



Judicial, Parliamentary and Independent Oversight in Pakistan's Counter-Terrorism Regime: Effectiveness and Human Rights Implications

Nazar Hussain¹ & Dr. Shaukat Hussain Bhatti²

¹Ph.D. Law (Scholar), Hajveri Law College, TIMES University, Multan, Pakistan, Email: advnazar770@gmail.com

²Professor, Hajveri Law College, TIMES University, Multan, Pakistan, Email: shaukathussain78682@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received: April 17, 2026
Revised: May 15, 2026
Accepted: May 24, 2026
Available Online: June 06, 2026

Keywords:

Counter terrorism, oversight mechanisms, human rights, judicial review, parliamentary oversight, independent monitoring.

Corresponding Author:

Dr. Shaukat Hussain Bhatti

Email:

shaukathussain78682@gmail.com

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.59075/tamsaal.v4i6.47>

ABSTRACT

Pakistan's counter-terrorism regime has significantly evolved over the past two decades in response to militancy, sectarian violence, and transnational extremist threats. Various legislative and institutional reforms, including special anti-terrorism courts, expanded surveillance powers, and preventive detention frameworks, have strengthened the state's security capacity. However, these measures have also raised serious concerns regarding constitutional rights, civil liberties, and compliance with international human rights standards. This study critically examines the effectiveness and human rights implications of judicial, parliamentary, and independent oversight mechanisms within Pakistan's counter-terrorism framework. The research adopts a doctrinal and qualitative methodology, analyzing constitutional provisions, statutes, judicial precedents, official reports, and academic literature. It is guided by social contract theory, proportionality doctrine, and rights-based constitutionalism, while also assessing Pakistan's obligations under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR). The findings reveal that judicial and parliamentary oversight mechanisms remain limited due to executive dominance, procedural ambiguities, lack of transparency, and insufficient institutional authority. Independent oversight bodies also face resource and structural constraints. The study concludes that strengthening judicial independence, enhancing parliamentary scrutiny, and institutionalizing effective monitoring mechanisms are essential to ensuring accountability, proportionality, and protection of fundamental rights within Pakistan's counter-terrorism governance.



© 2026 The Authors, Published by ULLR. This is an Open Access Article under the Creative Common Attribution ([CC-BY 4.0](#))

Introduction

Counter-Terrorism and the Security–Liberty Dilemma

Counter-terrorism has become a major governance challenge for states facing persistent security threats. Over the past two decades, Pakistan has experienced militancy, sectarian violence, and cross-border extremism, leading to the expansion of counter-terrorism laws, surveillance systems, and specialized judicial mechanisms. While these measures strengthened national

security, they also raised concerns regarding constitutional rights, civil liberties, and compliance with international human rights standards.

The tension between national security and individual liberty remains central to counter-terrorism governance. Classical social contract theory, particularly the ideas of John Locke, emphasizes that state authority must remain subject to law, accountability, and protection of fundamental rights.

Legal and Institutional Framework

Pakistan's constitutional framework guarantees due process, equality before law, and freedom of expression. However, laws such as the Anti-Terrorism Act (ATA) have expanded executive powers, preventive detention mechanisms, and investigative authority. Oversight institutions including courts, parliament, and human rights bodies are intended to maintain accountability and constitutional balance, though their effectiveness remains contested. This study examines the effectiveness of judicial, parliamentary, and independent oversight mechanisms in protecting human rights within Pakistan's counter-terrorism framework.

International Dimensions and Global Counter-Terrorism Efforts

The research adopts a doctrinal and qualitative methodology based on constitutional provisions, statutes, judicial precedents, official reports, and academic literature. It also analyzes Pakistan's obligations under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR).

International counter-terrorism cooperation, intelligence-sharing, and geopolitical pressures significantly influence Pakistan's domestic security policies, creating additional challenges for balancing sovereignty, security, and human rights protections.

Surveillance, Intelligence, and Legislation

Surveillance systems, intelligence operations, and counter-terrorism legislation form the foundation of Pakistan's security framework. Although intended to prevent terrorism, these measures raise concerns regarding privacy, due process, freedom of expression, and potential misuse of executive authority. Counter-terrorism measures also directly affect ordinary citizens, particularly marginalized communities that may experience disproportionate scrutiny and profiling.

Striking the Balance: Policy Considerations and Reconciling Conflicting Interests

Preliminary findings indicate that judicial, parliamentary, and independent oversight mechanisms in Pakistan face limitations due to executive dominance, political polarization, weak coordination, and limited transparency. Comparative constitutional experience suggests that effective oversight requires judicial independence, proportionality review, transparency, and coordinated accountability mechanisms. Ultimately, sustainable counter-terrorism governance depends upon balancing national security with constitutional rights, democratic accountability, and respect for human rights.

Literature Review

Scholarly discourse on counter-terrorism governance consistently underscores the inherent tension between national security imperatives and the protection of fundamental rights. Contemporary research concludes that ethical oversight and legal accountability are essential for regulating commercial, data driven screening mechanisms (Chug et al., 2026). While extraordinary threats may justify exceptional legal measures, such measures must remain firmly anchored in constitutionalism, the rule of law, and internationally recognized human rights obligations.

