Research Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences
(An Open Access International Peer Reviewed Journal)
ISSN: 2945-3968

Contribution of the Collegium System for Judicial Independence in India: An Analytical Study

Dayabir Singh[1], Dr. Ravinder Kaur[2]
[1]Ph.D. Scholar, Department of Law, School of Legal Studies, Central University of Punjab (CUP),Bathinda, Punjab, India
[2]Assistant Professor,Department of Law,School of Legal Studies, Central University of Punjab (CUP), Bathinda, Punjab, India

Abstract: Judicial independence forms the basic premise for the establishment of a constitutional democracy. The independence of the higher judiciary in India is intimately linked with the mode of appointment of the judges of the Supreme Court and High Courts. While the Constitution initially envisaged the President appointing judges after consulting constitutionally specified individuals, the Supreme Court, through a series of constitutional judgments, altered the nature of consultation, giving rise to what is now known as the Collegium System. The Second Judges Case in 1993 and Third Judges Case in 1998 laid down and gave shape to the principle of judicial primacy in appointments. The Collegium System was challenged through the creation of the National Judicial Appointments Commission (NJAC). However, the Supreme Court struck down the Ninety-Ninth Constitutional Amendment and the NJAC Act in 2015.

In this paper, the role of the collegium system in maintaining judicial independence in India is analysed. First, the constitutional aspects of judicial independence, the development of the collegium system, and its importance in protecting judicial independence from executive influence, ensuring judicial review, and upholding the separation of powers are assessed. However, at the same time, arguments against the system regarding its lack of transparency and accountability, poor diversity of appointed judges and delays are also considered. Special attention is paid to recent institutional innovations, including the Supreme Court's publication of appointment rules and information.

A doctrinal and analytical approach is employed, and the main sources in this paper include the Constitution, Supreme Court decisions, official materials, and relevant legal literature. In addition, the paper maintains that judicial independence and accountability are not mutually exclusive goals. The key function of the collegium system is to maintain judicial primacy and to avoid political interference in judicial appointments. However, the legitimacy and efficiency of the process could be improved by specifying appointment criteria, providing explanations and deadlines, documenting the procedure, and enhancing diversity.

Keywords: Judicial Independence; Collegium System; Judicial Appointments; Supreme Court of India; High Courts; NJAC; Separation of Powers; Constitutionalism.

How to cite this article: Singh D, Kaur R . Contribution Of The Collegium System For Judicial Independence In India: An Analytical Study. **Research Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences. 2026 Oct 11, 5(4): 292-301. doi.org/10.58924/rjhss.v5.iss4.p24**
Source of support: Nil.
Conflict of interest: None
DOI: doi.org/10.58924/rjhss.v5.iss4.p24

Received:	18-09-2026
Revised:	22-09-2026
Accepted	02-10-2026
Published:	11-10-2026

Copyright:© 2026 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

1. INTRODUCTION

Judicial independence is crucial for a constitutional democracy because courts should be able to resolve disputes based on the law, free from improper influence by the executive, legislature, political parties, and private interests. Judicial independence is particularly significant in cases where constitutional courts have the power of judicial review. An independent court could even be obliged to strike down the legislation, review executive actions, enforce fundamental rights, and place constitutional restraints on the government. Judicial independence thus serves as a protection for judges, citizens, and the Constitution.

The Indian Constitution establishes an independent judiciary with several constitutional roles. The Supreme Court and High Courts have jurisdiction over matters of constitutionality, fundamental rights, public law disputes, and the legality of governmental action. The Constitution provides safeguards regarding appointments,

tenure, removal, salaries, and jurisdiction. However, there is no mention of "Collegium System" in the Indian Constitution. The system as we know it today has evolved largely due to the interpretation of Articles 124 and 217 of the Constitution.

An ongoing institutional debate about the right balance between executive involvement and judicial independence has marked the history of judicial appointments in India. The First Judges Case, S.P. Gupta v. Union of India, involved an understanding that did not prioritize judicial independence. The Second Judges Case, decided in 1993, marked a major departure from that stance by recognizing the primacy of the judiciary. The Third Judges Case, decided in 1998, clarified the nature of consultation in the Collegium. The consequence was a system in which the judiciary emerged as the primary institutional player in appointments to the higher judiciary.

