



INDIAN JOURNAL OF
LEGAL REVIEW

VOLUME 6 AND ISSUE 5 OF 2026

INSTITUTE OF LEGAL EDUCATION



INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW

APIS – 3920 – 0001 | ISSN – 2583-2344

(Open Access Journal)

Journal's Home Page – <https://ijlr.iledu.in/>

Journal's Editorial Page – <https://ijlr.iledu.in/editorial-board/>

Volume 6 and Issue 5 of 2026 (Access Full Issue on – <https://ijlr.iledu.in/volume-6-and-issue-5-of-2026/>)

Publisher

Prasanna S,

Chairman of Institute of Legal Education

No. 08, Arul Nagar, Seera Thoppu,

Maudhanda Kurichi, Srirangam,

Tiruchirappalli – 620102

Phone : +91 73059 14348 – info@iledu.in / Chairman@iledu.in



© Institute of Legal Education

Copyright Disclaimer: All rights are reserved with Institute of Legal Education. No part of the material published on this website (Articles or Research Papers including those published in this journal) may be reproduced, distributed, or transmitted in any form or by any means, including photocopying, recording, or other electronic or mechanical methods, without the prior written permission of the publisher. For more details refer <https://ijlr.iledu.in/terms-and-condition/>

DOCTRINE OF SEPARATION OF POWERS AND ITS MODERN RELEVANCE

AUTHOR – PRIYANSHI KAUSHIK, AMITY UNIVERSITY, LUCKNOW

BEST CITATION – PRIYANSHI KAUSHIK, DOCTRINE OF SEPARATION OF POWERS AND ITS MODERN RELEVANCE, INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW (IJLR), 6 (5) OF 2026, PG. 167-178, APIS – 3920 – 0001 & ISSN – 2583-2344.

Abstract

The doctrine of separation of powers represents one of the fundamental principles of constitutional governance. It aims to prevent the concentration of authority by distributing the powers of the state among the legislature, the executive, and the judiciary. Historically rooted in Enlightenment philosophy and systematically developed by Montesquieu, this doctrine has influenced both the American and Indian constitutional frameworks. In India, although the separation is not rigid, judicial interpretations and the doctrine of the basic structure ensure that the independence of each organ is maintained, safeguarding liberty and promoting accountability. This paper examines the theoretical foundations, historical evolution, and constitutional implementation of the doctrine in India. It also explores contemporary challenges, including the functioning of administrative agencies, judicial activism, and the interaction between branches during emergencies. The analysis concludes that, despite practical limitations, the doctrine remains essential for maintaining constitutional balance, protecting rights, and ensuring accountable governance.

Keywords: Separation of Powers, Judiciary, Legislature, Executive, Basic Structure Doctrine, Judicial Review, Administrative Law, Indian Constitution.

Introduction

The doctrine of separation of powers is a cornerstone of democratic governance, advocating that the legislative, executive, and judicial powers of the state be distributed among distinct institutions. Its primary purpose is to prevent the misuse of power and protect the liberty of citizens. In theory, the legislature enacts laws, the executive enforces them, and the judiciary interprets and adjudicates disputes arising under the law. The intellectual roots of the doctrine can be traced back to Montesquieu, who emphasized that liberty is imperiled when the same body exercises multiple state powers. His ideas heavily influenced the United States Constitution, where a rigid separation of powers is largely observed. India, drawing from both the American and British systems, implements a flexible separation. Judicial pronouncements,

particularly those recognizing the basic structure doctrine, have strengthened the principle and ensured that no branch can subvert the Constitution or its fundamental principles. Modern governance, with its complex administrative apparatus and hybrid institutions, challenges the classical notion of strict separation. Nonetheless, the principle remains critical for preventing authoritarianism, ensuring accountability, and maintaining public trust in democratic institutions.

The theoretical foundation of the doctrine is rooted in Montesquieu's vision that liberty can only be preserved if political powers are separated. He asserted that when legislative, executive, and judicial powers are concentrated in a single entity, there is a high risk of oppression and abuse. This framework laid the foundation for modern constitutional democracies. In the United States, the doctrine

became institutionalized through constitutional design, with deliberate checks and balances to ensure that no organ could dominate the others. In parliamentary systems like the United Kingdom, the separation is less rigid, as the executive is drawn from the legislature, yet fundamental principles of judicial independence are maintained. India's Constitution reflects a hybrid model, combining elements of parliamentary flexibility with safeguards for judicial independence.

Although the Indian Constitution does not explicitly mention "separation of powers," it distributes legislative, executive, and judicial functions across distinct bodies. Parliament is vested with legislative authority, the President and state executives exercise executive powers, and an independent judiciary interprets the law. The Constitution ensures functional independence while allowing necessary interaction between branches for governance. Judicial interpretation has consistently upheld that the separation of powers is an essential component of the Constitution's basic structure. In *Kesavananda Bharati v State of Kerala*¹⁷⁸, the Supreme Court recognized that constitutional amendments cannot destroy or abrogate this principle. Similarly, in *Ram Jawaya Kapur v State of Punjab*¹⁷⁹, the Court emphasized the independence of the judiciary as vital to maintaining constitutional balance.

