CANONSPHERE LAW REVIEW

ISSN: 3107-460X (Online)

CANONSPHERE LAW REVIEW

Volume 1 Issue 3

July to September, 2025

@ 2025 CANONSPHERE LAW REVIEW.
All rights reserved.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

S.No	Contents	Page No
1.	Abstract	3
2.	Introduction	5
3.	Sociological Jurisprudence: Theory and Indian Adaptation	5
4.	PILs: Development, Doctrines, and Innovations	6
5.	Key Cases and Detailed Case Notes	7
6.	Contributions of PILs to Privacy and Social Protection	13
7.	PIL's, AI, Algorithmic governance and cyber law: emerging challenges	13
8.	Women's rights, workplace safety and intersection with privacy	14
9.	Cryptocurrency, financial privacy and regulatory choices	15
10.	Problems, misuse, judicial overreach and safeguards	15
11.	Recommendations and way forward	16
12.	Conclusion	16
13.	Expanded Analysis	17
14.	Limitations and areas for future research	20
15.	Footnote and references	21

CANONSPHERE LAW REVIEW

Privacy and Protection through the Lens of Sociological Jurisprudence: Public Interest Litigation, Digital Rights, and Social Justice in India

This long article is written by Pratik Prakash Jaiswal from, G. H. Raisoni Law College, Rashtrasant Tukadoji Maharaj Nagpur University,Maharashtra, India

Abstract

This article examines the evolution and contemporary relevance of Public Interest Litigation (PIL) in India through the analytical frame of sociological jurisprudence, with a specific focus on privacy and protection laws in the digital age. It traces doctrinal and practical developments from the procedural innovations that democratised access to courts, to landmark constitutional rulings that enshrined privacy, dignity and equality as enforceable rights. By analysing prominent PILs and constitutional judgments, including Hussainara Khatoon, Bandhua Mukti Morcha, Olga Tellis, Vishaka, NALSA, K.S. Puttaswamy, the Aadhaar litigation and Navtej Singh Johar, the paper demonstrates how courts have used purposive interpretation, continuing mandamus and proportionality tests to secure substantive protections for marginalised groups. The study then turns to emerging challenges: algorithmic decision-making, mass surveillance, cyber insecurity, and innovations in financial technology such as cryptocurrencies, all of which raise complex questions about informational autonomy, transparency, accountability and distributive fairness. Methodologically, the paper synthesises doctrinal analysis with socio-legal evidence and technical audits filed in PILs to assess real-world impact. Drawing on comparative perspectives and contemporary regulatory debates, the article proposes a pragmatic framework for deploying PILs in the digital era: clearer proportionality standards, institutional collaboration with regulators and technical experts, targeted and measurable remedies, and robust monitoring mechanisms. While PILs cannot substitute for comprehensive legislative frameworks, they catalyse rights protection, prompt regulatory action and ensure that vulnerable communities are not left behind. The conclusion emphasises that a renewed sociological jurisprudence, one that honors constitutional commitments to social justice while embracing technical expertise

CANONSPHERE LAW REVIEW

and democratic processes, can help preserve meaningful fundamental rights amid rapid technological change. Finally, the paper stresses that judicial success depends on sustained civic engagement, institutional accountability and continuous evaluation of technological systems for fairness and inclusion.

Keywords: Public Interest Litigation, Privacy, Data Protection, Sociological Jurisprudence, AI & Law

CANONSPHERE LAW REVIEW

Introduction

Public Interest Litigation (PIL) has been one of the most consequential judicial innovations in post-independence India. What began as a set of pragmatic procedural relaxations in the late 1970s, allowing letters and postcards to be treated as writ petitions, relaxing locus standi, and deploying continuing mandamus, gradually became an instrument that placed the court at the centre of major social transformations. This article reads that innovation through the lens of sociological jurisprudence: a jurisprudential orientation that insists law should serve social needs, be responsive to lived realities, and not remain confined to formalistic technicalities.

