



INTERNATIONAL LAW
JOURNAL

**WHITE BLACK
LEGAL LAW
JOURNAL
ISSN: 2581-
8503**

Peer - Reviewed & Refereed Journal

The Law Journal strives to provide a platform for discussion of International as well as National Developments in the Field of Law.

WWW.WHITEBLACKLEGAL.CO.IN

DISCLAIMER

No part of this publication may be reproduced or copied in any form by any means without prior written permission of Editor-in-chief of White Black Legal – The Law Journal. The Editorial Team of White Black Legal holds the copyright to all articles contributed to this publication. The views expressed in this publication are purely personal opinions of the authors and do not reflect the views of the Editorial Team of White Black Legal. Though all efforts are made to ensure the accuracy and correctness of the information published, White Black Legal shall not be responsible for any errors caused due to oversight or otherwise.

WHITE BLACK
LEGAL

EDITORIAL **TEAM**

Raju Narayana Swamy (IAS) Indian Administrative Service **officer**



a professional
Procurement from the World Bank.

Dr. Raju Narayana Swamy popularly known as Kerala's Anti-Corruption Crusader is the All India Topper of the 1991 batch of the IAS and is currently posted as Principal Secretary to the Government of Kerala. He has earned many accolades as he hit against the political-bureaucrat corruption nexus in India. Dr Swamy holds a B.Tech in Computer Science and Engineering from the IIT Madras and a Ph. D. in Cyber Law from Gujarat National Law University. He also has an LLM (Pro) (with specialization in IPR) as well as three PG Diplomas from the National Law University, Delhi- one in Urban Environmental Management and Law, another in Environmental Law and Policy and a third one in Tourism and Environmental Law. He also holds a post-graduate diploma in IPR from the National Law School, Bengaluru and diploma in Public

Dr. R. K. Upadhyay

Dr. R. K. Upadhyay is Registrar, University of Kota (Raj.), Dr Upadhyay obtained LLB , LLM degrees from Banaras Hindu University & Phd from university of Kota.He has succesfully completed UGC sponsored M.R.P for the work in the ares of the various prisoners reforms in the state of the Rajasthan.



Senior Editor

Dr. Neha Mishra



Dr. Neha Mishra is Associate Professor & Associate Dean (Scholarships) in Jindal Global Law School, OP Jindal Global University. She was awarded both her PhD degree and Associate Professor & Associate Dean M.A.; LL.B. (University of Delhi); LL.M.; Ph.D. (NLSIU, Bangalore) LLM from National Law School of India University, Bengaluru; she did her LL.B. from Faculty of Law, Delhi University as well as M.A. and B.A. from Hindu College and DCAC from DU respectively. Neha has been a Visiting Fellow, School of Social Work, Michigan State University, 2016 and invited speaker Panelist at Global Conference, Whitney R. Harris World Law Institute, Washington University in St.Louis, 2015.

Ms. Sumiti Ahuja

Ms. Sumiti Ahuja, Assistant Professor, Faculty of Law, University of Delhi,

Ms. Sumiti Ahuja completed her LL.M. from the Indian Law Institute with specialization in Criminal Law and Corporate Law, and has over nine years of teaching experience. She has done her LL.B. from the Faculty of Law, University of Delhi. She is currently pursuing Ph.D. in the area of Forensics and Law. Prior to joining the teaching profession, she has worked as Research Assistant for projects funded by different agencies of Govt. of India. She has developed various audio-video teaching modules under UGC e-PG Pathshala programme in the area of Criminology, under the aegis of an MHRD Project. Her areas of interest are Criminal Law, Law of Evidence, Interpretation of Statutes, and Clinical Legal Education.



Dr. Navtika Singh Nautiyal

Dr. Navtika Singh Nautiyal presently working as an Assistant Professor in School of law, Forensic Justice and Policy studies at National Forensic Sciences University, Gandhinagar, Gujarat. She has 9 years of Teaching and Research Experience. She has completed her Philosophy of Doctorate in 'Intercountry adoption laws from Uttranchal University, Dehradun' and LLM from Indian Law Institute, New Delhi.



