VOLUME 6 | ISSUE 2

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ADVANCED LEGAL RESEARCH

THE DOCTRINE OF CASUS OMISSUS IN INDIAN STATUTORY INTERPRETATION: SHOULD COURTS FILL LEGISLATIVE GAPS?

- Ankitha Lahari M N[1]

"Judges interpret the law; they do not make it." – Inspired by Lord Wensleydale

ABSTRACT:

Underlying basic limitation on judicial power in legislative interpretation is casus omissus, meaning "an omitted case." It provides that the courts can neither fill in a statue's gaps nor construe as read therein anything which the legislature intentionally or otherwise left out. But strict application of such approach often clashes with the constitutional obligation[2] of the judiciary to fill gaps in protecting justice as well as basic rights in contemporary Indian jurisprudence. This essay critically examines whether and to what extent Indian courts are to implement casus omissus theory in filling gaps in legislation.

It adheres to a doctrinal as well as analytical approach with significant Supreme Court as well as High Court judgments like *Vishaka v. State of Rajasthan (1997), Union of India v. Deoki Nandan Aggarwal (1992), as well as CIT v. National Taj Traders (1980)*. It also employs comparative perceptions from United States of America, United Kingdom, as well as other commonwealth countries to place India's evolving practice of interpreting within its jurisdictional context.

According to the report, judicial gap - filling must be used sparingly in order to maintain the separation of powers, even though it may seem essential to maintain justice in situations where lawmakers are silent. Only where omission impedes the obvious legislative goal or results in constitutional absurdity may courts step in. In order to guarantee that the court continues to be a genuine interpreternot a replacementof the legislature, the paper ultimately

[1] Ankitha Lahari M N, 4th Year BA LLB (Hons) at School of Law, Ramaiah University of Applied Sciences, Bengaluru, Karnataka. (All footnotes are cited according to Bluebook 21st Edition)

[2] Constitution of India, 1950, arts. 14, 15, 21.

© 2025 International Journal of Advanced Legal Research

promotesbalanced interpretative framework that balances judicial creativity with legislative supremacy[3].

KEYWORDS: Casus Omissus, Statutory Interpretation, Judicial Restraint, Legislative Gaps, Separation of Powers.

INTRODUCTION:

The core of the judicial function is statutory interpretation. Interpreting legislative provisions and figuring out their underlying intent are common tasks for courts. However, laws are not always complete; legislative drafting is inherently flawed and frequently ignores unforeseen circumstances. The doctrine of casus omissus, which warns that courts cannot read into a statute what the legislature has not stated or fill in gaps in legislation, is the result of this interpretive tension. The Latin-derived adage directly translates to "a case omitted." It guarantees that the judiciary does not take on the function of the legislative by embodying judicial restraint and respect for the separation of powers[4].

This doctrine plays a pivotal role within the broader outline of Indian statutory interpretation. India's constitutional system that is rooted in the doctrine of separation of power entrusts the power of legislative enactments with the legislature while allowing the court to deal with interpretation. Indian courts have nevertheless often encountered situations where legislative silence might lead to a constitutional void or injustice. *Vishaka v. State of Rajasthan (1997)*[5], *Union of India v. Deoki Nandan Aggarwal (1992)*[6], and *CIT v. National Taj Traders (1980)*[7] are few of the foundational cases that reflect the hard judicial choice between conforming to legislative text and ensuring justice through purposive interpretation.

This article's central concern is whether and to what extent Indian courts should employ casus omissus doctrine to fill legislative gaps. While traditional thought is that deficiencies cannot be made up through judicial innovation, courts have had to venture outside strict literalness on occasion due to evolving requirements of society and the evolving nature of constitutional interpretation. As a result of this, a thin line is drawn between protecting legislative intent

[3] G.P. Singh, Principles of Statutory Interpretation 45–50 (16th ed., LexisNexis 2020).
[4] Constitution of India, 1950, arts. 141, 245.
[5] Vishaka v. State of Rajasthan, AIR 1997 SC 3011.
[6] Union of India v. Deoki Nandan Aggarwal, (1992) 3 SCC 361.
[7] CIT v. National Taj Traders, (1980) 4 SCC 123.

© 2025 International Journal of Advanced Legal Research

and the duty of the judiciary on moral grounds to refrain from injustice in those cases when the statute is silent[8].

