

Balancing Fundamental Rights and State Authority: A Study of Pakistan's Constitutional Jurisprudence



Fazail Asrar Ahmed	Advocate High Court & Visiting Faculty Member, Dept. of Law. University of Sialkot, Pakistan fazailkh11@gmail.com
Mehmood Ul Hassan	LLM Scholar, Department of Law, University of Lahore, Pakistan mehmoodmalik432@gmail.com
Muhammad Haroon Irshad	LLM Scholar, Department of Law, University of Lahore, Pakistan m.haroonirshad@gmail.com

Abstract: *This article explores the intricate balance between fundamental rights and state authority within Pakistan's constitutional framework. The Constitution of Pakistan, 1973, enshrines a comprehensive array of fundamental rights aimed at safeguarding individual liberties and ensuring justice. However, it also permits limitations on these rights under specific circumstances, particularly in the context of national security and public order. This duality has led to a complex judicial landscape where the Supreme Court of Pakistan plays a crucial role in interpreting these provisions. Through a detailed examination of key judicial decisions, including the landmark case of Mehram Ali v. Federation of Pakistan and Zaheeruddin v. State, the article analyzes how the judiciary has navigated the tension between expanding individual rights and endorsing state actions that restrict these rights. The impact of societal values, particularly those rooted in Islamic principles, on legal interpretations is also explored, highlighting the challenges of reconciling fundamental rights with cultural and religious norms. The article further discusses the emerging challenges and future directions for Pakistan's constitutional jurisprudence, such as the need to address issues related to cyber security, digital privacy, and the regulation of social media. It underscores the judiciary's ongoing task of balancing fundamental rights with state authority in a rapidly changing legal and social environment. The study provides insights into the evolving nature of Pakistan's constitutional law and the significant role of the judiciary in shaping the future of fundamental rights and state governance.*

Keywords: Constitutional Jurisprudence, Fundamental Rights, Islamic Principles, Judicial Interpretation, National Security, State Authority

Introduction

The relationship between fundamental rights and state authority is a cornerstone of constitutional governance, with profound implications for the rule of law, individual freedoms, and the exercise of state power. In Pakistan, this relationship is particularly complex, given the country's unique socio-political history, its constitutional evolution, and the ongoing challenges it faces in maintaining a balance between these often-competing

interests. The Constitution of Pakistan, 1973, enshrines a broad array of fundamental rights, including the right to life, liberty, equality, and freedom of speech, among others. These rights are intended to protect individuals against the excesses of state power, ensuring that the government operates within the bounds of law and respect for human dignity (Khan & Zubair, 2023; Lin & Song, 2024). However, the exercise of these rights is not absolute and is often subject to limitations, particularly in matters involving

national security, public order, and societal values. The Constitution provides the state with the authority to impose restrictions on these rights under specific circumstances, creating a delicate balancing act between individual liberties and state responsibilities (Ranjah, 2023; Khan & Jiliani, 2023).

This balancing act is further complicated by Pakistan's historical context, marked by periods of military rule, political instability, and the ongoing threat of terrorism and extremism. During such times, the state has frequently invoked its authority to limit fundamental rights in the interest of maintaining order and protecting national security. The judiciary, particularly the Supreme Court of Pakistan, has played a critical role in interpreting the constitutional provisions that govern this balance, often navigating through complex and contentious issues. The Supreme Court's jurisprudence in this area reflects a dynamic and evolving understanding of how fundamental rights and state authority should coexist. On one hand, the Court has recognized the paramount importance of fundamental rights as a safeguard against arbitrary and unjust state action. On the other hand, it has also acknowledged the necessity of reasonable restrictions on these rights, particularly in situations where the state's ability to govern effectively or ensure the safety and security of its citizens might be at risk (Nelson, 2018; Faisal et al., 2023).

