ILE MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL

VOLUME 3 AND ISSUE 1 OF 2024

INSTITUTE OF LEGAL EDUCATION

ILE MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL

APIS – 3920 – 0007 | ISSN - 2583-7230

(OPEN ACCESS JOURNAL)

Journal's Home Page – https://mj.iledu.in/

Journal's Editorial Page - https://mj.iledu.in/editorial-board/

Volume 3 and Issue 1 (Access Full Issue on - https://mj.iledu.in/category/volume-3-and-issue-1-of-2024/)

Publisher

Prasanna S,

Chairman of Institute of Legal Education (Established by I.L.E. Educational Trust)

No. 08, Arul Nagar, Seera Thoppu,

Maudhanda Kurichi, Srirangam,

Tiruchirappalli – 620102

Phone : +91 94896 71437 - info@iledu.in / Chairman@iledu.in

ILE MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL [IF SCORE – 7.58]

VOLUME 3 AND ISSUE 1 OF 2024

APIS – 3920 – 0007 | ISSN - 2583-7230

Published by

Institute of Legal Education

https://iledu.in

CONSTITUTIONAL SAFEGUARDS AGAINST ADMINISTRATIVE ABUSE : LESSONS FROM JUDICIAL PRECEDENTS

AUTHOR - INDUSHA.K.R & ESAKKIAPPAN.K, STUDENTS AT THE TAMILNADU DR. AMBEDKAR LAW UNIVERSITY – SCHOOL OF EXCELLENCE IN LAW

BEST CITATION - INDUSHA.K.R & ESAKKIAPPAN.K, CONSTITUTIONAL SAFEGUARDS AGAINST ADMINISTRATIVE ABUSE : LESSONS FROM JUDICIAL PRECEDENTS, ILE MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL, 3 (1) OF 2024, PG. 151-156, APIS – 3920-0007 | ISSN - 2583-7230.

ABSTRACT :

This article pays attention to constitutional protection against administrative abuse. Laying emphasis will be given on the role that the courts play guaranteeing the rights of the individual and ensuring accountability in the government. The main judicial landmarks of precedent demonstrating the proper wielding of constitutional provisions such as due process and equal protection, among others, are presented in this discussion. This article illustrates through several key cases how legal standards have been shaped by the judiciary while taking protective measures about citizens from arbitrary administrative action. The important aspect that the discussion brings forth is the call for constitutional protection, legislative reforms, and enlightenment of the public to know how democracy should remain safe against ongoing challenges. The findings , therefore do conclude with the recommendation of a symbiotic balance between government authority and individual liberties that would be vital for just and transparent governance.

INTRODUCTION :

Constitutional protection of administrative abuse is important in the safeguarding of individual rights and subjecting the administration to accountability. Based on judicial precedents, this paper analyses how such precedents form safeguards against administrative abuse by adding a light to the contrary experience of the judiciary as such precedence restricts or controls arbitrary character or action of administrative decisions. Based on in-depth landmark case analysis, we consider how constitutional provisions like due process and equal protection may be able to effectively defend citizens against alleged overreach by the administration. The judicial interventions thus take lessons that may guide improvement of legal safeguards and provide checks on an equipoise between government authority and liberties of the people. This paper deals with the role of constitutional protections against administrative abuse. Salient aspects emanating from leading judicial decisions determine how, when, and with what scope the judicial forum interprets and applies constitutional provisions to protect individual rights against arbitrary administrative actions.

ADMINISTRATIVE ABUSE :

Administrative abuse is wrongful or excessive exercise by the authorities, thereby violating the rights of citizens and giving way to arbitrary, discriminating actions, losing the people's confidence in institutions and eventually going against democratic values themselves. This calls for strong constitutional protection, ensuring that the people are able to get fair processes, are answerable, and also have recourse against administrative overreaches.

CONSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK :

This is where constitutional frameworks apply crucial protection on the rights of an individual from administrative overreaching and therefore ensuring their place in society.This is why some

of the most important safeguards exist in due process, equal protection, and right to a fair hearing.

