

PSYCHOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF JUDICIAL BEHAVIOR, CULTURE, DECISION MAKING IN INDIA

P.B. VIJAYA KUMAR^{1*}, PROF. M.V.R. RAJU², P.S. ABHIRAM³

¹*RESEARCH SCHOLAR, ANDHRA UNIVERSITY, VISAKHAPATNAM, AP, INDIA EMAIL: pjvic.advocate@gmail.com

² SENIOR PROFESSOR, ANDHRA UNIVERSITY, VISAKHAPATNAM, INDIA EMAIL: mvrrajuau@gmail.com

³ DATA ANALYST, VISAKHAPATNAM, AP, INDIA EMAIL: ABHIRAM.attorney@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study explores the psychological and cultural components of judicial behavior, focusing on how these influence decision-making processes and legal consequences. Traditional legal theories prioritize procedural fairness and statute compliance, viewing judges as impartial arbiters. Interdisciplinary research shows that cognitive biases, emotional regulation, and cultural factors greatly influence judicial decision-making. This research aims to address the lack of understanding of psychological and cultural influences on judicial reasoning, as cognitive theories address biases and heuristics but disregard cultural narratives and societal expectations in legal interpretations. The study employs a mixed-methods approach, combining psychological analysis, cultural studies, and legal theory. The research aims to examine the impact of cognitive biases and emotional regulation on judicial reasoning, examine how cultural values and societal norms influence judicial interpretations of the law, and investigate the relationship between psychology and culture in comparative legal circumstances. The study aims to provide insights into the intersection of psychological and legal systems in judicial behavior.

KEYWORDS: Judicial behavior, decision-making, cognitive biases, emotional regulation, cultural factors, legal interpretations.

INTRODUCTION

Psychology, society, and law influence how judges read laws, resolve disputes, and make rulings. Traditional legal theories prioritize procedural fairness and statute compliance, viewing judges as impartial arbiters (Dworkin, 1986). Interdisciplinary research shows that cognitive biases, emotional regulation, and cultural factors greatly influence judicial decision-making (Sunstein, 2006). These findings show that legal principles and human elements like social norms and psychological predispositions complicate judicial conduct.

Research Problem and Significance

Some essential areas of judicial behaviour are understudied. Lack of understanding of psychological and cultural influences on judicial reasoning. Cognitive theories address biases and heuristics but disregard cultural narratives and societal expectations in legal interpretations (Gigerenzer&Selten, 2001). Cultural studies prioritize macro-level trends above micro-level psychological processes that affect individual decisions (Nisbett, 2003). This fragmentation impairs integrated theories of individual cognition and group cultural influences.

Research Objectives and Questions

The purpose of this study is to look into the psychological and cultural components of judicial behaviour, with an emphasis on how these influence decision-making processes and legal consequences. Specific aims include:

1. Analyse the impact of cognitive biases and emotional regulation on judicial reasoning.
2. Examine how cultural values and societal norms influence judicial interpretations of the law.
3. Investigating the relationship between psychology and culture in comparative legal circumstances.

The study seeks to address the following research questions:

1. What psychological elements, including heuristics and biases, impact judicial behaviour?
2. How do cultural narratives and values influence judicial thinking across different legal systems?
3. How do psychological and cultural elements influence judicial decisions?

METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Given its interdisciplinary nature, this research employs a mixed-methods approach that combines psychological analysis, cultural studies, and legal theory. This methodology includes:

1. **Cognitive Analysis:** Applying theories like bounded rationality and dual-process theory to examine judicial thinking under uncertainty (Simon, 1955; Evans, 2008).
2. **Cultural Analysis:** Comparing legal systems with various cultural orientations, including individualistic and collectivist societies (Hofstede, 2001).
3. **Case Studies:** Analyse key judicial decisions from India, the US, and Europe to see how psychological and cultural elements interact.

Scope and Delimitations

This study examines judicial behaviour in selected jurisdictions, focussing on India. Psychological and cultural variables are prioritised over procedural and institutional ones. The study compares global judicial behaviour but focusses on multicultural issues and dynamics.

Overview of Judicial Behavior

Judges' acts, thoughts, and decisions when adjudicating disputes, interpreting laws, and regulating courtroom dynamics are called judicial behaviour. This idea includes psychological, cultural, and institutional variables that affect judicial conduct beyond legal principles. According to Dworkin (1986), judges' behaviour reflects their dual duties as interpreters of statutes and protectors of constitutional morals, stressing their intellectual and ethical challenges.