The central claim of this paper is that PILs, when used with judicial restraint and principled reasoning, can translate abstract constitutional norms (dignity, equality, and life) into enforceable protections in domains as diverse as prison reform, bonded labour, environment, workplace rights, and increasingly, privacy and data protection. The article also recognizes the legitimate concerns that have been raised about misuse, institutional overreach, and enforceability. These concerns are analysed and confronted in later sections through recommendations for doctrinal clarity and better institutional cooperation.

Sociological Jurisprudence: Theory and Indian Adaptation

Sociological jurisprudence, associated with Roscoe Pound and other twentieth-century thinkers, interrogates the function of law in society: law is not merely a set of abstract rules but a living instrument that must be tested by its social effects. Eugen Ehrlich's concept of 'living law' complements this orientation by calling attention to rules that emerge from social practice rather than formal statute. India’s constitutional structure, which embeds social justice as a foundational value, provides a particularly receptive soil for sociological jurisprudence.

Indian courts translated sociological insights into practical judicial techniques: purposive interpretation, fact-finding missions, appointment of expert committees, and flexible

CANONSPHERE LAW REVIEW

remedies (like continuing mandamus). These techniques enabled judges to frame remedies that engaged with the empirical realities of disadvantaged populations. The jurisprudential counterpart to sociological jurisprudence in India is often called 'realist' or 'pragmatic' adjudication: judges calibrate doctrine to achieve constitutional values while remaining sensitive to democratic policy space.

PILs: Development, Doctrines, and Innovations

PILs reworked classical rules of procedure and access to courts. The most visible changes included:

1. Relaxed locus standi: Public-spirited persons, NGOs, and even media entities could approach the court on behalf of those unable to do so.

2. Epistolary jurisdiction: The Supreme Court treated letters and postcards as writ petitions, making remedies accessible.

3. Continuing mandamus: Courts issued supervisory, long-term directions for implementation over years, enabling structural change.

4. Guideline-making and interim regulations: In regulatory lacunae, courts sometimes issued guidelines that filled legislative or administrative gaps.

These devices were not ends in themselves but instruments to give skeletal constitutional guarantees substantive content. Their legitimacy turns on judicial discipline: doctrines must be principled, remedies measurable, and courts must avoid replacing policy design with judicial fiat.

CANONSPHERE LAW REVIEW

Key Cases and Detailed Case Notes

1. Hussainara Khatoon v. State of Bihar[1]

Role of parties: Petitioners were undertrial prisoners representing a larger cohort of detainees; the Respondent was the State of Bihar.

Facts: Large numbers of prisoners in Bihar were detained for prolonged periods as undertrials without speedy trial, often because of prison overcrowding, lack of legal assistance, and delay in judicial processes.

Legal issues: Whether the prolonged detention of undertrial prisoners without trial violated fundamental rights, including Article 21 (life and personal liberty), and whether the courts could intervene to secure speedy trial as a constitutional right.

Decision: The Supreme Court held that the right to speedy trial is implicit in Article 21 and directed that undertrials unable to furnish bail be released if their confinement amounted to violation of their fundamental rights. The Court issued directions to release prisoners and expedited trials where necessary.

Conclusion: Hussainara was transformative: it operationalised fair trial and speed as dimensions of life and liberty, and it underscored the Court's willingness to use PIL techniques to address systemic deprivation of liberty. The case is paradigmatic of sociological jurisprudence; the remedy was grounded in empirical justice, releasing vulnerable detainees and insisting on procedural reform.

2. Bandhua Mukti Morcha v. Union of India

[2]Role of parties: Bandhua Mukti Morcha (a social action group) and other petitioners acted on behalf of bonded labourers; Respondents included the Union of India and state authorities.

[1] AIR 1979 SC 1360/1369
[2] (1984) 3 SCC 161

CANONSPHERE LAW REVIEW

Facts: Bonded labourers were exploited in various industries and domestic contexts, often under debt bondage, coerced labour, and hazardous conditions.

Legal issues: Whether bonded labour and related practices violated constitutional guarantees (Articles 21, 23, and 24) and statutory protections; and what remedial steps the Court could order.

