



## Judicial Activism vs. Judicial Restraint: A Comparative Review of Landmark Cases

Dr. Manoj Kumar Sinha \*

Indian Law Institute, New Delhi.

Expertise in International Law and Human Rights.

Accepted: 28/08/2024

Published: 31/08/2024

\* Corresponding author

### How to Cite this Article:

Sinha, M. (2024). Judicial Activism vs. Judicial Restraint: A Comparative Review of Landmark Cases. *Indian Journal of Law*, 2(4), 103-108.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36676/ijl.v2.i4.49>



**Abstract:** The concepts of judicial activism and judicial restraint have long been central to debates about the role of the judiciary in interpreting and enforcing the law. Judicial activism refers to a more proactive role for judges in shaping policy and protecting rights, often leading to decisions that go beyond strict interpretation of the law. Judicial restraint, on the other hand, emphasizes a more conservative approach, where judges defer to the decisions of elected representatives and adhere closely to the text of the law. This paper provides a comparative review of landmark cases that illustrate these opposing judicial philosophies. By analyzing key decisions from different jurisdictions, the paper explores the implications of judicial activism and restraint for democracy, the rule of law, and the balance of power between branches of government.

**Keywords:** judicial activism, judicial restraint, interpretation of the law, landmark cases

### Introduction

The judiciary plays a crucial role in the interpretation and application of laws, and its approach to this role can significantly impact society. Two prominent judicial philosophies—judicial activism and judicial restraint—represent opposing views on how judges should exercise their power. Judicial activism advocates for an assertive role for the judiciary, where judges actively interpret laws to reflect contemporary values and address societal needs. In contrast, judicial restraint calls for judges to limit their power, adhere strictly to the text of the law, and defer to the legislative and executive branches. This paper compares these philosophies by reviewing landmark cases that exemplify judicial activism and restraint, analyzing their impact on legal and political landscapes.

### Judicial Activism: Concept and Examples

#### ❖ Defining Judicial Activism

Judicial activism occurs when judges interpret laws in ways that lead to new policies or legal principles, often filling gaps in legislation or addressing issues not explicitly covered by the law.





PPP This approach is often justified on the grounds of protecting fundamental rights, advancing social justice, or responding to evolving societal norms.

#### ❖ Landmark Cases of Judicial Activism

##### • *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954, United States)

One of the most iconic examples of judicial activism is the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in *Brown v. Board of Education*, where the Court declared racial segregation in public schools unconstitutional. This landmark ruling, which overturned the "separate but equal" doctrine established in *Plessy v. Ferguson* (1896), played a pivotal role in advancing civil rights in the United States. The Court's decision was seen as an activist move, as it relied on broader interpretations of the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to address racial injustice.

##### • *Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala* (1973, India)

The Indian Supreme Court's ruling in *Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala* is another prominent example of judicial activism. The Court introduced the "basic structure" doctrine, which limits Parliament's power to amend the Constitution. By asserting that certain fundamental principles—such as democracy, secularism, and the rule of law—constitute the Constitution's "basic structure," the Court effectively placed itself as a guardian against potential government overreach, protecting the constitutional framework from radical changes.

##### • *Roe v. Wade* (1973, United States)

In *Roe v. Wade*, the U.S. Supreme Court recognized a woman's constitutional right to privacy, which it interpreted as including the right to terminate a pregnancy. This decision is a hallmark of judicial activism because it extended the right to privacy beyond its traditional boundaries and struck down numerous state laws that restricted abortion. The ruling sparked ongoing debates about the role of the judiciary in making decisions on deeply divisive social issues.

### Judicial Restraint: Concept and Examples

#### ❖ Defining Judicial Restraint

Judicial restraint emphasizes a conservative approach to judicial decision-making, where judges limit their role to interpreting the law as it is written, without inferring broader implications or creating new policies. Proponents argue that this philosophy respects the separation of powers, leaving law-making to the legislature and policy implementation to the executive.

#### ❖ Landmark Cases of Judicial Restraint

##### • *Plessy v. Ferguson* (1896, United States)

The U.S. Supreme Court's decision in *Plessy v. Ferguson* is often cited as an example of judicial restraint. The Court upheld state laws requiring racial segregation in public facilities under the





"separate but equal" doctrine. This decision demonstrated a reluctance to interfere with state laws, reflecting judicial restraint by deferring to the legislature's judgment and refraining from using the judiciary to challenge prevailing social norms.

