



LAWFOYER INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF DOCTRINAL LEGAL RESEARCH

[ISSN: 2583-7753]

Volume 3 | Issue 4

2025

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.70183/lijdlr.2025.v03.147>

© 2025 LawFoyer International Journal of Doctrinal Legal Research

Follow this and additional research works at: www.lijdlr.com

Under the Platform of LawFoyer – www.lawfoyer.in

After careful consideration, the editorial board of LawFoyer International Journal of Doctrinal Legal Research has decided to publish this submission as part of the publication.

In case of any suggestions or complaints, kindly contact (info.lijdlr@gmail.com)

To submit your Manuscript for Publication in the LawFoyer International Journal of Doctrinal Legal Research, To submit your Manuscript [Click here](#)

KESAVANANDA BHARATI V. STATE OF KERALA: A LANDMARK IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF INDIA'S JUDICIAL PROCESS

Akansha Barua ¹

I. ABSTRACT

The judgment in Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala (1973) is widely regarded as a turning point in India's judicial and constitutional history. Delivered by a thirteen-judge bench of the Supreme Court, this case addressed the scope of Parliament's amending power under Article 368 of the Constitution. The central issue was whether Parliament's authority extended to altering the very foundation and identity of the Constitution. By a narrow margin of 7:6, the Court propounded the Basic Structure Doctrine, which held that while Parliament has extensive amending powers, it cannot destroy or abrogate the essential features that form the Constitution's identity. These include the supremacy of the Constitution, the rule of law, judicial review, democracy, secularism, separation of powers, and fundamental rights. This doctrine preserved the sanctity of the Constitution and redefined the relationship between the legislature and the judiciary by establishing the latter as the ultimate guardian of constitutional principles. The judgment was particularly significant during the Emergency period (1975–77), when democratic values and fundamental rights were under threat. It prevented the concentration of absolute power in the hands of transient parliamentary majorities, thereby safeguarding India's democratic framework. Thus, the Kesavananda Bharati judgment not only curtailed the risks of authoritarianism but also reaffirmed the Constitution as a living document that is flexible yet firmly anchored in its core principles. It remains the cornerstone of Indian constitutional jurisprudence and the defining moment that shaped the future of judicial review and constitutionalism in India.

¹ Akansha Barua, LL.M. (Cyber Law), IILM University, Greater Noida (India). Email: akanshabarua492@gmail.com.

II. KEYWORDS

Basic Structure Doctrine, Judicial Review, Constitutional Amendments, Supreme Court of India, Democracy

III. INTRODUCTION

The *Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala* case in 1973 is a major part of India's constitutional history and is often seen as one of the most important rulings by the Supreme Court. This important decision changed how the legislature and judiciary relate to each other and helped establish the idea of the "Basic Structure" of the Constitution. The ruling came during a time when there was a conflict between the power of Parliament to change the Constitution and the responsibility of the judiciary to protect its core values.

In this case, the Supreme Court had to decide if Parliament's power to change the Constitution under Article 368 was absolute, or if there were natural limits that protect key parts of the Constitution. The case started when Swami Kesavananda Bharati, who led the Edneer Mutt in Kerala, challenged the validity of the Kerala Land Reforms Act, which limited property rights. But what started as a disagreement about property rights turned into a major debate about whether Parliament's laws take precedence over the Constitution itself.

The Supreme Court of India, which had formed the largest bench ever in its history with thirteen judges, gave a historic decision by a narrow 7 to 6 majority. They said that although Parliament has broad powers to change the Constitution, it cannot change its basic structure or important features. This ruling had a big impact on India's democracy, making sure that key values like the rule of law, separation of powers, and fundamental rights stay protected from temporary political changes.

The case *Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala* is more than just a court ruling; it's a major turning point in India's constitutional history. It strengthened the judiciary's role as the protector of the Constitution and created a balance between allowing changes to

the Constitution and keeping its core principles stable. This judgment still influences how the Constitution is understood today, showing the strength of constitutionalism and the lasting nature of democracy in India.

A. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The *Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala* case did not come about suddenly; it was the outcome of a long and complicated battle between the legislature and the judiciary over how to interpret the Constitution and the limits of Parliament's power to make changes. To truly grasp its significance, it's important to look back at the history that led to this constitutional conflict.

After India became independent in 1947, the people who made the Constitution in 1950 aimed to create a democratic country based on justice, freedom, equality, and brotherhood.

The Constitution gave citizens Fundamental Rights (Part III) to safeguard their personal freedoms and human dignity. At the same time, Directive Principles of State Policy (Part IV) were added to help the government work towards social and economic fairness. But soon, a disagreement started between these two parts of the Constitution. The government's attempts to carry out social and economic changes often ran into conflicts with the Fundamental Rights of individuals, especially the right to property.

1. Early Conflicts Between Parliament and Judiciary

The first big disagreement happened in the case of *Shankari Prasad v. Union of India* in 1951. The Supreme Court at that time agreed that Parliament had the power to change the Constitution, even parts that protect basic rights, through Article 368². This idea was later supported again in the case of *Sajjan Singh v. State of Rajasthan* in 1965. These rulings made it easier for Parliament to change the Constitution to carry out important social changes, like redistributing land and ending the feudal system of land ownership called zamindari.

² <https://www.constitutionofindia.net/articles/article-368-power-of-parliament-to-amend-the-constitution-and-procedure-therefor/>

However, this balance shifted dramatically in *Golaknath v. State of Punjab* (1967). In this case, the Supreme Court ruled that Parliament did not have the power to amend Fundamental Rights. The Court declared that the Constitution was supreme and that any attempt to curtail or abridge Fundamental Rights would be unconstitutional. This decision deeply upset the government, which believed that such restrictions made it difficult to achieve the goals of social justice and equality promised by the Directive Principles.

2. Political and Constitutional Tension

After the *Golaknath* case, the Parliament made a few changes to the Constitution between 1971 and 1972. These changes were the 24th, 25th, and 29th Amendments. They were made to give Parliament more power to change the Constitution and to limit what the courts could do. The 24th Amendment in 1971 clearly said that Parliament could change any part of the Constitution, even the rights that are considered basic. The 25th Amendment in 1971 made it so that people's rights to property were less protected and made it harder for courts to check laws that were meant to follow certain guiding principles. The 29th Amendment in 1972 added some land reform laws from Kerala to the Ninth Schedule, which means the courts couldn't question those laws.

These changes were viewed as a way to show that Parliament had supreme power, which raised worries that it might use this power to change the fundamental democratic and constitutional structure of India. It was in this context that Swami Kesavananda Bharati, who led the Edneer Mutt in Kasaragod, Kerala, filed a case questioning whether these amendments and the Kerala Land Reforms Act of 1969 were in line with the Constitution. His case grew into a major constitutional discussion that dealt with the core nature and unity of the Indian Constitution.

3. Formation of the Largest Constitutional Bench

Given how serious the constitutional issues were, the Supreme Court formed a bench of thirteen judges — the biggest in India's history — to hear the case. The arguments lasted for 68 days, making it one of the longest court sessions ever. The case brought

together some of the top legal experts of that time, like Nani Palkhivala and M.K. Nambiar, who represented the petitioner, and the Attorney General, Niren De, who represented the government.

In 1973, the Court's decision was a major moment in India's constitutional history. It tried to balance the need for social change with the protection of people's rights, and also dealt with the tension between the power of the government and the independence of the courts.

IV. FACTS OF THE CASE

The Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala case started because of a disagreement between individual rights to property and the government's efforts to carry out land reform laws to create more social and economic fairness. The person who brought the case was His Holiness Swami Kesavananda Bharati, who led the Edneer Mutt, a Hindu religious organization in the Kasaragod area of Kerala. The Mutt had a lot of land and properties that were used for religious, charitable, and educational activities.

In the early 1960s, the Kerala government passed the Kerala Land Reforms Act, 1963, as part of its efforts to reform land use. The main goal of this law was to end the old feudal system, give land to those who didn't own it, and make land ownership fairer. But this law affected not just private landowners, but also religious groups like the Edneer Mutt, whose properties were taken over by the government.