This article seeks to explore the intricate balance between fundamental rights and state authority in Pakistan's constitutional framework. It examines the constitutional provisions that govern fundamental rights, the circumstances under which these rights may be restricted, and the role of the judiciary in interpreting and enforcing these provisions. Through an analysis of landmark Supreme Court decisions, the article highlights how Pakistan's constitutional jurisprudence has evolved in response to the challenges posed by national security concerns, societal values, and the need for effective governance (Munir, 2018). The study aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of how Pakistan's legal system navigates the tension between protecting individual rights and

upholding state authority. It also seeks to identify the key principles and trends that have emerged from the judiciary's approach to balancing these interests. In doing so, the article contributes to the broader discourse on constitutional law and human rights, offering insights into the unique challenges and opportunities faced by Pakistan in its ongoing journey toward a more just and equitable legal order.

Research Methodology

This study employs a qualitative research methodology to explore the intricate balance between fundamental rights and state authority within Pakistan's constitutional jurisprudence. The qualitative approach is particularly well-suited for this research as it allows for an in-depth examination of legal texts, judicial decisions, and the socio-political context that shapes the interpretation and application of constitutional principles in Pakistan. By focusing on the qualitative aspects of legal analysis, the study seeks to provide a nuanced understanding of how the judiciary has navigated the complex interplay between individual liberties and state power. The research is primarily based on the analysis of primary legal sources, including the Constitution of Pakistan, landmark Supreme Court judgments, and relevant statutory provisions. These sources provide the foundational legal framework within which the balance between fundamental rights and state authority is negotiated. The study also incorporates an examination of legal commentaries, academic articles, and historical documents to contextualize the legal developments and judicial decisions within the broader socio-political environment of Pakistan. A key component of the qualitative methodology used in this research is the doctrinal analysis of judicial decisions. This involves a detailed examination of how the Supreme Court of Pakistan has interpreted and applied constitutional provisions related to fundamental rights and state authority in various cases. The study analyzes the reasoning and legal principles articulated by the Court, identifying patterns, trends, and shifts in judicial

thinking over time. This approach allows for a deeper understanding of the judiciary's role in shaping the balance between individual rights and state power (Hussain et al., 2023; Khan & Ximei, 2022).

Additionally, the research methodology includes a thematic analysis of key issues that emerge from the case law, such as the tension between national security and civil liberties, the influence of societal values on judicial interpretation, and the impact of political pressures on the protection of fundamental rights. This thematic analysis helps to identify the underlying factors that influence the judiciary's approach to balancing these competing interests and provides insights into the broader implications of these judicial decisions for Pakistan's constitutional order. The qualitative nature of this research also involves a critical analysis of the socio-political context in which legal interpretations have evolved. By examining the historical and contemporary challenges faced by Pakistan, such as periods of martial law, political instability, and the threat of terrorism, the study seeks to understand how these factors have shaped the judiciary's approach to fundamental rights and state authority. This contextual analysis is crucial for understanding the dynamic and evolving nature of Pakistan's constitutional jurisprudence. Overall, the qualitative research methodology adopted in this study provides a comprehensive and in-depth analysis of the balance between fundamental rights and state authority in Pakistan's constitutional framework. By focusing on the interpretation of legal texts and judicial decisions within their socio-political context, the study aims to contribute to the broader understanding of constitutional law and human rights in Pakistan (Khan et al., 2022).

Constitutional Framework of Fundamental Rights in Pakistan

The Constitution of Pakistan, 1973, stands as the foundational legal document that enshrines a comprehensive set of fundamental rights aimed at safeguarding individual liberties and ensuring justice for all citizens. These rights are primarily located in Part II, Chapter 1, Articles 8-28, which collectively outline the basic freedoms

and protections afforded to individuals within the state. Among these fundamental rights are the right to life and liberty, the freedom of speech and expression, the freedom of assembly and association, and the right to equality before the law. These rights are central to Pakistan's legal framework, reflecting the country's commitment to upholding human dignity and ensuring that all citizens are treated with fairness and respect. Article 8 of the Constitution plays a critical role by explicitly declaring that any law inconsistent with these fundamental rights shall be void. This provision establishes the supremacy of fundamental rights within the legal hierarchy, ensuring that no legislation or governmental action can override the core principles of individual freedom and justice (Gilani et al., 2021; Javed et al., 2021).

