Peer Reviewed

Volume 7
Issue I

ISSN 2582-0311 (Print)
ISSN 2582-0303 (Online)

August 2025

VIPS STUDENT LAW REVIEW

VIVEKANANDA INSTITUTE OF PROFESSIONAL STUDIES - TECHNICAL CAMPUS

Affiliated to GGSIP University, Delhi
Grade A++ Accredited Institution by NAAC & Recognized by Bar Council of India and AICTE,
Recognized under section 2 (f) by UGC, NBA Accredited for MCA Programme
An ISO 9001:2015 Certified Institution

Volume 7, Issue I August, 2025 ISSN 2582-0311 (Print)
ISSN 2582-0303 (Online)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

S. No.	Title of the Paper / Author	Page No.
1.	Sextortion: Addressing the Impact and Law in India *Dr. Smita Sarmah & Dr. Kasturi Gakul*	1
2.	Cyber Operations Against Space Assets: A Legal Reassessment under the Law of Armed Conflict and International Telecommunication Regulation *Raghavendra S Kollurkar*	17
3.	The Basic Structure Doctrine as a Thin Line of Distinction Between Constitutional Amendment & Constitutional Dismemberment: An Analysis *Raajdwip Vardhan & Susmit Isfaq*	28
4.	Faith and Law at Crossroads: Unravelling the Complexities of Cult Crimes in India's Socio-Legal Framework *Saumya Tripathi*	46
5.	Navigating The Extent of Judicial Intervention in Pre-Arbitral Proceedings vis-a-vis Contemporary Judicial Trends in India *Meher Malik*	58
6.	Bridging Arbitration and Mediation: Evaluating the Arb-Med-Arb Hybrid in India's Investor-State Disputes *Jagyansh Kumar*	76
7.	Navigating Conflicts between IBC and PMLA: Prioritizing Insolvency Resolution over Asset Attachment *Shraddha Tiwari*	93
8.	Unearthing the Vices in Presumed Consent Law In Light of Recent Amendments To Transplantation of Human Organs and Tissues Act *Rishi Khemnani & Hardik Jain*	105
9.	Clickwrap Agreement: Validity, Enforceability And Challenges *Akarsh Raj*	115

10. Ethics v. Governance: A Critical Study of Misleading Advertisements And Consumer Rights in India
Palak Sharma 126

11. Post-Decisional Hearing In Administrative Law: Balancing Procedural Fairness And Administrative Efficiency
Garima Bansal 146

12. Balancing Corporate Tax Incentives and Revenue Collection: A Framework for Promoting Sustainable Business Practices in India
Shrey Bhatnagar & Mahi Singh 165

13. Electoral Disqualification Due To Criminal Antecedents: A Comparative Study
Diya Dhall & Suhani Anand 179

14. From Boardrooms to Ecosystems: A Study of Directors' Duty under Section 166(2) and Environmental Concerns With Reference To UK And Indian Laws
Prabhav Tripathi & Gargi Bindal 200

15. The Enforcement Dilemma of Interim Measures in Foreign Seated Arbitration: Emergency Arbitrator's Award in India
Divyam Desai & Shravin Relan 216

LEGISLATIVE COMMENT

16. Legislative Comment on the WAKF (AMENDMENT) BILL, 2025: Quoting the Contemporary Analysis of the Bill
Taarini Bhardwaj 226

Submission Guidelines 234

POST-DECISIONAL HEARING IN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW: BALANCING PROCEDURAL FAIRNESS AND ADMINISTRATIVE EFFICIENCY

Garima Bansal*

VIPS Student Law Review
August 2025, Vol. 7, Issue 1, 146-164
ISSN 2582-0311 (Print)
ISSN 2582-0303 (Online)
© Vivekananda Institute of Professional Studies
https://vslls.vips.edu/vslr/

ABSTRACT

In Indian administrative law, post-decisional hearings provide a vital yet flawed mechanism to uphold natural justice when pre-decisional hearings are not feasible. Anchored in the principles of natural justice- ensuring no one is a judge in their own cause and guaranteeing the right to be heard - this doctrine aims to harmonize procedural fairness with administrative efficiency. This research article explores their theoretical underpinnings, judicial development, and practical effectiveness of the post decisional hearing by relying on precedents. While post-decisional hearings offer a remedial safeguard, their effectiveness is hampered by institutional bias, irreversible injury, and the burden on individuals to prove prejudice. The Supreme Court's ruling in Maneka Gandhi emphasises the need for prompt, impartial hearings to ensure fairness. Although the principles of post-decisional hearings have been extensively examined in relation to natural justice, there is a lack of critical evaluation of their practical shortcomings in the Indian administrative context. Most legal commentary focuses on their validity rather than their efficacy. This research article seeks to fill that gap by analysing judicial reluctance to mandate independent adjudicators, assessing real-world failures in redress, and offering reform-oriented suggestions to enhance fairness. Real life examples, such as disciplinary suspensions or license revocations, highlight their necessity but also reveal delays and prejudgment that undermine redress. To address these deficiencies, the research article proposes

* 3rd Year Law Student, B.A. LL.B., Vivekananda School of Law & Legal Studies, Vivekananda Institute of Professional Studies-TC.

independent adjudicators, interim relief measures, and clear statutory guidelines to enhance procedural justice. This research article calls for reforms to uphold rule of law and to ensure post-decisional hearings are effective remedies, not mere formalities, reinforcing fairness and accountability in Indian administrative framework.

