

Judicial Intervention in Pakistan's Politics: Origins, Dynamics, and Consequences

Areez Tariq

Independent Political Analyst

Email: areeztariqkhan@gmail.com

Abstract: Judicial intervention has been a persistent and defining characteristic of Pakistan's political evolution. Rooted in early constitutional crises and the judiciary's use of the "Doctrine of Necessity," courts have long shaped political outcomes by validating military takeovers, resolving power struggles, and influencing governance during institutional turbulence. In the 21st century, a rise in judicial activism—driven by public interest litigation and high-profile political rulings—has expanded the judiciary's authority and deepened its role as an arbiter in political affairs. This intervention is shaped by weak political institutions, complex civil–military relations, public demand for accountability, and the judiciary's internal drive for independence. While judicial involvement has sometimes promoted accountability and upheld constitutional principles, it has also raised concerns regarding overreach, politicization, and instability in democratic processes. Strengthening parliamentary sovereignty, ensuring transparent judicial appointments, fostering political stability, and enhancing internal judicial accountability are essential reforms for restoring institutional balance. Overall, Pakistan's experience illustrates both the necessity and the risks of judicial engagement in politics, highlighting the need for clearer constitutional boundaries and cooperative governance to support democratic consolidation.

Keywords: Judicial Intervention; Pakistan Politics; Judicial Activism; Doctrine of Necessity; Civil–Military Relations.

INTRODUCTION

Judicial intervention has been a defining feature of Pakistan's political landscape since the country's inception. While courts are constitutionally mandated to uphold the law and protect fundamental rights, Pakistan's judiciary has at various times played an expansive role—sometimes acting as an arbiter in political disputes, at other times endorsing extra-constitutional actions, and more recently positioning itself as a powerful counterweight to the executive and legislative branches. This complex trajectory has shaped governance, public trust, and institutional balance in the country.

HISTORICAL FOUNDATIONS OF JUDICIAL INVOLVEMENT

Judicial intervention in Pakistani politics did not emerge suddenly; it has deep historical roots.

1. The Doctrine of Necessity

One of the earliest and most influential precedents was the judiciary's validation of executive and military actions under the "Doctrine of Necessity." This judicial principle—invoked

during constitutional crises—was used to affirm the legality of military coups and emergency rule. Although framed as a pragmatic effort to maintain order, it also normalized extra-constitutional takeovers and weakened civilian authority.

2. Constitutional Crises and Power Vacuums

Political instability, recurring dissolutions of assemblies, and frequent tensions between presidents, prime ministers, and the military provided openings for judicial involvement. With political actors often turning to the courts to resolve disputes, the judiciary became an informal political player.

JUDICIAL ACTIVISM IN THE 21ST CENTURY

From the early 2000s onward, the judiciary increasingly embraced a more activist role.

1. Public Interest Litigation

The rise of public interest petitions expanded the judiciary's influence over governance. Courts began addressing issues ranging from corruption scandals to administrative decisions, environmental cases, and human rights violations. This activism boosted public confidence but also raised questions about judicial overreach.

2. High-Profile Political Decisions

Several landmark judgements reshaped political alignments, including disqualifications of prime ministers and rulings affecting party leadership and parliamentary procedures. These decisions often had far-reaching political consequences, influencing electoral outcomes and policy directions.

3. Judiciary–Executive Tensions

As courts asserted greater authority, friction with elected governments intensified. Disputes over judicial appointments, interpretations of constitutional powers, and challenges to executive decisions contributed to an environment of institutional competition rather than cooperation.

INSTITUTIONAL DYNAMICS AND MOTIVATIONS

Judicial intervention in Pakistan's politics stems from multiple, overlapping factors:

1. Weak Political Institutions

Frequent political upheavals, short-lived governments, and internal party fragmentation have often left a vacuum that the judiciary tends to fill.

2. Civil–Military Relations

The judiciary has sometimes acted in ways that align with, resist, or indirectly influence military interests. Courts have played critical roles during transitions of power, accountability drives, and civil–military disputes.

3. Public Demand for Accountability

Widespread distrust in political institutions has increased public reliance on the judiciary to address corruption and governance failures. This societal expectation often pushes courts into an expanded policy-making space.

