



Name:

Enrolment No:

UNIVERSITY OF PETROLEUM AND ENERGY STUDIES
Online End Semester Examination, December 2020

Course: Environmental Law

Semester: VII

Program: BA LL.B (Hons.) (Criminal Law/ Labor Law/ Constitution Law)

Time 03 hrs.

Course Code: CLCC4004

Max. Marks: 100

SECTION A

1. Each Question will carry 5 Marks

2. Instruction: Conceptual questions

S. No.	Write short notes/define	Marks	CO
Q1	Vellore Citizens' Welfare Forum v/s Union of India	5	CO1
Q2	Public Trust Doctrine	5	CO1
Q3	Stockholm conference	5	CO1
Q4	Define Hazardous substance as given under EPA Act 1986	5	CO1
Q5	What is national park under Wildlife Protection Act 1972?	5	CO1
Q6	What is the objective of Air Act 1981?	5	CO1

SECTION B

1. Each question will carry 10 marks

2. Instruction: Analytical questions

Q7	Critically evaluate the Law and Policy of Forest Conservation in India.	10	CO2
Q8	Critically analyze the role of judiciary in protecting the environment through public interest litigation in India.	10	CO2
Q9	Discuss the composition, powers and function of the National Green Tribunal (NGT) of India. Explain the reasons behind the suggestion of the Supreme Court in various cases for establishing environmental courts.	10	CO4
Q10	Critically evaluate law on Wildlife protection.	10	CO3
Q11	Evaluate the administration and functioning of the pollution control board.	10	CO3

Section C

1. Each Question carries 10 Marks.

2. Instruction: Application based question

Q12-a)	<p>The activities of number of small-scale industries sprouted on the banks of a small river polluted the water of the river, the soil and the ambient air quality. The people in the vicinity of the area complain that the pollution caused by these industries badly affect their health and has become hazardous to their life, plants and crops.</p> <p>Discuss the remedial measures available to the people.</p>	10	CO5
b)	<p>A notice was given to about 165 dyeing factories to close down the business as they are polluting water and discharging dirty water on the public roads thereby causing damage to public health. The petitioners claimed that they were doing business for the last 25 years and providing employment to 20,000 to 25,000 families and that the order is against Article 19(1) (g). Is the argument justifiable?</p> <p>Explain with relevant case laws.</p>	10	CO5