

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS



Open Access, Refereed Journal Multi-Disciplinary
Peer Reviewed

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 II 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

EDITORIALTEAM

EDITORS

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 8Articles in various reputed Law Journals. Conducted IMoot 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.

THE CRITICAL ANALYSIS OVER BASIC STRUCTURE OF THE INDIAN CONSTITUTION

AUTHORED BY: - DHIRAJ KUAMR SHARMA

Final year (9th semester) Student of B.A LL.B

At: - University Law College (Vinoba Bhave University) Hazaribag, Jharkhand.

INTRODUCTION: -

The Indian Constitution, a monumental document crafted with meticulous deliberation and visionary foresight, stands as the guiding force shaping the nation's democratic framework. At the heart of this constitutional edifice lies a concept that has reverberated through decades of legal discourse and judicial interpretation—the Basic Structure Theory. Embedded within the constitutional tapestry of India, the Basic Structure Theory embodies a foundational doctrine that delineates the boundaries of parliamentary power to amend the Constitution. Emerging from significant legal deliberations and landmark judgments, this theory elucidates the immutable essence of the Constitution, beyond the reach of ordinary legislative amendments. The origins of the Basic Structure Theory can be traced through a series of pivotal cases that reshaped the landscape of constitutional law in India. Beginning with the early decisions in *Shankari Prasad* and *Sajjan Singh*, which affirmed Parliament's plenary power to amend the Constitution, the trajectory underwent a transformational shift with the landmark *Golaknath* case. It was the *Golaknath* judgment that signaled a departure from prior decisions, establishing that Fundamental Rights held an impervious status beyond the realm of parliamentary amendments. However, it was in the watershed moment of the *Kesavananda Bharati* case where the contours of the Basic Structure Theory took substantive shape. *Kesavananda Bharati* marked a turning point, introducing the doctrine that while Parliament possesses the authority to amend the Constitution, this power is circumscribed by a core framework—the Basic Structure—that forms the bedrock of the nation's constitutional ethos. This foundational concept, though not explicitly defined in precise terms by the judiciary, encompasses principles such as the supremacy of the Constitution, democracy, secularism, federalism, and judicial review, collectively regarded as inviolable components of India's constitutional identity. The subsequent legal battles, notably the *Indira Gandhi vs. Raj Narain* case, and affirmations in *Minerva Mills* and subsequent decisions, further fortified the Basic Structure Theory, underscoring its significance in safeguarding the foundational values and principles enshrined

within the Indian Constitution. In essence, the Basic Structure Theory serves as a sentinel guarding the essence of India's constitutional framework—a concept that embodies the resilience, adaptability, and enduring spirit of the nation's supreme legal document in a dynamic and ever-evolving society.

The basic structure in Indian Constitution: -

The "Basic Structure" doctrine in the Indian Constitution refers to the essential framework and fundamental principles that form the core foundation of the Constitution and cannot be altered or amended by the Parliament through its amending powers under Article 368. This doctrine was established through the landmark judicial decision in the *Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala* case (1973).

The doctrine of Basic Structure implies that while the Constitution can be amended, certain core features that constitute its essence, uphold its spirit, and ensure its identity and integrity must remain inviolable. These core features are regarded as essential pillars that form the bedrock of the Indian Constitution.

Though the Indian Constitution provides the Parliament with the authority to amend it under Article 368, the Supreme Court, in the *Kesavananda Bharati* case, held that this amending power is not absolute. The court ruled that any amendment that violates or damages the basic structure of the Constitution would be considered unconstitutional and hence, invalid. While the specific elements or principles constituting the basic structure have not been exhaustively defined by the Supreme Court, several characteristics have been recognized as part of the basic structure, including: -

- Supremacy of the Constitution
- Republican and democratic form of government
- Secularism
- Federalism
- Separation of powers among the legislature, executive, and judiciary
- Judicial review
- Rule of law
- Fundamental rights

These principles are deemed indispensable to the Constitution's identity and its functioning as

a democratic and just system of governance. Amendments that tamper with these fundamental features are subject to judicial scrutiny and can be struck down by the courts if found to violate the basic structure doctrine.

