International Journal of Law, Policy and Social Review
www.lawjournals.net
Online ISSN: 2664-6838
Received: 25-07-2026, Accepted: 24-08-2026, Published: 08-09-2026
Volume 8, Issue 3, 2026, Page No. 110-115

Curbing greenwashing in India: A critical evaluation of the legal and regulatory framework

Dr. Azim Hussain Mazumder
Advocate, Gauhati High Court, Assam, India
DOI: https://doi.org/10.66856/ijlpsr.2026.8.3.8147

Abstract
Greenwashing happens when companies make exaggerated or deceptive claims about the environmental benefits of their products, services, or policies, which tricks well-meaning consumers and diverts essential funding away from businesses that are genuinely eco-friendly. This research paper examines the core concept of greenwashing, its harmful impacts on consumer trust and sustainable development, and the current legal tools India uses to combat it—including consumer protection laws, ASCI advertising guidelines, and disclosure rules established by financial regulators like SEBI and the RBI. By critically evaluating these frameworks alongside landmark court decisions, the research reveals significant gaps, such as ambiguous legal standards, a lack of mandatory third-party verification, and overlapping, disconnected regulatory oversight. Ultimately, the paper demonstrates that India's current anti-greenwashing measures are overly reactive and fragmented, arguing for a streamlined, cross-sectoral regulatory authority with strong enforcement powers, mandatory independent audits, and strict legal penalties to ensure corporate transparency and protect market integrity.

Keywords:

Introduction

In the modern era, consumer behavior has undergone a profound shift towards eco-friendly products and services, driven by growing awareness of climate change, environmental degradation, and resource depletion. Fueled by greater access to information, ethical marketing, and the visible impacts of environmental crises, today's consumers increasingly prioritize sustainability when making purchasing decisions. Contemporary consumers, particularly younger demographics, actively align their purchasing power with their values, showing a distinct willingness to pay price premiums for products bearing verifiable eco-credentials. This transition is evident across diverse sectors—from the preference for energy-efficient appliances and zero-waste packaging to the rising demand for organic food, renewable energy, and ethically sourced textiles. Consequently, businesses no longer view sustainability as merely a compliance obligation or goodwill gesture, but as a primary mechanism for customer acquisition, brand differentiation, and competitive advantage in crowded marketplaces. [1]

Capitalizing on this shifting consumer landscape, corporate entities began leveraging "green" messaging to secure market share and justify premium pricing. As consumer demand for "green," "sustainable," and "net-zero" goods escalates, market actors increasingly deploy deceptive practice where they spend more time, effort, and money marketing the products as environmentally friendly than actually minimizing the ecological footprint of the products. [2] This deceptive practice portraying a product as eco-friendly is known as greenwashing. The practice of greenwashing ranges from using vague descriptors like "eco-friendly," "natural," or "green" without verifiable metrics, to highlighting one minor sustainable feature while concealing broader environmental harm caused across the product's overall life cycle.

The primary danger of greenwashing lies in its ability to distort consumer behavior and market integrity. By capitalizing on the rising public demand for sustainable choices, greenwashed claims exploit information asymmetry, coercing eco-conscious consumers into paying premium prices for products that fail to deliver genuine ecological benefits. According to economists, beyond misleading individuals, greenwashing creates systemic market issues. It is said that greenwashing unfairly diverts capital and market share away from authentically sustainable enterprises, erodes public trust in legitimate environmental certifications, and obscures real corporate impact behind persuasive, unverified marketing. [3]

The practice of greenwashing extends far beyond simple economic deception by corporate entities. It undermines statutory consumer protection, weakens corporate governance, and accelerates real-world environmental degradation. It constitutes an Unfair Trade Practice and a Misleading Advertisement under the Consumer Protection Act, 2019. Greenwashing exploits severe information asymmetry to defraud consumers who pay price premiums for false claims. Besides, when corporate entities misrepresent their environmental metrics in financial disclosures, it expands beyond consumer fraud to include securities violations and breach of fiduciary duties to investors. In this context, this paper proposes to discuss the practice of greenwashing in India and the existing legal frameworks to regulate this misleading practice. Since the issue creates challenges across consumer protection, corporate accountability, and environmental sustainability; the paper would like to explore the initiatives taken by the Central Consumer Protection Authority (CCPA), capital market regulators like Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI) and other regulatory authorities. At the end of the discussion, by evaluating the current legal landscape, the paper will propose some suggestions for stronger enforcement mechanisms against this corporate eco-deception in India.

