

# Index

- accountability
  - carbon majors, 247–48, 319–20
- attributing emissions, 248–53
  - deforestation, 263
  - lack of damaging narratives, 297–300
  - private parties, 246–47
  - supply-side accountability gap, 321–22, 334
    - common but differentiated responsibilities principle, 332–33
    - Gloucester Resources case, 328
    - Gray case, 328
    - no-harm principle, 332
    - People v. Arctic Oil*, 324–27, 334
    - perfect substitution principle, 329–31
    - visual evidence, importance of, 273, 284
- adequacy of efforts to reduce emissions. *See* assessment of climate change
  - policies; failure to adequately mitigate
- administrative due process claims, 127
- administrative law cases, 120, 122–24
- airport expansion, 124
  - climate litigation currents, 126–27
  - coal power stations, development of, 124
  - precedents, 117–29
- Africa
  - balancing development and environmental rights, 377–79
  - failures of legal systems, 379–80
  - Indigenous peoples' movements, 380–81
  - inequalities and injustices, 376–77
    - exacerbation through climate change, 377
    - See also* Kenya; South Africa
- air travel
  - balancing impact of emissions and rights of others, 179–80
  - offset or compensation for emissions, 179, 358
  - tax credits, 32
- airport expansion, 2, 124, 130
  - judicial deference, 309
- Alaska Inter-Tribal Council (AITC)
  - global warming, impact on Indigenous peoples, 282
- Alston, Philip, 267–68
- Amazon (corporation)
  - corporate liability for climate change, 139
- Amazon rainforest
  - deforestation, 2, 12–13, 99, 350
  - Kichwa Indigenous People of Sarayaku* case, 276–80
- assessment of climate change policies
  - “all appropriate measures”, 171
  - consistency, 173
  - due diligence obligation. *See* due diligence obligation
  - due process, 173
  - good faith, 173
  - “highest possible ambition”, 171
  - “maximum available resources”, 172
  - proportionality, 173
    - attribution research, 223–24, 238
    - failure-to-adapt claims, 234–38
    - failure-to-mitigate claims, 231–34
    - individual versus collective rights, 224–30
  - source attribution, 232–34
- Australia, 328–29
  - administrative climate litigation
    - Bushfire Survivors* case. *See* *Bushfire Survivors for Climate Action Incorporated v. Environment Protection Authority*

- Gloucester Resources Limited* case, 328
- Gray* case, 328
- Greenpeace Australia* case, 124
- National Environmental Policy Act, 124
- Torres Strait. *See* Torres Strait islanders
- wildfires, 227
- visual evidence, importance of, 285–87
- balancing competing priorities, 32, 257, 340, 343
  - Africa, 377–79
  - Amazon rainforest, 360
  - India, 364, 370–75
- Bangladesh
  - climate change inequalities, 134–35, 144
- baseline rights and duties
  - common ground doctrine, 25–27
- bioenergy with carbon capture and storage (BECSS), 185
- Brazil
  - challenges to environmental policy, 359–61
  - “direct” climate actions, 355
  - environmental and climate crisis
    - criminalization of environmental activism, 349
  - fires and deforestation, 349–50
    - illegal logging, 350
    - weakening of institutional framework, 350–52, 361–62
  - human rights defenders, 350–52
  - illegal drainage of mangrove forests, 357–58
  - illegal use of fire, 358
  - “indirect” climate actions, 355, 357–58
  - “isolated” court actions, 355
  - public civil actions, 358–59
  - racial inequalities
    - disproportionate impacts of climate change, 352–53, 363
  - release of carbon dioxide, 358
  - “structural” court actions, 355
- Bushfire Survivors for Climate Action Incorporated v. Environment Protection Authority*, 285–87
- Canada
  - forced displacement as a result of climate change, 226
  - public interest standing, 316
  - wildfires, 227
- carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), 240–41
  - oil and gas extraction, impact of, 241, 248, 320
  - sources, 241–44, 242
- carbon majors, 2
  - accountability, 319–20
    - attribution, 250–53, 251
    - supply-side accountability gap, 321–22
  - advancements in climate science, 209
  - aims of litigation, 210
  - attributing source emissions, 250
  - attribution
    - accountability, 250–53, 251
  - direct financial impacts of litigation
    - defendants, 215
  - direct regulatory impacts of litigation, 214
  - impacts of litigation, 207, 218–19
    - financial impacts, 215–18
    - regulatory impacts, 214–15
  - indirect financial impacts of litigation
    - devaluation of shares, 216–18
    - increasing capital costs, 216
    - investors, 216
    - liability insurance, 216
  - indirect regulatory impacts
    - of litigation, 215
  - land lost to sea level rises, 251
