EDITORIAL: INDIAN EXPRESS

GENERAL STUDIES 2: GOVERNANCE DATE: 10.04.2025

TOPIC: GOVERNOR'S ROLE

Supreme Court's judgment on Tamil Nadu governor: Why governors are so partial to the Centre

1. Context: Rising Concerns over Governor's Role

- The **Supreme Court intervened** to limit the discretionary powers of governors by setting **time-bound guidelines** for assenting to state bills.
- This decision aims to reduce political interference and strengthen federal democracy, especially in light of rising tensions between centrally appointed governors and elected state governments.

2. Ideal Vision of the Governor's Role

- Quoting Miguel de Cervantes, the article alludes to the traditional image of a governor quiet, impartial, and dignified, not interfering in day-to-day politics.
- Historically, governors were expected to be constitutional guides, offering counsel, warning, and encouragement when required.
- Their role was **not to govern**, but to **facilitate governance** by the elected state leadership, staying above party politics.

3. Political Overreach by Governors: A Distorted Reality

- In recent years, particularly under the present central government, governors have become active political players.
- Their interference includes:
 - **Blocking or delaying bills**, especially those politically inconvenient to the Centre.
 - Meddling in academic appointments, often ignoring recommendations of state governments or universities.
 - Altering or bypassing legislative procedures, like withholding customary addresses or delaying the summoning of the state assembly.
- These actions **undermine state autonomy**, violating the federal balance enshrined in the Constitution.
- 4. Supreme Court's Landmark Verdict (April 8, 2024)



MAKING YOU SERVE THE NATION

- A key judgment by Justices Pardiwala and Mahadevan reaffirmed that elected governments must have primacy over nominated officials like governors.
- Article 142 was invoked to ensure effective enforcement, and the Court imposed strict timelines for gubernatorial assent under Article 200.
- The ruling **restricts arbitrary discretion**, ensuring governors act within **constitutional limits** and not political convenience.

5. The Tamil Nadu Case: A Watershed Moment

- The Tamil Nadu governor **delayed assent to multiple bills** and then referred them to the President a move the **Court ruled as unconstitutional**.
- The Court treated these bills as having been assented from the date of submission, effectively overriding the governor's inaction.
- The case exposed a pattern of **governors yielding only to judicial pressure**, revealing reluctance to act unless nudged by the Centre or courts.

6. Insights from Constituent Assembly Debates

- Despite its colonial origin, the office of the governor was retained to ensure constitutional continuity and national unity.
- Key framers had differing views:
 - Nehru and others initially considered electing governors via state legislatures or choosing from a state-nominated panel.
 - Ambedkar, however, endorsed a nominated model, assuming governors would act with neutrality and dignity, free from partisanship.
- This expectation has often been **betrayed**, as governors increasingly align with central political interests.

7. Ignored Recommendations and Politicised Appointments

- Successive governments both Congress and BJP have **ignored important reforms** proposed by expert panels like the **Sarkaria Commission**.
- The **original spirit** of the governor as a **representative of the people of the state**, not of the Centre, has been eroded.
- Appointments are made based on **political loyalty**, reducing the governor to a **central agent** rather than a **constitutional sentinel**.

8. The Danger of Absolute Discretion



- Legal thinkers like **Edward Coke** and **Justice William Douglas** have long warned against **unfettered discretionary power**.
- True discretion, they argue, should be exercised based on **reason**, **justice**, **and legality**, not political bias or personal whims.
- In India, however, governors often act at the **behest of the central government**, compromising the **spirit of cooperative federalism**.

9. Tenure Insecurity and the Rise of Partisan Behavior

- A critical vulnerability is that **governors lack tenure protection**; they can be removed at the **pleasure of the President (effectively the Centre)**.
- This lack of job security incentivizes partisan alignment to avoid abrupt removal.
- Providing governors with fixed tenure and safeguards (like judges) would empower them to act independently and uphold constitutional morality over political expediency.

10. Conclusion: Reforms for Federal Balance

- The governor was envisioned as a guardian of the Constitution, not a political tool.
- The recent Supreme Court judgment is a vital corrective, reasserting constitutional boundaries and limiting misuse of discretion.
- For a stronger federal structure:
 - Transparent appointment mechanisms
 - Security of tenure
 - Strict accountability measures
 - Adherence to constitutional ethics are urgently required.
- Without these systemic reforms, the office of governor will remain vulnerable to central overreach, distorting the essence of India's cooperative federalism.

Source: https://indianexpress.com/article/opinion/columns/supreme-court-tamil-nadu-governor-rn-ravi-9932636/