



Balancing Tribal Rights and Biodiversity Conservation: A Critical Legal Analysis of the Forest Rights Act, 2006

Dr. Kamal Kishore

Assistant professor, Law college Dhanbad, Dhanbad, Jharkhand

Abstract

The Forest Rights Act, 2006 represents one of the most consequential legislative interventions in post-independence India — an explicit statutory admission that the Indian State, across more than a century of colonial and post-colonial forest governance, systematically dispossessed tribal and forest-dwelling communities of rights they had held since before the law itself existed. This paper examines the Act's central provisions — Sections 3 and 4 — through the dual lens of rights jurisprudence and conservation law, arguing that the tension between tribal community rights and ecological protection is not an irresolvable conflict but a contest between two governance paradigms, one of which the empirical evidence has substantially discredited. The paper traces the historical trajectory of forest dispossession from the Indian Forest Act of 1927 through the Wildlife Protection Act of 1972 and the Forest Conservation Act of 1980, situating FRA as a remedial statute grounded in Articles 21, 14, and 46 of the Constitution and the Fifth Schedule's special protections for Scheduled Areas. It analyses Section 3's tripartite rights architecture — individual forest rights, Community Forest Resource rights, and habitat rights of Particularly Vulnerable Tribal Groups — with particular attention to the recognition theory that distinguishes FRA from conventional grant-based tenure legislation and its implications for the burden of proof in claim adjudication. Section 4's procedural safeguards, including the absolute bar on eviction under Section 4(2) and the five-condition framework for resettlement from Critical Wildlife Habitats under Section (4)4, are examined both as legal instruments and as sites of institutional contestation. The paper undertakes a critical legal analysis of landmark judicial decisions — *Banwasi Seva Ashram* (1986), *Samata* (1997), *Orissa Mining Corporation v. MoEF* (2013), and *Wildlife First* (2019) — evaluating their doctrinal contributions and limitations. It identifies four unresolved tensions in FRA jurisprudence: the burden of proof for unrecorded customary rights, the overriding scope of Section 13 against conservation statutes, the legal validity of Critical Wildlife Habitat notifications made without completing the FRA process, and the extent of gram sabha authority over Forest Department management in Community Forest Resource areas. Implementation failures — mass rejections without reasons, Forest Department institutional resistance, gram sabha capacity deficits, and gender exclusion — are analysed as structural rather than incidental problems, reflecting the political economy of a bureaucratic order reluctant to surrender governance authority.

Keywords: Forest Rights Act 2006, tribal rights, community forest resources, Section 3, Section 4, gram sabha, conservation law, Wildlife Protection Act, Critical Wildlife Habitat, recognition theory, forest jurisprudence, Niyamgiri, indigenous tenure.

Introduction

Historical Injustice Against Forest-Dwelling Communities

To understand the Forest Rights Act, one must first sit with an uncomfortable truth: independent India, for six decades after 1947, continued a colonial crime. It did so not through malice alone, but through the quieter violence of institutional inertia — of laws left unreformed, of rights left unrecorded, of people left without names in the ledgers that determined whose land was whose.

For generations before the British arrived, tribal and forest-dwelling communities across India did not merely live in forests — they were forests, in the sense that their identity, economy, spirituality, and governance were inseparable from the ecosystems they inhabited. They managed biodiversity through seasonal rotation, maintained sacred groves, regulated hunting through customary law, and passed down ecological knowledge through oral tradition. Their tenure over forest land was not the ownership of a title deed — it was the deeper ownership of belonging, of stewardship across time.

The Indian Forest Act of 1927 could not see this. It was not designed to. Colonial forest law vested sovereign ownership of forests in the State and required a "settlement process" — survey, recording, compensation — before declaring Reserved Forests. In practice, this process was almost never completed. Communities without documents, lawyers, or political influence found their rights simply absent from the record. Occupation that had persisted for centuries became, by administrative default, encroachment. The forest-dweller became a criminal in the land their grandparents had tended.

