The Indian Journal for Research in Law and Management

Open Access Law Journal – Copyright © 2026

Editor-in-Chief – Dr. Muktai Deb Chavan; Publisher – Alden Vas; ISSN: 2583-9896

RAI SAHIB RAM JAWAYA KAPUR V. STATE OF PUNJAB (1955): A CASE COMMENTARY

Subasree S

Rai Sahib Ram Jawaya Kapur v. State of Punjab[1]

INTRODUCTION

Rai Sahib Ram Jawaya Kapur v. State of Punjab was one of the few early Supreme Court rulings that had the most impact on how the Indian government operated on a daily basis. The case, which resulted from a routine disagreement over school textbooks, was ruled in 1955 by a Constitution Bench led by Chief Justice Bijan Kumar Mukherjea. However, it provided one of the most enduring rulings on the extent of executive power under the Indian Constitution. Fundamentally, the ruling provides a response to an issue that arises in every area of administrative and constitutional law: may the executive act independently, or must each action be approved by a particular statute enacted by the legislature? Even today, Indian administrations still rely on the Court's ruling that executive power is coextensive with legislative power and does not require statute-by-statute approval.[2]

FACTS

From 1905 to the present, Punjabi schools chose textbooks from a list of commercially published books that the Education Department deemed acceptable. Publishers, such as the petitioners functioning under the name "Uttar Chand Kapur & Sons," fought to be added to this authorised list and centred their operations on it. The Punjab government started the process of nationalising textbook publishing after Partition. A series of notifications issued from 1950 onward gradually excluded third-party publishers, first inviting proposals only from authors directly and eventually setting up a state monopoly over the printing, publication, and sale of

---

[1]AIR 1955 SC 549.

[2]M.P. Jain, Indian Constitutional Law 92 (8th ed. 2018).

textbooks for Punjab's primary and middle schools. Due to dependence on the earlier competitive system, the petitioners were essentially barred. They petitioned the Supreme Court explicitly under Article 32, arguing that the Punjab government's policy was unable to withstand scrutiny under the Constitution.

ISSUES

The case raises two significant questions :

I. whether the State government could lawfully carry on the trade or business of textbook publishing without any specific legislative enactment authorising it to do so, given that legislative sanction had only ever come indirectly through annual budgetary appropriations rather than a dedicated statute.

II. whether the nationalisation policy, even if otherwise lawful, violated the petitioners' fundamental right to carry on any trade or business under Article 19(1)(g), and whether it amounted to an unreasonable restriction that could not be saved by Article 19(6).

ARGUMENTS

Counsel for the petitioners, led by G.S. Pathak, pointed out that the executive was, in fundamental terms, imposing a trade monopoly through administrative notification, something only Parliament or the State Legislature could legitimately undertake. Relying on Article 73 and Article 162 (define the boundaries of executive power between the central government and state government) , they argued that executive power has to monitor legislative competence precisely, thereby meaning the executive could act only where a specific law already existed authorising the particular action. In absence of such a law, the notifications consisted ultra vires. They further argued that even if the executive had some additional power to act, the practical impact of the notifications, suppressing the petitioners' established business, violated their right under Article 19(1)(g), a right that guarantees every citizen the freedom to practice any profession, or to carry on any occupation, trade, or business and could not be justified as a reasonable restriction under Article 19(6).

The State responded that its conduct had always been supported by necessary appropriation: the State Legislature granted the required funding through Appropriation Acts, and the costs associated with operating the textbook scheme were reflected in the yearly financial statement. It contended that the government had explicit authority under Article 298 to enter into contracts with authors and printers in order to carry out the scheme, and that no further statutory legislation required under the constitution for the executive to carry out such activities.

JUDGMENT

The applications were dismissed by the Supreme Court. It was decided that executive power under the Constitution is not limited to carrying out laws that have already been passed by the legislature; it also extends to the creation and execution of government policy, including carrying out trade or business, provided that the activity is within the scope that the legislature could have authorised and does not violate any existing laws. The Court determined that it would be impractical and inconsistent with the constitutional framework to require explicit parliamentary authorisation prior to every executive action. There was no need for a separate sanctioning legislation as long as government funding for the activity was granted through the standard budgeting procedure and Appropriations Acts.

Regarding the fundamental rights issue, the Court determined that the petitioners had no legal standing to have the government legally mandate particular textbooks. Under Article 19(1)(g), losing a customer base owing to the government's implementation of a new business model did not constitute an infringement of the freedom to conduct trade or commerce; in other words, it was just an economic liability that comes with contracting with a discretionary buyer. The issue of reasonable restriction under Article 19(6) wasn't brought forth as no fundamental right was harmed.

RATIO DECIDENDI

The Court agreed with a functional, flexible view of the separation of powers, acknowledging that the Indian Constitution does not establish rigid boundaries between the legislature, executive, as well as judiciary and this some overlap in the exercise of their functions is both unavoidable and constitutionally permissible. The case is best remembered for defining what later commentary refers to as the doctrine of co-extensive executive power: executive authority in India is broadened as far as the legislative authority of its respective legislature and does not require a specific statute to authorise each individual executive act as long as it complies with fundamental rights.

CRITICAL ANALYSIS

The judgment's practical wisdom is evident that a government that could act only if it's subject to a mandatory enabling statutory provision for every administrative decision, that would have immobilised the executive wing, particularly for essential but routine functions like managing government schools, hospitals, or printing services. Ram Jawaya Kapur empowered the Indian government to govern without having to wait for the legislature to make every incidental choice. Despite this, the decision has drawn criticism for the extent to which it widens executive authority, particularly when the doctrine is applied to support actions that have significantly greater implications than publishing textbooks.

Later courts have had to make clarifications between executive action that merely regulates and executive action that effectively deprives persons of their rights or establishes new legal responsibilities, the latter of which still requires appropriate legislative support. Ram Jawaya Kapur completes a two-sided representation of Indian administrative law when read together with the essential legislative function doctrine from In re Delhi Laws Act, which was decided solely four years earlier. The executive can take action, allocate funds, and govern within its policy domain without requiring the consent of Parliament at all levels, but it cannot make enforceable regulations of general use without delegation of authority.

CONCLUSION

The reason Rai Sahib Ram Jawaya Kapur v. State of Punjab continues to be recognised as a landmark decision is because it takes on a conflict that arises in parliamentary democratic systems, the question is how to maintain governance while barring the executive branch from functioning without restriction. The Court granted Indian administration the independence it needs to operate on an ongoing basis by determining that executive power is co-extensive with legislative proficiency and is not subject to statutory authorisation for every activity. The core argument of the case—where ease of administration should give ground to the oversight of the legislative process—is, if anything, of greater significance now than it was in 1955, as administrative rule-making and policy enforcement continue to broaden in scope and intensity.