

COURTS AND INFORMAL NETWORKS: TOWARDS A SOCIAL POINT OF VIEW ON JUDICIAL POLITICS OUTSIDE WESTERN DEMOCRACIES

Written by *Shyamji Kesarwani** & *Fakeha Khatoon***

** 2nd year BA LLB Student, Ramaiah Institute of Legal Studies*

*** 3rd year BA LLB Student, Aligarh Muslim University*

ABSTRACT

This exceptional issue proposes a social way to deal with the investigation of legal governmental issues outside of Western majority rules systems. The articles light up how normal political premiums, thoughts, social identity, family and proficient ties and even patron–customer commitments among judges and different performers shape an assortment of wonders important to the investigation of legal establishments, regarding how the legal executive is sorted out and managed, how judges are delegated and decide, and the prospects for legal reform Collectively, the articles investigate the informal component of legal legislative issues in a methodical manner, through rich observational contextual investigations in altogether different settings. In this manner, they help structure another relative plan for research on informal legal legislative issues outside of the West.

INTRODUCTION

Relative investigations of how courts and judges settle on choices have concentrated on Western majority rules systems, where legislators go after power by underwriting explicit strategy esteems and stages, however, all will in general grasp the standard of law. These examinations expect that political and legitimate foundations either oblige judges by means of acknowledged systems and precepts (lawful models); reflect ideological preferences (attitudinal models); or react deliberately to different performing artists and the national setting (key models). In any case, these suspicions exchange with trouble to nations other than built up Western majority rule governments and don't in every case completely perceive the substances of courts in other socio-political settings. In those specific situations, in this way, we think it basic to focus on different parts of political life, particularly those that are not really founded on philosophy alone. That implies going past existing parameters to take a gander at a scope of wonders that energize political and legal life in relative point of view – from the powerlessness (or reluctance) of courts to consider control holders responsible, to the disappointment of legal change in a few democratizing nations. An accentuation on the informal element of legal governmental issues can clarify a considerable measure of variety in how formal principles work – or neglect to – in nations where clientelism, debasement, support, and patrimonial governmental issues hold on. This exceptional issue looks to propel a social point of view that recognizes that in non- Western countries, formal practices are frequently nearly weaved with informal ones, and individual communications have important jobs that influence how organizations function – including legal establishments (Robust, 2011; Helmke and Levitsky, 2004). Like our givers, we surmise that even in entirely formal settings, the normal cooperation among people and the connections they share frequently shape who is designated to the seat; the vocation prospects of those delegated; the overall impact of various thoughts, political proclivities or lawful understandings on legal choices; and even how courts and other legitimate organizations are managed. To put it plainly, social elements among judges and different judges, government officials, political gatherings, lawful on-screen characters, and different people and group elements matter. By what means can these relations be sorted? How would they influence the activities of legal foundations also, the conduct of judges? What does a social viewpoint suggest as far as information gathering, investigation, and understanding? The articles that pursue offer understanding into issues fundamental to a social methodology; they

investigate nations in various locales and political settings and utilize a scope of hypothetical points of view and methodological methodologies. Next, we portray the primary ways to deal with legal governmental issues and recognize works that have thought that it was critical to investigate gatherings to whom judges relate so as to clarify, for instance, varieties in legal basic leadership. We at that point propose an applied structure to approach the social element of legal governmental issues, underscoring the principal parts of the connections investigated in this extraordinary issue. We likewise talk about the information and techniques utilized to break down legal informality, recognizing issues that specialists around there must frequently ponder. At last, we quickly feature how the supporters of this exceptional issue illustrate the volume's general theory. We trust this extraordinary issue opens new roads to understanding the numerous ways social elements can impact the activity of courts.