However, the Constitution also recognizes the necessity of balancing these rights with the state's obligation to maintain order, security, and the well-being of the nation as a whole. To this end, the Constitution provides for the suspension or limitation of fundamental rights under specific circumstances. Articles 232-237 detail the emergency provisions that grant the state significant authority to curtail fundamental rights during times of national crisis, such as war, internal disturbances, or threats to public order. These provisions enable the state to act decisively in protecting the country's sovereignty and security, even if it means temporarily restricting individual freedoms (Ahmed, 2021; KHAN et al., 2021).

The interplay between the constitutional provisions that guarantee fundamental rights and those that allow for their limitation has been a subject of extensive judicial interpretation in Pakistan. The judiciary, particularly the Supreme Court, has been tasked with the difficult role of interpreting these provisions in a way that balances the protection of individual rights with the state's need to respond effectively to emergencies and security threats. Over time, this balancing act has led to a complex body of jurisprudence that reflects the ongoing tension between preserving fundamental freedoms and ensuring the stability and security of the state.

Judicial Interpretation and the Role of the Supreme Court

The Supreme Court of Pakistan has played a crucial role in interpreting the balance between fundamental rights and state authority. Landmark decisions have demonstrated the Court's efforts to navigate this complex terrain, often expanding or contracting rights based on the contextual demands of specific cases (Rahman, 2006; USMAN et al., 2021).

One of the most significant cases in this regard is *Benazir Bhutto v. Federation of Pakistan* (1988), where the Supreme Court reaffirmed the importance of fundamental rights while recognizing the state's authority to impose reasonable restrictions in the interest of public order and national security. The Court held that any restriction on fundamental rights must meet the test of reasonableness and must not be arbitrary or excessive (Gledhill, 1965; Khan et al., 2020).

In *Shehla Zia v. WAPDA* (1994), the Supreme Court expanded the scope of Article 9, which guarantees the right to life and liberty, by including environmental protection within its ambit. This case illustrates how the Court has interpreted fundamental rights dynamically, adapting constitutional principles to contemporary challenges (Malik, 2018; Khan et al., 2020).

However, the judiciary's role in protecting fundamental rights has not always been consistent. In periods of martial law or emergency, the Supreme Court has sometimes upheld state actions that severely curtailed individual liberties. For instance, during General Zia-ul-Haq's regime, the Court in *Begum Nusrat Bhutto v. Chief of Army Staff* (1977) validated the imposition of martial law, effectively endorsing the suspension of fundamental rights in the name of state necessity (Hussain, 1985).

Balancing Act: National Security and Civil Liberties

The delicate balance between national security and civil liberties has been a persistent and challenging theme in Pakistan's constitutional jurisprudence. In a country frequently

confronted with internal and external security threats, the state's authority to limit fundamental rights is often justified by the imperative to protect national security and maintain public order. This tension has resulted in the enactment of legislation such as the Anti-Terrorism Act, 1997, which grants the state sweeping powers to detain individuals suspected of involvement in terrorism-related activities. Such laws are designed to equip the government with the necessary tools to respond swiftly and effectively to security threats, even if it means encroaching upon individual freedoms (Davis, 2003; Kanwel, S., KHAN et al., 2020).

The Supreme Court of Pakistan has generally upheld the constitutionality of these laws, acknowledging the paramount importance of national security in preserving the state's integrity and stability. The Court has recognized that, in certain circumstances, the state must exercise its authority to limit fundamental rights in order to safeguard the nation against significant threats. However, the judiciary has also been careful to ensure that such powers are not exercised arbitrarily or excessively. The Court has emphasized that any restriction on civil liberties, even in the name of national security, must be subject to strict procedural safeguards (Lopach & Luckowski, 2006).

