ILE MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL

VOLUME 4 AND ISSUE 2 OF 2025

INSTITUTE OF LEGAL EDUCATION

ILE MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL

APIS – 3920 – 0007 | ISSN - 2583-7230

(OPEN ACCESS JOURNAL)

Journal's Home Page – https://mj.iledu.in/

Journal's Editorial Page - https://mj.iledu.in/editorial-board/

Volume 4 and Issue 2 (Access Full Issue on - https://mj.iledu.in/category/volume-4-and-issue-2-of-2025/)

Publisher

Prasanna S,

Chairman of Institute of Legal Education

No. 08, Arul Nagar, Seera Thoppu,

Maudhanda Kurichi, Srirangam,

Tiruchirappalli – 620102

Phone : +91 94896 71437 - info@iledu.in / Chairman@iledu.in

ILE MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL [IF SCORE – 7.58]

VOLUME 4 AND ISSUE 2 OF 2025

APIS – 3920 – 0007 | ISSN - 2583-7230

Published by

Institute of Legal Education

https://iledu.in

GMO, BIOHAZARD WASTE AND BIODIVERSITY: CAN A "DNA POLLUTION TAX" BE THE ANSWER?

AUTHOR - NIVETHA BASKAR, STUDENT OF POST GRADUATION IN 2 YRS LLM IN TAXTION LAW PURSUING AT SCHOOL OF EXCELLENCE IN LAW, TAMIL NADU DR. AMBEDKAR LAW UNIVERSITY, THARAMANI, CHENNAI. 113

BEST CITATION - NIVETHA BASKAR, GMO, BIOHAZARD WASTE AND BIODIVERSITY: CAN A "DNA POLLUTION TAX" BE THE ANSWER?, ILE MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL, 4 (2) OF 2025, PG. 361-372, APIS – 3920-0007 | ISSN - 2583-7230.

ABSTRACT

The rapid growth of biotechnology has introduced new risks to the environment. This is due to the release of genetically modified organisms (GMOs), synthetic biology products, and biohazardous waste. This issue, often called DNA pollution, refers to the unintended introduction of genetically active material into natural ecosystems. This material can interact with native species, disrupt biodiversity, and create ecological imbalances. Traditional environmental laws in India, as well as international laws, mainly focus on chemical, industrial, and air and water pollution. However, they do not specifically regulate genetic or DNA-based pollutants. This research looks into whether a "DNA Pollution Tax" on industries like agricultural biotechnology, livestock and aquaculture, pharmaceuticals, industrial biotech, synthetic biology, and medical laboratories could be an effective legal tool for protecting biodiversity. The study uses a doctrinal approach, analyzing laws, court cases, international treaties, and academic literature to identify gaps in environmental regulation. It explores the possible effects of a DNA Pollution Tax in encouraging safer practices, reducing ecological risks, and promoting accountability in biotech industries. The findings show that while current laws touch on genetic pollution, there is a strong need for targeted regulatory tools that combine economic and legal approaches. The research concludes that a DNA Pollution Tax, if designed with specific scientific and legal safeguards, could be an innovative solution to balance technological advancement with environmental sustainability.

KEYWORDS: *DNA Pollution, Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs), Biodiversity Protection, Environmental Law, Biohazardous Waste, Synthetic Biology, Gene Editing (CRISPR, Gene Drives), Agricultural Biotechnology, Industrial Biotechnology, Pharmaceutical and Biomedical Waste, Environmental Regulation, Legal Accountability, Environmental Governance*

I. INTRODUCTION

Industries of contemporary age are making more and more use of genetically modified organism (GMO), gene editing technology and sophisticated genetical technologies including bio process and the advantages they have produced created pollution in different forms. India produces around 743 tons of biomedical waste every day, says the Central Pollution Control Board. Most of it gets burned or dumped illegally, which causes severe health risks these of these actively utilized genetic material and biohazards to environment summons new disease and pollution into population, these kinds of hazards and pollutants increase each year. In 2023-24, India had total approximately 990,000 metric tons of raw e-waste, and other harmful waste streams were likely to further increase as a result of rising urbanization and consumption. So all these wastes dumping and pollution will have negative impact on the living beings in the eco system with the exception of the chemical pollutant which exist due to the age old process these biologically and genetically evolved waste can spread multiple or mix with the eco

system like with water air soil, animals and other microbes which can happen in unpredictable manner this kind of pollution may have several harmful effects ranging from long term and possibly irreversible effect on the living beings as well as on the environment existing environmental law in India as well as international statues and legislation primarily control and overlook upon only air water and soil type pollution and put stress upon genetic and biologically evolved pollution as there is no specific legislation which puts stress upon the DNA pollution issues

II. RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

1. To explore the existing Indian and global legislation that addresses pollution, GMOs, and biotechnology, and determine whether they provide for addressing the threat of DNA-based pollution.
2. To analyze the constitutional and legislative authorities in India to impose new taxes, particularly for environmental purposes.
3. To determine if a "DNA Pollution Tax" would be legally acceptable under principles such as the Polluter Pays Principle, Precautionary Principle, and Sustainable Development.
4. To examine how other countries have similar environmental or "green" taxes and whether models there can be used for DNA or biohazard waste.
5. To formulate legal recommendations for creating and enforcing a DNA Pollution Tax which serves to promote biodiversity and advance safe biotechnology innovation.

III. RESEARCH PROBLEM

Industries, firms that handle genetically modified organisms (GMOs) and other biohazards can discharge waste containing active DNA and other genetic modified materials into the environment. In contrast to traditional chemical pollution, this genetic material has the ability to spread, mutate, and combine with natural plants, animals, and microbes in unforeseen manners, threatening biodiversity. There is current Indian and global law that manages pollution, biotechnology, and tax collection discretely, but no legal mechanism aimed at compelling industries to pay for the special risk of DNA-based pollution. This study explores if a new "DNA Pollution Tax" might be designed under India's constitutional and environmental law regime to compel polluters to pay for ensuing harm and, simultaneously, promote safer biotech innovation.

IV. HYPOTHESIS

H1 - Charging a "DNA Pollution Tax" for industries releasing GMOs or biohazardous waste will produce a legally justifiable and efficacious instrument for safeguarding biodiversity and promoting safer industry operations through fiscal responsibility.

V. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. Do the current Indian and global environmental laws address the issue of DNA-based or biohazardous pollution?
2. Is it possible under India's Constitution to have a special tax that can cover risks from GMOs or other genetic waste?
3. How do legal principles such as the Polluter Pays Principle and the Precautionary Principle enhance or constrain the concept of a DNA Pollution Tax?
4. What are some examples of environmental or "green" taxes elsewhere in the world that could inform the design of a DNA Pollution Tax in India?
5. How can a DNA Pollution Tax be designed so that it preserves biodiversity without discouraging safe and beneficial biotechnology innovation?

VI.SCOPE

The legal viability of implementing a "DNA Pollution Tax" in India will be the main topic of this study. It will look at the taxation, environmental, and constitutional provisions of India and compare them to international agreements and other nations' examples of

environmental taxes. The study will examine the ways in which legal precepts like the Precautionary Principle, the Polluter Pays Principle, and Sustainable Development can be used to justify taxing businesses that emit genetically modified organisms (GMOs) or other biohazardous waste. The study will continue to be doctrinal, which means that rather than using field research or lab data, it will rely on legal texts, case laws, and academic commentary.

VII.LIMITATION

The study will not estimate the precise amount of DNA-based pollution in India or forecast how it will affect biodiversity scientifically. It will not calculate the exact tax rate or financial model, as that would require detailed economic and scientific data outside the scope of doctrinal legal research. The research will also not evaluate the technical feasibility of monitoring and tracking genetic waste at every industry site. Instead, it will focus only on the legal framework and theoretical design of a tax-based approach to protect biodiversity from modern biotechnology risks.

VIII. RESEARCH METHODOLGY

This study will employ a doctrinal research methodology, focusing on legal texts, statutes, constitutional provisions, international treaties, case laws, and scholarly writings, rather than utilizing field surveys or experiments. The study will gather and examine primary sources, including the Indian Constitution, environmental statutes such as the Environment (Protection) Act, the Biological Diversity Act, and pertinent taxation laws, as well as significant rulings from Indian courts that address the Polluter Pays and Precautionary Principles. This study will incorporate secondary sources such as academic articles, commentaries, and reports related to environmental taxation and biotechnology regulation to pinpoint gaps and explore potential solutions.

