

Judicial Politics in India: The Crisis of Constitutional Silence

Somprity*

Assistant Professor, SSR College of Arts Commerce and Science, Sayli, Silvassa

Received: 09/01/2026

Accepted: 13/02/2026

Published: 27/02/2026

Abstract: India's constitutional framework, celebrated for its explicit enumeration of fundamental rights and directive principles, contains significant silences that have become the contested terrain of judicial politics. This paper examines how the Supreme Court of India has navigated, exploited, and at times exacerbated these silences — gaps in constitutional text concerning judicial appointments, the scope of basic structure doctrine, legislative accountability, and the boundaries of executive power. Drawing on landmark judgments from the Kesavananda Bharati case to the NJAC verdict and beyond, the paper argues that constitutional silence is not merely an interpretive void but a structural invitation for judicial agency. The resulting tension between democratic legitimacy and constitutional supremacy has produced a crisis of institutional ambiguity, wherein the judiciary's counter-majoritarian role is simultaneously indispensable and contested. The paper critically assesses how the collegium system emerged from silence, how PIL jurisdiction expanded beyond textual mandate, and how judicial overreach and restraint oscillate without principled demarcation. It concludes that resolving this crisis demands not only constitutional amendment but a broader deliberative reckoning with the normative foundations of judicial power in a plural democracy.

Keywords: *Judicial politics, Constitutional silence, Judicial overreach, Counter-majoritarian difficulty, public interest litigation.*

Cite this article: Somprity. (2026). Judicial Politics in India: The Crisis of Constitutional Silence. *MRS Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Studies*, 3(2), 42-45.

Introduction

The Indian judiciary has a central place in the constitutional and political framework of India. Designed as an independent organ of the state, the judiciary is regarded as the guardian of the Constitution, protector of fundamental rights, and interpreter of law. Over the decades, the judiciary in India has evolved from a relatively restrained institution into one of the most powerful judicial systems in the world. This transformation has given rise to the controversy of “judicial politics” — the interaction between courts, political institutions, and public policy. Judicial politics in India involves the increasing participation of courts in governance, constitutional interpretation, and political disputes.

The emergence of judicial activism, expansion of Public Interest Litigation (PIL), and judicial intervention in executive and legislative matters have significantly altered the balance among the organs of government. While many view judicial intervention as essential for protecting the democracy and constitutional morality, critics argue that excessive activism threatens the principle of separation of powers. Within this debate lies the issue of the “crisis of constitutional silence,” where ambiguities or gaps in the Constitution compel courts to assume interpretive authority in areas not explicitly addressed by constitutional text.

This paper examines judicial politics in India by analyzing the evolution of judicial power, judicial activism, politicization of the judiciary, and the constitutional crisis created by silence and ambiguity in constitutional provisions. It also evaluates the effects of judicial politics for Indian democracy and governance.

Meaning of Judicial Politics

Judicial politics refers to the influence of political considerations on judicial behavior and the role of courts in political processes. In democratic systems, courts can not function in complete isolation from politics because constitutional interpretation often affects governance, public policy, elections, and individual rights. Judicial politics emerges when judges make decisions with significant political consequences or when political actors attempt to influence judicial institutions.

In India, judicial politics can be understood through three dimensions:

- Judicial intervention in governance
- Political influence over judicial appointments and functioning
- Judicial interpretation of constitutional ambiguities

The judiciary's role expanded considerably after the 1970s since courts began interpreting the Constitution more creatively to protect rights and limit executive excesses.

Evolution of Judicial Power in India

Early Constitutional Phase

In the initial decades after independence, the Indian judiciary followed a relatively conservative approach. The Supreme Court generally respected parliamentary supremacy and avoided direct confrontation with the executive. However, disputes soon arose over land reforms, property rights, and constitutional amendments.

The conflict between Parliament and the judiciary intensified in cases involving the right to property. Parliament sought to implement socialist policies through constitutional amendments, while the judiciary attempted to protect fundamental rights.

The Kesavananda Bharati Case and Basic Structure Doctrine

A turning point came with the landmark judgment in *Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala*. The Supreme Court held that Parliament could amend the Constitution but could not alter its “basic structure.” This doctrine became one of the most powerful judicial innovations in constitutional law.

The Basic Structure Doctrine transformed the judicial politics in India because it established judiciary as the final guardian of constitutional identity. Through this doctrine, courts acquired authority to invalidate constitutional amendments passed by elected representatives.

Important aspects of the basic structure include:

- Rule of law
- Separation of powers
- Judicial review
- Federalism
- Secularism
- Democracy

This judgment fundamentally changed the relationship between the judiciary and Parliament.

Judicial Activism in India

Judicial activism refers to the proactive role played by judges in enforcing rights and shaping public policy. In India, judicial activism gained momentum after the Emergency period (1975–77), when the judiciary faced criticism for failing to protect civil liberties.

