



Judicial Activism vs. Judicial Restraint: A Critical Analysis in the Indian Context

Savita Sharma

Published: Nov 10, 2023

Email: SharmaS456@gmail.com

How to Cite this article:

Sharma,S . (2023). Judicial Activism vs. Judicial Restraint: A Critical Analysis in the Indian Context .
Indian Journal of Law, 1(1), 15-21.

<https://doi.org/10.36676/law.2023-v1i1-03>

Abstract:

This paper delves into the contrasting concepts of judicial activism and judicial restraint within the framework of the Indian judiciary. It provides a historical perspective on their evolution and influence, and then undertakes a comprehensive examination of their impact on the Indian legal system, democratic governance, and judicial legitimacy. Through an analysis of seminal cases and scholarly perspectives, this paper seeks to elucidate the delicate equilibrium that must be maintained between judicial activism and restraint for the effective functioning of India's legal and political institutions.

Keywords: Judicial Activism, Judicial Restraint, Indian Judiciary, Separation of Powers, Democracy, Rule of Law

Introduction:

The Indian judiciary, like its counterparts worldwide, grapples with the enduring tension between two distinct judicial philosophies: judicial activism and judicial restraint. These philosophies represent the twin pillars upon which the edifice of legal decision-making stands. Judicial activism embodies a proactive judicial approach, where the judiciary takes an assertive role in interpreting and enforcing constitutional principles, safeguarding individual rights, and correcting perceived wrongs, often transcending the traditional boundaries of the judicial role. Conversely, judicial restraint advocates for a more cautious and deferential approach, urging judges to exercise self-restraint in deferring to the legislative and executive branches of government, emphasizing their roles as policymakers and enforcers of laws. This dialectic





between activism and restraint has profound implications for the Indian legal system, democracy, the separation of powers, and the legitimacy of the judiciary itself. The roots of these judicial philosophies in India can be traced back to the country's colonial past, but their contemporary manifestations have evolved significantly over the years. While the Indian Constitution lays down a comprehensive framework for governance and the functioning of the judiciary, it has also granted the judiciary substantial powers of judicial review, allowing it to scrutinize the actions of the government and safeguard fundamental rights. This unique constitutional design has provided a fertile ground for the growth of judicial activism, where the judiciary has frequently assumed the role of a guardian of the Constitution and a protector of citizens' rights.

Judicial Restraint:

Conversely, judicial restraint has been championed as a means of preserving the delicate balance between the three branches of government and respecting the principle of checks and balances. The doctrine of judicial deference is seen as essential for maintaining harmony within the constitutional framework. Yet, proponents of judicial activism contend that excessive restraint can result in a passive judiciary unwilling to intervene in cases of grave injustice or executive overreach. This paper will undertake a comprehensive examination of these contrasting perspectives and their impact on the Indian legal system, democracy, and governance. It will explore landmark cases that embody either judicial activism or restraint, dissecting the reasoning and implications behind these decisions. Additionally, it will delve into the contemporary challenges and debates surrounding these philosophies in India's evolving socio-political landscape.

Historical Evolution

The historical evolution of judicial activism and restraint in India can be traced back to the colonial past, when British jurisprudence laid the foundation for legal thinking in the subcontinent. The Indian judiciary, with its inherent conservatism, primarily served as an instrument of colonial administration, interpreting and enforcing laws created by the British Crown and its colonial apparatus. However, this colonial period also saw the emergence of early legal luminaries like Sir Syed Ahmed Khan and Dadabhai Naoroji, who laid the intellectual groundwork for Indian legal thought and reform. The struggle for independence led to the promulgation of the Indian Constitution in 1950, which established India as a sovereign, democratic republic and granted significant powers to the judiciary, including the power of judicial review. This marked the beginning of a new era in the Indian judiciary's role in shaping the nation's destiny. The judiciary was