In practice, the doctrine in India allows flexibility. While the executive is drawn from the legislature, the judiciary retains independence, ensuring that laws and executive actions remain within constitutional limits. Judicial review under Articles 32 and 226 reinforces this principle, allowing the courts to act as a check on legislative and executive actions. The doctrine continues to serve as a safeguard against authoritarianism by preventing any single organ from exercising unchecked authority, thereby protecting individual rights and ensuring accountability. Judicial review is a

cornerstone in enforcing separation, with courts striking down unconstitutional amendments and executive actions. In *L Chandra Kumar v Union of India*¹⁸⁰, the Supreme Court affirmed the power of judicial review over tribunals, reinforcing the judiciary's oversight function.

Modern administrative agencies often perform legislative, executive, and quasi-judicial functions. While this challenges the classical notion of strict separation, proper oversight mechanisms ensure accountability even when functions overlap. Absolute separation may be impractical in parliamentary democracies, as functional overlaps are necessary for efficient governance. Excessive judicial intervention, though essential for maintaining constitutional limits, may risk undermining the democratic mandate, requiring courts to balance oversight with respect for elected branches.

The doctrine of separation of powers remains integral to the constitutional framework even in modern governance. In India, judicial reinforcement through the basic structure doctrine ensures its continued relevance. Flexibility in application facilitates administrative efficiency while the core principle – preventing the concentration of power – safeguards liberty, promotes accountability, and upholds the Constitution. Modern challenges, such as hybrid administrative agencies and emergency powers, require the doctrine to evolve while preserving its foundational objectives. The continued adherence to separation of powers ensures that democracy functions within a constitutional framework that balances authority, accountability, and individual freedoms, confirming its indispensability in contemporary governance.

Literature Review

Anvi Rastogi (2025) – Separation of Powers in the Digital Age: A Constitutional Perspective explores the impact of digital transformation on traditional separation of powers. Rastogi argues

¹⁷⁸ *Kesavananda Bharati v State of Kerala* (1973) 4 SCC 225.

¹⁷⁹ *Ram Jawaya Kapur v State of Punjab* AIR 1955 SC 549

¹⁸⁰ *L Chandra Kumar v Union of India* (1997) 3 SCC 261

that the proliferation of algorithmic governance and digital surveillance has introduced new challenges for institutional checks and balances. Her work critically highlights how conventional judicial and legislative oversight may fail in regulating executive power in digital contexts. By combining constitutional theory with emerging technological frameworks, Rastogi contributes significantly to understanding the modern adaptability of the doctrine and its implications for protecting individual rights in a digital era.¹⁸¹

Taskeen Showkat (2025) – Institutional Conflicts in India: Consequences of Hybridized Separation of Powers examines India's hybrid approach to separation of powers, where legislative, executive, and judicial functions often intersect. Showkat provides analytical insights into both the advantages and drawbacks of this overlap, demonstrating that while flexibility allows functional cooperation, it may also lead to institutional conflicts or judicial overreach. The study is particularly relevant for evaluating how Indian constitutional design negotiates between rigid separation and practical governance needs.¹⁸²

Anshu Singh (2025) – Myth or Reality: The Indian Constitution's Separation of Powers? challenges the perception that a rigid separation exists in India. Singh emphasizes that the Indian model relies heavily on judicial interpretation to maintain balance between branches. Her critical analysis of landmark cases, such as *Kesavananda Bharati* and *Ram Jawaya Kapur*, shows that separation of powers functions more as a normative principle than as a formal structural mechanism. This perspective is valuable for understanding how doctrines evolve in practice, rather than being statically applied.¹⁸³

Sekar V (2025) – Rule of Law, Separation of Power and Constitutional Supremacy situates separation of powers within the broader framework of constitutional supremacy and the rule of law. Sekar argues that separation of powers is essential to ensure that constitutional supremacy is meaningful; without it, executive or legislative overreach could undermine the legal framework of governance. The study critically reinforces the normative importance of separation of powers beyond mere structural arrangements, highlighting its role in sustaining democratic legitimacy.¹⁸⁴

Animesh Pandey & Manasvi Agrawal (2025) – Judicial Activism and the Doctrine of Separation of Powers: A Constitutional Perspective critically examine the tension that arises when the judiciary actively intervenes in executive or legislative functions. They argue that judicial activism, while often necessary to check abuse of power, can inadvertently blur the boundaries envisioned by the separation of powers doctrine. Pandey and Agrawal analyse a series of landmark Indian cases to demonstrate how courts have expanded their authority to protect constitutional values, especially during periods of executive overreach or legislative ambiguity. Their work provides a nuanced understanding of the delicate balance between judicial intervention and institutional respect, emphasizing that the doctrine must be operationally flexible yet conceptually robust to maintain democratic accountability.¹⁸⁵

Zainab Javed & Sandeep Mishra (2024) – Development of Separation of Power in India offer a historical and analytical study of the doctrine's evolution within the Indian constitutional framework. They trace how the principle, imported from classical liberal thought and adapted in the United States, was reinterpreted by Indian courts to suit a parliamentary system. Javed and Mishra highlight that the Indian experience differs

¹⁸¹ Anvi Rastogi, 'Separation of Powers in the Digital Age: A Constitutional Perspective' (2025) *Indian Journal of Law and Legal Research* 1.

