Beyond The Black Gold: A Chronicle Of Mining Hazards In Eastern Coalfields

Dr. Sharmistha Mukherjee

Assistant Professor in Geography
Achhruram Memorial College, Jhalda, Purulia

Abstract: Environmental degradation in coal mining regions remains a pressing issue in India, particularly in the Eastern Coalfields Limited (ECL) areas of West Bengal and Jharkhand. This article examines the various environmental hazards resulting from ECL's mining activities, including land degradation, air and water pollution, and threats to biodiversity. Through an in depth discussion based on credible studies and systematic field observation, the paper investigates the socio-ecological implications of open-cast and underground mining. It highlights the effects on local communities, agriculture and the atmosphere while reflecting on the role of government regulation and corporate responsibility. The article aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of the long-term environmental risks and proposes holistic measures for mitigation. By combining scholarly insights and critical reflection, this work emphasizes the urgency of sustainable practices in ECL regions to safeguard both nature and people.

Keywords: ECL, coal mining, environmental hazard, land degradation, pollution.

Introduction

Coal remains a crucial energy resource for India, powering over half of the nation’s electricity generation. Among India’s key coal-producing companies, Eastern Coalfields Limited (ECL), a subsidiary of Coal India Limited (CIL), holds a prominent place due to its extensive operations across West Bengal and parts of Jharkhand. ECL manages some of the oldest and most productive coalfields in the country, such as Raniganj, Jhanjra and Sonepur Bazari. While these mining operations have contributed significantly to industrial growth, employment and national energy security, they have also brought forth a legacy of environmental degradation, public health concerns, and socio-economic displacement that continues to affect the region to this day (Ghose, 2002; Lahiri-Dutt, 2003). The scale of environmental hazards associated with ECL's mining practices is both alarming and multifaceted. Open-cast and underground coal mining have not only altered landforms and disrupted ecosystems but also contributed to pollution of air, water and soil. The persistent and often unchecked environmental degradation in ECL areas has raised serious concerns among environmental scientists, public health experts and local communities (Ghose & Majee, 2001; Maiti, 2004). The ecological consequences have been further intensified by inadequate reclamation strategies, poor policy implementation, and lack of environmental accountability from mining authorities (Dutta, 2001). Among the most visible consequences of coal mining in the ECL region is land degradation. Open-cast mining, in particular, involves stripping of topsoil and vegetation to access coal seams, rendering large areas barren and ecologically unproductive (Sahu & Dash, 2011). In places like the Raniganj coalfield, vast stretches of land that once supported rice cultivation has now been transformed into desolate overburden dumps, abandoned pits and subsiding grounds (Chatterjee et al., 2015). Underground mining further aggravates the issue by causing subsidence, which damages roads, homes, and farmlands (Singh et al., 2007). Such transformations not only compromise ecological stability but also displace communities and endanger livelihoods dependent on agriculture and natural resources (Areeparampil, 1996; Bharati & Mishra, 2012).

Pollution is another critical facet of environmental hazard in ECL areas. Coal extraction, transportation and combustion generate significant amounts of airborne particulate matter, especially PM10 and PM2.5, which severely impact respiratory health (Ghose & Majee, 2001; Ghosh et al., 2004). Air quality deterioration is further exacerbated by mine fires, such as those reported in parts of the Raniganj and Jharia regions, which release a toxic mix of gases including carbon monoxide and sulfur dioxide (Mishra et al., 2008). Such emissions contribute to both local health crises and broader climate change concerns (Sarkar & Bose, 2003). Studies have consistently found that residents in mining towns like Asansol and Durgapur show higher incidences of chronic respiratory diseases and skin ailments, particularly among vulnerable groups such as children and the elderly (Chatterjee & Ghosh, 2005). The impact of coal mining on water resources is equally severe. The discharge of untreated mine water, slurry and waste rock into local rivers and ponds has resulted in the contamination of surface and groundwater with heavy metals like iron, manganese and arsenic (Singh & Roy, 2006; Kumar & Singh, 2005). Acid mine drainage (AMD), a phenomenon where sulfide minerals react with water and oxygen to form sulfuric acid, leads to a dramatic drop in pH levels, further dissolving harmful metals into water systems (Skousen et al., 1994; Mishra & Patel, 2010). The Damodar River, historically referred to as the "Sorrow of Bengal," continues to suffer from industrial effluents, mine runoff and sedimentation caused by ECL operations (Bhattacharya & Chakraborty, 2005). Local communities relying on these water bodies for drinking, irrigation and fishing are increasingly exposed to toxic pollutants, resulting in gastrointestinal infections, loss of aquatic life and declining agricultural productivity (Chopra et al., 2009; Maiti & Ghose, 2005).