A SOCIAL WAY TO DEAL WITH LEGAL GOVERNMENTAL ISSUES

The relative investigation of legal basic leadership, and other wonders important to legal politics, has recently progressed considerably (see e.g. Dressel, 2010, 2012; Dyevre, 2010; Ferejohn et al. 2007; Ginsburg and Moustafa, 2008; Helmke and Rios-Figueroa, 2010; Kapiszewski and Taylor, 2008; Kapiszewski et al., 2013). Past researchers have investigated the job of judges as political performers cross-broadly so as to see how judges carry on and how and why courts act to control the boisterous activities of those pioneers. These researchers have regularly pursued or taken motivation from one of three models of legal basic leadership: The legitimate, attitudinal, and key models. The legitimate model accepts that judges apply the law in similarity with composed rules, the point of reference, and other formal sources (Bailey and Maltzman, 2011); it considers judges to be impartial and objective, utilizing specialized translation aptitudes to determine the law relevant to the explicit case (Shapiro, 1981). Different methodologies depict made a decision as people with clear political inspirations. For example, attitudinal models contend that ideological positions and strategy inclinations shape legal choices, particularly in courts after all other options have run out (Segal and Spaeth, 1993, 2002). These examinations will, in general, make light of the impact of the law, considering judges to be centered on legitimate approach (Baum, 1994). This point of view has affected investigations of legal legislative issues in Canada (Ostberg and Wetstein, 2007) France (Brouard, 2009); Germany (Hönnige, 2009), and the United Kingdom (Hanretty, 2013). The

vital model additionally recognizes that makes a decision about consider the perspectives of different performing artists and the institutional setting yet may go astray from an ideal result so as to consider these perspectives (Epstein and Knight, 1998; Ramseyer, 1994; Spiller and Gely, 2010). The key methodology has opened novel roads of the legal request in a more extensive gathering of built up Western majority rules systems (Vanberg, 2005) and in less steady political settings (e.g. Helmke, 2005, Staton, 2010). Indeed, even in Western settings, however, taking a gander at belief system and the arrangement inclinations of judges has been censured (e.g. Dyevre, 2010). Regardless of huge advancement, be that as it may, look into dependent on these methodologies disregards the informal elements of legal and also political life. Some ongoing works have recognized that judges, being human, may seek after a large group of objectives past legitimate approach, for example, individual remaining with open and lawful gatherings of people (Baum, 2006); profession contemplations and individual outstanding task at hand (Posner, 2008); or keeping up collegial relations on the seat (Friedman, 2006). We recommend that a social point of view can productively enhance built up viewpoints on legal conduct – and legal governmental issues all the more by and large – by moving consideration from judges alone to the social systems in which they take an interest. We accept that in courts, formal practices are intertwined with informal ones and that everyday individual communications are fundamental to all parts of a country, including the legal executive.

In numerous social orders, informal social and political weights on judges can be amazing, cooperating with approach inclinations or notwithstanding consigning them to a less noticeable job. Lawful, attitudinal, and vital records will, in general, depict made a decision as protected adjudicators of clashes, drawing in with other lawful and political performers exclusively to propel their own objectives. Informal community examiners would state they center around the hubs, the individual on-screen characters, instead of the ties. However, judges take an interest in an assortment of circles of social cooperation, among them the legal chain of importance, political performers, confided in companions, relatives, moral guides and weight gatherings. From this point of view, informal ties become the dominant focal point. It doubts whether choices truly rely upon person attributes alone, looking rather at the cooperations among judges themselves, and among them and other individual and aggregate performing artists (Ellett, 2013; Ingram 2016a, 2016b). A few creators have asked consideration regarding the informal component of legal governmental issues (Llanos et al., 2016; Trochev and Ellett, 2014). Drawing on proof of how organizes impact made a decision in Africa, Asia, and Latin America,

new grant has utilized a social point of view to clarify varieties in such results as legal self-rule, ideational dispersion, support arrangements and even real choices (e.g. Helmke and Rios-Figueroa, 2010; Staton, 2010, Vitug 2010, 2012). By attracting thoughtfulness regarding social elements working on, behind, and between courts, the social methodology serves to enlighten the regularly watched yet methodologically disregarded substances of informal organization. Expanding on past work (e.g. Dressel, 2018; Dressel et al., 2017; Llanos et al., 2016; Sanchez Urribarri, 2012), we have composed this extraordinary issue, planning to help build up an examination motivation dependent on calculated, methodological and experimental reflections about the informal component of legal governmental issues.

JUDGES AND INFORMAL RELATIONS

So as to distinguish and talk about how, and to what degree, informal systems can clarify a scope of social and political marvels including judges, we propose a reasonable structure that takes due record of basic parts of this social dimension.¹ The accompanying three are basic:

- The fields where connections are built up;
- the straightforwardness of the connections; and
- the sorts of ties that spur connections.