Legal scholars argue that counter-terrorism regimes frequently expand executive authority in ways that risk normalizing emergency powers and reshaping ordinary legal standards. Research further indicates that fear driven governance may weaken state citizen relations and erode institutional credibility (Uygur et al., 2026). This phenomenon, often described as the “securitization” of law, raises continuing concerns regarding judicial independence, procedural fairness, and democratic accountability.

The literature also explores both the potential and limitations of law based civic advocacy, emphasizing how legal mobilization can empower communities, influence policy development, and promote rights-based accountability, while also acknowledging structural, institutional, and procedural constraints that may limit its effectiveness (Handmaker, 2026). A substantial body of scholarship focuses on judicial oversight in counter-terrorism contexts. Comparative studies demonstrate that courts often oscillate between assertive rights protection and deferential reasoning when confronted with national security claims. In jurisdictions facing prolonged security threats, courts frequently adopt institutional restraint, particularly where evidence is classified or derived from intelligence sources.

Critics argue that such judicial deference may weaken constitutional review, especially in cases involving preventive detention, surveillance, and special tribunals. The literature highlights persistent tensions between civil liberties and national security in counter-terrorism policy, emphasizing the need to safeguard human rights while addressing governance and security imperatives (Davila, 2025). Conversely, other scholars contend that even limited judicial intervention plays a vital symbolic and normative role in preserving the rule of law, deterring arbitrary state action, and protecting procedural guarantees.

The literature further provides an ICCPR-based analysis of Pakistan’s Anti-Terrorism Act, examining how its enforcement affects the balance between national security objectives and the protection of individual human rights (Adnan, Rehman, & Saeed, 2025). In the Pakistani context, extensive scholarship has examined the constitutional implications of special anti-terrorism courts, preventive detention regimes, and military tribunals. Commentators note that the expansion of jurisdiction under the Anti-Terrorism Act has blurred the distinction between ordinary criminal offences and terrorism-related crimes, thereby potentially undermining procedural safeguards.

Research also examines tensions between judicial accountability and independence in military courts, offering comparative insights into challenges related to impartiality, transparency, and compliance with human rights standards (Vedaschi & Ferrario, 2025). Scholars further observe that the establishment of military courts through constitutional amendments generated significant

debate regarding separation of powers, civilian judicial independence, and institutional legitimacy. However, much of this literature remains doctrinal and descriptive, focusing primarily on legality rather than evaluating institutional effectiveness or the operational performance of oversight mechanisms.

Parliamentary oversight of security governance represents another significant area of scholarly inquiry. One study explores how parliamentary scrutiny influences foreign policy formulation and implementation, emphasizing the importance of legal safeguards and democratic practices in ensuring transparent and accountable decision-making in international affairs (Arslan, 2025). International literature suggests that effective legislative oversight requires access to classified information, bipartisan cooperation, enforceable reporting obligations, and strong institutional autonomy.

Intelligence oversight committees in established democracies are often cited as models of effective institutional accountability. However, comparative studies indicate that legislative oversight tends to weaken in contexts marked by political instability, executive dominance, or underdeveloped committee systems. A comparative study of the parliaments of Nepal and Pakistan highlights differences in institutional capacity and their implications for governance outcomes (Bano et al., 2025). In Pakistan, scholarly attention to parliamentary oversight remains limited, with most studies focusing on constitutional design rather than practical effectiveness or enforcement capacity.

Independent oversight mechanisms, including national human rights institutions and civil society organizations, are widely recognized in global literature as essential components of accountability frameworks. Research highlights their role in documenting violations, advocating reform, shaping public discourse, and complementing formal institutional checks. However, scholars caution that such bodies often face resource constraints, fragmented mandates, and limited enforcement authority.

In developing democracies, institutional independence is frequently undermined by executive influence, political pressure, or insufficient statutory protection. Research on Pakistan acknowledges the advocacy role of independent commissions and non-governmental organizations but rarely assesses their structural capacity to influence counter-terrorism policy, implementation practices, or institutional reform. The “boomerang mechanism” in human rights advocacy illustrates how transnational networks can exert international pressure to influence domestic policy outcomes (Karo & Jatmika, 2025).

Theoretical scholarship further situates oversight debates within broader jurisprudential frameworks. Social contract theory emphasizes that the legitimacy of state coercive power depends on the reciprocal protection of individual rights. Proportionality theory argues that restrictions on rights must satisfy strict standards of legality, necessity, and minimal impairment. Human rights absolutist perspectives, by contrast, maintain that certain rights such as protection from torture, arbitrary detention, and cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment are non derogable even during emergencies.

Although these theoretical frameworks are widely discussed in global literature, their systematic application to Pakistan’s counter-terrorism oversight architecture remains limited. A study on counter-terrorism police training in Pakistan highlights the importance of operational

effectiveness, legal compliance, and rights protection in strengthening institutional capacity (Mehmood et al., 2025). Similarly, research on UN Security Council counter terrorism measures underscores the challenge of balancing international security objectives with human rights obligations under international humanitarian law (Moghadam, 2025).

