



## Administrative Discretion and Judicial Review in Pakistan: A Study of Evolving Standards of Reasonableness

Muhammad Atif Khokhar<sup>1\*</sup>

### ABSTRACT

Administrative discretion is essential for effective governance, allowing state authorities to respond flexibly to complex social needs. In Pakistan, however, such discretion has often prompted concerns regarding arbitrariness, political influence, and threats to fundamental rights. This study examines how judicial review functions as a safeguard against misuse of discretionary powers, with particular focus on the evolving standards of reasonableness applied by superior courts. Using a doctrinal method, it analyses constitutional provisions, statutory schemes, and key judgments, alongside comparative perspectives from the United Kingdom and India. Findings show a shift in Pakistani jurisprudence from the narrow *Wednesbury* test toward broader doctrines of fairness, proportionality, and substantive reasonableness. Although judicial activism, especially under Article 184(3), strengthened accountability, it also blurred the line between judicial and executive authority. The study concludes that while courts have refined their review standards, Pakistan still lacks a consistent doctrinal framework. Clearer judicial tests and legislative guidance are needed to balance administrative flexibility with constitutional accountability.

**Keywords:** Constitutional accountability, Proportionality doctrine, Separation of powers, Fundamental rights protection, public interest litigation, Rule of law, Arbitrary state action, Judicial activism, Constitutional morality.

© 2025 The Authors, Published by **(SJLS)**. This is an Open Access Article under the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial 4.0

### INTRODUCTION

The exercise of discretionary authority is a central feature of administrative governance in contemporary states. Legislatures frequently delegate broad powers to administrative agencies, recognizing their expertise and need for flexibility in implementing policy. Yet, such discretion, if left unchecked, carries the risk of arbitrariness, political favouritism, and infringement upon individual rights. In Pakistan, where governance has been shaped by a colonial legacy, military interventions, and fragile democratic institutions, administrative discretion has often been contested for its legitimacy and accountability. The judiciary, through the mechanism of judicial review, has emerged as the primary institution to regulate and guide the use of such powers. The

<sup>1</sup> Advocate Supreme Court of Pakistan. [m.atif\\_iui@hotmail.com](mailto:m.atif_iui@hotmail.com) (corresponding)

purpose of this study is to analyse how Pakistani courts have developed standards to review administrative discretion, with particular emphasis on the doctrine of reasonableness. It seeks to explore whether these evolving standards—from the traditional *Wednesbury* unreasonableness test to the more robust proportionality analysis—adequately safeguard constitutional rights while respecting executive autonomy. The central hypothesis of this research is that although Pakistani jurisprudence has progressively incorporated substantive standards of fairness and proportionality, the absence of a consistent doctrinal framework undermines predictability and balance in judicial review (Khan & Ximei, 2022; Sultan & Azeem, 2023).

The guiding research questions are: How have Pakistani courts defined and applied the standard of reasonableness in reviewing administrative discretion? To what extent has judicial activism contributed to shaping these standards? And what lessons can be drawn from comparative jurisdictions to strengthen Pakistan's framework of review? Methodologically, this article employs a doctrinal approach, analysing constitutional provisions, statutes, and case law, supplemented by comparative insights from common law jurisdictions. The expected outcome is to demonstrate the gradual but uneven evolution of judicial review in Pakistan, highlighting the need for clearer standards that balance governance efficiency with constitutional accountability. The article is structured as follows: Part I traces the historical background of administrative discretion in Pakistan. Part II outlines the conceptual foundations of judicial review. Part III examines the evolution of the reasonableness standard through key case law. Part IV offers comparative perspectives, while Part V highlights challenges and critiques. The article concludes with recommendations for developing a principled and consistent framework of judicial review in Pakistan (Khan, et al., 2021; Munir et al., 2020).