Decision: The Supreme Court held these practices to be unconstitutional and issued detailed directions for identification, release, rehabilitation, and compensation of bonded labourers. The Court insisted on monitoring mechanisms to ensure implementation.

Conclusion: The case is notable for the Court's empathetic fact-sensitive approach and for using continuing mandamus and directions tailored to social realities, classic sociological jurisprudence in action.

3. Olga Tellis v. Bombay Municipal Corporation[3]

Role of parties: Petitioners were pavement dwellers and affected families; Respondent was the municipal authority (BMC).

Facts: Evictions of pavement dwellers and slum populations in Bombay raised questions about the right to livelihood and the legality of forcible evictions without rehabilitation.

Legal issues: Whether the right to livelihood was encompassed within Article 21 and whether municipal authorities could evict without due process and alternatives.

Decision: The Supreme Court recognised that the right to life includes the right to livelihood and held that eviction without due process and consideration of alternatives violated Article 21 where it would render people homeless and destitute.

Conclusion: Olga Tellis expanded Article 21 and underscored that constitutional interpretation must account for social and economic realities, thereby protecting vulnerable populations through doctrinal expansion.

[3] 1986 AIR 180

CANONSPHERE LAW REVIEW

4. Vishaka v. State of Rajasthan[4]

Role of parties: Petitioners included women's groups and public interest organisations; Respondent was State of Rajasthan.

Facts: Systemic sexual harassment of women at the workplace, absence of effective statutory remedies, and failure of administrative mechanisms to redress grievances.

Legal issues: Whether the absence of statutory protections for sexual harassment violated fundamental rights and whether the Court could frame guidelines in the absence of legislation.

Decision: The Supreme Court issued the Vishaka Guidelines, mandatory standards and preventive measures for sexual harassment at workplaces, drawing on constitutional guarantees (Articles 14, 15, and 21) and international conventions where domestic law was lacking.

Conclusion: Vishaka demonstrates judicial creativity in protecting women's rights using sociological understandings of workplace power dynamics; the guidelines later catalysed legislative action (Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013).

5. People's Union for Civil Liberties v. Union of India (Right to Food / PUCL)[5]

Role of parties: Petitioners included civil liberties organisations; Respondent was the Union of India and state authorities.

Facts: Widespread hunger, failure of mid-day meal schemes and food distribution systems, and gaps in welfare delivery mechanisms.

[4] AIR 1997 SC 3011
[5] Writ Petition (Civil) No. 196 of 2001

CANONSPHERE LAW REVIEW

Legal issues: Whether the right to food could be given constitutional protection or be read as part of Article 21; and what directives the Court could issue to secure food entitlements.

Decision: The Supreme Court recognised the right to food as part of the State's obligation toward life and dignity, directing central and state governments to implement targeted schemes (including mid-day meals) and to adopt monitoring mechanisms.

Conclusion: The PUCL interventions exemplify how PILs can secure positive socio-economic rights through supervisory remedies and continuing mandamus, while highlighting implementation challenges that require administrative commitment.

6. National Legal Services Authority (NALSA) v. Union of India[6]

Role of parties: Petitioners included NALSA and activists representing transgender persons; Respondent was the Union of India.

Facts: Deep marginalisation of transgender persons, absence of legal recognition, and systemic discrimination across identity documents, education, employment and healthcare.

Legal issues: Whether constitutional guarantees of equality and dignity required recognition of transgender persons and protections against discrimination; and whether self-identification sufficed for legal recognition.

Decision: The Supreme Court recognised the rights of transgender persons as constitutionally protected, affirmed a right to self-identification, and directed affirmative measures to promote inclusion and access to public services.

Conclusion: NALSA illustrates the role of courts in recognizing emerging social identities and in directing administrative reforms to secure dignity and access for marginalised communities.

[6] AIR 2014 SC 1863

CANONSPHERE LAW REVIEW

7. K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India (Right to Privacy)[7]

Role of parties: Petitioners were a group of individuals and privacy advocates challenging state intrusion; Respondent was the Union of India.