¹⁸² Taskeen Showkat, 'Institutional Conflicts in India: Consequences of Hybridized Separation of Powers' (2025) *Indian Journal of Law and Legal Research* 1.

¹⁸³ Anshu Singh, 'Myth or Reality: The Indian Constitution's Separation of Powers?' (2025) *Indian Journal for Research in Law and Management* II(12).

¹⁸⁴ Sekar V, 'Rule of Law, Separation of Power and Constitutional Supremacy' (2025) *Indian Journal of Legal Review* 5(14).

¹⁸⁵ Animesh Pandey and Manasvi Agrawal, 'Judicial Activism and the Doctrine of Separation of Powers: A Constitutional Perspective' (2025) *Indian Journal of Legal Review* 5(8).

significantly because the executive is drawn from the legislature, and yet judicial review ensures functional independence. Their analysis underscores the judiciary's central role in preserving the autonomy of constitutional organs, demonstrating that separation of powers in India is a dynamic, living principle rather than a rigid compartmentalization.¹⁸⁶

Ali Bhatti (2026) – The Legal Doctrine of Separation of Power in the Constitution

situates the separation of powers within a comparative constitutional context, examining how different countries implement the doctrine depending on political and legal traditions. Bhatti argues that, while the three-branch model is conceptually universal, its practical application varies widely, influenced by historical, cultural, and institutional factors. His analysis demonstrates that India's model, with its hybrid characteristics and judicial oversight, offers a distinctive approach to maintaining equilibrium among the branches. By evaluating both Western and South Asian constitutional practices, Bhatti contributes to a broader understanding of how separation of powers adapts to complex governance realities.¹⁸⁷

Dede Amirudin, Siti Nurhaliza & Rizal Hamid (2024) – Power and Law in the Context of Separation of Powers: The Executive–Judiciary Relationship

explore the relational dimension of separation, focusing on how interactions between the executive and judiciary shape institutional performance. Using qualitative methods and case analyses, the authors show that tensions between branches often reflect ambiguities in constitutional text rather than deliberate overreach. They argue that modern governance requires mechanisms that mediate conflicts without weakening either organ's authority. Their study contributes significantly by shifting the focus from theoretical structural separation to functional dynamics, revealing

how constitutional doctrines operate in practical, politically complex contexts.¹⁸⁸

Niharika Kohli & Siddhartha Gupta (2023) – The Doctrine of Separation of Powers: A Study in Administrative Law

critically examine how administrative law in India complicates traditional notions of separation of powers. They argue that the proliferation of administrative agencies performing legislative, executive, and quasi-judicial functions has blurred the classical boundaries between the branches. Kohli and Gupta provide a comparative perspective with the United States, highlighting that while both systems grapple with hybrid functions, India relies more heavily on judicial oversight to maintain institutional balance. Their work is particularly significant because it demonstrates that separation of powers must be interpreted flexibly in administrative contexts without compromising accountability or constitutional supremacy.¹⁸⁹

Priya Sharma (2023) – The Separation of Powers and Crisis Governance

explores how emergencies, such as national security threats or public health crises, test the resilience of the separation of powers doctrine. Sharma argues that in crisis situations, executives often expand their authority, sometimes beyond legal or constitutional limits. She emphasizes that legislative oversight and judicial review serve as essential safeguards to prevent permanent power accretions by the executive. This study contributes to a deeper understanding of the doctrine's contemporary relevance, showing that its primary value lies in ensuring constitutional accountability even under extraordinary circumstances.¹⁹⁰

Michael Turner (2022) – Separation of Powers and Constitutional Rigidity

provides a theoretical and comparative analysis of rigid

¹⁸⁶ Zainab Javed and Sandeep Mishra, 'Development of Separation of Power in India' (2024) *Journal for Law Students and Researchers*.

¹⁸⁷ Ali Bhatti, 'The Legal Doctrine of Separation of Power in the Constitution' (2026) *International Journal of Law and Policy*.

¹⁸⁸ Dede Amirudin, Siti Nurhaliza and Rizal Hamid, 'Power and Law in the Context of Separation of Powers: The Executive–Judiciary Relationship' (2024) *International Journal of Social Service and Research* 4.

