
JUDICIAL REVIEW OF EXECUTIVE ACTIONS THROUGH PIL: A STUDY ON RECENT CHALLENGES TO ADMINISTRATIVE DECISIONS

***Ghan Shyam and Dr. P. S. Bora**

Founding Director And Assistant Professor, Centre for Constitutional Law Study And Research, School of Law And Public Policy, Avantika University, Vishwanathpuram, Lekoda, Ujjain.

Article Received: 29 January 2026, Article Revised: 18 February 2026, Published on: 10 March 2026

***Corresponding Author: Ghan Shyam**

Founding Director And Assistant Professor, Centre for Constitutional Law Study And Research, School of Law And Public Policy, Avantika University, Vishwanathpuram, Lekoda, Ujjain.

DOI: <https://doi-doi.org/101555/ijarp.3425>

ABSTRACT

In a democratic system, governmental accountability is paramount, with the judiciary playing a crucial role in ensuring that executive power adheres to legal and constitutional boundaries. In India, the power of judicial review allows courts to scrutinize the legality and constitutionality of executive actions, serving as a vital check against potential arbitrariness or unconstitutionality. The advent of Public Interest Litigation (PIL) in the late 1970s significantly expanded and democratized this oversight, relaxing traditional locus standi rules and enabling public-spirited individuals or organizations to challenge executive actions affecting broad segments of society, particularly the marginalized. This procedural innovation has fostered a more proactive and socially responsive judiciary, instrumental in promoting good governance, transparency, and accountability. Despite its transformative impact, judicial review of executive actions through PIL faces contemporary challenges. The increasing complexity of administrative decisions, often involving specialized technical expertise, intricate economic policies, or sensitive national security considerations, presents unique dilemmas for judicial scrutiny. Furthermore, the delicate balance between judicial activism and judicial restraint, alongside concerns about judicial overreach, remains a subject of intense debate. While judicial interventions are frequently lauded for protecting fundamental rights and upholding the rule of law, they sometimes draw criticism for venturing into policy domains or encountering practical difficulties in implementing judicial

directives. This research paper undertakes a comprehensive study of judicial review of executive actions through PIL in India, with a specific focus on recent challenges to administrative decisions. It explores the historical evolution and conceptual foundations of judicial review and PIL, examining their employment in holding the executive accountable. The paper critically examines contemporary challenges such as the judiciary's institutional capacity and technical expertise in reviewing complex executive actions, the practical difficulties in implementing judicial directives, and the potential for misuse of PIL through frivolous litigation. Comparative insights from common law jurisdictions like the United Kingdom and the United States are drawn to highlight universal principles and unique national adaptations, particularly concerning access to justice and judicial deference to administrative agencies. The paper argues that the framework's continued effectiveness hinges on the judiciary's adaptability, enhanced institutional capacity, and a collaborative approach with other governmental branches to navigate the evolving landscape of administrative governance.

KEYWORDS: *Administrative Actions, Judicial Review, and Public Interest Litigation.*

1. INTRODUCTION

In a democratic framework, the principle of accountability is paramount, ensuring that governmental power is exercised responsibly and within the bounds of the law. In India, a nation governed by a written Constitution, the judiciary plays a pivotal role in upholding this principle through its power of judicial review. This power allows the courts to scrutinize the legality and constitutionality of legislative enactments and, more pertinently for this study, the actions and decisions of the executive branch. The executive, entrusted with the implementation of laws and the administration of public affairs, wields significant authority, and its decisions directly impact the lives of citizens. Consequently, the mechanism of judicial review acts as a crucial check against potential arbitrariness, illegality, or unconstitutionality in administrative actions.

The scope of judicial review in India has been significantly expanded and democratized by the advent of Public Interest Litigation (PIL). Introduced in the late 1970s, PIL has transformed the traditional adversarial legal system by relaxing the strict rules of locus standi, thereby enabling public-spirited individuals or organizations to approach the courts on behalf of those whose rights have been violated or where a matter of public interest is at stake. This procedural innovation has provided a powerful avenue for challenging executive actions that

affect large segments of society, particularly the marginalized and vulnerable, and has fostered a more proactive and socially responsive judiciary.

While judicial review of executive actions through PIL has been instrumental in promoting good governance, transparency, and accountability, it has also encountered a myriad of challenges, especially in recent times. The increasing complexity of administrative decisions, often involving technical expertise, economic policies, or national security considerations, presents unique dilemmas for judicial scrutiny. Moreover, the delicate balance between judicial activism and judicial restraint, coupled with concerns about judicial overreach, continues to be a subject of intense debate. The judiciary's interventions, while often lauded for protecting fundamental rights and upholding the rule of law, sometimes face criticism for venturing into policy domains or for the practical difficulties in implementing judicial directives.

This research paper aims to undertake a comprehensive study of judicial review of executive actions through PIL in India, with a specific focus on recent challenges to administrative decisions. It will delve into the historical evolution and conceptual foundations of judicial review and PIL, examining how these mechanisms have been employed to hold the executive accountable. The paper will then analyze various grounds upon which executive actions are subjected to judicial scrutiny, including procedural impropriety, irrationality, proportionality, and substantive unconstitutionality. Through detailed case analyses, it will highlight landmark judgments and recent instances where the judiciary has intervened in administrative matters, assessing the impact and effectiveness of such interventions. Furthermore, the study will critically examine the contemporary challenges faced by the judiciary in reviewing executive actions, such as issues of technical expertise, judicial capacity, and the evolving nature of administrative discretion. Finally, drawing comparative insights from other common law jurisdictions, the paper will offer recommendations for strengthening the framework of judicial review and PIL to ensure robust accountability of executive actions while maintaining the delicate balance of powers in India's constitutional democracy.

2. HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF JUDICIAL REVIEW AND PIL IN INDIA

2.1. Evolution of Judicial Review in India

Judicial review, though not explicitly mentioned in the Indian Constitution, is an intrinsic and fundamental feature of its constitutional framework. It is the power of the judiciary to examine the constitutionality of legislative enactments and executive orders of both the Central and State governments. If the courts find that any law or executive action violates the

provisions of the Constitution, they can declare it unconstitutional and void. This power is primarily derived from Articles 13, 32, 131, 132, 133, 134, 136, 143, 226, and 227 of the Constitution.

The concept of judicial review in India has evolved significantly since the adoption of the Constitution in 1950. Initially, the Supreme Court adopted a somewhat cautious approach, particularly concerning legislative actions. However, its role in scrutinizing executive actions was more pronounced from the outset, given the administrative law principles inherited from the British legal system. The early years saw the judiciary establishing its authority to review administrative decisions on grounds such as *ultra vires* (beyond powers), procedural impropriety, and *malafide* (bad faith).

