



INTERNATIONAL LAW
JOURNAL

**WHITE BLACK
LEGAL LAW
JOURNAL**
**ISSN: 2581-
8503**

Peer - Reviewed & Refereed Journal

The Law Journal strives to provide a platform for discussion of International as well as National Developments in the Field of Law.

WWW.WHITEBLACKLEGAL.CO.IN

DISCLAIMER

No part of this publication may be reproduced or copied in any form by any means without prior written permission of Editor-in-chief of White Black Legal

– The Law Journal. The Editorial Team of White Black Legal holds the copyright to all articles contributed to this publication. The views expressed in this publication are purely personal opinions of the authors and do not reflect the views of the Editorial Team of White Black Legal. Though all efforts are made to ensure the accuracy and correctness of the information published, White Black Legal shall not be responsible for any errors caused due to oversight or otherwise.

WHITE BLACK
LEGAL

EDITORIAL TEAM

Raju Narayana Swamy (IAS) Indian Administrative Service officer



Dr. Raju Narayana Swamy popularly known as Kerala's Anti Corruption Crusader is the All India Topper of the 1991 batch of the IAS and is currently posted as Principal Secretary to the Government of Kerala . He has earned many accolades as he hit against the political-bureaucrat corruption nexus in India. Dr Swamy holds a B.Tech in Computer Science and Engineering from the IIT Madras and a Ph. D. in Cyber Law from Gujarat National Law University . He also has an LLM (Pro) (with specialization in IPR) as well as three PG Diplomas from the National Law University, Delhi- one in Urban Environmental Management and Law, another in Environmental Law and Policy and a third one in Tourism and Environmental Law. He also holds a post-graduate diploma in IPR from the National Law School, Bengaluru and a

professional diploma in Public Procurement from the World Bank.

Dr. R. K. Upadhyay

Dr. R. K. Upadhyay is Registrar, University of Kota (Raj.), Dr Upadhyay obtained LLB , LLM degrees from Banaras Hindu University & Phd from university of Kota.He has succesfully completed UGC sponsored M.R.P for the work in the ares of the various prisoners reforms in the state of the Rajasthan.



Senior Editor

Dr. Neha Mishra



Dr. Neha Mishra is Associate Professor & Associate Dean (Scholarships) in Jindal Global Law School, OP Jindal Global University. She was awarded both her PhD degree and Associate Professor & Associate Dean M.A.; LL.B. (University of Delhi); LL.M.; Ph.D. (NLSIU, Bangalore) LLM from National Law School of India University, Bengaluru; she did her LL.B. from Faculty of Law, Delhi University as well as M.A. and B.A. from Hindu College and DCAC from DU respectively. Neha has been a Visiting Fellow, School of Social Work, Michigan State University, 2016 and invited speaker Panelist at Global Conference, Whitney R. Harris World Law Institute, Washington University in St.Louis, 2015.

Ms. Sumiti Ahuja

Ms. Sumiti Ahuja, Assistant Professor, Faculty of Law, University of Delhi, Ms. Sumiti Ahuja completed her LL.M. from the Indian Law Institute with specialization in Criminal Law and Corporate Law, and has over nine years of teaching experience. She has done her LL.B. from the Faculty of Law, University of Delhi. She is currently pursuing Ph.D. in the area of Forensics and Law. Prior to joining the teaching profession, she has worked as Research Assistant for projects funded by different agencies of Govt. of India. She has developed various audio-video teaching modules under UGC e-PG Pathshala programme in the area of Criminology, under the aegis of an MHRD Project. Her areas of interest are Criminal Law, Law of Evidence, Interpretation of Statutes, and Clinical Legal Education.



Dr. Navtika Singh Nautiyal

Dr. Navtika Singh Nautiyal presently working as an Assistant Professor in School of law, Forensic Justice and Policy studies at National Forensic Sciences University, Gandhinagar, Gujarat. She has 9 years of Teaching and Research Experience. She has completed her Philosophy of Doctorate in 'Intercountry adoption laws from Uttranchal University, Dehradun' and LLM from Indian Law Institute, New Delhi.

