PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt / Egyptology

CONSTITUTIONAL DOCTRINES: AN ANALYSIS

Dr. Hiranmaya Nanda[1], Anwesha Tripathy[2]

[1,2] Assistant Professor, Faculty of Legal Studies, Siksha O Anusandhan

Email: [1]hiranmayananda@soa.ac.in, [2]anweshatripathy@soa.ac.in

Dr. Hiranmaya Nanda, Anwesha Tripathy: Constitutional Doctrines: An Analysis -- Palarch's Journal Of Archaeology Of Egypt/Egyptology 17(6). ISSN 1567-214x

Keywords: Colourable Legislation, Doctrine of Pith and Substance, Repugnancy, Supreme Court.

ABSTRACT

The name 'doctrine' comes from the Greek word doxa. It is traduced as a view. These were previously the faiths of the Catholic Church. The so-called teachings of the Church doctor are known as doctrines (religious academics). Today, however, many other sources could provide a doctrine. Legal doctrines are known as old but instead established legal principles. There is a common consensus that the doctrine is an example of the constitution or de facto jurisdiction rather than a formal source of law. The paper aims to highlight some more of the Supreme Court of India's leading decision to discover the principles of law that form a basis for the analysis of key teachings, namely the Pith and nuance teachings, repugnance, and even the English courts colourful laws. This article analyses the trident examination of the constitutionality of the laws relating to the legal relations between the Union and the States in India.

1. Introduction

In their separate realms, It shall remain only within framework given to it by state legislature Legislature and shall not breach the domain reserved in the other, and a law created by one that infringes or invades the other's given framework is not valid. Before the Legislature, which pretends to deal with an issue in one list and which touches on an issue in another, the courts apply what is identified as the proposition of pith but rather substance. The principle of flexibility into an otherwise static power network has also been presented

across India. The rationale for following this principle is that if all legislation were to be declared unconstitutional on the grounds that they violate authority, the powers of the legislature would be severely restricted. Under the rule the law in its entirety is tested to determine its true character and nature and to determine what kind it belongs to. When the legislation comes extensively in certain powers that have been levied on it by the legislature according to its true nature and character, it is simply not treated merely as affecting or inhibiting matters delegated to that other legislature inadvertently.

Under the Constitution, India's government and the state governments have the power to legislate only within competence of their elected leaders. In fact, this power is indeed not absolute. The Constitution has the authority to rule on the substantive integrity of all legislation in the judicial system. Where any provision of the Constitution is violated in law passed by the parliament or by State legisleratures, the Supreme Court may invalidate or ultra vires that very law. However, the founding fathers wished that the Constitutional is not a fixed governing structure, but just an adaptable text. Hence the privilege of parliament to change the constitution became invested. The impression provided in Article 368 of the Constitution is that now the trying to amend functions of both the Parliament become absolute and cover all parts of the text. However, since its independence, the Supreme Court has been a brake on Parliament's legislative zeal. In an effort to retain the constitution-makers original principles, the court of supreme held that Parliament, with the excuse of amending it, was not able to change, impair or modify its fundamental features. It is unlikely in the Constitution to find the term simple structure. Within historic case of KesavanandaBharati in 1973, the Supreme Court recognized this term for the first time. By then, the Constitution was interpreted by the Supreme Court as well as all Parliament's modifications were assigned to it.

The Pre- Keshavnanda Position

As early as 1951, Parliament's power to amend the Constitution, in specific the Chapter on Citizens' Fundamental Rights was questioned. In order to change land possession and lease systems, numerous laws were introduced after independence in the States. This corresponded to the electoral pledge of the governing main opposition party to meet the democratic goals of the Constitution, which entail an equal distribution of the capital of production to those people, as well as preventing accumulation of wealth in this country of some. [Articles 39 (b) and (c) of both the Directive Principles of State policy. Those owners of property — who are harmed by such laws negatively — demanded courts. The courts imposed restrictions on land reforms alleging that they violated the constitutionally guaranteed fundamental right to property. In the wake of the adverse rulings, by means of the First and the Fourth adjustments (1951 and 1952 respectively), the parliament inserted certain laws in the Ninth Schedule [2] of the Constitution, thus completely reducing themselves from the control of the judiciary.

