



The Role of Courts as Administrators in PIL and Its Social Dimensions

Dr. Kamal Kishor

(LL.M. Ph.D., NET) Assit. Professor Classic College of Law Bareilly, (Affiliated M.J.P Rohilkhand University, Bareilly)

Article Info: (Recieved- 05/11/2025, Accept- 16/12/2026, Published- 06/01/2026)
DOI- 10.65919/ijahssc.2026.v2i1003

Abstract

Public Interest Litigation (PIL) has emerged as one of the most significant developments in the Indian judicial system. It has enabled the courts to protect the rights of poor, disadvantaged and marginalized sections of society who are often unable to approach the courts themselves. The growth of PIL is closely associated with judicial activism, particularly the liberal interpretation of Fundamental Rights under the Constitution. Through PIL, the Supreme Court and High Courts have intervened in matters concerning bonded labour, prisoners, environmental protection, minimum wages, public health, women, children and the right to live with dignity. In several cases, the judiciary has issued directions that appear to enter the administrative or policy-making domain. This has generated an important constitutional debate concerning separation of powers and judicial overreach. This paper examines the development of PIL in India, its social dimensions, the judicial assumption of administrative functions, its contribution to distributive justice, and the need for judicial self-restraint.

Keywords: *Public Interest Litigation, Judicial Activism, Judicial Review, Fundamental Rights, Social Justice, Separation of Powers, Article 21.*

1. Introduction

The Indian Constitution establishes a democratic and constitutional system based on the principles of justice, liberty, equality and fraternity. India is a pluralistic society consisting of different religions, languages, cultures and social groups. To protect this diversity and ensure social justice, the Constitution provides Fundamental Rights under Part III and Directive Principles of State Policy under Part IV. Fundamental Rights protect individuals against arbitrary action of the State, while the Directive Principles seek to establish social and economic justice. Article 21, which guarantees protection of life and personal liberty, has been given an expansive interpretation by the Indian judiciary. The courts have gradually interpreted the right to life as including the right to live with human dignity and access to basic conditions necessary for a meaningful life. The Constitution envisages three organs of government Legislature, Executive and Judiciary. Traditionally, each organ is expected to perform its constitutionally assigned functions. The doctrine of separation of powers, associated

with Montesquieu, emphasizes the independence of these organs. However, social and administrative failures have sometimes compelled the judiciary to intervene in areas traditionally belonging to the Executive or Legislature.

Public Interest Litigation developed in this background. It relaxed the traditional rule of locus standi and permitted public-spirited individuals and organizations to approach the courts for protecting the rights of persons who could not effectively approach the judiciary themselves.

2. Development of Public Interest Litigation in India

Before the development of PIL, only an aggrieved person generally had the right to approach a court. This traditional principle of locus standi created difficulties for poor, illiterate and socially disadvantaged persons. They were often unable to approach courts because of poverty, lack of education or social conditions.

Indian courts gradually liberalized the rule of locus standi. Public-spirited persons, social organizations and voluntary groups were permitted to bring matters concerning public rights before the courts. Even letters and newspaper reports, in appropriate circumstances, were treated as petitions.

Judicial activism played an important role in the growth of PIL. After the Emergency period, the judiciary became particularly conscious of the need to protect Fundamental Rights. The interpretation of Article 21 in *Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India* significantly expanded the scope of personal liberty. The Supreme Court emphasized that laws and procedures affecting personal liberty must satisfy principles of fairness and reasonableness. PIL therefore became an important instrument for providing justice to people who otherwise had little access to the legal system.

3. PIL and Social Justice

The most important contribution of PIL has been in the field of social justice. Courts have used PIL to protect the rights of vulnerable sections of society, including bonded labourers, prisoners, workers, pavement dwellers, women, children and persons affected by environmental pollution.

3.1 Rights of Prisoners

PIL has exposed several serious conditions prevailing in prisons. In some cases, prisoners remained in jail for periods longer than the maximum punishment prescribed for their alleged offences. Cases concerning custodial violence, inhuman treatment and the detention of mentally ill persons also reached the courts through PIL. Judicial intervention helped establish that prisoners do not lose all their Fundamental Rights merely because they are in custody. Their right to life and dignity continues to receive constitutional protection.