Swami Kesavananda Bharati believed that the Kerala Land Reforms (Amendment) Act, 1969, was harming his ability to manage the religious properties of the Mutt. He went to the Supreme Court of India using Article 32³ of the Constitution, which lets people directly ask the court to protect their Fundamental Rights if they are being violated.

He argued that the law went against his rights under Articles 25 and 26, which protect freedom of religion, Article 14, which ensures equality, Article 19(1)(f), which covers the right to own, hold, and sell property, and Article 31, which safeguards the right to

³ <https://www.nextias.com/blog/right-to-constitutional-remedies/>

property. The petitioner claimed that the state could not interfere with how religious institutions like the Mutt managed their properties, as it would limit their autonomy and religious freedom.

While this petition was being considered, a bigger issue about the Constitution was happening. The Indian Parliament wasn't happy with some earlier Supreme Court decisions that had limited its ability to change the Constitution, especially the ruling in *Golaknath v. State of Punjab* (1967). So, the Parliament tried to show that it was in charge by passing a few changes to the Constitution. These were the 24th, 25th, and 29th Constitutional Amendment Acts between 1971 and 1972. The 24th Amendment Act of 1971 clearly said that Parliament could change any part of the Constitution, even the Fundamental Rights, and required the President to agree to any amendment bill.

The 25th Amendment Act of 1971 changed the word "compensation" to "amount" in Article 31(2), which made it harder for people to claim property rights and reduced judges' power to interfere in cases about social and economic changes. The 29th Amendment Act of 1972 ⁴added the Kerala Land Reforms Acts of 1969 and 1971 to the Ninth Schedule of the Constitution, which meant these laws couldn't be challenged in court even if they went against Fundamental Rights.

Swami Kesavananda Bharati started by challenging some land reform laws in Kerala, but his case grew to question whether these constitutional changes were valid. His lawyer, Nani Palkhivala, a well-known legal expert, said that even though Parliament has a lot of power to change the Constitution under Article 368, it cannot change its main parts or basic structure. The person who filed the case argued that if Parliament could change the Constitution without limits, it might one day remove democracy, the independence of the courts, or basic rights, which would mean the Constitution itself was no longer the same. So, there must be some limits to make sure the key parts of the Constitution stay the same.

⁴<https://cdnbbsr.s3waas.gov.in/s380537a945c7aaa788ccfcdf1b99b5d8f/uploads/2023/03/2023030227.pdf>

The State of Kerala and the Union of India, which are representing the respondents, defended the changes made to the Constitution. They said that the power of Parliament to amend the Constitution under Article 368 is not limited in any way. They believe that no part of the Constitution, including the Fundamental Rights, can be beyond the reach of this power. They explained that these amendments were needed to achieve the goals of the Directive Principles of State Policy, which are part IV of the Constitution. These principles aim to create a welfare state by reducing inequalities and making sure that social justice is provided. The government also said that without the freedom to amend the Constitution as needed, it would not be possible to bring about important social and economic changes in society.

Because the issues were very important in the Constitution, the Supreme Court formed a panel of thirteen judges, which was the biggest ever in India's history, to handle the case. The hearings started on October 31, 1972, and ended on March 23, 1973, after a long discussion that lasted 68 days, making it one of the longest court sessions in history. The case brought together some of the best lawyers in India, like Nani Palkhivala and M.K. Nambiar for the side that asked for the court's help, and Attorney General Niren De and Solicitor General L.N. Sinha for the government. Even though the case began as a disagreement over property, it soon turned into a bigger constitutional issue — whether Parliament could change the Constitution completely or if there were limits to protect its basic structure. The Supreme Court's final decision in 1973 turned this case into a major event in history, changing how power is shared between the law makers and the judges in India forever.

A. ISSUES BEFORE THE COURT

The Supreme Court was required to determine:

- Whether Parliament's power to amend the Constitution under Article 368 was unlimited.
- Whether the 24th, 25th, and 29th Amendments violated fundamental rights.

