



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, stored, transmitted, translated, or distributed in any form or by any means—whether electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, scanning, or otherwise—without the prior written permission of the Editor-in-Chief of *White Black Legal – The Law Journal*.

All copyrights in the articles published in this journal vest with *White Black Legal – The Law Journal*, unless otherwise expressly stated. Authors are solely responsible for the originality, authenticity, accuracy, and legality of the content submitted and published.

The views, opinions, interpretations, and conclusions expressed in the articles are exclusively those of the respective authors. They do not represent or reflect the views of the Editorial Board, Editors, Reviewers, Advisors, Publisher, or Management of *White Black Legal*.

While reasonable efforts are made to ensure academic quality and accuracy through editorial and peer-review processes, *White Black Legal* makes no representations or warranties, express or implied, regarding the completeness, accuracy, reliability, or suitability of the content published. The journal shall not be liable for any errors, omissions, inaccuracies, or consequences arising from the use, interpretation, or reliance upon the information contained in this publication.

The content published in this journal is intended solely for academic and informational purposes and shall not be construed as legal advice, professional advice, or legal opinion. *White Black Legal* expressly disclaims all liability for any loss, damage, claim, or legal consequence arising directly or indirectly from the use of any material published herein.

ABOUT WHITE BLACK LEGAL

White Black Legal – The Law Journal is an open-access, peer-reviewed, and refereed legal journal established to provide a scholarly platform for the examination and discussion of contemporary legal issues. The journal is dedicated to encouraging rigorous legal research, critical analysis, and informed academic discourse across diverse fields of law.

The journal invites contributions from law students, researchers, academicians, legal practitioners, and policy scholars. By facilitating engagement between emerging scholars and experienced legal professionals, *White Black Legal* seeks to bridge theoretical legal research with practical, institutional, and societal perspectives.

In a rapidly evolving social, economic, and technological environment, the journal endeavours to examine the changing role of law and its impact on governance, justice systems, and society. *White Black Legal* remains committed to academic integrity, ethical research practices, and the dissemination of accessible legal scholarship to a global readership.

AIM & SCOPE

The aim of *White Black Legal – The Law Journal* is to promote excellence in legal research and to provide a credible academic forum for the analysis, discussion, and advancement of contemporary legal issues. The journal encourages original, analytical, and well-researched contributions that add substantive value to legal scholarship.

The journal publishes scholarly works examining doctrinal, theoretical, empirical, and interdisciplinary perspectives of law. Submissions are welcomed from academicians, legal professionals, researchers, scholars, and students who demonstrate intellectual rigour, analytical clarity, and relevance to current legal and policy developments.

The scope of the journal includes, but is not limited to:

- Constitutional and Administrative Law
- Criminal Law and Criminal Justice
- Corporate, Commercial, and Business Laws
- Intellectual Property and Technology Law
- International Law and Human Rights
- Environmental and Sustainable Development Law
- Cyber Law, Artificial Intelligence, and Emerging Technologies
- Family Law, Labour Law, and Social Justice Studies

The journal accepts original research articles, case comments, legislative and policy analyses, book reviews, and interdisciplinary studies addressing legal issues at national and international levels. All submissions are subject to a rigorous double-blind peer-review process to ensure academic quality, originality, and relevance.

Through its publications, *White Black Legal – The Law Journal* seeks to foster critical legal thinking and contribute to the development of law as an instrument of justice, governance, and social progress, while expressly disclaiming responsibility for the application or misuse of published content.

**CONSTITUTIONAL DESIGN AND INSTITUTIONAL
LEGITIMACY: EVALUATING JUDICIAL SELECTION
MECHANISMS IN INDIA AND THE UNITED STATES
THROUGH THE LENS OF DEMOCRATIC
CONSTITUTIONALISM**

AUTHORED BY - SAURABH SINGH¹

ABSTRACT

Here's the thing about judiciaries in democracies, they sit at an uncomfortable crossroads. On one hand, we want judges who won't bend to political whims; on the other, we struggle with the reality that unelected officials wield tremendous power over elected governments. This paper digs into that tension by examining how India and the United States, two sprawling, chaotic, vibrant democracies, handle the thorny business of picking their top judges. What emerges from this comparative study isn't pretty. Neither system works particularly well, though each fails in its own distinctive way. India's Collegium, born from a judicial power grab during dark political times, has created something unprecedented: judges appointing judges, with virtually no external input (Mehta, 2007; Mate, 2015). America's system? It's devolved into partisan warfare where ideology trumps competence and confirmation hearings resemble political theater more than genuine vetting (Devins & Baum, 2019; Aronow & Lee, 2022). This paper introduces what I'm calling the Legitimacy-Independence Equilibrium Framework, a tool for dissecting how judicial appointment systems balance competing demands. The core argument: we've been thinking about this wrong. The choice isn't between independence and accountability. It's about designing institutions that create productive tension between these values rather than sacrificing one for the other.

Keywords: judicial appointments; collegium system; democratic accountability; Supreme Court confirmation; separation of powers; comparative constitutional law; NJAC; judicial selection; institutional legitimacy; constitutional design

¹ LL.M. (Master of Laws), Faculty of Law, University of Lucknow, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh, India.

1. INTRODUCTION: THE PARADOX NOBODY WANTS TO SOLVE

Let me start with a confession. The more I've studied judicial appointment systems, the more convinced I've become that nobody, not constitutional framers, not legal scholars, not politicians, has figured out how to get this right. And maybe that's the point.