XI.DNA POLLUTION

"DNA pollution" refers and means the unintentional release, spread, or lasting presence of genetically modified or synthetic genetic material from human activities into the natural environment. This material can interact with native organisms and ecosystems. It includes the escape of genetically modified crops, animals, insects, or microbes, the improper disposal of genetically active biomedical or industrial waste, and the introduction of synthetic genes or gene-editing systems like CRISPR or gene drives that may transfer traits to wild species. DNA pollution is different from traditional chemical pollution because it involves living or functional genetic material that can reproduce, mutate, or recombine. This poses long-term and sometimes irreversible risks to biodiversity, ecological balance, and public health. In this study, DNA pollution is seen as a legal and ecological challenge that needs new regulatory tools—such as targeted taxation—to create accountability and encourage safer biotechnology practices.[540]

X.INDUSTRIES INVOLED IN POLLUTION

Industries involved in DNA or genetically modified pollution include those that directly handle, create, or dispose of organisms or materials with altered genetic content. Agricultural biotechnology is a major sector, producing genetically modified (GM) seeds and crops that can cross-pollinate with wild plants and change local ecosystems. Livestock and aquaculture biotechnology introduces gene-edited fish, poultry, or insects. If these organisms escape or breed with wild populations, they may disrupt natural biodiversity. The pharmaceutical and biomedical industries use genetically engineered bacteria, yeast, or viral vectors to manufacture medicines, vaccines, and gene therapies. Poor containment or waste disposal can release these modified agents into the environment. Industrial biotechnology

[540] A.H. Parrott & J.K. Bartlett, *DNA Pollution: Genetically Modified Organisms and Environmental Risk*, 12 ENVTL. L. REV. 215, 217 (2002)

employs engineered microbes for biofuels, biodegradable plastics, and enzyme production. Similar risks arise if waste treatment is inadequate. Synthetic biology and gene-editing start-ups experiment with entirely new organisms, gene drives, and CRISPR-based tools, which create uncertainty regarding environmental impacts if they are accidentally released. Additionally, hospitals, diagnostic labs, and research facilities generate biohazardous waste with potentially genetically active materials, while food processing and fermentation industries sometimes use modified yeasts or bacteria in controlled systems. Together, these sectors represent the main human-made pathways through which DNA-based or biohazardous pollution can enter and interact with natural ecosystems, creating unique legal and ecological challenges.[541]

XI. DNA POLLUTION AND INDIAN AND INTERNATIONAL STATUES

Environmental laws globally mainly aim to control traditional pollution like air, water, soil, and chemical pollutants. However, the rapid growth of biotechnology and genetic engineering has brought new challenges, including DNA-based pollution and biohazardous waste. DNA-based pollution happens when genetically modified organisms (GMOs) or genetic material unintentionally enter natural ecosystems, potentially harming biodiversity. Biohazardous pollution involves pathogens, genetically engineered microorganisms, or other biological agents that can threaten humans, animals, or the environment.

A. INDIA

In India, the government recognizes the risks linked to GMOs and biohazardous waste and has created some regulatory frameworks, but the law is still developing. The main legislation includes:

1. Environment (Protection) Act, [542] – This law gives the government the power to regulate environmental pollution, including hazardous substances. Although it doesn't specifically mention DNA or GMOs, it allows the creation of rules to address new risks.

2. Rules for the Manufacture, Use, Import, Export, and Storage of Hazardous Microorganisms/Genetically Engineered Organisms (1989) – Known as the "Biohazard Rules," these are meant to regulate genetically engineered organisms and microbes. They enforce strict containment protocols in laboratories and industries to avoid accidental release into the environment. [543]

3. Genetic Engineering Appraisal Committee (GEAC) – Under the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, the GEAC oversees the environmental release of GMOs. Any large-scale use of GMOs in farming, industry, or research must get GEAC approval to ensure biosafety.

4. Biomedical Waste Management Rules, 2016 – These rules govern the disposal of biohazardous medical waste, including lab cultures and genetically modified material, to prevent environmental contamination. Even with these laws, enforcement can be difficult, and there are gaps in monitoring accidental releases or long-term ecological effects. [544]

B. INTERNATIONAL STATUES

On the international front, several agreements and guidelines tackle biohazards and genetic pollution, though they may not be directly labeled as "DNA pollution laws":

1. Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (2000) – This agreement, part of the Convention on Biological Diversity, addresses the safe handling, transport, and use of living modified organisms (LMOs) that might harm biodiversity. It is the

[541] *Genetically Engineered Salmon Approval*, U.S. Food & Drug Admin. (2015), https://www.fda.gov/animal-veterinary/animals-intentional-genomic-alterations/genetically-engineered-salmon

[542] *The Environment (Protection) Act, 1986*, No. 29, Acts of Parliament, 1986

[543] Rules for the Manufacture, Use, Import, Export, and Storage of Hazardous Microorganisms/Genetically Engineered Organisms, 1989, G.S.R. 1037(E), Gazette of India, Dec. 5, 1989 (India).