1. **Due Process :**

Process due: a legal prescription that ensures no arbitrary take of life, liberty, or property. Constitutional principle: peculiarly guaranteed by the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States which dictates as follows,

- Due Process: That before a government act, which will adversely affect one's rights, reasonable notice must be given and an opportunity to be heard. Prevents arbitrary or capricious decisions made by administrative bodies.
- Substantive Due Process: This guarantees certain fundamental rights against intrusion by the government and requires that the laws be fair, not only in application but also in substance. Courts have interpreted substantive due process to cover rights related to personal autonomy, privacy, and bodily integrity.

2. **Equal Protection :**

The Equal Protection Clause in the Fourteenth Amendment prohibits anyone, or any group of people from being denied protection under the law that others are allowed to enjoy. In this sense, it plays a very important role in:

- Non-Discrimination: Administrative actions should not be so conducted as to discriminate on the basis of race, gender, religion, or other protected characteristics. This ensures justice in the manner in which statutes and regulations are administered.
- Judicial Review: Courts apply various forms of scrutiny to administrative bodies classifications. Strict scrutiny is used in suspect classifications, and the rational basis review on least important distinctions. In this regard, discrimination must be linked to compelling governmental interests.

3. **Right to a Fair Hearing:**

Right to a fair hearing is the part and parcel of the due process framework. It therefore entitles people to have:

- Availability of a Neutral Arbiter: It should be that persons bringing an administrative action should receive their case before an independent arbiter, ensuring the issue is tackled on its merit rather than based on discrimination or preference.
- Representation and Advocacy: Presenting evidence, further supported by calling of witnesses, and even the option of being represented legally supports an open process with respect to rights.
- Clear and Reasoned Decisions: The administrative bodies are expected to provide clear reasoning for their decisions in order to enable the understanding of persons by the reason why the decision is being acted upon against them so as to challenge it appropriately.

The principles of due process, equal protection, and right to a fair hearing are constitutional provisions that form a strong framework for safety against administrative overreach. Not only do these provisions support democratic ideals but also let the actions of the government be accountable and understandable. The judiciary itself is a crucial player in enforcing such safeguards for the cause of protecting the rights of the individual and letting the rule of law prevail in administrative processes.

JUDICIAL PRECEDENTS :

Judicial precedents are found to be of importance in the formation of constitutional safeguards against administrative abuse. Notable judgments establish how courts have interpreted and enforced constitutional rights,

accountability, and protection for individual liberties.

- **Landmark Cases :**

1) **Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India (1978)**[146]

It became a landmark for determining the validity of a preventive detention law while considering the rights of a citizen under Article 21, Right to Life and Personal Liberty.

Judicial Reasoning: The Supreme Court held that right to life means right to live with dignity. It declared that any law taking away this right of a human being must conform to the principles of natural justice and it only reiterated the requirement of fair procedure in administrative action.

2) **Kehar Singh v. Union of India (1989)**[147]

This was a constitutional challenge to the Terrorist and Disruptive Activities (Prevention) Act (TADA)

Judicial Reasoning: The court emphasized due process pointing out that administrative action must not only be legal but just and fair. It made it clear that these constitutional protections may not be circumvented even in the name of national security.

3) **Vishaka v. State of Rajasthan (1997)**[148]

Summary: This is the case for regulating work place sexual harassment by setting guidelines for preventing it and redressing the administration's failure to act on this subject.

Judicial Reasoning: The Supreme Court held that the right of equality and the right to work with dignity are the fundamental rights. It ordered administrative bodies to take exemplary measures to protect these rights and held that judiciary can play an active role in ensuring accountability to administrative bodies.

4) **Minerva Mills Ltd. v. Union of India (1980)**[149]

Introduction: This case was related to amendments aiming to restrain judicial review.

Judicial Reasoning: The Supreme Court ruled that the Constitution is a living document which has to protect the rights of citizens from administrative high-handedness. It restated the principle of the separation of powers and the role of the judiciary in checking the administrative authority.