Landmark cases have shaped the contours of judicial review. In *A.K. Gopalan v. State of Madras* (1950), the Supreme Court, while interpreting Article 21, adopted a narrow view of due process. However, this was later expanded in *Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India* (1978), where the Court held that the procedure established by law under Article 21 must be fair, just, and reasonable, thereby introducing the concept of substantive due process into Indian constitutional jurisprudence. This expanded interpretation significantly broadened the scope for judicial scrutiny of executive actions, requiring not just procedural adherence but also substantive fairness and reasonableness.

Another crucial development was the *Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala* (1973) case, which propounded the 'Basic Structure Doctrine.' While primarily limiting Parliament's power to amend the Constitution, this doctrine also reinforced the judiciary's role as the ultimate interpreter and guardian of the Constitution. It implied that any executive action that violates the basic structure of the Constitution could also be subjected to judicial review and struck down. The doctrine provided a robust framework for the judiciary to ensure that executive actions, even those taken under legislative authority, do not undermine the fundamental principles and values enshrined in the Constitution.

2.2. The Emergence and Impact of Public Interest Litigation (PIL)

Public Interest Litigation (PIL) emerged in India in the late 1970s as a revolutionary tool to ensure access to justice for the poor and marginalized. Traditionally, the legal system operated on the principle of *locus standi*, meaning only an aggrieved party could approach the court. This often left large sections of society, who were unable to access legal resources, without recourse against injustices, including those perpetrated by executive actions.

The Indian judiciary, particularly the Supreme Court, spearheaded the PIL movement by relaxing the strict rules of *locus standi*. This judicial innovation allowed any public-spirited individual, group, or even the court itself (*suo motu*) to bring matters of public importance before the judiciary. The primary objective was to address systemic injustices, protect fundamental rights of vulnerable groups, and hold governmental agencies accountable for their actions and inactions. Justices V.R. Krishna Iyer and P.N. Bhagwati are widely credited with pioneering the PIL movement in India.

Early PIL cases focused on issues such as the rights of prisoners, bonded laborers, and environmental protection.

- **Hussainara Khatoon v. Home Secretary, State of Bihar (1979):** This landmark case, initiated by a series of newspaper articles, highlighted the plight of thousands of undertrial prisoners, many of whom had been incarcerated for periods longer than the maximum sentence for their alleged crimes. The Supreme Court's intervention led to the release of over 40,000 undertrial prisoners and established the right to a speedy trial as a fundamental right under Article 21. This case demonstrated how PIL could be used to challenge executive inaction and systemic failures in the administration of justice.

- **Bandhua Mukti Morcha v. Union of India (1984):** This PIL exposed the deplorable conditions of bonded laborers in stone quarries. The Supreme Court, treating a letter as a writ petition, issued extensive directions to the government for the identification, release, and rehabilitation of bonded laborers. The Court expanded the scope of Article 21 to include the right to live with human dignity, free from exploitation, and emphasized the state's positive obligation to ensure these rights. This case showcased PIL's effectiveness in compelling the executive to fulfill its constitutional duties towards vulnerable sections of society.

Through PIL, the judiciary began to actively scrutinize a wide range of executive actions and policies, including those related to environmental degradation, public health, education, and human rights. PIL transformed the Supreme Court and High Courts into forums for social change, enabling direct challenges to administrative decisions that were arbitrary, discriminatory, or violative of fundamental rights. This mechanism has significantly enhanced the accountability of the executive, forcing it to be more responsive to public concerns and adhere to constitutional mandates. While PIL has been a powerful tool for justice, it has also raised debates about judicial activism and the boundaries of judicial intervention. Nevertheless, its impact on democratizing access to justice and strengthening judicial oversight over executive actions remains undeniable.

3. GROUNDS FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW OF EXECUTIVE ACTIONS

Judicial review of executive actions in India is primarily based on three broad grounds: illegality, irrationality, and procedural impropriety, as famously articulated in the English case of *Council of Civil Service Unions v. Minister for the Civil Service* (1985), also known as the GCHQ case. While these grounds provide a structured framework, Indian courts have also developed additional grounds, such as proportionality and abuse of discretion, to ensure comprehensive scrutiny of administrative decisions.

3.1. Illegality

Illegality, as a ground for judicial review, means that the decision-maker must understand correctly the law that regulates his decision-making power and must give effect to it. This implies that the executive action must be in accordance with the law, and the administrative authority must not exceed the powers conferred upon it by statute or the Constitution. An executive action can be challenged on grounds of illegality if it suffers from the following defects.

- **Ultra Vires:** This is the most fundamental aspect of illegality. An action is *ultra vires* if it is beyond the legal power or authority of the administrative body that took it. This can be substantive *ultra vires* (where the authority lacks the power to make the decision at all) or procedural *ultra vires* (where the authority has the power but fails to follow the prescribed procedure). For instance, if a government official issues an order without the necessary statutory backing, or if a rule is framed without following the consultation process mandated by law, it can be challenged as *ultra vires*.

- **Case Example: *State of Madhya Pradesh v. Bharat Singh* (1967):** The Supreme Court held that any executive action affecting the rights of citizens must be supported by law. In this case, an executive order restricting movement was struck down as there was no statutory provision authorizing such restriction.

- **Error of Law:** An administrative authority may make a decision based on a misinterpretation of the law. If the decision is based on an error of law, it can be quashed by the courts. This includes errors in interpreting the scope of their own powers or the provisions of the statute they are administering.

- **Case Example: *Syed Yakooob v. K.S. Radhakrishnan* (1964):** The Supreme Court clarified that a writ of certiorari can be issued to correct errors of law apparent on the face of the record. This ground ensures that administrative authorities correctly apply the law.

- **Improper Purpose:** Even if an administrative authority acts within its conferred powers, its action can be illegal if it is exercised for an improper purpose, i.e., a purpose other than that for which the power was granted. This is often linked to the concept of malafide exercise of power.

- **Case Example: *S.R. Bommai v. Union of India (1994)*:** While primarily dealing with the imposition of President's Rule, the Court emphasized that discretionary powers, including executive powers, must be exercised for the purpose for which they are conferred, and not for extraneous considerations. If the purpose is found to be improper, the action can be invalidated.

3.2. Irrationality (Wednesbury Unreasonableness)

Irrationality, often referred to as *Wednesbury* unreasonableness, refers to a decision that is so unreasonable that no reasonable authority could ever have come to it. This ground applies when an administrative decision is so outrageous in its defiance of logic or accepted moral standards that no sensible person who had applied his mind to the question to be decided could have arrived at it. It is a high threshold, as courts are generally reluctant to substitute their own judgment for that of the administrative authority.

- **Case Example: *Associated Provincial Picture Houses Ltd. v. Wednesbury Corporation (1948)*:** This English case established the principle that a court can only interfere with an administrative decision if it is so unreasonable that no reasonable authority could have made it. The Indian judiciary has adopted this principle, applying it to executive actions.