The study of judicial behavior involves examining several interrelated dimensions:

1. Decision-Making Processes: Complex cases require judges to reconcile competing legal principles, analyse contradictory evidence, and clarify statutory language. Sunstein (2006) found that judges use mental frameworks and schemas to reason.

2. Cognitive biases including Anchoring, availability, and representativeness cognitive biases affect court decisions subtly. Anchoring—when judges are swayed by initial numerical concepts like sentence recommendations—is extensively documented (Rachlinski & Wistrich, 2005).

3. Emotional Regulation: High-stakes or emotionally charged cases affect judges' behaviour due to emotional controls. Maroney (2011) noted that emotional control can promote judicial impartiality and fairness.

4. Cultural and Societal Influences: Culture shapes authority, justice, and morality, which influences judicial behaviour. Hofstede (2001) highlighted how individuality vs collectivism affects decision-making and judicial conduct.

Thus, judicial behaviour combines legal thinking, psychological processes, and cultural norms, threatening judicial impartiality and objectivity..

Intersection of Psychology and Legal Systems

Psychological insights into judicial behavior's cognitive and affective mechanisms are useful. Though trained, judges have the same psychological biases and limitations as other decision-makers. This section stresses how key psychological ideas on judicial behaviour apply legally.

1. Bounded Rationality

According to Herbert Simon's (1955) bounded rationality theory, cognitive restrictions, temporal pressures, and imperfect knowledge limit decision-making. Courts show these restrictions as complicated case dockets, ambiguous statutes, and uncertain evidence. Judges settle by "satisficing" and reaching appropriate decisions.

2. Dual-Process Theory

Dual-process theory explains how judges think and decide. Evans (2008) says decision-making requires two cognitive systems: First, a rapid, automatic, intuitive method. Judges may utilise System 1 reasoning in routine situations under time constraints. System 2 is deliberate and analytical. Complex legal matters require System 2 reasoning—logical analysis and careful law interpretation. System 2 thinking is emphasised in legal training, although System 1 processes may triumph in emotionally charged or high-pressure situations (Guthrie et al., 2007).

3. Implicit Bias

Court rulings are influenced by implicit biases -- unconscious preconceptions. These biases can effect race, gender, and socioeconomic status decisions without judges knowing. Implicit racial preconceptions have caused significant sentence disparities for Black and White defendants in the US (Eberhardt et al., 2006). Awareness training and procedural safeguards can lessen implicit bias's impact on court decisions.

4. Emotional Regulation in Judicial Contexts

Emotions promote empathy and moral assessment and affect judges. Maroney (2011) said judges must be emotionally detached and conscious to rule properly and humanely. Judges must regulate their emotions in high-profile matters like violent crimes and child custody, highlighting the importance of emotional regulation.

Cultural and Historical Contexts

Judicial behaviour is shaped by culture and history. Cultural norms affect how society views law, authority, and justice, affecting how judges interpret and settle conflicts.

1. Cultural Influences on Judicial Reasoning

Hofstede's (2001) cultural aspects theory helps explain cross-cultural judicial behaviour. For instance:

1. Judicial decisions in individualistic societies like the United States prioritise personal rights and autonomy. Collectivist cultures like Japan value community peace and consensus-building in courts.
2. Societies with significant power distance, like India, show stronger respect for judicial authority, impacting courtroom dynamics and public perceptions of justice.

Historical Developments in Judicial Behavior

Historic legal theory and social values impacted judicial behaviour. Early approaches like legal formalism portrayed judges as unbiased arbitrators who mechanically applied rules. Legal realism opposed this approach in the 20th century by suggesting that human experiences and cultural values influence court decisions (Frank, 1930).

Colonialism and post-independence constitutionalism shaped India's judiciary. In landmark cases like *KesavanandaBharati v. State of Kerala* (1973), the judiciary interprets the Constitution and determines public policy (Austin, 1966).

Evolution of Studies in Judicial Behavior

Integrating psychology, sociology, and cultural studies into judicial behaviour research has replaced formalistic models. Milestones in this progression include:

1. Legal Formalism And Realism :The 19th-century legal formalism portrayed judges as passive interpreters of statutes who mechanically enforced rules. A legal realism like Jerome Frank (1930) emphasised judicial discretion and extralegal influences, questioning this approach. Legal realism brought judicial behaviour research from abstractions to reality.