5) **Union of India v. Association for Democratic Reforms (2002)**[150]

Digest: This was an election case related to the right to information and political transparency.

Judicial Reasoning: the court emphasized under citizens' right to information about the election process as an offshoot of their right to free and fair elections-attesting to how administrational steps have to be harmonized with constitutional rights.

- **Judicial Reasoning :**

Courts always interpreted constitutional provisions as being law and fair in administrative actions. Key principles include:

- **Due Process:** The courts held that due process constitutes a basic aspect of any administrative act, which requires that persons be given a fair hearing and an opportunity to dispute the decision made against their rights.
- **Proportionality:** This proportionality principle has become a super-standard requirement that the administrative act must be proportionate, necessary, and proportionate to the rights being restricted.
- **Judicial Activism:** Several times the judiciary has resorted to an activist approach in many cases. It stepped in when administrative bodies failed to

[146] Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India , AIR 1978 SC 597
[147] Kehar Singh v. Union of India , AIR 1989 SC 653
[148] Vishaka vs State of Rajasthan , AIE 1997 SC 3011
[149] Minerva Mills Ltd vs Union of India , AIR 1980 SC 1789
[150] Union of India vs Association for democratic Reforms , AIR 2002 SC 2112

take care of individual rights. Such activism acts as an antidote to administrative discretion, and there is sturdy protection of constitutional safeguards.

These interpretations through the years ensure that the safeguards remain relevant in the shifting dynamics of societies and practices by administrations. Through these landmark cases and thought processes by the judiciary, it is vivid that the judiciary is actually a very strong constitutional safeguard of rights against governmental abuse where issues of justice, equality, and dignity are upheld in governance principles.

IMPACT OF JUDICIAL PRECEDENTS ON CONSTITUTIONAL GUARANTEES AGAINST ADMINISTRATIVE ABUSE :

Judicial precedents have the power to shape the constitutional guarantees against administrative malpractices. It is the same judicial interpretation and court judgments that not only put into effect and enforce legal precepts but, through their judgments, affect bigger issues in governance and individual rights. The ensuing points detail some of the significant impacts of these precedents:

1. **Law Strengthening Individuals' Rights:**

Judicial precedents have reaffirmed protection to individual rights against capricious administrative actions. Glimpses of such kind have been there through famous cases like Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India , where the court established that due process should accompany deprivation of personal liberty as well. Such precedents have made an individual able to challenge administrative decisions effectively; it institutes accountability, however.

2. **Defining Legal Norms :**

Judicial decisions make law authoritative and confer binding norms of law upon the administrative body to be complied with. For instance, the standards prescribed by Vishaka v. State of Rajasthan on work place harassment did not only create a framework for administrative action but ensured active protection of rights. Such precedents set clear expectations about administrative conduct and encourage respect for constitutional requirements .

3. **Encouraging Judicial Review :**

Precedents of judiciary proliferate and improve the scope and significance of judicial review of administrative action. Expressing the role of the judiciary in reviewing decisions taken by the administrative authorities, cases such as Minerva Mills Ltd. v. Union of India reaffirm the policy of the separation of powers. This acts as a caution against potential excesses, and keeps the operating authorities in cheque.

4. **Encouraging Reforms in the Legislature:**

Judicial decisions often highlight defects in prevailing laws, and the legislatures are motivated to codify or enact legislation that safeguards constitutional rights better. The impacts of cases like Union of India v. Association for Democratic Reforms have made electoral procedures more transparent; as mentioned above, it reveals how precedents of the judiciary can be initiators that serve as a need for the betterment of public administration.

5. **Building Public Trust :**

An activist judiciary that guards constitutional rights can enhance citizen trust in the institutions of government. A belief is strengthened that the legal system can provide relief and justice if courts safeguard rights from administrative excesses. Citizen involvement and acceptance of the rule of law is very vital to a robust democracy, and trust in the legal system is at the heart of it.

