

Separation of Powers in the Age of Judicial Activism: A Critical Examination

¹Dr. Reema Bhattacharya, ²Dr. Suman Paliwal, ³Dr. Naresh Kumar, ⁴Dr. Tanu Arora

Associate Professor, Jagannath University, Bahadurgarh¹

Associate Professor, Jagannath University, Jaipur^{2*}

Associate Professor, Jagannath University, Bahadurgarh³

Assistant Professor, Jagannath University, Bahadurgarh⁴

Abstract

The doctrine of separation of powers constitutes a foundational principle of constitutional governance, ensuring the distribution of authority among the legislature, executive, and judiciary to prevent the concentration of power. In the Indian context, this doctrine operates in a flexible form, shaped by constitutional design and judicial interpretation. Over the past few decades, the rise of judicial activism has significantly influenced this balance, with courts increasingly intervening in matters traditionally reserved for the other branches of government. This paper critically examines the evolving relationship between separation of powers and judicial activism, with a particular focus on the Indian constitutional framework. Adopting a qualitative and doctrinal research methodology, the study analyses constitutional provisions, landmark judicial decisions, and scholarly literature to assess whether judicial activism strengthens democratic governance or leads to institutional overreach. Key cases, including *Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala* (1973), *Vishaka v. State of Rajasthan* (1997), and the National Judicial Appointments Commission (NJAC) case (2015), are examined to illustrate the judiciary's expanding role in law-making and policy intervention. The findings suggest that judicial activism has played a crucial role in safeguarding fundamental rights, addressing legislative and executive inaction, and advancing social justice. However, it also raises concerns regarding democratic legitimacy and the potential erosion of institutional boundaries. The paper argues for a calibrated approach that preserves judicial independence while maintaining respect for the functional domain of other branches. It contributes to contemporary constitutional discourse by offering a nuanced evaluation of judicial activism in the age of evolving governance dynamics.

Keywords: Separation of Powers; Judicial Activism; Judicial Review; Constitutional Law; India

1. Introduction

The doctrine of separation of powers remains one of the most enduring principles of constitutional governance, designed to prevent the concentration of authority by distributing state power among the legislature, executive, and judiciary. Rooted in the political philosophy of Montesquieu, the doctrine emphasizes that liberty is best preserved when institutional functions are divided and each branch operates within its defined sphere (Montesquieu, 1748/1989). While classical theory advocates a strict separation, modern constitutional systems, including India, have adopted a more flexible approach characterized by functional overlap and checks and balances (Sharma, 2024). In the Indian constitutional framework, separation of powers is not explicitly codified in rigid terms but is embedded within the structure of governance. The Constitution allocates distinct functions to each organ while simultaneously enabling interaction and mutual control. The judiciary, in particular, has emerged as a key institution in maintaining constitutional supremacy through the power of judicial review under Articles 13, 32, and 226 of the Constitution of India (Government of India, 1950). Over time, the Supreme Court has interpreted the doctrine as part of the "basic structure," thereby placing implicit limitations on legislative and executive authority (Pandey & Agrawal, 2025).

Parallel to this evolution, the concept of judicial activism has gained prominence as a defining feature of Indian constitutionalism. Judicial activism refers to the proactive role played by the judiciary in interpreting laws, enforcing rights, and, in certain cases, formulating guidelines in the absence of legislative action. This approach became particularly visible with the rise of Public Interest Litigation (PIL) in the late twentieth century, which expanded access to justice and enabled courts to address issues affecting marginalized and disadvantaged groups (Jaswal, 2021). Through purposive interpretation of fundamental rights, the judiciary has significantly broadened the scope of constitutional protections, transforming itself into an active agent of social change. However, the increasing assertiveness of the judiciary has also generated a critical debate concerning its constitutional limits. While judicial activism is often justified as a response to legislative inertia and executive inefficiency, critics argue that excessive intervention risks undermining the very principle of separation of powers it seeks to protect. Instances where courts have issued policy directives or assumed quasi-legislative functions have raised concerns about judicial overreach and democratic legitimacy (Sharma, 2024). This tension between necessary intervention and institutional encroachment forms the central concern of contemporary constitutional discourse.

The Indian experience offers a particularly compelling context for examining this issue, as the judiciary has played a transformative role in shaping governance, rights jurisprudence, and public policy. Landmark decisions such as *Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala* (1973) and *Vishaka v. State of Rajasthan* (1997) illustrate how judicial innovation has both strengthened constitutional values and redefined institutional boundaries. These developments highlight the dual character of judicial activism as both a safeguard of constitutional morality and a potential challenge to democratic balance. Against this backdrop, the present study seeks to critically examine the relationship between separation of powers and judicial activism in India. It aims to assess whether judicial intervention enhances accountability and rights protection or whether it disrupts the equilibrium among constitutional organs. By employing a qualitative and doctrinal research approach, the paper analyzes constitutional provisions, judicial precedents, and scholarly interpretations to provide a nuanced understanding of this evolving dynamic. The significance of this inquiry lies in its relevance to contemporary governance, where courts are increasingly called upon to resolve complex socio-economic and political issues. As India navigates the challenges of modern democracy, striking an appropriate balance between judicial activism and institutional restraint becomes essential for preserving both constitutional integrity and democratic legitimacy.

