

JUDICIAL POWER AND POLITICAL TURBULENCE: ANALYZING THE ROLE OF PAKISTAN'S JUDICIARY IN SHAPING POLITICAL CONFLICTS (2013–2023)

¹Rafi Ullah

²Dr. Fawad Ali

³Zulfiqar Khan

¹Department Of Political Science Gomal University DI.Khan

²Department of Political Science Gomal University DI.Khan

³Department of Political science Gomal University DI.Khan

rafio9597@gmail.com, fawad.lohani@gu.edu.pk, Zulfiqar@gu.edu.pk

Abstract

This study offers a nuanced exploration of Pakistan's judiciary and its evolving role in shaping the nation's political landscape from 2013 to 2023, drawing insights from six lawyers, two judges, and two politicians. Findings reveal that persistent electoral disputes, fragile governance, and entrenched regional grievances, including movements like PTM and Baloch nationalism, fueled political instability. Landmark cases, notably the 2017 Panama Papers verdict, emerged as critical junctures, intensifying debates over judicial impartiality and independence. Persistent allegations of corruption, favoritism, and delayed justice, compounded by external political and military pressures, eroded public trust. Judicial interventions in the leadership trajectories of Nawaz Sharif and Imran Khan underscored the courts' decisive yet contested influence on accountability and political transitions. The judiciary's oscillation between alignment and autonomy highlights its delicate struggle to uphold constitutional supremacy while navigating political realities. Overall, the findings position Pakistan's judiciary as both a stabilizing and polarizing force, striving to balance accountability, independence, and democratic legitimacy within a fragile governance framework.

Keywords: Judiciary, Political Conflicts, Judicial Activism, Disqualification of Politicians, Supreme Court of Pakistan

Article Details:

Received on 07 Oct 2025

Accepted on 26 Oct 2025

Published on 06 Nov 2025

Corresponding Authors*:

Introduction

Since its inception in 1947, Pakistan's judiciary has stood as one of the most dynamic and influential pillars of the state, shaping not only the contours of law but also the trajectory of national politics. Ahmed, S. S. (2022). Emerging from the legacy of the British colonial legal framework, the judiciary evolved into a dual system comprising the Supreme Court, High Courts, and Federal Shariat Court, each designed to interpret the constitution and safeguard justice. Al Jazeera. (2022) Over the decades, the judiciary has repeatedly played a decisive role in Pakistan's constitutional and political development, intervening during moments of crisis when executive and legislative powers clashed. Alecci, S. (2023). The foundational years, marked by landmark cases such as the Federation of Pakistan vs. Maulvi Tamizuddin Khan (1955), set the tone for the judiciary's complex relationship with political authority—a relationship oscillating between judicial independence and political accommodation. Arif, A. A. (2023). Pakistan's history, the judiciary has been deeply intertwined with national political events, acting at times as a stabilizing institution and at others as a participant in political turmoil. The doctrine of necessity, adopted by Chief Justice Munir in 1955, became a recurring justification for legitimizing unconstitutional military interventions, from General Ayub Khan's takeover in 1958 to General Pervez Musharraf's coup in 1999. Ashraf, S. (2024). These precedents deeply influenced the judiciary's reputation, portraying it alternately as a guardian of law or as a facilitator of extra-constitutional rule. Yet, even amid these controversies, the judiciary retained public visibility as a key arbiter in defining the boundaries of power among state institutions. Babbie, E., & Mouton, J. (2024). Entering the modern era, the judiciary's political prominence increased significantly after the Lawyers' Movement (2007–2009), which restored Chief Justice Iftikhar Muhammad Chaudhry and symbolized the rise of judicial activism in Pakistan. Bazmi, S. (2022). From this point onward, the superior judiciary began to assume a proactive role in political matters, reviewing executive decisions, disqualifying sitting prime ministers, and expanding the scope of Article 184(3) to address issues of "public importance." The post-2013 period—marking the beginning of Nawaz Sharif's third tenure as prime minister was particularly transformative for Pakistan's judicial politics. BBC News. (2022, April 10). The judiciary's involvement in the Panama Papers Case (2017), which led to Sharif's disqualification, cemented the court's image as a dominant political actor rather than a neutral adjudicator. Blaikie, N. (2020).