  - negligence, 119, 211
  - number of cases, 209
  - private nuisance, 119, 211
  - production gap, 321
  - public nuisance, 211
  - responsibility for emissions, 239, 242, 247–50
  - strategic litigation, 208
  - tort law, 211
- causality and human rights–based climate
  - litigation, 15, 36, 308
- asbestos litigation, 314
- attribution research, 224
- failure-to-adapt claims, 234–38
- Fairchild* principle, 339–41
- liability model of responsibility, 36
- wildfire litigation, 227
- Center for Climate Crime Analysis (CCCA), 256, 260
  - cooperation, 265
  - core principles, 261–62
  - illegal logging and deforestation, 265
- Children’s Investment Fund Foundation (CIFF), 196, 201
- children’s rights, 142, 224. *See also* *Future Generations v. Colombia*; *Juliana v. United States*; ICCPR complaint; UN Committee on the Rights of the Child; UN Convention on the Rights of the Child

- civil law cases, 119–20
- claims against corporations, 16, 35, 120, 246–47
  - Amazon (corporation), 139
  - corporate veil, 362
  - strategic litigation, 99
- ClientEarth, 201–2, 212
- Climate Accountability Institute, 249
- Climate Action and Low Carbon Development Act 2015 (Ireland), 305–6
- Climate Action Tracker (CAT), 341
- Climate Change Act 2016 (Kenya), 382
- Climate Change Act 2017 (Pakistan), 393–94
- Climate Change Advisory Council (Ireland), 305
- climate change science, 240
  - sources of greenhouse gases, 241–44
- climate justice
  - disproportionate impacts of global warming, 132–33
  - political inequalities, 137–38, 374–75
  - racial inequalities, 136–37, 352–53, 363
  - wealth versus poverty, 133–35, 138–40, 371–72
  - women, 135–36
    - ethics and moral responsibility, 140–41
- Climate Litigation Accelerator (CLX), 5
- climate refugees. *See Teitiota v. New Zealand*
- Climate Warrior Campaign (India), 374
- coal mining, 2, 17, 164
  - India, 364, 371, 375
  - Urgenda* case. *See Urgenda v. the Netherlands* *see also* oil and gas extraction
- coal-fired power stations, 17, 22, 37
  - Australia, 328
  - Kenya, 381–82
  - South Africa, 382–83
- collective rights, 226–27
- Indigenous communities, 226, 280, 379
- self-determination, right to, 226–27
- Colombia
  - deforestation in the Amazon region, 350
  - incorporation of human rights arguments, 102. *See also* deforestation; *Future Generations v. Colombia*
- Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW)
  - climate change as a human rights duty, 153–54. *See also* women,
- common but differentiated responsibility (CBDR) principle, 151, 245, 332, 337
  - ambiguity, 344
- common ground as a baseline for human rights claims, 25–27
- community rights versus individual rights, 224–30. *See also* collective rights; individual rights
- construction of new airport runways. *See* airport expansion
- corporate responsibility for emissions. *See* claims against corporations
- corporate veil, 362
- courts. *See* judicial proceedings
- COVID-19 pandemic
  - impact of, 180, 219, 333, 352, 359, 376, 381
- criminal and corporate liability law cases, 120
- dam construction
  - Narmada Bachao Andolan* case, 370
- dam disasters, 236, 350–51
- deforestation, 13, 99
  - cattle ranching, impact of, 2
  - Center for Climate Crime Analysis, 265
  - foreign enforcement targeting illegal commodities, 263–64
  - foreign enforcement, lack of information for, 264
  - illegal logging, 262, 350
  - Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, 262
  - link to other illegal activities, 263
  - local enforcement, lack of, 263. *See also* illegal logging,
- delay enacting national climate change law, 12, 37–38, 111, 186, 239, 247–48, 334, 337, 394
- democratic legitimacy
  - open standing, 315–18
  - subsidiarity principle, 343
- “direct” climate actions, 355
  - Brazil, 355, 360
- disillusionment with multilateral processes, 101
- diversity of legal actions
  - range of acts, policies, and practices, 98
  - range of legal principles, 98
  - range of parties, 908
- drug dealer defense
  - market substitution assumption, 329–30
- Duarte Agostinho v. Portugal*
  - minimum fair share norm, 31

- due diligence obligation
  - climate change policies, 173–75, 341
  - compliance, 175
  - consistency, 175–76
  - methodology, 176
  - policy gaps, 176
  - policy implementation/effectiveness, 176
  - progression, 176
  - targets and monitoring, 175
  - timelines, 176
  - transparency, 176
    - Milieudefensie* case, 212
    - no-harm principle, 332
    - Notre Affaire à Tous* case, 213
- due process, 34, 127, 173
- duty of care
  - Milieudefensie* case, 212
  - Notre Affaire à Tous* case, 213
  - Urgenda* case, 128, 142
- duty to take precautionary measures, 127.