Dr. Rinu Saraswat



Associate Professor at School of Law, Apex University, Jaipur,
M.A, LL.M, Ph.D,

Dr. Rinu have 5 yrs of teaching experience in renowned institutions like Jagannath University and Apex University. Participated in more than 20 national and international seminars and conferences and 5 workshops and training programmes.

Dr. Nitesh Saraswat

E.MBA, LL.M, Ph.D, PGDSAPM

Currently working as Assistant Professor at Law Centre II, Faculty of Law, University of Delhi. Dr. Nitesh have 14 years of Teaching, Administrative and research experience in Renowned Institutions like Amity University, Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Jai Narain Vyas University Jodhpur, Jagannath University and Nirma University.

More than 25 Publications in renowned National and International Journals and has authored a Text book on Cr.P.C and Juvenile Delinquency law.



Subhrajit Chanda



BBA. LL.B. (Hons.) (Amity University, Rajasthan); LL. M. (UPES, Dehradun) (Nottingham Trent University, UK); Ph.D. Candidate (G.D. Goenka University)

Subhrajit did his LL.M. in Sports Law, from Nottingham Trent University of United Kingdoms, with international scholarship provided by university; he has also completed another LL.M. in Energy Law from University of Petroleum and Energy Studies, India. He did his B.B.A.LL.B. (Hons.) focussing on International Trade Law.

ABOUT US

WHITE BLACK LEGAL is an open access, peer-reviewed and refereed journal providededicated to express views on topical legal issues, thereby generating a cross current of ideas on emerging matters. This platform shall also ignite the initiative and desire of young law students to contribute in the field of law. The erudite response of legal luminaries shall be solicited to enable readers to explore challenges that lie before law makers, lawyers and the society at large, in the event of the ever changing social, economic and technological scenario.

With this thought, we hereby present to you

COMPARATIVE STUDY OF STATUTORY INTERPRETATION IN COMMON LAW AND CIVIL LAW SYSTEMS

AUTHORED BY: URVI CHATURVEDI

ABSTRACT

The complexities of statutory interpretation across the common law and civil law systems are examined in depth in this research study. The paper examines how these two legal systems read statutes differently in essential ways, using different approaches, techniques, and guiding concepts. This dissertation attempts to provide a thorough grasp of the ways in which common law and civil law jurisdictions differ in their approaches to statutory interpretation by examining pertinent case law, academic works, and legal literature. This comparative examination sheds light on the advantages, disadvantages, and ramifications of each system, which eventually advances knowledge of legal interpretation techniques used around the globe.

INTRODUCTION

The fundamental component of legal decision-making, statutory interpretation forms the basis of jurisprudence in common law and civil law systems across the globe. Legislative bodies enact laws, and the process of interpreting such statutes is essential to settling conflicts, establishing rights and obligations, and guaranteeing the efficient operation of the legal system. The different historical, cultural, and philosophical foundations of common law and civil law regimes, however, are reflected in the differing approaches, concepts, and methodologies used in statute interpretation.

Common law systems, which have their origins in British law, place a strong emphasis on the role that stare decisis and judicial precedent play in establishing legal standards. Within this framework, courts frequently determine legislative purpose and resolve statutory ambiguities by applying well-established concepts including the golden rule, literal rule, and mischief rule. The way that common law ideas have developed as a result of court rulings highlights how dynamic the process of statutory interpretation is, and how case law is essential in forming legal doctrines.

On the other hand, civil law systems, which have their roots in continental Europe, give legislative intent and textualism precedence when interpreting laws. There are limitations on judicial discretion, and courts must use methods of methodical, teleological, and historical interpretation to clarify the intent of the legislature. Civil law systems are distinguished by their reliance on codified laws and legislative supremacy, where judges function primarily as translators of statutes rather than as producers of law through judicial precedent.

The reasons for developing a comparative approach to law are numerous. Academically, it aids in understanding and critiquing one's own legal system. Practically, it is crucial for legislators and lawyers to be familiar with basic principles of foreign law.¹ Legislators often face issues already addressed in other countries, and while foreign legislation may not always be directly adaptable, knowing different solutions is beneficial.