## CONCEPTUAL AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The conceptual and theoretical framework of this study draws on administrative law principles that regulate the exercise of discretionary authority, focusing on the interaction between executive power and judicial oversight. It is grounded in classical theories of the rule of law, which require that all state action be justified, non-arbitrary, and accountable, as well as contemporary public-law theories that emphasize good governance, procedural fairness, and proportionality. The framework incorporates *Wednesbury* unreasonableness, proportionality analysis, and substantive reasonableness as key theoretical lenses to assess the legitimacy of administrative decisions. It also situates Pakistani jurisprudence within comparative models from the United Kingdom and India, where courts have progressively expanded review standards to ensure transparency and rights-based decision-making. By synthesizing these normative and doctrinal foundations, the framework provides a basis to evaluate how judicial review in Pakistan constrains administrative discretion, promotes constitutional values, and maintains an appropriate balance between executive flexibility and judicial accountability.

## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study focusing on a qualitative analysis of primary and secondary legal sources to examine the evolution of judicial review over administrative discretion in Pakistan. Primary sources include the Constitution of Pakistan, relevant statutes, and landmark Supreme Court and

High Court judgments, which were selected to trace the development of standards such as *Wednesbury* unreasonableness, proportionality, and substantive reasonableness. Secondary sources, including academic commentary, law journals, and comparative studies from the United Kingdom and India, were used to contextualize and critically assess the legal principles and judicial reasoning. The rationale for this approach lies in its ability to systematically identify, process, and analyse authoritative legal materials, enabling a comprehensive understanding of how courts balance executive discretion with constitutional accountability. Comparative analysis was applied selectively to highlight lessons and best practices from other jurisdictions that may inform the development of a consistent doctrinal framework in Pakistan.

## **HISTORICAL CONTEXT OF ADMINISTRATIVE DISCRETION IN PAKISTAN**

Pakistan's administrative framework is deeply rooted in its colonial heritage. The British colonial state, governed under statutes such as the Government of India Act, 1935, relied heavily on administrative discretion to maintain control over a vast and diverse population. Discretion was vested in the bureaucracy, particularly in the civil service and provincial administrators, who wielded wide-ranging powers in matters of law and order, land revenue, and regulatory functions. This colonial legacy was carried forward into the constitutional and administrative structure of Pakistan after independence in 1947. In the early years of statehood, Pakistan faced severe political instability, with frequent dismissals of governments and the imposition of martial law. These circumstances reinforced a governance model in which discretion was concentrated in the executive and the bureaucracy. The superior judiciary, influenced by doctrines of necessity and deference, often refrained from robustly scrutinizing discretionary powers. Cases such as *Maulvi Tamizuddin Khan v. Federation of Pakistan* (PLD 1955 FC 240) and *State v. Dosso* (PLD 1958 SC 533) illustrate the judiciary's initial reluctance to question executive authority, thereby legitimizing broad administrative discretion. With the promulgation of successive constitutions (1956, 1962, and 1973), the legal basis of administrative discretion was reshaped. The 1973 Constitution, in particular, established fundamental rights as justiciable guarantees and empowered the superior judiciary under Articles 184(3) and 199 to review state action. This constitutional framework created the foundation for testing the validity of discretionary powers against principles of legality, equality, and due process (Hussain, et al., 2023; Munir, 2021).

Over time, particularly from the 1980s onwards, Pakistani courts began to gradually assert a more active role in curbing arbitrary discretion. Landmark cases such as *Benazir Bhutto v. Federation of Pakistan* (PLD 1988 SC 416) signaled a judicial turn toward enforcing reasonableness and fairness in executive action. The rise of public interest litigation in the 1990s and 2000s, coupled with an expansive interpretation of fundamental rights, further strengthened judicial oversight of discretionary powers. Thus, the historical trajectory of administrative discretion in Pakistan reveals a shift from colonial-style executive dominance and judicial restraint toward a more rights-oriented approach, where judicial review functions as a vital mechanism to uphold constitutional supremacy and the rule of law. Yet, the legacy of wide executive discretion and inconsistent judicial standards continues to shape contemporary debates on reasonableness and accountability. Following independence in 1947, Pakistan inherited a colonial bureaucratic structure heavily reliant on administrative discretion. The superior judiciary initially adopted a

deferential stance, particularly under martial law regimes, where executive dominance curtailed robust judicial scrutiny. However, over time, the courts began to articulate principles to review discretionary powers. The tension between executive convenience and judicial oversight has remained central to Pakistan's administrative law discourse (Khan, et al., 2022; Khan, 2021).

