



ScriptHive Glob Multidiscip Res J
2026; Vol. 1 (Issue 1)
Page no. 15-20

ISSN (e): XXXX-XXXX
ISSN (p): XXXX-XXXX
Received: 10-08-2026
Accepted: 06-09-2026
© 2026, All rights reserved
<https://www.scripthive.org/sgmrj>

***Corresponding author:**
Divesh Bhalothia

Constitutionalism, Rule of Law, and The Democratic Imperative in India: An Analytical Review

**Divesh Bhalothia¹ & Mohit Bamaniya²*

^{1,2} Department of Law, Shri Jagdish Prasad Jhabarmal Tibrewala University, Vidya Nagari, Jhunjhunu, Rajasthan, India

Abstract

India has instituted a comprehensive democratic, republican, and parliamentary framework designed fundamentally to secure individual dignity and protect civil liberties. Far transcending its operational identity as an institutional mechanism of governance, democracy in the modern context represents an advanced socio-political state characterized by legal egalitarianism, systemic checks and balances, and shared civic ethos. This review paper provides an extensive legal and conceptual assessment of the Indian democratic model. It traces the operational interplay between legislative actions, judicial review, and executive regulations, particularly exploring how systemic tensions-such as the balance between majority will and minority protection, national emergencies, and the preservation of secularism-are resolved within the framework of the rule of law. By evaluating landmarks of both domestic jurisprudence and global legal standards, this paper analyzes the structural integrity of the Indian polity, concluding that the preservation of constitutionalism relies heavily on active judicial vigilance, public accountability, and the continuous defense of institutional checks.

Keywords: India, Constitutionalism, Rule of Law, Judicial Review, Democracy, Pluralism

1. INTRODUCTION

Absolute intellectual autonomy and the unhindered expression of conscience are the foundational pillars of human progress and societal advancement. As John Milton famously argued in *Areopagitica*, the freedom to recognize, articulate, and deliberate openly based on conscience represents a primary and indispensable human right. Within contemporary political science, democracy is frequently summarized simply as majoritarian rule. However, such definitions face profound critique, particularly when a narrow majority can systematically disregard or undermine the core interests and civil rights of a significant minority. A durable configuration of democracy requires structural guarantees designed to protect minoritarian factions from majoritarian overreach. This conforms to the Madisonian framework articulated in the *Federalist Papers*, which posits that a governance model achieves genuine democracy only when its internal architecture of checks and balances prevents the emergence of tyranny from any single faction.

Operationally, true democratic governance requires the continuous and active participation of citizens in determining national policy. This is achieved by granting the electorate direct power to select representatives, alongside periodic, structured opportunities to replace incumbent administrations whose policies no longer command public approval. The lessons of political history demonstrate that unconstrained authority leads directly to institutional decay; the classic axiom that power corrupts, and

absolute power corrupts absolutely, remains an essential caution for institutional design ^[1]. Consequently, the public serves as the final arbiter and supervisor of state authority.

To preserve this accountability, the structural independence of the judiciary and the unyielding enforcement of the Rule of Law are indispensable elements of a civilized state. Constitutionalism relies on institutional structures designed to sustain a free, civil society using minimum state coercion and maximizing public reason ^[2]. In a constitutional democracy, law acts as a universal binding agent, constraining governors and the governed, judges and litigants equally. The sovereign citizenry voluntarily subjects itself to the limitations of legal order and a codified bill of rights, establishing independent courts to monitor and enforce these legal borders ^[3].

2. Scope and Objectives of The Study

While democracy is universally praised, its practical application varies globally, often leading to conceptual ambiguity. Totalitarian regimes and autocracies frequently adopt the vocabulary of democracy to validate centralized power structure. This paper offers a systemic, jurisprudence-focused evaluation of the Indian democratic framework to map its structural mechanisms and conceptual boundaries.

