

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Judiciary

Q1. Re-read the list of Fundamental Rights provided in Chapter 1. How do you think the Right to Constitutional Remedies connects to the idea of judicial review?

Ans. \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Q2. Re-read excerpts from the judgment on the Olga Tellis vs Bombay Municipal Corporation case. Now write in your own words what the judges meant when they said that the Right to Livelihood was part of the Right to Life.

Ans. \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

## Judiciary

Q1. Re-read the list of Fundamental Rights provided in Chapter 1. How do you think the Right to Constitutional Remedies connects to the idea of judicial review?

Ans. The Right to Constitutional Remedies connects to the idea of judicial review in its capacity of protecting the rights of an individual against the working of the State legislature or executive. The Right to Constitutional Remedies allows citizens to move the court if they think that any of their Fundamental Rights are being violated by the State administration. Judicial review implies invalidation of legislative or executive action if it is seen to violate Fundamental Rights. Hence, the Right to Constitutional Remedies and judicial review are inter-connected because the latter is practiced when a Fundamental Right is violated by the State. In this case, a higher court can repeal the judgments of a lower court based on its own investigation.

Q2. Re-read excerpts from the judgment on the Olga Tellis vs Bombay Municipal Corporation case. Now write in your own words what the judges meant when they said that the Right to Livelihood was part of the Right to Life.

Ans. In Olga Tellis vs. Bombay Municipal Corporation case, the judges said that the Right to Livelihood was part of the Right to Life. They stated that life does not merely imply an animal existence; it cannot be lived without a means of living, that is, "the means of livelihood". The judges conferred that eviction from a pavement or slum is deprivation of means of livelihood for the poor who cannot afford to live anywhere else. They take up small jobs in surrounding areas and to lose their pavement or slum would lead to loss of a job resulting in loss of a means of livelihood. Consequently, leading to "deprivation of life". This is how the judges connected Right to Livelihood to the Right to Life.