For the judicial branch, understanding foreign law has been important since American courts began applying foreign law through conflict of laws principles. Traditionally, the party with the burden of proof had to assert and prove foreign law like any other fact, but this requirement has been relaxed in several states. Ultimately, courts must apply and interpret foreign law, sometimes with the help of experts.

A notable example is the case of *Usatorre et al. v. The Victoria et al.*, involving a salvage claim against an Argentine vessel.² The plaintiffs, the ship's crew, had abandoned the ship but later salvaged it. The defense argued that under Argentine law, since the ship was not wrecked and the voyage contract was not terminated, no salvage award was due. The U.S. District Court initially applied *jus gentium* (general law of nations) but was reversed by the Court of Appeals, which ruled that Argentine law should apply.

An expert witness testified that Argentine law required literal interpretation of whether the vessel was incapable of navigation based on actual facts, not the captain's judgment. The testimony lacked consideration of Argentine case law, illustrating the potential for confusion in applying foreign legal

¹ Rheinstein, *Teaching Tools in Comparative Law*, 1 *Am. J. Cos p. LAW* 104(1952) ; McDougal, *Conservative Study of Law for Policy Purposes*, 1 *Ams. J. Comp. LAW* 34 (1952).

² *Usatorre et al. v. The Victoria et al.*, 172 F. 2d 434 (2d Cir. 1949). See comments by Nussbaum, *Proving the Law of Foreign Countries*, 3 *Am. J. Comp. LAW* 60-67 (1954)

principles.

Comparative research on statutory interpretation in civil law and common law systems provides insightful information about the different strategies and techniques used by these legal traditions. Through an analysis of the guiding principles, the functions of legislators and courts, and the difficulties and objections that come with each system, this study aims to clarify the benefits, drawbacks, and implications of various frameworks for statutory interpretation. Furthermore, in an age of globalization and growing efforts to harmonize laws, practitioners, academics, and politicians must all grasp the subtleties of statutory interpretation in many legal systems.

HISTORY

Both common law and civil law systems' historical foundations for statutory interpretation can be found in separate legal traditions that were influenced by various historical, cultural, and philosophical factors.

Systems of Common Law:

Common law systems originated in medieval England, where local norms and customs were used by royal courts to administer justice.³ As a result of judges applying precedent in their decisions, a collection of concepts known as common law developed naturally over time. A cornerstone of common law jurisprudence, the idea of stare decisis, or the rule of following earlier court rulings, influenced the formation of legal concepts and standards.

The common law tradition's approach to statutory interpretation is pragmatic and case-centric, with judges using well-established guidelines like the literal rule, golden rule, and mischief rule to try and determine the legislative meaning. Over centuries of judicial decision-making, these interpretive techniques have developed with the goal of balancing the language of statutes with the intent of legislators and the social environment.

³https://blog.ipleaders.in/a-comparison-between-civil-law-countries-and-common-law-countries/#The_historical_origins_of_common_and_civil_law_systems

Civil Law Frameworks:

On the other hand, civil law systems date back to the time of Emperor Justinian, who codified Roman law in ancient Rome. The foundation for contemporary civil law systems in continental Europe was laid by the Corpus Juris Civilis, a comprehensive codify of Roman legal ideas that was assembled in the sixth century CE. Civil law systems place a higher priority on the primacy of written law than do common law traditions.

The process of interpreting legislation in civil law jurisdictions involves applying textualism and systematic interpretation principles to ascertain the legislative intent expressed in the language of the statutes. Judges are not supposed to make laws through judicial precedent; rather, they are supposed to execute the law as interpreters of legislative intent. Civil law systems are distinguished from their common law equivalents by their emphasis on codified laws and legislative supremacy, which influences the methodology and approach to statutory interpretation. The main purpose of the civil procedure is to specify the rights and obligations among individuals in accordance with law. Determining the parties` rights and obligations to settle the disputes. In case there is no procedure, the individual might make use of their power in order to realize their rights and settle their disputes and consequently a more powerful result than justice will dominate.⁴

STATUTORY INTERPRETATION PRINCIPLES:

The foundation of legal decision-making is statutory interpretation, which directs judges in comprehending and interpreting legislative acts inside the bounds of the common law and civil law systems. There are some general principles that underlie the process of statutory interpretation in all legal systems, even though the precise approaches and guiding concepts may differ between countries.