This question is significant for two reasons. Firstly, it puts to the test the limits of judicial creativity without violating legislative primacy, pushing to its limits the limits of judicial interpretation within a constitutional democracy. Secondly, it probes the doctrine's relevance under a condition of rapid social evolution when new rights, new technologies, and governance questions regularly challenge the tempo at which laws can be enacted. This research seeks to determine when it is suitable for judicial action in filling legislative gaps and when it constitutes overreach through doctrinal analysis and comparison.

The research is structured thus as a result. The initial part considers the theoretical foundation and evolution of common law doctrine casus omissus. The subsequent parts consider its application within Indian jurisprudence, utilising principles of statutory interpretation as well as case law. The Indian experience is then contextualized on a world scale through the inclusion of comparative perspectives from outside India's common law jurisdictions. The research terminates with consideration of normative arguments both in support of and in opposition to gap-filling on the part of adjudicators and provision of a framework on principles for its constitutionally compatible and cautious implementation.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK:

In the area of statutory interpretation, the casus omissus doctrine has a well-established but contentious position. The doctrine, which is literally translated as "an omitted case," is based on the idea that courts lack the authority to add words or make omissions to a legislation that the legislature has purposefully or unintentionally left out. Casus omissus, which has its roots in English common law and has been carried over into Indian jurisprudence, acts as a check on judicial power to maintain the separation of powers and legislative supremacy. It upholds the notion that laws reflect popular will and that the judiciary's main function is interpretation rather than enactment.

1. Origins and Conceptual Background

The doctrine's roots are in early English common law, when courts strictly followed the wording of statutes. In *Grey v. Pearson (1857)*[9], Lord Wensleydale famously ruled that

[8]Maxwell, Sir F., Maxwell on Interpretation of Statutes 10–12.

© 2025 International Journal of Advanced Legal Research

unless doing so would result in absurdity, terms in a statute should be taken in their "ordinary and grammatical sense." Courts expanded on this, as demonstrated in *Jones v. Smart (1785)*[10] and *Lord Howard de Walden v. IRC(1948)*[11], by developing the idea that omissions cannot be judicially filled. The fundamental principle that judicial involvement cannot cover topics not specifically addressed by Parliament was established by these instances.

"A casus omissus cannot be supplied by the court since it is no part of a judge's duty to add to or repair, and by construction supply deficiencies which the legislature left," Maxwell stated in his Interpretation of Statutes, which is his condensation of the theory. The central axiom of the doctrinetextual fidelity and judicial restraintis underscored in this formulation[12].

2. Theoretical Premise: Separation of Powers and Legislative Supremacy

The separation of powers principle found in the constitution serves as justification for the casus omissus argument. The judiciary has the power to interpret and apply laws, but the legislature, as the elected body, has democratic legitimacy to enact laws. Therefore, judicial supplementing of legislative omissions would violate the institutional competence principle and constitute an infringement on the legislative function.

Rigor and unfairness may be induced by strict adherence to this doctrine. Theorists such as Ronald Dworkin and H.L.A. Hart have spotlighted the "open texture" of language and the inherent ambiguity of statutes. The "core" meaning of statutory terminology may well be evident, yet positivist Hart's approach acknowledges that it is only in "penumbral" cases outside literal meaning that interpretation is required[13]. In contrast, Dworkin advocates "law as integrity," arguing that courts should interpret laws consistently with core moral and legal maxims. Both perspectives illustrate that strict literalness may sometimes hinder aims of justice and enactments, permitting occasional creative exercise in adjudication[14].

3. Correlation with Other Interpretive Canons

Other rules of interpretation that point to legislative intention are also closely identified with the doctrine of casus omissus. In holding that that which is left undone was that which was

[9] Grey v. Pearson, (1857) 6 HL Cas 61.
[10] Jones v. Smart, (1785) 1 T.R. 52, 99 Eng. Rep. 963 (K.B.).
[11] Lord Howard de Walden v. IRC, [1948] AC 111.
[12] Maxwell, Sir F., *Maxwell on Interpretation of Statutes* 18–22.
[13] Hart, H.L.A., *The Concept of Law* 125–135 (3rd ed., Oxford Univ. Press 2012).
[14] Dworkin, Ronald, *Law's Empire* 53–60 (Harvard Univ. Press 1986).

© 2025 International Journal of Advanced Legal Research

intended to be left undone, that rule of expressio unius est exclusio alteriusmention of one article is exclusion of another supports that doctrine. In the same sense, literal rule favors textual over extraneous considerations. But a more proactive judicial role is facilitated through purposive interpretation and the mischief rule that was originally enunciated in *Heydon's Case*[15] (1584). The mischief rule prompts courts to identify from time to time the flaw or "mischief" that was intended to be remedied under the act and then interpret the provision correspondingly. Under this approach, courts are empowered to from time to time rectify small drafting errors or unintended gaps as long as it achieves the manifest legislative intention. This shows how casus omissus operates within a range of interpretive principles which balance textualism with purposivism rather than existing in a vacuum.