The Basic Structure doctrine serves as a safeguard against arbitrary changes to the Constitution that could potentially undermine its core principles and values, ensuring its stability, continuity, and adherence to the principles enshrined in it.

The evolution of the theory of basic structure

The evolution of the Basic Structure Theory in Indian constitutional law has been shaped by several landmark case laws that have contributed to defining and solidifying this doctrine. Here are some key cases that played pivotal roles in the development of the Basic Structure Doctrine:

Shankari Prasad vs. Union of India (1951)¹:- This case was the first instance where the Supreme Court ruled that Parliament had the power to amend any part of the Constitution, including Fundamental Rights. The Court held that there was no limitation on the amending power of Parliament under Article 368.

Sajjan Singh vs. State of Rajasthan (1965)²:- Similar to the Shankari Prasad case, the Supreme Court reiterated its stance that Parliament's amending power under Article 368 was plenary and could extend to Fundamental Rights.

Golaknath vs. State of Punjab (1967)³:- This landmark case marked a significant shift. The Supreme Court, departing from its previous decisions, held that Fundamental Rights could not be amended by Parliament under Article 368. It established the doctrine that the amending power was not absolute concerning Fundamental Rights.

Kesavananda Bharati case (1973)⁴

This was a landmark case in defining the concept of the basic structure doctrine.

The SC held that although no part of the Constitution, including Fundamental Rights, was

¹ 1951 AIR 458, 1952 SCR 89

² 1965 AIR 845, 1965 SCR (1) 933

³ 1967 AIR 1643, 1967 SCR (2) 762

⁴ (1972) 4 SCC 225, AIR 1973 SC 1461

beyond the Parliament's amending power, the basic structure of the Constitution could not be abrogated even by a constitutional amendment. The judgment implied that the parliament can only amend the constitution and not rewrite it. The power to amend is not a power to destroy.

The Kesavananda Bharati case is a watershed moment in Indian constitutional history. It revolved around the 24th⁵ Amendment Act of 1971, which sought to nullify the Supreme Court's judgments in Golaknath case, asserting Parliament's power to amend any part of the Constitution, including fundamental rights.

Context

The case was triggered by a challenge to the Kerala Land Reforms Act of 1969, where Kesavananda Bharati, a spiritual leader, argued that the Act violated his fundamental rights.

Arguments

Kesavananda Bharati contended that fundamental rights are inviolable and form the basic structure of the Constitution, beyond the reach of Parliament's amending power.

The Attorney General argued that Parliament had plenary powers to amend the Constitution under Article 368⁶, without any limitation.

Consequential Ruling

The Supreme Court, in a historic 7-6 decision, introduced the Basic Structure Doctrine. It held that while Parliament has the power to amend the Constitution, it cannot alter its basic structure.

The ruling outlined that certain essential features like the supremacy of the Constitution, democracy, secularism, federalism, and judicial review constitute the "basic structure" and are beyond the amending power of Parliament.

Article 368 of the Constitution gives the impression that Parliament's amending powers are absolute and encompass all parts of the document. But the Supreme Court has acted as a brake to the legislative enthusiasm of Parliament ever since independence. With the intention of

⁵ Confirmed Parliament's authority to modify any segment of the constitution, including Fundamental Rights. Mandated the president's approval for the constitution amendment bill, enforced since November 5, 1971.

⁶ Power of parliament to amend the constitution and procedure.

preserving the original ideals envisioned by the constitution-makers, the apex court pronounced that Parliament could not distort, damage or alter the basic features of the Constitution under the pretext of amending it. The phrase 'basic structure' itself cannot be found in the Constitution. The Supreme Court recognised this concept for the first time in the historic **Kesavananda Bharati case in 1973**. Ever since the Supreme Court has been the interpreter of the Constitution and the arbiter of all amendments made by Parliament.

