

CONSTITUTION (FIRST AMENDMENT) ACT, 1951

Aspect	Details
Enacted on	1951
Article(s) Amended	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Article 15 ● Article 19 (focus) ● Insertion of Articles 31A and 31B ● Article 35 ● Article 37 ● Article 174 ● Article 178 ● Article 341 ● Article 342 ● Article 372 ● Article 376
Note	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>This Amendment was challenged in</i> Sri Sankari Prasad Singh Deo vs. Union of India and State of Bihar 1951 INSC 47 [1952] 1 S.C.R.89
Key Amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Expansion of Article 19 to add reasonable restrictions to Freedom of Speech and Expression. ● Special provisions for socially and educationally backward classes by adding clause 4 to Article 15. ● Addition of the Ninth Schedule.

The Constitution of India came into force in 1950, and within a year, Parliament introduced its first constitutional amendment, even before the first general elections were conducted. [The Constitution \(First Amendment\) Act, 1951](#) brought about significant changes in response to early judicial interpretations that affected governance and social reform. The amendment pursued three key objectives. First, it sought to place reasonable restrictions on the freedom of speech and expression by expanding Article 19(2) to include grounds such as public order, friendly relations with foreign States, and incitement to an offence. Second, it introduced special provisions for socially and educationally backward classes by inserting Article 15(4), enabling affirmative action for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. Third, to facilitate land reform measures, Articles 31A and 31B were added, along

with the Ninth Schedule, shielding certain laws from constitutional challenge on the ground of violation of fundamental rights.

Before the amendment, Article 19(1)(a) guaranteed the **right to freedom of speech and expression**, but the restrictions under Article 19(2) were limited. The **First Amendment expanded these restrictions** to give the State broader powers to regulate speech in the interest of public order and national harmony. Specifically, it added the following grounds:

- Friendly relations with foreign states, to prevent harmful propaganda against other nations;
- Public order, to address disturbances and threats to social peace; and
- Incitement to an offence, to curb speech that could provoke criminal activity.

In addition, the amendment altered **Article 19(6)** (dealing with restrictions on occupation, trade, and business) to clarify the State's power to operate or control trade and commerce, including creating monopolies, by removing ambiguity about whether such restrictions had to be "reasonable."

The First Amendment introduced the **Ninth Schedule** to the Constitution, linked with **Article 31B**, to protect certain laws from being challenged in court on the ground that they violated fundamental rights. Initially, it included a list of important land reform statutes that aimed to redistribute land and abolish feudal land holdings. Over time, many more laws were added to this schedule. The Ninth Schedule was intended to shield agrarian reform laws from judicial review, thereby allowing Parliament and state legislatures to pursue social and economic reforms without fear of invalidation for violating fundamental rights.

Apart from changes to Article 19 and the insertion of the Ninth Schedule, the Constitution (First Amendment) Act, 1951 introduced several significant amendments to other provisions of the Constitution. Article 15 was amended by inserting clause (4), empowering the State to make special provisions for the advancement of socially and educationally backward classes, as well as for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, thereby laying the constitutional foundation for affirmative action. Further, Article 31A was inserted to protect laws relating to land reforms, including the acquisition of estates, extinguishment or modification of rights in land, and redistribution of property, from being challenged on the ground of violation of fundamental rights. Article 31B was also added to validate certain laws notwithstanding their inconsistency with fundamental rights, provided they were placed under constitutional protection.

Additionally, Article 85 was amended to remove ambiguity regarding the time gap between parliamentary sessions, ensuring smoother legislative functioning. Collectively, these amendments

strengthened the State's ability to pursue social and economic reforms while responding to early constitutional challenges in independent India.

This amendment was challenged in the [Shankari Prasad case](#). In the 1951 case Shankari Prasad against Union of India, the extent of Parliament's amending authority was contested. This is noteworthy because it was the first instance in which the judiciary contested Parliament's modifying authority. The Constitution (First Amendment) Act, 1951 was contested by petitioner Shankari Prasad. He said that the Parliament cannot enact any legislation that infringes upon or restricts the rights guaranteed by Part III of the Constitution, citing paragraph 2 of Article 13.

The Supreme Court has agreed to examine a PIL challenging the **1951 First Amendment** for allegedly violating the **basic structure doctrine** by diluting the right to free speech. The petitioner argues that **Section 3(1)** replaced the original Article 19(2) with a broader provision by adding **public order** and **incitement to an offence** as grounds for restriction, while removing the safeguard against speech that "tends to overthrow the State." The plea seeks to declare **Sections 3(1)(a) and 3(2)** unconstitutional for exceeding Parliament's amending power and damaging the Constitution's core features.

References

- LawBhoomi. (2025, August 27). *First Amendment of Indian Constitution*. Retrieved from <https://lawbhoomi.com/first-amendment-of-indian-constitution/>
 - Casemine. (1951, October 6). Casemine. <https://www.casemine.com>.
[https://www.casemine.com/commentary/in/validity-of-constitution-\(first-amendment\)-act,-1951:-power-of-provisional-parliament-to-amend-the-constitution/view](https://www.casemine.com/commentary/in/validity-of-constitution-(first-amendment)-act,-1951:-power-of-provisional-parliament-to-amend-the-constitution/view)
 - Drishti IAS. (2022, October 31). *First Amendment to the Indian Constitution*.
<https://www.drishtiiias.com/daily-updates/daily-news-analysis/first-amendment-to-the-indian-constitution>
 - Steuwer, B. (2021, April 30). *The shadow of the First Amendment*. The Caravan.
<https://caravanmagazine.in/books/law-first-amendment-constitution>
 - GKToday. (n.d.). *Constitution (First Amendment) Act, 1951*. Retrieved from <https://www.gktoday.in/constitution-first-amendment-act-1951-2/>
-

CONSTITUTION (SECOND AMENDMENT) ACT, 1952

Aspect	Details
Enacted in	1953
Article (s) Amended	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Article 81
Key Amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● The amendment removed the phrase “not less than one member for every 750,000 of the population” from Article 81(1)(b).● This relaxed the earlier rigid population cap for parliamentary constituencies.● Constituencies could now represent more than 750,000 people where necessary.● It introduced flexibility in seat allocation without altering the total strength of the Lok Sabha.

The Constitution (Second Amendment) Act, 1952 was enacted to address practical difficulties in implementing the scheme of representation in the House of the People under Article 81 of the Constitution. The original provision in Article 81(1)(b) required that there be not less than one member for every 750,000 of the population, thereby prescribing a population-based benchmark for representation, alongside the broader requirement of maintaining uniformity in representation across states. However, this rigid standard proved impractical in light of population variations across different regions following the first census after independence.

Before the amendment, Article 81(1)(b) imposed a strict numerical guideline linking population size to the number of representatives in the Lok Sabha. This requirement limited the flexibility of Parliament in determining constituency sizes and created practical difficulties in ensuring balanced representation across states with differing demographic profiles.

The Second Amendment removed the words “not less than one member for every 750,000 of the population” from Article 81(1)(b), thereby relaxing the minimum population requirement for constituencies. As a result, a parliamentary constituency could represent more than 750,000 people where necessary, allowing greater discretion in the process of delimitation.

The amendment did not alter the broader constitutional framework governing the composition of the Lok Sabha, but introduced essential flexibility in determining representation by removing the rigid lower limit of the population-based formula. It enabled a more practical and balanced approach to constituency formation while maintaining the underlying principle of representative democracy.

The amendment thus reflects an early instance of constitutional adaptation to administrative and demographic realities in independent India.

Reference:

- Constitution (Second Amendment) Act, 1952 (Act PDF)
Bombay High Court. (n.d.). *The Constitution (Second Amendment) Act, 1952* (Act No. 2 of 1953).
<https://bombayhighcourt.nic.in/libweb/misc/coi/constitution/act/ACT/C002Act.pdf>
- Statement of Objects and Reasons (Second Amendment)
Bombay High Court. (n.d.). *Statement of objects and reasons: Constitution (Second Amendment) Act, 1952*.
<https://bombayhighcourt.nic.in/libweb/misc/coi/constitution/act/SOR/C002SOR.pdf>
- Vajiram & Ravi. (2026, April 15). *2nd Constitutional Amendment Act: Background, need, provisions*.
<https://vajiramandravi.com/current-affairs/2nd-constitutional-amendment-act>

CONSTITUTION (THIRD AMENDMENT) ACT, 1954

Aspect	Details
Enacted in	1955
Article (s) Amended	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● 7th Schedule
Key Amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Expanded the scope of Entry 33 in the Concurrent List.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Enabled both Parliament and State Legislatures to regulate trade and commerce in certain essential commodities.● Included foodstuffs, cattle fodder, raw cotton, raw jute, and related products within the regulatory framework.
--	---

The Constitution (Third Amendment) Act, 1954 was enacted to strengthen the regulatory framework governing trade and commerce in essential commodities. It sought to address limitations in the existing distribution of legislative powers between the Union and the States, particularly in the context of ensuring equitable supply and price control of critical goods in the post-independence economy.

Before the amendment, legislative competence over trade and commerce in certain commodities was fragmented, creating challenges in implementing uniform policies across the country. While the Union had powers under specific circumstances, the absence of a clear concurrent framework limited coordinated action between the Centre and States in managing essential supplies.

The Third Amendment modified Entry 33 of the Concurrent List in the Seventh Schedule by expanding its scope to include a broader category of essential commodities, such as foodstuffs, cattle fodder, raw cotton, and raw jute. This change enabled both Parliament and State Legislatures to enact laws regulating the production, supply, and distribution of these goods.

By bringing these matters within the Concurrent List, the amendment facilitated greater coordination between the Union and the States. It allowed the central government to frame nationwide policies when required, while still permitting States to legislate based on local needs, subject to constitutional provisions governing repugnancy.

The amendment did not alter the basic federal structure but refined the allocation of legislative powers to ensure more effective governance of essential commodities. It played a significant role in enabling the State to respond to issues such as shortages, hoarding, and price instability in a developing economy.

The Third Amendment thus represents an early effort to balance federalism with economic regulation, ensuring that both levels of government could act in the public interest to maintain supply stability and market fairness.

Reference:

- Constitution (Third Amendment) Act, 1954 (Act No. 3 of 1954).
<https://www.legislative.gov.in/static/uploads/2025/07/d4b13be535b5e11a6784f227c57cf084.pdf>
- GKToday. (2019, July 1). Constitution (Third Amendment) Act, 1954.
<https://www.gktoday.in/constitution-third-amendment-act-1954/>
- Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India. (n.d.). Seventh Schedule to the Constitution of India.
<https://www.mea.gov.in/images/pdf1/S7.pdf>

CONSTITUTION (FOURTH AMENDMENT) ACT, 1955

Aspect	Details
Enacted in	1955
Article (s) and Schedule Amended	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Articles inserted: 31 & 31A ● Article Substituted: 305 ● Schedule Amended : 9th
Key Amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Clarified the State's power of compulsory acquisition of property. ● Restricted judicial review in matters of compensation for acquired property. ● Expanded the scope of laws protected under Article 31A. ● Added more laws to the Ninth Schedule under Article 31B to shield them from challenge on the ground of violation of Fundamental Rights.

The Constitution (Fourth Amendment) Act, 1955 was enacted to strengthen the State's ability to implement land reforms and regulate property rights in the larger public interest. It emerged in response to judicial decisions that had begun scrutinising the adequacy of compensation in cases of compulsory acquisition, thereby creating obstacles for socio-economic legislation.

Before the amendment, Article 31 guaranteed the right to property and required that compensation be provided when property was compulsorily acquired. However, courts had started examining whether such compensation was adequate, which introduced uncertainty and slowed down land reform initiatives aimed at redistributing resources and dismantling feudal landholding structures.

The Fourth Amendment modified Article 31 to clarify that the adequacy of compensation could not be questioned in a court of law. This limited the scope of judicial review in matters relating to property acquisition, thereby giving the legislature greater autonomy in determining compensation.

In addition, the amendment expanded the scope of Article 31A to provide stronger protection to laws related to agrarian reforms and other measures involving the acquisition or modification of property rights. It also extended the Ninth Schedule under Article 31B by including additional laws, thereby immunising them from constitutional challenge on the ground of violation of Fundamental Rights.

The amendment did not eliminate the right to property but significantly curtailed its enforceability against State-led economic reforms. It marked a shift towards prioritising collective socio-economic objectives over individual property rights within the constitutional framework.

The Fourth Amendment thus represents a critical phase in the evolution of India's constitutional approach to property, reflecting the State's commitment to land reforms and redistribution in the early years of independence.

Reference:

- Bombay High Court. (n.d.). Constitutional amendments. https://bombayhighcourt.nic.in/libweb/misc/coi/New-constitution_amendment.html
- Bombay High Court. (n.d.). Statement of objects and reasons: Constitution (Fourth Amendment) Act, 1955. <https://bombayhighcourt.nic.in/libweb/misc/coi/constitution/act/SOR/C004SOR.pdf>
- Legislative Department, Ministry of Law and Justice, Government of India. (1955). The Constitution (Fourth Amendment) Act, 1955. <https://www.legislative.gov.in/static/uploads/2025/07/68badaa2da25d641c51992f854344773.pdf>

CONSTITUTION (FIFTH AMENDMENT) ACT, 1955

Aspect	Details
Enacted in	1955
Article (s) Amended	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Article 3
Key Amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Empowered the President to prescribe a time limit for State Legislatures to express their views on reorganisation proposals.• Clarified the procedure for altering state boundaries, names, and areas.• Strengthened the role of the Union in the process of state reorganisation.

The Constitution (Fifth Amendment) Act, 1955 was enacted to refine the procedure governing the reorganisation of states under Article 3 of the Constitution. It sought to address procedural ambiguities that arose when Parliament initiated proposals affecting the boundaries, areas, or names of existing states.

Before the amendment, Article 3 required that any such proposal be referred by the President to the concerned State Legislature for its views. However, the Constitution did not prescribe any time limit within which the State Legislature was required to respond, leading to delays and uncertainty in the legislative process.

The Fifth Amendment modified Article 3 by empowering the President to specify a time period within which the State Legislature must express its views on the proposed changes. It also clarified that the President could extend this period if necessary.

This change ensured that the process of state reorganisation remained consultative but not indefinitely delayed. While the views of the State Legislature continued to be an important procedural

requirement, they were not binding on Parliament, and the amendment reinforced Parliament's authority to proceed within a defined timeframe.

The amendment did not alter the substantive distribution of powers between the Union and the States but improved the procedural efficiency of constitutional mechanisms relating to territorial reorganisation.

The Fifth Amendment thus represents an early effort to streamline federal processes, balancing the need for consultation with the practical requirements of timely governance in a newly independent nation.

Reference:

- Bombay High Court. (n.d.). Constitutional amendments.
https://bombayhighcourt.nic.in/libweb/misc/coi/New-constitution_amendment.html
- GKToday. (2019, July 1). Constitution (Fifth Amendment) Act, 1955.
<https://www.gktoday.in/constitution-fifth-amendment-act-1955/>
- Government of India. (1955). The Constitution (Fifth Amendment) Act, 1955 [Gazette Notification].
[https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/c/c5/The_Constitution_of_India_\(5th_Amendment\)_Act_1955.pdf](https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/c/c5/The_Constitution_of_India_(5th_Amendment)_Act_1955.pdf)

CONSTITUTION (SIXTH AMENDMENT) ACT, 1956

Aspect	Details
Enacted in	1956
Article (s) and Schedule Amended	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Article 269, 286● 7th Schedule
Key Amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Empowered the Union to levy and collect taxes on inter-State sales.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Amended provisions relating to restrictions on the imposition of sales tax by States.● Inserted provisions enabling Parliament to formulate principles for determining when a sale or purchase takes place in the course of inter-State trade or commerce.● Strengthened the central framework governing inter-State trade and taxation.
--	--

The Constitution (Sixth Amendment) Act, 1956 was enacted to address complexities in the taxation of inter-State trade and commerce, particularly in relation to sales tax. It aimed to create a uniform and coherent framework for taxing transactions that crossed state boundaries, which had become a significant issue in the early years of India's economic development.

Before the amendment, States had the power to levy sales tax, but the absence of clear constitutional principles for inter-State transactions led to overlapping claims of taxation, legal disputes, and barriers to the free flow of trade across state boundaries. This created uncertainty for businesses and hindered the development of a unified national market.

The Sixth Amendment modified Articles 269 and 286 to empower the Union to levy and collect taxes on inter-State sales, while assigning the proceeds to the States. It also authorised Parliament to formulate principles for determining when a sale or purchase of goods takes place in the course of inter-State trade or commerce, thereby ensuring clarity and uniformity in tax administration.

In addition, the amendment restricted the States from imposing taxes on certain inter-State transactions, thereby preventing multiple taxation and reducing trade distortions. It laid the constitutional foundation for a coordinated taxation regime governing inter-State commerce.

The amendment did not remove the States' power to levy sales tax within their own territories but restructured the framework to balance State autonomy with the need for a unified national market.

The Sixth Amendment thus represents an important step in the evolution of India's fiscal federalism, ensuring smoother inter-State trade and reducing conflicts arising from overlapping taxation powers.

Reference:

- Bombay High Court. (n.d.). Constitutional amendments.
https://bombayhighcourt.nic.in/libweb/misc/coi/New-constitution_amendment.html
- GKtoday(2019). Constitution (Sixth Amendment) Act, 1956.
<https://www.gktoday.in/constitution-sixth-amendment-act-1956/>
- iPleaders. (2022). Major Constitutional Amendments
<https://blog.ipleaders.in/the-major-constitutional-amendment-in-indian-history/>
- Legislative Department, Government of India. (1956). The Constitution (Sixth Amendment) Act, 1956.
<https://www.legislative.gov.in/static/uploads/2025/07/1a2c5f93dab41d00838c0cabe4ec6306.pdf>

CONSTITUTION (SEVENTH AMENDMENT) ACT, 1956

Aspect	Details
Enacted in	1956
Article (s) and Schedule Amended	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Article Amended: 1, 80, 131, 153, 158, 168, 171, 216, 217, 222 ● Articles inserted: 258A, 290A, 350A, 350B, 372A 378A ● Article Substituted: 81, 82, 170, 220, 224, 230, 231, 232, 239, 240, 298, 371 ● Schedule Amended : 2nd , 7th ● Schedule Substituted: 5th, 4th ● Amended : Part VIII
Key Amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Reorganised states on a linguistic basis. ● Abolished the classification of States into Part A, Part B, Part C, and Part D. ● Established a uniform structure of States and Union Territories. ● Provided for the reorganisation of High Courts and their jurisdictions. ● Adjusted representation in Parliament and State Legislatures.

The Constitution (Seventh Amendment) Act, 1956, which came into force on 1st November 1956, was a landmark constitutional reform aimed at reorganizing the structure of India's states and union territories in accordance with the States Reorganisation Act, 1956. It represented one of the most

significant amendments since independence, reshaping India's federal system to align more closely with linguistic and administrative realities.

A major change was to Article 1 and the First Schedule, redefining India's political map. The categories of Part A, Part B, Part C, and Part D states were abolished, and the country was reorganized into "States" and "Union Territories." Fourteen states (including Andhra Pradesh, Bombay, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Madras, Mysore, Punjab, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, West Bengal, and Jammu & Kashmir) and six union territories (Delhi, Himachal Pradesh, Manipur, Tripura, Andaman & Nicobar Islands, and Laccadive-Minicoy-Amindivi Islands) were formally recognized.

