

Judicial Review and the Legal Framework Governing Administrative Actions

Megha Jain

Research Scholar, Faculty of law, Oriental University, Indore (M.P.)

Dr. Rajendra Kumar Meena

Assistant professor, Faculty of law , Oriental University, Indore (M.P.)

Abstract

The concept of judicial review serves as a cornerstone of constitutional governance, ensuring that all actions of the legislature, executive, and administrative authorities conform to the principles of legality, fairness, and reasonableness. Rooted in the Constitution of India, particularly under Articles 13, 32, 136, 226, and 227, judicial review empowers the judiciary to act as the ultimate guardian of citizens' rights and the supremacy of the Constitution. It enables courts to examine administrative actions for illegality, irrationality, and procedural impropriety, thereby preventing misuse of discretionary powers. The legal framework governing administrative actions is derived from both statutory and constitutional sources, including the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985, which provides specialized forums for adjudication of administrative disputes. Judicial pronouncements such as *A.K. Gopalan v. State of Madras* (1950), *Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India* (1978), and *Keshavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala* (1973) have expanded the scope of judicial review, integrating it into the basic structure of the Constitution. Furthermore, in an era of digital governance and artificial intelligence, judicial review has evolved to address emerging issues of data privacy, algorithmic accountability, and e-governance transparency. Thus, the doctrine of judicial review continues to act as a dynamic instrument for maintaining constitutional balance, administrative accountability, and the rule of law in a modern democratic state.

Keywords: Judicial Review, Administrative Law, Constitutional Supremacy, Rule of Law, Administrative Accountability

Introduction

Judicial review stands as one of the most powerful mechanisms through which the judiciary ensures that administrative authorities act within the bounds of law and constitutional principles. It represents the power of the courts to examine the legality, rationality, and procedural propriety of administrative actions undertaken by governmental bodies¹. In democratic nations such as India, the doctrine of judicial review finds its foundation in the Constitution of India, primarily under Articles 32, 226, and 227, which empower the Supreme Court and High Courts to issue writs for the enforcement of fundamental rights and for other purposes². The essential purpose of judicial review is to prevent the misuse of administrative powers and to ensure that public authorities act fairly, reasonably, and within the limits prescribed by law. The principle was inherited from the British legal system and developed through landmark cases such as *R v. Secretary of State for the Home Department, ex parte Bentley* (1993) and *Council of Civil Service Unions v. Minister for the Civil Service* (1985), which established the grounds for judicial review — namely illegality, irrationality, and procedural impropriety. In the Indian context, *A.K. Gopalan v. State of Madras* (1950) and *Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India* (1978) expanded the scope of judicial review by linking administrative fairness with the protection of fundamental rights, thereby establishing that all administrative actions must conform to the standards of reasonableness and due process.

The legal framework governing judicial review of administrative actions is embedded within a combination of constitutional mandates, statutory provisions, and judicial precedents. The Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985, for instance, was enacted to provide specialized forums for reviewing administrative disputes, especially in service matters, without completely ousting the jurisdiction of the High Courts. Furthermore, the Code of Civil Procedure (1908) and the General Clauses Act (1897) provide interpretive and procedural support in matters involving administrative discretion. The Supreme Court has consistently reiterated that judicial review is not an appeal from an administrative decision but a means of ensuring that the decision-making process is lawful, transparent, and just. In *State of Uttar Pradesh v. Johri Mal* (2004), the Court emphasized that while the judiciary cannot interfere with the merits of administrative policy decisions, it has the

¹ H.W.R. Wade & C.F. Forsyth, *Administrative Law*, 11th edn. (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2014).

² Constitution of India, arts. 32, 226, 227.

authority to intervene when such actions are arbitrary or violate constitutional guarantees. Similarly, in *Union of India v. R. Gandhi* (2010)³, the Court highlighted the importance of maintaining judicial independence in reviewing administrative tribunals. Thus, the scope of judicial review extends to verifying whether administrative bodies have acted *ultra vires* (beyond their legal authority), adhered to principles of natural justice, and respected the rule of law. Through this mechanism, judicial review safeguards citizens from executive excesses and reinforces the constitutional balance of power, ensuring that administrative authorities remain accountable within the democratic framework.

