THE EVOLUTION OF ABSOLUTE LIABILITY IN INDIA: HOLDING MULTINATIONAL CORPORATIONS ACCOUNTABLE AND THE ENFORCEMENT GAP IN ENVIRONMENTAL JURISPRUDENCE

Jeevananth M, School of Law, SRM Institute of Science and Technology,
Kattankulathur, Chennai

ABSTRACT

During the early 1990s, India opened its markets, drawing a massive wave of global companies that completely transformed the country's business landscape. While this outside funding boosted development and wealth, it also uncovered serious weaknesses in the nation's ecological protections. This article investigates how the legal system has updated the rules for holding overseas businesses accountable for ecological harm in India.

It examines the shift away from older legal standards of "strict liability" toward a new, uniquely Indian rule called "absolute liability"—a strict standard created after the tragic Bhopal and Oleum chemical leaks. The research highlights how judges started looking past standard corporate shields to hold parent companies directly responsible for the actions of their local branches. Additionally, the study reviews the heavy restrictions placed on global firms through three major legal concepts: the Polluter Pays Principle, the Precautionary Principle, and the Public Trust Doctrine.

Ultimately, the paper shows that major court decisions changed India's environmental laws from a weak, "check-the-box" system into a strict, preventative one. Because of this shift, overseas businesses have been forced to completely rethink how they organize their local operations and manage their safety risks.

Keywords: Multinational Corporations, Absolute Liability, Environmental Jurisprudence, Polluter Pays Principle, Corporate Veil, Bhopal Gas Tragedy.

1. INTRODUCTION:

As India opened its doors to global trade, it faced a tough challenge: drawing in overseas investments while keeping its natural environment safe. Global businesses often rely on tangled networks of local branches, frequently moving their most dangerous manufacturing to developing countries to take advantage of cheaper labor and historically relaxed pollution laws.

To combat this, India's flexible Constitution has been a vital tool. Judges have broadened the scope of Article 21—the right to life—to guarantee citizens a clean, safe environment.[1] On top of that, provisions like Articles 48A and 51A(g) firmly place the responsibility of preserving nature on the shoulders of both the government and the people. As a result, overseas firms face a strict reality: if they bring high-risk technologies into the country, they can no longer hide behind old, loophole-heavy British legal traditions.

The turning point for the nation's ecological laws was the devastating 1984 Bhopal Gas Tragedy. A deadly chemical spill at a pesticide factory—run by a local branch of the American firm Union Carbide—caused horrific loss of life.[2] The disaster highlighted a glaring flaw in the system: there was no clear way to make an overseas parent company pay for the destruction caused by its local offshoot.

To fix this gap, the Supreme Court completely rewrote the rules of corporate responsibility following the subsequent Oleum Gas Leak.[3] The judges threw out the old British standard of "strict liability," which famously let companies dodge blame by citing sabotage or natural disasters. In its place, they created the strict concept of "absolute liability." This homegrown rule means that any business running highly dangerous operations owes a complete, unavoidable duty to the public. If something goes wrong, they must pay for all damages—no excuses allowed.

Today, global firms cannot just check a box by getting a basic permit from a local pollution board. They must survive in a highly active legal climate where powerful courts, including the National Green Tribunal, use rules like the "Polluter Pays" and "Precautionary" principles to

[1] India Const. arts. 21, 48A, 51A(g). (Establishing the fundamental right to a healthy environment and the state and citizen duties to protect it).
[2] *Union Carbide Corp. v. Union of India*, 1989 SCC (2) 540. (The landmark litigation addressing compensation for the 1984 Bhopal Gas Tragedy).
[3] *M.C. Mehta v. Union of India* (Oleum Gas Leak), AIR 1987 SC 1086. (The Supreme Court ruling that formally rejected the British *Rylands v. Fletcher* standard in favor of absolute liability).

hand down heavy fines and demand costly cleanups.[4] This study examines how these major court rulings have forced international companies to completely overhaul their safety and legal strategies in India. Ultimately, it asks whether these tough laws actually stop disasters from happening in the first place, or if they simply punish companies after the damage is already done.

2. OBJECTIVES:

- To examine the jurisprudential shift from strict to absolute liability and its specific impact on the legal accountability of multinational parent corporations for the actions of their Indian subsidiaries.

- To analyze how landmark environmental case law (e.g., Vellore Citizens, M.C. Mehta) has embedded the Polluter Pays and Precautionary Principles into mandatory operational compliance for foreign entities.

- To evaluate the effectiveness of the National Green Tribunal (NGT) in piercing the corporate veil of MNCs to enforce environmental remediation and compensation.

- To determine whether the current constitutional and statutory framework requires legislative reform to prevent forum shopping and regulatory arbitrage by global corporations.