2. Literature Review

The relationship between separation of powers and judicial activism has attracted sustained scholarly attention, particularly in constitutional democracies where courts play an increasingly prominent role in governance. Existing literature reflects a broad spectrum of perspectives, ranging from strong support for judicial intervention as a safeguard of rights to critical concerns about institutional overreach. This section reviews key theoretical, doctrinal, and empirical contributions relevant to the study.

2.1 Classical Doctrine of Separation of Powers

The classical understanding of separation of powers originates from the works of John Locke and Montesquieu, who emphasized the need to divide governmental authority to prevent tyranny. Montesquieu's articulation in *The Spirit of the Laws* laid the foundation for modern constitutional design, advocating a strict institutional division among legislative, executive, and judicial functions (Montesquieu, 1748/1989). However, contemporary scholars argue that a rigid application of this doctrine is neither practical nor desirable in modern welfare states. Instead, the emphasis has shifted toward a system of checks and balances, where overlapping functions ensure accountability while maintaining institutional independence (Vile, 1998). This shift is particularly relevant in jurisdictions like India, where constitutional design accommodates functional interdependence.

2.2 Separation of Powers in the Indian Context

Scholars examining the Indian Constitution highlight that it does not provide for a strict separation of powers but rather a pragmatic distribution of functions. The legislature enacts laws, the executive implements them, and the judiciary interprets them; however, these roles often intersect. The Supreme Court has reinforced this

interpretation by recognizing separation of powers as part of the basic structure of the Constitution, thereby safeguarding institutional boundaries while allowing flexibility (Pandey & Agrawal, 2025). Academic discussions further emphasize that this flexible model enables the judiciary to act as a constitutional sentinel, particularly in situations where the other branches fail to discharge their responsibilities effectively. At the same time, scholars caution that such flexibility must not translate into unchecked judicial authority, as it may disturb democratic equilibrium (Sharma, 2024).

2.3 Judicial Activism: Concept and Evolution

Judicial activism has been conceptualized in multiple ways within legal scholarship. Some authors define it as an interpretative approach that allows judges to expand the meaning of constitutional provisions in light of changing societal needs. Others view it as a departure from traditional judicial restraint, where courts go beyond adjudication to influence policy outcomes (Jaswal, 2021). In the Indian context, judicial activism gained momentum with the emergence of Public Interest Litigation (PIL) during the late 1970s and 1980s. Scholars note that PIL transformed the judiciary into an accessible forum for addressing social injustices, environmental concerns, and governance failures. This period marked a shift from procedural rigidity to substantive justice, with courts adopting innovative remedies and expanding the scope of fundamental rights.

2.4 Judicial Review and Constitutional Supremacy

A significant body of literature focuses on judicial review as the foundation of judicial activism. Judicial review empowers courts to invalidate laws and executive actions that violate constitutional provisions, thereby reinforcing the supremacy of the Constitution. In India, this power is explicitly recognized and has been expansively interpreted by the judiciary over time (Government of India, 1950). Scholars argue that judicial review serves as a critical check on majoritarian excesses and administrative arbitrariness. At the same time, concerns have been raised regarding the potential for courts to substitute their judgment for that of elected representatives, particularly in matters involving policy decisions. This tension underscores the delicate balance between constitutional guardianship and democratic accountability.

2.5 Judicial Activism versus Judicial Restraint

The debate between judicial activism and judicial restraint constitutes a central theme in the literature. Proponents of judicial activism argue that courts must adopt a proactive stance to protect fundamental rights and uphold constitutional values, especially in developing democracies where institutional deficiencies persist. Conversely, advocates of judicial restraint emphasize the importance of respecting the domain of the legislature and executive, warning that excessive intervention may undermine democratic processes (Sharma, 2024). This debate is particularly pronounced in the Indian context, where courts have occasionally issued directives that resemble legislative or executive functions. While such actions are often justified as necessary interventions, critics argue that they blur constitutional boundaries and risk eroding institutional legitimacy.

2.6 Research Gaps

Despite extensive scholarship on the subject, certain gaps remain evident. First, much of the existing literature adopts a normative approach, either supporting or criticizing judicial activism, without offering a balanced empirical assessment of its long-term institutional impact. Second, there is limited integration of case-based analysis with broader theoretical frameworks, particularly in the Indian context. Third, emerging dimensions of governance, including technological transformation and data-driven decision-making, have not been adequately incorporated into discussions on judicial power and institutional balance. This study seeks to address these gaps by combining doctrinal analysis with detailed case studies from India, offering a nuanced evaluation of judicial activism within the framework of separation of powers.

3. Theoretical Framework

This study is grounded in constitutional theory, particularly the doctrines of separation of powers, checks and balances, and the evolving concepts of judicial activism and judicial restraint. These theoretical constructs provide the analytical lens through which the role of the judiciary in contemporary governance is examined.

3.1 Doctrine of Separation of Powers

The doctrine of separation of powers, as articulated by Montesquieu, is based on the premise that liberty can be preserved only when governmental power is not concentrated in a single authority (Montesquieu, 1748/1989). The doctrine identifies three primary functions of the state: law-making, law enforcement, and adjudication, corresponding to the legislature, executive, and judiciary, respectively. In its classical formulation, the doctrine advocates strict institutional separation and non-interference among the branches. However, modern constitutional scholarship recognizes that absolute separation is neither feasible nor desirable. Instead, a functional approach has emerged, allowing limited overlap among institutions while maintaining their core independence (Vile, 1998). In India, this adapted model is reflected in the constitutional structure, where separation is maintained in principle but moderated through interdependence.

