

# Judicial Activism and Judicial Restraint

Anand Joshi

Department of Law

Teerthanker Mahaveer University, Moradabad, Uttar Pradesh, India

**Abstract:** *Therefore, the notion of judicial activism is now the absolute antithesis of judicial limitation. The two words used to characterise the ideology and motivation behind a certain judicial decision are judicial activism and judicial restraint. Judicial liberalism applies at most to a philosophy of judgement that takes whatever intent of the law and the changing times into account, while jurisprudence depends on a strict reading of the law and indeed the meaning of the legal precedent. The doctrine of judicial activism and its implementation in India by either the Apex Court are discussed in this report. The value that even the doctrine carries together with how this has been used frequently by the judiciary for the betterment of humanity has been addressed. The article concludes by discussing the need for the courts to really be judicially involved, specifically in a nation such as India, and that is a fusion of so many different cultural backgrounds.*

**Keyword:** *Amalgamation, Judicial Activism, Judicial restraint, Supreme Court.*

## INTRODUCTION

The judiciary is granted a position of extreme distinction in democratic nations. In casting doubt the rules including its Constitution, the court play the main role. The courts serve as the sole translator, defender and guardians of the Constitution's dominance. In the interpretation and regulation of religious freedom enshrined in the basic law of the land, the judiciary must play an important role. And as such, what the method of the judiciary must be in any matter of constitutional implementation needs to be considered.

A few of the Judiciary's duties is to establish strategies by which the laws constitutional can be interpreted by taking an innovative and purposeful approach. The epistemology of the Constitution is a highly innovative judicial activity that must conform to philosophy of the Constitution. When reading constitutional principles in such a way as to continuously institutionalise certain ideals on which capitalism thrives, values such as liberty, equality, and constitutionalism must be kept in mind. Thru the judicial activism, the Indian judiciary has also done away from its conventional approach and has offered a liberal interpretation of constitutional principles. In addition to the constructive role played by the Supreme Court in being judicial review innovative, this article deals with legislating from the bench in India.

## DISCUSSION

*The meaning of Judicial Activism:*

Judicial advocacy is viewed as a theory of justice administration, in which judges cause their personal opinions on public policy to be overlooked by judicial precedent. With a new approach, it is a creative, complex and law-making position of the court that discards dependency on old cases and mechanical, moderate and static views.

Judicial advocacy is a radical judicial thinking that creates the law for positive treatment of society's contemporary problems. It is the process of thinking that has the passion for social transformation and vigour again for development of ideals that will benefit society. Judicial activism is a weapon in the hands including its judges that they have an obligation and use this to alter the direction of cultural norms that suppress and exhibit sheer injustice. When reading constitutional principles in such a form as to continuously institutionalise certain ideals on which capitalism thrives, values such as liberty, equality, and democratic values must be kept in mind.

The five core meanings of "judicial activism" are:<sup>1</sup>

- (1) Invalidation of the arguably constitutional actions of other branches,
- (2) Failure to adhere to precedent,
- (3) Judicial "legislation,"
- (4) Departures from accepted interpretive methodology, and
- (5) result-oriented judging.

### *History*

The essence of the judicial process in India has undergone a transformation that has legitimately widened the reach of due process through judicial legislation. Judges were traditional creators of law. In India, judicial activism has evolved and gained tremendous credibility among the Indian public. According to Mr. Justice A.M.Ahmadi, the former Chief Justice of India, an approach marked by caution and circumspection was adopted during the initial years of the Supreme Court of India. Judicial activism was triggered by the growth of the legislative system and the interference in the legislation.

The result of a time arrival was just not judicial activism in India. It started with filling the holes in the statutory acts and led the judges to use their imagination in areas besides the only solving the missing elements of the laws and proceeded to illustrate their creative approach by non-conservative decisions.

The judges' interpretive research role empowers them to think about the legislature and therefore its intent and allows them to interpret it in the most way that the holes in the legal guidelines and norms can be resolved.