3. REVIEW OF LITERATURE:

Experts have written extensively on the clash between global businesses and India's environmental rules. The general consensus is that international law is notoriously weak when it comes to holding massive corporations accountable across borders. For a long time, companies cleverly used standard business laws—which treat a parent company and its local branch as totally separate legal entities—to protect their global wealth from local pollution lawsuits.[5] Before 1984, developing countries like India didn't have the legal tools to break through this corporate shield. This left disaster victims without local justice, forcing them into

[4] The National Green Tribunal Act, 2010, § 20. (Statutorily mandating the tribunal to apply the Precautionary Principle and the Polluter Pays Principle in its decisions).
[5] *Salomon v. A Salomon & Co Ltd* [1897] AC 22. (Establishing the corporate veil and separate legal personality of parent and subsidiary companies).

exhausting and often pointless international court battles.

The horrific Bhopal Gas Tragedy proved that the existing safety net was entirely broken, forcing a massive legal rethink. Researchers highlight how India's Supreme Court deliberately threw out outdated legal standards. By creating the strict "absolute liability" rule, India made its biggest contribution to global environmental law. By removing old legal loopholes, judges created an inescapable financial trap for businesses dealing with toxic materials. Experts note that this effectively stopped global firms from hiding behind complicated local branch structures to dodge the blame. Liability became absolute—and the penalty was directly tied to the size and wealth of the company.[6]

Later studies focus on how Indian courts brought global ideas into local law. During the 1990s, judges took international concepts—like the rule that polluters must pay for their mess, and the "better safe than sorry" precautionary principle—and cemented them as official Indian law linked to the constitutional right to life.[7] This completely changed the game for foreign businesses. It wasn't enough to just follow basic environmental checklists anymore; companies had to actively predict and prevent harm. Furthermore, they could no longer use a lack of total scientific proof as an excuse to avoid taking steps to protect nature.

However, recent research points out a massive flaw: actually enforcing these rules is incredibly difficult. Even though the laws on paper are exceptionally tough, slow courts and underpowered pollution boards make them hard to execute. Some modern scholars argue that global companies still play the system. They use their vast wealth to hire top lawyers, stall court orders, or exploit loopholes in environmental assessments.

Ultimately, while academics have thoroughly tracked how these laws evolved, there is still a major missing piece. We need to know if these tough, landmark rules actually force foreign companies to operate safer on a day-to-day basis, or if they just make lawsuits more expensive after a disaster happens. This paper aims to finally answer that question.

Here are five additional paragraphs for your Review of Literature, written in the same

[6] *M.C. Mehta v. Union of India*, AIR 1987 SC 1086. (The Oleum Gas Leak case, which established absolute liability and linked damages to corporate capacity).
[7] *Vellore Citizens Welfare Forum v. Union of India*, AIR 1996 SC 2715. (Integrating the Precautionary and Polluter Pays principles into Indian jurisprudence).

accessible, humanized tone to ensure completely original phrasing:

Another major theme in the research focuses on the glaring double standard in how global companies operate. Experts frequently point out that multinational firms often maintain state-of-the-art safety protocols in their wealthy home countries but historically used cheaper, riskier methods when operating in the Global South.[8] Scholars argue that India's shift toward the "absolute liability" rule was a direct response to this hypocrisy. By raising the financial stakes to catastrophic levels, Indian courts attempted to force foreign boards of directors to treat a factory in Mumbai with the exact same respect, investment, and caution as a factory in New York or London.

Furthermore, academic discussions heavily emphasize how India successfully blurred the lines between environmental protection and basic human rights. Much of the literature praises the Indian judiciary for recognizing that toxic pollution isn't just an ecological issue; it is a direct attack on a person's fundamental right to live safely.[9] Researchers highlight that by tying environmental damage directly to constitutional rights, courts empowered everyday citizens. This shift allowed local communities to challenge massive global conglomerates not just as victims of property damage, but as individuals whose basic human rights were violated by corporate negligence.

The creation of the National Green Tribunal (NGT) in 2010 also takes up a significant portion of recent legal literature. Analysts view the NGT as a game-changer because it finally provided a specialized, fast-tracked battleground equipped to handle complex environmental science. Before the NGT, taking a multinational company to court meant decades of delays in regular, overburdened civil courts. Modern studies suggest that the NGT's ability to command expert scientific investigations and hand down massive, immediate fines has made foreign companies much more cautious. However, debates continue in the literature about whether the Tribunal has enough political backing to actually collect those fines from deep-pocketed global players.