Fields and their associations:

Judges work in an assortment of social fields, for example, proficient relations inside a similar court or legal foundation, relations with outside on-screen characters (political, social, connection, and so on.), and relations between courts, as clarified beneath.

1. On-seat relations work in a similar court, connecting made a decision with different judges and inner on-screen characters. For example, gatherings of judges may look to merge their situation in connection to outside performers, or judges may make informal game plans about how to choose explicit kinds of cases.
2. Off-set relations are the social, political, social and different connections that judges keep up outside the court.

3. Between-seat relations are the informal systems of judges in various courts inside a similar nation or purview, and even crosswise over global borders.

These fields are regularly associated with one another. Judges and their systems can be pretty much confined from other legal systems; systems can fill in as center points of various performing artists or connection with different fields (Granovetter, 1973). They can likewise vary in arrangement, size, and thickness.

STRAIGHTFORWARDNESS: CONCEALED VERSUS PUBLIC RELATIONS

Legal systems change as far as whether they work straightforwardly or in mystery (e.g. Trochev and Ellett, 2014). Frequently, systems are open information yet judges and other significant performing artists may deny their reality – regardless of how considerable they are for legal conduct. Additionally shifting might be the explanations behind the mystery, and the degree to which it is a conscious, key proceed onward sake of the judges and different performing artists. These perspectives are exceptionally hard to examine, as we talk about underneath and as a few articles here delineate.

Sorts of social ties:

Not exclusively do the methods of ties vary yet additionally the motivations to continue them. The range and multifaceted nature of material and ideational inspirations are wide. At one extraordinary, inspirations can be particularistic or even clientelist; at alternate, relations and systems might be founded on philosophy. Systems can likewise comprise of social, nearby, local, religious, kinship and family ties.

Nor are these ties totally unrelated; they can exist together in complex connections and systems guided by familiarity. The ties may likewise reflect diverse kinds of intrapersonal elements, for example, singular advantages, ideational affinities, character, expert, reliability, and reciprocity. These three social measurements are useful to begin moving toward informal legal

governmental issues methodically. We can begin mapping them by contemplating how, and to what degree, judges take an interest in at least one of these measurements.

We can hypothesize about their dissimilar sources and varieties in the cooperation of various performing artists; that is, we can consider their spatial and transient elements, and how they are associated with various wonders of intrigue. Besides, we can reflect about the standardizing parts of these relations; despite the fact that we may, in general, connect them with 'grimy harmony's and to consider them inconsistent with the standard of law and its yearnings, this isn't really the situation. Recounted proof and precedents in the writing (e.g. Trochev and Ellett, 2014 and the articles in this extraordinary issue) uncover an image more convoluted than it may have appeared at first.

The impacts of informal relations and systems:

The relations help clarify diverse wonders important to legal legislative issues. Beneath we talk about a couple of zones distinguished to date (see Dressel et al., 2017) and investigated in the articles that pursue.

Arrangements and professions:

Recounted proof, journalistic records, and scholarly work recommend that informal network influence legal arrangements and advancements. This has remarkable ramifications for how courts are arranged, legal freedom and independence, dimensions of polished methodology, legal legitimacy, judicial change and execution. The impact of informal systems on arrangements, control and advancement may politicize legal conduct and elevate the probability of on-seat conflict (Fombad, 2014; Sanchez Urribarri, 2011). Support systems can undermine legal trustworthiness by encouraging advancement or generally compensating 'steadfast' judges (Gomez, 2011). The presence of informal systems and courses of action can influence institutional change; the writing appears, for instance, how notwithstanding their hypothetically directing impact (Ginsburg, 2003: 45), informal systems can impact the activity of free commissions that select, screen and advance judges (Chua et al., 2012), or weaken the impact of multi-track arrangements on legal autonomy and polished methodology (e.g. in Indonesia, see Butt, 2015). However, not all impacts are negative. For example, ideational and proficient systems can advance institutional change and meritocratic practices (e.g. in Mexico, see Ingram, 2016a, 2016b). Also, the negative impact of systems may have been diminished in

nations where there have been endeavors to improve the straightforwardness of legal determination, advancement and downgrade.