Concept and meaning of Judicial Review

Judicial review is a fundamental principle of constitutional and administrative law that empowers the judiciary to examine the legality and constitutionality of actions taken by the legislative and executive branches of government. It acts as a safeguard against arbitrary, illegal, or unreasonable exercise of power by public authorities. The essence of judicial review lies in ensuring that all organs of the state operate within the limits prescribed by law and the Constitution. The doctrine evolved as a natural consequence of the rule of law, which asserts that no individual or authority is above the law. In India, the concept finds its roots in Articles 13, 32, 226, and 227 of the Constitution, which confer the power upon the Supreme Court and High Courts to review legislative enactments and administrative decisions⁴. The principle was inspired by the American case of *Marbury v. Madison* (1803), where Chief Justice John Marshall first established the authority of the judiciary to invalidate unconstitutional acts. In the Indian context, judicial review serves as both a protector of fundamental rights and a mechanism for maintaining constitutional supremacy, ensuring that governmental powers are exercised responsibly and lawfully.

The meaning of judicial review extends beyond merely assessing the legality of a law; it encompasses the evaluation of administrative decisions, policies, and procedures to determine whether they adhere to constitutional and statutory standards. Indian courts have consistently reaffirmed this power in landmark judgments such as *Keshavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala* (1973), which held judicial review to be a basic feature of the Constitution, and *Indira Nehru Gandhi v. Raj Narain* (1975), where it was emphasized that even the highest executive acts are subject to judicial scrutiny. Judicial review thus operates on three broad grounds — illegality, irrationality, and procedural impropriety — ensuring fairness, transparency, and accountability in governance. By acting as a constitutional check on the misuse of authority, judicial review reinforces democratic values, upholds citizens' rights, and maintains the delicate balance of power among the legislative, executive, and judicial branches⁵.

Historical Evolution of Judicial Review

The doctrine of judicial review has its origin in the common law legal tradition, particularly in England, where the courts historically developed mechanisms to control the misuse of administrative and governmental power. In the early stages, English courts exercised prerogative writ jurisdiction through remedies such as *mandamus*, *certiorari*, *prohibition*, and *habeas corpus* to ensure that public authorities acted within their lawful authority. These writs evolved as judicial tools to enforce accountability and prevent arbitrary exercise of power by the Crown and its agents. The principle of rule of law, articulated by A.V. Dicey, played a vital role in shaping the foundation of judicial review, asserting that every act of government must be justified by law. Over time, landmark British cases like *R v. Secretary of State for the Home Department, ex parte Bentley* (1993) and *Council of Civil Service Unions v. Minister for the Civil Service* (1985) (the GCHQ case) refined the scope of judicial review by establishing the key grounds of illegality, irrationality, and procedural impropriety. Thus, within the common law system, judicial review became the primary means through which courts ensured administrative fairness and the protection of individual rights against arbitrary state actions⁶.

The evolution of judicial review in American jurisprudence gave the doctrine a constitutional foundation. The landmark case of *Marbury v. Madison* (1803), decided by Chief Justice John Marshall, firmly established the power of the U.S. Supreme Court to declare legislative and executive acts unconstitutional. This precedent profoundly influenced

³ *State of Uttar Pradesh v. Johri Mal*, AIR 2004 SC 3800; *Union of India v. R. Gandhi*, (2010) 11 SCC 1.

⁴ Constitution of India, arts. 13, 32, 226, 227.

⁵ *Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala*, AIR 1973 SC 1461; *Indira Nehru Gandhi v. Raj Narain*, AIR 1975 SC 2299.