Indira Gandhi vs. Raj Narain (1975)⁷:- In this case, the Supreme Court struck down parts of the 39th⁸ Amendment Act, which sought to insulate certain high-level political offices from judicial review. The Court reaffirmed the Basic Structure Theory by asserting that even during emergencies or crises, the core principles of the Constitution remained immune from infringement.

Minerva Mills Ltd. vs. Union of India (1980)⁹:- The Court, in this case, reiterated the Basic Structure Doctrine and emphasized that there were certain basic features of the Constitution that formed its backbone and could not be abrogated through amendments.

The thoughts of different personality on the theory of basic structure

- 1. Justice Hans Raj Khanna:** - In the Kesavananda Bharati case, Justice Khanna delivered a dissenting opinion, arguing that the Constitution's basic structure should be immune from amendments. His dissenting judgment played a crucial role in shaping the Basic Structure Doctrine.
- 2. Nani Palkhivala:** - Renowned jurist and constitutional expert Nani Palkhivala passionately advocated for the Basic Structure Doctrine. He strongly believed that certain fundamental principles are immutable and form the soul of the Constitution.
- 3. Granville Austin:** - An eminent constitutional historian, Granville Austin, commended the evolution of the Basic Structure Doctrine, emphasizing the importance of preserving the Constitution's core principles while allowing flexibility for growth and adaptation.

⁷ 1975 AIR 1590 1975 SCC (2) 159

⁸ During the Emergency of 1975–1977, the Thirty-ninth Amendment to the Constitution of India, enforced on August 10, 1975, exempted the election processes of the President, Vice President, Prime Minister, and Lok Sabha Speaker from review by Indian courts.

⁹ AIR 1980 SC 1789

4. **Fali S. Nariman:** - A prominent lawyer, Nariman has supported the Basic Structure Theory, emphasizing that while the Constitution is amendable, it should safeguard its fundamental pillars.
5. **Justice K. Subba Rao:** - Former Chief Justice of India, Justice Subba Rao, played a significant role in formulating the Basic Structure Doctrine in the Golaknath case. He argued that certain elements of the Constitution are fundamental and cannot be altered.
6. **Solomon Gandhi:** - An advocate and a constitutional expert, Solomon Gandhi, highlighted the need for balance, suggesting that while the Basic Structure Doctrine is vital, its application should be judicious to prevent judicial overreach.

The thoughts of Indian Present Vice President (Mr. Jaydeep Dhankar) **on the basic structure**

The Kesavananda Bharati case of 1973 stands as a pivotal judgment that fortified our democracy by affirming the fundamental structure of the constitution. Kesavananda Bharati, the head pontiff of a mutt in Kasargod, contested a Kerala Land Reform Act, establishing the principle that the Supreme Court acts as the guardian of the constitution's basic structure. This case, involving a bench of 13 judges, declared that while the constitution can be amended, its basic structure remains inviolable. This ruling became a fundamental belief transcending political ideologies, especially after the tumultuous Emergency period that sought to dismantle constitutional guarantees.

However, **Vice President Jagdeep Dhankhar** has recently cast doubts on the validity of the Kesavananda Bharati judgment. His suggestion implies that Parliament should possess the sovereign right to amend the constitution, even if it encroaches upon the basic structure, which includes fundamental rights. Notably, Dhankhar's former colleagues from the Supreme Court Bar Association have no recollection of him opposing the Kesavananda Bharati verdict. It has been a steadfast principle for jurists across the board.

This shift in Dhankhar's stance on the 1973 verdict has sparked surprise and bewilderment among opposition leaders and colleagues from his legal career. Rajya Sabha MP Vivek Tankha, who was a former colleague, reminded that leaders like Atal Bihari Vajpayee and Arun Jaitley from the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) had vouched for the sanctity of the constitution's basic structure in parliament.

Former Finance Minister P. Chidambaram also weighed in, stating that Parliament isn't supreme; instead, it's the Constitution that holds supremacy. He highlighted how the basic structure doctrine was formulated to safeguard the Constitution's foundational principles from being undermined by majoritarian influences.

