

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 what sever 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 & Utkrish 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.

JUDICIAL INDEPENDENCE AND POLITICAL INFLUENCE: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF SELECTION PROCESSES

AUTHORED BY – RAJNIKANT

1st Semester, LLM (1st.)

GD GOENKA UNIVERSITY

i. ABSTRACT

Judicial independence, which ensures the court is protected from outside pressures and political intervention, is a crucial component of democratic government. Since different appointment models vary in their vulnerability to political meddling, the judiciary's selection procedure is the most crucial way to preserve its independence. The judicial selection procedures in the US, UK, India, Germany, and France are compared in this essay. The study is on how much politics affects justice appointments and implications for judicial impartiality/ rule law and public trust.

This study also explores the benefits and drawbacks of election-based systems, judicial selection commissions, parliamentary participation, and executive appointments. The study will make suggestions for the optimal selection mechanism that strikes a balance between judicial independence and accountability using best practices from different models. The results will demonstrate that open, merit-based appointment processes free from political meddling necessitate the competency and integrity of the judiciary.

Keywords:

Judicial Independence, Political Influence, Judicial Selection, Judicial Appointments, Judiciary, Comparative Analysis, Merit-Based Selection, Constitutional Law.

ii. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

- To assess the degree of political meddling in the selection of judges
- To evaluate the selection procedures used by judges in various jurisdictions.
- To evaluate how well different models preserve independence.

iii. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

- How do different countries select their judges?
- What are the major political influences on the selection process?
- Which system ensures the highest degree of judicial independence?

1. BACKGROUND

Judicial independence is the cornerstone of democratic governance and the rule of law. Judges must be free from political, executive, or legislative influences and interfering in order to render rulings that are in accordance with the law and the constitution without fear or favor. The independence of the judiciary is essential because it upholds human rights, guarantees a fair trial, and increases public confidence in the legal system.¹

A free judiciary in a democratic system plays the following important roles:

Protection of the Constitution and Laws: The courts are the constitution's defenders in constitutional democracies.² They possess the power to interpret the legislation and use judicial review to overturn executive orders or legislation that violates the constitution. They will probably turn into tools of political power rather than impartial arbiters of conflicts unless they are autonomous.

Maintaining the Rule of Law: Democracy is predicated on respect for the Rule of Law, which requires all people, even those in positions of authority, to abide by it equally. It protects against arbitrary rule, which might lead to governing elites using a method that distorts the law.

Defending Fundamental Rights and Liberties: Both international treaties and national constitutions contain fundamental rights that can be successfully upheld by an independent court. It might not successfully defend individual liberties as it wouldn't be afraid to rule against the government or other political leaders in the event that independence were lost.

Functions of Checking and Balancing Government Power: Under the division of powers, the judiciary acts as a check on the other branches of government.

¹ Upendra Baxi, *The Indian Supreme Court and Politics* (Eastern Book Company, 1980), p. 45.

² S.P. Sathe, *Judicial Activism in India: Transgressing Borders and Enforcing Limits* (Oxford University Press, 2002), p. 23.

2. CONCEPT OF JUDICIAL INDEPENDENCE

2.1. DEFINITION AND SIGNIFICANCE IN CONSTITUTIONAL DEMOCRACIES

The ability of the court to make decisions without outside influence, particularly from the government's executive and legislative branches, is known as judicial independence. Judges may only understand and apply the law. Impartially in this way, free from the anticipation of rewards or fear of retaliation.³ It is a foundation of democracies with constitutions, where preserving democratic principles, the rule of law, and fundamental rights is the responsibility of the court.

