

DOCTRINE OF 'EJUEDEM GENERIS' AND ITS APPLICABILITY

Written by Srishti Virat

5th Year student of USLLS, GGSIPU Dwarka Sec-16, India

ABSTRACT

A key idea in statutory interpretation is the concept of ejusdem generis, which aids in identifying the scope and meaning of broad phrases in a statute. The concept works to limit a general term to things or topics of the same kind or nature as the examples given when it is followed by specific instances or phrases of a particular nature. In order to ensure uniformity and fairness in the execution of the law, this principle seeks to align the interpretation of the statute with the legislative intent. The doctrine is applicable in a number of legal contexts, including criminal law, administrative law, contract interpretation, insurance law, statutory interpretation. Ejusdem generis is a crucial instrument for reading statutes, but it should be used in conjunction with other statutory interpretation principles and taking each case's unique circumstances into account. For legal professionals and courts to arrive at correct and just interpretations of statutes, it is necessary that they comprehend the history, foundational ideas, applicability, and constraints of ejusdem generis.

INTRODUCTION

The Latin expression "**of a similar kind or nature**" is the reason for the lawful proverb "ejusdem generis," and that signifies "of a similar kind or nature." a regulative understanding rule is much of the time applied in general sets of laws from one side of the planet to the otherⁱ. The ejusdem generis concept directs courts and legal professionals in evaluating the extent and interpretation of certain statutory provisions, assisting in the resolution of ambiguities and gaps in the law. The general term should only be interpreted to cover objects or topics of the same sort or kind as those specifically described when a general term is followed by specific words or phrases in a statute. In other words, it restricts the use of the general term to a group or class of goods that are comparable to the specific products named in nature or character. Ejusdem generis is justified by the notion that when legislators describe particular items or attributes, they typically do so with a particular goal or objective in mind. Legislators express their purpose to deal with particular circumstances or situations by utilizing specific words or phrases. Therefore, it is assumed that the legislator meant to limit the general term's scope to items or situations of a comparable character when a general phrase is followed by such particular examples. Let's look at an example to demonstrate the idea. Imagine there is a law that says "no vehicles, including cars, trucks, motorcycles, and other motorized vehicles, are allowed in the park." Here, automobiles, trucks, and motorbikes are mentioned as specific instances. According to the ejusdem generis principle, "other motorized vehicles" is generally understood to refer to motorized vehicles that are similar to cars, trucks, and motorbikes in type or nature. Non-powered vehicles like bicycles and skateboards would not be included because they do not belong to the same category as motorized vehicles. Ejusdem generis can be used to guarantee consistency in statutory interpretation and help avoid an excessively broad reading of a statute. The approach encourages clarity, coherence, and fairness in legal interpretation by limiting the general term's meaning to things or issues that share characteristics with the specific examples. Even while ejusdem generis is a broadly accepted legal principle, its application can change based on the jurisdiction and unique factsⁱⁱ. Along with ejusdem generis, courts may also consider other statutory interpretation principles, such as the plain meaning rule, legislative intent, and the context in which the law was passed. There are events when an unanticipated situation might foster despite the fact that the governing body drafts regulation with extreme attention to detail and lucidity, considering all expected future prospects.

Notwithstanding, sporadically the council obstinately makes holes in the law, either because of an absence of understanding in the Parliament or in light of the fact that it accepts that the legitimate strategy might be carried out more really whenever picked on a singular premiseⁱⁱⁱ. Because of these variables, it becomes important to comprehend and decipher the terms of rules. The principle of the standard of *Ejusdem Generis* is one of the developments which decides that the legal executive should keep while deciphering and building rules. Every person who lives in a society is aware of the importance of the law. Law can be seen as a weapon for maintaining social harmony and the absence of problems, as well as for preventing interpersonal confrontations through policing behavior. Legal professionals design the laws that are passed into effect to govern society; hence it is to be expected that many of these laws will be vague and use ambiguous language. We regularly see that courts and lawyers are caught up with explaining the significance of such expressions and articulations and settling inconsistencies. All of this has brought about the making of some regulation understanding rules. We are mindful that there are three parts of the public authority: the administrative, leader, and legal branches. The job of legal translation becomes an integral factor, and it is significant for the legal executive to accurately manage equity by perusing the resolutions as the conditions call for. In different terms, "*Ejusdem Generis*" alludes to words that have a place with a similar class. The standard is that any conventional terms that observe ought to be perceived as by and large alluding to that class when explicit words have a typical trademark (i.e., of a class); no more extensive translation ought to be conceded.

