

**ONLINE OPEN ACCESS PEER-REVIEWED LAW**  
**JOURNAL**



VOLUME 1: ISSUE II

Email: [support@lexbonafide.com](mailto:support@lexbonafide.com)

Website: [www.lexbonafide.com](http://www.lexbonafide.com)

### **DISCLAIMER**

No part of this publication may be reproduced or copied in any form by any means without prior written permission of Editor-in-chief of Lex Bona Fide – The Law Journal. The Editorial Team of Lex Bona Fide holds the copyright to all articles contributed to this publication. The views expressed in this publication are purely personal opinions of the authors and do not reflect the views of the Editorial Team of Lex Bona Fide. Though all efforts are made to ensure the accuracy and correctness of the information published, Lex Bona Fide. shall not be responsible for any errors caused due to oversight or otherwise.

## **EDITORIAL TEAM**

### ***EDITOR IN CHIEF***

*Name – Mr. Neeraj Kumar Gupta*  
Asst. Professor Institute of Law, Nirma University  
LL.B., LL.M  
Email - [editorinchief@lexbonafide.com](mailto:editorinchief@lexbonafide.com)

### ***SENIOR EDITOR***

*Name – Mr. Vikas Guru*  
Chartered Accountant(CA)//Founder & Editor of Income Tax  
Judgement Fortnightly Journal  
Email – [vikasguruca@gmail.com](mailto:vikasguruca@gmail.com)

### ***SENIOR EDITOR***

*Name – Ms. Pankhuri Agrawal*  
Ph.D Scholar(NALSAR), LL.B., LL.M (NLSIU)  
Email - [pankhuri11agrawal@gmail.com](mailto:pankhuri11agrawal@gmail.com)

### ***SENIOR EDITOR***

*Name – Mr. Wasim Beg*  
Partner at L&L Law Offices and Ex-additional Advocate  
General (J&K)  
Email – [wbeg@luthra.com](mailto:wbeg@luthra.com)

### ***SENIOR EDITOR***

*Name – Mr. Swarnendu Chatterjee*  
Advocate on Record, Supreme Court of India and Partner at  
L&L Partners.  
Email – [chatterjeeaor@swarnendu.co](mailto:chatterjeeaor@swarnendu.co)

### ***SENIOR EDITOR***

*Name – Mr. Vatsal M. Parikh*  
Practicing Advocate Gujarat HC //LL.B., LL.M  
Email – [vatsalparikh93@gmail.com](mailto:vatsalparikh93@gmail.com)

**JUNIOR EDITOR**

*Name – Mr. Anirudh Kaushal*  
*Pursuing History Hons. //University of Delhi*  
Email – [anirudhk720@gmail.com](mailto:anirudhk720@gmail.com)

**JUNIOR EDITOR**

*Name – Ms. Bhavya Sharma*  
*B.Com. LL.B.(Hons.), Institute of Law, Nirma University*  
Email - [bhavyasharma0396@gmail.com](mailto:bhavyasharma0396@gmail.com)



## ***ABOUT US***

LEX BONA FIDE - LAW JOURNAL is an open access, peer- reviewed and refereed journal provide dedicated to express views on topical legal issues, thereby generating a cross current of ideas on emerging matters. This platform shall also ignite the initiative and desire of young law students to contribute in the field of law. The erudite response of legal luminaries shall be solicited to enable readers to explore challenges that lie before law makers, lawyers and the society at large, in the event of the ever changing social, economic and technological scenario.

With this thought, we hereby present to you

**LEX BONA FIDE: LAW JOURNAL**

# **WHAT IS THE BASIC STRUCTURE OF THE CONSTITUTION?**

\* (1) Priyanshi Trivedi (2) Harsh Upadhyay

(The Maharaja Sayajirao University of Baroda, Faculty of Law)

## **ABSTRACT**

In India Constitution is sovereign, Separation of Powers is a natural element of the Constitution of India. Division of Powers incorporates the idea of balanced governance. Since Court being the watchman of the Constitution consistently meddle in the issues influencing the sacred orders, yet nation watched the conflicts among the organs, explicitly, concerning Constitutional corrections. Court advanced the Principle of the basic structure of the Constitution. This idea has likewise made disarray with respect to the pertinence of this rule.