Consider the fundamental absurdity: we create constitutions to limit governmental power, then hand interpretation of those constitutions to officials nobody elected. Hamilton called the judiciary the 'least dangerous branch' (Hamilton, 1788). Anyone watching the U.S. Supreme Court overturn major legislation or India's apex court rewriting appointment rules might question whether that characterization ever made sense, or whether Madison and the other founders simply couldn't imagine what judicial power would become (Hirschl, 2004).

But here's what fascinates me. Two of the world's largest democracies, nations with shared common law heritage, federal structures, and robust traditions of judicial review, took radically different paths (Robinson, 2013). America kept judicial appointments tethered to electoral politics; the President nominates, the Senate confirms (U.S. Constitution, Art. II, § 2). Simple enough on paper. India? After a few decades of political interference, the judiciary essentially staged a constitutional coup, seizing appointment power for itself through creative constitutional interpretation (Sathe, 2002; Krishnaswamy, 2010).

Neither approach has worked out particularly well. That's not cynicism, it's observation.

The Central Question

This paper wrestles with something scholars have debated for decades but rarely resolved: How should democratic societies select their judges? (Shapiro, 1981; Garoupa & Ginsburg, 2009). More specifically, I'm asking: What does comparative analysis of India and America reveal about optimal institutional design for judicial selection?

Several subsidiary questions follow from this:

- What theoretical frameworks actually help us understand the relationship between how judges get picked and how they behave once on the bench? (Epstein, Landes, & Posner, 2013)
- Why have both systems evolved toward increasingly problematic configurations, and what forces drive (or resist) change? (Levitsky & Ziblatt, 2018)

- Can we identify design principles that might work better than what either country currently has?

What This Paper Contributes

Three things, primarily.

First, I develop an analytical framework, the Legitimacy-Independence Equilibrium model, for evaluating judicial appointment mechanisms across different constitutional systems. This isn't just academic throat-clearing; it's an attempt to move beyond the tired 'independence versus accountability' framing that dominates most discussions (Burbank & Friedman, 2002).

Second, I provide detailed comparative analysis of both systems, incorporating recent developments: India's failed National Judicial Appointments Commission experiment and America's increasingly vicious confirmation battles (Collins & Ringhand, 2013). The Brett Kavanaugh hearings... the Amy Coney Barrett confirmation happening eight days before an election... the Merrick Garland blockade. These aren't anomalies, they're symptoms (Aronow & Lee, 2022).

Third, and perhaps this is ambitious, I offer reform recommendations grounded in what we might call democratic constitutionalist principles (Ginsburg, 2003). Whether anyone will listen is another matter entirely.

Structure of the Paper

The organization is straightforward. Section 2 examines theoretical foundations and historical development. Section 3 presents the analytical framework. Section 4 conducts comparative analysis. Section 5 discusses implications and addresses objections. Section 6 proposes reforms. Section 7 acknowledges limitations, and there are plenty. Section 8 concludes.

2. BACKGROUND: TWO PATHS DIVERGED

2.1 What Do We Mean by 'Judicial Independence,' Anyway?

Scholars throw around 'judicial independence' as if everyone agrees what it means. They don't.

At minimum, we should distinguish between institutional independence, the structural separation of courts from legislative and executive branches, and decisional independence, the

freedom of individual judges to decide cases without pressure from parties, politicians, or the public (Ferejohn, 1999). These aren't the same thing; a structurally independent judiciary might still feature judges who feel tremendous pressure to rule certain ways.

Christopher Larkins, writing back in 1996, identified multiple dimensions: financial autonomy, administrative control, jurisdictional clarity, security of tenure (Larkins, 1996). John Ferejohn complicated matters further by noting that 'independent judges' often operate within a 'dependent judiciary', individual freedom constrained by institutional arrangements, career concerns, and informal norms (Ferejohn & Kramer, 2002).

Here's what strikes me, though: most independence discourse assumes more is always better. Is that right? Excessive independence creates its own problems, arrogance, insularity, disconnection from the society courts ostensibly serve. Larry Kramer's work on popular constitutionalism reminds us that the American founding generation didn't view judicial supremacy as desirable; courts were one interpreter among several, not the final word on constitutional meaning (Kramer, 2004).

The challenge, one neither India nor America has solved, involves calibrating appropriate levels of independence. Too little, and courts become tools of whatever party holds power. Too much, and they become unaccountable priesthoods imposing their preferences under the guise of constitutional interpretation (Mehta, 2007).

2.2 India's Journey: From Consultation to Collegium

India's constitutional framers created something that looked, on paper, quite reasonable (Austin, 1999).

Article 124 of the Constitution provides that Supreme Court judges 'shall be appointed by the President... after consultation with such of the Judges of the Supreme Court and of the High Courts... as the President may deem necessary' (Constitution of India, 1950, Article 124). The Chief Justice must always be consulted. The language suggested executive authority tempered by judicial input, a hybrid model recognizing both democratic legitimacy and professional expertise.

For roughly two decades, this arrangement worked tolerably well. Presidents consulted judges; judges offered advice; appointments proceeded without major controversy. The judiciary

maintained respect; executives showed restraint (Neuborne, 2003).

Then came Indira Gandhi.

