

## Economic Prudence in Judicial Pronouncements

### What is the issue?

\n\n

\n

- The number of legal disputes involving property, contract, labour, tax and corporate laws is bound to increase with an expanding economy.

\n

- But the judiciary doesn't seem to fully appreciate the economic consequences of its judgments and its implications on the people.

\n

\n\n

### What are some high impact judgments that are controversial?

\n\n

\n

- Court pronouncements have consequences not only for disputants but also for the larger public both directly and indirectly.

\n

- The judgements might directly affect individuals, and entities like banks, businesses and also indirectly alter their decision making rationale.

\n

- **Bankruptcy** - Allahabad High Court has ruled that only 'wilful loan default' will enable starting of bankruptcy proceedings against power companies.

\n

- But wilful default is hard to prove and is open to interpretation.

\n

- **Uddar Gagan Properties case** - 280 acres of land was acquired by the Haryana government in 2005, and was later transferred illegally to developers.

\n

- While the supreme court did decipher the fraudulent practice involved, it still decided to hand over the land to the state government (a partner in crime).

\n

- Consequently, farmers were forced to accept a paltry compensations for parting with their land.

\n

- **Developer State Nexus** - The Haryana government issued an acquisition

notification in 2007 to acquire 688 acres of land.

\n

- As soon as the notification was issued, developers approached the original land owners to buy their land.

\n

- Since the official compensation was slated to be meagre, many owners sold their land at throwaway prices to the approaching builders.

\n

- But after 100's of acres were sold by land owners to builders, the government decided to suspend acquisition plans.

\n

- Subsequently, with utter disregard for rules, the state authorities not only approved these land deals but also granted regulatory approval for builders.

\n

- Unsurprisingly, the Supreme Court held the State's actions constituted fraud due to a clear case of an unholy nexus between officials and builders.

\n

- But even in this case, instead of returning the land to its original owners (as the sale was unconscionable), the court handed it to the state government.

\n

\n\n

## **What are the implications of such judgements?**

\n\n

\n

- **Land Cases** - Through irrational judgments, rather than protecting the rights of real owners, the judiciary actively denies economic justice to the masses.

\n

- Moreover, the court has transferred land (precious economic resource), from those who need and use it, to governments which clearly don't need it.

\n

- Notably, it is due various such judgments, government agencies abuse laws and are sitting on a massive stock of unused land.

\n

- **Infra projects** - Several infrastructure projects are being held up due to judicial interventions in the bidding process.

\n

- Courts usually don't seem to realise that the quality of infrastructure assets and the technical capability of contractors to deliver them are serious issues.

\n

- Mere difference in bid price may or may not be a decisive factor in contract allocation and litigations in this context needs to be scrutinised for prudence.

\n

- Contrarily, court's intervention can delay projects, and escalate costs far more than any possible gains from ruling in favour of the lowest price bidder.

\n

\n\n

## **What is the way ahead?**

\n\n

\n

- **Dynamic Monitoring** - Contract manipulation is a challenging domain where the courts need to get innovative in their judgements.

\n

- Rather than strictly laying down clauses regarding operational and accessory finances, judgements could consider commissioning monitoring mechanisms.

\n

- Courts should also exercise prudence so that contracts don't get too diluted due to excessive judicial intervention (as it will discourage investments).

\n

- Also, strengthening our pre-trial arbitration mechanisms can help in clarifying laws, reducing legal uncertainty and disputes.

\n

- **Economic Consideration** - In cases that are squarely open, judges are to make pronouncements that will avoid adverse effects on employment, economic growth, and state revenue.

\n

- Some judgements like in the "Shivashakti Sugars Ltd (2017) case", saw prudent economic reasoning, an aspect that needs to be widely adopted.

\n

- Significantly, the same judgement also pushed for an inter-disciplinary (law & economics) approach for better litigational outcomes.

\n

- **Caution** - In its quest for economic prudence, courts should ensure that things don't go overboard and any such foray must be restricted to genuine public purposes.

\n

- Adjudication of cases requires a cost-benefit analysis of a different kind and infringement of individual rights is to be done only when absolutely necessary.

\n

- Moreover, the degree of infringement should be minimum to realise the purpose and the social benefit driven from it must be commensurate enough.

\n

\n\n

\n\n

**Source: The Hindu**

\n