## **JUDICIAL REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATIVE DISCRETION: CONCEPTUAL FOUNDATIONS**

Judicial review of discretion is rooted in constitutional provisions ensuring the right to equality (Article 25), due process (Articles 4 and 10A), and the supremacy of the Constitution (Article 5). The superior courts exercise judicial review under Articles 184(3), 199, and 187 of the Constitution. The guiding principles of review include:

### ***Constitutional Basis***

The exercise of administrative discretion in Pakistan is guided and constrained by the Constitution, which provides the legal framework for judicial oversight. The Constitution of 1973 ensures that discretionary powers are exercised within the boundaries of law, fairness, and reasonableness, and designates the judiciary as the guardian of fundamental rights and the rule of law. Article 199 empowers the High Courts to issue writs such as mandamus, prohibition, certiorari, and quo warranto to enforce fundamental rights or correct unlawful administrative actions. This mechanism enables individuals to challenge decisions that exceed statutory authority or violate legal standards, ensuring that discretionary powers are not applied arbitrarily. Under Article 184(3), the Supreme Court is granted original jurisdiction in matters of public importance concerning the enforcement of fundamental rights. Through this provision, the Court can actively review discretionary actions with wide-ranging implications for governance and civil liberties, particularly through Public Interest Litigation. This has strengthened judicial oversight over administrative powers while promoting accountability and transparency. In addition to these procedural provisions, Articles 4, 5, 9, and 25 provide substantive safeguards. Article 4 guarantees the right to seek redress against illegal actions, Article 5 emphasizes loyalty to the Constitution and the supremacy of law, Article 9 protects the right to life and personal liberty, and Article 25 ensures equality before the law. Together, these provisions limit arbitrary discretion and provide the constitutional foundation for reviewing administrative decisions through standards of legality, fairness, and reasonableness (Khan, et al., 2022; Baig et al., 2023).

### ***Balancing Discretion and Accountability***

Administrative discretion is essential for effective governance, allowing executive authorities to make context-sensitive decisions and respond flexibly to complex social, economic, and political challenges. Such discretion enables bureaucrats and officials to apply specialized expertise and exercise judgment in situations where rigid rules may be inadequate. In Pakistan, where administrative machinery often faces rapidly changing circumstances and political pressures, the latitude to make discretionary decisions is particularly important for policy implementation and public service delivery. However, unchecked discretion carries significant risks, including arbitrariness, favoritism, and potential violations of fundamental rights. Excessive or unregulated exercise of power can undermine public confidence in governance and erode the

rule of law. Judicial review serves as the critical counterbalance, ensuring that discretionary authority is exercised within constitutional and legal boundaries. Courts assess whether decisions are lawful, rational, and procedurally fair, thereby preventing abuse while allowing administrative authorities sufficient flexibility. The challenge lies in achieving a principled equilibrium between efficiency and accountability. Discretion must be guided by clear statutory objectives, evidence-based reasoning, and constitutional morality. Judicial scrutiny—through standards such as reasonableness, proportionality, and fairness ensures that decisions are not only legally valid but also socially justifiable. In Pakistan, this balance has been central to the evolution of administrative law, as courts navigate the tension between respecting executive expertise and upholding the rights of citizens. By articulating and applying standards of review, Pakistani courts aim to strike this delicate balance, fostering a governance model that is both efficient and accountable, where discretion serves public interest without compromising constitutional principles. Judicial review functions as the primary mechanism to ensure that administrative discretion is exercised within the bounds of law, reason, and fairness. In Pakistan, courts rely on several foundational principles to evaluate whether discretionary powers have been applied appropriately. These principles illegality, unreasonableness, and procedural impropriety—form the doctrinal basis for judicial scrutiny (Khan, et al., 2023; Sheikh et al., 2024).