- Whether there are implied limitations on the amending power to preserve the Constitution's basic structure.

These questions were not merely legal but philosophical, touching upon the nature of sovereignty, democracy, and constitutional supremacy.

B. ARGUMENTS OF THE PARTIES

In the *Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala* case, both sides made strong and detailed arguments that showed they had different views about the Constitution. On the side of the petitioner, Swami Kesavananda Bharati, who was helped by eminent jurist Nani Palkhivala and M.K. Nambiar, argued that although the Parliament has the power to change the Constitution under Article 368, this power is not limitless. They said that the Constitution is the highest law of the country, and since Parliament was created by the Constitution, it cannot change its basic nature.

Palkhivala explained that certain key aspects, like the country being a sovereign, democratic, and republican state, the separation of powers, the rule of law, and the protection of Fundamental Rights, are part of the Constitution's basic structure. Therefore, these features cannot be removed or changed even by a constitutional amendment. He also said that the 24th, 25th, and 29th Amendments were not valid because they tried to give Parliament unlimited power to change the Constitution and to make certain laws not open to court review, which went against the principle of judicial review – a vital part of the Constitution. The petitioner warned that if Parliament had unlimited power, it could potentially end democracy, take away Fundamental Rights, or even eliminate the judiciary, which would defeat the main purpose of the Constitution.

On the other hand, the people who spoke on behalf of the State of Kerala and the Union of India, including Attorney General Niren De and Solicitor General L.N. Sinha, said that the Parliament has full and complete power to change the Constitution under Article 368. They explained that this power covers every part of the Constitution,

including the Fundamental Rights. They said that the ability to change the Constitution also means the ability to add, change, or remove any part of it, as long as the right legal process is followed.

These people also pointed out that the changes in question were made to meet the goals in the Directive Principles of State Policy, especially those about social and economic fairness. They believed these goals are important for the country's development. They argued that the courts should not question Parliament's decisions to change the Constitution, because that would mean the courts are more powerful than the people's representatives. The government also said that the Constitution must be able to change with the needs of society, and that these changes were proper steps to achieve the Constitution's aim of equality and justice.

V. JUDGEMENT AND THE BASIC STRUCTURE DOCTRINE

The judgment in *Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala* was given on April 24, 1973, after one of the longest court hearings in the history of the Supreme Court of India, which took 68 days. The case was heard by a thirteen-judge panel, which was the biggest ever in the Court's history. The judges split 7:6 in their decision, showing strong disagreements, but the ruling was very important and changed India's constitution permanently. The court said that although Parliament has a lot of power under Article 368 to change the constitution, that power is not endless. The majority decided that Parliament cannot change, destroy, or remove the basic structure or key parts of the Constitution. This case created the Basic Structure Doctrine, which is one of the most important ideas in Indian constitutional law.

The majority opinion, led by Chief Justice S.M. Sikri, along with Justices Shelat, Grover, Hegde, Mukherjea, Reddy, and Khanna, held that the power to amend the Constitution does not include the power to destroy its identity. Justice H.R. Khanna played a decisive role with his balanced reasoning — his opinion formed the majority by a single vote.

He stated that while Parliament can amend any provision of the Constitution, including Fundamental Rights, it cannot use that power to change its basic framework. The Court upheld the validity of the 24th and 25th Amendments, but declared that certain portions of these amendments were unconstitutional to the extent that they took away the power of judicial review or allowed Parliament to violate Fundamental Rights. The 29th Amendment was also upheld, but subject to the limitation that laws placed in the Ninth Schedule could still be reviewed by courts if they violated the basic structure of the Constitution.

The Basic Structure Doctrine came out as the main idea from the court's decision. It said that the Constitution has some key parts that form its base and can't be changed or removed by the Parliament. Even though the court didn't list all the important parts of the basic structure, they mentioned several important ones, like the Constitution being supreme, the rule of law, separation of powers, an independent judiciary, a democratic and republican government, a secular state, and the sovereignty and unity of India. Later cases, such as *Indira Nehru Gandhi v. Raj Narain* (1975) and *Minerva Mills v. Union of India* (1980), added more elements to this list, including judicial review, free and fair elections, and the balance between Fundamental Rights and Directive Principles.