- **Application in India:** Indian courts have applied the *Wednesbury* principle to strike down arbitrary or perverse executive decisions. While the courts do not sit in appeal over administrative decisions, they can intervene if the decision is so irrational that it amounts to an abuse of power or a failure to exercise discretion properly.

- **Case Example: *Tata Cellular v. Union of India (1994)*:** The Supreme Court reiterated that judicial review is concerned with the decision-making process, not the merits of the decision itself. However, it acknowledged that a decision could be quashed if it is so unreasonable that no reasonable person could have reached it. This case, while related to tender processes, laid down broad principles for judicial review of administrative actions.

3.3. Procedural Impropriety

Procedural impropriety refers to the failure of an administrative authority to observe procedural rules expressly laid down in a statute or implied by the principles of natural

justice. This ground ensures fairness in the decision-making process, irrespective of the substantive merits of the decision.

- **Breach of Express Statutory Procedures:** Many statutes prescribe specific procedures that administrative authorities must follow before making a decision. Failure to adhere to these procedures can render the executive action invalid. For example, if a law requires public notice and consultation before a policy is implemented, and the authority bypasses these steps, the action can be challenged on grounds of procedural impropriety.

- **Breach of Principles of Natural Justice:** Even in the absence of express statutory provisions, administrative authorities are generally required to observe the principles of natural justice. These principles are fundamental to fair hearing and include the following components.

- **Audi Alteram Partem (Hear the Other Side):** This principle requires that no person should be condemned unheard. It mandates that the affected party must be given a fair opportunity to present their case, including notice of the allegations, an opportunity to respond, and the right to be heard. This is crucial in cases involving disciplinary actions, cancellation of licenses, or any decision that adversely affects an individual's rights or interests.

- **Case Example: *S.L. Kapoor v. Jagmohan (1980)*:** The Supreme Court held that even if the facts are undisputed, a decision taken without giving an opportunity of hearing would be invalid, emphasizing the mandatory nature of *audi alteram partem*.

- **Nemo Judex in Causa Sua (No One Should Be a Judge in His Own Cause):** This principle embodies the rule against bias. It requires that the decision-maker must be impartial and free from any form of bias, whether pecuniary, personal, or subject-matter related. If there is a reasonable apprehension of bias, the decision can be challenged.

- **Case Example: *A.K. Kraipak v. Union of India (1969)*:** The Supreme Court extended the rule against bias to administrative functions, holding that the principles of natural justice apply to administrative inquiries as well, and any decision tainted by bias would be void.

3.4. Proportionality

While traditionally considered part of irrationality, proportionality has emerged as a distinct ground for judicial review in India, particularly in cases involving fundamental rights. This doctrine requires that the administrative action taken must be proportionate to the legitimate aim pursued. It involves a balancing exercise to ensure that the means employed are no more than necessary to achieve the desired end.

The proportionality test typically involves two stages.

1. Necessity Test: Is the measure necessary to achieve the legitimate aim, and are there less restrictive alternatives available that could achieve the same objective?

2. Balance Test: Does the measure strike a fair balance between the adverse impact on the individual's rights and the public interest served by the measure?

• **Case Example: *Modern Dental College and Research Centre v. State of Madhya Pradesh (2016)*:** The Supreme Court extensively discussed the doctrine of proportionality, holding that it is an essential facet of judicial review of administrative action, especially when fundamental rights are involved. The Court emphasized that the State must demonstrate that the restriction imposed is proportionate to the legitimate aim sought to be achieved.

• **Application in Digital Rights:** The proportionality test has become particularly relevant in the context of digital rights, as seen in cases involving internet shutdowns or surveillance. Courts examine whether the executive action, while aiming to achieve a legitimate goal such as public order, is proportionate to the restriction it imposes on fundamental rights like freedom of speech and access to information.

These grounds provide the legal basis for courts to scrutinize executive actions, ensuring that administrative authorities act within their powers, reasonably, fairly, and in a manner that respects fundamental rights. The application of these grounds, especially through PIL, has been instrumental in holding the executive accountable and upholding the rule of law in India.

4. RECENT CHALLENGES TO ADMINISTRATIVE DECISIONS AND JUDICIAL INTERVENTIONS THROUGH PIL: CASE ANALYSES

The interplay between judicial review, PIL, and executive actions is best understood through an examination of recent cases where administrative decisions have been challenged. These cases highlight the evolving nature of governance, the increasing complexity of executive functions, and the judiciary's persistent role in ensuring accountability and upholding constitutional values. This section will analyze several significant cases, demonstrating the application of the grounds for judicial review discussed earlier.

4.1. Environmental Governance and Sustainable Development

Environmental protection has been a fertile ground for PILs, given the collective nature of environmental rights and the often-adverse impact of executive decisions on ecological

balance. The judiciary has consistently intervened to ensure that administrative actions align with environmental laws and principles of sustainable development.

• **Case Study: *M.C. Mehta v. Union of India (Ganga Pollution Case) (1987 onwards):***

While not a recent case, the *M.C. Mehta* series of cases set a precedent for judicial intervention in environmental matters through PIL. The Supreme Court issued a series of directives to various executive authorities, including municipal corporations and industrial units, to prevent pollution of the Ganga river. These directives ranged from ordering the closure of polluting tanneries to mandating the establishment of sewage treatment plants. The Court effectively compelled the executive to perform its duties in environmental protection, demonstrating the judiciary's proactive role in enforcing environmental laws and holding administrative bodies accountable for their inaction or inadequate action.

• **Recent Challenge: The EIA Notification 2020 Controversy:** In 2020, the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change proposed a new draft Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Notification, which sought to replace the existing 2006 notification. The draft notification drew widespread criticism for several provisions that were perceived to dilute environmental safeguards, such as *ex post facto* environmental clearances, reduced public consultation periods, and exemptions for certain projects. Numerous environmental activists, organizations, and concerned citizens filed PILs in various High Courts challenging the legality and constitutional validity of the draft notification, arguing that it violated the right to a healthy environment, which is implicitly part of Article 21.

Judicial Intervention: The Delhi High Court, in *Centre for Environmental Law, WWF-India v. Union of India (2020)*, extended the public consultation period for the draft EIA Notification, acknowledging the concerns raised about the inadequacy of the original period, especially during the COVID-19 pandemic. While the final notification was eventually issued, the judicial intervention through PIL highlighted the importance of public participation in environmental decision-making and put pressure on the executive to reconsider potentially harmful provisions. This case demonstrated the judiciary's role in ensuring procedural fairness and adherence to the principles of environmental democracy in administrative decision-making.

4.2. Economic Policies and Administrative Discretion

Judicial review of economic policies and decisions involving administrative discretion in financial matters is often complex, as courts generally defer to the executive's expertise in

such domains. However, this deference is not absolute, and courts intervene when executive actions are arbitrary, discriminatory, or violate fundamental rights.