[544] Biomedical Waste Management Rules, 2016, G.S.R. 343(E), Gazette of India, Mar. 28, 2016 (India).

most crucial international legal tool for dealing with DNA-based pollution. [545]

2. Codex Alimentarius and WHO Guidelines – These provide advice on the safe use of GMOs and handling biohazardous materials to protect humans and the environment. [546]

3. OECD Guidelines – The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development offers detailed biosafety standards for laboratories and industries that work with GMOs. Despite these frameworks, a significant limitation exists. Most environmental laws were not initially created to manage the complex risks of genetic pollution. Regulatory systems often react to issues rather than address them proactively, and monitoring, especially regarding unintentional environmental releases, is limited. This leads to legal and practical gaps that bioethicists, environmentalists, and policymakers are currently discussing. [547]

In short, existing Indian and international laws partially tackle DNA-based and biohazardous pollution through biosafety rules, GMO regulations, and biohazard management standards. However, these frameworks are still developing and have shortcomings in enforcement, long-term ecological oversight, and handling accidental or unknown risks. The law tends to focus more on containment and controlled use instead of fully preventing environmental genetic contamination

XII. CAN INDIA CREATE TAXING ARENA TO TAX THE POLLUTION

India's Constitution clearly outlines who can impose taxes and for what reason. Both the Union (Central Government) and the States can levy taxes, but each tax requires legal authorization. Article 265[548] of the Constitution states that no tax shall be levied or collected without the authority of law. This means the government must have a valid legal basis to impose any tax.

Environmental protection is a key public interest in India. The Constitution lists environmental matters in the Concurrent List, allowing both the Union and the States to create laws on related topics such as forests, wildlife, and pollution prevention. Therefore, creating a tax specifically to prevent environmental damage—such as harm from genetically modified organisms (GMOs) or genetic waste—falls within the government's constitutional authority.

A. Existing Legal Framework and Precedents

India already has special taxes, known as green cess or environmental cess. These taxes target pollution and fund environmental protection. For example: A cess on coal and mining activities funds pollution control measures. A plastic waste and water cess discourages environmental harm. In a similar way, a "GMO Risk Cess" or "Genetic Pollution Tax" or tax termed as DNA pollution tax could be legally introduced. This tax could apply to industries or laboratories that Produce, import, or handle genetically modified organisms, Generate genetically engineered or biohazardous waste.[549]

Such a tax would have two main objectives:

1. Preventive: It would discourage careless handling or excessive production of GMOs.

2. Remedial: The funds collected could support monitoring, research, and cleanup efforts related to genetic pollution risks.

[545] Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety to the Convention on Biological Diversity, Jan. 29, 2000, 2226 U.N.T.S. 208.
[546] Codex Alimentarius Commission, *Principles for the Risk Analysis of Foods Derived from Modern Biotechnology*, CAC/GL 44-2003 (2003).
[547] Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), *Recombinant DNA Safety Considerations* (1986). , OECD, *Safety Considerations for Biotechnology: Scale-up of Crop Plants* (1993)., OECD, *Best Practice Guidelines for Biological Resource Centres* (2007).
[548] INDIA CONST. art. 265 ("No tax shall be levied or collected except by authority of law.").
[549] Department of Biotechnology, Ministry of Science and Technology, Government of India, Rules for the Manufacture, Use, Import, Export and Storage of Hazardous Microorganisms/Genetically Engineered Organisms or Cells, 1989, available at https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC6069684/
Green Taxation in India: Its Impact and Necessity, Our Legal World, available at https://tax.ourlegalworld.com/green-taxation-its-impact-and-necessity-in-india/; Biotechnology Regulatory Authority of India, Wikipedia, available at https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Biotechnology_Regulatory_Authority_of_India

B. Constitutional Basis for Such a Tax

1. Union Government Powers:

The Union can impose taxes on goods, services, or imports under Article 246 and the Union List. [550]A central "GMO or Genetic Risk Cess" could apply to interstate commerce, imports, or national production.

2. State Government Powers:

States can impose local cess on industries within their jurisdictions. This could include laboratories, factories, or farms producing genetically modified seeds or organisms.

3. Legal Authorization:

Any such tax must be established through a legal framework by Parliament or the State Legislature. The Environment (Protection) Act, 1986 provides broad authority to the government to regulate activities that harm the environment. This act can support a tax aimed at preventing genetic or biohazardous pollution. Likewise, a new legislation can be established

C. International Obligations and Compliance

India is a party to international treaties like the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, which addresses the safe handling, transport, and use of living modified organisms (LMOs). A special tax could support these international commitments by funding:

• Monitoring of GMO releases.

• Research on biosafety.

• Actions to reduce potential ecological damage.

