, Adv.

Mr. Muhammad Ali Khan, Adv.

Mr. Tariq Ahmed, Adv.

Ms. Nupur Kumar, Adv.

Mr. Omar Hoda, Adv.

Mr. Zeeshan Diwan, Adv.

Mr. Prastut Dalvi, Adv.

Mr. Tapesk Kumar Singh, AOR

Mr. Ajay Aggarwal, Adv.

Mr. Kishan Rawat, Adv.

Mr. Rajan Narain, AOR

Mr. Pradeep Misra, Adv.

Mr. Suraj Singh, Adv.

Mr. Ajay Bansal, Adv.

Mrs. Veena Bansal, Adv.

Mr. Kuldip Singh, Adv.

Mr. Jishnu M.L., Adv.

Ms. Priyanka Prakash, Adv.

Ms. Beena Prakash, Adv.

Mr. G. Prakash, AOR

Dr. Sanjay Kulshrestha, Applicant-in-person

Mr. C. K. Rai, AOR

Mr. Rajat Jariwal, Adv.

Applicant-in-person

Petitioner(s)-in-person

Applicant-in-person, AOR

Petitioner-in-person

Mr. Neeraj Shekhar, AOR

Ms. Sakshi Kakkar, AOR

Mr. Gurmeet Singh Makker, AOR

Mr. Mukesh Kumar Maroria, AOR

Mr. P. K. Jain, AOR

Mr. Ramesh Babu M. R., AOR
Mr. Rajesh Kumar Chaurasia, AOR
Mr. Annam D. N. Rao, AOR
Mr. S. K. Bhattacharya, AOR
Mr. Ashok Mathur, AOR
Mr. Rakesh Kumar-i, AOR
Mr. R. P. Gupta, AOR
Mr. Munawwar Naseem, AOR
Mr. Balaji Srinivasan, AOR
Mr. Sushil Kumar Singh, AOR
Mr. Rakesh K. Sharma, AOR
Ms. Shalini Kaul, AOR
Mr. Pavan Kumar, AOR
Mr. Satya Mitra, AOR
Mr. Sushil Kumar Jain, AOR
Ms. Nandini Gidwaney, AOR
M/S. Parekh & Co., AOR
Mrs. Priya Puri, AOR
Mr. Ejaz Maqbool, AOR
Mr. Parijat Sinha, AOR
Mrs. B. Sunita Rao, AOR
Mr. K. R. Sasiprabhu, AOR
Mr. Ravindra Kumar, AOR
Mr. Rajiv Ranjan Dwivedi, AOR
Mr. E. C. Agrawala, AOR
M/S. S. Narain & Co., AOR
Mr. V. K. Verma, AOR
Mr. P. Parmeswaran, AOR
Mr. Vijay Panjwani, AOR
Mr. Hardeep Singh Anand, AOR
Ms. Ruchi Kohli, AOR
Mr. Radha Shyam Jena, AOR
Mr. Praveen Swarup, AOR
Ms. Sujeeta Srivastava, AOR
M/S. M. V. Kini & Associates, AOR
Dr. Monika Gusain, AOR
Mrs. Rani Chhabra, AOR
Mr. Aniruddha Deshmukh, AOR
Mr. Ajit Pudussery, AOR
Ms. Hemantika Wahi, AOR
Mr. Sudhir Mendiratta, AOR
M/S. Saharya & Co., AOR
Ms. Manjula Gupta, AOR
Mr. Shri Narain, AOR
Mr. Abhishek, AOR
Mr. Anil Kumar Jha, AOR
Mr. Pradeep Kumar Bakshi, AOR
Mr. Sandeep Narain, AOR
Mr. Chirag M. Shroff, AOR
M/S. Khaitan & Co., AOR
Mrs. K. Sarada Devi, AOR
Mr. Mohit D. Ram, AOR
Mr. B. V. Balaram Das, AOR