Facts: Widespread concerns about state surveillance, data collection, and the absence of a robust constitutional articulation of privacy in India's jurisprudence.

Legal issues: Whether the Constitution protects a fundamental right to privacy and, if so, what the contours of that right are in relation to liberty, dignity and informational autonomy.

Decision: A nine-judge bench unequivocally held that the right to privacy is intrinsic to Article 21 and interconnected with other fundamental rights. The Court articulated forms of privacy (decisional, informational, bodily, and territorial) and endorsed a proportionality framework to assess state intrusions.

Conclusion: Puttaswamy is doctrinally pivotal: by recognizing privacy as fundamental, it created a constitutional anchor for regulatory efforts in data protection, surveillance law, and algorithmic governance, and it supplied doctrinal tools (necessity, proportionality) for balancing state interests with individual autonomy.

CANONSPHERE LAW REVIEW

8. Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Aadhaar) Case[8]

Role of parties: Petitioners challenged the mandatory nature and scope of the Aadhaar biometric ID program; Respondent was the Union of India and UIDAI.

[7] (2017) 10 SCC 1
[8] (2017) 10 SCC 1

Facts: The Aadhaar program involved widespread biometric enrollment and the use of identification for welfare, subsidies, and private services, raising questions of informational privacy and state power.

Legal issues: Whether mandatory Aadhaar enrollment and certain uses of Aadhaar violated privacy, and whether the statutory framework had sufficient safeguards and legislative authorization for intrusive state action.

Decision: The Court upheld important elements of the Aadhaar scheme for welfare delivery but circumscribed intrusive uses, emphasized necessity and proportionality, and insisted on statutory safeguards, narrow access, and data protection measures.

Conclusion: The Aadhaar litigation manifested the tension between social policy objectives (efficient welfare delivery) and constitutional rights to privacy. The decision left open the need for comprehensive legislative data protection measures and clarified limits on state and private use of biometric data.

9. Navtej Singh Johar v. Union of India[9]

Role of parties: Petitioners included activists and LGBTQ persons challenging the constitutionality of Section 377 IPC; Respondent was the Union of India.

Facts: Section 377 criminalized certain consensual sexual acts as unnatural offences, creating a climate of stigma and criminalization for LGBTQ persons.

Legal issues: Whether Section 377, insofar as it criminalized consensual sexual conduct between adults in private, violated Articles 14, 15, 19 and 21, and whether earlier precedents should be revisited.

Decision: The Supreme Court read down Section 377 to exclude consensual sexual conduct between adults in private, emphasizing dignity, autonomy, and equal citizenship; it explicitly overruled the narrow reading in Suresh Koushal and restored constitutional protections.

[9] (2018) 10 SCC 1

CANONSPHERE LAW REVIEW

Conclusion: Navtej Singh Johar is part of a broader jurisprudential arc where courts interpret constitutional guarantees to end historic patterns of marginalization and exclusion.

Contributions of PILs to Privacy and Social Protection

PILs have contributed to social protection and privacy in multiple ways. First, they expanded access to justice for groups excluded from conventional litigation. Second, PILs often functioned as 'risk regulators', identifying systemic harms (for example overcrowded prisons, bonded labour, homelessness) and forcing remedial design. Third, with the recognition of privacy as a fundamental right, PILs and constitutional petitions became key mechanisms for policing novel intrusions arising from technology, administrative databases, and corporate data practices.

PILs also prompted administrative accountability and legislative responses. The Vishaka case, by crafting workplace standards, precipitated legislative reform; Puttaswamy and the Aadhaar litigation catalyzed the movement toward a statutory data protection framework. But PILs also face limits: courts can issue guidelines but cannot implement complex technical regimes without administrative expertise; they can compel policy but often must leave design choices to legislatures.

