



# INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS

Open Access, Refereed Journal Multi Disciplinary  
Peer Reviewed Edition :

[www.ijlra.com](http://www.ijlra.com)

## **DISCLAIMER**

No part of this publication may be reproduced or copied in any form by any means without prior written permission of Managing Editor of IJLRA. The views expressed in this publication are purely personal opinions of the authors and do not reflect the views of the Editorial Team of IJLRA.

Though every effort has been made to ensure that the information in Volume 2 Issue 7 is accurate and appropriately cited/referenced, neither the Editorial Board nor IJLRA shall be held liable or responsible in any manner whatsoever for any consequences for any action taken by anyone on the basis of information in the Journal.

Copyright © International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis

IJLRA

## **EDITORIAL TEAM**

### **EDITORS**



### **Megha Middha**

*Megha Middha, Assistant Professor of Law in Mody University of Science and Technology, Lakshmangarh, Sikar*

*Megha Middha, is working as an Assistant Professor of Law in Mody University of Science and Technology, Lakshmangarh, Sikar (Rajasthan). She has an experience in the teaching of almost 3 years. She has completed her graduation in BBA LL.B (H) from Amity University, Rajasthan (Gold Medalist) and did her post-graduation (LL.M in Business Laws) from NLSIU, Bengaluru. Currently, she is enrolled in a Ph.D. course in the Department of Law at Mohanlal Sukhadia University, Udaipur (Rajasthan). She wishes to excel in academics and research and contribute as much as she can to society. Through her interactions with the students, she tries to inculcate a sense of deep thinking power in her students and enlighten and guide them to the fact how they can bring a change to the society*

### **Dr. Samrat Datta**

*Dr. Samrat Datta Seedling School of Law and Governance, Jaipur National University, Jaipur. Dr. Samrat Datta is currently associated with Seedling School of Law and Governance, Jaipur National University, Jaipur. Dr. Datta has completed his graduation i.e., B.A.LL.B. from Law College Dehradun, Hemvati Nandan Bahuguna Garhwal University, Srinagar, Uttarakhand. He is an alumnus of KIIT University, Bhubaneswar where he pursued his post-graduation (LL.M.) in Criminal Law and subsequently completed his Ph.D. in Police Law and Information Technology from the Pacific Academy of Higher Education and Research University, Udaipur in 2020. His area of interest and research is Criminal and Police Law. Dr. Datta has a teaching experience of 7 years in various law schools across North India and has held administrative positions like Academic Coordinator, Centre Superintendent for Examinations, Deputy Controller of Examinations, Member of the Proctorial Board*



## Dr. Namita Jain



*Head & Associate Professor*

*School of Law, JECRC University, Jaipur Ph.D. (Commercial Law) LL.M., UGC -NET Post Graduation Diploma in Taxation law and Practice, Bachelor of Commerce.*

*Teaching Experience: 12 years, AWARDS AND RECOGNITION of Dr. Namita Jain are - ICF Global Excellence Award 2020 in the category of educationalist by I Can Foundation, India. India Women Empowerment Award in the category of "Emerging Excellence in Academics by Prime Time & Utkrisht Bharat Foundation, New Delhi.(2020). Conferred in FL Book of Top 21 Record Holders in the category of education by Fashion Lifestyle Magazine, New Delhi. (2020). Certificate of Appreciation for organizing and managing the Professional Development Training Program on IPR in Collaboration with Trade Innovations Services, Jaipur on March 14th, 2019*

## Mrs.S.Kalpana

*Assistant professor of Law*

*Mrs.S.Kalpana, presently Assistant professor of Law, VelTech Rangarajan Dr. Sagunthala R & D Institute of Science and Technology, Avadi. Formerly Assistant professor of Law, Vels University in the year 2019 to 2020, Worked as Guest Faculty, Chennai Dr. Ambedkar Law College, Pudupakkam. Published one book. Published 8 Articles in various reputed Law Journals. Conducted 1 Moot court competition and participated in nearly 80 National and International seminars and webinars conducted on various subjects of Law. Did ML in Criminal Law and Criminal Justice Administration. 10 paper presentations in various National and International seminars. Attended more than 10 FDP programs. Ph.D. in Law pursuing.*