Dhankhar's timing for these statements seems peculiar, especially amid Prime Minister Modi's efforts to showcase India's democratic legacy during its G-20 Presidentship celebrations. This viewpoint from a high-ranking constitutional functionary might bring embarrassment to the ruling party on a global platform.

This isn't the first time Dhankhar has criticized a judicial decision. He previously questioned the Supreme Court's rejection of the National Judicial Appointments Commission Act in 2015, asserting that it eroded Parliament's authority concerning higher judicial appointments.

The Concept of basic structure in different country: -

The Basic Structure In German Constitution.

In the German Constitution (Basic Law), the theory of the "basic structure" is not explicitly defined as it is in the Indian context. But the certain articles in the German Basic Law lay down fundamental principles and provisions that are considered essential and form the core of the constitutional order.

Article 1 - Human Dignity: - Article 1 of the German Basic Law declares human dignity to be inviolable and the basis of all human rights. It states, "Human dignity shall be inviolable. To respect and protect it shall be the duty of all state authority." This article forms the foundation of the entire constitutional framework and is often considered as part of the "basic structure" of the German Constitution. It establishes the principle that all human beings have inherent dignity and worth, and this dignity must be respected and protected by the state.

Article 20 - Basic Principles of the State: - Article 20 outlines the basic principles of the German state. It includes principles such as the democratic, social, federal, and rule-of-law nature of the state. These principles are considered fundamental and essential to the German constitutional order. The article specifies that all state authority emanates from the people and is exercised by them through elections and other democratic mechanisms.

Article 79 - Eternity Clause: - Article 79 includes the "eternity clause," which safeguards certain fundamental principles of the German Constitution from being amended or abolished. It states that certain constitutional principles, such as the federal structure, democracy, rule of law, and the fundamental rights outlined in Articles 1 to 20, are unamendable. These principles cannot be changed, even through the formal amendment process specified in the Basic Law.

The Basic Structure In French Constitution: -

The concept of a "basic structure" in the constitution of France is not explicitly defined or recognized in the same way as it exists in some other countries, such as India. The French Constitution, which is characterized by its principles of republican government, emphasizes key principles and fundamental rights but does not have a specific doctrine akin to the "basic structure" as found in other constitutional frameworks.

The French Constitution, established in its current form in 1958, is based on a combination of written and unwritten principles. It outlines the organization of the state, the separation of powers, the roles of the President, Parliament, and the judiciary, as well as fundamental rights and freedoms.

The Basic Structure In Greece Constitution: -

The Greek Constitution includes a list of unamendable provisions, specifying essential elements that cannot be altered. These encompass democratic governance, the separation of powers, human rights, and the country's territorial integrity. These unamendable provisions encompass various crucial aspects that are considered fundamental to the Greek constitutional in orders: -

Democratic Governance¹⁰:- The Greek Constitution protects the fundamental principles of democracy. This includes the basic structures and mechanisms ensuring democratic governance, such as free and fair elections, the rule of law, the rights of citizens to participate in the political process, and the functioning of democratic institutions.

Separation of Powers¹¹:- It upholds the principle of the separation of powers, which refers to

¹⁰ Article 1 of the Greece Constitution

¹¹ Article 26 to 32 deals with the structure and power of the legislative branch.

the division of governmental responsibilities among distinct branches - the executive, legislative, and judicial branches. This separation ensures checks and balances among these branches, preventing any single branch from consolidating excessive power.

Human Rights¹²:- The Greek Constitution enshrines the protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms. These rights encompass a wide range of civil, political, economic, social, and cultural rights, ensuring that individuals have certain inviolable protections against government infringement.

Territorial Integrity¹³:- This aspect emphasizes the protection of the country's territorial integrity, ensuring that the geographical boundaries and sovereignty of Greece are preserved and cannot be altered through constitutional amendments.

Portugal Constitution: -

The Portuguese Constitution includes a set of provisions deemed unamendable, meaning they are safeguarded from alterations or amendments through the standard constitutional amendment process. These unamendable provisions encompass several crucial aspects that are considered fundamental to the Portuguese constitutional order.