LEGAL AND LEGITIMATE CHANGE

A few examinations have shown how political, military and criminal systems undermine equity through degenerate exercises and protection from more extensive changes, especially in nations that are democratizing (Armytage, 2012; Domingo and Sieder, 2001; Hammergren, 2007; Sieder, 2010). Researchers have additionally remarked on informal elements of enthusiasm inside the legal executive, for example, particular courts (Klein, 2003; Pompe, 2005). Different investigations, worried about the elements of legal assurance of rights in relative viewpoint (Epp, 1998; Hilbink and Woods, 2009; Hirschl, 2004), have enlightened the job of ideational systems of judges in lawful change (Hilbink, 2007; Ingram, 2016a, 2016b; Nunes, 2010). In any case, investigations of support systems advise us that systems may have restricted capacity to oppose change (see Rios-Figueroa and Pozas Loyo, 2018).

Legal choices:

There is across the board affirmation, especially for the US setting, that frames of mind, qualities, and philosophy are basic determinants of how makes a decision about survey cases, address certain issues and decide results (cf. the 'attitudinal model' of basic leadership). Somewhere else, thinks about have stressed other ideational variables influencing court choices, for example, 'legal job originations', with respect, for instance, to legal activism or the absence of ability of courts to ensure rights and consider governments responsible (see Couso et al., 2010; Gonzales-Ocantos, 2016; Hilbink, 2012). However obviously judges don't choose in disengagement from their socio-political setting, or with no worry for the connections that develop inside them. Researchers worried about politicization of the courts have since quite a while ago recognized this issue, and have called attention to that the individual and associational relations among government officials and judges help to clarify legal concession and fanatic choices, particularly in political cases (e.g. Basabe-Serrano, 2015; Popova, 2012; Sanchez Urribarri, 2011). For instance, in this issue, Dressel and Inoue (2018) clarify how political or various leveled weights on judges from the official or boss equity, transmitted through expert or college systems, impact legal basic leadership when the administration is involved with a case under the watchful eye of the Preeminent Court of the Philippines.

SYSTEMS, LEGAL FREEDOM AND LEGAL AUTHENTICITY

Both formal and informal legal systems impact legal freedom and the authenticity of courts. Grant on the job of formal legal systems has expanded, for instance in Europe (Harlow and Rawlings, 2007) and somewhere else (De Visser, 2016). Formal systems coincide with (and frequently empower) informal trades and relations; for instance, in Asia, the standard trades of Relationship of Southeast Asian Nations– specific sacred courts have cultivated individual kinships and a feeling of the network (De Visser, 2016). Besides, systems can likewise secure legal self-sufficiency and upgrade decisiveness against different parts of intensity, as found in Sub-Saharan Africa and post-socialist nations (Trochev and Ellett, 2014). Worldwide systems of judges have helped courts to guard themselves against official obstruction and secure human rights (see Brett, 2018, in this uncommon issue). Alternately, where bolster systems are missing or political systems command the seat, the general population authenticity of courts may endure significantly (as Stroh, 2018, in this uncommon issue represents; see likewise Sanchez-Urribarri, 2012), especially when connected to degenerate exercises on the seat (Dressel, 2018).

METHODOLOGICAL CONTEMPLATIONS

The social point of view raises noteworthy difficulties for information gathering, examination, and spread. Albeit interpersonal organization investigation (SNA) is the pervasive methodological way to deal with estimating and examining social information, we suggest utilizing a large group of subjective and quantitative techniques to learn however much as could reasonably be expected about the nature, elements, and impacts of informal legal systems. SNA has turned out to be progressively prevalent in the social request (Borgatti et al., 2009) and political examination (Lazer, 2011; Victor et al., 2016; Ward et al., 2011). It very well may be focal in the efficient investigation of informal legal legislative issues, estimating an assortment of relational impacts and procedures, what's more, encouraging correlations between various sorts of relations after some time and crosswise over space. It can likewise investigate relations and communications among judges and different performing artists and to gauge the scattering of thoughts, inclinations, and assets. SNA has just been received to think about court points of reference (Lupu and Voeten, 2012), the structure of the legitimate calling in the USA (Katz

and Stafford, 2010) and dispersion of lawful change in Latin America (Ingram, 2016a). Nonetheless, the social viewpoint can likewise depend on other methodological methodologies, as showed in the all-around grounded subjective research custom (see Prell, 2012: 28– 43). Contingent upon the nature and finishes of the contentions and theories examined (and a large group of reasonable contemplations), orderly subjective investigations can offer favorable circumstances over SNA. Also, the subjective request can give a setting for SNA and other quantitative deliberate investigations, alongside help in triangulating information and digging into discoveries (or the scarcity in that department).