  - See also* precautionary principle
- Earthlife Africa Johannesburg v. Minister of Environmental Affairs & Others*, 382–83
- Ecuador
  - illegal mining operations, 274–76. *See also* *Kofan Indigenous People of Sinangoe v. Ecuador Ministry of Mining*
  - illegal oil exploration, 277–80. *See also* *Kichwa Indigenous People of Sarayaku v. Ecuador*
- emissions reduction plans
  - assessment of state human rights obligations, 178
  - CESCR assessment of state human rights obligations
    - whether avoiding regression, 182–83
    - whether climate plan appropriately ambitious, 181–82
    - whether emissions reductions consistent with human rights, 185
    - whether progressive increase in ambition, 182–83
    - whether state giving adequate priority to human rights, 181
    - whether state has taken/is taking all rights-respecting steps, 178–80
    - whether state planning to reduce emissions in line with global target, 183–85
  - challenges
    - mitigation targets, 18
    - rights-based challenges, 19
    - rulings, 22–24
    - specific projects and policies, 19
  - challenges to corporations, 16
  - challenges to states, 16, 166–70
  - Family Farmers and Greenpeace Germany* case, 168
  - Juliana* case, 166–67
  - Neubauer* case, 9
  - Norwegian Constitution, 167–68
  - reasonable minimum obligation, 339–40
  - Urgenda* case, 9, 167
- enforcement lawsuits, 193–94
  - balancing competing priorities, 257
  - evidence, 257
  - inadequate enforcement, 257
  - lack of coordination, 257
  - legal competence of courts, 27–28, 255–56
  - technological advancements
    - information sharing, 258–60
- environmental impact assessments
  - licenses granted by local planning authorities, 123, 125, 355, 381
  - obligations of States, 165
  - omission of climate impacts, 29, 123, 193, 328, 382, 384
  - People v. Arctic Oil*, 326–27
  - strategic litigation, 374
- equality-focused climate litigation, 140–41
  - benefits, 141–42
  - proliferation, 142–44
- Europe
  - human rights-based climate litigation, 9–11
- European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) claims, 305, 309–11
  - prohibition on inhuman or degrading treatment, 336
  - respect for private and family life, 236, 336, 343
  - right to life, 236, 336. *See also* European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR)
- European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR)
  - Budayeva and Others v. Russia*, 236
  - common ground doctrine, 25
  - Duarte Agostinho v. Portugal*, 31–32
  - failure-to-adapt claims, 235–36
  - Family Farmers and Greenpeace Germany v. Germany*, 168
  - Kolyadenko v. Russia*, 236

- European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) (cont.)  
*Öneryildiz v. Turkey*, 236  
*Six Portuguese Youth v. 33 Governments of Europe*, 335–38, 347–48  
 state's positive obligations in respect of natural disasters, 236  
*Urgenda* case. *See Urgenda v. the Netherlands*
- European Court of Justice (CJEU)  
 duty to carry out environmental impact assessments, 326
- European Union  
 mitigation targets, 29, 37
- evidence  
 enforcement lawsuits, 257  
*See also* visual evidence, importance of
- Extinction Rebellion, 1. *See also* social justice movements
- extraction and development projects  
 economic considerations, primacy of, 125  
*See also* balancing competing priorities
- failure to adapt  
 attribution science, 223, 234–38  
 causation analysis, 235  
 source attribution, 235  
 human rights–based climate litigation, lack of, 34  
*Sacchi* case, 225  
*Shehla Zia* case, 391
- failure to adequately mitigate, 177  
 attribution science, 223, 231–34  
*Sacchi* case, 225  
*Shehla Zia* case, 391
- Fairchild v. Glenhaven Funeral Services*, 339–40  
 causation, 339–41
- Family Farmers and Greenpeace Germany v. Germany*, 168
- Ferrão Carvalho v. Europe*, 29, 37
- foreseeability of climate impacts, 232, 235, 237–38
- forest-dwelling communities  
 stewardship rights, 366–67, 369, 372–75
- fossil fuel companies. *See* carbon majors
- Framework for Implementation of Climate Change Policy 2014–2030 (Pakistan), 390
- France  
 climate change inequalities, 140  
 failure to adequately mitigate, 226
- fraud and misrepresentation  
 misleading public opinion and investors, 120, 208, 210–12, 217
- #FridaysforFuture, 1, 205. *See also* social justice movements
- Friends of the Irish Environment v. Government of Ireland & Ors*, 168, 305, 318  
 deference, 308–12  
 judicial deference, 306  
 justiciability arguments, 307–8  
 policy discretion, 306–7  
 retrogressive steps, 314  
 right to a healthy environment, 305, 312–15  