The significance of judicial independence lies in its ability to prevent the misuse of authority. An independent court can protect constitutional ideals, stop human rights abuses, and restrain the government's capricious acts. The courts legitimacy is undermined and public trust in the legal system may be eroded when political actors exert influence over them. By demonstrating that legal decisions are grounded in adherence to the law instead of political expediency, an independent court fosters public trust. An unbiased judicial review also keeps governments from going beyond their constitutional bounds, which promotes stability in democracies.⁴

Judicial independence is safeguarded by institutional safeguards, legal frameworks, and constitutional guarantees in many democracies. These include limitations on political meddling in judicial decision-making, financial independence of the judiciary, and tenure security for judges. However, the degree of judicial independence differs from nation to nation based on institutional structures, political systems, and legal traditions. While political participation in the selection and oversight of judges is permitted to a certain extent in certain systems, others ensure the judiciary's total independence.⁵

2.2. SEPARATION OF POWERS AND CHECKS AND BALANCES

Judicial independence is closely related to the principle of separation of powers, which divides governmental authority among the legislative, executive, and judicial branches. The division prevents the concentration of power in one region by ensuring that each branch functions within the parameters set forth in the constitution. As one of the three branches of government, the judiciary is in charge of interpreting the law, settling

³ Alexander M. Bickel, *The Least Dangerous Branch: The Supreme Court at the Bar of Politics* (Yale University Press, 1986), p. 78.

⁴ Granville Austin, *Working a Democratic Constitution: A History of the Indian Experience* (Oxford University Press, 1999), p. 134.

⁵ Live Law (Legal News) - www.livelaw.in

disputes, and ensuring that government operations comply with the constitution.⁶ Because each branch establishes a system of checks and balances on the others, there is a separation of powers. Here, the judiciary checks the validity of legislation and government programs to keep an eye out for abuses and excess by the legislative and executive departments. For instance, courts may rule that rules that infringe upon fundamental rights or powers not authorized by the constitution are unconstitutional. Because of this, judicial review ensures that executive actions abide with the law and never violate people's rights.⁷

The judiciary is not totally separate from the other branches, even though it must be independent. Judicial appointments, the impeachment process, and financial appropriations approved by the other arms of government all create relationships. Finding a balance such that interactions between the political and judicial branches do not compromise judicial independence is the challenge. When the legislative or executive branch has excessive power over the judiciary, there is a chance that the courts may become politicised rather than unbiased arbiters of justice.⁸

Judicial independence will be protected and accountability will be encouraged via a functional separation of powers system. Courts that lack judicial independence are more vulnerable to political influence and are therefore less successful in advancing democratic ideals. However, a too isolated court is unaccountable and may lead to judicial overreach or inefficiency. A strong and reliable judicial system must strike a equilibrium between accountability and independence.

3. POLITICAL INFLUENCE IN JUDICIAL APPOINTMENTS

3.1. DEFINITION AND FORMS OF POLITICAL INFLUENCE

Political influence in judicial appointments refers to the involvement of political actors, such as the legislature, the executive branch, or political parties, in the selection of judges. A certain amount of political interference is inevitable in many legal systems, but excessive interference could compromise the judiciary's independence and impartiality. Political influence can take many different forms, ranging from direct control over nominations to indirect influences that shape the behavior of judges. The

⁶ David S. Law & Mila Versteeg, "The Evolution and Ideology of Global Constitutionalism," (2011) *California Law Review*.

⁷ Alec Stone Sweet, "The Politics of Constitutional Review in France and Europe," (2007) *International Journal of Constitutional Law*.

⁸ *International Journal of Constitutional Law*

executive branch has a great deal of power to appoint judges in various countries; in other words, the legislative or political body has the last say. Party affiliations and election campaigns influence judicial appointments and may result in biased selection of judges.⁹

The attempt by governments to select judges based on their political beliefs rather than qualifications is another example of political influence. In this case, judge nominations cease to ensure legal competence and instead serve to forward political goals. Judicial selection can also be influenced by lobbying, media pressure, and informal political talks, which creates an atmosphere where judges feel pressured to conform to political norms. In many respects, these factors undermine public trust in the court since the ultimate decision may be more motivated by political allegiance than by sound legal grounds.¹⁰

3.2. ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF POLITICAL INVOLVEMENT IN JUDICIAL SELECTION

Another justification for political engagement in judicial bench appointments is to increase the democratic credibility of the role.¹¹ Since these judges interpret laws that affect society, the elected people who represent democratic will must make a statement when they appoint them to avoid the judges seeming to be unelected and detached from democracy. An ideological balance within the court may also be fostered via political activity. Political involvement in judge selection can allow the judiciary to reflect the evolving views of the polity under legal systems where courts have a significant influence on public policymaking. Additionally, involving multiple branches of government in the process can serve as a check on any judicial overreach by keeping courts from becoming overly powerful.¹² Political participation can occasionally improve openness by exposing judicial nominees to public scrutiny. Legislative confirmation hearings, for example, given the opportunity to assess a candidate's credentials, legal philosophies, and any prejudices. Extreme or under qualified applicants may not be appointed to the bench thanks to this procedure.

