



International Environmental
Law Research Centre

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL ORIGINAL JURISDICTION

REVIEW PETITION (C) NO.1259 OF 2000

IN

WRIT PETITION (C) NO.319 OF 1994

NARMADA BACHAO ANDOLAN
(Petitioner(s))

VERSUS

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS.
(Respondent)

*This paper can be downloaded in PDF format from IELRC's website at
<http://www.ielrc.org/content/c0101.pdf>*

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA

CIVIL ORIGINAL JURISDICTION

REVIEW PETITION (C) NO.1259 OF 2000

IN

WRIT PETITION (C) NO.319 OF 1994

**Narmada Bachao Andolan
Petitioner**

...

Versus

**Union of India & Ors.
Respondents**

...

ORDER

This petition has been filed for the 'review and recall' of the majority judgment of this Court in Writ Petition (C) No.319 of 1994.

Prayer for oral hearing is declined.

We have carefully gone through the review petition and the connected record but we do not find any error apparent on the face of the record which may call for a review of the majority judgment. The contentions raised in the review petition, in effect, seek to challenge the correctness of the said judgment and that is impermissible being outside the parameters of review. The only ambiguity, if any, has been clarified with the recording of the statement of the counsel for the Union of India and the State of Gujarat on November 23, 2000 in I.A.No.17 (filed by the Petitioner) that even if humps are required to be constructed, the effective height of the dam shall not be raised beyond 90 meters for purposes of submersion until further construction is permitted as per the conditions laid down in

the judgment.

The review petition is accordingly dismissed.

Sd/- CJI

Sd/- (B.N. KIRPAL) J

New Delhi

March 29, 2001

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA

CIVIL ORIGINAL JURISDICTION

REVIEW PETITION (C) NO.1259 OF 2000

IN

WRIT PETITION (C) NO.319 OF 1994

**Narmada Bachao Andolan
Petitioner**

...

Versus

**Union of India & Ors.
Respondents**

...

ORDER

The review petition seeks the review of the majority judgment. The learned Judges who wrote the majority judgment have found no case for a review. The review petition must, therefore, be dismissed.

I stand by the view expressed by me in the minority judgment.

The review petition is dismissed.

Sd/- (S.P. BHARUCHA), J

New Delhi

March 29, 2001