International human rights scholarship further emphasizes the continuing relevance of treaty obligations during counter terrorism operations. Under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), states may impose temporary restrictions during emergencies; however, such measures must remain strictly necessary, proportionate, time-bound, and nondiscriminatory. Comparative evidence suggests that strong oversight institutions improve compliance with these standards by enhancing transparency, accountability, and judicial as well as independent review mechanisms.

Nevertheless, empirical studies assessing the effectiveness of Pakistan's oversight mechanisms in implementing these obligations remain limited. Research on international organizations in Pakistan highlights how political and institutional factors influence diplomatic mediation, peacebuilding, and human rights advocacy, thereby shaping overall operational outcomes (Shahnawaz et al., 2025).

Finally, Pakistan's counter-terrorism framework has been critically analysed in relation to balancing individual rights, national interests, and state security within legal and policy structures (Baig, 2024). Despite extensive global scholarship on counter-terrorism and human rights, three key gaps remain. First, existing studies often examine judicial, parliamentary, and independent oversight separately rather than as an integrated system. Second, limited attention has been given to evaluating the practical effectiveness of oversight mechanisms beyond their formal existence. Third, comparative and normative analyses remain underdeveloped, with insufficient engagement with international best practices and treaty-based standards.

Addressing these gaps, this study adopts an integrated approach to oversight by examining the interaction between judicial review, parliamentary scrutiny, and independent monitoring institutions within Pakistan's counter-terrorism framework. By combining doctrinal, comparative, and normative analysis, it moves beyond descriptive legality to assess effectiveness, legitimacy, and human rights compliance. In doing so, it contributes to emerging scholarship on security governance in transitional and developing democracies and proposes a coordinated oversight model that reconciles state security imperatives with constitutionalism, democratic accountability, and international human rights standards.

Theoretical Framework

The evaluation of oversight mechanisms within Pakistan's counter-terrorism regime requires a coherent normative framework capable of balancing national security with constitutional rights. Counter-terrorism laws reflect broader philosophical assumptions regarding state authority, individual liberty, and the limits of coercive power. This study employs three interrelated theoretical perspectives—social contract theory, proportionality doctrine, and rights-based constitutionalism—to critically examine judicial, parliamentary, and independent oversight mechanisms in Pakistan.

Social Contract and the Legitimacy of State Power

Social contract theory, particularly the ideas of John Locke, argues that individuals consent to governmental authority in exchange for the protection of life, liberty, and property. However, this authority remains conditional and loses legitimacy when exercised arbitrarily or beyond constitutional limits.

Within counter-terrorism governance, this framework emphasizes that security measures must protect rather than undermine individual rights. Expanded detention powers, surveillance mechanisms, and special courts therefore require effective oversight to prevent abuse of executive authority. Judicial review, parliamentary scrutiny, and independent monitoring function as institutional safeguards that ensure state power remains consistent with constitutional principles and democratic accountability.

Proportionality Doctrine and Rights Limitation

The principle of proportionality has become a central doctrine in constitutional adjudication. It requires that restrictions on fundamental rights satisfy four conditions: legality, legitimate aim, necessity, and proportionality. In counter-terrorism governance, proportionality acts as a safeguard against excessive state interference by requiring that security measures be justified and minimally restrictive.

In Pakistan, proportionality increasingly appears in constitutional jurisprudence relating to due process and civil liberties. However, its consistent application in security-related cases remains limited. Preventive detention laws and special anti-terrorism courts often operate through broad security justifications without rigorous judicial balancing of competing interests.

This framework provides a benchmark for evaluating oversight institutions. Courts must assess whether restrictions are genuinely necessary, parliament must ensure narrowly tailored legislation, and independent oversight bodies must evaluate whether security practices comply with constitutional and human rights standards.

Rights-Based Constitutionalism and Non-Derogable Guarantees

Rights-based constitutionalism emphasizes that certain fundamental rights are intrinsic and cannot be violated even during emergencies. International human rights law, particularly the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), permits restrictions on some rights only when they are strictly necessary, proportionate, and legally justified.

This approach shifts the focus from state-centred security narratives to the protection of constitutional freedoms. In Pakistan, guarantees such as fair trial, due process, and freedom of expression must remain effective even within counter-terrorism proceedings. Oversight institutions therefore function not only as procedural reviewers but also as guardians of constitutional morality and human rights.

The expansion of surveillance technologies and intelligence operations further highlights the need for transparent legal frameworks that prevent arbitrary intrusion into privacy and civil liberties. Oversight bodies that fail to ensure accountability and effective remedies risk weakening constitutional governance and public trust.

Integrated Oversight as a Democratic Safeguard

The convergence of these theoretical perspectives supports an integrated model of oversight. Social contract theory establishes the conditional legitimacy of state power, proportionality doctrine provides standards for rights limitations, and rights-based constitutionalism reinforces the protection of fundamental freedoms.