Democratic Principles: - The Constitution emphasizes the democratic organization of the state. It outlines principles governing the political system, including the election of representatives, the functioning of democratic institutions, and the protection of democratic values.

Fundamental Rights: - Portugal's Constitution enshrines a comprehensive set of fundamental rights and freedoms for its citizens. These rights encompass civil, political, social, economic, and cultural dimensions, ensuring the protection of individual liberties and dignity.

Sovereignty: - The Constitution safeguards the sovereignty of Portugal as a nation-state. It outlines provisions concerning the country's independence, territorial integrity, and autonomy in decision-making within the framework of international relations.

Rule of Law: - The principles of the rule of law are fundamental to the Portuguese

¹² Article 2 to 25 deals with provision of fundamental right and freedoms

¹³ The preamble and Article 1 and 3.

Constitution. This includes the supremacy of the Constitution, equality before the law, access to justice, and adherence to legal principles in governance.

Italian Constitution: -

Italy doesn't have an explicit basic structure doctrine either. However, the Constitutional Court has intervened to protect certain fundamental principles, such as the democratic and republican nature of the state. It declares laws unconstitutional if they contravene these foundational elements, emphasizing the importance of upholding these core principles within the Italian constitutional framework.

Iran¹⁴ :-

In Iran, unamendable provisions relate to the Islamic and democratic character, as well as the objectives of the republic, including social and economic goals. The Constitution safeguards these core principles against amendments that might undermine the Islamic foundation or democratic nature of the state, ensuring the preservation of these fundamental tenets within the Iranian constitutional order.

Pakistan:-

The Pakistani Supreme Court has had a fluctuating stance on the basic structure doctrine. While the Court initially debated the idea, it hasn't firmly established it. However, in certain cases, the Court hinted at implied limitations on amending powers, emphasizing the retention of fundamental features of the Constitution, indicating a willingness to protect essential aspects of Pakistan's constitutional framework.

Thailand :-

Thailand's Constitution prohibits amendments that change the democratic regime or alter the form of the state. Although it lacks explicit reference to a basic structure doctrine, certain provisions within the Constitution safeguard the core democratic structure of the government. These provisions aim to maintain the democratic nature of the state and prevent alterations that could fundamentally change its form.

Belize¹⁵:-

¹⁴ Qanuni assassi jumhuri i Isla ' mai Iran Constitution .

¹⁵ Northeastern coastal of the central America

The Belizean Supreme Court invoked the concept of basic structure to nullify amendments affecting fundamental rights and principles, particularly the rule of law, separation of powers, and respect for property rights.

Some foreign judgment on basic structure :-

1. Mahmood Khan Achakzai v. Federation of Pakistan¹⁶

The case of Mahmood Khan Achakzai v. Federation of Pakistan (PLD 1997 SC 426) was a significant legal challenge in Pakistan that dealt with the constitutional validity of the 13th Amendment to the Constitution of Pakistan.

Mahmood Khan Achakzai, a prominent political figure and leader of the Pakhtunkhwa Milli Awami Party (PkMAP), brought the case before the Supreme Court of Pakistan. The focal point of the challenge was the constitutional validity of the 13th Amendment, which sought to confer powers upon the President of Pakistan to dissolve the National Assembly under specific circumstances.

Achakzai argued that the 13th Amendment was unconstitutional as it allegedly contravened fundamental principles or essential features of the Constitution. His argument was based on the premise that certain elements within the Constitution were so fundamental that they could not be amended or altered by Parliament.

However, the Supreme Court of Pakistan, in its judgment, upheld the validity of the 13th Amendment. The Court ruled that the amendment did not violate the basic structure or essential features of the Constitution. It emphasized that under the Constitution of Pakistan, Parliament possessed the authority to enact amendments unless they violated explicit constitutional provisions or principles.

It's important to note that while the case addressed the constitutional validity of an amendment and the argument raised by Achakzai about the alleged infringement on fundamental constitutional principles, the Supreme Court did not explicitly endorse or recognize a doctrine similar to the "basic structure doctrine" established by the Indian judiciary.