THE RULE OF EJUSDEM GENERIS

There are sure broad standards of understanding that the courts have incidentally utilized. Development *Ejusdem Generis* is one of them, and it is examined beneath. The Latin expression "of a similar kind," or *ejusdem generis*, is utilized to decipher vaguely phrased resolutions. At the point when a regulation notices specific classes of individuals or things and afterward makes general references to them, the overall declarations just apply to the specific classifications of individuals or things that are expressed^{iv}. As a representation, on the off chance that a regulation notices vehicles, trucks, farm haulers, motorbikes, and other mechanized vehicles, it would reject planes from the meaning of "vehicles" on the grounds that

the rundown just included ground-based vehicles. Ejusdem Generis, as such, alludes to words in a similar class.

MEANING AND DEFINITION

‘Ejusdem Generis’ is a Latin term and the meaning of it is “of the same kind and nature”.

"The guideline of Ejusdem Generis is where general words adhere to a count of people or things by specific and explicit words," as per the Dark's Regulation Word reference (eighth version, 2004). Furthermore, it is held that these generic terms only apply to individuals or objects that fall within the same general category as those that are specifically listed. It is otherwise called Master Tenterden's Standard, and it is a conventional principle. As per the Precept of Ejusdem Generis, general words are limited to just involve merchandise or things that will be of similar kind as those of the particular terms when a rundown of explicit words is trailed by broad words. For example, on the off chance that a regulation alludes to vehicles, trucks, farm haulers, bicycles, and other mechanized vehicles, the general term "other mechanized vehicles" wo exclude any boats or planes in light of the fact that the particular words that precede them allude to kinds of land transportation, and when the ejusdem generis guideline is utilized, that general term may be permitted to allude to things in similar class as those referenced in the particular words.

ORIGIN OF THE STUDY

English common law is where the idea of ejusdem generis first appeared. "Ejusdem generis" is a Latin phrase that means "of the same kind or nature" and was originally used in legal terms. During the 18th and 19th centuries, the idea became a tool for statutory interpretation in English courts. It was created by judges as a way to clarify ambiguities and doubts brought on by the broad terminology used in legislation. The courts understood the necessity to interpret laws in a way that supported uniformity and fairness, along with the legislative objectives. In English common law, the use of ejusdem generis as a guideline for statutory interpretation came to be recognized and accepted^v. Its basic premise was that when the legislature offered a general

phrase coupled with a list of specific examples, the general term should be understood to only contain things or topics of the same kind or nature as the examples. Due to the adoption of English common law concepts by many other countries, the principle was incorporated into legal systems outside of England. Many Commonwealth nations, as well as the United States, Canada, and Australia, have acknowledged and implemented ejusdem generis into their legal systems. Even though ejusdem generis has its roots in English common law, it's crucial to remember that different jurisdictions may have different rules for its application and interpretation. Legal scholarship, local case law, and legislative enactments may all have an impact on the precise rules and standards that each legal system uses to interpret statutes. Ejusdem generis has developed over time, just as other statutory interpretation principles. Through the review of various instances and judicial precedents, courts have improved and clarified its applicability. It is still acknowledged and used as a technique for clarifying statutory issues and giving legislative purpose effect.

APPLICABILITY OF THE DOCTRINE OF 'EJUEDEM GENERIS'

- **Statutory Interpretation:** The main application of ejusdem generis is in the interpretation of laws. The notion aids in determining the general term's intended scope when it appears after a list of specific examples. It makes sure that the generic phrase is only applied to things or situations that fall under the same category as the examples given specifically.
- **Contract Interpretation:** The doctrine can be used to interpret contracts. Ejusdem generis can be used to help interpret general provisions that are followed by specific terms or illustrations in a contract. By relating the general language to the specific examples, it makes it easier to comprehend the intended reach and constraints of the general language.
- **Administrative Law:** When interpreting rules or administrative directives, ejusdem generis under administrative law may be applicable^{vi}. The notion aids in defining the intended scope of a general word used in conjunction with specific instances in a regulatory provision and aids in determining how the regulation should be applied.