Changes were also made to representation in Parliament. Article 80 was amended to include Union territories in the Council of States (Rajya Sabha), and a revised Fourth Schedule allocated 220 seats among the states and union territories. Similarly, Articles 81 and 82 were substituted to provide for up to 500 directly elected members and 20 representatives from Union territories in the Lok Sabha, with periodic readjustment after each census.

The amendment restructured state legislatures, substituting Article 170 to mandate legislative assemblies with 60–500 elected members, proportional to population. Article 171 altered the Legislative Council composition, raising the proportion of elected members to one-third.

Judiciary reforms were extensive. Provisions allowed the appointment of a common High Court for two or more states or states with union territories (Article 231). Union territories were placed under High Court jurisdiction through Article 230. Article 220 restricted post-retirement practice of permanent High Court judges, while Article 224 introduced provisions for appointing additional and acting judges.

On the executive side, Article 153 permitted a single Governor for two or more states, with related financial adjustments under Article 158. The amendment also inserted Article 239, placing union territories under direct administration of the President through administrators, and Article 240, empowering the President to legislate for certain territories.

Significant special provisions were also included. Article 290A ensured annual financial grants from Kerala and Madras to maintain religious institutions transferred from Travancore-Cochin. Article 350A imposed a duty on states to provide primary education in mother tongues for linguistic minorities, and Article 350B created the office of the Special Officer for Linguistic Minorities to safeguard their rights. Article 371 authorized special arrangements for regional committees in Andhra Pradesh, Punjab, and Bombay to ensure equitable development.

Additionally, Article 372A empowered the President to adapt pre-existing laws to the reorganized framework, and Article 378A fixed the term of the Andhra Pradesh Legislative Assembly. Numerous consequential changes removed references to “Rajpramukhs” and obsolete classifications of states.

The Seventh Amendment rationalized India’s federal system by streamlining state categories, reorganizing boundaries, clarifying legislative representation, and strengthening minority protections. It was a cornerstone in building a more coherent and administratively workable Union of India, laying the foundation for modern federal governance.

References:

- Bombay High Court. (n.d.). Constitutional amendments. https://bombayhighcourt.nic.in/libweb/misc/coi/New-constitution_amendment.html
- iPleaders. (2022). Major Constitutional Amendments <https://blog.iPLEaders.in/the-major-constitutional-amendment-in-indian-history/>
- Legislative Department, Government of India. (1956). *The Constitution (Seventh Amendment) Act, 1956*. <https://cdnbbsr.s3waas.gov.in/s380537a945c7aaa788ccfcdf1b99b5d8f/uploads/2023/03/2023030239-1.pdf>
- Vajiram & Ravi. (2026). *State Reorganisation Act, 1956*. <https://vajiramandravi.com/upsc-exam/state-reorganisation-act-1956/>

CONSTITUTION (EIGHTH AMENDMENT) ACT, 1959

Aspect	Details
Enacted in	1960
Article (s) Amended	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Article 334
Key Amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Extended the period of reservation of seats for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes in the Lok Sabha and State Legislative Assemblies. ● Extended the provision for representation of the Anglo-Indian community by nomination.

- | | |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Postponed the original 10-year limitation on these provisions by a further period of 10 years. |
|--|--|

The Constitution (Eighth Amendment) Act, 1960 was enacted to extend the duration of special constitutional provisions relating to the political representation of historically disadvantaged communities. These provisions, embedded in Article 334, were originally conceived as temporary safeguards to ensure adequate representation of Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, and the Anglo-Indian community in legislative institutions during the early years of the Republic.

At the time of the Constitution's commencement in 1950, it was anticipated that a period of ten years would be sufficient to achieve a reasonable degree of political integration and equality. Accordingly, Article 334 provided that the reservation of seats for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes in the House of the People and State Legislative Assemblies, along with the nomination of members of the Anglo-Indian community, would cease in 1960.

However, by the end of this initial period, it had become evident that the socio-economic and political conditions of these communities had not advanced to a level where such safeguards could be withdrawn without adversely affecting their representation. Persistent structural inequalities, limited access to political power, and uneven regional development continued to justify the need for constitutional protection.

In this context, the Eighth Amendment modified Article 334 by extending the operation of these provisions for a further period of ten years, that is, until 1970. The amendment did not introduce any substantive changes to the nature or scope of reservation or nomination; rather, it reaffirmed the continuing relevance of these mechanisms as tools of inclusive governance.

The amendment thus reflects a pragmatic constitutional approach—recognising that formal equality alone was insufficient in addressing deeply rooted historical disadvantages. It underscores the evolving understanding within the constitutional framework that social justice requires sustained institutional support beyond originally anticipated timelines.

The Eighth Amendment represents an early continuation of India's commitment to affirmative representation, ensuring that the process of democratic participation remained inclusive and responsive to ground realities.

References:

- Bombay High Court. (n.d.). Constitutional amendments.
https://bombayhighcourt.nic.in/libweb/misc/coi/New-constitution_amendment.html
- GKToday. (2019). Constitution (Eighth Amendment) Act, 1959.
<https://www.gktoday.in/constitution-eighth-amendment-act-1959/>
- iPleaders. (2022). Major Constitutional Amendments
<https://blog.ipleaders.in/the-major-constitutional-amendment-in-indian-history/>
- Legislative Department, Government of India. (1960). The Constitution (Eighth Amendment) Act, 1959.
[https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/2/23/The_Constitution_of_India_\(8th_Amendment\)_Act_1960.pdf](https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/2/23/The_Constitution_of_India_(8th_Amendment)_Act_1960.pdf)

CONSTITUTION (NINTH AMENDMENT) ACT, 1960

Aspect	Details
Enacted in	1960
Schedule Amended	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Schedule 1
Key Amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Gave effect to the India-Pakistan Agreement relating to the transfer of certain territories. ● Altered the territorial boundaries of India by modifying the First Schedule. ● Facilitated the cession of specified areas to Pakistan in accordance with an international settlement.

The Constitution (Ninth Amendment) Act, 1960 was enacted to give constitutional effect to an agreement between India and Pakistan concerning the settlement of boundary disputes and the exchange of certain enclaves and territories. It arose from the need to resolve longstanding territorial anomalies that had persisted since Partition, particularly in regions where enclaves and disputed boundaries created administrative and legal complications.

Before the amendment, the Constitution did not expressly provide a mechanism for implementing such territorial adjustments through executive action alone. The issue gained prominence following judicial interpretation, which indicated that any cession of Indian territory would require a constitutional amendment rather than being effected solely through an agreement or executive decision.

In this context, the Ninth Amendment modified the First Schedule of the Constitution to alter the territorial extent of India in accordance with the terms of the bilateral agreement. It enabled the transfer of certain territories, including enclaves, thereby formalising the agreed boundary settlement.

The amendment played a crucial role in implementing the Nehru–Noon Agreement, which aimed to rationalise the border and reduce administrative difficulties arising from fragmented territorial arrangements. By incorporating these changes into the Constitution, the amendment ensured legal clarity and constitutional validity for the territorial adjustments.

The Ninth Amendment did not merely redraw boundaries but also clarified the constitutional position regarding the cession of territory. It underscored the principle that such changes require parliamentary approval through constitutional amendment, thereby reinforcing the role of the Constitution in matters affecting the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the nation.

The Ninth Amendment represents an important moment in the evolution of India's constitutional law on territorial sovereignty, demonstrating how international obligations and domestic constitutional requirements were reconciled within the legal framework.

References:

- Bombay High Court. (n.d.). Constitutional amendments.
https://bombayhighcourt.nic.in/libweb/misc/coi/New-constitution_amendment.html
- iPleaders. (2022). Major Constitutional Amendments
<https://blog.ipleaders.in/the-major-constitutional-amendment-in-indian-history/>
- Legislative Department, Government of India. (1960). The Constitution (Ninth Amendment) Act, 1960.
<https://www.legislative.gov.in/static/uploads/2025/07/5aed44b7bcf65d872dfa970df29a9648.pdf>
- Vajiram & Ravi. (2026). Berubari Union Case: Constitutional Implications.
<https://vajiramandravi.com/upsc-exam/berubari-union-case/>

CONSTITUTION (TENTH AMENDMENT) ACT, 1961

Aspect	Details
Enacted in	1961
Article (s) and Schedule Amended	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Article Amended : 240● Schedule Amended : 1st
Key Amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Incorporated Dadra and Nagar Haveli into the Union of India as a Union Territory.● Amended the First Schedule to include Dadra and Nagar Haveli as a Union Territory.● Extended the President's power to make regulations for the administration of the territory under Article 240.

The Constitution (Tenth Amendment) Act, 1961 was enacted to formally integrate Dadra and Nagar Haveli into the constitutional framework of India as a Union Territory. The region had been under Portuguese control until 1954, when it was liberated by local resistance movements. Following its liberation, the territory functioned under a form of independent administration for several years before its formal incorporation into the Indian Union.

Prior to the amendment, Dadra and Nagar Haveli existed in a transitional constitutional position. Although it was effectively administered in alignment with Indian governance structures, it lacked formal recognition within the Constitution. This created a disconnect between its de facto administration and its de jure constitutional status, making it necessary to provide a clear legal foundation for its governance.

The Tenth Amendment addressed this gap by modifying the First Schedule to include Dadra and Nagar Haveli as a Union Territory of India. In addition, Article 240 was amended to extend the President's power to make regulations for the peace, progress, and good governance of the territory. This ensured that the Union government could directly administer the region through constitutionally sanctioned mechanisms.

The amendment also reflected a broader administrative logic underlying the governance of Union Territories during this period. Such territories were often placed under direct central control due to their size, strategic importance, or transitional political status. By bringing Dadra and Nagar Haveli within this framework, the amendment ensured administrative stability while allowing flexibility in governance tailored to local conditions.

Importantly, the amendment did not alter the federal balance between the Union and the States. Instead, it operated within the existing constitutional scheme to facilitate the integration of a formerly colonised territory into the Union. It thus represents a continuation of India's post-independence efforts to consolidate its territorial and political unity through constitutional means.

The Tenth Amendment stands as a significant step in the process of nation-building, ensuring that territories emerging from colonial rule were systematically incorporated into India's constitutional and administrative framework.

References:

- Bombay High Court. (n.d.). Constitutional amendments. https://bombayhighcourt.nic.in/libweb/misc/coi/New-constitution_amendment.html
- GKToday. (2025). Constitution (Tenth Amendment) Act, 1961. <https://www.gktoday.in/constitution-tenth-amendment-act-1961/>
- iPleaders. (2022). Major Constitutional Amendments <https://blog.ipleaders.in/the-major-constitutional-amendment-in-indian-history/>
- Legislative Department, Government of India. (1961). The Constitution (Tenth Amendment) Act, 1961. <https://www.legislative.gov.in/static/uploads/2025/07/9e2f8aa7cad5798c56d811820d905067.pdf>

CONSTITUTION (ELEVENTH AMENDMENT) ACT, 1961

Aspect	Details
Enacted in	1961
Article (s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Article 66 and 71

Amended	
Key Amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Changed the procedure for the election of the Vice-President. ● Provided that the election of the Vice-President would be conducted by an electoral college consisting of members of both Houses of Parliament. ● Clarified that the election of the President or Vice-President cannot be challenged on the ground of vacancies in the electoral college.

The Constitution (Eleventh Amendment) Act, 1961 was enacted to refine and clarify the constitutional provisions governing the election of the Vice-President of India. It responded to procedural uncertainties that had arisen in the early years of the Republic regarding the composition of the electoral college and the validity of elections conducted under less-than-complete conditions.

Under the original framework, Article 66 provided for the election of the Vice-President by members of both Houses of Parliament. However, questions had emerged as to whether nominated members were included within this electoral college and whether elections could be invalidated due to vacancies in either House. Such ambiguities carried the potential to disrupt the continuity of high constitutional offices.

The Eleventh Amendment resolved these issues by clarifying that the electoral college for the Vice-President includes both elected and nominated members of Parliament. It also amended Article 71 to explicitly provide that the election of the President or Vice-President cannot be challenged on the ground of any vacancy in the electoral college.

This change ensured that the electoral process remained stable and functional even in the presence of unavoidable vacancies, such as those arising from resignations, deaths, or delays in filling seats. It reduced the scope for technical challenges that could otherwise undermine the legitimacy of elections.

Importantly, the amendment did not alter the fundamental structure of the electoral system but strengthened its procedural robustness. It reflects an early effort to insulate key constitutional processes from disruption while maintaining democratic legitimacy.

The Eleventh Amendment represents a technical yet significant refinement, ensuring continuity, certainty, and stability in the functioning of India's highest constitutional offices.

References:

- Bombay High Court. (n.d.). Constitutional amendments.
https://bombayhighcourt.nic.in/libweb/misc/coi/New-constitution_amendment.html
- GKToday. (2019). Constitution (Eleventh Amendment) Act, 1961.
<https://www.gktoday.in/constitution-eleventh-amendment-act-1961/>
- iPleaders. (2022). Major Constitutional Amendments
<https://blog.ipleaders.in/the-major-constitutional-amendment-in-indian-history/>
- Legislative Department, Government of India. (1961). The Constitution (Eleventh Amendment) Act, 1961.
<https://www.legislative.gov.in/static/uploads/2025/07/2afd30b40699bdea0da82ff187745382.pdf>

CONSTITUTION (TWELFTH AMENDMENT) ACT, 1962

Aspect	Details
Enacted in	1962
Article (s) and Schedule Amended	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Article 240● Schedule 1
Key Amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Incorporated Goa, Daman and Diu into the Union of India as a Union Territory.● Amended the First Schedule to include these territories.● Extended the President's power to administer the territory through regulations under Article 240.

The Constitution (Twelfth Amendment) Act, 1962 was enacted to formally incorporate Goa, Daman and Diu into the constitutional framework of India following their liberation from Portuguese rule in December 1961. It marked a significant phase in the process of territorial consolidation and the completion of decolonisation within the Indian subcontinent.

Prior to the amendment, these territories were under Portuguese control and lay outside the constitutional structure of India. After their liberation, it became necessary to provide a clear constitutional basis for their governance, ensuring that administrative authority was exercised within the framework of the Constitution rather than through ad hoc arrangements.

The Twelfth Amendment achieved this by amending the First Schedule to include Goa, Daman and Diu as a Union Territory of India. It also extended the application of Article 240, empowering the President to make regulations for the peace, progress, and good governance of the territory. This allowed for direct central administration during a transitional phase, ensuring stability and continuity.

The amendment also reflects the broader constitutional approach towards newly integrated territories during this period. Union Territory status allowed the Union government to exercise closer administrative control, particularly in regions with distinct historical, political, or strategic considerations. Over time, such territories could be transitioned into full statehood, as seen later in the case of Goa.

While the amendment did not alter the federal balance between the Union and the States, it played a crucial role in extending the reach of the Constitution to newly integrated regions and consolidating India's territorial sovereignty. It ensured that the principles of constitutional governance, rule of law, and democratic administration were uniformly applied.

The Twelfth Amendment represents a key step in India's post-independence nation-building process, integrating formerly colonised territories into a unified constitutional and administrative system while maintaining flexibility in governance during transition.

References:

- Bombay High Court. (n.d.). Constitutional amendments. https://bombayhighcourt.nic.in/libweb/misc/coi/New-constitution_amendment.html
- GKToday. (2025). Constitution (Twelfth Amendment) Act, 1962 - Goa, Daman & Diu Integration. <https://www.gktoday.in/constitution-twelfth-amendment-act-1962/>
- iPleaders. (2022). Major Constitutional Amendments <https://blog.ipleaders.in/the-major-constitutional-amendment-in-indian-history/>
- Legislative Department, Government of India. (1962). The Constitution (Twelfth Amendment) Act, 1962. <https://www.legislative.gov.in/static/uploads/2025/07/90f537a2f96e5304e088b723b665d426.pdf>

CONSTITUTION (THIRTEENTH AMENDMENT) ACT, 1962

Aspect	Details
Enacted in	1962
Article (s) Amended	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Article Inserted 371 A● Amendment of Part : XXI
Key Amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Provided special constitutional status to Nagaland.● Inserted Article 371A to safeguard customary laws, religious practices, and land rights of the Naga people.● Facilitated the creation of the State of Nagaland within the Union of India.● Ensured limited application of Parliamentary laws to Nagaland in specified matters.

The Constitution (Thirteenth Amendment) Act, 1962 was enacted to facilitate the creation of the State of Nagaland and to provide it with a distinct constitutional status in recognition of its unique social, cultural, and political context. It formed part of a broader political settlement aimed at addressing longstanding demands for autonomy and self-governance in the Naga Hills region.

Prior to the amendment, the Naga Hills area was administered as part of the State of Assam, but growing political mobilisation and demands for autonomy highlighted the need for a more tailored constitutional arrangement. The integration of the region into the Indian Union required safeguards that would respect local customs, traditions, and governance systems.

The Thirteenth Amendment addressed these concerns by inserting Article 371A, which conferred special protections on Nagaland. It provided that no Act of Parliament relating to religious or social practices of the Nagas, Naga customary law and procedure, administration of civil and criminal justice involving decisions according to Naga customary law, and ownership and transfer of land and its resources would apply to the State unless the Legislative Assembly of Nagaland so decided.

This provision ensured a high degree of autonomy in matters central to the identity and traditional governance of the Naga people. It also recognised the importance of customary institutions and

practices within the constitutional framework, marking a departure from a uniform application of laws across all states.

In addition, the amendment facilitated the formal establishment of Nagaland as a separate state by modifying the First Schedule of the Constitution. This reorganisation was not merely administrative but reflected a negotiated accommodation of regional aspirations within the Union.

The amendment represents an early and significant example of asymmetrical federalism in India, where different states are accorded varying degrees of autonomy based on historical, cultural, and political considerations. It demonstrates the Constitution's flexibility in accommodating diversity while maintaining national unity.

The Thirteenth Amendment stands as a key moment in India's nation-building process, combining territorial reorganisation with constitutional safeguards to integrate a distinct region into the Union on mutually acceptable terms.

References:

- Bombay High Court. (n.d.). Constitutional amendments. https://bombayhighcourt.nic.in/libweb/misc/coi/New-constitution_amendment.html
- Drishti IAS. (2024). Article 371: Special Provisions for States. <https://www.drishtiiias.com/state-pcs-current-affairs/article-371-2>
- iPleaders. (2022). Major Constitutional Amendments <https://blog.ipleaders.in/the-major-constitutional-amendment-in-indian-history/>
- LegitQuest. (2022). Constitution (Thirteenth Amendment) Act, 1962. <https://www.legitquest.com/act/constitution-thirteenth-amendment-act-1962/2013>

CONSTITUTION (FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT) ACT, 1962

Aspect	Details
Enacted in	1962
Article (s) and Schedules	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Articles Amended: 81, 240● Articles inserted: 239A

Amended	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Schedule Amended: 1st, 4th
Key Amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Incorporated Pondicherry (now Puducherry) into the Union of India as a Union Territory. ● Amended the First Schedule to include the new Union Territory. ● Inserted Article 239A to provide for legislatures and Councils of Ministers in certain Union Territories. ● Provided for representation of Union Territories in the Lok Sabha.

The Constitution (Fourteenth Amendment) Act, 1962 was enacted to formally integrate Pondicherry into the constitutional framework of India and to provide a structured governance mechanism for certain Union Territories. It marked an important phase in the consolidation of territories that had previously been under colonial administration.