Dr. Rinu Saraswat

Associate Professor at School of Law, Apex University, Jaipur, M.A, LL.M, Ph.D,

Dr. Rinu have 5 yrs of teaching experience in renowned institutions like Jagannath University and Apex University. Participated in more than 20 national and international seminars and conferences and 5 workshops and training programmes.

Dr. Nitesh Saraswat

E.MBA, LL.M, Ph.D, PGDSAPM

Currently working as Assistant Professor at Law Centre II, Faculty of Law, University of Delhi. Dr. Nitesh have 14 years of Teaching, Administrative and research experience in Renowned Institutions like Amity University, Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Jai Narain Vyas University Jodhpur, Jagannath University and Nirma University.

More than 25 Publications in renowned National and International Journals and has authored a Text book on Cr.P.C and Juvenile Delinquency law.



Subhrajit Chanda

BBA. LL.B. (Hons.) (Amity University, Rajasthan); LL. M. (UPES, Dehradun) (Nottingham Trent University, UK); Ph.D. Candidate (G.D. Goenka University)

Subhrajit did his LL.M. in Sports Law, from Nottingham Trent University of United Kingdoms, with international scholarship provided by university; he has also completed another LL.M. in Energy Law from University of Petroleum and Energy Studies, India. He did his B.B.A.LL.B. (Hons.) focussing on International Trade Law.

ABOUT US

WHITE BLACK LEGAL is an open access, peer-reviewed and refereed journal providededicated to express views on topical legal issues, thereby generating a cross current of ideas on emerging matters. This platform shall also ignite the initiative and desire of young law students to contribute in the field of law. The erudite response of legal luminaries shall be solicited to enable readers to explore challenges that lie before law makers, lawyers and the society at large, in the event of the ever changing social, economic and technological scenario.

With this thought, we hereby present to you

PROPERTY RIGHTS IN CONSTITUTIONAL PERSPECTIVE - A COMPARATIVE STUDY BETWEEN INDIA, US AND EUROPE.

AUTHORED BY - MR. VETRIVEL M & MRS. P. BRINDA

ABSTRACT

The right to property is an important part of many countries' constitutions. It means that people have the legal right to own things like land, houses, or personal items, and that the government cannot take these things away without a good reason and fair payment. This abstract looks at how different countries protect this right and how it fits into their overall constitutional systems. In countries like the United States and many in Europe, the right to property is seen as a basic human right. For example, the U.S. Constitution says that people must be given fair payment if the government takes their property. Similarly, European countries follow laws that protect private property but also allow for limitations if it is for the public good. However, not all countries treat property rights the same way. In India, for example, the right to property used to be a fundamental right but was later changed to a legal right. This allows the government to focus more on social justice and helping poor people get access to land and housing. Many modern constitutions are trying to balance individual property rights with the needs of society. Courts now often consider issues like the environment, public housing, and the rights of indigenous people when making decisions about property. By looking at different countries, we see that the right to property is not just about owning things—it is also about fairness and social justice. Each country handles it differently depending on their history and goals. This comparison helps us understand how constitutional rights change and adapt over time.

KEYWORDS

Constitution, Right to property, Fundamental Rights, Legal Rights

Introduction

Property rights are a fundamental aspect of any constitutional framework, serving as a foundation for individual liberty, economic stability, and social development. While widely recognized, their constitutional treatment varies significantly across jurisdictions. This paper compares the treatment of property rights in India, the United States, and Europe, analyzing the extent of protection offered, the role of the judiciary, and the interaction between individual rights and state power.

2. Property Rights in India

2.1 Historical Evolution

Under the original Constitution of India, the right to property was a fundamental right under Articles 19(1)(f) and 31. However, due to socio-economic challenges and land reform initiatives, this right was frequently amended. The **44th Constitutional Amendment (1978)** abolished it as a fundamental right and reclassified it as a legal right under **Article 300A**.

