
THE EXPANDING SCOPE OF ARTICLE 21: JUDICIAL CREATIVITY OR JUDICIAL OVERREACH?

Nisha Parveen

Llm in corporate in law

ABSTRACT

Among the fundamental rights guaranteed by the Indian Constitution, Article 21 is among the most important and progressive. While the article initially provided protection against deprivation of life and personal liberty in procedural terms, judicial interpretation has significantly widened the scope of the article. This research discusses the development of the article on the basis of judgments delivered by the Supreme Court, starting from the narrow approach of A.K. Gopalan v. State of Madras up to the more progressive one laid down in Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India. The research looks into how judicial creativity played a role in identifying implied rights such as those to dignity, livelihood, education, health, privacy, and clean environment. The research also examines the constitutional issue of judicial activism vs. judicial overreach as far as issues of democratic accountability and separation of powers are concerned. While judicial innovation has been important for ensuring the advancement of human rights and constitutionalism, such innovations cannot exist without striking a balance between intervention and restraint in the constitutional order. The increasing ambit of Article 21 is indicative of how the judiciary has worked hard to uphold the constitutional ethos while recognizing the need for constitutional restraint amongst the various institutions of government.

Keywords: Article 21, Right to Life and Personal Liberty, Judicial Creativity, Judicial Activism, Judicial Overreach, Fundamental Rights, Human Dignity, Separation of Powers.

1. INTRODUCTION

The Indian Constitution is a dynamic and living document intended to secure individual freedom, foster social justice, and guarantee the supremacy of the law. Article 21 is one of the most significant of the Fundamental Rights guaranteed by Part III of the Indian Constitution. It states that no one may be deprived

of their life or freedom until legal procedures are followed. Despite being a short provision, the interpretation of this article has witnessed a phenomenal change due to judicial intervention. Over the years, Article 21 has developed from a mere procedural protection to a comprehensive fundamental right, which covers many rights necessary for human existence.

The enlargement of Article 21 is largely a result of the decisions taken by the Indian Supreme Court through interpretative development. Even though the judiciary had earlier followed a conservative trend while interpreting personal liberty, their approach has become more liberal and purposive over time. Through several significant rulings, the court expanded the scope of Article 21 to encompass rights pertaining to dignity, livelihood, education, health, privacy, the environment, and humane treatment. Such creativity by the courts has helped in strengthening the protection of fundamental rights. This has also ensured that the Constitution keeps pace with the dynamic world around us.

Even with its positive effect on human rights jurisprudence, the wide coverage of Article 21 has led to significant discussion in relation to the Constitution. While those who support judicial creativity believe that it is a necessity in order to protect constitutional values and address shortcomings of the legislature or the executive branch, others have accused it of being judicial activism. In this context, this research explores the development of Article 21, discusses the contribution of the judiciary in expanding its ambit, and determines whether such expansion is a constitutional interpretation or an intrusion into the functions of other organs of the state.

Therefore, the goal of the current study is to comprehend how the requirements of Article 21 have been interpreted and developed by judges, the use of judicial creativity for enlarging the scope of life and personal liberty by introducing new rights, and ascertain whether the expansion of Article 21 is a valid form of constitutional interpretation or an instance of judicial overreach which could have ramifications on the doctrine of separation of powers.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Tiwari and Shrivastava (2016) focused on the extent and importance of Article 21 with respect to human rights in India. They observed that the concept of the right to life and personal liberty had been greatly expanded by court interpretation to go beyond its procedural features. They focused on the evolution of Article 21 to become an effective constitutional tool for protecting human dignity and socio-economic

rights. It was found that the judiciary is essential in protecting human rights by interpreting the constitution in progressive terms.

Kumar (2014) examined how judicial activism affected the creation and advancement of India's constitutional provisions. It demonstrated that judicial activism had significantly aided in upholding constitutional values and safeguarding individuals' rights. However, the researcher warned that if there were too much judicial involvement in the process, it might cause judicial over-activism, creating conflict between the judiciary and other governmental branches. Therefore, it was crucial to strike a right balance between the two sides.