4. The Doctrine as a Tool of Judicial Disciplines

The theory of casus omissus serves as a restraint on judicial activity in practice. It draws a barrier between acceptable interpretation and illegal legislation. Omissions can only be provided when (a) the legislative intent is clear from the statute as a whole and (b) the omission is entirely accidental rather than intentional, according to courts frequently citing this theory. Without these prerequisites, judicial supplementation is considered an overreach. In *CIT v. National Taj Traders (1980)*[16], for instance, the Supreme Court of India ruled that a casus omissus may only be provided in the most exceptional circumstances to prevent absurdity and only when the legislative intent to include the missing scenario is "abundantly clear." This idea is similar to how English courts operate, allowing judicial correction only where it is necessary to avoid blatant injustice or ridiculousness that goes against the intent of the law.

5. Current Relevance

The casus omissus rule continues to be a reminder of judicial modesty within modern juristic traditions, especially those with written constitutions. But extreme adherence to the conception can hinder justice within society's swiftly transforming countries technologically. This tension underlines the perpetual need to find a balance between purposive interpretation on one hand and judicial restraint on another. Accordingly, it places casus omissus within a

[15]Heydon's Case, (1584) 76 ER 637.
[16] Supra note 7

© 2025 International Journal of Advanced Legal Research

broader jurisprudential debate between textualism and purposivism, judicial dynamism and restraint, as well as substantive justice and formal legality.

THE DOCTRINE OF CASUS OMISSUS IN INDIAN STATUTORY INTERPRETATION:

In Indian law, the doctrine of casus omissus has evolved distinctive forms that have been shaped by the country's socio-legal context, judicial ideology, and constitutional framework. While it derives its origins in the English common law, its usage in India reflects a cautious attempt to reconcile the judiciary's constitutional mandate to deliver justice with the notion of legislative dominance. Consequently, the Indian judiciary has struck a balance which allows for purposive interpretation without sacrificing legislative intent, as opposed to adopting a purely textualist stance or judicial lawmaking.

A. Constitutional and Jurisprudential Basis

The three branches of the government are to have separate powers, as provided in the Indian Constitution. While Article 141 demands that the law pronounced by the Supreme Court has to be binding on every court, Article 245 empowers Parliament and state legislatures to make laws[17]. It creates a hierarchy of interpretation where the decisions of courts not only interpret the law but, at times, alter it. Casus omissus serves as a check in this case, reminding the judges of the constitutional boundaries distinguishing legislation and interpretation.

At the same time, the Indian judiciary operates in terms of the constitutional requirement to maintain justice, equity, and good conscience while upholding fundamental rights. Consequently, where legislative gaps have left legal vacuums, the courts have sometimes expanded their perception of the statute to prevent injustice. This constitutional dichotomy between restraint and activism is at the core of the Indian application of casus omissus.

B. Judicial Articulation of the Doctrine

Indian courts have time and again asserted that judicial interpretation cannot make a casus omissus unless there are a clear legislative intent and a discernible necessity. "A casus omissus should not be easily implied and can only be supplied in the exceptional cases and only when a clear need and rationale for it is traced within the four corners of the statute itself," the Supreme Court laid down as a basic principle in *CIT v. National Taj Traders*

[17] Supra note 4

© 2025 International Journal of Advanced Legal Research

(1980)[18]. This decision, according to which supplementation by the judiciary is permissible only when omission destroys the purpose of the act or leads to absurdity, remains the pillar of the Indian doctrine.

Similarly, the Court held categorically that "the court cannot rewrite, recast, or reframe the legislation for the very good reason that it has no power to legislate" in *Union of India v. Deoki Nandan Aggarwal (1992)*[19]. The court emphasized that any move to shut purportedly gaping holes in the law was legislating from the bench and that judicial interpretation should be confined to ascertaining the legislative intent. This case reinforced that the judiciary may not substitute the opinions of the legislature with its own for the purpose of interpretation.

The Supreme Court restated this position in *Shyam Sunder v. Ram Kumar (2001)*[20], observing that courts cannot shift phrasing in order to attain apparent justice and that the "intention of the legislature is mainly to be ascertained from the language employed in the statute." In the view of the Court, the doctrine of casus omissus is a necessary discipline which ensures that interpretation does not encroach on legislation.