2. Behavioural Law and Economics :In the mid-20th century, behavioural law and economics advanced judicial research. Cognitive biases and prospect theory, developed by Kahneman and Tversky (1979), aid judicial reasoning analysis. Loss aversion research suggests judges may be more risk-averse in punitive damages or plea bargain cases (Sunstein, 2006).

3. Cultural and Anthropological Studies :Cultural and anthropological perspectives have expanded judicial studies to stress how societal norms and values impact law. Geertz (1983) felt law is a cultural system based on social narratives and customs. This method has revealed the variability of legal processes among civilisations in comparative studies of judicial practice.

Judicial Culture

Judicial culture is the conventions, attitudes, and practices that shape how judges read laws, interact with litigants and lawyers, and perform their duties. It changes with the judicial system and the obstacles of providing justice in different socio-political contexts (Voigt, 2002). Political and social changes have shaped judicial culture. Early modern monarchies and colonial governments utilised courts. The Enlightenment and constitutionalism highlighted the judiciary's check on executive and legislative power (Bickel, 1986).

History and constitution shape Indian judicial culture. British colonial authority introduced common law and formal courts to India. These organisations were condemned for favouring colonial administrative interests above indigenous legal systems and being inaccessible to most Indians (Jain, 2014).

A 1950 codified Constitution made the judiciary a democracy and fundamental rights guardian after independence. *KesavanandaBharati v. State of Kerala* (1973) established the constitution's "basic structure" and the judiciary's role as guardian (Austin, 1966).

Key Features of Indian Judicial Culture

- Judicial Activism**: Indian courts are known for aggressively addressing social and economic inequality through Public Interest Litigation. Justice P.N. Bhagwati's PIL has improved justice for underprivileged people and made the judiciary a policymaker (Sathe, 2002).
- Cultural Sensitivity**: As India is diverse, judicial culture combines constitutional values with cultural and religious pluralism. *ShayaraBano v. Union of India* (2017) banned triple talaq, demonstrating the judiciary's cultural mediation. (Basu, 2020).
- Judicial Independence and Accountability**: Collegium nominations highlight judicial independence from politics. Justice delays and lack of openness persist (Chandrachud, 2014).

Challenges in Indian Judicial Culture

- Judicial Delays and Backlogs**: Judicial delays damage public trust and justice with almost 40 million pending cases. Case management inefficiencies require structural adjustments (Ministry of Law and Justice, 2023).
- Implicit Bias**: Caste, gender, and religious biases in court decisions require better awareness and training (Agnes, 1999).
- Judicial Overreach**: Critics say excessive judicial activity undermines separation of powers, especially when courts enter executive or legislative realms (Mehta, 2007).

Case Studies on Judicial Culture in India

Sabarimala Temple Entry Case :The Supreme Court upheld gender equality in *Indian Young Lawyers Association v. State of Kerala* (2018), allowing menstruating women into Sabarimala. This case illustrates the judiciary's commitment to constitutional morality and the contradiction between legal conceptions and customs.

Right to Privacy and Fundamental Rights :In *Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India* (2017), the Supreme Court expanded Article 21 to include privacy. This case illustrates how courts handle data privacy and spying.

AyodhyaVerdict :The unanimous verdict in *M. Siddiq v. Mahant Suresh Das* (2019) handed the disputed land to a Ram temple trust and directed the government to provide mosque land. This case illustrates the difficulties of judicial mediation in politically sensitive cases.

Psychological and Cultural Dimensions in Judicial Behavior

Cognitive processes, hidden biases, emotional regulation, cultural norms, and social expectations influence judicial behaviour. These variables complexly affect court reasoning, procedures, and rulings. This chapter analyses judicial conduct using psychological theories, cultural underpinnings, systemic concerns, ethical dilemmas, and public opinion.

Psychological Theories Relevant to Judicial Decision-Making

Despite their impartiality training, judges are subject to psychological factors that influence decision-making. Understanding judicial behaviour requires several theories and concepts:

Bounded Rationality and Cognitive Overload

Herbert Simon's 1955 theory of bounded rationality states that decision-makers have time, information, and cognitive restrictions. Judges must use simpler decision-making due to their heavy caseloads.