Pondicherry, along with Karaikal, Mahe, and Yanam, had been under French control and was de facto transferred to India in 1954, with formal de jure transfer completed in 1962. Following this transition, it became necessary to provide constitutional recognition and a stable administrative framework for these regions within the Indian Union.

The Fourteenth Amendment achieved this by amending the First Schedule to include Pondicherry as a Union Territory of India. It also inserted Article 239A, which empowered Parliament to create legislatures and Councils of Ministers for certain Union Territories, thereby introducing a limited form of representative governance within a centrally administered framework.

In addition, the amendment made provisions for the representation of Union Territories in the House of the People (Lok Sabha) by modifying Article 81. This ensured that residents of Union Territories could participate in the democratic process at the national level through elected representation.

The amendment reflects a nuanced approach to governance, balancing central control with limited democratic participation in Union Territories. It recognised that while such territories required closer administrative oversight, there was also a need to provide institutional mechanisms for local representation and accountability.

The Fourteenth Amendment did not fundamentally alter the federal balance between the Union and the States but expanded the constitutional framework to accommodate diverse administrative

arrangements for different regions. It laid the foundation for the evolution of representative institutions in Union Territories over time.

The Fourteenth Amendment represents a significant step in India’s post-colonial integration process, combining territorial incorporation with the gradual introduction of democratic governance structures within Union Territories.

References:

- Bombay High Court. (n.d.). Constitutional amendments.
https://bombayhighcourt.nic.in/libweb/misc/coi/New-constitution_amendment.html
- CaseMine. Constitution (14th Amendment) Act, 1962.
<https://www.casemine.com/act/in/5a979da64a93263ca60b71d3>
- iPleaders. (2022). Major Constitutional Amendments
<https://blog.ipleaders.in/the-major-constitutional-amendment-in-indian-history/>
- LegitQuest. Constitution (Fourteenth Amendment) Act, 1962.
<https://www.legitquest.com/act/constitution-fourteenth-amendment-act-1962/2014>

CONSTITUTION (FIFTEENTH AMENDMENT) ACT, 1963

Aspect	Details
Enacted in	1963
Article (s) and Schedules Amended	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Articles Amended: 124, 128, 217, 222, 224, 226, 297, 311, 316 ● Article Inserted: 224A ● Schedule Amended : 7th
Key Amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Raised the retirement age of High Court judges from 60 to 62 years. ● Expanded the jurisdiction of High Courts under Article 226. ● Provided for the appointment of retired judges to sit and act as judges of High Courts. ● Strengthened provisions relating to the transfer of judges between High Courts. ● Clarified conditions relating to appointment and service of judges.

The Constitution (Fifteenth Amendment) Act, 1963 was enacted to strengthen the functioning of the higher judiciary, particularly the High Courts, in response to increasing caseloads and administrative challenges in the early years of the Republic. It sought to enhance judicial efficiency, clarify procedural ambiguities, and ensure greater flexibility in the appointment and functioning of judges.

Before the amendment, High Court judges retired at the age of 60, which was increasingly seen as inadequate in the context of rising judicial workload and the need to retain experienced members of the judiciary. The amendment addressed this by raising the retirement age of High Court judges to 62 years, thereby extending their tenure and ensuring continuity in judicial functioning.

The amendment also expanded the scope of Article 226 by empowering High Courts to issue writs not only for the enforcement of fundamental rights but also “for any other purpose.” While this phrase existed earlier, the amendment clarified and strengthened the territorial jurisdiction of High Courts, enabling them to exercise authority even when the cause of action arose partly within their jurisdiction. This significantly enhanced access to judicial remedies.

In addition, the amendment inserted Article 224A, allowing for the appointment of retired judges to sit and act as judges of High Courts, subject to their consent. This provision was intended to address temporary shortages and reduce case backlogs by utilising experienced judicial personnel.

Further, provisions relating to the transfer of judges under Article 222 were refined, and greater clarity was provided regarding the conditions of service and appointment of judges under Articles 217 and 224. The amendment also made provisions enabling retired Supreme Court and High Court judges to be requested to sit and act as judges when necessary, thereby adding flexibility to judicial administration.

The amendment did not alter the basic structure of the judiciary but introduced important institutional improvements aimed at strengthening its capacity and responsiveness. It reflects a recognition that judicial efficiency and accessibility are critical to the functioning of a constitutional democracy.

The Fifteenth Amendment represents a significant step in the evolution of India’s judicial system, enhancing both the capacity and reach of the High Courts while ensuring continuity and adaptability in judicial administration.

References:

- Bombay High Court. (n.d.). Constitutional amendments. https://bombayhighcourt.nic.in/libweb/misc/coi/New-constitution_amendment.html
- iPleaders. (2022). Major Constitutional Amendments <https://blog.ipleaders.in/the-major-constitutional-amendment-in-indian-history/>
- Physics Wallah. (2026). 15th Constitutional Amendment Act: Key Provisions. <https://www.pw.live/upsc/exams/15th-constitutional-amendment-act>
- Vajiram & Ravi. (2026). 15th Constitutional Amendment Act 1963: Judicial Reforms. <https://vajiramandravi.com/current-affairs/15th-constitutional-amendment-act/>

CONSTITUTION (SIXTEENTH AMENDMENT) ACT, 1963

Aspect	Details
Enacted in	1963
Article (s) and Schedules Amended	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Articles inserted: 19, 84, 173 ● Schedule Amended : 3rd
Key Amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Added “sovereignty and integrity of India” as a ground for reasonable restrictions on fundamental freedoms under Article 19. ● Modified forms of oath or affirmation for candidates seeking election to Parliament and State Legislatures. ● Required elected representatives to uphold the sovereignty and integrity of India.

The Constitution (Sixteenth Amendment) Act, 1963 was enacted in the context of rising concerns regarding national unity and secessionist tendencies in certain parts of the country. It sought to strengthen the constitutional framework by explicitly safeguarding the sovereignty and integrity of India against activities that could threaten the nation’s unity.

Prior to the amendment, Article 19 guaranteed various fundamental freedoms, including freedom of speech and expression, assembly, and association, subject to reasonable restrictions. However, “sovereignty and integrity of India” was not expressly included as a ground for imposing such restrictions, which was seen as a limitation in addressing emerging challenges to national unity.

The Sixteenth Amendment addressed this by amending Article 19 to include “sovereignty and integrity of India” as an additional ground on which the State could impose reasonable restrictions on freedoms guaranteed under clauses (1)(a), (1)(b), and (1)(c). This provided a clearer constitutional basis for regulating speech and activities that could undermine the unity of the nation.

In addition, the amendment modified Articles 84 and 173, which lay down qualifications for membership of Parliament and State Legislatures. It required candidates to take an oath or affirmation to bear true faith and allegiance to the Constitution and to uphold the sovereignty and integrity of India. This change ensured that those seeking public office were constitutionally bound to respect and preserve national unity.

The amendment did not curtail fundamental rights in a general sense but clarified the scope of permissible restrictions in light of concerns relating to national security and integrity. It reflected the constitutional balance between individual freedoms and the collective interest of preserving the unity of the State.

The Sixteenth Amendment represents a significant moment in the evolution of India’s constitutional framework, reinforcing the principle that democratic freedoms must operate within the bounds of national sovereignty and integrity.

References:

- Bombay High Court. (n.d.). Constitutional amendments. https://bombayhighcourt.nic.in/libweb/misc/coi/New-constitution_amendment.html
- iPleaders. (2022). Major Constitutional Amendments <https://blog.iplers.in/the-major-constitutional-amendment-in-indian-history/>
- Legislative Department, Ministry of Law and Justice, Government of India. (1963). The Constitution (Sixteenth Amendment) Act, 1963 (Act No. 16 of 1963). <https://www.legislative.gov.in/static/uploads/2025/07/44c47a4fe2b7c4b4e9afb4509aeba383.pdf>
- Vajiram & Ravi. (2026). 16th Constitutional Amendment Act 1963: Provisions and significance. <https://vajiramandravi.com/current-affairs/16th-constitutional-amendment-act/>

CONSTITUTION (SEVENTEENTH AMENDMENT) ACT, 1964

Aspect	Details
--------	---------

Enacted in	1964
Article (s) and Schedules Amended	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Article Amended: 31A ● Schedule Amended : 9th
Key Amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Expanded the scope of Article 31A to cover a wider range of land reform laws. ● Broadened the definition of “estate” to include various categories of land, including ryotwari and other tenures. ● Added additional state laws relating to land reforms to the Ninth Schedule. ● Provided protection to such laws from challenge on the ground of violation of Fundamental Rights.

The Constitution (Seventeenth Amendment) Act, 1964 was enacted to strengthen the constitutional protection afforded to agrarian reform laws and to address continuing legal challenges that were impeding the implementation of land redistribution policies. It formed part of a broader constitutional and legislative effort to restructure land ownership patterns and dismantle entrenched feudal systems in post-independence India.

Prior to the amendment, Article 31A protected laws relating to the acquisition of estates from being challenged on the ground of violation of Fundamental Rights. However, judicial interpretation—particularly in cases involving non-zamindari systems—had narrowed the scope of what constituted an “estate.” As a result, several categories of land, especially those under ryotwari and similar tenure systems, fell outside the protective ambit of Article 31A, leaving reform legislation vulnerable to constitutional challenge.

The Seventeenth Amendment addressed this limitation by significantly expanding the definition of “estate” under Article 31A. It brought within its scope a wider range of land tenures, including ryotwari lands and other intermediary-free holdings, thereby ensuring that laws affecting such lands would also receive constitutional protection. This expansion was crucial in extending the reach of land reforms beyond traditional zamindari systems.

In addition, the amendment added numerous state-level land reform statutes to the Ninth Schedule, thereby immunising them from judicial review on the ground that they violated Fundamental Rights. This move was intended to provide a protective constitutional shield to legislation that had already

been enacted but was facing or likely to face legal challenges. It reflected a deliberate policy choice to prioritise socio-economic transformation over strict judicial scrutiny in this domain.

The amendment did not abolish the right to property, which continued to exist as a fundamental right at the time, but it further limited the scope of judicial intervention in matters relating to agrarian reforms. It reinforced the constitutional trend, visible since the First and Fourth Amendments, of insulating redistributive legislation from legal challenges in order to facilitate structural economic change.

Importantly, the Seventeenth Amendment also contributed to the evolving constitutional debate on the balance between Parliament's amending power and the protection of Fundamental Rights. It later became part of the broader judicial discourse that culminated in landmark decisions such as [Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala](#), where the extent of Parliament's power to amend the Constitution was examined in depth.

The Seventeenth Amendment represents a critical phase in India's constitutional journey, reinforcing the State's authority to pursue land reforms while simultaneously shaping the trajectory of constitutional jurisprudence on the limits of amendment and judicial review.

References:

- Bombay High Court. (n.d.). Constitutional amendments. https://bombayhighcourt.nic.in/libweb/misc/coi/New-constitution_amendment.html
- CaseMine. Constitution (17th Amendment) Act, 1964. <https://www.casemine.com/act/in/5a979da64a93263ca60b71d6>
- iPleaders. (2022). Major Constitutional Amendments <https://blog.ipleaders.in/the-major-constitutional-amendment-in-indian-history/>
- *Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala*, AIR 1973 SC 1461. (1973). <https://indiankanoon.org/doc/257876/>

CONSTITUTION (EIGHTEENTH AMENDMENT) ACT, 1966

Aspect	Details
Enacted in	1966
Article (s) and Schedules Amended	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Article 3
Key Amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Clarified the meaning of the term “State” in Article 3. ● Specified that “State” includes Union Territories for the purpose of reorganisation. ● Enabled Parliament to reorganise Union Territories in the same manner as States.

The Constitution (Eighteenth Amendment) Act, 1966 was enacted to clarify the scope and application of Article 3 of the Constitution of India, particularly in relation to the reorganisation of Union Territories. It addressed interpretative ambiguities that had emerged in the practical exercise of Parliament’s powers to alter territorial boundaries and administrative units.

Under the original framework, Article 3 empowered Parliament to form new states, alter boundaries, and change the names of existing states. However, the provision did not explicitly define whether the term “State” included Union Territories for these purposes. As India’s administrative map continued to evolve in the years following the Seventh Amendment, this lack of clarity began to pose practical difficulties in undertaking reorganisation measures involving Union Territories.

The Eighteenth Amendment resolved this ambiguity by clarifying that, for the purposes of Article 3, the term “State” includes Union Territories. This interpretative clarification ensured that Parliament’s powers of reorganisation could be exercised uniformly across all territorial units within the Union, without requiring separate or additional constitutional mechanisms.

This change was particularly important in the context of ongoing administrative adjustments during the 1960s, when the Union was engaged in refining its territorial organisation to better reflect governance needs, regional identities, and administrative efficiency. By removing uncertainty, the amendment facilitated smoother legislative action in matters of territorial restructuring.

While the amendment was technical in nature, its implications were significant. It strengthened the flexibility of the constitutional framework by ensuring that reorganisation powers were not artificially

constrained by narrow interpretations. At the same time, it preserved the procedural safeguards embedded in Article 3, including the requirement of Presidential reference to the concerned legislature before any alteration affecting a State.

The amendment did not alter the substantive distribution of powers between the Union and the States but ensured that the constitutional scheme remained coherent and workable in practice. It reflects the Constitution's capacity to evolve through targeted clarifications that address emerging administrative realities without disturbing its foundational structure.

The Eighteenth Amendment represents a subtle yet important refinement, reinforcing Parliament's authority in matters of territorial reorganisation while maintaining the balance between flexibility and procedural accountability within India's federal system.

References:

- Bombay High Court. (n.d.). Constitutional amendments. https://bombayhighcourt.nic.in/libweb/misc/coi/New-constitution_amendment.html
- iPleaders. (2022). Major Constitutional Amendments <https://blog.ipleaders.in/the-major-constitutional-amendment-in-indian-history/>
- Legislative Department, Ministry of Law and Justice. (1966). The Constitution (Eighteenth Amendment) Act, 1966. <https://www.legislative.gov.in/static/uploads/2025/07/75c9ecd6164365d5816e0de381d33194.pdf>
- Vajiram & Ravi. (2026). Article 3 of Indian Constitution: Provisions & Amendments. <https://vajiramandravi.com/current-affairs/article-3-of-indian-constitution/>

CONSTITUTION (NINETEENTH AMENDMENT) ACT, 1966

Aspect	Details
Enacted in	1966
Article (s) and Schedules Amended	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Article 324

Key Amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Abolished Election Tribunals. ● Transferred jurisdiction over election disputes to High Courts. ● Strengthened the role of the judiciary in adjudicating election petitions. ● Integrated electoral dispute resolution into the regular judicial system.
-----------------------	---

The Constitution (Nineteenth Amendment) Act, 1966 was enacted to reform the institutional framework governing the adjudication of election disputes in India. It marked a shift from a specialised tribunal-based system to a fully judicial mechanism, reflecting a growing emphasis on consistency, independence, and procedural rigour in electoral adjudication.

Before the amendment, disputes relating to elections to Parliament and State Legislatures were adjudicated by Election Tribunals constituted under the Representation of the People Act, 1951. These tribunals were quasi-judicial bodies, often staffed by individuals with varying levels of judicial experience. Over time, concerns emerged regarding delays in disposal, lack of uniformity in decisions, and the absence of a stable, hierarchical appellate structure.

The Nineteenth Amendment addressed these concerns by abolishing Election Tribunals and vesting jurisdiction over election petitions in the High Courts. This brought election-related disputes within the domain of the established judicial system, ensuring that such matters were adjudicated by constitutionally recognised courts with well-defined procedures and standards.

This institutional shift had several important implications. First, it enhanced the credibility of the adjudicatory process by placing it in the hands of independent constitutional courts. Second, it ensured greater consistency in legal interpretation, as High Court decisions could be appealed to the Supreme Court, thereby creating a coherent appellate framework. Third, it improved procedural safeguards for parties involved in election disputes, aligning such proceedings more closely with established principles of natural justice.

The amendment also reinforced the role of the judiciary as a key guardian of the democratic process. By entrusting High Courts with the responsibility of resolving election disputes, the Constitution ensured that challenges to electoral outcomes would be addressed through a transparent, impartial, and legally robust mechanism. This contributed to strengthening public confidence in electoral institutions.

Importantly, the amendment did not alter the substantive provisions governing elections or the powers of the Election Commission under Article 324. Instead, it focused on improving the forum and process through which disputes were resolved, thereby enhancing the overall integrity of the electoral system.

The Nineteenth Amendment represents a significant institutional refinement, embedding electoral dispute resolution within the regular judicial hierarchy and reinforcing the constitutional commitment to free, fair, and credible elections.

References:

- Bombay High Court. (n.d.). Constitutional amendments. https://bombayhighcourt.nic.in/libweb/misc/coi/New-constitution_amendment.html
 - CaseMine. Constitution (19th Amendment) Act, 1966 - Full Text. <https://www.casemine.com/act/in/5a979da74a93263ca60b71d8>
 - iPleaders. (2022). Major Constitutional Amendments <https://blog.ipleaders.in/the-major-constitutional-amendment-in-indian-history/>
 - Law Commission of India. History of Electoral Reforms: 19th Amendment Analysis. <https://www.advocatekhoj.com/library/lawreports/electoralreforms/127.php>
-

CONSTITUTION (TWENTIETH AMENDMENT) ACT, 1966

Aspect	Details
Enacted in	1966
Article (s) Amended	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Article 233A (inserted)
Key Amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Validated the appointments, postings, and promotions of certain district judges.● Removed doubts regarding the legality of judicial actions taken by such judges.● Provided retrospective constitutional protection to appointments made irregularly.

The Constitution (Twentieth Amendment) Act, 1966 was enacted to address a constitutional crisis arising from judicial decisions that had cast doubt on the validity of appointments of district judges in certain states. It sought to validate past appointments and safeguard the legality of judicial proceedings conducted by such judges, thereby ensuring continuity and stability in the administration of justice.

Prior to the amendment, appointments of district judges were governed by Articles 233 and 235 of the Constitution, which required that such appointments be made by the Governor in consultation with the High Court. However, in some cases, appointments had been made without strict adherence to these constitutional requirements.

The issue came to prominence following the decision in [Chandra Mohan v. State of Uttar Pradesh](#), where the Supreme Court held that certain appointments of district judges were invalid as they did not comply with the prescribed constitutional procedure. This raised serious concerns about the validity of judgments delivered by such judges and the potential disruption of the judicial system.

To address this situation, the Twentieth Amendment inserted Article 233A into the Constitution. This provision retrospectively validated the appointments, postings, promotions, and transfers of district judges that had been made irregularly, and also upheld the validity of all judgments, decrees, and orders passed by them prior to the amendment.

The amendment thus served as a curative measure, preventing large-scale legal uncertainty and protecting the integrity of the judicial process. It ensured that past judicial actions were not invalidated solely due to procedural defects in appointments, thereby avoiding chaos in the administration of justice.

While the amendment did not alter the substantive requirements governing judicial appointments going forward, it highlighted the importance of strict adherence to constitutional procedures. At the same time, it demonstrated the Constitution's capacity to respond pragmatically to institutional crises through retrospective validation where necessary.

The Twentieth Amendment represents a significant intervention aimed at preserving judicial stability, balancing the need for constitutional compliance with the practical necessity of maintaining continuity in the legal system.

