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

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Non-Commercial-Share Alike 4.0 International (CC-BY-NC-SA 4.0) License, which permits unrestricted non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium provided the original work is properly cited.

THE ROLE OF PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION IN INDIA: FROM LOCUS STANDI TO EPISTOLARY JURISDICTION

(Nikky Singh)

Public Interest Litigation (PIL) in India stands as one of the most remarkable legal innovations in modern constitutional democracy. Unlike traditional adversary litigation, where two private parties fight over personal rights and damages, PIL transformed the judiciary into an accessible forum for social justice. It redefined the relationship between the citizen, the state, and the Supreme Court of India. By relaxing rigid procedural requirements and pioneering the concept of *epistolary jurisdiction*, the Indian judiciary expanded access to justice for millions of underprivileged, marginalized, and voiceless citizens.

1. Introduction and Conceptual Foundation

In traditional Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence, civil litigation strictly adhered to the doctrine of *locus standi* (standing to sue). Under this rule, only a person whose specific legal right was directly infringed could approach a court of law for a remedy. While this rule prevented courts from being inundated with vexatious litigation, in a developing nation like India—plagued by widespread illiteracy, poverty, and socio-economic inequality—it effectively shut the doors of justice for the vast majority of the population.

Public Interest Litigation emerged in the late 1970s and early 1980s to dismantle this barrier. Designed as an instrument of social action, PIL allows public-spirited citizens, non-governmental organizations, lawyers, and legal aid workers to move the court on behalf of individuals or groups who, due to poverty, ignorance, or institutional detention, are unable to seek judicial redress themselves.

2. The Paradigm Shift: From Strict Locus Standi to Expanded Standing

The transition from traditional standing to liberalized PIL jurisdiction was not merely procedural; it was deeply constitutional. The judiciary recognized that Article 32 (Right to Constitutional Remedies) and Article 226 of the Constitution of India could not fulfill their constitutional promise if remedies remained confined to the privileged elite.

Key Landmarks in Expanding Locus Standi

- **Mumbai Kamgar Sabha v. Abdulbhai:**[1] Justice V.R. Krishna Iyer initiated the relaxation of locus standi by recognizing that an association of workers could file a writ petition on behalf of affected workmen.
- **Hussainara Khatoon v. Home Secretary, State of Bihar:**[2] Often cited as the first major PIL case in India, advocate Pushpa Kapila Hingorani filed a petition based on newspaper reports detailing the plight of thousands of undertrial prisoners languishing in Bihar jails for periods longer than the maximum sentence for their alleged offences. The Supreme Court recognized the fundamental right to a speedy trial under Article 21 and ordered the release of over 40,000 undertrials.
- **S.P. Gupta v. Union of India:**[3] Authored by Justice P.N. Bhagwati, this historic judgment formally codified the liberalized doctrine of locus standi. The Court declared that where a legal injury is caused to a person or class of persons who, by reason of poverty, helplessness, or disability, cannot approach the court, any member of the public acting bona fide can maintain an application for appropriate relief.

3. The Emergence of Epistolary Jurisdiction

One of the most revolutionary facets of PIL jurisprudence in India is **Epistolary Jurisdiction**—the authority assumed by the Supreme Court and High Courts to treat simple letters, postcards, telegrams, or news reports addressed to the court or individual judges as formal writ petitions under Article 32 or Article 226.

[1]Mumbai Kamgar Sabha v. Abdulbhai Faizullabhai, (1976) 3 S.C.C. 832.
[2]Hussainara Khatoon v. Home Sec'y, State of Bihar, A.I.R. 1979 S.C. 1360.
[3]S.P. Gupta v. Union of India, A.I.R. 1982 S.C. 149.

In a country where hiring legal counsel and drafting elaborate pleadings is financially prohibitive for the impoverished, epistolary jurisdiction democratized constitutional remedies.