C. Qualified Departures and Judicial Flexibility

Where blind compliance with the theory would amount to gross injustice or contravene constitutional ideals, Indian jurisprudence is flexible despite formal limitation. A classic example is *Vishaka v. State of Rajasthan (1997)*[21], where the Supreme Court formulated guidelines on sexual harassment at workplaces in the absence of any legislation. The Court used India's international commitments under the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW)[22] to justify this action as a constitutional requirement under Articles 14, 15, and 21[23], even though it might have stretched traditional interpretation. Similarly, the Supreme Court recognized passive euthanasia in *Common Cause v. Union of India (2018)*[24]and gave full procedural safeguards despite the absence of a statutory framework.

[18] Supra note 7
[19] Supra note 6
[20] Shyam Sunder v. Ram Kumar, (2001) 5 SCC 45.
[21] Supra note 5
[22] Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, Dec. 18, 1979, 1249 U.N.T.S. 13.
[23] Constitution of India, 1950, arts. 14, 15, 21.
[24]Common Cause v. Union of India, (2018) 5 SCC 1.

© 2025 International Journal of Advanced Legal Research

The Court argued that the protection of the right to die with dignity under Article 21 could not be obstructed by legislative inaction on the subject. These decisions reflect a utilitarian and purposive application of the theory, under which the court solely fills legislative gaps for the purpose of safeguarding constitutional values and preventing legal vacuums—not for encroaching upon legislative power.

D. Interaction with Indian Statutory Framework

The General Clauses Act, 1897[25], is also a guidance to Indian statutory interpretation, assisting courts to interpret laws in a manner compatible with the legislative intent. But the Act provides no direct method of finding legislative omissions, and that reinforces the judiciary's limited power to supply gaps.

Thus, to decide whether an omission is deliberate or inadvertent, the judiciary resorts to interpretive approaches such as harmonious construction, the mischief rule, and purposive interpretation. In addition, the complex language of contemporary Indian legislation and regular amendments often leaves scope for doubt and requires courts to exercise interpretive reasoning on the brink of gap-filling. Thus, courts have sometimes waived lacunae in administrative law and taxation, provided the legislative intent was clear. This is an application of casus omissus that is functional rather than formalisticcourts attempt to further the purpose of the law rather than its literal wording.

E. The Balancing Function of the Doctrine

Consequently, the Indian solution to casus omissus achieves an uneasy equipoise: courts are obliged to construe legislation in order to effectuate legislative purpose, but they are not at liberty to ignore their constitutional duty to administer justice when there is a legislative silence. The habitual judicial warning that casus omissus is not to be readily assumed illustrates such equipoise. Courts have only judged by analogy where legislative silences lead to absurdity or contravene constitutional requirements. Indian judiciary has transformed casus omissus from a rigid rule of exclusion to a doctrine of controlled flexibility through this balanced approach. The judiciary understands that even if the will of the legislature is final, the judiciary remains the upholder of justice and constitutional morality[26]. In consequence,

[25] General Clauses Act, 1897.
[26] S. Sathe, "Judicial Activism in India: The Contours of Gap-Filling," *Indian Bar Review*, vol. 25, 2016, pp. 89–104.

© 2025 International Journal of Advanced Legal Research

the theory continues to evolve within the overall framework of Indian constitutionalism, being both responsive to the demands of justice within a transforming society and dutiful towards the legislative intent.

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS:

While common law jurisdictions share the concept of casus omissus, each country's constitutional tradition and philosophy of the judiciary determine how it is applied and interpreted. In dealing with legislative oversights, the United States, United Kingdom, and several Commonwealth countries such as Australia and Canada are contrasted to illustrate varying degrees of judicial activism and restraint. These approaches provide meaningful data on India's own emerging interpretive system.

1. United Kingdom: Judicial Restraint and Legislative Supremacy

Traditionally, casus omissus has been used in the UK with continued strong adherence to legislative sovereignty. The principle that judges should not make law in the guise of interpretation is strictly enforced by English courts. The role of the court "is to interpret the words which the legislature has used; it is not for the court to fill gaps or to remedy defects," Lord Simonds wrote in *Magor and St. Mellons Rural District Council v. Newport Corporation (1952)*[27]. This is the classic Diceyan view of parliamentary sovereignty. The judiciary merely declares the meaning of legislation; Parliament is the supreme lawmaking authority.

