

# LITIGATING CLIMATE CHANGE IN THE GLOBAL SOUTH

BY JOLENE LIN AND JACQUELINE PEEL  
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS 2024

The book, [Litigating Climate Change in the Global South](#), relies on analysis of a set of cases across Global South jurisdictions that we have summarised below. The law is as of 16 May 2023.

### Abbreviations used

Coy: Company or Corporation  
 Df: Defendant  
 EIA: Environmental Impact Assessment  
 GHG: Greenhouse Gas  
 Govt: government  
 Indv: Individual  
 NGO: non-governmental organisation  
 Pf: Plaintiff

### APPENDIX 1: CASES IN GLOBAL SOUTH AS OF 16 MAY 2023

S/N	Case (Filing Date)	Forum (Country)	Plaintiff (Pf)	Defendant (Df)	Brief Facts and arguments	Core (C) /Periphery (P)	Const. Rights	EIA	Climate Change Legislation/ Paris Agreement	Public Trust Doctrine
<b>LATIN AMERICA</b>										
01	<i>Barrick and Exploraciones Mineras Argentinas SA v. Argentina</i> (2019)	Supreme Court (Argentina)	Barrick and Exploraciones Mineras Argentinas SA (Coy)	Argentina (Govt)	Pf was a Coy which was legally permitted to operate a mine. Df was the Argentinian Govt. Pf argued that Df's Glacial Protection Law was unconstitutional as it violated the Coy's right to mine and explore gold.	P	Yes	No	Paris Agreement	No
02	<i>Guillermo Tristan Montenegro v. Ministry of Environment and</i>	Federal Court of Mar del Plata N. 2 (Argentina)	Guillermo Tristan Montenegro (City Govt)	Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (Govt)	Pf was the Mayor of the Argentinian City of Mar del Plata. Df was the Argentinian Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development. Pf argued that Df's approval of offshore	C	Yes	No	Paris Agreement	No

S/N	Case (Filing Date)	Forum (Country)	Plaintiff (Pf)	Defendant (Df)	Brief Facts and arguments	Core (C) /Periphery (P)	Const. Rights	EIA	Climate Change Legislation/ Paris Agreement	Public Trust Doctrine
	<i>Sustainable Development</i> (2022)				explorations in Resolution 436/2021 contravened Argentina's international climate commitments.					
03	<i>Organización de Ambientalistas Organizados v. Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development</i> (2022)	Federal Court of Mar del Plata N. 2 (Argentina)	Organización de Ambientalistas Organizados (NGO)	Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (Govt)	Pf was an environmental NGO. Df was the Argentinian Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development. Pf argued that Df's approval of an offshore explorations in Resolution 436/2021 was in violation of Argentina's international climate change commitments.	C	Yes	No	Paris Agreement	No
04	<i>OAAA v. Araucaria Energy SA.</i> (2018)	Federal Court of Mercedes (Argentina)	Organización de Ambientalistas Autoconvocados (NGO)	Araucaria Energy SA (Coy)	Pf was an environmental NGO. Df was an energy Coy. Pf brought an action for preventive action (i.e. an injunction) arguing that Df's operations on a thermoelectric plant violated the Kyoto Agreement and the Paris Agreement.	P	Yes	Yes	Paris Agreement and Kyoto Protocol	No
05	<i>Asociación Civil por la Justicia Ambiental v. Province of Entre Ríos et al.</i> (2020)	Supreme Court (Argentina)	Asociación Civil por la Justicia Ambiental (Indvs and NGOs)	Province of Entre Ríos and others (3 separate Govts)	Pfs were NGOs and youths. Dfs were 3 separate provincial and municipal Govts. Pfs argued that the Dfs' failure to curb and prevent fires on Ramsar sites contravened international climate change laws, demanding that the environment be granted a set of actionable environmental rights.	P	Yes	No	Paris Agreement	No
06	<i>Greenpeace Argentina et. al. v. Argentina</i> (2022)	Federal Court of Mar del Plata N. 2 (Argentina)	Greenpeace Argentina et. al. (NGOs)	Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development of Argentina (Govt)	Pfs were global environmental NGOs. Df was the Argentinian Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development. Pfs argued that Df's approval of an offshore explorations in Resolution 436/2021 was in violation of Argentina's international climate change commitments.	C	Yes	Yes	Paris Agreement	No
07	<i>Hahn et al. v. Araucaria</i>	Argentina's Federal	Hahn and others (Indvs and	APR Energy S.R.L (Coy)	Pf was a group of Indvs and NGOs. Df was the Coy operating a thermoelectric power station. Pf	C	Yes	Yes	Paris Agreement	No

S/N	Case (Filing Date)	Forum (Country)	Plaintiff (Pf)	Defendant (Df)	Brief Facts and arguments	Core (C) /Periphery (P)	Const. Rights	EIA	Climate Change Legislation/ Paris Agreement	Public Trust Doctrine
	<i>Energy Sociedad Anonima (II)</i> (2017)	Court of Campana (Argentina)	NGO)		argued that the plant should be prevented from being built since it was based on an inadequate EIA and was in contravention of the Kyoto Protocol and Paris Agreement.				and Kyoto Protocol	
08	<i>Hahn et al. v. APR Energy S.R.L</i> (2017)	Federal Court of Campana (Argentina)	Hahn and others (Indvs and NGOs)	APR Energy S.R.L (Coy)	Pf was a group of Indvs and NGOs. Df was the Coy operating a thermoelectric power station. Pf argued that the plant should be prevented from being built since it was based on an inadequate EIA and was in contravention of the Kyoto and Paris Agreements.	C	Yes	No	Paris Agreement and Kyoto Protocol	No
09	<i>Carballo et al. v. State of the Province of Buenos Aires and the Provincial Agency for Sustainable Development</i> (2017)	Administrative Court of Azul (Argentina)	Carballo and others (Indvs and NGOs)	State of the Province of Buenos Aires and its Provincial Agency for Sustainable Development (Govt and its agencies)	Pf was a group of Indvs. Df was the state Govt and its administering agencies. Pf argued that Df's authorisation for the building of a thermoelectric plant was improper, relying on the Paris Agreement and other human rights treaties.	C	No	Yes	Paris Agreement and Kyoto Protocol	No
10	<i>Carballo et al. v. MSU S.A., UGEN S.A., &amp; General Electric</i> (2017)	Federal Court of Azul (Argentina)	Carballo and others (Indvs and NGOs)	MSU S.A., UGEN S.A., General Electric (3 Coys)	Pf was a group of Indvs and NGOs. Dfs were 3 separate electrical Coys. Pf sought an injunction to stop the Dfs' construction of a thermoelectric plant on the basis that the EIA for the proposed plant was improper. The complaint relies on Argentina's Civil Code, the Constitution, the Paris Agreement and a number of human rights treaties.	C	Yes	Yes	Paris Agreement and Kyoto Protocol	No
11	<i>FOMEA v. MSU S.A., Rio Energy S.A., &amp; General Electric</i> (2017)	Federal Court of San Nicolás (Argentina)	FOMEA (NGO)	MSU S.A., Rio Energy S.A., General Electric (3 Coys)	Pf was an NGO. Df was a group of 3 Coys. Pf argued that Df's building of a thermoelectric plant should be blocked as it did not have the	C	Yes	Yes	Paris Agreement, Kyoto Protocol and	No

S/N	Case (Filing Date)	Forum (Country)	Plaintiff (Pf)	Defendant (Df)	Brief Facts and arguments	Core (C) /Periphery (P)	Const. Rights	EIA	Climate Change Legislation/ Paris Agreement	Public Trust Doctrine
					required environmental certificates. It would also be inconsistent with the Kyoto Protocol and Paris Agreement because it will use fossil fuels. The complaint relied on Argentina's civil code and international human rights treaties.				the General Law of the Environment	
12	<i>Mapuche Confederation of Neuquén v. YPF et al.</i> (2018)	None (Criminal complaint compelling investigations) (Argentina)	Mapuche Confederation of Neuquén (NGO)	Pampa Energia and others (Oil Coys); Secretary of Territorial and Env't Development and others (Govt)	Pf was an NGO. Df was a group of oil Coys and Govt officials. Pf filed a criminal complaint alleging that the Dfs were dumping waste produced by fracking, resulting in damage to the environment and public health.	P	No	No	Paris Agreement	No
13	<i>Public Prosecutor's Office v. H Carlos Schneider S/A Comércio e Industria &amp; Others</i> (2004)	Superior Tribunal de Justiça (Brazil)	Public Prosecutor's Office (Govt)	H Carlos Schneider S/A Comércio e Industria & Others (Coys)	Pf was the local prosecutor. Df was a group of Coys that had drained and cleared mangroves. Pf argued that Df's conduct was in breach of the Forest Code of 1965 and the Federal Constitution.	P	Yes	No	None	No
14	<i>Public Prosecutor's Office v. Oliveira &amp; Others</i> (2009)	Superior Tribunal de Justiça (Brazil)	Public Prosecutor's Office and Others (Govt)	Oliveira and others (Indvs)	Pf was the local prosecuting authorities. Df was Indv sugar cane farmers who were burning sugar cane to extract sugar. Pf sought to enforce an embargo preventing the burning practices, arguing that it releases too much GHG.	C	No	No	None	No
15	<i>Chiaradia v. Environmental Federal Agency</i> (2010)	Superior Tribunal de Justiça (Brazil)	Chiaradia (Indv)	IBAMA – Environmental Federal Agency (Govt)	Pf was a private Indv. Df was the national environmental agency. Pf argued against his penalty and lack of compensation for the obligation to reforest his property.	P	No	No	None	No.
16	<i>Sao Paulo Public Prosecutor's Office v. United</i>	Regional Federal Court of	Public Prosecutor's Office (Govt)	United Airlines and others (Airline Coys)	Pf was the local prosecutor. Dfs were various airline Coys. Pf sought to impose emission	C	No	No	None	No

S/N	Case (Filing Date)	Forum (Country)	Plaintiff (Pf)	Defendant (Df)	Brief Facts and arguments	Core (C) /Periphery (P)	Const. Rights	EIA	Climate Change Legislation/ Paris Agreement	Public Trust Doctrine
	<i>Airlines and Others</i> (2014)	Appeal, 3 <sup>rd</sup> Region (Brazil)			offsets on the Df Coys.					
17	<i>Maia Filho v. Environmental Federal Agency</i> (1995)	Superior Tribunal de Justiça (Brazil)	Maia Filho (Indv)	Environmental Federal Agency (Govt)	Pf was an Indv who had burned down forested area for livestock grazing. Df was the national environmental authority. Pf argued that her fines for burning down the forest were invalid and unconstitutional. Df reasoned that the fines were imposed alongside concerns on climate change.	P	Yes	No	National Environmental Policy Act	No
18	<i>Federal Environmental Agency v. Siderúrgica São Luiz Ltd. and Martins</i> (2019)	15 <sup>th</sup> Civil Federal Court (Brazil)	IBAMA - Environmental Federal Agency (Govt)	Geraldo Magela Martins (Indv) and Siderúrgica São Luiz Ltda (Coy)	Pf was the national environmental agency. Df was a steel Coy and its managing partner. Pf argued for compensation from Df for burning coal it had acquired via fraudulent means.	P	Yes	No	National Environmental Policy and National Policy on Climate Change	No.
19	<i>Instituto Socioambiental, Abrampa &amp; Greenpeace Brasil v. Ibama and the Federal Union</i> (2020)	7 <sup>th</sup> Environmental and Agrarian Court of the Judiciary Section of Amazonas (Brazil)	Instituto Socioambiental and Greenpeace Brazil (NGOs)	Brazil (Govt)	Pfs were environmental NGOs. Df was the Brazilian Govt. Pfs sought compensation from Df for enabling the export of native wood with reduced supervision, arguing that it had disrupted the whole ecosystem in the process.	P	Yes	No	National Environmental Policy	No
20	<i>PSB et al. v. Brazil (on Climate fund)</i> (2020)	Federal Supreme Court (Brazil)	Partido Socialista Brasileiro, Partido Socialismo e Liberdade, Partido dos Trabalhadores	Brazil (Govt)	Pfs were four political parties partnered with an NGO. Df was the Brazilian Govt. Pfs argued that Df failed to administer the Climate Fund properly and sought its implementation.	C	Yes	No	Paris Agreement and National Policy on Climate Change	No