Public Interest Litigation (PIL)

The introduction of PIL revolutionized access to justice. Courts relaxed procedural rules and allowed public-spirited individuals to approach the judiciary on behalf of marginalized groups. Prominent judges such as Justice P. N. Bhagwati and Justice V. R. Krishna Iyer expanded the scope of Article 21, interpreting the right to life broadly.

The judiciary addressed issues such as:

- Environmental protection
- Prison reforms
- Bonded labor
- Women’s rights
- Corruption
- Electoral reforms

Judicial activism strengthened democratic accountability by compelling governments to fulfill constitutional obligations.

Expansion of Fundamental Rights

The judiciary interpreted the Constitution dynamically to include several implied rights under Article 21. These included:

- Right to education
- Right to privacy
- Right to livelihood
- Right to clean environment

- Right to legal aid

Such interpretations demonstrated the judiciary’s willingness to adapt constitutional principles to changing social realities.

Judicialization of Politics

Judicialization of politics refers to the increasing dependence on courts for resolving political controversies. In India, courts frequently adjudicate issues relating to:

- Elections
- Corruption scandals
- Coalition politics
- Reservation policies
- Religious disputes
- Executive appointments

As political institutions weakened due to corruption, instability, or inefficiency, citizens increasingly turned to courts for solutions.

Some important examples are

The Indira Gandhi Election Case

The case involving Indira Gandhi demonstrated how judicial decisions could alter political power. The Allahabad High Court invalidated her election on grounds of electoral malpractice, leading to political instability and eventually the declaration of Emergency.

2G Spectrum and Coal Allocation Cases

The Supreme Court intervened in corruption scandals involving allocation of natural resources, cancelling licenses and monitoring investigations. These decisions significantly influenced public policy and political accountability.

Ayodhya land Dispute

The judiciary also played a crucial role in resolving the long-standing Ayodhya dispute through constitutional adjudication, illustrating how courts become central actors in politically sensitive matters.

Politicization of the Judiciary

While judicial activism has often been celebrated, concerns about politicization of the judiciary have also emerged.

Judicial Appointments and the Collegium System

The appointment of judges remains one of the most controversial issues in Indian judicial politics. Initially, the executive had substantial influence in appointments. However, through the “Judges Cases,” the Supreme Court established the Collegium System, giving senior judges primary authority in judicial appointments.

Critics argue that the collegium lacks:

- Transparency
- Accountability
- Diversity
- Democratic legitimacy

Supporters claim it protects judicial independence from political interference.

The conflict between the judiciary and executive intensified when Parliament passed the National Judicial Appointments Commission

(NJAC) Act to replace the collegium system. However, the Supreme Court struck down the NJAC as unconstitutional, reaffirming judicial supremacy in appointments.

Separation of Powers and Judicial Overreach

The Indian Constitution does not establish a strict separation of powers like the United States Constitution. Instead, it provides a system of checks and balances. However, critics argue that judicial activism has sometimes crossed into judicial overreach.

Areas of Judicial Overreach

Courts have intervened in:

- Policy formulation
- Administrative appointments
- Environmental regulation
- Police reforms
- Education policies
- Pandemic management

Some critics contend that courts lack the institutional expertise and democratic legitimacy to make policy decisions. Excessive judicial intervention may weaken elected governments and blur constitutional boundaries.

However, supporters argue that judicial intervention becomes necessary when the executive fails to discharge constitutional duties.

The Crisis of Constitutional Silence

One of the significant aspects of judicial politics in India is the “crisis of constitutional silence.” Constitutional silence refers to situations where the Constitution does not explicitly provide guidance on a legal or political issue. Such silence creates uncertainty and grants courts considerable interpretive discretion.

Nature of Constitutional Silence

The Indian Constitution is detailed, yet it cannot anticipate every future challenge. Constitutional silence may arise due to:

- Ambiguous language
- Absence of procedural clarity
- New social and technological developments
- Political compromises during constitution-making

In these situations, courts become responsible for filling constitutional gaps.

Judicial Interpretation and Constitutional Morality

To address constitutional silence, Indian courts often rely on concepts such as:

- Constitutional morality
- Basic structure
- Rule of law

Transformative constitutionalism

These principles allow judges to interpret the Constitution beyond literal text.

Examples of Constitutional Silence

Privacy Rights

The Constitution does not explicitly mention the right to privacy. In the landmark privacy judgment, the Supreme Court recognized privacy as a fundamental right derived from Article 21. This interpretation addressed constitutional silence regarding digital rights and personal autonomy.

Governor’s Powers

The Constitution provides broad discretionary powers to Governors without clearly defining their limits. This silence has generated frequent political disputes concerning:

Government formation

- Floor tests
- Dismissal of state governments

Courts have repeatedly intervened to regulate gubernatorial discretion.