Together, these frameworks demonstrate that no single oversight mechanism is sufficient in isolation. Judicial review without parliamentary accountability may lack democratic legitimacy, while parliamentary oversight without judicial independence may lack enforceability. Similarly, independent monitoring bodies without statutory authority often remain ineffective.

Therefore, an effective counter-terrorism regime requires coordinated and transparent institutional oversight. Oversight mechanisms must remain continuous, enforceable, and rights-oriented to ensure that national security measures operate within constitutional and democratic boundaries.

Judicial Oversight: Constitutional Authority and Practical Constraints

Judicial oversight is a central component of constitutional accountability within Pakistan's counter-terrorism framework. The superior judiciary is constitutionally empowered to protect fundamental rights, ensure due process, and restrain executive excess. Courts provide individuals with a mechanism to challenge arbitrary detention, unlawful surveillance, and procedural irregularities arising from counter-terrorism operations. However, the effectiveness of judicial oversight depends not only on constitutional authority but also on judicial independence, procedural transparency, and the willingness of courts to scrutinize executive claims in national security matters.

Constitutional Foundations of Judicial Review

Pakistan's Constitution grants superior courts broad powers of judicial review, enabling them to invalidate executive or legislative actions inconsistent with fundamental rights. This authority is particularly important in counter-terrorism cases involving preventive detention, extended remand periods, and special evidentiary procedures. Courts have repeatedly emphasized that security concerns do not completely override constitutional protections.

Despite these constitutional safeguards, judicial review in security matters often faces limitations due to confidentiality claims, operational secrecy, and restricted access to intelligence information. Limited evidentiary disclosure weakens adversarial proceedings and restricts meaningful judicial scrutiny.

Special Courts and Procedural Ambiguities

Special anti-terrorism courts established under the Anti-Terrorism Act were designed to expedite terrorism-related trials. However, accelerated procedures and modified evidentiary standards have raised concerns regarding compatibility with ordinary criminal justice safeguards. Critics argue that broadened definitions of terrorism and shortened procedural timelines may compromise fair trial rights, including adequate defence preparation and effective cross-examination.

Judicial oversight over these courts remains inconsistent. Structural pressures such as case backlogs, public demand for swift convictions, and jurisdictional overlaps between civilian and military tribunals contribute to legal uncertainty and weaken accountability mechanisms.

Preventive Detention and Executive Discretion

Preventive detention remains one of the most controversial aspects of Pakistan's counter-terrorism regime. Such detention frameworks grant broad discretionary powers to executive authorities to prevent anticipated threats. Judicial oversight in these cases frequently focuses on procedural legality rather than substantive evaluation of threat assessments.

From a proportionality perspective, preventive detention raises concerns because restrictions imposed without formal conviction must satisfy strict necessity and minimal impairment standards. Where courts limit review to technical compliance, oversight risks becoming symbolic and weakens protection of the presumption of innocence.

Judicial Deference and National Security Narratives

A recurring issue in counter-terrorism adjudication is judicial deference to executive claims framed as national security concerns. Courts may consider themselves institutionally unsuited to evaluate intelligence assessments or operational decisions. In Pakistan, periods of heightened security threats have occasionally coincided with reduced judicial intervention.

Although judicial restraint may reflect separation-of-powers considerations, excessive deference can undermine the judiciary's constitutional role as guardian of fundamental rights and weaken meaningful constitutional scrutiny.

Strengths and Emerging Trends

Despite these limitations, judicial oversight in Pakistan has shown resilience in several respects. Superior courts have invalidated unlawful detentions, reinforced due process protections, and increasingly relied on proportionality principles in constitutional adjudication. International human rights norms, particularly under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), have also influenced rights-based judicial interpretation.

Evaluation of Effectiveness

The effectiveness of judicial oversight in Pakistan's counter-terrorism framework remains conditional rather than absolute. Although courts possess substantial constitutional authority, their impact is constrained by evidentiary secrecy, executive discretion, procedural limitations, and occasional judicial deference.

Judicial oversight functions most effectively when courts apply proportionality analysis, demand evidentiary justification, and maintain institutional independence. However, sustainable rights-compliant counter-terrorism governance requires stronger coordination between judicial, parliamentary, and independent oversight institutions.

Parliamentary Oversight: Democratic Accountability and Structural Limitations

Parliamentary oversight represents the democratic dimension of accountability within Pakistan's counter-terrorism framework. Unlike judicial review, which operates through adjudication, parliamentary oversight functions proactively by shaping legislation, scrutinizing executive conduct, and monitoring the use of state power. In constitutional theory, parliament supervises security institutions on behalf of the public. However, the effectiveness of this oversight depends on institutional independence, political commitment, and access to reliable information.

Constitutional and Institutional Basis

Pakistan's parliamentary system grants legislative authority to elected representatives responsible for enacting and reviewing counter-terrorism laws. Standing committees in the National Assembly and Senate are formally empowered to examine bills, review policies, and summon executive officials for briefings. In theory, these committees provide an institutional framework for assessing the legality and human rights implications of counter-terrorism measures.

In practice, however, legislative review often occurs during periods of heightened security pressure, where emergency laws may be passed with limited debate. As a result, the existence of formal oversight mechanisms does not always guarantee meaningful democratic accountability.

