IJNRD.ORG ISSN : 2456-4184
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF NOVEL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT (IJNRD) | IJNRD.ORG
An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

THE "TRAFFIC LIGHT" THEORIES OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW – AN ANALYSIS

Yuvakeerthana K, LL.B(H)Student, Chabina Gresoria P S, LL.B(H)Student,

Chettinad School of Law, Chettinad Academy of Research and Education, Chennai.

ABSTRACT:

The idea of red light green light theory was first raised by Carol Harlow and Richard Rawling in 1948 and it is one of the theories of law and order. Rule of Law is a basic principle of administrative law. This theory was acquainted to evaluate administrative law with a rationale to stop the abuse of power. The red light theory essentially centers around the control of powers that are vested with the government and puts legal control on top. In the green light theory, the state procures a more extensive job and has bigger power and permits state intercessions. This theory puts political accentuation on top of than legal executive. Most legal frameworks in every one of the nations are a blend of both these theories. For administration to be perceived as equitable it ought to be in the middle of between these two theories and this sort of administration is prevalently known as the Amber light theory. The two schools of thought explain the impedance of law in the administration of a country. This article centers around the idea of administrative law, the traffic light theories, and their analysis concerning the administration.

KEY WORDS: Law, State, Governance, Powers, Rights, Liabilities.

INTRODUCTION:

Laws that oversee the administrative acts are known as administrative laws and the red light green light theory is one among the theories of laws that makes administration more productive. As per (Dicey, 1889)[1] administrative law is a blend of rights and liabilities of people in terms with authorities which determines the system through which the vested rights are being implemented. The instance of (Marbury v. Madison, 1803)[2] is the principal case that should the judicial supremacy and later it was perceived in numerous different nations to date. In this paper we will get into the profundity of these school of thoughts and examine their values.

RED LIGHT THEORY:

This theory is probably originated from political practice when the industrial revolution existed in the 19th century which pushed laissez fair theory. This theory was principally to limit the inordinate intercession by the government. It fundamentally has no faith in states and as per this theory, more extensive power to the government prompts the non-presence of rights and freedom of the citizens and that is the justification for why this theory expects to control the issues by courts where courts and law are viewed as the supreme. As indicated

[1] A. V. Dicey, Introduction to the Study of the Law of the Constitution, MacMillan & Co, Third Edition, 1889
[2] Marbury v. Madison 5 U.S. 137 (1803)

by the article (Dhital, 2020)[3], the idea of legal power is an impression of the red light theory on the grounds that the government should work according to the legitimate rules and regulations laid by the parliament. In legal power there should be a body that orders and where individuals can pursue. It essentially limits people or gatherings from acting past the extent of the law. Administrative law will undoubtedly control the state exercises which will safeguard private rights. On account of (Indira Gandhi v. Raj Narain, 1975)[4] the 39th amendment remembered the appointment of the Head of the state for the ninth schedule making it liberated from judicial investigation. This obviously shows us that the state needed to safeguard their chief and made the amendment according to their desire which is a reasonable abuse of power by the government. The Supreme Court for this case properly ascertained that the 39th amendment was unconstitutional. Assuming this case was supportive of the government it would have prompted state

intercession and we can plainly forecast that there would emerge a situation of oppression and defilement.

A significant presumption of this theory is that when public bodies or executive authorities surpass their powers, judicial mediation functions as an approval. This is on the grounds that regulatory and executive power of the state and its establishments, if uncontrolled, will compromise the freedom, everything being equal. Subsequently, judicial control is expected in the political structure of a state. The red light scholars likewise accept that the judiciary has its own principles of freedom and reasonableness and can be depended upon, in analyzing the legality of executive activity. Thus, it tends to be utilized as a viable component for check and equilibrium in a state framework.

These are the different principles of this theory:

1. Courts are the essential weapon for insurance of the citizen and control of the executive.
2. The supremacy of law should beat politics.
3. The administrative authorities should be held under judicial control.
4. For judicial control, the overall arrangement of settlement is fitting.
5. Public law should be arranged towards reinforcing individual freedoms.
6. The universe of law is objective, nonpartisan and free of the universe of government, politics and administration.
7. Administrative law ought to mean to check or control the state.

Accordingly, the red light theory accentuates on law as an instrument for the control of power and security of individual freedom. It advocates for an interventionist viewpoint by the courts to the review of administrative choices. As clarified by Dicey, this theory shifts focus over to the model of the 'adjusted constitution' obliging the judicial control of executive power as dependent upon political control by the Parliament through regulation of severe standards and to legal control through judicial checking by the courts.