Judicial Appointments

The Constitution originally provided limited clarity regarding judicial appointments. Through judicial interpretation, the collegium system emerged despite lacking explicit constitutional basis. Critics argue this demonstrates how constitutional silence can enable judicial expansion of power.

Emergency Powers

Ambiguities regarding emergency provisions led to misuse during the Emergency period. Later judicial interpretations sought to impose constitutional limitations on executive authority.

Consequences of Constitutional Silence:

Positive Consequences

- Flexibility of the Constitution
- Constitutional silence allows adaptation to changing social realities.
- Protection of Rights
- Courts can expand rights in response to emerging challenges.
- Strengthening Constitutionalism
- Judicial interpretation ensures that constitutional values remain relevant.

Negative Consequences

- Judicial Supremacy
- Excessive interpretive power may undermine democratic institutions.
- Uncertainty
- Lack of textual clarity can produce inconsistent judgments.
- Politicization
- Courts may become deeply involved in political controversies.
- Democratic Deficit
- Unelected judges may effectively create law without electoral accountability.

Judicial Accountability and Reform

As judicial power has expanded, demands for accountability have also increased.

Need for Judicial Reforms

Important reforms include:

- Greater transparency in appointments
- Timely disposal of cases
- Ethical standards for judges
- Improved access to justice
- Institutional accountability
- Balancing Independence and Accountability

Judicial independence is essential for democracy, but unchecked power may weaken constitutional balance. Therefore, reforms must be there to preserve independence while ensuring transparency and public confidence.

Judicial Politics and Indian Democracy

Judicial politics has profoundly shaped Indian democracy. The judiciary has acted both as:

- A protector of constitutional rights
- A participant in political governance

In many cases, courts have defended democracy against authoritarian tendencies. The judiciary's role during periods of political crisis demonstrates its importance in maintaining constitutional order.

At the same time, increasing judicial intervention raises concerns about democratic legitimacy and institutional balance. A democracy functions effectively only when all constitutional organs respect their respective boundaries.

The crisis of constitutional silence intensifies these tensions because judges often become the ultimate interpreters of unresolved constitutional questions. This gives the judiciary immense influence over political and constitutional development.

Conclusion

Judicial politics in India reflects the dynamic relationship between law, politics, and constitutional governance. Over time, the judiciary has evolved into a powerful institution capable of shaping public policy, protecting rights, and restraining governmental excesses. Through doctrines such as basic structure and judicial review, the courts have emerged as guardians of constitutional democracy.

However, the rise of judicial activism and judicialization of politics has also generated concerns regarding overreach, accountability, and democratic legitimacy. The judiciary's expanding role is closely linked to the crisis of constitutional silence, where constitutional ambiguities compel courts to interpret and fill institutional gaps.

Constitutional silence can serve as both a strength and a weakness. It allows constitutional flexibility and adaptation, but it also grants

unelected judges significant political authority. The challenge for Indian democracy lies in maintaining a careful balance between judicial independence and democratic accountability.

Ultimately, judicial politics in India illustrates the continuing evolution of constitutional governance in a complex and diverse democracy. The judiciary remains indispensable to the protection of constitutional values, but its legitimacy depends on restraint, transparency, and respect for democratic principles.

References

Books

1. Constitutional Law of India, Seervai, H. M. Constitutional Law of India. Universal Law Publishing, 4th Edition, 1991.
2. Introduction to the Constitution of India, Basu, D. D. Introduction to the Constitution of India. LexisNexis, 22nd Edition, 2015.
3. Judicial Activism in India, Sathe, S. P. Judicial Activism in India: Transgressing Borders and Enforcing Limits. Oxford University Press, 2002.
4. The Indian Constitution: Cornerstone of a Nation, Austin, Granville. The Indian Constitution: Cornerstone of a Nation. Oxford University Press, 1966.
5. Working a Democratic Constitution, Austin, Granville. Working a Democratic Constitution: The Indian Experience. Oxford University Press, 1999.
6. Judicial Review and Judicial Activism, Baxi, Upendra. Judicial Review and Judicial Activism in India. Indian Law Institute Publications.

Important Cases

1. Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala, AIR 1973 SC 1461.
2. Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India, AIR 1978 SC 597.
3. Indira Nehru Gandhi v. Raj Narain, AIR 1975 SC 2299.
4. Minerva Mills v. Union of India, AIR 1980 SC 1789.
5. S. R. Bommai v. Union of India, AIR 1994 SC 1918.
6. Justice K. S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India, (2017) 10 SCC 1.
7. Supreme Court Advocates-on-Record Association v. Union of India, (2016) 5 SCC 1.
8. Reports and Constitutional Sources
9. Constituent Assembly of India, Constituent Assembly Debates, Official Reports, 1946–1949.
10. Law Commission of India, 230th Report on Reforms in the Judiciary, 2009.
11. Supreme Court of India, Constitution of India, Government of India.
12. National Judicial Appointments Commission, NJAC Act, 2014.