INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS

Open Access, Refereed Journal Multi Disciplinary
Peer Reviewed

www.ijlra.com

ISSN: 2582-6433

DISCLAIMER

The views, opinions, interpretations, and conclusions expressed in the articles published in this journal are solely those of the respective authors. They do not necessarily reflect the views of the Editorial Board, Editors, Reviewers, Advisors, or the Publisher of IJLRA.

Although every reasonable effort has been made to ensure the accuracy, authenticity, and proper citation of the content published in this journal, neither the Editorial Board nor IJLRA shall be held liable or responsible, in any manner whatsoever, for any loss, damage, or consequence arising from the use, reliance upon, or interpretation of the information contained in this publication.

The content published herein is intended solely for academic and informational purposes and shall not be construed as legal advice or professional opinion.

ISSN: 2582-6433

ABOUT US

The *International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis (IJLRA)* (ISSN: 2582-6433) is a peer-reviewed, academic, online journal published on a monthly basis. The journal aims to provide a comprehensive and interactive platform for the publication of original and high-quality legal research.

IJLRA publishes Short Articles, Long Articles, Research Papers, Case Comments, Book Reviews, Essays, and interdisciplinary studies in the field of law and allied disciplines. The journal seeks to promote critical analysis and informed discourse on contemporary legal, social, and policy issues.

The primary objective of IJLRA is to enhance academic engagement and scholarly dialogue among law students, researchers, academicians, legal professionals, and members of the Bar and Bench. The journal endeavours to establish itself as a credible and widely cited academic publication through the publication of original, well-researched, and analytically sound contributions.

IJLRA welcomes submissions from all branches of law, provided the work is original, unpublished, and submitted in accordance with the prescribed submission guidelines. All manuscripts are subject to a rigorous peer-review process to ensure academic quality, originality, and relevance.

Through its publications, the *International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis* aspires to contribute meaningfully to legal scholarship and the development of law as an instrument of justice and social progress.

ISSN: 2582-6433

PUBLICATION ETHICS, COPYRIGHT & AUTHOR RESPONSIBILITY STATEMENT

The *International Journal for Legal Research and Analysis (IJLRA)* is committed to upholding the highest standards of publication ethics and academic integrity. All manuscripts submitted to the journal must be original, unpublished, and free from plagiarism, data fabrication, falsification, or any form of unethical research or publication practice. Authors are solely responsible for the accuracy, originality, legality, and ethical compliance of their work and must ensure that all sources are properly cited and that necessary permissions for any third-party copyrighted material have been duly obtained prior to submission. Copyright in all published articles vests with IJLRA, unless otherwise expressly stated, and authors grant the journal the irrevocable right to publish, reproduce, distribute, and archive their work in print and electronic formats. The views and opinions expressed in the articles are those of the authors alone and do not reflect the views of the Editors, Editorial Board, Reviewers, or Publisher. IJLRA shall not be liable for any loss, damage, claim, or legal consequence arising from the use, reliance upon, or interpretation of the content published. By submitting a manuscript, the author(s) agree to fully indemnify and hold harmless the journal, its Editor-in-Chief, Editors, Editorial Board, Reviewers, Advisors, Publisher, and Management against any claims, liabilities, or legal proceedings arising out of plagiarism, copyright infringement, defamation, breach of confidentiality, or violation of third-party rights. The journal reserves the absolute right to reject, withdraw, retract, or remove any manuscript or published article in case of ethical or legal violations, without incurring any liability.

ISSN: 2582-6433

PRINCIPLES OF NATURAL JUSTICE IN INDIAN SERVICE LAWS: AN ANALYSIS

AUTHORED BY - PRAKHAR PRABHAT SRIVASTAV
LLM Student
NALSAR University of Law, Hyderabad

The paper examines the role and application of the principles of natural justice within the framework of Indian service laws, with particular emphasis on their constitutional, administrative, and judicial dimensions. Natural justice constitutes a fundamental safeguard against arbitrary exercise of power and serves as a cornerstone of fair administrative decision-making. The study analyses the core principles of audi alteram partem (right to a fair hearing), nemo judex in causa sua (rule against bias), and the requirement of reasoned or speaking orders, highlighting their significance in ensuring procedural fairness and accountability. It further traces the historical evolution of Indian service laws and explores the incorporation of natural justice principles within constitutional provisions, particularly Articles 14, 21, 22, 309, 310, and 311 of the Constitution of India. The paper critically evaluates the Doctrine of Pleasure and its constitutional limitations, demonstrating how judicial interpretations have sought to balance administrative efficiency with the protection of public servants' rights. Through an analysis of landmark judicial decisions, including A.K. Kraipak v. Union of India, Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India, and Union of India v. Tulsiram Patel, the study illustrates the expanding scope of natural justice in administrative and disciplinary proceedings. It also examines the recognized exceptions to natural justice and the practical challenges associated with their implementation. The paper concludes that adherence to natural justice principles is indispensable for ensuring transparency, fairness, and legitimacy in public administration. While constitutional and judicial safeguards have significantly strengthened the rights of public servants, continued institutional reforms are necessary to ensure effective, timely justice within India's administrative framework.

Keywords: Natural Justice, Rule of Law, Judicial Review, Procedural Fairness

The term "natural justice" initially denoted many procedural rights inside the English legal system. Over time, the phrase has developed to encompass several foundational concepts

ISSN: 2582-6433

regarding administrative, quasi-judicial, and judicial decision-making. For millennia, all advanced civilizations have adhered steadfastly to these values. The practice of natural justice for over a millennium is hardly an exaggeration. Two principles of natural justice recognized by traditional English law are "Audi alteram Partem," signifying "to hear the opposing viewpoint" or "no one can be condemned without being heard," and "Nemo debet esse judex in propria causa," meaning "no man shall be a judge in his own cause," or "a suitor or adjudicating authority must be impartial and unbiased." The third assumption that has evolved is that only logical or verbal directives may be considered decisive. One could argue that the core thesis, which requires the execution and demonstration of justice, logically underpins the initial two concepts.

a) No one can be condemned unheard
b) No one can be a judge in his own case
c) Justice should not only be done but should manifestly appear to have been done
d) Final order must be speaking order

In ***A K Kraipak vs. Union of India***[1], Justice K S Hegde adeptly elucidated these concepts, encompassing their extent, intent, and applicability. In other words, concerning matters not addressed by legislation, the principles of natural justice augment rather than supplant the law of the nation. Their objective is to prevent or ensure equitable treatment for all individuals, rather than to establish fixed regulations. Considering the recent expansion of the concept, it is fitting to incorporate the principles of natural justice into administrative procedures as well. When selecting a natural justice rule, one must evaluate the specific facts of the case, applicable statutes and regulations, and the membership of the tribunal or other entity conducting the inquiry. The court adjudicating the claim of a natural justice principle violation must ascertain whether, under the circumstances, the application of the rule was necessary for a fair resolution. The principles of natural justice primarily dictate the execution of inquiries with impartiality, integrity, and without unjust or capricious bias.