Applications in Judicial Behavior

- **Cognitive Overload in Indian Courts:** India has around 40 million pending cases (Ministry of Law and Justice, 2023), forcing judges to use precedents and summary judgements. This emphasis on efficiency over deliberation can compromise fairness.
- **Decision-Making Shortcuts:** In recurrent matters like bail applications, judges may acquire heuristic tendencies to speed up rulings, omitting critical details (Gigerenzer & Selten, 2001).

Dual-Process Theory: Balancing Intuition and Deliberation

Dual-process theory, as proposed by Evans (2008), categorizes human reasoning into two systems:

1. **System 1:** Intuitive, automatic, and emotional.
2. **System 2:** Deliberative, analytical, and logical.

Judges are trained to engage in System 2 reasoning, emphasizing careful consideration of evidence and legal principles. However, high-pressure situations, such as emergency hearings or emotionally charged cases, often trigger System 1 processes.

Examples

- **System 1 in High-Stakes Cases:** Judges in emotionally charged instances like sexual violence trials may inadvertently use social norms to guide their decisions. Moral and symbolic justice were evident in Nirbhaya judgements under intense public scrutiny (Mukesh v. State, 2017).
- **System 2 in Constitutional Interpretation:** In constitutional cases like Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala (1973), the Supreme Court of India developed the “basic structure” theory after careful analysis.

Heuristics and Decision-Making Biases

Cognitive heuristics—mental shortcuts used to simplify complex decisions—are common in judicial contexts but can introduce biases:

1. **Anchoring Bias:** Judges may be influenced by initial figures, such as sentencing recommendations, even when these suggestions lack evidentiary support (Rachlinski & Wistrich, 2005).
2. **Confirmation Bias:** Judges may selectively focus on evidence that supports their initial interpretations or predispositions (Nickerson, 1998).
3. **Framing Effects:** The way information is presented (e.g., victim testimony vs. statistical data) can shape judicial perception and decisions (Kahneman & Tversky, 1979).

Judicial Relevance

In Indian courts, sentencing practices often exhibit anchoring effects, where prosecutors' recommendations heavily influence outcomes (Baxi, 1980).

Role of Emotional Regulation

Judges frequently encounter emotionally charged cases involving violence, abuse, or family disputes. Emotional regulation, or the ability to manage emotions effectively, is critical to maintaining judicial impartiality.

Emotional Challenges in High-Stakes Cases

- **Domestic Violence Cases:** Judges must navigate personal empathy for victims while adhering to procedural fairness.
- **Communal Violence Trials:** For example, cases like the Gujarat riots trials required balancing community outrage with legal standards of evidence and neutrality.

Implicit Bias and Judicial Behavior

Implicit bias refers to unconscious stereotypes that affect decision-making. In judicial contexts, these biases can have significant consequences, particularly in areas such as sentencing, custody decisions, and credibility assessments.

Manifestations of Implicit Bias

1. **Caste and Social Hierarchies in India:** In marginalised community instances, implicit caste biases impact rulings. Dalit atrocities often face procedural delays due to judicial prejudice (Narula, 1999).
2. **Gender Stereotypes:** Family law judgements may assume mothers are superior carers in custody battles or penalise women for questioning patriarchal standards (Agnes, 1999).

Cultural and Societal Influences on Judicial Behavior

Judicial reasoning is heavily rooted in culture and society. Cultural norms and values of cultures influence how judges understand laws and handle conflicts in legal systems.

Cultural Dimensions in Legal Systems

Hofstede's (2001) cultural dimensions theory identifies key factors shaping judicial behavior:

- **Individualism vs. Collectivism:** Individualistic cultures prioritize personal rights and autonomy, often emphasizing adversarial litigation (e.g., the United States). Collectivist cultures, such as India and Japan, emphasize community harmony, leading to preferences for mediation and restorative justice.
- **Power Distance:** Societies with high power distance exhibit greater deference to judicial authority, while low power distance cultures encourage participatory legal processes (Friedman, 2019).

Intersection of Religion and Law

India's pluralistic society requires courts to mediate conflicts between secular constitutional principles and religious norms. Cases such as *ShayaraBano v. Union of India* (2017), which declared triple talaq unconstitutional, illustrate the judiciary's role in balancing constitutional morality with cultural sensitivity (Basu, 2020).

Systemic and Ethical Challenges: Judicial behavior is also shaped by systemic and ethical factors, including institutional constraints, public accountability, and ethical dilemmas.

Influence of Public Opinion: Media focus on high-profile cases puts judges under tremendous scrutiny. Public demonstrations influenced the judiciary's speedy capital punishment in the Nirbhaya case, illustrating law and society (Mukesh v. State, 2017).