2.2 Current Constitutional Framework

Article 300A states: "No person shall be deprived of his property save by authority of law." It provides a procedural safeguard but lacks substantive protections such as mandatory compensation or strong judicial scrutiny.

2.3 Judicial Interpretation

The judiciary has clarified the scope of property protection in cases like:

K.T. Plantation v. State of Karnataka (2011): Upheld Article 300A as a constitutional right, requiring due process but not mandating compensation. Courts generally defer to the legislature, especially in matters involving land acquisition and public interest.

3. Property Rights in the United States

3.1 Constitutional Foundation

The **Fifth Amendment** of the U.S. Constitution provides: "*Nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.*" The **Fourteenth Amendment** incorporates this protection at the state level, ensuring due process in property-related matters.

3.2 Eminent Domain and Regulatory Takings

U.S. jurisprudence recognizes both direct and indirect (regulatory) takings:

- ❖ **Kelo v. City of New London (2005):** Expanded “public use” to include economic development.
- ❖ **Penn Central v. New York City (1978):** Established a balancing test to assess the impact of regulations on property.

3.3 Strong Judicial Oversight

U.S. courts actively enforce property rights, often requiring compensation and scrutinizing governmental regulations that interfere with private ownership.

4. Property Rights in Europe

4.1 Legal Framework

The **European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR)**, particularly **Protocol 1, Article 1**, protects the right to peaceful enjoyment of possessions. While not as absolute as the U.S. model, it provides a human rights-based framework.

4.2 European Court of Human Rights (ECTHR) Approach

The ECtHR uses a **proportionality** test to evaluate whether an interference with property is justified:

- **James v. United Kingdom (1986):** Upheld broad state discretion in regulating property for public interest.
- Key principles include legality, public interest, and fair balance.

4.3 National Variations

- **Germany:** Strong constitutional property protections under Article 14 of the Basic Law.
- **France and others:** Property is protected under civil codes and constitutional principles, though with varying degrees of judicial activism.

5. Comparative Analysis

Criteria	India	United States	Europe (ECHR + States)
Constitutional Status	Legal right (Article 300A)	Fundamental right (5th Amendment)	Human right (Protocol 1, Art. 1)

Criteria	India	United States	Europe (ECHR + States)
Compensation	Not guaranteed	Mandatory	Required but flexible
Judicial Scrutiny	Weak	Strong	Proportional and balanced
Regulatory Takings	Limited recognition	Fully developed doctrine	Case-by-case proportionality
Focus	Development and equity	Individual liberty and market	Public interest and social balance

6. Challenges and Contemporary Debates on Property Rights

India: Balancing Land Reform, Development, and Fair Compensation

India's property rights regime has undergone a transformative shift—from being a fundamental right under Article 31 of the Constitution to a legal right under Article 300A. This change has had significant implications, particularly in the context of land acquisition, social justice, and economic development.

Land Reform and Industrialization

Post-independence, India prioritized land redistribution and agrarian reforms to address historical inequalities. The state acquired land from large landlords and redistributed it to landless farmers, often with minimal compensation. In more recent decades, industrial and infrastructure development has required the acquisition of land on a massive scale for projects like highways, SEZs (Special Economic Zones), and urban expansion.

Land Acquisition Act, 2013

The Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013, replaced the colonial-era Land Acquisition Act, 1894. It was designed to ensure:

- Fair compensation to landowners,
- Consent of affected parties (70–80% depending on the project),
- Rehabilitation and resettlement of displaced persons,
- Transparency and accountability in the acquisition process.

- Despite these provisions, implementation challenges persist:
- Bureaucratic delays and corruption in valuation and disbursement,
- Conflicts between landowners and the state over “public purpose” justification,
- Disputes related to tribal and forest lands, especially under the Forest Rights Act, 2006.