The Collegium has come under criticism for a lack of transparency, unclear criteria, issues with representation and diversity, and delays in appointments. The effort to replace it with the National Judicial Appointments Commission led to a major constitutional crisis. In 2015, the Supreme Court struck down the NJAC scheme and restored the Collegium. Significantly, the Supreme Court also recognized the need to reform the existing system.

The contemporary debate should therefore not be reduced to a simple choice between the Collegium and executive control. The more significant constitutional question is how India can preserve judicial independence while ensuring transparency, accountability, efficiency and public confidence in judicial appointments. This paper examines that question through a doctrinal and analytical study.

Research Problem

The core problem stems from a conflict between two constitutional goals. The first goal is judicial independence, whereby judges need sufficient insulation from political influence to make impartial judgments, including decisions involving the government. The second goal is institutional accountability, meaning that the use of constitutional power should be guided by processes that are open, reasonable, and fair.

The Collegium seeks to safeguard judicial independence by placing the judiciary at the forefront of the appointment process. Nonetheless, the fact that judicial actors have made recommendations for appointmentscasts doubt on openness and accountability. The problem that is discussed here is whether the Collegium System has contributed to judicial independence in light of the criteria of transparency, diversity, and efficiency.

Research Objectives

1. To examine the constitutional foundations of judicial independence in India.
2. To trace the historical and judicial evolution of the Collegium System.
3. To analyse the contribution of judicial primacy to the independence of the higher judiciary.
4. To examine major criticisms regarding transparency, accountability, diversity, and delay.
5. To analyse the constitutional controversy surrounding the National Judicial Appointments Commission.
6. To examine recent transparency measures adopted by the Supreme Court.
7. To suggest reforms that can strengthen transparency and accountability without undermining judicial independence.

Research Questions

1. What is the constitutional basis of judicial independence in India?
2. How did the Collegium System emerge through judicial interpretation?
3. How does judicial primacy in appointments contribute to judicial independence?
4. What are the principal institutional criticisms of the Collegium System?
5. Why was the NJAC declared unconstitutional?
6. Can transparency and accountability be strengthened without compromising judicial independence?
7. What reforms can improve the legitimacy, efficiency, and inclusiveness of judicial appointments?

2. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This research is doctrinal and analytical in nature. The sources of law are the Constitution of India, judgments of the Supreme Court, amendments to the Constitution, judicial appointments-related laws, and official materials. The secondary sources used are texts on constitutional law, scholarly articles and literature. The most relevant judicial decisions are S.P. Gupta vs. Union of India; Supreme Court Advocates-on-Record Association vs. Union of India (1993); the 1998 presidential reference; and Supreme Court Advocates-on-Record Association vs. Union of India (2015). Official Supreme Court material on judicial appointments and the Collegium is also included. The research does not purport to demonstrate any statistical causality between the Collegium and judicial independence, but its contribution to the constitution.

Constitutional Framework of Judicial Independence

Constitutional Structure

Judicial independence in India is safeguarded by provisions in the Constitution rather than by a single clause. Article 124 relates to the Supreme Court, and Article 217 relates to the High Courts; other provisions deal with the tenures, removal, and salaries of judges, the jurisdiction of these courts, and the functioning of these institutions. Article 50 mandates that the State take measures to ensure the separation of the judiciary from the executive in the State's public services. Though Article 50 is a Directive Principle, it shows the constitutional concern for separation.

The security of tenure of judges is yet another important protection. The judges of the Supreme Court and High Courts cannot be removed just because their judgments are politically inconvenient. Removal is governed by the procedure specified in the Constitution for removal on the ground of misbehavior or incapacity.

Judicial Independence as a Constitutional Principle

The Supreme Court has often reiterated the connection between judicial independence and the courts' constitutionality. Independence is not only an issue for individual judges but also for the judiciary as a whole. If judges were appointed, transferred, or dismissed at the political executive's discretion, the issue of institutional independence would be a concern.

Judicial independence is thus a two-fold concept, having structural and functional aspects. While structural independence concerns the mode of appointment, terms of service, and financial and institutional security, functional independence concerns the judge's capacity to make decisions without external pressure in individual cases. The issue of Collegium is mainly related to structural independence.