S/N	Case (Filing Date)	Forum (Country)	Plaintiff (Pf)	Defendant (Df)	Brief Facts and arguments	Core (C) /Periphery (P)	Const. Rights	EIA	Climate Change Legislation/ Paris Agreement	Public Trust Doctrine
			(Indvs) and Rede Sustentabilidade (NGO)							
21	<i>PSB et al v Brazil (on Amazon fund)</i> (2020)	Federal Supreme Court (Brazil)	Partido Socialista Brasileiro, Partido Socialismo e Liberdade, Partido dos Trabalhadores (Indvs) and Rede Sustentabilidade (NGO)	Brazil (Govt)	Pfs were four political parties partnered with an NGO. Df was the Brazilian Govt. Pf argued that Df failed to administer the Amazon Fund to promote REDD+ mechanisms properly through extinguishing two of its crucial operating bodies.	C	Yes	No	National Policy on Climate Change	No
22	<i>Institute of Amazonian Studies v. Brazil</i> (2020)	Federal District Court of Curitiba (Brazil)	Instituto de Estudos Amazônicos (NGO)	Brazil (Govt)	Pf was an environmental NGO. Df was the Brazilian state. Pf sought to compel Govt to comply with its own climate targets pursuant to national legislation and its climate commitments to the Paris Agreement.	C	Yes	No	Paris Agreement and National Policy on Climate Change	No
23	<i>PSB et al. v. Brazil (on deforestation and human rights)</i> (2020)	Federal Supreme Court (Brazil)	Partido Socialist Brasileiro and six others (Indvs)	Brazil (Govt)	Pfs were several political parties. Df was the Brazilian state. Pfs sought to compel Govt to implement its anti-deforestation agenda which was mandatory by national legislation.	P	No	No	Paris Agreement, Action Plan for Prevention and Control of the Legal Amazon Deforestation	No
24	<i>Brasilcom et. al. v. Ministério de Minas e Energia</i> (2020)	Superior Tribunal de Justiça (Brazil)	Association of Fuel Distributors (Coy)	Ministério de Minas e Energia (Govt)	Pfs were several oil and gas Coys. Df was the Brazilian Govt. Pfs sought to challenge the imposition of decarbonisation targets intended to	C	No	No	Paris Agreement and National Biofuels	No

S/N	Case (Filing Date)	Forum (Country)	Plaintiff (Pf)	Defendant (Df)	Brief Facts and arguments	Core (C) /Periphery (P)	Const. Rights	EIA	Climate Change Legislation/ Paris Agreement	Public Trust Doctrine
					contribute to achieving Paris Agreement commitments.				Policy	
25	<i>Famílias pelo Clima vs. Governo do Estado de São Paulo</i> (2020)	Court of Justice of Sao Paulo (Brazil)	Parents for Future (NGO)	State of Sao Paulo (Govt)	Pf was a community NGO. Df was a local state Govt. Pf sought to acquire undisclosed information from Df's national programme to incentivise automaking, on the grounds that the programme did not require any environmental mitigation measures by automakers and was in violation with Brazil's climate agenda in the Paris Agreement.	P	No	No	National Policy on Climate Change	No
26	<i>Six Youths v. Minister of Environment and Others</i> (2021)	14 <sup>th</sup> Federal Court of Sao Paulo (Brazil)	Six youths (Indvs)	Brazil (Govt) and Ricardo de Aquino Salles and Ernesto Henrique Fraga Araújo (Govt officials)	Pfs were six youths. Df was the Brazilian Govt. Pfs sought an injunction against Df's 2020 NDC, arguing that it was less ambitious than its 2016 NDC and thus in contravention of the Paris Agreement.	C	Yes	No	Paris Agreement and the National Policy on Climate Change	No
27	<i>Ministério Público Federal v. de Rezende</i> (2021)	Federal Environmental and Agrarian Court (Brazil)	Ministério Público Federal (Govt)	Dauro Parreiras de Rezende (Indv)	Pf was the Brazilian Govt. Df was an Indv Brazilian farmer. Pf sought damages and compensation from Df for his cattle farm, alleging that it had caused widespread deforestation in the Amazon.	P	Yes	No	Paris Agreement and the National Policy on Climate Change	No
28	<i>Associação Brasileira dos Membros do Ministério Público de Meio Ambiente vs. Ministro de Estado do Meio</i>	Brazil's Federal Supreme Court (Brazil)	Associação Brasileira dos Membros do Ministério Público de Meio Ambiente (NGO)	Ministro de Estado do Meio Ambiente (Govt)	Pf was an environmental NGO. Df was the Brazilian Govt. Pf sought to stop changes to the composition of the management committee of the National Fund on Climate Change. Pf argued, <i>inter alia</i> , that the changes reduced participation for vulnerable stakeholders and reduced transparency of the fund's governance.	C	Yes	No	Paris Agreement and National Fund on Climate Change	No

S/N	Case (Filing Date)	Forum (Country)	Plaintiff (Pf)	Defendant (Df)	Brief Facts and arguments	Core (C) /Periphery (P)	Const. Rights	EIA	Climate Change Legislation/ Paris Agreement	Public Trust Doctrine
	<i>Ambiente ADPF 814</i> (2020)									
29	<i>Ministério Público Federal v. IBAMA</i> (2020)	7 <sup>th</sup> Federal and Agrarian Court of the Judiciary Section of Amazonas (Brazil)	Ministério Público Federal (Federal Prosecution)	Brazilian Institute for the Environment and Renewable Natural Resources (Govt Agency)	Pf was the Brazilian federal prosecuting authority. Df was the Brazilian environmental Govt agency. Pf sought to compel Df to implement measures to curb deforestation in the Amazon.	P	No	No	Paris Agreement, National Policy on Climate Change and the Plan to Control Illegal Deforestation and Recovery of Native Vegetation	No
30	<i>Instituto Preservar et. al. v. Copelmi Mineração Ltda. and IBAMA</i> (2021)	9 <sup>th</sup> Federal Court of Rio Grande do Sul (Brazil)	AGAPAN, INGÁ, COONATERRA-BIONATUR, CEPPA (NGOs)	IBAMA (Govt) and Copelmi (Coy)	Pfs were NGOs. Df was the Brazilian environmental agency and a mining Coy. Pfs filed the case for precautionary measures to be taken in relation to a proposed mining project, alleging that climate change concerns were not adequately addressed in its EIA.	C	No	Yes	Paris Agreement and National Policy on Climate Change	No
31	<i>Laboratório do Observatório do Clima v. Minister of Environment and Brazil</i> (2021)	7 <sup>th</sup> Federal Environmental and Agrarian Court of the Judiciary Section of Amazonas (Brazil)	Laboratório do Observatório do Clima (NGO)	Minister of Environment and Brazil (Govt)	Pf was a group of environmental NGOs. Dfs were the Brazilian Govt and national environmental agency. Pf sought an update of Df's national laws setting its climate change agenda based on the latest available science.	C	Yes	No	Paris Agreement and National Policy on Climate Change	No
32	<i>Extraordinary Appeal to Declare</i>	Supreme Federal	Union of alcohol	Paulinia Municipal Govt	Pf was a trade union representing alcohol and	P	Yes	No	None	No



S/N	Case (Filing Date)	Forum (Country)	Plaintiff (Pf)	Defendant (Df)	Brief Facts and arguments	Core (C) /Periphery (P)	Const. Rights	EIA	Climate Change Legislation/ Paris Agreement	Public Trust Doctrine
	<i>the Unconstitutionality of Law Number 1.952</i> (2015)	Court (Brazil)	manufacturers and Union of Sugar producers in the state of Sao Paolo (Indv)	(Govt)	sugar producers. Df was the Paulinia municipal Govt. Pf sought a declaration that a law preventing the burning of sugarcane was unconstitutional.					
33	<i>ADI 7095 (Complexo Termelétrico Jorge Lacerda)</i> (2022)	Supreme Federal Court (Brazil)	Rede Sustentabilidade (Rede), Partido Socialismo e Liberdade (PSOL) and Partido Socialista Brasileiro (PSB)	Brazilian Congress (Govt)	Pfs were several political parties. Df was the Brazilian Congress. Pfs alleged that the Just Energy Transition Program, which gives subsidies for the purchase of electricity from burning coal and fossil fuels, is unconstitutional. It also contravenes the Paris Agreement and the National Policy on Climate Change (Federal Law 12, 187/2009).	C	Yes	No	Paris Agreement and National Policy on Climate Change	No
34	<i>Conectas Direitos Humanos v. BNDES and GNDESPAR</i> (2022)	9 <sup>th</sup> Federal Civil Court of the Federal District of Brazil (Brazil)	Conectas Direitos Humanos (NGO)	BNDES and BNDESPAR (Govt)	Pf was an NGO. Dfs were the Brazilian Development Bank (BNDES) and its investment arm. Pf sought to compel the Dfs to adopt transparent practices in relation to its investments so as to align to the National Policy on Climate Change.	C	Yes	No	Paris Agreement and National Policy on Climate Change	No
35	<i>Regional Government of Atacama v Ministry of Mining and Other</i> (2022)	Court of Appeal of Copiapo (Chile)	Regional Government of Atacama (Regional Govt)	Ministry of Mining and Other (State Govt)	Pf was a regional Govt. Df was the national Govt agency. Pf challenged the award of exploration and exploitation limits on the basis that the changes in Govt policies related to lithium exploitation for the country's energy transition were made without sufficient assessment of environmental impacts and insufficient public participation.	P	No	Yes	None	No
36	<i>Women from Huasco and Others v. the Government of</i>	Court of Appeal of Copiapo (Chile)	Residents of Huasco (Indvs)	Chile (Govt)	Pfs were the residents of the Chilean city of Huasco. Df was the Chilean Govt. Pfs sought to have two units of thermoelectric power plants	C	Yes	Yes	Paris Agreement	No

S/N	Case (Filing Date)	Forum (Country)	Plaintiff (Pf)	Defendant (Df)	Brief Facts and arguments	Core (C) /Periphery (P)	Const. Rights	EIA	Climate Change Legislation/ Paris Agreement	Public Trust Doctrine
	<i>Chile, Ministry of Energy, Environment and Health</i> (2021)				shut down. Pfs argued that the decision not to shut the power plants down and reduce GHG emissions amounted to a violation of their right to live in a pollution-free environment and was contrary to Chile's Paris Agreement obligations. Df argued that shutting down a power plant was a complex decision, decarbonisation being only one of several factors to be taken into account. The decision did not amount to a violation of Pf's fundamental rights.					
37	<i>Company Workers Union of Maritima &amp; Commercial Somarco Limited and Others v Ministry of Energy</i> (2021)	Supreme Court and the Court of Appeal of Antofagasta (Chile)	Company Workers Union (Indvs) and Commercial Somarco Limited and Others (Coy)	Ministry of Energy (Govt)	Pfs were some union workers and a mining Coy. Dfs were the Chilean national Govt agency. Pfs sought a repeal of the Dfs' environmental pledges, arguing that the Dfs' commitment to carbon neutrality violated their right to work and equality under the law.	P	Yes	No	Paris Agreement and Energy Sector Decarbonization Plan	No
38	<i>Mejillones Tourist Service Association and Others v. Environmental Assessment Service</i> (2021)	Supreme Court (Chile)	Mejillones Tourist Services Association and other local community organisations (NGOs)	Comisión Regional del Medio Ambiente de la II Región de Antofagasta (Govt)	Pfs were a group of NGOs. Df was a Govt body conducting EIA services for the Chilean Antofagasta region. Pfs challenged an EIA issued by the Df for a thermoelectric power plant project on the grounds that its EIA lacked consideration of climate change and violated constitutional rights to life, equality before the law, to live in a pollution-free environment and to property.	C	Yes	Yes	Paris Agreement, Law No. 20.600 creating the Environmental Court	No
39	<i>Grez et al. v. Environmental Evaluation Service of Chile</i> (2018)	Environmental Court of Valdivia (Chile)	Gabriela Simonetti Grez and others (Indv)	Environmental Evaluation Service of Chile (Govt)	Pfs were a group of Chilean Indvs. Df was the national environmental agency. Pfs challenged the EIA for a proposed coal blasting project, arguing that the failure to consider the climate impacts of coal blasting contravened Chile's commitments under international law, including	C	No	Yes	Paris Agreement	No