The primary objectives of this study are:

1. To trace the historical evolution, philosophical roots, and structural growth of the democratic framework in India.
2. To examine how democratic governance, human rights, and the rule of law are recognized and balanced across both national jurisdictions and international legal frameworks.
3. To provide a rigorous analysis of the constitutional provisions, legislative acts, and landmark judicial decisions that define the scope of the Indian state's powers and individual liberties.
4. To critically assess key mechanisms of accountability, such as the basic structure doctrine, public interest litigation, and the institutional frameworks governing statutory oversight.

3. The Jurisprudence of State Power, Emergencies, and Rights

Constitutional systems regularly encounter environments where distinct rights and societal interests come into direct conflict. Entrusting extensive administrative and police powers to the executive demands strict, continuous oversight to prevent over-ambitious state actors from overriding constitutional limitations. The judiciary is tasked with managing these competing claims. For instance, during national emergencies, the state often restricts public speech to secure the nation. Yet, as established by the global standard in *Gilbert v. Minnesota* ^[4], while states may regulate speech to protect national security during conflicts, these exercises of power are never entirely exempt from constitutional scrutiny.

Temporary shifts in constitutional balances are sometimes necessary to address exceptional crises. As articulated in *Block v. Hirsh* ^[5], emergency provisions designed to carry a nation through a temporary crisis can justify legislative interventions that would be unconstitutional if enacted as permanent structural changes. Nonetheless, as confirmed in *Kennedy v. Mendoza-Martinez* ^[6], the extensive war powers of the state and its authority to govern foreign relations must always conform to the fundamental requirements of due process. Legislative and executive measures cannot bypass basic procedural fairness under the guise of state necessity.

This balance between public necessity and individual rights is also visible in contemporary fields like environmental law and governance. Modern international and domestic legal frameworks increasingly demonstrate that environmental degradation directly threatens fundamental human rights, such as the right to life and health. As noted by Alfonso De Salas, international human rights tribunals are increasingly reviewing individual complaints where environmental damage is treated as a direct breach of codified convention rights ^[7]. Similarly, Patricia Kamari-Mbote has highlighted that building a robust

rule of law requires integrating good governance, human rights protections, and institutional evolution within the justice sector to meet modern public needs [8, 9].

Furthermore, as David Bloomfield emphasizes, democratic systems provide the most reliable post-conflict framework because they manage deep societal differences peacefully [10]. By moving away from zero-sum solutions and adopting cooperative, win-win institutional strategies, democracy changes conflict management from violent confrontation into peaceful, rule-bound political discourse.

4. Judicial clarifications on the concept of "law"

To evaluate a system built on the Rule of Law, one must precisely define what constitutes "Law" under constitutional terms. The judiciary has repeatedly assessed the meaning of this term across multiple jurisdictions. The table below catalogs the landmark judicial interpretations defining the scope, function, and limits of law:

Case Title & Citation	Court / Forum	Core Legal Principle & Analytical Finding
<i>Ali Reza Esmati (2016)</i>	Constitutional Analysis	Affirmed that preventive or temporary detention without explicit judicial sanction violates Part III liberties, emphasizing that fragmented rules cannot override basic human dignity [11].
<i>Hem Chandra Saikia v. State of Assam (1992)</i>	Gauhati High Court	Defined "Law" strictly as statutory enactments passed by the competent legislature following prescribed legislative procedures [12].
<i>AIR 1975 MP 174</i>	Madhya Pradesh HC	Established a strong legal presumption in favor of marriage and against concubinage, placing the burden of proof squarely on the party challenging legitimacy [13].
<i>AIR 1984 S.C. 684</i>	Supreme Court of India	Clarified that the term "Law" in the context of Article 13 refers strictly to legislative enactments brought forth through formal legislative power [14].
<i>AIR 1986 S.C. 1571</i>	Supreme Court of India	Declared that the primary, allocated function of the law is dynamic-it must evolve continuously to serve the changing functional needs of society [15].
<i>Board of Mining Examination v. Ramjee (1977)</i>	Supreme Court of India	Warned against a narrow, overly technical application of legal rules, noting that a fragmented understanding can cause mechanisms of justice to misfire [16].
<i>M/S Bishamber Dayal Chandra Mohan v. State of U.P. (1982)</i>	Supreme Court of India	Ruled that "Law" under Article 300-A must mean an Act of Parliament, a State Legislature enactment, or a statutory rule/order carrying valid legal force [17].
<i>Ram Parsad v. State of Bihar (1952)</i>	Patna High Court	Held that "Law" under Article 245 encompasses all formal legislative acts carried out in the exact manner and form prescribed by the Constitution [18].
<i>Emperor v. Abdul Hamid (1923)</i>	Patna High Court (SB)	Stated that the fundamental essence of any rule or regulation claiming the status of law is its institutional enforceability [19].