Regarded as having been recognized by the ancient Greeks and Romans for centuries, natural justice is Subsequent generations of English common law judges affirmed the principles of natural justice. The common law traditions persisted in Indian courts following the nation's independence. Ancient Indian judges not only proclaimed but also actively upheld their rigorous norms of justice. The primary duty of a judge in ancient India was to maintain integrity, synonymous with complete impartiality and detachment. Brihaspati asserts that a

ISSN: 2582-6433

judge must adjudicate issues impartially, devoid of personal advantage or bias, and that decisions should adhere to the established procedural procedures. The definition of integrity was relatively broad, and the judges' code of integrity was quite stringent.[2]

A judge who fulfills his legal responsibilities in this manner attains an equivalent level of spiritual merit as a Yajna leader. Judges and advisers, seated behind the King during a trial, were required to exhibit courage, objectivity, and the capacity to confront his severe treatment of others or his personal deficiencies. Katyayana asserts that the judge's (samya) duty is to inform the monarch of the possibility of an immoral or unlawful ruling being rendered to the plaintiffs (vivadinam). In addition to an impartial and autonomous judiciary, ancient India established procedures for the management of affairs. It is improbable that anyone would have utilized the clause to render a ruling without allocating sufficient time for a hearing.

The principles of natural justice constrain administrative law by ensuring decision-making procedures include the right to a fair hearing, which encompasses the opportunity to present arguments, pose inquiries, and have biases acknowledged. forty-three One prominent legal perspective asserts that "violation of the principles of natural justice" can justify the issuance of a writ of certiorari by India's highest courts. The court may assess administrative acts that violate the principles of natural justice. This transpires rather often. forty-seven We deem the conditions for compliance with fundamental rights essential. However, due to discrepancies in substance between these two domains, there are debates regarding the potential significance and nature of the concepts of natural justice.

CORE PRINCIPLES OF NATURAL JUSTICE

The concept of "natural justice" represents fairness aligned with one's personal moral principles. Natural justice is the inherent sense of right and wrong. Throughout history, numerous individuals have understood natural justice in various ways. Initially, it was perceived that its complete meaning was synonymous with natural law. Certain perspectives assert that decisions must be substantiated by evidence, and the entity rendering them can only operate based on evidence possessing probative value. "Natural justice" serves as the standard for resolving conflicts between private parties. Adjudication must be equitable and impartial; both parties must have equal access to relevant authorities; and both parties must be informed of the opposing side's arguments and supporting material. These are several standards and norms governing the adjudication process.

ISSN: 2582-6433

AUDI ALTERAM PARTEM

The Latin phrase "Audi Alteram Partem" means "hear the other side." Natural justice primarily relies on the assurance of equality in governmental processes and judicial proceedings. This perspective asserts that we must afford both parties in a conflict or legal dispute the opportunity to present their evidence. All involved parties must have the opportunity to articulate their views and have them acknowledged in order to achieve a fair resolution, according to the core principle. The Audi Alteram Partem principle is fundamental in administrative law as it prevents judges from acting arbitrarily and safeguards the rule of law.[3] Fair hearing, commonly referred to as audi alteram partem, is the cornerstone of civilized civilizations. Consequently, we must afford a reasonable opportunity for self-defense to any individual subject to actions impacting their rights. We must consistently acknowledge that a "fair hearing" is more than just a formality. A "fair hearing" so encompasses

i. Document
ii. Listening
iii. Affirming
iv. Contingent upon legal counsel
v. Evidence
vi. The decision-maker relies fundamentally on attentive listening.

Notice is fundamental to natural justice because it informs all parties of any impending actions against them. This enables individuals to respond and safeguard themselves. The absence of the necessary notification renders any ensuing order or decision null and void from the outset, or ab initio. The right to notice is crucial as it enables individuals to understand the allegations and evidence against them prior to a hearing. In addition to the jurisdiction of the litigation, the notice must provide essential details such as the date, time, and venue of the hearing. The charges against the individual and the subsequent steps should be transparently clear. The notification is invalid if it omits any of these specifics. In the case of ***Punjab National Bank v. All India Bank Employees Federation***[4], the notification failed to adequately inform the party of the enforced consequences. The incorrect notification resulted in the nullification of the penalty. ***Keshav Mills Co. Ltd. v. Union of India*** [5]emphasized the importance of concise and clear notices. Ambiguous notifications fail to provide the involved parties with sufficient and proper notice.

The provision of a fair hearing is a crucial component of the audi alteram partem principle,

ISSN: 2582-6433

which guarantees each party the chance to present their case and receive a hearing before making a decision. An authority issues a directive without affording the affected individual an opportunity to present their case, rendering the order null and void. The case of ***Harbans Lal v. Commissioner and Others*** [6]asserts that the implementation of natural justice is contingent upon a fair trial. The opportunity for the parties to present their case, either in writing or orally, is contingent upon the authority responsible for that determination. The governing legislation may alter this prerequisite if it specifies otherwise. The authority is required to ensure that the affected parties have opportunities for an in-person or oral hearing.

Every judicial proceeding necessitates the presentation of evidence to all parties involved as a vital element. The presented evidence will assist a court or quasi-judicial entity in making its decision. The ***Stafford v. Minister of Health*** [7]case determined that the opposing party must be present for evidence to be admissible. The authority must provide the opposing party with the documented material. The case of Hira Nath v. Principal demonstrated that this concept is pertinent beyond the realm of formal evidence. The court must duly inform the affected party before relying on any information, such as an individual's previous convictions, without giving them an opportunity to contest it.