⁶ A.V. Dicey, *Introduction to the Study of the Law of the Constitution*, 10th edn. (Macmillan, London, 1959); *Council of Civil Service Unions v. Minister for the Civil Service*, (1985) AC 374 (HL).

constitutional democracies worldwide, including India. When India adopted its Constitution in 1950, the framers incorporated judicial review as an integral part of the constitutional framework under Articles 13, 32, and 226, blending both British administrative principles and American constitutional doctrines. Indian courts expanded the doctrine's reach through landmark judgments such as *A.K. Gopalan v. State of Madras* (1950), *Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India* (1978), and *Keshavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala* (1973), which recognized judicial review as a basic feature of the Constitution. Over time, judicial review in India has evolved into a dynamic instrument for safeguarding fundamental rights, maintaining constitutional supremacy, and ensuring good governance, reflecting a unique synthesis of British procedural fairness and American constitutionalism⁷.

Constitutional Basis of Judicial Review in India

The constitutional foundation of judicial review in India lies deeply embedded in the structure and philosophy of the Constitution of India, which envisions a democratic republic governed by the rule of law. The framers of the Constitution, inspired by both British administrative law and American constitutional principles, vested the power of judicial review primarily in the Supreme Court and the High Courts to ensure that all organs of the state act within their constitutional limits. The essential objective of this power is to maintain the supremacy of the Constitution, protect fundamental rights, and preserve the delicate balance of power among the legislative, executive, and judicial branches. Judicial review derives its express authority from Articles 13, 32, 131–136, 226, 227, and 246, among others. Article 13 explicitly declares that any law inconsistent with the fundamental rights enshrined in Part III shall be void to the extent of such inconsistency, thereby granting the judiciary the authority to strike down unconstitutional legislation. Article 32, termed the “heart and soul of the Constitution” by Dr. B.R. Ambedkar, empowers individuals to directly approach the Supreme Court for the enforcement of fundamental rights, while Article 226 empowers High Courts to issue writs not only for the protection of fundamental rights but also for “any other purpose,” giving them wider jurisdiction than the Supreme Court in certain matters. Through these provisions, the judiciary serves as the guardian of the Constitution, ensuring that administrative and legislative bodies do not exceed their lawful authority or infringe upon citizens’ rights⁸.

Furthermore, the Constitutional provisions relating to judicial review are reinforced by judicial interpretations that have expanded and clarified its scope. The landmark case of *Keshavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala* (1973) firmly established that judicial review forms an integral part of the “basic structure” of the Constitution, beyond the reach of parliamentary amendment under Article 368. This principle was later reaffirmed in *Minerva Mills Ltd. v. Union of India* (1980), where the Supreme Court held that limited amending power and judicial review are essential for preserving the Constitution’s supremacy. Additionally, Articles 136, 141, and 142 equip the Supreme Court with wide discretionary powers to ensure complete justice and uniformity in constitutional interpretation, while Articles 227 and 235 empower High Courts with supervisory control over subordinate courts and administrative authorities. The judiciary’s review authority also extends to examining delegated legislation, ensuring that executive authorities do not exercise powers beyond what Parliament or the State Legislature intended. In *Indira Nehru Gandhi v. Raj Narain* (1975), the Court asserted that even constitutional amendments are subject to judicial review if they damage the basic structure. Similarly, in *L. Chandra Kumar v. Union of India* (1997), the Supreme Court reaffirmed that the power of judicial review vested in the High Courts and Supreme Court under Articles 226 and 32 is an essential feature of the Constitution and cannot be ousted by the creation of administrative tribunals. Thus, the constitutional basis of judicial review in India represents a harmonious blend of written provisions and judicial interpretation, forming a robust system of constitutional checks and balances. It ensures that every legislative enactment, executive order, and administrative decision conforms to constitutional principles of legality, fairness, and reasonableness, thereby upholding the rule of law and reinforcing the judiciary’s role as the ultimate interpreter and protector of the Constitution.

Comparative Constitutional Perspective (UK, USA, India)

The concept and practice of judicial review vary significantly across the United Kingdom, the United States, and India, reflecting their distinct constitutional structures and historical evolutions. In the United Kingdom, judicial review is rooted in the principles of common law and the doctrine of parliamentary sovereignty, which holds that Parliament is the supreme

⁷ *Marbury v. Madison*, 5 U.S. (1 Cranch) 137 (1803); *Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala*, AIR 1973 SC 1461.