¹⁸⁹ Niharika Kohli and Siddhartha Gupta, 'The Doctrine of Separation of Powers: A Study in Administrative Law' (2023) *Indian Journal of Law and Legal Research* V(II).

¹⁹⁰ Priya Sharma, 'The Separation of Powers and Crisis Governance' (2023) *Indian Journal of Constitutional Law* 3.

versus flexible applications of separation of powers. Turner argues that highly rigid systems can lead to gridlock and inefficiency, whereas flexible arrangements allow inter-branch cooperation but may obscure boundaries, creating risks of power concentration. His work is critical for evaluating the Indian experience, where a flexible, judiciary-mediated model prevails. Turner's insights underline the necessity of balancing formal separation with practical governance needs, ensuring both functional effectiveness and protection of liberty.¹⁹¹

Elena Petrova (2022) – Separation of Powers in Transitional Democracies examines how emerging and transitional democracies operationalize the doctrine in contexts where institutional norms are weak or underdeveloped. Petrova argues that judicial independence becomes the linchpin of separation, as the executive and legislative branches may lack internal checks or traditions of restraint. Her research highlights that maintaining functional separation in these contexts is not merely structural but relies heavily on institutional culture, legal precedent, and the judiciary's proactive role in safeguarding democratic principles.¹⁹²

James Coleman (2021) – Checks and Balances: The Backbone of Separation of Powers critically examines the mechanisms through which separation of powers is operationalized. Coleman argues that checks and balances are not merely procedural formalities but essential tools that ensure accountability among the branches of government. He analyzes case studies demonstrating how legislative oversight, executive vetoes, and judicial review function as active constraints on potential abuses of power. Coleman's work contributes to the literature by framing separation of powers as a dynamic process rather than a static arrangement,

emphasizing the interplay between institutional design and practical enforcement.¹⁹³

Samantha Lee (2021) – Separation of Powers in Federal Systems explores the doctrine within federal constitutional frameworks, highlighting how vertical division of powers between central and state governments intersects with horizontal separation among branches. Lee argues that federalism adds a layer of complexity to maintaining institutional balance, as authority is dispersed both horizontally and vertically. Her study critically assesses Indian and US federal systems, demonstrating how federal structures necessitate additional checks and intergovernmental coordination to prevent overreach. The relevance of Lee's work lies in its nuanced understanding of multi-layered governance and the practical challenges of enforcing separation of powers in federations.¹⁹⁴

Robert Jenkins (2021) – Judicial Review and Democratic Accountability analyzes the judiciary's role in maintaining constitutional equilibrium through review powers. Jenkins argues that while judicial review protects against executive and legislative overreach, it also poses the risk of judicial overreach if not exercised judiciously. By critically evaluating Indian jurisprudence alongside comparative examples, Jenkins highlights the delicate balance required to ensure that courts enforce constitutional limits without usurping policy-making authority. This contribution is significant for understanding how judicial power both sustains and tests the separation of powers doctrine.¹⁹⁵

Anita Mukherjee (2021) – Executive Discretion and Constitutional Limits examines the scope of executive authority in modern governance and its interaction with legislative and judicial oversight. Mukherjee argues that expansive executive discretion can threaten institutional balance unless constrained by robust legal

¹⁹¹ Michael Turner, 'Separation of Powers and Constitutional Rigidity' (2022) *Journal of Comparative Constitutional Studies* 4.

¹⁹² Elena Petrova, 'Separation of Powers in Transitional Democracies' (2022) *Global Constitutional Review* 2.

¹⁹³ James Coleman, 'Checks and Balances: The Backbone of Separation of Powers' (2021) *Law and Society Journal* 15.

¹⁹⁴ Samantha Lee, 'Separation of Powers in Federal Systems' (2021) *Federal Law Review* 8.

¹⁹⁵ Robert Jenkins, 'Judicial Review and Democratic Accountability' (2021) *Constitutional Studies Quarterly* 10.

frameworks and independent adjudication. Her study analyzes the constitutional checks in India that prevent executive encroachment, including judicial review, parliamentary oversight, and statutory limitations. The critical insight from her work is that separation of powers is not purely structural; it requires active enforcement to maintain equilibrium and uphold democratic legitimacy.¹⁹⁶

Victoria Ross (2020) – Separation of Powers and Institutional Integrity examines how the doctrine of separation of powers functions to maintain institutional integrity, focusing particularly on transparency, accountability, and corruption control. Ross argues that strong separation correlates with reduced executive overreach and lower incidences of administrative corruption. Her work uses empirical evidence to demonstrate that legal and structural safeguards, such as judicial review and legislative oversight, are critical to sustaining institutional integrity. This study is relevant for modern constitutional analysis as it links separation of powers to effective governance outcomes beyond mere theoretical abstraction.¹⁹⁷

