



PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION

By *Abhijeet Sidh*

From *Lloyd Law College, Greater Noida (UP)*

ABSTRACT

PIL has a fundamental part in the common equity framework in that it could accomplish those destinations which could barely be accomplished through ordinary private case. PIL, for example, offers a step to equity to distraught segments of society, gives a road to implement diffused or aggregate rights, and empowers common society to spread mindfulness about human rights as well as enables them to take an interest in government basic leadership. PIL could likewise add to great administration by keeping the legislature responsible. The concept of PIL has emerged in USA but spread through the world. PIL has been invaluable innovative Judicial remedy, but now in this 21th century the significance of PIL has been undermined by filing fictitious, baseless, vague PIL which is prevented in the cost & interest of Justice.

This article will appear, with reference to the Indian experience, that PIL could accomplish these vital targets. In any case, the Indian PIL encounter likewise demonstrates to us that it is basic to guarantee that PIL does not turn into a veneer to satisfy private interests, settle political scores or increase simple attention. Legal in a majority rules system ought to likewise not utilize PIL as a gadget to run the nation on an everyday premise or enter the honest to goodness space of the official and assembly. The test for states, in this

manner, is to strike an adjust in permitting real PIL cases and debilitating silly ones. One approach to accomplish this adjust could be to work in financial (dis)incentives in PIL and furthermore limit it fundamentally to those situations where access to equity is undermined by some sort of incapacity.

INTRODUCTION

In Indian law, Public Interest Litigation means prosecution of the public interest. It is prosecution in an official courtroom, not by the bothered party but rather by the court itself or by some other private gathering. PIL, in simple word, implies, prosecution filed in a courtroom, for the protection of "Public Interest", for example, Pollution, Terrorism, Road Safety, Constructional hazards and so on. Any issue where the interest of open everywhere is influenced can be reviewed by recording PIL in official courtroom. PIL isn't vital, for the activity of the court's locale, that the individual who is the casualty of the infringement of his or her privilege ought to actually approach the court. PIL is the power given to the people in general by courts through judicial activism however, the individual recording the appeal to must demonstrate as per the general inclination of the court that the request of is being petitioned for an public interest and not similarly as a unimportant prosecution by a busy body.

Such cases may happen when the casualty does not have the vital assets to initiate case or his flexibility to move court has been smothered or infringed upon. The court would itself be able to take comprehension of the issue and continue suomotu or cases can initiate on the appeal to of any public-



spirited person. PIL is not defined in any statute or any act. It has been translated by judges to think about the aim of public. In spite of the fact that, the fundamental and just concentration of such suit is public interest.

ORIGIN & DEVELOPMENT OF PIL

The term “PIL” originated in US in the mid-1980s. Since the 19th century, various movements in that country had contributed to public interest law, which was part of legal aid movement. The first legal aid office was built up in New York in 1876. In the 1960s the PIL movement began to receive financial support from the office of Economic Opportunity. This supported lawyers and public spirited persons to take up cases of the underprivileged and fight against dangers to environment and public health and misuse of consumers and the weaker sections.

The seeds of the idea of public interest suit were at first sown in India by Krishna Iyer J., in 1976 in Mumbai Kamagar Sabha versus Abdul Thai (AIR 1976 SC 1455; 1976 (3) SCC 832) and was started in Akhil I3/taratiyaSos/trouble Karnuu: hariSangh (Raihvaiv versus Union of India), wherein an unregistered relationship of specialists was allowed to initiate a writ request of under Art.32 of the constitution for the redressal of normal grievances. Krishna Iyer J., articulated the explanations behind progression of the lead of Locus Standi in Fertilizer Corporation Kamgar versus Union of India (AIR 1981 SC 149; 1981 (2) SCR 52) and the perfect of PIL was bloomed in S.F. Gupta and others versus Union of India, (AIR 1982 SC 149).

HISTORY OF PIL IN INDIA

PIL had begun towards the ends of 1970s and came into full bloom in 1980s. Justice V.R. KrishnaIyer and Justice PM. Bhagwati, honorable Judges of Supreme Court of India delivered landmark judgements which open up new vistas in PIL.

According to Justice V.R. Krishna Iyer, PIL is a process, of obtaining justice for the people, of voicing people’s grievances through the legal process. The aim of PIL is to give to the common people of this country access to the courts to obtain legal redress.