Mrs. Bina Gupta, AOR
Mr. G. Prakash, AOR
Mr. Prashant Kumar, AOR
Mr. Ravindra Bana, AOR
Mr. T. V. Ratnam, AOR
Mr. Mukesh K. Giri, AOR
Mr. Umesh Kumar Khaitan, AOR
Ms. Binu Tamta, AOR
Mr. Sarvam Ritam Khare, AOR
Mr. S. S. Shroff, AOR
Mrs. Anil Katiyar, AOR
Mr. Sanjay Kumar Visen, AOR
Mr. Bimal Roy Jad, AOR
Mr. Pramod Dayal, AOR
Mr. Surya Kant, AOR
Ms. Pritha Srikumar, AOR
Mr. Rajiv Yadav, AOR
Ms. Divya Jyoti Singh, AOR
Gaurav, AOR
Mr. Vinod Sharma, AOR
Mr. Prakash Ranjan Nayak, AOR
Mr. Joggy Scaria, AOR
Mr. Anas Tanwir, AOR
Mr. Akshay Girish Ringe, AOR
Mr. Vinay Garg, AOR
Mr. Aakarshan Aditya, AOR
Mr. Santosh Kumar - I, AOR
Mr. Rishi Matoliya, AOR
Mr. Senthil Jagadeesan, AOR
Ms. Shagun Matta, AOR
Mr. Anil Kumar, AOR
Mr. Shovan Mishra, AOR
Mr. Mahfooz Ahsan Nazki, AOR
Mr. Kamlendra Mishra, AOR
Ms. Nidhi Mohan Parashar, AOR
Ms. Kiran Bhardwaj, AOR
Mr. Rajan Narain, AOR
Mr. Neeraj Shekhar, AOR
Mr. Ashutosh Dubey, AOR
Mr. Subhro Sanyal, AOR
Ms. Uttara Babbar, AOR
Mr. Rishi Malhotra, AOR
Mr. M. P. Devanath, AOR
Ms. Astha Tyagi, AOR
Mr. T. R. B. Sivakumar, AOR
Mr. M. Yogesh Kanna, AOR
Mr. Yoginder Handoo, AOR
Ms. Tulika Mukherjee, AOR
Mr. D. Abhinav Rao, AOR
Mr. Pranav Sachdeva, AOR
Ms. Madhumita Bhattacharjee, AOR
Mr. Gopal Jha, AOR
Mr. V. N. Raghupathy, AOR

Ms. Astha Sharma, AOR
 Ms. Sakshi Kakkar, AOR
 Mr. Debojit Borkakati, AOR
 Ms. Surabhi Sanchita, AOR
 Mr. Vipin Nair, AOR
 Ms. Puja Sharma, AOR
 Mr. M. Shoeb Alam, AOR
 Ms. Aswathi M.k., AOR
 Ms. Divya Roy, AOR
 M/S. Ram Sankar & Co, AOR
 Mr. Vivek Gupta, AOR
 Mr. S. K. Dhingra, AOR
 Mr. Anurag Kishore, AOR
 Mr. V. G. Pragasam, AOR
 Mr. D. N. Goburdhan, AOR
 Mr. Shekhar Kumar, AOR
 Ms. G. Indira, AOR
 Ms. Surbhi Mehta, AOR
 Ms. K. Enatoli Sema, AOR
 Mr. Kuldip Singh, AOR
 Mr. Narendra Kumar, AOR
 Mr. Sandeep Kumar Jha, AOR
 Ms. Jaikriti S. Jadeja, AOR
 Mr. Chandra Prakash, AOR
 Mr. Yash Pal Dhingra, AOR
 Mr. R. C. Kohli, AOR
 Mr. Vikrant Singh Bais, AOR
 Mr. Shuvodeep Roy, AOR
 Mr. Ayush Sharma, AOR
 Ms. Garima Prashad, AOR
 Ms. Charu Ambwani, AOR
 M/S. Karanjawala & Co., AOR
 Mr. Sameer Shrivastava, AOR
 Mr. Mritunjay Kumar Sinha, AOR
 Mr. Tapes Kumar Singh, AOR
 Mr. Sunil Fernandes, AOR

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
 O R D E R

IN RE: REGISTRATION OF BS IV VEHICLES

Heard learned counsel for the parties at length.