However, English law has come to incorporate an objective, purposive orientation, particularly since the Human Rights Act of 1998[28] and the UK accession to the European Community. The House of Lords has permitted purposive interpretation in order to give effect to legislative intention in *Litster v. Forth Dry Dock & Engineering Co. Ltd. (1989)*[29], even where the words were silent on specific matters. Purposive interpretation is utilized to advance legislative intent rather than to rewrite legislatures, yet British courts are still reticent notwithstanding this shift. Thus, the need for statutory language to correspond to broader human rights and policy objectives underlies the application of the doctrine of casus omissus, even though it does remain inhibitory of judicial creativity.

[27] Magor and St. Mellons Rural District Council v. Newport Corporation, [1952] 2 All ER 113.
[28] Human Rights Act 1998, c. 42 (U.K.).
[29] Litster v. Forth Dry Dock & Engineering Co. Ltd., [1989] AC 546.

© 2025 International Journal of Advanced Legal Research

2. United States: Pragmatic Judicial Law-Making

The United States, conversely, is more pragmatic in its approach to legislative gaps, founded on the "judicial review" theory established in *Marbury v. Madison (1803)*[30]. The Constitution and legislation have historically been regarded by the US Supreme Court as "living documents" that may be interpreted flexibly. Where strict textualism would interfere with justice, American courts often resort to legislative history, considerations of policy, and moral argument.

This pragmatic tradition is encapsulated in Justice Holmes' famous declaration that "the life of the law has not been logic; it has been experience." In a bid to achieve legislating purposes or protect constitutional rights, United States courts are allowed to "fill in gaps" where necessary. But such flexibility resulted in a constant debate between purposivists, such as Justice Stephen Breyer, who advocated for interpretation according to legislative intent, and textualists, such as Justice Antonin Scalia, who were opposed to judicial legislation.

Hence, the American precedent indicates that courts can lawfully complete legislative voids when such action upholds the essence of the legislation and avoids injustice, even if casus omissus formally prohibits judicial completion. This interpretative pragmatism, contrary to the British heritage, has influenced constitutional and human rights adjudication in the modern world massively.

3. Australia and Canada: The Purposive Middle Ground

Canada and Australia adopt a balanced approach that blends purposive interpretation with textual fidelity. The Australian High Court has consistently emphasized that although language should be accorded precedence in statutory construction, purpose and context cannot be ignored. As dictated by the principle set in *Project Blue Sky Inc. v. Australian Broadcasting Authority (1998)*,[31]courts are to interpret acts in a manner that fulfils the legislative purpose, but are not to fill omissions unless doing so clearly contravenes that intention.

Canada permits a freer interpretation under its Charter of Rights and Freedoms.The contemporary rule of interpretation that "the words of an Act are to be read in their whole context and in their grammatical and ordinary meaning harmoniously with the scheme of the Act, the object of the Act, and the intention of Parliament" was applied by the Supreme Court

[30]Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. (1 Cranch) 137 (1803).

[31] Project Blue Sky Inc. v. Australian Broadcasting Authority, (1998) 194 CLR 355 (Austl.).

© 2025 International Journal of Advanced Legal Research

of Canada in the 1998 case of *Rizzo & Rizzo Shoes Ltd. (Re)*[32]. So long as judicial interpretation is compatible with legislative intentions and constitutional values, Canadian courts are able to complete statutory silences with the help of this purposive approach.

Important Takeaways for India

India's response to casus omissus, based on a comparative analysis, is between the United States and Canadian pragmatic purposivism and the rigorous textualism of early English law. Like North American pragmatism, Indian courts have repeated the British model of legislative supremacy but in a manner that is not reluctant to intervene when omissions threaten justice or constitutional rights[33].

The comparative experience stresses that instead of judicial legislation, judicial gap-filling would be a deed of interpretative necessity. Purposive interpretation is permitted by India's constitution's commitment to justice, liberty, and equality, but within moderation so as to maintain democratic administration. The reconciliation, thus, is in judicial sensitivity: to fill gaps in legislation only if such omissions thwart the legislative scheme or transgress fundamental rights, and not to re-make the law in the pursuit of policy results[34].

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST JUDICIAL FILLING OF LEGISLATIVE GAPS

A constant tension between judicial creativity and constitutional constraint is illustratedin the debate over whether courts may apply the rule of casus omissus to fill gaps in legislation. In support, proponents argue that judicial intervention is required to defend justice and ensure that supervision or inaction will not contradict the purpose of legislation. But critics caution that such action risks undermining the democratic legitimacy of the legislature and violating the principle of separation of powers.