Practical Implementation

A practical approach to implementing a "GMO Risk Cess" could involve:

• Tax subjects: Companies producing or importing GMOs, research labs dealing with genetic material, and industrial units producing genetic waste.

• Tax calculation: This could be based on the volume of GMOs handled, the activity's risk level, or annual revenue.

• Fund usage: Establish a national biosafety fund to monitor environmental effects, conduct risk studies, and finance emergency containment measures.

• Regulatory oversight: Collaborate with the Genetic Engineering Appraisal Committee (GEAC), which already manages the environmental release of GMOs.

XIII. LEGAL PRINCIPLES RELEVANT TO DNA POLLUTION TAX

Two key principles in environmental law—the Polluter Pays Principle (PPP) and the Precautionary Principle (PP)—are directly related to the idea of creating a tax on genetic or DNA-based pollution. Both principles are recognized under Indian law and international environmental law.

A. The Polluter Pays Principle (PPP)

The Polluter Pays Principle states that those responsible for environmental harm should bear the costs of preventing, controlling, or fixing the damage. It ensures that the financial burden of pollution does not fall on society or the state. As such for the DNA Pollution Tax or "GMO Risk Cess" embodies the PPP. Industries handling GMOs or biohazardous waste are the potential polluters. By imposing a tax, these industries would take on the financial responsibility for the ecological or health risks they create. The tax must relate to the risk or pollution level; if set randomly, courts may see it as punitive instead of compensatory. And the tax imposed must related to the environmental harm caused Predominately the collected funds could be used for:

- Monitoring the unintentional release of GMOs.
- Containment and cleanup of biohazardous waste.

[550] INDIA CONST. art. 246

ILE MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL [IF SCORE – 7.58]
VOLUME 4 AND ISSUE 2 OF 2025
APIS – 3920 – 0007 | ISSN - 2583-7230
Published by
Institute of Legal Education
https://iledu.in

- Research on safe genetic engineering methods.
- This aligns with the principle, as it internalizes the cost of pollution and discourages risky practices.[551]

B. The Precautionary Principle (PP)

The Precautionary Principle asserts that if an activity could pose a significant risk of serious or irreversible harm to the environment or human health, the absence of full scientific certainty should not delay taking preventive action.as such the GMOs and genetic waste present emerging and uncertain risks—for instance, the accidental spread of genetically modified DNA into wild species could disrupt ecosystems in unknown ways. A DNA Pollution Tax is a preventive measure consistent with the Precautionary Principle. Even if risks are not fully quantified, the tax encourages industries to adopt safer handling practices and reduces the chance of harm. It also creates a financial reserve for the government to conduct research and respond to emergencies in the event of unforeseen contamination. The Precautionary Principle does not automatically validate high or punitive taxes; measures must be reasonable, necessary, and proportionate to potential risks. [552]

XIV. GLOBAL EXAMPLES OF ENVIRONMENT RELATED TAX

A.Switzerland – CO_2 Act

Overview: Switzerland's CO_2 Act, enacted in 2011, introduced a carbon tax on fossil fuels used for heating and industrial processes. It is applied to CO_2 emissions from fossil fuels, with revenues directed toward climate protection projects. Two-thirds of the tax revenue is redistributed to households and businesses to offset higher energy costs. It is Supported by an emissions trading scheme for industries that exceed emission limits. Likewise, a similar approach could be applied for DNA pollution, using revenues to support environmental remediation and public health initiatives.[553]

B. Denmark – Agricultural Emissions Tax

Denmark plans to impose a carbon tax on livestock emissions starting in 2030, aiming to reduce methane emissions from agriculture. Tax levied per ton of greenhouse gas emissions from livestock, with rates increasing over time. It provides for the establishment of a fund to assist the agricultural sector's change to sustainable practices. Policies developed through negotiations with farmers, industry, and environmental groups. likewise, an India's agricultural sector could be motivated to adopt sustainable practices through a similar tax structure, with provisions to support affected communities. [554]

C.European Union – Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism (CBAM)

The EU established CBAM to impose carbon costs on imports from countries with weaker climate policies. Importers must acquire carbon certificates that match the EU's carbon price, ensuring fairness for domestic producers. Gradual rollout, starting with data collection and leading to full implementation. Designed to promote worldwide adoption of carbon pricing strategies. Likewise, an India could consider a similar mechanism to tackle DNA pollution from imported goods, ensuring environmental costs are considered in trade.