## Avinash Kumar



*Avinash Kumar has completed his Ph.D. in International Investment Law from the Dept. of Law & Governance, Central University of South Bihar. His research work is on "International Investment Agreement and State's right to regulate Foreign Investment." He qualified UGC-NET and has been selected for the prestigious ICSSR Doctoral Fellowship. He is an alumnus of the Faculty of Law, University of Delhi. Formerly he has been elected as Students Union President of Law Centre-1, University of Delhi. Moreover, he completed his LL.M. from the University of Delhi (2014-16), dissertation on "Cross-border Merger & Acquisition"; LL.B. from the University of Delhi (2011-14), and B.A. (Hons.) from Maharaja Agrasen College, University of Delhi. He has also obtained P.G. Diploma in IPR from the Indian Society of International Law, New Delhi. He has qualified UGC - NET examination and has been awarded ICSSR - Doctoral Fellowship. He has published six-plus articles and presented 9 plus papers in national and international seminars/conferences. He participated in several workshops on research methodology and teaching and learning.*

## **ABOUT US**

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH & ANALYSIS  
ISSN

2582-6433 is an Online Journal is Monthly, Peer Review, Academic Journal, Published online, that seeks to provide an interactive platform for the publication of Short Articles, Long Articles, Book Review, Case Comments, Research Papers, Essay in the field of Law & Multidisciplinary issue. Our aim is to upgrade the level of interaction and discourse about contemporary issues of law. We are eager to become a highly cited academic publication, through quality contributions from students, academics, professionals from the industry, the bar and the bench. INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH & ANALYSIS ISSN 2582-6433 welcomes contributions from all legal branches, as long as the work is original, unpublished and is in consonance with the submission guidelines.

# **DEMOCRATIC ANALYSIS OF JUDICIAL REVIEW: DEBATE ON JUDICIAL ACTIVISM VS. JUDICIAL RESTRAINT**

AUTHORED BY - CHERRY SINGHAL AND  
VANSI CHADHA

## **I. ABSTRACT**

The assessment of legal validity by the judiciary, known as judicial review, plays a pivotal role in contemporary democratic governance, ensuring that legislative and executive actions conform to constitutional principles. This study delves into the multifaceted function of judicial review within constitutional democracies, focusing particularly on its application in India while drawing parallels with international democratic norms. Fundamentally, judicial review authorizes the judiciary to evaluate the constitutionality of laws and governmental measures, thereby safeguarding individual liberties, maintaining constitutional order, and preserving the system of checks and balances within the government. Through landmark cases like *Marbury v. Madison* in the United States and *Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala* in India, judicial review has asserted its significance in upholding the supremacy of the constitution. This study examines the ongoing discourse between judicial activism and judicial restraint, analyzing how divergent judicial ideologies impact the breadth and depth of judicial review. Moreover, it underscores the importance of judicial review in adjudicating disputes, fostering public trust in legal and political institutions, and upholding the integrity of democratic processes. Through an in-depth analysis of the intricacies of judicial review, this study aims to offer a comprehensive comprehension of its role in balancing governmental authorities and preserving democratic values across varied political contexts.

**Keywords:** *Judicial Review, Constitutional Democracy, Judicial Activism, Judicial Restraint, Separation of Powers*

## II. INTRODUCTION

Judicial review is an essential cornerstone of constitutional democracies globally, epitomizing the principle that all individuals, institutions, and governmental entities are subject to the law. It entails the judicial examination of the conformity of legislative and executive actions with the principles and provisions outlined in the constitution.<sup>1</sup> The notion of judicial review has been fundamental to contemporary democratic governance, providing a mechanism to safeguard individual rights, uphold the separation of powers, and maintain the rule of law.<sup>2</sup>

Fundamentally, judicial review encompasses the authority granted to the judiciary to assess the constitutionality of laws, regulations, executive orders, and other governmental actions. This power enables courts to nullify actions that violate the constitution, thereby protecting the rights and freedoms of individuals. Judicial review functions as a system of checks and balances, preventing potential abuses of power by the legislative and executive branches of government.<sup>3</sup>

In practical terms, judicial review entails courts interpreting the constitution and evaluating whether the actions of other branches of government align with its provisions. Should a law or action be deemed unconstitutional, courts possess the authority to render it null and void.<sup>4</sup> This authority empowers the judiciary to uphold the supremacy of the constitution and verify that governmental actions align with its principles.<sup>5</sup>

The pivotal case of *Marbury v. Madison* (1803)<sup>6</sup> established the principle of judicial review in the United States. In this instance, the Supreme Court deemed a congressional act unconstitutional, establishing a precedent for judicial oversight of the legislative branch. Similarly, in *Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala* (1973)<sup>7</sup>, the Indian Supreme Court affirmed the doctrine of basic structure, asserting that Parliament cannot amend the constitution in a manner that undermines its fundamental framework.

The importance of judicial review in constitutional democracies cannot be overstated. It fulfills several critical functions that are indispensable for the operation of democratic systems:

---

<sup>1</sup> R. V. Ramachandrasekhara Rao, *Bases of Judicial Review*, 03, Journal of the Indian Law Institute, 293, 295, (1961).

