

Supreme Court's Power to Overrule itself

What is the issue?

 $n\n$

\n

- A 5-judge Supreme Court Bench led by the Chief Justice is now slated to hear the conflicting judgments of two previous three member SC benches.
- This new episode was triggered by cases reagarding land acquisition, and has brought to highlight, a pressing constitutional issues.

 $n\$

How did the current issue come up?

 $n\n$

\n

- Three separate cases involving compensations to be paid for land acquired for various activities came up to the Supreme Court at various times.
- Firstly, in January 2014, a three-judge Bench unanimously held that "paid" would mean compensation offered or rendered, and deposited in court.
- In February 2018, another 3 judge bench held that once compensation had been unconditionally offered and refused, it would be considered "paid".
- In another subsequent case recently heard by a 3 judge bench the bench was surprised to know that one 3 judge bench had overruled another previously.

\n

- As this is against judicial convention, the case has now been referred to the Chief justice of India to constitute a larger bench to resolve this issue.
- \bullet The matter is now slated to be heard by a 5 judge constitutional bench that would include the CJI. $\ensuremath{\backslash n}$

 $n\n$

Can the Supreme Court rule against its own decisions?

 $n\$

\n

- The Supreme Court has the power to overrule its own decisions, but it has affirmed that this power will be used sparingly and only in compelling cases.
- But it has been fairly established that a Bench of the Supreme Court can't overrule a previous judgment delivered by a bench of equal or larger size.
- In such a situation, in case of an inability to agree, the only option available is to refer the matter to the CJI, requesting that a larger Bench to hear the same.

\n

 Notably, this has to be a mere reference to the CJI and criticism or doubts about the correctness of the previous judgment (of a larger bench) can't be aired.

\n

- Notably, this is merely a convention followed for ensuring certainty in law and there is no explicit constitutional provision for the same.
- It is to be noted that, since the Supreme Court has 11 to 13 Benches hearing cases concurrently in different contexts, conflicting opinions are only natural.

\n

 $n\n$

Why does the Supreme Court have benches of different sizes?

 $n\n$

\n

- It was proposed in the constituent assembly that India's Supreme Court should exercise its jurisdiction as a full court, and not as separate Benches.
- But this was not accepted as it might not help in the optimal use of judicial time, may lead to a slower judicial process and backlogs.
- Initially, the Supreme Court was envisaged as having a Chief Justice and seven other judges, with Parliament having the power to increase this number.

\n

• **Evolution** - In the early years, all judges sat together, but as the work of the court increased, Parliament increased the number of judges. \n

- From 8 in 1950 to 11 in 1956, 14 in 1960, 18 in 1978, 26 in 1986 and 31 in 2008 (the current strength), the number of judges have gone up with time.
- To deal with more cases, judges started sitting in smaller Benches of two or three, and larger Benches of five or more were constituted only for some cases.

\n

Notably, a matter can be referred to a larger Bench only by a judicial order.

 $n\n$

\n

- **Special benches** Any case involving a substantial question of law (like interpreting the Constitution) must be heard by a Bench of at least 5 judges.
- \bullet While it is a norm to constitute such a bench, there have however been constitutional cases that were decided by smaller benches. \n

 $n\n$

\n

- Chief Justice of India is the head of the judiciary, and is vested with the administrative responsibility to constitute the benches.
- While all judges including the CJI are equal in their judicial powers, it is a norm to use the experienced senior judges for Constitutional Benches.
- Other Countries In the US, UK, Australia, Canada and South Africa, in most cases, all judges of the Supreme Court sit together in large Benches.
- \bullet Notably, Supreme Courts of the above mentioned countries usually have seven to nine judges only and their juristrictions are also very selective. \n
- \bullet Considering the small number of judges, a judgment of a bench over 5 members would mostly imply the majority opinion of the entire court. \n

 $n\n$

 $n\n$

Source: The Indian Express