Various troubles gathering solid data about judges and different performing artists ought not to keep researchers from directing exploration on informal legal legislative issues – subjective hands-on work, meeting, authentic research and the efficient investigation of papers and different sources can all assist researchers with mapping informal relations and more extensive systems. Regardless, as officially noted, informal relations of judges with different performers are frequently hard to watch specifically; doing as such may even be dangerous. A frank previous Established Court equity in Benin underlines both how imperative systems are, and how hesitant judges are to concede they exist.

When you are assigned, you should confine your contacts ... Regardless of whether you were great companions with an imperative lawmaker, when you're named, you don't have any acquaintance with him any more ... on the grounds that everybody will associate you with anything. Consequently, you live an, exceptionally hermitic life. (Meeting, resigned established judge, Cotonou, September 2012, interpreted from French by the creators).

Accordingly, scientists should be careful and inventive in watching and recording informal associations also, the bonds at the center of the relationship. They should utilize thorough strategies to get to the information required without influencing its quality or making moral issues, for interviewees or on the other hand others. In meetings, specialists must be especially cautious about the ramifications of the inquiries asked: Judges dodge examination, consider tact to be an expert goodness, and may disapprove of a few inquiries concerning their relations with partners or other individual or aggregate performing artists. It benefits scientists to plan well progress of time for meetings and hands-on work. They should be to a great degree cautious to pick up the certainty of interviewees, hold the regard of tight-sew lawful and legal networks, and remember the significant moral contemplations (Ellett, 2015).

Research on informal systems ought to likewise go past a solitary target gathering and straightforwardly connected on-screen characters to likewise examine (regularly by means of meetings) potential connections and the jobs of potential system individuals, for example, different on-screen characters in the lawful mind-boggling, political establishments or common society. Whenever important, specialists ought not to shun mulling over close to home, family and other expert associations – the nature, degree, and pertinence of various relations is in some cases hard to imagine ahead of time.

Analysts ought to likewise consider the developing accessibility of information in authentic records, journalistic sources, official sites, writes and even web-based social networking (Dressel et al., 2017). Despite the fact that the undertaking of gathering and breaking down social information appears to be overwhelming, judges are frequently part of a generally little gathering that shares individual, scholastic and expert foundations and in numerous spots make a formal relationship and in addition informal gatherings. In spite of the fact that they keep some portion of their work mystery, numerous additionally have high open profiles and are outstanding in social, lawful and political tip-top circles. Thus, exploring familiarity in legal legislative issues has as of late turned out to be progressively practical, permitting researchers to complete work that, in the not very far off past, would have been increasingly troublesome or even outlandish.

HOW THIS ISSUE IS ORGANIZED

We presently direct our concentration toward the commitments in this unique issue. The articles that pursue offer experimentally grounded bits of knowledge on shifted legal legislative issues marvels, utilizing distinctive methodological devices, and from various locales. Drawing on discussions about the rise of transnational systems of legal and other legitimate on-screen characters, Dwindle Brett investigates the impacts of two Southern African transnational systems on legal basic leadership, with extraordinary consideration regarding two surely understood ongoing choices by the High Court of Botswana and the Southern African Improvement People group Council. He clarifies how significant cases offer judges a chance to flag their participation in a 'worldwide network of law' and dispose of (or possibly make light of) vital contemplations identified with their political condition – in some cases notwithstanding putting their courts, and themselves, in danger. Systems can bolster choices,

Brett states, even where judges may expect a serious political kickback. In spite of the fact that his examination focuses on human rights cases – the destined to pull in such impact – he offers profitable understanding into ways systems can impact legal results, even in generally antagonistic settings (Brett, 2018).