3.2 Checks and Balances Model

Closely related to the doctrine of separation of powers is the concept of checks and balances, which ensures that each branch of government has mechanisms to limit the powers of the others. This model recognizes that some degree of overlap is essential to prevent abuse of authority and to maintain accountability. Within the Indian framework, checks and balances operate through various mechanisms: judicial review over legislative and executive actions, legislative oversight over the executive, and constitutional amendments subject to judicial scrutiny. Scholars argue that this system creates a dynamic equilibrium, where power is distributed but not isolated (Sharma, 2024). The judiciary's role in this system is particularly significant, as it acts as the final interpreter of the Constitution and a guardian of fundamental rights.

3.3 Judicial Activism and Judicial Restraint

Judicial activism and judicial restraint represent two contrasting interpretative philosophies that define the scope of judicial intervention. Judicial activism refers to a proactive judicial approach that emphasizes purposive interpretation, social justice, and the expansion of rights. It often involves creative interpretation of constitutional provisions to address gaps in legislation or executive action (Jaswal, 2021). In contrast, judicial restraint advocates a limited role for the judiciary, emphasizing adherence to the text of the Constitution and respect for the domains of the legislature and executive. Proponents of restraint argue that unelected judges should not substitute their judgment for that of democratically elected representatives, particularly in policy matters. The tension between these two approaches forms a central theme of this study. While judicial activism can serve as a corrective mechanism in cases of institutional failure, excessive activism may lead to judicial overreach, thereby disrupting the balance envisaged under the doctrine of separation of powers.

3.4 Conceptual Model for Analysis

To systematically examine the interaction between judicial activism and separation of powers, this study adopts a conceptual framework based on causal relationships between key variables:

- **Independent Variable:** Judicial activism (extent of judicial intervention)
- **Dependent Variable:** Institutional balance among the three organs of government
- **Mediating Factors:**
 - Legislative inaction
 - Executive inefficiency
 - Public interest and rights-based claims

This framework assumes that judicial activism does not operate in isolation but is often triggered by deficiencies in other branches of government. For instance, legislative delays or executive inaction may prompt judicial intervention in order to uphold constitutional values and protect fundamental rights. At the same time, the framework allows for the possibility that excessive or frequent judicial intervention may weaken institutional boundaries, leading to friction among branches and raising concerns about democratic legitimacy. Thus, the relationship between judicial activism and separation of powers is not linear but contingent upon contextual factors.

3.5 Normative Position of the Study

The study adopts a balanced normative position, recognizing both the necessity and the limitations of judicial activism. It does not treat judicial intervention as inherently positive or negative; rather, it evaluates its impact in relation to constitutional principles and institutional balance. The framework thus facilitates a critical examination of whether judicial activism in India operates as a mechanism of constitutional protection or evolves into a form of institutional overreach. By integrating classical theory with contemporary constitutional practice, this section establishes the foundation for the subsequent analysis of judicial decisions and their implications for the doctrine of separation of powers.

4. Research Methodology

This study adopts a qualitative and doctrinal research methodology to examine the relationship between judicial activism and the doctrine of separation of powers within the Indian constitutional framework. Given the theoretical and interpretative nature of the research problem, a non-empirical approach is most suitable for analyzing legal principles, judicial reasoning, and constitutional developments.

4.1 Research Design

The research is primarily qualitative in nature, focusing on the interpretation of legal texts, judicial decisions, and scholarly writings. It follows a doctrinal (black-letter law) approach, which involves the systematic analysis of statutes, constitutional provisions, and case law to understand the evolution and application of legal doctrines. This design is appropriate because the study seeks to explore normative and conceptual questions, such as the extent of judicial intervention and its implications for institutional balance, rather than measure quantifiable variables.

4.2 Data Sources

The study relies on both primary and secondary sources:

Primary Sources

- The *Constitution of India* (Government of India, 1950)
- Landmark judgments of the Supreme Court of India, including:
 - *Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala* (1973)
 - *Vishaka v. State of Rajasthan* (1997)
 - *Supreme Court Advocates-on-Record Association v. Union of India* (2015)

These sources provide direct insight into judicial reasoning and constitutional interpretation.

Secondary Sources

- Peer-reviewed journal articles on constitutional law and judicial activism
- Books and commentaries by legal scholars
- Reports and legal analyses from credible institutions

Secondary sources are used to contextualize judicial decisions and engage with existing academic debates.

4.3 Method of Analysis

The study employs a thematic and analytical approach to evaluate the collected data:

- **Doctrinal Analysis:** Examination of constitutional provisions and legal principles governing separation of powers and judicial review.
- **Case Law Analysis:** Detailed analysis of landmark judgments to identify patterns of judicial behavior, including instances of activism and restraint.
- **Thematic Coding:** Judicial decisions are categorized based on themes such as:
 - Expansion of fundamental rights
 - Judicial law-making
 - Intervention in policy matters
 - Institutional conflict

This method allows for a structured comparison of judicial trends over time.