Arguments for Judicial Gap-Filling

- Preserving Fairness and Precluding Absurdity: The writing of legislation is not without its faults. If read strictly, laws can contain contradictions, loopholes, or out-of-date wording that causes injustice. Thus, in order to prevent ludicrous or inequitable results, on occasion, courts are obligated to look beyond the language. In

[32] Rizzo & Rizzo Shoes Ltd. (Re), [1998] 1 SCR 27 (Can.).
[33] P.S. Jaiswal, "Casus Omissus and Statutory Interpretation: A Comparative Study," *JILI*, vol. 59, 2018, pp. 201–220.
[34] G.C. Venkatesan, "Judicial Interpretation and Casus Omissus: Lessons from Indian Courts," *Indian Journal of Legal Studies*, vol. 12, no. 1, 2019, pp. 45–67.

© 2025 International Journal of Advanced Legal Research

CIT v. National Taj Traders (1980)[35], the Supreme Court acknowledged that in the "rarest of cases," there may be omissions to prevent absurdity and other legislative intent. In such cases, judicial intervention ensures that the law will serve its fundamental purpose, which is justice.

- Adaptive Interpretation in a Developing Culture: Since society evolves, the law must evolve as well. Courts play a critical role in filling normative gaps where legislatures fail to act on new matters such as gender rights, ecology, or online privacy. The Supreme Court's 1997 judgment in *Vishaka v. State of Rajasthan*[36], where it formulated guidelines against sexual harassment at work, is a good example of the judicial creativity that fills a constitutional gap and pushes fundamental rights forward. In all such cases, judicial innovation aid's legislative role instead of going against it.
- Preservation of Constitutional Principles: Maintenance of constitutional morality and basic rights is a constitutional obligation of the Indian judiciary. When these principles are breached through legislative inaction, judicial filling of gaps becomes obligatory under the constitution. In *Common Cause v. Union of India (2018)*[37], the approval of passive euthanasia was seen as an act of constitutional stewardship under Article 21[38] and not judicial legislation. Based on this view, courts protect rights and not supplant legislation[39].

Arguments Against Judicial Gap-Filling

- Violation of Separation of Powers: The central argument is that the separation of the judiciary and legislature in the constitution is breached when judges supplement legislative omissions. In the *Union of India v. Deoki Nandan Aggarwal case of 1992*[40], it was mentioned that "the court cannot rewrite, recast, or reframe legislation." Judicial supplementing of omissions essentially makes courts legislative institutions, undermining democratic accountability and elected legislature legitimacy.
- Risk of Inconsistency and Subjectivity: Judges' perceptions of justice, morality, and policy dominate judicial gap-filling. The legal system becomes subject to being

[35]Supra note 7
[36]Supra note 5
[37]Supra note 23
[38] Supra note 22
[39] Supra note 25
[40]Supra note 6

© 2025 International Journal of Advanced Legal Research

unpredictable and subjective as a consequence. Judicially created norms can be devoid of democratic coherence and consistency if there is no discipline of parliamentary debate and deliberation, which can lead to uncertainty in the application of the law.

- Legislative Responsibility Erosion: Routine court intervention might discourage legislative initiative. Legislators might become idle and resort to judicial relief instead of legislative amendment if courts constantly correct legislative lapses. This subverts the constitutionally ordained institutional balance, whereby each organ should function in its own sphere.

Neither extreme is optimal, Indian experience suggests. Untethered judicial activism can erode democratic legitimacy, and unfettered judicial restraint can allow injustice to persist. Judicial restraint with principle is optimal; courts should merely fill legislative lacunae were

(a) omission violates the evident legislative intent or

(b) inaction puts fundamental rights at risk. Judicial intervention in such cases needs to be short and ephemeral to prompt legislative action.

By finding a harmony between judicial creativity and constitutional adherence, this model ensures that interpretation will ever remain a servant of justice and not legislation.

CASE STUDY

The simplest method of understanding the practical application of the doctrine of casus omissus in India is to examine historical court decisions where the courts had to interpret and, in some cases, fill gaps in statutes because of legislative silence. Two seminal judgments, *Common Cause v. Union of India (2018)*[41] and *Vishaka v. State of Rajasthan (1997)*[42], reflect the intricate usage of the doctrine in Indian law and demonstrate the tension between upholding justice and judicial restraint.

I. Vishaka v. State of Rajasthan (1997)[43]

Lack of legislation on sexual harassment of women employees in the workplace led to the Vishaka case. To protect women's rights through Articles 14, 15, and 21 of the Constitution[44],

[41]Supra note 23
[42]Supra note 5
[43]ibid

© 2025 International Journal of Advanced Legal Research

the petitioners sought judicial intervention when social worker Bhanwari Devi, who aimed at preventing child marriage, was brutally gang-raped. There was a huge legislative void since the government had failed to enact any law regulating sexual harassment at the workplace. The Supreme Court established the Vishaka Guidelines, which provide detailed procedural and substantive safeguards against sexual harassment in the workplace, by way of recognition of this imbalance.