Alexander Stroh's commitment takes a gander at the accomplishment of Benin's Protected Court and examines how semi-mystery arrange structures influence court authenticity through the off-seat relations of established judges after some time. His quintessential knowledge is that arrange structures that are socio-politically adjusted cultivate court authenticity. This underscores the duty government officials go up against when settling on choices about legal arrangements. His commitment recommends that well past Benin, legal system structures made, continued or surrounded by such choices can either help merge majority rule government or endanger it (Stroh, 2018).

The article by Björn Dressel and Tomoo Inoue correspondingly utilize formal SNA to survey how informal ties, in light of college and work associations, help to clarify prominent choices of the Incomparable Court of the Philippines. Giving measurably noteworthy proof of the impacts of political (presidential) and various leveled (Boss Equity) weight that these systems transmit to the seat, they propose that a proceeding with pressure among familiarity and polished skill comes to illuminate their choices, especially in prominent political cases (Dressel and Inoue, 2018).

Somewhere else in Asia, Ling Li takes a gander at informal 'guanxi' organizes inside China's court that clarifies defilement in the legal executive. Contending that judges are hard to coordinate into the guanxi systems, she depicts a business opportunity for extension ties in which proficient agents, for example, relatives of judges and attorneys, move their administrations as guanxi go-betweens – consequently incomprehensibly additionally democratizing guanxi-based debasement. In the meantime, strict intra-party supervision, however enduring a specific level of the degenerate utilization of guanxi for individual finishes, represses the foundation of on-seat systems or ideological solidarity bunches advancing more noteworthy self-sufficiency for judges or legal freedom for the most part (Li, 2018). The rise and tasks of systems inside the legal executive are likewise the topic of Julio Rios- Figueroa and Andrea Pozas-Loyo. Giving a historical– institutional examination of support systems ('Honorable men's Agreements' on filling legal opportunities) in the Mexican Government

Legal executive, they represent the development, types, and factors vitalizing change inside the support systems of Mexico's made a decision for a large portion of the twentieth century (Rios-Figueroa and Pozas-Loyo, 2018).

Alexei Trochev's investigation of legal systems in Ukraine adjusts the contextual investigations. Investigating how and why legal systems have any kind of effect in support based nations like Ukraine, he clarifies how they advantage the two benefactors and judges by sharing data about the trading of solid rewards and authorizes, producing assumptions regarding the resilience of the benefactors and activating judges as required. In Trochev's record, joining of legal systems into the administration support arrange depends to an extensive degree on (a) regardless of whether there is a solitary prevailing support system, and (b) whether the legal executive is brought together, with the Preeminent Court at the best (Trochev, 2018). This enables the routine to manage the potential points of interest of systems for judges, for example, free trade of data and the capacity to activate to accomplish such objectives as the security of self-assertive choices from benefactors.

The articles in this exceptional issue in this manner show the extensive variety of methodologies and techniques that can be utilized to ponder legal systems and their job in various points of enthusiasm for legal legislative issues researchers. Together, they present an exceptionally perplexing picture, not just of the kinds of systems to which judges have a place, yet in addition of how their consequences for real legal basic leadership fluctuate, keeping up legal self-rule and the authenticity of the legal executive as an establishment. By offering a social way to deal with supplement customary points of view, it is we would like to offer another viewpoint on how courts work in an assortment of non-Western settings and past. These works ought to add to an increasingly complex comprehension of informal relations and courts by proposing new methodological roads for study and making a valuable commitment grounded in efficient investigations so as to empower more research here.

REFERENCES

- Armytage, Livingston (2012) *Reforming Justice. A Journey to Fairness in Asia*. Cambridge: Cambridge