References:

- Bombay High Court. (n.d.). Constitutional amendments. https://bombayhighcourt.nic.in/libweb/misc/coi/New-constitution_amendment.html

- iPleaders. (2022). Major Constitutional Amendments <https://blog.iplayers.in/the-major-constitutional-amendment-in-indian-history/>
- Legislative Department, Ministry of Law and Justice. (1966). The Constitution (Twentieth Amendment) Act, 1966. <https://www.legislative.gov.in/static/uploads/2025/07/f81e5911e7c0855ebbc17420de69acc5.pdf>
- Supreme Court of India. (1966). Chandra Mohan v. State of Uttar Pradesh, AIR 1966 SC 1987 (1972) 2 SCC 306. <https://indiankanoon.org/doc/806713/>

CONSTITUTION (TWENTY FIRST AMENDMENT) ACT, 1967

Aspect	Details
Enacted in	1967
Schedule Amended	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Schedule 8th
Key Amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Included Sindhi as an official language in the Eighth Schedule. ● Recognised the linguistic and cultural identity of the Sindhi-speaking community. ● Expanded the list of constitutionally recognised languages.

The Constitution (Twenty-First Amendment) Act, 1967 was enacted to recognise the linguistic and cultural identity of the Sindhi-speaking community by including Sindhi in the Eighth Schedule of the Constitution. It marked a significant step in the evolution of India’s constitutional approach to linguistic diversity and cultural inclusion.

At the commencement of the Constitution in 1950, the Eighth Schedule contained a limited set of recognised languages, reflecting major linguistic groups within the country. However, several communities with distinct linguistic identities remained outside its scope. The Sindhi-speaking community, in particular, occupied a unique position. Following the Partition of India in 1947, a large section of the Sindhi population migrated to India and became geographically dispersed across various states, without a single linguistic homeland.

This absence of a territorially concentrated state made the question of linguistic recognition more complex. Unlike other languages that were often tied to specific regions or states, Sindhi lacked a defined territorial base within India. Despite this, the community maintained a strong linguistic and cultural identity, along with a rich literary and historical tradition.

The Twenty-First Amendment addressed this situation by adding Sindhi to the Eighth Schedule, thereby granting it constitutional recognition as one of the languages of India. This inclusion carried both symbolic and functional significance. Symbolically, it acknowledged the historical experiences and cultural contributions of the Sindhi community. Functionally, it enabled the promotion and development of the language through its use in education, literature, and public examinations, including those conducted by national bodies such as the Union Public Service Commission.

The amendment also reflects a broader constitutional philosophy that linguistic recognition need not be strictly tied to territorial or administrative considerations. It demonstrated that the Constitution could accommodate non-territorial linguistic identities, thereby expanding the scope of cultural inclusion within the national framework.

Importantly, the amendment did not alter the federal structure or distribution of powers but enriched the cultural dimension of the Constitution. It reinforced the idea that India's unity is rooted in its diversity, and that constitutional recognition plays a vital role in preserving and promoting that diversity.

The Twenty-First Amendment represents a meaningful step in India's constitutional journey, affirming that linguistic identity, even in the absence of territorial concentration, is worthy of recognition and protection within a pluralistic democratic system.

References:

- Bombay High Court. (n.d.). Constitutional amendments. https://bombayhighcourt.nic.in/libweb/misc/coi/New-constitution_amendment.html
 - iPleaders. (2022). Major Constitutional Amendments <https://blog.iPLEaders.in/the-major-constitutional-amendment-in-indian-history/>
 - Parliament of India. (1967). The Constitution (Twenty-First Amendment) Act, 1967. [https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/c/c0/The_Constitution_of_India_\(21st_Amendment\)_Act_1967.pdf](https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/c/c0/The_Constitution_of_India_(21st_Amendment)_Act_1967.pdf)
-

CONSTITUTION (TWENTY SECOND AMENDMENT) ACT, 1969

Aspect	Details
Enacted in	19639
Article (s) Amended	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Article amended : 275● Article Inserted : 244A, 371B
Key Amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Inserted Article 244A to enable the creation of an autonomous State within the State of Assam.● Provided for the establishment of a Legislature and Council of Ministers for such an autonomous State.● Allowed Parliament to define the structure, powers, and jurisdiction of the autonomous State.● Made provisions for financial arrangements, including grants-in-aid for such regions.

The Constitution (Twenty-Second Amendment) Act, 1969 was enacted to address regional aspirations for autonomy within certain tribal areas of Assam, particularly in the hill regions that later became Meghalaya. It sought to create a flexible constitutional mechanism that could accommodate demands for self-governance without immediately altering the territorial boundaries of existing states.

Prior to the amendment, the Constitution provided for the administration of tribal areas under the Sixth Schedule, which established Autonomous District Councils with limited legislative and administrative powers. However, growing political mobilisation in the hill regions of Assam highlighted the inadequacy of these arrangements in meeting aspirations for greater autonomy and self-rule.

The Twenty-Second Amendment responded to these demands by inserting Article 244A, which empowered Parliament to create an autonomous State within Assam. This provision allowed for the establishment of a separate Legislature and Council of Ministers for the autonomous State, thereby providing a higher degree of self-governance than what was available under the Sixth Schedule.

This mechanism was subsequently used to create the autonomous State of Meghalaya within Assam in 1970, which later became a full-fledged state in 1972. The amendment thus served as an intermediate constitutional arrangement, facilitating a gradual transition from limited autonomy to full statehood.

The amendment also made provisions for financial arrangements under Article 275, enabling the Union to provide grants-in-aid to support the administration of such autonomous regions. This ensured that the new governance structures were backed by adequate fiscal support.

Importantly, the amendment did not disrupt the federal structure but introduced a form of asymmetrical federalism, allowing different regions to have varying degrees of autonomy based on their unique socio-political contexts. It reflected the Constitution's adaptability in responding to regional diversity and political demands.

The Twenty-Second Amendment represents a significant innovation in India's constitutional framework, creating a flexible model for accommodating regional aspirations while preserving national unity and constitutional order.

References:

- Bombay High Court. (n.d.). Constitutional amendments. https://bombayhighcourt.nic.in/libweb/misc/coi/New-constitution_amendment.html
- Drishti IAS. Constitutional Promise of Autonomy: Article 244(A). <https://www.drishtiiias.com/daily-updates/daily-news-analysis/constitutional-promise-of-autonomy-article-244-a>
- iPleaders. (2022). Major Constitutional Amendments <https://blog.ipleaders.in/the-major-constitutional-amendment-in-indian-history/>
- Legislative Department, Ministry of Law and Justice. (1969). The Constitution (Twenty-Second Amendment) Act, 1969. <https://www.legislative.gov.in/static/uploads/2025/07/5d6c7ed399a157defd3b146994808380.pdf>

CONSTITUTION (TWENTY THIRD AMENDMENT) ACT, 1969

Aspect	Details
Enacted in	1970
Article (s) and	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Articles 330, 332, 333, 334

Schedules Amended	
Key Amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Extended the reservation of seats for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes in the Lok Sabha and State Legislative Assemblies. ● Extended the nomination of members of the Anglo-Indian community in legislatures. ● Modified provisions relating to representation of Anglo-Indians in State Legislative Assemblies. ● Introduced a conditional, need-based approach to Anglo-Indian nomination.

The Constitution (Twenty-Third Amendment) Act, 1969 was enacted to continue and recalibrate constitutional provisions relating to the political representation of historically disadvantaged communities. It built upon earlier amendments, particularly the Eighth Amendment, which had already extended the duration of reservations for Scheduled Castes (SCs) and Scheduled Tribes (STs), as well as the nomination of Anglo-Indian members in legislative bodies.

At the commencement of the Constitution, Article 334 had provided that such special provisions would cease after ten years, that is, in 1960. This period was first extended to 1970 by the Eighth Amendment. However, by the late 1960s, it had become evident that deep-rooted socio-economic inequalities and disparities in political participation persisted, making it premature to withdraw these safeguards.

In this context, the Twenty-Third Amendment extended the reservation of seats for SCs and STs in the House of the People and in the Legislative Assemblies of the States for a further period of ten years, that is, until 1980. This continuation reflected the constitutional commitment to ensuring meaningful representation of communities that had historically been excluded from political power structures.

A significant feature of the amendment was its treatment of the Anglo-Indian community. While it continued the provision for nomination of Anglo-Indian members to legislative bodies, it introduced an important refinement by amending Article 333. The amendment clarified that such nomination by the Governor to State Legislative Assemblies would be made only if the community was not adequately represented. This shifted the provision from an automatic entitlement to a conditional safeguard based on representational necessity.

This distinction is important, as it reflects a more calibrated constitutional approach. While the extension of SC/ST reservations remained broadly structural and time-bound, the Anglo-Indian nomination was made contingent on actual need, thereby introducing a degree of flexibility and responsiveness into the framework.

The amendment also forms part of a broader constitutional pattern in which “temporary” safeguards were periodically reassessed and extended in light of empirical realities. Rather than treating the original ten-year limit as a rigid deadline, the Constitution evolved to recognise that social transformation required sustained institutional support over a longer horizon.

Importantly, the amendment did not alter the nature of reservations or fundamentally restructure the system of representation. Instead, it reinforced the existing framework while introducing targeted refinements to ensure that it remained relevant and proportionate to contemporary conditions.

The Twenty-Third Amendment represents both continuity and constitutional maturity, preserving mechanisms of affirmative representation while refining them to better align with evolving social and political realities in India’s democratic system.

References:

- Bombay High Court. (n.d.). Constitutional amendments. https://bombayhighcourt.nic.in/libweb/misc/coi/New-constitution_amendment.html
- Drishti IAS. Removal of Anglo-Indian Reservations: Constitutional Context. <https://www.drishtiiias.com/daily-news-analysis/removal-of-anglo-indians-reservation-in-legislative-bodies>
- iPleaders. (2022). Major Constitutional Amendments <https://blog.ipleaders.in/the-major-constitutional-amendment-in-indian-history/>
- Legislative Department, Ministry of Law and Justice. (1970). The Constitution (Twenty-Third Amendment) Act, 1969. <https://www.legislative.gov.in/static/uploads/2025/07/6421aae09fc09b38fdb9c3bd9a47921c.pdf>

CONSTITUTION (TWENTY FOURTH AMENDMENT) ACT, 1971

Aspect	Details
--------	---------

Enacted in	1971
Article(s) Amended	Article 13, 368
Note	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>This Amendment was challenged in</i> His Holiness Kesavananda Bharati Sripadagalavaru vs. State of Kerala 1973 INSC 91 [1973] Supp. (1) S. C. R. 1
Key Amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affirmed Parliament's power to amend any part of the Constitution, including Fundamental Rights. • Made it obligatory for the President to give assent to Constitutional Amendment Bills. • Clarified that amendments made under Article 368 do not fall within the scope of "law" under Article 13. • Strengthened the procedure and scope of constitutional amendment.

At the time of the adoption of the Constitution, Parliament was empowered to amend any part of the Constitution through the procedure set out in Article 368. However, questions arose concerning whether this power extended to Fundamental Rights enshrined in Part III of the Constitution. This power of the Parliament had earlier been discussed during the trials of various landmark cases like the Shankari Prasad case and [Sajjan Singh v. State of Rajasthan](#). In 1971, the Indian parliament enacted the 24th constitutional amendment act. Its main goal was to overturn the Supreme Court's ruling in the Golaknath case and other instances that followed.

Article 368 of the constitution curtailed the parliament's ability to change basic rights as a result of the case's ruling. The 24th Amendment brought about a number of significant modifications to address those. The 24th Amendment to the Indian Constitution is extremely crucial. It significantly changed the balance of power between the judiciary and Parliament, particularly with regard to the protection of fundamental rights and the authority to amend the Constitution. The Golaknath judgment faced strong criticism from the government and lawmakers, who argued that it restricted Parliament's ability to implement social welfare reforms, particularly those involving wealth redistribution and the enforcement of Directive Principles of State Policy (Part IV), which often conflicted with Fundamental

Rights. Parliament maintained that the amendment power under Article 368 should extend to Fundamental Rights to adapt the Constitution to evolving societal needs.

The amendment made significant changes to Articles 13 and 368 in order to re-establish Parliament's absolute authority to amend any part of the Constitution, including Fundamental Rights, and to make the President's approval of constitutional amendment bills mandatory. It also sought to safeguard social welfare legislation from judicial invalidation and to overturn the effects of the Golaknath judgment by specifying that amendments made under Article 368 would not be considered "law" within the meaning of Article 13.

A new clause, Article 13(4), was added, declaring that the provisions of Article 13 would not apply to any constitutional amendment made under Article 368. This effectively meant that amendments passed under Article 368 would not be considered "law" under Article 13, thereby placing them beyond judicial review for violating Fundamental Rights.

The marginal heading of Article 368 was revised from "Procedure for amendment of the Constitution" to "Power of Parliament to amend the Constitution and procedure thereof." A new clause (3) was added, stating that Article 13 would not apply to any amendment made under Article 368. Additionally, the amendment made it compulsory for the President to assent to any Constitutional Amendment Bill passed by both Houses of Parliament, thereby eliminating the President's discretion to withhold approval.

The 24th Amendment reaffirmed Parliament's authority to amend any part of the Constitution, including Fundamental Rights, thereby overturning the Golaknath ruling and reinforcing parliamentary supremacy. By excluding constitutional amendments from Article 13, it limited judicial review over such amendments and created a sphere where Fundamental Rights could be altered without court intervention. Marking the beginning of a phase that expanded parliamentary power and curtailed judicial influence, it was followed by the 25th, 38th, 39th, and notably the 42nd Amendment of 1976 during the Emergency.

References

- GKToday. (n.d.). *Constitution (24th Amendment) Act, 1971*. <https://www.gktoday.in/constitution-24th-amendment-act-1971/> (gktoday.in)
- Nayak, V. (n.d.). *The Basic Structure of the Indian Constitution*. ConstitutionNet. Retrieved March 2, 2026, from <https://constitutionnet.org/vl/item/basic-structure-indian-constitution>

- Priya, K. (n.d.). *24th Constitutional Amendment: History and effect. The Amikus Qriac.*
<https://theamikusqriac.com/24th-constitutional-amendment-history-and-effect/>

CONSTITUTION (TWENTY-FIFTH AMENDMENT) ACT, 1971

Aspect	Details
Enacted in	1972
Article(s) Amended	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Article Amended : 31 • Article Inserted : 31C
Note	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This Amendment was challenged in His Holiness Kesavananda Bharati Sripadagalavaru vs. State of Kerala 1973 INSC 91 [1973] Supp. (1) S. C. R. 1
Key Amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Replaced the concept of “compensation” with “amount” in cases of compulsory acquisition of property. • Limited judicial review over the adequacy of such amount. • Inserted Article 31C to give primacy to certain Directive Principles over Fundamental Rights. • Protected laws implementing Article 39(b) and 39(c) from challenge under Articles 14, 19, and 31.

[The Constitution \(Twenty-Fifth Amendment\) Act](#), also known as the 25th Amendment, is a significant amendment which curtailed the provisions of the Right to Property enshrined in Article 31 of Part III. The 25th Amendment changed existing Article 31 and introduced a new Article 31C. The amendment was enacted in 1971 to prohibit citizens from challenging the laws related to property acquisition.

The 25th Constitutional Amendment was not the first time Article 31 was amended. The very [First Constitutional Amendment of 1951](#) also brought changes to this Article. The major reason was the complex nature of the Right to Property and which caused hindrance with various state policies. Article 31 stated that if the State acquired any property, it should provide compensation equal to the market value of the property. Though the [4th Constitutional Amendment](#) prohibited individuals

from challenging the acquisition of property by the government on the grounds of inadequate compensation. The individuals continued to challenge the government, and the Court held its position in favour of compensation.

The backdrop for this Constitutional Amendment was bank nationalisation by the Indira Gandhi-led government and the [R.C. Cooper versus Union of India](#) case. The Government in 1969 nationalised 14 private banks. R.C. Cooper was a shareholder of one such bank, and he moved to the Supreme Court on the grounds of inadequate compensation being given by the Government. The court passed the judgment in favour of Cooper and held that the nationalisation violated his right to perform any occupation. To reverse the decision given by the Supreme Court, the 25th Amendment was introduced.

The 25th Amendment substituted the word ‘compensation’ with ‘amount’. It stated that the state would provide a nominal amount on the acquisition of property, and this acquisition cannot be challenged in court on the grounds of being inadequate and a violation of the fundamental right of freedom to carry on any occupation. The amendment also introduced a new Article named 31C. This new article stated that laws passed to fulfil the aims of the Directive Principles of State Policies enshrined in Article 39 cannot be reviewed by the judiciary on the grounds of violation of fundamental rights enshrined in Article 13, Article 14 and Article 31. Thus, in this way, the 25th Amendment led to the supremacy of the Parliament over the Judiciary. Through this, the government ensured the smoother implementation of policies. The amendment vastly curtailed the property rights by not having any burden on the government to provide adequate compensation. It can also be seen as a precursor to the 44th Amendment, which omitted Article 31 and made the Right to Property a legal right in Article 300A.

References

- Government of India. (1971). *The Constitution (Twenty-fifth Amendment) Act, 1971*. National Portal of India.
<https://www.india.gov.in/my-government/constitution-india/amendments/constitution-india-twenty-fifth-amendment-act-1971>
- Government of India. (1951). *The Constitution (First Amendment) Act, 1951*.
<https://bombayhighcourt.nic.in/libweb/misc/coi/constitution/act/ACT/C001Act.pdf>
- Government of India. (1955). *The Constitution (Fourth Amendment) Act, 1955*.
<https://bombayhighcourt.nic.in/libweb/misc/coi/constitution/act/ACT/C004Act.pdf>
- *R.C. Cooper versus Union of India AIR 1970 SUPREME COURT 564*
<https://indiankanoon.org/doc/513801/>

CONSTITUTION (TWENTY SIXTH AMENDMENT) ACT, 1971

Aspect	Details
Enacted in	1971
Article(s) Amended	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Article Amended : 366● Article Inserted : 363A● Article Omitted : 291, 362
Note	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● This Amendment was challenged in His Holiness Kesavananda Bharati Sripadagalavaru vs. State of Kerala 1973 INSC 91 [1973] Supp. (1) S. C. R. 1
Key Amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Abolished privy purses and privileges of former rulers of princely states.● Inserted Article 363A to terminate recognition of rulers.● Removed constitutional guarantees relating to privy purses.● Ended special privileges and entitlements of former princely rulers.

With the 26th Constitutional Amendment, the Indian government abolished the privileges as well as the privy purses granted to the former rulers of the Princely States. The government sought to remove the privileges due to the understanding that an egalitarian social structure is incompatible with the idea of rulership, which entails privy purses and unique privileges unrelated to any contemporary roles or social objectives. As a result, the government chose to end the erstwhile Indian States' rulers' rights and privy purses. In addition to amending the relevant sections of the Constitution, a new article was added for this purpose in order to explicitly end the recognition that has already been given to these Rulers, abolish privy purses, and eliminate all rights, obligations, and liabilities related to them. Thus, this bill was passed.

Articles 291 and 362 provided royal families with a tax-free privy purse, which was roughly one-fourth of their previous earnings, in exchange for ceding their authority.