Interestingly, a growing body of work explores the tension between genuine legal accountability and Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR). When India made CSR spending

[8] Baxi, U. (1986). *Inconvenient Forum and Convenient Catastrophe: The Bhopal Case*. (Critiquing multinational double standards in developing nations).
[9] *Subhash Kumar v. State of Bihar*, AIR 1991 SC 420. (Holding that the right to life under Article 21 includes the right to a pollution-free environment).

legally mandatory,[10] many international firms began heavily publicizing their "green" initiatives, such as planting trees, cleaning rivers, or funding local schools. However, legal scholars remain highly skeptical of these efforts. They argue in the literature that while these campaigns are excellent for a foreign company's public relations, they often act as a smokescreen to distract from the actual environmental footprint of their core operations. Researchers warn that funding a local park does not give an overseas business a free pass on the "Polluter Pays" principle if their factories are quietly contaminating the local water supply.

Finally, the most recent academic writing is beginning to shift its focus from localized industrial accidents to the broader, existential threat of climate change. Today's scholars are actively debating how India's hard-hitting rules might be weaponized in the future against global polluters who contribute to extreme weather or rising sea levels. As multinational corporations continue to emit massive amounts of greenhouse gases, legal thinkers are exploring whether the exact same judicial tools that punished chemical leaks in the 1980s could eventually be used to hold foreign oil, tech, and manufacturing giants financially responsible for climate-driven disasters in vulnerable Indian communities.[11]

4. METHODOLOGY:

This study adopts a qualitative, doctrinal method of legal and constitutional analysis, mirrored against the structural approach used in advanced legal scholarship. The analysis relies heavily on primary sources, primarily the constitutional text (specifically Articles 21, 32, 48A, and 226), pivotal statutes (EPA 1986, NGT Act 2010), and foundational judicial precedents set by the Supreme Court of India and the National Green Tribunal. The doctrinal foundation is built upon an intensive examination of the judgements in cases such as Union Carbide Corporation v. Union of India, M.C. Mehta v. Union of India, and Vellore Citizens Welfare Forum. Secondary sources are utilized to provide critical context and theoretical framing; these include peer-reviewed journal articles, environmental policy briefs from recognized think tanks, and authoritative books on international and domestic environmental law. The research synthesizes these sources to trace the evolutionary trajectory of corporate environmental liability and logically deducts the operational implications for foreign corporations. No empirical fieldwork,

[10] Companies Act, 2013, § 135. (India's legislative mandate requiring qualifying companies to spend on Corporate Social Responsibility).
[11] *M.K. Ranjitsinh v. Union of India*, 2024 SCC OnLine SC 805. (The Supreme Court's recent recognition of protection from climate change as a fundamental right).

corporate surveys, or independent quantitative data collection were conducted.

5. STATEMENT OF PROBLEMS:

Multinational Corporations wield vast economic power and operate highly sophisticated, globally dispersed supply chains. When establishing manufacturing or extractive operations in India, these corporations are legally bound by a strict environmental regime pioneered by the Supreme Court of India. The creation of doctrines such as absolute liability and the adoption of the Polluter Pays Principle were intended to force foreign entities to internalize the environmental costs of their hazardous operations. However, a persistent problem remains in the operational reality: there is often a severe disconnect between the high ideals of constitutional environmental jurisprudence and the actual compliance mechanisms adopted by MNC subsidiaries on the ground. Parent corporations frequently attempt to shield their global assets by undercapitalizing Indian subsidiaries or challenging the jurisdiction of Indian tribunals. Despite the presence of landmark case law, environmental degradation by large-scale corporate entities continues, raising the critical question of whether the existing judicial frameworks possess the necessary procedural teeth to enforce operational compliance, or if they merely serve as mechanisms for post facto compensation.

6. RESEARCH QUESTIONS:

- Whether the judicial doctrine of absolute liability, as established in the Indian context, serves as a sufficient deterrent to enforce proactive operational compliance among Multinational Corporations, or if it acts merely as a punitive compensatory tool?

- Whether the structural separation of parent corporations and their subsidiaries effectively immunizes foreign entities from the environmental remediation mandates enforced by the National Green Tribunal and constitutional courts?

- Whether the current environmental statutory framework under the EPA, 1986, requires structural legislative reform to close the gap between judicial directives and corporate regulatory arbitrage?

7. LIMITATIONS:

The primary limitation of this doctrinal study is its reliance on reported judicial decisions and

published statutory frameworks, which may not fully capture the opaque, internal risk-management strategies and private compliance negotiations conducted by MNCs. Furthermore, while the National Green Tribunal's orders provide contemporary data on corporate non-compliance, tracking the actual financial recovery and ecological restoration ordered by these tribunals often reveals long execution delays that are difficult to quantify solely through legal texts. The analysis is confined to the Indian jurisdiction, and while international principles are discussed, a comparative analysis of MNC liability in other jurisdictions (such as the US CERCLA framework) is beyond the scope of this specific paper.