S/N	Case (Filing Date)	Forum (Country)	Plaintiff (Pf)	Defendant (Df)	Brief Facts and arguments	Core (C) /Periphery (P)	Const. Rights	EIA	Climate Change Legislation/ Paris Agreement	Public Trust Doctrine
					the Paris Agreement. Pfs also asserted the need to eliminate the use of fossil fuels.					
40	<i>Private Corporation for the Development of Aysen, et al. v. Environmental Evaluation Service of Chile</i> (2016)	Environmental Court of Valdivia (Chile)	Private Corporation for the Development of Aysén and Corporation Pro Defense of flora and Fauna (Coys) and Hugo Dóaz Manque (Indv)	Environmental Evaluation Service of Chile (Govt)	Pfs were a group of Coys and an Indv. Df was the national environmental agency. Pfs sought to have the EIA for a proposed hydroelectric plant annulled on the grounds that it was inadequate for not considering climate impacts.	C	Yes	Yes	None	No
41	<i>Future Generations v. Ministry of Envnt</i> (2018)	Supreme Court (Colombia)	25 youths (Indvs) represented by Dejusticia (NGO)	Columbian Ministry for the Environment and other Govt entities (Govt and agencies)	Pfs were a group of youths represented by environmental NGO. Df was the Colombian state. Pfs sought for the Dfs to stop the deforestation of the Amazon, arguing that its rate of deforestation was in contravention to the Paris Agreement and Colombia's NDC.	C	Yes	No	Paris Agreement and National Development Plan	No
42	<i>Decision C-035/16 of February 8, 2016</i> (2015)	Constitutional Court (Colombia)	Group of Citizens (Indvs)	Colombia (Govt)	Pfs were a group of Indvs comprising four congressmen and three lawyers. Df was the Colombian state. Pfs sought to challenge the constitutionality of a technicality in the law that Df used to permit mining activities in Colombia's páramos (high altitude ecosystem). Pfs argued that the legal loophole violates the rights to the environment and to water because of the impacts of mining on the páramos' vegetation, soil and water. Further, the páramos are vital carbon sinks and therefore play a critical role in climate change mitigation.	P	Yes	No	Law 1753 of 2015 on the National Development Plan and Law 1450 of 2011 on National Development Plan	No

S/N	Case (Filing Date)	Forum (Country)	Plaintiff (Pf)	Defendant (Df)	Brief Facts and arguments	Core (C) /Periphery (P)	Const. Rights	EIA	Climate Change Legislation/ Paris Agreement	Public Trust Doctrine
43	<i>Decision C-298/16 of June 8, 2016</i> (2015)	Constitutional Court (Colombia)	Group of Citizens (Indvs)	Colombia (Govt)	This case is largely similar to Decision C035/16 above. The court thus declared res judicata and reiterated its C035/16 decision striking down parts of the law which authorised the Govt to permit certain mining projects in the paramos. In addition, the court struck down provisions that allowed the Govt to designate mining areas without temporal limits on the basis that this provision of an indefinite power violated the right to a healthy environment for present and future generations.	P	Yes	No	Law 1753 of 2015 on the National Development Plan	No
44	<i>Advisory opinion No 016-13-DTI-CC</i> (2013)	Constitutional Court (Ecuador)	National Legal Secretariat of the Presidency (Govt)	None	Pf was the Ecuadorian state. Pf applied to court for a constitutional review of a bilateral treaty on climate change, biodiversity and sustainable development between Ecuador and Peru.	P	No	No	No	No
45	<i>Baihua Caiga et al., v. PetroOriental S.A.</i> (2020)	Family, Women, and Children Judicial Unit from Francisco de Orellana Canton (Ecuador)	Juana Mintare Baihua Caiga, Pego Enomenga Enomenga, and Juan Pablo Enomenga (Indvs), UDAPT, and FIDH (NGOs)	PetroOriental S.A. (Coy)	Pfs were a group of Indvs and environmental NGOs. Df was an oil Coy. Pfs sought the cessation of gas flaring from the Df's oil operations, arguing that the Df's conduct violates their constitutional rights because it emits GHG that contribute to climate change.	C	Yes	No	National environmental Law	No
46	<i>Herrera Carrion et al. v. Ministry of the Environment et al. (Caso Mecheros)</i> (2020)	Multicompetent Chamber of the Provincial Court of Justice of Sucumbíos	Herrera Carrion et al. (Indvs)	Ministry of the Environment et al. (Caso Mecheros) (Govt)	Pfs were a group of nine Ecuadorian girls. Df was the Ecuadorian environmental authorities. Pfs sought to ban gas flaring as implicitly authorised by the Df through common practice, arguing that it violated their rights and contributed to climate change.	P	Yes	No	Paris Agreement and Organic Code on the Environment	No

S/N	Case (Filing Date)	Forum (Country)	Plaintiff (Pf)	Defendant (Df)	Brief Facts and arguments	Core (C) /Periphery (P)	Const. Rights	EIA	Climate Change Legislation/ Paris Agreement	Public Trust Doctrine
		of Ecuador and the Family, Women, and Children Judicial Unit of Lago Agrio in the Sucumbios Province of Ecuador (Ecuador)								
47	<i>Thomas v EPA</i> (2020)	Supreme Court (Guyana)	Troy Thomas (Indv)	Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) (Govt)	Pf was an Indv scientist. Df was the EPA of Guyana. Pf sought to have an oil exploration permit reduced from twenty-three to five years, arguing that a twenty-three-year permit would cause climate change.	C	No	No	Paris Agreement and Environmental Protection Act	No
48	<i>Thomas &amp; De Freitas v. Guyana</i> (2021)	Supreme Court (Guyana)	Quadad de Freitas and Troy Thomas (Indvs)	Guyana (Govt) and Esso Exploration and Production Guyana (Coy)	Pfs were two Indvs. Dfs were the Guyana Govt and an oil Coy. Pfs sought to have a cessation of issuing oil exploration licenses, arguing that further issuance would exacerbate climate change.	C	Yes	No	Environmental Protection Act and Paris Agreement	No
49	<i>Henry v. EPA</i> (2022)	Supreme Court (Guyana)	Sinikka Henry, Sherlina Nageer, and Andriska Thorington (Indvs)	Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) (Govt)	Pf was a group of Indvs. Df was the Guyana EPA. Pf alleged that the EPA's decision to grant Esso/ExxonMobil a modified permit that permits gas flaring (upon payment of fees) violated national environmental laws.	C	No	Yes	Environmental Protection Act and Environmental Protection Regulations 2000	No
50	<i>Ruling on Modification to</i>	Supreme Court	Mexico (Govt)	None	Pf was the Mexican state. Pf applied to the court	C	Yes	No	Paris Agreement	No

S/N	Case (Filing Date)	Forum (Country)	Plaintiff (Pf)	Defendant (Df)	Brief Facts and arguments	Core (C) /Periphery (P)	Const. Rights	EIA	Climate Change Legislation/ Paris Agreement	Public Trust Doctrine
	<i>Ethanol Fuel Rule</i> (2019)	(Mexico)			to validate its decision to raise the maximum ethanol content in fuel across the country. The court invalidated the proposed moved, reasoning that the measures fell afoul of the precautionary principle and had concerns over the increase in GHG emissions.					
51	<i>Ruling on the constitutionality of state “green taxes” in Zacatecas</i> (2017)	Supreme Court (Mexico)	Fernando Castañeda Ibarra (Indv)	Government of Zacateca (Govt)	Pf was an Indv representing beer manufacturers. Df was a state Govt. Pf sought to have Df’s implementation of state carbon taxes invalidated on the grounds that it exceeded the authority of Congress.	P	No	No	General Law on Climate Change	No
52	<i>Youth v. Government of Mexico</i> (2020)	District Court of Administrative Matters (Mexico)	15 anonymous youths (Indvs)	Mexico (Govt)	Pfs were 15 youths. Df was the Mexican state. Pfs sought to compel Df to implement climate change policies, arguing that despite legislation and the constitution mandating such measures, none were in place in the state of Baja. In May 2022, the District Court dismissed the case on the basis of lack of standing. Pfs filed an appeal which is pending at the time of writing.	C	Yes	No	Paris Agreement and General Law on Climate Change	No
53	<i>Greenpeace Mexico v. Ministry of Energy and Others (on the Energy Sector Program)</i> (2020)	District Court of Administrative Matters (Mexico)	Greenpeace Mexico (NGO)	Mexico (Govt)	Pf was a global environmental NGO. Df was the Mexican state. Pf sought to have Df’s energy proposals paused as it violated human rights. Pf argued that the plan had an overemphasis on coal powered sources instead of renewable sources.	C	Yes	No	Paris Agreement	No
54	<i>Greenpeace Mexico v. Ministry of Energy and Others (on the National Electric</i>	First Circuit Collegiate Tribunal (Mexico)	Greenpeace Mexico (NGO)	Mexico (Govt)	Pf was an environmental NGO. Df was the Mexican state. Pf sought to have Df’s energy policies struck down, arguing that, <i>inter alia</i> , they were in contravention of Mexico’s commitment to climate change by preferring coal-powered energy instead of renewable	C	Yes	No	Paris Agreement and General Law on Climate Change	No

S/N	Case (Filing Date)	Forum (Country)	Plaintiff (Pf)	Defendant (Df)	Brief Facts and arguments	Core (C) /Periphery (P)	Const. Rights	EIA	Climate Change Legislation/ Paris Agreement	Public Trust Doctrine
	<i>System policies)</i> (2019)				energy sources.					
55	<i>Greenpeace v. Mexico (Budget reduction for combating climate change)</i> (2020)	Supreme Court (Mexico)	Greenpeace Mexico (NGO)	Mexico (Govt)	Pf was an environmental NGO. Df was the Mexican state. Pf sought to challenge Df's decision to reduce the amount of money the state committed to combatting climate change from previous years.	C	Yes	No	No	No
56	<i>Julia Habana et. al., v. Mexico (Unconstitutionality of the reform to the Electricity Industry Law)</i> (2021)	Supreme Court (Mexico)	Julia Habana and others (Indvs)	Mexico (Govt)	Pfs were a group of youth Indvs. Df was the Mexican state. Pfs sought to invalidate Df's amendments to legislation which would effectively give the state priority to purchase coal-powered energy over renewably produced energy.	C	Yes	No	Paris Agreement, General Law on Climate Change and Energy Transition Law	No
57	<i>Challenge to the constitutionality of amendments to the rules governing Clean Energy Certificates</i> (2021)	Supreme Court (Mexico)	Members of the Senate's minority	Mexico (Govt)	Pfs were members of the Senate's minority. They petitioned the Supreme Court, challenging the constitutionality of amendments to the Electric Industry Act.	P	Yes	No	No	No
58	<i>Nuestros Derechos al Futuro y Medio Ambiente Sano et. al., v. Mexico (Unconstitutionality of the reform to the Electric Industry Law)</i> (2021)	First Circuit Collegiate Tribunal (Mexico)	Neustros Derechos al Futuro y Medio Ambiente Sano et. al (NGOs)	Mexico (Govt)	Pfs were environmental NGOs. Df was the Mexican state. Pfs sought to invalidate Df's amendments to legislation which would effectively give the state priority to purchase coal-powered energy over renewably produced energy.	P	Yes	No	Paris Agreement, Energy Transition Law and General Law on Climate Change	No