4.4 Analytical Framework

The analysis is guided by the conceptual model outlined in the theoretical framework. Judicial activism is assessed in relation to:

- The extent of intervention
- The context of legislative or executive inaction
- The impact on institutional balance

This framework ensures consistency and coherence in evaluating different case studies.

4.5 Scope of the Study

The scope of the research is limited to:

- The Indian constitutional system
- Key developments in judicial activism from the 1970s to the present
- Select landmark cases that have significantly influenced the doctrine of separation of powers

This focused scope enables an in-depth examination while maintaining analytical clarity.

4.6 Limitations of the Study

Despite its comprehensive approach, the study has certain limitations:

- **Doctrinal Limitation:** The research is based on legal texts and judicial decisions, without empirical data such as interviews or statistical analysis.
- **Case Selection Bias:** The focus on landmark cases may overlook less prominent decisions that also contribute to judicial trends.
- **Contextual Constraints:** The study is confined to India and does not undertake a detailed comparative analysis with other jurisdictions.

4.7 Ethical Considerations

The research is based entirely on publicly available legal documents and academic literature. Proper citation and referencing in APA style are maintained to ensure academic integrity and avoid plagiarism.

5. Evolution of Judicial Activism in India

The evolution of judicial activism in India reflects a gradual but significant transformation in the role of the judiciary from a passive interpreter of law to an active participant in governance and rights protection. This shift has been shaped by constitutional interpretation, socio-political conditions, and the perceived need to address gaps left by the legislature and executive. Broadly, this evolution can be understood in three phases: judicial restraint, judicial expansion, and contemporary assertiveness.

5.1 Phase I: Era of Judicial Restraint (1950s–1970s)

In the early decades following independence, the Indian judiciary largely adhered to the principle of judicial restraint. Courts adopted a formalistic approach, emphasizing strict interpretation of constitutional provisions and maintaining deference to legislative authority. This period was characterized by a limited view of fundamental rights and a reluctance to interfere in policy matters. Decisions such as *A.K. Gopalan v. State of Madras* (1950) reflected a narrow interpretation of personal liberty, where the judiciary prioritized procedural legality over substantive justice. Scholars have observed that during this phase, the judiciary sought to preserve institutional legitimacy by avoiding confrontation with the political branches. However, this approach began to face criticism for its inability to adequately protect individual rights, particularly in the context of expanding state power and socio-economic challenges.

5.2 Phase II: Emergence of Judicial Activism (1970s–1990s)

The turning point in the evolution of judicial activism came during the 1970s, particularly in the aftermath of the Emergency (1975–1977). The judiciary began to adopt a more assertive role, recognizing the need to act as a guardian of constitutional values and fundamental rights. A landmark moment in this transformation was *Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala* (1973), where the Supreme Court introduced the Basic Structure Doctrine, holding that Parliament's power to amend the Constitution is not unlimited. This decision significantly strengthened judicial review and established the judiciary as the ultimate arbiter of constitutional boundaries. The emergence of Public Interest Litigation (PIL) further expanded judicial activism during this period. PIL relaxed procedural requirements, allowing individuals and groups to approach courts on behalf of marginalized communities. Through PIL, the judiciary addressed issues such as bonded labor, environmental protection, prison reforms, and gender justice. Another significant development was the expansion of Article 21 (Right to Life and Personal Liberty), which the judiciary interpreted to include a wide range of rights, such as the right to livelihood, education, and a clean environment. This transformative interpretation marked a shift from procedural to substantive justice (Jaswal, 2021).

5.3 Phase III: Judicial Assertiveness and Policy Intervention (2000s–Present)

In the contemporary period, judicial activism has evolved into a more assertive form, with courts increasingly intervening in matters of governance and public policy. The judiciary has not only interpreted laws but has also issued detailed guidelines and directives in areas where legislative or executive action has been absent or inadequate. A notable example is *Vishaka v. State of Rajasthan* (1997), where the Supreme Court laid down guidelines to address sexual harassment at the workplace in the absence of specific legislation. Similarly, in environmental and administrative matters, courts have frequently issued directions that resemble policy decisions. The use of Article 142 of the Constitution, which empowers the Supreme Court to pass orders necessary for “complete justice,” has further strengthened judicial intervention. This provision has enabled the judiciary to craft remedies that go beyond traditional adjudication, thereby expanding its functional role. However, this phase has also witnessed growing concerns about judicial overreach. Critics argue that frequent intervention in policy matters risks undermining the principle of separation of powers and encroaching upon the domains of the legislature and executive (Sharma, 2024). The National Judicial Appointments Commission (NJAC) case (2015), where the Supreme Court struck down a constitutional amendment, reignited debates about judicial supremacy and institutional balance.

5.4 Drivers of Judicial Activism in India

Several factors have contributed to the rise and fall of judicial activism in India:

- **Legislative Inaction:** Delays or failures in law-making often prompt judicial intervention.
- **Executive Inefficiency:** Weak implementation of laws creates a vacuum that courts seek to fill.
- **Public Interest Litigation:** Increased access to justice encourages judicial engagement with social issues.
- **Rights Consciousness:** Growing awareness of rights leads to higher expectations from the judiciary.