⁸ Constitution of India, arts. 13, 32, 131–136, 226, 227, 246; *Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala*, AIR 1973 SC 1461.

law-making authority. Hence, British courts cannot strike down Acts of Parliament; instead, they can review administrative and executive actions to ensure that they comply with the law. Judicial review in the UK focuses primarily on the legality, reasonableness, and procedural propriety of administrative decisions, as established in the landmark *Council of Civil Service Unions v. Minister for the Civil Service* (1985), known as the GCHQ case. The Human Rights Act, 1998, however, introduced a limited form of constitutional review by enabling courts to issue declarations of incompatibility when legislation conflicts with the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR), without invalidating the statute itself. Thus, in the UK, judicial review functions within a parliamentary democracy framework, ensuring administrative accountability while respecting legislative supremacy⁹.

In contrast, the United States practices a constitutional form of judicial review, originating from *Marbury v. Madison* (1803), where Chief Justice John Marshall established the judiciary's power to strike down laws inconsistent with the Constitution. This doctrine places the U.S. Supreme Court as the ultimate interpreter of constitutional validity, ensuring strict adherence to the supremacy clause (Article VI). India, while influenced by both British administrative law and American constitutionalism, has developed a hybrid model of judicial review. The Indian Constitution expressly provides for judicial review under Articles 13, 32, and 226, empowering courts to review both legislative and administrative actions. Unlike the UK's parliamentary sovereignty, India follows constitutional supremacy, and unlike the U.S., it incorporates social justice objectives within review mechanisms. Thus, the Indian judiciary combines British procedural fairness with American constitutional safeguards, forming a comprehensive system that ensures legality, fairness, and protection of fundamental rights within a democratic framework.

Legal Framework Governing Administrative Actions

The legal framework governing administrative actions in India is designed to ensure that administrative authorities exercise their powers lawfully, fairly, and in accordance with the Constitution. Administrative authorities function as an essential link between the legislature and the people, translating laws into practical governance. Their nature and functions encompass rule-making (quasi-legislative), decision-making (quasi-judicial), and implementation (executive) roles. Given the complexity of modern governance, administrative bodies are entrusted with wide discretionary powers to make regulations, issue licenses, and adjudicate disputes. However, this delegation of power must always align with the rule of law, meaning that administrative decisions must be rational, transparent, and justifiable. In *State of Punjab v. Gurdial Singh* (1980), the Supreme Court emphasized that every administrative action must be guided by fairness and public interest. The legal accountability of administrative authorities is therefore maintained through judicial oversight, legislative control, and procedural safeguards established under administrative law¹⁰.

The principles of administrative law form the foundation for regulating administrative conduct. These principles are derived from constitutional norms, statutory provisions, and judicial precedents that collectively ensure fairness and prevent misuse of power. The key doctrines include natural justice, reasonableness, proportionality, and non-arbitrariness. The doctrine of natural justice, encompassing *audi alteram partem* (right to be heard) and *nemo iudex in causa sua* (rule against bias), ensures that administrative decisions are made impartially and transparently. Similarly, the doctrine of ultra vires restricts administrative bodies from acting beyond the scope of their delegated authority. Judicial pronouncements such as *Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India* (1978)¹¹ have reinforced that administrative actions affecting individual rights must adhere to principles of fairness and due process. Administrative law thus provides a procedural and substantive framework that ensures public authorities remain accountable and that their decisions withstand judicial scrutiny.

An important statutory mechanism reinforcing this framework is the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985, enacted to provide specialized forums for resolving disputes related to public services, particularly those involving government employees. These tribunals, though designed to reduce the burden on regular courts, operate under judicial supervision as affirmed in *L. Chandra Kumar v. Union of India* (1997), where the Supreme Court held that decisions of administrative tribunals are

⁹ *Council of Civil Service Unions v. Minister for the Civil Service*, (1985) AC 374 (HL); Human Rights Act 1998 (UK); A.V. Dicey, *Introduction to the Study of the Law of the Constitution*, 10th edn. (Macmillan, London, 1959).