Between 2013 and 2023, Pakistan's judiciary repeatedly found itself at the center of high-stakes political controversies. The Supreme Court, under successive chief justices including Nasir-ul-Mulk, Saqib Nisar, and Asif Saeed Khosa, issued rulings that shaped electoral politics, accountability processes, and civil-military relations. Cheema, M. H. (2023). During Imran Khan's tenure as prime minister (2018–2022), judicial scrutiny over constitutional and procedural matters intensified. Corsi, M. (2018). The 2022 Supreme Court ruling declaring Khan's attempt to dissolve the National Assembly unconstitutional exemplified the judiciary's pivotal role in maintaining constitutional continuity amid political chaos. Similarly, the Justice Qazi Faez Isa case (2019–2023) reflected growing tensions between the judiciary and the executive branch, highlighting struggles for institutional autonomy and judicial integrity. Dawood, J. M. (2022). At the provincial level, the High Courts in Lahore, Karachi, Peshawar, and Quetta have also contributed significantly to shaping Pakistan's political narrative by addressing election disputes, governance failures, and administrative challenges. Judicial interventions during events such as the 2014 PTI sit-in (Dharna) and the 2018 General Elections revealed the judiciary's

expanding jurisdiction into matters once reserved for the political domain. Faqir, K. (2024). Furthermore, the judiciary's role in overseeing electoral accountability, directing the Election Commission of Pakistan (ECP), and ensuring constitutional compliance demonstrated its rising influence over the mechanics of democracy. Gohar, S., Khan, Y., & Noareen, S. (2022). The judiciary's power, however, has not been without controversy. Critics argue that judicial overreach and politicized verdicts have undermined parliamentary sovereignty and blurred the separation of powers. The frequent invocation of suo motu jurisdiction has allowed the Supreme Court to intervene in executive affairs, raising questions about judicial neutrality and accountability. Gohar, S., Khattak, F. J., Sajid, H., & Mehboob, T. (2023). Nonetheless, proponents of judicial activism contend that, in the absence of strong democratic institutions, an assertive judiciary is necessary to uphold the rule of law and curb executive excesses. The years 2018 to 2023 witnessed intensified polarization within the political and judicial landscape. Hanif, R. A., Sultan, M. I., & Haqeeq, M. M. (2024). Following Imran Khan's ouster through a no-confidence vote in April 2022, the judiciary again became a battlefield for constitutional interpretation, with cases concerning election delays, assembly dissolutions, and contempt proceedings dominating national discourse. Hassan, A. (2022). The court's rulings during this period were not merely legal judgments they were political events shaping the fate of governments, alliances, and leadership legitimacy. Historically and contemporarily, Pakistan's judiciary remains a key instrument in negotiating the delicate balance between democracy and authority. Hesse-Biber, S. N., & Leavy, P. (2021). From Tamizuddin Khan (1955) to Panama Papers (2017) and Imran Khan's dissolution case (2022), the judiciary's journey mirrors Pakistan's broader struggle for constitutionalism and political stability. Husain, I. (2018). Between 2013 and 2023, this institution has evolved from a passive interpreter of law into an active player in the political arena its decisions defining the trajectories of leaders, parties, and governments. Hussain, F. A., & Khan, A. B. (2022). As Pakistan moves forward, the judiciary's dual legacy of activism and intervention continues to spark debate over its rightful place in a democracy still striving to reconcile legality with legitimacy. Iqbal, H., Shahzad, M. N., Ali, U., Aslam, S., & Asif, M. (2023)

Literature Review

Since its inception in 1947, Pakistan's judiciary has stood as one of the most vibrant and decisive pillars of the state, shaping not only the legal framework but also the political direction of the country. Javed, R., & Mamoon, D. (2022). ' Emerging from the remnants of the British colonial judicial structure, the system evolved through multiple constitutional transitions, coups, and democratic restorations, leaving a profound imprint on governance and civil liberties. Headquartered in Islamabad, the Supreme Court of Pakistan remains the apex authority, guiding a network of high courts, Shariat courts, and subordinate tribunals established across provinces such as Punjab, Sindh, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, and Balochistan. Khalid, I. (2012). Since Justice Sir Abdul Rashid became the first Chief Justice in 1949, the court has continually defined the limits of power, interpreting constitutional provisions to settle disputes between legislative, executive, and military authorities. Khan, H. (2020).