These factors suggest that judicial activism is not merely a product of judicial ambition but also a response to systemic deficiencies in governance.

5.5 Critical Evaluation

The evolution of judicial activism in India demonstrates its dual character. On one hand, it has played a transformative role in expanding rights, ensuring accountability, and promoting social justice. On the other hand, it has raised important questions about institutional boundaries, democratic legitimacy, and the proper role of the judiciary in a constitutional democracy. This historical trajectory underscores the need to evaluate judicial activism not in isolation but in relation to the broader constitutional framework and the functioning of other branches of government.

6. Case Studies from India

To critically examine the interplay between judicial activism and the doctrine of separation of powers, this section analyzes select landmark judgments of the Supreme Court of India. These cases illustrate how judicial intervention has shaped constitutional interpretation, expanded rights, and, at times, raised concerns regarding institutional boundaries.

6.1 *Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala (1973)*

The decision in *Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala (1973)* marks a constitutional watershed in Indian legal history. The primary issue before the Court was the extent of Parliament's power to amend the Constitution under Article 368. In a historic judgment, the Supreme Court introduced the Basic Structure Doctrine, holding that while Parliament has wide amending powers, it cannot alter the fundamental structure of the Constitution. This ruling represents a significant instance of judicial activism, as the Court effectively imposed substantive limitations on constitutional amendments despite the absence of explicit textual restrictions. By doing so, the judiciary asserted its role as the ultimate guardian of the Constitution. From the perspective of separation of powers, the judgment strengthened checks and balances by preventing potential abuse of legislative authority. However, critics argue that the doctrine reflects judicial overreach, as it allows unelected judges to determine the limits of constitutional change.

6.2 *Vishaka v. State of Rajasthan (1997)*

In *Vishaka v. State of Rajasthan (1997)*, the Supreme Court addressed the issue of sexual harassment at the workplace in the absence of specific legislation. Recognizing the legislative vacuum, the Court formulated the Vishaka Guidelines, which established binding norms to prevent and redress workplace harassment. This case exemplifies judicial activism in its most constructive form. The judiciary not only interpreted fundamental rights under Articles 14, 19, and 21 but also engaged in judicial law-making by creating enforceable guidelines. These guidelines remained in force until the enactment of the Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013. While widely praised for advancing gender justice, the case also raises important questions about the judiciary's role in policy formulation. By stepping into the legislative domain, the

Court blurred traditional institutional boundaries, highlighting the tension between necessity and constitutional propriety.

6.3 *Supreme Court Advocates-on-Record Association v. Union of India (2015)* – NJAC Case

The NJAC case (2015) represents a contemporary example of judicial assertiveness. The Supreme Court struck down the 99th Constitutional Amendment and the National Judicial Appointments Commission Act, which sought to reform the process of judicial appointments by introducing greater executive and legislative involvement. The Court held that judicial independence is part of the basic structure of the Constitution and that the NJAC mechanism violated this principle. As a result, the collegium system for judicial appointments was reinstated. This decision underscores the judiciary's commitment to preserving its independence, a key element of separation of powers. However, it also attracted criticism for reinforcing judicial primacy without adequate accountability. Scholars have argued that the judgment reflects a form of institutional self-preservation, raising concerns about transparency and democratic legitimacy.

6.4 Expanding Judicial Powers under Article 142

Article 142 of the Constitution empowers the Supreme Court to pass any order necessary to do “complete justice” in a case. Over time, this provision has become a powerful tool of judicial activism, enabling the Court to craft innovative remedies and address complex issues. The use of Article 142 has been evident in cases involving environmental protection, governance reforms, and social justice. The Court has issued directives that extend beyond traditional adjudication, often resembling executive or legislative action. While this expansive use of power allows the judiciary to respond effectively to unique situations, it also raises concerns about the erosion of institutional boundaries. The discretionary nature of Article 142 has led to debates about the limits of judicial authority and the need for self-restraint.

6.5 Comparative Analysis of Case Studies

The selected cases collectively demonstrate the evolving nature of judicial activism in India:

- **Strengthening Constitutional Governance:**
 - Protection of fundamental rights
 - Reinforcement of constitutional supremacy
 - Accountability of legislature and executive
- **Expanding Judicial Role:**
 - Judicial law-making in the absence of legislation
 - Intervention in policy and administrative matters
- **Challenges to Separation of Powers:**
 - Blurring of institutional boundaries
 - Concerns regarding democratic legitimacy
 - Potential for judicial overreach

These case studies reveal that judicial activism operates along a spectrum, ranging from necessary constitutional intervention to controversial institutional expansion. Its legitimacy often depends on context, particularly the presence of legislative or executive failure.

6.6 Synthesis

The Indian experience demonstrates that judicial activism cannot be evaluated in absolute terms. In certain instances, it has served as a vital instrument for protecting rights and upholding constitutional values. In others, it has raised legitimate concerns about the concentration of power within the judiciary. By examining these landmark

cases, this section highlights the complex and evolving relationship between judicial activism and the doctrine of separation of powers. It sets the stage for a broader discussion on whether such activism ultimately strengthens or destabilises democratic governance.

7. Findings and Discussion

This section synthesizes the insights derived from doctrinal analysis and case studies to evaluate the impact of judicial activism on the doctrine of separation of powers in India. The findings reveal a complex and context-dependent relationship, where judicial intervention simultaneously strengthens constitutional governance and raises concerns about institutional imbalance.

