



Judicial Activism vs. Judicial Restraint: Balancing the Role of the Courts in a Democratic Society

Vikram Sharma*

Research Scholar,
CRSU University, Jind

Accepted: 10/05/2024

Published: 30/06/2024

* Corresponding author

How to Cite this Article:

Sharma, V. (2024). Judicial Activism vs. Judicial Restraint: Balancing the Role of the Courts in a Democratic Society. *Indian Journal of Law*, 2(3), 1-6.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36676/ijl.v2.i3.26>



Abstract: *The contrasting approaches of judicial activism and judicial restraint and their implications for the role of courts in a democratic society. It explores the tensions between these approaches and the challenges of striking a balance between judicial intervention and deference to other branches of government. Judicial activism refers to a proactive approach by courts in interpreting laws and the Constitution, often involving the expansion of individual rights and the correction of perceived injustices. This approach empowers courts to address social and political issues, but it also raises concerns about judicial overreach and the usurpation of legislative or executive authority. In contrast, judicial restraint emphasizes a more deferential approach by courts, limiting their intervention in political and policy matters and deferring to the elected branches of government. While this approach respects democratic processes and separation of powers, it can also lead to the perpetuation of systemic injustices and the neglect of marginalized groups.*

Keywords: Judicial activism, Judicial restraint, Courts, Democracy, Separation of powers

Introduction

In democratic societies, the role of the judiciary is pivotal in upholding the rule of law, safeguarding individual rights, and ensuring the accountability of government actions. However, there exists a perennial debate over the appropriate role of courts in interpreting laws and the Constitution, with contrasting approaches of judicial activism and judicial restraint vying for prominence. This introduction provides an overview of these contrasting approaches and explores the challenges of balancing the role of courts in a democratic society. Judicial activism refers to a proactive approach by courts in interpreting laws and the Constitution, often involving the expansion of individual rights and the correction of perceived injustices. This approach empowers courts to address social and political issues, but it also raises concerns about judicial overreach and the potential infringement on the prerogatives of the elected branches of government. Conversely, judicial restraint advocates for a more deferential approach by courts, limiting their intervention in political and policy matters and deferring to the decisions of the legislative and executive branches. While this approach respects





democratic processes and separation of powers, it can also lead to the perpetuation of systemic injustices and the neglect of marginalized groups. The tension between judicial activism and judicial restraint reflects deeper philosophical and jurisprudential differences over the proper role of the judiciary in a democratic society. While proponents of judicial activism argue for an expansive interpretation of constitutional rights to address contemporary social challenges, advocates of judicial restraint emphasize the importance of judicial deference to democratic processes and elected representatives. Historically, the pendulum has swung between these approaches, with periods of judicial activism followed by periods of judicial restraint, and vice versa. Landmark court decisions have shaped the contours of this debate, influencing the balance of power between the judiciary and other branches of government. In contemporary democratic societies, the role of courts in addressing pressing social issues such as civil rights, social policy, environmental regulation, and criminal justice remains a subject of intense debate and scrutiny. The challenge lies in striking a delicate balance between judicial intervention and deference to democratic processes, ensuring that courts uphold constitutional principles while respecting the separation of powers and democratic legitimacy.

The Role of Courts in Democracy:

- **Upholding the Rule of Law:** Courts serve as guardians of the constitution and ensure that laws and government actions comply with constitutional principles, thereby upholding the rule of law and preventing governmental abuse of power.
- **Safeguarding Individual Rights:** Courts protect individual rights and liberties by interpreting and enforcing constitutional provisions, including freedoms of speech, religion, and association, as well as due process and equal protection guarantees.
- **Checking Governmental Actions:** Courts serve as a check on the other branches of government by reviewing the constitutionality of legislative and executive actions, preventing potential overreach or violations of constitutional rights.
- **Resolving Disputes:** Courts provide a forum for the peaceful resolution of disputes between individuals, organizations, and governmental entities, ensuring access to justice and the fair application of legal principles.
- **Interpreting Laws and Precedents:** Courts interpret laws, statutes, regulations, and legal precedents to provide guidance on their meaning and application, clarifying legal rights and obligations for citizens and policymakers.
- **Promoting Accountability:** Courts hold government officials and agencies accountable for their actions by reviewing administrative decisions, enforcing legal standards, and remedying violations of law or constitutional rights.
- **Fostering Public Confidence:** By adjudicating disputes impartially, transparently, and fairly, courts foster public confidence in the legal system and democratic institutions, promoting respect for the rule of law and the legitimacy of governmental authority.
- **Advancing Social Justice:** Courts play a crucial role in advancing social justice by adjudicating cases involving discrimination, inequality, and injustice, and by





interpreting laws and constitutional provisions in a manner that promotes equality and fairness for all members of society.