• **Case Study:** *Vivek Narayan Sharma v. Union of India* (2023): In 2016, the Government of India announced the demonetisation of all ₹500 and ₹1000 banknotes. This executive decision, aimed at curbing black money, counterfeit currency, and terrorism financing, had a massive impact on the Indian economy and daily lives of citizens. Numerous petitions were filed in the Supreme Court challenging the legality and procedural validity of the demonetisation notification, arguing that it was arbitrary, disproportionate, and violated fundamental rights.

Judicial Intervention: A five-judge Constitution Bench of the Supreme Court, in a 4:1 majority, upheld the demonetisation notification. The majority held that the decision-making process was not flawed and that the government had consulted with the Reserve Bank of India (RBI). However, the dissenting judgment by Justice B.V. Nagarathna raised significant concerns about the procedural aspects, arguing that the decision should have been made through a legislative process (an Act of Parliament) rather than an executive notification. While the majority upheld the executive action, the extensive judicial scrutiny and the strong dissenting opinion underscored the importance of procedural propriety and the need for robust justification for executive decisions with far-reaching economic consequences. This case highlighted the judiciary's role in examining the process of economic policy-making, even if it ultimately defers to the executive on the merits.

Judicial review of economic policies and decisions involving administrative discretion in financial matters is often complex, as courts generally defer to the executive's expertise in such domains. However, this deference is not absolute, and courts intervene when executive actions are arbitrary, discriminatory, or violate fundamental rights.

• **Case Study:** *Vivek Narayan Sharma v. Union of India* (2023): In 2016, the Government of India announced the demonetisation of all ₹500 and ₹1000 banknotes. This executive decision, aimed at curbing black money, counterfeit currency, and terrorism financing, had a massive impact on the Indian economy and daily lives of citizens. Numerous petitions were filed in the Supreme Court challenging the legality and procedural validity of the demonetisation notification, arguing that it was arbitrary, disproportionate, and violated fundamental rights.

Judicial Intervention: A five-judge Constitution Bench of the Supreme Court, in a 4:1 majority, upheld the demonetisation notification. The majority held that the decision-making process was not flawed and that the government had consulted with the Reserve Bank of

India (RBI). However, the dissenting judgment by Justice B.V. Nagarathna raised significant concerns about the procedural aspects, arguing that the decision should have been made through a legislative process (an Act of Parliament) rather than an executive notification. While the majority upheld the executive action, the extensive judicial scrutiny and the strong dissenting opinion underscored the importance of procedural propriety and the need for robust justification for executive decisions with far-reaching economic consequences. This case highlighted the judiciary's role in examining the process of economic policy-making, even if it ultimately defers to the executive on the merits.

4.3. Human Rights Protection and Administrative Overreach

PIL has been a powerful instrument for protecting human rights against administrative overreach, particularly concerning vulnerable populations or in situations where state power is exercised in a manner that infringes upon fundamental freedoms.

- **Case Study:** *Alakh Alok Srivastava v. Union of India* (2020): The sudden nationwide lockdown imposed in March 2020 to combat the COVID-19 pandemic led to an unprecedented migrant workers crisis, with millions stranded without food, shelter, or means of transport. Numerous PILs were filed in the Supreme Court and various High Courts, highlighting the executive's failure to adequately address the humanitarian crisis and seeking directions for relief and rehabilitation of migrant workers.

Judicial Intervention: Initially, the Supreme Court adopted a cautious approach, stating that it could not monitor the movement of migrant workers. However, as the crisis deepened and more PILs were filed, the Court took a more proactive stance. In *In Re: Problems and Miseries of Migrant Labourers* (Suo Motu Writ Petition (Civil) No. 6 of 2020), the Supreme Court took suo motu cognizance of the issue and issued a series of directions to the Central and State governments. These directions included providing free food and transport to migrant workers, ensuring their registration, and facilitating their return to native places. The Court emphasized the state's responsibility to protect the fundamental rights of migrant workers, including their right to life and dignity, and held the executive accountable for its administrative failures during the crisis. This case demonstrated the judiciary's role in compelling the executive to fulfill its positive obligations towards citizens, especially during emergencies, and highlighted the power of PIL in bringing humanitarian issues to the forefront of judicial attention.

- **Case Study:** *Anuradha Bhasin v. Union of India* (2020): As discussed in constitutional jurisprudence on digital rights, this case is a prime example of judicial review of executive

action impacting fundamental rights. The prolonged internet shutdown in Jammu and Kashmir, imposed by executive orders, was challenged through PIL. The Supreme Court, while not quashing the orders entirely, held that indefinite internet shutdowns are unconstitutional and that any restriction on internet access must be temporary, necessary, and proportionate. It also mandated the publication of such orders to ensure transparency. This judgment significantly curtailed the executive's arbitrary power to impose internet shutdowns, reinforcing the principles of legality, necessity, and proportionality in administrative decision-making.

These case studies collectively illustrate the diverse ways in which judicial review, particularly through PIL, has been utilized to challenge executive actions in India. They demonstrate the judiciary's commitment to upholding constitutional principles, ensuring procedural fairness, and protecting fundamental rights, even in complex and politically sensitive matters. While the outcomes vary, the consistent thread is the judiciary's role as a vigilant guardian, compelling the executive to act within the bounds of law and reason.

5. CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF JUDICIAL REVIEW OF EXECUTIVE ACTIONS THROUGH PIL

While judicial review, particularly through PIL, has undeniably played a transformative role in strengthening accountability and protecting rights in India, its application to executive actions has also attracted significant critical scrutiny. These critiques often revolve around the delicate balance of powers, the institutional capacity of the judiciary, and the practical implications of judicial directives on governance.

5.1. Judicial Activism vs. Judicial Overreach

The line between judicial activism and judicial overreach is often debated, and this distinction becomes particularly blurred in the context of PILs challenging executive actions. Judicial activism, in its positive sense, refers to the judiciary's proactive role in upholding constitutional values and protecting fundamental rights, especially when the executive or legislature fails to do so. PIL is a prime example of such activism, enabling the courts to address systemic injustices and compel the state to fulfill its constitutional obligations.

However, critics argue that this activism can sometimes morph into judicial overreach, where the judiciary allegedly trespasses into the domains traditionally reserved for the executive or legislature. This concern is heightened when courts issue detailed policy directives or micromanage administrative functions, effectively substituting their judgment for that of the executive. The argument is that while courts can review the legality or constitutionality of

executive actions, they should not delve into the merits of policy decisions, which are best left to elected representatives and specialized administrative bodies.