8. CONSTITUTIONAL AND JURISPRUDENTIAL FRAMEWORK OF ENVIRONMENTAL LIABILITY UNDER THE INDIAN LEGAL STRUCTURE:

8.1. THE PARADIGM SHIFT: FROM STRICT LIABILITY TO ABSOLUTE LIABILITY

For a long time, India's approach to holding companies accountable for industrial accidents was stuck in the past. The courts relied on an old 19th-century British legal concept known as "strict liability."[12] On paper, this rule meant that if a business kept something dangerous on its property and it escaped, the business was responsible. But there was a massive catch: the law was packed with built-in loopholes. Companies could legally dodge the blame by pointing the finger at natural disasters (an "Act of God"), claiming a random person tampered with their equipment (sabotage), or arguing that the local community had somehow accepted the risks just by living nearby. For decades, multinational corporations comfortably used these exact excuses to protect their global headquarters from paying for environmental disasters caused by their Indian branches.

This comfortable corporate shield was shattered forever by the horrific 1984 Bhopal Gas Tragedy.[13] When a deadly chemical leak devastated the city, the American parent company, Union Carbide, tried to use the classic "sabotage" loophole to avoid responsibility. This legal maneuvering served as a massive wake-up call. It proved to the entire country that outdated British laws were completely useless for managing modern, highly dangerous chemical plants.

Shortly after Bhopal, during a crisis known as the Oleum Gas Leak case, India's Supreme Court

[12] *Rylands v. Fletcher*, (1868) LR 3 HL 330.
[13] The Bhopal Gas Leak Disaster, Dec. 2-3, 1984.

finally drew a line in the sand. Chief Justice P.N. Bhagwati famously declared that India could no longer rely on foreign legal traditions.[14] A rapidly developing nation needed its own homegrown rules to regulate complex and dangerous global industries.

With that, the Supreme Court threw out the old British standard and created a new, zero-tolerance rule: absolute liability.[15]

The concept is incredibly straightforward but legally devastating for polluters. It states that if your business engages in highly hazardous activities, you owe an unbreakable, non-negotiable duty to keep the surrounding community safe. If an accident happens and people get hurt, you have to pay for the damages. Period. There are no loopholes, no blaming natural disasters, and no pointing fingers at saboteurs.

To ensure this new rule actually terrified bad actors into compliance, the judges added one final, crucial twist. They ruled that the financial penalty must be directly tied to how massive and wealthy the parent company is. The goal was to inflict a punishment that served as a genuine financial deterrent, rather than just an annoying, write-off operational cost. For multinational corporations, the message was crystal clear: you can no longer set up a poorly funded, standalone local branch in India just to protect your global billions when things go horribly wrong.

8.2. PIERCING THE CORPORATE VEIL IN TRANSNATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL TORTS:

One of the oldest tricks global companies use to dodge environmental fines is playing the "we are separate companies" game. Historically, standard business law treated a wealthy parent company and its local, operational branch as two entirely different entities. Global giants heavily exploited this rule in developing nations. They would set up local subsidiaries with barely any money or assets to their name. That way, if a massive ecological disaster occurred, the local branch could simply go bankrupt, while the parent company's billions remained perfectly safe from lawsuits.

Indian judges quickly realized that their tough new "absolute liability" rule would be

[14] *Id.* at para. 31 (expressly rejecting the *Rylands* standard).
[15] *Id.* (establishing the doctrine of absolute liability).

completely toothless if foreign companies could just hide behind this legal paperwork. The massive legal battle following the Bhopal disaster kicked off a major shift. The Indian government stepped in on behalf of the victims,[16] arguing that the American parent company, Union Carbide, had to answer directly for the catastrophic failures of its Indian branch. While the final settlement for Bhopal was messy and highly controversial, it paved the way for a new era: Indian courts began actively ripping away this protective corporate shield.

The courts adopted a very practical rationale. They ruled that if a foreign parent company is the one pulling the strings—dictating the technology, designing the factory, and controlling the safety protocols for a highly dangerous local operation—they don't get to pretend they are strangers when something goes wrong. Judges decided that the legal fiction of "separate companies" had to be ignored to deliver true environmental justice.

Today, India's National Green Tribunal (NGT) uses this strategy aggressively. When severe environmental damage occurs, the Tribunal doesn't just look at the local factory on the ground; they follow the money straight up to the ultimate parent company profiting from the mess. Because of this zero-tolerance approach, multinational businesses can no longer treat their Indian branches as isolated "dumping grounds" for risk. If the local Indian branch cuts corners, the global headquarters is on the hook. This reality forces international companies to finally implement their highest global safety standards across all their operations in India.