- ***Gibbons v. Ogden (1824, United States)***

In *Gibbons v. Ogden*, the U.S. Supreme Court, under Chief Justice John Marshall, took a restrained approach in interpreting the Commerce Clause of the Constitution. The Court ruled that Congress had the power to regulate interstate commerce but did so in a way that maintained a balance between federal authority and states' rights. This case is significant for its cautious expansion of federal power, illustrating judicial restraint in avoiding broad interpretations that could disrupt the federal-state balance.

- ***A.L.A. Schechter Poultry Corp. v. United States (1935, United States)***

In *Schechter Poultry Corp. v. United States*, the U.S. Supreme Court struck down the National Industrial Recovery Act, a cornerstone of President Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal. The Court ruled that the Act delegated excessive legislative power to the executive branch, thus violating the separation of powers. This decision exemplifies judicial restraint by emphasizing adherence to constitutional limits and resisting pressure to uphold popular or executive-driven policies during a national crisis.

## Comparative Analysis of Judicial Activism and Judicial Restraint

### ❖ Impact on Legal Precedents and Public Policy

Judicial activism often results in significant shifts in legal precedents and public policy. For example, *Brown v. Board of Education* not only transformed civil rights law in the United States but also catalyzed broader social changes. Similarly, *Roe v. Wade* set a precedent for reproductive rights that has influenced subsequent legal battles. In contrast, judicial restraint tends to preserve the status quo, as seen in *Plessy v. Ferguson*, where the Court's decision delayed the progress of civil rights for decades.

### ❖ Democratic Principles and the Balance of Power

Judicial restraint is often justified on the grounds of respecting democratic principles and the balance of power. By deferring to the legislative and executive branches, judges practicing restraint avoid encroaching on the roles of elected representatives. However, critics argue that this can lead to judicial abdication, where the courts fail to protect fundamental rights. Judicial activism, on the other hand, can be seen as necessary for correcting legislative or executive failures, but it also risks undermining the principle of separation of powers by allowing judges to overstep their constitutional role.

### ❖ Public Perception and Legitimacy of the Judiciary





Public perception of the judiciary can be influenced by whether it is seen as activist or restrained. Judicial activism can enhance the judiciary's role as a protector of rights and an agent of social change, but it can also lead to accusations of judicial overreach and politicization. Conversely, judicial restraint may be viewed as upholding the rule of law and preserving judicial impartiality, yet it can also be criticized for being too conservative or indifferent to social injustices.

## Challenges and Criticisms

### ❖ Judicial Activism: Potential for Overreach

The primary criticism of judicial activism is the potential for judicial overreach, where courts make decisions that are seen as creating new laws rather than interpreting existing ones. Critics argue that this can undermine democracy by allowing unelected judges to impose their views on society, rather than deferring to the will of the people as expressed through their elected representatives.

### ❖ Judicial Restraint: Risk of Judicial Abdication

Judicial restraint is criticized for its potential to result in judicial abdication, where courts fail to protect individual rights or address injustices. By adhering strictly to the text of the law or deferring to other branches of government, judges practicing restraint may neglect their role as guardians of the Constitution and fail to check abuses of power.

## Contemporary Perspectives and Future Directions

### ❖ The Evolving Role of the Judiciary

As societies become more complex and interconnected, the role of the judiciary continues to evolve. Both judicial activism and judicial restraint have their place in the legal system, depending on the context and the issues at stake. Future judicial approaches may require a balance between activism and restraint, recognizing the need for judicial intervention in certain circumstances while maintaining respect for democratic processes.

### ❖ The Importance of Judicial Independence

Regardless of the approach taken, judicial independence remains a cornerstone of the legal system. Judges must be free from external pressures and influences, whether political, economic, or social, to ensure that their decisions are based on the law and not on external considerations. Maintaining this independence is essential for the legitimacy and credibility of the judiciary.

## Conclusion

The debate between judicial activism and judicial restraint is central to discussions about the role of the judiciary in democratic societies. While judicial activism can drive social change and protect rights, it also raises concerns about judicial overreach and the balance of power. Judicial restraint,





on the other hand, upholds the rule of law and respects the separation of powers but may fail to address pressing social issues. A comparative review of landmark cases illustrates the strengths and weaknesses of both approaches, highlighting the need for a nuanced understanding of the judiciary's role. As legal and societal challenges continue to evolve, the judiciary will need to navigate the tension between activism and restraint, ensuring that justice is served while respecting democratic principles.