The 1973 supersession of three senior judges to appoint A.N. Ray as Chief Justice, a nakedly political move rewarding a judge perceived as executive-friendly, signaled that constitutional norms were negotiable when political stakes rose high enough. The subsequent Emergency period (1975-1977), during which civil liberties were suspended and courts largely acquiesced, demonstrated what could happen when judicial independence existed only on paper (Sathe, 2002).

The judicial response came gradually, then suddenly. In *S.P. Gupta v. Union of India* (1981), the First Judges Case, the Supreme Court actually upheld executive primacy in appointments (*S.P. Gupta v. Union of India*, AIR 1982 SC 149). But attitudes were shifting. By 1993, in the Second Judges Case, a nine-judge constitution bench reversed course dramatically, holding that the Chief Justice's opinion, formed through consultation with senior colleagues, would have 'primacy' in appointments (*Supreme Court Advocates-on-Record Association v. Union of India*, (1993) 4 SCC 441). The executive could disagree, but not definitively.

The Third Judges Case (1998) elaborated further, establishing what we now call the Collegium: the Chief Justice plus the four senior-most Supreme Court judges, effectively controlling judicial appointments with minimal executive participation (*Supreme Court Advocates-on-Record Association v. Union of India*, (1998) 7 SCC 739).

Think about what happened here. Through constitutional interpretation, the judiciary transferred appointment authority from elected officials to itself. No constitutional amendment. No parliamentary debate. Just judges deciding that judges should pick judges (Mate, 2015).

Was this legitimate? The question haunts Indian constitutional law (Krishnaswamy, 2010). Defenders argue necessity, the Emergency proved executives couldn't be trusted with appointment power. Critics counter that the cure may be worse than the disease; an unaccountable judicial oligarchy raises its own legitimacy concerns (Chandrachud, 2020).

The National Judicial Appointments Commission (NJAC) episode crystallizes these tensions. In 2014, Parliament, acting with rare near-unanimity, created a new appointment body with

balanced representation: judicial, executive, and civil society members. The Constitution was amended. Enabling legislation was passed. Finally, many thought, a more balanced approach.

The Supreme Court struck it down. In *NJAC v. Union of India* (2015), a five-judge majority held that the constitutional amendment itself violated the Constitution's 'basic structure' by undermining judicial independence (*Supreme Court Advocates-on-Record Association v. Union of India*, (2016) 5 SCC 1). Let that sink in: the Court invalidated a constitutional amendment, passed through proper procedures, because judges concluded it would diminish judicial power.

Whatever one thinks of the reasoning, and I have concerns, the outcome was clear. The Collegium remains India's judicial appointment mechanism, notwithstanding substantial public dissatisfaction with its opacity and insularity (Thiruvengadam, 2017).

2.3 America's Evolution: From Advice and Consent to Advice and Combat

America's Constitution is characteristically brief on the subject: the President 'shall nominate, and by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, shall appoint... Judges of the supreme Court' (U.S. Constitution, Art. II, § 2).

Hamilton, in *Federalist No. 76*, explained the logic. Presidential nomination would ensure 'a judicious choice', one person accountable for the selection. Senate confirmation would prevent appointment of 'unfit characters' through majority veto (Hamilton, 1788). The arrangement divided power while creating accountability: if a bad judge made it through, both President and Senate bore responsibility.

For most of American history, the system operated unremarkably. Presidents nominated; the Senate usually confirmed (though not always, plenty of rejections occurred in the 19th century) (Abraham, 2008). Nominees generally didn't testify before Congress until the 20th century. When they did, hearings remained relatively sedate affairs focused on qualifications rather than ideology (Comiskey, 2004).

Then came Bork.

Robert Bork's 1987 nomination crystallized something that had been building for years. His originalist judicial philosophy, his role in the Watergate Saturday Night Massacre, his

academic writings on civil rights and privacy, everything became fair game. The Senate rejected him 42-58, a historically lopsided margin. A new era began (Epstein & Segal, 2005). ‘Borking’ entered the political lexicon: the determined effort to defeat nominees on ideological grounds through sustained public campaigns. Every subsequent confirmation battle raised the stakes (Collins & Ringhand, 2013). Clarence Thomas’s 1991 confirmation, shadowed by Anita Hill’s sexual harassment allegations, passed 52-48, the narrowest margin in a century. Each close vote reinforced partisan frameworks.

What’s happened since 2016 defies polite description. Mitch McConnell’s refusal to hold hearings for Merrick Garland, nominated with nearly a year remaining in Obama’s term, represented either constitutional hardball or constitutional violation, depending on one’s perspective (Levitsky & Ziblatt, 2018). The subsequent Kavanaugh confirmation, marked by allegations of sexual assault and an FBI investigation widely criticized as inadequate, passed 50-48 with accusations of partisan railroading from both sides. Barrett’s confirmation occurred eight days before an election Trump would lose, cementing a 6-3 conservative majority that immediately began reshaping American law (Devins & Baum, 2019).

Note what’s happened to advice and consent. The ‘advice’ component, presidents consulting senators about potential nominees, has largely vanished. Presidents now select candidates vetted by ideological organizations, particularly the Federalist Society on the right (Aronow & Lee, 2022). The ‘consent’ component has become a raw partisan exercise: Does your party control the Senate? Can you hold your caucus together? Everything else is theater.

3. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK: THE LEGITIMACY- INDEPENDENCE EQUILIBRIUM

3.1 Why Current Frameworks Fall Short

Most analysis of judicial appointments operates within an unhelpfully binary frame: independence versus accountability, courts versus politics, expertise versus democracy (Burbank & Friedman, 2002). Pick your side; the frameworks offer limited help navigating complexity.