Cross-examination is an essential component of the judicial system, as it permits one side to interrogate the evidence presented by the other party without revealing its source. The court must afford the opportunity for cross-examination, even though it is not required to disclose the defendant's identity or the nature of the evidence against them. An anonymous source indicates that law enforcement, in their capacity as enforcers of the Sea Customs Act, confiscated clocks from a commercial entity in ***Kanungo & Co. v. Collector of Customs***[8]. The court ruled that prohibiting the concerned party from cross-examining the witness regarding objects confiscated under the Sea Customs Act did not contravene the principle of natural justice, despite the significance of cross-examination in contesting evidence.

Although not typically deemed essential for a fair hearing in administrative proceedings, legal assistance can significantly augment a party's understanding and ability to navigate the legal system. At times, it would be unjust to deprive an individual of their right to legal counsel. Cases such as ***J.J. Mody v. State of Bombay***[9] and ***Krishna Chandra v. Union of India*** [10]have upheld this idea. The party in question may lack the expertise to effectively navigate the intricacies of the law without the assistance of an attorney.

ISSN: 2582-6433

NEMO JUDEX IN CAUSA SUA

Causa Sua adheres to the Nemo Judex Doctrine as its anti-bias principle. In addition to ensuring justice, the doctrine of natural justice seeks to avert errors in the judicial process. The court in Ridge v. Baldwin determined that the natural justice method is inadequate—both wholly and partially—in elucidating a reasonable person's comprehension of acceptable conduct. India lacks statutory provisions delineating the essential procedures that administrative entities must adhere to in making decisions. A method should be reasonably equitable. According to the judicial philosophy of law, all judicial, quasi-judicial, and administrative authorities shall adhere to this common law standard when their actions jeopardize the interests of private individuals. Three pillars constitute the cornerstone of natural justice: liberty, equality, and equity.

In welfare states such as India, administrative agencies are rapidly expanding their jurisdiction and influence. Without the state's instruments responsible for impartially and equitably executing these responsibilities, the Rule of Law becomes worthless. Constitutional articles 14 and 21 establish the natural justice system in India. Article 21 clarifies the concepts of substantive and procedural due process, potentially acknowledging any equity inherent in the principles of natural justice. Outside the scope of Article 14's natural justice provision, arbitrary decisions arise from breaches of natural justice principles. The prohibition of bias ensures the consistent objectivity and impartiality of a decision-maker. Two factors eliminate the potential for a judge to be biased:

- No one should feign impartiality as a judge.
- In addition to its administration, justice is fundamentally necessary. Operating under biased or self-serving settings may compromise the decision-making techniques of the official making the judgment.

Organizational bias, whether deliberate or inadvertent, refers to a predisposition favoring one group or inquiry over another. Various forms of prejudice that may manifest in the workplace include rigid perceptions of how matters ought to be and biased viewpoints that arise from a constrained perspective. The ***G. N. Nayak v. Goa University*** [11]verdict suggests that financial or personal self-interest, rather than rationality, primarily motivates "bias". Consequently, the presumption against partiality seeks particular factors that may deceitfully mislead a judge in any unique case. One ought to act in accordance with moral principles rather than pursue convenience, as this is a widely recognized ethical standard. Justice will remain elusive as long

ISSN: 2582-6433

as individuals act independently.

The concept extends beyond the legal system; it may also be applicable to administrative and quasi-judicial processes. Essentially, natural justice compels individuals to behave in a fair and non-discriminatory manner. Without a fair trial, the "Coram non judice" decision would be null and invalid. the tertiary

- The prohibition on preference comprises two fundamental components as well.
- The individual responsible must report any personal or contractual interest they possess in the case's outcome.

There must be a significant likelihood of discrimination. The subjective notion of "real possibility of partiality" may denote either a fair suspicion of prejudice or actual partiality. Depicting an individual's psychological condition is challenging. Consequently, the courts ascertain reasonable grounds to presume that the decisive factor in the case was likely biased. Prejudice often influences judgment in a distinct manner. We can broadly categorize prejudice into six types:

Personal bias:

In both personal and professional interactions, authorities and parties establish an emotional or adversarial connection. Individuals exhibit kindness towards those they know and cherish; however, they may also use them for self-preservation. In the case of ***Manak Lal v. Dr. Pram Chand, Justice Gajendragadkar*** [12]provided an observation "It is clear that a candidate should not be considered for the position of judge, regardless of the minimal financial benefit."

As stated in ***Motor Transport LTD. v. Bangaruraju***[13] the cooperative company was required to get a license. Simultaneously, he secured the authority to act as president of the Local Transit Authority. He also held the position of neighborhood chairman. The Court overturned the ruling due to its disregard for principles of social justice.

Pecuniary Bias

A minor financial interest could disrupt regulatory efforts. Do you possess any financial interest? The court's ruling is not acceptable. An English court annulled the planning committee's decision in ***R v. Hendon Rular District Council***[14], citing the fact that one of its members was an estate agent working for the petitioner who requested permission.

ISSN: 2582-6433

Subject Matter Bias

Scenarios in which the outcome is influenced, either directly or indirectly, by the decision-maker. The absence of evident bias did not disqualify the judge in ***R v. Deal Justices, ex p. Curling***[15], a fellow of the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, from adjudicating a case of animal maltreatment.

Departmental Discrimination

Departmental bias can undermine the concept of fairness in administrative functions in the absence of adequate checks and balances; hence, it exacerbates the inherent difficulties of the administrative process. In ***Gullapalli Nageswara Rao v. APSRTC***[16], the courts annulled the government's resolution to nationalize road transportation. For example, issues arose when the Transport Department Secretary oversaw the plan's implementation, leading to only partial execution. The Court reversed the ruling, deeming it irrational in light of the Secretary's constraints.

Policy Bias

The judge's tendency to engage in departmental politics elucidates his apparent bias against the department's policy. The department's lethargy aligns with the judge's. A judge is disqualified from serving in a case if they own any pecuniary interest in its outcome, regardless of the magnitude of that interest.