Considered the rival arguments. The lockdown was imposed from
 25.03.2020. The sales data has been furnished for the lockdown
 period by FADA and Non-FADA Members for the period with effect from
 15.03.2020. There are unusually a large number of transactions,

which had taken place during the lockdown period *inter se* dealers, which cannot be recognised for the purpose of actual sales and registration. We disallow the registration on the basis of such kind of transactions *inter se* dealers. As they are not sales to the customers and registration of these kinds of vehicles cannot be allowed, there is a ploy to misuse of the order and such vehicles cannot be permitted to be sold in market now. They are not genuine transactions of the sale to the customers. Hence, no registration of such kind of vehicles shall be made, which were sold *inter se* dealers during the lockdown period.

Apart from that, there are large number of vehicles, sales of which were not uploaded on E-Vaahan Portal. Since, sales were not uploaded, as required, the transactions cannot be recognised as genuine sales. The order passed by this Court on 24.10.2018 is clear that sale and registration of BS-IV vehicles shall not be allowed after 31.03.2020. We cannot allow the registration of such vehicles, sales of which were not uploaded on E-Vaahan Portal of the Central Government or the portal of the concerned State Government.

There are still stated to be a large number of sales which have been made and uploaded on the E-Vaahan Portal, even temporary registrations were made. Their registration during the lockdown period could not be made. Hence, we allow registration of such vehicles only which could not be registered during lockdown in the month of March, 2020 and for no other reason. However, the position of Delhi and NCR is different. We clarify our order dated 27.03.2020 to the effect that no registration of BS-IV vehicles is

to be made in Delhi and NCR as people are suffering from severe air pollution and the order passed by this Court in 2018 was clear. No vehicle of BS-IV in Delhi and NCR to be registered.

We order that in the Delhi and NCR, no registration of the vehicles of BS-IV is to be made after 31.03.2020.

This order is for the rest of the country and only due to lockdown, not to be used for any other purpose/reason and for registration of other vehicles of which registration was not done for any other reason.

I.A. NOS. 56015, 56017 AND 56018/2020

(APPLNS. FOR IMPLEADMENT, DIRECTIONS AND EXEMPTION FROM FILING ATTESTED AFFIDAVIT ON B/O NORTH EAST PLANTATION AND COMMERCIAL PVT. LTD.)

The application for impleadment is allowed to the extent of intervention. In the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case, registration of vehicles in question in these applications be made. However, it shall not be treated as a precedent for any other case. Application for directions is, accordingly, allowed.

Pending interlocutory application(s), if any, is/are disposed of.

The remaining interlocutory applications and Diary No. 36562 of 2019 [Item No. 19.1] and Civil Appeal No. 8187 of 2019 [Item No. 19.2] be listed next week.

(NARENDRA PRASAD)
AR-CUM-PS

(JAYANT KUMAR ARORA)
COURT MASTER

(JAGDISH CHANDER)
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

ITEM NO.2 Court 1 (Video Conferencing)

SECTION PIL-W

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Writ Petition(s)(Civil) No(s). 13029/1985

M.C. MEHTA

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

Respondent(s)

(BS-IV VEHICLES(i) IA NOS. 85655 AND 85658/2020 (APPLNS. FOR INTERVENTION AND DIRECTION ON B/O DELHI WASTE MGT. NAJAFGARH PVT. LTD.)(ii) I.A. NOS. 86182 AND 86184/2020 (APPLNS. FOR INTERVENTION AND DIRECTIONS ON B/O METRO WASTE HANDLING PVT. LTD.)"ONLY" IN W.P. (C) NO. 13029/1985 ARE LISTED."ONLY" NAME OF THE FOLLOWING ADVOCATES MAY BE TREATED TO HAVE BEEN SHOWN IN THE LIST:MR. HARISH N. SALVE, SR. ADVOCATE (A.C.)MS. APARAJITA SINGH, SR. ADVOCATE (A.C.)MR. A.D.N. RAO, ADVOCATE (A.C.)MR. SIDDHARTHA CHOWDHURY, ADVOCATE (A.C.)PETITIONER-IN-PERSONMR. G.S. MAKKER, ADVOCATEMR. B.K. PRASAD, ADVOCATEMR. B.V. BALRAM DAS, ADVOCATEMR. CHIRAG M. SHROFF, ADVOCATEMR. SANJAY KR. VISEN, ADVOCATEMR. KAMLENDRA MISHRA, ADVOCATEMR. SANDEEP KR. JHA, ADVOCATEMS. NIDHI MOHAN PARASHAR, ADVOCATE)

Date : 18-09-2020 This petition was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.S. BOPANNA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V. RAMASUBRAMANIAN

Counsel for the parties:

Mr. Harish N. Salve,Sr.Adv.(AC)

Ms. Aparajita Singh,Sr.Adv.(AC)

Mr. A.D.N. Rao,Adv. (AC)

Mr. Siddhartha Chowdhury,Adv.(AC)

Mr. B.K. Prasad,Adv.

