



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS

Open Access, Refereed Journal Multi Disciplinary
Peer Reviewed Edition :

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 8Articles in various reputed Law Journals. Conducted 1Moot 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.

DOCTRINE OF PROSPECTIVE OVERRULING: A CRITICAL STUDY

AUHTORED BY: KARAN GUPTA

SEMESTER: 10

COURSE: BA.LLB(H)

ABSTRACT

Prospective overruling is a judicial doctrine that allows courts to limit the retroactive effects of their decisions, thereby balancing the need for legal stability with the necessity for legal evolution and adaptation to changing circumstances and societal values. This paper explores the concept, application, and implications of prospective overruling in various areas of law, including constitutional law, administrative law, and private law. It examines the factors influencing the decision to apply prospective overruling, procedural mechanisms for implementing it, and recommendations for enhancing its effectiveness and fairness in judicial decision-making. Through a comprehensive analysis of prospective overruling, this paper aims to contribute to scholarly discourse, judicial practice, and policy development on issues of fairness, justice, and legal certainty in the contemporary legal landscape.

Keywords: Prospective Overruling, Judicial Doctrine, Legal Stability, Legal Evolution, Constitutional Law, Administrative Law.

INTRODUCTION

A fundamental foundation within the legal system of many countries is the theory of future overruling, which aims to reconcile the goals of legal stability on fairness. To make sure the new rule doesn't mess up the legal system or disrupt settled transactions, it lays out the process by which court rulings that overturn precedents are implemented prospectively. This critical study explores the doctrine's complexities, looking at its history, reasoning, applications, and legal ramifications. In the common law tradition, where judges had to balance following precedent with fixing mistakes in the law or adjusting to new social standards, prospective overruling first arose. The rules of prospective overruling were established in the seminal decision of Chevron

Oil Co. v. Huson (1971) in the United States. Although the Supreme Court might reverse its own judgments, it ruled that, barring unusual situations, such rulings should apply prospectively. Recognizing the need of a more pragmatic and adaptable approach, this represented a change from the prior inflexible position of applying retroactively.

Legal and policy factors are both taken into account when deciding to overrule in the future. Fairness, the assurance that the parties may reasonably depend on preexisting legal standards and expectations, is its fundamental concept. The reliability of legal connections may be jeopardized when court rulings are applied retroactively, which disrupts established transactions and unsettles expectations. Courts attempt to lessen these negative impacts while still enacting essential revisions to the law by using a prospective approach. The public has more faith in the justice system and judges are seen as more legitimate when projected overruling encourages predictability, consistency, and adherence to precedent.

Recent decades have seen the Indian Supreme Court's judicial declarations largely responsible for the concept of prospective overruling's meteoric rise to popularity in the country. The Supreme Court upheld individuals' basic rights in the landmark case *Golaknath v. State of Punjab* (1967), but it limited the decision's retroactive impact on constitutional revisions by using the theory of prospective overruling. The Supreme Court later reaffirmed the value of prospective overruling in protecting individual rights and facilitating the adoption of new legal norms in *Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India* (1978).

QUO VADIS, PROSPECTIVE OVERRULING: A QUESTION OF JUDICIAL RESPONSIBILITY

Prospective overruling of court rulings is a concept that evokes an enticing sense of the future. While its superficial relationship to laws gives the idea that judgments might draw on a long-standing concept with roots in Roman law—that statutes only apply in the future—this is not always the case. That concept was reaffirmed by Bracton in 1250. It was a well-established principle of common law legislative interpretation by the seventeenth century, thanks to Coke's incorporation of the idea into English common law, that legislation only function prospectively. The customary belief among attorneys and judges was that applying the rule backwards would be fundamentally unjust, and so the rule was born. That perspective had developed into the idea that legislation act prospectively by definition by the time Blackstone lived. Since a statute was unable to take effect until it was passed into law, it could not be used to deal with matters that had place before the law was made.

After making it over the Atlantic, these opinions were finally legitimized by the US Constitution's ex post facto and impairment of contracts clauses. Retroactive laws that failed to provide notice or a fair hearing were also fought against by the due process provision.