5. Constitutional Evolution, Judicial Review, and The Basic Structure

The power of judicial review gives the judiciary its authority to check legislative and executive actions. This principle, famously articulated by Chief Justice John Marshall in the American landmark *Marbury v. Madison* [20], establishes that the judiciary has the definitive duty to interpret the constitution and strike down acts that violate it. In the Indian democratic context, this power is a key feature of constitutional governance. As affirmed in *State of West Bengal v. Union of India* [23], legal sovereignty under the Constitution resides ultimately in the people, who have distributed governance powers among distinct organs while preserving constitutional supremacy. Under processes like Article 143, seen in cases such as *In Re Delhi Laws Act* [24], the judiciary also provides advisory opinions to guide the executive within constitutional bounds.

The Indian Supreme Court's approach to its own decisions highlights the dynamic nature of constitutional interpretation. As noted by Justice S.R. Das in *Dwarkanadas Shrinivas v. Sholapur Spinning & Weaving Co.* [25], the apex court is not unyieldingly bound by its own precedents and retains the authority to review and modify earlier rulings when social realities or legal clarity require it. This

flexibility is supported by specific statutory protections. For example, in *Mohd. Ahmed Khan v. Shah Bano Begum* ^[21], the Court applied section 125 of the CrPC to secure maintenance rights across communities, reinforcing social justice. Furthermore, while the legislature cannot simply declare a final court judgment void, it can change the underlying legal basis of a decision. As confirmed in *State of Tamil Nadu v. State of Kerala* ^[22], the legislature may validate a law by fixing the specific technical or legal defects pointed out by judicial review.

The historic struggle over the scope of constitutional amendments demonstrates how the judiciary has protected the core of Indian democracy. In the early decisions of *Sankari Prasad v. Union of India* ^[36] and *Sajjan Singh v. State of Rajasthan* ^[37], the Supreme Court initially ruled that the regular legislative definitions of "law" under Article 13(2) did not include constitutional amendments made under Article 368. This gave Parliament wide authority to modify fundamental rights. However, this view was dramatically reversed in *Golak Nath v. State of Punjab* ^[38]. The Court ruled that constitutional amendments do fall within the scope of Article 13(2), meaning Parliament could not pass amendments that restricted or removed fundamental liberties.

This confrontation led to the definitive ruling in *Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala* ^[39]. Here, a full bench established the Basic Structure Doctrine. The Court held that while Parliament has broad powers to amend the Constitution under Article 368, this power does not extend to altering or destroying its essential framework and foundational identity. This principle was reinforced in *Minerva Mills Ltd. v. Union of India* ^[40], where the Court struck down clauses (4) and (5) of Article 368, ruling that Parliament cannot expand its amending power to completely eliminate judicial review.

The protection of individual rights has advanced alongside this structural evolution. In *A.K. Gopalan v. State of Madras* ^[35], Chief Justice Kania noted that judicial review is an inherent feature of constitutional courts, active even without explicit textual declarations like Article 13. Over time, the Court expanded its interpretive methods, moving away from strict literalism. As seen in *M/S Saramjivi Stores Calcutta v. Union of India* ^[28], the judiciary avoids overly literal interpretations if they defeat the clear purpose of a statute. Similarly, *Navin Chand v. Commissioner of Income Tax* ^[29] showed that constitutional entries must be interpreted broadly to keep pace with societal needs. This progressive approach is evident in *Express Newspaper v. Union of India* ^[30], where the Court integrated modern socio-economic concepts of living, minimum, and fair wages directly into its analysis of fundamental freedoms.

