

By Email

No.F-6.-1253/FC/For-2020/ 1368

Government of Tripura
Office of the Principal Chief Conservator of Forest
Tripura : Agartala

Dated:- Agartala. the 30th December, 2020

To
The Deputy Director General Forests (Central)
Ministry of Environment, Forest & Climate Change
North Eastern Regional Office, Law-U-Sib,
Lumbatngen, Near M.T.C Workshop,
Shillong-793021

Subject: - 1) Four (4) Proposals for diversion of forest land for settlement of Bru Migrants in
-regarding.


Ref:- 1) Your letter No.F.3-TR C 062/2020-SHI/2806-07 dated 11/12/2020.
2) Your letter No.F.3-TR C 064/2020-SHI/2876-77 dated 16/12/2020.

Sir,

With reference to the letter cited on the subject mentioned above enclosed herewith is the copy of the response from the Secretary to Govt. of Tripura, Department of Revenue regarding the issues raised in your above mentioned letters.

In view of the above I would request you to arrange to convey the approval against the above noted projects.

Yours faithfully


30/12/20
[A. Shukla,]

Chief Conservator of Forests,
& Nodal Officer, FCA

Copy to:-

Relevant files of Bru Migrants of FC section.


30/12/20

Chief Conservator of Forests,
& Nodal Officer, FCA

No.F.11(2)/RR&DM/Reang/2020(P-I)
Government of Tripura
Revenue (RR&DM) Department
Tripura :Agartala.

Dated, Agartala, the 24th December, 2020.

To
The Deputy Inspector General of Forest (C)
Regional Office Ministry of Forest & Environment & CC,
Government of India,
Shillong, Meghalaya.

Reference: 1. Letter to REC vide No.F.1(1)/Secy/Rev/Bru/2020/277-280 dated 02.11.2020
2. Letter to MHA vide D.O.No.F.11(2)/RR&DM/Reang/2020/(P-I) dated 03.12.2020
3. Letter from Mizoram Government dated 04.12.2020
4. Letter from AIGF (MoEF) dated 21.12.2020

Sub: 4 Diversion proposals submitted for Bru Resettlement

Sir,

In reference to your letter vide F.No. 3-TR C 064/2020-SHI 2876-77 dated 16.12.2020 and vide F.No. 3-TR C 062/2020-SHI 2806-07 dated 11.12.2020 and clarifications required regarding 4 locations proposed for forest diversion for Bru-Reang settlement in Tripura, the point wise clarifications have been given. However, I would like to reiterate that the similar and more detailed justifications were sent earlier as well to MOEF through MHA and to REC vide letters given in reference (also enclosed). It is requested that the clarifications below may be read with the clarifications that were given earlier as well.

1) State Govt to furnish further justification on the effort that was put into finding revenue land by the State Govt. so as to make strong justification case for diversion as required :-

There is no other suitable land in non-forest area where they can be settled in Tripura besides 1 revenue land that has been identified in Unakoti district. Tripura has over 70% area notified as forest and it is worth to point out that on scrutiny of the land bank, it has been observed that there is no land measuring area of 10 hectares or above in a contiguous patch wherein 300 nos. families can be settled. The revenue lands which are available are situated in scattered areas in small discontinuous patches. It would be uneconomical to use such patchy lands for settlement since the requirement for fund for infrastructure development would also



settlement in the forest land.


The state government has prepared the proposals with utmost sincerity & care giving compliance to the rules under the Forest (Conservation) Act. Due diligence has been done to ensure that only after confirming that no other suitable revenue land is available, the proposed forest parcels were identified. Moreover, only minimum land required for dwelling and common infrastructure has been proposed for diversion.

These locations for resettlements have been finalized after multiple rounds of consultations with different stake holders, particularly representatives of Bru refugees. Bru refugees, being primitive tribal group, are by nature forest dwellers. Their culture, life style and livelihood are traditionally forest dependent. They always prefer to stay in forest land where they are accustomed and comfortable. Therefore, while selection of any place for settlement, cultural similarity with the existing inhabitants in neighboring habitations were considered to avoid any future displacement on account of conflict between different ethnic groups.

2) The State Govt to provide a note on the admissibility of this proposal based on para 1.15 of the comprehensive guidelines of F(C) Act.1980 as discussed in REC.

During the REC meeting the para regarding 1.16 which states that "*such diversion may be considered as a special case, if diversion of forest land is essentially required for the rehabilitation of persons belonging to Scheduled Tribes, Scheduled Castes and other people who may have to be shifted from the core zone of a national park, sanctuary or reserve*" was discussed threadbare and it was informed that the the instant proposals were eligible under the clause given that Mizoram Government was confirmed that Bru-Reangs were earlier occupying various Forest Reserve areas including Dampa Tiger Reserve in Mizoram before they were driven out due to ethnic clashes. Letter from Mizoram Government is enclosed. In this fresh perspective, the proposals must be considered again withing the purview of 1.16.

However even under para 1.15 non linear projects may be allowed if "*justification for locating the project in the forest area giving details of the alternatives examined and reasons for their rejection has to be furnished*" and "*justification for locating the project in the forest area giving details of the alternatives examined and reasons for their rejection has to be furnished*" and "*the State Government has scrutinized the alternatives in more details and must give complete justification establishing its inescapability for locating the project in forest area*". The proposal may, therefore, please be considered given the justification provided in support of non availability of Revenue land in contiguous stretches that would be suitable for



such resettlement. Other points like humanitarian and historical perspectives may also be considered.

In the background of delay in the diversion process, the Secretary, MHA has recently conducted a meeting on 15.12.2020 with DG, Forests, MoEF to review the progress of diversion proposals. Subsequently, a letter has been written on 21.12.2020 by AIGF (MoEF) to REC to communicate the decision to consider these proposals for Bru resettlement as a special case in relaxation of existing guidelines if required as the agreement has to be implemented in a time bound manner.

In the above light it is ardently requested again to kindly expedite the process of diversion of all 13 proposals submitted to REC.

Encls: As stated.

Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Tanusree Deb Barma', is written over a horizontal line. To the right of the signature, the date '24/12/20' is handwritten.

(Tanusree Deb Barma, IAS)

Secretary to Government of Tripura,
Department of Revenue, IT, TW, ST&E