Pillay (2014) reviewed the case of India in terms of the experience with the adjudication of economic and social rights. The report specifically argued that judicial activism played a critical role in advancing a number of economic and social rights, including those pertaining to social security, healthcare, and education. At the same time, the author also highlighted the importance of taking an ethical stance when balancing judicial activism and judicial restraint.

Singh (2023) analyzed judicial activism as one of the important instruments for safeguarding and advancing human rights in India. The author noted that, particularly in interpreting Article 21, the Indian judiciary has significantly transformed the scope of fundamental rights. The analysis stressed the significant role played by the important judicial pronouncements in promoting social justice, safeguarding vulnerable sections of society, and ensuring government accountability.

3. EVOLUTION OF ARTICLE 21 THROUGH JUDICIAL INTERPRETATION

The interpretation of Article 21 by the judiciary has seen a tremendous change from the date when the Constitution of India came into effect. While Article 21 was initially viewed as a protection against arbitrary taking away of one's life and liberty, its interpretation remained static for the first few decades after the constitution came into force. As time progressed, however, a more progressive interpretation emerged from the Supreme Court. The process of judicial evolution has turned Article 21 from what was once seen as a restricted procedural right to a broader fundamental right that is crucial for upholding human dignity and personal liberty. The evolution of Article 21 can be said to take place in two broad periods – the restrictive period of Gopalan followed by the liberal approach of Maneka Gandhi.

3.1 The Narrow Interpretation of Article 21: The Gopalan Era

Article 21's early constitutional interpretation has been determined with reference to a landmark case – *A.K. Gopalan vs State of Madras* (1950). The case was about preventive detention of a leader from the communist party under the Preventive Detention Act, 1950. In this instance, the Supreme Court took Article 21 literally and declared that the State might deny someone their personal freedom in accordance with the terms of a legislation that was duly passed. Emphasis was laid on the expression "procedure established by law" by the Court without considering whether such procedure is reasonable and just according to the law laid down by the legislature.

Another important aspect of the case *Gopalan* is that it introduced the concept of compartmentalization of fundamental rights. Articles 14, 19, and 21 were treated as separate provisions and could not be combined as the law concerning liberty had nothing to do with equality and freedom. This narrow reading had the effect of restricting the range of judicial review and conferring extensive powers on the legislature with regard to individual freedom. Accordingly, the constitutional guarantee provided by Article 21 was procedural in nature rather than substantive.

Gopalan's era was an embodiment of the judicial conservatism that marked the initial years of constitutional democracy. The courts usually adhered to legislative wisdom and avoided going beyond the literal sense of fundamental rights. Although this attitude brought about judicial restraint, it hindered the judiciary from responding effectively to new challenges in the field of human rights and social justice. It was not until subsequent decades that Article 21 would become an effective tool of the Constitution.

3.2 The Transformative Interpretation of Article 21: The Maneka Gandhi Era and Beyond

This narrow interpretation was completely overhauled in the *Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India* case of 1978. In this instance, the government had seized the petitioner's passport without providing any justification. The Supreme Court ruled that Article 21's usage of the phrase "procedure established by law" could not be read mechanically. Rather, there must be justice and reasonableness in this process as otherwise the law becomes an instrument of oppression which violates Article 21.

Additionally, the judgment has made one very significant link between Articles 14, 19, and 21. The Court noted that these three Articles were inter-related and their interpretation should be in harmony. Thus, such an approach gave a great boost to the constitutional protection since any limitation on personal liberty had to meet the requirement of reasonableness and non-arbitrary nature. As a result, a new age emerged in which the Constitution's fundamental rights were interpreted differently.

Following the Maneka Gandhi decision, the Supreme Court expanded the scope of Article 21 to encompass a number of rights necessary for living a life of dignity. In a series of judgments, the Supreme Court identified rights such as livelihood, education, health, privacy, environment, legal aid, adequate housing, and humane treatment of prisoners under Article 21. This innovative interpretation made it possible for Article 21 to become a dynamic part of the Constitution. As a result, Article 21 became the foundation of human rights law in India.