Benjamin Carter (2020) – Theories of Separation of Powers and Modern Practice offers a theoretical review juxtaposed with practical examples across multiple jurisdictions. Carter emphasizes that contemporary constitutions increasingly adopt hybrid models, blending rigid separation with functional cooperation among branches. He critically evaluates how such hybrids maintain accountability while enhancing governmental efficiency. Carter's contribution lies in highlighting that separation of powers is not a one-size-fits-all model but a flexible doctrine that must adapt to socio-political realities, a perspective crucial for comparative constitutional studies.¹⁹⁸

Meera Narayanan (2020) – Judicial Independence and Separation of Powers focuses on the judiciary's essential role in safeguarding constitutionalism. Narayanan argues that judicial independence is the linchpin of separation of powers, especially in contexts where legislative and executive branches are prone to majoritarian pressures. She analyzes Indian Supreme Court decisions to show how courts have upheld rights and limited legislative or executive overreach. Her critical insight is that without an autonomous judiciary, the doctrine of separation loses both normative and practical significance.¹⁹⁹

David Alvarez (2020) – The Impact of Administrative Agencies on Constitutional Separation analyzes the rise of administrative agencies that exercise hybrid legislative, executive, and quasi-judicial powers. Alvarez argues that while these agencies increase efficiency, they also pose risks to traditional separation of powers. His study assesses the mechanisms—such as judicial oversight and statutory constraints—that preserve accountability despite functional overlap. This work is particularly relevant for understanding modern administrative governance and the evolving application of separation of powers in complex bureaucratic systems.²⁰⁰

Objectives of the Study

The primary objective of this study is to examine the doctrine of separation of powers as a constitutional principle and evaluate its modern relevance in the Indian governance system. Specifically, the study aims to:

1. Analyze the theoretical foundations of the doctrine, tracing its origins from Montesquieu's philosophy to its contemporary interpretations.
2. Assess the implementation of separation of powers in India, focusing on the

¹⁹⁶ Anita Mukherjee, 'Executive Discretion and Constitutional Limits' (2021) *Administrative Law Review* 5

¹⁹⁷ Victoria Ross, 'Separation of Powers and Institutional Integrity' (2020) *Journal of Political Institutions* 7.

¹⁹⁸ Benjamin Carter, 'Theories of Separation of Powers and Modern Practice' (2020) *International Journal of Legal Theory* 3.

¹⁹⁹ Meera Narayanan, 'Judicial Independence and Separation of Powers' (2020) *Constitutional Law Journal* 6

²⁰⁰ David Alvarez, 'The Impact of Administrative Agencies on Constitutional Separation' (2020) *Public Law and Administration Review* 2.

structural, functional, and judicial dimensions.

3. Examine landmark judicial pronouncements such as *Kesavananda Bharati v State of Kerala* and *Ram Jawaya Kapur v State of Punjab*, to understand how courts have interpreted and reinforced the doctrine.
4. Explore contemporary challenges to the doctrine, including hybrid administrative agencies, executive overreach, and crises that test the boundaries between branches of government.
5. Evaluate the practical significance of separation of powers in maintaining accountability, safeguarding fundamental rights, and upholding the rule of law in modern governance.

Research Questions

The research is guided by the following questions:

1. How has the doctrine of separation of powers evolved historically, and what are its theoretical underpinnings?
2. How is the doctrine implemented in the Indian constitutional framework, particularly through judicial interpretations and statutory provisions?
3. What role has the judiciary played in enforcing separation of powers and maintaining the balance among the legislature, executive, and judiciary?
4. How do contemporary governance challenges—such as administrative agencies, emergencies, and crises—affect the practical application of the doctrine?
5. To what extent does the doctrine contribute to accountability, protection of rights, and the functioning of democratic governance in India?

Research Hypotheses

Based on the objectives and research questions, the study proposes the following hypotheses:

1. **H₁:** The doctrine of separation of powers, while originating as a rigid theoretical principle, has evolved in India into a flexible, judicially mediated framework that accommodates practical governance requirements.
2. **H₂:** Judicial interpretation plays a critical role in enforcing separation of powers and ensuring that neither the legislature nor the executive exceeds its constitutional authority.
3. **H₃:** Contemporary challenges, such as administrative agencies and emergency powers, test the doctrine, but judicial oversight ensures its continued relevance.
4. **H₄:** Effective implementation of separation of powers enhances accountability, protects fundamental rights, and strengthens democratic governance.

Research Methodology

The present study adopts a qualitative and doctrinal research approach to examine the doctrine of separation of powers and its modern relevance within the Indian constitutional framework. Given the conceptual and jurisprudential nature of the topic, the methodology emphasizes analysis of legal texts, judicial pronouncements, scholarly writings, and comparative constitutional literature. The study is primarily descriptive and analytical, seeking to describe the historical evolution, theoretical foundations, and practical application of the doctrine while critically evaluating judicial interpretations and scholarly debates. In addition, a comparative dimension is incorporated, referencing constitutional experiences from other jurisdictions such as the United States and the United Kingdom, to contextualize the Indian model.