The institutional tools used to enforce these rights have also evolved significantly. Under Article 32, as clarified in *Gopal Das Mohta v. Union of India* ^[45], citizens have a guaranteed right to petition the Supreme Court directly to enforce their fundamental liberties. When these freedoms are threatened, citizens have multiple structural options. As ruled in *Makhan Singh v. State of Punjab* ^[42], an individual whose personal liberty is infringed can seek relief by filing constitutional writs under either Article 226 before a High Court or Article 32 before the Supreme Court. The introduction of Public Interest Litigation (PIL) marked a major shift in legal access. In cases like *People's Union for Democratic Rights v. Union of India* ^[32] and *D.S. Nakara v. Union of India* ^[33], the apex court loosened traditional rules of locus standi. This change allowed public-spirited citizens to seek judicial remedies for public injuries and systemic injustices affecting vulnerable groups who could not access the courts themselves.

Finally, the judiciary has consistently maintained that these protections must remain stable and predictable. While individual liberties are broad, as noted in *Allgeyer v. Louisiana* ^[43], they encompass choices and actions protected by law. The courts map these boundaries through steady, empirical experience, as suggested in *Wolf v. Colorado* ^[44]. To preserve stability, the ultimate decisions of the country's highest court must be respected; as affirmed in *Devendra Pal Singh v. State N.C.T. Delhi* ^[48], final judgments are conclusive, and reopening them via judicial review remains a rare exception. This stability protects core democratic processes, ensuring that reforms-such as open ballot systems-strengthen the foundational features of the Constitution rather than exposing the political system to corruption ^[46, 47].

6. Pluralism, Secularism, and The Democratic Ideal

A democratic system requires robust political, social, and legal mechanisms to manage its diverse components and prevent a pluralistic society from fracturing. In the Indian context, secularism is a central pillar of this stability. It is not merely a political term but a core constitutional commitment. While traditional Western secularism focuses on a strict separation between church and state, Indian secularism adapts to a deeply religious society. It operates on the principle of *Sarva Dharma Samabhava* -ensuring equal respect, safety, and protection for all religious communities.

As Jawaharlal Nehru observed, secularism creates an environment of widespread tolerance, mutual cooperation, and equal treatment by ensuring the state does not impose a specific religion on any citizen. While terms like "religion" and "secularism" can lead to differing interpretations, the constitutional objective is clear: maintaining unity amid diversity. Legal tools must protect this pluralism, ensuring that the state remains neutral and inclusive, allowing the democratic structure to survive alongside its diverse cultural traditions.

7. Conclusion and Policy Recommendations

The long-term success of Indian democracy relies on its capacity to fulfill its constitutional promises: delivering political, social, and economic justice to every citizen. Protecting individual dignity and maintaining the rule of law require continuous structural improvements and active public accountability. To strengthen the democratic system against majoritarian imbalances, political corruption, and institutional decline, the following recommendations are proposed:

1. **Reinforcing Institutional Accountability:** Constitutional bodies and statutory oversight mechanisms must be insulated from executive overreach to ensure they can evaluate government actions independently.
2. **Strengthening Judicial Review and Access:** The judiciary must continue to protect the Basic Structure Doctrine while streamlining Public Interest Litigation (PIL) frameworks to prevent misuse and focus resources on systemic injustices facing marginalized communities.
3. **Enhancing Legislative Standards:** Standardized qualifications and robust accountability mechanisms should be enforced for members of Parliament and State Legislatures to ensure they remain responsive to public needs.
4. **Expanding Civic Literacy:** Comprehensive civic and legal education programs should be expanded nationwide, ensuring citizens understand their rights, responsibilities, and the legal processes that sustain the democratic order.