The majority of members of Congress rejected paying privy purses. However, on [October 12, 1949](#), Sardar Patel gave a powerful speech to the Constituent Assembly. He urged members to understand

that this was a minor cost and a '[Bloodless Revolution](#)' to ensure India's integration. Both these articles were omitted by the 26th Amendment.

Article 363 barred judiciary's involvement or interference in disputes arising out of certain treaties, agreements or matters regarding Privy purses. A new article, [Article 363A](#) was added to this, which explicitly declared the abolition of any privileges or privy purses granted to the then and future rulers of Princely states and stripped them of their titles.

However, there was an important ruling regarding royal families' rights to maintain temples. A two-judge panel ruled that the death of the ruler, who signed the accession document with the Indian government in 1949, which united the former princely state of Travancore with the Indian union, does not terminate the royal family's Shebaitship (the authority to care for and oversee the temple and the deity). Additionally, the royal family's Shebait rights would not be affected by the 26th Amendment's abolition of the royal family's rights and privileges.

References

- CaseMine. (n.d.). *Constitution (26th Amendment) Act, 1971*.
<https://www.casemine.com/act/in/5a979da74a93263ca60b71df>
- iPleaders. (2022). Major Constitutional Amendments
<https://blog.ipleaders.in/the-major-constitutional-amendment-in-indian-history/>
- OptimizeIAS Team. (2020, July 14). *26th constitutional amendment*.
<https://optimizeias.com/26th-constitutional-amendment/>

CONSTITUTION (TWENTY SEVENTH AMENDMENT) ACT, 1971

Aspect	Details
Enacted in	1972
Article(s) Amended	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Article Amended : 239A, 240,● Article Inserted : 239B, 371C
Key Amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Reorganised certain North-Eastern territories within the Union.● Provided for legislative and administrative arrangements in Union Territories.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Inserted Article 239B empowering administrators to promulgate ordinances.● Strengthened the framework for governance of Union Territories.
--	---

The Constitution (Twenty-Seventh Amendment) Act, 1971 was enacted to facilitate administrative reorganisation in the North-Eastern region and to strengthen the constitutional framework governing Union Territories. It operated in tandem with the North-Eastern Areas (Reorganisation) Act, 1971, which marked a major restructuring of the region in response to longstanding political, ethnic, and administrative demands.

In the years following independence, the North-East presented unique governance challenges due to its geographical isolation, ethnic diversity, and distinct historical trajectories. Existing constitutional arrangements, including those under the Sixth Schedule, provided a degree of autonomy through Autonomous District Councils, but were increasingly seen as insufficient to meet evolving aspirations for self-governance and political representation.

The Twenty-Seventh Amendment addressed these challenges by strengthening the constitutional basis for differentiated governance structures. It amended Article 239A to expand Parliament's authority to establish legislatures and Councils of Ministers for Union Territories, thereby enabling the introduction of representative institutions where necessary. This was particularly important in territories transitioning towards greater autonomy or statehood.

A key feature of the amendment was the insertion of Article 239B, which empowered the Administrator of a Union Territory to promulgate ordinances when the legislature was not in session. This provision mirrored the ordinance-making powers available at the Union and State levels, ensuring continuity of governance while retaining ultimate control with the President.

Further, amendments to Articles 240 and 241 refined the scope of administrative and judicial arrangements applicable to Union Territories. These changes ensured that the constitutional framework could accommodate varying institutional needs, including the extension or modification of High Court jurisdiction and the issuance of regulations for governance.

The amendment played a crucial enabling role in the reorganisation of the North-East, which led to the elevation of Manipur and Tripura to full statehood, the creation of Meghalaya as an autonomous entity (later a state), and the restructuring of other territories such as Mizoram and Arunachal Pradesh

(then known as NEFA). It thus supported a phased and flexible transition towards more representative political structures.

Importantly, the amendment reflects a deeper constitutional principle—India’s adoption of asymmetrical federalism. Rather than imposing a uniform governance model, the Constitution allowed for tailored institutional arrangements based on regional needs, thereby balancing unity with diversity.

The amendment did not alter the core federal structure but expanded its flexibility, ensuring that governance mechanisms could evolve alongside political realities. It demonstrated the Constitution’s capacity to respond to complex regional dynamics through calibrated institutional innovation.

The Twenty-Seventh Amendment represents a significant step in India’s constitutional evolution, enabling more responsive governance in the North-East while reinforcing the broader framework of cooperative and asymmetrical federalism.

References:

- Bombay High Court. (n.d.). Constitutional amendments. https://bombayhighcourt.nic.in/libweb/misc/coi/New-constitution_amendment.html
- iPleaders. (2022). Major Constitutional Amendments <https://blog.ipleaders.in/the-major-constitutional-amendment-in-indian-history/>
- Legislative Department, Ministry of Law and Justice. (1971). The Constitution (Twenty-Seventh Amendment) Act, 1971. <https://www.legislative.gov.in/static/uploads/2025/07/5eecdd73586cdaabe3ffc54ed2ab10f8.pdf>

CONSTITUTION (TWENTY EIGHTH AMENDMENT) ACT, 1972

Aspect	Details
Enacted in	1972
Article(s) Amended	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Article Inserted : 312A● Article Omitted : 314

Key Amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Abolished special constitutional protections and privileges of members of the Indian Civil Service (ICS). ● Omitted Article 314, which had safeguarded service conditions of pre-independence civil servants. ● Enabled the government to regulate service conditions of all civil servants under a uniform framework. ● Strengthened the authority of Parliament to manage All India Services.
-----------------------	--

The Constitution (Twenty-Eighth Amendment) Act, 1972 was enacted to remove special constitutional protections that had been granted to members of the pre-independence civil services, particularly the Indian Civil Service (ICS). It marked a significant step in aligning the administrative structure of independent India with the principles of equality and uniformity under a republican constitutional order.

At the time of independence, members of the ICS and certain other services had been assured protection of their service conditions as part of the transition from colonial administration to sovereign governance. These guarantees were incorporated into the Constitution under Article 314, which provided that their rights and privileges would not be varied to their disadvantage.

Over time, however, these special protections came to be viewed as inconsistent with the evolving administrative and constitutional framework of India. The continuation of differential service conditions for a specific class of civil servants was increasingly seen as incompatible with the principles of equality and uniform service standards across the public administration.

The Twenty-Eighth Amendment addressed this by omitting Article 314, thereby removing the constitutional guarantee protecting the service conditions of members of the former ICS and similar services. This enabled the government to bring all civil servants under a common regulatory framework, subject to laws and rules made by Parliament and the executive.

The amendment also reinforced the authority of Parliament in relation to the creation and regulation of All India Services under Article 312. It ensured that service conditions, disciplinary control, and administrative structures could be adapted to meet the needs of a modern, democratic state without being constrained by legacy provisions from the colonial era.

Importantly, the amendment did not undermine the institutional role of the civil services but sought to modernise and rationalise their legal framework. It reflected a transition from a system of protected colonial-era privileges to one based on uniformity, accountability, and constitutional equality.

The Twenty-Eighth Amendment represents a significant moment in the evolution of India's administrative framework, completing the process of integrating colonial-era services into a unified and democratically governed civil service structure.

References:

- Bombay High Court. (n.d.). Constitutional amendments.
https://bombayhighcourt.nic.in/libweb/misc/coi/New-constitution_amendment.html
- Constitution of India. Article 314: Protection of Existing Officers (Repealed).
<https://www.constitutionofindia.net/articles/article-314-provision-for-protection-of-existing-officers-of-certain-services/>
- India.gov.in. The Constitution (Twenty-eighth Amendment) Act, 1972.
<https://www.india.gov.in/my-government/constitution-india/amendments/constitution-india-twenty-eighth-amendment-act-1972>
- iPleaders. (2022). Major Constitutional Amendments
<https://blog.ipleaders.in/the-major-constitutional-amendment-in-indian-history/>

CONSTITUTION (TWENTY NINTH AMENDMENT) ACT, 1972

Aspect	Details
Enacted in	1972
Schedule Amended	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Schedule Amended : 9th
Note	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● <i>This Amendment was challenged in</i> His Holiness Kesavananda Bharati Sripadagalavaru vs. State of Kerala 1973 INSC 91 [1973] Supp. (1) S. C. R. 1

Key Amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Added two Kerala land reform laws to the Ninth Schedule.● Provided constitutional protection to these laws from challenge on the ground of violation of Fundamental Rights.● Strengthened the State’s authority to implement agrarian reforms.
-----------------------	--

The Constitution (Twenty-Ninth Amendment) Act, 1972 was enacted to provide constitutional protection to key land reform legislation enacted by the State of Kerala. It formed part of a broader effort to insulate socio-economic reform measures from judicial challenges, particularly those relating to property rights and equality.

Prior to the amendment, several land reform laws across states had faced constitutional challenges on the ground that they violated Fundamental Rights, especially the right to property under Article 31 and the right to equality under Article 14. Although earlier amendments had created protective mechanisms such as Article 31A and the Ninth Schedule, courts continued to scrutinise certain laws that fell outside or at the margins of these protections.

The Twenty-Ninth Amendment addressed this by adding two specific Kerala statutes—the Kerala Land Reforms Act, 1963 and its amending legislation of 1969—to the Ninth Schedule. By placing these laws within the Ninth Schedule, the amendment sought to immunise them from being challenged in courts on the ground that they violated Fundamental Rights.

This step was particularly significant in the context of Kerala’s ambitious land reform programme, which aimed to abolish tenancy, redistribute land, and reduce concentration of ownership. These reforms were central to the State’s socio-economic policy but had encountered legal resistance. The amendment ensured that such legislation could be implemented without the risk of being invalidated by judicial review on specified grounds.

The amendment also became a focal point in the evolving constitutional debate on the limits of Parliament’s amending power. It was directly challenged in [Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala](#), where the Supreme Court examined whether Parliament could place laws beyond judicial scrutiny by including them in the Ninth Schedule. This case ultimately led to the formulation of the Basic Structure Doctrine, which placed substantive limits on Parliament’s power to amend the Constitution.

Thus, while the Twenty-Ninth Amendment was aimed at protecting specific land reform laws, its broader constitutional significance lies in its role in shaping one of the most important doctrines in

Indian constitutional law. It highlights the tension between legislative efforts to pursue socio-economic justice and judicial efforts to preserve constitutional limits.

The Twenty-Ninth Amendment represents a critical intersection of land reform policy and constitutional theory, contributing both to the implementation of agrarian reforms and to the development of enduring constitutional principles.

References:

- Bombay High Court. (n.d.). Constitutional amendments.
https://bombayhighcourt.nic.in/libweb/misc/coi/New-constitution_amendment.html
- iPleaders. (2022). Major Constitutional Amendments
<https://blog.ipleaders.in/the-major-constitutional-amendment-in-indian-history/>
- Legislative Department, Ministry of Law and Justice, Government of India. (1972). The Constitution (Twenty-ninth Amendment) Act, 1972 (Act No. 29 of 1972).
<https://www.legislative.gov.in/static/uploads/2025/07/32c2b9a302c83703871e081351af5f49.pdf>

CONSTITUTION (THIRTIETH AMENDMENT) ACT, 1972

Aspect	Details
Enacted in	1973
Article(s) Amended	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Article 133
Key Amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Revised the conditions for appeals to the Supreme Court in civil cases.● Removed the fixed monetary threshold requirement for appeals.● Introduced a certification-based mechanism by High Courts.● Enabled appeals where the case involves a substantial question of law of general importance.

The Constitution (Thirtieth Amendment) Act, 1972 was enacted to reform the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of India in civil matters. It aimed to move away from a rigid, value-based system of appeals towards a more principled and jurisprudence-oriented framework.

Prior to the amendment, Article 133 allowed appeals to the Supreme Court from High Court judgments in civil cases primarily based on a monetary threshold. Only cases involving a specified minimum value could be appealed, regardless of the legal significance of the issues involved. This approach often excluded cases raising important legal questions while allowing appeals in matters of limited jurisprudential value solely because of their financial magnitude.

The Thirtieth Amendment addressed this limitation by amending Article 133 to remove the monetary threshold and replacing it with a certification-based system. Under the revised provision, an appeal to the Supreme Court could be made if the High Court certified that the case involved a “substantial question of law of general importance” and that, in its opinion, the question needed to be decided by the Supreme Court.

This shift marked a significant reorientation of the Court’s appellate jurisdiction. It ensured that access to the Supreme Court in civil matters would be determined by the legal importance of the issues rather than the monetary value of the dispute. As a result, the Court’s role as a constitutional and interpretative authority was strengthened.

The amendment also contributed to a more efficient use of judicial resources by filtering out appeals that lacked broader legal significance. It aligned the appellate process with the Supreme Court’s primary function of settling important questions of law and ensuring uniformity in legal interpretation across the country.

Importantly, the amendment did not restrict access to justice but restructured the pathway to the apex court in a manner that prioritised substantive legal questions over economic considerations. It reflected a maturing constitutional approach to judicial administration and appellate review.

The Thirtieth Amendment represents a crucial step in the evolution of India’s judicial system, reinforcing the Supreme Court’s role as the final arbiter of significant legal questions while ensuring a more rational and principled appellate framework.

References:

- Bombay High Court. (n.d.). Constitutional amendments. https://bombayhighcourt.nic.in/libweb/misc/coi/New-constitution_amendment.html
- Eastern Book Company. Constitution (Thirtieth Amendment) Act, 1972.

<https://www.ebc-india.com/lawyer/articles/73v2a2.htm>

- iPleaders. (2022). Major Constitutional Amendments

<https://blog.iplayers.in/the-major-constitutional-amendment-in-indian-history/>

THE CONSTITUTION (THIRTY-FIRST AMENDMENT) ACT, 1973

Aspect	Details
Enacted in	1973
Article(s) Amended	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Article 81, 330 and 332
Key Amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Increased the maximum strength of the Lok Sabha from 525 to 545 members.• Provided for up to 530 representatives from States and up to 20 from Union Territories.• Retained the provision for nomination of two members of the Anglo-Indian community by the President.• Adjusted provisions relating to reservation of seats for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes.

[The Constitution \(Thirty-First Amendment\) Act of 1973](#) is a crucial amendment that increased the number of seats in the Lok Sabha. This amendment made changes to Article 81 of the Indian Constitution and increased the Lok Sabha seats from 500 to 525. The major reason for this amendment was the North-Eastern Areas (Reorganisation) Act, 1971 and the country's increasing population. To maintain the population ratio, an amendment was made to Article 81.

[Article 81](#) of the Indian Constitution deals with the Composition of the House of the People (Lok Sabha). Article 81 originally stated that the maximum limit of directly elected MPs from states in the Lok Sabha should not exceed 500, with 25 members representing Union Territories. The article stated the necessary criteria to form a constituency. For a maximum of 7,50,000 of the population and a minimum of 5,00,000 of the population, one member should be allotted. Additionally, the ratio between members and the population should be practicable.

The 31st amendment, in its statement of objective and reason, stated that due to the [North-Eastern \(Reorganisation\) Act of 1971](#), the number of seats allocated to each state has

increased from 500 to 506. The actual number of members before the amendment was 522, with 489 from 15 major states, 17 from 6 minor states and 16 from UTs. Citing Clause 2 of Article 81, the Parliament felt the need to readjust the number of members for a practicable ratio between population and members. Through this amendment, the Lok Sabha seats were increased from 500 to 525. The members allocated to Union Territories decreased from 25 to 20.

The amendment also brought some changes to Article 330, which deals with the representation of the Scheduled Caste and the Scheduled tribes in the Assembly. The provisions of this article, Lok Sabha seats were reserved for the state of Nagaland. However, citing the Census of 1971, the Parliament decided that provisions of Article 330 should not apply to the states of Nagaland, Meghalaya, Arunachal Pradesh and Mizoram (Both UTs at that time) because all of these States have near to 80 or more percent of tribal population.

References

- Constitution of India. (n.d.). *Article 81: Composition of the House of the People*. <https://www.constitutionofindia.net/articles/article-81-composition-of-the-house-of-the-people/>
- Government of India. (1973). *The Constitution (Thirty-First Amendment) Act, 1973*. Bombay High Court <https://bombayhighcourt.nic.in/libweb/misc/coi/constitution/act/ACT/C031Act.pdf>
- Government of India. (1971). North-Eastern (Reorganisation) Act of 1971 (*Act No. 81 of 1971*). India Code. <https://www.indiacode.nic.in/bitstream/123456789/1534/1/A1971-81.pdf>

THE CONSTITUTION (THIRTY SECOND AMENDMENT) ACT, 1973

Aspect	Details
Enacted in	1974
Article(s) and Schedules Amended	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Article Amended : 371 ● Article Inserted : 371D, 371E ● Schedule Amended : 7th
Note	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>This Amendment was challenged in P. Sambamurthy & Ors. Etc. Etc. vs. State of Andhra Pradesh</i>

	<p>& Anr. 1986 INSC 283 [1987] 1 S.C.R. 879</p>
<p>Key Amendments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Inserted Article 371D to provide special provisions for the State of Andhra Pradesh. ● Ensured equitable opportunities in public employment and education across different regions of the State. ● Empowered the President to issue orders for local cadres and allocation of posts. ● Provided for the establishment of administrative tribunals for service matters. ● Inserted Article 371E to enable the establishment of a Central University in Andhra Pradesh.

The Constitution (Thirty-Second Amendment) Act, 1973 was enacted to address regional disparities within the State of Andhra Pradesh, particularly in matters of public employment and educational opportunities. It emerged in the backdrop of regional movements and demands for equitable distribution of resources and opportunities among different parts of the State, especially between Telangana and other regions.

Prior to the amendment, disparities in access to government jobs and educational institutions had led to political unrest and demands for safeguards to ensure fair representation. Existing constitutional provisions did not provide a sufficiently tailored mechanism to address these intra-state inequalities, which required a more specific and enforceable framework.

The Thirty-Second Amendment addressed these concerns by inserting Article 371D, which empowered the President to make orders ensuring equitable opportunities and facilities for people belonging to different regions of the State. These orders could provide for the creation of local cadres in public services, allocation of posts, and reservation of seats in educational institutions on a regional basis.

A key feature of Article 371D was the provision for the establishment of administrative tribunals to adjudicate disputes relating to public employment under these special arrangements. This mechanism was designed to provide speedy and specialised resolution of service-related grievances, thereby reducing the burden on regular courts.

The amendment also inserted Article 371E, which enabled the establishment of a Central University in Andhra Pradesh. This reflected an effort to strengthen higher education infrastructure as part of a broader strategy to address regional imbalances.

Importantly, the amendment represents a clear instance of asymmetrical federalism, where specific constitutional provisions are tailored to address the unique socio-political conditions of a particular state. It demonstrates the Constitution’s flexibility in responding not only to inter-state but also intra-state disparities.

The amendment did not alter the broader federal structure but introduced targeted safeguards within a state to promote balanced regional development and social stability. It reflects an evolving understanding that equality in a diverse society may require differentiated constitutional measures.

The Thirty-Second Amendment represents a significant effort to institutionalise regional equity within a state framework, balancing the principles of uniform governance with the need for context-specific constitutional solutions.