Illegality occurs when an administrative authority acts beyond the scope of powers granted by law or Constitution. Courts intervene when decisions are *ultra vires*, meaning they exceed statutory authority or contravene constitutional provisions. For example, if a regulatory body enacts policies not authorized by legislation, such action can be struck down as illegal. This principle ensures that discretion is exercised within the legal framework intended by the legislature, preventing executive overreach. Unreasonableness, often referred to as irrationality, evaluates whether a decision is so illogical or arbitrary that no reasonable authority could have made it. Initially, Pakistani courts applied the *Wednesbury* unreasonableness standard, inherited from English administrative law, which focused on decisions that were outrageously unreasonable. Over time, this standard has evolved toward broader assessments of proportionality and substantive reasonableness, especially in cases involving fundamental rights. Procedural impropriety ensures that discretionary actions comply with principles of natural justice, fairness, and due process. Courts examine whether affected parties were given adequate notice, an opportunity to be heard, and a fair procedure before a decision was made. Failure to observe these procedural safeguards renders a decision invalid, even if the substantive outcome appears reasonable. Together, these principles provide a coherent framework for judicial review in Pakistan. They allow courts to balance respect for administrative expertise with the necessity of protecting citizens' rights and upholding constitutional norms. By applying these standards, the judiciary ensures that discretion is exercised lawfully, rationally, and fairly, reinforcing the rule of law and accountability in public administration (Abdelrehim, et al., 2021; Naqvi et al., 2023).

## **EVOLUTION OF REASONABLENESS IN PAKISTANI JURISPRUDENCE**

### ***Wednesbury Unreasonableness***

The concept of *Wednesbury* unreasonableness originates from English administrative law, specifically the case *Associated Provincial Picture Houses v. Wednesbury Corporation* (1948), and

has had a significant influence on Pakistani jurisprudence. Under this doctrine, a discretionary decision is considered unreasonable only if it is so irrational or perverse that no reasonable authority could have made it. The standard is intentionally narrow, emphasizing judicial restraint and deference to administrative expertise. In Pakistan, the courts initially adopted the *Wednesbury* principle to review executive and administrative actions, particularly in the early decades following independence. Decisions were overturned only in cases of extreme arbitrariness or flagrant abuse of discretion. For instance, in *Federation of Pakistan v. Saeed Ahmed Khan* (PLD 1974 SC 229), the Supreme Court demonstrated judicial restraint, intervening only where the administrative decision was clearly outside the realm of reason. While *Wednesbury* unreasonableness provides a framework for limiting arbitrary decisions, its narrowness has been criticized for allowing many unjust or irrational administrative actions to stand. Pakistani courts gradually recognized the need for a more substantive approach that incorporates fairness, proportionality, and the protection of fundamental rights. This evolution laid the groundwork for the development of a broader standard of reasonableness, enabling courts to scrutinize not just procedural compliance but also the substantive rationality of discretionary actions. Thus, *Wednesbury* unreasonableness represents the foundational stage of judicial review in Pakistan, marking the judiciary's cautious entry into supervising administrative discretion, and setting the stage for more robust, rights-oriented standards in subsequent jurisprudence. Derived from English law (*Associated Provincial Picture Houses v. Wednesbury Corporation*), this standard was adopted in early Pakistani jurisprudence. Courts intervened only when decisions were outrageous in defiance of logic. For instance, in *Federation of Pakistan v. Saeed Ahmed Khan* (1974), the Supreme Court restrained itself to a narrow review of discretion (Khan, et al., 2020; McHarg, 2017).

### ***Proportionality and Substantive Review***

As Pakistani jurisprudence evolved, courts recognized the limitations of the narrow *Wednesbury* standard and increasingly adopted a more nuanced approach to reviewing administrative discretion. This approach emphasizes proportionality and substantive reasonableness, focusing not only on the legality of a decision but also on its fairness, rationality, and alignment with constitutional principles. Proportionality requires that administrative action must be appropriate, necessary, and balanced in relation to the objective it seeks to achieve. A decision is disproportionate if it imposes excessive burdens, violates fundamental rights, or fails to adequately consider less restrictive alternatives. This doctrine enables courts to move beyond formalistic review, scrutinizing whether the administrative exercise of discretion aligns with constitutional morality and public interest. Pakistan, landmark cases illustrate this shift. In *Benazir Bhutto v. Federation of Pakistan* (PLD 1988 SC 416), the Supreme Court emphasized fairness and reasonableness as constitutional imperatives, asserting that discretionary powers must not undermine fundamental rights or democratic principles. Similarly, *Ms. Shehla Zia v. WAPDA* (PLD 1994 SC 693) expanded substantive review by linking environmental protection to the right to life, demonstrating that discretionary decisions could be assessed for their broader social and constitutional impact. Substantive review thus represents a more rigorous standard than *Wednesbury* unreasonableness. It allows courts to examine both the process and the substance of administrative decisions, ensuring that discretion is exercised rationally, proportionately, and in