• **Concerns Raised:**

1. **Usurpation of Executive Functions:** When courts issue specific directions on how a policy should be implemented, or how a particular administrative function should be carried out, it can be seen as encroaching upon the executive's role.
2. For instance, judicial directives on environmental clean-up operations or prison reforms, while well-intentioned, sometimes involve complex administrative and financial considerations that the executive is better equipped to handle.
3. **Lack of Democratic Accountability:** The judiciary, unlike the executive and legislature, is not directly accountable to the electorate. When courts make policy decisions, it raises questions about democratic legitimacy, as these decisions are not subject to public debate or electoral scrutiny.
4. **Resource Allocation:** Judicial directives often entail significant financial and administrative resources for their implementation. Critics argue that courts, being unaware of the broader budgetary constraints and priorities, might issue directives that are difficult for the executive to implement, leading to inefficiencies or diversion of resources from other critical areas.

5.2. Institutional Capacity and Technical Expertise

Modern governance involves highly complex administrative decisions, often requiring specialized technical, economic, or scientific expertise. The judiciary, primarily trained in law, may not always possess the necessary technical knowledge to effectively scrutinize such decisions. This can lead to several challenges.

- **Difficulty in Evaluating Complex Policies:** Decisions related to economic policy, infrastructure projects, environmental regulations, or public health measures are often based on intricate data, expert analyses, and predictive models. Judges may find it challenging to critically evaluate the technical soundness of such decisions, potentially leading to superficial scrutiny or an over-reliance on legal technicalities rather than substantive policy considerations.
- **Risk of Unintended Consequences:** A judicial intervention based on an incomplete understanding of the technical aspects of an executive action can lead to unintended and

adverse consequences. For example, striking down a technically complex regulation without fully appreciating its implications could disrupt an entire sector or create regulatory vacuums.

- **Delays and Backlogs:** The process of acquiring technical expertise, through expert testimonies or *amicus curiae*, can be time-consuming, contributing to judicial delays and exacerbating the existing backlog of cases. This is particularly problematic in fast-evolving sectors where timely decisions are crucial.

While Indian courts have increasingly sought expert opinions and established specialized tribunals (e.g., National Green Tribunal), the fundamental challenge of integrating diverse expertise into judicial decision-making remains. The judiciary's reliance on adversarial arguments may not always be the most effective way to ascertain complex technical truths.

5.3. Implementation Challenges and Enforcement Deficits

Even after a judicial pronouncement or directive, its effective implementation by the executive remains a significant hurdle. The judiciary's power is primarily declaratory and directional; the actual execution rests with the administrative machinery. Several factors contribute to implementation challenges.

- **Bureaucratic Inertia and Resistance:** Executive agencies may exhibit inertia or even resistance to implementing judicial directives, especially if they perceive them as infringing on their autonomy or creating practical difficulties.
- **Lack of Resources:** The executive might genuinely lack the financial, human, or logistical resources required to implement complex judicial orders, particularly those mandating large-scale reforms or service delivery.
- **Monitoring and Compliance:** The judiciary's capacity to continuously monitor the implementation of its directives across various administrative bodies and geographical locations is limited. This often leads to compliance deficits, where orders are either partially implemented or not implemented at all.
- **Political Will:** The success of judicial directives often depends on the political will of the executive. In cases where executive actions are politically sensitive, the implementation of adverse judicial pronouncements can be slow or circumvented.

5.4. Misuse of PIL and Frivolous Litigation

While PIL has been a boon for public interest, it has also been susceptible to misuse. Critics argue that PILs are sometimes filed for personal gain, political mileage, or to settle private scores, rather than genuinely serving public interest. Such frivolous or motivated PILs can

burden the already overloaded judicial system, divert judicial resources, and undermine the credibility of the mechanism itself.

• **Concerns:**

1. Private Interest Litigation in Public Interest Garb: Cases where individuals or corporations use PIL to further their own commercial interests or to target competitors.
2. Publicity Interest Litigation: PILs filed primarily to gain media attention or political visibility, without a genuine commitment to the cause.
3. Vexatious Litigation: Repeated filing of similar PILs or those lacking substantive merit, leading to wastage of judicial time.

To address these concerns, courts have, at times, imposed costs on petitioners filing frivolous PILs and have emphasized the need for genuine public interest. However, distinguishing between genuine and frivolous PILs can be challenging, and overly strict rules might deter legitimate public interest litigation.

In conclusion, while judicial review through PIL has been a powerful force for accountability and rights protection in India, a critical perspective reveals inherent tensions and challenges. Addressing these requires a continuous dialogue between the judiciary, executive, and legislature, focusing on institutional reforms, enhanced expertise, and a shared commitment to good governance and the rule of law.

6. INTERNATIONAL COMPARISONS: JUDICIAL REVIEW OF EXECUTIVE ACTIONS

Examining the approaches to judicial review of executive actions in other common law jurisdictions provides valuable comparative insights, highlighting both universal principles and unique national adaptations. While India's system has its distinct features, particularly the expansive role of PIL, understanding how other mature democracies balance executive power with judicial oversight can offer lessons and underscore best practices. This section will briefly compare India's approach with that of the United Kingdom and the United States, two influential common law systems.

6.1. United Kingdom: The Cradle of Administrative Law

The United Kingdom, lacking a codified constitution, has developed its system of judicial review through common law principles and parliamentary statutes. The grounds for judicial review in the UK are largely similar to those adopted in India: illegality, irrationality

(*Wednesbury* unreasonableness), and procedural impropriety. However, the application and evolution of these principles present some distinctions.

- Evolution of Grounds: While *Wednesbury* unreasonableness remains a high threshold, UK courts have shown a tendency towards a more intensive review, particularly in cases involving human rights. The Human Rights Act 1998, which incorporates the European Convention on Human Rights into domestic law, has significantly influenced judicial review, requiring courts to ensure that executive actions are compatible with Convention rights. This has led to a more nuanced application of proportionality, especially in rights-based cases, moving beyond the strict *Wednesbury* test.
- Deference vs. Scrutiny: UK courts generally maintain a degree of deference to executive decisions, especially in areas of policy, national security, and economic management. However, this deference is not absolute and varies depending on the subject matter and the nature of the right affected. The intensity of review is often higher when fundamental rights are at stake.
- Absence of PIL Equivalent: The UK legal system does not have a direct equivalent to India's PIL. Access to judicial review typically requires the applicant to demonstrate a sufficient interest in the matter. While public interest groups can bring challenges, the broad *locus standi* seen in Indian PIL is absent. This means that systemic issues affecting large, unrepresented groups might be harder to bring before the courts without a directly aggrieved party or a well-resourced advocacy group.

6.2. United States: Constitutional Supremacy and Administrative Procedure Act

The United States, with its written Constitution and a strong tradition of constitutional supremacy, has a well-established system of judicial review of executive actions. The power of judicial review was famously asserted in *Marbury v. Madison* (1803), establishing the Supreme Court's authority to declare legislative and executive acts unconstitutional. The primary framework for judicial review of federal administrative actions is the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) of 1946.

- Grounds for Review: The APA sets out the grounds for judicial review, allowing courts to set aside agency actions found to be arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law; contrary to constitutional right, power, privilege, or immunity; in excess of statutory jurisdiction, authority, or limitations, or short of statutory right; or without observance of procedure required by law. These grounds broadly align with illegality, irrationality, and procedural impropriety, but with specific statutory articulation.