 right to bodily integrity, 305, 312  
 separation of powers, 306–7
- Future Generations v. Colombia*, 191, 299  
 attribution science, 232, 237  
 government responsibility for adequate mitigation, 128  
 state and non-state collaboration, 148
- Germany, 9  
 domestic climate litigation  
 incorporation of human rights arguments, 102  
 lawyer-activists, 200  
 standing, 37  
*See also Neubauer v. Germany*
- Global South  
 common but differentiated responsibility principle, 151  
 constitutional and human rights arguments, 147–48  
 development of climate litigation, 146, 189–91  
 enforcement of existing laws, 193–94  
 rights-based claims, prevalence of, 191–93  
 stealthy climate litigation, 194–95  
 implement mitigation projects, 155–56  
 implementation of climate law frameworks, 146–47  
 modes of legal action, 187–89, 195–205  
 remedies in climate cases, 148–49  
 polluter pays principle, 151  
 reparations for climate-related harms, 149  
*restitutio in integrum*, 150
- Gloucester Resources Limited v. Minister for Planning*  
 market substitution assumption, 330
- Golder v. United Kingdom*, 344

- governmental responsibility for adequate mitigation, 128
- source attribution, 232, 238
- See also* states' responsibilities to guarantee protection from climate change-related harms
- grassroots activism, 197–99
- greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions
  - climate change science, 241–44
  - Neubauer* case
  - insufficient pledges, 9
  - Urgenda* case
  - insufficient pledges, 9
- Greenpeace Australia Ltd v. Redbank Power Co*, 124
- Greenpeace Germany v. Germany*, 26, 32, 169
- greenwashing, 208, 217, 239
- violations of OECD guidelines, 212
- Guiding Principles on Shared Responsibility
  - indivisible injury, 338–39
- human rights–based climate change (HRCC)
  - litigation, 1–2
  - baseline rights and duties. *See* baseline rights and duties
  - cases (2005–2021), 11–12, 22, 40–83
  - failure to adapt. *See* failure to adapt
  - failure to adequately mitigate. *See* failure to adequately mitigate
  - legal mobilization theory. *See* legal mobilization theory
  - limitations
    - geographic reach, 34
    - not an end in and of itself, 34
  - “new wave”/“next generation” cases, 99–101
  - post-Paris Agreement, 10–18
    - common ground doctrine, 25–27
    - compatibility of government policies with climate rights and duties, 29–33
    - establishing baseline rights and duties, 25–27
    - justiciability of legal obligations, 27–29
  - pre-Paris Agreement, 10
  - procedure, 24–25
  - proliferation, 3, 10–14
  - recent key legal challenges, 2–3
- ICT. *See* technological advancements
- illegal logging, 262–64, 350
  - Center for Climate Crime Analysis, 265
  - import embargoes, 264. *See also* deforestation
- illegal mining operations
  - Kofan Indigenous People of Sinangoe* case, 274–76
- impacts of global warming
  - climate litigation, 145–48
  - disproportionate nature, 132–33
  - gender inequality, 135–36
  - Global South, 155–56
  - political inequality, 137–38
  - poor and marginalized people, 133–35, 371–72
  - racial inequality, 136–37
  - See also* climate justice
- international cooperation, 152–55
  - remedies, 148–51
- India
  - development policies
    - balancing environmental protection, 370–71
  - emissions, 364
  - exclusionary conservation, 371–73
  - international environmental law, 373
  - judicial proceedings, 365–66
  - environmental jurisprudence, 366–67
  - land acquisition, 365
  - non-implementation of environmental laws, 368
  - public trust doctrine, 365, 368, 373
  - standing, 364
  - strategic litigation
    - balancing development with environmental protection, 372–75
- Indigenous peoples' movements, 1, 226
  - Baleni* case, 385
  - constitutional obligation to manage shared natural resources, 280–83
  - granting mining rights, 385
  - illegal mining operations, 274–76
  - illegal oil exploration, 276–80
  - land grabs, 375
  - public international law cases, 121
  - rights of forest-dwellers, 372
  - Torres Strait islanders, 158–65
- “indirect” climate actions, 355, 357–58
  - Brazil, 355
- individual rights, 227
- insufficient pledges, 2, 32, 180
  - greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions
  - Neubauer* case, 9
  - Urgenda* case, 9
  - reducing deforestation, 12

- Inter-American Court of Human Rights (IACtHR)
  - Advisory Opinion on Human Rights and the Environment, 22, 88, 192
  - failure-to-adapt claims, 237
  - forms of evidence, 278
  - Kichwa Indigenous People of Sarayakur* case, 277–80
  - Velasquez Rodriguez* case, 150