Understanding Greenwashing and Its Impact

Greenwashing can be broadly described as any deceptive environmental claim that overstates or fabricates the sustainability performance of a product, service, or entity. It is a deceptive practice where corporations, service providers, or institutions falsely market or exaggerate the environmental benefits of their products, services, or practices. The term geenwashing was coined in 1986 by American environmentalist and researcher Jay Westerveld in an essay addressing the hospitality industry. [4] He pointed out the hypocrisy of a resort asking guests to reuse towels to "save the environment," while simultaneously expanding its footprint and causing massive damage to local ecosystems. The term blends "green" (eco-friendly) with "whitewashing" (covering up uncomfortable truths).

In India, there was no dedicated statutory definition until 2024. The Guidelines for Prevention and Regulation of Greenwashing or Misleading Environmental Claims, 2024, issued by the Central Consumer Protection Authority (CCPA) under the Consumer Protection Act, 2019 defines greenwashing as “any deceptive practice involving misleading environmental claims, whether by concealing, omitting, or hiding relevant information, or by using vague, unverified, or exaggerated terms, imagery, or assertions to make a product, service, or entity appear more environmentally friendly than it actually is." [5] Further, in a parallel definition, by the Advertising Standards Council of India (ASCI) in its Guidelines for Advertisements Making Environmental/Green Claims, greenwashing is defined as "unsubstantiated, false, deceptive, or misleading environmental claims about products, services, processes, brands, or operations as a whole." [6]

Greenwashing distorts consumer behavior and destabilizes sustainable market mechanics. It creates severe information asymmetry, misleading well-intentioned consumers into paying premium prices for conventional or harmful products while breeding widespread public cynicism, which erodes trust in genuine sustainability efforts. Greenwashing also distorts market competition by creating an uneven playing field. Due to the rampant practice of greenwashing, companies making legitimate, costly structural adjustments toward eco-friendly supply chains are financially disadvantaged compared to dishonest competitors using cheap, deceptive marketing. [7] Furthermore, in capital markets, financial greenwashing misallocates Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG)-focused capital, inflating environmental asset bubbles while depriving authentic decarbonization and green technology projects of essential funding.

The practice of greenwashing transforms standard corporate communication into actionable statutory violations. In India, regulatory enforcement against greenwashing has been intensified under legal frameworks such as CCPA Guidelines, 2024, Section 21 of the Consumer Protection Act 2019, SEBI's BRSR Core directives and the circular issued by the Reserve Bank of India (RBI). These frameworks classify unsubstantiated environmental claims as misleading advertisements and unfair trade practices. Beyond statutory penalties, greenwashing expands civil and corporate liability by exposing boards to shareholder derivative lawsuits, misrepresentation claims, and enforcement actions for breaches of fiduciary duty when ESG disclosures fail independent verification.

From the international perspective, greenwashing undermines multilateral climate governance and creates friction in global trade. When multinational corporations manipulate environmental disclosures, it distorts tracking under global frameworks like the Paris Agreement, 2015 making true progress toward national emission reduction targets difficult to evaluate. Internationally, greenwashing has catalyzed strict cross-border regulatory standards such as the European Union’s Green Claims Directive, 2023 and the US FTC's Green Guides, 1992. [8] These disparate frameworks pose significant compliance challenges and non-tariff barrier risks for exporters in developing economies who must meet rigorous, multi-jurisdictional supply-chain transparency standards to maintain international trade access.

Protection against Unfair Trade Practice under Consumer Protection Law

The Consumer Protection Act, 1986 has been the primary law of the land to protect consumers from exploitation until passing of the Consumer Protection Act, 2019 as a replacement of the previous one. The Act of 1986 defines unfair trade practices broadly as practices that induce consumers to buy goods or services through deception, false representation, or omission of important information. [9] This Act penalizes false representations regarding the quality, standard, grade, style, or efficacy of goods and services, as well as misleading claims about pricing or reconditioned goods sold as new. [10] The Act also outlaws’ deceptive promotional schemes, such as offering bargain prices without intending to supply at those rates, conducting non-genuine contests or lotteries, offering gifts or prizes with concealed costs, and manufacturing or offering hazardous goods that fail to comply with prescribed safety standards. [11]

To enforce these protections against deceptive frauds, Section 14 of the Consumer Protection Act, 1986 empowers District Forums, State Commissions, and the National Commission to grant direct remedies to aggrieved consumers. [12] Upon establishing the occurrence of an unfair trade practice, these consumer redresal forums can issue binding orders directing the trader or manufacturer to discontinue the unfair trade practice and refrain from repeating it. Additionally, the forums are authorized to award compensation for loss or injury, order the withdrawal of hazardous goods from the market, require the payment of punitive damages where appropriate, and compel the publication of corrective advertisements to neutralize the effect of misleading representations.