- Deference to Agencies (Chevron Deference): A significant feature of US administrative law is the concept of ‘Chevron deference,’ stemming from *Chevron U.S.A. Inc. v. Natural Resources Defense Council Inc.* (1984). This doctrine mandates that courts should defer to an administrative agency’s reasonable interpretation of an ambiguous statute that the agency administers. This grants significant power to executive agencies in interpreting their own mandates, limiting judicial intervention unless the agency’s interpretation is unreasonable or contrary to clear statutory language. This contrasts with India, where courts generally do not apply such a strong doctrine of deference to executive interpretations of law.
- Standing: The US legal system maintains a strict requirement for ‘standing,’ meaning a litigant must demonstrate a concrete and particularized injury, causation, and redressability. This is a more stringent requirement than India’s relaxed *locus standi* in PIL, making it harder for public interest groups to bring generalized grievances before the courts without a direct injury to themselves or their members. While there are exceptions for certain public interest cases, the overall approach is more restrictive than India’s PIL regime.

6.3. Comparative Insights and Lessons for India

Strength of PIL in India: India’s PIL mechanism stands out for its broad accessibility and its effectiveness in addressing systemic issues and protecting the rights of the marginalized. This is a unique strength that allows for a more proactive and socially responsive judiciary compared to the more traditional standing requirements in the UK and US.

- Balancing Deference and Scrutiny: The UK’s evolving approach to proportionality, especially in human rights cases, and the US’s *Chevron* deference highlight the ongoing tension between judicial scrutiny and executive autonomy. India’s judiciary, while not explicitly adopting *Chevron*-like deference, often grapples with similar questions of expertise and policy domains. The Indian courts could potentially develop a more articulated framework for deference in highly technical or policy-laden matters, while maintaining robust scrutiny where fundamental rights are concerned.
- Procedural Fairness: All three jurisdictions emphasize procedural fairness as a cornerstone of administrative justice. India’s strong adherence to natural justice principles aligns well with global best practices, ensuring that executive decisions are made transparently and with due regard for affected parties.
- Challenges of Expertise: The challenge of judicial expertise in complex administrative matters is universal. While the UK and US have specialized administrative law courts or a more developed system of expert evidence, India’s judiciary could benefit from further

institutionalizing mechanisms for technical assistance and specialized benches to handle increasingly complex executive actions.

In essence, while the fundamental principles of judicial review are shared across these common law systems, the nuances in their application, particularly concerning access to justice (PIL vs. standing), deference to executive agencies, and the intensity of review, offer valuable insights for continuous refinement of India's own robust system of judicial oversight.

7. CONCLUSION

The Indian judiciary, through its potent instruments of judicial review and Public Interest Litigation (PIL), has carved out a unique and indispensable role in ensuring the accountability of executive actions and upholding the rule of law. This study has delved into the historical evolution of these mechanisms, tracing their journey from constitutional imperatives to dynamic tools for social justice. The analysis of various grounds for judicial review—illegality, irrationality, procedural impropriety, and proportionality—underscores the multifaceted approach adopted by Indian courts to scrutinize administrative decisions, ensuring they are not only legally sound but also fair, reasonable, and proportionate.

Recent case analyses, spanning environmental governance, economic policies, and human rights protection, vividly illustrate the judiciary's active engagement. From compelling the executive to address environmental degradation and the migrant workers' crisis during the COVID-19 pandemic to scrutinizing the procedural validity of demonetisation and curbing arbitrary internet shutdowns, the courts have consistently demonstrated their commitment to safeguarding constitutional values and fundamental rights. These interventions, often initiated through PIL, have served as a vital check on executive power, compelling administrative authorities to act within the bounds of law and reason, and fostering greater transparency and responsiveness in governance.

However, this robust judicial oversight is not without its complexities and challenges. The persistent debate surrounding judicial activism versus judicial overreach highlights the delicate balance the judiciary must strike to avoid encroaching upon the domains of the executive and legislature. Concerns regarding the judiciary's institutional capacity, particularly its technical expertise in adjudicating increasingly complex administrative decisions involving specialized knowledge, remain pertinent. Furthermore, the practical challenges of implementing judicial directives and the potential for misuse of PIL underscore the need for continuous introspection and reform within the judicial system.

Comparative insights from the United Kingdom and the United States reveal both shared principles and divergent approaches to judicial review. While the fundamental grounds for review are similar, India's expansive PIL mechanism stands out for its broad accessibility and its effectiveness in addressing systemic injustices, a feature not directly replicated in the more stringent standing requirements of the UK and US. Conversely, doctrines like Chevron deference in the US highlight a more formalized approach to judicial deference in technical matters, offering a point of reflection for the Indian judiciary on how to balance scrutiny with administrative expertise.

In essence, judicial review of executive actions through PIL in India represents a powerful testament to the country's commitment to constitutionalism and democratic accountability. It has served as a crucial corrective mechanism, preventing arbitrary exercise of power and ensuring that administrative decisions align with the principles of justice and fairness. Moving forward, the effectiveness of this framework will depend on the judiciary's continued adaptability, its willingness to enhance its institutional capacity, and a collaborative approach with other branches of government to navigate the evolving landscape of administrative governance. The ongoing dialogue and refinement of these mechanisms are essential to ensure that the Indian judiciary remains a vigilant guardian of citizens' rights and a cornerstone of good governance in the face of emerging challenges.

REFERENCES

Cases

1. A.K. Gopalan v. State of Madras, AIR 1950 SC 27.
2. A.K. Kraipak v. Union of India, (1969) 2 SCC 262.
3. A.K. Roy v. Union of India, (1982) 1 SCC 271.
4. Alakh Alok Srivastava v. Union of India, (2020) 7 SCC 211.
5. Anuradha Bhasin v. Union of India, (2020) 3 SCC 637.
6. Associated Provincial Picture Houses Ltd. v. Wednesbury Corporation [1948] 1 KB 223 (CA).
7. B.C. Chaturvedi v. Union of India, (1995) 6 SCC 749.
8. B.P. Singhal v. Union of India, (2010) 6 SCC 331.
9. Balco Employees' Union v. Union of India, (2002) 2 SCC 333.
10. Bandhua Mukti Morcha v. Union of India, (1984) 3 SCC 161.
11. Bank Mellat v. HM Treasury (No. 2) [2013] UKSC 39.
12. Barium Chemicals Ltd. v. Company Law Board, AIR 1967 SC 295.