- **Insurance Law:** The doctrine is frequently used to analyze policy provisions in insurance law. The generic words in insurance contracts are frequently followed by a series of specific examples. By confining the meaning of generic phrases to situations similar to the specific examples mentioned, ejusdem generis assists in identifying the coverage and exclusions.
- **Environmental and Natural Resources Law:** The principle of ejusdem generis is also applicable in this area of law. The theory aids in defining the scope of broad phrases in the context of the specific instances given when statutes or regulations refer to certain categories of natural resources or environmental dangers.
- **Criminal Law:** The ejusdem generis principle can also be applicable in criminal law. The theory assists in assessing the intended scope of the generic language used in criminal statutes when it appears alongside specific offenses or forbidden conduct to make sure that it covers offenses or acts of a like sort or kind.

It is significant to remember that ejusdem generis applicability can change according on the jurisdiction and the particulars of each case^{vii}. Along with ejusdem generis, courts may also consider other statutory interpretation principles, such as the plain meaning rule, legislative intent, and the general context of the statute. The precise text and intent of the statute or other legal document being interpreted determine the extent of its applicability in a given circumstance.

THE NEED FOR DOCTRINE OF EJUSDEM GENERIS

Understanding of the rule by the tenet of Ejusdem Generis emerges when-

- There is vagueness in the text of legal arrangements,
- The arrangement could be deciphered in two unique ways,
- The understanding that the arrangement of a regulation gives subverts the aim of the rule.

There is no need for interpretation if the statute's text is unambiguous and there are no ambiguities^{viii}. At the point when a legal arrangement contains an identification of explicit words, the subject of the count hence comprising a class or class, however which class or class

isn't at the same time depleted by the list, and the general term follows the list with no particular sign of any unique regulative expectation, the standard of Eiusdem generis is applied. The regulation of Eiusdem Generis isn't a law and order, yet rather a standard of development that empowers a court to decide the authoritative aim when that purpose is questionable. It prohibits the court from undermining or overcoming the official expectation by restricting a resolution's activity to a smaller degree than the lawmakers had planned. It does not have an all-encompassing application. Because it is only a rule of construction, it might not be helpful when the legislature's meaning is obvious enough to avoid the need for canons of construction. The rule should only be applied where the statute's language is ambiguous or unclear. The guideline of Eiusdem generis states that general words should be restricted to things of similar kind as those demonstrated when they follow specific and explicit terms of a similar kind^{ix}. In any case, it is clear from the circumstances shown that the particular words should frame a different class or sort. It is only a reasonable surmising without any proof in actuality; it's anything but a tough law and order. Considering different guidelines of understanding that all words in a resolution are to be given impact, in the event that conceivable that piece of the state is to be built together, and the lawmaking body is assumed not to have utilized unnecessary words, the teaching of Eiusdem Generis is an endeavor to accommodate a contradiction among explicit and general words. The conventional words are given their total and normal significance, which is the importance a theoretical form of them would have, in which case the particular words become pointless in light of the fact that they would likewise incorporate the thing they were expected to depict. The standard accomplishes the objective of giving impact to both the specific and general words by regarding the specific words as showing the class and the general words as broadening the arrangement of the resolution to everything embraced in that class, however not explicitly named by the specific words. Then again, assuming that the series of explicit words is given its full and regular significance, the general words become repetitive^x. The possibility of Eiusdem Generis was essentially a piece of a bigger guideline of development, which was that each word and expression in a composed message ought to, on the off chance that it is sensible to do as such, be given some importance and significance.

APPLICATION IN INDIA AND IN FOREIGN NATIONS

Latin for "of a similar kind or nature," "ejusdem generis" signifies "of a similar kind or nature." A resolution or agreement will utilize the thought when a general word or expression is trailed by unambiguous words or expressions, demonstrating that the general term ought to just be perused to cover objects of similar kind or kind as the particular models advertised. Ejusdem generis is a legal principle that is used in India to interpret contracts and statutes. Let's examine some instances when it has been used in both India and other countries:

- ***Indian Application:***

a. Legal interpretation: Indian courts interpret statutes according to the ejusdem generis principle. For instance, the court will interpret a broad phrase to only encompass objects of the same sort or nature as the specific examples if a statute employs general terms followed by specific examples. This makes it easier to ascertain the legislative meaning and guarantees uniform interpretation.

b. Contracts: The doctrine is used to interpret contracts as well. The general provision of a contract will only be considered to embrace issues that fall under the same category as the specific provisions if it is followed by specific provisions^{xi}. This guarantees that the contract appropriately reflects the parties' intentions.