3.2 Bonded Labour

PIL has also played a significant role in protecting bonded labourers. The practice of bonded labour involved workers remaining under the control of employers until debts were repaid. The Constitution prohibits forced labour under Article 23, and the law was enacted to abolish this system. The judiciary used PIL to ensure that constitutional and statutory protections were actually implemented for vulnerable workers.

3.3 Minimum Wages and Labour Rights

Although several labour welfare laws had been enacted, their implementation was often inadequate. PIL enabled the courts to draw attention to the non-payment of minimum wages and exploitation of workers. Judicial directions helped convert statutory rights into practical protections for disadvantaged labourers.

4. PIL and Environmental Protection

Environmental protection is one of the most important areas in which PIL has expanded the role of the judiciary. Environmental degradation directly affects the right to life under Article 21. Courts have intervened in matters involving air pollution, water pollution, industrial hazards, deforestation and protection of historical monuments. A notable example is the Taj Trapezium case, where pollution caused by industries around the Taj Mahal threatened the monument. The Supreme Court issued directions to control industrial pollution and protect the Taj Mahal. The case demonstrated the difficult balance between industrial development, employment and environmental and cultural protection. Similarly, industrial units and tanneries causing pollution of the Ganga have faced judicial intervention. Such cases demonstrate that economic development cannot take place at the cost of public health and environmental sustainability. PIL has therefore become an important mechanism for enforcing environmental laws when administrative authorities fail to take effective action.

5. PIL and the Right to Livelihood

PIL has frequently involved conflicts between the livelihood of a particular group and the larger public interest. In matters relating to fishing, for example, the use of mechanized fishing methods may provide greater economic benefits to some groups but can also damage fish resources and affect traditional fishermen. Courts have therefore attempted to balance economic interests with the livelihood rights of weaker sections. The principle underlying such decisions is that development must be compatible with social justice and environmental protection. Similarly, in cases concerning industrial hazards, courts have considered the safety and lives of the larger population even when closure of an industry may affect employment. The judiciary has attempted to balance the right to life with the right to livelihood.

6. PIL and the Judiciary's Administrative Role

One of the most controversial aspects of PIL is the extent to which courts may enter the administrative domain. The Constitution distributes governmental functions among the Legislature, Executive and Judiciary. The Legislature makes laws, the Executive implements them, and the Judiciary interprets the Constitution and laws and protects legal rights. However, when statutory authorities fail to perform their duties, courts may issue directions to ensure enforcement of existing laws and Fundamental Rights. In this process, judicial directions can sometimes resemble administrative decisions.

For example, courts have issued directions concerning the conditions of protective homes, prisons, hospitals, environmental regulation, police protection, road facilities and public institutions. The question therefore arises whether such intervention amounts to judicial administration. The answer depends largely upon the nature of the judicial direction. If the court merely directs an authority to perform a duty already imposed by law, such intervention can be justified as judicial review. However, if the court begins to formulate detailed policies or continuously administer institutions, it may cross the constitutional boundary separating judicial and executive functions.

7. Judicial Activism and Separation of Powers

Montesquieu emphasized that liberty requires separation between legislative, executive and judicial powers. If judicial power is combined with legislative or executive power, there is a danger of arbitrary government. This principle remains relevant to PIL. Courts are not elected institutions and therefore do not possess the same democratic accountability as the Legislature and Executive.

Critics argue that excessive judicial activism may result in courts making policy decisions that should be made by elected representatives. It may also create difficulties in administration because judges generally do not possess the financial, technical and administrative machinery required to implement complex policies. The criticism becomes particularly relevant when courts attempt to monitor the day-to-day functioning of public institutions.

8. Important Social Dimensions of PIL

The social significance of PIL can be summarized in several areas:

1. Protection of vulnerable groups: PIL provides access to justice for poor and marginalized persons.
2. Protection of human dignity: It has expanded Article 21 to include dignified living conditions.
3. Environmental protection: Courts have protected air, water, forests and historical monuments.
4. Prison reforms: PIL has highlighted illegal detention, custodial violence and poor prison conditions.
5. Labour welfare: It has assisted in enforcing minimum wages and preventing bonded labour.
6. Women and children: Courts have intervened where vulnerable persons face exploitation or unsafe conditions.
7. Public health: Judicial directions have been issued where administrative failure threatens public health.
8. Accountability of public authorities: PIL encourages government authorities to perform their legal and constitutional duties.