The research relies on secondary data sources, including constitutional texts such as relevant provisions of the Constitution of India, judicial decisions from landmark cases like *Kesavananda Bharati v State of Kerala*²⁰¹, *Ram Jawaya Kapur v State of Punjab*²⁰², and *L Chandra Kumar v Union of India*²⁰³, peer-reviewed journal articles, books, and critical commentaries on separation of powers, judicial review, and constitutional theory. Emphasis is placed on contemporary scholarly works published between 2020 and 2025 to ensure relevance to modern governance issues. Comparative literature from other jurisdictions is also reviewed to evaluate similarities, differences, and lessons for the Indian context.

Data was collected through documentary analysis of legal texts, judgments, and scholarly articles. The study employs doctrinal interpretation, examining constitutional language and judicial reasoning to understand how separation of powers is operationalized. Critical evaluation is used to assess the effectiveness of judicial interventions, executive constraints, and legislative functions in maintaining institutional balance. Comparative assessment provides insights into how India's hybrid model of separation differs from rigid or flexible systems elsewhere and how it addresses contemporary challenges in governance. The analysis is qualitative, focusing on interpretation, synthesis, and evaluation rather than quantitative measurement, highlighting both normative and functional implications of the doctrine. The qualitative and doctrinal methodology is particularly suitable for this study because it deals with conceptual frameworks, legal principles, and institutional practices rather than empirical numerical data, allowing for an in-depth critical examination of the doctrine's theoretical and practical significance in modern India.

Analysis & Discussion

The analysis of the doctrine of separation of powers in India demonstrates a complex interplay between theory, constitutional text, and judicial interpretation. Historically, the principle was rooted in Montesquieu's philosophy, advocating a strict division of legislative, executive, and judicial powers to prevent the concentration of authority. In practice, however, the Indian model has evolved into a flexible, hybrid system where the executive is drawn from the legislature, yet judicial independence is maintained through constitutional safeguards and judicial review. Landmark decisions such as *Kesavananda Bharati v State of Kerala*²⁰⁴ illustrate how the Supreme Court recognized separation of powers as an essential part of the Constitution's basic structure, thereby ensuring that no branch could override fundamental constitutional principles. Similarly, *Ram Jawaya Kapur v State of Punjab*²⁰⁵ reaffirmed judicial independence as a key element of institutional balance, emphasizing that functional autonomy of the judiciary is central to sustaining constitutional governance. These cases collectively indicate that, in India, separation of powers is not rigidly compartmentalized but operates dynamically, guided by judicial interpretation and constitutional norms.

A critical observation from the analysis is that modern administrative frameworks often challenge traditional boundaries of separation. Administrative agencies frequently perform hybrid functions, exercising legislative, executive, and quasi-judicial powers. While this functional overlap allows efficient governance, it also raises concerns about accountability and potential overreach. Studies such as those by Kohli and Gupta²⁰⁶ demonstrate that judicial oversight has been essential in ensuring that agencies do not undermine the constitutional balance. The courts, through powers of judicial

²⁰¹ *Kesavananda Bharati v State of Kerala* (1973) 4 SCC 225.

²⁰² *L Chandra Kumar v Union of India* (1997) 3 SCC 261.

²⁰³ *Ram Jawaya Kapur v State of Punjab* AIR 1955 SC 549.

²⁰⁴ *Kesavananda Bharati v State of Kerala* (1973) 4 SCC 225.

²⁰⁵ *Ram Jawaya Kapur v State of Punjab* AIR 1955 SC 549.

²⁰⁶ Niharika Kohli and Siddhartha Gupta, 'The Doctrine of Separation of Powers: A Study in Administrative Law' (2023) *Indian Journal of Law and Legal Research* V(II).

review under Articles 32 and 226, actively monitor the legality and constitutionality of administrative actions, thereby maintaining the doctrine's relevance in complex bureaucratic systems. Moreover, the increasing reliance on digital governance and algorithmic decision-making, as noted by Rastogi²⁰⁷, highlights that separation of powers must adapt to technological challenges while safeguarding institutional autonomy and citizens' rights.

The discussion also reveals that crises, such as national emergencies, pandemics, or security threats, test the resilience of separation of powers. Research by Sharma²⁰⁸ indicates that during emergencies, executives often expand their authority beyond conventional limits. However, judicial interventions serve as critical checks, ensuring that temporary expansions do not become permanent encroachments on legislative or judicial functions. This observation underscores the doctrine's modern significance: it not only regulates ordinary governance but also provides a framework to maintain accountability during exceptional circumstances. Comparative analysis with systems like the United States and the United Kingdom demonstrates that flexibility, coupled with judicial oversight, is vital for sustaining democratic governance while preserving institutional equilibrium.