- ***Foreign Application:***

a. Common law nations: The United States, the United Kingdom, Canada, and Australia are among the common law nations that frequently apply the ejusdem generis theory. By limiting the meaning of general words to the same category or class as the specific words that come before them, it aids courts in interpreting legislation and contracts.

b. Nations with civil law: Despite the fact that civil law systems frequently focus more on textual interpretation, several civil law nations also acknowledge and use the ejusdem generis theory^{xii}. For instance, the theory is used in statutory interpretation in France, Germany, and Italy to determine the extent of generic phrases.

THE DOCTRINE OF EJUSDEM GENERIS: LIMITATIONS

For the use of the standard of ejusdem generis, there should be a couple of necessities that have been given above, in the nonattendance, this standard can't be applied^{xiii}. The presence of a variety/class in the characterized words that the objective of the regulation was there to peruse the rule in such manner is one among them. Therefore, it tends to be derived that the Tenet of Ejusdem Generis isn't appropriate in the underneath referenced circumstances:

1. If the general words are there before the assigned words, then this idea isn't material. So, it tends to be asserted that particular words should be trailed by expansive terms. (*Department of Customer Vs. Sharad Gandhi, 2019 Supreme Court.*)^{xiv}
2. This model doesn't have any significant bearing in the event that the particular terms in the rule's arrangement that are trailed by the nonexclusive words don't comprise a special variety or class. The ejusdem nonexclusive rule ought to be utilized to restrict the general term to similar variety as the gave words since this is the main component. In *Jagdish Chandra Gupta v. Kajaria Traders (India) Ltd, 1964 Supreme Court,*^{xv} The Court decided that the understanding of ejusdem generis isn't required where explicit terms are trailed by broad words. Before such translation, a classification or family should be laid out for the expansive terms alluding to it to be bound as expected.
3. The teaching of ejusdem generis is likewise unimportant assuming that the general word is trailed by just a single word in light of the fact that a solitary word can't comprise a particular class or variety, with the proviso that the general word might be restricted to the single word family that the court has laid out^{xvi}.
4. This notion is not relevant if the terms supplied exhaust the entire genus or class.
5. If there is a legislative aim that is in conflict with the rule's applicability, the rule of ejusdem generis is also inapplicable. The doctrine of ejusdem generis has been deemed to be "not an inviolable rule of law" in numerous decided decisions. "Permissible inference in the absence of a contrary indication".

Thus, **EJUSDEM GENERIS** is:

It is feasible to limit the understanding of general words that follow explicit words in a Demonstration's count of different subjects by regarding them as applying to things of the very kind as those that were recently referenced, except if there is proof to propose that a more extensive sense was expected. If the particular terms cover everything in the genus, the generic words are taken to cover a wider genus. A statute's general language should be interpreted according to its common usage. Ordinarily, general terms should be interpreted in their broad sense, even when they follow specific words, unless a more reasonable interpretation calls for their usage to be restricted to items Ejusdem Generis with those specifically named^{xvii}. However, the generic words must be interpreted to apply to a different, larger genus if the specific phrases exhaust the entire genus. The Ejusdem Generis theory is simply a small portion of a larger principle of construction, which is that, where it is reasonable to do so, each and every word and phrase in a written text should be given some significance and meaning. Given that this is the doctrine's goal, it is difficult to see how including or omitting the term "other" can make a difference, provided-and this is crucial-that the examples offered belong to a clearly discernible genus. Applying the guideline of Ejusdem Generis requires critical consideration since it recommends changing the significance of words from their customary importance to mirror an indicated regulative point^{xviii}. The crucial rule that expresses that regulations should be deciphered to do their planned reason should be applied to this standard. The general terms might be thought to be restricted to that class on the off chance that the specific words are every one of similar variety as expected by the standard.

ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS

- **General phrase:** Ejusdem generis is based on the idea that a statute uses a general phrase. This phrase refers to a broader group or class of things that aren't always named or defined in the statute.
- **Specific instances:** The ejusdem generis principal mandates that specific instances or terms of a specific nature be included in the statute alongside the broad term. Compared to the general term, these instances are often more precise and constrained in nature.