13. Canara Bank v. Debasis Das, (2003) 4 SCC 557.
14. Centre for Environmental Law, WWF-India v. Union of India, W.P.(C) 5665/2020 (Delhi High Court).
15. Centre for PIL v. Union of India, (2011) 4 SCC 1.
16. Chevron U.S.A. Inc. v. Natural Resources Defense Council Inc., 467 U.S. 837 (1984).
17. Common Cause v. Union of India, (2018) 5 SCC 1.
18. Council of Civil Service Unions v. Minister for the Civil Service [1985] AC 374 (HL).
19. Dattaraj Nathuji Thaware v. State of Maharashtra, (2005) 1 SCC 590.
20. Divisional Manager, Aravali Golf Club v. Chander Hass, (2008) 1 SCC 683.
21. Erusian Equipment & Chemicals Ltd. v. State of West Bengal, (1975) 1 SCC 70.
22. Express Newspapers (P) Ltd. v. Union of India, (1986) 1 SCC 133.
23. Foundation for Media Professionals v. Union Territory of J&K, (2020) 5 SCC 746.
24. Hanuman Laxman Aroskar v. Union of India, (2019) 15 SCC 401.
25. Hari Vishnu Kamath v. Ahmad Ishaque, AIR 1955 SC 233.
26. Harsh Mander v. Union of India, (2020) 7 SCC 219.
27. Hussainara Khatoon (I) v. Home Secretary, State of Bihar, (1980) 1 SCC 81.
28. Hussainara Khatoon (IV) v. State of Bihar, (1980) 1 SCC 98.
29. I.R. Coelho v. State of Tamil Nadu, (2007) 2 SCC 1.
30. In Re: Destruction of Public & Private Properties v. State of A.P., (2009) 5 SCC 212.
31. In Re: Problems and Miseries of Migrant Labourers, Suo Motu Writ Petition (Civil) No. 6 of 2020 (SC).
32. Indira Nehru Gandhi v. Raj Narain, 1975 Supp SCC 1.
33. Inhuman Conditions in 1382 Prisons, In re, (2016) 3 SCC 700.
34. Internet and Mobile Association of India v. Reserve Bank of India, (2020) 10 SCC 274.
35. Janata Dal v. H.S. Chowdhary, (1992) 4 SCC 305.
36. Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India, (2017) 10 SCC 1.
37. K.S. Puttaswamy (Aadhaar-5J.) v. Union of India, (2019) 1 SCC 1.
38. Kalyaneshwari v. Union of India, (2011) 3 SCC 287.
39. Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala, (1973) 4 SCC 225.
40. Kisor v. Wilkie, 588 U.S. ____ (2019).
41. L. Chandra Kumar v. Union of India, (1997) 3 SCC 261.
42. Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife, 504 U.S. 555 (1992).
43. M.C. Mehta v. Union of India (Oleum Gas Leak), (1987) 1 SCC 395.
44. M.C. Mehta v. Union of India, (1988) 1 SCC 471.

45. M.C. Mehta v. Union of India, (2021) 17 SCC 619.
46. Madras Bar Association v. Union of India, (2021) 7 SCC 369.
47. Manak Lal v. Dr. Prem Chand Singhvi, AIR 1957 SC 425.
48. Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India, (1978) 1 SCC 248.
49. Manoj Misra v. Union of India, (2017) 11 SCC 312.
50. Manoj Narula v. Union of India, (2014) 9 SCC 1.
51. Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. (1 Cranch) 137 (1803).
52. Massachusetts v. Environmental Protection Agency, 549 U.S. 497 (2007).
53. Michigan Rubber (India) Ltd. v. State of Karnataka, (2012) 8 SCC 216.
54. Minerva Mills Ltd. v. Union of India, (1980) 3 SCC 625.
55. Modern Dental College and Research Centre v. State of Madhya Pradesh, (2016) 7 SCC 353.
56. Mohinder Singh Gill v. Chief Election Commissioner, (1978) 1 SCC 405.
57. Municipal Council, Ratlam v. Vardichan, (1980) 4 SCC 162.
58. Navtej Singh Johar v. Union of India, (2018) 10 SCC 1.
59. Neeraja Chaudhary v. State of M.P., (1984) 3 SCC 243.
60. Olga Tellis v. Bombay Municipal Corporation, (1985) 3 SCC 545.
61. Om Kumar v. Union of India, (2001) 2 SCC 386.
62. People's Union for Democratic Rights v. Union of India, (1982) 3 SCC 235.
63. Prakash Singh v. Union of India, (2006) 8 SCC 1.
64. R (Begum) v. Denbigh High School Governors [2006] UKHL 15.
65. R (Daly) v. Secretary of State for the Home Department [2001] 2 AC 532 (HL).
66. R (Miller) v. Prime Minister [2019] UKSC 41.
67. R (Ullah) v. Special Adjudicator [2004] 2 AC 323 (HL).
68. R (UNISON) v. Lord Chancellor [2017] UKSC 51.
69. R v. Inland Revenue Commissioners, ex p National Federation of Self-Employed and Small Businesses Ltd. [1982] AC 617 (HL).
70. Ridge v. Baldwin [1964] AC 40 (HL).
71. S.L. Kapoor v. Jagmohan, (1980) 4 SCC 379.
72. S.N. Mukherjee v. Union of India, (1990) 4 SCC 594.
73. S.P. Gupta v. Union of India, 1981 Supp SCC 87.
74. S.R. Bommai v. Union of India, (1994) 3 SCC 1.
75. State of Madhya Pradesh v. Bharat Singh, AIR 1967 SC 1170.
76. State of Madras v. Champakam Dorairajan, AIR 1951 SC 226.

77. State of NCT of Delhi v. Sanjeev, (2005) 5 SCC 181.
78. State of Punjab v. Gurdial Singh, (1980) 2 SCC 471.
79. State of Punjab v. V.K. Khanna, (2001) 2 SCC 330.
80. State of U.P. v. Maharaja Dharmander Prasad Singh, (1989) 2 SCC 505.
81. State of U.P. v. Singhara Singh, AIR 1964 SC 358.
82. State of Uttar Pradesh v. Jeet S. Bisht, (2007) 6 SCC 586.
83. State of Uttaranchal v. Balwant Singh Chaufal, (2010) 3 SCC 402.
84. Subhash Kumar v. State of Bihar, (1991) 1 SCC 598.
85. Supreme Court Advocates-on-Record Association v. Union of India, (2016) 5 SCC 1.
86. Supreme Court Legal Aid Committee v. Union of India, (1994) 6 SCC 731.
87. Swiss Ribbons Pvt. Ltd. v. Union of India, (2019) 4 SCC 17.
88. Syed Yakoob v. K.S. Radhakrishnan, AIR 1964 SC 477.
89. Tata Cellular v. Union of India, (1994) 6 SCC 651.
90. Tehseen Poonawalla v. Union of India, (2018) 9 SCC 501.
91. Union of India v. Tulsiram Patel, (1985) 3 SCC 398.
92. Vellore Citizens' Welfare Forum v. Union of India, (1996) 5 SCC 647.
93. Vineet Narain v. Union of India, (1998) 1 SCC 226.
94. Vivek Narayan Sharma v. Union of India, (2023) 3 SCC 1.