A key case that illustrates the Supreme Court's approach to balancing national security with civil liberties is *Mehram Ali v. Federation of Pakistan* (1998). In this case, the Court upheld the validity of the Anti-Terrorism Act, but it also underscored the necessity of due process and fair trial guarantees, even in cases involving serious security concerns. The Court ruled that while the state has the right to impose limitations on fundamental rights to protect national security, these limitations must be implemented within the framework of the rule of law. This includes ensuring that individuals are afforded the basic procedural protections enshrined in the Constitution, such as the right to a fair hearing and the right to appeal. The decision in *Mehram Ali* reflects the judiciary's ongoing efforts to strike a balance between two competing imperatives: the need to protect individual rights and the necessity of allowing the state to fulfill

its security responsibilities. By insisting on procedural safeguards, the Supreme Court has sought to prevent the misuse of state power and to ensure that measures taken in the name of national security do not undermine the fundamental principles of justice and human rights. This balancing act remains a central concern in Pakistan's constitutional jurisprudence, particularly as the country continues to face evolving security challenges. The judiciary's role in this context is crucial, as it must continually navigate the complex interplay between upholding the rule of law and allowing the state the flexibility it needs to address threats to national security (Kennedy, 2004).

The Impact of Societal Values on Constitutional Jurisprudence

Pakistan's constitutional jurisprudence is deeply influenced by the interplay between fundamental rights and societal values, particularly those rooted in Islamic principles. The Constitution of Pakistan explicitly declares that all laws must conform to the injunctions of Islam as outlined in the Quran and Sunnah. This foundational requirement shapes the legal landscape in a way that intertwines religious considerations with the interpretation and application of fundamental rights, leading to a distinctive form of judicial reasoning that reflects the country's Islamic identity (Grimm, 2015).

One of the most prominent cases that exemplifies this dynamic is *Zaheeruddin v. State* (1993). In this case, the Supreme Court upheld restrictions on the religious practices of the Ahmadiyya community, a minority group in Pakistan, on the grounds that these practices were seen as infringing upon the sanctity of Islam. The Court reasoned that allowing the Ahmadiyya community to publicly express their beliefs in a manner that resembled Islamic practices would be misleading to the broader Muslim population and could potentially harm the integrity of Islamic values. The decision was based on the principle that the protection of Islam as the state religion warranted certain limitations on the freedom of religion and expression (Mayer, 1999).

The ruling in *Zaheeruddin v. State* illustrates the complexities and challenges involved in balancing fundamental rights with state authority, particularly in a society where religious values are deeply embedded in the legal and cultural framework. The decision sparked significant debate and criticism, especially from human rights advocates who argued that it represented a dangerous precedent where religious orthodoxy could be used to justify the curtailment of individual liberties. However, the Court's ruling also reflects a broader societal consensus at the time, where the protection of Islamic values was deemed paramount, even if it meant restricting the rights of certain minority groups. This case underscores the unique nature of Pakistan's constitutional jurisprudence, where societal values—particularly those derived from Islam—play a crucial role in shaping legal interpretations. The judiciary often finds itself in the difficult position of mediating between the protection of individual rights and the enforcement of societal norms rooted in religious doctrine. This mediation is further complicated by the fact that Pakistan's legal system operates within a framework that is both secular and religious, requiring the courts to navigate a complex terrain where the boundaries between state authority, fundamental rights, and societal values are constantly being redefined. As a result, Pakistan's constitutional jurisprudence is marked by a continuous negotiation between upholding universal human rights principles and accommodating the specific religious and cultural context of the country. This balancing act has significant implications for the development of the legal system, as it influences how fundamental rights are interpreted and the extent to which they can be limited in favor of societal values. The case of *Zaheeruddin v. State* remains a key example of how these tensions manifest in the judicial process, highlighting the ongoing challenges faced by the judiciary in maintaining a balance between individual liberties and the collective values of the society (Tamanaha, 2001).

Challenges and Future Directions

The evolving nature of Pakistan's constitutional

jurisprudence presents a myriad of challenges and opportunities as the judiciary strives to maintain a delicate balance between fundamental rights and state authority. As the legal and social landscape becomes increasingly complex, the judiciary is confronted with new issues that require innovative legal interpretations and adaptive judicial approaches. The emergence of cyber security concerns, digital privacy rights, and the regulation of social media platforms has introduced novel dimensions to the traditional debate surrounding civil liberties and state power. These issues, rooted in rapidly advancing technology, necessitate a rethinking of existing legal frameworks to ensure that individual rights are adequately protected in the digital age (Lombardi, 2013).