- **Similarity in Kind or Nature:** The key component of ejusdem generis is that only things or matters that are similar to the specific instances given are included when the general word is applied. The general term is restricted to the same category or class and is not given a broad interpretation.
- **Restrictive Interpretation:** Ejusdem generis limits the scope of the general word by limiting its use to things or situations that resemble the specific examples. By guaranteeing that the general phrase corresponds with the specific instances given, it avoids an overly broad interpretation.
- **Legislative Intent:** Ejusdem generis application is predicated on the assumption that the legislature intended to limit the meaning of the general term to the same category or class as the specific examples. The goal of the principle is to make the statute's legislative intent clear.
- **Preventing ludicrous or Inconsistent Outcomes:** Preventing ludicrous or inconsistent outcomes in statutory interpretation is one of the goals of ejusdem generis. The principle encourages consistency and coherence in the interpretation of the statute by limiting the general term to be of the same sort or nature as the specific examples.
- **Contextual factors include:** Even though ejusdem generis offers a general guideline, it's vital to take the statute's broader context and other pertinent statutory interpretation criteria into account. To fully grasp the objective of the act, the concept should be used in conjunction with other interpretative techniques, such as the plain meaning rule, legislative history, and statutory purpose.

CASE LAWS

1. Powell v. Kempton Park Racecourse Co. Ltd (1899).

A regulation made it against the law to keep "a house, office, room, or other spot" explicitly for betting. For betting, the litigant kept an open walled in area. Where utilizing a home, office, room, or "other spot for wagering" is unlawful. The respondent guaranteed that he has a business somewhere else. As per the court, the phrasing in the rundown required that "other spot" apply to other indoor areas. At the point when words in a demonstration get their

importance from different words in a similar part or organization, this is known as "noscitur a sociis."

Held: The three particular things were all enclosed places, yet the defendant's action did not fit the Ejusdem generis list. Therefore, a prelude cannot be used to limit or qualify the legislation that follows.

2. *Siddeshwari Cotton Mills (P) Ltd v. UOI, 1989 Supreme Court.*

When deciphering the expansive expression "some other cycle" under segment 2(f) of the Focal Extract and Salt Demonstration, 1944, alongside Warning Number 230 and 231 dated 15-07-1977, the High Court in the previously mentioned case utilized the rule of ejusdem generis. The particular expressions "blanching, mercerizing, coloring, printing, water-sealing, rubber treating, recoil sealing, natural handling" were trailed by this general term^{xix}. That's what the court decided "the particular words structure a class of cycle which is bringing in a change which is of an enduring sort" for this situation by utilizing the ejusdem generis teaching. Along these lines, "some other word" should be connected with that cycle or occurrence here and there".

3. *Hamdard Dawakhana v. Union of India.*

In this case, the main thing concerned how to decipher the expansive expression "some other drinks containing natural product squeezes or natural product mash". This was expressed in the 1955 Natural product Items Request, which was taken on as per Segment 3 of the 1955 Fundamental Wares Act. The order laid out the necessity that there ought to be 25 peons of natural product juice in organic product syrup. The applicant contended that the choice wouldn't have any significant bearing to its item, Rooh Afza, in light of the fact that it included "squashes, pulverizes, cordials, grain water, barreled squeeze, and prepared to-serve refreshments or some other drinks containing natural product squeezes or natural product mash". The expansive expression will likewise be restricted to the terms demonstrated by utilizing the ejusdem generis.

Held: The High Court dismissed this contention, finding that the ejusdem generis measure doesn't have any significant bearing on the grounds that the things indicated before the wide expression don't have a place with a particular sort. The setting makes clearly the design was

to cover any remaining beverages that contain natural product juice. Since the terms that preceded the general words for this situation didn't lay out a particular variety or class, the High Court decided that the convention of Eiusdem Generis isn't relevant.

4. *Muir v Keay LR 10 (1875) QBD 594*

The litigant guaranteed that since he didn't offer diversion, his bistro didn't need a permit. The adjudicator decided that giving food and housing to visitors considers amusement as well as music. 'Expressiouniusest rejection alterious' is a linguistic rule. This assertion guarantees that all individuals from the class being referred to, whether at least one, are killed.

5. *Harris, R v (1836) CCR*

The prosecution said that Harris bit the tip of a woman's nose as part of a "stab, cut, or wound." This suggested that a tool would need to be utilized. It was determined that the statute's language, which states that injuries must be caused by an object and not by hands or teeth, applies to the interior of the law. The accuser was found not responsible.