The judiciary's political significance began taking shape in the early 1950s with landmark cases such as *Federation of Pakistan v. Maulvi Tamizuddin Khan* (1955), which legitimized Governor-General Ghulam Muhammad's dissolution of the Constituent Assembly under the infamous "Doctrine of Necessity." Khan, T. (2022). This principle, later reaffirmed in *State v. Dosso* (1958) under Chief Justice Muhammad Munir, provided legal

cover for military interventions, embedding a cycle of judicial complicity in undemocratic rule. From Ayub Khan's military takeover in 1958 to General Zia-ul-Haq's regime (1977–1988) and General Pervez Musharraf's coup (1999), the courts played a pivotal role in legitimizing authoritarian control, undermining parliamentary sovereignty in the name of national stability. Kishwar Munir, I. K. (2022).

Yet, judicial activism also found its champions. The judiciary reasserted independence during the *Asma Jilani v. Government of Punjab* (1972) case under Chief Justice Hamoodur Rahman, declaring Yahya Khan's regime unconstitutional. Similarly, in the 2007–2009 Lawyers' Movement, Justice Iftikhar Muhammad Chaudhry's reinstatement after suspension by General Musharraf reignited debates about judicial power and political accountability. Kokab, R. U. (2013). The movement, rooted in Islamabad, Lahore, and Karachi, marked a turning point in the judiciary's evolution as a politically assertive institution willing to challenge executive overreach. Kronstadt, K. A., & Kumar, S. (2024).

Between 2013 and 2023, the judiciary once again stood at the heart of Pakistan's political conflicts. Under Chief Justices Nasir-ul-Mulk, Saqib Nisar, Asif Saeed Khosa, and Umar Ata Bandial, the Supreme Court adjudicated high-profile political cases, including the *Panama Papers Case* (2017), which resulted in Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif's disqualification. Kureshi, Y. (2022). The judiciary's verdicts during Imran Khan's tenure (2018–2022) from the *Justice Qazi Faez Isa vs. President of Pakistan* case to rulings on constitutional violations in 2022's no-confidence motion further showcased its expanding authority in mediating political disputes. These decisions reflected an active judicial role in determining the legitimacy of elected governments and setting limits on executive power. Mahmood, N. (2023).

At the same time, the judiciary's interventionist tendencies have drawn criticism for undermining parliamentary supremacy and blurring the separation of powers. Malik, M. A. (2022). The courts' frequent involvement in political crises from validating coups to disqualifying premiers has raised fundamental questions about judicial neutrality. While the judiciary has often defended constitutionalism and civil rights, it has also been perceived as an arbiter of political struggles, reflecting Pakistan's enduring tension between law and politics. Manzoor, S. (2023).

Today, as Pakistan navigates political instability, judicial interventions remain both a stabilizing and polarizing force. Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (2016). From Lahore to Peshawar and Karachi to Islamabad, courtrooms have become arenas where the fate of governments, opposition movements, and constitutional interpretation are decided. Martin, A. (2024). The judiciary's evolution from colonial legacy to political actor underscores its dual identity as guardian of the rule of law and participant in the political process. Understanding its trajectory between 2013 and 2023 offers crucial insight into how legal institutions shape governance, accountability, and democratic resilience in Pakistan's complex political landscape.

Research Methodology

The research employed thematic analysis to identify recurring patterns and key themes within the collected data, allowing for an in-depth understanding of participants' perspectives. The interpretivist research approach was adopted because it emphasizes subjective experiences and social realities, aligning with the study's aim to explore individual viewpoints. A post-positivist research philosophy was chosen as it acknowledges that knowledge is constructed through interpretation, yet guided by systematic and logical inquiry. The study utilized both primary and secondary data to ensure comprehensive and

credible findings, combining firsthand insights with existing literature. Primary data were gathered through interviews to capture authentic experiences, while secondary data provided contextual and theoretical grounding. A total of 10 respondents were interviewed using a well-structured interview protocol to maintain consistency across sessions. The semi-structured interview format was selected for its flexibility, enabling participants to express their views freely while allowing the researcher to probe deeper when necessary. This methodological combination ensured rich, nuanced, and reliable data to support the study's objectives.