One of the significant challenges facing Pakistan's judiciary is the need to address these modern issues without compromising the foundational principles of justice and human rights. The regulation of social media, for example, raises questions about freedom of expression, privacy, and the state's authority to monitor and control digital spaces. As Pakistan continues to grapple with the implications of technology on civil liberties, the judiciary must find ways to interpret constitutional provisions that were drafted in a pre-digital era to apply to contemporary issues. This requires not only a deep understanding of technological

advancements but also a commitment to ensuring that legal interpretations align with the principles of fairness, justice, and human dignity (Nazir, 2008).

In addition to these technological challenges, the judiciary's role in safeguarding fundamental rights is continually tested by political pressures and the state's security concerns. In a country where political instability and security threats are recurrent, the judiciary often finds itself under pressure to prioritize national security over individual freedoms. The judiciary's ability to resist such pressures and uphold its constitutional mandate to protect civil liberties is crucial for maintaining the rule of law and ensuring that the state does not overreach in its exercise of power.

Moreover, the judiciary must navigate the complex relationship between state authority and societal values, particularly in a context where religious and cultural norms heavily influence legal interpretations. The challenge lies in ensuring that these societal values do not become a pretext for eroding fundamental rights, particularly for minority groups or those whose beliefs and practices diverge from the mainstream. As Pakistan continues to evolve, the judiciary must find ways to reconcile these societal values with the need to protect individual liberties, ensuring that all citizens enjoy the full benefits of the rights enshrined in the Constitution.

Challenges	Description
Cyber Security and Digital Privacy	The rise of cyber security concerns and digital privacy issues requires new legal interpretations of fundamental rights.
Regulation of Social Media	Balancing freedom of expression with the need for state control over social media platforms presents a significant legal challenge.
Technological Advancements	The judiciary must interpret constitutional provisions in light of new technologies, such as artificial intelligence, to protect civil liberties.
Political Pressures	The judiciary often faces pressure to prioritize national security over individual rights, which can threaten judicial independence.
Security Concerns	Ongoing national security threats challenge the judiciary's ability to protect civil liberties while ensuring state security.
Societal Values and Religious Influence	Balancing fundamental rights with societal values rooted in Islamic principles, especially in cases involving minority rights, remains a complex issue.
Judicial Capacity-Building	The need for training in modern legal issues like cyber law, digital rights, and artificial intelligence is critical for future jurisprudence.

Reconciliation of Rights and State Authority	The judiciary must continuously find ways to uphold individual liberties while allowing the state to perform its essential functions.
--	---

Table 01: Challenges (Nishtar et al., 2013)

Looking forward, the future direction of Pakistan’s constitutional jurisprudence will likely be shaped by the judiciary’s response to these emerging challenges. There is a growing need for judicial training and capacity-building initiatives that focus on contemporary legal issues, such as cyber law, human rights in the digital age, and the implications of artificial intelligence on civil liberties. By equipping judges with the knowledge and skills to handle

these complex issues, the judiciary can better navigate the evolving legal landscape and provide more informed and balanced rulings. The judiciary’s ongoing challenge is to uphold the constitutional mandate to protect individual liberties while allowing the state to perform its essential functions. This balancing act requires a nuanced understanding of the interplay between fundamental rights, state authority, and societal values, as well as a willingness to adapt to the changing legal and social environment.

Future Directions	Description
Judicial Adaptation to Technological Advances	The judiciary needs to develop frameworks that address emerging issues like cyber law, digital privacy, and artificial intelligence, ensuring these technologies do not infringe on fundamental rights.
Enhanced Judicial Training	Investing in capacity-building initiatives for judges, focusing on contemporary legal challenges, will enable the judiciary to make informed decisions in a rapidly changing legal landscape.
Balancing Security with Civil Liberties	The judiciary must continue to refine its approach to balancing national security concerns with the protection of individual rights, resisting political pressures that may compromise justice.
Evolving Interpretations of Constitutional Provisions	As societal values and technologies evolve, the judiciary will need to reinterpret constitutional provisions to ensure they remain relevant and protective of individual freedoms.
Strengthening the Rule of Law	Future jurisprudence should focus on reinforcing the rule of law, ensuring that all state actions are subject to legal constraints and that judicial decisions are respected and implemented.
Promoting Human Rights in the Digital Age	The judiciary should emphasize the protection of human rights in the context of digital transformation, addressing challenges related to online expression, privacy, and data protection.
Judicial Independence	Maintaining and strengthening judicial independence is crucial for the judiciary to function effectively as a guardian of constitutional rights against state overreach.
Inclusive Jurisprudence	The judiciary should strive to create jurisprudence that accommodates diverse societal values while protecting the rights of minority groups and ensuring equal justice for all citizens.