References

- Bombay High Court. (n.d.). Constitutional amendments. https://bombayhighcourt.nic.in/libweb/misc/coi/New-constitution_amendment.html
- CaseMine. Andhra Pradesh Presidential Orders under Article 371D. <https://www.casemine.com/act/in/5a979da74a93263ca60b71e4>
- GKToday. Article 371D: Regional Equity in Andhra Pradesh. <https://www.gktoday.in/article-371d/>
- iPleaders. (2022). Major Constitutional Amendments <https://blog.ipleaders.in/the-major-constitutional-amendment-in-indian-history/>

THE CONSTITUTION (THIRTY THIRD AMENDMENT) ACT, 1973

Aspect	Details
Enacted in	1974
Article(s) and Schedules Amended	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Article 101 and 190
Key Amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Regulated the resignation of Members of Parliament and State Legislatures. ● Empowered the Speaker/Chairman to verify the voluntariness

	<p>and genuineness of resignations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Allowed rejection of resignations that are not voluntary or genuine. ● Strengthened safeguards against coerced or manipulated resignations.
--	--

The Constitution (Thirty-Third Amendment) Act, 1974 was enacted to address concerns relating to the resignation of members of legislative bodies, particularly the possibility of resignations being obtained through coercion, inducement, or political pressure. It aimed to ensure that such resignations reflected the genuine and voluntary decision of the elected representative.

Prior to the amendment, Articles 101 and 190 provided that a member of Parliament or a State Legislature could resign by submitting a written resignation to the Speaker or Chairman. However, these provisions did not expressly empower the presiding officer to examine whether the resignation was made voluntarily and in good faith. This created the risk of misuse, especially in politically sensitive situations.

The Thirty-Third Amendment addressed this gap by amending Articles 101 and 190 to authorise the Speaker or Chairman to verify the voluntariness and genuineness of a resignation. If the presiding officer is satisfied that the resignation is not voluntary or is otherwise not genuine, they may refuse to accept it.

This change introduced an important procedural safeguard, ensuring that elected representatives are not forced out of office through undue influence or manipulation. It also helped preserve the stability of legislative bodies by preventing abrupt or engineered vacancies.

At the same time, the amendment balanced this safeguard with the autonomy of elected representatives by allowing resignations to be accepted promptly when they are found to be genuine. The role of the presiding officer thus became both protective and facilitative.

The amendment did not alter the structure or composition of legislative bodies but strengthened the integrity of the processes governing membership. It reflects a broader constitutional concern with maintaining the independence of elected representatives and the proper functioning of democratic institutions.

The Thirty-Third Amendment represents a targeted institutional reform, ensuring that the resignation process within legislatures remains fair, transparent, and resistant to misuse.

References:

- Bombay High Court. (n.d.). Constitutional amendments.
https://bombayhighcourt.nic.in/libweb/misc/coi/New-constitution_amendment.html

- GKToday. Article 101: Vacation of Seats.
<https://www.gktoday.in/article-101/>
- iPleaders. (2022). Major Constitutional Amendments
<https://blog.ipleaders.in/the-major-constitutional-amendment-in-indian-history/>
- Ministry of External Affairs. Part V - The Union (Articles 101-190).
<https://www.mea.gov.in/Images/pdf1/Part5.pdf>

THE CONSTITUTION (THIRTY FOURTH AMENDMENT) ACT, 1974

Aspect	Details
Enacted in	1974
Schedules Amended	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Schedule 9th
Note	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>This Amendment was challenged in</i> Glanrock Estate (P) Ltd. vs. State of Tamil Nadu 2010 INSC 589 [2010] 12 S.C.R. 597
Key Amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Added multiple land reform laws to the Ninth Schedule. ● Provided constitutional protection to these laws from challenge on the ground of violation of Fundamental Rights. ● Strengthened the State's ability to implement agrarian reforms.

The Constitution (Thirty-Fourth Amendment) Act, 1974 was enacted to extend constitutional protection to a number of land reform laws enacted by various states. It formed part of a continuing legislative strategy to safeguard socio-economic reform measures from judicial scrutiny, particularly in relation to property rights and equality.

Following independence, land reform emerged as a central policy objective aimed at dismantling feudal landholding patterns, redistributing land, and promoting social justice. However, many such laws were challenged in courts on the ground that they violated Fundamental Rights, especially the right to property under Article 31 and the right to equality under Article 14.

To address these challenges, the Constitution had earlier introduced mechanisms such as Article 31A and the Ninth Schedule, which provided immunity to certain laws from being invalidated on

the ground of inconsistency with Fundamental Rights. Despite these protections, states continued to face legal hurdles in implementing land reform policies, particularly when new legislation was enacted.

The Thirty-Fourth Amendment responded to this situation by adding a substantial number of state land reform statutes to the Ninth Schedule. By doing so, it ensured that these laws would be protected from judicial review on specified grounds, thereby enabling their effective implementation without the risk of being struck down by courts.

This amendment reinforced the constitutional trend of prioritising socio-economic objectives over individual property rights in the context of agrarian reform. It reflected a policy choice to insulate redistributive legislation from prolonged litigation and to accelerate the process of economic transformation in rural areas.

At the same time, the continued expansion of the Ninth Schedule contributed to an evolving constitutional debate on the limits of Parliament's amending power and the scope of judicial review. This issue would later be addressed in landmark decisions such as [Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala](#) and subsequent cases, which examined whether such immunisation could override the basic structure of the Constitution.

The amendment did not introduce new principles but extended existing constitutional mechanisms to a broader set of laws. It reflects the iterative nature of constitutional development, where earlier frameworks are expanded to meet continuing policy challenges.

The Thirty-Fourth Amendment represents a continuation of India's land reform agenda within the constitutional framework, reinforcing the State's authority to pursue redistributive policies while contributing to the ongoing discourse on constitutional limits and judicial review.

References:

- Bombay High Court. (n.d.). Constitutional amendments. https://bombayhighcourt.nic.in/libweb/misc/coi/New-constitution_amendment.html
- GKToday. (2018, February 24). Article 31A. <https://www.gktoday.in/article-31a/>
- iPleaders. (2022). Major Constitutional Amendments <https://blog.ipleaders.in/the-major-constitutional-amendment-in-indian-history/>
- LegalDesire. (2020, June 23). Constitutional provisions on agrarian reform legislation. <https://legaldesire.com/constitutional-provisions-on-agrarian-reform-legislation/>

Aspect	Details
Enacted in	1975
Article (s) and Schedules Amended	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Article Amended : 80, 81 ● Schedule Inserted : 10th ● Article Inserted : 2A
Key Amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Introduced the concept of an “Associate State” within the Union of India. ● Granted Sikkim the status of an Associate State. ● Inserted Article 2A to provide for the admission of Sikkim as an Associate State. ● Inserted a new Tenth Schedule to define the terms and conditions of this association.

The Constitution (Thirty-Fifth Amendment) Act, 1974 was enacted to provide a unique constitutional arrangement for the integration of Sikkim into the Indian Union. It marked an intermediate stage in Sikkim’s constitutional evolution, creating a special status that fell short of full statehood but went beyond a conventional external relationship.

Prior to the amendment, Sikkim functioned as a protectorate of India, with its internal administration largely governed by its own institutions while India exercised control over defence, external affairs, and communications. However, growing political developments within Sikkim, including demands for greater democratic representation and closer integration with India, necessitated a new constitutional framework.

The Thirty-Fifth Amendment addressed this by introducing Article 2A, which enabled the admission of Sikkim as an “Associate State” of India. This was a novel constitutional category, not previously envisaged in the Constitution, designed to accommodate Sikkim’s distinct political status while initiating its integration into the Indian constitutional system.

In addition, the amendment inserted a new Tenth Schedule, which laid down the terms and conditions governing Sikkim’s association with India. This included provisions relating to its representation in Parliament, the extent of application of Indian laws, and the structure of its internal governance during the transitional phase.

This arrangement allowed Sikkim to participate in certain aspects of India’s constitutional and political framework while retaining elements of its existing institutional structure. It represented a carefully calibrated approach, balancing the need for integration with sensitivity to local political conditions and identity.

Importantly, the amendment did not establish a permanent constitutional status but served as a transitional mechanism. It paved the way for Sikkim’s eventual full integration as a state of India through the subsequent Thirty-Sixth Amendment in 1975.

The Thirty-Fifth Amendment represents a unique experiment in constitutional design, demonstrating the flexibility of the Indian Constitution in accommodating non-traditional forms of political integration while maintaining the broader framework of the Union.

References:

- Bombay High Court. (n.d.). Constitutional amendments. https://bombayhighcourt.nic.in/libweb/misc/coi/New-constitution_amendment.html
- Drishti IAS. (2025, June 1). 50th anniversary of Sikkim's integration with India. <https://www.drishtiias.com/daily-updates/daily-news-analysis/50th-anniversary-of-sikkim-s-integration-with-india>
- iPleaders. (2022). Major Constitutional Amendments <https://blog.ipleaders.in/the-major-constitutional-amendment-in-indian-history/>
- Testbook. (2026, March 15). Sikkim became an associate state of the Indian Union through. <https://testbook.com/question-answer/sikkim-became-an-associate-state-of-the-indian-uni--5efdf3bb1bbba50d17b53814>

THE CONSTITUTION (THIRTY SIXTH AMENDMENT) ACT, 1975

Aspect	Details
Enacted in	1975
Article (s) and Schedules Amended	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Article Amended : 80,81 ● Schedule Amended : 1st, 4th ● Article Inserted : 371F ● Scheldule Omitted : 10 ● Article Ommited : 2A
Key Amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Granted full statehood to Sikkim within the Union of India. ● Inserted Article 371F providing special provisions for the State of Sikkim. ● Amended the First Schedule to include Sikkim as a State. ● Provided representation for Sikkim in Parliament through the Fourth Schedule. ● Removed the earlier “Associate State” framework introduced by

	the 35th Amendment.
--	---------------------

The Constitution (Thirty-Sixth Amendment) Act, 1975 was enacted to complete the integration of Sikkim into the Indian Union by granting it full statehood. It marked the culmination of a phased constitutional process that began with the Thirty-Fifth Amendment, which had introduced Sikkim as an Associate State.

Prior to this amendment, Sikkim had a distinct political status. It functioned as a protectorate of India and, following the Thirty-Fifth Amendment, as an Associate State with limited integration into the constitutional framework. However, internal political developments, including demands for democratic reforms and closer alignment with India, accelerated the move towards full statehood.

The Thirty-Sixth Amendment addressed this by omitting Article 2A and the Tenth Schedule introduced by the earlier amendment, thereby dismantling the Associate State framework. It simultaneously amended the First Schedule to include Sikkim as a full-fledged State of India and amended the Fourth Schedule to provide for its representation in the Council of States (Rajya Sabha).

A key feature of the amendment was the insertion of Article 371F, which provided special constitutional provisions tailored to Sikkim's unique historical and political circumstances. These included safeguards relating to the continuation of existing laws, protection of local customs and institutions, and provisions ensuring political representation and administrative continuity during the transition.

The amendment thus combined formal integration with constitutional flexibility, ensuring that Sikkim's distinctive identity and institutional arrangements were respected even as it became part of the Union. It represents a clear instance of asymmetrical federalism, where specific provisions are crafted to address the needs of a particular state.

Importantly, the amendment did not merely alter territorial boundaries but effected a fundamental change in Sikkim's constitutional status, bringing it fully within the framework of Indian federalism. It ensured that democratic governance, constitutional rights, and institutional structures applicable to other states were extended to Sikkim.

The Thirty-Sixth Amendment represents a significant moment in India's constitutional and political history, demonstrating the Constitution's capacity to accommodate diverse paths to integration while maintaining unity, stability, and democratic governance.

References:

- Bombay High Court. (n.d.). Constitutional amendments. https://bombayhighcourt.nic.in/libweb/misc/coi/New-constitution_amendment.html
- Civildaily. (2025, May 16). 50 years of Sikkim's integration with India. <https://www.civildaily.com/news/50-years-of-sikkims-integration-with-india/>
- CaseMine. (n.d.). Constitution (36th Amendment) Act, 1975. <https://www.casemine.com/act/in/5a979da74a93263ca60b71e9>
- iPleaders. (2022). Major Constitutional Amendments <https://blog.iplayers.in/the-major-constitutional-amendment-in-indian-history/>

THE CONSTITUTION (THIRTY SEVENTH AMENDMENT) ACT, 1975

Aspect	Details
Enacted in	1975
Article (s) Amended	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Article 239A, 240
Key Amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Provided for the establishment of a Legislative Assembly and Council of Ministers for Arunachal Pradesh.● Extended representative governance to the Union Territory.● Enabled greater local participation in administration.

The Constitution (Thirty-Seventh Amendment) Act, 1975 was enacted to introduce a representative form of governance in Arunachal Pradesh, which was then a Union Territory administered directly by the Centre. It marked an important step in extending democratic institutions to regions that had previously been governed through largely administrative mechanisms.

Prior to the amendment, Arunachal Pradesh (formerly known as the North-East Frontier Agency or NEFA) was administered without an elected legislature. Governance was primarily carried out by the Union government through appointed administrators, with limited scope for local political participation. However, as the region evolved politically and administratively, there was a growing recognition of the need to introduce representative institutions.

The Thirty-Seventh Amendment addressed this by extending the application of Article 239A to Arunachal Pradesh, thereby enabling the creation of a Legislative Assembly and a Council of Ministers for the Union Territory. This provided a constitutional basis for limited self-governance, allowing elected representatives to participate in the legislative and executive processes.

This development was significant in the broader context of India's approach to governing the North-Eastern region. Rather than immediately granting full statehood, the Constitution adopted a phased approach, introducing representative institutions as an intermediate step towards greater autonomy. This allowed administrative systems to evolve gradually while maintaining overall stability.

The amendment also reflects the principle of asymmetrical federalism, where different regions are accorded varying degrees of autonomy based on their specific historical, geographical, and political conditions. In the case of Arunachal Pradesh, the introduction of a legislature represented a move towards integrating the region more fully into the democratic framework of the Union.

While the amendment did not grant full statehood, it laid the institutional foundation for future developments. Arunachal Pradesh would eventually attain full statehood in 1987, making this amendment an important transitional milestone in its constitutional journey.

The Thirty-Seventh Amendment represents a significant step in expanding democratic governance to previously underrepresented regions, reinforcing the Constitution's commitment to gradual and inclusive political integration.

References:

- Arunachal Pradesh Public Service Commission. (n.d.). Constitutional history of Arunachal Pradesh. <https://appsc.gov.in/Index/history>
- Bombay High Court. (n.d.). Constitutional amendments. https://bombayhighcourt.nic.in/libweb/misc/coi/New-constitution_amendment.html
- CaseMine. (n.d.). Constitution (37th Amendment) Act, 1975. <https://www.casemine.com/act/in/5a979da84a93263ca60b71ea>
- iPleaders. (2022). Major Constitutional Amendments <https://blog.ipleaders.in/the-major-constitutional-amendment-in-indian-history/>

Aspect	Details
Enacted in	1975
Article (s) Amended	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Article 123, 213, 239B, 352, 356, 359, 360
Key Amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Made the satisfaction of the President and Governors in certain matters final and conclusive. • Barred judicial review of proclamations of Emergency under Article 352. • Extended similar immunity to proclamations under Articles 356 (President’s Rule) and 360 (Financial Emergency). • Protected the ordinance-making powers of the President and Governors from judicial scrutiny.

The Constitution (Thirty-Eighth Amendment) Act, 1975 was enacted during the period of Emergency and sought to significantly curtail the scope of judicial review in relation to key executive actions. It marked a decisive shift towards strengthening executive authority by insulating certain constitutional functions from judicial scrutiny.

Before the amendment, the exercise of powers under provisions such as Article 352 (National Emergency), Article 356 (President’s Rule), and Article 360 (Financial Emergency) was formally based on the “satisfaction” of the President. While this satisfaction was understood to involve executive discretion, courts had begun to examine whether such powers could be subject to limited judicial review, particularly in cases of mala fide or misuse.

The Thirty-Eighth Amendment addressed this by declaring that the satisfaction of the President or the Governor in these matters would be “final and conclusive” and could not be questioned in any court. This effectively placed proclamations of Emergency and related executive decisions beyond the scope of judicial review.

In addition, the amendment extended similar protection to the ordinance-making powers under Articles 123 and 213, as well as Article 239B in the context of Union Territories. By doing so, it ensured that the promulgation of ordinances—often used when legislatures are not in session—would not be open to judicial challenge on grounds relating to the adequacy or validity of the executive’s satisfaction.

The amendment thus concentrated substantial discretionary authority in the executive, particularly during extraordinary situations such as an Emergency. It reflected a broader constitutional trend during this period, where the balance between the executive, legislature, and judiciary shifted in favour of executive dominance.

However, the provisions introduced by this amendment later became subject to reconsideration and were effectively diluted by subsequent constitutional developments and judicial interpretation, particularly after the end of the Emergency. Courts eventually reasserted the principle that even constitutional powers must be exercised within the bounds of legality and are subject to judicial review in appropriate cases.

References:

- Bombay High Court. (n.d.). Constitutional amendments.
https://bombayhighcourt.nic.in/libweb/misc/coi/New-constitution_amendment.html
- GKToday. (2019). Thirty-eighth Amendment of the Constitution of India.
<https://www.gktoday.in/thirty-eighth-amendment-of-the-constitution-of-india/> iPleaders. (2022). Major Constitutional Amendments
<https://blog.ipleaders.in/the-major-constitutional-amendment-in-indian-history/>
- Vajiram & Ravi. (2026). 38th Constitutional Amendment Act: Judicial Review during Emergency.
<https://vajiramandravi.com/current-affairs/38th-constitutional-amendment-act/>

THE CONSTITUTION (THIRTY NINTH AMENDMENT) ACT, 1975

Aspect	Details
Enacted in	1975
Article (s) and Schedules Amended	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Article Amended : 329 ● Schedule Amended : 9th ,Article Inserted : 329A, ● Article Substituted : 71
Note	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>This Amendment was challenged in</i> Smt. Indira Nehru Gandhi vs. Shri Raj Narain 1975 INSC 272 [1976] 2 S.C.R. 347

Key Amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Inserted Article 329A to exclude judicial review of election disputes relating to certain high constitutional offices. ● Placed disputes concerning the election of the President, Vice-President, Prime Minister, and Speaker of the Lok Sabha beyond the jurisdiction of courts. ● Provided that such disputes would be determined by a body constituted by Parliament. ● Added certain laws to the Ninth Schedule to protect them from judicial challenge.
-----------------------	--

The Constitution (Thirty-Ninth Amendment) Act, 1975 was enacted during the Emergency and is closely associated with efforts to shield high political offices from judicial scrutiny, particularly in the context of election disputes. It represents one of the most controversial amendments in India's constitutional history due to its direct implications for the rule of law and judicial independence.

The immediate backdrop to the amendment was the decision of the Allahabad High Court in [*Raj Narain v. Indira Gandhi \(1975\)*](#), which set aside the election of the Prime Minister on grounds of electoral malpractice. This judgment created a significant constitutional and political crisis, raising questions about the accountability of the highest executive office to judicial review.

In response, the Thirty-Ninth Amendment inserted Article 329A, which provided that disputes relating to the election of the President, Vice-President, Prime Minister, and Speaker of the Lok Sabha would not be subject to judicial review by courts. Instead, such disputes were to be determined by an authority established by Parliament. It also retrospectively validated the election of the Prime Minister, thereby nullifying the effect of the High Court's judgment.

The amendment thus sought to carve out a category of election disputes that would be insulated from the ordinary judicial process. This marked a significant departure from the constitutional principle that electoral disputes should be adjudicated by independent courts under a uniform legal framework.