6. **Ability to Adapt to Social Changes :**

Judicial precedents prove very instrumental in continuing to make constitutional safeguards adapt to contemporary challenges. As the society changes, courts try to interpret the provisions of the constitution in light of new realities that might include scientific

advancement and changed social mores and norms. In this manner, safeguards will not lose their relevance and continue to protect the individual rights effectively.

7. **Deterrence of Administrative Overreach :**

For one, solid judicial precedents deter abusive practices from administrative bodies by compelling them to act within the bounds of the law established by judicial scrutiny while also promoting compliance and accountability.

Judicial precedents greatly affect and relate to constitutional protection against administrative abuse. Courts in their interpretation and decisions protect individual rights but also impose high standards on the conduct of administrations, effectuate needed reforms, and establish public confidence in the rule of law. As custodians of constitutional principles, the courts are called to the role of ensuring administrative power exercised responsibly, in accordance with the values enshrined in the Constitution.

RECOMMENDATIONS :

Citizens rights protection against administrative abuse is an integral part of democratic governance. Though so far constitutional provisions offer a basic structure for accountability, the changing political climate calls for supplementary measures. This paper suggests recommendations regarding how better protections can be built between the state and citizens' rights under the constitution with respect to administrative abuse, thus protecting the citizens rights more effectively from the overreach of the government.

1. **Legislative Reforms:**
   - Strengthen Statutory Protections: Comprehensive legislation with specific delineation of the limits of power of administration, and all administrative actions brought within constitutional limits.
   - Periodic Review of Administrative Laws: Mechanism for periodic review of existing administrative laws to continue being relevant and protective.
2. **Improving the Mechanism of Judicial Review:**
   - Ease Access Judicial Redress: Administration courts procedures made easier and encouraged access to such courts. This will promote accountability and the citizenry will have a chance to challenge administrative decisions.
   - Set Proper Administrative Courts Dedicated courts should be set up to handle the administrative cases such that the cases heard by them are by judges who specialize in the area of administrative law.
3. **Training and Capacity Building:**
   - Judicial Education Programs: Educate judges on constitutional rights and administrative law so that they can better adjudicate the cases.
   - Administrative Training: Educate public servants of rights under the constitution and the imperative for ensuring due process is followed.
4. **Public Awareness Programs:**
   - Citizen Education on Rights: Publicize to citizens of rights under the constitution and how such rights can be enforced against administrative arbitrariness
   - Transparency of Government: Make available for public perusal periodical report with prime cognizance of the administrative processes for making decisions
5. **Institutional Reforms of Oversight Structures:**
   - Independent Oversight Bodies: Set or grant independent agencies authority to monitor administrative actions and implementation in conformity with constitutional principles.
   - Enhance Protections on Whistleblower Reports on administrative abuse for accountability to thrive in the environment.

These recommendations, then, will strengthen constitutional protection against administrative abuses to uphold the rights of individuals and prevent governmental actions that fall outside of what the law permits. These measures will push toward a more responsive and transparent administration for a more solid democratic governance institution.

CONCLUSION :

In conclusion, constitutional protections against administrative oppression serve as essential elements of democratic principles and ensure protection of individual rights. This is because the judiciary plays a very crucial role in enforcing these safeguards; it does this by exercising jurisdiction over constitutional provisions, thus muzzling government excesses as well as the excesses of administrative functionaries. Analysis of landmark cases is reflective of the responsibility that the judiciary should confront in ensuring administrative accountability to the principles of due process as well as equal protection. Based on a review of the things learned from these judicial interventions, it appears that an important role of the judiciary lies in making it equal in power between state authority and citizen rights. Continuing issues, like an adjustment of administrative practices and, perhaps a convergence with civil liberties, require further vigilance and reform. These constitutional protections help strengthen legal frameworks as well as build public trust in governance. Ultimately, a sound system of checks and balances will safeguard democracy and make sure that it is carried out with justice and great transparency.