The judgment was a big turning point in how India's constitution developed. It helped settle a big disagreement between the power of Parliament and the importance of the Constitution itself. The court said that even though Parliament can change the Constitution, it can't use that power to erase its main values. This ruling made the judiciary more independent and made sure India stays a democracy based on laws. The *Kesavananda Bharati* case changed the Indian court system into a protector of the Constitution and made the Basic Structure Doctrine a key rule to stop misuse of the power to change the Constitution.

VI. OPINIONS OF THE JUDGES

The *Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala* case was decided by a thirteen-judge panel, which was the biggest ever in the history of the Indian Supreme Court. The verdict was split, with seven judges supporting and six opposing the idea that Parliament can change the Constitution without limits. Each judge wrote their own opinion, and while the majority agreed that Parliament can change parts of the Constitution, they couldn't change its basic structure; their arguments and focus were quite different.

Chief Justice S.M. Sikri wrote the main opinion and agreed with Justices Shelat, Grover, Hegde, Mukherjea, Reddy, and Khanna. He said that Article 368 gives Parliament the power to change the Constitution, even the Fundamental Rights, but this power doesn't let Parliament completely change what makes the Constitution important. He said the Constitution gets its power from the people, and Parliament can't use its power to change the basic nature of the Constitution. He listed some key features that are part of the basic structure, like the Constitution being supreme, the country being a republic and democratic, being secular, having separate powers for different branches of government, and having a federal structure.

Justice H.R. Khanna, whose opinion was crucial in forming the majority, agreed that Parliament could change any part of the Constitution but could not change or destroy its basic structure. His opinion helped bring together the two different views on the bench. He explained that if Parliament had the power to change the Constitution without limits, it could completely rewrite it, even ending democracy or the judiciary. This was not what the framers of the Constitution intended. So, while he supported the idea that Parliament can amend the Constitution, he also stressed that this power should be used carefully and within the limits set by the Constitution.

Justices Shelat and Grover also agreed that there are certain limits to Parliament's power to amend the Constitution. They emphasized that the Constitution is based on key principles like the rule of law, judicial review, and the balance between Fundamental Rights and Directive Principles, which cannot be removed. Likewise, Justices Hegde

and Mukherjea said that although Parliament has broad power to make changes, it cannot erase the basic features that keep India's democracy and constitutional structure intact.

On the other hand, a group of judges, led by Justice A.N. Ray and including Justices Palekar, Mathew, Beg, Dwivedi, and Chandrachud, had a completely different opinion. They believed that Parliament has full and unlimited power under Article 368 to change or even remove any part of the Constitution, including the Fundamental Rights.

They said that the word "amendment" means Parliament can make big changes as long as they follow the proper constitutional process. Justice Ray said that the people, through their elected leaders, are the highest authority, and it would not be fair to let judges stop Parliament from changing the Constitution. Justice Mathew also stressed the importance of being flexible in how the Constitution is interpreted so that Parliament can address new social and economic challenges as they come.

The split decision clearly showed the difference in ideas between those who believe the courts should have the most power and those who think the parliament should be in charge. Some judges believed that Parliament can change any part of the Constitution if it wants, while others thought certain basic parts of the Constitution should never be changed. Justice Khanna's opinion was especially important because it led to the creation of the Basic Structure Doctrine. This new idea from the courts made sure that Parliament couldn't change the main principles of the Indian Constitution.

VII. CONSEQUENCES AND LATER DEVELOPMENTS

The *Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala* case in 1973 had big effects on India's constitution and court history. One of the main things from the case was the idea called the Basic Structure Doctrine. This means that even though the government can change the constitution under Article 368, they can't change its most important parts like democracy, the rule of law, the courts' ability to check laws, and keeping government powers separate. This idea made sure the constitution stays the highest law and that the

government can't do anything without limits. The case also made the Supreme Court the last line of defense for the constitution, giving it the power to check and cancel any changes that harm its main ideas.