GREEN LIGHT THEORY:

This theory specifies that one individual holding power can be risky. It expresses more than individual rights there should be aggregate rights and for that state should change over into absolutist simultaneously it should be ensured that cooperation is constantly advanced and the prosperity of individuals is at its pinnacle. This theory is essentially a counter to the red light theory. As per (Stott and Felix, 1997)[5] green light theory may likewise be known as a functionalist theory which shows a positive methodology toward the states. As per this theory, the law is only a simple matter of political conversation and administrative law should not zero in just on lessening negative practices by the government be that as it may, ought to likewise zero in on working with the administration. The Authors here feel this theory has advanced from the utilitarian theory since philosophers, for example, Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Plant have pushed that an action is correct assuming an actiony advances happiness and wrong assuming it gives happiness. Thus, the crucial target of green light theory is to

[3] Anjana Dhital, Red, Green and Amber light theories of administrative law, IPLEADERS, https://blog.ipleaders.in/red-green-amber-light-theories-administrative-law/#_ftn7 (Last Accessed on 18/12/2022, 05.56pm)
[4] Indira Gandhi v. Raj Narain AIR 1976 (2) SCR 347
[5] David Stott & Alexandra Felix, Principles of administrative law, Cavendish Publishing Limited, London, United Kingdom, 1997.

restrict the impact of courts over administration since courts are viewed as a boundary to administrative development due to their legal values.

These are the different fundamentals of this theory:

1. Law is only a question of political conversation. In this way, law isn't better than administration or can't beat administration.
2. Public administration is definitely not a means to an end yet a decent component of the state.
3. Administrative law shouldn't just concentration towards restricting negative acts of the government. It ought to likewise deal with working with the administration and sound administrative practices.
4. For empowering the administration, adjudication in light of legal standards isn't the sole fitting thought.
5. There can be different options in contrast to courts.

Thusly, the fundamental worry of green light theory is to lessen the impact of courts over administration on the grounds that the courts with their legal qualities are considered as an obstacle to administrative advancement. The green light favors vote based type of responsibility. In view of these suspicions, green light scholars consent in working with the administration through anticipation of any judicial or legal command over executive activities.

AMBER LIGHT THEORY:

The theory is a harmony between red light and green light theory which follows the center way. It doesn't refute the unbending nature of the red light theory in any case, they contend that unreasonable straightforwardness can likewise prompt higher issues. Everything should not be transparent to the public since certain things might be exceptionally delicate in nature which might prompt interior disturbances. The theory additionally proposes that law is better than politics and politics should continuously be lower contrasted with the law. Thus, we can say from this theory that a state can be effectively restricted by the judiciary and the judiciary should similarly take into consideration a legitimate administration. The objective of this theory is to save common liberties in a specific vision. The Authors feel that human rights should be adhered and yet, state security should likewise be central.

These are the different fundamentals of this theory:

1. Law is both discrete from and better than politics.
2. The state can effectively be restricted by law albeit that law ought to appropriately take into consideration the administration to partake in a degree but controlled level of optional power.
3. The most effective way of controlling the state is through the judicial verbalization and authorization of expansive principles of legality.
4. The objective of this theory is to defend a specific vision of common liberties.

Along these lines, the amber light theory is a combination which consolidates the need for some command over administrative choices with worry for setting great guidelines of administrative lead, compelling choice taking, responsibility, and common freedoms. It has a nearby relationship with the two theories anyway it doesn't uphold the presence of any one theory in confinement. It recognizes the principles of both the theories and attempts to accommodate between the two.

EVALUATION OF THE THEORIES:

This theory was recognized by numerous nations, for example, India and Canada which brought up basic issues all through the world. One of the inquiries was in regards to the role of law and the capability of the judiciary. The Authors feel the laws are made to make moral norms and advance public policies which work with internal harmony for the general public. The judiciary then again acts as an intermediator between law, individuals and administration. The Authors likewise feel the judiciary assumes a significant part as they have the ability to decipher laws and apply them to the verifiable conditions and choose the questions. Deciphering the rules is one