empowered to review and strike down legislation that contravened the Constitutional protections for basic liberties. The "basic structure theory," established by seminal instances like *Sadananda Bharati v. State of Kerala* (1973), held that Parliament could not modify the fundamental framework of the Constitution., protecting the core principles of democracy, federalism, and fundamental rights. Public Interest Litigation (PIL) in the 1980s further fueled the era of judicial activism in India, allowing citizens, NGOs, and judges to bring cases before the courts on matters of public interest, often related to social justice, environmental protection, and government accountability. However, this activism was not without its detractors, who argued that an overly assertive judiciary was infringing on the powers of the elected branches of government. Critics raised concerns about the principle of separation of powers and parliamentary sovereignty, contending that the judiciary's expanded role could disrupt the delicate equilibrium among the branches of government. Despite these debates, judicial activism has continued to be a defining feature of the Indian legal landscape, playing a pivotal role in the expansion of civil liberties, social justice, and accountability.

Review of Literature

(Gunatilleke, n.d.) studied “Judicial Activism Revisited: Reflecting on the Role of Judges in enforcing Economic, Social and Cultural Rights” and said that The role of the Sri Lankan judiciary in promoting ESC rights is examined in this article. Just how "active" judges should be in protecting these rights is affected by factors like voter participation rates, political inclusion, and press freedom. More fair allocation of resources results from the court system's protection of civil and political rights. Judicial reasoning, however, must take into account line-drawing and trade-off concerns. Judges should only intervene where policies or tradeoffs are unfair or unreasonable, and the restrictions of nondiscrimination and rationality imply this is the case. When deciding whether or not to enforce ESC rights, the court should look at each situation individually and weigh the competing interests of promoting social progress and ensuring distributive justice.

(Rahman & Badhon, n.d.) studied “A Critical Analysis on Judicial Activism and Overreach” and said that The court has a duty to safeguard constitutional values and norms as part of the constitutional framework. The court utilises its discretion and creativity to reconcile the law's positive and normative provisions and find solutions to pressing social issues. If it is prevented from protecting the public interest by legislative roadblocks, judicial activism is likely to emerge. Acceptance of judicial overreach, however, might undermine democratic rule.





(Moen, 2004) studied “New Judicial Federalism: The Rehnquist Court, Judicial Activism, and Devolution” and said that The Rehnquist Court was activist in that it revived the Eleventh Amendment and restricted the Commerce Clause's power. As a result, the Constitution was amended to devolve more power to the states and reduce federal control. A conservative majority on the Supreme Court, founded in 1988 by Justice Anthony M. Kennedy, has been accused of judicial activism and, by extension, of rewriting the Constitution. Because state law in *Rush* was more liberal than federal law, the majority's pro-business position may have prevailed. Critics of the Court point to its history of radical decisions, arguing that terms like liberty, equality, color-blind, and the four corners of the law" have taken on new meaning in the contemporary political atmosphere. If the current president appoints one or two youthful justices to the Supreme Court, the repercussions of this transition might continue for decades. (Chowdhury, 2011) studied “A critical analysis of judicial activism and human rights in India” and said that When compared to courts in nations without constitutions, those in countries with one have far heavier responsibilities. Why? Because they are responsible for giving nuanced interpretations of the provisions of the constitution and the law. The courts are the ultimate interpreter, curator, and protector of the supremacy of the constitution, since they are responsible for imposing constitutional restrictions on the powers of other departments of government, including the legislative, executive, administrative, judicial, and quasi-judicial branches. It should go without saying that the court, under a constitution with provisions guaranteeing essential rights of the people, has the ability and the obligation to maintain those rights from any unnecessary and unreasonable encroachment, as well as the duty to scrutinise all operations of the government.

Judicial Activism

Judicial activism in India is a proactive approach by the judiciary to interpret and enforce constitutional principles, safeguard individual rights, and address societal issues beyond the traditional purview of the judicial role. This philosophy transcends mere legal interpretation and involves judges actively shaping public policy and effecting social change. Judicial activism is rooted in the constitutional framework, which grants the judiciary the authority to review and strike down laws that contravene the Constitution's fundamental principles. The earliest manifestations of judicial activism in India came with the case of *A.K. Gopalan v. State of Madras* (1950), where the Supreme Court grappled with the interpretation of Article 21 of the Constitution. This shift in judicial interpretation marked the beginning of a more activist approach by the judiciary in safeguarding individual liberties. The judiciary's role expanded beyond traditional legal doctrines, engaging with principles of justice, fairness, and equity in its decisions. This broader perspective





was particularly evident in cases related to social justice and equality. The advent of Public Interest Litigation (PIL) in India in the 1980s marked a significant milestone in judicial activism. PIL allowed citizens, non-governmental organizations, and judges to bring cases before the courts on matters of public interest, often involving issues related to social justice, environmental protection, and government accountability. This innovative legal tool expanded the judiciary's reach beyond the traditional realm of individual rights, enabling it to address systemic issues and societal concerns.