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid* at 297.

<sup>3</sup> Saikrishna B. Prakash, John C. Yoo, *The origins of Judicial Review*, 70, The University of the Chicago Law Review, 887, 890, (2003).

<sup>4</sup> Yuval Eylon, Alon Harel, *The Right to Judicial Review*, 92, Virginia Law Review, 991, 1004, (2006).

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid* at 1005.

<sup>6</sup> 5 U.S. (1 Cranch) 137 (1803).

<sup>7</sup> 1973 AIR SC 1461.

- **Protection of Individual Rights:** Judicial review serves as a barrier against governmental encroachment upon individual rights. Through the examination of laws and policies, courts can deter the implementation of measures that contravene the rights safeguarded by the constitution, including freedom of speech<sup>8</sup>, religion<sup>9</sup>, and privacy<sup>10</sup>.
- **Preservation of Constitutional Order:** Judicial review contributes to upholding the integrity and coherence of the constitution by verifying that all governmental actions adhere to its provisions. This preservation fosters the rule of law and mitigates the risk of arbitrary exercises of power by government officials.<sup>11</sup>
- **Checks and Balances:** Via judicial review, courts play a pivotal role in sustaining the equilibrium of power among the branches of government. By subjecting legislative and executive actions to scrutiny against the constitution, the judiciary impedes any single branch from attaining excessive dominance or exceeding its authority.<sup>12</sup>
- **Resolution of Disputes:** Judicial review furnishes a platform for resolving disputes between various branches of government, between governments and individuals, and among individuals. Courts act as neutral arbitrators, applying legal principles to settle conflicts and uphold the tenets of justice.<sup>13</sup>
- **Promotion of Public Confidence:** The presence of judicial review cultivates public trust in the legal and political framework. With the assurance that their rights are safeguarded and that governmental actions are subject to evaluation by an impartial judiciary, citizens are inclined to place greater faith in the equity and validity of the democratic process.<sup>14</sup>

The aim of this paper is to explore the intricate role of judicial review in constitutional democracies, concentrating on examining its application within the Indian context and juxtaposing it with other democratic systems worldwide.

### III. HISTORICAL EVOLUTION OF JUDICIAL REVIEW

Judicial review, as a conceptual framework, has undergone a profound and intriguing evolution throughout history, influencing the governance structures of diverse societies. Its origins can be traced back to ancient civilizations, where rulers often found themselves under the scrutiny of

---

<sup>8</sup> INDIA CONST. art. 19, cl. 1(a).

<sup>9</sup> INDIA CONST. art. 25.

<sup>10</sup> INDIA CONST. art. 21.

<sup>11</sup> R. V. Ramachandrasekhara Rao, *supra* note 1.

<sup>12</sup> Mohammad Moin Uddin, Rakiba Nabi, *Judicial Review Of Constitutional Amendments In Light Of The "Political Question" Doctrine: A Comparative Study Of The Jurisprudence Of Supreme Courts Of Bangladesh, India And The United States*, 58, *Journal of the Indian Law Institute*, 313, 320, (2016).

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>14</sup> Yuval Eylon, Alon Harel, *supra* note 4.

religious or legal authorities. For instance, in ancient Greece, the notion of "*isonomia*" (equality before the law) laid the groundwork for the belief that even the highest authority should be bound by legal restrictions. Similarly, in ancient Rome, the principle of "*auctoritas*" (authority) was constrained by legal limitations, exemplified by the Senate's role in overseeing the actions of magistrates.<sup>15</sup>

Nonetheless, it wasn't until the *Enlightenment era* in Europe that the contemporary notion of judicial review started to emerge. The works of political thinkers like *John Locke* and *Montesquieu* underscored the significance of dividing powers within government and subjecting them to legal limitations. These concepts provided the foundation for the advancement of constitutionalism and the rule of law.<sup>16</sup>

One of the earliest instances of judicial review is evident in medieval England, where the *Magna Carta of 1215* introduced the principle that even the monarch was accountable to the law. Across centuries, English common law courts gradually asserted their power to scrutinize the actions of the king and other governmental figures, establishing significant precedents for judicial independence and accountability.<sup>17</sup>

The pivotal moment in the evolution of judicial review occurred with the landmark case of *Marbury v. Madison (1803)*<sup>18</sup> in the United States. Chief Justice John Marshall's ruling in this case solidified the principle of judicial review as an inherent authority of the judiciary under the U.S. Constitution. Marshall famously asserted that it is "emphatically the province and duty of the judicial department to say what the law is," thereby affirming the judiciary's power to interpret and nullify laws that conflict with the Constitution.<sup>19</sup>

## Evolution of Judicial Review:

- 1. United States:** The United States has been a leading figure in the advancement of judicial review. Expanding upon the precedent established by *Marbury v. Madison*<sup>20</sup>, the U.S. Supreme Court has been pivotal in shaping constitutional law through significant rulings.