The Court justified its intervention as an exercise of its constitutional responsibility to uphold fundamental rights, although it did not make any explicit claims to legislate. Although conceding the legislative silence and the resultant danger to women's rights, the Court expressly referred to the doctrine of casus omissus, stressing that its directions would remain in operation until Parliament enacted a formal statute.

The case illustrates that whereas legislative inaction would perpetuate injustice and would directly endanger constitutional guarantees, judicial fillinthegap is permissible. The Vishaka judgment is significant on several grounds, such as setting up an orderly process of filling statutory gaps, evincing purposive interpretation, and reaffirming the judiciary's role in the presence of legislative lacunae. It also underscores that such intervention is not permanent but to fill the gap with the insistence on maintaining the separation of powers and enforcing the constitutional role of the judiciary.

II. Common Cause v. Union of India (2018)[45]

In the case of Common Cause, the Supreme Court dealt with two subjects where Indian law had remained silent: passive euthanasia and living wills. The petitioners argued that Article 21[46], which safeguards the right to life and liberty, grants terminally ill individuals the right to refuse life-sustaining treatment.The lack of statutory law to regulate end-of-life medical decisions left a large legal void. To address this, the Court set up procedural safeguards to ensure informed consent and protection against abuse, acknowledging passive euthanasia as a constitutionally protected right.

The ruling clearly declared that constitutional principles, and not judicial legislation, were the compass for the decision. The Court balanced the protection of legislative supremacy with

[44]Supra note 22
[45] Supra note 23
[46] Supra note 22

© 2025 International Journal of Advanced Legal Research

protection of basic rights by invoking a purposive interpretation of the Constitution and remedying a legislative shortcoming. The Common Cause case is an illustration of the manner in which the judiciary can cautiously fill legal gaps without transcending its constitutional limits. The approach of the Court reaffirmed the necessity of principled, specifically targeted judicial intervention designed to supplement and not supplant legislative inertia.

Analysis of these cases:

Both Vishaka and Common Cause note significant trends in the application of casus omissus in India:

- Constitutional Justification: Where an omission threatens fundamental rights or constitutional values, the judiciary fills the gap.
- Temporary Nature: Courts often explain that their intervention is only temporary and open to future legislative intervention.
- Purposive Interpretation: For the purpose of giving effect to legislative intent or constitutional requirements, the courts interpret current constitutional or statutory provisions as opposed to altering the law.
- Controlled Judicial Creativity: The court employs its powers judiciously in a way that precludes temporary legislation becoming permanent legislation.

To ensure justice while keeping the constitutional doctrine of separation of powers intact, Indian courts observe legislative loopholes, intervene only when necessary, and provide structured guidance. These cases demonstrate a pragmatic equipoise. They provide a model of judicial accountability that is both principled and responsive to social demands.

CRITICAL ANALYSIS

In Indian legislative theory, casus omissus has a nuanced role to play, posing a continuing dilemma between judicial restraint and upholding justice. Theoretically based on legislative sovereignty and text fidelity, its practice in India demonstrates that strict adherence to it is not always wished for or possible. A critical analysis places the merits and demerits of the Indian method into perspective and provides observations regarding the changing balance of judicial intervention to interpretation.

© 2025 International Journal of Advanced Legal Research

- Judicial restraint and consistency

The requirement of rarity of judicial filling of legislative loopholes has been underscored by Indian courts on numerous occasions. The judiciary cannot make, change, or interpret law as discussed in seminal cases like *CIT v. National Taj Traders (1980)*[47] *and Union of India v. Deoki Nandan Aggarwal (1992)*[48]. These cases demonstrate the significance of the doctrine for upholding the separation of powers and keeping the elected legislature as the main legislature. This practice maintains institutional discipline, avoids encroachment by the judiciary, and protects democratic legitimacy from a constitutional point of view. Judicial restraint is praiseworthy when casus omissus is reasonably used as a limiting doctrine. The judiciary usually shows respect to the legislature by reminding that interpretation has to turn its mind to the clarification of meaning rather than filling gaps in policy. The rule of law is supported by its regular application, which keeps the judiciary away from acting as a de facto legislature.