Data Analysis

Table 1: Codification of Participants

No.	Participants	Total	Codes Assigned
1	Lawyers	06	A-1 to A-6
2	Judges	02	B-1 to B-2
3	Politicians	02	C-1 to C-2

Total 10 Participants

Source: Compiled by the researcher (2025)

Analysis

The study involved 10 participants in total, including 6 lawyers (A-1 to A-6), 2 judges (B-1 to B-2), and 2 politicians (C-1 to C-2).

Each group was assigned unique identification codes to ensure confidentiality and systematic data analysis.

This coding structure facilitated clear differentiation of perspectives across professional categories.

Table 2: Theme 1 – Political Instability and Governance Challenges

Main Question	What are the primary causes of political conflicts in Pakistan (2013–2023)?
Key Subthemes	Electoral disputes, judicial activism, ethnic/regional grievances, poor economic management, suppression of media, and governance failures
Interpretation Summary	Respondents emphasized persistent political instability caused by election disputes (2013 & 2018), judicial interventions, regional grievances (PTM, Baloch nationalism), economic mismanagement, and declining media freedom.
Overall Theme	Political instability and weak governance as root causes of political turbulence in Pakistan.

Source: Derived from interview responses A-1 to C-2

Analysis

The analysis of Table 2 reveals that Pakistan's political instability between 2013 and 2023 primarily stemmed from recurring electoral disputes, judicial activism, and weak governance mechanisms. Respondents highlighted that regional grievances, such as those linked to the PTM and Baloch nationalism, combined with economic mismanagement and media suppression, intensified political conflicts. Overall, the findings underscore that fragile governance structures and unresolved political disputes remain the core drivers of Pakistan's persistent political turbulence.

Table 3: Theme 2 – Judicial Accountability and Political Interference (Panama Papers Case 2017)

Main Question	What was the judiciary’s role in the Panama Papers Case (2017) and how did it impact Pakistan’s politics?
Key Subthemes	Judicial activism vs. independence, Article 62(1)(f) debate, political influence on judicial process, selective accountability
Interpretation Summary	Participants expressed divided views: some viewed Nawaz Sharif’s disqualification as promoting accountability, others saw it as politically motivated. Concerns arose over judicial overreach, involvement of intelligence agencies in investigations, and inconsistent application of the law.
Overall Theme	The Panama Papers case deepened judicial–political tensions and raised questions about impartiality, accountability, and the politicization of the judiciary.

Source: Derived from interview responses A-1 to C-2

Analysis

The analysis of Table 3 indicates that the judiciary’s handling of the Panama Papers case in 2017 significantly intensified political polarization and debates over judicial impartiality in Pakistan. While some respondents regarded Nawaz Sharif’s disqualification as a step toward accountability, others perceived it as a politically driven decision reflecting selective justice and external influence. Overall, the case highlighted the judiciary’s growing involvement in political affairs, raising concerns about overreach, politicization, and the erosion of judicial independence.

Table 4: Theme 3 – Judicial Credibility, Corruption, and Delayed Justice

Main Question	Why was the judiciary criticized during 2013–2023?
Key Subthemes	External influence, corruption allegations, judicial favoritism, delay in justice delivery
Interpretation Summary	The judiciary faced accusations of partiality, corruption, and inefficiency. Many noted external pressures from political and military elites, delayed rulings, and unequal accountability for lower vs. higher judges. These factors eroded public trust.
Overall Theme	Erosion of judicial credibility due to corruption perceptions, delays, and external political influence.

Source: Derived from interview responses A-1 to C-2

Analysis

The analysis of Theme 3 reveals that between 2013 and 2023, Pakistan’s judiciary suffered a noticeable decline in public trust due to recurring allegations of corruption, favoritism, and inefficiency. Participants highlighted that external political and military pressures often influenced judicial outcomes, undermining the perception of independence. Delayed justice and unequal accountability between lower and higher courts further deepened skepticism toward the system. Consequently, these issues collectively contributed to the erosion of judicial credibility and institutional legitimacy.