Ethical Dilemmas in Judicial Conduct: Judges often struggle with ethical issues including reconciling personal and legal standards or conflicts of interest. Judicial ethical norms and accountability are crucial in these situations (Maroney, 2011).

Case Studies

Nirbhaya Case (India) The 2012 Delhi gang rape case showed how the judiciary delivers symbolic justice despite popular outcry, highlighting emotional, sociological, and legal factors.

Gujarat Riots Trials (India) These trials highlighted the judiciary's challenges in navigating communal tensions, balancing procedural justice with societal reconciliation.

Decision-Making Process in the Judiciary

Introduction to Judicial Decision-Making

Judges decide disputes, interpret laws, and balance society's interests. Although judges are meant to be impartial and obey the law, psychological, social, and institutional variables often influence their decisions. (Dworkin, 1986). As they balance personal traits, institutional influences, and cultural expectations, Supreme Court judges worldwide make complex decisions. Supreme Court Chief Justice Earl Warren said, "The life of the law has not been logic; it contains experience." *Brown v. Board of Education*, 1954. Indian Supreme Court Justice Krishna Iyer said judges must mix intellectual clarity and humane justice. 1978 (*Maneka Gandhi v. India*).

Judges analyse cases and make decisions using cognitive and procedural processes. Its main goal is to balance impartial legal thinking with social fairness. Ronald Dworkin (1986) said judges "find" the law in complex instances by interpreting legal principles congruent with society values and earlier judgements.

However, decision-making is difficult. Judges must handle legislation ambiguities, conflicts between individual rights and public interest, and human behaviour variety. *K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India* (2017), which enhanced Article 21 privacy rights, shows how changing social norms affect judicial thinking.

Factors Influencing Judicial Decision-Making

Judicial decision-making reflects regional legal traditions, cultural norms, and institutional frameworks.

- **Principle:** Judicial activism bridges legislative gaps, addressing socio-economic inequalities.
- **Key Cases:**
 - *Vishaka v. State of Rajasthan* (1997): Introduced workplace harassment guidelines in the absence of legislation.
 - *Sabarimala Case* (2018): Balanced constitutional morality with religious traditions.

Scholarly Insights:

- Sathe (2002) observed that PILs have transformed Indian courts into "problem-solving" institutions.

Cognitive and Psychological Factors

Judicial decisions are shaped by cognitive biases, emotional regulation, and mental frameworks.

Scholarly Insight

- Rachlinski and Wistrich, (2005). Anchoring effects affect punishment, with judges relying on early numerical ideas even when irrelevant
- Maroney (2011) stressed the significance of emotional control in reducing cognitive overload in high-stakes situations.

Case Example

State of Rajasthan v. Balchand (1977): The court emphasized the importance of considering the circumstances of the accused, reflecting cognitive flexibility in balancing societal protection and individual rights.

5.3.2 Socio-Cultural Influences

Judicial reasoning reflects societal values and cultural norms, particularly in pluralistic societies like India.

Scholarly Insight

- Geertz (1983) argued that legal systems are embedded within cultural contexts, influencing interpretations of justice.
- Hofstede (2001) identified cultural dimensions like individualism vs. collectivism that shape judicial behavior.

Case Example

- **ShayaraBano v. Union of India (2017)**: The court declared triple talaq unconstitutional, balancing constitutional principles with cultural sensitivities.

Institutional and Political Pressures

Judicial independence is often tested in politically sensitive cases.

Scholarly Insight

- Ferejohn (1999) argued that institutional constraints, such as budgetary dependence, undermine judicial autonomy.
- Balkin (2009) discussed how judicial appointments in the U.S. reflect political ideologies.

Case Example

- **Indira Nehru Gandhi v. Raj Narain (1975)**: Despite political pressure, the Allahabad High Court annulled Indira Gandhi's election, demonstrating judicial courage.

Enhancing Judicial Decision-Making

Judicial Training and Sensitization :Programs addressing implicit biases, emotional regulation, and decision-making models are essential.

Transparency and Accountability :Standardized procedures, like sentencing guidelines, reduce the scope for subjective biases.

Diversity in Judicial Appointments :Greater representation of marginalized groups enhances inclusivity and fairness.

CONCLUSION

The psychological and cultural aspects of judicial behaviour make decision-making complicated. Judges function under human intellect and social standards while seeking impartiality. Knowing these influences and avoiding their dangers helps the court provide fair and just results.