S/N	Case (Filing Date)	Forum (Country)	Plaintiff (Pf)	Defendant (Df)	Brief Facts and arguments	Core (C) /Periphery (P)	Const. Rights	EIA	Climate Change Legislation/ Paris Agreement	Public Trust Doctrine
59	<i>Greenpeace v. Instituto Nacional de Ecología y Cambio Climático and Others</i> (2021)	Eleventh Collegiate Court of the First Circuit in Administrative Matters (Mexico)	Greenpeace (NGO)	Instituto Nacional de Ecología y Cambio Climático and Others (Govt)	Pf was an environmental NGO. Df was the Mexican state and its authorities. Pf sought to challenge Df's revised 2020 NDC, claiming that it contravened the principle of non-regression in human rights law.	C	Yes	No	Paris Agreement, General Law on Climate Change	No
60	<i>Mexican Center for Environmental Law (CEMDA) v National Agency for Industrial Security and Environmental Protection in the Hydrocarbon Sector (ASEA)</i> (2020)	Circuit Court (Mexico)	Mexican Center for Environmental Law (NGO)	National Agency for Industrial Security and Environmental Protection in the Hydrocarbon Sector (Govt)	Pf was an environmental NGO. Df was the Mexican state. Pf sought to challenge Df's decision to lengthen the time period during which regulated entities can submit their methane emissions reduction plans.	P	Yes	No	None	No
61	<i>Ruling on Constitutionality of "green taxes" in Baja California</i> (2021)	Circuit Court (Mexico)	Indvs	Mexico (Govt)	Pfs' identities are unknown. Df was the Mexican state. Pfs sought to strike down Df's implementation of state carbon taxes in Baja California by taxing the sale of gas on the grounds that taxation powers rest exclusively with Congress.	P	No	No	None	No
62	<i>Greenpeace v. Ministry of Energy and Others (on the Energy Sector Program 2022)</i> (2022)	District court in Administrative Matters (Mexico)	Greenpeace Mexico (NGO)	Ministry of Energy and Others (Govt)	Pf was a global environmental NGO. Dfs were the Ministry of Energy and other Govt entities. Pf sought to complain about the Df's human right population, as the latter's Energy Sector Program as it does not facilitate a just energy transition, delays the fulfilment of clean energy target, and entrenches adverse impacts suffering	C	No	No	Energy Transition Law, Decree issuing the Electricity Industry Law, the Geothermal	No



S/N	Case (Filing Date)	Forum (Country)	Plaintiff (Pf)	Defendant (Df)	Brief Facts and arguments	Core (C) /Periphery (P)	Const. Rights	EIA	Climate Change Legislation/ Paris Agreement	Public Trust Doctrine
					in vulnerable populations.				Energy law and amending the Law on National Waters, and the General Law on Climate Change	
63	<i>Mexican Center for Environmental Law (CEMDA) v. Ministry of Energy and Others (on the Energy Sector Program 2022)</i> (2022)	District court in Administrative Matters (Mexico)	Mexican Center for Environmental Law (CEMDA)	Ministry of Energy and Others (Govt)	Pf was a legal NGO. Dfs were the Ministry of Energy and other Govt entities. Pf alleged that the Df's Energy Sector Program does not facilitate a just energy transition, delays the fulfilment of clean energy target, and entrenches adverse suffering from the impacts of climate change in vulnerable populations.	C	No	No	Energy Transition Law, Decree issuing the Electricity Industry Law, the Geothermal Energy law and amending the Law on National Waters, and the General Law on Climate Change	No
64	<i>Álvarez et al v. Peru</i> (2019)	Superior Court of Lima	Álvarez and Others (Indvs)	Peruvian Government (Govt)	Pfs were a group of youths represented by their parents. Df was the Peruvian Govt. Pfs sought to compel Df to implement measures to reduce the rate of deforestation so as to bring Peru in compliance with its climate change commitments.	C	Yes	Yes	National Policy on the Environment and the National Policy on Forests and	No

S/N	Case (Filing Date)	Forum (Country)	Plaintiff (Pf)	Defendant (Df)	Brief Facts and arguments	Core (C) /Periphery (P)	Const. Rights	EIA	Climate Change Legislation/ Paris Agreement	Public Trust Doctrine
									Forest Wildlife	
<b>ASIA</b>										
65	<i>Friends of Nature v. State Grid Ningxia Electric Power Co</i> (自然之友诉国网宁夏电力公司) (2017)	Yingchuan Municipal Intermediate People's Court (China)	Friends of Nature (NGO)	State Grid Ningxia Electric Power Company (State Owned Coy)	Pf was an environmental NGO. Df was a Coy operating electrical grids in China. Pf sought for the Df to purchase all of the power generated from renewable sources within the region it operated in, claiming that it was in contravention of China's Renewable Energy Law which mandates state agencies to purchase power from renewable sources.	P	No	No	Environmental Protection Law of the People's Republic of China and Renewable Energy Law	No
66	<i>Karnataka Industrial Areas Development Board v Sri C Kenchappa &amp; Others</i> (1999)	Supreme Court (India)	Sri C. Kenchappa and Others (Indvs)	Karnataka Industrial Areas Development Board (Govt)	Pfs were a group of Indv agriculturalists whose lands were taken by the local Govt. Df was the Govt agency in charge of the land acquisition. Pfs sought to have Df's act of acquiring their lands to be converted for industrial purposes blocked, on the basis that those land were crucial grazing sites and that an industrial area would result in climate change.	P	Yes	Yes	None	Yes
67	<i>Manushi Sangthan, Delhi v. Govt. of Delhi &amp; Ors.</i> (2010)	High Court of Delhi (India)	Manushi Sangthan, Anand Nandan with Mr. Nalin Kumar Singhan (Indvs) with the help of Initiative Transportation and Development (NGO)	Government of Delhi and the Municipal Corporation of Delhi (Govt)	Pfs were Indvs aided by a transport workers NGO. Df was the Delhi state Govt. Pfs sought to have Df's act of capping the number of rickshaw licenses illegal on the basis of discrimination and environmental concerns.	P	Yes	No	None	No
68	<i>Jan Chetna v Ministry of Environment &amp; Forests</i> (2012)	Delhi High Court (India)	Jan Chetna	Ministry of Forest and the Chhattisgarh Environmental Conservation	Pf was an environmental NGO. Dfs were the state authorities and a steel plant Coy. Pf sought the invalidation of the EIA for a proposed steel plant on the basis that there was insufficient public participation.	P	No	Yes	None	No

S/N	Case (Filing Date)	Forum (Country)	Plaintiff (Pf)	Defendant (Df)	Brief Facts and arguments	Core (C) /Periphery (P)	Const. Rights	EIA	Climate Change Legislation/ Paris Agreement	Public Trust Doctrine
				Board (Govt) and M/s Monnet Ispat and Energy Ltd (Coy)						
69	<b>Vimal Bhai and others v Ministry of Environment &amp; Forests</b> (2011)	National Green Tribunal (India)	Vimal Bhai, Bharat Jhunjunwala and Briharshraj Singh Tariyual (Indvs)	Ministry of Environment and Forests, Department of Forest (Govt) and Tehri Hydro Development Corporation (Coy)	Pfs were Indvs who were social activists. Df was the Indian environmental authorities and a hydroelectric dam operator Coy. Pfs challenged the legality of the Df's decision to award a permit to clear forest for a hydroelectric dam. Pfs argued that the EIA was inadequate as no mitigation studies were done.	P	No	Yes	None	No
70	<b>Punamchand v Union of India</b> (2013)	National Green Tribunal (India)	Punamchand S/o Ramchandra Pardeshi and Deelip S/o HiralalGujarathi (Indvs)	Union of India and its environmental bodies (Govt)	Pfs were 2 indvs. Df was the Indian Govt. Pfs sought to invalid Df decision to grant permits to clear forests for dam projects as they cause "great loss to the environment".	P	No	No	None	No
71	<b>Durga Dutt Ors v. State of Himachal Pradesh</b> ["Rohtang Pass"] (2013)	National Green Tribunal (India)	Court on its own motion (Suo moto jurisdiction)	Various Indian state authorities (Govt)	Tribunal exercised <i>suo moto</i> jurisdiction to compel Govt bodies to take steps to address the environmental degradation caused by heavy tourism and unbridled development in an area that is part of the fragile Himalayan ecosystem.	P	Yes	No	National Green Tribunal Act	Yes
72	<b>M/S Singh Timber Traders and Others v. State of Uttar Pradesh and Others</b> (2014)	Allahabad High Court (India)	M/s Singh timber Trader and others (Coys)	State of U.P. (Govt)	Pfs were plywood and veneer manufacturing Coys. Df was the state authorities of Uttar Pradesh. Pf challenged Df's raising of license fees for plywood and veneer manufacturing, arguing that it was arbitrary. Df argued that the increases were mandated by climate change concerns and to deter illegal logging.	P	Yes (discrimination and not environmental)	No	None	No

S/N	Case (Filing Date)	Forum (Country)	Plaintiff (Pf)	Defendant (Df)	Brief Facts and arguments	Core (C) /Periphery (P)	Const. Rights	EIA	Climate Change Legislation/ Paris Agreement	Public Trust Doctrine
73	<b><i>Om Dutt Singh v State of Uttar Pradesh</i></b> (2015)	National Green Tribunal (India)	Members of NGOs	State of Uttar Pradesh (Govt)	Pfs were members of an environmental NGOs. Df was the state Govt. Pfs challenged the construction of a massive irrigation project, arguing <i>inter alia</i> that the project will cause forest loss which will in turn increase carbon dioxide and methane emissions as well as loss of carbon sequestration potential.	P	No	Yes	National Green Tribunal Act	No
74	<b><i>Kalpavalli Vrishka Pempakamdarula Paraspara Sahayaka Sahakara Sangam Ltd. and Others v. Union of India</i></b> (2015)	National Green Tribunal (India)	Kalpavalli Vrishka Pempakamdarula Paraspara Sahayaka Sahakara Sangam Ltd. Timbaktu Collective and Society for Promotion of Wastelands Development (NGOs)	Union of India and other Govt agencies (Govt)	Pfs were NGOs. Dfs were the Indian Govt and private Coys responsible for the construction of windmills. Pfs sought compensation for the ecological damage caused by construction projects undertaken by the Dfs.	P	No	Yes	National Green Tribunal Act	No
75	<b><i>Hindustan Zinc Ltd. v. Rajasthan Regulatory Commission</i></b> (2013)	Supreme Court (India)	Hindustan Zinc (Coy)	Rajasthan Electricity Regulatory Commission (Govt)	Pfs were a group of Coys producing zinc and its related metals. Df was a state power authority. Pfs sought to invalidate Df's regulation that mandates all power producing Coys to purchase a certain amount of renewable energy.	C	Yes	No	National Action Plan on Climate Change and the Electricity Act	No
76	<b><i>Wilfred J and Ors. v. Ministry of Environment and Forest and Ors</i></b> (2014)	National Green Tribunal (India)	Wilfred J. and Marydasan V. (Indvs)	Ministry of Environment and Forests and the State of Kerala (Govt)	Pfs were fishermen. Df was the Indian state Govt and environmental authorities. Pfs sought to invalid the granting of a permit allowing for land clearance for a seaport. They argued that, <i>inter alia</i> , the project's EIA was inadequate, and that the changes to the climate would lead to the	P	Yes	Yes	None	Yes

S/N	Case (Filing Date)	Forum (Country)	Plaintiff (Pf)	Defendant (Df)	Brief Facts and arguments	Core (C) /Periphery (P)	Const. Rights	EIA	Climate Change Legislation/ Paris Agreement	Public Trust Doctrine
					inundation of the region in light of climate change and rising sea levels. On appeal, the NGT upheld the MoEF's grant of environmental and coastal clearance.					
77	<b><i>Sukhdev Vihar Residents Welfare Association v Union of India</i></b> (2017)	National Green Tribunal (India)	Locals affected by the Waste to Energy Plant	State of Delhi and its agencies (Govt)	Pfs were a series of welfare associations representing residents in their respective areas. Df was the Delhi state. Pfs sought to have a waste disposal facility removed since it was using dangerous technology situated in a densely populated area and emitted large amounts of GHG in the process.	P	Yes	Yes	None	No
78	<b><i>Society for Protection of Environment and Biodiversity v. Union of India</i></b> (2017)	National Green Tribunal (India)	Society for the Protection of Environment & Biodiversity (NGO)	Union of India (Govt)	Pf was an environmental NGO. Df was the Indian state. Pf challenged the validity of proposed amendments to EIA legislation which provided broad exemptions for various construction works. The Pfs argued that these changes to the law would, <i>inter alia</i> , usher in a greater rate of climate change.	P	Yes	Yes	Paris Agreement, National Green Tribunal Act	Yes
79	<b><i>Courts on its own motion v. State of Himachal Pradesh</i></b> (2017)	National Green Tribunal (India)	National Green Tribunal ( <i>Suo moto</i> )	Preminder Kzaur, Amrik Singh Nagpal, Praveen Sharma (Indvs) and State of H.P. (Govt)	The tribunal exercised <i>suo moto</i> jurisdiction to compel the state of Himachal Pradesh and its agencies to explain media reports about illegal logging.	P	No	No	National Green Tribunal Act	No
80	<b><i>Pandey v. India</i></b> (2017)	National Green Tribunal (India)	Ridhima Pandey (Indv)	Union of India (Govt)	Pf was an Indv. Df was the Indian Govt. Pf sought to compel Df to take steps to meet its NDC pursuant to the Paris Agreement.	C	Yes	No	Paris Agreement and the National Green Tribunal Act	Yes
81	<b><i>Hanuman Laxman Aroskar</i></b>	Supreme Court	Hanuman Laxman Aroskar	Union of India (Govt)	Pfs were an Indv and an environmental NGO. Df was the Indian state. Pfs sought to invalidate the	P	No	Yes	Paris Agreement	No