Article 368 of the Constitution gives the feeling that Parliament's correcting powers are total and include all pieces of the record. However, the Supreme Court has gone about as a brake to the authoritative excitement of Parliament since the time of autonomy. With the aim of protecting the first goals imagined by the constitution-creators, the Supreme court articulated that Parliament couldn't mutilate, harm, or adjust the fundamental highlights of the Constitution under the affection of altering it. The phrase 'basic structure' itself can't be found in the Constitution. Ever since the Supreme Court has been the mediator of the Constitution and the authority of all corrections made by Parliament.

This article is a push to break down the idea of the basic structure of the constitution.

## **INTRODUCTION**

The basic features of the constitution consist of Supremacy of the constitution, Republican and democratic form of government, secular character of the constitution, federal character of the constitution, separation of power, unity, and sovereignty of India, and Individual freedom.

The constitution enables the Parliament and the State Legislatures to make laws within their separate jurisdiction. Bills to correct the constitution must be presented in the Parliament, however, this force isn't supreme. On the off chance that the Supreme Court finds any law made by the Parliament conflicting with the constitution, it has the ability to pronounce that law to be invalid. Subsequently, to safeguard the goals and reasoning of the first constitution, the

Supreme Court has set out the essential structure precept. As indicated by the precept, the Parliament can't devastate or adjust the fundamental structure of the doctrine.

"Basic Structure" isn't referenced in the constitution of India. The idea grew bit by bit with the impedance of the judiciary every once in a while, to secure the fundamental privileges of individuals and the standards and the way of thinking of the constitution. The First Constitution Amendment Act, 1951 was tested in the Shankari Prasad v. Union of India case[1]. The revision was tested on the ground that it disregards Part-III of the constitution and in this way, should be viewed as invalid. The Court gave a similar decision in the Sajjan Singh Vs State of Rajasthan case in 1965[2]. The Supreme Court held that the Parliament, under Article 368, has the ability to change any piece of the constitution including central rights.

The Parliament, in 1971, passed the 24th Constitution Amendment Act. The demonstration gave the total capacity to the parliament to roll out any improvements in the constitution including the basic rights. It additionally made it obligatory for the President to give his consent on all the Constitution Amendment charges sent to him.

The constitution of Indian is one of the most enchanting documents on god's green earth. No other country has a constitution as far-reaching as ours and is the longest constitution in the world which was enforced on January 26, 1950[3]. The constitution safeguards our fundamental rights against the action of the parliament or the legislature, to be precise the Article 13 of the Constitution protects our rights. Article 13 simply states that Part three of the Constitution should not be violated, abridged, or contravened which means that part 3 of the constitution should be sacrosanct from the perspective of Article 13. Article 13 was very strong and not be touched till the 24th amendment act came into play in 1971[4] which made changes in Article 13 by add clause (4), the change in It expressed that any change done under Article 368 would not be liable to Article 13. Article 368 if simplified states that the amending power of the parliament in any part of the constitution is unlimited therefore the legislative wisdom is the wisdom which the whole country needs to follow as per the 24th Amendment Act.

The Basic Structure Doctrine states there are sure central structures and establishing standards of the constitution that make the foundation of the constitution. In straightforward terms, they are belief systems of the constitution which are fundamental for the endurance of the constitution. A few models are Free and Fair Election, the Federal idea of the Nation, Judicial audit, and Separation of Power. The administration is limited from contacting these shapes of the constitution through change.

#### **The Basic Structure Doctrine of the Constitution Includes:**

- The supremacy of the Constitution.
- Republican and democratic form of government.
- Secular form of Constitution.

- Separation of powers among Legislature, Executive, and Judiciary.
- Federal character of the Constitution.
- Unity and integrity of the nation.
- Directive Principles of the State policy mandate to build a welfare State.
- Essential fundamental freedom.

### **The Changes in the Basic Structure of the Constitution through different Judgements**

**Keshavanda Bharti v. State of Kerala, 1973.** The Basic Structure Doctrine was created in the following case which was introduced for the first time by M.K Nambiar. The Supreme court who is the final interpreter of the constitution stated that the parliament cannot use its power under Article 368 to change the basic structure of the framework of the constitution, therefore the amendments which change the basic structure of the constitution will be not valid. Supreme court simply restricted the unlimited power of the parliament and put a limit to the power by giving this judgment.