The Consumer Protection Act, 1986 was replaced by the Consumer Protection Act, 2019 to bridge critical enforcement gaps created by digital commerce, mounting judicial delays, and an evolving marketplace that the old legislation failed to address. The new Act offers definitions of "consumer", "unfair trade practice", "defect", and "deficiency" and other related terms for creating legal basis of identifying violations and enabling consumer redress. The Act defines a consumer as any person who buys goods or hires services for consideration, with some exceptions for purposes of resale or commerce. [13] Unfair trade practices is defined in the Act as the practices by a trader that cause consumer harm in a variety of ways ranging from false representations to deliberate omissions of important information. [14] In addition to defining unfair trade practices, the Act also puts forth meanings for a defective good and deficient service. A defect as described in the Act is any fault, imperfection or shortcoming in the quality, quantity, potency, purity, or standards of goods or products. [15] Deficiency indicates any fault, imperfection, shortcoming or inadequacy in the quality, nature, substance, or standards of service provided. [16] These definitions are crucial for consumers seeking consumer redressal under the Act as they form the basis of a being a consumer and to establish unfair trade practices or a defect in purchased goods or a deficiency in services rendered.

Role of Judiciary against Misleading Environmental Disclosures

The Indian judiciary, particularly the Supreme Court of India plays an important role in curbing greenwashing practice where entities make unsubstantiated or deceptive claims about the environmental benefits of their products, services, or operations. As there was no codified statutory definition of greenwashing until 2024, the courts historically, have relied on constitutional mandates under Article 21 (Right to a Clean Environment) [17] and Article 19 [1](a) (Right to Information/Commercial Speech) [18] to address the issue. Recognizing that greenwashing distorts market mechanics and exploits public trust for commercial gain, the judiciary has actively expanded consumer protection doctrines and environmental compliance requirements to target deceptive environmental marketing.

While adjudicating cases concerning corporate accountability and misleading advertisements, the Supreme Court of India has reinforced strict standards against deceptive marketing practices. In *Indian Medical Association* vs. *Union of India* (2024), the Supreme Court emphasized that manipulative and misleading advertisements exploit consumer vulnerabilities for commercial gain. [19] This judgment has established a judicial precedent that commercial claims must be backed by verifiable evidence. Applying this line of reasoning to green disclosures, different high courts have also consistently warned corporations against making unsubstantiated claims. Furthermore, in *M.K. Ranjitsinh* vs. *Union of India* (2024), the Supreme Court explicitly recognized a distinct fundamental right to be free from the adverse effects of climate change under Articles 14 and 21. [20] This landmark judgment elevates accurate environmental reporting from simple advertising compliance to a matter of constitutional integrity. It also created a precedent that misleading corporate "green claims" undermine broader climate goals and public rights.

The National Green Tribunal (NGT) and lower judicial forums have similarly enforced accountability when entities attempt to mask ecological harm under the guise of eco-friendly initiatives or "green" developments. In *Manoj Misra* vs. *Union of India* (2015), concerning the Yamuna floodplains issues, the National Green Tribunal (NGT) has scrutinized high-profile events and corporate projects that claimed compliance with ecological norms despite causing severe environmental degradation. [21] Besides, by enforcing the Polluter Pays Principle and the Precautionary Principle, the Supreme Court required companies to provide transparent, scientifically verified impact assessments rather than vague, self-assessed claims. This judicial proactive posture is said to complement the 2024 Guidelines by the Central Consumer Protection Authority (CCPA).

The Regulatory Framework Governing Greenwashing in India

Though the term greenwashing has been in discourse for a long time, however, there was no statutory legal definition of the term until the 2024 regulations. The issue of greenwashing was covered within the general provisions against "unfair trade practices" and "misleading advertisements" under the Consumer Protection Act, 2019. Both the statutes i.e. the CPA, 1986 and the CPA 2019 contained no explicit mention of environmental or ecological claims. The general mandate against deceptive commercial conduct established the baseline framework through which misleading green statements were scrutinized. Thus, before the 2024 regulations, false ecological assertions were considered as a matter of ordinary consumer deception.

