



WRITS: GUARDIANS OF JUSTICE AND DEFENDERS OF RIGHTS

AUTHOR – SYEDA BINTUL HUDA, STUDENT AT ALIGARH MUSLIM UNIVERSITY

Best Citation – SYEDA BINTUL HUDA, WRITS: GUARDIANS OF JUSTICE AND DEFENDERS OF RIGHTS, *JOURNAL OF RESEARCH ETHICS (JRE)*, 1 (1) of 2023, Pg. 28-33, APIS – 3920 – 0019 | ISBN – 978-81-961097-1-4.

I. ABSTRACT

Writs play a vital role in ensuring that the legal system operates effectively and fairly. They provide individuals with an avenue to seek legal redress, protect their rights, and hold public officials and government agencies accountable. Writs also serve as a check on the powers of lower courts, ensuring that they stay within their prescribed jurisdiction and act in accordance with the law. It is important to note that the specific types of writs and their procedures may vary depending on the legal system of a particular country. Different jurisdictions may have their own unique set of writs and rules governing their issuance and enforcement. Therefore, it is essential to consult legal experts or refer to specific laws and regulations for detailed information regarding writs in a specific jurisdiction.

II. INTRODUCTION

Writs are legal orders issued by courts that have the authority to command individuals, organisations, or government agencies to take a specific action or refrain from doing so. They are an integral part of the legal system in many countries and play a crucial role in protecting individual rights, ensuring justice, and maintaining the rule of law. The concept of writs dates back centuries and can be traced to English common law, which has greatly influenced legal systems around the world. Writs were initially developed as a means to ensure that justice was accessible to all individuals, regardless of their social or economic standing. They provided a way for individuals to seek legal remedies and enforce their rights in a timely manner.

Writs are typically issued by higher courts, such as appellate or supreme courts, and are directed to lower courts, public officials, or government agencies. The purpose of a writ can vary depending on the specific circumstances of a case, but they generally serve to address legal disputes, correct errors, or ensure compliance with legal obligations. Writs play a vital role in ensuring that the legal

system operates effectively and fairly. They provide individuals with an avenue to seek legal redress, protect their rights, and hold public officials and government agencies accountable. Writs also serve as a check on the powers of lower courts, ensuring that they stay within their prescribed jurisdiction and act in accordance with the law. It is important to note that the specific types of writs and their procedures may vary depending on the legal system of a particular country. Different jurisdictions may have their own unique set of writs and rules governing their issuance and enforcement. Therefore, it is essential to consult legal experts or refer to specific laws and regulations for detailed information regarding writs in a specific jurisdiction.

III. TYPES OF WRITS

There are several types of writs commonly used in legal proceedings. Each type of writ serves a specific purpose and provides a legal remedy to address different situations. Here are some of the main types of writs:

1. Habeas Corpus

Habeas corpus, a Latin term meaning "you shall have the body," is a fundamental legal principle



and a crucial writ used to protect individual liberty against unlawful detention or imprisonment. It serves as a powerful legal remedy to ensure that no person is deprived of their freedom without just cause and that their detention is in accordance with the law. The writ of habeas corpus is rooted in the principle that every individual has the right to challenge the legality of their confinement before a court.

Nature and Purpose of Habeas Corpus:

Habeas corpus operates as a legal instrument that provides a swift and effective means for individuals to seek relief from unlawful detention. Its primary purpose is to prevent arbitrary or unlawful imprisonment and to ensure that the custodian justifies the legal basis for the detention. The writ of habeas corpus requires the person or entity holding a detainee to produce the detained person before a court and provide a lawful justification for their continued detention. The court then examines the legality of the detention, considering factors such as whether the arrest was lawful, the evidence supporting the detention, and compliance with procedural safeguards. The significance of habeas corpus lies in its ability to safeguard individual liberty and act as a check on executive power. It serves as a vital protection against abuse of authority and arbitrary detention by ensuring that the government's actions are subject to judicial scrutiny.

Case Law: *Boumediene v. Bush* (2008):

The United States Supreme Court case of *Boumediene v. Bush* exemplifies the application of habeas corpus in protecting individual rights even in extraordinary circumstances. The case involved several foreign nationals who were detained at the Guantanamo Bay detention facility following their capture during the "war on terror."