Evolution of the Collegium System

Constitutional Position Before the Collegium

The constitutional text assigns the President a formal role in appointing judges of the Supreme Court and High Courts, subject to consultation with specified authorities. The central interpretive question was the meaning of "consultation" and whether the Chief Justice of India or the judiciary should have primacy over the executive. During the early decades of the Constitution, executive influence remained significant in the appointment process.

First Judges Case: S.P. Gupta

In S.P. Gupta v. Union of India, the Supreme Court considered questions concerning judicial appointments, transfers and disclosure of governmental materials. The majority did not accept a position giving decisive primacy to the Chief Justice of India. The judgment consequently represented a constitutional arrangement in which executive participation retained substantial weight.

Second Judges Case, 1993

The second Judges case, Supreme Court Advocates-on-Record Association v. Union of India, marked a turning point in the law on this subject. The Supreme Court's interpretation of the constitutional necessity of consultation took into account the necessity of preserving judicial independence. It held that the opinion of the Chief Justice of India arrived at through consultation with senior judges ought to be paramount in judicial appointments. This judgment came to be the cornerstone of the Collegium system.

The rationale for such a judgment was institutional: if the executive exercised discretion in appointing judges, judges could become politically susceptible. Therefore, the judiciary's primacy in such decisions was a necessary structural safeguard.

Third Judges Case, 1998

The Presidential Reference of 1998 defined the jurisdiction and composition of the Collegium. The Chief Justice of India could no longer work alone; consultations were to become an institutional requirement. The composition of the Collegium for appointments to the Supreme Court would comprise the Chief Justice of India and the four senior-most judges of the Supreme Court. For appointments to High Courts, the composition of the Collegium would start at the High Court, proceed to the Supreme Court Collegium, and then to the Union Government.

As a result of the Third Judges Case, the institution of judicial primacy became an organized process. The modern-day Collegium is therefore an outcome of constitutional interpretations in several cases and is not mentioned directly in the Constitution.

Contribution of the Collegium System to Judicial Independence

Limiting Direct Political Influence

The most important achievement of the Collegium is the lessening of the direct influence of the executive on judicial appointments. Constitutional courts hear cases concerning government departments, legislation, and executive branch policies. The appointment of judges by an independent executive authority may raise questions about political influence. Judicial supremacy makes a wider gap between appointments and politics.

Protection of Decisional Autonomy

A judge's independence is influenced by the institutions within which the appointment process takes place. While it may be true that independence in appointments does not necessarily entail decision-making independence, it remains that such independence reduces the likelihood that judges will have to anticipate political preferences. This means the Collegium indirectly helps achieve independence in decision-making.

Protection of Judicial Review

Judicial review is an essential element of constitutionalism in India. The Supreme Court and the High Courts are empowered to review actions by the executive and the legislature for consistency with constitutional standards. This process of judicial review will be effective only when judges have sufficient institutional independence to make decisions against the government, where necessary.

Separation of Powers and Checks and Balances

India does not have a separation of powers system. The distribution of powers and the establishment of checks and balances are provided for in the Constitution. Judicial independence can be considered one of the checks and balances provided by the Constitution. The Collegium may be regarded as a system that addresses the danger of weakening judicial independence due to the excess power of the executive.

Professional and Institutional Knowledge

Serving judges have professional knowledge of how courts function and of the legal profession. They can have first-hand experience regarding a candidate's professional qualifications, legal qualifications, integrity, and behavior before the court. However, this professional knowledge can work alongside clear criteria to ensure that it does not replace objective standards.

The National Judicial Appointments Commission Controversy

The issue of judicial appointments in the constitutional sense took another turn with the Constitution (Ninety-Ninth Amendment) Act, 2014 and the National Judicial Appointments Commission Act, 2014. In the NJAC proposal, an attempt was made to reform the Collegium system by introducing a more inclusive process that incorporates both judicial and non-judicial elements.

In the case of Supreme Court Advocates-on-Record Association v. Union of India (2015), the Supreme Court, through its majority judgment, held the constitutional amendment and the NJAC Act unconstitutional. The Supreme Court held that judicial independence is a basic component of the basic structure, and the NJAC arrangement was found insufficient to provide the primacy considered essential.

The significance of the NJAC judgment is that it struck a balance in the constitutional sense by preserving the primacy of judges while at the same time not denigrating the Collegium. Thereafter, discussions continued regarding the memorandum of procedure, transparency, criteria, and so forth.