Table 5: Theme 4 – Judicial Decisions and Political Leadership (Nawaz Sharif & Imran Khan)

Main Question	How did court decisions affect political leaders like Nawaz Sharif and Imran Khan?
Key Subthemes	Disqualification rulings, constitutional interpretation, selective accountability, judicial neutrality
Interpretation Summary	Judicial verdicts, especially against Nawaz Sharif (Panama Case) and Imran Khan (Assembly dissolution case), had long-term political consequences. While some perceived these as upholding the Constitution, others saw them as politically motivated interventions that reshaped leadership dynamics.
Overall Theme	Judicial rulings significantly altered Pakistan’s political leadership, shaping power transitions and redefining democratic accountability.

Source: Derived from interview responses A-1 to C-2

Analysis

The analysis of Theme 4 indicates that judicial decisions played a pivotal role in reshaping Pakistan’s political leadership during 2013–2023. The disqualification of Nawaz Sharif and the verdict against Imran Khan underscored the judiciary’s influential position in determining political outcomes. While some viewed these rulings as affirmations of constitutional supremacy, others criticized them as manifestations of selective accountability. Consequently, judicial interventions became central to leadership transitions and debates over democratic legitimacy in Pakistan.

Table 6: Theme 5 – Judicial Role during Imran Khan’s Government (2018–2023)

Main Question	What role did the judiciary play during Imran Khan’s government (2018–2023)?
Key Subthemes	Judicial–executive tension, selective justice, military influence, constitutional compliance
Interpretation Summary	Initially perceived as supportive of Khan, the judiciary later asserted independence by rejecting his dissolution of the National Assembly and reference against Justice Qazi Faez Isa. Yet, accusations of selective justice and external influence persisted, reflecting complex judicial–executive relations.
Overall Theme	The judiciary’s mixed conduct under Imran Khan’s rule demonstrated oscillation between political alignment and constitutional independence.

Source: Derived from interview responses A-1 to C-2

Analysis

The analysis of Theme 5 highlights the judiciary’s fluctuating stance during Imran Khan’s government, marked by both cooperation and confrontation with the executive. Initially perceived as supportive of Khan’s political agenda, the judiciary later exhibited autonomy through key verdicts that upheld constitutional limits. Nonetheless, allegations of selective justice and military influence persisted, raising concerns about genuine independence. This inconsistency reflected the judiciary’s ongoing struggle to balance political pressures

with constitutional responsibility. Overall, the period revealed a judiciary caught between institutional assertion and political entanglement.

Table 7: Theme 6 – Judicial Intervention and Separation of Powers

Main Question	Did the judiciary interfere excessively in political matters during 2013–2023?
Key Subthemes	Judicial activism, balance of power, constitutional limits, democratic legitimacy
Interpretation Summary	Some respondents defended judicial interventions as necessary to uphold the Constitution and accountability, while others warned such involvement threatened separation of powers and weakened democratic institutions.
Overall Theme	Judicial overreach vs. constitutional duty: balancing the judiciary’s accountability role with the preservation of democratic separation of powers.

Source: Derived from interview responses A-1 to C-2

Analysis

The analysis of Theme 6 reveals that judicial intervention between 2013 and 2023 sparked intense debate over the balance between constitutional duty and political overreach. While many viewed judicial activism as essential for ensuring accountability and safeguarding constitutional principles, others argued it encroached upon executive and legislative domains. This tension exposed the judiciary’s expanding influence in political affairs, often blurring institutional boundaries. The persistent struggle to maintain separation of powers highlighted underlying weaknesses in Pakistan’s democratic framework. Ultimately, the judiciary’s role oscillated between guardian of the Constitution and challenger to democratic equilibrium.

Table 8: Consolidated Thematic Summary

Theme No.	Core Theme Title	Key Analytical Focus
1	Political Instability and Governance Challenges	Electoral disputes, weak institutions, ethnic & economic conflicts
2	Judicial Accountability and Political Interference	Political manipulation of judicial processes, Article 62(1)(f)
3	Judicial Credibility and Corruption	Public mistrust, favoritism, delayed justice
4	Judiciary and Political Leadership	Disqualification politics, constitutional enforcement
5	Judiciary under Imran Khan Government	Shifting independence, selective accountability, military influence
6	Judicial Activism and Separation of Powers	Overreach vs. constitutional guardianship

Source: Thematic synthesis prepared by the researcher (2025)

Analysis

The analysis of Table 8 synthesizes the recurring themes that define the judiciary’s complex role in Pakistan’s political landscape from 2013 to 2023. Across all themes, the judiciary

emerged as both a stabilizing and polarizing force, alternately promoting accountability and inviting criticism for political bias. Persistent issues such as delayed justice, external influence, and selective rulings weakened institutional credibility. Moreover, tensions between judicial activism and democratic separation of powers underscored the fragile balance within Pakistan's governance framework. Collectively, the findings reveal a judiciary struggling to reconcile its constitutional mandate with the realities of political power.