Mr. Maninder Singh, Senior Advocate

Ms. Nidhi Mohan Parashar, AOR

Mr. Sarad Kumar Sunny, Adv

Mr. Vikrant Kumar, Adv

Mr. Tushar Mehta, SG
 Ms. Aishwarya Bhati, ASG
 Mr. Gurmeet Singh Makker, AOR
 Mr. D L Chidananda, Adv.
 Ms. Suhasini Sen, Adv.
 Mr. S S Rebello, Adv
 Mr. Rajesh Kr Singh, Adv.

Mr. Tushar Mehta, LD SG
 Ms. Aishwarya Bhati, LD ASG
 Ms. D.L. Chidananda, Adv.
 Ms. Suhasini Sen, Adv.
 Mr. Rajesh Kr. Singh, Adv.
 Mr. S.S. Rebello, Adv.
 Mr. Raj Bahadur Yadav, Adv.

Ms. Aishwarya Bhati, ASG
 Shri W.A. Quadri, Sr. Adv.
 Shri Vibhu Shankar Mishra, Adv.
 Ms. Snidha Mehra, Adv.
 Mr. B.V. Balram Das, Adv.

Mr. Anil Grover ,Sr. AAG HARYANA
 Ms. Noopur Singhal, Advocate
 Mr. Rahul Khurana, Advocate
 Mr. Satish Kumar, Advocate
 Mr. Sanjay Kumar Visen, AOR

Mr. V. Shekhar, Sr. Adv.
 Mr. Rajeev Kumar Dubey, Adv.
 Mr. Mukesh Verma, Adv.
 Mr. Kamalendra Mishra, Adv.

Dr. Manish Singhvi, Senior Advocate
 Mr. Sandeep Kumar Jha (AOR)

Applicant-in-person, AOR

Petitioner-in-person

Mr. Jatinder Kumar Bhatia, Adv.
 Mr. Ashutosh Kumar Sharma, Adv.

Mr. Rajesh Kumar Chaurasia, AOR

Mr. Mukesh Kumar Maroria, AOR

Mr. P. K. Jain, AOR

Mr. Ramesh Babu M. R., AOR

Mr. Surya Kant, AOR

Mr. Annam D. N. Rao, AOR

Mr. S. K. Bhattacharya, AOR

Mr. Rakesh Kumar-i, AOR

Mr. Ashok Mathur, AOR

Ms. Shalini Kaul, AOR

Mr. R. P. Gupta, AOR

Mr. Munawwar Naseem, AOR

Mr. Sushil Kumar Singh, AOR

Mr. Balaji Srinivasan, AOR

Mr. Pavan Kumar, AOR

Mr. Rakesh K. Sharma, AOR

Mrs. Priya Puri, AOR

Mr. Satya Mitra, AOR

Ms. Nandini Gidwaney, AOR

Mr. Sushil Kumar Jain, AOR

Mr. Ejaz Maqbool, AOR

M/S. Parekh & Co., AOR

Mr. Vivek Bhojrajka, Adv.

Mr. Vinod Kumar, Adv.

Mr. Rajiv Ranjan Dwivedi, AOR

Mr. Parijat Sinha, AOR

Mr. K. R. Sasiprabhu, AOR

Mrs. B. Sunita Rao, AOR

Mr. E. C. Agrawala, AOR

Mr. Ravindra Kumar, AOR

Ms. Ruchi Kohli, AOR

M/S. S. Narain & Co., AOR

Mr. V. K. Verma, AOR

Mr. Vijay Panjwani, AOR

Mr. P. Parmeswaran, AOR

Mr. Radha Shyam Jena, AOR

Mr. Hardeep Singh Anand, AOR

Mr. Aniruddha Deshmukh, AOR

Mr. Wasim Qadri, Sr. Adv.

Mr. Praveen Swarup, AOR

Mr. Amit Singh, Adv.