Table 02: Future Directions (Nishtar et al., 2013)

As Pakistan moves forward, the judiciary's ability to meet these challenges will be crucial in shaping the future of the country’s constitutional jurisprudence and ensuring that the rights and

freedoms of all citizens are respected and protected.

Conclusion

The study of Pakistan’s constitutional jurisprudence reveals a complex and evolving

interplay between fundamental rights and state authority. The Constitution of Pakistan, 1973, provides a robust framework for the protection of individual liberties, enshrining key rights such as life, liberty, freedom of expression, and equality before the law. However, the Constitution also recognizes the necessity of limiting these rights under certain circumstances, particularly in the interests of national security and public order. Through landmark cases and judicial interpretations, the Supreme Court of Pakistan has played a critical role in navigating this delicate balance. The Court has both expanded and curtailed individual rights, depending on the context, reflecting the dynamic nature of constitutional law in a society deeply influenced by religious, cultural, and societal values. The balancing act between protecting civil liberties and ensuring national security has been a recurring theme in Pakistan's legal history, with the judiciary often mediating between the demands of the state and the rights of individuals. As Pakistan faces new challenges, particularly those posed by technological advancements and the digital age, the judiciary's role will become even more crucial. The need for innovative legal interpretations and a deeper understanding of emerging issues will be paramount in shaping future constitutional jurisprudence. The ongoing development of this legal landscape will likely continue to reflect the tension between safeguarding fundamental rights and empowering the state to fulfill its responsibilities, offering valuable lessons for both domestic and international legal scholars and practitioners.

References

- Ahmed, N. (2021). A critical analysis of fundamental rights under the constitution of Pakistan, 1973. *J. Pol. Stud.*, 28, 11.
- Davis, R. N. (2003). Striking the Balance: National Security vs. Civil Liberties. *Brook. J. Int'l L.*, 29, 175.
- Faisal, S. M., Usman, M., & Khan, A. (2023). Unraveling the Constitutional Quandry: The Status of FATA Pre-Merger in the 1973 Constitution. *Pakistan JL Analysis & Wisdom*, 2, 591.
- Gilani, S. R. S., Rehman, H. U., & Khan, I. (2021). The Conceptual Analysis of the Doctrine of Proportionality and, its Role in Democratic Constitutionalism; A Case Study of UK. *sjesr*, 4(1), 204-210.
- Gledhill, A. (1965). Fundamental rights in Pakistan. *Journal of the Indian Law Institute*, 7(1/2), 70-81.
- Grimm, D. (2015). The role of fundamental rights after sixty-five years of constitutional jurisprudence in Germany. *International Journal of Constitutional Law*, 13(1), 9-29.
- Hussain, F. (1985). Review on the Supreme Court Judgment in Begum Nusrat Bhutto v. Chief of Army Staff etc. PLD (1977) SC 657. *JL & Soc'y*, 4, 65.
- Hussain, N., Khan, A., & Chandio, L. A. (2023). Legal Safeguards against Mob Justice: An Analysis of Blasphemy Laws in Pakistan and International Human Rights Norms.
- Javed, K., Jianxin, L., & Khan, A. (2021). Constitutional exceptions of right to speech: Evidence from the apex courts of Pakistan. *Journal of Humanities, Social and Management Sciences (JHSMS)*, 2(1), 72-84.
- Kanwel, S., KHAN, M. I., Usman, M., & Khan, A. (2020). Navigating Constitutional Challenges: An In-depth Exploration of Pakistan's Constitutional Landscape. *International Review of Social Sciences (IRSS)*, 8(11), 273-279.
- Kennedy, C. H. (2004). The creation and development of Pakistan's anti-terrorism regime, 1997-2002'. *Religious radicalism and security in South Asia*, 387-411.
- Khan, A. S. I. F., Amjad, S. O. H. A. I. L., & Usman, M. U. H. A. M. M. A. D. (2020). The Evolution of Human Rights Law in the Age of Globalization. *Pakistan journal of law, analysis and wisdom*.
- Khan, A., & Jiliani, M. A. H. S. (2023). Expanding The Boundaries Of