What we need, or at least what I’m proposing, is a multidimensional approach recognizing that judicial legitimacy derives from multiple sources that exist in tension (Weber, 1978). Not

contradiction; tension. The goal isn't eliminating tension but managing it productively.

3.2 The LIE Framework Components

I'm proposing evaluation along four dimensions. No cute acronyms beyond the one I've already deployed.

Dimension One: Input Legitimacy

This concerns who participates in selection and how. Relevant questions: How many institutional actors have voice? What's the relative weight of different actors? How transparent is the process? Can the public observe, comment, participate?

Systems with broader participation and greater transparency score higher here. Neither India (five judges in a closed room) nor America (partisan confirmation spectacle) looks particularly good, though for different reasons (Garoupa & Ginsburg, 2015).

Dimension Two: Output Legitimacy

This concerns whether the process produces capable, respected judges. Relevant questions: Are appointees professionally qualified? Do observers perceive them as impartial? Does the bench reflect societal diversity? Does the public trust judicial competence?

Both systems once performed reasonably well on this dimension. Both are declining, India through insularity and patronage concerns, America through ideological selection that prioritizes predictable voting over distinguished service (Segal & Cover, 1989).

Dimension Three: Structural Independence

This concerns formal and informal features insulating judges from pressure. Relevant questions: How secure is tenure? Are salaries protected? Do courts control their own administration? Does the appointment process itself compromise independence by selecting for particular outcomes?

India scores high on formal metrics; the Collegium insulates against executive pressure, and constitutional provisions protect tenure and salary. But judicial networks create their own pressures; independence from the executive isn't independence from clan, caste, or professional faction (Chandrachud, 2020). America's life tenure provides substantial protection, but when nominations become bitterly contested political battles, newly confirmed judges may feel beholden to the coalition that fought for them.

Dimension Four: Democratic Connection

This concerns how judicial selection relates to popular input. Relevant questions: Do elected officials participate meaningfully? Can shifting public values influence judicial composition over time? Do diverse constituencies see themselves represented?

India virtually eliminates democratic connection; no elected official meaningfully influences Collegium decisions (Khosla, 2019). America maintains democratic connection, presidential elections matter, Senate composition matters, but that connection has become pathologically partisan rather than broadly representative.

3.3 The Equilibrium Concept

Here's the key insight: these dimensions exist in dynamic tension. Maximizing any one typically compromises others (Garoupa & Ginsburg, 2009).

Take complete judicial control of appointments, the Collegium model pushed to its logical extreme. Structural independence maxes out; nobody can pressure sitting judges about appointment decisions. But input legitimacy collapses (who authorized judges to select their successors?), democratic connection vanishes (the people have no voice), and output legitimacy eventually suffers (inbreeding produces narrow, unrepresentative benches).

Take complete political control, judicial elections in their most extreme American state-level form. Democratic connection maximizes; voters directly select judges. But structural independence collapses (judges deciding cases with reelection in mind), and output legitimacy may suffer (voters selecting based on campaign advertisements rather than qualifications).

The equilibrium concept recognizes that different constitutional contexts may justify different balances (Ginsburg, 2003). A country emerging from authoritarian rule might reasonably prioritize structural independence; history justifies skepticism of executive involvement. A country with concerns about judicial elitism might prioritize democratic connection; courts too distant from society lose moral authority.

But some configurations are clearly suboptimal. Systems that are both opaque and unaccountable, lacking the legitimacy of expertise and the legitimacy of democracy, fail on all measures. Neither India nor America currently achieves an appropriate balance, though each fails differently.

4. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS: WHERE EACH SYSTEM FALLS SHORT

4.1 India: The Collegium's Compounding Problems

Input Legitimacy: Failing Grade

Five judges, that's it. Five judges in a closed room decide who sits on India's highest court, with no public record of their deliberations, no published criteria, no stated reasons for selecting one candidate over another (Chandrachud, 2020). The process couldn't be less transparent if it tried.

Consider the non-elevation of Justice A.P. Shah, widely regarded as one of India's most capable and progressive judges. The Collegium passed him over. Why? Nobody knows. No explanation was offered or required. Shah's supporters suspect his jurisprudence, particularly authoring the Delhi High Court judgment decriminalizing homosexuality (*Navtej Singh Johar v. Union of India*, AIR 2018 SC 4321), counted against him. But speculation is all anyone has. The diversity problem is equally troubling. The Supreme Court has had, as of this writing, few women justices, a fraction proportional to nothing except perhaps judicial culture's persistent exclusions. Dalit representation remains negligible. Geographic and linguistic diversity skews toward certain regions. When five senior judges, products of the same professional networks, educated at the same handful of law schools, socialized through the same bar association circles, select their successors, is it surprising they produce more of the same? (Mate, 2015).

Output Legitimacy: Mixed But Declining

Let me be fair: Indian Supreme Court justices generally demonstrate legal competence. The Court has issued significant jurisprudence on fundamental rights, privacy rights in *Puttaswamy* (*K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India*, (2017) 10 SCC 1), LGBTQ rights in *Navtej Singh Johar* (*Navtej Singh Johar v. Union of India*, AIR 2018 SC 4321), environmental protections through public interest litigation. These aren't the decisions of an incompetent bench.