accordance with constitutional guarantees. While this approach strengthens accountability, it also requires careful balancing to avoid judicial overreach into policy matters traditionally reserved for the executive. Overall, the adoption of proportionality and substantive review in Pakistan reflects a maturation of judicial standards, enabling courts to protect rights and uphold constitutional values while maintaining respect for administrative expertise. With the constitutionalization of fundamental rights, courts increasingly employed proportionality. In *Benazir Bhutto v. Federation of Pakistan* (1988), the Supreme Court emphasized fairness and reasonableness as constitutional mandates. Later, *Ms. Shehla Zia v. WAPDA* (1994) expanded judicial review by interpreting the right to life under Article 9 to include environmental protection, reflecting substantive reasonableness (Khan, et al., 2020; Malik, 2023).

### ***Judicial Activism and Public Interest Litigation***

Judicial activism in Pakistan represents a significant shift in the role of the judiciary from passive adjudicator to proactive guardian of constitutional rights. Particularly since the 1980s and 1990s, courts have increasingly embraced the responsibility to review discretionary administrative actions to ensure accountability, transparency, and protection of fundamental rights. This proactive approach is closely linked with the expansion of Public Interest Litigation PIL, which allows courts to entertain cases on behalf of aggrieved parties or the public at large, even when the litigants themselves are not directly affected. The Supreme Court's original jurisdiction under Article 184(3) has been pivotal in facilitating judicial activism. Through PIL, the Court has addressed a wide range of issues involving administrative discretion, from environmental protection and labor rights to corruption and electoral fairness. In cases such as *Mubashir Hassan v. Federation of Pakistan* (PLD 2010 SC 497), the Court intervened in matters of national significance, scrutinizing executive decisions that had substantial political and social consequences. These interventions reflect a willingness to enforce standards of reasonableness and proportionality beyond conventional legal boundaries. While judicial activism enhances accountability and protects public interest, it has also drawn criticism for potentially encroaching on executive authority and policy-making. Critics argue that excessive judicial interference risks undermining the separation of powers and may lead to unpredictability in administrative governance. Nonetheless, judicial activism, combined with PIL, has played a transformative role in shaping the application of discretionary powers, ensuring that administrative decisions are not only legal but also just, fair, and consistent with constitutional values. In sum, judicial activism and PIL have expanded the scope of judicial review in Pakistan, embedding substantive standards of reasonableness and proportionality into the evaluation of administrative discretion, and reinforcing the judiciary's role as a constitutional watchdog (Kahn & Wu, 2020; Cheema, 2018).

### **COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVES**

Examining judicial review of administrative discretion in other jurisdictions provides important insights into the evolution of reasonableness standards and helps contextualize Pakistan's approach. Comparative analysis demonstrates how courts balance executive flexibility with the protection of rights and constitutional principles. In the United Kingdom, judicial review historically relied on the narrow *Wednesbury* unreasonableness standard, intervening only where decisions were outrageously unreasonable. However, the incorporation of the European

Convention on Human Rights through the Human Rights Act 1998 has led UK courts to increasingly adopt proportionality as a refined standard, especially in cases involving fundamental rights. Proportionality allows courts to evaluate whether governmental measures are suitable, necessary, and balanced, rather than simply assessing whether they fall within broad bounds of reasonableness. Indian jurisprudence provides a more expansive approach under Article 14 of the Indian Constitution, which guarantees equality before the law. Indian courts have developed the doctrine of “manifest arbitrariness,” enabling substantive review of discretionary decisions that violate fairness, reason, and equality. Landmark judgments, such as *Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India* (1978), demonstrate a rights-oriented approach where both procedural and substantive reasonableness are considered essential to constitutional compliance. Pakistan’s judicial review framework has been influenced by both UK and Indian doctrines. Initially adopting the *Wednesbury* standard, Pakistani courts have gradually incorporated proportionality, substantive reasonableness, and constitutional morality. Unlike the UK, Pakistani courts often exercise review in rights-based and public interest contexts, frequently through PIL under Article 184(3). Compared to India, courts are similarly active in curbing arbitrariness but face unique challenges due to political instability, executive dominance, and inconsistent application of standards. Comparative analysis underscores that rights-oriented jurisdictions favor substantive review and proportionality over narrow unreasonableness tests. For Pakistan, these examples suggest the potential to develop a more consistent doctrinal framework that balances executive discretion with robust protection of fundamental rights, guided by clear legal standards and respect for the separation of powers (Usman, et al., 2021; Gul & Ahmad, 2025).