Information Asymmetry and Executive Dominance

One of the major limitations of parliamentary oversight is the imbalance of information between parliament and the executive. Security agencies control classified intelligence, operational details, and threat assessments, limiting the ability of legislators to independently evaluate counter-terrorism policies.

Parliamentary committees often rely on selective executive briefings, which restrict critical examination of the necessity and proportionality of security measures. Executive dominance is further reinforced by the securitization of counter-terrorism policy, where secrecy and rapid decision-making are prioritized over legislative scrutiny.

Committee System and Functional Constraints

Although parliamentary committees are authorized to review legislation and executive performance, their effectiveness remains limited by insufficient technical expertise, lack of investigatory powers, and restricted access to confidential information. Political polarization and party discipline also weaken independent oversight, as committee decisions may reflect political interests rather than objective evaluation.

Additionally, committee recommendations are generally advisory and lack binding force, reducing their impact on policy reform and institutional accountability.

Emergency Legislation and Democratic Deficits

Pakistan's counter-terrorism framework has frequently relied on emergency legislation during periods of security crisis. While intended to address urgent threats, such laws are often enacted through expedited procedures with limited parliamentary debate.

This approach can lead to broad executive powers, weakened procedural safeguards, and the normalization of exceptional measures. Consequently, security concerns may overshadow constitutional deliberation and democratic accountability.

Comparative Parliamentary Oversight Models

Comparative constitutional systems demonstrate that effective parliamentary oversight requires specialized institutions with statutory authority, secure access to classified information, and mandatory executive reporting obligations. Many democracies employ dedicated intelligence oversight committees that combine accountability with operational confidentiality.

In contrast, Pakistan lacks fully institutionalized intelligence review mechanisms with comparable authority and independence. Strengthening committee specialization and formalizing reporting procedures could improve legislative scrutiny while maintaining national security objectives.

Evaluation of Effectiveness

Parliamentary oversight in Pakistan is formally established but practically constrained. Its effectiveness is limited by executive dominance, information asymmetry, political polarization, and weak enforcement mechanisms.

Although parliament contributes to consultation and legislative review, its role as a strong accountability institution remains limited. Effective reform requires greater institutional autonomy, improved access to information, and enforceable oversight mechanisms to ensure transparency, accountability, and rights-compliant counter-terrorism governance.

Independent Oversight Mechanisms and Civil Society Accountability

Independent oversight mechanisms and civil society actors form the third pillar of accountability within Pakistan's counter-terrorism framework. Unlike judicial and parliamentary oversight, these mechanisms operate outside formal state institutions through monitoring, advocacy, documentation, and public engagement. Their role becomes particularly important where executive authority expands in the name of national security.

National Human Rights Institutions and Statutory Bodies

Statutory bodies such as the National Commission for Human Rights (NCHR) are mandated to investigate violations, review legislation, and promote compliance with constitutional and international human rights standards, including the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR). These institutions help connect domestic constitutional protections with international obligations.

However, their effectiveness is often limited by inadequate resources, restricted access to security-related information, and lack of binding enforcement powers. Their recommendations are generally advisory and depend upon executive willingness for implementation.

Civil Society Organizations and Advocacy Networks

Civil society organizations, bar associations, academic institutions, and human rights groups contribute to accountability through strategic litigation, policy critique, public awareness campaigns, and documentation of alleged abuses. Their advocacy often strengthens transparency and highlights procedural violations that may otherwise remain ignored.

Despite their importance, these organizations frequently face operational challenges, including regulatory restrictions, funding limitations, and political sensitivities surrounding security issues.

Media as an Informal Oversight Mechanism

The media acts as an informal oversight mechanism by informing the public about counter-terrorism operations and exposing unlawful practices or procedural irregularities. Investigative journalism can encourage judicial and parliamentary responses to abuses of power.

However, media reporting on national security matters is often constrained by regulatory controls, limited access to information, and broader security concerns, which may weaken transparency and public accountability.

Structural Fragmentation and Coordination Deficits

A major limitation of independent oversight in Pakistan is institutional fragmentation. Human rights bodies, civil society organizations, and media institutions often operate independently without formal coordination mechanisms. This weakens the overall impact of oversight efforts and limits accountability.

Human Rights Implications

Strong independent oversight promotes transparency, discourages abuse of authority, and reinforces constitutional protections. Conversely, weak oversight creates accountability gaps that may normalize excessive executive powers and weaken the rule of law.

Evaluation of Effectiveness

Independent oversight mechanisms in Pakistan possess important normative value but limited practical effectiveness. Their impact remains constrained by weak enforcement authority, fragmented coordination, and limited institutional independence. Strengthening statutory powers, institutional autonomy, and coordination with judicial and parliamentary mechanisms is essential for ensuring rights-compliant counter-terrorism governance.

Comparative Analysis and Toward an Integrated Oversight Model

Pakistan's counter-terrorism oversight framework includes judicial, parliamentary, and independent accountability mechanisms; however, these institutions often operate in isolation. Comparative constitutional experience demonstrates that effective oversight depends not only on

the existence of institutions but also on their coordination, independence, and access to reliable information.