Common Law Systems (A):

The following fundamental ideas govern legislation interpretation in common law systems:

1. Verbal Guideline: This approach gives the text of the law precedence and instructs courts to interpret statutes in accordance with their plain and usual sense. Strict adherence to the exact norm, however, could produce ludicrous results, forcing courts to use alternative interpretive techniques.

⁴ James R. Maxeiner, pleading and Access to civil procedure: Historical and comparative reflections on Iqbol, A day in court and decision according to law, 26 March 2010

2. **The Golden Guideline:** The golden rule permits courts to deviate from the literal reading of a legislation and substitute a meaning that is consistent with the legislative intent or purpose where the literal interpretation would result in absurdity or inconsistency.
3. **Rule of Mischief:** The mischief rule, often referred to as the purposive method, is determining the legislative intent by looking at the purpose and historical background of the act. Courts read legislation with this goal in mind, attempting to address the "mischief" or issue that the law was meant to address.
4. **Equivocal Subject:** This concept states that a general term in a statute that comes after specific terms is taken to mean only things that are the same as those that are specified expressly. In interpreting statutes, this rule aids in ensuring coherence and uniformity.

B. Systems of Civil Law:

Different concepts are used in civil law systems to interpret statutes, with an emphasis on legislative intent and textual fidelity:

1. **Textualism:** In order to ascertain legislative intent directly from the language of the law, civil law interpreters give priority to the text of legislation. Judges interpret the statute strictly, consulting no external sources unless absolutely required.
2. **Organisational View:** According to this theory, legislation must be interpreted in light of the overall legal system, taking into account how they relate to the larger scheme of laws and legal precepts. In order to preserve the integrity of the legal system, judges make an effort to interpret the law consistently and coherently.
3. **Explanation of Teleology:** Teleological interpretation, sometimes referred to as purposivism, concentrates on the fundamental goal or intention of the statute. Judges interpret the law in a way that accomplishes its intended aims by looking beyond the text to comprehend the legislative intent.
4. **Historical Interpretation:** In civil law systems, it is essential to comprehend the historical background surrounding the enactment of the statute. In order to clarify the legislative intent behind a statute, judges may take into account legislative history, parliamentary discussions, and other historical sources.

Judicial Discretion and Approach:

Judicial discretion is crucial in statutory interpretation because it shapes legal decisions and

determines how laws are applied in common law and civil law systems. The way that courts interpret cases is greatly impacted by the exercise of judicial discretion, which is influenced by a number of factors including legal tradition, judicial philosophy, and society standards.

Common Law Systems (A):

Judges in common law systems have a great deal of latitude in interpreting statutes, giving them the freedom to use established precedents and principles in a flexible way to produce just results. The concept of stare decisis, which gives courts the authority to decide cases on a case-by-case basis and gradually evolve legal principles, is the foundation of judicial discretion in common law jurisdictions.

Common law courts frequently use a pragmatic and context-sensitive approach when interpreting statutes, evaluating several interpretive strategies such as the literal rule, golden rule, and mischief rule to determine the meaning of the legislature. With fidelity to the basic objectives of the law, this method enables judges to resolve contradictory legal principles and negotiate legislative ambiguities.

Furthermore, in order to clarify legislative meaning and guide their interpretation choices, common law courts may take into account extrinsic aids including legislative history, parliamentary discussions, and societal context. Common law courts are able to successfully address new legal concerns and adjust to changing society values because of their vast discretion.

B. Systems of Civil Law:

On the other hand, civil law regimes typically mandate a more limited use of judicial discretion when interpreting statutes. Judges in civil law jurisdictions have an obligation to interpret statutes literally, without significant variation or reliance on extraneous guidance. This method emphasises the superiority of passed legislation over the judgement of judges, reflecting the idea of legislative supremacy.

Judges of civil law are obliged to avoid imposing their own judicial policies or giving weight to subjective factors, instead strictly adhering to the wording of statutes and giving literal interpretation priority. By limiting judicial discretion and emphasising textual fidelity and legislative intent, the legal system ensures consistency and predictability in decisions.