Democracy, fundamental rights, and government balance depend on the court. Effectiveness depends on a delicate balance of independence, impartiality, and accountability. This thesis examined decision-making, cultural and psychological factors, and systemic issues in judicial behaviour. We summarise the important findings, identify critical gaps, and make forward-looking recommendations to improve the judiciary's integrity, efficiency, and inclusion in this chapter.

Lord Denning once said, "The judiciary should ensure justice is done and seen to be done." Justice depends on the judiciary's independence, responsibility, and adaptation to changing social needs. Judicial institutions may build public trust and deliver fair and timely justice by addressing structural issues, improving training, and using technology.

Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg stated that lasting transformation occurs gradually. The judiciary must grow with society while maintaining its commitment to equality and justice."This paper recommends reforms to create an inclusive, transparent, and resilient court that seeks justice.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Agnes, F. (1999). *Law and Gender Inequality: The Politics of Women's Rights in India*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
2. Austin, G. (1966). *The Indian Constitution: Cornerstone of a Nation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
3. Bachan Singh v. State of Punjab, AIR 1980 SC 898.
4. Balkin, J. M. (2009). *Living Originalism*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
5. Basu, D. D. (2020). *Introduction to the Constitution of India* (24th ed.). New Delhi: LexisNexis.
6. Becker, G. S. (1968). Crime and punishment: An economic approach. *Journal of Political Economy*, 76(2), 169–217.
7. Bhagwati, P. N. (1985). Judicial activism and public interest litigation. *Columbia Journal of Transnational Law*, 23(3), 561–577.
8. Basu D.K. v. State of West Bengal, AIR 1997 SC 610.
9. Dworkin, R. (1986). *Law's Empire*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
10. Eberhardt, J. L., Goff, P. A., Purdie, V. J., & Davies, P. G. (2006). Looking deathworthy: Perceived stereotypicality of Black defendants predicts capital-sentencing outcomes. *Psychological Science*, 17(5), 383–386.
11. Evans, J. S. B. T. (2008). Dual-process accounts of reasoning, judgment, and social cognition. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 59(1), 255–278.
12. Ferejohn, J. (1999). Independent judges, dependent judiciary: Explaining judicial independence. *Southern California Law Review*, 72(2), 353–384.
13. Frank, J. (1930). *Law and the Modern Mind*. New York: Coward-McCann.
14. Geertz, C. (1983). *Local Knowledge: Further Essays in Interpretive Anthropology*. New York: Basic Books.

15. Gigerenzer, G. (2008). *Rationality for Mortals: How People Cope with Uncertainty*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
16. Guthrie, C., Rachlinski, J. J., & Wistrich, A. J. (2001). Inside the judicial mind. *Cornell Law Review*, 86(4), 777–830.
17. Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions, and Organizations Across Nations* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
18. Jhaveri, S. (2020). The digital divide in India's legal system. *The Indian Express*.
19. Kahneman, D. (2011). *Thinking, Fast and Slow*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
20. KesavanandaBharati v. State of Kerala, AIR 1973 SC 1461.
21. Maroney, T. A. (2011). Emotional regulation and judicial behavior. *California Law Review*, 99(6), 1485–1556.
22. Nisbett, R. E. (2003). *The Geography of Thought: How Asians and Westerners Think Differently... and Why*. New York: Free Press.
23. Rachlinski, J. J., & Wistrich, A. J. (2005). Judging the judiciary by the numbers. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*, 1(1), 203–226.
24. Sathe, S. P. (2002). *Judicial Activism in India: Transgressing Borders and Enforcing Limits*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
25. ShayaraBano v. Union of India, AIR 2017 SC 4609.
26. Simon, H. A. (1955). A behavioral model of rational choice. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 69(1), 99–118.
27. Sunstein, C. R. (2006). *A Constitution of Many Minds*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Cases

Indian Young Lawyers Association v. State of Kerala, 2018
Indira Nehru Gandhi v. Raj Narain, 1975
Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India, 2017
KesavanandaBharati v. State of Kerala, 1973
M. Siddiq v. Mahant Suresh Das, 2019
Maneka Gandhi v. India, 1978
Mukesh Singh Vs. State (NCT of Delhi), 2017
ShayaraBano v. Union of India, 2017
State of Rajasthan v. Balchand, 1977
Vishaka v. State of Rajasthan, 1997