Key Case Illustrations

- **Sunil Batra v. Delhi Administration:**[4] A prisoner at Tihar Jail wrote a simple letter to a Supreme Court judge complaining about extreme torture inflicted on a fellow inmate by prison guards. Justice V.R. Krishna Iyer converted the letter into a habeas corpus writ petition, leading to landmark prison reforms.
- **Bandhua Mukti Morcha v. Union of India:**[5] An NGO addressed a letter highlighting the deplorable conditions of bonded laborers working in stone quarries in Haryana. Treating the letter as a petition under Article 32, the Court directed the government to release and rehabilitate bonded workers and establish welfare measures.
- **Sheela Barse v. State of Maharashtra:**[6] A letter written by a female journalist complaining of custodial violence against women prisoners in Bombay police lock-ups was converted into a PIL, prompting the Court to lay down comprehensive guidelines for female detainees.

4. Multi-Faceted Impact of PIL on Indian Society

Over four decades, PIL has expanded into diverse spheres of governance, fundamental rights expansion, and institutional accountability:

Area of Impact	Key Landmark Cases	Judicial Contribution
Environmental Protection	M.C. Mehta v. Union of India[7]	Established the "Polluter Pays" principle, the "Precautionary Principle", and recognized the Right to a Clean Environment under Article 21.
Gender Justice & Workplace Safety	Vishaka v. State of Rajasthan[8]	Formulated legally binding guidelines against sexual harassment at the workplace in the absence of legislation, laying the groundwork for the POSH Act, 2013.

[4]Sunil Batra v. Delhi Admin., A.I.R. 1980 S.C. 1579.
[5]Bandhua Mukti Morcha v. Union of India, (1984) 3 S.C.C. 161.
[6]Sheela Barse v. State of Maharashtra, (1983) 2 S.C.C. 96.
[7]M.C. Mehta v. Union of India, (1987) 1 S.C.C. 395.
[8]Vishaka v. State of Rajasthan, A.I.R. 1997 S.C. 3011.

Area of Impact	Key Landmark Cases	Judicial Contribution
Prison Reforms & Human Rights	D.K. Basu v. State of West Bengal[9]	Laid down mandatory procedural safeguards during arrest and detention to prevent custodial violence and torture.
Transparency & Good Governance	People's Union for Civil Liberties (PUCL) v. Union of India[10]	Enforced the right of voters to know candidates' criminal antecedents and assets, and introduced the NOTA (None of the Above) voting option.

5. Judicial Activism vs. Judicial Overreach: Challenges and Criticisms

Despite its immense contribution, the PIL mechanism has faced significant criticism regarding its potential abuse and impact on the separation of powers:

- **Frivolous Litigation & Publicity Interest Litigation:** Courts are increasingly burdened with petitions filed for personal gain, political mileage, or publicity (often termed "Publicity Interest Litigation" or "Private Interest Litigation").
- **Judicial Overreach:** Critics argue that through extensive PIL orders, courts sometimes cross into executive policymaking and legislative roles, managing administrative matters such as city garbage collection, traffic control, or environmental regulation.
- **Backlog of Cases:** The liberal admission of PIL petitions risks diverting judicial time and resources away from long-pending traditional civil and criminal appeals.

6. Regulatory Safeguards and Judicial Restraint

To curb the misuse of public interest petitions, the Supreme Court has issued strict guidelines (notably in *State of Uttaranchal v. Balwant Singh Chaufal*[11]). Courts now require petitions to establish bona fide public interest, verify the petitioner's credentials, and impose heavy costs on frivolous or politically motivated filings.

7. Conclusion

From the relaxation of strict *locus standi* to the birth of *epistolary jurisdiction*, Public Interest Litigation has permanently altered the constitutional landscape of India. By transforming simple

[9]D.K. Basu v. State of West Bengal, (1997) 1 S.C.C. 416.
[10]People's Union for Civil Liberties (PUCL) v. Union of India, (2003) 4 S.C.C. 399.
[11]State of Uttaranchal v. Balwant Singh Chaufal, (2010) 3 S.C.C. 407.

letters from prisoners and activists into powerful judicial mandates, the Supreme Court ensured that fundamental rights were not high-sounding platitudes, but enforceable reality for the most vulnerable. While maintaining vigilance against misuse remains critical, PIL remains India's most effective judicial catalyst for human rights, governance accountability, and social change.