Judges of civil law, however, are essentially interpreters rather than legislators, even though they may use their discretion when using accepted interpretative techniques.

COMPARISON:

Comparing the methods, tenets, and strategies used by the common law and civil law legal traditions in their respective statutory interpretation processes might provide important insights. The general objective of both systems is to balance legislative intent with statutory text, but they diverge greatly in terms of judicial functions, interpretive frameworks, and methods of legal reasoning.

A. Disparities in Methodologies:

1. Interpretive Principles:

- Common law systems place a high value on judicial discretion and flexibility, enabling courts to modify statutory interpretation techniques in order to produce equitable results. Emphasising the formation of legal standards through precedent, principles including the literal rule, golden rule, and mischief rule promote context-sensitive interpretation.

In contrast, civil law systems place a strong emphasis on textual faithfulness and legislative intent, with judges strictly following the wording of the statutes and avoiding subjective judgements. Legislative supremacy and legal certainty are given priority by principles such as textualism, systematic interpretation, teleological interpretation, and historical interpretation.

2. Role of Precedent:

- Common law systems primarily rely on stare decisis and judicial precedent to direct the interpretation of statutes, with courts expanding on earlier rulings to create logical legal doctrines. The ability to respond to changing legal developments and societal norms is made possible by precedent.

Legislative supremacy supersedes judicial precedent in civil law regimes, where courts interpret the law rather than make it. Common law judges are bound by precedent, whereas civil law judges are not, even though they may take previous rulings into consideration for advice.

B. The Function of Judiciary Discretion:

1. Flexibility vs. Constraint:

- Common law judges have a great deal of latitude in interpreting statutes, which allows them to

strike a balance between conflicting interpretation strategies and adjust to evolving situations. Although this flexibility promotes fair results, it also raises the possibility of erroneous judgements and subjective interpretation. Judges of civil law act under more restricted guidelines, giving textual accuracy and legislative intent top priority. Judges are supposed to use recognised interpretive approaches with rigour in order to maintain legal predictability and certainty, hence restricting their discretion.

2. Judicial Activism:

- A certain amount of judicial activism, wherein judges actively mould legal concepts through precedent and fairness concerns, is a characteristic of common law systems. Statutory interpretation is dynamic because changing cultural attitudes and policy considerations can be reflected in judicial rulings.

- Judges are supposed to respect legislative purpose and abstain from judicial lawmaking or wide interpretations under civil law regimes, which tends to limit judicial activism. Judges of civil law may interpret statutes in a purposeful manner, but their main function is to apply the law, not to create it.

C. Consequences

1. Legal Certainty and Predictability:

Civil law systems place a high value on legal certainty and predictability, placing special emphasis on following the wording of statutes and the intentions of legislators. Enhancing stability and fostering confidence in the legal system are two benefits of consistent, clear interpretation.

Common law systems strike a compromise between legal clarity and flexibility, which permits flexible interpretation but may result in unpredictable and inconsistent court decisions.

2. Adaptability and history:

Thanks to the formation of court precedent, common law regimes exhibit flexibility and responsiveness to shifting social norms and legal advances. Although this dynamic approach permits egalitarian decisions, it may give rise to legal ambiguity. Civil law systems place a high value on continuity and stability and rely on well-established methods of interpretation to uphold the rule of law. Civil law regimes offer stability and clarity in legal interpretation, but at the expense of flexibility.

CONCLUSION

The comparison of common law and civil law systems' approaches to statutory interpretation highlights the subtleties and complexity of legal thinking and decision-making. Statutory interpretation is a fundamental component of jurisprudence in many legal traditions, providing guidance to courts as they apply legislative enactments to specific circumstances and guaranteeing the efficient operation of the legal system. Several significant findings and insights are revealed by this comparative study, providing insight into the advantages, disadvantages, and consequences of statutory interpretation procedures in common law and civil law regimes.