The emergence of Judicial Activism in India began as a descendant of due process from both the mid-seventies when many transformative reforms were brought into in the channel of the judicial system by the judiciary as an activator. The judiciary became an un-elected representative after 1975.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> *The origin and current meanings of "Judicial Activism"* by Keenan D.Kmiec, CLR – 2004

<sup>2</sup> Justice M.Jagannadha Rao: What is the Secret of Judicial Creativity and Innovation?, Judiciary in India Constitutional Perspectives, Edited by Prof.G.Manohar Rao, Dr.G.B.Reddy & V.Geeta Rao (Asia Law House, Hyderabad 1st Edn., 2009)

The emergence of Judicial Activism in India began as a descendant of due process from both the mid-seventies when many transformative reforms were brought into in the channel of the judicial system by the judiciary as an activator. The judiciary became an un-elected representative after 1975. The court were mechanical in both its approach to politics on which it was labelled upon to adjudicate, owing to indigenous strain. More specifically, before the 1975 emergency, the Supreme Court barely demonstrated any revolutionary propensity before the sixties.<sup>3</sup>

#### *Creativity of the Supreme Court:*

The emergence of Judicial Activism in India began as a descendant of due process from both the semi because many transformative reforms were brought into in the channel of the judicial system by the judiciary as an activator. The judiciary became an un-elected voice of the party after 1975. The court has shown sheer elegance in the reading of the law who had led to even a rule of law society in India and strengthened the wellbeing of individuals.

One field that is greatly enhanced by the imaginative and creative reading of the Supreme Court and High Courts is innovation in law through judicial process. Consequently, the innovation of the Supreme Court and of the High Courts in India always will constitute a high standard of judicial creativity. On the contrary, it is also conceivable so there could often be some defects in the phase of imagination and invention, but such errors could be corrected or modified or corrected either in the appeal or in the latter case, and the latter decision will be one more step in the development of the law. Judicial activism is a weapon in the hands including its judges that they all have an obligation and use this to alter the direction of cultural norms that disrupt and exhibit sheer injustice.<sup>4</sup>

In something like a mechanical way, the courts can not clarify the laws and the constitution. They have the responsibility of preserving the constitution with the evolving scenarios and situations and updating it in such a way that it remains suitable for the current situations by interpretation. Justice Benjamin Cardozo said, 'A court must owe "a preservation and expression" to the words of a constitution. In legal doctrine, the rate of required imagination could be much higher than is normally the case for commonplace arbitrators.<sup>5</sup>

The judiciary is continually striving and up with newer methods in order to make constitutional rights relevant to the people. Judges in so-called penumbral cases that have not been specifically protected by current law have an intercellular law-making feature.<sup>6</sup>

Article 21 was described by the Supreme Court as implying not merely animal life, but living with human dignity. In *Menaka Gandhi v. India's Union*. The court broadened the scope of the

<sup>3</sup> Rajeev Dhavan: *The Supreme Court of India - A Socio Legal Critique of its juristic techniques* (Bombay 1977p.421)

<sup>4</sup> Justice M.Jagannadha Rao: *What is the Secret of Judicial Creativity and Innovation?*, Judiciary in

India Constitutional Perspectives, Edited by Prof.G.Manohar Rao, Dr.G.B.Reddy & V.Geeta Rao (Asia Law House, Hyderabad 1st Edn, 2009) p.140

<sup>5</sup> Mauro Cappelletti, *The Judicial Process in Comparative Perspective*, p.29.

<sup>6</sup> H.L.A.Hart, *The Concept of Law*, (Oxford University Press, London, 1961) p.125.

---

constitutional provisions and considered that the provisions of Part III should also be viewed as narrowly as possible in order to extend the scope of fundamental rights but rather to minimise their meaning and substance,<sup>7</sup>

A vast jurisprudence for the reading of statutory protections and several other laws was established by the Supreme Court of India. Over the years, many un-enumerated rights have been denied by the Supreme Court as being implied within the granted by the constitution fundamental rights found in Section III of the Constitution. In order to enforce the human rights of people, the Apex Court broadened the spectrum of legal amendments and tried to bring Indian law into line with the international trends in human particular law. Around the same time, process developments were adopted with a view to implementing themselves more available to marginalised parts of society, giving rise to all the problem of public interest litigation. Beyond being a mere legal entity, the tribunal has moved; its decisions have immense social, cultural and military implications.<sup>8</sup>

### CONCLUSION

In a country like India, and it's a combination of so many religions and cultures or inhabits this very large number of people, when it has it within hands, the judiciary cannot shut its eyes to injustice, the wisdom to mould the laws in such a fashion where it can to a huge degree benefit the community. For example, climate change is one of the biggest issues facing the whole world not only the country. The Supreme Court was conscious of this situation and has developed rules for combating the same as the principle of polluter payments and indeed the precautionary principle. The court needs not only to be conscious of the conditions, but also to act to just the best of its ability to combat them by drawing principles from current laws that write the laws more efficient.

---

<sup>7</sup> AIR 1978 SC 597

<sup>8</sup> Justice A.M.Ahmadi, *Judicial Process: Social Legitimacy and Institutional Viability*, (1996) 4 SCC (J) P.5