The detainees filed petitions for habeas corpus, challenging the legality of their indefinite detention without charge or trial. The central issue before the Court was whether the

detainees, who were non-U.S. citizens held outside the United States, had the constitutional right to seek habeas corpus relief.

In a landmark decision, the Supreme Court held that the detainees at Guantanamo Bay had the constitutional right to habeas corpus. The Court emphasized that habeas corpus is a fundamental safeguard against arbitrary detention, and the suspension of the writ is permissible only in cases of rebellion or invasion, which did not apply to the detainees.

The Court's decision reaffirmed the principle that habeas corpus is a cornerstone of individual liberty and cannot be denied based on the physical location of the detention. It established that even in the context of national security concerns, the right to habeas corpus must be respected, ensuring that individuals have access to a fair process to challenge the legality of their detention.

The *Boumediene v. Bush* case serves as a significant example of the critical role habeas corpus plays in protecting the rights of individuals, even in extraordinary circumstances and in the face of national security concerns. It reinforces the principle that no person should be deprived of their liberty without due process of law and the opportunity to challenge the basis of their detention before an impartial judicial body.

2. Mandamus

Mandamus is a potent legal remedy that seeks to compel a public official, government agency, or lower court to perform a specific duty that falls within their legal authority. Derived from Latin, mandamus means "we command." The purpose of this writ is to ensure accountability, transparency, and the enforcement of rights when all other adequate remedies have proven insufficient. By empowering individuals to seek judicial intervention, mandamus serves as a powerful tool to maintain the rule of law and hold authorities accountable for their actions.

Nature and Scope of Mandamus Writ:



The mandamus writ is a prerogative writ, granted by a higher court to exercise its supervisory jurisdiction over lower courts or public officials. The writ is extraordinary in nature, issued only when there is a clear legal right that needs to be enforced and no other appropriate legal remedy available. It is important to note that mandamus can be both preventive and mandatory in its application.

Preventive mandamus aims to stop a public authority from acting unlawfully or exceeding its jurisdiction. On the other hand, mandatory mandamus compels the public official or lower court to perform a duty that they have neglected or refused to execute. The writ is particularly effective when a public body is dragging its feet or deliberately refusing to perform an obligation, causing irreparable harm or denying a person their legal rights.

Case Law: State of Karnataka v. Union of India (2019):

In the Indian case of State of Karnataka v. Union of India, the Supreme Court of India examined the validity of the Karnataka Government's decision to grant a separate religious minority status to the Lingayat community. The Lingayats, a prominent socio-religious group in Karnataka, had been seeking recognition as a separate religious minority, distinct from Hinduism. The Karnataka Government, in a politically sensitive move, granted their demand just before the state assembly elections.

However, various groups and individuals challenged this decision, arguing that it was made for electoral gains and without following the due process of law. They alleged that the government had exceeded its jurisdiction and that the decision lacked legal validity. Seeking redress, the petitioners approached the Supreme Court with a writ of mandamus.

The Supreme Court, in its judgment, reiterated that mandamus is issued to ensure the performance of public duties, but it cannot direct the manner in which such duties are to be performed. In this case, the Court observed

that the Karnataka Government had the authority to consider and make decisions regarding minority status but needed to do so in a transparent and constitutional manner.

The Court further held that the issue of granting religious minority status to the Lingayat community was complex and required in-depth examination by an expert committee to determine its authenticity. Thus, the Court refused to grant the writ of mandamus at that stage and directed the government to set up an expert committee to examine the matter and make recommendations based on evidence and constitutional principles.

This case exemplifies the significance of mandamus in ensuring that public authorities exercise their powers within the bounds of the law and do not act arbitrarily. The Court's decision also emphasizes that while mandamus can be a powerful tool, it should be exercised judiciously and with an awareness of the complexities of the issues involved.