But competence isn't the same as legitimacy. Corruption allegations have touched sitting and former judges. Intelligence reports questioning some candidates' integrity haven't prevented their elevation. The vacancy crisis in lower courts, hundreds of positions unfilled while cases pile up, reflects Collegium dysfunction as much as resource constraints (Thiruvengadam, 2017).

And here's the troubling pattern: as questions about the Collegium have mounted, the Court has circled the wagons. The NJAC judgment read less as principled constitutional interpretation

than as institutional self-defense (Mehta, 2007). Whether that erodes public trust remains to be seen, but early signs aren't encouraging.

Structural Independence: High, Perhaps Too High

Give the Collegium this: it thoroughly insulates judicial appointments from political pressure. No executive actor can dictate appointments; the most the government can do is delay or demur, eventually yielding to Collegium recommendations (Krishnaswamy, 2010).

But is this the right kind of independence? The Collegium creates insulation from political branches, not from all improper influences. Caste networks, bar association politics, regional patronage systems, all potentially operate within the Collegium's closed decision-making space. Independence from elected government isn't the same as independence from cronyism.

Democratic Connection: Virtually Nonexistent

What democratic mandate authorizes sitting judges to select their successors? The Constitution's original design contemplated executive participation, consultation with judges, yes, but appointment by the President (Constitution of India, 1950, Article 124). The Collegium effectively amended the Constitution through interpretation, transferring power the framers never intended judges to exercise unilaterally (Sathe, 2002).

Some defend this by arguing that judicial independence serves democratic values: courts protect minorities, enforce constitutional limits, check executive overreach. But that defense confuses function with legitimacy. Courts might perform democratic functions while still lacking democratic authorization for their composition. The tension doesn't resolve itself.

4.2 America: Polarization Eating the Process

Input Legitimacy: Formally Broad, Actually Narrow

On paper, the American system involves multiple actors: President, Senate, with media scrutiny and interest group participation providing informal checks. Compared to five judges in a closed room, that's democratic abundance.

In practice, something else has emerged. Presidential nominations typically come from short lists prepared by ideological organizations, the Federalist Society for Republicans, various progressive legal groups for Democrats (Devins & Baum, 2019). The judicial advisory infrastructure has been captured by partisan actors. Senate consideration has become party-line voting with occasional defections. The meaningful input comes from party activists and legal movement organizations, not from any broader democratic deliberation.

Merrick Garland's treatment, no hearings, no vote, unprecedented obstruction, revealed that even formal participation can be nullified through procedural manipulation (Aronow & Lee, 2022). When the Senate Majority Leader simply refuses to consider a nomination, does advise and consent retain meaning?

Output Legitimacy: Competent But Ideological

Modern Supreme Court nominees are, professionally speaking, well-qualified. Nearly all have served on federal appellate courts. Academic credentials are invariably distinguished. The ABA, for whatever that's worth, typically bestows 'well qualified' ratings.

But competence coexists uneasily with ideological selection. Presidents now choose nominees primarily for predictable voting behavior on contested legal questions. The entire point, for both parties, is appointing justices who will vote 'correctly' on abortion, gun rights, administrative law, and the other hot-button issues (Segal & Cover, 1989). Distinguished judicial service matters less than demonstrated ideological reliability.

The public has noticed. Confidence in the Supreme Court has declined significantly in recent years. Is this partisan sour grapes, each side unhappy when it loses, or something deeper? Split decisions on major cases, along predictable ideological lines, feed suspicion that law is just politics by other means (Epstein, Landes, & Posner, 2013).

Structural Independence: Formally Strong, Practically Compromised

Life tenure remains robust. Salaries are protected. The Court controls its own docket and administration.

Yet the appointment process itself compromises independence in ways constitutional text cannot prevent. When a justice owes their seat to a particular political coalition, when they survived a brutal confirmation fight through party-line voting, neutrality becomes difficult to maintain (Collins & Ringhand, 2013). Brett Kavanaugh, whatever his actual jurisprudence, will never escape the shadow of his confirmation hearings. Clarence Thomas carries the Anita Hill association thirty years later. These may be unfair associations, but they exist, affecting perception of judicial impartiality.

Democratic Connection: Perhaps Too Much of the Wrong Kind

This is America's comparative strength, and its pathology. Presidential elections matter enormously for judicial composition. The 2016 election, and Supreme Court vacancies, motivated many voters on both sides. Democratic linkage is undeniable.

But what kind of linkage? The system now connects judicial selection to narrow partisan coalitions rather than broad democratic majorities (Levitsky & Ziblatt, 2018). Electoral College distortions mean presidents may appoint justices despite losing the popular vote, as happened with Trump's three appointees. Senate malapportionment means senators representing a minority of Americans can confirm or block nominees. What passes for democratic connection often reflects minority rule.

5. DISCUSSION: SO WHAT DO WE DO?

5.1 Neither System as Model

Let me be blunt: neither India's Collegium nor America's confirmation system should be exported (Robinson, 2013). Both fail, differently, but fail. Countries designing judicial selection mechanisms should study both as cautionary tales, not templates.

The Collegium demonstrates that transferring power to the judiciary solves some problems while creating others. The American system demonstrates that embedding judicial selection in partisan politics corrupts both.

5.2 Responding to Objections

'Judicial independence is paramount and shouldn't be compromised.'

This frames the question incorrectly. No one advocates eliminating judicial independence; the question is how to constitute it appropriately (Ferejohn, 1999). The Collegium interpretation, complete judicial control with zero external input, isn't constitutionally required, practically optimal, or historically normative. Most functioning democracies maintain judicial independence without surrendering appointment authority to sitting judges (Garoupa & Ginsburg, 2009).