## **CHALLENGES IN JUDICIAL REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATIVE DISCRETION IN PAKISTAN**

Judicial review of administrative discretion in Pakistan faces several interrelated challenges that affect the consistency, effectiveness, and legitimacy of the judiciary’s oversight role. One major challenge is institutional overreach. While judicial intervention is essential to prevent arbitrary action, excessive activism can blur the separation of powers, allowing courts to encroach on policy-making and administrative expertise. This tension often generates criticism that the judiciary is overstepping its constitutional mandate. Another significant challenge is the lack of doctrinal consistency. Pakistani courts have oscillated between narrow *Wednesbury* unreasonableness, proportionality, and *ad hoc* standards depending on the context, resulting in unpredictability for administrators and litigants alike. This inconsistency makes it difficult for authorities to clearly understand the limits of their discretionary powers, potentially undermining both efficiency and accountability. A third challenge lies in weak legislative oversight and over-delegation. Legislatures frequently grant broad discretionary powers without providing sufficient statutory guidelines, leaving the courts with the burden of policing these powers. The absence of well-defined criteria complicates judicial assessment and contributes to inconsistent application of reasonableness standards. Finally, political pressures and the volatile nature of governance in Pakistan often influence judicial review. High-profile cases involving executive decisions or politically sensitive issues can expose courts to external pressures, affecting impartiality and public perception of the judiciary. These challenges underscore the need for a more coherent framework that balances administrative efficiency with judicial accountability. Clear statutory guidelines,



consistent doctrinal standards, and principled application of proportionality and reasonableness can strengthen the effectiveness of judicial review while preserving the separation of powers and protecting fundamental rights (Khan, 2024; Gul et al., 2025).

## CONCLUSION

The analysis of administrative discretion and judicial review in Pakistan reveals a dynamic yet uneven evolution of legal standards. From the initial reliance on the narrow *Wednesbury* unreasonableness to the adoption of proportionality and substantive reasonableness, Pakistani courts have progressively sought to ensure that discretionary powers are exercised within constitutional and legal boundaries. Judicial activism and Public Interest Litigation have further expanded the scope of review, embedding accountability, fairness, and protection of fundamental rights into administrative governance. Despite these advances, several challenges persist. The judiciary continues to grapple with inconsistent doctrinal application, political pressures, and the over-delegation of discretionary powers by legislatures. These factors hinder predictability, weaken the rule of law, and create tension between judicial oversight and executive autonomy. Addressing these challenges is essential for strengthening governance and ensuring citizens' rights are adequately protected. Future reforms should focus on codifying clear standards for reasonableness and proportionality, providing statutory guidance for discretionary powers, and promoting judicial training in balancing executive flexibility with constitutional safeguards. Comparative insights from jurisdictions such as the UK and India suggest that embedding structured frameworks for review can enhance consistency, legitimacy, and public trust.

Further research could explore the integration of international administrative law principles, empirical studies on the impact of judicial review on administrative efficiency, and the role of emerging technologies in shaping administrative decision-making. By emphasizing both accountability and efficiency, Pakistan can develop a judicial review framework that safeguards constitutional values while respecting the practical realities of governance, ensuring that administrative discretion serves public interest in a just and lawful manner. The trajectory of judicial review in Pakistan demonstrates a gradual evolution from deferential *Wednesbury* unreasonableness to more substantive standards of fairness and proportionality. However, the absence of a settled doctrinal framework continues to create uncertainty in administrative law. For a balanced system, Pakistani courts must articulate clearer tests for reasonableness, emphasizing proportionality and evidence-based decision-making. Simultaneously, legislatures should impose statutory guidelines on discretion, reducing the burden on courts. Future research should explore the integration of international administrative law principles and comparative constitutional jurisprudence to enrich Pakistan's evolving standards of reasonableness.