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), 1–2, 130, 244
  - common ground doctrine, 26
  - GHG emissions reduction targets, 10
  - impacts of global warming, 132, 320
- international cooperation
  - international law as persuasive authority, 153
  - judicial and quasi-judicial bodies, 152–55
  - teleological or purposive method of interpretation, 152
- International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR)
  - right to life, 143
  - rights of Indigenous peoples
    - Torres Strait islanders, 158–65
    - Adaptation Claim, 162–63
    - Australia's human rights obligations, 164–65
    - Mitigation Claim, 163–64
- International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR)
  - adequacy of efforts to reduce emissions, 177
  - international cooperation, 153
- international treaties, importance of, 131
- Ireland
  - Climate Action and Low Carbon Development Act, 305–6
  - National Mitigation Plan, 305–6
  - See also *Friends of the Irish Environment v. Government of Ireland & Ors*
- “isolated” court actions, 355, 362
  - Brazil, 355
- Israel
  - climate change inequalities, 137–38
- judicial activism, 192, 307, 311, 393–95
- judicial and quasi-judicial bodies
  - international cooperation, 152–55
- judicial deference, 27, 32
  - Friends of the Irish Environment* case, 306, 308–10
- judicial proceedings, 255
  - enforcement concerns, 255–56
  - Friends of the Irish Environment* case, 305–7
  - deference, 308–12
  - justiciability arguments, 306–8
  - right to a healthy environment, 312–15
  - standing, 315–18
- India, 365–66
  - balancing development with environmental protection, 370–71
  - environmental jurisprudence, 366–67
  - right to a healthy environment, 312–15
  - technological advancements, impact of, 256
- Juliana v. United States*, 84, 99, 143, 166–67, 228, 299
- justiciability
  - Friends of the Irish Environment* case, 306–8
- justiciable right to government climate action, 27–29
  - non-justiciability doctrine, 93, 194, 307
- Kanuk v. State of Alaska*
  - constitutional obligation to manage shared natural resources, 280–83
  - Public Trust doctrine, 280
- Kenya
  - coal-fired power stations, 381–82
- Kichwa Indigenous People of Sarayaku v. Ecuador*, 276–80
- Kofan Indigenous People of Sinangoe v. Ecuador Ministry of Mining*, 274–76
- Kyoto Protocol, 16, 164
  - India, 373
  - Netherlands, 346
- land acquisition
  - India, 365, 375
- lawyer-activists, 199–201
- legal certainty, 313–14
- legal challenges, nature of
  - coal mining, 2
  - fossil fuel companies, 2
  - high-emission economic activities, 2
  - insufficient government pledges, 2
  - Neubauer* case, 9
  - Urgenda* case, 9, 32
  - UN Committee on the Right of the Child, 3
  - young plaintiffs and future generations, 2, 12

- legal mobilization theory, 85–86, 93–94
  - group dynamics and collective mobilization, 89–92
  - institutional and structural incentives and disincentives, 86–89
  - micro-politics of disputing behaviour, 92–93
- legal transplant litigation, 203–4
- Leghari v. Pakistan*, 2, 11, 99, 191, 236
  - attribution science, 232
  - Climate Change Commission, 389–91
  - continuing mandamus, 391
  - failure to implement climate change policy, 390
  - state and non-state collaboration, 148
- links between human activity and climate
  - impact, 1, 320–22. *See also* attribution research
- locus standi. *See* standing
- low-profile climate litigation, 117
  - administrative law cases, 120–21
  - civil law cases, 119–20
  - criminal and corporate liability law cases, 120
  - public international law cases, 121
- major fossil fuel companies. *See* carbon majors
- Manushi Sangathan v. Government of Delhi*, 367
- margin of appreciation, 28–29, 173
  - ECtHR, 310, 342–44
  - emissions reductions
    - choice of means, 342–43
  - Hatton* case, 342–44
  - respect for private and family life, 343–44
  - Taşkın* case, 342
  - Urgenda* case, 346–47
  - use of its resources and rights obligations, 179
- margin of discretion, 155, 167, 173
- market incentives
  - illegal deforestation, 264
  - renewable energy projects, 125, 130
- market substitution assumption, 329–30. *See also* perfect substitution argument
- Massachusetts v. EPA*, 189, 193
  - air pollutant, concept of, 128
  - minimum fair share norm, 30–33, 37
  - nationally determined contributions, 170–75
  - Urgenda* case, 167, 175
- modes of litigation, 205
  - “The Enforcer”, 197, 204–5
  - “The Engineer”, 197, 203–4
  - “The Farmer”, 197, 201–3
  - “Grassroots Activist”, 197–99
  - “Hero Litigators”, 197, 199–201
- Narmada Bachao Andolan v. Union of India*, 370–71