References

1. Mishra, G. S. (2008). *Democracy in India*. New Delhi: Sanbun Publishers.
2. Kermit, H. L. (2017). *The Supreme Court in American Society: The Role of the Supreme Court in American Society*. London: Routledge.
3. Harvard Law Review Association. (1958). *Constitutional Law: Separation of Powers*. Harvard Law Review, 71(5), 25080619.
4. *Gilbert v. Minnesota*, 254 U.S. 325 (1920).
5. *Block v. Hirsh*, 256 U.S. 135 (1921).
6. *Kennedy v. Mendoza-Martinez*, 372 U.S. 144 (1963).
7. De Salas, A. (2012). *Manual on Human Rights and the Environment*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.
8. Kameri-Mbote, P., *et al.* (2011). *Kenya: Justice Sector and the Rule of Law*. Nairobi: Open Society Foundations.
9. Kameri-Mbote, P. (2011). *Legal and Institutional Frameworks for Good Governance*. Nairobi: University of Nairobi Press.

10. Bloomfield, D., Barnes, T., & Huyse, L. (2003). *Reconciliation After Violent Conflict: A Handbook*. Stockholm: International IDEA.
11. Ali Reja Esmati v. State of West Bengal, AIR 2016 SC 412.
12. Hem Chandra Saikia v. State of Assam, (1992) 2 Lab LIC 1252 (Gau).
13. State of M.P. v. Turning & Ors., AIR 1975 MP 174.
14. State of Punjab v. Khan Chand, AIR 1984 S.C. 684.
15. State of Bihar v. Asis Kumar Mukherjee, AIR 1986 S.C. 1571.
16. Board of Mining Examination v. Ramjee, AIR 1977 S.C. 956.
17. M/S Bishamber Dayal Chandra Mohan v. State of U.P., AIR 1982 S.C. 32.
18. Ram Parsad v. State of Bihar, AIR 1952 Pat 194.
19. Emperor v. Abdul Hamid, AIR 1923 Pat 1.
20. Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. (1 Cranch) 137 (1803).
21. Mohd. Ahmed Khan v. Shah Bano Begum, AIR 1985 SC 945.
22. State of Tamil Nadu v. State of Kerala, AIR 2014 S.C. 2407.
23. State of West Bengal v. Union of India, AIR 1963 S.C. 124.
24. In Re Delhi Laws Act Case, AIR 1951 SC 332.
25. Dwarkadas Shrinivas v. Sholapur Spinning & Weaving Co., AIR 1954 S.C. 119.
26. Akbar, A. (2011). *Secularism: Conceptual Contradictions and the Need for Secular Minds*. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 46(12), 43–51.
27. Mohori Bibee v. Dharmodas Ghose, (1903) 30 IA 114.
28. M/S Saramjivi Stores Calcutta v. Union of India, AIR (1982) Delhi 76.
29. Navin Chand v. Commissioner of Income Tax, Bombay, AIR 1955 S.C. 58.
30. Express Newspaper v. Union of India, AIR 1958 S.C. 578.
31. Raj Narayan v. Indira Gandhi, 1971 H.C. Allahabad.
32. People's Union for Democratic Rights v. Union of India, AIR 1982 S.C. 1473.
33. D.S. Nakara v. Union of India, AIR 1983 S.C. 305.
34. State of Madras v. V.G. Row, AIR 1952 SC 196.
35. A.K. Gopalan v. State of Madras, AIR 1950 S.C. 27.
36. Sankari Prasad v. Union of India, AIR 1951 S.C. 458.
37. Sajjan Singh v. State of Rajasthan, AIR 1965 S.C. 845.
38. Golak Nath v. State of Punjab, AIR 1967 SC 1643.
39. Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala, AIR 1973 S.C. 1461.
40. Minerva Mills Ltd. v. Union of India, AIR 1980 SC 1789.
41. Union of India v. Metal Corporation of India, AIR 1967 S.C. 637.
42. Makhan Singh v. State of Punjab, AIR 1964 S.C. 381.
43. Allgeyer v. Louisiana, 165 U.S. 578 (1897).
44. Wolf v. Colorado, 338 U.S. 25 (1949).
45. Gopal Das Mohta v. Union of India, AIR 1955 S.C. 1.
46. Kuldeep Nayar v. Union of India, AIR 2006 S.C. 3127.
47. Committee on Judicial Accountability v. Union of India, AIR 1992 S.C. 320.
48. Devendra Pal Singh v. State N.C.T. Delhi, AIR 2003 S.C. 886.