Criticism of the Collegium System

Transparency

The most persistent criticism concerns transparency. Historically, the public could not easily determine the criteria applied to individual recommendations or the reasons why a particular candidate was selected or rejected. Judicial appointments are public constitutional decisions, and the absence of adequate information can affect public confidence even where the underlying decisions are professionally sound.

Accountability

The second issue is accountability. The Collegium wields substantial public power yet functions primarily in the judicial sector. There have been criticisms of how accountability can be achieved given the Collegium's workings. It would be wrong to say that the best way out is to give the executive full power, since this will repeat the problem of independence.

Diversity and Representation

Another important factor is diversity. The higher judiciary wields power over people from all strata of society. Having women and individuals from various regions and backgrounds can make the institution more legitimate and enhance the experience. It must be remembered, however, that such diversity should be achieved by constitutional means.

Lack of Clearly Articulated Criteria

Another concern is that the relative importance of seniority, merit, competence, integrity, representation, and institutional considerations is often not apparent to the general public. General criteria will not involve disclosing any private information. It would help explain the standards used to make these evaluations.

Delay

Delays in appointments can result in vacancies and additional burden on courts. This process requires the involvement of several parties, including the collegia of the High Courts, the Supreme Court collegium, and the executive. It is thus inappropriate to blame the entire delay on a single organization. Instead, what is needed is to establish a timeline for each step.

Recent Transparency Developments

The Collegium System has evolved as an institutional practice since the previous version. On 5 May 2025, the Supreme Court of India informed that the full procedure for appointments to the High Courts and the Supreme Court has been made available on its website, covering the procedures involving the High Court Collegium, the State Governments, the Government of India, and the Supreme Court Collegium. The Court also posted the details of the High Court appointments proposed from 9 November 2022 to 5 May 2025, including the source of the nominee, the date of nomination and appointment, and the category in the context of diversity.

The Supreme Court Collegium Resolutions webpage continues to post Collegium resolutions related to appointments and transfers. The webpage currently has several Collegium Resolutions of 2026.

This is important from a constitutional perspective because it shows that the independence and transparency of the courts go hand in hand. Transparency need not mean disclosing all confidential consultations. There can be a more balanced approach in which criteria, processes, and reasons are disclosed while protecting confidential personal information.

Analytical Assessment

Judicial independence as a result of the Collegium must be considered in an evaluation of the institution that is not either infallible or inherently illegitimate. The greatest strength of the system lies in its structure, whereby those charged with judging government actions cannot themselves be placed in a situation in which the political executive has sole decision-making powers over appointments.

Equally, however, judicial independence is not judicial isolationism. An institution may be independent of politics while still being governed by rules of transparency and accountability. In fact, judicial independence will perhaps be enhanced where the process of selecting judges is sufficiently intelligible and rational.

The correct analytical approach is thus that of institutional equilibrium. The basic function of the Collegium, namely that of ensuring judicial primacy, can be maintained alongside improvements in procedure. Neither transparency, diversity, nor efficiency has to be compromised by executive power.

Comparative Constitutional Perspective

Various types of constitutional systems also use different methods for appointing judges. While in some cases there is significant executive participation followed by legislative approval, in other cases, special judicial councils and commissions are involved. No system of appointment automatically ensures judicial independence.

As shown by the Indian case, the institutional design must take into consideration at least four goals – judicial independence, transparency, accountability and competence with diversity. The crucial problem here is not only who to appoint but also how to protect the judicial process from political domination and arbitrariness.

3. SUGGESTIONS AND REFORMS

Clear General Selection Criteria

The collegium should formulate general criteria regarding professional competence, integrity, judicial temperament, constitutional knowledge, experience, and, if applicable, seniority and institutional diversity. Criteria of this nature will enhance predictability without disclosing personal details.

Reasoned Transparency

The recommendations must be supported with adequate reasoning to some degree. The confidentiality of information can be maintained; however, the rationale of the recommendation should normally be comprehensible.

Diversity

The process needs to take into consideration issues of diversity within the higher judiciary, including gender, regional, and professional diversity, as well as underrepresentation.

Time-Bound Procedure

Each institutional stage should operate within a reasonable time frame. A documented timeline would reduce avoidable vacancies and make it easier to identify responsibility for delays.

Better Documentation

An official record of recommendations, results, and processes is vital in improving institutional accountability. The Supreme Court's current online publication process is a good starting point.