---

<sup>15</sup> Saikrishna B. Prakash, John C. Yoo, *supra* note at 3.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid* at 892.

<sup>17</sup> R. V. Ramachandrasekhara Rao, *supra* note 1.

<sup>18</sup> U.S. (1 Cranch) 137 (1803).

<sup>19</sup> Edward S. Corwin, *Marbury v. Madison and the Doctrine of Judicial Review*, 12, Michigan Law Review, 538, 555, (1914).

<sup>20</sup> U.S. (1 Cranch) 137 (1803).

Cases such as *Brown v. Board of Education (1954)*<sup>21</sup> and *Roe v. Wade (1973)*<sup>22</sup> exemplify the Court's ability to invalidate laws that infringe upon fundamental rights or constitutional principles.

2. **United Kingdom:** In the United Kingdom, the development of judicial review has been shaped by the absence of a written constitution and the doctrine of parliamentary sovereignty. Nevertheless, UK courts have progressively asserted their power to scrutinize the actions of government officials and guarantee adherence to human rights principles. The case of *R (Miller) v. Secretary of State for Exiting the European Union (2017)*<sup>23</sup> serves as an illustration of the judiciary's readiness to intervene in matters of constitutional importance.
3. **India:** India's encounter with judicial review is distinctive, given the nation's adoption of a written constitution and a federal system of governance. The Indian Supreme Court has emerged as a formidable protector of constitutional principles, with seminal cases such as *Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala (1973)*<sup>24</sup> solidifying the doctrine of basic structure and broadening the ambit of judicial review to safeguard fundamental rights.

#### IV. JUDICIAL REVIEW IN INDIA

India, boasting a robust constitutional framework and a vibrant democracy, has experienced the profound influence of judicial review on governance, rights protection, and the rule of law.

The Indian Constitution, enacted in 1950, establishes the framework for judicial review through various provisions:

1. **Article 13**<sup>25</sup>: This provision stipulates that any legislation contradicting the fundamental rights guaranteed under Part III of the Constitution shall be deemed void to the extent of such contradiction. It grants the judiciary the authority to invalidate laws that are incongruent with fundamental rights.
2. **Article 32**<sup>26</sup>: Known as the "Right to Constitutional Remedies," this provision endows individuals with the right to directly approach the Supreme Court for the enforcement of their fundamental rights. It constitutes a cornerstone of judicial review, empowering the Court to safeguard and uphold constitutional rights.

---

<sup>21</sup> 347 U.S. 483 (1954).

<sup>22</sup> 410 U.S. 113 (1973).

<sup>23</sup> [2017] UKSC 5.

<sup>24</sup> 1973 AIR SC 1461.

<sup>25</sup> INDIA CONST. art. 13.

<sup>26</sup> INDIA CONST. art. 32.

3. **Article 226<sup>27</sup>**: This provision grants comparable authority to the High Courts to issue writs for the enforcement of fundamental rights and for other purposes. It offers an alternative avenue for individuals to seek recourse for infringements of their rights.

These constitutional provisions authorize the judiciary to scrutinize legislative and executive actions and verify their compliance with the Constitution and fundamental rights.

The Supreme Court of India has played a pivotal role in shaping constitutional jurisprudence through its exercise of judicial review. In the landmark case of *Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala (1973)*<sup>28</sup>, the Supreme Court delivered a historic ruling, affirming the doctrine of "basic structure." It declared that while Parliament possesses the authority to amend the Constitution, it cannot alter its fundamental framework. This decision underscored the judiciary's role as the protector of the Constitution and imposed constraints on the amending power of the legislature.

Similarly, in the case of *Indira Gandhi v. Raj Narain (1975)*<sup>29</sup>, the Supreme Court reaffirmed its authority to scrutinize the actions of the executive and uphold the rule of law. The Court annulled the election of then Prime Minister Indira Gandhi on grounds of electoral misconduct, signaling its readiness to hold even the highest office accountable. Through landmark judgments and progressive interpretations of the Constitution, the Court has broadened the scope of fundamental rights, safeguarded individual liberties, and upheld principles of equality and justice. Its proactive stance in defending constitutional values has earned it the moniker of the "guardian of the Constitution."

### Critiques and Challenges to Judicial Review in India:

Despite its significance, judicial review in India has not been without its critics and challenges:

1. **Judicial Activism vs. Judicial Restraint<sup>30</sup>**: The judiciary, notably the Supreme Court, has occasionally embraced judicial activism, surpassing its constitutional mandate and intruding into the realms of the executive and legislature. Consequently, debates have arisen concerning the appropriate equilibrium between judicial activism and judicial restraint.