Equally alarming is the loss of biodiversity and ecological function in the region. Forests surrounding ECL mines, which once housed a diverse range of flora and fauna, have been fragmented or completely cleared to make space for mining operations and related infrastructure (Roy, 1998; Chakraborty, 2006). The loss of canopy cover, soil organisms and habitat connectivity disrupts ecological balance, endangers native species and weakens the region's resilience to environmental stressors (Gupta & Mallick, 2004). Moreover, afforestation efforts, though present, often involve the plantation of fast-growing exotic species like Eucalyptus, which do not support local wildlife or soil regeneration (Rai et al., 2002; Sengupta, 2010). In the absence of effective environmental planning, these initiatives offer limited restoration benefits. The human dimension of these hazards cannot be ignored. Displacement due to land acquisition, deterioration of public health, and reduced access to clean air and water have contributed to rising socioeconomic inequality in mining-affected areas (Fernandes & Raj, 1992; Sharma & Singh, 2009). Many households who once depended on agriculture and forest-based livelihoods now find themselves underemployed or dependent on irregular, low-paying mining jobs (Deb, 1998). Additionally, the psychological stress caused by uncertainty, relocation, and environmental degradation adds a hidden layer of trauma to the mining experience (Ray, 1997). The lack of adequate compensation, vocational retraining, or healthcare support further amplifies the vulnerability of these populations. While environmental impact assessments (EIAs) are mandatory for mining projects, their implementation in the ECL region has been widely criticized. Reports indicate that many EIAs are based on superficial assessments and public consultations are often either bypassed or manipulated to facilitate quick project approvals (Dutta, 2001; Pandey, 2001). Environmental management plans (EMPs) submitted by ECL frequently lack measurable goals, timelines, or budget allocations. Similarly, corporate social responsibility (CSR) initiatives, though mandated by law, have been criticized for being symbolic rather than transformative (Mukherjee, 2003).

The governance framework also suffers from institutional fragmentation. Regulatory oversight is shared across multiple agencies such as the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change (MoEFCC), Central Pollution Control Board (CPCB) and state pollution boards. This often results in overlapping mandates, bureaucratic delays and weak enforcement (Bajaj, 2002). On the ground, pollution control mechanisms such as dust suppression systems, effluent treatment plants and monitoring stations are either absent or poorly maintained (Banerjee, 2003). Given this context, the environmental hazards in ECL mining areas are not just a byproduct of industrial activity but a reflection of systemic governance failures, socio-economic marginalization and policy inertia. The challenge lies not only in mitigating existing damage but also in reimagining a model of development that places environmental sustainability and community well-being at its core. A shift toward decentralized planning, community participation and ecosystem-based restoration is critical to reversing the degradation witnessed in these coal belts.

Materials and methods

With reference to the above discourse the primary objective of this study is to evaluate the environmental hazards caused by coal mining activities in the Eastern Coalfields Limited (ECL) operational areas, with specific focus on land degradation, pollution, ecological loss and their socio-economic consequences. The research also aims to identify gaps in policy implementation and propose context-sensitive strategies for sustainable management. To achieve these objectives, a mixed-methods approach was adopted, integrating both primary field investigations and secondary data analysis. Primary data were collected through field surveys conducted between October 2016 and March 2017 in selected mining-impacted areas, including Raniganj, Pandaveswar, Sonepur Bazari, and Jhanjra. The survey methodology included direct observation, semi-structured interviews and community-based discussions.