⁹ International Journal of Constitutional Law - academic.oup.com/icon

¹⁰ David Kairys, *The Politics of Law: A Progressive Critique* (Basic Books, 1998).

¹¹ Rosalind Dixon & Tom Ginsburg, *Comparative Constitutional Law* (Edward Elgar Publishing, 2011), p. 45.

¹² David S. Law & Mila Versteeg, "The Evolution and Ideology of Global Constitutionalism," (2011) *California Law Review*, Vol. 99, p. 1163.

3.3. ARGUMENTS AGAINST POLITICAL INVOLVEMENT IN JUDICIAL SELECTION

Critics contend that the rule of law and judicial independence are compromised when politicians meddle in the selection of judges. Judges lose their capacity to make unbiased decisions if they are chosen based on their political affiliation rather than their legal knowledge. This might undermine the role of judiciary as a check and balance on the legislative and executive branches by resulting in politically motivated rulings that support the administration or governing party. Unrestricted political meddling may also deter highly skilled legal professionals from pursuing judicial positions. The ability of the court as an institution may be compromised if competent individuals who want independence are discouraged from applying for judicial office if they believe that judicial appointments are political. Appointments with political motivations are especially unstable because shifting administrations may spur attempts to reshape the judiciary along new political lines.¹³ The public's trust in the courts would be weakened, which is another legitimate worry. People may lose trust in the impartiality and objectivity of court rulings if judges are perceived as political appointments rather than objective arbiters. This might result in a faulty judicial system where decisions made by the courts are viewed as expressions of political will rather than as being founded on justice and the law. Most legal systems have implemented protections including merit-based recruitment processes, independent judicial commissions, and fixed tenure of judges to protect them from political influences in order to mitigate such dangers. Maintaining democratic stability, defending fundamental rights, and making sure that rulings are made in accordance with the law rather than politics all depend on a robust and independent judiciary.¹⁴

4. JUDICIAL SELECTION PROCESSES: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

4.1 UNITED STATES

The selection of judges in the United States is heavily influenced by political considerations, especially at the federal level. Nominees for federal judges, including Supreme Court justices, must be confirmed by the Senate. This procedural framework,

¹³ Cass R. Sunstein, *One Case at a Time: Judicial Minimalism on the Supreme Court* (Harvard University Press, 1999), p. 78

¹⁴ Martin Shapiro, *Courts: A Comparative and Political Analysis* (University of Chicago Press, 1981).

which ensures the involvement of the legislative and executive departments in judicial appointment procedures, reflects the idea of checks and balances. But this also suggests that judicial appointments are usually the subject of political discussion, especially when vacancies come from divided government. Since federal judges are appointed for life, every nomination has long-term consequences, making the nomination process essential to the judiciary's growth.¹⁵

In the US, party affiliation and political views are two of the most contentious aspects of judicial nominations.¹⁶ In an effort to influence legal interpretations for a long time, presidents typically appoint judges who reflect their political and judicial beliefs. For example, liberal presidents like to nominate judges who have a more progressive approach to constitutional interpretation, whereas conservative presidents prefer originality justices who interpret the Constitution in accordance with its original intent. This ideological difference is also evident in the Senate confirmation process, as senators from opposition parties frequently examine nominees based more on their ideologies than their legality. Filibusters, fierce confirmation fights, and, in certain situations, protracted judicial vacancies as a result of party deadlock have all been caused by this partisan impact. One of the primary problems with the American judge selection process is the problem of judicial activism combined with partisanship. Judicial activism is the term used to describe judges who render decisions that are seen to deviate from literal legal interpretation, often influencing public policy in the process. Critics contend that this kind of activity erodes the democratic process by enabling unelected judges to make choices that belong only to elected officials. However, proponents contend that in order to uphold constitutional rights and alter legal interpretations to meet contemporary societal needs, judicial activism is required. Judges are now perceived as politically motivated people, particularly in light of the Supreme Court's rulings on contentious issues like abortion, healthcare.¹⁷ The American judicial selection process is nevertheless an essential part of the country's democratic structure in spite of these problems. Attempts to maintain judicial independence, such as lifetime appointments and constitutional safeguards, are essential to preserving the judiciary's integrity despite the unavailability of politics. The procedure for nomination and confirmation is still up for dispute, though, and