Keywords- *Administrative Law, Post Decisional Hearing, Natural Justice, Fairness, Audi Alteram Partem*

1. INTRODUCTION

The edifice of Indian administrative law rests on the twin pillars of fairness and accountability, enshrined in the principles of natural justice: *nemo judex in causa sua* and *audi alteram partem*. These principles ensures that administrative actions affecting individuals' rights are neither arbitrary nor obscure. Within this framework, post-decisional hearings have carved a place as an exceptional procedural mechanism, allowing affected parties to challenge administrative decisions after they have been made when pre-decisional hearings are impractical due to urgency, statutory constraints, or public interest.

The significance of such hearings lies in their ability to harmonise state's need for swift action and the individual's right to be heard. For instance, in cases like passport impoundment, where prior notice might enable evasion,[1] or disciplinary suspensions to prevent institutional harm[2], post-decisional hearings provide a reasonable solution. However, their remedial nature invites scrutiny: do they genuinely uphold natural justice, or are they a procedural veneer that fails to redress harm? The judiciary's role in shaping this doctrine has been pivotal, drafting guidelines to preserve fairness while acknowledging the importance for administrative effeciency. However, practical challenges-such as prejudice in decision-making bodies or the difficulty of rectifying injury-raise doubts about their efficacy. By analyzing precedents, the article contends that while post-decisional hearings offer a flexible safeguard, their effectiveness is curtailed by institutional bias, procedural delays, and the irreversibility of certain administrative actions.

1 Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India, AIR 1978 SC 597; (1978) 1 SCC 248, para 56.

2 Canara Bank v. V.K. Awasthy, AIR 2005 SC 2090; (2005) 6 SCC 321, para 16.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

A post-decisional hearing is a procedural mechanism that grants an individual the opportunity to be heard after an administrative authority issues a preliminary decision. It serves as a safeguard to uphold natural justice when pre-decisional hearings are impractical due to urgency, statutory constraints, or public interest. However, the Supreme Court has consistently emphasized that post-decisional hearings should be exceptional, with pre-decisional hearings being the preferred norm.[3]

The Court deems post-decisional hearings justifiable in specific scenarios:

a. When the initial decision causes no significant prejudice to the affected party.

b. When immediate action is required to address urgent circumstances.

c. When providing a pre-decisional hearing is logistically or legally infeasible.

The essence of post-decisional hearings lies in ensuring that only tentative rather than definitive, decisions are made without prior consultation, preserving the core objective of natural justice i.e., fair treatment.[4] A final decision without a hearing risks defeating the objective of justice, rendering post-decisional hearings ineffective[5]. In cases like *V.K. Awasthy*,[6] the Court examined whether a subsequent hearing could remedy procedural lapses, concluding that fairness must be maintained even in demanding situations.

Judicially, post-decisional hearings balance administrative efficiency with procedural fairness. The Supreme Court permits minimal safeguards—such as issuing notices or conducting post-decisional reviews—when pre-decisional hearings might impede governance[7]. However, it remains divided on whether post-decisional hearings fully satisfy natural justice or merely serve as a limited corrective measure[8].

The concept of post-decisional hearing is rooted in theoretical perspectives that emphasize the importance of fairness, justice, and due process in administrative decision-making. This section provides an overview of these theoretical perspectives and discusses key concepts that underpin the principle of post-decisional hearing.

3 Maneka Gandhi, *supra* note 1, para 14.

4 Swadeshi Cotton Mills v. Union of India, (1981) 1 SCC 664, para 44.

5 Swadeshi Cotton Mills, *supra* note 2, para 10.

6 *Id.,* para 8.

7 Liberty Oil Mills v. Union of India, (1984) 3 SCC 465, para 16.

8 Managing Director, ECIL v. B. Karunakar, (1993) 4 SCC 727, para 31.

2.1 Natural Justice

Principles of natural justice are fundamental in ensuring that individuals are treated fairly by decision-making authorities. It is ingrained in the idea that individuals have inherent rights and dignity that must be respected. The essential principles of natural justice are (i) *Nemo judex in causa sua* and (ii) *Audi alteram partem*. These principles safeguard fairness and prevent any arbitrary exercises of power by administrative bodies.

a. Nemo Judex in Causa Sua (Rule Against Bias):

This rule ensures that adjudicators remain impartial and free from any conflict of interests by prohibiting them from adjudicating any matter where lies their personal interest. As articulated by the courts, *"A judge is disqualified from determining any case in which he may be, or may fairly be suspected to be, biased; and it is of fundamental importance that justice should not only be done but should manifestly and undoubtedly be seen to be done."*[9] The integrity of decision-making depends upon the impartiality of the adjudicator.[10]

b. Audi Alteram Partem (The Right to be Heard):

This maxim embodies an individual's right to be heard before any adverse decision is made against them. It requires that a fair opportunity is provided to them to present their case. The courts have recognized that this principle as an essential aspect of fair decision-making, stating that no one should be condemned unheard. *Notice is the first limb of this principle.* It must be precise and unambiguous. It should appraise the party determinatively the case he has to meet.[11]