6. *Pillois v. Billingsley, 179 F.2d 205, 2d Cir. (1950)*

This allure comes from a choice for a situation recorded under the court's variety ward to recover the sensible worth of the litigant's administrations, which were given at their solicitation to get an agreement for a company of which the person in question was a chief. As per the protest, the offended party and respondent settled on the accompanying settlement nearby July 9, 1947: the offended party would head out to Paris, France to the litigant's detriment, and assuming that the offended party were to effectively haggle with a specific French fragrance producer, which delivered the Le Galion line of scents and latrine waters, and secure from it an agreement that would give Cigogne, Inc., an organization where the litigant was intrigued, the selective right to sell the Le Galion line of scents and latrine waters, The respondent employed the offended party to get "from La Societe Le Galion a drawn out restrictive portrayal of S. A. Le Galion scents in the US of America and somewhere else in the Western Side of the equator for the sake of Cigogne, Inc.," and the litigant consented to pay the offended party for his administrations in doing as such. The court additionally saw that as "the offended party went to La Societe Le Galion to get a drawn out restrictive portrayal of S. A. Le Galion scents in the Assembled The court observed that the offended party was qualified

for pay for the sensible worth of his administrations, which was \$6,000. The judgment was placed for that aggregate, in addition to expenses and interest.

7. *Westmorland County Council v. Secretary of State for the Environment (1972)*

Assuming the Secretary of State's endorsement of the improvement of the Fulham Football Club site at Cowardly Cabin ought to stand, that is the issue in question in these procedures. The gatherings' methodologies for managing that matter offer a ton of similitudes. It is recognized that Gathering Order (85/337/E.E.C.) presents a right under Local area regulation that can be practiced by people like the litigant. It is recognized that the Town and Nation Arranging (Evaluation of Natural Impacts) Guidelines 1988 precisely made an interpretation of the Mandate into homegrown regulation. It is generally acknowledged that the Secretary of State ought to have thought about this inquiry (anything their decision could have been assuming the person had), that the individual abused guideline 4(2) in giving arranging authorization by neglecting to consider whether the proposed improvement was a metropolitan advancement project that would probably altogether affect the climate because of variables like its temperament, size, or area^{xx}. recommended, notwithstanding, that the Secretary of State might have legally postponed the cycle framed in the Guidelines for deciding the ecological effect assuming he had pondered the issue and had arrived at the resolution that the proposed advancement was a metropolitan improvement project that would probably fundamentally affect the climate because of variables like its temperament, size, or area.

8. *Halsbury's Laws of England, Volume 44, para 112:*

Halsbury's Laws of England is a widely recognized legal encyclopedia even though it does not cover a specific case. Volume 44, paragraph 112, talks about the ejusdem generis theory. The general terms are interpreted to be limited to the same category as the specific words when a list of specific words is followed by more general words in a statute, according to this rule. The passage gives a broad summary of the idea and how it is used in legislative interpretation.

CONCLUSION

Judges use the Ejusdem Generis rule, which is regarded as a canon of interpretation, when the statute's provisions are unclear or ambiguous in order to clarify them while taking the legislature's intent into account and thereby effectively accomplish the legislative goal. Therefore, it may be claimed that this doctrine must be used by the Courts with the appropriate care and caution, considering both the situations in which it should be applied and those in which it should not, as well as both its fundamental components and exceptions. By providing a framework for comprehending the meaning and application of generic phrases within a statute, the principle of ejusdem generis plays a crucial role in the interpretation of statutory language. Courts and legal professionals can determine the legislative intent and make sure the general term only includes things or topics of the same sort or kind by looking at the specific instances mentioned alongside the general term. The use of ejusdem generis contributes to keeping the legal system coherent and consistent by preventing too expansive interpretations of statutes. By limiting the generic term to a group or class of things that share qualities with the given examples specifically, it assures that the legislation is administered fairly and predictably.