A total of 160 residents from affected villages were interviewed to document their experiences with land displacement, water pollution, air quality deterioration and health issues. In addition, insights were gathered from 20 local healthcare providers and 18 displaced landowners. Observational notes were maintained regarding visible signs of environmental degradation, including open mine pits, overburden dumps, polluted water bodies and loss of vegetation. Secondary data were sourced from verified academic literature, government reports and environmental assessments. These materials provided regional context, historical continuity and supplementary evidence to support field-based findings. Data triangulation was used to ensure

Environmental degradation and pollution dynamics in ECL mining areas

In ECL mining areas, open-cast mining has been a primary cause of land degradation. Large tracts of agricultural land have been converted into mining zones, often with inadequate reclamation plans (Ghose, 2002). The topsoil is frequently removed or buried under overburden, leading to a decline in soil fertility and loss of agricultural productivity (Sahu & Dash, 2011). Areas around Raniganj, one of the oldest coal mining sites in India, have seen drastic transformation of land use, where lush paddy fields have been replaced by barren pits and overburden dumps (Chatterjee & Ghosh, 2015). The soil in these regions is also contaminated with heavy metals such as arsenic, lead and mercury due to the leaching of mine tailings and industrial effluents (Kumar & Singh, 2005). This contamination not only affects local flora and fauna but also poses health risks to communities relying on subsistence farming. Studies have shown that vegetables grown in mining-affected zones contain higher concentrations of toxic metals (Maiti & Ghose, 2005), making them unsafe for consumption. Moreover, land degradation results in the displacement of communities who are dependent on farming. Rehabilitation efforts often fall short, with resettled populations facing poor infrastructure and reduced access to cultivable land (Bharati & Mishra, 2012). The environmental impacts thus intersect with social justice issues, further complicating the challenge of sustainable mining. Subsidence, a major consequence of underground mining, causes the surface to sink, damaging homes and agricultural lands (Singh et al., 2007). Such events are common in older mining fields like Raniganj and Sonepur Bazari, where abandoned mines collapse due to weakened earth structures. These incidents not only pose physical risks but also contribute to the psychological trauma of affected residents. In addition, the reclamation of mined-out land has not been uniformly successful. Despite policies mandating afforestation and soil treatment, many reclaimed sites continue to remain infertile or are covered with invasive species, providing little ecological value (Sengupta, 2010). The cumulative effects of poor land management further exacerbate environmental vulnerabilities in ECL zones.

Coal mining in ECL areas contributes significantly to air pollution, primarily through dust emissions, vehicular exhaust and the release of methane and sulfur compounds. Open-cast mining involves drilling, blasting and transportation of coal, which generates high levels of particulate matter (Ghose & Majee, 2001). These particles, especially PM10 and PM2.5, pose severe respiratory risks to miners and nearby populations. Studies have demonstrated a higher prevalence of respiratory diseases like bronchitis, asthma and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) among residents of ECL mining towns (Ghosh et al., 2004). The dust generated during coal handling and loading operations settles on vegetation, reducing photosynthetic efficiency and affecting agricultural yields (Tiwary, 2001). Moreover, constant exposure to coal dust leads to occupational diseases such as pneumoconiosis, which remains a concern despite regulatory efforts. Mine fires in regions like Jharia, which have extended into parts of ECL operations, release toxic gases including carbon monoxide, benzene and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (Mishra et al., 2008). These gases not only contribute to greenhouse emissions but also lead to eye irritation, skin disorders and long-term carcinogenic effects. Children and the elderly are particularly vulnerable to such pollutants. In urbanized mining zones like Asansol and Durgapur, coal burning and dust accumulation contribute to the urban heat island effect, raising local temperatures and altering microclimates (Sarkar & Bose, 2003). The degradation of air quality also deters tourism and investment, impacting the region's economic diversification prospects. The use of outdated equipment and lack of dust suppression technologies further amplify the problem. Despite recommendations for the use of water sprinklers, green belts and enclosed conveyors, compliance remains low due to cost-cutting and poor monitoring (Banerjee, 2003). Consequently, air pollution from ECL mines represents a systemic failure in balancing development with environmental responsibility.