In addition, the amendment expanded the Ninth Schedule by including certain statutes, thereby continuing the practice of protecting selected laws from judicial challenge on the ground of violation of Fundamental Rights.

The constitutional validity of the amendment was subsequently challenged in *Indira Nehru Gandhi v. Raj Narain*, where the Supreme Court struck down clause (4) of Article 329A as unconstitutional. The Court held that the exclusion of judicial review in election disputes affecting high constitutional offices violated the basic structure of the Constitution, particularly the principles of free and fair elections and the rule of law.

The amendment thus became a critical moment in the development of the Basic Structure Doctrine, reinforcing the idea that even constitutional amendments are subject to substantive limitations. It underscored the judiciary's role in preserving the integrity of democratic processes against attempts to insulate them from accountability.

References:

- Bombay High Court. (n.d.). Constitutional amendments. https://bombayhighcourt.nic.in/libweb/misc/coi/New-constitution_amendment.html
- iPleaders. (2022). Major Constitutional Amendments <https://blog.ipleaders.in/the-major-constitutional-amendment-in-indian-history/>
- iPleaders. (2024). Indira Nehru Gandhi vs. Shri Raj Narain & Anr. (1975). <https://blog.ipleaders.in/indira-nehru-gandhi-vs-shri-raj-narain-anr-1975/>
- Vajiram & Ravi. (2026). Basic structure doctrine cases. <https://vajiramandravi.com/upsc-exam/basic-structure/>

THE CONSTITUTION (FORTIETH AMENDMENT) ACT, 1976

Aspect	Details
Enacted in	1976
Article (s) and Schedules Amended	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Article Substituted : 297 ● Schedule Amended : 9th
Key Amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Vested ownership of certain natural resources in the Union of India. ● Expanded the scope of Article 297 to include resources in the territorial waters, continental shelf, and exclusive economic zone. ● Added a large number of laws to the Ninth Schedule. ● Provided constitutional protection to these laws from challenge on the ground of violation of Fundamental Rights.

The Constitution (Fortieth Amendment) Act, 1976 was enacted during the Emergency period and addressed two distinct but significant areas, control over natural resources and continued expansion of

the Ninth Schedule. It reflected a broader constitutional trend of strengthening State authority, both in economic matters and in insulating legislation from judicial scrutiny.

A key feature of the amendment was the modification of Article 297, which deals with the ownership of resources underlying the ocean. The amendment clarified and expanded the Union's control over natural resources located in the territorial waters, continental shelf, and maritime zones of India. By vesting these resources explicitly in the Union, it ensured centralised control over offshore assets such as minerals, oil, and other valuable resources.

This change was particularly important in the context of evolving international law relating to maritime zones and the growing economic significance of offshore resources. It provided a clear constitutional basis for the Union government to regulate, exploit, and manage these resources in the national interest.

In addition to this, the amendment added a substantial number of state laws—primarily relating to land reforms and property regulation, to the Ninth Schedule. By including these laws, Parliament sought to protect them from being challenged in courts on the ground that they violated Fundamental Rights, especially the right to property and equality.

This continued expansion of the Ninth Schedule reflected a legislative strategy aimed at shielding socio-economic legislation from judicial review. It was consistent with earlier amendments that had prioritised redistributive policies and State-led economic reform over strict judicial scrutiny.

However, the growing use of the Ninth Schedule during this period also contributed to an ongoing constitutional debate regarding the limits of Parliament's amending power. The question of whether laws placed in the Ninth Schedule could be completely insulated from judicial review later became a central issue in constitutional jurisprudence.

The amendment did not alter the basic structure of governance but reinforced executive and legislative authority in key domains, particularly natural resource management and socio-economic policy implementation. It reflects a phase in constitutional development where the emphasis was on centralisation and protection of reform-oriented legislation.

References:

- Bombay High Court. (n.d.). Constitutional amendments.
https://bombayhighcourt.nic.in/libweb/misc/coi/New-constitution_amendment.html

- CaseMine. (n.d.). Constitution (40th Amendment) Act, 1976.
<https://www.casemine.com/act/in/5a979da84a93263ca60b71ed>
- Constitution of India. (2024, May 5). Article 297: Things of value within territorial waters.
<https://www.constitutionofindia.net/articles/article-297-things-of-value-within-territorial-waters-or-continental-shelf-and-resources-of-the-exclusive-economic-zone-to-vest-in-the-union/>
- iPleaders. (2022). Major Constitutional Amendments
<https://blog.ipleaders.in/the-major-constitutional-amendment-in-indian-history/>
- Prepp.in. (2023, May 11). The 40th Amendment Act of 1976 was applied to which Article.
<https://prepp.in/question/the-40-th-amendment-act-of-1976-was-applied-to-whi-645e0db64a9d2cf3323df60f>

THE CONSTITUTION (FORTY FIRST AMENDMENT) ACT, 1976

Aspect	Details
Enacted in	1976
Article (s) Amended	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Article 316
Key Amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Raised the retirement age of members of State Public Service Commissions from 60 to 62 years. • Aligned service conditions to ensure continuity and administrative efficiency.

The Constitution (Forty-First Amendment) Act, 1976 was enacted to strengthen the functioning of State Public Service Commissions by extending the tenure of their members. It addressed practical concerns relating to administrative continuity, institutional memory, and the effective discharge of recruitment functions within the public service system.

Before the amendment, members of State Public Service Commissions were required to retire at the age of 60. Given the specialised nature of their role, overseeing recruitment, examinations, and advisory functions relating to public services, this relatively lower retirement age was increasingly viewed as limiting the effective utilisation of experienced individuals. Frequent turnover at the senior level often disrupted continuity in recruitment processes and policy consistency.

The amendment addressed this by modifying Article 316 to raise the retirement age of members of State Public Service Commissions to 62 years. This extension allowed members to serve longer terms, enabling them to contribute more meaningfully to the functioning of these institutions and ensuring greater stability in their operations.

The change also reflects a broader administrative rationale. Public Service Commissions are expected to function as independent constitutional bodies, insulated from political pressures and guided by principles of merit and fairness. Longer tenures for members help reinforce this independence by reducing the frequency of appointments and allowing institutional practices to evolve with greater consistency over time.

Further, the amendment contributed to improving the efficiency of recruitment systems across states. By retaining experienced members for a longer duration, commissions were better positioned to handle increasing volumes of recruitment, standardise procedures, and maintain continuity in examination and selection processes.

It is important to note that the amendment was limited in scope. It did not alter the composition, powers, or constitutional status of Public Service Commissions, nor did it affect the Union Public Service Commission, where the retirement age was already set at a higher level. Instead, it focused specifically on strengthening the operational capacity of State Commissions through a targeted institutional adjustment.

The amendment fits within a broader pattern of incremental constitutional reforms aimed at improving governance mechanisms without altering foundational principles. It reflects a pragmatic approach, recognising that institutional effectiveness often depends not only on formal powers but also on continuity, experience, and administrative stability.

References:

- Bombay High Court. (n.d.). Constitutional amendments. https://bombayhighcourt.nic.in/libweb/misc/coi/New-constitution_amendment.html
- GKToday. (2019, June 26). Forty-first Amendment of the Constitution of India. <https://www.gktoday.in/forty-first-amendment-of-the-constitution-of-india/>
- iPleaders. (2022). Major Constitutional Amendments <https://blog.ipleaders.in/the-major-constitutional-amendment-in-indian-history/>
- Legislative Department, Ministry of Law and Justice. (1976). The Constitution (Forty-first Amendment) Act, 1976.

THE CONSTITUTION (FORTY-SECOND) AMENDMENT ACT, 1976

Aspect	Details
Enacted In	1977
Article(s) and Schedules Amended	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Article Amended : Preamble, 31C, 39, 55, 74, 77, 81, 82, 83, 100, 102, 105, 118, 145, 166, 170, 172, 189, 191, 194, 208, 217, 225, 227, 228, 311, 312, 330, 352, 353, 356, 357, 358, 359, 366, 368, 371F● Schedule Amended : 7th Amendment of Parts : Part IV A - Fundamental Duties and Part XIV A - Tribunals● Article Inserted : 31, 31D, 32A, 39A, 43A, 48A, 51A, 131A, 139A, 144A, 226A, 228A, 257A, 323A, 323B● Article Substituted : 103, 150, 192, 226
Note	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● <i>This Amendment was challenged in</i> Minerva Mills Ltd. & Ors. Etc. Etc. vs. Union of India & Ors. 1986 INSC 185 [1986] 3 S.C.R. 718
Key Amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Added the words “Socialist”, “Secular”, and “Integrity” to the Preamble.● Expanded Directive Principles and gave them precedence over certain Fundamental Rights.● Curtailed the power of judicial review.● Inserted Fundamental Duties under Part IVA (Article 51A).● Extended the duration of Lok Sabha and State Assemblies from 5 to 6 years.● Strengthened the role of the executive, particularly the Union government.● Provided for the establishment of administrative and other tribunals.

[The Constitution\(Forty-Second Amendment\) Act](#) is a landmark amendment that significantly brought changes into the Preamble, Judiciary, and Legislature and introduced Fundamental

Duties. The amendment, due to the vast number of changes it brought, is often referred to as the 'Mini-Constitution'. The amendment was passed in 1976 during the period of Emergency, and various of its amendments were reversed by the 44th Amendment of 1978.

The 42nd Amendment, in its statement of object and reasons, stated that the main aim of these amendments is to address the socio-economic inequalities and make the democratic institutions much more sound, which have been stressed by the selfish interests of individuals. The most crucial amendment was made in the Preamble. This amendment added 'Socialist' and 'Secular' to the Preamble of the Constitution, which were part of the Directive Principles. It stated that the Directive Principles should be made much more comprehensive and give them precedence over Fundamental Rights for socio-economic development. It also substituted 'unity of the nation' with 'unity and integrity of the nation'.

The next key amendments were made regarding the Fundamental Rights and DPSPs. The Supreme Court, in its judgment of the [Kesavanand Bharti Case](#), had struck down the second part of the 25th Amendment, which made policies for the implementation of DPSPs outside the reach of judicial review. As a reversal to it, the 42nd amendment immunised all the DPSPs enshrined in Part IV from any kind of judicial review on the grounds of fundamental rights, thus giving precedence to the Directive Principles over Fundamental Rights. A new Article 31D was also added, which defined anti-national activities and stated that laws made for the prevention of these activities shall not be challenged on the grounds of violation of Article 13, 19 or 31. Anti-national activities, according to this article, were any activities aimed at cession of Indian Territory, intended to disrupt unity, sovereignty, integrity of India or aimed to overthrow the government, create internal disturbances or disrupt harmony between communities.

The amendment also brought changes in Parliament and the Judiciary in order to centralise power. Amending Article 74, it made the President obligated to follow the aid and advice of the Council of Ministers. It also allowed the centre to deploy armed forces in any particular state on the grounds of law and order problems. Making an amendment to Article 172, it increased the terms of members in the Lok Sabha and State Legislatures from 5 to 6 years. Making amendments to Article 100, which deals with quorum requirements and voting in the house, it omitted clauses 3 and 4 of the amendment, which stated 10% of the necessary quorum requirement and procedure if this requirement is not fulfilled. Curtailing the power of the judiciary, the amendment made Central Laws outside the scope of judicial review of the High Courts.

Bringing changes to the 7th schedule of the Constitution, the 42nd amendment transferred six subjects from the State List to the Concurrent List. The Subjects were - Education, Forests, Administration of Justice, Weights and Measures, Protection of Wild Animals and Birds, Population Control and Family Planning. A new [Part XIVA](#) was added, which dealt with

tribunals dealing with administrative and other matters. The 42nd amendment also introduced 11 Fundamental Duties of the citizens enshrined in [Article 51A](#).

The 42nd Amendment came at a crucial juncture of Indian Democracy. The majority of its provisions empowered Parliament and, thus, the Prime Minister ultimately. The changes made for centralising the power reflect the anxiety as well as the precautions of the ruling government. Various of these provisions were readressed and reversed by the 44th Amendment of 1978.

References

- Government of India. (1976). *The Constitution (Forty-Second Amendment) Act, 1976*. <https://bombayhighcourt.nic.in/libweb/misc/coi/constitution/act/ACT/C042Act.pdf>
- Raghavan, P. (2025, June 25). Not just ‘socialist’, ‘secular’ — a lot more from Emergency-era 42nd Amendment still part of the Constitution. ThePrint. <https://theprint.in/india/governance/not-just-socialist-secular-a-lot-more-from-emergency-era-42nd-amendment-still-part-of-constitution/2673050/>
- Kesavananda Bharati Sripadagalvaru & Ors. v. State of Kerala & Anr. AIR 1973 SC 1461 <https://indiankanoon.org/doc/257876/>
- Rajagopal, A. (2020, September 7). *Kesavananda Bharati: The case that redefined India’s Constitution*. Swarajya. <https://swarajyamag.com/legal/kesavananda-bharati-the-case-that-redefined-indias-constitution>
- Constitution of India. (n.d.). *Article 51A: Fundamental Duties*. <https://www.constitutionofindia.net/articles/article-51a-fundamental-duties/>
- Constitution of India. (n.d.). *Part XIVA: Tribunals*. <https://www.constitutionofindia.net/parts/part-xiva/>

THE CONSTITUTION (FORTY-THIRD) AMENDMENT ACT, 1977

Aspect	Details
Enacted In	1978
Article(s) Amended	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Article Amended : 145, 226, 228, 366 ● Article Omitted : 31D, 32A, 131A, 144A, 226A, 228 A
Key Amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Repealed several provisions inserted by the 42nd Amendment that curtailed judicial review. ● Restored the jurisdiction of High Courts under Article 226.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Removed restrictions on the Supreme Court's power to review constitutional validity of laws.● Reaffirmed the role of the judiciary in constitutional interpretation.
--	---

The Constitution (Forty-Third Amendment) Act, 1977 was enacted in the immediate aftermath of the Emergency to reverse several controversial changes introduced by the 42nd Amendment. It marked a significant restoration of the balance between the legislature and the judiciary, particularly in relation to the power of judicial review.

During the Emergency, the 42nd Amendment had introduced provisions that substantially curtailed the jurisdiction of courts. These included restrictions on the power of High Courts to examine the constitutional validity of central laws, limitations on the Supreme Court's role in such matters, and procedural barriers such as special majorities required for courts to declare laws unconstitutional. Collectively, these changes weakened the judiciary's ability to act as a check on legislative and executive power.

The Forty-Third Amendment sought to undo these constraints by repealing key provisions such as Articles 31D, 32A, 131A, 144A, 226A, and 228A. In doing so, it restored the ordinary jurisdiction of both the Supreme Court of India and the High Courts, allowing them to freely exercise their powers of judicial review.

A particularly important aspect of the amendment was the restoration of the High Courts' jurisdiction under Article 226. The 42nd Amendment had significantly restricted this power, but the 43rd Amendment reinstated it fully, thereby re-establishing High Courts as key forums for the protection of fundamental rights and constitutional remedies.

The amendment also removed procedural constraints that had made it difficult for courts to strike down unconstitutional laws, such as the requirement of a special majority of judges. This ensured that constitutional adjudication could proceed in accordance with established judicial principles rather than extraordinary procedural hurdles.

In essence, the amendment reaffirmed the central role of the judiciary as an independent and co-equal branch of government. It restored the principle that legislative and executive actions remain subject to constitutional scrutiny, thereby strengthening the rule of law.

The Forty-Third Amendment forms part of a broader post-Emergency constitutional correction, alongside the 44th Amendment, aimed at reversing excesses and restoring democratic safeguards. It reflects a renewed commitment to constitutionalism, separation of powers, and the protection of fundamental rights.

References:

- Bombay High Court. (n.d.). Constitutional amendments. https://bombayhighcourt.nic.in/libweb/misc/coi/New-constitution_amendment.html
- CaseMine. (n.d.). Constitution (43rd Amendment) Act, 1977. <https://www.casemine.com/act/in/5a979da84a93263ca60b71f0>
- GKToday. (2025, October 12). Forty-third Amendment of the Constitution of India. <https://www.gktoday.in/forty-third-amendment-of-the-constitution-of-india/>
- iPleaders. (2022). Major Constitutional Amendments <https://blog.ipleaders.in/the-major-constitutional-amendment-in-indian-history/>
- Sleepy Classes. (2024, July 14). The 42nd Amendment: How it transformed the Indian Constitution. <https://sleepyclasses.com/the-42nd-amendment-how-it-transformed-the-indian-constitution/>

THE CONSTITUTION (FORTY-FOURTH AMENDMENT) ACT, 1978

Aspect	Details
Enacted In	1979
Article(s) and Schedules Amended	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Article Amended: 19, 22, 30, 31A, 31C, 38, 74, 77, 83, 105, 123,132,133,134,139A,150,166, 172, 194, 213, 217, 225, 226, 227, 239B, 329, 352, 356, 358, 359, 360, 371F ● Scheduled Amended : 9th Part XII- Chapter IV- Right to Property ● Article Inserted : 134A, 300A, 361 A ● Article Substituted : 71, 103, 192 ● Article Omitted : Sub heading after article 30, 31, 257A, 329A
Note	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>This Amendment was challenged in</i>

	<p>A. K. Roy Etc. vs. Union of India and Anr. 1981 INSC 210 [1982] 2 S.C.R. 272</p>
<p>Key Amendments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Abolished the Right to Property as a Fundamental Right and inserted it as a legal right under Article 300A. ● Restored and strengthened civil liberties curtailed during the Emergency. ● Made the proclamation of Emergency under Article 352 more stringent. ● Provided safeguards against misuse of preventive detention laws. ● Ensured that certain Fundamental Rights cannot be suspended even during an Emergency. ● Restored the primacy of the Cabinet in advising the President.

[The Constitution \(Forty-Fourth Amendment\) Act, 1978](#), is a crucial amendment that was primarily aimed at reversing the provisions made by the [42nd Amendment](#) during the emergency. It removed various amendments done by the 42nd amendment aimed to centralise power and safeguard fundamental rights and civil liberties. Additionally, it also omitted the Right to Property from being a fundamental right and changed it into a legal right.

The 44th amendment, in its statement of objective and reason, stated that Article 352- Proclamation of Emergency greatly empowers the state to suspend the Fundamental Rights. It found that necessary safeguards should be in place to prevent a democratic state from becoming an authoritarian state. Additionally, it also changed the due conditions in which Article 352 can be invoked, making the declaration of emergency a much more stringent process.

The 44th Amendment, which amended Article 352, substituted "internal disturbances" with "armed rebellion" as a due condition for the declaration of an emergency. Additionally, an emergency could only be declared upon a written recommendation from the Council of Ministers. Additionally, if members with a quorum requirement of one-tenth move a resolution for disapproval of the emergency declaration to the speaker or the President, a special sitting of the Lok Sabha can be called for reconsideration of the emergency within 14 days.

Amending Fundamental Rights, the right to property enshrined in Article 31 and Article 19(f) was omitted, and it was made a legal right in Article 300A. Article 22, which deals with arrest and preventive detention, was also amended. For preventive detention, a 2-month maximum limit was made, which could be extended only with a report of the advisory board, whose

chairman was to be a serving judge. In Article 30, a clause was added which stated that while acquiring an educational institution managed by a minority, adequate compensation should be provided, and it should be ensured that it does not abrogate their rights enshrined in Article 30.