The Golaknath verdict

In 1967, the Supreme Court 's eleven-judge bench changed position. Chief Justices of the State of Punjab, providing a 6:5 majority opinion, posed the curious view that Article 368, which included constitutional amendments, only provided for an amending process. The Chief Justice, SubbaRao, expressed a curious viewpoint. The right to amend the Constitution was not bestowed on Parliament by Article 368. Every clause of the constitution (Articles 245, 246, 248) provided the parliament with the power to pass laws. The constitutional authority (plenary legislative power) granted Parliament the authority to enact laws. The supreme court also ruled that Parliament had exactly the same amending authority and statutory authority. Therefore, the legislation as interpreted in Article 13(2) shall be deemed to be some addition to the Constitution.

The majority opinion referred to the idea of conditional constraints on the ability of Government to pass a constitutional amendment. This view holds that the Constitution provides the basic freedoms of the individual with a permanent position. The people had claimed fundamental rights it themselves by granting the Constitution among itself. Article 13 articulated this restriction on Parliament's powers and according to majority opinion. Because of this particular Constitutional structure and the essence of the protections given under it, Parliament may not alter, limit or impede fundamental freedoms.The judges declared that fundamental rights are so sacrosanct and vital that, while such a change was accepted unanimously by both chambers, they could never be diminished. It acknowledged that a Constituent Assembly appointed by Parliament, if required, to change constitutional rights.

Inevitably, before the plenary session of the Supreme Court (thireteen judges), the constitutionality of these amendments became challenged. Their decision is contained in 11 different rulings. In this case, nine judges have signed a summary statement describing their primary findings. Granville Austin states that the interpretation presented in the judges' report reveals some inconsistencies with the views expressed in respective separate judgments. Nevertheless, a plurality decision accepted the fundamental principle of 'primary structure' of the Constitution.

The example is helpful in demonstrating the disparity between the representative power of the Parliament and the legislative powers. Under Article 21 of the Constitution, no party in the country, other than by statute, shall be deprivation of his or her life or of personal freedom. The Constitution does not set down the substantive specifics because the parliamentarians and the government are responsible for that role. Parliaments shall enact the laws required to instigate offensive acts for the imprisonment or death of a individual. The administration shall decide the way such laws are applied and also the defendant shall be prosecuted in a court of law. Amendments to such laws can be enacted in the State legislature by such a unanimous vote. The Constitution must not be revised to add amendments to theselaws. However, if a proposal is made for Article 21 of the Constitution to be turned into a basic right to life by repealing, Parliament's legislative power will have to be properly changed.

2. Discussion

1. Doctrines:

- Doctrine of Pith and Substance:

This doctrine is also referred to as the prevailing principle of intent or the true nature and differing nature of the law. The doctrine derives its origins from the principle necessary for an investigation of the true nature and character of the legislation to establish whether it falls in a prohibited sphere3. Sometimes, the doctrine is expressed in terms of the nature of the law and of the true nature of it. Again, the scope and effects of its provisions are to be considered for the application of Pith and Substance doctrine, I, to its entirety; (ii) to its main purposes; and This doctrine was first applied in India by Justice Porter, in **Prafulla Kumar Mukherjea v. Bank of Commerce Ltd., Khulna.** The government's law on personal loans was held to be not unconstitutional simply because it includes incidental partial payment. In central valley and in the Berar Act No. Gwyer, Sir Maurice, C.J. XIV of 1938.noticed that the concept of pith and substance is often used to determine the necessities and purposes of the law. Nonetheless, so there is a mutually incompatible dispute between two laws, the main law will prevail. Any effort to rationalize dispute would, however, be made. The entire Court adopted the doctrine of "pith and substance" established by the Privy Council. In Bombay State v. F. In response to the decision of the Judiciary Committee, N. Balsara Fazl Ali, J., representing the Constitution Bench reiterated that if, as he sees it, it meets the criteria of the legislative power that clearly and explicitly enacted it, the Act shall not be deemed invalid simply because it incidentally intrudes on matters that have also been assigned to a different legislature. The validity of both the Act was considered not to be affected by trenches btw on matters outside the authorized field, which is why in also every case that was necessary to investigate the content and pith of the Act contested.

2. Doctrine of repugnancy:

The theory of inhumanity is not valid as far as the asian and european constitutions are concerned, since the Concurrent List is missing, although there is no clause in accordance with Article 254 of the Indian Constitution.