of the key capabilities that is given to the judiciary to apply the law in various cases. The subsequent inquiry was in regards to whether the courts can be fundamentally liable for administration. The Authors feel that for a legitimate administration there ought to be something over the government to screen their acts continually. As per the article (Said, 2020)[6] nobody is above law, and that implies no individual or government or its authorities is exempt from the rules that everyone else follows and the law upholds government it is the obligation of the courts with comply to the law without predisposition. Thus, we can learn that courts are above administration making them basically liable for the appropriate running of the administration. Since one theory totally goes for the judiciary and the other theory totally goes for the government and the inquiry emerged concerning who should have a definitive power? The Authors feel both government and judiciary should have specific powers to satisfy their obligations. That's what the red light theory predicts in the event that a definitive power is vested with the government, there is a high likelihood that the public bodies and executive authorities will act past their powers and judicial intervention acts the hero. The green light theory says that judicial intervention limits the productivity of administration. Relating to this inquiry, the authors would recommend that the amber light theory be followed in light of the fact that the authors feel that the most effective way to control a state is by judicial interventions and in the event that the state is above law they could without much of a stretch amend the law as per their wish which would cause serious challenges for individuals.

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE THEORIES:

As we have expressively examined the various theories presently let us talk about the contrast between these theories.

• The red light theory sees judicial review as a method for directing administrative activities, while the green light theory perceives that judicial review is in some cases essential exclusively to work with administrative activities.

• The green light theory discovers judicial control as a snag to the running of the administration while the red light theory considers judicial control over administration for the administration to effectively run.

• The red light theory is amicable to the intervention by courts while the green light theory questions the courts intervention in taking a look at the executive actions.

• The green light theory believes law to be something that stops administration while the red light theory lays everything on the courts and law and order.

The point of administrative law is to hold the government under thorough management and to guarantee that every one of the rights of citizens are secured. This large number of theories have been proposed at various times to distinguish the objectives of administrative law. As per (Franklin, 2018)[7] in the public eye, their laws are a bunch of rules and regulations that decide a system of do's and don'ts in the society, as well as the establishments that enact and implement the laws. Likewise, for a legitimate administration, the government should act as indicated by the law that decides the do's and don'ts.

The red light theory insists that administrative law should be severe and to hold the government under huge control. The green light theory in spite of the red light theory considers that when policy implementation is held under control, it can't work actually yet, it doesn't deny the role of law totally. The amber light theory supporting both the theories considers that there is no reasonable winner among the theories and the objective of administrative law ought to be to take the best aspects of the two theories and apply them to the governmental structure.

ANALYSIS OF THE THEORIES:

Administrative law has a great concern of safeguarding the interest of people inside society from the one-sided or unconstitutional acts of the public administration through managing the power and works and restricting the

[6] Mark Said, No one is above the law, TIMES MALTA, (Last Accessed on December 19, 2022), https://timesofmalta.com/articles/view/no-one-is-above-the-law-mark-said.931456

[7] Robert Franklin, The Red Light Theory and The Green Light Theory Portray Contrary Views as to the Extent and Object of Administrative law, THE LAWYERS AND JURISTS, (Last Accessed on December 25, 2022), https://www.lawyersnjurists.com/article/the-red-light-theory-and-the-green-light-theory-portray-contrary-viewsas-to-the-extent-and-object-of-administrative-law-2/

acts of the executive body whenever required. Compelling executive administration is of most extreme significance for the fruitful running of any country. The Red Light Theory carries to the light issue related with the executive administration. The procedural inappropriateness, abuse of power by executive requests for the obstruction of judiciary in the administrative issues. The idea of Public interest suit is a creating idea in India and red-light theory is predominantly worried about individual rights. The Red Light Theory which can likewise be called control-situated theory is vital in the present circumstances. The new hardly any dubious bills drafted by the government have gotten analysis from the world, in such a case judicial control is an unquestionable necessity to safeguard the uprightness of the country. Judicial control will guarantee that the government abuses no arrangement of the constitution. Any administrative action which disregards standards, such movement ought to be disallowed by law. For instance, in India, it has been a pattern now to have 'Hartals' to satisfy the necessities. Be that as it may, once in a while these hartals make public irritation and misfortune the economy. Despite the fact that the hartals are now and again for good explanation, the judiciary should have the power to mediate to forestall conceivable misfortune. The law ought to have more prominent power than politics. Having administrative power better than the law is off-base.