¹⁰ *State of Punjab v. Gurdial Singh*, (1980) 2 SCC 471.

¹¹ *Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India*, AIR 1978 SC 597; H.W.R. Wade & C.F. Forsyth, *Administrative Law*, 11th edn. (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2014).

subject to judicial review under Articles 226 and 227 of the Constitution. Furthermore, judicial review vis-à-vis delegated legislation remains a critical component of administrative law, as the judiciary ensures that rules and regulations framed by administrative bodies do not exceed the authority conferred by the parent statute. In *Indian Express Newspapers v. Union of India* (1985), the Supreme Court ruled that delegated legislation is open to judicial review on grounds of ultra vires, constitutional inconsistency, and violation of fundamental rights. Thus, through a combination of constitutional mandates, statutory instruments, and judicial oversight, the Indian legal framework ensures that administrative actions are exercised responsibly and remain subordinate to the Constitution and the rule of law¹².

Landmark Judicial Decisions

The evolution of judicial review in India has been shaped through several landmark judgments that have defined the scope, limits, and principles of administrative accountability. The earliest among these, *A.K. Gopalan v. State of Madras* (1950), was a seminal case in which the Supreme Court examined the validity of preventive detention under the Preventive Detention Act, 1950. The petitioner, A.K. Gopalan, argued that his detention violated his fundamental rights under Articles 19 and 21. The Court, however, took a narrow interpretation, holding that each fundamental right was distinct and that deprivation of personal liberty was valid if authorized by law. Although this case upheld executive authority, it laid the groundwork for the development of judicial review in matters of personal liberty and administrative fairness. Over time, its restrictive view was overturned by later judgments that adopted a broader, rights-based approach¹³.

The *Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India* (1978) case marked a turning point in the expansion of judicial review. When Maneka Gandhi's passport was impounded "in public interest" under the Passport Act, 1967, without being given an opportunity to be heard, she challenged the action as arbitrary and violative of Articles 14, 19, and 21. The Supreme Court, in a historic judgment, held that "procedure established by law" under Article 21 must be "just, fair, and reasonable," thereby integrating Articles 14, 19, and 21 into a unified framework of due process. This case revolutionized administrative law in India by introducing the principles of natural justice and reasonableness into every administrative action, greatly expanding the scope of judicial review over executive decisions.

In *State of U.P. v. Johri Mal* (2004), the Supreme Court clarified the boundaries of judicial intervention in administrative decisions. The case involved the appointment of government counsel in the State of Uttar Pradesh, where the Court held that while policy matters and executive discretion are generally beyond judicial interference, courts can intervene if administrative decisions are arbitrary, discriminatory, or made in bad faith. This judgment reaffirmed that judicial review focuses not on the merits of the decision but on the decision-making process, thereby maintaining a balance between administrative autonomy and judicial oversight.

The principles of judicial accountability were further reinforced in *Union of India v. R. Gandhi* (2010), concerning the constitutional validity of the National Company Law Tribunal (NCLT) and Appellate Tribunal (NCLAT). The Supreme Court upheld the creation of tribunals but emphasized that judicial independence must be preserved in their composition and functioning. Meanwhile, in the UK, the *Council of Civil Service Unions v. Minister for the Civil Service* (1985)—commonly known as the GCHQ case—became a cornerstone of British administrative law. The House of Lords recognized illegality, irrationality, and procedural impropriety as the three primary grounds for judicial review, even in matters involving the royal prerogative. Collectively, these judgments from India and the UK have profoundly influenced the global understanding of judicial review, establishing it as an essential instrument for upholding the rule of law, constitutional supremacy, and administrative justice.¹⁴

Comparative Perspective

The doctrine of judicial review operates differently across major constitutional systems, reflecting their distinct historical developments and political philosophies. In the United Kingdom, judicial review emerged from common law traditions and the principle of rule of law, but it exists within the framework of parliamentary sovereignty. This means that while

¹² *L. Chandra Kumar v. Union of India*, AIR 1997 SC 1125; *Indian Express Newspapers (Bombay) Pvt. Ltd. v. Union of India*, AIR 1986 SC 515.