Judicial activism has played a pivotal role in upholding constitutional values, ensuring social justice, and holding the government accountable. However, it has faced criticisms, such as encroachment upon the powers of the elected branches of government, potential inconsistency in judicial decisions, and unpredictability. Striking the right balance between judicial activism and restraint is an ongoing debate in India's legal and political discourse.

Rule of Law

The rule of law is a crucial pillar of modern democracies, providing a framework for a just and equitable society. In India, a vibrant democracy with a rich legal tradition, the rule of law is a fundamental necessity for the preservation of individual rights, social justice, and democratic governance. The principle of legality dictates that laws must be clear, accessible, and applied consistently and fairly. The Indian legal system, influenced by its colonial legacy and democratic aspirations, has strived to uphold these principles through a robust framework of laws and institutions. Central to the rule of law is the concept of equality before the law, as enshrined in Article 14 of the Constitution. This provision ensures that every person, regardless of their background or status, is entitled to equal treatment under the law. The judiciary, as the custodian of the rule of law, plays a pivotal role in upholding its principles through its hierarchical structure and independent Supreme Court. The principle of legal certainty is another vital component of the rule of law, requiring that laws be clear, predictable, and consistent. The Indian legal system, influenced by English common law traditions, emphasizes the importance of precedent and consistency in legal decision-making, contributing to the rule of law by providing a stable and predictable legal environment for individuals and businesses.

Access to justice for all members of society, regardless of their economic or social standing, is essential for the rule of law. The judiciary in India has taken steps to make justice more accessible through mechanisms such as Legal action taken in the name of the public good is known as "public interest litigation" (PIL).bring





cases of public interest before the courts, often related to social justice, environmental protection, and government accountability.

Judicial Independence

Judicial independence is a crucial principle in democratic governance and the rule of law, ensuring that the judiciary operates without undue influence from political actors, vested interests, or external pressures. In India, judicial independence is guaranteed through various provisions and safeguards, such as the security of judicial tenure, financial autonomy, and the collegium system for judicial appointments. These safeguards protect the judiciary's autonomy, fair and equitable administration of justice, and uphold the fundamental rights of citizens. The collegium system in India insulates judges from arbitrary removal by the executive or legislative branches, ensuring they can make decisions without fear of dismissal. Financial autonomy ensures that funds for the judiciary are charged on the consolidated fund of the state, ensuring that the judiciary's functioning is not subject to political whims or budgetary constraints. The process of judicial appointments in India is designed to protect judicial independence, with judges selected based on their legal acumen and integrity rather than partisan considerations. Judicial review allows the judiciary to examine and strike down laws or government actions that violate the Constitution, ensuring that they adhere to the constitutional framework. Landmark cases like *Sadananda “Bharati v. State of Kerala (1973)* and *Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India (1978)*” exemplify the judiciary's commitment to upholding the Constitution and protecting individual rights. Transparency and accountability mechanisms are essential for maintaining judicial independence in India. Open court hearings and the publication of judgments contribute to the judiciary's accountability to the public, ensuring that decisions are made in the public domain, subject to scrutiny, and open to appeal.

However, challenges persist in safeguarding and preserving judicial independence in India. The collegium system for judicial appointments has faced criticism for its lack of transparency and accountability, and reforms in the appointment process are needed to strike a balance between transparency and judicial independence. Additionally, the judiciary's ability to self-regulate and address issues of misconduct and corruption within its ranks remains a complex task.