Nonetheless, in the event that the administration is liberated from the control it can meet strategy goals in a superior manner. The laws outlined by the government are as per the arrangements of the constitution, seldom it happens that the law is unconstitutional. 'The resistance condemning the government' is currently similar to a laid out standard and this standard guarantees that the government don't cause one-sided law and resistance to bring to the general public the genuine flaw related with the law. Subsequently judiciary shouldn't control the administration cycle as the executive body keeps the guidelines and guidelines, and the judiciary totally being an alternate body from the council (politics), shouldn't meddle except if the law hampers the freedom of individuals. For instance, In India to be a State leader, just least age rules must be observed though there is no most extreme cutoff for his/her term thus Top state leader could serve the country for quite a while. Then again, a representative of a government organization or bank can't offer its types of assistance to the country for quite a while, as the residency must be trailed by them. Here, the subject of 'balance under the watchful eye of the law' emerges. Green Light Theory shows that the law is better than the executive.

It is challenging to conclude who ought to triumph ultimately the last say - government or court. In India law is supreme. Law concludes everything including the working of the government. Despite the fact that both the way of thinking are in opposition to one another however they have something typical, the prerequisite for judicial mediation assuming the law is erratic. Safeguarding the interest of people from mediation is an unquestionable requirement and administrative law manages this intercession. There ought to be a really look at over the administrative state. Administrative bodies should have straightforwardness so there doesn't emerge the subject of judicial intercession. The green light theory favors inside control and accepts uncontrolled nature in the administration would assist with offering better types of assistance to its kin yet at present time it's anything but a decent choice to forbid the judiciary from controlling the government activities. As the public law hold back nothing red-light theory would be viable. The government should be considered liable for its unlawful acts. It doesn't make any difference who includes in misbehavior or abuse of power, the law is supreme. In some cases executive bodies don't uncover the data to the overall population expressing that it doesn't go under the ambit of Right to Data, in such case judiciary should be kept mindful of the happenings in the government as it could assist with controlling the maladministration of the government, if any, consequently safeguarding the singular's freedom. This large number of theories had been propounded at different places of time to decide the targets of administrative law and the degree to which public administration can involve watchfulness in practicing its powers and works. The red light theory states that the administration should not be given uncontrolled carefulness. Assuming it is permitted to practice limitless carefulness, there are high probabilities for it to abuse its powers. Consequently, the point of administrative law should be to hold the government under severe control so the freedoms of all citizens are safeguarded.

Conversely, the green light theory keeps up with that public administration can't work proficiently when held under severe judicial control. It doesn't deny the job of law altogether anyway suggests that regardless of whether the component of law is applied to public administration, it ought to be facilitative instead of prohibitive or controlling.

At last, the golden light theory looks for a place of agreement or compromise between the two theories and holds that nobody theory beats the other. Both the theories have positive components in their fundamentals, as a matter of fact. Furthermore, the point of administrative law ought to be to extricate positive components from the two theories and apply those in the state structure. Assuming we are to evaluate the meaning of every one of this

theory, the golden light theory ought to acquire supremacy since it attempts to interface both the red and green light theories without easing their singular pith.

CONCLUSION:

Administrative law is concerned about the opertion and the executives of administrative authorities and manages the techniques to be continued in practicing their functions and obligations. In the judgment of (A.K. Kraipak v. Association of India, 1970) the court held that each arrangement of the Constitution streams like a brilliant string through it, and evidently one of the key perspectives requests each instrument of the state to act inside the limits of powers given by the law. The Authors finish up by advising that to safeguard individual freedoms the law should act supreme and win over the government and there should be some kind of restriction to the administrative powers to stay away from any conceivable abuse or abuse of such capacities subsequently, the supremacy of law is expected for control the administration.

REFERENCES:

A. V. Dicey, Introduction to the Study of the Law of the Constitution, MacMillan & Co, Third Edition, 1889

Adam Tomkins, 'In Defence of the Political Constitution', Oxford Journal of Legal Studies, 2002, available at https://s3.amazonaws.com/oxbridgenotes/samples/15602/original/Theory_sample.pdf, accessed on 29 December 2022.

Carol Harlow & Richard Rawlings, Law and Administration, Cambridge University Press, New York, USA, 2009, p.25.

Ian Ellis-Jones, Essential Administrative Law, Cavendish Publishing Limited, London, United Kingdom, 2001, p.9.

Peter Leyland & Gordon Anthony, Textbook on Administrative Law, Oxford University Press, United Kingdom, 2013, p.5.

William Wade & Christopher Forsyth, Administrative Law, Oxford University Press, United Kingdom, 2014, pp. 5-6.