This principle also extends to post-decisional hearings, where individuals are given an opportunity to challenge decisions that have already been made. In *Liberty Oil Mills*, the Court upheld the validity of post-decisional hearings in certain cases, recognizing that there may be situations where prior notice and hearing could defeat the very purpose of the proceedings.[12] The Court further clarified that there is a distinction between no hearing[13] and an inadequate hearing.[14] If a person is dismissed from service without any hearing, the order would be void, whereas if there is a procedural lapse in affording an adequate

9 Krishnadatt Awasthy v. State of Madhya Pradesh & Ors., (2024) 4 S.C.R. 151.; R v. Sussex Justices, (1924) 1 KB 256.

10 Dimes v. Grand Junction Canal (HL), (1852) 10 ER 301.

11 Board of Education v. Rice (HL), (1911) AC 179.

12 Liberty Oil Mills, *supra* note 7.

13 Ridge v. Baldwin (HL), (1964) AC 40.

14 B. Karunakar, *supra* note 8.; K.L. Tripathi v. State Bank of India, (1984) 1 SCC 43.

hearing, the order's validity must be tested on the touchstone of prejudice.[15]

The courts have consistently reiterated that adherence to principles of natural justice is crucial in administrative and quasi-judicial proceedings. The SC in *A.K. Kraipak*[16] observed that *"the dividing line between quasi-judicial and administrative functions has become quite thin and almost indistinguishable"* necessitating a broader application of fairness. Therefore, ensuring a fair hearing, whether pre-decisional or post-decisional, is imperative in protecting individuals from arbitrary decisions.

2.2 Fairness

It is an essential element of natural justice, ensuring that individuals are treated equitably, without any bias. Fairness mandates that administrative authorities consider the interests and perspectives of all parties that are affected by the decision and provide them with adequate opportunity to challenge adverse decisions. In this context, post-decisional hearings emerge as an essential procedural safeguard designed to mitigate the absence of a pre-decisional hearing and for upholding fairness, that is a just hearing for individuals whose rights are at stake,[17] especially in circumstances where pre-decisional hearings are impractical. The House of Lords in *CCSU v. Minister for the Civil Service*[18] equated natural justice with fairness, reinforcing the idea that procedural fairness is indispensable.

In *S.K. Sharma*,[19] the SC observed that *"principles of natural justice cannot be reduced to any hard and fast formulae. These principles cannot be put in a strait-jacket. Their applicability depends upon the context and the facts and circumstances of each case. The objective is to ensure a fair hearing to the person whose rights are affected."*[20] The objective of natural justice is to ensure a fair hearing and a fair deal to individuals whose rights are affected.[21] In *P.K. Roy*,[22] the Court observed that certain situations might necessitate immediate administrative action, with the affected party given a subsequent opportunity to contest the decision.

15 State Bank of India v. S.K. Sharma, (1996) 3 SCC 364, para 28.; Calvin v. Carr (PC), (1980) AC 574.

16 A.K. Kraipak v. Union of India, (1969) 2 SCC 262, para 13.

17 Mohinder Singh Gill v. Chief Election Commr., (1978) 1 SCC 405, para 48.

18 Council of Civil Service Unions v. Minister for the Civil Service, (1984) 3 All ER 935.

19 State Bank of India v. S.K. Sharma, (1996) 3 SCC 364, para 28.

20 Russell v. Duke of Norfolk, (1949) 1 All ER 109.; Mohinder Singh Gill, *supra* note 17.; A.K. Roy v. Union of India, (1982) 1 SCC 271.; Swadeshi Cotton Mills, *supra* note 4.

21 Mohinder Singh Gill, *supra* note 17.; A.K. Roy, *supra* note 20.; Swadeshi Cotton Mills, *supra* note 4.

22 Union of India v. P.K. Roy, (1968) 2 SCR 186.

The test of prejudice plays a crucial role in determining whether a violation of fairness principles warrants judicial intervention. The Court in *Calvin v. Carr*[23] held that not every procedural irregularity results in automatic annulment; rather, courts must assess whether the party suffered any substantial prejudice. In other words, procedural deficiencies must be evaluated in light of their impact on the affected party's ability to present a defense.[24]

2.3 Due Process

Due process emphasises the necessity of adhering to established legal procedures to ensure fairness in administrative and judicial decisions. The doctrine of natural justice, which finds its equivalent in the American concept of due process, mandates that every individual must be provided with notice and an opportunity to be heard before any adverse action is taken against them.[25] The Constitution of India incorporates these principles through Articles 14 and 21, which serves as safeguards against any arbitrary state action. The Supreme Court has recognized the blurring distinction between administrative and quasi-judicial functions, emphasizing that procedural fairness is fundamental to protecting individual rights.[26]

The doctrine of due process and the rule of *audi alteram partem* thus serve as essential checks on the exercise of administrative and judicial power, ensuring that individuals are not subjected to unfair and arbitrary decisions. The jurisprudence developed by the Supreme Court[27] rendered procedural fairness as indispensable to the protection of fundamental rights under the Constitution.