This assertion regarding policy bias is false. A successful lawsuit contesting disciplinary actions rooted in personal bias requires the establishment of a "just presumption of partiality" or a "genuine likelihood of partiality." The "real probability" test focuses on the Court's own probability assessment, while the "reasonable suspicion" examination primarily evaluates appearances. ***Metropolitan Properties Co. v. Lannon*** [17] has rendered the genuine likelihood bias test more broadly applicable.

SPEAKING ORDERS

Thirdly, the evolution of the concept of natural justice demands a clear order for every rule affecting an individual's rights. This ensures that the decision is not solely dependent on chance. One may perceive a directive as issued nonchalantly and without consideration. We have reached a significant milestone in the establishment of a law-governed society. Moreover, it is essential to emphasize that the individual receiving an order must be informed of the rationale behind it if it is issued justly. All individuals have the right to ascertain its

ISSN: 2582-6433

origin.

Appealable orders must pertain to communication. In the absence of this, the aggrieved party will lack grounds to argue before the appellate court that the initial verdict was unconstitutional or erroneous. In certain instances, well-delineated policies render the appeals process superfluous. Administrative authorities or tribunals lack the authority to issue complete orders, unlike courts of law. These instructions, no matter how brief, must demonstrate the application of appropriate logic and the receipt of the directive by the aggrieved party. There is no specific mechanism for delivering orders; we must meet the aforementioned requirement. The Supreme Court has determined on multiple occasions that a silent order equates to a denial of appellate rights. When appellate authorities reverse a decision, they are required to provide a justification for their rulings.[18]

Natural justice serves as a procedural safeguard protecting individuals from injustice. These values should not be adhered to if there is no possibility of one party being unjustly treated or if their application leads to greater injustice. The military must prioritize national defense during conflict, rather than accommodate the concerns of individuals affected by their decisions. Imposing the rules of natural justice onto them, even as Indian citizens, would be disastrous. Adhering to these procedural requirements is unnecessary in the absence of the relevant state. Similarly, when interim preventive measures are impractical, adherence to natural justice principles is not required.

In a social welfare state like India, the government has numerous responsibilities to fulfill the constitutional objective of social, political, and economic justice. Attaining the concept of "justice" necessitates adherence to appropriate principles. Decisions made by any administrative, quasi-judicial, or judicial authority must adhere to established procedures and be equitable, rational, and just. The principles of natural justice aim to prevent injustice through an impartial, independent adjudicatory body based on rational reasoning. This body shall be governed by fair processes to ensure the prevention of injustice.

NATURAL JUSTICE IN THE CONTEXT OF INDIAN SERVICE LAWS

The term "natural justice" is not present in the Indian Constitution. The principle of natural justice is intricately woven within the Indian Constitution. The preamble of the constitution emphasizes "Social, Economic, and Political Justice," alongside equality in status and opportunity, as well as the freedom of thought, opinion, expression, belief, and worship. In addition to ensuring fair social and economic conduct among individuals, these rights protect against governmental overreach—a fundamental principle of Natural Justice theory.[19]

ISSN: 2582-6433

Article 14, in conjunction with the preamble, ensures that Indian citizens are afforded equality before the law and equal protection under the law. Article 21, which safeguards life and liberty, and Article 14, which addresses arbitrary decisions, collectively affirm the right to exist and to be free from capricious interference. Article 22 ensures that the imprisoned individual is afforded natural justice and a fair hearing. The concepts underpinning state policy Article 39-A specifically safeguards politically, socially, and economically disadvantaged groups. Article 311 of the constitution provides constitutional protection for government employees, ensuring that low-income and disabled individuals receive free legal assistance to achieve this objective. Furthermore, Articles 32, 226, and 136 of the Constitution provide remedies for violations of fundamental rights, especially in instances of breaches of natural justice principles.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF INDIAN SERVICE LAWS

The British established the current Indian civil services during their colonial rule. The Indian Civil Service was established under the Charter Act of 1853. The civil service finally gained respect after the enactment of the Indian Civil Service Act in 1861. Sir Charles Atkinson consequently supervised the establishment of the Public Service Commission in 1886. However, circumstances changed significantly following the publication of the Montague Chelmsford Report in 1918. The Government of India Act implemented distinctive alterations in 1935. Section 240(1) and 240(2) of the Government of India Act, 1935 significantly enhanced Section 96B of the Government of India Act, 1919, thereby providing substantial protections for government officials. Section 240 of the Government of India Act, 1935 stipulates that no government officer may be dismissed by an official of inferior level to that designated by their superiors.

Additionally, the Act provided citizens with a legitimate opportunity to articulate their dissent regarding any proposed measure. Although English Common Law stipulates that the duration of service is at the Crown's discretion, Section 240, Subsection (1) delineates two limitations on the length of duty under the Crown in India. The second subsection of Section 240, "No one below the appointed individual may remove them from His Majesty's service," establishes the initial stipulation. The second provision, outlined in Subsection (3) of Section 240, mandates a reasonable opportunity to provide information contesting any proposed dismissal or demotion. Efficiently conducting their operations necessitates a substantial workforce providing a diverse range of services for both federal and state governments. No individual

ISSN: 2582-6433

can entirely encompass the breadth of a minister's responsibilities.

The government employs permanent staff, sometimes referred to as civil servants, to execute the minister's duties. Public officials are responsible for executing policies, whereas ministers are tasked with formulating them. Ministers often serve five-year terms, whereas government employees retain their positions until they attain retirement age. No government agency can function effectively without the assistance of a competent civil worker. The Union and State Governments rely on the All-India Civil Services, Central Civil Services, and State Civil Services to ensure efficient administration and implement various policies, programs, and plans. The term "civil servant," despite its comprehensive usage, lacks a precise definition. Ensuring the integrity, impartiality, courage, and autonomy of public service or office positions relies on the assurance of job security. Article 311 of the Indian Constitution ensures the job security of public officers.

According to ***Rattan Lal v. Haryana*** [20], the state of Haryana routinely employed teachers on a temporary basis at the commencement of the academic year and dismissed them just prior to the summer recess. The Supreme Court deems government conduct intolerable due to the "unjustifiable hiring and firing" practices imposed on these ad hoc teachers. The majority of educated unemployed individuals are teachers; these positions are filled when required and conducted under deplorable conditions. The government appears to be profiting from these situations. This personnel policy contains several deficiencies. The military adheres to the Doctrine of Pleasure in a manner analogous to the civil service. The Ministry of Defense firmly opposed the notion of granting immunities to defense services, asserting that they should not be subjected to the same standards as public personnel. The armed services adhere to an extensive code that safeguards their rights and privileges in accordance with military discipline.