---

<sup>27</sup> INDIA CONST. art. 226.

<sup>28</sup> 1973 AIR SC 1461.

<sup>29</sup> 1975 AIR SC 2299.

<sup>30</sup> A.S. Anand, Judicial Review - Judicial Activism - Need for Caution, 42, Journal of the Indian Law Institute, 149, 153, (2000).

2. **Backlog of Cases**<sup>31</sup>: The Indian judiciary contends with a substantial backlog of cases, leading to delays in the administration of justice. This backlog compromises the efficacy of judicial review and presents a notable challenge to the rule of law.
3. **Judicial Independence and Accountability**<sup>32</sup>: Concerns have been raised regarding the independence and accountability of the judiciary, particularly concerning the appointment process of judges and allegations of judicial corruption. Ensuring the autonomy and integrity of the judiciary is imperative for upholding public trust in the institution of judicial review.

## V. JUDICIAL REVIEW IN THE UNITED STATES

The United States has been a trailblazer in the advancement and implementation of judicial review, with its Supreme Court assuming a pivotal role in interpreting the Constitution and shaping the trajectory of American democracy. The landmark case of *Marbury v. Madison* (1803)<sup>33</sup> is regarded as the cornerstone of judicial review in the United States. In this case, Chief Justice John Marshall affirmed the authority of the Supreme Court to scrutinize the constitutionality of laws enacted by Congress and executive actions. Marshall famously proclaimed that it is "emphatically the province and duty of the judicial department to say what the law is," thereby establishing the principle of judicial supremacy and the Court's authority in constitutional interpretation.

Through subsequent decisions, the Supreme Court further solidified its role as the ultimate arbiter of constitutional disputes, shaping the contours of American democracy. Cases such as *McCulloch v. Maryland* (1819)<sup>34</sup> and *Gibbons v. Ogden* (1824)<sup>35</sup> expanded federal power and affirmed the supremacy of the Constitution and federal law over state laws.

In the United States, the Supreme Court plays a vital role in interpreting the Constitution and ensuring its alignment with the principles of democracy, individual rights, and the rule of law. As the highest judicial authority in the nation, the Court exercises the power of judicial review to evaluate the constitutionality of laws, executive actions, and government policies. Guided by principles such as originalism, textualism, and the living Constitution theory, justices employ

---

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>32</sup> Mohammad Moin Uddin, Rakiba Nabi, *supra* note 12.

<sup>33</sup> U.S. (1 Cranch) 137 (1803).

<sup>34</sup> 17 U.S. 316 (1819).

<sup>35</sup> 22 U.S. 1 (1824).

various interpretive methods to ascertain the original intent of the Constitution's provisions and adapt its principles to contemporary societal values and norms.

In *Brown v. Board of Education (1954)*<sup>36</sup>, the Supreme Court invalidated racial segregation in public schools, asserting that separate educational facilities are inherently unequal and contravene the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. The Court's ruling in this case marked a pivotal moment in the civil rights movement and underscored the potency of judicial review in safeguarding individual liberties and advancing equality.

Likewise, in *Roe v. Wade (1973)*<sup>37</sup>, the Supreme Court recognized a woman's constitutional right to privacy and determined that laws prohibiting abortion infringe upon the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. The Court's decision legalized abortion nationwide and ignited a contentious debate concerning reproductive rights, personal autonomy, and the judiciary's role in shaping social policy.

### Debate on Judicial Activism vs. Judicial Restraint:

The discourse surrounding judicial activism versus judicial restraint has long been a focal point of discussions regarding the appropriate role of the judiciary in American democracy. Advocates of judicial activism contend that courts should proactively interpret and enforce the Constitution to address urgent social concerns and safeguard individual rights, even if doing so necessitates deviating from precedent or legislative intent.<sup>38</sup> Advocates of judicial restraint, conversely, argue that judges should proceed with caution and defer to elected officials and traditional legal principles, refraining from excessive involvement in policymaking and yielding to the political branches whenever feasible.

This debate is exemplified in cases such as:

- **Bush v. Gore (2000)**<sup>39</sup>: The Supreme Court's involvement in the 2000 presidential election, which effectively decided the outcome in favor of George W. Bush, ignited controversy and reignited discussions regarding the appropriate boundaries of judicial authority and the Court's role in adjudicating political disputes.

---

<sup>36</sup> 347 U.S. 483 (1954).

<sup>37</sup> 410 U.S. 113 (1973).

<sup>38</sup> A.S. Anand, *supra* note 30.

<sup>39</sup> 531 U.S. 98 (2000).