PILs, AI, Algorithmic Governance and Cyber Law: Emerging Challenges

The rise of algorithmic decision-making, AI systems used for welfare targeting or policing, ubiquitous municipal and national surveillance, and data-heavy private platforms present challenges that fit squarely within the existing concerns PILs were created to redress. AI systems can perpetuate bias, reduce accountability by creating opaque decision chains, and intensify surveillance risks. These problems are particularly acute for marginalised groups who already face structural discrimination.

PILs can be adapted to confront algorithmic harms by:

CANONSPHERE LAW REVIEW

1. Seeking transparency and explanation of automated decisions affecting life, liberty or important interests.

2. Requesting judicially-supervised audits and independent algorithmic impact assessments.

3. Compelling procedural safeguards (notice, redress, human oversight) and demanding data minimisation and purpose limitation in public programs.

4. Pushing for institutional frameworks, data protection authorities, algorithmic regulatory sandboxes and sectoral oversight bodies, while using court directions to shape minimum safeguards.

Cyber laws and criminal procedure must also be calibrated to avoid conflating privacy protection with state security imperatives. Courts must ensure cybercrime enforcement respects due process and avoids disproportionate surveillance or data seizure without adequate safeguards.

Women's Rights, Workplace Safety and Intersection with Privacy

Women's rights have been a central concern of PIL jurisprudence. Vishaka is the paradigmatic example, the Court used the law instrumentally to curb workplace sexual harassment and to create institutional mechanisms for complaint and redress. Privacy, dignity and bodily autonomy have particular salience for women: laws and administrative practices that ignore privacy (for example invasive medical or surveillance practices) can disproportionately affect women's capacity to participate in public life.

PILs can therefore serve a dual purpose: protecting substantive rights (protection from sexual harassment, access to health and services) while guarding informational privacy (safeguarding sensitive health and identity data that could expose women to stigma or violence). A sociological approach demands remedies that account for gendered risks in design and implementation of digital programs (for example gender-sensitive data governance in welfare schemes).

CANONSPHERE LAW REVIEW

Cryptocurrency, Financial Privacy and Regulatory Choices

Cryptocurrency and blockchain technology raise complex privacy and regulatory questions. On one hand, cryptocurrencies promise a form of financial privacy and inclusion; on the other, they can enable illicit flows or be used to circumvent regulatory safeguards. Indian jurisprudence and law are still evolving in how best to reconcile financial privacy with legitimate state interests in anti-money laundering and taxation.

PILs in the financial sphere can ask courts to clarify the constitutional baseline for financial privacy and to ensure that measures taken in the name of market integrity do not trample basic liberties. Courts can insist on proportionality when the state demands intrusive financial surveillance and can invite legislatures to craft balanced frameworks that protect privacy while securing market and security objectives.

Problems, Misuse, Judicial Overreach and Safeguards

Critics of PILs make several points: (a) PILs may be filed for publicity or private advantage; (b) judicial orders can impinge on policy design and overstep separation of powers; (c) implementation and resource constraints may leave judgments as unenforced litany. The judiciary has responded by tightening locus standi rules in select judgments, dismissing vexatious petitions, and insisting on strict compliance procedures.

Safeguards must be practical: courts should require prima facie satisfaction before entertaining PILs; adopt better case management to prevent abuse; rely on independent fact-finding and expert assistance for technical matters; and strive for structured orders that set measurable metrics and clear timelines while allowing administrative autonomy in technical design.

Recommendations and Way Forward

CANONSPHERE LAW REVIEW

To ensure PILs remain effective instruments for privacy and social protection in the digital age, the following reforms are recommended:

1. Doctrinal clarity: Courts should consistently use proportionality and necessity tests when adjudicating privacy and surveillance challenges, and outline clear standards for evidence and remedy.

2. Institutional cooperation: Judicial orders that require technical design should be accompanied by institutionalized consultation with regulators, data protection authorities and recognized technical experts.

3. Procedural safeguards: Pilots, sunset clauses and staged implementation of court-mandated policies can preserve democratic space while achieving protection goals.

4. Access to expertise: Courts should encourage amici, expert panels and independent auditors for algorithmic and data protection cases.