DOCTRINE OF PLEASURE

Prior to any official facing departmental disciplinary action, an impartial investigation must be undertaken. One cannot impose punishment without first conducting an investigation. The severity of the punishment in question determines the methodology and nature of the inquiry. During the departmental investigation, the policies and practices of all pertinent departments must be adhered to precisely. The absence of investigative rules necessitates that the officer employs principles of natural justice. Determining the extent of the obligation violation often

ISSN: 2582-6433

necessitates preliminary research. Prior to generating a charge sheet, one must conduct thorough investigation. If a serious breach of duty warrants a substantial penalty, the employee requires a comprehensive, clear, and precise charge sheet to present his defense.

The Doctrine of Pleasure, originating from British common law, permits the Crown—and by extension, the President or the Governor in India—to terminate a public officer's employment without prior notification. This indicates that the appointment of a public official is entirely discretionary. Public policy underpins this approach by ensuring that officials deemed unfit or harmful to the public interest can be swiftly dismissed, hence promoting more efficient and effective governance. The Indian Constitution predominantly embodies this principle in Articles 155 and 310. Article 155 asserts that a state governor operates at the discretion of the president, hence emphasizing the president's supremacy in such significant appointments.[21] This principle, strengthened by Article 310, applies to members of the Defense Services, Civil Services, All-India Services, and anyone in a civil or military role under the Union or State governments. These officers uphold the principles within the Indian public administration framework, contingent upon the discretion of the President or Governor.

The English common law system, which has historically granted the Crown the power to dismiss public servants without justification and at any time, has contributed to the delineation of pleasure. The concept is founded on Articles 154(1) and 310(1) of the Indian Constitution. Article 154(1) grants the president the authority to choose the duration of a state's governor's tenure at his discretion. Article 310(1) encompasses many categories of public officials, including the all-India service, the defense service, and the civil service, within this framework. These individuals serve for the duration specified by the governor or president, contingent upon the nature of their service.

The Doctrine of Pleasure, a key concept of the British Parliamentary system, is particularly significant in public employment and is incorporated into the Indian Constitution. Articles 310 and 311 of the Constitution, which aim to reconcile the rights of government employees with the interests of the state, distinctly embody this notion. Article 310(1) of the Indian Constitution stipulates that all government employees, including those in civil or defense services, are subject to the authority of the president or the governor, regardless of whether their position is under the central government or the states. This section highlights the inherently unpredictable nature of public officials' terms and their vulnerability to the whims

ISSN: 2582-6433

of their appointing authorities, establishing the constitutional foundation for the doctrine of pleasure.

The applicability of this theory is not without limitations. Article 311 enhances protections by modifying this technique and conferring explicit powers to civil officials. No government employee shall be demoted, dismissed, or removed from their position without an inquiry in which the accused is informed of the allegations and had an opportunity to defend themselves. The procedure will remain equitable, and the authority will not be employed indiscriminately as long as this is maintained. In the landmark case ***Union of India v. Tulsiram Patel***[22], the Supreme Court adeptly navigated the intersection of Articles 309, 310, and 311. The court emphasized the need to balance the assurance of job security for capable and honest employees with the imperative to terminate dishonest, corrupt, or incompetent individuals. The legal and procedural framework of Article 309 maintains equilibrium by regulating conditions of service and recruitment; nonetheless, adherence to the stipulations of Article 310 and Article 311 is important.

The Supreme Court further elucidated in State of ***U.P. v. Babu Ram Upadhya*** [23]that common law does not constrain the doctrine of pleasure, as articulated in Article 310. While actions and policies established under Article 309 are essential for standard governance, the discretion of the President or Governor under Article 310 remains unimpeded unless constrained by other constitutional provisions, such as Article 311. Section 310 of the Indian Constitution establishes the Doctrine of Pleasure, empowering the Governor or the President to dismiss government employees at their discretion. Article 310(1) stipulates that employees of the Union's civil service, military, all-India, and other governmental entities are subordinate to the discretion of these senior authorities. This statement clearly indicates that the authority to which these public servants are accountable may jeopardize them at any point; the assurance is merely transient.

The Constitution has safeguards designed to prevent the misuse of such significant power. Article 310(2) includes exclusions that safeguard some professions from unanticipated layoffs. Articles 124, 148, 217, 218, and 324, along with other constitutional provisions, confer substantial tenures onto holders of high constitutional offices and safeguard their integrity and autonomy. Article 311 substantially constrains the doctrine of pleasure to mitigate the capricious termination of public employees. No government employee may be

ISSN: 2582-6433

dismissed, terminated, or removed from office without undergoing a comprehensive investigation first. The accused must be informed of the allegations and had the opportunity to defend themselves during this inquiry. This statistic assesses the maintenance of procedural justice and the prevention of power abuse in public administration.

The Doctrine of Pleasure, firmly embedded in India's public service management framework, has been significantly shaped by historical judicial decisions that delineate its constitutional significance. The Supreme Court decision in ***Union of India v. Roshan Lal Tandon*** [24]determined that laws or statutory regulations, which the government can unilaterally amend, form the fundamental basis for the rights and responsibilities of government employees. This ruling emphasized the government's authority in utilizing its personnel under the doctrine of pleasure. Case of ***Sankaranarayanan v. State of Kerala*** [25] (1971) Unique, Strongly Connected Components. The Supreme Court ruled that no agreement can limit the authority conferred by Article 309 of the Constitution, so affirming the applicability of the doctrine of pleasure. This verdict affirms the constitutional right to enter into private transactions.

This ruling indicates that no legislation or regulation enacted under Article 309 undermines the Doctrine of Pleasure. This underscores the constitutional significance of the subject, imparting greater authority than typical legislative impact. The Supreme Court of ***India v. Tulsiram Patel*** [26]elucidates Articles 309, 310, and 311 comprehensively. The Supreme Court recognized the necessity of the Doctrine of Pleasure in removing corrupt or incompetent authorities, alongside the importance of the tenure protection afforded by Article 311 for capable and honest employees.