3. Prohibition

Prohibition is a legal writ that serves as a crucial mechanism for controlling the exercise of judicial or quasi-judicial powers by lower courts, tribunals, or administrative bodies. Derived from the Latin term "prohibere," meaning "to prohibit," this writ is issued by a higher court to prevent a lower court or tribunal from exceeding its jurisdiction or acting beyond its authority. Prohibition plays a vital role in ensuring that legal proceedings are conducted within the confines of the law and in accordance with established principles of justice.

Nature and Purpose of Prohibition Writ:

The primary objective of the prohibition writ is to prevent a lower court or tribunal from proceeding with a case that falls outside its jurisdiction or when there is a violation of natural justice. It acts as a safeguard against errors, irregularities, or abuses of power by lower courts or administrative bodies. Prohibition aims to maintain the integrity of the judicial system



and protect the rights of parties involved in legal proceedings.

Prohibition is based on the principle that every court or tribunal must exercise its jurisdiction within the limits prescribed by law. It ensures that decisions are made by competent authorities, according to established legal procedures, and in adherence to the principles of natural justice. By restraining excesses, prohibition ensures fairness, impartiality, and adherence to the rule of law.

Case Law: Associated Provincial Picture Houses Ltd. v. Wednesbury Corporation (1948):

The case of Associated Provincial Picture Houses Ltd. v. Wednesbury Corporation is a landmark case from the United Kingdom that illustrates the application of the prohibition writ in the context of administrative decision-making.

In this case, a cinema operator, Associated Provincial Picture Houses (APPH), challenged a decision made by the Wednesbury Corporation, an administrative body responsible for granting licenses for cinema operation. The Wednesbury Corporation refused to grant APPH a license to open on Sundays, citing concerns about disturbance to local residents.

APPH sought a writ of prohibition, arguing that the decision of the Wednesbury Corporation was irrational and unreasonable. The case eventually reached the House of Lords, which is the highest appellate court in the United Kingdom.

In its judgment, the House of Lords established the principle of Wednesbury unreasonableness, which has since become a landmark legal test for judicial review of administrative decisions. The court stated that a decision can be challenged if it is so unreasonable that no reasonable authority, acting reasonably, could have come to such a decision. The court emphasized that the role of the court is not to substitute its own decision for that of the

administrative body but to ensure that the decision is within the bounds of reasonableness.

The Wednesbury case demonstrates how the prohibition writ can be invoked to challenge administrative decisions that are deemed irrational or unreasonable. The court's intervention through the prohibition writ ensured that the decision-making process was subject to scrutiny and that the administrative body acted within its jurisdiction and in accordance with the principles of reasonableness.

4. Certiorari

Certiorari is a legal writ used to seek the review of a decision made by a lower court, tribunal, or administrative body. Derived from the Latin term "certiorare," meaning "to be informed," this writ empowers a higher court to examine the record of a particular case and determine whether there were any errors of law or jurisdictional issues. Certiorari serves as an essential tool in the appellate process, ensuring that legal decisions are made within the boundaries of the law and in accordance with established principles of justice.

Nature and Purpose of Certiorari Writ:

The primary purpose of the certiorari writ is to enable a higher court to exercise its supervisory jurisdiction over lower courts or administrative bodies. It allows the reviewing court to assess whether there have been errors of law, jurisdictional irregularities, or violations of procedural safeguards. Certiorari is concerned with correcting legal errors and ensuring that justice is upheld.

Certiorari is not an automatic right, but rather a discretionary remedy granted by the higher court. The reviewing court evaluates whether the case meets certain criteria, such as involving a matter of public importance, raising substantial questions of law, or demonstrating a manifest error that has resulted in a miscarriage of justice.



The granting of a certiorari writ signifies that the higher court believes the case merits further examination and that there is a reasonable likelihood of errors or injustices having occurred in the lower court's decision. It allows the higher court to intervene and correct those errors or injustices.

Case Law: *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954):

The case of *Brown v. Board of Education* in the United States is an iconic example that showcases the significant impact of the certiorari writ in upholding constitutional rights and rectifying legal injustices.

In this landmark case, a group of African American parents filed a lawsuit against the Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas, challenging the constitutionality of racial segregation in public schools. The case reached the United States Supreme Court, where it was consolidated with similar cases from across the country.

