

Firecracker Ban in NCR

Why in news?

 $n\n$

Supreme Court recently reinstated the 2016 temproary ban on the sale of fireworks in Delhi-NCR

 $n\n$

What are the criticisims against the judgment?

 $n\n$

\n

• Judicial overreach - SC's judgment was driven primarily by concerns around air quality.

\n

- But it is to be noted that matters concerning policy and its implementation are best left to the legislature & executive.
- \bullet The courts should ideally be stepping in only when there is neglect. $\mbox{\ensuremath{\backslash}} n$
- As the governments are already working to stop polluting practices, SC's intervention is seen as a problematic overstep.
- **Previous experience** The 2015 verdict that banned stubble burning in Punjab has proven ineffective.
- \bullet The governments concerned still stumble to implement the same due to their inability to get farmers on board. \n
- Only alternative approaches like making stubble itself a renumerative commodity have contributed to reduced burning, not the ban.
- **Rationality** Much bigger factors like vehicular pollution, industries and unpaved roads factors contribute more to the disastrous air quality of Delhi.
- So the focus on fireworks alone seems disproportionate.

What could be fallouts of the ban?

 $n\$

\n

 An outright ban may alienate people who are in the mood for a good celebration.

\n

- \bullet Coming just 10 days before the festival, it will be tough to impose the ban on an industry that has already produced stocks. \n
- This might drive sales in black markets at inflated prices.
- \bullet The ban will also harm the livelihoods of numerous people involved in the fire-cracker supply chain. $\ensuremath{\backslash} n$

 $n\n$

What could be the way forward?

 $n\n$

\n

• Instead of ban, there should be a persuasive approach to give up the practise.

۱n

- Holistic solutuions that backed by sustained policy initiatives are needed to address multi-dimensional issues like pollution.
- \bullet Innovative ideas bagged by vigourous campaigns are needed to help people shift to eco-friendly ways. $\mbox{\sc h}$

\n\n

SC's previous views on cracker ban

 $n\n$

\n

- 2015 Verdict A case seeking ban crackers throughout India was filed.
- It highlighted the health hazards & environmental impact of crackers.
- \bullet But SC categorically refused to ban people from bursting firecrackers.
- The court felt that it might be "dangerous" to infringe into the common man's right to enjoy his religious festivities.

\n

- 2016 verdict The 2016 case sought a cracker ban specific to Delhi NCR. $\ensuremath{^{\backslash n}}$
- \bullet The court imposed a ban in the wake of increased particulate matter concentration in the lower atmosphere above Delhi. $\mbox{\sc h}$

 $n\n$

 $n\n$

Source: Indian Express, The Hindu

\n