The judgment also marked a big change in India's political history, especially because it happened when there was a lot of tension between the judiciary and the Indira Gandhi government. The government didn't like the limits put on its power. During the Emergency, from 1975 to 1977, efforts were made to reduce the judiciary's influence and undo the decision, but the idea of the Basic Structure Doctrine stayed strong and became a key part of Indian constitutional law. Later court cases, such as *Indira Nehru Gandhi v. Raj Narain* (1975)⁵, *Minerva Mills v. Union of India* (1980), ⁶*Waman Rao v. Union of India* (1981), ⁷and *I.R. Coelho v. State of Tamil Nadu* (2007), ⁸supported and explained the Basic Structure Doctrine. These cases made it clear that even laws and amendments placed in the Ninth Schedule could be checked if they went against the basic structure of the Constitution.

In the long run, the *Kesavananda Bharati* case made sure that no government could use its majority to change the basic values of India's Constitution, like democracy, secularism, and being a republic. It kept the balance between the different parts of the government—legislature, executive, and judiciary—and protected the rights of all citizens. In simple words, this case protected the core values of the Indian Constitution and helped build a stronger, more independent court system that still supports democracy and the rule of law in India.

VIII. CRITICISM AND SUPPORT

The *Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala* (1973) judgment received both criticism and support from various sections of the society, legal experts and political leaders. On the one hand, this decision was strongly supported by those who believed in the

⁵ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Indira_Gandhi_v._Raj_Narain

⁶ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Minerva_Mills_v._Union_of_India

⁷ <https://blog.ipleaders.in/waman-rao-case-analysis-and-importance/>

⁸ <https://blog.ipleaders.in/ir-coelho-case-analysis/>

supremacy of the Constitution and the need to protect it from political abuse. Proponents argued that the basic structure principle was necessary to preserve the democratic spirit of the nation and ensure that no ruling government could amend the Constitution for its own benefit.

He believed that the judgment strengthened the role of the judiciary as the guardian of the Constitution and maintained the delicate balance of power between the legislature, the executive and the judiciary. Many constitutional scholars hailed the judgment as a milestone in judicial independence and said that it saved India from turning into an authoritarian state by placing limits on Parliament's power to amend the Constitution. The decision was seen as a safeguard of the fundamental rights of citizens and a way to ensure that the basic ideals of justice, liberty, equality and secularism remain intact. However, the case also faced strong criticism, especially from the political class and some legal experts, who believed that the decision gave too much power to the judiciary.

Critics argued that by introducing the concept of the basic structure doctrine, judges went beyond their role and entered into the domain of the legislature, thereby weakening the principle of parliamentary sovereignty. Some felt that the doctrine was vague and undefined, as the Court did not explicitly list all the elements of the basic structure, leaving its interpretation open and dependent on future judicial opinions. The Indira Gandhi government viewed this decision as a hindrance to social and economic reforms, arguing that it limited Parliament's ability to enact constitutional changes aimed at achieving social justice.

However, the case also faced strong criticism, especially from the political class and some legal experts, who believed that the decision gave too much power to the judiciary. Critics argued that by introducing the concept of the basic structure doctrine, judges went beyond their role and entered into the domain of the legislature, thereby weakening the principle of parliamentary sovereignty. Some felt that the doctrine was vague and undefined, as the Court did not explicitly list all the elements of the basic

structure, leaving its interpretation open and dependent on future judicial opinions. The Indira Gandhi government viewed this decision as a hindrance to social and economic reforms, arguing that it limited Parliament's ability to enact constitutional changes aimed at achieving social justice.

Despite the criticism, over time, the *Kesavananda Bharati* judgment gained wide acceptance and respect as one of the most important rulings in Indian constitutional history. It continues to be celebrated for protecting the core values of democracy and ensuring that the Constitution remains a living document that cannot be distorted by political majorities. In the long run, even many of its critics acknowledged that the doctrine played a crucial role in preserving constitutional stability and preventing misuse of power.

