

World Commission on Environmental Law Webinar 5 "Judges as Guardians of Water Resources: The Brasília Declaration of Judges on Water Justice"



A Legal Understanding of the Connection between Water and the Environment

Michael Hantke-Domas, PhD
Lawyer & Consultant
Former Chief Justice, Third Environment Court (Chile)

Content

- Considerations about the Brasilia Declaration of Judges on Water Justice: principles 1 and 9.
- Case Law.

Considerations about the Brasilia Declaration of Judges on Water Justice

Principles 1 and 9

The First Paragraph

"I - WE AGREE TO BE GUIDED BY THE FOLLOWING TEN FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES IN PROMOTING WATER JUSTICE THROUGH APPLICATION OF WATER LAW AND THE ENVIRONMENTAL RULE OF LAW:"

 This is an agreement by judges to be guided by 10 fundamental principles in promoting water justice through the application of water law and environmental rule of law.

The First Paragraph

Prominent features of the opening statement:

- The aim is to promote water justice.
- This is done by applying water law and the environmental rule of law.
- Principles as guidance.
 - Theory of principles: principles provide for optimization, in contrast to rules (Alexy).
 - Principles dictate less precise results than rules, and are compulsory when valid (Dworking).
 - H.L.A. Hart.

Principle 1

Principle 1 – Water as a Public Interest Good

The State should exercise stewardship over all water resources, and protect them, in conjunction with their associated ecological functions, for the benefit of current and future generations, and the Earth community of life.

Principle 9

<u>Principle 9 – Water Justice and Environmental</u> <u>Integration</u>

Environmental and ecosystem considerations should be integrated into the application and enforcement of water law. In adjudicating water and water-related cases, judges should be mindful of the essential and inseparable connection that water has with the environment and land uses, and should avoid adjudicating those cases in isolation or as merely a sectoral matter concerning only water.

Case Law

Chile Third Environment Court

Municipality of Rio Negro

V.

Seimura Carrasco Valdeavellano



The Black Letter & the Environment

- The riverbank collapsed on a particularly rainy and windy day, flooding the pit as well as homes in the area.
- The Third Environment Court, building on its previous ruling in Jaque Blu, included ecosystem services as an element of the environmental damage in this case.
- In order to assess the damage, the Court analyzed
 - (a) the damaged environmental components,
 - (b) the ecosystem involved,
 - (c) the harm to the ecosystem consisting of its services, conservation and preservation, and
 - (d) the significance of that harm.
- The damaged component was defined as the riverbank.





The Black Letter & the Environment

- The ecosystem was defined as the river.
- The harm consisted of the inability of the riverbank to contain the river, and its inability to conserve and preserve its biotic and abiotic components.
- The extension of the damage, and the inability of the riverbank to regenerate was considered significant.
- The Court ruled that the defendant had to restore the riverbank to the same characteristics of the existing but unharmed riverbank, promoting the restoration of structural and ecosystemic functions.
- Furthermore, the Court ordered an assessment of the current state on the harmed riverbank by using an environmental quality index before and after the restoration.

Brazil Superior Court of Justice

Appeal N.º 1.782.692-PB(2018/0268767-7)

Instituto Brasileiro do Meio Ambiente e dos Recursos Naturais Renováveis (IBAMA) v.

Alberis Nunes and others

Judge Antonio Herman Benjamin, for the Court

The Facts

- Petitioner: Ibama.
- Respondents: group of people and the Municipality of Pitimbu, State of Paraiba.
- A group of people built different constructions such as a bar, a pharmacy, holiday houses, and residences, on the margins of river Acaú.
- The land over which the buildings where constructed is a permanent riverbank preservation area, according to the Brazilian Forests Code.

The Facts

- Accordingly, Ibama requested the bar of extensions and demolitions of the 11 illegal constructions.
- The trial court decided that the illegal use of the riverbank and the wastewater poured into the river amounted to environmental damage.
- The trial court ordered the demolition of the illegal buildings
- The Superior Court of Justice upheld.

The Black Letter and the Environment

- The case has, at least 2 important arguments for this presentation:
 - The area is under an absolute presumption of inviolability:
 - The area is at the heart of the environmental-planning legal regime:
 - The no-construction zone is in place to protect health, security, property, and welfare of people against risk of many kinds, particularly in urban areas.
 - Wittingly, Judge Benjamin recognizes the aim of the law in protecting environmental services, but he is quick to dismiss it as its unique aim, as it is intertwined with health, security, property and welfare. Although he doesn't mention it, he is viewing the whole picture as an attack against the relation between humans and nature (ecosystem services).



The Black Letter and the Environment

- The absolute protection provided by the law means that any damage accounts for its violation (in re ipsa).
- Being an area as such protected by the law —because of its ecosystem services I might add—, it is irrelevant its ecological health (it can be even derelicted). The law provides for a propter rem obligation to illegal occupant to "vacate, demolish and restitution".
- Right to a healthy environment and the right to housing.
 - Judge Benjamin doubts on the equity and legitimacy of land grabbing based on the right to housing, as usually is the case that individual interests percolate at the end.

The Black Letter and the Environment

- Right to a healthy environment and the right to housing.
 - Confronted the human right to housing against the human right to a healthy environment, the solution comes from the public interest service of environmental provisions against particular interests.
 - But, there is no incompatibility between both rights: Social misery does not trump ecological misery. The center of the issue is the disgraceful housing deficit in the country.



Thank you for your attention!

¡Muchas gracias por su atención!

Michael Hantke Domas

mhantke@gmail.com www.linkedin.com/in/mhantke