The necessity for legal reform came into sharp focus due to the rapid growth of the "green economy," which revealed the inadequacy of legacy consumer and corporate laws. General provisions of the Consumer Protection Act, 2019 struggled to address nuanced, specialized practices like selective data disclosure (for example, cherry-picking of favorable data while concealing systemic emissions), visual deception by using green branding and unverified leaves or eco-logos, and vague terminology by making absolute assertions like "eco-friendly" or "carbon-neutral" without scientific proof. By applying the Polluter Pays Principle and Precautionary Principle, the Supreme Court also mandated that companies must back their claims with transparent, scientifically validated impact assessments instead of self-assessed assertions. [22] Besides, international parallel shifts reflect a global legislative migration from general ad-hoc monitoring to strict, pre-verified, and enforceable anti-greenwashing laws.

Recognizing these gaps, statutory authorities shifted from passive misrepresentation frameworks toward mandatory, highly specialized anti-greenwashing regimes. The evolution of regulating greenwashing in India is primarily culminated with the issuing of guidelines for prevention and regulation of greenwashing by the Central Consumer Protection Authority (CCPA), enforcement of self-regulatory standards to evaluate eco-claims by the Advertising Standards Council of India (ASCI), in 2024 and introduction of targeted disclosures by the Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI) in different phases starting from 2017 to 2024. Thus, India currently does not have any single anti-greenwashing legislation; instead, several regulatory and self-regulatory frameworks address different aspects of environmental claims and ESG disclosures. The basic aspects of all these regulations are being discussed as under.

1. CCPA Guidelines on Greenwashing and Misleading Environmental Claims, 2024

The CCPA guidelines, 2024 seek to ensure that environmental claims made by businesses are truthful, accurate, capable of substantiation and not misleading to consumers. Environmental claims made in advertisements and communications concerning goods and services covered by the guidelines. The guidelines also require environmental claims to be supported by adequate and credible evidence.

Businesses making specific environmental claims must ensure that the basis for such claims is adequately disclosed and that consumers are not likely to be misled by the manner in which the claim is presented. [23] Relevant information supporting a claim may, where appropriate, be made available through mechanisms such as QR codes or web links. The guidelines further address the use of broad environmental terminology and require businesses to provide sufficient context and qualification where necessary. [24] Claims based on scientific studies, research or data should not selectively present favorable information while concealing material information that could alter the overall impression created by the claim.

2. ASCI Guidelines for Advertisements Making Environmental/Green Claims, 2024

The ASCI is an advertising industry and a self-regulatory body rather than a statutory regulator. Its guidelines supplement the broader consumer protection framework and provide advertisers with standards for making environmental claims. The framework addresses several categories of environmental claims, including absolute and comparative claims, claims relating to the entire lifecycle of a product, future environmental objectives, carbon-offset claims and claims involving certification or environmental credentials. The guidelines mandate that forward-looking environmental claims should be supported by a clear and actionable plan demonstrating how the stated objective is intended to be achieved. [25] The guidelines also provided that environmental imagery or symbols should not create an impression of environmental benefit where the underlying claim cannot be substantiated.

3. BRSR, Green Debt Securities and ESG Disclosure Frameworks by the SEBI

The Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI) has systematically developed a regulatory architecture to mitigate greenwashing, progressing from initial disclosure mandates to targeted operational guidelines. The BRSR framework is a standardized set of guidelines that requires the top 1000 listed companies to disclose their Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) performance. [26] Moving away from vague, voluntary story-telling, the BRSR mandates that companies report clear, numeric data on key sustainability indicators such as total energy use, greenhouse gas emissions, water consumption, and employee welfare. [27] To prevent companies from selectively sharing only good news or making misleading claims, SEBI established a stricter sub-framework called the BRSR Core framework. Under the BRSR Core framework, companies are required to get their critical sustainability metrics verified by independent third-party auditors. [28] By enforcing uniform standards, quantitative reporting, and third-party auditing, the BRSR Core framework ensures that businesses present accurate, verified data to investors and the public.