Comparative Institutional Design and Best Practices

Many democracies facing security threats have developed integrated oversight systems combining judicial review, parliamentary scrutiny, and independent monitoring. For example, the United Kingdom's intelligence oversight committees operate with statutory authority and secure access to classified information, while courts in Germany and South Africa apply structured proportionality analysis to security measures.

These systems demonstrate that accountability and national security can coexist through effective institutional design and coordinated oversight mechanisms.

Lessons for Pakistan's Counter-Terrorism Framework

Pakistan's oversight framework contains formal accountability institutions but lacks structural coordination among them. Judicial decisions, parliamentary findings, and independent investigations rarely interact in a systematic manner. Additionally, counter-terrorism laws contain limited provisions for periodic review, contributing to the long-term expansion of executive authority.

Comparative experience suggests that stronger coordination and mandatory legislative reassessment are necessary to prevent the normalization of exceptional powers.

Proportionality and Structured Rights Review

Comparative constitutional jurisprudence identifies proportionality as a key safeguard in counter-terrorism adjudication. The proportionality test requires legality, legitimate purpose, necessity, and balanced restriction of rights.

Although Pakistani courts increasingly apply rights-based reasoning, proportionality has not been consistently institutionalized in security-related cases. Greater reliance on proportionality would strengthen constitutional protection and align domestic jurisprudence with international human rights obligations under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR).

Proposed Integrated Oversight Model for Pakistan

This study proposes a four-pillar oversight model for Pakistan: strengthening judicial proportionality review, establishing a specialized parliamentary intelligence committee, granting stronger statutory powers to independent oversight bodies, and creating formal coordination mechanisms linking courts, parliament, and independent institutions.

Such reforms would reduce institutional fragmentation and improve accountability within counter-terrorism governance.

Normative and Democratic Implications

An integrated oversight system enhances transparency, public trust, institutional legitimacy, and rights protection. Conversely, fragmented oversight may normalize excessive executive authority and weaken constitutional safeguards.

Synthesis

Comparative evidence demonstrates that security and liberty are not mutually exclusive. Their reconciliation depends on coordinated institutions grounded in constitutionalism, proportionality, and accountability. Pakistan's oversight framework therefore requires stronger institutional integration, transparency, and independence to ensure sustainable and rights-compliant counter-terrorism governance.

Conclusion and Policy Recommendations

This study examined the effectiveness and human rights implications of judicial, parliamentary, and independent oversight mechanisms within Pakistan's counter-terrorism framework. The findings reveal that although these institutions formally exist, their practical effectiveness remains limited due to weak coordination, institutional fragmentation, and structural constraints.

Overall Findings

Judicial oversight in Pakistan is constitutionally strong and has protected due process in several cases involving unlawful detention and procedural violations. However, evidentiary secrecy, procedural delays, and judicial deference to national security claims often weaken effective rights-based scrutiny.

Parliamentary oversight remains constrained by information asymmetry, political polarization, and limited access to classified material. Emergency-driven legislation frequently reduces opportunities for meaningful democratic deliberation and sustained review.

Independent oversight institutions and civil society organizations contribute significantly to transparency, advocacy, and public accountability. Nevertheless, their effectiveness is limited by advisory status, weak enforcement powers, and resource constraints.

Theoretical Implications

The study reaffirms the relevance of social contract theory, proportionality doctrine, and rights-based constitutionalism. Counter-terrorism measures remain legitimate only when exercised within constitutional limits and subject to effective oversight.

International obligations under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) further require that security measures remain necessary, proportionate, and subject to review.

Policy Recommendations

Key reforms include institutionalizing proportionality review in counter-terrorism adjudication, reforming preventive detention laws and special courts, and establishing a specialized parliamentary intelligence oversight committee with access to classified information.

Independent oversight institutions should receive stronger investigatory powers, while structured coordination mechanisms should connect judicial, parliamentary, and independent oversight bodies. Greater transparency through periodic public reporting would also strengthen democratic accountability and public trust.

Final Reflection

Counter-terrorism governance cannot rely solely on coercive authority. Its legitimacy depends upon constitutional compliance, institutional accountability, and public confidence. Pakistan's challenge is not to choose between security and liberty, but to develop an institutional framework capable of protecting both simultaneously.

Through stronger oversight, proportionality-based adjudication, and democratic accountability, Pakistan can promote a counter-terrorism framework that is both effective and rights compliant, demonstrating that security and liberty are mutually reinforcing rather than contradictory.