Mr. Kanishik Chaudhary, Adv.

Mr. R.K. Singh, Adv.

M/s Divya Kushwaha, Adv.

Ms. Sujeeta Srivastava, AOR

Dr. Monika Gusain, AOR

M/S. M. V. Kini & Associates, AOR

Mr. Pukhrambam Ramesh Kumar, Adv.

Ms. Anupama Ngangom, Adv.

Mr. Karun Sharma, Adv.

Mr. Ajit Pudussery, AOR

Mrs. Rani Chhabra, AOR

Mr. Abhishek, AOR

Ms. Hemantika Wahi, AOR

Mr. Sudhir Mendiratta, AOR

Ms. Manjula Gupta, AOR

M/S. Saharya & Co., AOR

Mr. Anil Kumar Jha, AOR

Mr. Shri Narain, AOR

Mr. Mohit D. Ram, AOR

Mr. Pradeep Kumar Bakshi, AOR

Mr. Sandeep Narain, AOR

M/S. Khaitan & Co., AOR

Mr. Chirag M. Shroff, AOR
Ms. Sanjana Nangia, Adv.
Ms. Abhilasha Bharti, Adv.

Mrs. K. Sarada Devi, AOR

Mrs. Bina Gupta, AOR

Mr. Jishnu M.L. Adv.
Ms. Priyanka Praksh, Adv.
Ms. Beena Praksh, Adv.
Mr. G. Prakash, AOR

Mr. Ravindra Bana, AOR

Mr. Prashant Kumar, AOR

Mr. T. V. Ratnam, AOR

Mr. Mukesh K. Giri, AOR

Mr. Umesh Kumar Khaitan, AOR

Mr. Sarvam Ritam Khare, AOR

Ms. Binu Tamta, AOR

Mr. S. S. Shroff, AOR

Mrs. Anil Katiyar, AOR

Mr. Sanjay Kumar Visen, AOR

Mr. Pramod Dayal, AOR

Mr. Bimal Roy Jad, AOR

Ms. Pritha Srikumar, AOR

Mr. Jogy Scaria, AOR
Ms. Beena Victor, Adv.

Mr. Sunil Fernandes, AOR

Ms. Divya Jyoti Singh, AOR

Ms. Nidhi Jaswal, AOR

Mr. Vinay Garg, AOR

Mr. Prakash Ranjan Nayak, AOR

Mr. Santosh Kumar - I, AOR

Mr. Anas Tanwir, AOR

Mr. Senthil Jagadeesan, AOR

Mr. Akshay Girish Ringe, AOR

Mr. Vishwajit Singh, AOR

Mr. Shovan Mishra, AOR

Mr. Aakarshan Aditya, AOR

Mr. Kamlendra Mishra, AOR

Mr. Rishi Matoliya, AOR

Ms. Kiran Bhardwaj, AOR

Ms. Shagun Matta, AOR

Mr. Anil Kumar, AOR

Mr. Ashutosh Dubey, AOR

Mr. Mahfooz Ahsan Nazki, AOR

Mr. Polanki Gowtham, Adv.

Mr. Amitabh Sinha, Adv.

Mr. Neeraj Singh Deswal, Adv.

Ms. Uttara Babbar, AOR

Ms. Nidhi Mohan Parashar, AOR

Mr. M. P. Devanath, AOR

Mr. Ajay Aggarwal, Adv.

Mr. Kishan Rawat, Adv.

Mr. Rajan Narain, AOR

Mr. Neeraj Shekhar, AOR

Mr. M. Yogesh Kanna, AOR

Mr. Subhro Sanyal, AOR

Mr. Kumar Anurag Singh, Adv.

Mr. Nishant Piyush, Adv.

Ms. Tulika Mukherjee, AOR

Mr. Rishi Malhotra, AOR

Mr. Pranav Sachdeva, AOR

Ms. Astha Tyagi, AOR

Mr. T. R. B. Sivakumar, AOR

Mr. V. N. Raghupathy, AOR

Mr. Yoginder Handoo, AOR

Ms. Sakshi Kakkar, AOR

Mr. D. Abhinav Rao, AOR

Ms. Surabhi Sanchita, AOR

Ms. Madhumita Bhattacharjee, AOR

Mr. Gopal Jha, AOR

Mr. M. Shoeb Alam, AOR

Mr. Siddhesh Kotwal, Adv.