Public policy is the foundation of the Doctrine of Pleasure. This perspective posits that public employees, being employed by the populace, possess an ethical obligation to serve the public interest and contribute to societal advancement. This concept is crucial for ensuring integrity and efficacy in government, as it facilitates the removal of unfit officials without the typical constraints associated with termination procedures. These judicial decisions seek to balance the safeguarding of civil servant rights, the promotion of administrative efficacy, and the prevention of abuse. The doctrine of pleasure is a significant aspect of the Indian Constitution, permitting public officers to serve at the discretion of the President or Governor, subject to certain exceptions. The constraints, elucidated by constitutional demands and judicial decisions, aim to protect the rights of public employees and preserve specific discretionary

ISSN: 2582-6433

powers of the executive branch.

Article 310(2) delineates notable exceptions to the Doctrine of Pleasure by exempting individuals appointed to civil positions for a specified duration based on their exceptional competence. These exemptions do not pertain to positions outside the standard state or union civil service, military service, or all-India service. This provision exempts specific posts from the at-will termination principle of the Doctrine of Pleasure, acknowledging their necessity for security and stability. This section significantly limits the Doctrine of Pleasure, as no public official may be demoted, removed, or dismissed without undergoing a proper investigation, during which the accused must be informed of the allegations and have a fair opportunity to defend herself. Incorporating principles of natural justice into administrative procedures ensures equity and transparency in disciplinary hearings.

The doctrine of pleasure and the constitutional guarantee of fundamental rights cannot be in contradiction. An analysis of the Supreme Court's decision in ***Kameshwar Prasad v. State of Bihar*** [27] illustrates why the doctrine cannot infringe upon an individual's fundamental rights. The court annulled Commissioner, the Comptroller and Auditor General, and judges of the Supreme Court and High Court are high-ranking constitutional officers exempt from the Doctrine of Pleasure. Specific constitutional protocols govern their nomination and dismissal, ensuring their autonomy and safeguarding against state interference. Article 320(3)(c) further constrains the doctrine by mandating communication with the Public Service Commission about disciplinary matters involving public servants. This additional layer of oversight and procedural requirement promotes fairness in disciplinary hearings.

Furthermore, judicial interpretations of the Doctrine of Pleasure indicate that government employees cannot have their tenure prolonged beyond the retirement age without their consent, save in rare circumstances deemed necessary for the public good. This was confirmed in ***Pratap Singh v. State of Punjab*** [28] Article 368 grants Parliament the power to amend or repeal Article 310, potentially abolishing the Doctrine of Pleasure. This constitutional article illustrates the adaptability and dynamic nature of constitutional law in addressing the evolving requirements of governance by emphasizing the preeminence of legislative authority above doctrinal principles. According to Article 310(1) of the Indian Constitution, the President or Governor of India has the authority to invoke the Doctrine of Pleasure. This authority enables them to terminate certain public employees at their discretion. It is fairly uncommon for the

ISSN: 2582-6433

President or Governor to solicit assistance from the Council of Ministers or to execute the policies advised under Article 309.

Legal precedent has altered the viewpoint of the delegability of the Doctrine of Pleasure. Article 311 facilitated this, although the Supreme Court initially ruled in State of U.P. v. Babu Ram Upadhya that the power to dismiss a public worker was not solely vested in the administrative authorities delineated in Article 154. It was seen as a fundamental authority not conferred onto the subordinate authorities of the ruler. The decision primarily emphasized centralized control over this essential constitutional authority. The Supreme Court's decision in ***Moti Ram Deka v. N.E.F. Railway*** [29] demonstrated a shift from the inflexible stance on the non-delegability of this authority. The Court overturned the majority opinion of Babu Ram Upadhya, asserting that the delegation under the Doctrine of Pleasure should be approached with greater leniency. This was a substantial change as it allocated the utilization of this authority to subordinate officials who can now exercise it under particular circumstances.

The Union of India v. Tulsiram Patel reaffirmed the delegation of the doctrine. The Supreme Court clearly indicated in this landmark ruling that personal involvement from the President or Governor is unnecessary for the application of the Doctrine of Pleasure. Articles 53(1), 74(1), 77(1), 154(1), 163(1), and 166(1) designate it as an executive authority; the ruling acknowledges this (1). Additionally, the President or Governor was afforded the opportunity to utilize the Council of Ministers for direction and support in executing this function. This interpretation guarantees that the exercise of this essential power remains part of the democratic and communal decision-making process, adhering to the constitutional framework that requires executive actions by the President or Governor to be executed upon the counsel of the Council of Ministers.

JUDICIAL INTERPRETATION AND CHALLENGES

The concept of natural justice has undergone substantial transformation over a reasonable period. The pertinent legislation and case facts determine the applicability of the Natural Justice rule. Administrative and judicial actions are no longer differentiated. All administrative actions with civil consequences must comply with the principles of natural justice. The Honorable Supreme Court asserts that an order is null and illegal in the absence of adequate notice and a sufficient opportunity for the accused to appear in court. Consequently,

ISSN: 2582-6433

the Honorable Supreme Court has delineated the Principles of Natural Justice and their scope.

The Hon'ble Supreme Court examined the "useless formality theory" in the case ***M.C. Mehta v. Union of India***[30]. Prior to examining the final aspect of this argument, it is important to understand that the previously mentioned court determined that violations of natural justice may arise from the inadequate recognition or management of particular facts. Although the court determines that the applicant's claim lacks "real substance," it remains ambiguous based on existing case law and literature whether such conditions justify the denial of relief, whether the outcome would be unaffected by the application of natural justice, or whether there exists a viable prospect of success.

The Supreme Court's ruling in ***Bar Council of India v. High Court, Kerala*** [31]underscores the necessity of interpreting the principles of natural justice with flexibility. If these values are purportedly violated, the court may demand evidence of harm to intervene or reverse a decision. The Supreme Court, in ***S.N. Mukherjee vs. Union of India***[32], observed that the requirement to document reasons is a principle of natural justice that informs the exercise of authority by administrative bodies, in a case concerning procedures stemming from a general Court martial sanctioned by the Chief of Army Staff. Natural justice has evolved into a widely recognized principle, as noted by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the notable case of ***Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India***[33], which assessed its increasing significance. Natural justice, intended to imbue the law with equity and fairness, has emerged as a significant humanizing principle.