- narrative change strategies, 290–93
  - climate litigation, 296–97, 300–1
  - negative/damaging narratives, 297–300
    - Even it Up* campaign, 294
    - human stories, use of, 295–96
  - Ley Pulpin, Peru, 293–94
- National Climate Change Fund (Brazil), 356
- National Climate Change Policy 2012 (Pakistan), 390
- National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (Australia), 124
- National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (USA), 124
- National Green Tribunal (India), 365
- National Policy on Climate Change (Brazil), 356
- nationally determined contributions (NDC)
  - assessment of emissions reductions, *See* assessment of climate change policies; emissions reduction plans
  - Australia and Torres Strait, 163
  - Global South, 195
  - Paris Climate Agreement, 170–75, 178, 245
- negative emissions, 184–85, 337
- negligence
  - cases against carbon majors, 119, 211
- Netherlands, 9
  - domestic climate litigation
    - incorporation of human rights arguments, 102
  - See also Urgenda v. the Netherlands*
- Neubauer v. Germany*, 2, 9–10
  - failure to mitigate, 18
  - justiciability, 27
  - material incentives, 33
  - standing, 37
  - temporal dimensions of climate change, 38
- “new wave”/“next generation” cases, 99–101
- strategic litigation, 101–3
- New Zealand, 13. *See also Teitiota v. New Zealand*
- no-harm principle, 175, 332
- non-justiciability doctrine, 93, 194, 307



- non-profit organization litigants, 188, 195, 201–3, 205
- Norway  
carbon emissions, 323, 333  
regulation of petroleum activities, 324  
*See also* *People v. Arctic Oil*
- OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises, 35, 212, 264
- oil and gas extraction, 122–25, 212–13, 322  
CO<sub>2</sub> impact of, 241, 248, 320  
enforcement concerns, 255  
Norwegian Constitution, 167–68, 324  
*People v. Arctic Oil*, 324–27  
*See also* carbon majors; coal mining; extraction and development projects
- oil exploration, 2  
*Kichwa Indigenous People of Sarayaku* case, 276–80  
*People v. Arctic Oil*, 323, 324–27  
*See also* coal mining; *Kichwa Indigenous People of Sarayaku v. Ecuador*; *People v. Arctic Oil*
- open standing regime, 315–18
- Oslo Principles on Global Climate Change (2015), 125
- “others do it too” defense, 234
- Pakistan, 11, 387  
environmental justice, 391  
environmental protection provisions, 387, 393–94  
identity of polluters, 391  
judicial activism, 393–95  
judicially enforceable rights, 387  
public interest litigation, 388–89
- Palestine  
climate change inequalities, 137–38
- Pandey v. Union of India*, 193, 368, 373
- Paris Climate Agreement (2015), 1–2, 15–30, 373  
adoption and implementation, 14, 245  
Africa, 380  
common but differentiated responsibilities, 332  
common ground doctrine, 26  
GHG emissions reduction targets, 10, 332  
human rights impacts, recognition of, 2  
international cooperation, 153, 333  
*People v. Arctic Oil*, 333
- People v. Arctic Oil*, 320  
oil drilling licenses, 324
- Paris Agreement, 333
- perfect substitution argument, 331  
right to a healthy environment, 324–25  
Supreme Court judgment  
supply-side accountability, 325–27  
*See also* market substitution assumption
- Philippi Horticultural Area v. MEC for Local Government, Environmental Affairs and Development Planning*, 383–84
- Philippines’ Human Rights Commission  
impact of climate change on human rights, 17, 35, 99, 101, 213, 298–99
- Planning Act (UK)  
airport expansion, 309  
environmental assessments, 326
- policy discretion, 27–29, 166, 168, 174, 179  
*Friends of the Irish Environment* case, 306–7  
*People v. Arctic Oil*, 325–27  
*Urgenda* case, 346
- political inequalities  
disproportionate impacts of climate change, 137–38
- polluter pays principle, 151, 156, 368
- Portillo Cáceres v. Paraguay*, 149–50, 171
- Portugal, 31. *See also* *Duarte Agostinho v. Portugal*; *Six Portuguese Youth v. 33 Governments of Europe*
- precautionary principle, 90, 125, 128, 165, 174  
*Kofan Indigenous People of Sinangoe* case, 276  
*Pandey* case, 368  
*Save Lamu* case, 382
- precedent and legal certainty, 313–15
- private nuisance  
cases against carbon majors, 119, 211  
prohibition on inhuman or degrading treatment, 336
- prosecutor/enforcement authority initiated litigation, 204–5
- public activism, 110–11
- public interest litigation (Pakistan)  
limitations  
lack of substantive action, 392  
reluctance to appoint climate change experts, 392  
statutory appeals, 392  
right to a clean and healthy environment, 389  
right to life, 388  
*Shehla Zia* case, 389