Books

95. A.V. Dicey, Introduction to the Study of the Law of the Constitution (10th edn., Macmillan 1959).
96. Aharon Barak, Proportionality: Constitutional Rights and Their Limitations (Cambridge University Press 2012).
97. Anuj Bhunia, Courting the People: Public Interest Litigation in Post-Emergency India (Cambridge University Press 2017).
98. Arun K. Thiruvengadam, The Constitution of India: A Contextual Analysis (2nd edn., Hart Publishing 2018).
99. Arun Shourie, Courts and Their Judgments (Rupa 2019).
100. Carol Harlow & Richard Rawlings, Law and Administration (4th edn., Cambridge University Press 2020).
101. De Smith, Woolf & Jowell, Judicial Review of Administrative Action (8th edn., Sweet & Maxwell 2018).

102. Erwin Chemerinsky, *Constitutional Law: Principles and Policies* (6th edn., Wolters Kluwer 2020).
103. Gautam Bhatia, *The Transformative Constitution* (HarperCollins India, Updated edn. 2022).
104. Granville Austin, *The Indian Constitution: Cornerstone of a Nation* (Oxford University Press 1966, reprint 2019).
105. H.W.R. Wade and C.F. Forsyth, *Administrative Law* (12th edn., Oxford University Press 2022).
106. M.P. Jain, *Indian Constitutional Law* (9th edn., LexisNexis 2023).
107. M.P. Singh and V.N. Shukla, *Constitution of India* (13th edn., Eastern Book Company 2022).
108. Madhav Khosla, *India's Founding Moment* (Harvard University Press 2020).
109. Mark Elliott & Robert Thomas, *Public Law* (4th edn., Oxford University Press 2020).
110. Mark Tushnet, *Advanced Introduction to Comparative Constitutional Law* (2nd edn., Edward Elgar 2018).
111. Paul Craig, *Administrative Law* (9th edn., Sweet & Maxwell 2023).
112. Richard J. Pierce Jr., *Administrative Law Treatise* (6th edn., Wolters Kluwer 2022).
113. S.P. Sathe, *Judicial Activism in India: Transgressing Borders and Enforcing Limits* (2nd edn., Oxford University Press 2021).
114. V.R. Krishna Iyer, *Law and the People* (Eastern Book Company 1972).
115. Vicki C. Jackson, *Constitutional Engagement in a Transnational Era* (Oxford University Press 2019).

Articles

116. Alison L. Young, *Democratic Dialogue and the Constitution* (Oxford University Press 2017).
117. Aparna Chandra, "Institutional Capacity and the Supreme Court of India" (2021) 63 JILI 89.
118. Aparna Chandra, "Institutional Design and the Supreme Court of India" (2021) 63 JILI 89.
119. Ashok H. Desai & S. Muralidhar, "Public Interest Litigation: Potential and Problems" (2022) 64 JILI 102.
120. Cass R. Sunstein, "Chevron Step Zero" (2020) 92 Va. L. Rev. 187.

121. Gautam Bhatia, "The Demonetisation Judgment: Judicial Deference and the Constitution" (2023) 58 EPW 12.
122. Indira Jaising, "Judicial Accountability and Constitutional Governance" (2023) 65 JILI 45.
123. Lon L. Fuller, "The Forms and Limits of Adjudication" (1978) 92 Harv. L. Rev. 353.
124. Mark Elliott, "Judicial Deference and Democratic Dialogue" (2021) 80 CLJ 1.
125. Markandey Katju, "Judicial Overreach in India" (2017) 5 NLUJ Law Review 1.
126. P.N. Bhagwati, "Judicial Activism and Public Interest Litigation" (1984) 23 Columbia J. Transnat'l L. 561.
127. R.K. Jain, "Judicial Review of Economic Policy in India" (2022) 64 JILI 1.
128. Ronojoy Sen, "Judiciary and Democratic Balance in Contemporary India" (2024) 59 EPW 14.
129. Ronojoy Sen, "The Limits of Public Interest Litigation" (2024) 59 EPW 14.
130. S. Muralidhar, "Courts and Policy: Limits of Judicial Review" (2022) 64 JILI 23.
131. S. Muralidhar, "Judicial Activism and the Supreme Court of India" (2021) 63 JILI 45.
132. Shibani Ghosh, "The Draft EIA 2020: Diluting Environmental Safeguards?" (2020) 55(35) Economic & Political Weekly 12.
133. Suhrith Parthasarathy, "Demonetisation and the Limits of Judicial Review" (2024) 8 Indian L. Rev. 45.
134. Tarunabh Khaitan, "Executive Aggrandizement and Judicial Response" (2020) 8 International Journal of Constitutional Law 336.
135. Tarunabh Khaitan, "Institutional Balance and the Indian Supreme Court" (2020) 8 International Journal of Constitutional Law 336.
136. Tarunabh Khaitan, "Judicial Review and Institutional Competence" (2020) 8 International Journal of Constitutional Law 336.
137. Tarunabh Khaitan, "Proportionality: Constitutional Rights and Judicial Review in India" (2021) 19 Int'l J. Const. L. 456.
138. Upendra Baxi, "The Avatars of Indian Judicial Activism" (2021) 63 JILI 1.
139. Upendra Baxi, "Taking Suffering Seriously: Social Action Litigation in the Supreme Court of India" (1985) 4 Third World Legal Studies 107.

Statutes and Reports

140. Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. §§ 551–559, 701–706 (1946).

141. Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative, Police Reforms in India: Progress and Challenges (2023).
142. Comptroller and Auditor General of India, Report on Union Government Finances (2023).
143. Constitution of India, 1950.
144. Disaster Management Act, 2005 (Act 53 of 2005).
145. Environment (Protection) Act, 1986.
146. Human Rights Act 1998 (UK).
147. Law Commission of India, 245th Report on Arrears and Backlog: Creating Additional Judicial (Wo)manpower (2014).
148. Law Commission of India, 272nd Report on Assessment of Statutory Frameworks of Tribunals in India (2017).
149. Law Commission of India, Report No. 255: Electoral Reforms (2015).
150. Law Commission of India, Report No. 277: Wrongful Prosecution (Miscarriage of Justice) (2018).
151. Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, Annual Report 2023–24.
152. National Green Tribunal Act, 2010 (Act 19 of 2010).
153. National Human Rights Commission, Advisory on the Rights of Migrant Workers (2020).
154. National Judicial Data Grid, Pendancy Statistics Report (2024).
155. Reserve Bank of India, Annual Report 2016–17 (RBI, 2017).
156. Senior Courts Act 1981 (UK).
157. Supreme Court of India, Annual Report 2023–24.
158. Supreme Court Rules, 2013.
159. Temporary Suspension of Telecom Services (Public Emergency or Public Safety) Rules, 2017.