3. EVOLUTION OF POST DECISIONAL HEARING IN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW

The doctrine of post-decisional hearing has undergone substantial evolution in administrative law, with the Court playing a pivotal role in shaping its jurisprudence. The gradual recognition of this principle reflects judiciary's attempt to balance administrative efficiency with fairness and procedural justice.

23 Calvin v. Carr, (1980) AC 574 (PC).

24 *supra* note 8.

25 *supra* note 1.

26 *supra* note 16.

27 Maneka Gandhi, *supra* note 1; Hussainara Khatoon, (1980) 1 SCC 81.

3.1 Historical Development of Post-Decisional Hearing

Initially, courts did not explicitly recognize post-decisional hearing as a distinct procedural safeguard. Overtime, however, the judiciary acknowledged that, in specific circumstances, a hearing granted after the decision could serve the broader objectives of justice. The Supreme Court, through various judgements, has clarified that while a pre-decisional hearing is the general rule, post-decisional hearings may be employed in cases where immediate action is necessary or pre-decisional hearing is impractical.

3.2 Judicial Recognition of Post-Decisional Hearing

a. Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India[28]

In this case, the Supreme Court while rejecting government's contention that the Act did not mandate a pre-decisional hearing and that national interests justified the immediate action, expanded the scope of Article 21 to include procedural fairness, and recognized the flexibility of natural justice. It held:

> *"14. …What opportunity may be regarded as reasonable would necessarily depend on the practical necessities of the situation. It may be a sophisticated full-fledged hearing or it may be a hearing which is very brief and minimal; it may be a hearing prior to the decision or it may even be a post-decisional remedial hearing. The audi alteram partem rule is sufficiently flexible to permit modifications and variations to suit the exigencies of myriad kinds of situations which may arise…A fair opportunity of being heard following immediately upon the order impounding the passport would satisfy the mandate of natural justice and a provision requiring giving of such opportunity to the person concerned can and should be read by implication."*

The Court emphasized that a post-decisional hearing could meet the requirements of natural justice in urgent instances, but emphasized that it must be prompt, substantive, and impartial to avoid being a mere formality. While the Court rightly recognized the importance for flexibility, it fell short of establishing clear procedural standards for what constitutes a prompt and impartial post-decisional hearing, thus allowing wide administrative discretion.

28 *supra* note 1.

b. Swadeshi Cotton Mills v. Union of India[29]

Central Government issued an order under Sec. 18A of *the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act, 1951*, to take over the management of Swadeshi Cotton Mills. The government alleged mismanagement, financial irregularities, and a threat to the public interest, including potential unemployment and disruption to the textile industry. The takeover was executed without a hearing, as the government claimed that urgency precluded prior consultation to avert economic collapse. The company challenged the order, contending that the lack of a hearing violated natural justice and rendered the action arbitrary.

The Supreme Court, reversing the High Court's ruling, limited scope of post-decisional hearings, emphasizing their exceptional nature:

> *"49. …the general principle—as distinguished from an absolute rule of uniform application—seems to be that where a statute does not, in terms, exclude this rule of prior hearing but contemplates a post-decisional hearing amounting to a full review of the original order on merits, then such a statute would be construed as excluding the audi alteram partem rule at the pre-decisional stage… The court must make every effort to salvage this cardinal rule to the maximum extent possible, with situational modifications"*

According to the court pre-decisional hearings may be waived only in situations of *"imminent danger or injury"* to the public interest, such as economic disruption. However, a post-decisional hearing must be conducted to rectify procedural deficiencies. Notably, while the Court rightly reaffirmed and emphasised the importance of pre-decisional hearings, it introduced ambiguity by employing subjective phrases like *"imminent danger"* without articulating specific benchmarks. This allowed future administrations to invoke urgency without adequate judicial scrutiny. The lack of enforcement on follow-up post-decisional hearings further diluted its practical value.

c. Liberty Oil Mills v. Union of India[30]

In this case, the petitioners faced an interim order under the Imports and Exports (Control) Act, suspending their license to import edible oils. The government alleged that the petitioners violated import regulations by engaging in fraudulent transactions, necessitating immediate action to protect the domestic edible oil market from any economic harm. The

29 *supra* note 4, para 49.

30 *supra* note 7.

suspension was imposed without a prior notice, and the authorities claimed that a pre-decisional hearing would allow further violations. The petitioners challenged the order, contending that the absence of a hearing violated the principles of natural justice and caused irreparable financial loss.

The Supreme Court upheld the validity of post-decisional hearings for interim measures, stating:

> *"15. ...It may be that the opportunity to be heard may not be pre-decisional; it may necessarily have to be post-decisional where the danger to be averted or the act to be prevented is imminent or where the action to be taken can brook no delay… Procedural fairness embodying natural justice is to be implied whenever action is taken affecting the rights of parties..."*

The Court also noted that interim measures, by their nature, require flexibility, distinguishing them from final orders that demand stricter procedural compliance. The Court's reasoning, though context-sensitive, risked reducing the right to be heard to a discretionary administrative tool. The absence of a requirement for written reasons or timelines for the remedial hearing diminished the protective value of the principle. This judgment arguably weakened procedural fairness by legitimizing ex parte actions without sufficient remedial rigor.

d. Canara Bank v. V.K. Awasthy[31]

In this case, the respondent was dismissed without a hearing, following the allegations of financial misconduct that jeopardized the bank's integrity. The bank contended that immediate action was necessary to maintain public trust and prevent financial harm. A post-decisional hearing was provided through an appellate process, where Awasthy could present his defense, but he claimed it was inadequate and biased. He challenged the dismissal, alleging a violation of natural justice and arguing that the appellate hearing failed to cure the initial procedural defect.