¹⁶ (PLD 1997 SC 426)

In India, the basic structure doctrine posits that certain elements or features of the Constitution are so fundamental that they are beyond the scope of amendment by the Parliament. However, in the Mahmood Khan Achakzai case, the Pakistani Supreme Court did not explicitly adopt such a doctrine. Instead, the Court primarily focused on the specific issue regarding the constitutional validity of the 13th Amendment.

2. Hind V/s Queen ¹⁷

Facts: -

By the Gun Court Act 1974 the Parliament of Jamaica established a new court, the Gun Court, to try “firearms offences.” The Act provided for three divisions of the court; the Circuit Court Division and the Resident Magistrate’s Division, constituted by a Supreme Court judge and a resident magistrate respectively, and the Full Court Division constituted by three resident magistrates. Section 8 prescribed a mandatory sentence of detention at hard labour during the Governor-General’s pleasure for specified offences, determinable only by the Governor-General on the advice of the Review Board. The appellants, who had all incurred the mandatory sentence under s.8, sought to argue that the provisions of the Act under which they were tried and sentenced were inconsistent with the Jamaican Constitution.

Issues: -

The Privy Council was called upon to determine whether those provisions of the Gun Courts Act which purported to transfer sentencing powers to an executive body were compatible with the Jamaican Constitution.

Decision: -

In allowing the appeal in part, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council found the following: -

1. The provisions of the Gun Court Act relating to the Circuit Court Division and the Resident Magistrate’s Division which did no more than extend geographically the jurisdiction of a Supreme Court judge in a Circuit Court and

¹⁷ PC 1 Dec 1975

a resident magistrate respectively were not contrary to the Constitution and were valid.

2. That the principle of separation of powers was implicit in the Constitution and Parliament had no power to transfer from the judiciary to the Review Board, the majority of whose members were not qualified to exercise judicial powers, a discretion to determine the severity of punishment.
3. That the provisions of the Act which were inconsistent with the Constitution were severable from the valid provisions, since the valid provisions would survive without the invalid.

3. UDM vs President of the RSA¹⁸.

In this case, the United Democratic Movement, a political party in South Africa, challenged the constitutionality of certain constitutional amendments related to floor-crossing legislation. The amendments allowed members of political parties to switch parties without losing their seats in the legislature, altering the balance of power between political parties.

The Constitutional Court of South Africa had to assess whether these amendments were consistent with the Constitution of South Africa, particularly regarding principles of democracy, the rights of voters, and the role of political parties.

The Court ruled that while the amendments did not violate the Constitution, they did affect the fundamental principles of the Constitution, particularly the rights of voters and the principle of proportional representation. However, the Court decided that the amendments were within the scope of the Constitution and the authority of the Parliament to amend the law.

4. Nationwide News Pty Ltd v Wills¹⁹:-

Facts:-

- Section 229 of the Industrial Relations Act 1988 (Cth) established an offense for bringing the Australian Industrial Relations Commission into disrepute. Nationwide News, the parent company of "The Australian"

¹⁸ 2002 ZACC 21

¹⁹ (1992) 177 CLR 1,

newspaper, published an article titled "Advance Australia Fascist" on November 14, 1989. The article, contributed by freelance journalist Mr. Maxwell Newton, criticized the "Arbitration Commission" and its members.

- Nationwide News contended that the Act violated the implied freedom of political communication. On the other hand, the Commonwealth argued that the Act was valid under section 51(xxxv) (conciliation and arbitration power) and section 51(xxxix) (express incidental power) of the Constitution.

Issue:- Was the Act valid or did it infringe the implied freedom of political communication?

Decision of the court: -

- The majority of the High Court, comprising Brennan, Deane, Toohey, and Gaudron JJ, determined that the Act fell within the scope of the conciliation and arbitration authority. However, they also concluded that it encroached upon the implied freedom of political communication.
- Within the Constitution, the "doctrine of representative government" stands as one of the three fundamental doctrines, alongside federal government and the separation of powers.
- According to this doctrine, all citizens who are not subject to specific limitations should have access to the advantages of engaging in political discussions. Without this access, individuals wouldn't be able to participate fully in Australia's representative government system.