MERITS OF PIL

1. In P careful nationals of the nation can local a modest legitimate cure on the grounds that there is just an nominal settled court expense associated with this.
2. Further, through the supposed PIL, the prosecutors can concentrate consideration on and accomplish comes about relating to bigger open issues, particularly in the fields of human rights, consumer welfare and condition.

DEMERITS OF PIL

- 1 The certified cause and instances of public interest have in retreated to the foundation and unreliable PIL activists everywhere throughout the nation have begun to play a major yet not a productive part in the field of case. Generally, a significant number of the PIL activists in the nation have discovered the PIL as a convenient instrument of badgering since silly cases could recorded without venture of substantial court expenses as required in private common prosecution and



arrangements could then be consulted with the casualties of stay orders got in the supposed PILs.

- 2 The framers of Indian Constitution did not join a strict principle of partition of forces yet imagined an arrangement of governing rules. Arrangement making and usage of approach are routinely seeing as the select area of the official and the legislature. Vishaka vs State of Rajasthan which was a PIL concerning inappropriate behavior of ladies at work place. The court announced that till the governing body established a law steady with the tradition on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women which India was a signatory, the rules set out by the court would be enforceable.
- 3 The adaptability of technique that is a character of PIL has offered to another arrangement of issues. It gives a chance to inverse gatherings to learn the exact claim and react particular issues.
- 4 The believability of PIL process is presently unfavorably influenced by the feedback that the legal is exceeding the limits and that it can't administer the compelling execution of its requests. It has likewise been progressively felt that PIL is being abused by the general population fomenting for private grievance in the get of public interest and looking for reputation as opposed to upholding public reason.

WHO CAN FILE A PIL

In normal cases, it is seen that abused gathering i.e. the victim, who is influenced needs to record his case in an official courtroom. That individual ought to have an enthusiasm for the debate. In any case, in

documenting PIL there is no such condition. Any individual can record a PIL. The main condition being that the same must be documented Public Interest. PIL is case presented in an official courtroom, not by the oppressed party but rather by the court itself or by some other private gathering. It isn't fundamental, for the activity court's locale, that the individual who is the casualty of the infringement of his or her privilege ought to personally approach the court. PIL is the power given to the general population by courts to ensure interest of public at large.

Such cases may happen when the victim does not have the fundamental assets to initiate case or his opportunity to move court has been smothered or infringed upon. The court would itself be able to take insight of the issue and go before suomotu or cases can initiate on the appeal to of any public-spirited person.

PROCEDURE TO FILE A PIL IN THE HIGH COURT

Any public spirited native can move/approach the court for the general population cause (in light of a legitimate concern for people in general or open welfare) by documenting an appeal:

1. In Supreme Court under Art.32 of the Constitution;
2. In High Court under Art.226 of the Constitution; and
3. In the Court of Magistrate under Sec.133, Cr. P.C.



With the view to direct the mishandle of PIL the apex court it has confined certain rules (to administer the administration and transfer of PILs). The court must be careful so as to see that the applicant who approaches it is acting real and not for individual increase, private benefit or political or other angled contemplations. The court ought not enable its procedure to be manhandled by legislators and others to postpone genuine managerial activity or to increase political targets.

At present, the court can regard a letter as a writ appeal to and make a move upon it. Be that as it may, it isn't each letter which might be dealt with as a writ request of by the court. The court would be supported in regarding the letter as a writ request of just in the accompanying cases-

- (i) It is just where the letter is tended to by an abused individual or
- (ii) An open lively individual or
- (iii) A social activity aggregate for authorization of the sacred or the legitimate privileges of a man in care or of a class or gathering of people who by reason of neediness, inability or socially or financially impeded position think that its hard to approach the court for review.

Despite the fact that it is especially basic to check the abuse and manhandle of PIL, any move by the legislature to control the PIL brings about far reaching challenges from the individuals who don't know about its mishandle and compare any type of

direction with disintegration of their crucial rights. Under these conditions the Supreme Court of India is required to venture in by fusing safe watchmen gave by the Civil Procedure Code in issues of stay orders/orders in the field of PIL.

PIL is an instrument in hands of public interest residents who have a good motive behind the PIL and to keep it from turning into a weapon in the hands of those prosecutors who need to either abuse this idea for either business pick up or exposure the peak court has on numerous occasions set down different rules and by forcing costs on the trivial open intrigue suit the courts have just fortified their position.

WE PRESENT FIVE OF MANY MILESTONES OF PIL REVELUTION

1) SheelaBarse vs State of Maharashtra (February 15, 1983):

This was a historic judgment that dealt with the issue of custodial violence against women in prisons.