Mr. Divyansh Tiwari, Adv

Ms. Astha Sharma, AOR

Ms. Divya Roy, AOR

Mr. Debojit Borkakati, AOR

Mr. Vivek Gupta, AOR

Mr. Vipin Nair, AOR

Mr. Mohit Chaudhary, Adv.

Ms. Puja Sharma, AOR

Mr. Kunal Sachdeva, Adv.

Mr. Shyam Singh Yadav, Adv.

Mr. Imran Ali, Adv.

Mr. Balwinder Singh Suri, Adv.

Ms. Garima Sharma, Adv.

Mr. Parveen Kumar, Adv.

Mr. V. G. Pragasam, AOR

Mr. S. Prabu Ramasubramanian, Adv.

Ms. Aswathi M.k., AOR

Mr. Shekhar Kumar, AOR

Mr. Ram Sankar, Advocate.

Ms. G. Chitrakala, Advocate.

Mr. Om Prakash Kr. Srivastava, Advocate.

Mr. Ashish Cheaubey, Advocate.

Mr. G. Anandan, Advocate

RAM SANKAR & CO, AOR

Mr Pradeep Misra Advocate

Mr Suraj Singh Advocate

Ms. Surbhi Mehta, AOR

Ms. K. Enatoli Sema, AOR

Mr. Amit Kumar Singh, Adv.

Mr. Anurag Kishore, AOR

Mr. B. V. Balaram Das, AOR

Mr. D. N. Goburdhan, AOR

Ms. Jaikriti S. Jadeja, AOR

Mr. K.V. Jagdishvaran, Adv.

Ms. G. Indira, AOR

Ms. Rangoli Seth, Adv.

Mr. Aman Panwar Advocate

Mr. Nitin Saluja AOR

Mr. Mukesh Verma, Adv

Mr. Yash Pal Dhingra, AOR

Mr. R. C. Kohli, AOR

Mr. Kuldip Singh, AOR

Mr. Shuvodeep Roy, AOR

Mr. Kabir Shankar Bose, Adv.

Mr. Rahul Raj Mishra, Adv.

Mr. Sandeep Kumar Jha, AOR

Ms. GARIMA PRASHAD. AOR

Mr. G.S. OBEROI, ADV

Mr. Chandra Prakash, AOR

Mr. Vinodh Kanna B., AOR

M/S. Karanjawala & Co., AOR

Mr. Sameer Shrivastava, AOR

Mr. Vikrant Singh Bais, AOR

Mr. Tapes Kumar Singh, AOR

Mr. Ayush Sharma, AOR

Mr. Rajiv Yadav, AOR

Ms. Charu Ambwani, AOR

Ms. Misha Rohatgi, AOR

Mr. Gaurav, AOR

Mr. Vikas Mahajan (A.A.G State of H.P)

Mr. Vinod Sharma, AOR

Mr. Anil Kumar (ADV)

Mr. Mritunjay Kumar Sinha, AOR

Mr. S. Udaya Kumar Sagar, AOR,

Ms. Swati Bhardwaj, Adv.

Mr. Raghvendra Kumar, Adv.

Mr. Anand Kumar Dubey, Adv.

Mr. Narendra Kumar, AOR

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

IA NOS. 85655 AND 85658/2020 (APPLNS. FOR INTERVENTION AND DIRECTION ON B/O DELHI WASTE MGT. NAJAFGARH PVT. LTD. AND I.A. NOS. 86182 AND 86184/2020 (APPLNS. FOR INTERVENTION AND DIRECTIONS ON B/O METRO WASTE HANDLING PVT. LTD.))

Applications for impleadment are allowed for the purpose of instant applications for directions.

These are applications for registration of three types of vehicles viz., (a) CNG vehicles (2) BS-IV compliant vehicles and (3) BS-VI compliant vehicles for being used for essential public utility services.

Insofar as CNG vehicles are concerned, there cannot be any valid rejection to the vehicles, as the emission from these vehicles is within the limits. Therefore, we direct that these vehicles may be registered.

Insofar as BS-IV and BS-VI compliant vehicles are concerned, admittedly BS-VI norms came into force on 01.04.2020. The vehicles purchased upto 31.03.2020 were BS-IV compliant.