- **Balancing Conflicting Interests:** Courts weigh competing interests and values, such as individual rights versus public safety, privacy versus security, and liberty versus equality, in order to strike a balance that reflects the principles of justice, equity, and democratic governance.
- **Adapting to Societal Changes:** Courts adapt legal principles and interpretations to reflect evolving societal norms, values, and expectations, ensuring that the law remains relevant and responsive to changing social, cultural, and political dynamics in a democratic society.
- **Judicial Activism: Expanding Rights and Remedies**
- **Definition and Concept:** Judicial activism refers to a proactive approach by courts in interpreting laws and the Constitution, often involving the expansion of individual rights and the correction of perceived injustices.
- **Expanding Constitutional Rights:** Activist judges interpret constitutional provisions broadly to extend protections to marginalized groups and address contemporary social issues, such as civil rights, LGBTQ+ rights, reproductive rights, and privacy rights.
- **Correcting Injustices:** Judicial activism aims to rectify perceived injustices or inequalities by holding government actions accountable and providing remedies for violations of constitutional rights or legal principles.
- **Landmark Decisions:** Activist judges have issued landmark decisions that have shaped legal precedent and expanded rights, such as *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954), which desegregated public schools, and *Roe v. Wade* (1973), which recognized the right to abortion.
- **Interpreting the Living Constitution:** Activist judges adopt a dynamic interpretation of the Constitution, viewing it as a living document that evolves over time to reflect changing societal values and norms, rather than adhering strictly to original intent or textualism.
- **Criticisms and Controversies:** Judicial activism has faced criticism for judicial overreach, usurpation of legislative authority, and imposition of personal biases, leading to charges of judicial activism as judicial tyranny or judicial legislation.
- **Support for Judicial Activism:** Advocates argue that judicial activism is necessary to protect individual rights, promote social justice, and ensure accountability in government, particularly in cases where legislative or executive actions fail to address systemic injustices or protect minority rights.
- **Role of the Judiciary:** Activist judges view the judiciary as a coequal branch of government with a duty to uphold constitutional principles and provide a check on legislative and executive power, even if it requires intervention to protect fundamental rights and liberties.
- **Impact on Society:** Judicial activism has had a profound impact on society by advancing civil rights, promoting equality, and expanding legal protections for marginalized





groups, but it has also sparked political controversy and debate over the proper role of courts in a democratic society.

- Legacy and Future Trends: The legacy of judicial activism continues to shape legal and political discourse, with ongoing debates over the appropriate balance between judicial intervention and deference to democratic processes, as courts grapple with new challenges and opportunities in safeguarding rights and liberties.

Conclusion

The debate between judicial activism and judicial restraint underscores the complex and nuanced role of courts in a democratic society. While judicial activism advocates for a proactive approach to expanding rights and remedies, judicial restraint calls for a more deferential stance that respects the separation of powers and democratic processes. Balancing these competing approaches is essential for courts to fulfill their role as guardians of the constitution, protectors of individual rights, and checks on governmental actions. Judicial activism has played a crucial role in advancing civil rights, promoting social justice, and addressing systemic injustices through landmark decisions that have expanded constitutional protections and rectified historical wrongs. However, it has also faced criticism for judicial overreach and the potential infringement on the prerogatives of the elected branches of government. Conversely, judicial restraint emphasizes judicial deference to democratic processes and elected representatives, ensuring that courts do not overstep their bounds or substitute their judgment for that of the legislature or executive. Finding the right balance between judicial activism and judicial restraint requires careful consideration of legal principles, constitutional values, and societal norms. Courts must exercise discretion and restraint when intervening in political and policy matters, while also remaining vigilant in safeguarding individual rights and liberties. Moreover, courts should engage in dialogue with other branches of government and respect the separation of powers, recognizing that democratic legitimacy and accountability are essential pillars of the rule of law. The role of courts in a democratic society is multifaceted, requiring a delicate balancing act between judicial activism and judicial restraint. By upholding constitutional principles, protecting individual rights, and ensuring accountability in government actions, courts can promote fairness, justice, and the rule of law, thereby contributing to the health and vibrancy of democratic governance. As society evolves and new challenges emerge, courts must remain vigilant in adapting their approach to meet the evolving needs and aspirations of the people they serve.