5. Legislative action: The Parliament should expedite comprehensive data protection, privacy and AI governance laws, informed by constitutional standards set by the judiciary.

Together, these measures will enable a jurisprudence that is both socially responsive and institutionally respectful of democratic policymaking.

Conclusion

PILs and sociological jurisprudence have been powerful engines of social change in India. From criminal justice to bonded labour, from livelihood claims to workplace safety, courts have used flexible doctrines to secure dignity and basic rights for vulnerable groups. In the last decade, the recognition of privacy as a fundamental right and subsequent adjudication in Aadhaar and related cases have extended these protective practices into the digital realm.

The new frontier, algorithmic governance, AI, cybercrime, and cryptocurrency, presents both risks and opportunities. PILs will remain vital tools to identify systemic harm and

CANONSPHERE LAW REVIEW

compel remedies, but their effectiveness depends on doctrinal rigor, inter-institutional collaboration and a commitment to measurable implementation. A sociological jurisprudence for the twenty-first century must combine empathy for lived reality with doctrinal standards that preserve legal certainty and democratic legitimacy.

Expanded Analysis: Doctrinal Depth, Implementation Experience and Future Litigation Strategies

This expanded analysis deepens doctrinal engagement with select cases and explores strategic litigation choices suited to the digital era. It also reviews implementation experience, identifying what worked, what did not, and proposes litigation strategies to strengthen enforcement and accountability.

Deeper doctrinal reading of K.S. Puttaswamy and Aadhaar: Puttaswamy's articulation of privacy is multi-dimensional. The opinion synthesised autonomy, bodily integrity, decisional privacy and informational privacy into a coherent constitutional principle. But doctrinal work remained: the Court invited proportionality to structure permissible intrusions, and it required that any law authorising intrusion sit on a clear statutory base, be necessary, and be proportionate. The Aadhaar litigation tested this framework in practice. The Court accepted the social utility of identification for targeted welfare but placed firm limits on expansive state or private uses of sensitive biometric data. For litigators, these cases suggest a dual strategy: challenge intrusive programmes on proportionality grounds while simultaneously seeking remedial frameworks that reconcile welfare delivery with rights required by constitutional proportionality tests.

Algorithmic governance and evidentiary paradigms: One lesson from existing PIL practice is that courts respond readily to concrete evidence of harm. In algorithmic cases, petitioners must therefore develop replicable evidence: disparity metrics, impact-assessment reports, expert audits and documented case studies of persons harmed

CANONSPHERE LAW REVIEW

by automated decisions. Courts have been receptive to technical amici and court-appointed experts; structured evidence enables judges to fashion narrow, evidence-based remedies (for example temporary suspension of an algorithmic module pending independent audit).

Implementation experience: successes and shortcomings: PILs that included specific implementation roadmaps, named nodal officers, budgetary commitments and measurable indicators tended to make more progress. By contrast, wide-ranging moral pronouncements without implementation detail often led to slow uptake. The mid-day meal orders and certain environmental remediations show that when executive agencies were given practical, staged directions coupled with monitoring, outcomes improved. For digital programs, courts should require documentation of data flows, retention limits, breach response protocols and logged access to personal data as a condition of continued operation.

Strategic litigation in financial privacy and cryptocurrency: Litigation in the financial sphere faces a special evidentiary challenge: blockchain transactions are public and pseudo-anonymous, while centralized exchanges mediate the interface with fiat currency and KYC processes. Constitutional claims about financial privacy must therefore engage both technological and regulatory dimensions: seek revelations of policy scope, demand proportionality assessments for freeze orders or interceptions, and insist that any extraordinary financial surveillance be accompanied by judicial oversight mechanisms and audit trails.

PIL drafting and remedies for the AI era: A practical PIL template for an AI/data matter would include (a) a concrete factual matrix showing affected individuals or test data showing algorithmic bias; (b) expert affidavits explaining methodology; (c) precise interim relief (e.g., pause on automated decisions in a defined programme and

CANONSPHERE LAW REVIEW

preservation of logs); (d) a prayer for supervised audit by an independent technical panel; and (e) a request for structural transparency measures (impact assessments, access to redress and human oversight). This template preserves the court's role as arbiter of constitutional limits while enabling administrative expertise to design technical fixes.