4. Judicial Independence and Self-Assertion

Judges, particularly after moments that threatened judicial autonomy, have at times sought to assert institutional independence through public activism and assertive rulings.

CRITIQUES AND CONCERNS

While judicial intervention has occasionally protected democratic values, it raises several concerns:

1. Judicial Overreach

Excessive intervention in executive decisions and parliamentary matters risks upsetting constitutional separation of powers.

2. Politicization of the Bench

Perceptions that judicial decisions are influenced by political or institutional actors undermine public trust.

3. Unpredictability in Governance

Political uncertainty grows when major political questions are settled in courts instead of parliament, affecting policy continuity and democratic stability.

4. Impact on Democratic Processes

Disqualifying elected leaders or reshaping political landscapes through judicial verdicts can weaken democratic institutions and encourage political actors to rely on legal battles rather than electoral competition.

POTENTIAL PATHWAYS FOR REFORM

To foster a more balanced democratic system, several reforms are often suggested:

1. Strengthening Parliamentary Sovereignty

Clearer constitutional boundaries and respect for legislative processes are essential to reducing judicial–political conflict.

2. Transparent Judicial Appointments

Improving transparency and meritocracy in judicial appointments can enhance legitimacy and independence.

3. Political Stability and Institutional Maturity

Stable political parties, internal democracy, and consistent civilian governance can reduce reliance on courts for political arbitration.

4. Internal Judicial Accountability

Mechanisms to ensure judicial accountability—without compromising independence—can improve public trust.

CONCLUSION

Judicial intervention in Pakistan's politics is a product of historical patterns, institutional weaknesses, and societal expectations. While the judiciary has at times acted as a guardian of

constitutionalism, its expanded political role has also generated debates about overreach and the balance of power.

For Pakistan to progress toward stronger democratic governance, all institutions—including the judiciary—must operate within their constitutional domains while mutually reinforcing the rule of law. A more predictable, stable, and cooperative institutional framework is essential for the country's political and legal development.

References

- [1] Ahmed, I. (2013). *The Pakistan military in politics: Origins, evolution, consequences*. Oxford University Press.
- [2] Alavi, H. (1972). The state in post-colonial societies: Pakistan and Bangladesh. *New Left Review*, 74, 59–81.
- [3] Cheema, M. A. (2015). Judicial activism in Pakistan: A comparative analysis. *Asian Journal of Comparative Law*, 10(2), 1–28.
- [4] Hirschl, R. (2008). The judicialization of politics. In K. E. Whittington, R. D. Kelemen, & G. A. Caldeira (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of law and politics* (pp. 119–141). Oxford University Press.
- [5] International Crisis Group. (2008). *Reforming Pakistan's civil service*. Asia Report No. 185.
- [6] Jilani v. Government of Punjab, PLD 1972 SC 139.
- [7] Khan, H. (2017). *Constitutional and political history of Pakistan* (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- [8] Malik, I. H. (2010). *Pakistan: Democracy, terrorism, and the building of a failed state*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- [9] Munir, M. (1955). *From Jinnah to Zia*. Vanguard Books.
- [10] Pakistan Lawyers' Forum v. Federation of Pakistan, PLD 2007 SC 578.
- [11] Sajjad Ali Shah v. Federation of Pakistan, PLD 2000 SC 869.
- [12] Shah, S. A. (2014). *Law, courts and politics in Pakistan*. Oxford University Press.
- [13] State v. Dosso, PLD 1958 SC 533.
- [14] Talbot, I. (2012). *Pakistan: A modern history* (2nd ed.). Hurst & Company.
- [15] Waseem, M. (2006). *Democratization in Pakistan: A study of the 2002 elections*. Oxford University Press.
- [16] Zafar Ali Shah v. General Pervez Musharraf, PLD 2000 SC 869.

Received on 09-12-2025

Accepted on 20-12-2025

Published on 30-12-2025

© 2025; Areez Tariq; Licensee ATSK Publishers.

This is an open access article licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/>) which permits unrestricted, noncommercial use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the work is properly cited.