To address greenwashing specifically in financial markets, SEBI has also established strict guidelines for Green Debt Securities and broader ESG-labeled bonds. Under these regulations, issuers raising capital for environmentally friendly projects must clearly define how the borrowed money will be spent and track the actual impact of those projects over time. SEBI explicitly defines greenwashing and prohibits issuers from using misleading labels, omitting negative environmental impacts, or cherry-picking data to make a bond appear greener than it is. [29] Furthermore, with expanded frameworks covering social and sustainability-linked bonds, SEBI mandates independent third-party reviews prior to issuance and on an ongoing basis. If an issuer fails to achieve its promised sustainability targets, the framework incorporates mechanisms such as public disclosures or options for early bond redemption. Together, these rules ensure that capital raised for sustainable growth is genuinely utilized for environmental benefits, protecting investors from deceptive eco-marketing.

4. Circular issued by the Reserve Bank of India

The Reserve Bank of India (RBI) has also addressed greenwashing concerns in its Circular on Framework for acceptance of Green Deposits. The circular proposes the use of third-party verification/assurance and impact assessments for the allocation of funds from green deposits. A green deposit is an interest-bearing fixed deposit accepted by regulated entities whose proceeds are strictly earmarked for allocation toward pre-defined green projects that promote sustainability and combat climate change. [30] This approach aims to retain consumer trust and prove the veracity of eco-friendly practices claimed by financial institutions. The framework provides clear definition of eligible green projects, where banks must establish and disclose criteria for projects that qualify for funding through green deposits. It also includes transparent fund allocation, requiring banks to maintain separate accounts for green deposits and provide regular reports on fund utilization and impact assessment. The framework mandates banks to conduct and disclose assessments of the environmental impact of projects funded through green deposits and third-party verification, encouraging banks to obtain independent verification of their green practices and impact assessments. [31] The RBI framework helps to prevent financial institutions from simply labeling their products as "green" without substantive environmental benefits. It also provides consumers with more reliable information when choosing green financial products.

Analyzing the Gaps: Are the frameworks sufficient to curb greenwashing?

As discussed in the preceding parts, India has taken notable strides towards establishing a regulatory architecture to deter greenwashing in 2024. By mandating disclosure under the frameworks, it ushers in curtailing the practice of corporate greenwashing to a considerable extent. While India has introduced a couple of regulatory measures to promote transparency and curb greenwashing, there are still significant gaps in the frameworks.

The Consumer Protection Act provides an avenue for affected consumers to seek redress in cases of misleading and deceptive advertisements. The CCPA guidelines have taken the right step in defining and prohibiting greenwashing, however, its strict enforcement of the guidelines is yet to be seen. Besides, the ASCI guidelines focus purely on the advertising and marketing aspect of greenwashing, but these frameworks do not fully address greenwashing in corporate reporting, investor communication or other areas of business. Analyzing these gaps, it is often commented that the former is limited in operation to the protection of consumers while the latter is limited to the scope of advertisements only. [32]

The SEBI's frameworks on Green Debt Securities, 2023 and the Business Responsibility and Sustainability Reporting (BRSR/BRSR Core) have been considered as the pioneering strides toward corporate ESG accountability. However, it is often said by experts that significant regulatory and enforcement gaps persist in these frameworks. Legal commentators and market experts point out that SEBI's regime lacks a unified, legally binding definition of "greenwashing" across statutory acts, relying instead on high-level administrative guidelines. [33] In India, corporate misrepresentation in market disclosures is traditionally addressed through anti-fraud mechanisms. The SEBI's Prohibition of Fraudulent and Unfair Trade Practices Regulations (PFUTP), 2003 and the principles laid down by the Supreme Court in *N. Narayanan* vs. *Adjudicating Officer, SEBI* (2013), [34] established full disclosure and transparency as key pillars of market integrity. However, experts highlight that invoking fraud standards requires proving intent or material inducement, which is difficult to apply to sustainability claims. This difficulty arises because corporate ESG metrics are often forward-looking statements such as "Net-Zero by 2050" rather than present factual misstatements. Such statements are said to create an avenue of aspirational environmental claims to escape strict enforcement.