- University Press. Bailey, Michael A and Forrest Maltzman (2011) *The Constrained Court: Law, Politics and the Decisions*
- *Justices Make*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Basabe-Serrano, Santiago (2015) Informal Institutions, and Judicial Independence in Paraguay, 1954–2011.
- *Law and Policy* 37(4): 350–378.
- Baum, Lawrence (1994) What Judges: Judges’ goals and judicial behavior. *Political Research Quarterly* 47(3): 749–768.
- Baum, Lawrence (2006) *Judges, and Their Audiences: A Perspective on Judicial Behavior*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Borgatti, Stephen P, Ajay Mehra, Daniel J Brass and Giuseppe Labianca (2009) Network Analysis in the Social Sciences. *Science* 323(5916): 892–895.
- Brett, Peter (2018) Who are judicial decisions meant for? The ‘global community of law’ in Southern Africa. *International Political Science Review* 39(5): 585–599.
- Brouard, Sylvain (2009) The Politics of Constitutional Veto in France: Constitutional council, legislative majority, and electoral competition. *West European Politics* 32(2): 384–403.
- Butt, Simon (2015) *The Constitutional Court and Democracy in Indonesia*. Leiden, NL: Brill Nijhoff. Chua, Yvonne T, Booma B Cruz, Ma Gisela Ordenes-Cascolan, Luz Rimban, Jennifer Santiago and Ellen Tordessillas (2012) Political Economy Analysis of Judicial Appointments in the Philippines. Manila: *VERA Files*.
- Couso, Javier A, Alexandra Huneeus and Rachel Sieder (eds) (2010) *Cultures of Legality: Judicialisation and Political Activism in Latin America*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ginsburg, Tom (2003) *Judicial Review in New Democracies. Constitutional Courts in Asian Cases*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ginsburg, Tom and Tamir Moustafa (2008) *Rule by Law: The Politics of Courts in Authoritarian Regimes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gomez, Manuel A (2011) Greasing the Squeaky Wheel of Justice: Lawyers, social networks and dispute processing in Venezuela. In Yves Dezalay and Bryant Garth (eds) *Lawyers and the Rule of Law in an Era of Globalisation*. New York, NY: Routledge, 19–38.

- Gonzales-Ocantos, Ezequiel A (2016) *Shifting Legal Visions: Judicial Change and Human Rights Trials in Latin America*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Kapiszewski, Diana and Matthew Taylor (2008) Doing Courts Justice? Studying judicial politics in Latin America. *Perspectives on Politics* 6(4): 741–767.
- Katz, Daniel M and Derek K Stafford (2010) Hustle and Flow: A social network analysis of the American federal judiciary. *Ohio State Law Journal* 71(3): 467–510.
- Klein, James R (2003) The Battle for the Rule of Law in Thailand: The constitutional court of Thailand. In Amara Raksasataya and James R Klein (eds) *The Constitutional Court of Thailand. The Provisions and the Working of the Court*. Bangkok: Constitution for the People Society, 34–90.
- Lazer, David (2011) Networks in Political Science: Back to the future. *Political Science and Politics* 44: 61–68.
- Li, Ling (2018) Moral economy of corruption - Guanxi networks in China's courts. *International Political Science Review* 39(5): 634–646.
- Llanos, Mariana, Cordula Tibi Weber, Charlotte Heyl and Alexander Stroh (2016) *Informal Interference in the Judiciary in New Democracies: A comparison of six African and Latin American cases*. GIGA
- Working Papers, No. 245. Hamburg: German Institute of Global and Area Studies (GIGA). Spiller, Pablo and Rafael Gely (2010) Strategic Judicial Decision-making. In Keith E Whittington, Daniel
- R Kelemen and Gregory A Caldeira (eds) *The Oxford Handbook of Law and Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 35–43.
- Staton, Jeffrey K (2010) *Judicial Power and Strategic Communication in Mexico*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stroh, Alexander (2018) Sustaining and Jeopardizing a Credible Arbiter: Judicial networks in Benin's consolidating democracy. *International Political Science Review* 39(5): 600–615.
- Trochev, Alexei (2018) Patronal politics, judicial networks, and collective judicial autonomy in Post-Soviet Countries. *International Political Science Review* 39(5): 662–678.
- Trochev, Alexei and Rachel Ellett (2014) Judges and their Allies. *Journal of Law and Courts* 2(1): 67–91.

- Vanberg, Georg (2005) *The Politics of Constitutional Review in Germany*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Victor, Jennifer N, Alexander H Montgomery and Mark Lubell (eds) (2016) *The Oxford Handbook of Political Networks*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Vitug, Marites Danguilan (2010) *Shadow of Doubt: Probing the Supreme Court*. Quezon City: Public Trust Media Group.
- Vitug, Marites Danguilan (2012) *Hour Before Dawn. The Fall and Uncertain Rise of the Philippine Supreme Court*. Quezon City: Cleverheads.