S/N	Case (Filing Date)	Forum (Country)	Plaintiff (Pf)	Defendant (Df)	Brief Facts and arguments	Core (C) /Periphery (P)	Const. Rights	EIA	Climate Change Legislation/ Paris Agreement	Public Trust Doctrine
	<i>v. Union of India and Others</i> (2019)	(India)	(Indv) and Federation of Rainbow Warriors (NGO)		environmental permit for the construction of an airport, arguing that it would contribute to adverse climate change.					
82	<i>Association for Protection of Democratic Rights v. The State of West Bengal and Others</i> (2021)	Supreme Court (India)	Association for protection of democratic rights (NGO)	State of West Bengal (Govt)	Pf was an environmental NGO. Df was the State of West Bengal. Pf sought to prevent the Df from cutting old trees for road projects, citing climate change and forest cover concerns.	P	Yes	No	Paris Agreement	No
83	<i>MOE v. PT Selatnasik Indokwarsa and PT Simpang Pesak Indokwarsa</i> (2010)	North Jakarta District Court (Indonesia)	Ministry of Environment (Govt)	PT Selatnasik Indokwarsa and PT Simpang Pesak Indokwarsa (Mining coys)	Pf was the Indonesian Ministry of Environment. Dfs were 2 mining Coys. Pfs sought compensation from Df for their allegedly illegal clearing or protected forest and situating their mining operations in or near nature reserves.	P	No	No	Law 32/2009 Environmental Protection and Management	No
84	<i>Komari et al v. Mayor of Samarinda</i> (2013)	District Court of Samarinda (Indonesia)	Komari and other Indvs (Indvs)	Mayor of Samarinda (Govt)	Pfs were a group of Indvs. Df was the local Govt of Samarinda, East Kalimantan. Pfs sought compensation for Df's alleged mismanagement of the environment by handing out too many mining permits and for lax enforcement of those permits. Pfs contended that they were climate change victims.	C	No	No	Presidential Regulation Number 61 of 2011 concerning National Action Plan for Reducing Greenhouse Gas Emissions	No
85	<i>Ministry of Environment v. PT Merbau Pelalawan Lestari</i>	Supreme Court (Indonesia)	Ministry of Environment (Govt)	PT Merbau Pelalawan (Coy)	Pf was the Indonesian Ministry of Environment. Df was a logging Coy. Pf sought compensation from Df for conducting illegal logging activities beyond permitted areas, arguing that its conduct reduced the area of carbon sinks.	P	No	No	Law 32/2009 Environmental Protection and Management	No

S/N	Case (Filing Date)	Forum (Country)	Plaintiff (Pf)	Defendant (Df)	Brief Facts and arguments	Core (C) /Periphery (P)	Const. Rights	EIA	Climate Change Legislation/ Paris Agreement	Public Trust Doctrine
	(2014)									
86	<i>Ministry of Environment v. PT Kalista Alam</i> (2015)	Meulaboh District Court (Indonesia)	Ministry of Environment (Govt)	PT Kalista Alam (Coy)	Pf was the Indonesian Ministry of Environment. Df was a Coy. Pf sought compensation for Df for illegally draining and burning peatlands causing a fire, resulting in release of GHG contributing to climate change.	P	No	No	Law 32/2009 Environmental Protection and Management	No
87	<i>Ministry of Environment and Forestry v. PT Bumi Mekar Hijau</i> (2015)	Palembang Court of Appeal (Indonesia)	Ministry of Environment and Forestry (Govt)	PT Bumi Mekar Hijau (Timbre Coy)	Pf was the Indonesian Ministry of Environment. Df was a timber Coy. Pf sought compensation for Df's conduct of burning peatlands, arguing that the burning of the wetlands caused the release of substantial amounts of GHG contributing to climate change.	P	No	No	Law 32/2009 Environmental Protection and Management	No
88	<i>Ministry of Environment and Forestry v. PT Jatim Jaya Perkasa</i> (2015)	North Jakarta District Court (Indonesia)	Ministry of Environment and Forestry	PT Jatim Jaya Perkasa (Coy)	Pf was the Indonesian Ministry of Environment. Df was a palm oil plantation Coy. Pf sought compensation for Df's clearing of forests by fire, arguing that the burning of the wetlands caused the release of substantial amounts of GHG contributing to climate change.	P	No	No	Law 32/2009 Environmental Protection and Management	No
89	<i>Ministry of Environment and Forestry v. PT Waringin Agro Jaya</i> (2017)	Supreme Court (Indonesia)	Ministry of Environment and Forestry (Govt)	PT Waringin Agro Jaya (Coy)	Pf was the Indonesian Ministry of Environment. Df was a palm oil plantation Coy. Pf sought compensation for Df's clearing of forests by fire, arguing that the burning of the wetlands caused the release of substantial amounts of GHG contributing to climate change.	P	No	No	Law 32/2009 Environmental Protection and Management	No
90	<i>Yayasan Wahana Lingkungan Hidup Indonesia v. Governor of Bali and others</i> (2013)	Supreme Court (Indonesia)	Yayasan Wahana Lingkungan Hidup Indonesia (NGO)	Governor of Bali and others (Govt)	Pf was an environmental NGO. Df was the Balinese local Govt. Pf sought to rescind a license granted by the Df to allow for tourist accommodation to be built on and around a mangrove, arguing that it would lead to biodiversity loss and climate change.	P	Yes	No	Law 32/2009 Environmental Protection and Management	No
91	<i>Greenpeace Indonesia and Others v. Bali Provincial Governor</i> (2018)	Denpasar Administrative Court (Indonesia)	Greenpeace Indonesia (NGO) and 3 Indvs	Bali Provincial Governor (Govt)	Pfs were 3 Indvs and an environmental NGO. Df was the provincial state authorities. Pfs sought to have a permit granted by Df for a coal power plant rescinded as it violated its federal legislations and international commitments.	C	No	Yes	Paris Agreement, Law 32/2009 Environmental Protection	No

S/N	Case (Filing Date)	Forum (Country)	Plaintiff (Pf)	Defendant (Df)	Brief Facts and arguments	Core (C) /Periphery (P)	Const. Rights	EIA	Climate Change Legislation/ Paris Agreement	Public Trust Doctrine
									and Management	
92	<i>Ministry of Environment and Forestry v. PT Palmina Utama</i> (2016)	Banjarmasin District Court (Indonesia)	Ministry of Environment and Forestry (Govt)	PT Palmina Utama (Coy)	Pf was the Indonesian environmental authority Df was a palm oil plantation Coy. Pf sought compensation for Df's clearing of forests by fire, arguing that the burning of the wetlands caused the release of substantial amounts of GHG contributing to climate change.	P	No	No	Law 32/2009 Environmental Protection and Management	No
93	<i>Ministry of Environment and Forestry v. PT Arjuna Utama Sawit</i> (2019)	Palangkaraya District Court (Indonesia)	Ministry of Environment and Forestry (Govt)	PT Arjuna Utama Sawit (Coy)	Pf was the Indonesian environmental authority. Df was a palm oil plantation Coy. Pf sought compensation for Df's clearing of forests by fire, arguing that the burning of the wetlands caused the release of substantial amounts of GHG contributing to climate change.	P	No	No	Law 32/2009 Environmental Protection and Management	No
94	<i>Ministry of Environment and Forestry v. PT Asia Palem Lestari</i> (2019)	North Jakarta District Court (Indonesia)	Ministry of Environment and Forestry (Govt)	PT Asia Palem Lestari (Coy)	Pf was the Indonesian environmental authorities. Df was a palm oil plantation Coy. Pf sought compensation for Df's clearing of peatlands by fire, arguing that the burning of the wetlands caused the release of substantial amounts of GHG contributing to climate change.	P	No	No	Law 32/2009 Environmental Protection and Management	No
95	<i>Ministry of Environment and Forestry v. PT Rambang Agro Jaya</i> (2019)	Central Jakarta District Court (Indonesia)	Ministry of Environment and Forestry (Govt)	PT Rambang Agro Jaya (Coy)	Pf was the Indonesian environmental authorities. Df was a palm oil plantation Coy. Pf sought compensation for Df's clearing of peatlands by fire, arguing that the burning of the wetlands caused the release of substantial amounts of GHG contributing to climate change.	P	No	No	Law 32/2009 Environmental Protection and Management	No
96	<i>Indonesian Youths and Others v. Indonesia</i> (2022)	National Human Rights Commission (Indonesia)	Indvs	Indonesian Government (Govt)	Pfs were thirteen youth Indonesians. Df was the Indonesian Govt. Pfs called for the Df to address constitutional human rights violations linked to climate change, arguing that their human rights are under threat from present and foreseeable future harms caused by climate change.	C	Yes	No	Paris Agreement	No
97	<i>Hendrikus Woro v. Papua</i>	Jayapura State	Hendrikus 'Franky' Woro	Papua Provincial	Pf was a leader of the indigenous Awyu clan. Df was a local provincial Govt. Pf sought to have a	C	No	Yes	Paris Agreement,	No



S/N	Case (Filing Date)	Forum (Country)	Plaintiff (Pf)	Defendant (Df)	Brief Facts and arguments	Core (C) /Periphery (P)	Const. Rights	EIA	Climate Change Legislation/ Paris Agreement	Public Trust Doctrine
	<i>Provincial Government</i> (2023)	Administrative Court (Indonesia)	(Indv)	Government (Govt)	permit to clear land (issued by Df to a palm oil Coy) revoked on the grounds that it was on indigenous lands and the EIA process was conducted without consultation and participation of the Awyu community. This violates the principle of Free Prior Informed Consent and the rights of the Papuan Indigenous people as enshrined in the Special Autonomy Law for Papua No. 2 of 2021. Pf also included calculations of the expected amount of carbon dioxide that would be released in the event that the forest is cleared to create plantations, arguing that this would run counter to Indonesia's Nationally Determined Contribution under the Paris Agreement.				Law 32/2009 Environmental Protection and Management, Law on State Administrative Court	
98	<i>Padam Bahadur Shrestha v. Office of the Prime Ministers and Council of Ministers &amp; Ors.</i> (2017)	Supreme Court (Nepal)	Padam Bahadur Shrestha (Indv)	Office of the Prime Minister and other Govt authorities (Govt)	Pf was an Indv. Dfs were Nepalese state authorities. Pf sought to compel Df to enact climate change laws following the inadequacies of earlier legislations to combat climate change.	C	Yes	No	Paris Agreement, Environmental Protection Act of 1997 and the Climate Change Policy of 2011	No
99	<i>Ashgar Leghari v. Federation of Pakistan</i> (2015)	Lahore High Court Green Bench (Pakistan)	Ashgar Leghari (Indv)	Federation of Pakistan (Govt)	Pf was an Indv farmer. Df was the state of Pakistan. Pf sought to compel Df to implement its policies on climate change, arguing that the Govt's failure to do so would adversely affect Pakistan's water, food and energy security.	C	Yes	No	National Climate Change Policy 2012 and the Framework for Implementation of Climate	Yes