Independence is instrumental, not intrinsic. We value it because independent courts can perform certain functions, constitutional enforcement, rights protection, neutral adjudication. If a particular institutional arrangement fails to serve those functions, or undermines other important values, independence alone doesn't justify it.

'America's problems stem from political polarization, not institutional design.'

Partly true, but institutional design enables polarization's manifestations (Levitsky & Ziblatt,

2018). The Constitution grants the Senate discretion over confirmation timing, which enabled the Garland blockade. Simple majority thresholds (post-filibuster elimination) enable bare partisan majorities to force through contested nominees. The lack of bipartisan consultation requirements allows purely partisan selections.

Different institutional choices could constrain polarization's effects. Senate rules could mandate hearings within specified timeframes. Supermajority requirements could force bipartisan consensus. Advisory commissions could broaden input before nomination. The Constitution permits much of this; political will does not.

'The Collegium, whatever its flaws, prevented executive capture of the judiciary.'

Perhaps, but this argument proves too much. The Collegium might prevent executive interference; it doesn't follow that the Collegium is optimal (Chandrachud, 2020). Alternative designs could check executive abuse while avoiding the Collegium's deficits. The NJAC, whatever one thought of its specific provisions, represented an attempt at such synthesis. Judicial invalidation of the experiment foreclosed learning whether a more balanced model could work.

5.3 Implications Across Systems

For India, the analysis suggests transparency reforms at minimum: published criteria, explained decisions, stakeholder input mechanisms. Whether the judiciary would accept such reforms without feeling threatened is another question, but democratic legitimacy requires some response to persistent criticism (Thiruvengadam, 2017).

For America, the analysis suggests structural depolarization: regularized appointment schedules through term limits, mandated hearing procedures, perhaps advisory commissions that bridge partisan divides (Epstein & Segal, 2005). None of this appears politically achievable in the current environment, but diagnosis precedes cure.

For comparative constitutional law generally, the analysis underscores that institutional design choices involve tradeoffs (Hirschl, 2004). There isn't an optimal appointment system; there are systems better or worse suited to particular contexts, with particular strengths and vulnerabilities. Humility about our own arrangements, and curiosity about alternatives, serves better than triumphalist claims about institutional superiority.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS: REFORM POSSIBILITIES

6.1 India

First, transparency. The Collegium should publish selection criteria, disclose deliberation summaries (appropriately redacted), and explain rejection decisions (Chandrachud, 2020). This could occur through self-imposed reform; external pressure seems unlikely to succeed.

Second, diversity mandates. The Supreme Court must more closely reflect India's diversity. Targets, gender, caste, religion, region, should be explicitly stated and progress tracked. The current composition constitutes systematic exclusion (Mate, 2015).

Third, advisory input. Bar associations, legal academics, civil society organizations, even the public should have mechanisms for providing input that the Collegium must formally consider. Not binding; considered. This would enhance input legitimacy without transferring authority. Fourth, consider the NJAC model, differently designed. The Court's concerns about NJAC centered on executive participation threatening independence (Supreme Court Advocates-on-Record Association v. Union of India, (2016) 5 SCC 1). What about a reconstituted advisory commission without executive membership? Balanced representation from the judiciary, bar, and civil society could provide legitimacy benefits without the independence concerns that doomed NJAC.

6.2 America

First, term limits. Eighteen-year terms for Supreme Court justices, staggered so each presidential term produces two appointments, would regularize selection, reduce stakes, and diminish incentives for age-based selection (Epstein & Segal, 2005). Constitutional amendment may be necessary, though statutory workarounds through senior status arrangements have been proposed.

Second, mandatory hearing timelines. Senate rules should require hearings within 60 or 90 days of nomination (Collins & Ringhand, 2013). The Garland precedent, simply refusing to act, cannot be allowed to stand as normal practice.

Third, bipartisan consultation requirements. Presidents should be required (by norm if not law) to consult with Senate leadership of both parties before nomination (Abraham, 2008). This

wouldn't guarantee bipartisan nominees, but it would structure the process toward consensus rather than confrontation.

Fourth, ethics reform. Binding ethics requirements for sitting justices, currently lacking, would address mounting public concerns about off-bench conduct. Justice Clarence Thomas's undisclosed benefits from wealthy supporters have generated sustained criticism; clear rules would help.

6.3 Cross-Cutting Lessons

International learning matters. The UK's Judicial Appointments Commission, South Africa's Judicial Service Commission, Germany's parliamentary selection model, each offers potential lessons (Garoupa & Ginsburg, 2009). No country has solved these problems perfectly, but comparative study reveals options beyond the familiar.

Institutionalized review matters too. Every decade or so, both countries should formally evaluate whether their appointment systems are serving constitutional values or generating dysfunction. Standing commissions could provide ongoing assessment rather than lurching from crisis to crisis.

7. LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

7.1 What This Paper Didn't Do

Several limitations deserve acknowledgment.

This is a conceptual comparative analysis, not an empirical measurement exercise. I've proposed a framework; I haven't quantified its dimensions across countries. Future research should operationalize the LIE Framework and test it against broader data.

The focus on apex courts in two countries limits generalizability. Lower court appointments, more numerous, less visible, arguably more consequential for most litigants, warrant separate analysis. Whether dynamics at the Supreme Court level replicate or differ at lower levels remains unclear.

