

Topic: The Balance Between Fundamental Rights And DPSPs Is An Essentials Feature Of The Basic Structure Of The Constitution

Name of the case: Minerva Mills v. UOI, AIR 1980 SC 1789

Bench: Chief Justice Y.V. Chandrachud, Justice P.N. Bhagwati, Justice A.C. Gupta, Justice N.L. Untwalia, Justice P.S. Kailasam

Judgment: The Supreme Court held that Fundamental Rights are not an end in themselves but are the means to an end. The end is specified in the directive principles. It was further observed in the same case that Fundamental Rights and directive principles together constitute the core of commitment to social revolution and it together, are the conscience of the Constitution. The Indian Constitution is founded on the bedrock of the balance between the two. To give absolute primacy to one over the other is to disturb the harmony of the Constitution. This harmony and balance between Fundamental Rights and directive principles is a sensual feature of the basic structure of the Constitution.

The goals set out in directive principles are to be achieved without aggregating the Fundamental Rights. It is in the sense that Fundamental Rights and directive principles together constitute the core of our Constitution and combine to form its conscience. Anything that destroys the balance between the two part will ipso facto (by that very fact or act) will destroy the essential element of the basic feature of Constitution.

The concept of DPSPs also developed in Olga Tellis v. Bombay municipal Corporation, AIR 1986 SC 194, wherein the Court held that the directive principles are fundamental in the governance of the country, they must, therefore, be regarded as equally fundamental to the understanding and interpretation of the meaning and content of Fundamental Rights.