Water contamination is another serious hazard linked to coal mining in the ECL belt. The discharge of mine water, slurry and tailings into nearby rivers and ponds introduces toxic substances like iron, manganese and suspended solids into the ecosystem (Singh & Roy, 2006). In mining areas of Pandaveswar and Kenda, groundwater samples have been found to exceed permissible limits of dissolved solids and heavy metals (Chopra et al., 2009). Acid mine drainage (AMD) is a particular concern in older mines where sulfide minerals interact with air and water to produce sulfuric acid, lowering pH levels in nearby water bodies (Skousen et al., 1994). This acidic runoff dissolves heavy metals, making the water unfit for drinking and irrigation. The aquatic life in such streams is either wiped out or severely reduced due to toxicity and reduced oxygen levels (Mishra & Patel, 2010). The overuse and diversion of groundwater for mining and dust suppression also lead to a drop in water tables, making it difficult for local residents to access clean water (Tiwary, 2001). Wells and boreholes in adjacent villages often dry up or become contaminated, increasing the dependency on external water sources and raising the cost of living. River systems like the Damodar have historically borne the brunt of mining pollution due to frequent contamination from coal washing plants and industrial effluents (Bhattacharya & Chakraborty, 2005). The lack of modern effluent treatment plants and proper waste disposal systems continues to endanger this crucial waterway. Seasonal variation in pollution levels is also evident, with the monsoon washing away surface pollutants into water bodies, leading to sudden spikes in contamination. This not only affects fishery resources but also endangers cattle and livestock that depend on these sources for hydration (Maiti, 2004). Thus, the impact of mining on water systems reflects both direct contamination and systemic neglect of water management.

Ecological collapse and the crisis of biodiversity in ECL mining zones

Mining operations in the Eastern Coalfields Limited (ECL) region have had a profoundly disruptive effect on local ecosystems. The large-scale conversion of natural landscapes into industrial extraction zones has led to a loss of ecological integrity and fragmentation of once-continuous habitats. Forests that once supported a diverse array of flora and fauna have been systematically cleared to make room for open-cast mining pits, transportation routes, storage yards and overburden dumps. This has not only diminished forest cover but also broken critical ecological corridors that sustained seasonal migration and inter-species interactions (Roy, 1998). The Ajay-Damodar interfluvial region, once rich in biodiversity, now presents a fragmented and degraded landscape due to incessant mining, pollution and anthropogenic disturbances (Chakraborty, 2006). The implications of this ecological degradation are evident in the disappearance or drastic reduction in wildlife populations. Species that were once common, such as foxes, snakes, mongoose, peacocks and various migratory birds are now rarely sighted in the region. Their decline is primarily attributed to habitat destruction, pollution and the absence of ecological niches. Insect pollinators such as bees and butterflies, essential for crop production and wild plant regeneration, have also declined significantly due to both air and chemical pollution from coal processing activities. This, in turn, affects agricultural productivity and ecosystem regeneration. The soil fauna, including earthworms, ants and other decomposers, has been disrupted due to toxic leachates and topsoil removal, further hampering soil health and nutrient cycling.

Equally concerning is the gradual disappearance of key native plant species like Shorea robusta (Sal), Madhuca longifolia (Mahua), and Butea monosperma (Palash), especially in areas subjected to continuous overburden dumping and frequent blasting (Gupta & Mallick, 2004). These species not only provided ecological stability but were also of cultural and economic significance to local communities, being used in traditional medicine, rituals and forest-based livelihoods. Their removal represents both a biological and socio-cultural loss. Reclamation activities undertaken by mining authorities, where present, often prioritize visual restoration over ecological functionality. Afforestation programs typically involve fast-growing exotic or non-native species such as Eucalyptus or Acacia auriculiformis, which may produce biomass rapidly but fail to support native wildlife or reestablish original plant-pollinator interactions (Rai et al., 2002). As a result, reclaimed areas often appear green superficially but remain ecologically barren, incapable of hosting diverse trophic levels or reestablishing the native forest ecosystem. Such green washing tactics, though cosmetically appealing in reports and Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) documents, do little to repair long-term ecological damage. Moreover, the absence of ecological buffer zones between mining infrastructure and surrounding forests increases the likelihood of spillover effects such as edge degradation, wildlife conflict and illegal encroachment. Forest edges near mines often become degraded due to continuous vehicular movement, noise, light pollution and accumulation of coal dust. This further stresses sensitive species, especially those dependent on stable microclimates or undisturbed forest interiors. Edge habitats also facilitate the invasion of non-native or opportunistic species, thereby altering the structure and function of local ecosystems.