Protection Against Political Domination

Legitimate government influences that do not violate the Constitution must continue to be included in the procedure. Still, no political organization must have so much influence that it could subvert judicial independence.

Periodic Institutional Review

The functioning of the appointment process should be periodically reviewed for efficiency, transparency, diversity, and procedural consistency. Such a review should improve the system rather than become a mechanism for political control.

4. FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

1. Judicial independence is an essential constitutional value and a precondition for effective judicial review.
2. The Collegium System emerged through judicial interpretation of constitutional provisions rather than through an express constitutional provision using that terminology.
3. The Second Judges Case established the central principle of judicial primacy in appointments.
4. The Third Judges Case provided greater institutional structure to the Collegium.
5. Judicial primacy reduces the possibility of direct executive dominance in judicial appointments.
6. The system nevertheless raises legitimate questions concerning transparency, accountability, diversity, and procedural delay.
7. The NJAC controversy demonstrates the constitutional difficulty of balancing broader participation with judicial independence.
8. The Supreme Court's recent publication of appointment procedures and recommendation data represents a significant transparency development.
9. Judicial independence and accountability can be pursued simultaneously if accountability is designed without transferring decisive appointment power to political actors.
10. Future reform should focus on clearer criteria, reasoned disclosure, time-bound procedures, documentation and diversity.

5. CONCLUSION

The Collegium System plays a significant role in India's constitution regarding judicial appointments. It was created as a result of judicial interpretation of Articles 124 and 217, developing over the Second and Third Judges Cases. The basic constitutional basis of the Collegium is the need for judicial independence. By prioritizing the body of judges' decision-making process rather than placing decision-making power under the control of the political executive, the Collegium ensures the institutional independence of constitutional courts.

The role of the Collegium is especially important, as the Supreme Court and High Courts constantly examine actions taken by the Government. The judicial branch, which has the authority to impose constitutional constraints on the State, requires adequate protection from political influence. In this respect, the Collegium serves as an important institutional mechanism connected to the idea of separation of powers in its broader sense.

Nevertheless, the issue of institutional independence cannot answer all other problems. The issues associated with the Collegium therefore warrant continued constitutional and institutional consideration. While the NJAC ruling provided a decisive answer to the issue of judicial primacy in the current constitutional scheme, it certainly did not immunize the appointment process from reform.

Recent trends are important. For one, the Supreme Court has made the appointment procedure and substantial information on recommendations public, and continues to do

so through the Collegium Resolutions page. This shows how transparency can be achieved without giving up judicial primacy.

It follows that the most sustainable course of action is reform under an independence-protective framework. General criteria, reasons, timeliness, improved documentation and consideration of diversity are measures that can help legitimate the process of judicial appointments. Such reforms do not necessarily have to transform the appointment process into an executive-led process.

References

1. Constitution of India, articles. 50, 124, 217, 222, and related provisions.
2. Constitution (Ninety-Ninth Amendment) Act, 2014.
3. National Judicial Appointments Commission Act, 2014.
4. S.P. Gupta v. Union of India, 1982 Supp SCC 87.
5. Supreme Court Advocates-on-Record Association v. Union of India, (1993) 4 SCC 441.
6. Special Reference No. 1 of 1998, (1998) 7 SCC 739.
7. Supreme Court Advocates-on-Record Association v. Union of India, (2016) 5 SCC 1.
8. Mahesh Chandra Gupta v. Union of India, (2009) 8 SCC 273.
9. Supreme Court of India, Collegium Resolutions, official website.
10. Supreme Court of India, Press Release dated 5 May 2025, concerning the publication of the process of appointments to the High Courts and Supreme Court.
11. Department of Justice, Ministry of Law and Justice, Government of India, materials concerning judicial appointments.
12. M.P. Jain, Indian Constitutional Law, LexisNexis.
13. H.M. Seervai, Constitutional Law of India, Universal Law Publishing.
14. V.N. Shukla, Constitution of India, Eastern Book Company.
15. D.D. Basu, Introduction to the Constitution of India, LexisNexis.
16. S.P. Sathe, Judicial Activism in India: Transgressing Borders and Enforcing Limits, Oxford University Press.
17. Upendra Baxi, The Crisis of the Indian Legal System, Vikas Publishing House.

***