Reference

1. Bester, P. C. (2019, January). Emerging challenges in terrorism and counterterrorism: A national security perspective. In *Paper presented on* (Vol. 17).
2. Suri, S. (2017). Collective Counter-Terrorism Efforts. *World Affairs: The Journal of International Issues*, 21(4), 74-81.
3. Ilxomovich, G. I. (2023). Smuggling And Methods Of Increasing The Efficiency Of Fighting It At The Present Stage Of State Development. *International Journal of Law And Criminology*, 3(07), 74-80.
4. Kalia, R. (Ed.). (2015). *Pakistan's Political Labyrinths: Military, society and terror*. Routledge.
5. Kapur, S. A. (2021). *Bridging the Gap Between Theory and Praxis: An Exploration of International Society's Responsibility Towards Instability in Pakistan, 1947-2020*. Lancaster University (United Kingdom).
6. Ackerman, B. (2003). The emergency constitution. *Yale LJ*, 113, 1029.
7. Nawaz, A. (2021). *The transition of US foreign policy and Pakistan after 9/11* (Doctoral dissertation, RMIT University).
8. Löckenhoff, C. E., & Carstensen, L. L. (2004). Socioemotional selectivity theory, aging, and health: The increasingly delicate balance between regulating emotions and making tough choices. *Journal of personality*, 72(6), 1395-1424.
9. Allan, C., Xia, J., & Pahl-Wostl, C. (2013). Climate change and water security: challenges for adaptive water management. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, 5(6), 625-632.
10. Balkin, J. M. (2008). The constitution in the national surveillance state. *Minn. L. Rev.*, 93, 1.
11. Diener, E., & Suh, E. M. (2003). 22-National differences in subjective well-being. *Well-being: The foundations of hedonic psychology*.
12. Richards, J. (2012). Intelligence dilemma? Contemporary counter-terrorism in a liberal democracy. *Intelligence and national security*, 27(5), 761-780.
13. Lo, B. (2009). *Resolving ethical dilemmas: a guide for clinicians*. Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.

14. Van Baarda, T. A., & Verweij, D. E. M. (Eds.). (2009). The moral dimension of asymmetrical warfare: Counter-terrorism, democratic values and military ethics. BRILL.
15. Demirsu, I. (2017). Counter-terrorism and the Prospects of Human Rights: Securitizing Difference and Dissent. Springer.
16. Rawls, J. (1982). The basic liberties and their priority. *The Tanner lectures on human values*, 3, 3-87.
17. ESMAILZADEH, Y. (2023). Unveiling the uic approach: towards a novel framework for rethinking the definition and implications of terrorism. *Russian Law Journal*, 11(12s).
18. Nathanson, S. (2010). Terrorism and the Ethics of War. Cambridge University Press.
19. Singh, C. (2021). Prosecuting terrorism: secret courts, evidence and special advocates. The panoply of challenges facing criminal justice, the United Kingdom perspective. *Current Issues in Criminal Justice*, 33(3), 382-408.
20. Majeed, S., Zaidi, N. A., & Waheed, Z. (2017). Saffron Dreams-A Journey Of Evolving Identity. *Al-Burz*, 9(1), 30-54.
21. Buonfino, A. (2004). Between unity and plurality: the politicization and securitization of the discourse of immigration in Europe. *New political science*, 26(1), 23-49.
22. Rizvi, A., Khan, A. R., & Elahi, M. M. (2023). Navigating the Threat Landscape: A Study on Counter-terrorism Measures in Pakistan. *Pakistan Social Sciences Review*, 7(4), 603-614.
23. Rehman, A., & Nabi, S. G. (2023). Diplomacy to Lawfare: Analyzing Legal Claims in Jammu and Kashmir. *Pakistan Social Sciences Review*, 7(4), 231-249.
24. Mir, T. A. (2023). Beyond Borders: Rethinking Pakistan's National Security in a Global Context. *India Quarterly*, 79(3), 425-434.
25. Buzan, B. (2008). *People, states & fear: an agenda for international security studies in the post-cold war era*. ECPR press.
26. Bossong, R. (2012). *The evolution of EU counter-terrorism: European security policy after 9/11*. Routledge.
27. Wilson, R. (2001). *The politics of truth and reconciliation in South Africa: Legitimizing the post-apartheid state*. Cambridge University Press.
28. Hough, P. (2013). *Understanding global security*. Routledge.
29. Afzal, M. (2018). *Pakistan under siege: Extremism, society, and the state*. Brookings Institution Press.
30. Clarke, R. D. (2019). *A feminist critique of the militarization of knowledge production on terrorism studies: a scholar-activist counter-narrative account*. Nottingham Trent University (United Kingdom).
31. Habib, A., & US Army School for Advanced Military Studies Fort Leavenworth United States. (2018). Counter narrative: the missing link in Pakistan's counter-terrorism strategy. *US Army School for Advanced Military Studies Fort Leavenworth United States*.
32. Jones, B. D., Pascual, C., & Stedman, S. J. (2009). *Power and responsibility: building international order in an era of transnational threats*. Rowman & Littlefield.
33. Hussain, M., & Jamali, A. B. (2019). Geo-political dynamics of the China–Pakistan economic corridor: a new great game in South Asia. *Chinese Political Science Review*, 4(3), 303-326.
34. Flint, C., & Radil, S. M. (2009). Terrorism and counter-terrorism: Situating al-Qaeda and the global war on terror within geopolitical trends and structures. *Eurasian Geography and Economics*, 50(2), 150-171.