Natural justice lacks established criteria. The specific legislative environment in which administrative authority is granted defines its extent. If legislators determine that it is not in the public's best interest—particularly when administrative authorities are executing judicial or quasi-judicial functions—they may opt not to require notification of the aggrieved party and the rationale for their directives. This can be achieved by explicitly including a clause to that effect. This sort of exclusion could also be excluded from reasonable deductions based on the wording, intent, and legislative subject matter. In these instances, the public interest served by mandating it would surpass the benefits derived from such action. Administrative authorities executing judicial or quasi-judicial functions must record the rationale for their decisions unless explicitly exempted or inferred as necessary.

ISSN: 2582-6433

EXCEPTIONS TO THE GENERAL PRINCIPLE

Legal systems universally are founded on natural justice, sometimes referred to as the cornerstone of procedural fairness. Natural justice, like any other legal doctrine, has limitations. Adhering to these rules may occasionally be nonessential, impracticable, or detrimental to society as a whole. The principles of natural justice possess exceptions and exclusions applicable to specific situations, aiding decision-makers in navigating difficult scenarios while upholding the ideals of justice and fairness.[34]

In an emergency or crisis, prompt action is generally necessary to ensure public safety or avert damage. Typically, the procedural principles of natural justice may be suspended to enable authorities to act swiftly and efficiently under such circumstances. Consequently, decision-makers may need to move swiftly, as they may lack the time for public health emergency or extended appeals processes. Although addressing urgent matters necessitates this exclusion, it is essential to ensure that decisions made in these situations are fair and rational. Legislators possess the power to establish regulations that may entirely prohibit or modify the implementation of natural justice principles in specific administrative processes. Specific legislative exclusions provide legal clarity and may be deemed necessary to achieve particular policy objectives or accelerate the decision-making process. Any statutory exclusion must be examined by courts and adhere to constitutional principles to prevent authorities from exercising their power arbitrarily or aberrantly.

The principles of natural justice may be inapplicable if their disclosure jeopardizes public safety, security, or significant interests. Cases requiring intricate diplomatic discussions or national security may need balancing the imperative of adhering to procedural fairness with the obligation to protect state secrets or confidential information. While transparency is essential in a democratic society, the public interest may occasionally supersede an individual's right to procedural fairness. Postponing action may result in catastrophic loss or harm; hence, decision-makers might need to expedite their actions and overlook established procedural norms of natural justice. For instance, authorities may need to provide prompt instructions or directives without conducting comprehensive hearings or arguments when public health or safety is evidently at stake. While severe measures may be warranted in extreme cases, decision-makers must exercise discretion to avoid arbitrary or disproportionate actions.[35]

ISSN: 2582-6433

Holding a formal hearing or permitting an appeal is not always practical or reasonable. Due to the urgency of the case, matters pertaining to national security or military operations may exclude hearings or appeals. Although this exclusion may be necessary under exceptional circumstances, decision-makers should endeavor to provide other avenues for review or recourse wherever feasible. Decisions that are purely administrative and lack substantial legal rights or interests may not need the use of natural justice principles. Administrative tasks encompass record-keeping, scheduling, and procedural policies, which may not align with the principles of audi alteram partem and nemo judex in causa sua. To adhere to the principles of procedural fairness, decision-makers must remain rational and equitable, especially in administrative matters.

An individual may not be entitled to the protections of natural justice if their legal rights or interests are not affected by a decision. An individual may lack a legal entitlement to procedural fairness if their interests are not directly affected by a policy decision or discretionary judgment. Decision-makers should exercise prudence and consider a broader range of stakeholders while making judgments. If the erroneous process did not alter the outcome, the decision may remain valid, and the method cannot be considered unlawful. In a hearing, for instance, discrepancies or minor procedural flaws not pertaining to the parties' rights may be deemed inconsequential. Adhering to established protocols by decision-makers will enhance public confidence in the integrity of the process.

Have confidence in the decision-maker; assume they acted with integrity, sincerity, and without ill intent. Relaxation of natural justice standards may be permissible if strict adherence would provide no different outcome. In evaluating the validity of the judgment, courts may exhibit leniency if the decision-maker genuinely commits an error or inadvertently overlooks a procedural requirement. Prudent decision-making and consistent use of therapies can reduce the likelihood of legal issues. Identifying a balanced approach among pragmatic considerations, the necessity for procedural justice, and societal interests requires meticulous examination of the exceptions and exclusions to the principles of natural justice. These exceptions afford decision-makers significant latitude in complex legal issues; but, their application should be judicious, taking into account the principles of transparency, justice, and accountability.[36] Any legal system must ultimately aim for the rule of law, the advancement of the public interest, and the protection of individual liberties.

ISSN: 2582-6433

CONCLUSION

Natural justice is a universal principle recognized by all civilized countries. Throughout history, individuals have held certain fundamental, timeless truths in great esteem. Modern legal systems continue to endorse and implement notions of Natural Justice. A prevalent rationale underpins this justice. Historically, it was referred to as the rule of law. A welfare state cannot function without this principle, which allows individuals to enjoy dignified lives. Administrative authorities manage the responsibilities of each democratic state. The duties of these officials affect the freedoms of state people. The public believes that law enforcement professionals will execute their duty justly and ethically. Consequently, the fundamental principle behind this action is the concept of natural justice.

Concepts of natural justice must account for both the public interest and the requirements of an evolving community. This renders it sufficiently adaptable to accommodate all essential occurrences rather than being rigid. These notions imply that one should consider all perspectives before to making a decision.[37] Prior to the resolution of the disagreement, the aggrieved party may not consistently receive the chance to express their perspective. This leads us to the conclusion that Natural Justice should not provide artificial outcomes. Effective governance is based on inherent equity. Part XIV of the Constitution delineates the foundation of the Indian civil service structure. The federal structure of India differentiates its civil service from those of other countries. The guarantee of consistently elevated standards safeguards and fortifies the integrity and cohesion of the nation. This facilitates enhanced cooperation between federal and state administrations. Public officials are obligated to the government and the public to do their jobs effectively. This is governed by regulations and statutes established by the pertinent authorities. The Indian Constitution presents the concept of enjoyment as a mechanism of regulation, particularly in Article 310(1). Consequently, it might be argued that the framers of the Constitution recognized the existing inequities, including widespread governmental corruption.