Noise pollution from blasting, drilling and heavy machinery operations introduces another layer of ecological disruption. Many vertebrates, particularly amphibians, birds and reptiles, rely on acoustic signals for mating calls, territorial behavior and navigation. Prolonged exposure to noise can suppress reproductive behaviors, disrupt migration and disorient animal movement patterns (Verma et al., 2007). Amphibians such as frogs and toads, already sensitive to chemical changes in aquatic systems, face compounded risks from acoustic interference, leading to population decline or local extinction. Even ground-dwelling and burrowing species are not spared, as frequent vibrations from mining disturb their nesting grounds and natural burrows. Unfortunately, the regulatory mechanisms intended to mitigate such ecological damages have not performed effectively. Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs), which are legally required prior to mining expansion or new project approval, often fall short of comprehensive evaluation. In many cases, biodiversity assessments within EIAs are limited in scope, conducted hastily, or presented using outdated or generalized data. This leads to underreporting of ecological value and misrepresentation of the likely impacts (Pandey, 2001). Furthermore, the monitoring and follow-up mechanisms outlined in such assessments are rarely enforced or resourced adequately, resulting in non-compliance and ecological oversight.

One of the most critical gaps lies in the exclusion of local communities from the environmental monitoring and management process. Indigenous and forest-dependent populations possess generations of traditional ecological knowledge (TEK) that could significantly inform sustainable conservation strategies. However, these voices are often sidelined or entirely ignored in official mining consultations and planning forums. The top-down nature of mining governance in ECL zones limits participation and fosters distrust. As a result, even when conservation plans are proposed, they are viewed with skepticism by communities who have repeatedly witnessed displacement and degradation without adequate rehabilitation or compensation. The cumulative impact of ecological disruption and biodiversity loss in ECL mining areas is long-lasting and not easily reversible. Unlike air or water pollution, where certain improvements may occur with technical intervention, loss of biodiversity, particularly at the species and genetic levels can be permanent. Additionally, ecosystem services such as climate regulation, water filtration, carbon sequestration and natural pest control diminish drastically when biodiversity is compromised. The loss of such services not only affects the environment but also undermines human health, food security and local economies.

Socioeconomic vulnerabilities and administrative apathy

The environmental hazards caused by ECL mining activities are intricately linked with socioeconomic challenges. Communities residing near the mines face a multitude of risks from health disorders to livelihood losses, all exacerbated by inadequate compensation and lack of participatory planning (Areeparampil, 1996). Land acquisition often occurs without proper consultation or adherence to the principles of free, prior and informed consent, especially affecting marginalized tribal groups in the region (Fernandes & Raj, 1992). The employment benefits offered by coal mining are often overstated. With increasing mechanization, the number of direct jobs has declined, while the burden of environmental degradation has been left to the local people to bear (Deb, 1998). Traditional livelihoods such as farming, fishing and forest gathering have diminished due to pollution; land loss and ecosystem decline (Sharma & Singh, 2009). This displacement without adequate economic rehabilitation leads to social instability, migration, and increased poverty. Health expenditures among affected communities are disproportionately high. Studies show elevated medical costs related to respiratory diseases, skin conditions and waterborne illnesses among residents living within a 5 km radius of ECL mines (Chatterjee & Ghosh, 2005). Many lack access to clean water and medical facilities, further aggravating their vulnerabilities.

From a policy standpoint, the existing regulatory framework under agencies like the Ministry of Environment and Forests (MoEF) and the Central Pollution Control Board (CPCB) has failed to enforce accountability effectively (Bajaj, 2002). Environmental Clearances (ECs) are granted without rigorous ground assessment or long-term monitoring. Environmental Management Plans (EMPs) are often prepared as a formality, with little follow-up action on ground reclamation, resettlement, or pollution mitigation (Dutta, 2001). Additionally, corporate social responsibility (CSR) initiatives by ECL are frequently limited to tokenistic projects like building schools or donating water tanks, while ignoring the structural causes of vulnerability (Mukherjee, 2003). These projects do not address the cumulative environmental impacts or promote sustainable alternatives. Community feedback mechanisms are either absent or not institutionalized, weakening democratic oversight. In many cases, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and community-based movements have attempted to fill these gaps by documenting violations, advocating for rights and supporting local protests (Ray, 1997). However, they often face resistance, lack of funds and bureaucratic delays. The legal avenues, such as filing complaints through the National Green Tribunal (NGT) are time-consuming and not easily accessible to the poor and marginalized. A holistic policy response is urgently required, one that integrates environmental conservation with community development. This must involve stricter environmental auditing, participatory land use planning and effective grievance redress mechanisms. Additionally, a transition strategy must be envisioned for a post-coal economy in ECL zones, with investments in green jobs and ecological restoration (Lahiri-Dutt, 2003). Without such structural reforms, the region will continue to suffer long after coal reserves are exhausted.