What is genuinely disturbing is what happened after independence. Rather than dismantling this architecture, the post-colonial State extended it. The Wildlife Protection Act of 1972 carved out inviolate protected areas from which human beings were excluded as a matter of ecological principle. The Forest Conservation Act of 1980 imposed centralised Union Government control over all forest land use. Operation-level forest department orders through the 1980s and 1990s directed mass evictions with the quiet efficiency of bureaucracies that know they will not be held accountable. By 2004, the Ministry of Tribal Affairs had itself conceded that one to two million families had been evicted from forests without legal process, compensation, or any alternative means of survival.

The Need for the Forest Rights Act

Courts had noticed. In *Banwasi Seva Ashram v. State of Uttar Pradesh* (1986) and *Samata v. State of Andhra Pradesh* (1997), the Supreme Court recognised that customary rights of forest communities survive forest notifications and carry constitutional protection. But judicial recognition without institutional machinery is like a map without roads — it tells you where to go without giving you any means of getting there. What India needed was not another court pronouncement but a statute with teeth: one that vested rights, created a process for adjudicating them, and forced the State to act.

The Forest Rights Act, 2006 — formally the Scheduled Tribes and Other Traditional Forest Dwellers (Recognition of Forest Rights) Act — was that statute. Its Preamble does something remarkable in Indian legislative drafting: it admits wrongdoing. It acknowledges

"the historical injustice done to the forest-dwelling Scheduled Tribes and other traditional forest dwellers who are integral to the very survival and sustainability of the forest ecosystem." This admission is not rhetorical decoration — it is legally significant, because it frames the Act as remedial legislation, which courts must interpret generously in favour of the intended beneficiaries.

Most importantly, the Act does not create rights — it recognises pre-existing rights that colonial and post-colonial law had merely failed to record. This distinction — between recognition and grant — is the single most important legal idea in the entire statute. A granted right can be refused on policy grounds. A recognised right can only be denied on evidentiary grounds — the State must show the right does not exist, not merely that it is inconvenient to acknowledge it. This recognition theory has become, as we shall see, the central battleground of FRA jurisprudence.

Legal Framework: Constitutional Basis and Statutory Architecture

The Forest Rights Act does not stand alone. It is embedded in a constitutional framework that, read carefully, makes tribal rights not just statutory entitlements but fundamental and directive obligations of the State. Article 14 prohibits arbitrary denial of rights held by custom — and what is more arbitrary than denying rights simply because the colonial administration never bothered to write them down? Article 21's right to life, as the Supreme Court has expansively read it, includes the right to livelihood and protection against arbitrary displacement from one's home. For a community whose livelihood is the forest and whose home is the forest edge, these are not abstract constitutional principles — they are existential protections.

Article 46 places an affirmative duty on the State to promote the educational and economic interests of Scheduled Tribes and protect them from social injustice and exploitation. The Fifth and Sixth Schedules, together with PESA of 1996, create a special constitutional regime for tribal areas that pre-figures FRA's gram sabha primacy — recognising, at the constitutional level, that tribal communities must be the governors of their own affairs and not merely the objects of State welfare.

The Act's architecture is straightforward but powerful. Section 2 defines its scope broadly — "forest land" includes unclassified and undemarcated forests, deemed forests, and revenue forests, a definition far wider than the Forest Department's preferred narrow reading. The cut-off date is December 13, 2005 — communities must have been residing and dependent on forest land before this date. The Forest Rights Rules of 2008, amended in 2012, prescribe the evidence admissible to prove occupation, the composition of the three-tier adjudicative structure — Forest Rights Committee at village level, Sub-Divisional Level Committee, and District Level Committee — and the form of title to be issued. The machinery is there. The question, always, is whether it is operated honestly.

Section 3 Analysis: The Architecture of Rights

If the Preamble is FRA's conscience, Section 3 is its spine. It enumerates the rights being recognised with a comprehensiveness that, had it been fully implemented, would have

transformed the relationship between the Indian State and its forest-dwelling citizens more thoroughly than perhaps any legislation since land reform.

Section (1)3(a) recognises the right to live in and cultivate forest land for bona fide livelihood needs. The Forest Rights Rules impose a four-hectare cap on new recognition — but here is a significant doctrinal problem: the Act itself contains no such cap. The Rules are sub-statutory instruments; they cannot restrict what the Act does not restrict. Several High Courts have held that pre-existing occupation of areas exceeding four hectares must be recognised in full, since a Rule cannot amend a statute. This question has not received a definitive Supreme Court answer and remains one of the most important outstanding issues in FRA law.