7.1 Key Findings

The analysis indicates that judicial activism in India has emerged primarily as a response to systemic deficiencies within the legislative and executive branches. In several instances, courts have intervened to address governance gaps, protect fundamental rights, and ensure accountability. This is particularly evident in cases involving environmental protection, gender justice, and administrative inaction. A key finding is that judicial activism has significantly expanded the scope of fundamental rights. Through purposive interpretation, the judiciary has transformed constitutional provisions into dynamic instruments of social justice. The expansion of Article 21 to include a wide range of socio-economic rights exemplifies this transformative role. At the same time, the study finds that judicial activism has led to an expansion of judicial power beyond traditional adjudicatory functions. Courts have increasingly engaged in guideline formulation, policy direction, and monitoring of executive actions, thereby assuming roles that are not strictly judicial in nature.

7.2 Judicial Activism as a Corrective Mechanism

One of the central arguments emerging from the analysis is that judicial activism often functions as a corrective mechanism within the constitutional framework. When the legislature fails to enact necessary laws or the executive fails to implement them effectively, the judiciary steps in to uphold constitutional values. The *Vishaka* case, for instance, demonstrates how judicial intervention can fill legislative vacuums and provide immediate remedies for pressing social issues. Similarly, the development of the Basic Structure Doctrine in *Kesavananda Bharati* serves as a safeguard against potential abuse of constitutional amendment powers. From this perspective, judicial activism enhances the system of checks and balances by ensuring that no branch of government operates without accountability.

7.3 Concerns of Judicial Overreach

Despite its positive contributions, the study identifies significant concerns regarding judicial overreach. Judicial overreach occurs when courts extend their authority into areas traditionally reserved for the legislature or executive, particularly in matters of policy formulation and governance. The increasing use of Article 142 and the judiciary's involvement in administrative decision-making illustrate this trend. While such interventions may be well-intentioned, they risk undermining democratic principles by allowing unelected judges to make decisions that have far-reaching policy implications. The NJAC case further highlights tensions between judicial independence and accountability. By invalidating a constitutional amendment aimed at reforming judicial appointments, the judiciary reinforced its autonomy but also attracted criticism for limiting institutional reform.

7.4 Impact on Separation of Powers

The findings suggest that judicial activism has a dual impact on the doctrine of separation of powers:

Strengthening Effects

- Reinforces constitutional supremacy
- Protects fundamental rights

- Ensures accountability of other branches
- Prevents abuse of power

Weakening Effects

- Blurs institutional boundaries
- Encourages judicial encroachment into policy domains
- Creates friction among branches of government
- Raises questions about democratic legitimacy

This duality indicates that judicial activism does not inherently violate the separation of powers; rather, its impact depends on the extent, context, and justification of judicial intervention.

7.5 Contextual Nature of Judicial Intervention

Another important finding is that judicial activism in India is highly context-dependent. Courts are more likely to intervene in situations characterised by:

- Legislative silence or delay
- Executive inaction or inefficiency
- Urgent public interest concerns

This suggests that judicial activism is not purely discretionary but often reactive, shaped by the broader governance environment. However, the absence of clear doctrinal limits makes it difficult to distinguish between legitimate intervention and overreach.

7.6 Normative Evaluation

From a normative standpoint, the study argues that judicial activism should neither be uncritically celebrated nor categorically rejected. Instead, it should be evaluated based on its alignment with constitutional principles and its impact on institutional balance. A calibrated approach is necessary, where the judiciary exercises restraint in matters of policy while remaining proactive in protecting fundamental rights and ensuring accountability. Such an approach would preserve the integrity of the separation of powers while allowing the judiciary to fulfil its constitutional mandate.

7.7 Synthesis of Discussion

Overall, the findings underscore that judicial activism in India operates as a double-edged sword. It has been instrumental in advancing justice and constitutional governance, but also poses risks to institutional equilibrium if exercised without restraint. The discussion highlights the need for a nuanced understanding of judicial power, recognising that the legitimacy of judicial activism ultimately depends on maintaining a delicate balance between intervention and restraint. This balance is essential for sustaining both the rule of law and democratic governance in a constitutional system.

8. Policy Implications

The preceding analysis highlights that judicial activism in India plays a significant yet complex role in shaping constitutional governance. While it has been instrumental in protecting rights and addressing institutional failures, it also raises concerns regarding the erosion of the doctrine of separation of powers. In this context, there is a need for well-defined policy measures to ensure a balanced and sustainable constitutional framework.

8.1 Establishing Judicial Guidelines for Activism

One of the primary policy implications is the need to develop clear normative guidelines governing the exercise of judicial activism. While the judiciary enjoys wide interpretative authority, the absence of defined limits can lead to inconsistency and unpredictability.

The Supreme Court may evolve self-regulatory principles that:

- Distinguish between rights-based intervention and policy-making
- Define thresholds for intervention in cases of legislative or executive inaction
- Promote consistency in the use of extraordinary powers such as Article 142

Such internal discipline would enhance judicial credibility while preventing accusations of overreach.