Thus, PIL has strengthened the connection between constitutional rights and social realities.

9. Criticism and Limitations of PIL

Despite its importance, PIL has certain limitations and risks.

First, excessive judicial intervention may undermine the principle of separation of powers. Courts may unintentionally enter areas requiring political, financial or administrative expertise. Second, PIL may sometimes be misused for personal interests, political rivalry, publicity or private disputes. Such petitions can unnecessarily burden the judiciary. Third, courts themselves face practical difficulties in implementing their directions. The judiciary does not possess the administrative machinery, financial resources or enforcement agencies necessary for managing government institutions on a continuous basis. Fourth, excessive judicial intervention may result in the Executive becoming dependent on judicial directions for ordinary administrative decisions. This can weaken democratic accountability.

Therefore, PIL should be used only where there is a genuine public interest and where ordinary legal remedies are inadequate.

10. Need for Judicial Self-Discipline

Judicial activism should not become judicial governance. Courts must remain conscious of their constitutional limitations while protecting Fundamental Rights. The judiciary should primarily ensure that laws and constitutional duties are implemented. Where administrative authorities fail to act, courts may issue appropriate directions. However, detailed policy-making and routine administration should normally remain with the elected branches. Judicial self-restraint does not mean ignoring violations of rights. Rather, it means exercising judicial power carefully, proportionately and constitutionally. A balanced approach is therefore necessary. The

judiciary should intervene where constitutional rights are seriously threatened, but it should avoid replacing the Executive or Legislature.

11. Conclusion

Public Interest Litigation has transformed the Indian judicial system by making justice more accessible to disadvantaged sections of society. It has helped protect prisoners, bonded labourers, workers, women, children and persons affected by environmental degradation. Through the liberal interpretation of Article 21 and other Fundamental Rights, courts have strengthened the constitutional guarantee of human dignity. At the same time, PIL has expanded the practical role of the judiciary and, in some situations, brought it close to the administrative domain. This has generated concerns regarding separation of powers, democratic accountability and judicial overreach. The proper approach is therefore neither complete judicial restraint nor unlimited judicial activism. Courts should intervene when there is a clear failure of constitutional or statutory duties and when Fundamental Rights require protection. However, they should avoid assuming the day-to-day functions of the Executive or making policies that belong to elected institutions.

Ultimately, PIL should remain a means of public justice rather than private or political gain. When exercised with judicial discipline, it can continue to serve as a powerful constitutional mechanism for social justice, protection of human rights, environmental protection and enforcement of the rule of law.

Author's Declaration-

I/We accept full responsibility, jointly and individually, for this article's content, views, analysis, conclusions, and any related errors, plagiarism, copyright, ethical, defamatory, or legal issues, now or in the future. The publisher, editors, and reviewers shall bear no liability. I/We declare no financial, personal, academic, or professional conflict of interest.

References

1. Constitution of India, particularly Articles 14, 21, 23, 32, 46 and 226.
2. Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India, AIR 1978 SC 597.
3. Brown v. Board of Education, 347 U.S. 483 (1954).
4. Bonded Labour System (Abolition) Act, 1976.
5. Kerala Marine Fishing Regulation Act, 1980.
6. Montesquieu, The Spirit of Laws.
7. Lord Denning, The Discipline of Law.
8. Indian Bar Review, discussions on Public Interest Litigation and Judicial Activism.
9. Bonded Labour System (Abolition) Act, 1976
10. Joyachan Antony v. State of Kerala AIR1994 SC 721
11. Umed Rams Case AIR 1986 SC 847
12. Brown v. Board of Education 1984 Law ed 873

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The views, content, and claims expressed in this article are solely the "responsibility of the author(s). The publisher and editors accept no legal liability for any errors, "copyright infringement, or loss or damage arising from its use.

Cite this Article

"Kishor. K." (2026), "The Role of Courts as Administrators in PIL and Its Social Dimensions", International Journal of Arts, Humanities, Social Sciences and Commerce, 2(1), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.65919/ijahssc.2026.v2i1003>

"Copyright © 2026 The Author(s). This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0) License, permitting sharing and adaptation with appropriate attribution for non-commercial purposes".