The Supreme Court affirmed the remedial nature of post-decisional hearings in disciplinary proceedings, stating:

> *"10. The adherence to principles of natural justice as recognised by all civilised States is of supreme importance when a quasi-judicial*

31 *supra* note 2.

> *body embarks on determining disputes between the parties, or any administrative action involving civil consequences is in issue… Where a post-decisional hearing is granted and adequately addresses procedural irregularities, the defect in failing to provide a pre-decisional hearing may stand cured, thereby negating any alleged violation of the principles of natural justice"*

The Court asserted that disciplinary actions often require swift measures to protect institutional integrity, but fairness must not be sacrificed. With regards to prejudice the Court clarified that adequacy of the hearing depends on its ability to address prejudice caused by the initial action.

The Court's confidence in post-decisional appellate processes as curative of natural justice violations assumes ideal institutional conduct. However, in disciplinary matters, appellate forums often suffer from institutional bias or hierarchical constraints, limiting impartial post-hearing. This reliance ignores power asymmetries and workplace politics that may preclude genuine redress, thereby diluting substantive justice. A true remedy must not only retrospectively correct errors but also proactively prevent harm - a function that post-decisional hearings inherently struggle to fulfil.

Across these cases, the judiciary has failed to evolve a consistent procedural test to determine when a post-decisional hearing suffices. The result is a fragmented jurisprudence where administrative convenience often trumps individual rights. Furthermore, the growing reliance on the 'prejudice' test to uphold decisions despite procedural lapses[32] shifts the burden onto affected individuals, contradicting the protective rationale of natural justice and undermining the doctrine's preventive purpose.

3.3 Dimensions and Case-Specific Application of Post-Decisional Hearing

The Supreme Court has consistently ruled that post-decisional hearing is not rigid or absolute substitute for pre-decisional hearing.[33] In fact, its applicability is contingent on the facts and circumstances of each case. Courts have ruled that post-decisional hearings can satisfy the *audi alteram partem* principle only in exceptional situations where prior notice is impractical. Nonetheless, the judiciary has warned against reliance on post-decisional hearings to justify bypassing procedure. Ensuring pre-decisional fairness whenever possible is preferred over post-decisional remedies which serves as a supplementary measure.

32 *supra* note 19.

33 Canara Bank v. Debasis Das and Others, 2003(4) SCC 557; para 24.

4. PRINCIPLES AND GUIDELINES FOR POST-DECISIONAL HEARING

4.1 Principles and Guidelines Laid Down by Courts and Administrative Authorities:

The principle of natural justice is not confined within a rigid framework but is subject to context, as held by the Supreme Court in *P.K. Roy*.[34] The Court emphasized that the procedural requirements of natural justice can vary depending upon the nature of the case and the statutory provisions governing it. It was observed that:

> *"12. ....The principles of natural justice cannot be imprisoned within the strait-jacket of a rigid formula. The application of the doctrine depends upon the nature of the jurisdiction conferred on the administrative authority, upon the character of the rights of the persons affected, the scheme and policy of the statute and other relevant circumstances disclosed in the particular case...."*

Also, mere violation of the principles of natural justice isn't sufficient to vitiate an order; it must be shown that such a violation has caused prejudice to the party. This was reiterated in *B. Karunakar*,[35] where the Court held that the person challenging the order must demonstrate how the alleged violation of natural justice has prejudiced him in the decision taken against him, lack of which will rectify the initial deficiency of no pre-decisional hearing.[36]

In *V.K. Awasthy*,[37] the Court, to a great extent solidified the role of post-decisional hearings as a corrective measure for procedural deficiencies in disciplinary proceedings, ruling where a post-decisional hearing is granted and has adequately addressed procedural irregularities, the defect in failing to provide a pre-decisional hearing may stand cured, thereby negating any alleged violation of the principles of natural justice.

4.2 Factors Influencing the Conduct of Post-Decisional Hearings:

The effectiveness of a post-decisional hearing in upholding natural justice is influenced by various factors, which have been articulated by courts through judicial interpretation. The following key considerations determine whether a post-decisional hearing can adequately substitute for a pre-decisional hearing:

34 *supra* note 22, para 12.
35 *supra* note 8, para 31.
36 *supra* note 33, para 15.
37 *supra* note 2, para 16.

4.3 Nature and Urgency of the Decision

Courts have recognized that in certain cases, administrative exigencies may preclude an opportunity for a hearing before a decision as it may not always be feasible. The judiciary has acknowledged that in such circumstances, post-decisional hearings serve as a remedial measure rather than a substitute.[38] In *Swadeshi Cotton Mills*,[39] it was held that a pre-decisional hearing may be dispensed with in an urgent situation where immediate action is required to prevent some imminent danger or injury or hazard to paramount public interest. Mere urgency is, however, no reason for exclusion of the *audi alteram partem* rule and cannot be used as a blanket justification for doing away with procedural fairness. If a decision is taken without a prior notice, it must be followed by a substantive post-decisional hearing.