Table 1: Factors Influencing the Evolution of Article 21 Jurisprudence

Factor	Influence on Judicial Interpretation
Constitutional Maturity	Increased judicial confidence in interpreting rights broadly over time.
Growth of Human Rights Discourse	Encouraged courts to align constitutional protections with international human rights standards.
Public Interest Litigation (PIL)	increased access to justice and made it possible for courts to deal with problems impacting under-represented populations.
Socio-Economic Challenges	Prompted recognition of rights necessary for dignified living, such as health and livelihood.
Democratic Development	Increased expectations regarding accountability, transparency, and protection of individual freedoms.
Technological Advancements	Led to recognition of emerging rights such as informational privacy and data protection.
Judicial Activism	Facilitated innovative constitutional interpretation to address governance gaps and rights violations.

Source: Compiled by the Author based on constitutional jurisprudence relating to Article 21.

4. JUDICIAL CREATIVITY AND EXPANSION OF ARTICLE 21

Expansive interpretation of Article 21 has been achieved through judicial innovation introduced by the Supreme Court of India while interpreting the Constitution in light of its evolving nature. Instead of limiting the meaning of the right to life and personal liberty to its literal understanding, the courts have continuously stressed that constitutional rights should be interpreted in a way that enhances human dignity, social justice, and individual liberty. Over time, the Indian Supreme Court has established a number of implied rights under Article 21 that are essential to leading a life of worth and dignity. Article 21 is now the most comprehensive clause in the chapter on fundamental rights due to judicial developments.

- **Right to Human Dignity:** The Supreme Court has often held that the right to life encompasses both the right to a dignified life and the right to physical survival. Human dignity involves having self-respect, personal autonomy, and an enjoyment of basic conditions that make life worth living. Thus, through making human dignity the core of the interpretation of constitutional rights, the Supreme Court has laid the ground for recognizing various other rights guaranteed under Article 21.
- **Right to Livelihood:** The Supreme Court ruled in *Olga Tellis v. Bombay Municipal Corporation* (1985) that the right to livelihood and the right to life are intertwined. The Supreme Court ruled that taking away someone's ability to make a living is equivalent to taking away their right to life. By concentrating on the economic aspect of life, the Supreme Court used this logic to broaden the scope of Article 21.
- **Right to Education:** The judiciary has viewed education as both a method of achieving other constitutionally given rights and a significant component in the development of an individual's personality. Education was recognized as a fundamental component of human dignity thanks to court rulings like *Mohini Jain v. State of Karnataka* and *Unni Krishnan v. State of Andhra Pradesh*. This had great impact on educational policies and ultimately helped in conferring a fundamental status on education through the Constitution.
- **Right to Health:** According to the Supreme Court's view, Article 21 ensures the right to health and medical facilities. In this sense, the Supreme Court has stressed the fact that the maintenance of human life assumes utmost priority, and the state must provide sufficient medical facilities to

its citizens. Therefore, it is believed that having a healthy lifestyle is crucial to living a dignified life.

- **Right to a Clean Environment:** Environmental protection has become an important part of the jurisprudence of Article 21. The courts have realized that fresh and unpolluted air, water, and an overall healthy environment are necessary for enjoying life and personal liberty. By means of different environmental cases, the apex court has made a connection between ecology and basic rights leading to sustainable development.
- **Right to Privacy:** Following the historic 2017 decision in Justice *K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India*, where the Supreme Court unanimously ruled that privacy is a fundamental right under Article 21 of the Constitution, privacy became a fundamental right. Thus, privacy is viewed as a crucial element of individual freedom, dignity, and self-determination. It comes as no surprise that this ruling would have profound implications in today's world of advanced technological capabilities and extensive data mining.
- **Rights of Prisoners and Undertrials:** The Supreme Court has consistently stressed that incarceration does not deprive inmates of their fundamental rights. The interpretation of Article 21 has provided legal protections against torture, abuse, unlawful confinement, and mistreatment in custody. This has ensured that human dignity remains intact for all people, even in confinement, by upholding decent detention conditions and procedural justice.