## References

- Bickel, A. M. (1986). *The Least Dangerous Branch: The Supreme Court at the Bar of Politics*. Yale University Press.
- Bhadani, U. (2024). Smart Grids: A Cyber–Physical Systems Perspective. In *International Research Journal of Engineering and Technology (IRJET)* (Vol. 11, Issue 06, p. 801). <https://www.irjet.net>
- Chaudhary, D. (2022). A review of Recent trends in Supreme Court and Indian Parliament. *Universal Research Reports*, 9(2), 39–44. Retrieved from <https://urr.shodhsagar.com/index.php/j/article/view/974>
- Dr. Neeraj Malik. (2024). MENS REA. *Innovative Research Thoughts*, 10(3), 78–84. <https://doi.org/10.36676/irt.v10.i3.1437>
- Ely, J. H. (1980). *Democracy and Distrust: A Theory of Judicial Review*. Harvard University Press.
- Epstein, L., & Knight, J. (1998). *The Choices Justices Make*. CQ Press.
- Kashyap, B., Sachdeva, V., Shirahatti, A., Singh, G., Arya, A., Jagatheesan, S. and Kumar, C., 2023. A Novel Approach for Human Behaviour Prediction Using Deep Learning Algorithms. *International Journal of Intelligent Systems and Applications in Engineering*, 12(1), pp.793-801.
- Kaushik, N. (2023). Pile of Files: Remedies to Unburden the Honourable. *Universal Research Reports*, 10(1), 46–49. Retrieved from <https://urr.shodhsagar.com/index.php/j/article/view/1062>
- Klarman, M. J. (2004). *From Jim Crow to Civil Rights: The Supreme Court and the Struggle for Racial Equality*. Oxford University Press.
- Koteswar Ramesh Rakesh, Akbar Hussain (2021). Personality Factors in Choice Blindness. *Shodh Sanchar Bulletin*, 11(41) 158-162.
- Kumari, R. (2018). Study about Writs in India and Habeas Corpus in India. *Universal Research Reports*, 5(1), 122–125. Retrieved from <https://urr.shodhsagar.com/index.php/j/article/view/496>
- Mandeep Kumar. (2023). A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF JUDICIAL REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS IN INDIA: A COMPARATIVE STUDY WITH THE



- UNITED KINGDOM. Innovative Research Thoughts, 9(2), 197–201. Retrieved from <https://irt.shodhsagar.com/index.php/j/article/view/717>
- Sanju Purohit, SMART SOLUTIONS FOR ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY AND CLIMATE Changes' 10(4), doi: 10.46587/JGR. 2024.v10i01.016.
  - Sharma, S. (2023). Judicial Activism vs. Judicial Restraint: A Critical Analysis in the Indian Context. Indian Journal of Law, 1(1), 18–25. <https://doi.org/10.36676/ijl.2023-v1i1-03>
  - Singh, G., Singh, A., Singh, B. (2021). Incorporation of Additional Modules Within Particle Swarm Optimization for Feasibility Conditions of Multi-index Transportation Problem. In: Abraham, A., Hanne, T., Castillo, O., Gandhi, N., Nogueira Rios, T., Hong, TP. (eds) Hybrid Intelligent Systems. HIS 2020. Advances in Intelligent Systems and Computing, vol 1375. Springer, Cham. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-73050-5\\_76](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-73050-5_76)
  - Soma Chakraborty. (2023). Assessing the Impact of National Green Tribunal on the Development of Environmental Jurisprudence in India. International Journal for Research Publication and Seminar, 14(1), 127–136. Retrieved from <https://jrps.shodhsagar.com/index.php/j/article/view/350>
  - Subhash Kumar. (2024). Judicial Activism vs. Judicial Restraint: Balancing the Role of the Courts in a Democratic Society. Indian Journal of Law, 2(2), 5–8. <https://doi.org/10.36676/ijl.v2.i2.02>
  - Sunil Kumar Singh. (2024). Exploring the Impact of Judicial Activism on Legal Precedent: A Comparative Analysis. Indian Journal of Law, 2(2), 23–26. <https://doi.org/10.36676/ijl.v2.i2.06>
  - Sunstein, C. R. (1999). *One Case at a Time: Judicial Minimalism on the Supreme Court*. Harvard University Press.