Parliament in England may create or change the law retrospectively, even if it means taking away money from a victorious litigant, as there are no such constitutional constraints in the UK. So, the plaintiff's property near Rangoon was demolished the day before Japanese authorities invaded Rangoon under British military instructions in *Burmah Oil Co. v. Lord Advocate*³. Since the case did not fall within the purview of statutes granting compensation for war damage, the plaintiff sought it out after the war under the common law. The plaintiff's claim was upheld by the House of Lords. The plaintiff's decision was annulled shortly thereafter when an Act of Parliament retrospectively eliminated the common law right of compensation proclaimed by the House of Lords.⁴ Maybe this will be seen as a rare example of Parliament's sovereignty, rather than a situation where a temporary majority in parliament might use it to undermine the notion of judicial independence. The only thing we can hope for is that Parliament will exercise prudence and respect for the independence of the judiciary so that these shocks are reserved for the most extreme cases. With this kind of constraint, Professor Arthur Goodhart argues that the unique pouring of Burmah Oil into judicial waterways should not cause concern but rather confidence about the robustness of the English constitution.

HISTORICAL EVOLUTION OF PROSPECTIVE OVERRULING

A judgment in one instance would only apply going forward, according to the theory of prospective overruling, and would not affect previous rulings in any way. "Overrule" means to reverse a previous decision or precedent, and "prospective" is anything that only works in the future, according to the literal interpretation of this term. Some have said it's a break with the Blackstonian school of thought, which maintains that judges should adhere to the Doctrine on Stare Decisis and that their authority ends at announcing laws rather than creating them. From this vantage point, it is clear that the precedent's retrospective rule is correct. Since the concept of retrospective operation denied a person a fair trial and result, the courts' primary objective in implementing this Doctrine has always been to attain justice. Within the bounds set down by the Doctrine, a court's decision must operate. Translated into simple English, it says that deals made before a court ruling won't be seen as illegal after the rules change. Justice Cardozo argued that the changeable character of law would be undermined if the Doctrine were not applied, and that this would lead to severe injustice. To meet the evolving needs of society and maintain equity in

justice, this Doctrine is an indispensable instrument. Acceptance of the idea, according to Justice Subba Rao, paves the way enable future transactions to acknowledge new and improved standards. American case law is the cradle of the notion of future overruling. Prior to the adoption and implementation of this concept, the American judicial system adhered to the Blackstonian principle. Courts, on this view, could not legislate themselves but could only apply, interpret, and elaborate upon preexisting statutes. But many American jurists were against this idea, and their dissent made way for the adoption of the theory of future overruling. American jurist George F. Canfield argues that when a rule's validity is called into question or its applicability is outmoded, the court has a responsibility to acknowledge this and establish a new rule.

PRACTICAL APPLICATION OF PROSPECTIVE OVERRULING

Constitutional law relies on the theory of future overruling to strike a balance between the need of maintaining a rigid legal framework and the desire for the document to develop and change in response to shifting social mores. To ensure the steady evolution of constitutional concepts while mitigating the disruptive impacts of overturning precedent, constitutional courts across the globe have adopted prospective overruling in various scenarios. Looking at how prospective overruling has been used in historic cases, how it has affected judicial decision-making, and what it means for the rule of law, this chapter delves into the practical application of constitutional law. Cases regarding the interpretation and implementation of basic rights and freedoms are one major area where prospective overruling is used in constitutional law. Striking a balance between safeguarding individual rights and meeting the needs of maintaining public order, national security, & social cohesiveness is a common difficulty for constitutional courts. In these situations, courts may employ future overruling to find a middle ground between furthering justice and protecting the integrity of legal standards. To illustrate the use of prospective overruling to increase the breadth of constitutional rights and provide the government a fair amount of time to conform to the new legal requirements, consider the Indian Supreme Court's judgment in *Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India* (1978). While nevertheless providing better protection for people's rights, the Court used future overruling to avoid upsetting preexisting legal systems and eroding public faith in the court. The constitutional use of retroactive legislation or court rulings that run counter to constitutional standards has also been addressed via the use of prospective overruling. Courts have the discretion to restrict the retroactive implications of their rulings on laws or decisions that they find unconstitutional by using the principle of prospective overruling. This allows them to safeguard the reasonable expectations of parties impacted by

these actions. In the seminal American case of *Marbury v. Madison* (1803), the Supreme Court upheld the supremacy of the Constitution and maintained the stability of previous legal arrangements by ruling that its declaration of an act of Congress unconstitutional would apply only to future cases.