- **Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission (2010)**<sup>40</sup>: The Court's ruling in *Citizens United*, which invalidated limitations on corporate and union spending in political campaigns, elicited divided opinions regarding the degree to which the judiciary should intervene in issues pertaining to campaign finance and electoral regulation.

## VI. JUDICIAL REVIEW IN UNITED KINGDOM

Unlike nations with codified constitutions, the UK lacks a singular, written document that functions as the supreme law of the land. Instead, its constitution comprises an amalgamation of statutes, common law principles, conventions, and treaties. This unwritten constitution, underscored by parliamentary sovereignty, bears notable ramifications for the application of judicial review. The judicial review process in the UK is chiefly regulated by the Senior Courts Act 1981 and the Constitutional Reform Act 2005. The High Court and the Court of Appeal possess jurisdiction to adjudicate judicial review cases, with the latter serving as the ultimate appellate tribunal for the majority of issues.<sup>41</sup>

Judicial review in the UK has undergone centuries of evolution, with its origins dating back to the prerogative writs issued by the King's Bench in medieval England. The progression of administrative law principles, including ultra vires (beyond the powers) and natural justice, established the foundation for contemporary judicial review.<sup>42</sup> The 20th century marked notable advancements in the application of judicial review in the UK. The landmark case of *Anisminic v. Foreign Compensation Commission (1969)*<sup>43</sup> broadened the ambit of judicial review by affirming that errors of law committed by public bodies could be subject to court scrutiny, regardless of whether they purported to act within their jurisdiction.

In *R (Miller) v. Secretary of State for Exiting the European Union (2017)*<sup>44</sup>, the UK Supreme Court ruled that the government could not trigger Article 50 of the Treaty on European Union (the mechanism for initiating Brexit) without parliamentary approval. The Court's decision upheld the principle of parliamentary sovereignty and underscored the necessity of legislative oversight in matters of constitutional significance.

---

<sup>40</sup> 558 U.S. 310 (2010).

<sup>41</sup> Annabelle Lever, *Democracy and Judicial Review: Are They Really Incompatible?*, 07, *Perspectives on Politics*, 805, 810, (2009).

<sup>42</sup> Paul Craig, *Ultra Vires and the Foundations of Judicial Review*, 57, *The Cambridge Law Journal*, 63, 69, (1998).

<sup>43</sup> [1969] 2 AC 147.

<sup>44</sup> [2017] UKSC 5.

Similarly, in *R (UNISON) v. Lord Chancellor (2017)*<sup>45</sup>, the lawfulness of employment tribunal fees introduced by the government in 2013 was contested. The Supreme Court determined that the fees were unlawful as they effectively obstructed access to justice and undermined the rule of law by hindering individuals' ability to enforce their employment rights.

## VII. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

Judicial review, serving as a mechanism for assessing the legality of governmental actions, exhibits considerable variation across different legal systems. This comparative analysis delves into the judicial review systems in India, the United States, and the United Kingdom, elucidating disparities in approach, scope, and constraints. Additionally, it scrutinizes the ramifications of judicial review on democracy, governance, and the rule of law, extracting lessons and insights from this comparative inquiry.<sup>46</sup>

### Comparison of Judicial Review Systems:

1. **India:** In India, judicial review is entrenched in the Constitution and is predominantly wielded by the Supreme Court and High Courts. The Indian judiciary possesses broad authority to scrutinize legislative and executive actions for adherence to constitutional provisions, especially fundamental rights. Judicial activism and public interest litigation have widened the purview of judicial review in India, enabling courts to intercede in governance and social justice issues.<sup>47</sup>
2. **United States:** The United States boasts a longstanding tradition of judicial review, as solidified in the landmark case of *Marbury v. Madison (1803)*<sup>48</sup>. The U.S. Supreme Court possesses the jurisdiction to evaluate the constitutionality of laws and executive actions, construing the Constitution and preserving individual rights. The adversarial legal system and the principle of stare decisis (precedent) influence the approach to judicial review in the United States.<sup>49</sup>
3. **United Kingdom:** Judicial review in the United Kingdom functions within the framework of parliamentary sovereignty and the rule of law. Despite the absence of a written constitution, the courts possess the authority to scrutinize the legality of governmental

---

<sup>45</sup> [2017] UKSC 51.

<sup>46</sup> Mohammad Moin Uddin, Rakiba Nabi, *supra* note 12.

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid* at 318.

<sup>48</sup> U.S. (1 Cranch) 137 (1803).