During the emergency period, various changes were made to the powers of the president. Substituting article 71, a new article was made which stated that matters related to elections of President and Vice-President shall be solved by the Supreme Court, and the decision shall be considered final. A proviso was added to clause 1 of Article 74, which empowered the President to ask the Council of Ministers to reconsider the advice and accept the advice given by the Council after reconsideration, even if it is the same. Before this amendment, the President was to work in accordance with the advice given.

The other significant changes made by the 44th amendment were the restoration of powers of the judiciary regarding various adjudications of matters. The 42nd amendment had kept the President, Vice-President, Prime Minister and Speaker out of judicial review. This amendment was reversed, and people holding these designations came within the ambit of judicial review. Article 257A, which empowered the Central Government to deploy armed forces in a particular state, was omitted. The amendment also restored the term of members of Lok Sabha and state legislatures to 5 years, which was made 6 years during the emergency. A new clause was added to the directive principle, Article 38, which stated that the state should actively work for minimising inequalities in income, status and opportunity not only among individuals but also amongst groups.

References

- Government of India. (1976). *The Constitution (Forty-Second Amendment) Act, 1976*. <https://bombayhighcourt.nic.in/libweb/misc/coi/constitution/act/ACT/C042Act.pdf>
- Government of India. (1978). *The Constitution (Forty-Fourth Amendment) Act, 1978*. <https://bombayhighcourt.nic.in/libweb/misc/coi/constitution/act/ACT/C042Act.pdf>
- iPleaders. (2022). Major Constitutional Amendments <https://blog.ipleaders.in/the-major-constitutional-amendment-in-indian-history/>

THE CONSTITUTION (FORTY-FIFTH AMENDMENT) ACT, 1980

Aspect	Details
--------	---------

Enacted In	1980
Article(s) Amended	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Article 334
Key Amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Abolished the Right to Property as a Fundamental Right and inserted it as a legal right under Article 300A. ● Restored and strengthened civil liberties curtailed during the Emergency. ● Made the proclamation of Emergency under Article 352 more stringent. ● Provided safeguards against misuse of preventive detention laws. ● Ensured that certain Fundamental Rights cannot be suspended even during an Emergency. ● Restored the primacy of the Cabinet in advising the President..

The Constitution (Forty-Fourth Amendment) Act, 1978 was enacted as a major corrective measure following the Emergency, with the objective of restoring democratic balance, strengthening civil liberties, and preventing the misuse of executive power. It represents one of the most significant post-Emergency reforms in India’s constitutional history.

During the Emergency (1975–1977), several constitutional provisions had been used to curtail fundamental freedoms, weaken judicial oversight, and concentrate power in the executive. The experience highlighted structural vulnerabilities in the Constitution, particularly in relation to the declaration and operation of Emergency powers.

The Forty-Fourth Amendment addressed these concerns through a series of substantive changes. One of its most notable features was the abolition of the Right to Property as a Fundamental Right by repealing Article 31 and introducing Article 300A, which reclassified it as a constitutional legal right. This shift reduced the scope for challenging redistributive legislation while preserving a basic protection against arbitrary deprivation of property.

The amendment also introduced important safeguards in relation to the proclamation of Emergency under Article 352. It replaced the earlier ground of “internal disturbance” with the more specific term “armed rebellion,” thereby narrowing the circumstances in which a National Emergency could be declared. Additionally, it required that such a proclamation be issued only on the written advice of the Cabinet, preventing unilateral executive action.

Further, the amendment strengthened parliamentary oversight by requiring that a proclamation of Emergency be approved within a shorter timeframe and be subject to periodic review. It also ensured that the Lok Sabha could revoke an Emergency through a simple majority, thereby enhancing democratic control.

In relation to Fundamental Rights, the amendment ensured that rights under Articles 20 and 21, protection in respect of conviction for offences and protection of life and personal liberty, could not be suspended even during an Emergency. This was a direct response to judicial and executive actions during the Emergency that had severely restricted personal liberty.

The amendment also made changes to preventive detention laws by introducing procedural safeguards, including limits on detention without advisory board review. It restored the jurisdiction of courts and reinforced the role of judicial review in protecting individual rights.

Additionally, it reaffirmed the principle of collective responsibility of the Council of Ministers by clarifying that the President is bound by the advice of the Cabinet, thereby strengthening parliamentary democracy and limiting discretionary executive authority.

The Forty-Fourth Amendment thus represents a comprehensive effort to rebalance the constitutional framework by restoring civil liberties, reinforcing institutional checks and balances, and preventing the recurrence of Emergency-era excesses. It stands as a defining moment in the evolution of India's constitutional democracy, reaffirming the primacy of the rule of law and individual freedoms.

References:

- Bombay High Court. (n.d.). Constitutional amendments. https://bombayhighcourt.nic.in/libweb/misc/coi/New-constitution_amendment.html
- GKToday. (2019, June 25). Forty-fourth Amendment of the Constitution of India. <https://www.gktoday.in/forty-fourth-amendment-of-the-constitution-of-india/>
- iPleaders. (2022). Major Constitutional Amendments <https://blog.ipleaders.in/the-major-constitutional-amendment-in-indian-history/>
- PMF IAS. (2025, March 26). National Emergency: Provisions & 44th Amendment. <https://www.pmfias.com/national-emergency/>

Aspect	Details
Enacted In	1980
Article(s) Amended	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Article 334
Note	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>This Amendment was challenged in</i> <p>Builders Association of India and Ors. Etc. Etc. vs. Union of India and Ors. Etc. Etc. 1989 INSC 112: [1989]2 S.C.R. 320</p>
Key Amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expanded the definition of “tax on the sale or purchase of goods. • Inserted Article 366(29A) to include deemed sales such as works contracts, hire-purchase, and leasing. • Enabled States to levy sales tax on transactions previously not considered “sales.” • Clarified taxation powers between the Union and States.

The Constitution (Forty-Sixth Amendment) Act, 1982 was enacted to overcome judicial limitations on the taxation powers of States, particularly in relation to sales tax. It marked a significant development in India’s fiscal federal framework by expanding the scope of what constitutes a “sale” for taxation purposes.

Prior to the amendment, the Supreme Court in [State of Madras v. Gannon Dunkerley & Co.](#) had held that the expression “sale of goods” in the Constitution had to be interpreted in its traditional legal sense under the Sale of Goods Act, 1930. This meant that certain composite transactions, such as works contracts, hire-purchase agreements, and leasing arrangements, could not be taxed as sales, as they did not involve a straightforward transfer of ownership in goods.

This interpretation significantly restricted the ability of States to levy sales tax on a wide range of commercial transactions that were becoming increasingly common in a modernising economy. As a result, there was a growing demand for constitutional clarification to expand the tax base.

The Forty-Sixth Amendment addressed this by inserting Article 366(29A), which introduced the concept of “deemed sales.” It explicitly brought within the scope of taxable sales several categories of

transactions, including works contracts, hire-purchase agreements, transfer of the right to use goods, and supply of goods as part of service contracts.

By doing so, the amendment effectively decoupled the constitutional definition of “sale” from its traditional common law meaning and allowed States to tax transactions that involved elements of both goods and services. This significantly expanded the fiscal capacity of States and aligned the taxation framework with evolving commercial practices.

The amendment also made related changes to Articles 269 and 286 to clarify the distribution of taxing powers between the Union and the States, particularly in the context of inter-State trade and commerce. These changes helped ensure that the expanded definition of “sale” could be effectively implemented within the existing constitutional scheme.

The Forty-Sixth Amendment represents a key moment in the evolution of India’s indirect tax regime. It laid the foundation for a more flexible and comprehensive approach to taxation, which would later evolve further with the introduction of Value Added Tax (VAT) and eventually the Goods and Services Tax (GST).

References:

- Bombay High Court. (n.d.). Constitutional amendments. https://bombayhighcourt.nic.in/libweb/misc/coi/New-constitution_amendment.html
- Eastern Book Company. (2001). 46th Amendment: Works contracts taxation. <https://www.ebc-india.com/lawyer/articles/2001v1a3.htm>
- iPleaders. (2022). Major Constitutional Amendments <https://blog.ipleaders.in/the-major-constitutional-amendment-in-indian-history/>

THE CONSTITUTION (FORTY-SEVENTH AMENDMENT) ACT, 1984

Aspect	Details
Enacted In	1984
Schedules Amended	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Schedule 9th
Key	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Added several land reform laws to the Ninth Schedule.

Amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Provided constitutional protection to these laws from challenge on the ground of violation of Fundamental Rights. ● Strengthened the State's ability to implement agrarian reforms.
-------------------	--

The Constitution (Forty-Seventh Amendment) Act, 1984 was enacted to extend constitutional protection to additional land reform laws enacted by various states. It continued the established legislative approach of using the Ninth Schedule as a shield against judicial review in matters relating to socio-economic reform, particularly land redistribution.

Since independence, land reform has remained a central component of India's policy framework aimed at addressing inequality in land ownership and dismantling feudal agrarian structures. However, such laws were frequently challenged in courts on the ground that they violated Fundamental Rights, especially the right to property (prior to its removal as a fundamental right) and the right to equality.

To overcome these challenges, earlier constitutional amendments had introduced mechanisms such as Article 31A and the Ninth Schedule, which allowed certain laws to be protected from being invalidated on the ground of inconsistency with Fundamental Rights. Despite these safeguards, states continued to face litigation when enacting new or amended land reform legislation.

The Forty-Seventh Amendment addressed this by adding a number of such laws—primarily dealing with land ceilings, tenancy reforms, and redistribution measures—to the Ninth Schedule. By doing so, it ensured that these laws would not be struck down by courts on the specified grounds, thereby facilitating their implementation.

This amendment reflects the continued emphasis on achieving socio-economic justice through legislative action, even at the cost of limiting the scope of judicial review in specific areas. It also illustrates the persistence of land reform as a policy priority well into the 1980s, requiring ongoing constitutional support.

At the same time, the repeated expansion of the Ninth Schedule contributed to a broader constitutional debate regarding the limits of Parliament's amending power. The question of whether such laws could be completely insulated from judicial scrutiny remained a live issue, particularly in light of evolving jurisprudence on the basic structure of the Constitution.

The Forty-Seventh Amendment thus represents a continuation of the constitutional strategy of protecting redistributive legislation, reinforcing the State's role in pursuing agrarian reform while contributing to the ongoing dialogue between Parliament and the judiciary on the scope of constitutional amendments.

References:

- Bombay High Court. (n.d.). Constitutional amendments.
https://bombayhighcourt.nic.in/libweb/misc/coi/New-constitution_amendment.html
- CaseMine. (n.d.). Constitution (47th Amendment) Act, 1984.
<https://www.casemine.com/act/in/5a979da84a93263ca60b71f4>
- GKToday. (2019, June 25). Forty-seventh Amendment of the Constitution of India.
<https://www.gktoday.in/forty-seventh-amendment-of-the-constitution-of-india/>
- iPleaders. (2022). Major Constitutional Amendments
<https://blog.ipleaders.in/the-major-constitutional-amendment-in-indian-history/>

THE CONSTITUTION (FORTY-EIGHTH AMENDMENT) ACT, 1980

Aspect	Details
Enacted In	1980
Article(s) Amended	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Article 356
Key Amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Provided a special provision allowing extension of President's Rule in Punjab beyond one year.● Enabled continuation of central rule without requiring fresh parliamentary approval every six months in the usual manner.

The Constitution (Forty-Eighth Amendment) Act, 1984 was enacted as a targeted constitutional response to the exceptional political and security situation prevailing in the State of Punjab during the early 1980s. It reflected a moment where the ordinary constitutional framework governing Centre–State relations was considered insufficient to deal with sustained breakdown of public order and governance.

Under the standard scheme of Article 356, President's Rule could ordinarily continue for a maximum of one year. Extensions beyond this period were tightly regulated and typically linked to the existence of a National Emergency under Article 352. This limitation was designed as a safeguard to prevent excessive central intervention in the affairs of states and to preserve the federal balance.

However, the conditions in Punjab at the time, marked by prolonged insurgency, political instability, and serious threats to constitutional governance, were viewed as requiring longer direct central control. The absence of a stable elected government and the difficulty in restoring normalcy made periodic short-term extensions impractical from an administrative standpoint.

The Forty-Eighth Amendment therefore created a specific constitutional exception, allowing the continuation of President's Rule in Punjab beyond the usual one-year limit. This effectively relaxed the temporal safeguard built into Article 356, enabling the Union to maintain uninterrupted administrative control over the State for an extended period.

What's important here is that this was not a blanket expansion of central power across all states. The amendment was narrowly framed and applied specifically to Punjab, signalling that it was intended as an exceptional measure rather than a structural change to India's federal framework.

Even so, the amendment sits within a larger constitutional conversation about the use—and potential overuse—of Article 356. It highlights the tension between two competing concerns: on one hand, the need for the Union to act decisively in situations of grave breakdown; on the other, the risk of prolonged central rule undermining the autonomy of states and the democratic principle of elected governance.

In practice, this amendment contributed to a period where Punjab remained under extended central administration until conditions stabilised enough to restore electoral politics. It underscores how constitutional flexibility can be invoked in crisis situations, but also why such flexibility remains closely scrutinised in Indian constitutional law.

References:

- Bombay High Court. (n.d.). Constitutional amendments. https://bombayhighcourt.nic.in/libweb/misc/coi/New-constitution_amendment.html
- GKToday. (2019, June 24). Forty-eighth Amendment of the Constitution of India. <https://www.gktoday.in/forty-eighth-amendment-of-the-constitution-of-india/>
- BYJU'S. (2016, July 8). Article 356 – President's Rule. <https://byjus.com/free-ias-prep/article-356/>
- iPleaders. (2022). Major Constitutional Amendments <https://blog.ipleaders.in/the-major-constitutional-amendment-in-indian-history/>

THE CONSTITUTION (FORTY-NINTH AMENDMENT) ACT, 1984

Aspect	Details
Enacted In	1985
Article(s) and Schedules Amended	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Article Amended : 244• Schedule Amended : 5th, 6th
Key Amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Extended the provisions of the Sixth Schedule to certain tribal areas of Tripura.• Provided for the creation of an Autonomous District Council in Tripura.• Strengthened self-governance for tribal populations through constitutional mechanisms.

The Constitution (Forty-Ninth Amendment) Act, 1984 was enacted to extend the constitutional framework of autonomous governance to tribal areas in the State of Tripura. It aimed to address longstanding concerns relating to the protection of tribal identity, land rights, and political representation in a region experiencing significant demographic and social change.

Prior to the amendment, the Sixth Schedule of the Constitution—which provides for Autonomous District Councils with legislative, administrative, and limited judicial powers—applied primarily to certain tribal areas in the North-Eastern states such as Assam, Meghalaya, Mizoram, and Tripura (partially, but not comprehensively). In Tripura, tribal communities had expressed concerns over loss of land, cultural marginalisation, and inadequate institutional safeguards.

The Forty-Ninth Amendment addressed these concerns by formally extending the full framework of the Sixth Schedule to designated tribal areas in Tripura. This enabled the establishment of the Tripura Tribal Areas Autonomous District Council (TTAADC), a constitutionally recognised body with powers over specified subjects such as land, forest management (excluding reserved forests), customary laws, and local governance.

The creation of the Autonomous District Council provided tribal communities with a structured platform for self-governance, allowing them to manage local affairs in accordance with their customs and traditions while remaining within the broader constitutional framework of the State. It also

ensured representation through elected members, thereby strengthening democratic participation at the regional level.

This amendment reflects a clear application of asymmetrical federalism, where different regions are accorded varying degrees of autonomy based on their historical, cultural, and socio-political contexts. In the case of Tripura, it was designed as a protective and stabilising mechanism to balance development with preservation of tribal identity.

The amendment did not alter the overall federal structure but deepened decentralisation within a state by empowering sub-state institutions. It illustrates how the Constitution accommodates diversity not just between states, but also within them, through tailored governance arrangements.

The Forty-Ninth Amendment thus represents a significant step in strengthening constitutional protections for tribal communities, reinforcing local self-governance while maintaining integration within the Union framework.

References:

- Bombay High Court. (n.d.). Constitutional amendments. https://bombayhighcourt.nic.in/libweb/misc/coi/New-constitution_amendment.html
- CaseMine. (n.d.). Constitution (49th Amendment) Act, 1984. <https://www.casemine.com/act/in/5a979da84a93263ca60b71f6>
- iPleaders. (2022). Major Constitutional Amendments <https://blog.ipleaders.in/the-major-constitutional-amendment-in-indian-history/>
- Vajiram & Ravi. (2026, March 9). 6th Schedule of Indian Constitution. <https://vajiramandravi.com/upsc-exam/sixth-schedule/>

THE CONSTITUTION (FIFTIETH AMENDMENT) ACT, 1984

Aspect	Details
Enacted In	1984

Article(s) Amended	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Article 33
Key Amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Expanded the scope of Article 33 to include additional security and intelligence personnel. ● Enabled Parliament to restrict or abrogate Fundamental Rights of such personnel. ● Strengthened discipline and operational efficiency in sensitive services.

The Constitution (Fiftieth Amendment) Act, 1984 was enacted to broaden the scope of Article 33, which empowers Parliament to restrict or modify the application of Fundamental Rights in relation to members of the armed forces and other forces charged with maintaining public order. The amendment responded to the evolving nature of national security and the increasing role of specialised forces and intelligence agencies.

Before the amendment, Article 33 primarily applied to members of the armed forces, paramilitary forces, and police forces. However, with the expansion of internal security mechanisms and the emergence of specialised organisations involved in intelligence gathering, counter-insurgency, and national security operations, it became necessary to extend similar constitutional flexibility to these personnel.

The Fiftieth Amendment addressed this by widening the categories of personnel to whom Article 33 could apply. It enabled Parliament to impose restrictions on the Fundamental Rights of members of forces engaged in intelligence and security functions, where such restrictions were necessary to ensure discipline, confidentiality, and effective performance of duties.

This change recognised that certain rights, such as freedom of speech, association, or movement—may need to be limited in the context of sensitive roles where disclosure of information or lack of discipline could compromise national security or operational effectiveness. By providing a clear constitutional basis for such restrictions, the amendment ensured that they could be imposed through law rather than ad hoc executive action.

At the same time, the amendment did not automatically curtail rights but authorised Parliament to determine the extent and manner of such restrictions. This maintained a balance between operational necessity and constitutional oversight, as any restriction would still require legislative backing.

The amendment reflects a broader constitutional principle—that the full exercise of Fundamental Rights may be subject to reasonable limitations in contexts where collective security and institutional discipline are at stake. It illustrates how the Constitution adapts to changing security needs while retaining a framework of legal accountability.

References:

- Bombay High Court. (n.d.). Constitutional amendments.
https://bombayhighcourt.nic.in/libweb/misc/coi/New-constitution_amendment.html
 - GKToday. (2016, February 23). Fundamental Rights of Armed Forces in India.
<https://www.gktoday.in/fundamental-rights-of-armed-forces-in-india/>
 - iPleaders. (2022). Major Constitutional Amendments
<https://blog.ipleaders.in/the-major-constitutional-amendment-in-indian-history/>
 - Prepp.in. (2024, February 11). Article 33 – Indian Polity Notes.
<https://prepp.in/news/e-492-article-33-indian-polity-notes>
 - Testbook. (2025, August 5). Article 33 amended by Constitution (Fiftieth Amendment) Act, 1984.
<https://testbook.com/question-answer/which-of-the-following-articles-was-amended-by-the--66a3a734f08c9cd68fba6a50>
-