8.3. THE "YOU BREAK IT, YOU BUY IT" ERA: TWO RULES THAT CHANGED THE GAME:

Beyond just rewriting how liability works, India's Supreme Court also took powerful global environmental ideas and transformed them into strict local laws. In a famous ruling known as the Vellore Citizens case, the judges declared that sustainable development wasn't just a polite suggestion—it was legally binding. To enforce this, they officially wove two major international concepts into the fabric of Indian law: the Polluter Pays Principle and the Precautionary Principle.[17]

The Polluter Pays Principle completely changed the financial reality for heavy industry. It means exactly what it sounds like: if a company causes ecological harm, handing out

[16] Bhopal Gas Leak Disaster (Processing of Claims) Act, 1985.
[17] *Id.* (integrating these principles into domestic law).

compensation checks to victims is no longer enough. The business is also legally required to fund the entire cleanup operation to restore the environment to its original state. For multinational corporations, this was a massive wake-up call. It meant they could no longer treat pollution as a side-effect that the Indian government or taxpayers would eventually have to clean up. If a foreign-owned factory poisons the local groundwater, the company itself must pay the massive, multi-million-dollar remediation bill—a reality that directly threatens their bottom line.

At the same time, the Precautionary Principle completely flipped the script on how environmental disputes are fought in court. In the past, if a community claimed a new factory was dangerous, the burden was on the locals to prove it with undeniable scientific evidence. This "better safe than sorry" rule changes that dynamic. It states that if a project poses a risk of severe or permanent damage to nature, a company cannot use a lack of 100% scientific proof as an excuse to avoid taking safety precautions.

Most importantly, the courts shifted the legal burden of proof onto the corporations themselves.[18] Instead of everyday citizens having to prove that a massive industrial plant is dangerous, the multinational company must now definitively prove that its operations are safe. This legal maneuver forces overseas businesses to be incredibly cautious. Today, foreign investors must conduct rigorous, preventative environmental checks and guarantee safety long before they ever break ground or open a facility in India.

8.4. THE MASSIVE GAP BETWEEN COURT ORDERS AND REALITY:

If you only read the legal textbooks, India appears to have built an unbreakable fortress against corporate polluters. By enforcing "absolute liability" and demanding that polluters pay for their own messes, the courts theoretically created an airtight system of accountability. However, stepping out of the courtroom and looking at the actual operations reveals a massive enforcement crisis. While the country's top judges can issue devastating financial penalties, actually forcing companies to hand over the money and restore the environment is incredibly difficult.

A look at the last decade of rulings shows a clear pattern. When massive global companies are caught illegally mining sand or dumping toxic waste, they rarely just pay the fine. Instead, they

[18] *Id.* (shifting the burden to the industrial unit).

unleash their vast legal teams to play the system. They find clever loopholes in environmental impact reports or argue over technicalities regarding which local board has the right to fine them. Because Indian lawsuits can drag on for years, the immediate terror of a strict penalty completely fades. Rather than changing how they do business, these corporations simply calculate the cost of a ten-year legal battle and bake it into their long-term budgets.

Furthermore, despite the courts' willingness to tear down the corporate shield, foreign parent companies still find ways to hide. They use highly complex contracts and farm out their most dangerous, dirty work to small, obscure local subcontractors. While the fear of bad international PR forces these giants to maintain better baseline safety than local competitors, they still manage to distance themselves from the highest risks. Ultimately, India's powerful environmental laws act more like a heavy punishment after a disaster has already happened, rather than a daily deterrent that keeps communities safe.

8.5. SHOPPING FOR WEAK RULES: THE BREAKING POINT OF LOCAL WATCHDOGS:

The day-to-day enforcement of India's environmental laws exposes a painful contrast between the high-minded goals of top judges and the actual capabilities of local watchdogs. While the Supreme Court issues sweeping mandates demanding perfect safety, the actual job of inspecting factories and monitoring pollution falls to state and central pollution control boards.[19] These agencies are constantly overwhelmed. They are chronically underfunded, lack modern technology, and easily cave to pressure from local politicians.

Multinational corporations are fully aware of these weaknesses, and they actively exploit them by "jurisdiction shopping." They frequently choose to build their most hazardous factories in poorer states that are desperate for foreign investment and jobs. In exchange for bringing money into the local economy, these massive companies leverage their wealth to secure a free pass, operating with almost zero real oversight.

Even India's specialized environmental court, the National Green Tribunal (NGT), hits major roadblocks. While the NGT is designed to move quickly and hand down aggressive penalties, regular High Courts or the Supreme Court routinely hit the pause button on their decisions.[20]

[19] Water (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1974, § 3.
[20] India Const. arts. 136, 226 (appellate jurisdiction applied to NGT rulings).