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid* at 320.

actions and guarantee adherence to legal norms. The principle of deference to administrative authorities and the doctrine of parliamentary sovereignty shape the scope and methodology of judicial review in the UK.<sup>50</sup>

### Differences in Approach, Scope, and Limitations:

- **Approach:** India tends to feature a more activist judiciary, with courts often intervening in issues of public policy and governance. Conversely, the United States and the United Kingdom typically adopt a more restrained stance, with courts showing deference to the political branches on matters of policy.
- **Scope:** The extent of judicial review fluctuates across jurisdictions, with India boasting the broadest scope owing to its expansive interpretation of fundamental rights. In the United States, judicial review encompasses federal and state laws, whereas in the UK, it primarily centers on administrative actions and adherence to statutes.
- **Limitations:** Each judicial system encounters its distinct array of constraints. In India, hurdles encompass judicial backlog and apprehensions regarding judicial overreach. In the United States, critiques of judicial activism and the susceptibility to partisan bias in judicial appointments are prominent. In the United Kingdom, limitations arise from the lack of a codified constitution and the doctrine of parliamentary sovereignty, which could curtail the judiciary's capacity to invalidate laws.

Judicial review serves as a cornerstone in upholding democratic principles by ensuring governmental accountability, safeguarding minority rights, and mitigating the abuse of power. It contributes to governance by fostering transparency, legality, and fairness in administrative decision-making. Nonetheless, excessive judicial intervention can disrupt the functionality of government institutions. Judicial review reinforces the rule of law by subjecting governmental actions to legal scrutiny and adhering to constitutional norms, thereby cultivating a culture of legality and accountability within society.

Comparative analysis underscores the significance of striking a balance between judicial activism and restraint. While an activist judiciary can protect rights and advance justice, it must also uphold the separation of powers and defer to democratic processes. The efficacy of judicial review systems hinges on their adaptability to cultural and legal contexts. What proves effective in one

---

<sup>50</sup> B. V. Harris, *Judicial Review, Justiciability and the Prerogative of Mercy*, 62, *The Cambridge Law Journal*, 631, 642, (2003).

jurisdiction may not necessarily be suitable for another, underscoring the necessity for context-specific approaches to judicial review. Judicial independence emerges as a critical component in ensuring the efficacy and legitimacy of judicial review. Comparative analysis accentuates the imperative of safeguarding judicial independence to uphold the integrity of the judiciary and reinforce the rule of law.

## VIII. CHALLENGES TO JUDICIAL REVIEW

Indeed, while judicial review is indispensable for maintaining the rule of law and safeguarding individual rights, it is not immune to challenges and criticisms.

### 1. Threats to Judicial Independence:

Judicial independence, the bedrock of a robust judiciary, faces persistent threats from multiple quarters. Politicization of the judiciary, executive meddling, budgetary limitations, and public assaults on judges present substantial obstacles to judicial autonomy.

In numerous nations, judicial appointments have become deeply politicized, with governments endeavouring to manipulate the makeup of the judiciary to further their political objectives. Executive intrusion in judicial rulings, whether through coercive measures or efforts to undercut judicial independence, undermines public confidence in the judiciary and erodes the rule of law.<sup>51</sup> Budgetary constraints can indeed undermine judicial independence by hampering the effective functioning of courts. Inadequate funding for court systems can result in delays in case processing, insufficient resources for judicial training and education, and restricted access to justice for marginalized communities.

Furthermore, public assaults on judges, driven by political rhetoric or media sensationalism, have the potential to erode public trust in the judiciary and intimidate judges into rendering decisions based on popular sentiment rather than legal principles.

### 2. Judicial Activism vs. Judicial Restraint:

Indeed, budgetary constraints can compromise judicial independence by impeding the efficient operation of courts. Insufficient funding for court systems can lead to delays in case processing, a lack of resources for judicial training and education, and limited access to justice for

---

<sup>51</sup> Annabelle Lever, *supra* note 41.

marginalized communities.

Moreover, public attacks on judges, fueled by political rhetoric or media sensationalism, can erode public confidence in the judiciary and intimidate judges into rendering decisions influenced by public opinion rather than adhering to legal principles.<sup>52</sup>

### 3. Judicial Overreach and the Counter-Majoritarian Difficulty:

Critiques of judicial overreach revolve around concerns that unelected judges may overstep their constitutional authority by substituting their own policy preferences for those of democratically elected lawmakers. This undermines the democratic process and contravenes the principle of separation of powers.

The counter-majoritarian difficulty, as articulated by Alexander Bickel, underscores the tension between judicial review and democratic governance. Bickel posited that judicial review places unelected judges in the position of invalidating laws enacted by democratically elected representatives, thereby thwarting the will of the majority. Critics of judicial overreach and proponents of the counter-majoritarian difficulty argue that judges lack democratic legitimacy and should exercise restraint in striking down laws enacted by elected officials. They advocate for unelected judges to defer to the political branches on matters of policy and limit their intervention to cases where laws unmistakably violate constitutional principles.<sup>53</sup>

## IX. CONCLUSION

As judicial review undergoes continual evolution in response to evolving legal, political, and social landscapes, it is imperative to anticipate emerging trends and contemplate strategies for fortifying this indispensable mechanism in constitutional democracies.