The jurisprudential concept of the Basic Structure Theory

The jurisprudential concept of the Basic Structure Theory in constitutional law revolves around the interpretation of the inherent principles and foundational features of a constitution that form its essential framework. This concept emerged prominently in Indian constitutional jurisprudence, shaping the boundaries of constitutional amendments and judicial review.

At its core, the jurisprudential understanding of the Basic Structure Theory focuses on identifying and protecting certain fundamental principles, features, or pillars within a constitution that are considered sacrosanct and beyond the scope of regular amendments by the

legislative body, such as Parliament.

Key elements of the jurisprudential concept of the Basic Structure Theory include: -

Foundational Principles: - The theory identifies fundamental principles that are regarded as integral to the constitutional framework. These principles often include democracy, secularism, federalism, separation of powers, rule of law, judicial independence, and protection of fundamental rights.

Inviolability of Core Features: - The theory asserts that the identified basic features or core principles of the constitution are immune from arbitrary change through ordinary legislative amendments. These elements are considered inherent to the constitutional identity and structure and are protected from alteration by the ordinary political process.

Judicial Review and Limitation on Amendment Power: - The concept affirms the role of the judiciary in reviewing constitutional amendments and ensuring that changes made by the legislative body do not violate or alter the fundamental principles or the basic structure of the constitution. The judiciary holds the authority to strike down amendments that infringe upon the basic structure.

Evolutionary Nature: - The jurisprudential concept acknowledges that the Basic Structure Theory is not rigid or static but evolves over time. It allows for the identification and incorporation of new principles or interpretations that may become integral to the constitutional framework.

Balance and Flexibility: - While safeguarding the core principles, the concept also emphasizes the need for a balance between constitutional stability and adaptability. It acknowledges the necessity of constitutional reforms but within the framework of the basic structure, ensuring that the essence of the constitution remains intact.

Merits of the basic structure theory.

The Basic Structure Theory in constitutional law has several merits and serves as a pivotal

safeguard within the framework of a nation's constitution. Some of its key merits include: -

Preservation of Fundamental Principles: - The Basic Structure Theory ensures the preservation of fundamental principles and values enshrined in the constitution. It protects these core values from being altered or diluted through ordinary legislative amendments, maintaining the integrity of the constitutional framework.

Maintenance of Constitutional Stability: - By delineating certain principles as part of the basic structure, this theory provides stability to the constitution. It prevents hasty changes that could undermine the foundational elements of the legal and political system, thereby ensuring continuity and stability in governance.

Upholding Constitutional Supremacy: - The Basic Structure Theory reinforces the supremacy of the constitution over the transient will of the legislative majority. It establishes that certain aspects of the constitution are immutable, maintaining a balance between constitutionalism and parliamentary sovereignty.

Protection of Fundamental Rights: - The theory acts as a shield for fundamental rights. By safeguarding these rights within the basic structure, it prevents the dilution or infringement of rights by the government through amendments that could erode the core principles of liberty, equality, and justice.

Limitation on Arbitrary Power: - It sets limitations on the power of the legislative body to amend the constitution arbitrarily. This ensures that the government does not tamper with the essential features of the constitution for short-term political gains, protecting against potential abuse of power.

Role in Judicial Review: - The Basic Structure Theory empowers the judiciary to review and strike down constitutional amendments that violate the basic structure. It strengthens the role of the judiciary as a guardian of the constitution, ensuring its adherence to the foundational principles.

Adaptability and Evolution: - While preserving core principles, the theory allows for the evolution and adaptation of the constitution to changing societal needs. It permits necessary

reforms within the confines of the basic structure, accommodating progress while maintaining the foundational ethos.

Constitutional Consensus: - The Basic Structure Theory often reflects a broad consensus among legal experts and scholars on the foundational principles that form the essence of a nation's constitutional identity, promoting a shared understanding of the constitution's core values.