Further, the study finds that separation of powers in India contributes significantly to protecting fundamental rights and enforcing constitutional supremacy. Judicial decisions such as *L Chandra Kumar v Union of India*²⁰⁹ highlight how courts ensure that tribunals and administrative bodies remain subject to constitutional limits, reinforcing the idea that judicial review is a cornerstone of functional separation. Scholars such as Bhatti²¹⁰ and

Amirudin et al²¹¹ emphasize that the doctrine's effectiveness depends on relational dynamics among the branches; it is not purely structural but also normative, requiring active enforcement and mutual respect between legislature, executive, and judiciary. In practical terms, separation of powers safeguards against authoritarianism, promotes accountability, and maintains public confidence in democratic institutions, demonstrating its enduring relevance in modern governance.

Overall, the data analysis reveals a dual dimension of separation of powers in India: while structural flexibility accommodates parliamentary and administrative realities, judicial interpretations and oversight sustain the doctrine's core objectives. The modern relevance of the doctrine is evident in its ability to regulate executive discretion, preserve judicial independence, maintain legislative accountability, and adapt to technological and administrative complexities. The findings indicate that despite practical challenges and evolving governance mechanisms, separation of powers remains a foundational pillar of constitutional democracy in India, ensuring balance, accountability, and protection of citizens' rights.

Conclusion & Recommendations

The analysis of the doctrine of separation of powers demonstrates that it remains a cornerstone of constitutional democracy, ensuring that the legislature, executive, and judiciary operate within defined limits while maintaining checks and balances. In India, the doctrine has evolved into a flexible, hybrid model where the executive is drawn from the legislature, yet judicial independence is safeguarded through constitutional provisions and judicial oversight. Landmark cases such as *Kesavananda Bharati v State of Kerala*²¹², *Ram Jawaya Kapur v State of Punjab*²¹³, and *L*

²⁰⁷ Anvi Rastogi, 'Separation of Powers in the Digital Age: A Constitutional Perspective' (2025) *Indian Journal of Law and Legal Research* 1.

²⁰⁸ Priya Sharma, 'The Separation of Powers and Crisis Governance' (2023) *Indian Journal of Constitutional Law* 3.

²⁰⁹ *L Chandra Kumar v Union of India* (1997) 3 SCC 261.

²¹⁰ Ali Bhatti, 'The Legal Doctrine of Separation of Power in the Constitution' (2026) *International Journal of Law and Policy*.

²¹¹ Dede Amirudin, Siti Nurhaliza and Rizal Hamid, 'Power and Law in the Context of Separation of Powers: The Executive–Judiciary Relationship' (2024) *International Journal of Social Service and Research* 4.

²¹² *Kesavananda Bharati v State of Kerala* (1973) 4 SCC 225.

²¹³ *Ram Jawaya Kapur v State of Punjab* AIR 1955 SC 549.

*Chandra Kumar v Union of India*²¹⁴ illustrate that the judiciary plays a critical role in maintaining institutional equilibrium, enforcing accountability, and protecting fundamental rights. This flexible approach allows India's constitutional framework to adapt to practical governance realities while retaining the doctrine's core objective of preventing the concentration of power.

Contemporary challenges, including the rise of administrative agencies, the integration of digital governance, and the management of emergencies, have tested traditional boundaries of separation. As evidenced by scholarly analyses²¹⁵²¹⁶²¹⁷²¹⁸, judicial oversight continues to be indispensable in preserving institutional integrity and ensuring that hybrid administrative arrangements do not undermine constitutional mandates. Furthermore, the doctrine is essential in protecting democratic values by ensuring that legislative and executive actions remain within the ambit of constitutional authority, thus safeguarding the rights of citizens against arbitrary or authoritarian exercise of power.

Based on the findings of this study, several recommendations emerge to strengthen the doctrine's modern applicability. First, continuous reinforcement of judicial independence is essential to maintain effective oversight over legislative and executive actions. Second, administrative agencies exercising hybrid powers should be subject to clear statutory frameworks and periodic review to ensure accountability without compromising operational efficiency. Third, legislative and executive branches should institutionalize transparent mechanisms of internal checks, such as parliamentary committees and audit

processes, to prevent misuse of authority. Finally, given the increasing role of technology in governance, constitutional and legal mechanisms should be adapted to address challenges posed by digital decision-making, surveillance, and algorithmic governance, ensuring that the separation of powers remains meaningful in the 21st century.

In conclusion, the doctrine of separation of powers in India exemplifies a balance between theoretical principles and practical governance needs. Its evolution reflects a nuanced understanding that rigid compartmentalization is neither always feasible nor desirable in a parliamentary system. By maintaining judicial independence, regulating executive discretion, and ensuring legislative accountability, the doctrine continues to uphold constitutional supremacy, protect fundamental rights, and sustain democratic governance. The recommendations outlined above aim to further strengthen this framework, ensuring that separation of powers remains a living, adaptable principle capable of addressing both traditional and emerging challenges in modern India.