¹⁵ Upendra Baxi, "Judicial Independence and Its Politics," (1985) *Indian Journal of Constitutional Law*.

¹⁶ Sujit Choudhry, "Transitional Constitutionalism in India and South Africa," (1999) *International Journal of Constitutional Law*.

¹⁷ Ministry of Law and Justice (India) - www.legalaffairs.gov.in

maintaining judicial neutrality while balancing political participation is still a difficult and ever- changing problem in American politics.¹⁸

4.2. UNITED KINGDOM

In the United Kingdom, the judicial appointment process is designed to be impartial and merit- based.¹⁹ The UK has an organized, transparent process run by the Judge Appointments Commission (JAC), in contrast to the US, where political considerations often influence judge nominations. In accordance with the Constitutional Reform Act of 2005, the JAC was established in 2006. The JAC is an independent body that has the power to choose applicants for positions in England and Wales' judiciary. The JAC, which operates independently of the government, seeks to nominate people based on their professional abilities rather than their party affiliation. The committee, which is made up of members from the judiciary, non-legal members, and legal members, strikes a balance between legal and non-legal input to stay. The emphasis on merit-based nominations rather than political factors is one of the cornerstones of the UK judicial appointment system. The JAC evaluates applicants based on their judicial independence, professional integrity, and legal proficiency. Since politicians are not allowed to participate directly in the selection process, judges are chosen based on their qualifications rather than their political beliefs or party affiliation. This type of system stands in stark contrast to the U.S. system, where the selection of judges is often heavily influenced by political ideology. The depoliticised version, according to critics, does make the judiciary less answerable to the people.²⁰ The system, however, is mostly viewed as a bulwark against adjudication based on partisan considerations. By giving emphasis to merit instead of politics, the UK ensures the judges work as unbiased arbitrators of justice rather than tools of the government's executive or legislative branches.

The independence of the UK judiciary from legislative and political influence is one of its distinguishing characteristics. Judges in the UK are chosen independently of direct political interference, in contrast to many other countries where government agencies have significant influence on judicial appointments. Judges have safe tenure after nomination, which shields them from being fired arbitrarily by the administration. In

¹⁸ Cass R. Sunstein, *Designing Democracy: What Constitutions Do* (Oxford University Press, 2001).

¹⁹ David S. Law & Mila Versteeg, "The Evolution and Ideology of Global Constitutionalism," (2011) *California Law Review*, Vol. 99, p. 1163.

²⁰ Justice R.S. Pathak, "Judicial Appointments and Political Considerations," (1995) *Supreme Court Cases*, p. 203.

2009, the Supreme Court of the United Kingdom took the role of the House of Lords' Appellate Committee, and it operates completely independently of Parliament. This essential distinction forbids excessive political interference and maintains public trust in the judiciary's impartiality.²¹

Additionally, the Lord Chancellor's office, which once had significant authority over judicial appointments, has largely been reduced to ceremonial status, further limiting political meddling. In general, the UK's judicial appointment procedure is seen to be among the most impartial and open in the world. The United Kingdom guarantees the impartiality, justice, and resilience of the court against political meddling by emphasising meritocracy above political considerations and maintaining a distinct division from executive and legislative authority. This concept stands in stark contrast to systems where the integrity of the courts is threatened by political meddling in judge appointments. However, there are also disagreements over whether or not the process should incorporate more public accountability, especially given the growing role of judges in interpreting constitutional and human rights issues.²²