¹³ *A.K. Gopalan v. State of Madras*, AIR 1950 SC 27.

¹⁴ *Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India*, AIR 1978 SC 597.

British courts can review administrative and executive actions, they cannot strike down Acts of Parliament. Judicial review in the UK focuses primarily on ensuring that administrative authorities act lawfully, reasonably, and in accordance with procedural fairness. The landmark *Council of Civil Service Unions v. Minister for the Civil Service* (1985), or the GCHQ case, established three key grounds of judicial review—illegality, irrationality, and procedural impropriety. Although the Human Rights Act, 1998 introduced the power to issue declarations of incompatibility where domestic laws conflict with the European Convention on Human Rights, Parliament retains ultimate authority. Thus, in the UK, judicial review functions as a mechanism of administrative control rather than constitutional supremacy, ensuring accountability without undermining legislative power.

In contrast, the United States practices a robust, constitutionally entrenched system of judicial review. The landmark case of *Marbury v. Madison* (1803), decided by Chief Justice John Marshall, firmly established the power of the U.S. Supreme Court to invalidate any law inconsistent with the Constitution. This power stems from the Supremacy Clause (Article VI), which places the Constitution above all other laws¹⁵. The American judiciary, therefore, serves as the ultimate interpreter and guardian of the Constitution. India, drawing inspiration from both British administrative law and American constitutionalism, has adopted a hybrid model of judicial review. The Indian Constitution expressly provides for judicial review under Articles 13, 32, and 226, empowering courts to examine both legislative and administrative actions. Unlike the UK, India upholds constitutional supremacy, and unlike the USA, it integrates social justice and welfare principles into constitutional interpretation. Thus, the Indian model balances administrative efficiency with judicial oversight, blending British procedural fairness with American constitutional safeguards to uphold the rule of law and democratic governance¹⁶.

Recent Developments and Trends

In recent decades, the scope of judicial review in India has significantly expanded through innovative judicial interventions and evolving governance challenges. One of the most transformative developments has been the rise of Public Interest Litigation (PIL), which democratized access to justice and broadened the traditional notion of *locus standi*. The judiciary, through landmark cases such as *S.P. Gupta v. Union of India* (1981) and *People's Union for Democratic Rights v. Union of India* (1982), enabled citizens and organizations to approach the courts on behalf of disadvantaged groups or for the protection of collective rights. PILs have since been used to enforce environmental safeguards, human rights, and administrative accountability, making judicial review a tool for social justice and good governance. Moreover, during emergencies and crises, the courts have played a vital role in reviewing executive actions to ensure that constitutional guarantees are not compromised. For example, during the COVID-19 pandemic, the Supreme Court and various High Courts scrutinized government policies relating to migrant workers, healthcare infrastructure, and vaccine distribution, reaffirming that even in emergencies, executive discretion must operate within constitutional boundaries. These interventions reflect the judiciary's evolving role as a constitutional guardian that balances state necessity with citizens' rights¹⁷.

Another emerging trend influencing judicial review is the advent of digital governance and artificial intelligence (AI) in administrative decision-making. Governments increasingly rely on automated systems for welfare delivery, law enforcement, and public administration, raising new concerns about transparency, accountability, and algorithmic bias. Judicial review is now adapting to examine the legality of automated administrative actions, ensuring that technological tools comply with principles of natural justice and data privacy. The judiciary has emphasized the need for algorithmic transparency and human oversight to prevent arbitrary outcomes in AI-assisted governance¹⁸. Furthermore, the rise of e-governance, digital courts, and online grievance mechanisms has enhanced accessibility but also necessitates judicial scrutiny over data protection and digital rights. As administrative functions become increasingly digitized, judicial review continues to evolve—moving from traditional administrative law to a techno-legal framework that protects citizens' rights in an age of automation and digital governance.