CONCLUSION

A living testimony to the ever-evolving character of our legal systems and the never-ending pursuit of equity, clarity, and justice is the theory of prospective overruling. Applying prospective overruling in different fields of law, such as private law, administrative law, and constitutional law, has made it a crucial tool for balancing the necessity of stable law with the necessity of evolving and adapting to new situations and societal values. The relevance of prospective overruling, its effects on the rule of law, and potential future directions for study are all discussed in this last section. In order to keep legal systems flexible and legitimate in the face of fast social, technical, and political developments, prospective overruling is essential. To ensure that parties' reliance interests and vested rights are adequately protected, courts might use prospective overruling to restrict the retroactive impacts of their judgments. This promotes predictability, transparency, and justice in judicial decision-making. When it comes to matters of basic rights, constitutional principles, regulatory enforcement, administrative actions, contractual agreements, and property rights, courts can use prospective overruling to find a happy medium between preserving precedent and encouraging innovation in the law.

Protecting individual rights, democratic principles, and the rule of law is the primary function of future overruling in constitutional law. To foster social peace, balance conflicting interests, and keep constitutional principles adaptable to evolving social norms and values, courts use prospective overruling. The public's faith in the judicial system and the constitutionality of government are strengthened when courts demonstrate their dedication to equity, justice, and the common good by using prospective overruling in matters concerning basic liberties and rights.

Just as regulatory agencies may adjust their enforcement procedures and regulatory frameworks to meet evolving policy goals, prospective overruling allows them to do the same under administrative law. Future overruling encourages innovation in regulations, conformity with the law, and good governance by giving agencies more leeway to apply new legal standards or interpretations as they see fit. For a regulatory climate that strikes a balance between regulatory goals, economic efficiency, and social welfare, prospective overruling is a great tool for administrative agencies, regulated firms, and the general public to work together and

communicate.

REFERENCES

LawTeacher. (n.d.). Jurisprudence Prospective Overruling In Reference Administrative Law Essay. Retrieved from <https://www.lawteacher.net/free-law-essays/administrative-law/jurisprudence-prospective-overruling-in-reference-administrative-law-essay.php>

LexLife. (2020, July 21). Constitutional Law: Prospective Overruling. Retrieved from <https://lexlife.in/2020/07/21/constitutional-law-prospective-overruling/#:~:text=The%20Doctrine%20of%20Prospective%20Overruling%20dictates%20that%20a%20decision%20made,effect%20on%20any%20past%20decisions.&text=The%20Doctrine%20prescribes%20the%20parameters,decision%20is%20bound%20to%20operate.>

LegalServiceIndia. (n.d.). Doctrine of Prospective Overruling. Retrieved from <https://www.legalserviceindia.com/legal/article-2678-doctrine-of-prospective-overruling.html>

Indian Kanoon. (n.d.). Search results for "prospective overruling". Retrieved from <https://indiankanoon.org/search/?formInput=prospective%20overruling+doctype:judgments>

Jain, M. P. (1986). The Doctrine of Prospective Overruling: A Critique. *Journal of the Indian Law Institute*, 28(3), 356–368. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/43949956.pdf>

Alemika, A. O. (2005). Judicial Precedent and Prospective Overruling in Nigeria. *Journal of African Law*, 49(1), 72–91. doi:10.1017/s0021855305000043

Brown, D. A. (2007). Prospective Overruling and Retroactive Lawmaking. *Harvard Law Review*, 120(7), 1720–1761. doi:10.2307/4495546.

IJLRA