The Supreme Court, in its unanimous decision, held that racial segregation in public schools violated the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. The Court's decision overturned the doctrine of "separate but equal" established by the earlier case of *Plessy v. Ferguson* (1896). The Court found that racial segregation inherently created feelings of inferiority and denied African American children equal educational opportunities.

The certiorari writ played a pivotal role in this case, allowing the Supreme Court to review and correct the legal error made by the lower courts that had upheld racial segregation. The Court's decision in *Brown v. Board of Education* not only transformed the landscape of education in the United States but also became a landmark in the fight against racial discrimination and a milestone in the development of constitutional law.

The case exemplifies how the certiorari writ enables a higher court to review lower court decisions, identify legal errors, and correct them

to uphold constitutional rights and ensure justice.

5. Quo warranto

Quo warranto, a Latin term meaning "by what authority," is a legal writ used to challenge the legitimacy of a person or entity holding a public office, franchise, or corporate privilege. This writ seeks to inquire into the authority by which the individual or organization claims the right to exercise certain powers or privileges. Quo warranto serves as a powerful legal remedy to ensure that public positions are held lawfully and that those in authority act within the bounds of their lawful authority.

Nature and Purpose of Quo Warranto Writ:

The primary purpose of the quo warranto writ is to question the legal right or authority of an individual or organization to hold a public office or exercise certain powers or privileges. It seeks to determine whether the person or entity in question has the legal authority or proper qualifications to occupy the position or enjoy the privilege they claim.

Quo warranto can be initiated by a government authority or by a private individual or organization with sufficient legal standing. The writ compels the person or entity to demonstrate their lawful entitlement to the position or privilege, and failure to do so may result in the removal from office or the termination of the privilege.

By challenging the legitimacy of individuals or entities in positions of power, quo warranto ensures that public offices and privileges are not unlawfully occupied or abused. It promotes transparency, accountability, and the rule of law by holding those in authority to legal standards and preserving the integrity of public positions.

Case Law: *State of Karnataka v. Selvi J. Jayalalitha* (2001):

The case of *State of Karnataka v. Selvi J. Jayalalitha* in India is an illustrative example of



the application of quo warranto to challenge the authority and legitimacy of a public official.

In this case, Selvi J. Jayalalitha, a prominent political leader, held the position of Chief Minister of the state of Tamil Nadu. The opposition party filed a quo warranto petition, challenging Jayalalitha's right to hold the office on the grounds of alleged disqualification and corrupt practices.

The case ultimately reached the Supreme Court of India, where the Court examined the evidence and legal arguments presented. The Court found that Jayalalitha had failed to disclose certain assets and sources of income in her election affidavit, which violated the law and constituted a disqualification for holding public office. The Court held that her appointment as Chief Minister was invalid and ordered her removal from office.

The Jayalalitha case exemplifies how the quo warranto writ can be utilized to challenge the legitimacy of a public official and ensure adherence to legal qualifications and standards. The Court's intervention through quo warranto affirmed the importance of transparency, integrity, and the rule of law in the exercise of public authority.

IV. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, writs play a vital role in the legal system, serving as powerful tools to protect individual rights, ensure fair and just proceedings, and maintain the rule of law. Each type of writ serves a distinct purpose and operates as a safeguard against abuses of power, violations of constitutional rights, and errors in legal decision-making.

Writs are cornerstones of the legal system, essential for upholding justice, protecting individual liberties, and maintaining the integrity of the rule of law. They act as safeguards against arbitrary actions, ensure transparency and accountability, and serve as a means to rectify legal errors or injustices. By enabling individuals to challenge wrongful detention,

restraining excesses of lower courts or administrative bodies, reviewing decisions for legal errors, or questioning the legitimacy of those in power, writs ensure that the principles of fairness, justice, and the rule of law are upheld in society.

REFERENCES

1. <https://www.legalserviceindia.com/legal/article-9960-5-types-of-writs-in-indian-constitution.html>
2. <https://cleartax.in/s/writs>
3. <https://jlrjs.com/writs-and-its-types/>
4. <https://testbook.com/ias-preparation/types-of-writs-in-india>