8.2 Strengthening Legislative Accountability

Judicial activism often arises as a response to legislative gaps or delays. Therefore, improving the efficiency and responsiveness of the legislature is essential to reducing excessive judicial intervention.

Policy measures may include:

- Timely enactment of laws on emerging social and technological issues
- Strengthening parliamentary committees for better scrutiny
- Encouraging evidence-based law-making

A more proactive legislature would reduce the need for courts to step into policy domains.

8.3 Enhancing Executive Efficiency

Executive inefficiency and poor implementation of laws frequently trigger judicial intervention. Strengthening administrative mechanisms can help maintain institutional balance.

Key reforms may include:

- Improving governance through transparency and accountability mechanisms
- Ensuring effective implementation of welfare policies
- Reducing bureaucratic delays and arbitrariness

An efficient executive reduces the vacuum that often invites judicial activism.

8.4 Promoting Institutional Dialogue

A collaborative approach among the three branches of government is crucial for maintaining constitutional equilibrium. Instead of operating in isolation or conflict, institutions should engage in constructive dialogue.

This can be achieved through:

- Respect for institutional boundaries
- Responsive action by legislature and executive following judicial observations
- Avoidance of confrontational approaches between branches

Such dialogue would strengthen democratic governance and reduce institutional friction.

8.5 Reforming Judicial Appointments and Accountability

The NJAC debate has highlighted the need for balancing judicial independence with accountability. While independence is essential for impartial adjudication, accountability ensures transparency and public trust.

Possible reforms include:

- Enhancing transparency in the collegium system
- Establishing clear criteria for judicial appointments
- Strengthening mechanisms for judicial performance review

These measures would address concerns about institutional self-regulation without compromising independence.

8.6 Capacity Building within the Judiciary

As courts increasingly deal with complex socio-economic and technological issues, there is a need to enhance judicial capacity.

Policy initiatives may include:

- Specialized training for judges in emerging areas such as technology, environment, and public policy
- Appointment of expert committees to assist courts in complex cases
- Strengthening research support within the judiciary

This would enable more informed and balanced decision-making.

8.7 Clarifying the Scope of Article 142

Given the expansive use of Article 142, it is important to develop clearer jurisprudential boundaries around its application. While the provision is essential for ensuring complete justice, its discretionary nature requires careful regulation.

The judiciary may:

- Define principles governing the invocation of Article 142
- Limit its use to exceptional circumstances
- Ensure that such orders do not conflict with existing statutory frameworks

This would help maintain the balance between flexibility and constitutional discipline.

8.8 Integrating Technology and Governance (“Soil to Server” Perspective)

In line with the broader theme of evolving governance, the increasing role of technology in decision-making calls for judicial awareness and restraint. As governance shifts from traditional systems (“soil”) to digital infrastructures (“server”), courts must carefully navigate issues related to data governance, algorithmic decision-making, and digital rights.

Policy considerations include:

- Developing legal frameworks for digital governance
- Ensuring judicial competence in technology-related disputes
- Avoiding premature judicial intervention in evolving regulatory domains

This dimension adds a contemporary layer to the debate on judicial activism and institutional balance.

8.9 Synthesis

The policy implications underscore that the challenge is not to eliminate judicial activism but to regulate and balance it within the constitutional framework. A coordinated effort involving all three branches of government is necessary to preserve the doctrine of separation of powers while ensuring effective governance. By adopting

these measures, India can maintain a dynamic yet stable constitutional system where judicial activism continues to serve as a tool for justice without undermining democratic principles.

9. Conclusion and Future Research

9.1 Conclusion

The doctrine of separation of powers remains a cornerstone of constitutional governance, ensuring that authority is distributed among the legislature, executive, and judiciary to prevent the concentration of power. In the Indian context, this doctrine operates in a flexible and dynamic manner, shaped by constitutional design and judicial interpretation. Within this framework, judicial activism has emerged as a defining feature of Indian constitutionalism, significantly influencing the balance among institutional actors. This study demonstrates that judicial activism has played a transformative role in advancing constitutional values, particularly in the areas of fundamental rights, social justice, and governmental accountability. Through mechanisms such as Public Interest Litigation and expansive interpretation of constitutional provisions, the judiciary has acted as a guardian of rights and a corrective force in situations of legislative and executive failure. Landmark decisions such as *Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala* (1973) and *Vishaka v. State of Rajasthan* (1997) illustrate how judicial intervention has strengthened constitutional governance and addressed critical societal issues. At the same time, the analysis highlights that judicial activism is not without its limitations. The increasing tendency of courts to engage in policy-making, issue detailed administrative directions, and expand the scope of their powers raises important concerns regarding judicial overreach. Such practices risk blurring institutional boundaries and may undermine the democratic legitimacy of decision-making processes. The NJAC case (2015) further underscores the tension between judicial independence and accountability, reflecting the complexities inherent in maintaining institutional balance.

The findings of this study suggest that judicial activism operates as a double-edged sword. While it is essential for safeguarding constitutional principles and addressing governance gaps, excessive or unregulated intervention can disrupt the equilibrium envisioned under the doctrine of separation of powers. Therefore, the legitimacy of judicial activism depends on its ability to strike a careful balance between intervention and restraint. A calibrated approach is necessary, where the judiciary remains proactive in protecting rights and ensuring accountability but exercises caution in matters that fall within the domain of the legislature and executive. Such an approach would preserve both constitutional integrity and democratic governance, reinforcing the role of the judiciary as a constitutional sentinel rather than a parallel policymaking authority.