The court decided that a dispute between the taxing powers between the Union and States could not exist within the Constitution in M.P. Sundararamier & Co. v. Andhra Pradesh & Anr's state,29. The two laws are, therefore. Subscribers. Subscribers. (3) The s. (3) The Central bank has provided subparagraphs 5 of the Act and section 21 of the Control Order. (1) Roma Section 3 of the Essential Commodities Act is applicable in two separate and distinct fields. This was therefore held that no disagreement was found between some of the two codes, and that there was no possibility of disgust.

In the following scenarios between central and government regulations, the philosophy of wrongness or inconsistency can arise in all of India. First of all, in the case of a Central and even a State Act, for any entry region specified in List III of the Seventh Schedule (Competitor List). To these cases of confusion

or incoherence the provision of section 254 of the Constitution shall apply. In the event of this discrepancy, Article 254(1) makes it very clear that the provisions of Article 254(2) and Article 254(2), are subject to constitutional state.

The second situation of repudiation or misunderstanding is for a subsequent core law protected with an entry in List I and a previous State law concerning one or maybe more entries in List II. The unanswered concern for the courts is how to discuss and react appropriately to that same type of situation and the primacy of legislation.

This could also occur where all actions reside in a single place and the two do not coexist, for example if they also prosecute for almost the same criminal offence, but perhaps the consequence varies according to gradation or form or procedure prescribed.

3. Doctrine of colourable legislation:

The policy was based on "Quandoa liquid prohibetur ex directo, prohibeturet per obliquum" ("Quandoa liquid prohibetur ex directo, prohibeturet per obliquum"), which means: "Wherever anything is strictly banned, this is also indirectly prohibited." The Colorful Law Theory or a Constitutional Fraud is founded on the basis of the concept of separation of powers. Power division makes it possible to find the right balance of force here between various components of the state , i.e. the law, the executive and judicial. The primary function of the legislation is to lay down laws.

In Naga People's Movement of Human Rights v. Union of India, "colourable legislation" is passed throughout the legislation in order to do explicitly what it cannot. If the government tries to change the balance of powers inward to itself, it causes the "colorful legislation' concept to resolve its constitutional obligation. The reason for the parliament is inconsequential, as established by Justice V.R. Krishna Iyyer, to punish an Act for its colorful purpose.

3. Conclusion

Therefore the doctrine of pith and essence can still be described as the predominant object or true extent and property of law, elsewhere. When every statute is challenged as ultra-violates the powers of that body, its pith and its material or its true essence and character must be decided. The purpose of this doctrine was to determine whether legislative powers fall under Articles 246(1) and 246(3) of the Constitution. It applies to both the resolution of the conflict of jurisdiction. If, following an adverse violation, the Act fails in one list of its own substance and essence, it must be considered in some other list as not failing.The validity of the claim must be determined. Therefore, in order to investigate the 'true nature and character' of the statute, the rule of thumb and substance deals with the matter of 'combining any two entries into two distinct lists vis-à-vis the Act and aims at deciding whether a disputed law is significantly within the jurisdiction of the legislature who enacts it, though incidentally it falls within the competence of. If, as it is seen, it falls significantly beyond the competence expressly given to the Legislature which has passed it, it cannot then be rendered unconstitutional, merely through

accidental interference with matters delegated to another statute. It does not apply.

Therefore the principle of pith and essence can still be described as the predominant object or true extent and property of law, elsewhere. When every statute is challenged as ultra-violates the powers of that body, its pith and its material or its true essence and character must be decided. The purpose of this doctrine was to determine whether legislative powers fall under Articles 246(1) and 246(3) of the Constitution. It applies to both the resolution of the conflict of jurisdiction. If, following an adverse violation, the Act fails in one list of its own solvent and essence, it must be considered in some other list as not failing. Unless the legislative body or perhaps the things obtained are not assigned to it explicitly or implicitly, and indeed the specific laws shall be complied with.

References

AIR 1947 PC 60
UCO Bank &Anr v. Dipak Debbarma2016 SCC OnLine SC 1391
A P Sen J., T. Barai v. Henry Ah Hoe AIR 1983 SC 150
Ibid
The State of Punjab v. Gurdial Singh &Ors AIR 1980 SC 319
(1998) 2 SCC 109,
R. S. Joshi, S.T.O. Gujarat v. Ajit Mills Ltd., Ahmedabad AIR 1977 SC 2279