4.3. INDIA

The primary cause of the controversy surrounding the Indian judicial selection process is the continuous tension between the independence of the judiciary and governmental authority. Initially, the executive branch oversaw the country's judicial appointment procedure.²³ Later, the court took over judicial selections through a series of historic decisions that established the Collegium System. But the system's lack of transparency and confidentiality has drawn criticism. The most notable example of reform attempts is the proposed National Judicial Appointments Commission (NJAC).

a. *Collegium System vs. National Judicial Appointments Commission (NJAC):*

The Indian Collegium System was founded by the Second Judges' Case (1993) and was later clarified by a series of court decisions. Under this arrangement, the panel of judges that selects judges for the Supreme Court and the High Courts is composed of the Chief Justice of India (CJI) and senior justices of the Supreme Court. The

²¹ Robert Dahl, "Decision-Making in a Democracy: The Supreme Court as a National Policy Maker," (1957) *Journal of Public Law*, Vol. 6, p. 279.

²² Martin Shapiro, *Courts: A Comparative and Political Analysis* (University of Chicago Press, 1981).

²³ Tom Ginsburg & Tamir Moustafa, *Rule by Law: The Politics of Courts in Authoritarian Regimes* (Cambridge University Press, 2008).

Collegium's recommendations for judicial appointments are either accepted or sent back for additional review by the administration, which includes the President and the Law Ministry. However, if the Collegium's recommendation is unchangeable, the executive must follow it. By selecting judges according to their legal expertise the method was established to protect the court from political interference based on merits rather than political affiliation.²⁴ In 2014, a constitutional amendment was made to replace the Collegium System with the National Judicial Appointments panel (NJAC). The Chief Justice, two senior judges, the Law Minister, and two eminent non-judiciary figures would make up the panel. The goal of bringing in outsiders was to make the appointment process more transparent and accountable. However, in 2015, the Supreme Court declared the NJAC unlawful, raising fears that government participation in the nomination of judges might undermine judicial independence. This decision maintained the judiciary's power to select its members and reignited debate about the need for changes to increase accountability and transparency in the selection of judges.

b. Supreme Court's Role in Self-Appointment:

The ability to select judges of their own choosing, which is uncommon in other democracies, is one of the unique features of India's judiciary. The Collegium System was created owing to the Supreme Court's unwavering belief that judicial independence necessitates little governmental influence. Critics note that although the procedure avoids unjustified political interference, it creates a closed system in which judges select their successors without consulting anybody else. Concerns about bias, lack of diversity, and lack of objective selection criteria have been highlighted by this self-reinforcing system.

Lack of established criteria to screen applicants frequently results in uneven appointments, with complaints that some selections were made based more on personal taste than qualifications. Furthermore, there is no established system for evaluating judges' performance before they are promoted, which limits public accountability. Although the judiciary argues that the system must be autonomous, many argue that some level of external oversight is necessary to maintain equity and prevent bias.

²⁴ Vikram Raghavan, *Judicial Review in India: A Historical and Comparative Perspective* (Cambridge University Press, 2017).

c. *Debate Over Transparency and Executive Interference:*

The opaqueness of the Collegium System continues to be one of its main criticisms. Unlike other countries where judge nominations are open to public scrutiny, collegium discussions take place behind closed doors, and the reasoning behind selections or rejections is rarely disclosed. This opacity has led to calls for more transparency, with legal experts endorsing the public release of recorded discussions, structured selection processes, and appointment reasons. The Supreme Court has tried to ease these concerns by making Collegium resolutions available online, but critics argue that more substantial reforms are needed.²⁵

The debate over judicial nominees is still influenced by concerns about presidential interference, though. Despite not having direct control over nominations under the Collegium System, the government has been accused of delaying recommendations, particularly for justices of the High Court, in an effort to exert indirect pressure on the judiciary. In addition, disagreements between the government and the court have arisen in politically sensitive circumstances, raising worries that judicial independence would be in danger if the nomination process is not safeguarded.²⁶

In conclusion, India's judicial selection procedure is changing drastically. Although the Collegium System is shielded from overt political meddling, calls for reform have been fueled by the judiciary's lack of accountability and transparency. India needs a more open, well-run, merit-based nomination process that protects judge integrity and public confidence after the NJAC's demise brought to light the difficulties in striking a balance between judicial independence and outside scrutiny.