Admittedly the emission from BS-VI compliant vehicles is within the norms and hence the vehicles purchased on or after 01.04.2020 and which are BS-VI compliant, should also liable to be registered.

Insofar as vehicles purchased upto 31.03.2020 which are BS-IV compliant are concerned, they must have been registered with the E-Vahan Portal before the cut-off date to establish the date of purchase. If the purchase had been made on or before 31.03.2020 and these vehicles are BS-IV compliant, such vehicles necessary for the Municipal Corporation to carry essential public utility services should also be registered. But such cases shall be scrutinized by the Environment Pollution Control Authority (EPCA).

In order to avoid repeated applications being filed before this Court just for the purpose of getting registration, we direct that the EPCA shall scrutiny the pending cases and submit a report to this Court so that a common order could be passed without the necessity for several interlocutory applications.

The interlocutory applications stand disposed of in the above terms.

(MADHU BALA)
AR-CUM-PS

(INDU KUMARI POKHRIYAL)
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

No.RT-11021/47/2014-MVL
Government of India
Ministry of Road Transport and Highways
Transport Bhawan, 1, Parliament Street, New Delhi-110001.

August 19th, 2020

To

The Principal Secretaries/ Secretaries, Department of Transport
The Transport Commissioners of All States/UTs.

Subject: Compliance of Hon'ble Supreme Court's order dated 13.08.2020 passed in the matter of W.P (C) No. 13029 of 1985, M.C. Mehta V/s Union of India.

Sir/Madam,

Please refer to the Hon'ble Supreme Court's order dated 13.08.2020 (copy enclosed) passed in the matter of W.P (C) No. 13029 of 1985, M.C. Mehta V/s Union of India. Hon'ble Supreme Court vide order dated 13.08.2020 has passed following orders with regard to registration of BS-IV vehicles:-

"Considered the rival arguments. The lockdown was imposed from 25.03.2020. The sales data has been furnished for the lockdown period by FADA and Non-FADA Members for the period with effect from 15.03.2020. There are unusually a large number of transactions, which had taken place during the lockdown period inter se dealers, which cannot be recognised for the purpose of actual sales and registration. We disallow the registration on the basis of such kind of transactions inter se dealers. As they are not sales to the customers and registration of these kinds of vehicles cannot be allowed, there is a ploy to misuse of the order and such vehicles cannot be permitted to be sold in market now. They are not genuine transactions of the sale to the customers. Hence, no registration of such kind of vehicles shall be made, which were sold inter se dealers during the lockdown period.

Apart from that, there are large number of vehicles, sales of which were not uploaded on E-Vaahan Portal. Since, sales were not uploaded, as required, the transactions cannot be recognised as genuine sales. The order passed by this Court on 24.10.2018 is clear that sale and registration of BS-IV vehicles shall not be allowed after 31.03.2020. We cannot allow the registration of such vehicles, sales of which were not uploaded on E-Vaahan Portal of the Central Government or the portal of the concerned State Government.

There are still stated to be a large number of sales which have been made and uploaded on the E-Vaahan Portal, even temporary registrations were made. Their registration during the lockdown period could not be made. Hence, we allow registration of such vehicles only which could not be registered during lockdown in the month of March, 2020 and for no other reason. However, the position of Delhi and NCR is different.

Cont...2/-


We clarify our order dated 27.03.2020 to the effect that no registration of BS-IV vehicles is to be made in Delhi and NCR as people are suffering from severe air pollution and the order passed by this Court in 2018 was clear. No vehicle of BS-IV in Delhi and NCR to be registered. We order that in the Delhi and NCR, no registration of the vehicles of BS-IV is to be made after 31.03.2020. This order is for the rest of the country and only due to lockdown, not to be used for any other purpose/reason and for registration of other vehicles of which registration was not done for any other reason.

.....”

3. It is requested to ensure compliance of the above directions of Hon'ble Supreme Court w.r.t registration of BS-IV vehicles.

Encls: As above.

Yours faithfully,



(S.K. Geeva)

Under Secretary to the Govt. of India
Ph. No. 011-23739074
Email:-geeva.sk@nic.in

Copy to : DDG, NIC, Lodhi Road, New Delhi.