Adaptability vs. Stability:

Common law systems, which are flexible and rely on judicial discretion, show flexibility in reacting to changing legal developments and social norms. ... While judicial precedent is a major influence on legislative interpretation techniques, it can also result in ambiguity and inconsistent implementation of the law. This makes equitable outcomes possible. Civil law systems, on the other hand, place a higher priority on continuity and stability and rely on well-established methods of interpretation to preserve predictability and legal certainty. Civil law systems, although less adaptable, offer uniformity and clarity in the interpretation of the law, boosting trust in the rule of law.

The Function of Judiciary Discretion:

There are significant differences between common law and civil law regimes regarding the function of courts and the use of judicial discretion. Common law judges have broad latitude when reading statutes, which gives them the ability to weigh conflicting interpretation strategies and establish precedents that may shape future legal concepts.

While this adaptability encourages judicial activism and response to social developments, it also raises the possibility of erroneous interpretations and contradictory results. Civil law judges, on the other hand, follow stricter guidelines and give special weight to literal accuracy and legislative meaning. The limitation of judicial discretion ensures legal predictability and legal certainty when interpreting statutes.

To sum up, the examination of statutory interpretation in civil law and common law systems through comparison broadens our knowledge of legal interpretation techniques and their consequences for

equity, justice, and the rule of law. Understanding how different legal traditions read statutes enhances communication, encourages teamwork, and advances the values of justice, predictability, and accessibility in legal systems around the globe.

REFERENCES

- Akkas, S. A. (2004). Appointment of judges: A key issue of judicial independence. *Bond Law Review*.
- Andrews, N. (2006). *English Civil Procedure: A Synopsis Japan Course*. Ritsumeikan Law Review.
- Apple, J. G. (1995). *A primer on the civil-law system*. Washington, D.C., Federal Judicial Center.
- Aron, R., Balas, R., LaPorta, F., Lopez-de-Silanes, F., & Shleifer, A. (2008). The divergence of legal procedures. The National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Beck, T., & Levine, R. (2006). *Legal institutions and financial development*. Maastricht University.
- Blas, F., & Hottler, P. (2004). Remarks on the damages provisions in the CISG principles of European contract law (PECL) and UNIDROIT principles of international contracts. Retrieved from www.cisg.law.pace.edu/cisg/biblio/blase3.
- Clermont, K. (2004). French article 14 jurisdiction, viewed from the United States. Cornell Law Faculty Publications.
- David, R. (1999). *The great contemporary legal systems* (4th ed., H. Safa'i, E. Iraq, & M. Ashoori, Trans.). Tehran, University Publishing Center.
- Dodson, S. (2009). Comparative convergences in pleading standards. William & Mary School of Law.
- Ferejohn, J., Rosenbluth, F., & Shipan, C. (2004). Comparative judicial politics. Retrieved from www.oxfordhandbooks.com.
- Fiorini, A. (2008). The codification of private international law in Europe. *Electronic Journal of Comparative Law*.
- Gottwald, P. (2004). *Comparative civil procedure*. Ritsumeikan University.
- Koskinen, G. (2010). Specific performance in CISG and Finnish law. Electronic library on international commercial contracts and the CISG. Retrieved from www.cisg.law.pace.edu.

- Langbein, J. H. (1987). Comparative civil procedure and style of complex contracts. Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.law.yale.edu/fss_papers/537.
- Lecce, G. (2009). Office of Democracy and Governance Bureau for Democracy, Conflict, and Humanitarian Assistance, U.S. Agency for International Development. Washington, DC: DCHA U.S. Foreign Assistance Performance Publication FY.
- Lee, A. (2004). Legal traditions and competition policy. The Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance.
- Levine, R. (2005). Law, endowments, and property rights. Journal of Economic Perspectives.
- Loicccadiet, P. (2010). Introduction to French civil justice system and civil procedural law. Ritsumeikan Law Review.
- Maute, J. L. (2006). English reforms to judicial selection: Comparative lessons for American states? Fordham Urban Law Journal.
- Maxeiner, J. R. (2010). Pleading and access to civil procedure: Historical and comparative reflections on Iqbal, a day in court and decision according to law. University of Baltimore School of Law Legal Studies Research Paper.



W H I T E B L A C K
L E G A L