Judicial Legitimacy

Judicial legitimacy is a crucial aspect of democracy, ensuring the public's trust and belief in the judiciary's authority, fairness, and impartiality. It is essential for maintaining the balance between the judiciary,





legislative and executive branches, and the overall democratic fabric of the nation. In India, judicial legitimacy is linked to the concept of judicial independence, which guarantees judicial independence by providing security of tenure, financial independence, and safeguards against arbitrary removal of judges. Transparency and accountability are also essential for the legitimacy of the judiciary. Open court hearings, publication of judgments, and adherence to due process contribute to the perception of fairness and transparency within the judicial system. A judiciary's ability to deliver timely and effective justice is crucial, and delays and inefficiencies can undermine public trust. Landmark cases and judgments often play a pivotal role in shaping the judiciary's legitimacy, as decisions that uphold fundamental rights, protect vulnerable populations, and ensure accountability resonate with the public. Judicial legitimacy is also closely linked to its role as a check on the power of the executive and legislative branches. It is critical to maintain public trust by impartially upholding the Constitution in such situations. The Indian judiciary has demonstrated its commitment to upholding via seminal decisions like *Sadananda Bharati v. State of Kerala* (1973) and *Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India* (1984), the rule of law and the ideals of justice (1978). However, the issue of judicial appointments and vacancies in the higher judiciary has been a subject of debate in India, with concerns about transparency, alleged political interference, and delays in delivering justice. In recent years, the Indian judiciary has faced challenges related to internal functioning, including allegations of misconduct and corruption among some judges. These issues have raised questions about the judiciary's ability to effectively self-regulate and maintain the highest ethical standards, which are vital for its legitimacy.

Conclusion

The Indian judiciary faces a complex and dynamic pattern in its legal landscape, balancing judicial activism and restraint. This delicate equilibrium is essential for preserving democracy, separation of powers, and the rule of law. Judicial activism, as demonstrated in landmark decisions like *Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala* (1973), has been instrumental in upholding the Constitution's core values and protecting individual rights. However, it must be wielded judiciously, respecting the boundaries set by the Constitution. Judicial restraint, as exemplified in decisions like *S.R. Bommai v. Union of India* (1994), emphasizes the importance of respecting the autonomy of elected representatives and preserving the principles of federalism. It acts as a counterbalance to the potential excesses of judicial activism, ensuring the judiciary does not usurp the legitimate policymaking functions of the legislature and executive. However, excessive restraint can pose challenges, such as erode public trust and undermine its responsibility as the guardian of the Constitution.





The delicate balance between activism and restraint is not static; it must adapt to the evolving needs and challenges of society. The Indian judiciary must be responsive to complex issues related to gender equality, environmental conservation, economic justice, and social inclusion while maintaining the principles of democracy and separation of powers. Landmark cases have played a pivotal role in shaping the trajectory of Indian jurisprudence, representing the judiciary's commitment to upholding constitutional values, protecting fundamental rights, and addressing societal challenges. However, challenges such as judicial appointments, vacancies, and delays in justice continue to test its efficiency and effectiveness.

Reference

- Chowdhury, P. R. (2011). Judicial activism and human rights in India: A critical appraisal. *The International Journal of Human Rights*, 15(7), 1055–1071. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13642987.2010.482912>
- Gunatilleke, G. D. (n.d.). *Judicial Activism Revisited: Reflecting on the Role of Judges in enforcing Economic, Social and Cultural Rights*.
- Moen, O. O. (2004). New Judicial Federalism: The Rehnquist Court, Judicial Activism, and Devolution. *American Studies in Scandinavia*, 36(2), 49–76. <https://doi.org/10.22439/asca.v36i2.4479>
- Rahman, M., & Badhon, R. Z. (n.d.). *A Critical Analysis on Judicial Activism and Overreach*.
- Singh, H., Kumar, V., Samadhiya, P., & Rohira, K. (2023). *The Judicial Adventurism under the realm of Judicial Review in India: A Critical Analysis*.
- Temper, L., & Martinez-Alier, J. (2013). The god of the mountain and Godavarman: Net Present Value, indigenous territorial rights and sacredness in a bauxite mining conflict in India. *Ecological Economics*, 96, 79–87. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2013.09.011>