S/N	Case (Filing Date)	Forum (Country)	Plaintiff (Pf)	Defendant (Df)	Brief Facts and arguments	Core (C) /Periphery (P)	Const. Rights	EIA	Climate Change Legislation/ Paris Agreement	Public Trust Doctrine
									Change Policy (2014-2030)	
100	<i>Ali v. Federation of Pakistan</i> (2016)	Supreme Court (Pakistan)	Rahab Ali (Indv)	Federation of Pakistan (Govt)	Pf was a young female Indv. Df was the state of Pakistan. Pf sought to invalidate the Df's permission for the development of coal fields, arguing that it would lead to devastating climate consequences through GHG emissions.	C	Yes	No	Paris Agreement, National Climate Change Policy 2012 and the Framework for Implementation of Climate Change Policy (2014-2030)	Yes
101	<i>Sheikh Asim Farooq v. Federation of Pakistan etc.</i> (2018)	Lahore High Court (Pakistan)	Sheikh Asim Farooq and others (Indvs)	Federation of Pakistan (Govt)	Pfs were a group of Indvs. Df was the Pakistani state. Pfs sought to compel Dfs to implement and enforce national laws protecting forests. The court referred to the right to a healthy environment, the precautionary principle, and the public trust doctrine. The court summarized the negative impacts of climate change on forests and obligations under the National Climate Change Policy 2012 to protect biodiversity and prevent wetland degradation by reducing deforestation.	C	Yes	Yes	Forest Act 1927, Punjab Plantation and Maintenance of Trees Act 1974, National Climate Change Policy 2012, and National Forest Policy 2015	Yes
102	<i>Maria Khan et al. v. Federation of Pakistan et al.</i>	Lahore High Court (Pakistan)	Maria Khan and a Coalition of women (Indvs)	Federation of Pakistan (Govt)	Pfs were a group of women. Df was the Pakistani state. Pfs sought to compel the Df to act on its NDC commitments, arguing that its	C	Yes	No	Paris Agreement and the	Yes

S/N	Case (Filing Date)	Forum (Country)	Plaintiff (Pf)	Defendant (Df)	Brief Facts and arguments	Core (C) /Periphery (P)	Const. Rights	EIA	Climate Change Legislation/ Paris Agreement	Public Trust Doctrine
	(2019)				omissions and inaction led to the rise in GHG emissions in Pakistan.				Policy for Development of Renewable Energy for Power Generation	
103	<i>D. G. Khan Cement Company v. Government of Punjab</i> (2021)	Supreme Court (Pakistan)	D.G. Khan Cement Company (Coy)	Federation of Pakistan (Govt)	Pf was a cement Coy. Df was the Pakistani state. Pf sought to invalidate Df's implementation of zones wherein no new cement plants can operate in. Df argued that these zones were decided based on scientific proof and with a view to mitigate the impact of climate change.	P	Yes	No	National Climate Change Policy 2012	No
104	<i>Saonu and Morobe Provincial Government v. Minister for Environment and Conservation and Others</i> (2021)	Court of Justice at Waigani (Papua New Guinea)	Saonu and Morobe Provincial Government (Provincial Govt)	Minister for Environment and Conservation and Climate Change and Others (Govt)	Pf was the provincial authorities for Saonu and Morobe. Df was the Papua New Guinean environmental authorities. Pf sought to invalidate a permit for mining handed out by the Df, arguing that it would violate Papua New Guinea's environmental pledges on climate change.	P	No	No	Environmental Act	No
105	<i>In re Greenpeace Southeast Asia et al.</i> [Carbon Majors Petition] (2015)	Commission on Human Rights (Philippines)	Greenpeace Southeast Asia and Others (NGOs)	Major Oil Companies (Coys)	Pfs were a group of environmental NGOs. Dfs were a group of large Coys producing crude oil, natural gas, coal and cement. Pfs sought for the commission to investigate into the extents Dfs have contributed to the effects of climate change, namely the release of GHG and ocean acidification.	C	Yes	No	Paris Agreement	Yes
106	<i>Global Legal Action on Climate Change v. The Philippines</i>	Supreme Court (Philippines)	Global Legal Action on Climate Change (NGO)	Philippine Government (Govt)	Pf was an environmental NGO. Df was the Philippine authorities. Pf sought to compel the Govt to enact and enforce laws to mitigate the impacts of floods which were more prevalent due to climate change.	P	Yes	No	None	No

S/N	Case (Filing Date)	Forum (Country)	Plaintiff (Pf)	Defendant (Df)	Brief Facts and arguments	Core (C) /Periphery (P)	Const. Rights	EIA	Climate Change Legislation/ Paris Agreement	Public Trust Doctrine
	<i>Government</i> (2010)									
107	<i>Segovia et al. v. Climate Change Commission</i> (2017)	Supreme Court (Philippines)	Victoria Segovia and Others (Indvs)	Philippines (Govt)	Pfs were a group of Indvs who do not use cars. Df was the Philippines environmental authority. Pfs sought to compel Df to promote alternative, eco-friendlier policies and to discourage motorcar usage so as to reduce pollution and fossil fuel consumption.	P	Yes	No	Executive Orders 774/2008 and 785/2009 on the Presidential Task Force on Climate Change	No
108	<i>Residents of Omkoi v. Expert Committee on EIA Consideration and the Office of Natural Resources and Environmental Policy and Planning</i> (2022)	Chiang Mai Administrative Court (Thailand)	Fifty representatives of the Kaboedin Vilage (Indvs)	Expert Committee on EIA Consideration and the Office of Natural Resources and Environmental Policy and Planning (Govt)	Pfs were villagers. Dfs were Govt entities. Pfs sought to have an EIA and its official approval rescinded on the grounds of falsification in relation to coal mining on lands forcibly taken from traditional Kaboedin village lands.	P	No	Yes	None	No
<b>AFRICA</b>										
109	<i>Save Lamu et al. v. National Environmental Management Authority and Amu Power Co. Ltd.</i> (2017)	National Environmental Tribunal (Kenya)	Save Lamu and (NGO) other Indvs	Amu Power Co. Ltd (Coy) and National Environmental Management Authority (Govt)	Pf was an environmental NGO. Df was the Kenyan environmental agency and a power Coy. Pf sought to invalidate a license granted by the Govt to Amu Power for the construction of a coal powered power plant, arguing that the Coy had not conducted an adequate EIA as mandated by Kenyan law.	P	Yes	Yes	Paris Agreement	No
110	<i>Iten ELC Petition No. 007 of 2022 – Legal Advice Centre T/K Kituo</i>	The Iten Environment and Land Court	Members of Ilchamus and Tugen communities	Attorney General (Govt) and 7 Ors. (Indvs)	Pfs were Indvs from two communities living near Lake Baringo, partnered with a Human Rights NGO. Dfs were the Kenyan Attorney General and several other Govt officials. Pfs	C	Yes	No	Climate Change Act No. 11 of 2016 Laws	No

S/N	Case (Filing Date)	Forum (Country)	Plaintiff (Pf)	Defendant (Df)	Brief Facts and arguments	Core (C) /Periphery (P)	Const. Rights	EIA	Climate Change Legislation/ Paris Agreement	Public Trust Doctrine
	<i>cha Sheria &amp; Anor. v. Attorney General and 7 Others</i> (2022)	(Kenya)	(Indvs) and Kituo cha Sheria (NGO)		alleged the violation of several constitutional rights as they are victims of climate change induced flooding which has caused displacement, loss of life and property. They seek enforcement of duties of public officials pursuant to Kenya's Climate Change Act.				of Kenya	
111	<i>Gbemre v. Shell Petroleum Development Company of Nigeria Ltd et al.</i> (2004)	Federal Court (Nigeria)	Jonah Gbemre (Indv)	Shell Petroleum Development Company Nigeria Ltd, Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation, (Coys) and Attorney General of the Federation (Govt)	Pf was a Nigerian Indv. Dfs were oil Coys and the Nigerian Govt. Pf sought to stop the Df Govt to allow flaring and to stop the Df Coys from conducting its gas flaring practices without the relevant EIAs as they adversely affected climate change.	P	Yes	Yes	Environmental Impact Assessment Act, Associated Gas Re-injection Act, Federal Environmental Agency Act	No
112	<i>Sustaining the Wild Coast NPC and Others v. Minister of Mineral Resources and Energy and Others</i> (2021)	High Court (South Africa)	Sustaining the Wild Coast NPC and Others (NGOs)	Minister of Mineral Resources and Energy (Govt), Shell Corporation and Impact Africa (Coys)	Pfs were a group of environmental and human rights NGOs. Df was the South African Govt and 2 oil Coys. Pfs sought to prevent the Df Coy's seismic surveys for fossil fuels, arguing that it would be in violation of their right to consultation and other statutory rights.	P	Yes	Yes	None	No
113	<i>Africa Climate Alliance et. al., v. Minister of Mineral Resources &amp; Energy et. al.</i> [#CancelCoal case] (2021)	High Court (South Africa)	Africa Climate Alliance and Others (NGOs)	Minister of Mineral Resource Energy and Others (Govt)	Pfs were a group of civil society NGOs. Dfs were the South African energy authorities. Pfs sought a judicial review to prevent Df's decision to acquire a substantial amount of new coal-powered electricity, arguing that it was in violation of their constitutional rights given the consequent impact on climate change.	C	Yes	No	Paris Agreement, Electricity Regulation Act and the National Energy Regulator	No

S/N	Case (Filing Date)	Forum (Country)	Plaintiff (Pf)	Defendant (Df)	Brief Facts and arguments	Core (C) /Periphery (P)	Const. Rights	EIA	Climate Change Legislation/ Paris Agreement	Public Trust Doctrine
									Act	
114	<i>South Durban Community Environmental Alliance v. Minister of Environment and Others</i> (2021)	High Court (South Africa)	South Durban Community Environmental Alliance (NGO)	Minister of Environment and Others (Govt) and Sasol and Eni (Coys)	Pf was an environmental NGO. Dfs were the South African Govt and some oil Coys. Pf sought to challenge Df Govt decision to grant approval for Df Coys to conduct offshore oil and gas exploration for fossil fuels, arguing that its approvals failed to consider its climate change commitments and EIA laws.	P	Yes	Yes	Paris Agreement and National Environmental Management Act	Yes
115	<i>SDCEA &amp; Groundwork v. Minister of Forestry, Fisheries, and the Environment</i> (2021)	High Court (South Africa)	SDCEA and Groundwork (NGOs)	Minister of Forestry, Fisheries and Environment (Govt)	Pfs were various environmental NGOs. Dfs were the South African environmental authorities. Pfs sought to have Df's approval of constructing a power plant set aside, arguing that its EIA were not up to its requisite standard.	P	Yes	Yes	Paris Agreement and National Environmental Management Act	No
116	<i>Coal Transporters Forum v. Eskom Holdings Limited and Others</i> (2019)	High Court (Gauteng Division, Pretoria) (South Africa)	Coal Transporters Forum (NGO)	Eskom Holdings Limited (State-owned Coy), Independent power producers (Coys), National Energy Regulator of South Africa and Minister of Energy (Govt)	Pf comprises of Coys providing coal transport for a state-owned power Coy. Dfs were Eskom (state owned Coy distributing, producing and transmitting energy in South Africa), Govt officials as well as independent energy producers of renewable power. Pf sought annulment of power purchase agreements signed by Eskom with independent power producers. The High Court held that the procedures for finalising these agreements were correctly followed and recognised that the Pf's legal challenge was, in essence, one against diversification of the country's energy mix.	P	No	No	None	No
117	<i>Earthlife Africa Johannesburg v. Minister of Environmental Affairs &amp; others</i> (2017)	High Court (South Africa)	Earthlife Africa Johannesburg (NGO)	Minister of Environmental Affairs & Others (Govt)	Pf wa an environmental NGO. Df was the environmental authorities of South Africa. Pf sought to have Df's decision to approve power stations invalidated given their inadequate EIAs, which failed to consider its global impacts towards climate change.	C	Yes	Yes	Paris Agreement and National Environmental Management Act	No