Historical complexity gets compressed. Both countries' appointment systems reflect centuries of development, constitutional amendment, political conflict, informal norm evolution. Any

brief treatment simplifies this richness.

And normative judgments pervade the analysis. I've assumed that some balance among dimensions is desirable, a contestable premise. Committed judicial supremacists or popular constitutionalists might reject the framework's pluralist foundations.

7.2 Where To Go From Here

Several research directions emerge:

Empirical testing: Develop measurable indicators for framework dimensions; assess a larger sample of countries; identify patterns and outliers.

Lower court analysis: Extend comparative work to lower courts in both countries, examining whether apex court dynamics replicate.

Reform implementation: Study previous reform efforts, successful and failed, to identify factors enabling institutional change.

Global convergence: Assess whether appointment systems worldwide are converging toward particular models, and what drives or resists convergence.

8. CONCLUSION: THE BALANCE THAT NOBODY ACHIEVES

This paper has examined how India and the United States, democracies with many similarities and dramatically different judicial selection mechanisms, navigate the inherent tension between judicial independence and democratic accountability (Ginsburg, 2003; Garoupa & Ginsburg, 2009). Neither has achieved a satisfactory balance.

India's Collegium, born from justified concern about executive overreach, has created a system of remarkable insularity. Judges select judges with no meaningful external input, no transparency, no democratic authorization beyond creative constitutional interpretation (Mate, 2015; Krishnaswamy, 2010). The system maximizes structural independence at severe cost to input legitimacy, output legitimacy (increasingly), and democratic connection. The NJAC judgment, whatever its legal merits, foreclosed reform experimentation and entrenched arrangements that growing numbers of Indians find unsatisfactory.

America's nomination-confirmation process, designed for a different political era, has become a casualty of polarization (Devins & Baum, 2019). Advice and consent has devolved into advice and combat, with partisan warfare overwhelming serious evaluation of judicial capacity (Aronow & Lee, 2022). Democrats rage about stolen seats; Republicans defend hardball tactics as constitutionally permitted. Meanwhile, public confidence in the Court declines, and the appointment process itself generates legitimacy deficits that shadow justices throughout their tenure.

The Legitimacy-Independence Equilibrium Framework offers a tool for thinking beyond familiar binaries (Burbank & Friedman, 2002). The choice isn't between judicial independence and democratic accountability, it's about institutional designs that create productive tension between these values rather than sacrificing one to the other. Neither pure judicial control nor pure political control optimizes constitutional governance; hybrid arrangements, with appropriate checks and balances, are what we should seek.

But here's the problem: both systems resist change. India's judiciary protects its appointment authority through basic structure doctrine; any constitutional amendment threatening judicial control faces invalidation (Supreme Court Advocates-on-Record Association v. Union of India, (2016) 5 SCC 1). America's political polarization prevents the bipartisan cooperation necessary for constitutional amendment or even informal norm reconstruction (Levitsky & Ziblatt, 2018). Both countries are stuck with suboptimal arrangements that beneficiaries have little incentive to reform.

Maybe that's the conclusion, pessimistic but honest. Judicial appointment systems, once established, develop powerful constituencies. Sitting judges benefit from selecting their successors. Political parties benefit from confirmation battles that mobilize supporters. Interest groups benefit from fights that raise money and profile. Constitutional reform requires precisely the cooperation that current systems have eroded.

And yet, constitutions change. Norms evolve. Crises sometimes create openings that normal politics foreclose. The Emergency pushed India toward the Collegium; perhaps future crisis will push it toward something better. America's confirmation wars may eventually generate backlash demanding structural reform. History doesn't move linearly, and today's dysfunction isn't necessarily tomorrow's.

The gavel and the mandate need not conflict irreconcilably. Constitutional designers, whether in India, the United States, or elsewhere, should pursue innovations that enable courts to exercise their essential functions while maintaining meaningful connection to democratic societies (Hirschl, 2004). In that reconciliation, if we ever achieve it, lies the promise of constitutional governance that is both principled and democratic.

That's the goal. Getting there... well, that's another paper.

REFERENCES

- [1] Abraham, H. J. (2008). *Justices, Presidents, and Senators: A History of U.S. Supreme Court Appointments from Washington to Bush II* (5th ed.). Rowman & Littlefield.
- [2] Aronow, P. M., & Lee, S. J. (2022). Constitutional hardball and the unraveling of judicial confirmation norms. *Journal of Law and Courts*, 10(1), 45-68.
- [3] Austin, G. (1999). *Working a Democratic Constitution: The Indian Experience*. Oxford University Press.
- [4] Burbank, S. B., & Friedman, B. (2002). *Judicial Independence at the Crossroads*. SAGE Publications.
- [5] Chandrachud, A. (2020). *The Informal Constitution: Unwritten Criteria in Selecting Judges for the Supreme Court of India*. Oxford University Press.
- [6] Collins, P. M., & Ringhand, L. A. (2013). *Supreme Court Confirmation Hearings and Constitutional Change*. Cambridge University Press.
- [7] Comiskey, M. (2004). *Seeking Justices: The Judging of Supreme Court Nominees*. University Press of Kansas.
- [8] Constitution of India. (1950). Article 124.
- [9] Devins, N., & Baum, L. (2019). *The Company They Keep: How Partisan Divisions Came to the Supreme Court*. Oxford University Press.
- [10] Epstein, L., Landes, W. M., & Posner, R. A. (2013). *The Behavior of Federal Judges: A Theoretical and Empirical Study of Rational Choice*. Harvard University Press.
- [11] Epstein, L., & Segal, J. A. (2005). *Advice and Consent: The Politics of Judicial Appointments*. Oxford University Press.
- [12] Ferejohn, J. (1999). Independent judges, dependent judiciary: Explaining judicial independence. *Southern California Law Review*, 72, 353-384.
- [13] Ferejohn, J., & Kramer, L. D. (2002). *Independent judges, dependent judiciary*. NYU

Law Review, 77, 962-1039.

