BLOGS

Detailed Case Analysis: Sajjan Singh v. State of Rajasthan

Indrasish Majumder · 16 Jan 2025

Sajjan Singh v State of Rajasthan upheld Parliament's power to amend the Constitution, including fundamental rights. Read the detailed case analysis in this post!

Background of the Case

The Sajjan Singh v. State of Rajasthan case arose amidst growing debates about the power of Parliament to amend the fundamental rights enshrined in the Indian Constitution.

The case followed earlier landmark judgments, such as **A.K. Gopalan v. State of Madras** and Shankari Prasad v. Union of India, that had addressed the interplay between constitutional amendments and fundamental rights.

Facts of the Case

The Rajasthan Government had enacted the Land Reforms Act, which sought to redistribute land as part of agrarian reforms. To protect this and similar state laws from legal challenges, the 17th Amendment Act was passed.

This amendment expanded the definition of "estate" under Article 31A and included additional laws in the Ninth Schedule, insulating them from judicial scrutiny.

The petitioner, Sajjan Singh, a former ruler of the princely state of Ratlam, challenged the amendment, contending that it infringed upon his fundamental rights and violated constitutional principles.

Several landlords also filed petitions under ***Article 32***, arguing that the amendment excluded courts from adjudicating disputes involving fundamental rights, thereby undermining constitutional guarantees.

Issues Raised

1. Is the 17th Amendment Act constitutionally valid?
2. Did the term “law” include constitutional amendments, thereby subjecting them to Article 13(2)?
3. Does Parliament have the authority to amend fundamental rights under its constituent power?

Arguments by the Petitioners

- The 17th Amendment Act encroached upon judicial review and fundamental rights, making it unconstitutional.
- Parliament lacked authority to legislate on land matters, which fell within the jurisdiction of state legislatures.
- We did not follow the Article 368 procedure, which calls for the ratification of specific amendments by half of the states.
- We should reevaluate the ruling in Shankari Prasad v. Union of India (1951).

Arguments by the Respondents

- The petition was premature, as the amendment did not directly affect the petitioners’ rights at the time of filing.
- Parliament’s constituent power under Article 368 allowed it to amend any part of the Constitution, including fundamental rights.
- The amendment was essential for implementing socioeconomic reforms and promoting public welfare.

Judgment and Observation

The Supreme Court, by a majority of 3:2, upheld the constitutional validity of the 17th Amendment Act.

Justice P.B. Gajendragadkar, delivering the majority opinion, made the following observations:

1. Parliament’s Power Under Article 368: Parliament had the authority to amend any part of the Constitution, including fundamental rights, as the framers of the Constitution did not impose explicit restrictions on such amendments.

2. Interpretation of “Law” in Article 13: The term “law” in Article 13 referred to ordinary legislation, not constitutional amendments. Thus, amendments made under Article 368 were not subject to Article 13(2).
3. The primary purpose of the 17th Amendment Act was to facilitate land reforms, which were crucial for addressing socioeconomic inequalities. The Court ruled that this objective did not violate constitutional principles.

Dissenting Opinions

1. Justice Mudholkar emphasized the importance of safeguarding the “basic features” of the Constitution, arguing that unrestricted amendment powers could compromise its fundamental principles.
2. Justice Hidayatullah asserted that fundamental rights are integral to the Constitution and should not be subject to amendments that could compromise their sanctity.

Significance of the Judgment

The dissenting opinions in Sajjan Singh v State of Rajasthan laid the intellectual groundwork for the basic structure doctrine. Justice Mudholkar’s remarks directly influenced the landmark ruling in *Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala* , where the Court established that Parliament could not alter the Constitution’s fundamental framework.

The majority opinion upheld the Shankari Prasad (1951) precedent, asserting Parliament’s authority to amend fundamental rights. This strengthened the legislative branch’s role in addressing evolving social and economic needs.

By upholding the validity of the 17th Amendment Act, the Court facilitated land reforms essential for achieving agrarian justice. The judgment highlighted the importance of balancing individual rights with collective welfare.

The majority’s decision reflected a deferential approach to legislative intent, emphasizing Parliament’s role in shaping policies for public good. However, this deference drew criticism for potentially undermining judicial review.

Criticism of the Judgement

- The majority's narrow interpretation of Article 13 created a potential loophole by excluding constitutional amendments from the scope of "law."
- Critics argued that the Court's deference to legislative intent compromised its role as the guardian of fundamental rights.
- While land reforms were vital, the judgment's prioritization of economic objectives over constitutional principles raised concerns about setting a dangerous precedent.

Overruling of Sajjan Singh v State of Rajasthan

In I.C. Golaknath (1967), the Court effectively overruled the Sajjan Singh judgment, adopting a more activist stance and holding that Parliament could not amend fundamental rights. Kesavananda Bharati (1973) later tempered this decision by introducing the basic structure doctrine, striking a balance between parliamentary power and constitutional integrity.

Conclusion

Sajjan Singh v State of Rajasthan occupies an important place in India's constitutional history. The judgment upheld Parliament's authority to amend the Constitution while exposing critical tensions between legislative supremacy and judicial oversight. Its dissenting opinions anticipated the basic structure doctrine, shaping subsequent debates on constitutional amendments.

The case underscores the dynamic interplay between legislative and judicial powers, highlighting the need for safeguards to preserve democratic values and fundamental rights. The judgment's legacy lies in its role as a catalyst for evolving jurisprudence, ensuring that the Constitution remains a living document adaptable to societal needs while safeguarding its foundational principles.