Research Findings

- The study involved a total of ten participants, comprising six lawyers (A-1 to A-6), two judges (B-1 to B-2), and two politicians (C-1 to C-2). Each participant group was assigned unique identification codes to ensure confidentiality and facilitate systematic qualitative analysis. This coding structure allowed for clear differentiation of perspectives across professional categories, providing a balanced and multidimensional understanding of the judiciary's role in Pakistan's political landscape from 2013 to 2023.
- The findings reveal that Pakistan's political instability during this period was primarily driven by recurring electoral disputes, judicial activism, and fragile governance mechanisms. Respondents emphasized that regional grievances—particularly those related to movements such as the PTM and Baloch nationalism—combined with economic mismanagement and media suppression, exacerbated political conflicts. Weak institutional structures and unresolved political disputes emerged as the core factors sustaining the country's political volatility.
- The analysis further indicates that the judiciary's handling of the Panama Papers case (2017) marked a turning point in Pakistan's political and judicial history. While some participants viewed the disqualification of Nawaz Sharif as a legitimate act of accountability, others perceived it as selective justice influenced by political and military pressures. This case heightened debates on judicial impartiality and deepened concerns about the erosion of judicial independence and overreach into the political domain.
- Between 2013 and 2023, the judiciary faced growing public skepticism due to recurring allegations of corruption, favoritism, and delayed justice. Participants reported that external influences from both political and military elites often shaped judicial outcomes, creating a perception of bias and inefficiency. Unequal accountability across different judicial tiers further undermined institutional legitimacy and contributed to a decline in public trust.
- The study also found that judicial decisions significantly influenced Pakistan's political leadership during this decade. The disqualification of Nawaz Sharif and later verdicts affecting Imran Khan demonstrated the judiciary's decisive role in shaping political power transitions. While some respondents interpreted these decisions as necessary for upholding constitutional principles, others criticized them as politicized judgments that disrupted democratic continuity and reinforced selective accountability.
- During Imran Khan's tenure (2018–2023), the judiciary exhibited a fluctuating pattern of alignment and autonomy. Initially perceived as supportive of Khan's government, it later demonstrated independence through key rulings such as rejecting the dissolution of the National Assembly and the reference against Justice Qazi Faez Isa. Nonetheless, accusations of selective justice and military influence persisted, highlighting the judiciary's ongoing struggle to balance constitutional duty with political realities.

- Respondents also debated the judiciary's expanding role in political affairs, with some defending judicial activism as a safeguard against corruption and constitutional violations, while others warned of excessive interference that threatened the principle of separation of powers. This tension underscored the judiciary's dual identity as both a guardian of the Constitution and a potential challenger to democratic equilibrium.
- Overall, the consolidated thematic findings reveal that the judiciary in Pakistan functioned as both a stabilizing and polarizing force throughout 2013–2023. Although it often acted to uphold accountability and constitutional governance, persistent issues such as external influence, delayed justice, and selective rulings weakened its credibility. The balance between judicial activism and institutional restraint remained delicate, reflecting the judiciary's ongoing effort to reconcile its constitutional mandate with the pressures of political power in a fragile democratic system.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this study based on insights from six lawyers, two judges, and two politicians—provides a multidimensional understanding of the judiciary's evolving role in Pakistan's political landscape from 2013 to 2023. The findings reveal that recurring electoral disputes, fragile governance, and deep-seated regional grievances such as those linked to the PTM and Baloch nationalism intensified political instability. The judiciary's handling of landmark cases, particularly the 2017 Panama Papers verdict, emerged as a defining moment that deepened polarization over judicial impartiality and independence. Persistent allegations of corruption, favoritism, and delayed justice further eroded public trust, as external political and military influences continued to shape judicial behavior. Moreover, judicial interventions in the cases of Nawaz Sharif and Imran Khan underscored the courts' decisive yet controversial role in determining political leadership and accountability. During Imran Khan's tenure, the judiciary's oscillation between political alignment and constitutional autonomy reflected its complex struggle to uphold independence amid institutional and external pressures. While some viewed judicial activism as vital for enforcing constitutional governance, others warned it risked undermining the separation of powers. Ultimately, the judiciary functioned as both a stabilizing and polarizing force seeking to safeguard constitutional integrity while simultaneously grappling with the enduring challenges of credibility, impartiality, and political influence within Pakistan's fragile democratic framework.