4.4 The Availability and Effectiveness of the Post-Decisional Hearing

For a post-decisional hearing to rectify the procedural lapses, it must provide the affected party with a real and reasonable opportunity to challenge the decision. In *Maneka Gandhi*,[40] the Court emphasised the importance of procedural fairness:

> *"14. ...this is a rule of vital importance in the field of administrative law and it must not be jettisoned save in very exceptional circumstances where compulsive necessity so demands. It is a wholesome rule designed to secure the rule of law and the court should not be too ready to eschew it in its application to a given case....The core of it must, however, remain, namely, that the person affected must have a reasonable opportunity of being heard..."*

The Court, however, also held that a post-decisional hearing cannot serve as an absolute substitute for a pre-decisional hearing except in rare cases.

4.5 The Extent of Prejudice Caused to the Affected Party

The burden of proof in establishing prejudice due to the denial of a pre-decisional hearing lies on the affected party. In *B. Karunakar*,[41] the Court held a person challenging an administrative action must show that the lack of procedural fairness that has caused a

38 A.K. Roy v. UOI, (1982) 1 SCC 271; SWADESHI COTTON MILLS, *supra* note 4.

39 *supra* note 4, para 49.

40 *supra* note 1.

41 *supra* note 8.

substantial injustice to his rights. Thus, post-decisional hearings are considered valid procedural safeguards if the affected party fails to show the absence of a pre-decisional hearing has resulted in actual prejudice.

4.6 Statutory Provisions Governing the Decision

Where a statute expressly provides for a post-decisional hearing as an alternative to a pre-decisional hearing, courts are more inclined to uphold such procedures. *Justice O. Chinnappa Reddy*, in his dissenting opinion, observed:

> *"Where an express provision in the statute itself provides for a post-decisional hearing, the other provisions of the statute will have to be read in the light of such provision and the provision for post-decisional hearing may then clinch the issue where pre-decisional natural justice appears to be excluded on the other terms of the statute."*[42]

The preceding principles reflect an uneasy balance between fairness and administrative exigency. While judiciary has rightly recognised the importance of post-decisional hearings in circumstances involving urgency, it has failed to evolve consistent, enforceable criteria to regulate their conduct. Without precise procedural benchmarks, general phrases such as *"reasonable opportunity," "prejudice test,"* and so on are heavily relied upon. Without enforceable requirements on timeliness, impartiality, and transparency of post-decisional hearings, the doctrine remains susceptible to perfunctory application and token compliance.

5. EVALUATING PRACTICAL EFFICACY

The practical efficacy of post-decisional hearings in fulfilling natural justice remains a subject of debate. Their flexibility offers administrative expediency, yet simultaneously exposes serious normative and structural weaknesses.

5.1 Strengths of Post-Decisional Hearings

Post-decisional hearings serve as a critical safety net in urgent circumstances, allowing authorities to act swiftly-such as in matters involving national security, public safety, or financial integrity-without bypassing fairness. For instance, in disciplinary proceedings, an employee may be suspended to prevent further misconduct, with a subsequent hearing ensuring that they can challenge the decision. The Court has acknowledged that a post-decisional remedial hearing, if prompt and meaningful, could suffice under compelling

42 Swadeshi Cotton Mills, *supra* note 4, para 49; See Mohinder Singh Gill, *supra* note 17, para 52.

circumstances.[43] This principle was extended in *Liberty Oil Mills*, where the Court upheld such hearings in situations involving interim orders affecting economic interests.[44]

The Supreme Court has highlighted the corrective potential of the post decisional hearing as:

> *"If after hearing the parties, the Court/Tribunal comes to the conclusion that the non-supply of the report would have made no difference to the ultimate findings and the punishment given, the Court/Tribunal should not interfere with the order of punishment"*[45].

This flexibility is evident in cases like *K.L. Tripathi*,[46] where a post-decisional review cured procedural defects in a banking inquiry, and other cases already mentioned above, in which the court has consistently held that a post facto hearing could validate prior omission, if there had been no demonstrable prejudice.[47]

In a hypothetical case of a food safety violation, a restaurant's license may be suspended to protect public health, with a post-decisional hearing allowing the owner to show compliance or a case where hospital's license is suspended due to an outbreak of contamination which might warrant immediate action, with the post-decisional hearing offering the hospital a chance to present compliance evidence. Such hearings ensure that urgent actions don't prevent redress, preserving credibility of administration while upholding individual rights[48].