## REFERENCES

- Abdelrehim Hammad, A. A., Khan, A., & Soomro, N. E. (2021). Digital Economy Barriers to Trade Regulation Status, Challenges, and China's Response. *International Journal of Social Sciences Perspectives*, 8(2), 41-49.
- Baig, K., Hashmi, M. A. I., Akhtar, S. T., & Ahmed, N. (2023). Analysis of Judicial Review: The Role of Higher Courts in Assessing Legislative and Executive Actions in the Context of Pakistan. *Bulletin of Business and Economics (BBE)*, 12(3), 888-894.
- Cheema, M. H. (2018). Two steps forward one step back: The non-linear expansion of judicial power in Pakistan. *International journal of constitutional law*, 16(2), 503-526.
- Gul, S., & Ahmad, R. (2025). Consent and Coercion: Examining Contractual Autonomy in Islamic Jurisprudence and Anglo-American Law. *Pakistan Journal Of Law, Analysis And Wisdom*, 4(5), 01-11.
- Gul, S., Ahmad, R., & Rahman, S. U. (2025). The Myth of Neutrality: Judicial Review, Ideology, and Constitutional Interpretation in Pakistan and the United Kingdom. *The Critical Review of Social Sciences Studies*, 3(2), 1742-1754.
- 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.
- Kahn, A., & Wu, X. (2020). Impact of digital economy on intellectual property law. *J. Pol. & L.*, 13, 117.
- Khan, A. (2024). The intersection of artificial intelligence and international trade laws: Challenges and opportunities. *IIUMLJ*, 32, 103.
- Khan, A., & Jiliani, M. A. H. S. (2023). Expanding The Boundaries Of Jurisprudence In The Era Of Technological Advancements. *IIUMLJ*, 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., Amjad, S., & Usman, M. (2020). The Role of Customary International Law in Contemporary International Relations. *International Review of Social Sciences*, 8(08), 259-265.
- Khan, A., Bhatti, S. H., & Shah, A. (2021). An overview on individual criminal liability for crime of aggression. *Liberal Arts and Social Sciences International Journal (LASSIJ)*, 5(1), 432-442.
- 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., Javed, K., Khan, A. S., & Rizwi, A. (2022). Aggression and individual criminal responsibility in the perspective of Islamic law.
- 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, F. A. (2021). The Law of Public Administration and Discretionary Powers: A Critically Appraisal to the Judicial Review. *Issue 4 Int'l JL Mgmt. & Human.*, 4, 928
- Malik, A. A. (2023). Judicial Review and the Rule of Law in Pakistan. *Asian Journal of Comparative Law*, 18(3), 291-302.
- McHarg, A. (2017). Administrative discretion, administrative rule-making, and judicial review. *Current legal problems*, 70(1), 267-303.

- Munir, B. (2021). Controls over Administrative Discretion: A case Law Study in the context of Pakistan. *ISSRA Papers*, 13.
- Munir, B., Thaheem, D. M. S., & Mahmood, A. K. (2020). Principles of Administrative Discretion: A Case Study of Pakistan. *Pakistan Social Sciences Review*, 4, 1023-1035.
- Naqvi, S. Z. H., & Ali, S. (2023). Describing the Scope, Process and Grounds of Review in the Legal Framework of Pakistan. *Pakistan JL Analysis & Wisdom*, 2, 844.
- Sheikh, W. R., Qayyum, A., & Khan, A. A. (2024). Judicial Review and Its Impact on Public Policy: A Critical Analysis. *Pakistan Research Journal of Social Sciences*, 3(2).
- Sultan, M. S., & Azeem, H. M. (2023). Reevaluating administrative discretion and its regulatory framework. *Journal of Law and Social Studies (JLSS)*, 5(3), 507-524.
- Usman, M. U. H. A. M. M. A. D., Khan, A. S. I. F., & Amjad, S. O. H. A. I. L. (2021). State Responsibility and International Law: Bridging the Gap.