Conclusion

The Eastern Coalfields Limited (ECL) mining areas offer a vivid illustration of how economic development, when pursued without ecological foresight and social sensitivity, can produce enduring damage to both nature and human lives. The environmental hazards found in these regions, soil degradation, air and water pollution, and biodiversity loss do not exist in silos. They are deeply interlinked consequences of prolonged, unregulated and profit-driven mining practices. These operations, conducted over decades, have not only disfigured the physical landscape but have fundamentally altered the ecological equilibrium of the region. Equally troubling is the socio-economic dislocation that mining has brought upon local communities. Agricultural livelihoods have been uprooted; ancestral lands have been turned into barren waste; and clean water, once a public good is now a scarce resource. Residents live with chronic respiratory ailments, economic uncertainty and cultural disconnection. The promise of development has failed to materialize for the very populations who sacrificed the most. The benefits have accrued largely to external stakeholders, urban industries, energy conglomerates, and distant consumers while the mining zones themselves remain marked by poverty, neglect and social fragmentation. Government policies and institutional frameworks have not adequately responded to these crises. Although environmental regulations, rehabilitation programs and corporate responsibility mandates do exist, they are frequently undermined by poor implementation, tokenism and a lack of accountability. Communities are rarely consulted meaningfully; their voices are either ignored or sidelined in favor of extractive agendas. In many cases, the processes meant to protect these populations have become performative gestures rather than instruments of real justice and restoration.

What is urgently required is a radical transformation in the way mining is perceived, governed and executed in the ECL region. The future of these landscapes and their people hinges on a shift from extractivism to regeneration, where technological innovation, policy reform and ethical governance converge to rebuild what has been lost. Mining must no longer be seen merely as an economic activity but as a high-stakes interaction with nature and society that carries long-term responsibilities. This entails adopting low-impact extraction technologies, enforcing strict post-mining land reclamation, investing in renewable alternatives and ensuring that affected communities are active participants in planning and benefit-sharing. Ecological restoration cannot be treated as an afterthought. It should be the foundation of any development model pursued in mining zones. This involves reviving native biodiversity, rebuilding topsoil, reestablishing water flows and allowing landscapes to heal in ecological timeframes. Equally, social restoration demands secure housing, functional healthcare, education and the rebuilding of cultural and economic systems destroyed by displacement. The ECL mining story encapsulates the larger dilemma of modern development, whether we prioritize short-term gains or commit to long-term sustainability. For India, which aspires to economic leadership on the global stage, the question is not whether to develop, but how to develop in a way that safeguards its ecological heritage and honors its people. A just transition is not only desirable but necessary where progress does not come at the cost of planetary and human integrity. Ultimately, the scars left by mining in ECL areas serve as a cautionary tale. But they also offer an opportunity to rethink, rebuild and restore. The path forward must be one of inclusive development grounded in respect for nature, empathy for the displaced and a vision of prosperity that is shared, not extracted.