XV. CONSIDERATIONS FOR LEGAL FRAMEWORK IN INDIA

As Inspired by Switzerland's CO_2 Act, India could create a federal law that specifically addresses DNA pollution. This law would set the scope, tax rates, and how the revenue would be used. Like Denmark, the revenues could go to a

[551] Application of Polluter Pays Principle in Indian Legal Jurisprudence, LawGratis,https://www.lawgratis.com/blog-detail/application-of-polluter-pays-principle-in-indian-legal-jurisprudence-1
[552] Precautionary Principle, its Interpretation and Application by the Indian Judiciary, GN Gill, *Environmental Law Review*, 2019,https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1461452919890283
[553] CO2 Act (Switzerland), Federal Act on the Reduction of CO2 Emissions (2024 revision),https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/CO2_Act_(Switzerland);
[554] Denmark to Introduce CO_2 Tax on Farms, Reuters (June 25, 2024),https://www.reuters.com/sustainability/denmark-will-be-first-impose-co2-tax-farms-government-says-2024-06-25

dedicated fund for environmental restoration and public health programs. Can farmed Involving affected communities, industries, and environmental groups, as Denmark does, would make sure the tax is fair and effective. A gradual rollout, starting with data collection and progressing to full enforcement, would allow for changes based on early results.

A. Legal Basis and Authority

To implement a DNA Pollution Tax in India, a clear legal structure is needed. It could be based on Articles 245–254 enable Parliament to make laws on any issue, including new taxes. Articles 48A and 21 emphasize environmental protection and public health. The law could be crafted as an amendment to current statutes like the Environment Protection Act of 1986, or as a new "DNA Pollution Control and Taxation Act." Can be created, The Ministry of Environment, Forests, and Climate Change (MoEFCC) could manage the tax, with help from the Central Pollution Control Board (CPCB) for monitoring. Or the power to enforce the tax can be vested with taxing authorities.

1. Clear Purpose

The first step is to define what the tax is meant to achieve. A DNA Pollution Tax should have two main goals:

1. Prevent harm to biodiversity from unsafe or uncontrolled release of genetically modified organisms (GMOs), synthetic DNA, or biohazardous genetic material.

2. Encourage innovation in safe, useful biotechnology, such as disease-resistant crops, medical treatments, and clean industrial processes. This means the tax should not punish all biotechnology but only risky or careless practices that threaten ecosystems.

B. Scope of the Tax

The DNA Pollution Tax would target industries or entities that release genetically modified organisms (GMOs), synthetic DNA, or other hazardous genetic material into the environment such as

• Biotechnology firms

• Pharmaceutical companies dealing with synthetic DNA

• Agricultural industries that release GM crops

• Waste management and lab effluents containing DNA or engineered organisms. The tax could cover both the production and disposal of genetic material.

C.Taxable Event and Measurement

• Emission-based: Tax based on the amount or concentration of DNA/genetic material released into air, water, or soil.

• Risk-based: Tax based on potential harm to biodiversity, human health, or ecosystems.

• Activity-based: Tax applied to the sale, import, or disposal of genetically modified organisms or synthetic DNA products. Instead of a flat tax, the structure should be sensitive to risk. This way, companies using safe practices pay less or nothing, while those creating higher risks pay more.

D.Measurement Mechanism:

• Laboratories and factories must report their emissions of genetic material.

• CPCB and State Pollution Control Boards (SPCBs) would conduct periodic audits.

• Advanced bio surveillance methods, like DNA barcoding or environmental genomics, can measure DNA pollution levels.

E.Tax Rate Design

The DNA Pollution Tax could be designed in tiers:

• Base Rate: A fixed amount for each kilogram or unit of genetically active material released.

• Progressive Rate: Higher rates for larger amounts or higher-risk organisms.

• Penalty for Non-Compliance: Significant fines or even suspension of operations for underreporting or illegal disposal. This approach is similar to Switzerland's method of using progressive carbon taxes and Denmark's livestock emission taxes.

F. Revenue from the DNA Pollution Tax could be dedicated to:

• Environmental restoration projects

• Biodiversity protection and conservation programs

• Research on safe disposal of genetic waste

• Public awareness campaigns on GMOs and biohazards

• Funding for biosafety labs and training programs. This follows the idea that "the polluter pays," making polluters responsible for environmental damage.

G. Incentives for Compliance

To promote voluntary compliance and innovation, the law might include:

• Recognition Programs: "Green Biotechnology" certification for compliant companies. A good tax should not only punish but also reward. The government could create: Tax credits for companies that Develop biotech that protects biodiversity, like bioremediation plants and disease-resistant native species. Invest in better containment, monitoring, or cleaning technology. Refunds or reductions for Firms proving their products have no harmful ecological impact.