S/N	Case (Filing Date)	Forum (Country)	Plaintiff (Pf)	Defendant (Df)	Brief Facts and arguments	Core (C) /Periphery (P)	Const. Rights	EIA	Climate Change Legislation/ Paris Agreement	Public Trust Doctrine
118	<i>Philippi Horticultural Area Food &amp; Farming Campaign, et al. v. MEC for Local Government, Environmental Affairs and Development Planning: Western Cape, et al.</i> (2019)	High Court (South Africa)	Philippi Horticultural Area Food & Farming Campaign et al (NGOs) and Nazeer Ahmed Souday (Indv)	The city of Cape Town and Others (Govt)	Pfs were a farmland preservation NGO and its president. Dfs were the Cape Town state authorities. Pfs sought to prevent Df's plans and EIAs enabling the development of agricultural lands, claiming that it would affect the groundwater sources in the midst of climate change.	P	No	Yes	National Environmental Management Act	No
119	<i>groundWork v. Minister of Environmental Affairs, ACWA Power Khanyisa Thermal Power Station RF (Pty) Ltd Others</i> (2017)	High Court (South Africa)	groundWork (NGO)	Minister of Environmental Affairs and Others (Govt)	Pf was an environmental NGO. Dfs were the South African environmental authorities. Pf sought to have Dfs' decision to approve power stations invalidated given their inadequate EIAs, which failed to consider the impacts of climate change.	C	Yes	Yes	Paris Agreement and National Environmental Management Act	No
120	<i>groundWork Trust v. Minister of Environmental Affairs and Others, KiPower (Pty) Ltd, and Others</i> (2017)	High Court (South Africa)	groundWork (NGO)	Minister of Environmental Affairs and Others (Govt)	Pf was an environmental NGO. Dfs were the South African environmental authorities. Pf sought to have Dfs' decision to approve power stations invalidated given their inadequate EIA which failed to consider the impacts of climate change.	C	Yes	Yes	Paris Agreement and National Environmental Management Act	No
121	<i>The City of Cape Town v. National Energy Regulator of South Africa</i>	High Court (South Africa)	City of Cape Town (Govt)	Minister of Energy (Govt)	Pf was the Cape Town state Govt. Dfs were the national South African energy authorities. Pf sought to declare that the approval of Dfs for changes to its own sources of energy were	P	No	No	No	No

S/N	Case (Filing Date)	Forum (Country)	Plaintiff (Pf)	Defendant (Df)	Brief Facts and arguments	Core (C) /Periphery (P)	Const. Rights	EIA	Climate Change Legislation/ Paris Agreement	Public Trust Doctrine
	<i>and Minister of Energy</i> (2017)				unnecessary in light of lengthy delays, arguing that its plans were better for climate change as it intended to purchase more renewable energy.					
122	<i>Save the Maize Belt Society v. Minister and Others</i> (2014)	High Court (South Africa)	Save the Maize Belt Society (NGO)	Mpumalanga Provincial Govt (Govt)	Pf was an NGO. Dfs were the Mpumalanga provincial state authorities. Pf sought to challenge Dfs approval of a mining project, arguing that it did not include a climate change EIA and thus fell foul of the EIA legislations.	P	No	Yes	National Environmental Management Act	No
123	<i>Mbabazi and Others v. The Attorney General and National Environmental Management Authority</i> (2012)	High Court of Uganda Holden at Kampala (Uganda)	Youths (Indvs) and Greenwatch (NGO)	The Attorney General and Others (Govt)	Pfs were youth Indvs and an environmental NGO. Dfs were the Ugandan authorities. Pfs argued that Df was in breach of its constitutional duties by failing or omitting to care for the environment, and sought to compel the Df to, <i>inter alia</i> , account for emissions and develop a mitigation plan.	C	Yes	No	None	Yes
124	<i>Tsama William and Others v. Uganda's Attorney General and Others</i> (2020)	High Court of Uganda at Mbale (Uganda)	Tsama William and Others (Indvs)	Uganda's Attorney General and Others (Govt)	Pfs were the victims of a spate of landslides in Uganda. Dfs were the Ugandan authorities. Pfs sought compensation for the suffering they experienced from the landslides, arguing that the Dfs had a duty to ensure that such natural disasters were mitigated against, especially since it has been exacerbated by climate change.	P	Yes	No	Paris Agreement	No



**APPENDIX 2: CASES IN GLOBAL NORTH JURISDICTIONS AND INTERNATIONAL TRIBUNALS INVOLVING GLOBAL SOUTH PLAINTIFFS AND/OR PROJECTS AS OF 16 MAY 2023**

S/N	Case (Filing Date)	Jurisdiction	Plaintiff (Pf)	Defendant (Df)	Brief Facts and arguments	Core (C) /Periphery (P)	Const. Rights	EIA	Climate Change Legislation/ Paris Agreement	Public Trust Doctrine
<b>INTERNATIONAL TRIBUNALS</b>										
01	<i>UN Human Rights Committee Views Adopted on Teitiota Communication (2015)</i>	United Nations Human Rights Committee	Ioene Teitiota (Indv)	New Zealand (Govt)	Pf was an Indv from Kiribati. Df was the New Zealand state. Pf sought refugee status in New Zealand under the International Covenant on Social and Political Rights, arguing that climate change had rendered him a refugee under those provisions.	C	No	No	None	No
02	<i>Certain Activities Carried Out by Nicaragua in the Border Area (Costa Rica v. Nicaragua) (2016)</i>	International Court of Justice	Costa Rica (Govt)	Nicaragua (Govt)	Pf sought compensation for the damage Df caused during its occupation of some of its territories during armed conflict. Amongst the services for which Costa Rica sought compensation was the impaired ability of the excavated area to provide ecosystem services including carbon sequestration.	P	No	No	None	No
03	<i>A Request for an Advisory Opinion from the Inter-American Court of Human Rights Concerning the Interpretation of Article 1(1), 4(1) and 5(1) of the American Convention on Human Rights (2016)</i>	Inter-American Court on Human Rights	Colombia (Govt)	None	Pf sought an advisory opinion on whether the right to a healthy environment is a human right.	P	No	No	None	No
04	<i>Eco Oro Minerals Corp. v. Republic of Colombia (2016)</i>	International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes	Eco Oro Minerals Corp (Coy)	Republic of Colombia (Govt)	Pf was a mining Coy. Df was the Colombian Govt which had introduced regulatory measures to protect the paramos ecosystem. Pf argued that the measures deprived them of their mining rights and that Colombia had breached its obligations under the Free Trade Agreement between Colombia and Canada through unlawful and indirect expropriation of its investment and for failing to accord the	P	No	No	None	No

S/N	Case (Filing Date)	Jurisdiction	Plaintiff (Pf)	Defendant (Df)	Brief Facts and arguments	Core (C) /Periphery (P)	Const. Rights	EIA	Climate Change Legislation/ Paris Agreement	Public Trust Doctrine
					Coy's investment the minimum standard of treatment.					
05	<i>Sacchi et al. v. Argentina et al. (2020)</i>	United Nations Committee on the Rights of the Child	Sixteen children (Indvs)	Turkey, Germany, France, Brazil, Argentina (Govts)	Pfs were children from various countries. Dfs were States. Pfs sought to recover damages for losses arising from climate change, alleging that the Dfs have violated their rights under the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child by failing to reduce GHG.	C	No	No	Paris Agreement	No
06	<i>The Planet v. Bolsonaro (2021)</i>	International Criminal Court	All Rise (NGO)	Bolsonaro and Others (Govt)	Pf was an environmental NGO. Df was the former Brazilian president. Pf sought to initiate an investigation into Df for crimes against humanity through undermining the Amazonian biome through deforestation during his tenure as President.	P	No	No	None	No
07	<i>Request for Advisory Opinion from ITLOS (2022)</i>	International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea	Co-Chairs of the Commission of Small Island States on Climate Change and International Law (Govts)	None	Pfs were Govts from small island states. Pfs sought an advisory opinion on whether state parties to the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea have an obligation to prevent and reduce pollution caused by climate change, and whether this duty extended to preserving it from adverse impacts from climate change.	C	No	No	None	No
<b>INTER-GOVERNMENTAL DIPLOMACY</b>										
08	<i>Micronesia Transboundary EIA Request (2009)</i>	None (Inter-governmental request)	The Federal States of	Czech Republic (Govt)	Pf was a non-Annex I (Kyoto Protocol) country. Df was an Annex I country. Pf sought to have Df conduct a transboundary	C	No	Yes	Czech EIA Law (Consolidate	No

S/N	Case (Filing Date)	Jurisdiction	Plaintiff (Pf)	Defendant (Df)	Brief Facts and arguments	Core (C) /Periphery (P)	Const. Rights	EIA	Climate Change Legislation/ Paris Agreement	Public Trust Doctrine
			Micronesia (Govt)		EIA in relation to enhancements to one of the Df's power plants, on the basis that the Pf would be adversely affected by increased carbon dioxide emissions.				d Act. No. 100/2001 Sb.)	
<b>REGIONAL TRIBUNALS</b>										
09	<i>Center for Food and Adequate Living Rights et al. v. Tanzania and Uganda (2020)</i>	East African Court of Justice	Center for Food and Adequate Living Rights and 3 others (NGOs)	Uganda and Tanzania (Govts)	Pfs were environmental NGOs. Dfs were the Govts of Uganda and Tanzania. Pfs sought an injunction to stop the construction of the East African Crude Oil Pipeline on the basis that the Govts had signed agreements to build the pipeline without proper environmental, social, human rights, and climate impact assessments.	P	No	No	The National Environment Act (Uganda)	No
10	<i>Plan B. Earth and Others v. United Kingdom (2022)</i>	European Court of Human Rights	Plan B. Earth (NGO) and 4 Indvs	United Kingdom (Govt)	Pfs were an environmental NGO coupled with 4 Indvs, 3 of whom are British Citizens with family members from regions "vulnerable to climate change". Df the UK Govt. Pfs sought to compel Df to change its implementation of its Paris Agreement obligations on the basis that its current acts were inadequate and amounted to a breach of human rights.	C	No	No	Paris Agreement	No
11	<i>Armando Ferrao Carvalho and Others v. The European Parliament and Council (2018)</i>	European Court of Justice	37 Indvs, including 12 from Kenya and Fiji.	European Parliament and Council (Govt)	Pfs were a group of 37 Indvs. Dfs were the European Parliament and the European Council. Pfs sought to compel the Dfs to adopt more stringent climate change policies.	C	No	No	Paris Agreement	No
<b>NATIONAL / DOMESTIC COURTS</b>										
12	<i>Friends of the Earth et al. v. Total (2019)</i>	Court of Cassation (France)	Friends of the Earth and	Total (Coy)	Pfs were a group of six environmental NGOs. Df was an oil Coy. Pfs sued the Dfs over the environmental damages caused by its oil	P	No	No	None	No

S/N	Case (Filing Date)	Jurisdiction	Plaintiff (Pf)	Defendant (Df)	Brief Facts and arguments	Core (C) /Periphery (P)	Const. Rights	EIA	Climate Change Legislation/ Paris Agreement	Public Trust Doctrine
			Others (NGOs)		spills in Tanzania and Uganda.					
13	<i>Amis de la Terre and Sherpa v. Perenco</i> (2020)	Court of Cassation (France)	Amis de la Terre and Sherpa (NGOs)	Perenco (Coy)	Pfs were a group of environmental NGOs. Df was an oil Coy. Pfs sued the Df over damage it had allegedly caused in the Democratic Republic of Congo and sought documentary evidence under French law.	P	No	No	None	No
14	<i>Representatives of the Zapotec Community of Unión Hidalgo et al. v. Electricité de France</i> (2020)	Paris Civil Court (France)	Representatives of the local community of Union Hidalgo (Indvs), <i>Proyecto de Derechos Economicos, Sociales y Culturales</i> and European Center for Constitutional and Human Rights	Electricité de France (Coy)	Pfs were Mexican citizens and NGOs. Df was a majority state-owned electricity producer. Pfs alleged that the Df has violated its obligations pursuant to the French Corporate Duty of Vigilance Law to prevent human rights abuse and environmental damage on a wind farm in Mexico.	P	No	No	Corporate Duty of Vigilance Law	No