Contemporary debates focus on striking a balance between development and justice, with critics arguing that land acquisition is still often coercive or opaque, particularly in rural and marginalized communities.

II. United States: Expanding Interpretation of “Public Use”

The Fifth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution protects private property by stating that it shall not be "taken for public use without just compensation." However, the term "public use" has become a focal point of legal and ideological controversy.

Eminent Domain and “Public Use”

While traditionally applied for public infrastructure (roads, schools, etc.), the interpretation of “public use” has expanded to include projects that serve public benefit, such as economic development. This broader reading has been contested in several landmark cases.

Kelo v. City of New London (2005)

In this highly controversial decision, the U.S. Supreme Court upheld the use of eminent domain to transfer land from private homeowners to a private developer as part of an economic revitalization plan. The Court ruled that economic development can qualify as a public use under the Fifth Amendment.

- This case triggered a national backlash, with critics arguing it weakened property rights and gave undue power to corporations and local governments. In response:
- Many states enacted laws to restrict eminent domain powers.
- The debate continues over property protection vs. community development.
- The challenge lies in balancing individual property rights with economic growth, while ensuring that eminent domain is not abused for private profiteering.

III. Europe: Balancing Environmental Regulation and Private Ownership

In European legal systems, particularly under the influence of the European Convention on

Human Rights (ECHR), property rights are not absolute. Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 to the ECHR provides that every natural or legal person is entitled to the peaceful enjoyment of their possessions, but also allows for state interference under certain conditions.

Environmental Protection vs. Property Rights

One of the most pressing contemporary debates in Europe concerns the tension between environmental regulations and private ownership rights. Governments across Europe have introduced laws to:

- Prevent deforestation,
- Restrict industrial pollution,
- Limit urban expansion near protected areas.
- While these policies serve important ecological goals, they often limit the use or development of private land, leading to litigation.

Key Legal Tensions and Court Decisions

The European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) applies the principle of proportionality, requiring that state actions interfering with property must pursue a legitimate aim and be proportionate to that aim.

Pine Valley Developments Ltd v. Ireland (1991)

Fredin v. Sweden (1991)

the Court has upheld state environmental measures but emphasized the need for fair balance between public interest and individual rights.

Climate Policy and Green Transitions

As the EU leads the charge on climate neutrality, there is increasing pressure on landowners to comply with restrictions related to:

- Renewable energy zoning,
- Carbon offset areas,
- Water and land conservation.

The legal challenge in Europe is to ensure that green regulation does not disproportionately burden private owners without compensation or recourse.

7. Conclusion

The constitutional approach to property rights varies across legal systems, reflecting distinct historical and philosophical foundations.

India treats property as a legal right, prioritizing state interests and development goals over absolute private ownership.

In contrast, the United States Constitution strongly protects individual property rights, with robust judicial safeguards under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments.

European jurisdictions, especially under the European Convention on Human Rights, adopt a balanced approach, weighing public interest against individual claims.

These differences illustrate the tension between state control and private autonomy in property law.

India's pragmatic shift from fundamental right status in 1978 allows for more flexible land and economic policies.

However, it also raises concerns about adequate compensation and access to justice.

The U.S. model shows the importance of judicial oversight, while Europe's system emphasizes proportionality and fairness.

Understanding these frameworks helps in designing equitable and efficient property regimes.

A comparative lens can guide future legal reforms and policy innovation in India and beyond.

8. References

- The Constitution of India (1950)
- U.S. Constitution, Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments
- Protocol 1, Article 1 of the European Convention on Human Rights
- K.T. Plantation Pvt. Ltd. v. State of Karnataka, (2011) 9 SCC 1
- Kelo v. City of New London, 545 U.S. 469 (2005)
- James v. United Kingdom, ECHR (1986)
- Basu, D.D. *Commentary on the Constitution of India*
- Michelman, F. "Property, Utility, and Fairness," *Harvard Law Review*