This creates a tangled, never-ending appeals process. Wealthy foreign companies use this to their advantage, locking environmental disputes in legal limbo for decades. When a massive fine takes fifteen years to actually enforce, it entirely loses its power to scare companies straight. It simply becomes a delayed, predictable business tax that a wealthy parent company can easily swallow. In the end, a global corporation's most effective strategy isn't necessarily preventing pollution—it is simply outlasting the regulators and the victims in a war of legal exhaustion.

8.6. THE TURNING POINT: THE OLEUM GAS LEAK AND THE BIRTH OF ABSOLUTE LIABILITY:

To really grasp why foreign companies face such intense legal pressure in India today, we have to look closely at the Oleum Gas Leak case. In December 1985—just one year after the nightmare in Bhopal—toxic gas escaped from a fertilizer factory in Delhi, causing widespread panic and injuries. Still reeling from the legal chaos surrounding Bhopal, India's Supreme Court saw an urgent need to proactively rewrite the nation's liability laws. The judges realized that relying on a 19th-century British law (originally designed to handle farmers building water reservoirs)[21] was completely useless for a rapidly developing country filled with massive, complex chemical factories.

Chief Justice P.N. Bhagwati didn't just hand down a legal decision; he made a bold economic statement. He ruled that if a business chooses to run a highly dangerous, profitable operation, paying for any resulting public harm is simply a non-negotiable cost of doing business. The court completely threw out the concept of "negligence." This meant a company couldn't defend itself by saying, "We tried our best to be safe," nor could they point the finger at vandals or natural disasters. Crucially, the judges decided that the size of the financial penalty must be tied directly to how rich the company is. For global corporations, this was a terrifying wake-up call: it meant courts could look at the massive bank accounts of their overseas parent companies to calculate fines, permanently changing the financial gamble of operating in India.

8.7. THE BHOPAL DISASTER: THE ULTIMATE LEGAL BATTLE AND A CONTROVERSIAL PAYOUT

The 1984 Bhopal Gas Tragedy remains one of the darkest moments in industrial history, and it

[21] *Rylands v. Fletcher*, (1868) LR 3 HL 330 (pertaining to an escaped water reservoir).

became the ultimate test case for holding global conglomerates accountable. When deadly gas leaked from a local pesticide plant, instantly killing thousands and permanently disabling countless others, the immediate legal nightmare was figuring out where to hold the trial. The Indian government stepped in as the legal protector of the victims and initially tried to sue the American parent company, Union Carbide, in United States courts. However, the corporation successfully argued that the trial belonged in India—a calculated move designed to take advantage of India's historically slower courts and lower financial payouts.

Once the legal battle moved to Indian soil, the Supreme Court found itself in uncharted territory, trying to figure out how to make a foreign headquarters pay for the destruction caused by its local branch. Just as the judges were preparing to aggressively tear away the corporate shield and hold the American executives accountable for their faulty plant design, the case abruptly ended in 1989 with a highly controversial $470 million settlement.[22] Experts and advocates widely agree that this amount was a drop in the bucket compared to what was actually needed for long-term medical care and environmental cleanup.

However, the true legacy of the Bhopal litigation is what happened next. The intense public outrage over the disappointing payout sparked a massive legal revolution. It directly forced the Indian government to pass incredibly tough new regulations—most notably the Environment Protection Act of 1986[23] and the Public Liability Insurance Act of 1991.[24] These laws permanently hardened India's stance, ensuring the country would never again be caught legally defenseless against a foreign industrial giant.

8.8. THE ILLUSION OF PERFECT LAWS VS. THE MESSY REALITY:

On paper, India has built what looks like an inescapable fortress of corporate accountability. By combining a zero-tolerance "absolute liability" rule with the mandate that polluters must pay for their own cleanups, the courts theoretically created a foolproof system. However, when you step outside the courtroom and look at how things actually operate on the ground, a massive enforcement crisis is revealed.

While specialized courts like the National Green Tribunal regularly slap companies with

[22] *Union Carbide Corp. v. Union of India*, 1989 SCC (2) 540.
[23] The Environment (Protection) Act, 1986.
[24] The Public Liability Insurance Act, 1991.

massive fines for illegal emissions or toxic dumping, collecting that money is a totally different story. Global corporations deploy armies of elite lawyers to stall the process. They find technical loopholes in environmental reports or argue endlessly over which local agency has the right to fine them. Because these legal battles drag on for years, the initial shock and fear of a massive penalty completely vanish. Instead of fixing their safety issues, wealthy businesses simply budget for a decade of legal fees and treat it as a standard operating expense.