Innovation funds: Part of the tax revenue could support safe biotech startups and public research that protects biodiversity. This creates a push-and-pull mechanism, pushing away from harm and pulling toward safety.

H. Administration and Monitoring

Effective administration requires:

• Centralized Registry: All industries handling genetic material must register with MoEFCC.

• Reporting Requirements: Mandatory quarterly reporting of DNA emissions.

• Inspections and Audits: Conducted by CPCB/SPCB following standard testing protocols.

• Penalties for Non-Compliance: Fines, production halts, or prosecution under Environmental Protection laws.

I. Phased Implementation Strategy

1. Phase 1 – Pilot Program: Identify high-risk industries and regions; start voluntary reporting.

2. Phase 2 – Partial Taxation: Introduce a low base tax with subsidies for compliance.

3. Phase 3 – Full Tax Enforcement: Scale nationwide with progressive tax rates and penalties.

4. Phase 4 – Review and Adjust: Assess environmental impact, how revenue is used, and adjust rates as necessary.

J. Special Protection for Sensitive Ecosystems

The tax system can include extra protection zones:

Higher tax or full prohibition near forests, wetlands, coral reefs, or biodiversity hotspots. Lower tax in controlled industrial zones or green biotech parks. This ensures that delicate natural areas are never exposed.

XVI. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Draft a new law or amend existing environmental laws to specifically target genetically active or biohazardous waste. Use the money collected to support biodiversity protection, gene monitoring programs, and emergency response plans for genetic contamination.

2. Classify industries and projects into low, medium, and high-risk categories. Apply graduated tax rates; higher taxes for industries working with high-risk GMOs or synthetic biology that can disrupt natural biodiversity.

3.Establish a regulatory body to track the creation, use, transport, and disposal of genetic materials across the country. Require real-time reporting of genetic waste movements and releases.

4. Make industries deposit a biosafety bond, a refundable amount held by the government. If

no harm occurs and proper disposal is undertaken, they receive it back. If there's an accident, the bond pays for cleanup.

5. Align India's tax mechanism with global treaties like the Cartagena Protocol, and other statues

6. Offer tax holidays or reduced fees to biotech companies developing bio-safe alternatives, such as self-limiting GMOs or biodegradable genetic materials.

7. Instead of a flat rate, design the DNA Pollution Tax to adjust over time, if a company reduces its risk by upgrading waste treatment, the tax decreases automatically. If a company causes contamination, the tax rate increases as a penalty. This creates a direct reward and punishment cycle without requiring new court cases every time.

8. Citizen and Community Monitoring by use some of the tax funds to create open biodiversity maps and public reporting apps where communities can track and report suspicious ecological changes.

9. Built-In Legal Review Mechanism with committee of scientists, legal experts, and environmental economists will review rates, risk categories, and enforcement. Update the tax to align with new technologies like CRISPR, gene drives, or synthetic biology.

10. Make the DNA Pollution Tax visible in corporate responsibility reports and also can Link tax performance to ESG ratings, so investors can identify which biotech companies are safer.

XVII. FINDINGS

A. Legal Gaps Exist

Current Indian and international environmental laws were designed for chemical, physical, and radiological pollution. They do not directly address the unique risks of DNA-based or biohazardous waste, even though such waste can spread, change, and interact with nature in unpredictable ways.

B. No Direct Financial Accountability

Existing laws use permits, approvals, and penalties, but there is no continuous financial system that makes industries bear the long-term cost of potential genetic pollution. This leaves biodiversity protection dependent on reactive enforcement rather than proactive prevention.

C. Tax Powers Are Available

India's Constitution gives Parliament and State Legislatures the power to create new taxes when backed by a valid purpose and legal authority. There is no legal barrier to designing a special environmental tax as long as it serves a public purpose like biodiversity protection.

D. Environmental Principles Support a Tax Approach

The Polluter Pays Principle and the Precautionary Principle, both recognized by Indian courts, provide a strong legal and ethical basis for making industries internalize the costs of the risks they create, even before actual damage occurs.

E. Global Practice Shows the Model Works

Other countries have successfully used environmental taxes, or "green taxes," to control carbon emissions, plastic waste, and hazardous chemicals. While none specifically target DNA pollution, these examples demonstrate that taxes can influence industrial behavior, fund mitigation, and signal government priority.

F. Innovation Need Not Be Stopped

A well-designed DNA Pollution Tax can be flexible. Risk-based rates, rebates for safe practices, and integration with insurance or research funding can make it a tool that protects biodiversity while allowing safe and useful biotechnology to grow.