But it's important to understand that ejusdem generis isn't the only guideline for interpreting statutes. The legislative intent, the context in which the law was passed, and other factors like the plain meaning rule may also be relevant. To arrive at a thorough and accurate interpretation of the statute, courts must take these guidelines into account in addition to ejusdem generis. Ejusdem generis may also be used differently in different jurisdictions since different legal systems may have different standards on how to interpret statutes. When applying the principle, legal practitioners must be knowledgeable of the pertinent case law and precedents in their jurisdiction. Overall, ejusdem generis is a crucial instrument for statutory interpretation, helping to clarify unclear language and fill in legislative gaps. The principle serves to clarify the legislature's intent and ensures a consistent and equitable execution of the law by carefully evaluating the specific examples supplied alongside a generic word.

SUGGESTIONS

Here are some suggestions for further exploration and consideration

- **Comparative Analysis:** Compare how *ejusdem generis* is used in various legal frameworks. Analyze any differences or patterns in how the idea is interpreted and applied across different jurisdictions. This comparative analysis can emphasize the effects of cultural, historical, or legal circumstances on the application of *ejusdem generis* and shed light on the advantages and disadvantages of various interpretations.
- **Case Studies:** Examine prominent legal situations where the principle of *ejusdem generis* has been crucial to the interpretation of statutes. Analyze the court's rationale, the arguments put out by the parties, and the case's final result. You can develop a deeper knowledge of how the concept functions in practice and how it affects legal results by studying examples from real-world situations. **Changes in Interpretation:** Examine the origins and progression of the *ejusdem generis* principle of statutory interpretation. Investigate its historical development and legal system origins. Think about any important decisions, legislative modifications, or scholarly discussions that have influenced its implementation and interpretation. Knowing the principle's background can help one better understand why it exists and whether it still holds true in today's legal system.
- **Critiques and Limitations:** Examine the drawbacks and restrictions related to the use of *ejusdem generis*. Examine alternative viewpoints or opposing legislative interpretation principles that might provide various methods for addressing statutory issues. Think about any circumstances when the use of *ejusdem generis* might result in undesirable effects or ambiguous results. The principle and its application in real-world situations can be better understood thanks to this critical analysis. **Relationship to Other Principles** Examine the interactions between *ejusdem generis* and other statutory interpretation principles. Examine circumstances in which many principles might be in force at once and investigate how courts might resolve any potential contradictions between these principles. A more sophisticated understanding of how courts approach statutory interpretation and deal with complicated legal issues can be gained by studying the interaction between *ejusdem generis* and other interpretive instruments. **Lawmaking Drafting:** Examine how *ejusdem generis* affects the creation of legislation.

Think about how politicians can write laws to make the most of the principle and prevent ambiguous interpretations. To ensure that laws are clear and coherently interpreted, look into best practices for include particular examples and generic phrases in legislation.

REFERENCES

1. Construction In the Interpretation of Statutes, available at: <https://www.legalserviceindia.com/legal/article-6955-doctrine-of-harmonious-construction-in-the-interpretation-of-statutes.html> (visited on 23 November,2021).
2. Constitution of India blog. pleaders.in/all-you-need-to-know-about-the-doctrine-of-ejusdem-generis/
3. Clark, W. M. (1952). The Doctrine of Ejusdem Generis in Missouri. *Wash. ULQ*, 250.
4. Englert, G. R. (2007). The Other Side of Ejusdem Generis. *Scribes J. Leg. Writing*, 11, 51.
5. Kimble, J. (2016). Ejusdem Generis: What Is It Good For. *Judicature*, 100, 49.
6. deJ, R. (1931). Statutory Construction. Doctrine of Ejusdem Generis. *Virginia Law Review*, 511-516.
7. MacKay, D. (1920). The Ejusdem Generis Principle of Interpretation. *Cent. LJ*, 90, 285.
8. Joshua, J. (2020). Uncertainty in Application of Doctrine of Ejusdem Generis in Civil Suits with Special Reference to the SARFAESI Act. *Supremo Amicus*, 17, 218.
9. Torphy, T. E. (1946). The maxim ejusdem generis. *Ins. LJ*, 15.
10. Strong, D. (1989). Oil and Gas: Ejusdem Generis: Oklahoma's Approach to the Interpretation of Other Minerals after Commissioners of Land Office v. Butler. *Okla. L. Rev.*, 42, 483.
11. Dietz, G. A. (1950). Statutory Construction: Ejusdem Generis Versus Legislative Intent. *U. Fla. L. Rev.*, 3, 258.
12. Wexler, J. (2020). Fun with reverse ejusdem generis. *Minn. L. Rev.*, 105, 1.
13. Slocum, B. G. (2016). Conversational implicatures and legal texts. *Ratio Juris*, 29(1), 23-43.