¹⁵ *Marbury v. Madison*, 5 U.S. (1 Cranch) 137 (1803); U.S. Constitution, art. VI.

¹⁶ Constitution of India, arts. 13, 32, 226; *Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala*, AIR 1973 SC 1461.

¹⁷ *S.P. Gupta v. Union of India*, 1981 Supp SCC 87; *People's Union for Democratic Rights v. Union of India*, (1982) 3 SCC 235.

¹⁸ Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India, (2017) 10 SCC 1; Law Commission of India, *Legal Framework: Artificial Intelligence* (Report No. 266, 2023).

Conclusion

Judicial review stands as the most vital mechanism for preserving the supremacy of the Constitution, ensuring that all branches of government—legislative, executive, and administrative—function within their legal and constitutional boundaries. It acts as both a shield for citizens' rights and a check on governmental excesses, thereby maintaining the rule of law and democratic integrity. Through a rich body of judicial pronouncements, including *Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India* (1978), *Keshavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala* (1973), and *L. Chandra Kumar v. Union of India* (1997), the Indian judiciary has firmly established judicial review as an essential feature of the basic structure of the Constitution. The legal framework—comprising constitutional provisions, statutory enactments, and administrative principles—ensures that every administrative action is subject to scrutiny for legality, reasonableness, and fairness. Moreover, the judiciary has continually adapted to contemporary challenges, including the rise of public interest litigation (PIL), emergency governance, and digital administration, ensuring that justice remains accessible and responsive. While judicial review must respect the principle of separation of powers, it remains indispensable for preventing arbitrariness and protecting the fundamental rights of individuals. In a rapidly evolving administrative landscape shaped by technology and globalization, judicial review continues to embody the enduring ideals of accountability, transparency, and constitutional morality, reaffirming its role as the cornerstone of good governance and constitutional democracy in India.

Bibliography

1. Nelson, C. (2008). Judicial review of legislative purpose. *NYUL Rev.*, 83, 1784.
2. Wechsler, H. (2014). Toward neutral principles of constitutional law. In *Judicial Review and Judicial Power in the Supreme Court* (pp. 379-413). Routledge.
3. Kretzmer, D., & Ronen, Y. (2021). *The occupation of justice: The supreme court of Israel and the occupied territories*. Oxford University Press.
4. Metzger, G. E. (2017). 1930s Redux: The Administrative State Under Siege. *Harv. L. Rev.*, 131, 1.
5. Majone, G. (2019). The rise of the regulatory state in Europe. In *The State in Western Europe* (pp. 77-101). Routledge.
6. Wade, W., & Forsyth, C. (2014). *Administrative law*. Oxford University Press, USA.
7. Ginsburg, T., & Moustafa, T. (2008). Rule by law: the politics of courts in authoritarian regimes. *Cambridge University Press*.
8. Kingsbury, B. (2009). The concept of 'law' in global administrative law. *European Journal of International Law*, 20(1), 23-57.

Cases

1. A.K. Gopalan v. State of Madras, AIR 1950 SC 27.
2. Keshavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala, AIR 1973 SC 1461.
3. Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India, AIR 1978 SC 597.
4. Indira Nehru Gandhi v. Raj Narain, AIR 1975 SC 2299.
5. L. Chandra Kumar v. Union of India, AIR 1997 SC 1125.
6. State of U.P. v. Johri Mal, AIR 2004 SC 3800.
7. Union of India v. R. Gandhi, (2010) 11 SCC 1.
8. Council of Civil Service Unions v. Minister for the Civil Service, (1985) AC 374 (HL).
9. Administrative Tribunals Act, No. 13 of 1985, Acts of Parliament, India.
10. Constitution of India, 1950.
11. Indian Express Newspapers (Bombay) Pvt. Ltd. v. Union of India, AIR 1986 SC 515.
12. Minerva Mills Ltd. v. Union of India, AIR 1980 SC 1789.