35. Sutter, R. G. (2012). *Chinese foreign relations: Power and policy since the Cold War*. Rowman & Littlefield.
36. Mirtchev, A. V. (2021). *The Prologue: the Alternative Energy Megatrend in the Age of Great Power Competition*. Post Hill Press.
37. Staser McGill, A. K., & Gray, D. H. (2012). Challenges to International Counterterrorism Intelligence Sharing. *Global Security Studies*, 3(3).
38. Rosand, E., Millar, A., Ipe, J., & Healey, M. (2008). *UN Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy and Regional and Subregional Bodies: Strengthening a Critical Partnership*. Global Center on Cooperative Security..
39. Young, R. (2006). Defining terrorism: The evolution of terrorism as a legal concept in international law and its influence on definitions in domestic legislation. *BC Int'l & Comp. L. Rev.*, 29, 23.
40. Romaniuk, P. (2010). *Multilateral counter-terrorism: the global politics of cooperation and contestation*. Routledge.
41. Balkin, J. M. (2008). The constitution in the national surveillance state. *Minn. L. Rev.*, 93, 1.
42. Baur, D., & Schmitz, H. P. (2012). Corporations and NGOs: When accountability leads to co-optation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 106, 9-21.
43. Clarke, R. (2011). *Crime-terror nexus in South Asia: states, security and non-state actors*. Taylor & Francis.
44. Song, Z., Foo, M. D., Uy, M. A., & Sun, S. (2011). Unraveling the daily stress crossover between unemployed individuals and their employed spouses. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(1), 151.
45. Gearty, C. (2013). *Liberty and security*. John Wiley & Sons.
46. Palasinski, M., & Bowman-Grieve, L. (2017). Tackling cyber-terrorism: Balancing surveillance with counter-communication. *Security Journal*, 30, 556-568.
47. Lindekilde, L., & Sedgwick, M. (2012). Impact of counter-terrorism on communities: Denmark background report. *Institute for Strategic Dialogue*. Retrieved from <https://scholar.googleusercontent.com/scholar>.
48. HM, S. K. (2023). *Deconstructing India-Pakistan Relations: State Security and Colonial History* (Vol. 43). Taylor & Francis.
49. Abels, G. (2007). Citizen involvement in public policy-making: Does it improve democratic legitimacy and accountability? The case of pTA. *Interdisciplinary information sciences*, 13(1), 103-116.
50. Mir, T. A. (2023). Beyond Borders: Rethinking Pakistan's National Security in a Global Context. *India Quarterly*, 79(3), 425-434.
51. Fassinger, R. E. (2005). Paradigms, praxis, problems, and promise: Grounded theory in counseling psychology research. *Journal of counseling psychology*, 52(2), 156.
52. Žižek, S. Š., Mulej, M., & Potočnik, A. (2021). The sustainable socially responsible society: Well-being society 6.0. *Sustainability*, 13(16), 9186
53. Bellamy, R. (2007). *Political constitutionalism: a republican defence of the constitutionality of democracy*. Cambridge University Press.
54. Imran, M., & Kazmi, S. S. (2025). The Rule of Law Crisis and its Implications on National Security in Pakistan. *J. Pol. Stud.*, 32, 36.
55. Baig, K. (2024). *Analyzing Pakistan's counter-terrorism strategies in the lens of balancing rights, interests and security*. *Pakistan JL Analysis & Wisdom*, 3, 46.

56. Chug, L. V., Muhammed, K. A., & Brown, J. N. Ethical and Privacy Challenges in Developmental Risk Screening Using Commercial Data Sources.
57. Uygur, M. R., Tekin, F., Sever, F., & Toye, S. A. (2026). The Sustainability of Obedience: A Comparative Analysis of Political Behavior Between Fear and Trust. *Highlights of Sustainability*, 5(1), 15-33.
58. Jarvis, L., & Legrand, T. (2020). *Banning them, securing us?: Terrorism, parliament and the ritual of proscription*. Manchester University Press.
59. Fellmeth, A., & McInerney-Lankford, S. (2022). International human rights law and the concept of good governance. *Human Rights Quarterly*, 44(1), 1-37.
60. Ayogu, M. (2023). Fostering transparency and accountability enhancing statutory audits in Nigeria. *Journal of business and economic options*, 6(1), 37-44.
61. Akerboom, S., & Craig, R. K. (2022). How law structures public participation in environmental decision making: A comparative law approach. *Environmental Policy and Governance*, 32(3), 232-246.
62. Hassan, M. S., Hed, N. M., & Kamilan, I. H. (2022). Parliamentary reforms and Sustainable Development Goals (SDG): the way forward for an inclusive and sustainable parliament. *The Journal of Legislative Studies*, 28(4), 578-605.
63. Langtry, D., & Lyster, K. R. (2021). *National human rights institutions: Rules, requirements, and practice*. Oxford University Press.
64. Wentworth, M. (2020). The UK's Executive Counter-Terrorism Measures: A Critical Analysis of Strategy and Implementation.
65. HELLEN, A. (2021). *UGANDA'S ANTI-TERRORISM LEGISLATION: A QUEST FOR JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS OF TERRORISM* (Doctoral dissertation, School of Law, Makerere University).