9.2 Future Research

While this study provides a comprehensive doctrinal and qualitative analysis of judicial activism in India, several avenues remain open for further research. First, comparative studies examining judicial activism across different jurisdictions, such as the United States, the United Kingdom, and other constitutional democracies, could provide deeper insights into how institutional balance is maintained in varying legal systems. Such comparisons would help contextualize the Indian experience within global constitutional trends. Second, there is scope for empirical research assessing the long-term impact of judicial decisions on governance outcomes. Quantitative studies analyzing the effectiveness of judicial interventions in areas such as environmental protection, administrative reforms, and social justice would complement doctrinal analysis. Third, future research may explore the intersection of technology and judicial power, particularly in the context of digital governance, artificial intelligence, and data protection. As governance increasingly shifts toward digital platforms, new challenges will arise regarding the role of the judiciary in regulating algorithmic decision-making and safeguarding digital rights. Fourth, further inquiry into judicial accountability mechanisms is necessary to address concerns about transparency and legitimacy. This includes examining reforms in judicial appointments, performance evaluation, and institutional oversight. Finally, interdisciplinary approaches that integrate law with political science, sociology, and public policy can offer a more holistic understanding of judicial activism and its broader societal implications.

9.3 Final Reflection

In conclusion, the evolving relationship between judicial activism and separation of powers reflects the dynamic nature of constitutional governance in India. Rather than viewing judicial activism as inherently beneficial or problematic, it must be understood as a context-driven phenomenon that requires continuous evaluation and careful calibration. Maintaining this balance will be critical for ensuring that the Indian constitutional system remains both resilient and responsive in the face of emerging challenges.

References

- [1] Austin, G. (1999). *Working a democratic constitution: The Indian experience*. Oxford University Press.
- [2] Baxi, U. (1985). Taking suffering seriously: Social action litigation in the Supreme Court of India. *Third World Legal Studies*, 4(1), 107–132.
- [3] Dicey, A. V. (1959). *Introduction to the study of the law of the constitution* (10th ed.). Macmillan. (Original work published 1885)
- [4] Government of India. (1950). *The Constitution of India*.
- [5] Jaswal, N. (2021). Judicial activism in India: A critical analysis. *Indian Journal of Legal Studies*, 12(2), 45–62.
- [6] Khosla, M. (2012). *The Indian Constitution*. Oxford University Press.
- [7] Locke, J. (1988). *Two treatises of government* (P. Laslett, Ed.). Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1689)
- [8] Mehta, P. B. (2007). The rise of judicial sovereignty. *Journal of Democracy*, 18(2), 70–83.
- [9] Montesquieu. (1989). *The spirit of the laws* (A. M. Cohler, B. C. Miller, & H. S. Stone, Trans.). Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1748)
- [10] Pandey, A., & Agrawal, M. (2025). Judicial activism and the doctrine of separation of powers in India. *Indian Journal of Constitutional Law*, 9(1), 1–18.
- [11] Rosenberg, G. N. (2008). *The hollow hope: Can courts bring about social change?* (2nd ed.). University of Chicago Press.
- [12] Sathe, S. P. (2002). *Judicial activism in India: Transgressing borders and enforcing limits*. Oxford University Press.
- [13] Seervai, H. M. (1996). *Constitutional law of India* (4th ed.). Universal Law Publishing.
- [14] Sharma, Y. (2024). Judicial activism in the backdrop of separation of powers: A constitutional analysis. *Indian Journal of Integrated Research in Law*, 4(3), 1–15.
- [15] Shukla, V. N. (2017). *Constitution of India* (13th ed.). Eastern Book Company.

Case Laws

- [16] A.K. Gopalan v. State of Madras, AIR 1950 SC 27.
- [17] Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala, AIR 1973 SC 1461.
- [18] Indira Nehru Gandhi v. Raj Narain, AIR 1975 SC 2299.
- [19] Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India, AIR 1978 SC 597.
- [20] Minerva Mills Ltd. v. Union of India, AIR 1980 SC 1789.
- [21] Bandhua Mukti Morcha v. Union of India, AIR 1984 SC 802.
- [22] Olga Tellis v. Bombay Municipal Corporation, AIR 1986 SC 180.
- [23] M.C. Mehta v. Union of India, AIR 1987 SC 1086.
- [24] Vishaka v. State of Rajasthan, AIR 1997 SC 3011.
- [25] I.R. Coelho v. State of Tamil Nadu, (2007) 2 SCC 1.
- [26] Supreme Court Advocates-on-Record Association v. Union of India, (2016) 5 SCC 1.

Additional Legal & Conceptual Sources

- [27] Vile, M. J. C. (1998). *Constitutionalism and the separation of powers* (2nd ed.). Liberty Fund.
- [28] Wade, H. W. R., & Forsyth, C. F. (2014). *Administrative law* (11th ed.). Oxford University Press.
- [29] Jain, M. P. (2016). *Indian constitutional law* (8th ed.). LexisNexis.
- [30] Tripathi, P. K. (1978). Judicial activism in India. *Journal of the Indian Law Institute*, 20(3), 303–312.