Policy Recommendations

Strengthen Judicial Independence: Implement safeguards to minimize political and military influence over judicial decision-making, ensuring impartiality in high-profile cases.

Enhance Transparency and Accountability: Establish clear mechanisms for monitoring judicial conduct, addressing corruption allegations, and ensuring timely delivery of justice across all court levels.

Promote Consistency in Judicial Rulings: Develop guidelines to reduce selective accountability and ensure uniform application of laws to maintain public trust.

Reinforce Separation of Powers: Encourage clear boundaries between the judiciary, executive, and legislature to prevent overreach while preserving judicial activism for constitutional protection.

Capacity Building and Training: Invest in professional development for judges and court staff to improve efficiency, legal reasoning, and ethical standards.

Public Awareness and Engagement: Foster initiatives that educate citizens about judicial processes and rights, thereby strengthening confidence in the justice system.

Institutional Reforms: Introduce systemic reforms to streamline case management, reduce delays, and improve governance structures to mitigate political instability.

Balanced Judicial Activism: Encourage courts to exercise judicial activism responsibly, balancing constitutional enforcement with respect for democratic institutions.

References

Ahmed, S. S. (2022). *The Judiciary of Pakistan and its role in political crisis*. Karachi: Royal Book Company.

Al Jazeera. (2022). Pakistan PM Imran Khan gone after losing no-confidence vote.

Alecci, S. (2023). Former Pakistan PM Nawaz Sharif sentenced to 10 years over Panama Papers. International Consortium of Investigative Journalists.

Arif, A. A. (2023). *Balancing Justice: The Judiciary's Critical Role in Democracy and the Rule of Law*. University of London.

Ashraf, S. (2024). *Pakistan's Political Meltdown*. Singapore: National University of Singapore.

Babbie, E., & Mouton, J. (2024). *The Practice of Social Research* (14th ed.). Oxford University Press.

Bazmi, S. (2022). 'Politico-Judicial Activism in Pakistan: A Historical Overview'. *Pakistan Journal of Social Research*, 4(03), 97-104.

BBC News. (2022, April 10). Imran Khan: What led to charismatic Pakistan PM's downfall.

Blaikie, N. (2020). *Designing Social Research* (2nd ed.). Malden, MA: Polity.

Cheema, M. H. (2023). 'Two Steps Forward One Step Back: The Non-Linear Expansion of Judicial Power in Pakistan'. *International Journal of Constitutional Law*, 16(2), 503-526.

Corsi, M. (2018). 'Pakistan 2018: General Elections and the Government of Imran Khan'. *Asia Maior*, 29.

Dawood, J. M. (2022). *The Role Superior Judiciary in Politics of Pakistan*. Karachi Book Company.

Faqir, K. (2024). 'Judicial Crisis in Pakistan during Musharraf Regime'. *Pakistan Journal of History and Culture*, 35(2).

Gohar, S., Khan, Y., & Noareen, S. (2022). 'Panama Leaks Case, 2016: Reaction of PPP as Parliamentary Opposition towards PML(N) Government'. *Global Legal Studies Review*, VII(II), 111-118.

Gohar, S., Khattak, F. J., Sajid, H., & Mehboob, T. (2023). 'Judicial Politics in Pakistan since 2009: A Critical Appraisal'. *Russian Law Journal*, 11(3), 3182-3188.

Hanif, R. A., Sultan, M. I., & Haqeeq, M. M. (2024). 'Political Polarization Issues and Challenges faced by Pakistan'. *NDU Journal*, 38(1), 35-44.

Hassan, A. (2022). 'Agitational Politics in Pakistan: A Case Study of the PTI's Dharna 2014'. *Journal of the Research Society of Pakistan*, 59(1), 69.