IX. RELEVANCE IN CONTEMPORARY INDIA

The *Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala* (1973) judgment remains highly relevant in contemporary India, even decades after it was delivered. Its core principle—the Basic Structure Doctrine—continues to act as a powerful safeguard against any attempt to alter the essential values of the Indian Constitution. In today's political and social environment, where governments frequently amend laws and policies to suit their agendas, the doctrine ensures that no authority can destroy the fundamental framework of democracy, secularism, federalism, and the rule of law. It serves as a constant reminder that the Constitution belongs to the people, not to those in power.

This judgment is particularly important in modern India as it protects the fundamental rights of citizens from being diluted by constitutional amendments or executive actions. Whenever a law or amendment is challenged in court as being unconstitutional, the judiciary uses the basic structure doctrine as a guiding test to determine whether it violates the basic principles of the Constitution. For example, in recent years, this principle has been applied in matters related to judicial appointments, reservation policies, and federal relations, thereby ensuring that the balance of power between the three branches of government is maintained.

Moreover, in an era of rapid political changes and majoritarian tendencies, the Kesavananda Bharati ruling ensures that democratic values and constitutional morality prevail over political interests. It reinforces the independence of the judiciary and provides citizens with confidence that the Constitution cannot be easily manipulated. The case also continues to influence debates on constitutional reforms, highlighting the need for stability, continuity, and protection of India's founding ideals.

In essence, the relevance of the Kesavananda Bharati case in contemporary India lies in its enduring ability to preserve constitutional supremacy and the spirit of democracy. It remains a cornerstone of India's legal system, ensuring that while the Constitution can evolve with time, its soul – the basic structure – remains untouchable and eternal.

X. CONCLUSION

The Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala (1973) case is a major moment in the history of Indian constitutional law. It settled a big disagreement about the power of Parliament to change the Constitution and the role of the judiciary in keeping it safe. This case also started the idea of the Basic Structure Doctrine, which still helps shape India's democracy today. The court made sure that even though the Constitution can change with time, its basic ideas like democracy, secularism, rule of law, and an independent judiciary are not allowed to be changed in a way that harms them.

This important decision showed that the Supreme Court is the main protector of the Constitution and the rights of citizens. It found a good way to allow changes to the Constitution while keeping its main values safe. As time went on, this ruling became widely respected for keeping the Constitution above all other powers and stopping any government from breaking its basic values.

In short, the Kesavananda Bharati case is more than just an old court decision. It continues to protect India's democracy by keeping its laws and rights strong; making sure the Constitution stays fair, stable, and lasting for the world's largest democracy.

XI. BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala, AIR 1973 SC 1461.
- Austin, Granville. Working a Democratic Constitution: The Indian Experience. Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Seervai, H.M. Constitutional Law of India: A Critical Commentary. 4th ed., Universal Law Publishing Co., 2013.
- Jain, M.P. Indian Constitutional Law. 8th ed., LexisNexis, 2018.
- Basu, D.D. Introduction to the Constitution of India. 24th ed., LexisNexis, 2019.
- Sathe, S.P. Judicial Activism in India: Transgressing Borders and Enforcing Limits. Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Dhavan, Rajeev. "The Supreme Court of India and Parliamentary Sovereignty: The Impact of Kesavananda Bharati." Journal of the Indian Law Institute, Vol. 25, No. 1-2, 1983, pp. 25-45.
- Baxi, Upendra. The Indian Supreme Court and Politics. Eastern Book Company, 1980.
- Chandrachud, Abhinav. Republic of Rhetoric: Free Speech and the Constitution of India. Penguin Random House, 2017.
- Tripathi, P.K. "Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala: The Untold Story of Judicial Power." Supreme Court Cases (SCC), Vol. 4, 1973.
- Pathak, R.S. "The Basic Structure Doctrine: Safeguard of the Constitution." Indian Law Review, Vol. 5, No. 2, 1985.
- Jain, S.N. "Amending Power and the Basic Structure Doctrine." Indian Journal of Public Administration, Vol. 30, No. 3, 1984, pp. 193-205.