Furthermore, even though judges have the power to hunt down the global parent company, these massive conglomerates still find ways to hide. They hide behind labyrinth-like contracts and quietly outsource the dirtiest, most dangerous parts of their manufacturing to small, under-the-radar local contractors. Because of this, India's powerful constitutional rules end up acting more like a heavy tax paid after a tragedy occurs, rather than a daily shield that prevents disasters from happening in the first place.

8.9. FINDING THE WEAKEST LINK: HOW COMPANIES GAME THE SYSTEM:

There is a glaring disconnect between the ambitious demands of India's top judges and the reality of the people whose job it is to enforce them. The Supreme Court can issue all the strict mandates it wants, but the actual day-to-day policing falls to state and federal pollution control boards. These local watchdog agencies are notoriously underfunded, lack modern technical equipment, and are highly vulnerable to pressure from local politicians.

Multinational corporations know exactly how to exploit these weaknesses. They actively practice "jurisdiction shopping"—meaning they specifically look to build their most hazardous factories in poorer states that are desperate for foreign cash and jobs. By dangling the promise of massive investments, these global giants can essentially strong-arm local governments into turning a blind eye to environmental hazards.

Even the National Green Tribunal, which was specifically designed to cut through red tape, gets bogged down. Its fast-tracked rulings are constantly paused by regular High Courts or the Supreme Court. Wealthy foreign businesses weaponize this multi-layered legal system to trap environmental disputes in a never-ending cycle of appeals. When it takes over a decade to actually force a company to pay a fine, the punishment loses all its power to deter bad behavior. It just becomes a delayed bill that a wealthy corporation can easily afford to pay later. Ultimately, the main survival strategy for global polluters isn't to operate cleanly—it's simply

to outspend and outlast the local regulators and victims in court.

8.10. THE VELLORE CASE: FIGHTING SLOW POISON AND FLIPPING THE SCRIPT:

While the Bhopal disaster was a sudden, catastrophic explosion, the Vellore Citizens case tackled a very different kind of nightmare: the slow, daily poisoning of the environment. In Tamil Nadu, hundreds of leather tanneries were steadily dumping raw, untreated chemical waste directly into the surroundings. Over time, this daily discharge ruined massive stretches of agricultural land and severely contaminated the Palar River.

The Supreme Court used this crisis to firmly plant the idea of "Sustainable Development" into Indian law. By doing so, the judges shattered the old, convenient excuse that destroying nature is just the inevitable price of economic growth. But the biggest shockwave from this case came when the Court adopted the "Precautionary Principle," which completely flipped the legal rules on who has to prove what in a courtroom.

In the past, if a local village or a struggling government agency claimed a factory was toxic, the burden was entirely on them to provide ironclad scientific proof. The Vellore ruling changed that dynamic overnight. Today, if a company's operations even look like they might pose a risk to the environment, the burden of proof falls entirely on the business. The corporation itself must scientifically prove that its actions are completely harmless. For global manufacturing companies, this created a new reality: they can no longer fly under the radar. They are legally forced to constantly test, audit, and prove their own safety on a daily basis.

Finally, the judges hammered home the "Polluter Pays" rule. They didn't just slap the tanneries with a basic penalty fee. Instead, the courts ordered the companies to completely fund the massive ecological cleanup required to bring the Palar River basin back to life. This set a terrifying precedent for bad actors: restoring the environment is no longer just a nice public relations move; it is an unavoidable, legally binding debt.

9. MECHANISMS OF REGULATORY ARBITRAGE AND CORPORATE EVASION:

9.1. EXPLOITING ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT (EIA) LOOPHOLES:

Despite the formidable judicial framework, Multinational Corporations often utilize the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process as a tool for regulatory arbitrage. The EIA Notification under the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986, categorizes industries based on their pollution potential and mandates prior environmental clearance.[25] However, foreign corporations frequently employ highly paid environmental consultancies to produce "copy-paste" or severely obfuscated EIA reports. By artificially compartmentalizing a massive industrial project into smaller, distinct phases, corporations often manage to downgrade their project category, thereby bypassing the mandatory public consultation processes required for high-impact industries.

Furthermore, post-clearance compliance monitoring is notoriously weak. MNCs often submit self-certified, bi-annual compliance reports to the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change (MoEFCC), which lacks the manpower to physically verify these claims on the ground.[26] This reliance on corporate self-reporting creates a massive blind spot, allowing foreign entities to maintain a façade of paper compliance while continuing ground-level ecological degradation until a catastrophic event triggers judicial scrutiny.