5 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR AN IDEAL JUDICIAL SELECTION MODEL

To guarantee impartial and capable selections, an efficient judicial selection mechanism must strike a balance between independence, accountability, and openness. This entails implementing optimal practices that preserve public confidence while reducing political meddling.

²⁵ European Journal of International Law

²⁶ Rosalind Dixon & David Landau, "Transnational Constitutionalism and a Limited Doctrine of Unconstitutional Constitutional Amendment," (2015) *International Journal of Constitutional Law*.

- **ENSURING TRANSPARENCY AND MERITOCRACY:**
To promote transparency, selection criteria and reasons for decisions should be made publicly available during judicial selection processes. Merit-based appointments should prioritise integrity and legal expertise. Structured assessments, which involve exams and interviews by unbiased panels, have the advantage of preventing favouritism and ensuring that judges are chosen based on their qualifications.²⁷
- **REDUCING EXECUTIVE AND LEGISLATIVE INFLUENCE:**
Even in cases when some level of political engagement is necessary, executive and legislative influence should be minimised. The executive branch should have little influence on judicial appointments, which should be made by independent panels. Legislative confirmation, if necessary, ought to be determined by qualifications rather than political opinions.²⁸
- **STRENGTHENING JUDICIAL APPOINTMENT COMMISSIONS:**
Independent judicial appointment committees composed of judges, solicitors, and civil society representatives ought to oversee appointments. These commissions must be free from extraneous pressures in order to ensure justice and impartiality in the appointment of judges.²⁹
- **FINDING A BALANCE BETWEEN ACCOUNTABILITY AND INDEPENDENCE:**
To maintain judicial independence, neutral institutions should conduct performance assessments and frequent evaluations of judges. This ensures competence and moral values while maintaining judicial authority.

➤ SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND KEY TAKEAWAYS

Comparing the selection processes employed by judges in various countries reveals the difficult balance between judicial independence and political influence. In nations like the United States, where the Senate approves presidentially nominated judicial nominees, sometimes based on party affiliation, party considerations are a significant impact. A major contributor to the UK's more merit-based system, which ensures that judges are selected based on their credentials rather of their political connection, is the Commission for Judicial Appointments (JAC). The protracted dispute in India between

²⁷ Alec Stone Sweet, "The Politics of Constitutional Review in France and Europe," (2007) *International Journal of Constitutional Law*.

²⁸ Robert Dahl, "Decision-Making in a Democracy: The Supreme Court as a National Policy Maker," (1957) *Journal of Public Law*.

²⁹ S.P. Sathe, "Judicial Activism in India," (2001) *Journal of Democracy*.

the Collegium System and the National Judicial Appointments Commission (NJAC), which ultimately failed, highlights the difficulties in maintaining judicial autonomy while also aiming for greater accountability and openness in the selection process.³⁰ The main takeaway from all three countries is that maintaining the rule of law and the rule of law requires judicial independence, integrity of the legal system. However, this independence needs to be balanced with accountability to preserve the judiciary's representativeness and responsiveness to public expectations. In many systems, like India's Collegium, there are still problems with executive intervention and a lack of transparency, even if merit and independence are prioritized in systems like the UK's JAC. One significant finding from this comparative study is that political considerations continuously jeopardize judicial independence, despite the fact that it is a crucial concept in maintaining the judiciary's legitimacy.³¹ All of the systems under examination have the goal of shielding judges from political interference because a separate judiciary is necessary for the rule of law to exist. However, the primary issue that all models have in common is transparency. Many systems still have limited public access to the selection process, which often leads to public suspicion of the impartiality and fairness of judicial appointments.

³⁰ Tom Ginsburg, "Constitutional Courts in New Democracies," (2003) *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*.

³¹ Upendra Baxi, "Judicial Independence and Its Politics," (1985) *Indian Journal of Constitutional Law*.