- Judicial Flexibility and Constitutional Necessity

Where legislative inaction leads to constitutional or social injustice, Indian courts have displayed pragmatic flexibility with formal restraint. *Common Cause (2018)*[49] *and Vishaka (1997)*[50] are instances that demonstrate how purposive interpretation could fill the gaps without encroaching upon legislative domain. Where legislative failure posed danger to the welfare of society, judicial intervention became necessary as a constitutional imperative to safeguard fundamental rights and provide access to justice.

The pragmatic and sensitive understanding of the Indian judiciary that strict textualism might produce irrational or unjust decisions is reflected by this flexibility. Courts render the law applicable to modern issues through a risk-averse filling of gaps so that there remains a balance between formal legalism and substance justice. But the policy also invites apprehensions regarding the exact boundaries of judicial power and judicial activism.

- Challenges and Risks

[47]Supra note 7
[48]Supra note 6
[49]Supra note 23
[50]Supra note 5

© 2025 International Journal of Advanced Legal Research

There are some difficulties with the Indian doctrine of casus omissus. Even if it is attempted sincerely, judicial completion is bound to blur the distinction between statute and interpretation. Courts may be accused of legislating rather than interpreting if they over-rely on purposive consideration. Finally, unequal application by various benches can undermine legal certainty by creating unpredictability.

The loss of legislative accountability is also a potential worry. Legislators may procrastinate or neglect passing comprehensive laws so that they can rely on judicial relief to fill gaps in statutes when the judiciary steps in to plug loopholes[51]. The constitutional balance contemplated by the separation of powers may be upset with this process, and the authority of the legislature as the sole lawmaking institution may be undercut.

- Comparative Insights

Indian experience can also be appreciated with a comparative lens.Indian courts have a goal-oriented and contextual approach similar to Canada and, to some extent, the United States, unlike the United Kingdom, which is adamant about strong textual fidelity focus. This approach is aligned with India's constitutional requirement of ensuring justice and safeguarding fundamental rights[52]. But Indian courts have chosen to apply the doctrine sparingly and, on a case,-by-case basis, shying away from the extensive judicial lawmaking found in certain American decisions.

CONCLUSION

One of the key principles of Indian statutory interpretation is the principle of casus omissus, which reflects the effort on the part of the judiciary to walk the tightrope between constitutional mandate of dispensing justice and respect for legislative sovereignty.

Studies have shown that Indian courts have always realized that it is the responsibility of the judiciary to interpret the law and not make the law; loopholes in legislation cannot be filled haphazardly. This idea is consolidated by landmark rulings like *CIT v. National Taj Traders (1980)*[53] *and Union of India v. Deoki Nandan Aggarwal (1992)*[54], which emphasize the idea that judicial intervention would only be invoked in the worst of circumstances in which

[51] Supra note 33
[52] Aharon Barak, *The Judge in a Democracy* 76–89 (Princeton Univ. Press 2006).
[53] Supra note 7
[54] Supra note 6

© 2025 International Journal of Advanced Legal Research

legislative purpose is thwarted by statutory silence or results in absurdity. This restraint safeguards democratic legitimacy and maintains the purity of the separation of powers. But where legislative failure poses jeopardy to fundamental rights or creates immense lacunae in the law, Indian courts have resorted to principled flexibility in addressing the situation.

Vishaka v. State of Rajasthan (1997)[55] *and Common Cause v. Union of India (2018)*[56] are two examples of how judges have filled legislative gaps on a temporary basis to promote individual rights and collective interests, based on constitutional morality and purposive interpretation. These interventions demonstrate that judicial gap-filling, if executed judiciously, realizes the constitutional responsibility of the judiciary to dispense justice as opposed to legislating. In comparative research, India's approach lies in between expansive judicial activism in the US and sheer textualism, as demonstrated by the UK.

Indian courts, as a result, have evolved an even-handed system that upholds constitutional values without undermining legislative intent. There are still issues, though: judicial discretion needs to be exercised prudently to prevent subjectivity, inconsistency, and encroachment upon legislative domain. Legitimacy and predictability of statutory interpretation can be furthered by certain standards specifying the conditions under which judicial supplementation is acceptable. In short, Indian doctrine of casus omissus is a moral intervention device, as also a limiting principle[57].

In order to preserve the intent of the law and the safeguards of the Constitution, courts must continue to use cautious judicial creativity, fleshing out legislating gaps only where required. By upholding that balance, the judiciary can ensure that statutory interpretation remains a tool of enforcement of justice and not one of legislation, so advancing democratic government and the rule of law.

[55] Supra note 5
[56] Supra note 23
[57] Supra note 3

© 2025 International Journal of Advanced Legal Research