Institutional reform: law, regulators and courts: Courts cannot be the sole architects of complex socio-technical regimes. The right institutional architecture couples a constitutional baseline set by courts (principles of necessity, proportionality, redress) with a legislature that enacts technical, sectoral rules and a regulator empowered with investigatory and enforcement powers. A Data Protection Authority, empowered and procedurally independent, can operationalise privacy standards while courts act as constitutional guarantors. Where regulators exist, PILs are most effective when they seek judicial enforcement of regulatory standards rather than substitute ad hoc judicial rules for complex technical governance.

Citizen empowerment and digital literacy: Finally, litigation and regulation must be complemented by measures that empower individuals: accessible privacy notices, simplified redress mechanisms, public education on data rights, and capacity building for public interest groups to monitor and litigate. Sociological jurisprudence includes an implicit education mandate, law only works if communities can claim it. Strengthening legal aid and supporting NGOs and academics to carry out audits and impact studies will ensure that rights are not merely declarative but also practically .

Limitations and Areas for Future Research

This study recognises limits. First, PILs are reactive instruments that require a concrete factual matrix; they are less suited to addressing slow, diffuse harms that lack identifiable claimants. Second, judicial remedies depend on executive capacity, courts can mandate reforms but cannot implement them directly. Third, the dynamic nature of technology

CANONSPHERE LAW REVIEW

means that litigation-based precedents may need continual doctrinal updating. Future research should examine longitudinal outcomes of PIL-driven reforms, evaluate the effectiveness of court-mandated monitoring mechanisms, and develop standardised methodologies for algorithmic audits that courts can rely upon.

Practical Checklist for Public Interest Litigants in Digital Matters:

1. Define a clear factual cohort: identify individuals, communities or datasets that evidence the harm.

2. Produce reproducible technical evidence: expert affidavits, algorithmic impact assessments and sample data showing bias.

3. Seek targeted interim relief: preservation orders, freezes on automated decision modules, and preservation of logs.

4. Request supervised independent audit: ask the court to direct staged audits by accredited experts or academic centres.

5. Design measurable remedies: timelines, named nodal officers, performance indicators, and transparency commitments.

6. Plan post-order monitoring: propose dashboards, third-party verification and sunset reviews to ensure remedies translate into practice.

This pragmatic checklist is intended to improve the evidential basis for digital rights litigation and to increase the probability that judicial remedies will yield tangible improvements for affected communities.

CANONSPHERE LAW REVIEW

Footnotes & References

Hussainara Khatoon v. State of Bihar, AIR 1979 SC 1360.

S.P. Gupta v. Union of India, AIR 1982 SC 149.

People's Union for Democratic Rights v. Union of India, AIR 1982 SC 1473.

Bandhua Mukti Morcha v. Union of India, AIR 1984 SC 802.

Olga Tellis v. Bombay Municipal Corporation, AIR 1986 SC 180.

M.C. Mehta v. Union of India (Oleum Gas Leak), AIR 1987 SC 1086.

Vishaka v. State of Rajasthan, AIR 1997 SC 3011.

PUCL v. Union of India (Right to Food Case), AIR 2001 SC 1455.

Prakash Singh v. Union of India, AIR 2006 SC 2177.

K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India, (2017) 10 SCC 1.

Justice K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India (Aadhaar), (2018) 1 SCC 809.

Navtej Singh Johar v. Union of India, (2018) 10 SCC 1.

National Legal Services Authority v. Union of India (NALSA), (2014) 5 SCC 438.

Upendra Baxi, Taking Suffering Seriously: Social Action Litigation in the Supreme Court of India (Oxford University Press, 1985).

Roscoe Pound, Jurisprudence (West Publishing, 1959).

Eugen Ehrlich, Fundamental Principles of the Sociology of Law (Harvard University Press, 1936).

CANONSPHERE LAW REVIEW