BLOGS

Case Analysis: IC Golaknath v. State of Punjab

Ruchika Mohapatra · 09 Aug 2025

Introduction

The case of IC Golaknath v State of Punjab is one of the most significant constitutional law cases in India. It addressed the fundamental question of whether Parliament has the authority to amend fundamental rights under Part III of the Indian Constitution.

This case set a crucial precedent, influencing later landmark decisions such as Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala. The Supreme Court's ruling in I.C. Golaknath reaffirmed the inviolability of fundamental rights and introduced the doctrine of prospective overruling in India.

Background of the Case

In post-independence India, land reforms were introduced to ensure equitable distribution of agricultural land and eliminate feudal landholding systems. Various states enacted laws imposing landholding ceilings, restricting large landowners from holding excess land.

The Punjab Security and Land Tenures Act, 1953, was one such law aimed at redistributing land. This law affected several landowners, including the petitioners in this case.

The 17th Constitutional Amendment, passed in 1964, placed land reform laws under the Ninth Schedule of the Constitution, making them immune to judicial review. The Golaknath family challenged this amendment, arguing that it violated their fundamental rights under Articles 14 (Right to Equality), 19 (Freedom to practice any profession or carry on any occupation), and 31 (Right to Property). This case raised a broader question- whether Parliament had the power to amend fundamental rights.

Issues Raised

The case revolved around two key legal questions:

1. Whether Parliament has the authority to amend fundamental rights under Article 368 of the Indian Constitution.
2. Whether the 17th Constitutional Amendment, which placed certain laws in the Ninth Schedule and made them immune to judicial review, was valid.

Arguments by the Petitioners

The petitioners argued that fundamental rights are inalienable and cannot be amended by Parliament. They contended that:

- The power to amend the Constitution under Article 368 does not extend to fundamental rights.
- Fundamental rights form the core of the Constitution and cannot be subject to modifications by legislative action.
- The placement of land reform laws in the Ninth Schedule, making them beyond judicial review, was unconstitutional as it violated the fundamental principles of democracy and individual freedoms.

Arguments by the Respondents (State of Punjab)

The State of Punjab and the Union Government defended the 17th Amendment by asserting that:

- Article 368 provides Parliament with an unrestricted power to amend any part of the Constitution, including fundamental rights.
- The Constitution is a living document that must evolve to meet the changing socio-economic needs of the country.
- Land reforms were introduced to achieve socio-economic justice and reduce disparities in land ownership, and judicial intervention in such matters would hinder legislative intent.

Judgment of the Supreme Court

The Supreme Court, in a narrow 6:5 majority, ruled in favor of the petitioners. Chief Justice K. Subba Rao delivered the majority opinion, holding that:

- Fundamental rights are sacrosanct and beyond the reach of Parliament’s amending power.

- Article 368 only lays down the procedure for amendment but does not confer the power to amend fundamental rights.
- To prevent instability, the Court applied the doctrine of prospective overruling for the first time in India. This meant that while the judgment would apply to future constitutional amendments, it would not invalidate past amendments, including the 17th Amendment.

Dissenting Opinion

The dissenting judges opined that:

- Parliament possesses absolute power to amend the Constitution, including fundamental rights.
- The Constitution must remain flexible and adaptable to changing times.
- Judicial intervention in Parliament's power to amend the Constitution could lead to governance challenges and undermine the democratic process.

Impact and Aftermath

The Golaknath v State of Punjab judgment significantly altered the constitutional landscape of India. By restricting Parliament's power to amend fundamental rights, it led to intense political and legal debates.

In response to the ruling, the government enacted the 24th Constitutional Amendment in 1971, which explicitly granted Parliament the power to amend any part of the Constitution, including fundamental rights.

However, the issue was finally settled in Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala, where the Supreme Court upheld Parliament's power to amend the Constitution but introduced the Basic Structure Doctrine. This doctrine held that while Parliament could amend the Constitution, it could not alter its fundamental structure.

Significance of the Case

The Golaknath v State of Punjab case is regarded as a milestone in Indian constitutional law for several reasons:

- It reinforced the idea that fundamental rights are inviolable and cannot be easily amended by legislative action.
- The doctrine of prospective overruling, introduced in this case, became a significant judicial tool in India.
- It laid the groundwork for the Basic Structure Doctrine, which continues to guide constitutional amendments in India.

Conclusion

The Supreme Court's ruling in I.C. Golaknath v State of Punjab was a defining moment in the Indian constitutional jurisprudence. It temporarily curtailed Parliament's power to amend fundamental rights, leading to significant constitutional amendments and judicial interpretations in later years. While its direct impact was neutralized by subsequent amendments and the Kesavananda Bharati ruling, the judgement emphasized the judiciary's role in safeguarding fundamental rights against legislative encroachment.

Read More: AK Gopalan v. State of Madras