14. Smolka, J. (2022). Argumentation in the interpretation of statutory law and international law: not ejusdem generis. *Languages*, 7(2), 132.
15. Baetens, F. (2018, July). Ejusdem Generis and Noscitur a Sociis in Municipal and International Law: Interpretative Cross-Fertilisation?. In *Between the Lines of the Vienna Convention* (pp. 133-160).
16. Braimah, T. S. (2017). The Admission of Lesbians and Gay Asylum Seekers to the USA: From Victory (Ejusdem Generis) to Complications (Social Visibility). *Sexuality, Gender & Policy*, 1(1), 1-30.
17. Bhattacharyya, P. (2015). The Rule of Ejusdem Generis: A Novel Interpretation by the Indian Supreme Court and its Socio-Legal Impacts. *Labor Law Journal*, 66(4), 256.
18. Kelly, L. (2018). The Ejusdem Generis of AB-: Ongoing Asylum Advocacy for Domestic Violence Survivors. *Nat'l Law. Guild Rev.*, 75, 65.

ENDNOTES

ⁱ Construction In the Interpretation of Statutes, available at: <https://www.legalserviceindia.com/legal/article-6955-doctrine-of-harmonious-construction-in-the-interpretation-of-statutes.html>.

ⁱⁱ Constitution of India blog. pleaders.in/all-you-need-to-know-about-the-doctrine-of-ejusdem-generis/.

ⁱⁱⁱ Clark, W. M. (1952). The Doctrine of Ejusdem Generis in Missouri. Wash. ULQ, 250.

^{iv} Englert, G. R. (2007). The Other Side of Ejusdem Generis. *Scribes J. Leg. Writing*, 11, 51.

^v Kimble, J. (2016). Ejusdem Generis: What Is It Good For. *Judicature*, 100, 49.

^{vi} deJ, R. (1931). Statutory Construction. Doctrine of Ejusdem Generis. *Virginia Law Review*, 511-516.

^{vii} MacKay, D. (1920). The Ejusdem Generis Principle of Interpretation. *Cent. LJ*, 90, 285.

^{viii} Joshua, J. (2020). Uncertainty in Application of Doctrine of Ejusdem Generis in Civil Suits with Special Reference to the SARFAESI Act. *Supremo Amicus*, 17, 218.

^{ix} Torphy, T. E. (1946). The maxim ejusdem generis. *Ins. LJ*, 15.

^x Strong, D. (1989). Oil and Gas: Ejusdem Generis: Oklahoma's Approach to the Interpretation of Other Minerals after *Commissioners of Land Office v. Butler*. *Okla. L. Rev.*, 42, 483.

^{xi} Dietz, G. A. (1950). Statutory Construction: Ejusdem Generis Versus Legislative Intent. *U. Fla. L. Rev.*, 3, 258.

^{xii} Wexler, J. (2020). Fun with reverse ejusdem generis. *Minn. L. Rev.*, 105, 1.

^{xiii} Slocum, B. G. (2016). Conversational implicatures and legal texts. *Ratio Juris*, 29(1), 23-43.

^{xiv} SLP(CrL.) No.9159 of 2015.

^{xv} 1964 AIR 1882, 1964 SCR (8) 50.

^{xvi} Smolka, J. (2022). Argumentation in the interpretation of statutory law and international law: not ejusdem generis. *Languages*, 7(2), 132.

^{xvii} Baetens, F. (2018, July). Ejusdem Generis and Noscitur a Sociis in Municipal and International Law: Interpretative Cross-Fertilisation. In *Between the Lines of the Vienna Convention* (pp. 133-160).

^{xviii} Braimah, T. S. (2017). The Admission of Lesbians and Gay Asylum Seekers to the USA: From Victory (Ejusdem Generis) to Complications (Social Visibility). *Sexuality, Gender & Policy*, 1(1), 1-30.

^{xix} Bhattacharyya, P. (2015). The Rule of Ejusdem Generis: A Novel Interpretation by the Indian Supreme Court and its Socio-Legal Impacts. *Labor Law Journal*, 66(4), 256.

^{xx} Kelly, L. (2018). The Eiusdem Generis of AB-: Ongoing Asylum Advocacy for Domestic Violence Survivors. Nat'l Law. Guild Rev., 75, 65.