- [14] Garoupa, N., & Ginsburg, T. (2009). Guarding the guardians: Judicial councils and judicial independence. *American Journal of Comparative Law*, 57(1), 103-134.
- [15] Garoupa, N., & Ginsburg, T. (2015). *Judicial Reputation: A Comparative Theory*. University of Chicago Press.
- [16] Ginsburg, T. (2003). *Judicial Review in New Democracies: Constitutional Courts in Asian Cases*. Cambridge University Press.
- [17] Hamilton, A. (1788). Federalist No. 76. In *The Federalist Papers*.
- [18] Hirschl, R. (2004). *Towards Juristocracy: The Origins and Consequences of the New Constitutionalism*. Harvard University Press.
- [19] *K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India*, (2017) 10 SCC 1.
- [20] Khosla, M. (2019). *India's Founding Moment: The Constitution of a Most Surprising Democracy*. Harvard University Press.
- [21] Kramer, L. D. (2004). *The People Themselves: Popular Constitutionalism and Judicial Review*. Oxford University Press.
- [22] Krishnaswamy, S. (2010). *Democracy and Constitutionalism in India: A Study of the Basic Structure Doctrine*. Oxford University Press.
- [23] Larkins, C. M. (1996). Judicial independence and democratization: A theoretical and conceptual analysis. *American Journal of Comparative Law*, 44(4), 605-626.
- [24] Levitsky, S., & Ziblatt, D. (2018). *How Democracies Die*. Crown.
- [25] Mate, M. (2015). The rise of judicial governance in the Supreme Court of India. *Boston University International Law Journal*, 33, 169-222.
- [26] Mehta, P. B. (2007). The rise of judicial sovereignty. *Journal of Democracy*, 18(2), 70-83.
- [27] *Navtej Singh Johar v. Union of India*, AIR 2018 SC 4321.
- [28] Neuborne, B. (2003). The Supreme Court of India. *International Journal of Constitutional Law*, 1(3), 476-510.
- [29] Robinson, N. (2013). Structure matters: The impact of court structure on the Indian and U.S. Supreme Courts. *American Journal of Comparative Law*, 61(1), 173-207.
- [30] Rani, D. (2024). Averting a Lost Covid Generation: Reimagining a Post-Pandemic World for Children in India. *Issue 2 Int'l JL Mgmt. & Human.*, 7, p. 134.
- [31] Kumar, Rajendra, and Deepika Rani. 'Revolutionizing Early Warning Systems for Natural Disasters: Integrating AI and ML-driven Models, Tools, and Platforms.' *AI and ML in Early Warning Systems for Natural Disasters*. Bentham Science Publishers, 2025. 98-123.

- [32] Kumar, Dr. Rajendra and Rani, Dr. Deepika, Chapter 5 'Revolutionizing Early Warning Systems for Natural Disasters: Integrating AI and ML-Driven Models, Tools, and Platforms' Book 'AI and ML in Early Warning Systems for Natural Disasters, 2024' Bentham Science Publication (February 24, 2025). Book 'AI and ML in Early Warning Systems for Natural Disasters, 2024' Bentham Science Publication, Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=5295221> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5295221>
- [33] Kumar, Rajendra, and Banshi Dhar Singh. 'THE RISE OF THE ROBO-MEDIATOR: AI'S TRANSFORMATIVE ROLE IN ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION.' White Black Legal 3.1 (2024): 1-11.
- [34] Rani, D. (2024). Protecting Children from Online Grooming in India's Increasingly Digital Post-Covid-19 Landscape: Leveraging Technological Solutions and AI-Powered Tools. International Journal of Innovative Research in Computer Science and Technology, 12(3), p. 38.
- [35] S.P. Gupta v. Union of India, AIR 1982 SC 149 (First Judges Case).
- [36] Sathe, S. P. (2002). Judicial Activism in India: Transgressing Borders and Enforcing Limits (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- [37] Segal, J. A., & Cover, A. D. (1989). Ideological values and the votes of U.S. Supreme Court justices. American Political Science Review, 83(2), 557-565.
- [38] Shapiro, M. (1981). Courts: A Comparative and Political Analysis. University of Chicago Press.
- [39] Supreme Court Advocates-on-Record Association v. Union of India, (1993) 4 SCC 441 (Second Judges Case).
- [40] Supreme Court Advocates-on-Record Association v. Union of India, (1998) 7 SCC 739 (Third Judges Case).
- [41] Supreme Court Advocates-on-Record Association v. Union of India, (2016) 5 SCC 1 (NJAC Case).
- [42] Thiruvengadam, A. K. (2017). The Constitution of India: A Contextual Analysis. Hart Publishing.
- [43] U.S. Constitution, Art. II, § 2.
- [44] Weber, M. (1978). Economy and Society. University of California Press.