5. JUDICIAL CREATIVITY VERSUS JUDICIAL OVERREACH: A CONSTITUTIONAL DEBATE

The amazing evolution that has taken place with respect to Article 21 has led to a critical debate concerning the position of the judiciary in a democracy. While most scholars see the broad construction by the judiciary with regard to Article 21 as an inevitable and progressive step, there are also those who think that the judiciary has crossed the boundaries of constitutional provisions on various occasions. The question that arises from such a debate is whether the judiciary has discharged its constitutional duty or has at times encroached upon territories which belong to the other branches of government.

5.1 Judicial Creativity: Strengthening Constitutional Rights

Advocates of judicial activism say that the Constitution is a living instrument and should be understood taking into account social, economic, and technological changes. The framers being unable to predict all

the problems that may occur in the future, the courts have the responsibility to make sure that the rights enshrined in the Constitution are relevant and effective. Thanks to creative interpretations of Article 21, the Supreme Court has been able to declare several basic rights without which human life cannot exist.

The other important aspect in which judicial creativity played an important role was the protection of disadvantaged groups in the society. Judicial activism was often used when there were deficiencies on part of the legislature and the administration. The Court has used public interest litigation and rights-based jurisprudence to widen the ambit of Article 21, making it an effective tool to promote social justice and protect individual liberties.

Moreover, judicial innovations have made the government more constitutional through the maintenance of a coherence between State action and basic rights. By applying a purposive interpretation of the Constitutional text, the judiciary has kept the constitution relevant to contemporary times. The proponents of judicial activism argue that the judicial reinterpretation of Article 21 is nothing but a constitutional construction and not an intrusion into any other institution's jurisdiction.

5.2 Judicial Overreach: Concerns and Criticisms

In spite of the good impact, however, the growth of Article 21 has also invited criticism from some experts of constitutional law and politics. According to the critics, the courts, at times, go beyond their jurisdiction when they define new rights or provide policy directions in a manner that resembles legislative and executive work. This could be problematic in terms of constitutional balance between branches and democratic legitimacy.

A further criticism concerns the doctrine of separation of powers. Under a democratic Constitution, making of laws is the main function of the legislature whereas the execution of such policies lies under the jurisdiction of the executive branch. By engaging themselves in policy making or administration, courts might unintentionally weaken the position of elected bodies. The claim here is that unelected judges lack both democratic legitimacy and competence in policy matters.

There have also been concerns regarding judicial responsibility and competence. Judicial activism is a justified position when dealing with exceptional situations, but too much activism can cause confusion about constitutional duties. Thus, it is argued that the courts need to be moderate and consider constitutional constraints in their interpretation of Article 21. In this regard, the viability of

constitutionalism in the long term relies on more than the safeguarding of rights; it relies also on keeping the correct balance between the branches.

Table 2: Judicial Creativity vs. Judicial Overreach under Article 21

Parameter	Judicial Creativity	Judicial Overreach
Purpose	Expands rights protection	Extends judicial influence
Basis	Liberal constitutional interpretation	Excessive interpretation
Effect	Strengthens fundamental rights	Blurs institutional boundaries
Legislature	Fills legislative gaps	Encroaches on legislative functions
Executive	Promotes accountability	Interferes with policymaking
Democracy	Protects constitutional values	Raises accountability concerns
Outcome	Advances social justice	May affect separation of powers

Source: Compiled by the Author.

6. BALANCING JUDICIAL ACTIVISM AND CONSTITUTIONAL RESTRAINT

Article 21 has seen its scope widened owing to the very importance of judicial intervention for protecting fundamental rights in our Constitution. Judicial activism has frequently proved an important tool for dealing with violations of rights when there was inadequate legislative or executive intervention. This has helped strengthen the constitution and cater to changing social conditions. Hence, judicial activism has emerged as a necessary part of constitutional practice in India.

On the other hand, judicial power has to be exercised in the light of constitutional considerations as well as the duties and responsibilities attached thereto. The judicial system has been established against a background which acknowledges the separate functions assigned to the legislative branch, the executive branch, and the judicial branch. The courts may have powers to interpret the constitution and to determine the legality of governmental acts, but they need to be careful not to encroach upon the functions of other branches.