- standing requirements, 388
- public international law cases, 121
- public nuisance
  - cases against carbon majors, 211
- public trust doctrine, 284
  - India, 365, 368, 373
  - Kanuk* case, 280–83
- Punjab Environmental Protection Act 1997 (Pakistan), 394
- racial inequalities
  - disproportionate impacts of climate change, 136–37, 143–44
  - Brazil, 352–53, 363
- regulation-forcing litigation, 193–94
- remedies
  - balancing competing priorities, 32
  - duty to cooperate as a judicial remedy, 152–55
  - Global South
    - polluter-pays principle, 150
    - Portillo Cáceres* case, 149
- reparations, 149
- restitutio in integrum*, 150
  - Teitiota* case, 149
  - Velasquez Rodriguez* case, 150
  - injunctive relief, 211
  - international law, 153–55
  - strategic litigation, 111–13
- resource allocation
  - comparison to peer states, 181–82
  - margin of appreciation, 179
  - emissions reduction, 178–80
  - state subsidies, 181
- respect for private and family life, 224
  - ECHR, 236, 336, 343
- retrogressive steps, 182–83
  - Friends of Irish Environment* case, 314
- right to a healthy environment, 27, 319, 378
  - Friends of the Irish Environment* case, 305–6, 312–15, 318
  - IACtHR, 22
  - Norwegian Constitution, 324–25
  - Pakistan, 389
  - People v. Arctic Oil*, 324
- right to bodily integrity, 305
  - Friends of the Irish Environment* case, 305, 312
- right to health, 224, 319
- right to life, 38, 88, 165, 192, 224, 319
  - Africa, 378
  - ECHR, 236, 336
  - Friends of the Irish Environment* case, 305, 312
  - IACtHR, 311
  - ICCPR, 143, 158
  - Portillo Cáceres* case, 149
  - Shehla Zia* case, 389
  - Subhash Kumar* case, 369
  - Teitiota* case, 149
- Rio Declaration (1992), 2
- risks associated with litigation, 113–15
- Sacchi v. Argentina*
  - children's rights, 225
  - failure to adapt, 225
  - failure to adequately mitigate, 225
  - UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, 225, 228–29
- Save Lamu & Five Others v. National Environmental Management Authority & Another*, 381–82
- separation of powers doctrine, 28, 155, 168, 232, 307, 309, 317, 347
- shared responsibility
  - causation, 340–41
  - common but differentiated responsibilities, 337 *See also* common but differentiated responsibility (CBDR) principle
  - ECHR obligations, 338–41
  - fair share, 337–38, 341
  - Guiding Principles on Shared Responsibility, 338–39
  - indivisible injury, 338–39
  - reasonable minimum obligation, 339–40
  - Urgenda* case, 347
  - Shehla Zia and Others v. WAPDA*, 389, 391
  - Six Portuguese Youth v. 33 Governments of Europe*, 335–36
  - ECHR claims, 336–38, 347–48
- social inequalities. *See* climate justice
- social justice movements, 1
  - India, 365
- South Africa
  - coal-fired power stations, 383
  - development impacts on aquifers, 383–84
  - international agreements, 381
  - See also* Earthlife Africa Johannesburg v. Minister of Environmental Affairs & Others; Philippi Horticultural Area v. MEC for Local Government, Environmental Affairs and Development Planning

- standing, 37
  - applicable standing rules, 315
  - Friends of the Irish Environment* case, 315
  - India, 364
  - liberal approach
    - government decision-making, 317
  - rule of law, 315–16
  - trend, 316
  - rule of law, relationship with, 315–16
  - separation of powers argument, 317
  - traditional approach, 316
- states' responsibilities to guarantee protection
  - from climate change-related harms, 149–51, 156, 158–60. *See also* shared responsibility
- stealthy climate litigation
  - Global South, 194–95
- strategic ambitions of climate change
  - litigation, 97–98
  - climate change in human rights terms, 101–3
  - Juliana* case, 99
  - Leghari* case, 99
  - targeting corporations, 99
  - Urgenda* case, 99
  - young plaintiffs and future generations, 99
  - See also* *Juliana v. United States*; *Leghari v. Pakistan*; *Urgenda v. the Netherlands*
- Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive (EU)
  - airport expansion, 309
  - environmental assessments, 326
- strategic litigation, 115–16, 386
  - balancing development with environmental protection, 372–75
  - broader plan for change, 108–10
  - carbon majors, 208
  - definition, 104–5
  - history, 105–6
  - impact assessment processes, 374
  - implementation challenges, 111–13
  - legal context, 108
  - political context, 108
  - public activism, 110–11
  - risk assessment, importance of, 113–15
  - social change, relationship with, 105–6
  - social context, 108, 353–55
  - “structural” court actions, 355, 362
  - Brazil, 355, 360
  - Subhash Kumar v. State of Bihar*, 369