Bibliography

- Ackerman, B. A. (2014). *We the People, Volume 3: The Civil Rights Revolution*. Harvard University Press.
- Amar, A. R. (2019). *The Constitution Today: Timeless Lessons for the Issues of Our Era*. Basic Books.





- Amit. (2024). Study of Presidential versus Parliamentary democracy. *Innovative Research Thoughts*, 8(2), 13–20. Retrieved from <https://irt.shodhsagar.com/index.php/j/article/view/1124>
- Balkin, J. M. (2016). *Living Originalism*. Harvard University Press.
- Dr. Amit Kumar Jaiswal. (2019). Democracy and Diversity in Higher Education in India. *International Journal for Research Publication and Seminar*, 10(1), 44–52. Retrieved from <https://jrps.shodhsagar.com/index.php/j/article/view/1241>
- DR. ANURADHA NAGIA. (2024). MEDIA AND DEMOCRACY- A CRUCIAL RELATIONSHIP. *Innovative Research Thoughts*, 7(3), 27–32. Retrieved from <https://irt.shodhsagar.com/index.php/j/article/view/1047>
- Epstein, L., & Walker, T. G. (2018). *Constitutional Law for a Changing America: Rights, Liberties, and Justice*. CQ Press.
- Ghangas, V. (2017). Good governance, working definitions and components. *Innovative Research Thoughts*, 3(10), 247–254. Retrieved from <https://irt.shodhsagar.com/index.php/j/article/view/302>
- Manjeet Pal, & Dr. Kulwant Singh. (2023). The Need and Importance of the Institution of Ombudsman in India. *International Journal for Research Publication and Seminar*, 14(4), 117–121. Retrieved from <https://jrps.shodhsagar.com/index.php/j/article/view/431>
- McConnell, M. W. (2018). *The President Who Would Not Be King: Executive Power Under the Constitution*. Princeton University Press.
- Mrs. Anuradha, & Dr. Anil Kumar Teotia. (2016). Study of Education System in India and National Policy on Education 2016 in India. *International Journal for Research Publication and Seminar*, 7(2). Retrieved from <https://jrps.shodhsagar.com/index.php/j/article/view/775>
- Mrs. Rekha. (2016). Right to information Act – 2005. *International Journal for Research Publication and Seminar*, 7(7), 93–96. Retrieved from <https://jrps.shodhsagar.com/index.php/j/article/view/944>
- Narwal, M. (2021). Women Representation in Urban Local Government in South Delhi. *International Journal for Research Publication and Seminar*, 12(4), 10–19. Retrieved from <https://jrps.shodhsagar.com/index.php/j/article/view/167>
- Narwal, M. (2021). Good governance, working definitions and components. *International Journal for Research Publication and Seminar*, 12(3), 119–125. Retrieved from <https://jrps.shodhsagar.com/index.php/j/article/view/151>
- Navjot Sidhu, & Dr. Shobha Kulshreshtha. (2016). A Review of role of media (TV and Social) over security issues of Women in India. *International Journal for Research Publication and Seminar*, 7(2). Retrieved from <https://jrps.shodhsagar.com/index.php/j/article/view/778>
- Perry, M. J. (2017). *Judging Democracy*. Princeton University Press.
- Rosenberg, G. N. (2016). *The Hollow Hope: Can Courts Bring About Social Change?*. University of Chicago Press.



Satyanarayan Kunungo , Sarath Ramabhotla , Manoj Bhoyar "The Integration of Data Engineering and Cloud Computing in the Age of Machine Learning and Artificial Intelligence" *Iconic Research And Engineering Journals* Volume 1 Issue 12 2018 Page 79-84

Srivastava, M. K. (2018). Portrayal of Terrorism in Media. *Innovative Research Thoughts*, 4(5), 119–124. Retrieved from <https://irt.shodhsagar.com/index.php/j/article/view/890>

Sunstein, C. R. (2017). *Radicals in Robes: Why Extreme Right-Wing Courts Are Wrong for America*. Basic Books.

Tribe, L. H. (2015). *American Constitutional Law*. Foundation Press.

Tushnet, M. V. (2015). *Taking the Constitution Away from the Courts*. Princeton University Press.