Demerits of the basic structure theory: -

the Basic Structure Theory in constitutional law offers numerous advantages, it also faces certain criticisms and potential drawbacks: -

Subjectivity and Lack of Clarity: - One of the primary criticisms of the Basic Structure Theory is its inherent subjectivity and lack of precise definition. The concept of what constitutes the "basic structure" remains somewhat nebulous and open to interpretation, leading to ambiguity and uncertainty in its application.

Judicial Overreach: - Critics argue that the theory could empower the judiciary excessively, leading to judicial activism and encroachment into the domain of the legislature. There are concerns that judges might use the doctrine to impose their subjective views, thereby undermining the principle of separation of powers.

Undermining Democratic Process: - Some critics contend that the theory restricts the power of the elected representatives and infringes upon the will of the majority. They argue that the judiciary should not have the authority to curtail the legislative body's ability to make necessary changes as per the democratic process.

Potential for Judicial Dictatorship: - There are apprehensions that an expansive interpretation of the Basic Structure Doctrine might grant the judiciary unchecked power to strike down constitutional amendments, potentially leading to a form of judicial dictatorship where unelected judges hold considerable sway over elected representatives.

Evolutionary Challenges: - As society evolves, new challenges emerge, and the constitutional framework may need to adapt. Critics argue that the rigidity imposed by the Basic Structure

Theory could hinder the constitution's ability to address contemporary issues adequately.

Nflexibility In Constitutional Amendments: - The Doctrine's Restrictions On Constitutional Amendments Might Impede Necessary And Legitimate Changes Required To Keep The Constitution Relevant And Responsive To Societal Needs, Potentially Hindering The Progress Of The Legal System.

Lack of Legal Certainty: - Due to the lack of a definitive list or precise definition of the basic structure, legal uncertainty prevails. This ambiguity could lead to inconsistent application and decision-making by the courts, making it challenging for lawmakers to foresee the acceptability of proposed amendments.

Conclusion: -

The Basic Structure Theory stands as a monumental doctrine in Indian constitutional jurisprudence, serving as a guardian of the fundamental principles enshrined in the Constitution. It emerged from significant judicial interpretations and landmark cases, shaping the framework within which constitutional amendments are viewed and scrutinized by the judiciary. The evolution of this doctrine, notably highlighted in the Kesavananda Bharati case, established that while Parliament possesses the power to amend the Constitution, it is not absolute. There exists a core or basic structure comprising essential features—such as the supremacy of the Constitution, democracy, secularism, federalism, and judicial review—that form the bedrock of India's constitutional identity. These elements are considered sacrosanct and beyond the reach of ordinary amendments. Throughout the history of Indian jurisprudence, various judgments, including *Indira Gandhi vs. Raj Narain*, *Minerva Mills Ltd. vs. Union of India*, and others, reaffirmed the inviolability of this basic structure. They underscored the importance of preserving the foundational values and principles, ensuring that amendments do not erode or dilute the essence of the Constitution. The doctrine, however, remains subject to ongoing debate and interpretation. It has sparked discussions among legal scholars, jurists, and experts regarding its scope, limitations, and the elements encompassed within the basic structure. The application of this doctrine demands a delicate balance between safeguarding the core principles and allowing for legitimate constitutional reforms necessitated by changing societal needs. In essence, the Basic Structure Theory encapsulates the spirit of constitutional supremacy, ensuring that the Constitution remains a living document capable of adapting to the evolving aspirations of the nation while safeguarding its foundational values. It reaffirms

the judiciary's role as the custodian of constitutional morality, maintaining the delicate equilibrium between constitutional stability and progress. As India continues its journey, the Basic Structure Doctrine remains an indispensable tool for judicial review, guiding constitutional amendments and reinforcing the vision of a democratic, secular, and just society enshrined in the Constitution. In conclusion, the Basic Structure Theory is not merely a legal doctrine but an embodiment of India's constitutional ethos—a testament to the resilience and endurance of its foundational values in the face of evolving challenges.