Section(1)3(c) recognises ownership over Minor Forest Produce — bamboo, tendu leaves, mahua, medicinal herbs, resins — products that constitute between twenty and forty per cent of annual income for forest-dependent families across central India. Before FRA, forest departments controlled MFP collection through monopoly marketing arrangements that systematically extracted below-market prices from tribal collectors. The recognition of MFP ownership rights struck directly at this extraction.

Section (1)3(f) — perhaps the most transformative provision in the entire Act — recognises the right to protect, regenerate, conserve, and manage Community Forest Resources. When CFR rights vest in a gram sabha, the community acquires quasi-ownership authority over the entire customarily used forest landscape within its traditional boundaries, displacing — not merely supplementing — the Forest Department's management authority. Full implementation of this provision alone could place over 170 million hectares under community governance. That it has not done so tells us everything about the gap between law and political will.

Section 3(1)(e) recognises the rights of Particularly Vulnerable Tribal Groups to their "habitat" — not a plot, not a parcel, but an entire ecosystem. The Supreme Court in the Niyamgiri case read this to include the cultural, spiritual, and religious dimensions of the habitat relationship, recognising that for communities like the Dongria Kondh, the mountain is not just land — it is deity, ancestor, and identity. This reading brought Indian domestic law into meaningful alignment with international indigenous rights norms, without India having to formally subscribe to any international instrument.

Section 4 Analysis: Safeguards Against Eviction

Section 4 is where FRA goes from aspiration to protection — it builds around the rights in Section 3 a set of procedural and substantive walls that make lawful eviction genuinely difficult.

Section 4(1) vests recognised rights in perpetuity, free from encumbrances, alienable only by inheritance. A title under FRA is not a licence that the State can revoke — it is a permanent recognition of tenure.

Section 4(2) is the provision that has generated the most litigation and the most abuse: no forest-dwelling community member shall be evicted until the recognition and verification process is complete. This is an absolute bar. Its plain language is unambiguous. And yet, states across India have evicted families during pending proceedings, rejected claims in bulk without process, and treated the Section (2) bar as an inconvenient administrative obstacle

rather than a mandatory legal protection. The Wildlife First litigation of 2019 brought this abuse to a national crisis point — an eviction order covering 11.8 lakh families was passed by the Supreme Court itself, only to be stayed when the government admitted that the very rejection process that supposedly justified those evictions had been conducted in wholesale violation of the Act's requirements.

Section 4(4) is the Act's most carefully thought-through provision — a five-condition test for relocation from Critical Wildlife Habitats that makes forced displacement almost legally impossible when properly applied. All five conditions are cumulative: the FRA process must be complete; the community must be shown to directly affect the critical habitat; rehabilitation facilities must be in place before displacement; free and informed gram sabha consent must be obtained; and no coexistence alternative must exist. The provision represents a direct legislative rejection of the administrative practice of displacing communities from wildlife areas as a routine conservation measure. It says, plainly: you may not move these people unless you have exhausted every alternative and obtained their genuine agreement.

The gram sabha's role under Section 6 ties the entire structure together. By making the gram sabha the primary adjudicative authority — whose resolutions can be modified only for recorded procedural reasons — the Act places the community at the centre of its own recognition. This is not merely procedural democracy. It is a recognition that the people best placed to know what rights exist over a particular forest are the people who have lived with and in that forest for generations.

Conflict with Conservation Laws

The Forest Rights Act was always going to collide with conservation law — not because their ultimate goals are different, but because their institutional assumptions are diametrically opposed. Conservation law assumes that the State, through its technical agencies, is the appropriate guardian of ecological resources. FRA assumes that communities are. This is not merely a policy disagreement — it is a contest over governance authority, and governance authority is never surrendered without a fight.

The tension with the Wildlife Protection Act is the sharpest. WPA Section (8)35 prohibits the acquisition of rights in National Parks after notification — yet FRA's recognition of pre-existing rights directly contradicts this where communities were present before December 13 2005. Courts have generally held that rights recognised under FRA survive WPA notification, but have avoided declaring the full overriding effect of Section 13 in protected area contexts, leaving a zone of legal ambiguity that Forest Departments routinely exploit.