5.2 Limitations and Challenges

Despite the strengths, post-decisional hearings face significant hurdles that undermine their efficacy and remedial character.

a. Institutional Bias and Pre-judgment

A major challenge is *institutional bias*, where the authority who made the original decision, also makes the subsequent post decisional hearing, thereby they may be inclined to affirm their initial actions. This structure challenges the *nemo judex* principle. In *Jaggo*, the termination of long-term contractual workers was justified post facto, despite procedural

43 *supra* note 1, para 14.
44 *supra* note 7, para 15.
45 *supra* note 8, para 31.
46 K.L. Tripathi v. SBI, (1984) 1 SCC 43.
47 V.K. Awasthy, *supra note* 2; Debasis Das, *supra* note 33.
48 *supra* note 7, para 20.

irregularities and outsourcing during judicial stay.[49] The hearing process failed to engage an independent forum, revealing the systemic unwillingness to reassess foundational errors. The Court in *Maneka Gandhi* cautioned against hearings that are mere *"rituals of compliance,"* warning that hearings conducted with foreclosed conclusions are *"inherently suspect."*[50] The decision-maker's impartiality must not only exist in theory but must also be visible in practice[51].

b. Irreversible Harm and Burden of Prejudice

The risk is pronounced in disciplinary proceedings, where authorities may resist reversal to maintain credibility. In employment disputes particularly, a dismissal may lead to financial ruin or reputational damage before a hearing occurs, as acknowledged in *S.K. Sharma*[52] that where grave harm results before a hearing, the damage may be functionally irreparable*:*

> *"28....there may be situations where observance of the requirement of prior notice/hearing may defeat the very proceeding—which may result in grave prejudice to public interest. It is for this reason that the rule of post-decisional hearing as a sufficient compliance with natural justice...—in which case, the validity of the order has to be tested on the touchstone of prejudice, i.e., whether, all in all, the person concerned did or did not have a fair hearing..."*[53]

The *"prejudice test"* -which requires the aggrieved party to prove how lack of hearing changed the outcome-places an unjust and undue evidentiary burden on the weaker party, in the present case, the employees.[54] Further, it assumes that a full, fair, and timely hearing can always cure the original procedural defect. It fails in cases involving reputational or irreversible harm. A striking example is *L.K. Ratna*, where the Court recognized that:

> *"There are cases where an order may cause serious injury as soon as it is made, an injury not capable of being entirely erased when the error is corrected on subsequent appeal. [...] To many a man, his professional reputation is his most valuable possession [...] it is difficult*

49 Jaggo v. UOI, 2024 SCC OnLine SC 3826, pp-24, 25.

50 *supra* note 1.

51 *Id.*, para 56.

52 *supra* note 19, para *28.*

53 K.L. Tripathi, *supra* note 46; B. Karunakar, *supra* note 8.

54 UOI v. Tulsiram Patel, (1985) 3 SCC 398, para 102.

to contemplate complete restitution through an appellate decision."[55]

The Court's acknowledgment that reputational loss cannot always be undone by subsequent hearing threaten the logic of treating such hearings as curative in every instance. While the disciplinary order was ultimately quashed for violating *audi alteram partem,* the judgment exposes a fundamental flaw in post-decisional hearing-namely, that not all consequences are reversible, and not all remedies are adequate. In such cases, procedural inclemency before the initial decision becomes essential, not optional. The court further upheld that only those procedural violations that are causing substantial injustice or harm will require review thereby further limiting remedial outcomes as it sets a dangerously high threshold, especially where economic, reputational, or liberty interests are at stake.

c. Procedural Delays and Ineffectiveness

Procedural delays further erode efficacy. In *H.L. Trehan*, the Court lamented that "belated hearings are no hearings," emphasizing that postponement dilutes justice[56]. In practice, hearings often occur months after adverse actions, rendering it ineffective. These challenges emphasise the doctrine's reactive nature, which is in contradistinction with the preventive role of pre-decisional hearings[57].

Recent judicial developments expose the frailty of post-decisional hearings in protecting procedural fairness. In *K-9 Enterprises*,[58] the blocking of GST credit under Rule 86A without a hearing was quashed, with the Court reiterating that financial urgency cannot override procedural rights. Similarly, in the *Tanul Thakur website blocking case*,[59] the MeitY blocked satirical news website *Dowry Calculator* under Sec. 69A of the IT Act without providing the affected party any hearing. A post-decisional hearing was granted, only after prolonged litigation, which the Delhi High Court held as inadequate and ruled that a hearing after the harm had already occurred-especially when reputational harm was at stake-does not satisfy the minimum threshold of natural justice.

In *Mohinder Singh Gill*, the court warned that superficial hearings erode the trust:

"…Justice must be felt to be just by the community if democratic legality is to animate the rule of law. And if the invisible audience sees a man's

55 Institute of Chartered Accountants v. L.K. Ratna, (1986) 4 SCC 537, para 18.

56 H.L. Trehan v. UOI, AIR 1989 SC 568, (1989) 1 SCC 764, para 13.

57 Olga Tellis v. BMC, AIR 1986 SC 180, (1985) 3 SCC 545, para 47.

58 State of Karnataka v. K-9 Enterprises, SLP (Civil) Diary No. 11543/2025 dated 16.05.2025.

59 Tanul Thakur v. UOI, Delhi HC, W.P.(C) 13037/2019 & CM No.53165/2019.

> *case disposed of unheard, a chorus of 'no-confidence' will be heard to say, 'that man had no chance to defend his stance'…."*[60]

In *Mukesh Kumar Paswan*,[61] the victim was dismissed without any opportunity to defend himself or present his case. Though post-facto proceedings were initiated but it was only after public outcry, by which time the damage to livelihood and dignity had become irreversible. The case reflects how systemic disregard for even remedial hearings enables irreparable harm to livelihood and dignity.