References

1. Areeparampil, M. (1996). Displacement Due to Mining in Jharkhand. Economic and Political Weekly, 31(24), 1524–1528.
2. Bajaj, J. K. (2002). Environmental Regulation in India: Policy and Practice. Centre for Policy Studies Working Paper.
3. Banerjee, S. (2003). Dust Control in Opencast Mines: Techniques and Performance. Indian Journal of Environmental Protection, 23(5), 456–460.
4. Bharati, K., & Mishra, K. (2012). Mining and Land Use Conflicts in India. Journal of Land and Development, 6(1), 45–59.
5. Bhattacharya, A., & Chakraborty, S. (2005). Pollution of Damodar River Due to Industrial Effluents. Indian Journal of Environmental Health, 47(2), 91–99.
6. Chakraborty, T. (2006). Forest Fragmentation in Eastern Coalfields. Biodiversity Watch, 4(3), 35–42.
7. Chatterjee, R., & Ghosh, S. (2005). Public Health Risk Assessment in Coal Mining Areas. Environment and Urbanization Asia, 12(1), 55–67.
8. Chatterjee, R., Singh, A., & Das, S. (2015). Impacts of Coal Mining on Land Use in Raniganj Area. Indian Journal of Geoscience, 69(2), 90–101.
9. Chopra, H., Dutta, M., & Sen, B. (2009). Hydro-Geochemistry of Mining Zones in ECL. Journal of Environmental Studies, 14(4), 203–210.
10. Deb, M. (1998). Labour and Mechanization in the Coal Sector. Indian Labour Journal, 39(8), 801–810.
11. Dutta, R. (2001). EIA in Mining Projects: A Critical Review. Indian Journal of Environmental Management, 11(2), 101–107.
12. Fernandes, W., & Raj, S. A. (1992). Development-Induced Displacement: Impact on Women. Indian Social Institute, New Delhi.
13. Ghose, M. K. (2002). Environmental Problems in Coal Mining Areas. The Indian Mining & Engineering Journal, 41(4), 24–27.
14. Ghose, M. K., & Majee, S. R. (2001). Air Pollution in Mining: Sources and Control. Journal of Environmental Management, 63(2), 187–198.
15. Ghosh, T., Banerjee, R., & Mitra, D. (2004). Respiratory Disorders in Mining Towns: A Study of ECL. Health and Environment, 8(2), 13–19.
16. Gupta, R., & Mallick, S. (2004). Vegetation Loss in Mining Impact Zones. Indian Forester, 130(6), 637–643.
17. Kumar, A., & Singh, P. K. (2005). Soil Pollution Due to Heavy Metals in Mining Areas. Journal of Industrial Pollution Control, 21(1), 103–108.
18. Lahiri-Dutt, K. (2003). Gendered Livelihoods in Small Mines and Quarries in India. Working Paper, ANU.
19. Maiti, S. K. (2004). Ecorestoration of the Degraded Lands Due to Mining. Journal of Scientific and Industrial Research, 63(11), 865–876.
20. Maiti, S. K., & Ghose, M. K. (2005). Vegetables as Biomarkers for Heavy Metal Pollution. Environmental Monitoring and Assessment, 107(1-3), 1–12.
21. Mishra, D., & Patel, R. (2010). Water Pollution and Its Control in Coal Mining Areas. Journal of Environmental Science and Engineering, 52(3), 231–236.
22. Mishra, R., Jha, M., & Pathak, M. (2008). Mine Fires and Their Environmental Impact. Mining Engineers Journal, 9(10), 20–27.

23. Mukherjee, S. (2003). CSR in Mining Industry: A Critical Overview. Indian Journal of Corporate Affairs, 2(1), 45–52.
24. Pandey, D. N. (2001). Participatory Forest Management: Policy Implications. World Forest Review, 76(3), 209–217.
25. Rai, R., Singh, V., & Roy, S. (2002). Reclamation Strategies in Coal Mining. Ecological Engineering, 18(4), 439–445.
26. Ray, R. (1997). Environmental Movements in Eastern India. Social Action, 47(2), 143–157.
27. Roy, S. (1998). Forest Clearance for Mining Projects: An Ecological Appraisal. Ecology and Development, 5(1), 22–31.
28. Sahu, H. B., & Dash, S. (2011). Land Use Changes in Coal Mining Areas. Earth Science Frontier, 18(3), 62–69.
29. Sarkar, A., & Bose, A. (2003). Urban Microclimate in Industrial Towns. Climatology Bulletin of India, 31(1), 34–42.
30. Sengupta, S. (2010). Reclamation of Coal Mining Sites: A Case Study. Indian Journal of Environmental Sciences, 14(2), 102–109.
31. Sharma, R., & Singh, D. (2009). Socioeconomic Impact of Mining: A Study from Jharkhand. Social Change, 39(2), 243–259.
32. Singh, G., & Roy, P. (2006). Water Pollution Due to Coal Mining. Indian Mining Journal, 50(3), 13–18.
33. Singh, T. N., Verma, A. K., & Yadav, R. (2007). Subsidence and Surface Deformation in Mining Areas. Journal of Mining Science, 43(3), 301–308.
34. Skousen, J., Ziemkiewicz, P. F., & McDonald, L. M. (1994). Acid Mine Drainage Control and Treatment. Environmental Technology Journal, 15(3), 203–216.
35. Tiwary, R. K. (2001). Environmental Impact of Coal Mining in India. Environmental Management, 26(3), 263–281.
36. Verma, S. K., Singh, R., & Dubey, M. (2007). Noise Pollution and Wildlife in Mining Areas. Indian Wildlife Journal, 8(1), 49–55.