Hesse-Biber, S. N., & Leavy, P. (2021). *The Practice of Qualitative Research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Husain, I. (2018). 'Pakistan's Economy and Regional Challenges'. *International Studies*, 55(3), 253-270.
- Hussain, F. A., & Khan, A. B. (2022). 'Role of the Supreme Court in the Constitutional and Political Development of Pakistan: History and Prospects'. *J. Pol. & L.*, 5, 82.
- Iqbal, H., Shahzad, M. N., Ali, U., Aslam, S., & Asif, M. (2023). 'No Confidence Politics in Pakistan: A Historical Analysis'. *Journal of Positive School Psychology*, 869-881.
- Javed, R., & Mamoon, D. (2022). 'Political Instability and Lessons for Pakistan: Case Study of 2014 PTI Sit-in Protests'. *Journal of Social and Administrative Sciences*.
- Khalid, I. (2012). 'Role of Judiciary in the Evolvement of Democracy in Pakistan'. *Journal of Political Studies*, 19(2), 125-142.
- Khan, H. (2020). *Constitutional and Political History of Pakistan*. Oxford University Press.
- Khan, T. (2022). Khawaja Ahmed Tariq Raheem Case [Video]. Retrieved from <http://www.youtube.com>.
- Kishwar Munir, I. K. (2022). 'Judicial Activism in Pakistan: A Case Study of Supreme Court Judgments 2008-13'. *South Asian Studies*, 32, 321-334.
- Kokab, R. U. (2013). *Lawyers' Movement in Pakistan*. Pakistan Study Centre, University of the Punjab.
- Kronstadt, K. A., & Kumar, S. (2024). *Pakistan Political Unrest: In Brief*. Congressional Research Service.
- Kureshi, Y. (2022). *Politics at the Bench: The Pakistani Judiciary's Ambitions and Interventions*.
- Mahmood, N. (2023). 'Opinion: Government and Judiciary in Pakistan'. *The Commonwealth Journal of International Affairs*.
- Malik, M. A. (2022). *The Pakistan Lawyers' Movement: An Unfinished Agenda*. Pakistan Law House.
- Manzoor, S. (2023). 'Political Polarization in Pakistan'. *World Geostrategic Insights*. Retrieved from <https://www.wgi.world/political-polarization-in-pakistan/>
- Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (2016). *Designing Qualitative Research* (6th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Martin, A. (2024). 'Political Influence on the Judicial System: Aspirations and Involvement of the Judiciary in Pakistan'. University of Kelaniya.

Appendix A

Interview Protocol

This data collection instrument is purely intended for academic purposes. The researcher is carrying out research for his M.Phil in Political Science from the Department of Political Science, Gomal University Dera Ismail Khan. The topic of the study is **⑧The role of Judiciary in Political conflicts of Pakistan (2013-2023)⑨**

Rafi Ullah

M. Phil Scholar (Political Science)

Note: How To Complete This Interview Protocol. Please Read Each Statement Carefully And Answer Each One That Best Represents Your Opinion.

Q No 1. What are the primary causes of political conflicts in Pakistan?

Q No 2. What was the Judiciary role in the Panama Papers case (2017) and how did it impact Pakistan Politics?

Q No 3. Why was the judiciary criticized during this period (2013-2023)?

Q No 4. How did Court decisions affect leaders Like Nawaz Sharif and Imran Khan?

Q No 5. What role did the judiciary play during Imran Khan government?

Q No 6. Do you think the judiciary interfered too much in political matters during 2013-2023?

Appendix-B The Respondents Bio-Data

Respondent Profile

Name : _____

Designation : _____

Date : _____

Lawyers

A-1: Baig, A.

Personal Interview

December 2, 2024

A-2: Shah, M. H.

Personal Interview

December 9, 2024

A-3: Khan, H.

Email Interview

December 15, 2024

A-4: Tahir, M.

Personal Interview

December 23, 2024

A-5: Khan, R. U.

Email Interview

December 26, 2024

A-6: Ullah, M. A.

Personal Interview

January 8, 2025

Judge 

B-1: Zeb, M.


Personal Interview

January 11, 2025

B-2: Ayaz, M.

Email Interview

January 13, 2025

Politician 

C-1: Khan, H. I. U.

Email Interview

January 24, 2025

C-2: Khan, M. U.

Personal Interview

January 29, 2025