With the Forest Conservation Act, the problem is more insidious. FCA requires Union Government approval for any "non-forest use" of forest land. Forest Departments have used this provision to demand FCA clearance even for activities — cultivating a recognised plot, building a house — that are the direct exercise of vested FRA rights. The logical answer, that an activity within the scope of a vested right is not a "diversion" requiring clearance, has not been consistently adopted by courts. The result is a legal paradox: a community holds a recognised right to cultivate, but must seek government permission to exercise it.

Beneath these legal disputes lies a philosophical question with a now-established empirical answer. The fortress conservation model insists people must be removed

from forests for nature to survive. Community-based conservation research — including landmark studies from Gadchiroli in Maharashtra and Rayagada in Odisha — shows that forests under community governance consistently outperform state-managed forests on regeneration, fire control, and biodiversity indicators. The legal battle over FRA is, in part, a battle over whether Indian conservation policy will follow the evidence or cling to a colonial model that the evidence has discredited.

Critical Legal Analysis of Case Laws

The judicial history of FRA is a story of three things: hard-won recognition, near-catastrophic reversal, and important questions still awaiting answers. Banwasi Seva Ashram (1986) established the principle that later became FRA's philosophical core — that customary rights exist independently of their recording, and the State cannot extinguish them merely by omitting to write them down. Samata (1997) constitutionalised this principle, anchoring tribal land rights in Article 21 and making the Fifth Schedule's protections affirmative rather than merely declaratory.

Niyamgiri — Orissa Mining Corporation v. Ministry of Environment and Forest (2013) — is the Act's finest judicial hour. When Vedanta sought to mine bauxite from the sacred hills of the Dongria Kondh, the Supreme Court held that the gram sabha's determination of project impact on community forest rights is an unreviewable substantive veto. No ministry, no court, no technical committee may substitute its judgment for the community's. The twelve gram sabhas that were convened each said no, unanimously. The mountain stayed. The case demonstrated, more powerfully than any academic argument could, that the gram sabha mechanism — when actually used — is a genuine instrument of democratic self-determination.

The Wildlife First order of 2019 was, by contrast, a near-catastrophe. A PIL by conservationists produced a Supreme Court direction to evict 11.8 lakh families with rejected claims. The order violated Section 4(2)'s unambiguous eviction bar, denied hearing to the affected families in breach of the most elementary principles of natural justice, and ignored the Union Government's own concession that rejection orders had been passed en masse without reasons, without gram sabha verification, and without any individual examination of claims. It was stayed, and states were directed to reprocess claims — but only after the government intervened. The case teaches a sobering lesson: the Supreme Court is not, by institutional nature, immune to the conservationist narrative that frames tribal communities as threats to wildlife. Vigilance in PIL proceedings affecting FRA rights is essential.

The Godavarman litigation created a further structural problem — a court-created Central Empowered Committee with no statutory basis has repeatedly recommended against FRA claims in wildlife corridors, bypassing the Act's prescribed process. Since FRA creates the exclusive statutory procedure for adjudicating forest rights, no judicially created body can substitute for it. This point has been argued before courts but not definitively resolved.

The deepest unresolved doctrinal problem running through all of these cases is the burden of proof. FRA recognises pre-existing rights. Pre-existing rights, by definition, were never documented. To require documentary proof of an unrecorded customary right is to demand the impossible — and to use that impossibility as grounds for rejection is to perpetuate the very injustice the Act was designed to remedy. The ultimate burden should lie with the State,

which must rebut demonstrated evidence of customary occupation. District Level Committees that mechanically reject claims for insufficient documentation are not applying FRA — they are undoing it.

Implementation Challenges

If implementation of FRA were a patient, the diagnosis would be chronic, not acute — a slow, sustained failure of institutional will rather than a single dramatic collapse. Approximately 44 lakh claims have been filed nationally. Around 23–24 lakh titles have been issued — barely over fifty per cent. CFR titles have reached only about 70,000 communities out of a potential 1.7 lakh eligible. In states where rejection rates historically exceeded sixty per cent, most orders contain no reasons — a bureaucratic shorthand that is both legally invalid and deeply revealing of intent.