- Jurisprudence In The Era Of Technological Advancements. *IJUMIJ*, 31, 393.
- Khan, A., & Ximei, W. (2022). Digital economy and environmental sustainability: Do Information Communication and Technology (ICT) and economic complexity matter?. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 19(19), 12301.
- Khan, A., Iqbal, N., & Ahmad, I. (2022). Human Trafficking in Pakistan: A Qualitative Analysis. *Journal of Social Sciences Review*, 2(3), 257-268.
- Khan, A., Usman, M., & Amjad, S. (2020). Enforcing Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights: A Global Imperative. *International Review of Social Sciences (IRSS)*, 8(09).
- KHAN, A., USMAN, M., & RIAZ, N. (2021). The Intersectionality of Human Rights: Addressing Multiple Discrimination. *Asian Social Studies and Applied Research (ASSAR)*, 2(03), 498-502.
- Khan, S. H., & Zubair, M. (2023). Constitutionalism And Judicial Activism: Transforming Authority In Pakistan. *Russian Law Journal*, 11(4), 659-677.
- Lin, S., & Song, Y. (2024). Upholding Human Rights in Mega Sports: A Study of Governance Practices within the IOC and FIFA through the Lens of the Ruggie Principle. *Heliyon*.
- Lombardi, C. B. (2013). Designing Islamic constitutions: Past trends and options for a democratic future. *International journal of constitutional law*, 11(3), 615-645.
- Lopach, J. J., & Luckowski, J. A. (2006). National security and civil liberty: Striking the balance. *The Social Studies*, 97(6), 245-248.
- Malik, A. U. (2018). Fundamental Rights as Basic Structure of Constitution: Judicial Restraint of Pre-Achakzai Case. *Journal of Pakistan Vision*, 19(1).
- Mayer, A. E. (1999). Protection for Religious Freedom: The Grim Legacy of Zaheeruddin v. State. In *Democracy: the Rule of Law and Islam* (pp. 545-567). Brill.
- Munir, B. A. K. H. T. (2018). CONSTITUTIONALISM AND THE DILEMMA OF JUDICIAL AUTONOMY IN PAKISTAN: A CRITICAL ANALYSIS. *CONSTITUTIONALISM AND THE DILEMMA OF JUDICIAL AUTONOMY IN PAKISTAN: A CRITICAL ANALYSIS*.
- Nazir, M. (2008). The problems and issues of federalism in Pakistan. *Journal of Pakistan Vision*, 9(1), 109-128.
- Nelson, M. J. (2018). Indian basic structure jurisprudence in the Islamic Republic of Pakistan: Reconfiguring the constitutional politics of religion. *Asian Journal of Comparative Law*, 13(2), 333-357.
- Nishtar, S., Boerma, T., Amjad, S., Alam, A. Y., Khalid, F., ul Haq, I., & Mirza, Y. A. (2013). Pakistan's health system: performance and prospects after the 18th Constitutional Amendment. *The Lancet*, 381(9884), 2193-2206.
- Rahman, M. M. (2006). Right to Life as a Fundamental Right in the Constitutional Framework of India, Bangladesh and Pakistan: An Appraisal. *Dhaka Univ. Stud. Part F*, 17, 143.
- Ranjah, Z. U. (2023). *Separation of State Powers in Pakistan*. Pakistan Law House.
- Tamanaha, B. Z. (2001). *A general jurisprudence of law and society*. Oxford University Press, USA.
- USMAN, M., KANWEL, S., KHAN, M. I., & Khan, A. (2021). Advancing Gender Equality within the Legal Framework of Pakistan: Navigating Progress and Overcoming Persistent Challenges. *International Review of Social Sciences (IRSS)*, 9(5), 310-316.