S/N	Case (Filing Date)	Jurisdiction	Plaintiff (Pf)	Defendant (Df)	Brief Facts and arguments	Core (C) /Periphery (P)	Const. Rights	EIA	Climate Change Legislation/ Paris Agreement	Public Trust Doctrine
			(NGOs)							
15	<i>Envol Vert et al. v. Casino</i> (2021)	Saint-Étienne Judicial Court (France)	Envol Vert and Others (NGOs)	Casino Group (Coy)	Pfs were environmental NGOs. Df was a French supermarket Coy. Pfs alleged that Df's involvement in the cattle industry in Brazil and Colombia was causing environmental harm and human rights abuses, and sought the end of such practices and compensation to the affected indigenous people in Brazil and Colombia.	P	No	No	Corporate Duty of Vigilance Law	No
16	<i>Notre Affaire À Tous v. FIFA</i> (2022)	Jury Déontologie Publicitaire (France)	Notre Affaire À Tous (NGO)	FIFA (NGO)	Pf was an environmental NGO. Df was a sports association. Pf alleged that Df's marketing of the 2022 World Cup in Qatar as "carbon neutral" breached the ICC Advertising and Marketing Communications Code and the Sustainable Development Recommendations of the Autorité de Régulation Professionnelle de la Publicité.  Similar claims were simultaneously launched in Belgium, the UK, Switzerland and the Netherlands. The relevant authorities in all five jurisdictions announced that the complaints would be examined jointly by the Swiss authority.	C	No	No	Sustainable Development Recommendations of the Autorité de Régulation Professionnelle de la Publicité	No
17	<i>Luciano Lliuya v. RWE</i> (2015)	Higher Regional Court of Hamm (Germany)	Saúl Luciano Lliuya (Indv)	RWE (Coy)	Pf was a Peruvian Indv. Df was Germany's largest electricity producer. Pf alleged that Df's emissions caused the melting of glaciers which significantly increased the risks of flooding of his home. Flood protection measures needed to be built. Pf sought monetary contribution by Df towards building the flood protection. The amount of contribution would be proportional to Df's	C	No	No	None	No

S/N	Case (Filing Date)	Jurisdiction	Plaintiff (Pf)	Defendant (Df)	Brief Facts and arguments	Core (C) /Periphery (P)	Const. Rights	EIA	Climate Change Legislation/ Paris Agreement	Public Trust Doctrine
					contribution to causing climate change and consequently, requiring flood protection in the Pf's Huarez home.					
18	<b><i>Fossil Free Football and Reclame Fossilvrij v. FIFA</i></b> (2022)	Advertising Code Committee (Netherlands)	Fossil Free Football and Reclame Fossilvrij (NGO)	FIFA (NGO)	Pf was an environmental NGO. Df was a sports NGO. Pf alleged that Df's marketing of the 2022 World Cup in Qatar as "carbon neutral" breached the Environmental Advertising Code. Similar claims were simultaneously launched in France, the UK, Switzerland and Belgium. The relevant authorities in all five jurisdictions announced that the complaints would be examined jointly by the Swiss authority.	C	No	No	Environmental Advertising Code (MRC)	No
19	<b><i>Ioane Teitiota v. The Chief Executive of the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment</i></b> (2013)	Supreme Court (New Zealand)	Ioane Teitiota	The Chief Executive of the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment (Govt)	Pf was a Kiribati resident. Df was the New Zealand Govt. Pf sought refugee status under the Refugee Convention in light of the adverse effects of climate change on his home in Kiribati.	C	No	No	None	No
20	<b><i>In re: AD (Tuvalu)</i></b> (2014)	Immigration and Protection Tribunal (New Zealand)	AD Tuvalu (Indv)	Refugee Status Branch and the Immigration and Protection Tribunal (Govt)	Pf was a Tuvalu resident. Df was the New Zealand Govt. Pf sought refugee status under the Refugee Convention in light of the adverse effects of climate change on his home in Tuvalu.	C	No	No	None	No
21	<b><i>Four Islanders of Pari v. Holcim</i></b> (2022)	Justice of the Peace of the	Four Islander	Holcim (Coy)	Pfs were Indonesian citizens. Df was a Swiss Coy that sells building materials including	C	No	No	None	No

S/N	Case (Filing Date)	Jurisdiction	Plaintiff (Pf)	Defendant (Df)	Brief Facts and arguments	Core (C) /Periphery (P)	Const. Rights	EIA	Climate Change Legislation/ Paris Agreement	Public Trust Doctrine
		Canton of Zug (Switzerland)	s of Pari (Indvs)		cement. Pfs sought compensation for the climate-related damage Df allegedly inflicted on the island of Pari, costs for adaptation measures, as well as orders for Df to reduce its emissions.					
22	<i>Climate Alliance Switzerland v. FIFA</i> (2022)	Fair Trading Commission (Switzerland)	Klimaallianz Schweiz (NGO)	FIFA (NGO)	Pf was an environmental NGO. Df was a sports NGO. Pf alleged that Df's marketing of the 2022 World Cup in Qatar as "carbon neutral" breached the ICC and unfair competition legislation. Similar claims were simultaneously launched in France, the UK, the Netherlands and Belgium. The relevant authorities in all five jurisdictions announced that the complaints would be examined jointly by the Swiss authority.	C	No	No	Federal Act against Unfair Competition, the ICC Code and the Swiss Fairness Rules	No
23	<i>Plan B. Earth and Others v. The Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy</i> (2017)	Court of Appeal (United Kingdom)	Plan B. Earth (NGO) and 11 Indvs	The Secretary of State for Business, Energy, and Industrial Strategy (Govt)	Pfs were an environmental NGO and eleven Indvs, four of whom are from small island developing states. Df was the Govt. Pfs sought to have Df amend its climate targets pursuant to the Climate Change Act based on new legal and scientific evidence.	C	No	No	Climate Change Act, Paris Agreement	No
24	<i>Specific Instance to the UK NCP under the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises filed by Global Witness against UK Export Finance</i> (2020)	UK National Contact Point for the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises (United Kingdom)	Global Witness (NGO)	UK Export Finance (Govt)	Global Witness filed a "specific instance" before the UK National Contact Point for the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises against UK Export Finance for breaching the Guidelines by failing to contribute to the goals of the Paris Agreement, disclose emissions, and rapidly phase out support for fossil fuels. The UK National Contact Point rejected the complaint	C	No	No	Paris Agreement	No

S/N	Case (Filing Date)	Jurisdiction	Plaintiff (Pf)	Defendant (Df)	Brief Facts and arguments	Core (C) /Periphery (P)	Const. Rights	EIA	Climate Change Legislation/ Paris Agreement	Public Trust Doctrine
		Kingdom)			on the basis that UK export Finance was not a multinational enterprise and the complaint was therefore out of scope.					
25	<i>Friends of the Earth v. UK Export Finance</i> (2020)	High Court of Justice, Queen's Bench Division (United Kingdom)	Friends of the Earth (NGO)	United Kingdom (Govt)	Pf was an NGO. Df was the UK Govt. Pf alleged that the UK Govt acted unlawfully in approving UKEF's \$1.15 billion investment in a liquified natural gas project in Mozambique. Pf contended that, on the true construction of the Paris Agreement, by the application of the rules of interpretation contained in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties (1969) (VCLT), such funding was not in accordance with the UK's obligations. On appeal, the court found in favour of the df.	C	No	Yes	Paris Agreement	No
26	<i>Plan B. Earth and Others v. Prime Minister</i> (2021)	High Court of Justice, Queen's Bench Division (United Kingdom)	Plan B. Earth (NGO) and 4 Indvs	Prime Minister, Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Secretary for State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (Govt)	Pf was an environmental NGO and 4 Indvs. Df was the UK Govt. Pf sought judicial review of the Df's policies pursuant to the UK Climate Change Act and the Paris Agreement. One of the arguments made by 3 of the Pfs was that Art. 8 of ECHR (right to respect for private or family life) was particularly relevant to them because they are young and have family members who live outside the UK in parts of the world that are particularly vulnerable to climate change, including Ghana and Mexico. The judge found that the Article 8 claim could not be sustained because there was lack of evidence of the type of family life which Article 8 protects. There is even less evidence of that family life being carried on in the UK or of circumstances that warrant UK Courts	C	European Convention of Human Rights	No	Climate Change Act, Paris Agreement	No



S/N	Case (Filing Date)	Jurisdiction	Plaintiff (Pf)	Defendant (Df)	Brief Facts and arguments	Core (C) /Periphery (P)	Const. Rights	EIA	Climate Change Legislation/ Paris Agreement	Public Trust Doctrine
					extending jurisdiction to family life overseas.					
27	<i>New Weather Institute v. FIFA</i> (2022)	Advertising Standards Authority (United Kingdom)	New Weather Institute (NGO)	FIFA (NGO)	Pf was an environmental NGO. Df was a sports NGO. Pf alleged that Df's marketing of the 2022 World Cup in Qatar as "carbon neutral" breached the Code of Non-broadcast Advertising and Direct & Promotional Marketing. Similar claims were simultaneously launched in France, the Netherlands, Switzerland and Belgium. The relevant authorities in all five jurisdictions announced that the complaints would be examined jointly by the Swiss authority.	C	No	No	Code of Non-broadcast Advertising and Direct & Promotional Marketing.	No
28	<i>Border Power Plant Working Group v. Dept of Energy</i> (2002)	District Court for the Southern District of California (USA)	Border Power Plant Working Group (NGO)	Department of Energy (Govt)	Pfs were a group of environmentalists. Df was the national energy agency. Pfs sought to have Df's finding under an EIA challenged for a project that is based in both the USA and in Mexico.	C	No	Yes	National Environmental Policy Act	No
29	<i>Aldabe v. Environmental Services, Inc.</i> (2016)	District Court, District of Massachusetts (USA)	Fermin Aldabe (Indv)	Environmental Services, Inc., Verified Carbon Standard Association, National Standards Institute (Coys)	Pf was a Singaporean and Bolivian resident. Dfs were a group of Coys involved in carbon credit awards in the US. Pf sought to have Dfs liable in breach of contract for not awarding carbon credits for Pf's reforestation project in Bolivia in breach of contractual obligations.	P	No	No	None	No
30	<i>In re Alto Maipo Delaware LLC</i> (2021)	District of Delaware Bankruptcy	Alto Maipo Delawar	None (Declaration)	Pf was a Coy constructing a hydroelectric dam in Chile. Pf filed for bankruptcy, citing Climate Change as the reason for their	P	No	No	None	No

S/N	Case (Filing Date)	Jurisdiction	Plaintiff (Pf)	Defendant (Df)	Brief Facts and arguments	Core (C) /Periphery (P)	Const. Rights	EIA	Climate Change Legislation/ Paris Agreement	Public Trust Doctrine
		Court (USA)	e LLC (Coy)		project becoming unviable.					
31	<b>0907346 [2009] RRTA 1168</b> (2009)	Refugee Review Tribunal (Australia)	Anonymous applicant (Indv)	Australia Minister for Immigration and Citizenship (Govt)	Pf was a Kiribati resident who arrived in Australia. Df was the Australian immigration authorities. Pf sought refugee status on the basis that climate change had destroyed his livelihood in Kiribati. The Tribunal found that the continued production of carbon emissions that cause climate change is not sufficient to constitute persecution under the Refugee Convention as there was no evidence that the persecution the Pfw was fearing was occurring because of his membership of any particular group.	C	No	No	None	No
32	<b>Carbon Market Watch v. FIFA</b> (2022)	Jury d'éthiquepublique (Belgium)	Carbon Market Watch (NGO)	FIFA (NGO)	Pf was an environmental NGO. Df was a sports NGO. Pf alleged that Df's marketing of the 2022 World Cup in Qatar as "carbon neutral" breached the Green Advertising Code. Similar claims were simultaneously launched in France, the UK, Switzerland and the Netherlands. The relevant authorities in all five jurisdictions (including Belgium) announced that the complaints would be examined jointly by the Swiss authority.	C	No	No	Green Advertising Code	No
33	<b>Neubauer et al. v. Germany</b> (2021)	Federal Constitutional Court (Germany)	Individuals and NGOs	Germany (Govt)	In this decision on four constitutional complaints concerning the German Climate Protection Act, the court ordered the legislature to improve existing climate law provisions and strengthen future climate mitigation pathways. The court granted standing to complainants living outside Germany (in Bangladesh and Nepal) but was unwilling to accept that protection duties	C	Yes	No	German Climate Protection Act; Paris Agreement	No

S/N	Case (Filing Date)	Jurisdiction	Plaintiff (Pf)	Defendant (Df)	Brief Facts and arguments	Core (C) /Periphery (P)	Const. Rights	EIA	Climate Change Legislation/ Paris Agreement	Public Trust Doctrine
					arising from the Basic Law create constitutional obligations for the German Govt in relation to the complainants living in Bangladesh and Nepal.					