As per experts, beyond conceptual and legal limitations, operational and structural gaps weaken the efficacy of the SEBI frameworks. As per the guidelines, big companies must have an independent auditor to verify key parts of their sustainability reports (BRSR Core) but they are not bound to report on their supply chain like Scope 3 emissions and upstream/downstream environmental impacts. [35] As checking the supply chain is optional, companies can skip reporting where most of their actual pollution and environmental damage happen. This makes it much harder to hold them accountable for their full impact. Furthermore, expert analyses of corporate disclosures continuously highlight widespread data inconsistencies, non-standardized measurement units, and a lack of technical capacity among third-party assurance providers to audit complex lifecycle assessments. With respect to Green Debt Securities, the SEBI mandates disclosures aligned with national or global taxonomies, however, India still lacks an officially codified, cross-sectoral National Green Taxonomy. [36] Without clear legal rules defining what is truly "green," mandatory supply chain reporting, and specific punishments for lying about sustainability, SEBI's reporting rules risk becoming just a paper-pushing exercise. Thus, the frameworks seem instead of stopping companies from misleading the public about their environmental record, they just give them more paperwork to fill out.

While the RBI's 2023 Green Deposit Framework is a major step toward stopping banks from making fake environmental claims (greenwashing), experts say it still has serious loopholes. In practice, these gaps make it hard for regulators to strictly monitor how banks actually use green funds. A core operational challenge lies in the structural timing mismatch between bank funding and project lending. Green deposits are typically short to medium term fixed deposits from depositors. [37] However, environmental and green transition projects such as infrastructure or renewable energy installations require long term loans extending over many years. Therefore, when financial institutions use short term deposits to fund long term green projects, they face significant liquidity and interest rate risks if depositors withdraw or roll over their funds before the long term loans mature. Besides, the framework lacks enforceability teeth. It mandates no quantitative green lending targets, nor does it prescribe specific penal provisions or depositor grievance mechanisms when entities misallocate earmarked funds or fail impact metrics. Furthermore, it is said that the absence of a finalized and officially codified National Green Taxonomy forces banks to rely on an interim, broad list of eligible activities, which dilutes the precise classification of sustainable assets. [38] Thus, combined with the absence of a regulatory framework to hold third-party ESG assurance providers accountable, experts warn that these gaps leave the framework vulnerable to administrative compliance checks rather than serving as a foolproof shield against greenwashing.

Conclusion and Suggestions

At the end of the discussion, it can be said that the guidelines on the prevention and regulation of greenwashing initiated in the recent years mark a milestone to establish a green and sustainable commercial landscape in the country. The issue of greenwashing is no longer seen as a mere ethical or reputational concern, rather it has evolved into a question of legal responsibility and regulatory accountability. The statutory frameworks have created an environment in which unsupported environmental claims on goods and services can lead to serious consequences. The focus seems to shift away from attractive sustainability language towards the ability of companies to substantiate what they publicly claim.

In analyzing the regulatory frameworks, it has been observed that though they have established necessary prohibitions against vague jargon like "eco-friendly" or "carbon-neutral," there are still gaps in the existing frameworks. The frameworks seem to be still at an early stage of development as they lack mandatory, standardized life-cycle assessment methodologies and third-party audit requirements for claims. The current legal landscape recognizes the severity of misleading environmental claims, but its effectiveness remains hampered by enforcement silos. Consumer protection authorities, market regulators, self-regulatory advertising bodies, and central banking institutions operate through distinct mandates that often fail to intersect, allowing deceptive environmental claims to persist in the regulatory gaps between marketing, corporate reporting, and financial underwriting.

The initiative with guidelines by CCPA, ASCI, SEBI and the RBI against greenwashing in the recent years is an important beginning in India that no one can deny. However, considering the profound shift towards eco-friendly products and services in today's market, clearer standards are to be set immediately. More specific sector-based guidelines would help the companies to understand what kind of evidence is required for environmental claims. To transform India's anti-greenwashing regime to an advanced and proactive one, this paper suggests for some reforms in the mechanism. First of all, there must be a legally binding National Green Taxonomy to provide unified, science-based criteria for what constitutes a sustainable activity across consumer, capital, and banking markets. Secondly, regulatory frameworks of greenwashing must shift from voluntary self-substantiation to mandatory independent third-party verification for corporate disclosures, integrating standardized Life-Cycle Analyses into CCPA enforcement and requiring mandatory value-chain assurance across all SEBI ESG disclosures. Finally, the paper suggests for creating an inter-regulatory task force between CCPA, SEBI, RBI, and ASCI to harmonize enforcement to eliminate jurisdictional loopholes, and it must ensure that deceptive environmental practices face immediate, cross-sectoral legal consequences.