The essential structure teaching is an Indian legal standard, most eminently propounded by Justice Hans Raj Khanna, that the Constitution of India has certain essential highlights that can't be adjusted or demolished through changes by the parliament<sup>[5]</sup> Key among these "essential highlights", as elucidated by Justice Khanna, are the key rights ensured to people by the constitution.<sup>[6]</sup> The principle in this way shapes the premise of the intensity of the Supreme Court to survey and strike down protected alterations and acts established by the Parliament which struggle with or try to modify this "fundamental structure" of the Constitution. The fundamental highlights of the Constitution have not been expressly characterized by the Judiciary, and the case of a specific component of the Constitution to be an "essential" include is dictated by the Court for each situation that precedes it. In this way, it gives the additional capacity to court to audit and strike down any protected corrections and act ordered by Parliament<sup>[7]</sup>.

#### **1. Indra Nehru Gandhi v. Raj Narain, 1975.**

The issue raised in the following case was to keep the election matter out of the preview of the court but the Supreme court stroked out the issue by stating democracy is one of the basic features of the Constitution which includes free and fair election further adding that parliament is the voice of the people, therefore, the constitution can be amended at the desire of people and therefore the election matters cannot be put out of the court preview. The following case strengthened the Basic Structure of the Constitution<sup>[8]</sup>.

#### **2. Minerva Mills v. Union of India. 1980.**

The following case crystallized the concept of the Basic Structure of the Constitution by stating that the Constitution is supreme and nothing else in a democracy, the judgment made the power of amendment partial of the parliament therefore the unlimited power of the parliament of the amendment was restricted[9].

### **3. Waman Rao v. Union of India, 1981.**

In this, it was defined that Article 32 of the constitution is to be considered as a part of the Basic Structure Doctrine further adding any future amendment that can be challenged on the ground that it damaged basic structure[10].

### **4. I. R. Coelho v. State of Tamilnadu, 2007**

In this case, the proportion of *Minerva Mills Ltd. v. Union of India* was turned around. It likewise cleared significant questions in the *Kesavananda Bharati* case, for example, the Validity of Acts went before the judgment, it also added new dimensions to the doctrine. As we have known that there is no certainty or unanimity about the doctrine therefore Supreme court in this particular case imposed certain limitations on the constitutional power of the parliament. Any Constitutional amendment which entails the violation of any fundamental right which the court regarded as the basic structure of the constitution can be struck down as per consequences[11].

### **Conclusion**

Presently we can say, there is no rigid principle for a fundamental element of the Constitution. Diverse adjudicator keeps various perspectives concerning the hypothesis of premise structure. In any case, at one point they have a comparative view that parliament has no capacity to amend, modify, or undermine the 'Basic structure' or system of the constitution. "On the off chance that the verifiable foundation, the prelude, the whole plan of the constitution and the important arrangements thereof including article 368 are remembered then there can be no trouble, in figuring out what are the fundamental components of the essential structure of the constitution. These words apply with more prominent power to precept of the essential structure, because, the government and vote based structure of the constitution, the detachment of forces, the mainstream character of our state is a lot clearer than either carelessness or normal justice. So, for the insurance of government assistance state, central rights, Unity and trustworthiness of the country, Sovereign popularity-based republic and for Liberty of thought, articulation, conviction, confidence, and love, translation of legal executive is required. We can say none is above the constitution even parliament and legal executive. The parliament can

make changes in the constitution as per the requirement of the time, but the amendments, changes should not change the basic structure doctrine, the amendments should be totally in the good faith of the citizens.

Endnotes:

[1] 1951 AIR 458, 1952 SCR 89

[2] 1965 AIR 845, 1965 SCR (1) 933

[3] <https://www.thehindu.com/features/kids/Celebrate-the-supreme-law/article14011992.ece>

[4] <http://legislative.gov.in/constitution-twenty-fourth-amendment-act-1971>

[5] <https://www.thehindu.com/opinion/lead/legitimacy-of-the-basic-structure/article26168775.ece>

[6] Writ Petition (civil) 135 of 1970

[7] <https://web.archive.org/web/20131203063934/http://www.hindu.com/fline/fl2901/stories/20120127290107100.htm>

[8] Appeal (civil) 887 of 1975

[9] AIR 1980 SC 1789, 1981 SCR (1) 206

[10] (1981) 2 SCC 362, 1981 2 SCR 1

[11] Appeal (civil) 1344-45 of 1976