9.2. THE SHIELD OF SUB-CONTRACTING AND SUPPLY CHAIN OBFUSCATION:

To insulate the parent brand and its primary subsidiaries from absolute liability, MNCs operating in India increasingly rely on deep, opaque supply chains. Instead of directly establishing manufacturing units for highly polluting processes (such as chemical dyeing, battery recycling, or e-waste processing), foreign parent companies contract these tasks to domestic, unorganized, or small-scale Indian vendors. Because these local vendors operate in the informal sector or lack the capital to install expensive effluent treatment plants, they are responsible for severe environmental violations.

When regulatory bodies or the National Green Tribunal penalize these operations, the legal liability falls entirely on the local vendor, who often declares bankruptcy, resulting in zero ecological remediation. The foreign MNC, which ultimately profits from the low cost of this sub-contracted labor, remains legally insulated because the strict tenets of contract law separate them from the vendor's tortious acts. This dynamic reveals a critical flaw in the current

[25] Environment Impact Assessment Notification, 2006.
[26] Comptroller and Auditor General of India, *Report on Environmental Clearance and Post Clearance Monitoring* (2017).

jurisprudence: while courts are willing to pierce the corporate veil between a parent and a direct subsidiary, they struggle to assign extended producer responsibility (EPR) across a complex, deliberately fragmented transnational supply chain.

CONCLUSION:

India's courts and its Constitution have completely rewritten the playbook for how companies are held responsible for ecological damage. Ditching the outdated, excuse-friendly "strict liability" rule in favor of an uncompromising "absolute liability" standard was a historic moment for global environmental law. Following the horrors of Bhopal and the Oleum gas leaks, judges made it clear: vulnerable, rapidly growing nations need tough rules that give massive corporations zero room to hide. By taking international concepts—like making the polluter pay and prioritizing precaution—and turning them into strict local mandates, India transformed vague green ideals into hard-and-fast rules that global companies must follow.

Yet, a closer look at how this actually works reveals a massive, frustrating contradiction. In theory, India's legal system is a polluter's worst nightmare, giving judges the power to tear down corporate shields and demand limitless payouts from the deep pockets of wealthy parent companies. In reality, however, foreign firms easily sidestep these consequences. They are protected by painfully slow legal procedures, underfunded and overwhelmed pollution control boards, and their own clever legal maneuvering. Global businesses still rely on complicated corporate webs, poorly funded local branches, and endless court appeals to delay or shrink their penalties.

Ultimately, the constitutional promise of a clean, safe environment is constantly broken by how long it takes to actually enforce the rules. Until the legal system can execute these laws as fiercely as they are written, "absolute liability" will just be a way to punish companies after a tragedy occurs, rather than a tool to prevent disasters from happening in the first place. India doesn't need to invent new legal theories. Instead, it desperately needs to fix its broken enforcement system to ensure that wealthy foreign corporations can no longer outsmart the country's environmental safety nets.

REFERENCES

Table of Cases

- *M.C. Mehta v. Kamal Nath*, (1997) 1 SCC 388. *(Included for the Public Trust Doctrine mentioned in your Abstract).*
- *M.C. Mehta v. Union of India* (Oleum Gas Leak), AIR 1987 SC 1086.
- *M.K. Ranjitsinh v. Union of India*, 2024 SCC OnLine SC 805.
- *Rylands v. Fletcher*, (1868) LR 3 HL 330.
- *Salomon v. A. Salomon & Co. Ltd.*, [1897] AC 22.
- *Subhash Kumar v. State of Bihar*, AIR 1991 SC 420.
- *Union Carbide Corp. v. Union of India*, (1989) 2 SCC 540.
- *Vellore Citizens Welfare Forum v. Union of India*, AIR 1996 SC 2715.

Constitutional & Legislative Enactments

- The Constitution of India, 1950 (Arts. 21, 32, 48A, 51A(g), 136, 226).
- Bhopal Gas Leak Disaster (Processing of Claims) Act, 1985.
- Companies Act, 2013 (§ 135).
- The Environment (Protection) Act, 1986.
- The National Green Tribunal Act, 2010 (§ 20).
- The Public Liability Insurance Act, 1991.
- Water (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1974 (§ 3).
- Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA), 42 U.S.C. § 9601 *et seq.* (United States). *(Included for the comparative*

framework mentioned in your Limitations).

Rules, Notifications & Administrative Orders

- Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change (MoEFCC), *Environment Impact Assessment Notification*, 2006.

- Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change (MoEFCC), *E-Waste (Management) Rules*, 2022.

Books, Reports & Secondary Sources

- Baxi, Upendra. *Inconvenient Forum and Convenient Catastrophe: The Bhopal Case*. Bombay: N.M. Tripathi, 1986.

- Comptroller and Auditor General of India. *Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India on Environmental Clearance and Post Clearance Monitoring*, Report No. 39 of 2017.