References

1. Aravkar R. Consumer Perspectives on Eco-friendly Packaging: An Indian Context. Mintel, available at: https://www.mintel.com, 2024.
2. Rai P. Greenwashing and Its Impact on Consumers and Environment. IJMER ,2021:10(1):3.
3. Shamsi MS, Siddiqui ZS. Green Product and Consumer Behaviour: An Analytical Study. Pertanika Journal of Social Science and Humanities ,2017:25(4):1545-1554.
4. Katait SK. Greenwashing in India: An Alarming Issue: Misleading and Deceptive Environmental Claims in Advertising. International Journal of Commerce and Management Research ,2017:3(2):91.
5. Central Consumer Protection Authority. Guidelines for Prevention and Regulation of Greenwashing or Misleading Environmental Claims, cl. 2(f), Notification No. F. No. CCPA-1/1/2023-CCPA (Issued on Oct. 15, 2024), 2024.
6. Advertising Standards Council of India. Guidelines for Advertisements Making Environmental/Green Claims, Clause 1.1 (Issued on Feb. 15, 2024), 2024.
7. Hussain ZA. Green or gimmick? Guidelines aim to regulate misleading environmental claims. Mongabay-India, May 24, available at: https://india.mongabay.com/2024/05/green-or-gimmickguidelines-aim-to-regulate-misleading-environmental-claims/, 2024.
8. Chaudhary M. India's Ecomark rule 2024 for sustainable plastic products. Corpbiz, Nov. 15, available at: https://corpbiz.io/learning/indias-ecomark-rule-2024-for-sustainable-plastic-products/, 2024.
9. The Consumer Protection Act, Section 2(1)(r), 1986.
10. Ibid.
11. Ibid.
12. The Consumer Protection Act, Section 14, 1986.
13. The Consumer Protection Act, Section 2 (7), 2019.
14. The Consumer Protection Act, Section 2 (47), 2019.
15. The Consumer Protection Act, Section 2 (10), 2019.
16. The Consumer Protection Act, Section 2 (11), 2019.
17. Subhash Kumar vs. State of Bihar, 1 SCC 598, 1991.
18. Tata Press Ltd. vs. Mahanagar Telephone Nigam Ltd., AIR SC 2438, 1995.
19. Indian Medical Association vs. Union of India, INSC 406, 2024.
20. M.K. Ranjitsinh vs. Union of India, INSC 280, 2024.
21. Manoj Misra vs. Union of India, SCC OnLine NGT 840, 2015.
22. Indian Council for Enviro-Legal Action vs. Union of India, AIR SC 1446, 1996.
23. Supra note 5.
24. Ibid.
25. Supra note 6.
26. Securities and Exchange Board of India. Circular on Business Responsibility and Sustainability Reporting by Listed Entities, Circular No. SEBI/HO/CFD/CMD-2/P/CIR/2021/562 (May 10), 2021.
27. Ibid.
28. Securities and Exchange Board of India. BRSR Core – Framework for Assurance and ESG Disclosures for Value Chain, Circular No. SEBI/HO/CFD/CFD-SEC-2/P/CIR/2023/122 (July 12), 2023.
29. Securities and Exchange Board of India. Dos and Don'ts Relating to Green Debt Securities to Avoid Occurrences of Greenwashing, Circular No. SEBI/HO/DDHS/DDHS-RACPOD1/P/CIR/2023/020 (Feb. 3), 2023.
30. Reserve Bank of India. Framework for Acceptance of Green Deposits, Circular No. RBI/2023-24/14 (Apr. 11), 2023.
31. Ibid.
32. Supra note 7.
33. Maini S. Greenwashing and Corporate Accountability in India. Indian Journal of Law and Environmental Studies ,2024:5:44:48–49.
34. N. Narayanan vs. Adjudicating Officer, SEBI, AIR SC 3191, 2013.
35. Supra note 33.
36. Shanmugam JK, Saidon IM, Noor MM, Lokanathan K, Wan Ya WKH. Unmasking Greenwashing: A Brief Note to Consumers. International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science , 2024, 8(10).
37. Tikkha V, Agarwal P, Rajwanshi R. Assessing Greenwashing Practices with Special Relevance to the Food & Beverage Industry. International Journal of Agriculture and Environmental Research ,2024:10(4):472 at 475–478.
38. Supra note 33.