  - subsidiarity principle
    - margin of appreciation, 342
  - subsidies
    - clean energy suppliers, 19, 181, 185
    - fossil fuels, 181, 186, 248, 332
    - resource allocation, 181
  - supply-side accountability. *See* accountability: carbon majors
  - taxation and tax exemption measures, 181
    - air travel, 32
    - carbon taxes, 185
  - technological advancements
    - bioenergy with carbon capture and storage, 185
    - judicial proceedings, impact on, 256
    - law enforcement, 258–60, 266
  - Teitiota v. New Zealand*, 2, 13, 143, 149
  - temporal dimensions of climate change, 125
  - temporality of human rights law, 37–39
  - Thunberg, Greta, 2, 13, 247
  - Torres Strait islanders, 158–60
    - ICCPR complaint, 160–65
      - Adaptation Claim, 162–63
      - Australia's human rights obligations, 164–65
      - Mitigation Claim, 163–64
      - loss of culture, 161–62
  - tort law
    - cases against carbon majors, 211
  - trends in climate litigation
    - strategic cases, 99–101
  - UN Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (CESCR)
    - adequacy of efforts to reduce emissions, 186
      - whether a state has taken/is taking all rights-respecting steps, 178–80
      - whether avoiding regression, 182–83
      - whether climate plan appropriately ambitious, 181–82
      - whether emissions reductions consistent with human rights, 185
      - whether progressive increase in ambition, 182–83
      - whether state giving adequate priority to human rights, 181
      - whether state planning to reduce emissions in line with global target, 183–85

- UN Committee on the Rights of the Child (CRC), 3, 13, 228–29, 234
  - climate change as a human rights duty, 153–54
- UN Convention on Biological Diversity's (CBD), 380
- UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC)
  - Sacchi v. Argentina*, 225, 228–29
- UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), 380
- UN Declaration on the Rights of Peasants and Other People Working in Rural Areas (2018), 380
- UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC 1992), 30, 244–45, 332
  - Africa, 380
  - Brazil, 356
  - good faith, 173
  - India, 373
  - international cooperation, 153
  - Kenya, 382
  - no-harm principle, 332
  - South Africa, 381
  - Torres Strait* case, 163–64
  - Urgenda* case, 345
- UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, 35, 213
- UN Human Rights Committee
  - harmonization of international law, 149–50
  - physical integrity and climate harms, 2, 13
  - Portillo Cáceres* case, 149–50
  - right to life, 311
  - Teitiota* case, 2, 13, 143, 149
  - Torres Strait* islanders, 160–65
- UNEP Emissions Gap Report, 321
- United Nations Charter
  - international cooperation, 153
- United States
  - administrative climate litigation
    - National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), 124
  - civil law cases, 119–20
  - climate change inequalities, 133–37, 143
  - climate forced displacement, 235
  - criminal and corporate liability law cases, 120
    - Juliana* case. *See Juliana v. United States*
    - Kanuk* case. *See Kanuk v. State of Alaska*
  - Urgenda v. the Netherlands*, 2, 9, 84, 189, 191, 193, 203–4, 207, 227
  - duty of care, 128, 142
  - ECHR claims, 311, 345–47
  - emissions reduction plans, 9, 167
  - insufficient government pledges, 9, 32
  - margin of appreciation, 346
  - minimum fair share norm, 30, 167
  - separation of powers argument, 155
  - shared responsibility, 347
  - strategic ambitions of climate change, 99
  - temporal dimensions of climate change, 38
- Velasquez Rodriguez v. Honduras*, 150
- visual evidence, importance of, 287–88
  - Feather River Lumber Co.* case, 273
  - Kanuk* case, 280–83
  - Kichwa Indigenous People of Sarayaku* case, 276–80
  - Kofan Indigenous People of Sinangoe* case, 274–76
  - public opinion, impact on, 270–73, 284–85
  - Bushfire Survivors* case, 285–87
- Volkswagen
  - Dieselgate scandal, 217
- We the People v. Union of India*, 368
- WildEarth Guardians v. United States Forest Service et al.*
  - perfect substitution argument, 330
- wildfires
  - Australia, 227, 285–87
  - Canada, 227
  - causality and human rights–based climate litigation, 227
  - visual evidence, importance of
    - Australia, 285–87
- Wildlife First and Others v. Ministry of Environment and Forests*, 369
- women
  - African patriarchy, 379
  - disproportionate impacts of climate change, 135–36 *See also* climate justice: disproportionate impacts of global warming; Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW)
- Youth Climate Movement, 299