G. Administrative Infrastructure Will Be Needed

To make such a tax meaningful, India will need a system to classify genetic risks, monitor compliance, and ensure tax

proceeds are transparently used for biodiversity protection and emergency responses to genetic contamination.

XVIII. CONCLUSION

Biotechnology is expanding faster than most legal systems can keep up. The same tools that help feed, heal, and power societies, such as genetically modified crops, engineered microbes, and synthetic biology, can also create new types of waste. Unlike smoke or chemical effluents, DNA-based or biohazardous waste is living material that can become active again. It can travel, mix with wild species, mutate, and cause harm that is not easily reversible. This study shows that Indian and international environmental laws recognize pollution and biosafety but lack a special mechanism requiring industries to continuously pay for the unique risks of DNA pollution. At the same time, India's Constitution gives lawmakers broad authority to create taxes for public purposes, and courts have already adopted principles like the Polluter Pays and Precautionary principles. Together, these provide a solid legal foundation for a new, preventive tool. A well-structured "DNA Pollution Tax" could bridge this legal gap. If designed with clear definitions, risk-based rates, transparent fund use, and built-in safeguards for safe innovation, such a tax can convert abstract principles into practical governance. It can discourage unsafe practices, fund biodiversity protection, and motivate industries to develop safer processes. This would also place India at the forefront of environmental law innovation, demonstrating how a country can use its legal and fiscal systems to manage 21st-century ecological risks while supporting scientific progress.

XIX. REFERENCE

A. BOOK

1. Sheldon Krimsky, *Genetic Alchemy: The Social History of the Recombinant DNA Controversy* (MIT Press 1982).
2. Mats G. Löfstedt, *Genetic Engineering and Environmental Pollution* (Oxford Univ. Press 1997).
3. Martha L. Crouch, *Genetic Engineering and the Intrusion of DNA Pollution* (Univ. of Chicago Press 2001).

B. JOURNALS AND ARTICLE

1. Denmark to Introduce CO_2 Tax on Farms, REUTERS (June 25, 2024), https://www.reuters.com/sustainability/denmark-will-be-first-impose-co2-tax-farms-government-says-2024-06-25.
2. Precautionary Principle, its Interpretation and Application by the Indian Judiciary, GN Gill, *Environmental Law Review*, 2019, https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1461452919890283
3. CO2 Act (Switzerland), Federal Act on the Reduction of CO2 Emissions (2024 revision), https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/CO2_Act_(Switzerland)
4. Application of Polluter Pays Principle in Indian Legal Jurisprudence, LawGratis, https://www.lawgratis.com/blog-detail/application-of-polluter-pays-principle-in-indian-legal-jurisprudence-1
5. Department of Biotechnology, Ministry of Science and Technology, Government of India, Rules for the Manufacture, Use, Import, Export and Storage of Hazardous Microorganisms/Genetically Engineered Organisms or Cells, 1989, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC6069684/
6. Green Taxation in India: Its Impact and Necessity, Our Legal World, available at https://tax.ourlegalworld.com/green-taxation-its-impact-and-necessity-in-india/;
7. Biotechnology Regulatory Authority of India, Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Biotechnology_Regulatory_Authority_of_India

8. Biomedical Waste Management Rules, 2016, G.S.R. 343(E), Gazette of India, Mar. 28, 2016 (India).
9. Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety to the Convention on Biological Diversity, Jan. 29, 2000, 2226 U.N.T.S. 208.
10. Codex Alimentarius Commission, *Principles for the Risk Analysis of Foods Derived from Modern Biotechnology*, CAC/GL 44-2003 (2003).
11. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), *Recombinant DNA Safety Considerations* (1986). ,OECD, *Safety Considerations for Biotechnology: Scale-up of Crop Plants* (1993)., OECD, *Best Practice Guidelines for Biological Resource Centres* (2007).
12. *Genetically Engineered Salmon Approval*, U.S. Food & Drug Admin. (2015), https://www.fda.gov/animal-veterinary/animals-intentional-genomic-alterations/genetically-engineered-salmon
13. *The Environment (Protection) Act, 1986*, No. 29, Acts of Parliament, 1986
14. Rules for the Manufacture, Use, Import, Export, and Storage of Hazardous Microorganisms/Genetically Engineered Organisms, 1989, G.S.R. 1037(E), Gazette of India, Dec. 5, 1989 (India).
15. A.H. Parrott & J.K. Bartlett, *DNA Pollution: Genetically Modified Organisms and Environmental Risk*, 12 ENVTL. L. REV. 215, 217 (2002)

C. STATUES

1. Indian constitution 1950