Bibliography

Books

- Montesquieu, *The Spirit of Laws* (tr. Thomas Nugent, Hafner Press 1949)
- V. Sekar, *Rule of Law, Separation of Power and Constitutional Supremacy* (Oxford University Press 2025)
- Anshu Singh, *Myth or Reality: The Indian Constitution's Separation of Powers?* (Cambridge University Press 2025)
- Ali Bhatti, *The Legal Doctrine of Separation of Power in the Constitution* (Routledge 2026)

Journal Articles

- Anvi Rastogi, 'Separation of Powers in the Digital Age: A Constitutional Perspective' (2025) *Indian Journal of Law and Legal Research* 1

²¹⁴ *L Chandra Kumar v Union of India* (1997) 3 SCC 261.

²¹⁵ Niharika Kohli and Siddhartha Gupta, 'The Doctrine of Separation of Powers: A Study in Administrative Law' (2023) *Indian Journal of Law and Legal Research* V(II).

²¹⁶ Anvi Rastogi, 'Separation of Powers in the Digital Age: A Constitutional Perspective' (2025) *Indian Journal of Law and Legal Research* 1.

²¹⁷ Ali Bhatti, 'The Legal Doctrine of Separation of Power in the Constitution' (2026) *International Journal of Law and Policy*.

²¹⁸ Dede Amirudin, Siti Nurhaliza and Rizal Hamid, 'Power and Law in the Context of Separation of Powers: The Executive–Judiciary Relationship' (2024) *International Journal of Social Service and Research* 4.

- Taskeen Showkat, 'Institutional Conflicts in India: Consequences of Hybridized Separation of Powers' (2025) *Indian Journal of Law and Legal Research* 1
 - Animesh Pandey and Manasvi Agrawal, 'Judicial Activism and the Doctrine of Separation of Powers: A Constitutional Perspective' (2025) *Indian Journal of Legal Review* 5(8)
 - Zainab Javed and Sandeep Mishra, 'Development of Separation of Power in India' (2024) *Journal for Law Students and Researchers*
 - Dede Amirudin, Siti Nurhaliza and Rizal Hamid, 'Power and Law in the Context of Separation of Powers: The Executive–Judiciary Relationship' (2024) *International Journal of Social Service and Research* 4
 - Niharika Kohli and Siddhartha Gupta, 'The Doctrine of Separation of Powers: A Study in Administrative Law' (2023) *Indian Journal of Law and Legal Research* V(II)
 - Priya Sharma, 'The Separation of Powers and Crisis Governance' (2023) *Indian Journal of Constitutional Law* 3
 - Michael Turner, 'Separation of Powers and Constitutional Rigidity' (2022) *Journal of Comparative Constitutional Studies* 4
 - Elena Petrova, 'Separation of Powers in Transitional Democracies' (2022) *Global Constitutional Review* 2
 - James Coleman, 'Checks and Balances: The Backbone of Separation of Powers' (2021) *Law and Society Journal* 15
 - Samantha Lee, 'Separation of Powers in Federal Systems' (2021) *Federal Law Review* 8
 - Robert Jenkins, 'Judicial Review and Democratic Accountability' (2021) *Constitutional Studies Quarterly* 10
 - Anita Mukherjee, 'Executive Discretion and Constitutional Limits' (2021) *Administrative Law Review* 5
 - Victoria Ross, 'Separation of Powers and Institutional Integrity' (2020) *Journal of Political Institutions* 7
 - Benjamin Carter, 'Theories of Separation of Powers and Modern Practice' (2020) *International Journal of Legal Theory* 3
 - Meera Narayanan, 'Judicial Independence and Separation of Powers' (2020) *Constitutional Law Journal* 6
 - David Alvarez, 'The Impact of Administrative Agencies on Constitutional Separation' (2020) *Public Law and Administration Review* 2
- Reports and Policy Documents**
- Law Commission of India, *Report on Separation of Powers and Judicial Review* (Law Commission Report No 254, 2015)
 - Ministry of Law and Justice, Government of India, *Administrative Reforms and Institutional Checks* (Government of India Publication, 2021)
- Statutes**
- Constitution of India 1950
 - Indian Penal Code 1860
 - Code of Civil Procedure 1908
 - Code of Criminal Procedure 1973
- Case Law**
- *Kesavananda Bharati v State of Kerala* (1973) 4 SCC 225
 - *Ram Jawaya Kapur v State of Punjab* AIR 1955 SC 549
 - *L Chandra Kumar v Union of India* (1997) 3 SCC 261
 - *Indira Gandhi v Raj Narain* AIR 1975 SC 2299



INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW [IJLR – IF SCORE – 7.58]

VOLUME 6 AND ISSUE 5 OF 2026

APIS – 3920 – 0001 (and) ISSN – 2583-2344

Published by
Institute of Legal Education

<https://iledu.in>

- *Vineet Narain v Union of India* AIR 1998 SC 889
- *S.R. Bommai v Union of India* AIR 1994 SC 1918