The Forest Department's resistance is structural, not incidental. When CFR rights vest in gram sabhas, the Department loses jurisdictional authority, revenue from MFP, and influence over forest-adjacent economic activity. These are not small losses — they represent the erosion of an institutional empire built over a century and a half. The Department's obstruction takes many forms: inventing documentary requirements the Rules do not prescribe, treating its own objections as determinative at SDLC hearings, scheduling gram sabha meetings without notifying affected communities. None of this is accidental.

The gram sabha's institutional fragility is the Act's Achilles heel. The law places enormous responsibility on village-level bodies without providing them resources, training, or legal support. The expectation that a gram sabha in a remote Bastar village can independently survey forest boundaries, compile occupancy evidence, and navigate a three-tier adjudicative process against an adversarial Forest Department is, without support, unrealistic. Gender exclusion deepens these failures — titles in male names, women absent from deliberations, the Act's joint-titling mandate honoured in form and ignored in substance.

Critical Analysis

FRA is, as legislation, genuinely sophisticated. The recognition theory elegantly avoids creating legal conflict with prior statutes. The gram sabha mechanism is democratically innovative. The five-condition test in Section 4(4) is more analytically rigorous than most statutory balancing frameworks. These are real achievements in legal drafting.

But the Act has a structural vulnerability: it decentralises power without decentralising capacity. The gram sabha is powerful on paper and fragile in practice. Section 13 should provide clear legal hierarchy over conservation statutes, but courts have been reluctant to enforce it fully — a reluctance that reflects not legal analysis but judicial deference to the conservation establishment. The "paper rights" problem is real and important: a title that cannot be exercised without departmental permission, that cannot secure institutional credit, and that does not break the MFP intermediary chain is a legal recognition without material consequence. FRA created the rights. It did not create the institutional ecosystem — legal aid, credit access, market linkages, departmental accountability — that would make those rights economically alive.

Conclusion

The Forest Rights Act, 2006 is a statute with an honest Preamble and an ambitious architecture — and an implementation record that has not yet honoured either. Sections 3 and 4, read together, offer something genuinely rare in Indian law: a coherent, rights-based framework that treats forest-dwelling communities as subjects of constitutional dignity rather than objects of administrative management. The gram sabha is placed at the centre not as a token of participation but as the primary governance institution. The recognition theory treats the State as a debtor, not a benefactor. The five-condition resettlement test demands justification, not just notification.

The conflict with conservation law is, at its heart, a conflict the evidence has already resolved — community tenure works better than fortress exclusion. The courts that have understood this, particularly in Niyamgiri, have produced decisions that will outlast the cases that generated them. The courts that have not, as in the initial Wildlife First order, have come perilously close to undoing in an afternoon what Parliament spent decades building.

The unresolved questions — burden of proof, the full reach of Section 13, the legal status of CWHs notified without completing the FRA process, the extent of gram sabha authority over Forest Department management — will eventually reach the Supreme Court for definitive answers. What those answers look like will matter enormously, not just for the communities waiting for titles but for India's constitutional self-understanding. The question FRA ultimately asks is simple: does India believe that the people who have lived in and with its forests for generations are its stewards, or its trespassers? The law has given its answer. The institutions have not yet caught up.

References

- Forest Rights Act, 2006
- Forest Rights Rules, 2008 (amended 2012)
- Wildlife Protection Act, 1972
- Forest Conservation Act, 1980
- PESA, 1996
- Banwasi Seva Ashram v. State of UP, (1986) 4 SCC 753
- Samata v. State of AP, AIR 1997 SC 3297
- T.N. Godavarman v. Union of India, (1997) 2 SCC 267
- Orissa Mining Corporation v. MoEF, (2013) 6 SCC 476
- Wildlife First v. MoEF, W.P.(C) 109/2008 (SC, 2019)
- Chhatre & Agrawal, Trade-offs and synergies between carbon storage and livelihood benefits, PNAS, 2009
- Ministry of Tribal Affairs, FRA Implementation Reports, 2019–2023