They opposed any measures that might facilitate the dismissal of corrupt government officials to prevent the squandering of taxpayer funds over the years. The courts have ensured that authority has not been misused by limiting judicial review and departmental appeal, so adapting the idea of pleasure, originally rooted in British law, to align with the Indian context and its primary social framework. The court's exercise of judicial review jurisdiction has been crucial in mitigating the arbitrary aspects of the concept. The Indian Constitution provides safeguards

ISSN: 2582-6433

for the working circumstances of public servants. Article 310 of the Indian Constitution restricts the principle of enjoyment within constitutional safeguards. Article 309 grants the Union and the States the power to establish regulations governing employee working conditions. If a public servant is subject to criminal prosecution, they are entitled to the protections provided by the Indian Constitution (Article 311) and the relevant Service Rules (Article 309). Expressions such as "removal," "dismissal," and "rank decrease" pertain exclusively to Article 311. "Civil services" denotes the cadre of government employees essential for the orderly functioning of the government.

The Rules encompass all aspects of the inquiry or the execution of a proposed sanction, whether minor or substantial. Judicial bodies have interpreted the notion of "reasonable opportunity," as authorized by Article 311(2) of the Indian Constitution, in accordance with the principles of natural justice while assessing the procedures for imposing either lenient or stringent sanctions as outlined in the service regulations. Objective research must adhere to numerous principles. The pre-investigation phase must encompass all material detailing the allegations, including the chargesheet, show cause notice, and any responses, along with the authority's determination to initiate an inquiry or dismiss the charges.

Every administrative system fundamentally relies on government workers. Any dispute involving public officials must be addressed immediately. required for the collective benefit. The effective operation of government relies on our judicial institutions making timely decisions rather than proceeding at a sluggish pace, which is unjust. The establishment of the Administrative Tribunal addressed this backlog. The primary objective was not achieved. Despite objections to its orders being submitted to the High Courts since the ***L. Chandra Kumar case***[38], administrative tribunals should be elevated to the status of the High Court, so making the Supreme Court the sole appellate authority for such decisions. The Tribunal requires numerous modifications to function optimally. An objective entity, akin to UPSC, should select the president and Tribunal members to avert governmental interference. To expedite justice, we must enact substantial reforms.

[1] A.K. Kraipak & Ors. v. Union of India & Ors., AIR 1970 SC 150
[2] MP Jain, *Principles of Administrative Law* (6th edn, LexisNexis 2021).
[3] M L Singhvi, 'Natural Justice Redefined' (1994) 36(1) *Journal of the Indian Law Institute* 65.
[4] Punjab National Bank v. All India Bank Employees Federation, AIR 1960 SC 160.
[5] Keshav Mills Co. Ltd. v. Union of India, AIR 1973 SC 389

ISSN: 2582-6433

[6] Harbans Lal v. Commissioner and Others, AIR 1987 SC 1227
[7] Stafford v. Minister of Health [1946] 2 All ER 769 (KB)
[8] Kanungo & Co. v. Collector of Customs, AIR 1972 SC 2136
[9] J.J. Mody v. State of Bombay, AIR 1962 SC 1921
[10] Krishna Chandra v. Union of India, AIR 1975 SC 1389
[11] G. N. Nayak v. Goa University, AIR 2002 SC 790
[12] Manak Lal v. Dr. Pram Chand (Justice Gajendragadkar), AIR 1957 SC 425;
[13] Motor Transport Co. Ltd. v. Bangaruraju, AIR 1961 SC 93
[14] R v. Hendon Rural District Council, ex p Chorley [1933] 2 KB 696.
[15] R v. Deal Justices, ex p Curling [1961] 1 WLR 1063
[16] Gullapalli Nageswara Rao v. Andhra Pradesh State Road Transport Corporation (APSRTC), AIR 1959 SC 308
[17] Metropolitan Properties Co. (F.G.C.) Ltd. v. Lannon [1969] 1 QB 577
[18] Anirudh Rajput, 'Role of Natural Justice in Administrative Proceedings' (2016) 9(2) *NALSAR Law Review* 23.
[19] S P Sathe, *Administrative Law* (7th edn, LexisNexis 2010)
[20] Rattan Lal v. State of Haryana, AIR 1987 SC 478
[21] C K Takwani, *Lectures on Administrative Law* (6th edn, Eastern Book Company 2017)
[22] Union of India v. Tulsiram Patel, AIR 1985 SC 1416
[23] State of Uttar Pradesh v. Babu Ram Upadhya, AIR 1961 SC 751
[24] Union of India v. Roshan Lal Tandon, AIR 1967 SC 1889
[25] Sankaranarayanan v. State of Kerala, AIR 1971 SC 1997
[26] Supra Note 22
[27] Kameshwar Prasad v. State of Bihar, AIR 1962 SC 1166
[28] Pratap Singh v. State of Punjab, AIR 1964 SC 72
[29] Moti Ram Deka v. N.E.F. Railway, AIR 1964 SC 600
[30] M.C. Mehta v. Union of India, AIR 1987 SC 1086
[31] Bar Council of India v. High Court of Kerala, AIR 2004 SC 2227
[32] S.N. Mukherjee v. Union of India, AIR 1990 SC 1984
[33] Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India, AIR 1978 SC 597
[34] I P Massey, *Administrative Law* (9th edn, Eastern Book Company 2017)
[35] Justice P N Bhagwati, 'Evolution of the Principles of Natural Justice and Its Application in India' (1980) 22 *Journal of the Indian Law Institute* 123.
[36] Usha Mehta, 'Judicial Trends in Natural Justice in India' (2010) 12 *National Law University Delhi Review* 87.
[37] Anirudh Rajput, 'Role of Natural Justice in Administrative Proceedings' (2016) 9(2) *NALSAR Law Review* 23.
[38] L. Chandra Kumar v. Union of India, AIR 1997 SC 1125