This resulted in an order facilitating separate police lockups for women convicts in order to shield them from further trauma and brutality.

(Photo: Reuters)

2) MC Mehta vs Union of India (Pollution in the Ganga)

This judgement delivered on January 12, 1988, lashed out at civic authorities for



allowing untreated sewage from Kanpur's tanneries making its way into the Ganges.

A taxi driver sleeps at a cabstand in New Delhi, March 29, 2001. (Photo: Reuters)

It was the beginning of green litigation in India. In 1996, environmentalist M C Mehta's PIL, (M C Mehta vs Union of India on December 30, 1996) resulted in stringent orders against Mathura refineries for polluting the ambient air around the TajMahal.

Yet another PIL by M C Mehta resulted in the CNG verdict (July 28, 1998) that forced the vehicles in the capital to switch to a different fuel in order to keep a check on vehicular pollution.

(Photo: Reuters, April 23, 2001)

3) When the court kept its distance from policy decisions:

The disinvestment season initiated by the NDA-1 government to sell 51% stake in BALCO (Bharat Aluminium Company Limited) was challenged by the Supreme Court in 2001.

Quite significantly the Supreme Court in its decision on December 10, 2001 said,

PIL is not a pill or a panacea for all wrongs. There have been, in recent times, increasingly instances of abuse of PIL. Therefore, there is a need to re-emphasise the parameters within which PIL can be resorted to by a Petitioner and entertained by the Court.

Executive vs Judiciary

The judges also drew a line distinguishing between the domain of the executive and the judiciary in a bid to avoid the clash between the two. Thus, the judgement read:

Public Interest Litigation was not meant to be a weapon to challenge the financial or economic decisions which are taken by the Government in exercise of their administrative power.

(Photo: Reuters, April 2, 2011)

4) The C.J. Judgment

The judiciary chose not to impinge on the authority of the government and its policy decisions in 2001, but a decade later the Supreme Court chose to step into what was described as one of the biggest scams in post-independent India.

On February 2, 2012, the top court criticised a policy decision - one taken to use 'first-come-first-served' as the basis to allocate natural resources. The court's advice was to use auctions for allocations.

This was the result of separate PILs by Subramanian Swamy and Prashant Bhushan and it embarrassed the UPA government. Though some saw it through the prism of 'judicial overreach', that didn't stop the court from scrapping 122 2G licences.

(Photo: Reuters, May 14, 2006)

5) Indira Sawhney judgment

On November 16, 1992, the Supreme Court responded to a PIL filed by lawyer Indira



Sawhney and introduced 27% reservation for backward classes in posts and services under the Government of India.

Citing the age old Varna system, the court justified its reason for reservation. The court also spelled out that such a system should not exceed a tenure of ten years once a particular section is adequately represented in society.

A question often raised in this context is - has this constitutional vision been accomplished?

1. Former Delhi High Court Judge Justice RS Sodhi tells *The Quint*:
PILs have been able to pick up the grievances of people as a whole, with the objective of en masse improvement of a system. When individuals could not come to court, the courts became obliged to look into a situation as was prevalent and bring improvement in system.
 – **Former Delhi High Court Judge, Justice RS Sodhi**

2. Courts have not hesitated in charting unknown territory, but the fast-increasing number of PILs have increased the load on the judiciary. Responding to that, Justice RS Sodhi says:
There are always two sides to a coin. There will be people who will try and exploit [PILs], whether courts allows themselves to be misused... that is where the wisdom of the courts lie.
 – **Former Delhi High Court Judge, Justice RS Sodhi**

3. *The Court has to innovate new methods and strategies to provide access to justice to large masses of people who are denied basic human rights, to whom freedom and liberty have no meaning.*
 — **Justice PN Bhagwati (SP Gupta vs Union of India, 1981)**

CONCLUSION

Public Interest Litigants, everywhere throughout the nation, have not taken generously to such court choices. They do expect that this will sound the demise ring of the general population inviting idea of PIL. Be that as it may, genuine disputants of India have nothing to fear. Just those PIL activists who want to document paltry protestations should pay compensations to then opposite parties. It is really an appreciated move in light of the fact that nobody in the nation can deny that even PIL activists ought to be capable and responsible. In any capacity, PIL now requires a total reconsider and rebuilding. Anyway, abuse and mishandle of PIL can just influence it to stale and insufficient. Since it is a remarkable cure accessible at a less expensive cost to all residents of the nation, it should not to be utilized by all defendants as a substitute for common ones or as a way document negligible objections.