Put differently, the theory of separation of powers provides a crucial foundation for preserving the delicate equilibrium between judicial activity and judicial restraint. It is proper that the judiciary intervene whenever it becomes absolutely necessary to safeguard basic liberties, check any abuse of power by the State, and comply with constitutional requirements. However, there may be instances when the excesses of judicial intervention can bring issues relating to judicial competence and accountability.

It is imperative that there should be a proper balance between judicial activism and constitutional constraint for the proper functioning of the constitutional democracy. Courts should always remain vigilant in their role of guardians of fundamental rights but must exercise their authority prudently. Courts should safeguard the constitution but at the same time they should not intrude into the areas of law-making and implementation by legislators and executive. This will ensure constitutional harmony.

7. CONCLUSION

According to the article, it is evident that Article 21 has changed from being seen as a procedural protection right into a fundamental right which protects the integrity of a person's life and the dignity. Following the case of *Maneka Gandhi v Union of India*, the courts have used progressive interpretations of the article in protecting rights like education, health, livelihood, and environment among others. The results clearly show that judicial creativity has made an important contribution to the development of basic rights and the establishment of good constitutional governance in India. However, judicial activism gives cause for concern if judges try to encroach on legislative and executive authority. The viability of the extension of Article 21 will thus depend on preserving the delicate balance between judicial activism and constitutionalism.

REFERENCES

1. Elliott, M. (2017). *Judicial power and the United Kingdom's changing constitution*. *University of Queensland Law Journal*, The, 36(2), 273-287.
2. Glam, L. (2014). *A critical examination of overreach in judicial decision-making by the Constitutional Court of South Africa*.
3. Gupta, P. S. (2023). *The Role of Judiciary in Providing Justice Through Public Interest Litigation*. *Journal of Scientific Research and Technology*, 1-10.
4. Hodge, P. S. (2021). *The scope of judicial law-making in constitutional law and public law*. *Judicial Review*, 26(2), 146-177.
5. Ka, P. (2020). *Judicial Activism in India*. *Journal Co Ntemporary Issues of Law*, 3(3), 11-12.
6. Karuna. (2023). *The Impact of Judicial Activism on the Enforcement of Fundamental Rights in India*. *Issue 6 Int'l JL Mgmt. & Human.*, 6, 2656.
7. Kumar, V. (2014). *The Role of Judicial Activism in the Implementation and Promotion of Constitutional Laws and Influence of Judicial Overactivism*. *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*.
8. Petersmann, E. U. (2020). *From Integration Through Law to Global Community Law? Between Arbitration, Adjudication and Judicial Overreach*. *Max Planck Institute for Comparative Public Law & International Law (MPIL) Research Paper*, (2020-37).
9. Pillay, A. (2014). *Revisiting the Indian experience of economic and social rights adjudication: the need for a principled approach to judicial activism and restraint*. *International & Comparative Law Quarterly*, 63(2), 385-408.
10. Schwarzschild, M. (2015). *Judicial activism, judicial independence and judicial hubris: The case of international courts*. In *Judicial Activism: An Interdisciplinary Approach to the American and European Experiences* (pp. 197-206). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
11. Sharma, P. *Judicial Activism VIS-A-VIS Judicial Overreach: A Comparative Study*. *International Journal For Multidisciplinary Research*, 5.
12. Shukla, S. (2018). *Judicial Overreach: The Role of the Judiciary in Contemporary India*. *Anish Kumar Verma*, 25.
13. Singh, V. P. (2023). *Judicial activism as an essential tool for the protection and expansion of human rights in India*. *Kutafin Law Review*, 10(1), 88-109.

14. TIWARI, D., & SHRIVASTAVA, D. R. (2016). A STUDY ON ARTICLE 21 AND ITS ROLE IN PROTECTING HUMAN RIGHTS. *Sciences*, 6, 1-10.
15. Tyagi, N. (2020). *Parliament vis-a-vis judiciary-a critical analysis of separation of powers and judicial creativity. Bennett Journal Of Legal Studies*, 1(1), 83-104.