AILET

IR Coelho v. State of Tamil Nadu: The Ninth Schedule and Judicial Review in India

Indrasish Majumder · 08 Apr 2025

IR Coelho v State of Tamil Nadu upheld judicial review, limiting Ninth Schedule immunity and reinforcing fundamental rights under the Constitution. Read the detailed case analysis in this post!

Introduction

The landmark judgment of IR Coelho v. State of Tamil Nadu is a cornerstone in the evolution of constitutional jurisprudence in India. This judgment, delivered by a nine-judge bench of the Supreme Court in 2007, underscored the primacy of the basic structure doctrine and reaffirmed the judiciary's role as the guardian of the Constitution. This case specifically dealt with the interplay between the Ninth Schedule of the Indian Constitution and the principles of judicial review.

The Ninth Schedule: A Historical Perspective

The First Amendment to the Constitution introduced the Ninth Schedule in 1951. Its primary objective was to protect laws related to land reforms and agrarian policies from being challenged in courts on the grounds of violation of fundamental rights. The government aimed to implement its socio-economic agenda without judicial interference through this move.

However, over the years, the Ninth Schedule became a repository for laws that sought immunity from judicial scrutiny. The Ninth Schedule shielded a wide array of legislation- some not directly related to land reforms- under successive governments. This led to concerns about the misuse of the Ninth Schedule as a mechanism to bypass constitutional limitations.

The Basic Structure Doctrine and Judicial Review

The basic structure doctrine, propounded in the Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala case, established that the Parliament's power to amend the Constitution is not absolute. It cannot alter the basic structure or fundamental framework of the Constitution. Judicial review, a key component of this doctrine, ensures that the actions of the legislature and executive conform to constitutional mandates.

In the context of the Ninth Schedule, the question arose whether laws placed under this schedule were beyond the scope of judicial review, even if they violated fundamental rights. The Supreme Court had to address this critical issue in the IR Coelho case.

Key Issues in the IR Coelho Case

The primary question before the court was whether laws inserted into the Ninth Schedule after April 24, 1973 (the date of the Kesavananda Bharati judgment) were subject to judicial review. The court also scrutinized whether we could test these laws against the principles of the basic structure doctrine.

Judgment Given in IR Coelho v State of Tamil Nadu

In its unanimous verdict, the Supreme Court held that all laws placed under the Ninth Schedule after April 24, 1973, are subject to judicial review.

The court observed:

"A law will not have absolute immunity if it enters the Ninth Schedule after April 24, 1973." Such a law will be open to challenge on the ground that it destroys or damages the basic structure of the Constitution."

The bench emphasized that the Ninth Schedule cannot be used as a tool to undermine the supremacy of the Constitution. Laws that violate fundamental rights and affect the basic structure of the Constitution cannot be granted blanket protection merely by including them in the Ninth Schedule.

Significance of the Judgment

The judgment given in IR Coelho v State of Tamil Nadu reaffirmed the judiciary's role as the sentinel of the qui vive. It ensured that the Ninth Schedule could not be misused to shield

unconstitutional laws. By allowing judicial review of laws listed in the Ninth Schedule, the court found a middle ground between the ideas of constitutional supremacy and parliamentary supremacy.

This judgment also highlighted the dynamic nature of the Constitution. The court observed that constitutional amendments and laws must align with evolving societal needs and constitutional principles. The decision in IR Coelho thus served as a safeguard against potential legislative overreach and ensured the protection of fundamental rights.

The judgment had far-reaching implications for Indian democracy. It strengthened the principle of constitutionalism and ensured that no branch of government could act arbitrarily. The court upheld the basic structure doctrine, reinforcing the notion that the Constitution is the ultimate law of the land, and any attempt to weaken its fundamental principles would be scrutinized.

Furthermore, the decision empowered citizens by reaffirming their faith in the judiciary as the guardian of fundamental rights. Legislative or executive actions cannot override constitutional principles.

Conclusion

IR Coelho v State of Tamil Nadu stands as a testament to the resilience of India’s constitutional framework. By subjecting laws under the Ninth Schedule to judicial review, the Supreme Court ensured that the principles of justice, equality, and the rule of law remain sacrosanct. This case serves as a reminder that while the Constitution provides the framework for governance, its true strength lies in its ability to adapt to changing times while upholding its core values.

Read More: Vishakha v. State of Rajasthan