The failure to grant timely and substantive post-action hearings not only violates the *audi alteram partem* principle but entrenches administrative impunity. As seen above, the delayed or perfunctory nature of hearings fails to undo the economic or reputational consequences caused by the initial action.

5.3 Comparative Analysis: UK and US Jurisprudence[62]

When examined in contrast with jurisdictions that have codified procedural safeguards, the weakness of India's post-decisional hearing framework becomes more apparent. In UK, the right to a fair hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal is enshrined in Art 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights (*ECHR*), deriving its power through the Human Rights Act, 1998.[63] Tribunals must be fair even when exercising discretion, especially where livelihoods are at stake. Courts have enforced doctrines like legitimate expectations, requiring consistency and prior consultation in employment and social-welfare decisions.[64]

In the US, the 5th Amendment's Due Process Clause has been interpreted through the *Mathews v. Eldridge* framework, balancing:

a. private interest,

b. risk of erroneous deprivation, and

c. the government's interest.[65]

60 *supra* note 17, para 56.

61 Mukesh Kumar Paswan v. State of Bihar, W.P. (C) No.8071 of 2023.

62 Harsh Sethi, *International Norms on Fair Hearing: The Case of US, UK and India*, Mod. Diplomacy (July 6, 2021), https://moderndiplomacy.eu/2021/07/06/international-norms-on-fair-hearing-the-case-of-us-uk-and-india/.

63 ECHR, art. 6(1), Nov. 4, 1950, 213 U.N.T.S. 221; Human Rights Act, 1998 (UK).

64 Ridge v. Baldwin, *supra* note 13; Council of Civil Service Unions, *supra* note 18.

65 Mathews v. Eldridge, 424 U.S. 319 (1976).

This test ensures procedural predictability and aids to determine when a post-decisional hearing might suffice. Reinforcing independent adjudication, the principle of *"he who hears must decide"* is upheld by the US courts.[66]

Starkly, India lacks a uniform statutory standard, instead relying on broad judicial terms like *"urgency"* or *"compelling necessity"* without clear definitions. The courts have permitted post-decisional hearings, while not requiring specific procedural guarantees, as seen above.[67] This flexibility has created inconsistencies and room for administrative arbitrariness by providing them discretion. Cases such as *Tanul Thakur* and *Mauria Udyog v. SEBI* reveal the repercussions of this ambiguity. In both, procedural lapses were justified, with inadequate or delayed post-decisional hearing that failed to undo reputational or financial harm caused.[68]

Therefore, its recommended, India would benefit from codifying a procedural test akin to *Mathews*[69] and adopting safeguards similar to ECHR, ensuring that post-decisional hearings are just, timely, and effective- rather than retrospectively justifying the arbitrary action.

6. CONCLUSION

The analysis of post-decisional hearings within administrative law emphasises the delicate balance between procedural fairness and administrative efficiency. While the principle of *audi alteram partem* remains a cornerstone of natural justice, courts have consistently reiterated that post-decisional hearings must be remedial rather than preventive.[70] However, their inherent limitations, such as institutional bias, necessitate a careful scrutiny and review to ensure that they don't become mere procedural formality.

Precedents emphasized that such hearings should and must be restricted to cases where pre-decisional hearings are impractical due to any urgency or statutory exclusion.[71] Courts have moreover cautioned us against their misuse as a substitute for pre-decisional safeguards unless justified by compelling circumstances.[72] Additionally, trivial technical violations of natural justice don't automatically invalidate administrative decisions unless apparent

66 Morgan v. US, 304 U.S. 1 (1938).

67 Swadeshi Cotton Mills, *supra* note 4; Liberty Oil Mills, *supra* note 7; H.L. Trehan, *supra* note 56.

68 Tanul Thakur, *supra* note 59; Mauria Udyog Ltd. v. SEBI, Appeal No. 577 of 2023 (SAT, Aug. 18, 2023).

69 *supra* note 65.

70 V.K. Awasthy, *supra* note 2; Swadeshi Cotton Mills, *supra* note 4; Maneka Gandhi, *supra* note 1.

71 Swadeshi Cotton Mills, *supra* note 4; Maneka Gandhi, *supra* note 1.

72 *supra* note 2.

prejudice is established.[73]

To uphold fairness and transparency in administrative decision-making, it is crucial to ensure that post-decisional hearings provide an adequate opportunity for redress, rather than being used as a perfunctory mechanism to justify an otherwise arbitrary decision.[74] Safeguards must be mandated to prevent authorities from circumventing pre-decisional hearings under the guise of efficiency.[75] The continued evolution of administrative law through judicial interpretation, necessitates a critical examination of post-decisional hearings, to curb its overuse and misuse, and to ensure that procedural justice must genuinely protect individuals' rights and ensure fairness—not just fulfil technical or symbolic requirements.[76]

73 *supra* note 8.

74 Canara Bank, *supra* note 2; B. Karunakar, *supra* note 8.

75 *supra* note 4, para 49.

76 Maneka Gandhi, *supra,* note 1, (1978) 1 SCC 248; B. Karunakar, *supra,* note 8.