### Recommendations for Strengthening Judicial Review in Constitutional Democracies:

- **Protect Judicial Independence:** Preserving judicial independence stands as paramount in ensuring the integrity and impartiality of judicial review. Governments ought to abstain from exerting undue influence on the judiciary and uphold the separation of powers.

---

<sup>52</sup> A.S. Anand, *supra* note 30.

<sup>53</sup> Vibhuti Singh Shekhawat, *Judicial Review in India: Maxims And Limitations*, 55, *The Indian Journal of Political Science*, 177, 180, (1994).

- **Promote Judicial Education and Training:** Investing in judicial education and training programs can bolster judges' ability to adeptly adjudicate intricate legal matters and uphold constitutional tenets. Continuous professional development guarantees that judges stay current with evolving legal trends and adhere to best practices in judicial review.
- **Enhance Access to Justice:** Governments should prioritize initiatives aimed at enhancing access to justice for all citizens, especially marginalized and underserved communities. This encompasses implementing measures such as legal aid programs, alternative dispute resolution mechanisms, and leveraging technology to facilitate remote court proceedings.
- **Ensure Transparency and Accountability:** Transparency and accountability serve as linchpins for upholding public trust in the judiciary and the legitimacy of judicial review. Courts should embrace transparent decision-making procedures, issue reasoned judgments, and be subject to suitable oversight and review mechanisms.
- **Embrace Judicial Innovation:** Embracing judicial innovation holds the potential to augment the efficiency and efficacy of judicial review processes. Courts should delve into the utilization of technology, including artificial intelligence and data analytics, to streamline case management, enhance legal research, and bolster the dispensation of justice.

In conclusion, judicial review remains a cornerstone of constitutional democracies, serving as a bulwark against governmental overreach, safeguarding individual rights, and upholding the rule of law. Despite facing challenges and critiques, the ongoing evolution of judicial review presents opportunities for enhancing its effectiveness and relevance in the 21st century. By embracing emerging trends such as globalization, technology, and environmental justice, judicial review can adapt to the evolving needs of society and continue to serve as a potent force for advancing justice, equality, and accountability. Protecting judicial independence, promoting access to justice, and fostering transparency and innovation are crucial steps in strengthening the foundations of judicial review and ensuring its continued vitality in safeguarding democratic values.

As we navigate the complexities of governance and the demands of a rapidly changing world, the principles of judicial review remain indispensable for preserving the rights and liberties of citizens and maintaining the integrity of democratic institutions. By adhering to the recommendations outlined above and remaining steadfast in upholding the rule of law, constitutional democracies can chart a course toward a future where justice and equality prevail for all.

## X. REFERENCES

Vibhuti Singh Shekhawat, *Judicial Review in India: Maxims And Limitations*, 55, The Indian Journal of Political Science, 177, 180, (1994).

Annabelle Lever, *Democracy and Judicial Review: Are They Really Incompatible?*, 07, Perspectives on Politics, 805, 810, (2009).

B. V. Harris, *Judicial Review, Justiciability and the Prerogative of Mercy*, 62, The Cambridge Law Journal, 631, 642, (2003).

Paul Craig, *Ultra Vires and the Foundations of Judicial Review*, 57, The Cambridge Law Journal, 63, 69, (1998).

A.S. Anand, *Judicial Review - Judicial Activism - Need for Caution*, 42, Journal of the Indian Law Institute, 149, 153, (2000).

Edward S. Corwin, *Marbury v. Madison and the Doctrine of Judicial Review*, 12, Michigan Law Review, 538, 555, (1914).

Mohammad Moin Uddin, Rakiba Nabi, *Judicial Review Of Constitutional Amendments In Light Of The "Political Question" Doctrine: A Comparative Study Of The Jurisprudence Of Supreme Courts Of Bangladesh, India And The United States*, 58, Journal of the Indian Law Institute, 313, 320, (2016).

Yuval Eylon, Alon Harel, *The Right to Judicial Review*, 92, Virginia Law Review, 991, 1004, (2006).

Saikrishna B. Prakash, John C. Yoo, *The origins of Judicial Review*, 70, The University of the Chicago Law Review, 887, 890, (2003).

R. V. Ramachandrasekhara Rao, *Bases of Judicial Review*, 03, Journal of the Indian Law Institute, 293, 295, (1961).