Indian Journal of Modern Research and Reviews

This Journal is a member of the *'Committee on Publication Ethics'*

Online ISSN:2584-184X

Research Article

Freedom of Trade, Commerce and Intercourse Under Articles 301 To 307 of the Constitution of India: A Constitutional Analysis

Dr. Rafiul Ahmed

Assistant Professor & Research Supervisor, Department of Law, Arunodaya University, Arunachal Pradesh, India

Corresponding Author: * Dr. Rafiul Ahmed

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22125813

Abstract

The Constitution of India seeks to establish an integrated economic and political union by guaranteeing freedom of trade, commerce and intercourse throughout the territory of India. Part XIII of the Constitution, comprising Articles 301 to 307, provides the constitutional framework for this freedom while simultaneously recognising the legitimate regulatory powers of Parliament and State Legislatures. Article 301 lays down the basic guarantee of free movement of trade, commerce and intercourse, whereas Articles 302 to 305 provide constitutionally permitted limitations and exceptions. Article 306 has been repealed, and Article 307 enables Parliament to establish an authority for implementing the purposes of Part XIII. The Supreme Court has played a significant role in determining the scope of this freedom, particularly through Atiabari Tea Co. Ltd. v. State of Assam, Automobile Transport (Rajasthan) Ltd. v. State of Rajasthan and the Constitution Bench decision in Jindal Stainless Ltd. v. State of Haryana. The later decision in Jindal Stainless clarified the constitutional position concerning taxation and held that a non-discriminatory tax does not, by itself, violate Article 301. This article examines the constitutional scheme, judicial interpretation and contemporary significance of Articles 301–307, with particular emphasis on the balance between economic integration and the regulatory autonomy of the States.

Manuscript Information

- **ISSN No:** 2584-184X
- **Received:** 09-07-2026
- **Accepted:** 23-08-2026
- **Published:** 27-08-2026
- **MRR:**4(8); 2026: 289-293

- **Plagiarism Checked:** Yes
- **Peer Review Process:** Yes

How to Cite this Article

Ahmed R. Freedom of Trade, Commerce and Intercourse Under Articles 301 To 307 of the Constitution of India: A Constitutional Analysis. Indian J Mod Res Rev. 2026;4(8):289-293.

Access this Article Online

www.mrrjournal.in

KEYWORDS: Article 301, Free Trade, Commerce, Economic Unity, Part XIII.

1. INTRODUCTION

India is constitutionally structured as a Union in which different States and Union Territories form part of one economic and political system. The existence of internal State boundaries should not, therefore, result in the creation of economic barriers that obstruct the movement of goods, services, persons or commercial activities. The constitutional guarantee contained in Part XIII reflects this objective.

Articles 301 to 307 constitute a distinct constitutional scheme concerning trade, commerce and intercourse within the territory of India. Article 301 declares the basic principle that trade, commerce and intercourse throughout India shall be free, subject to the other provisions of Part XIII. The guarantee, however, is not absolute. The Constitution itself permits Parliament and State Legislatures to impose restrictions under specified circumstances.

The constitutional design attempts to reconcile two competing considerations. On the one hand, India requires an integrated national market in which economic activities can move across State boundaries without unjustified barriers. On the other hand, State Governments require sufficient legislative space to regulate economic activities, protect public interests and raise revenue. Part XIII therefore represents an attempt to preserve national economic unity without completely eliminating the regulatory authority of the constituent States.

The Supreme Court's interpretation of these provisions has evolved considerably. Initially, the Court focused on restrictions having a direct and immediate effect on trade. Later constitutional adjudication, particularly the decision in Jindal Stainless Ltd. v. State of Haryana, substantially clarified the position concerning taxation and the meaning of freedom under Article 301.

2. Constitutional Framework of Part XIII

Part XIII begins with Article 301 and extends to Article 307. Each provision performs a specific constitutional function.

Article 301 establishes the general freedom of trade, commerce and intercourse throughout India. Article 302 permits Parliament to impose restrictions on this freedom in the public interest. Article 303 seeks to prevent discriminatory legislative treatment between States, while permitting Parliament to depart from the prohibition in exceptional circumstances. Article 304 deals specifically with the legislative powers of States. Article 305 protects certain existing laws and laws relating to State monopolies. Article 306 was repealed by the Constitution (Seventh Amendment) Act, 1956. Article 307 authorises Parliament to establish an appropriate authority for carrying out the purposes of Articles 301 to 304.[1]

The scheme demonstrates that Article 301 cannot be interpreted independently. Its opening words—"Subject to the other provisions of this Part"—make the freedom subject to constitutionally recognised qualifications. Thus, the real constitutional question is not whether trade is absolutely free, but whether a particular legislative measure falls within one of the constitutionally permissible limitations.

3. Meaning and Scope of Article 301

Article 301 declares that trade, commerce and intercourse throughout the territory of India shall be free. The expression "throughout the territory of India" indicates that the constitutional guarantee is concerned not merely with inter-State trade but also with the movement of trade and commerce within States.

The provision has an important federal dimension. It prevents the internal boundaries of States from becoming economic frontiers. A State cannot ordinarily treat its territory as an isolated economic unit and erect barriers that unnecessarily obstruct the national flow of commerce.

The Supreme Court in Atiabari Tea Co. Ltd. v. State of Assam examined the scope of Article 301 in detail. The Court recognised that the freedom guaranteed by Article 301 is subject to the other provisions of Part XIII and is intended to prevent restrictions that directly and immediately affect the movement of trade.[2] The case arose from the Assam Taxation (on Goods Carried by Roads or Inland Waterways) Act, 1954. The Court concluded that the impugned levy imposed a direct restriction on the movement of goods and was therefore constitutionally vulnerable.

The decision established the importance of examining the actual effect of legislation upon trade rather than merely considering its formal character.

4. Regulation and Restriction

An important distinction under Article 301 is between legitimate regulation and unconstitutional restriction. Not every law affecting commercial activity necessarily violates the constitutional guarantee.

In Automobile Transport (Rajasthan) Ltd. v. State of Rajasthan, the Supreme Court considered the constitutional validity of a motor vehicle taxation law.[3] The Court developed what came to be known as the "working test" for determining whether a measure constitutes a restriction upon trade. Regulatory measures that facilitate the movement of trade and provide necessary infrastructure were distinguished from measures that directly impede commercial movement.

The distinction is constitutionally important because modern economic activity cannot function without regulation. Roads require maintenance, commercial vehicles require licensing, markets require standards, and public safety requires regulatory intervention. Treating every regulation as a constitutional restriction would make the regulatory powers of government practically impossible to exercise.

Therefore, the constitutional enquiry requires attention to the substance and effect of the law rather than merely its form.

[1] The Constitution of India, arts. 301–307, Part XIII, Government of India, Ministry of Law and Justice, available at India Code – Constitution of India.

[2] Atiabari Tea Co. Ltd. v. State of Assam, AIR 1961 SC 232.

[3] Auto The Constitution of India, art. 302

5. Article 302: Power of Parliament

Article 302 empowers Parliament to impose restrictions on the freedom of trade, commerce or intercourse between one State and another or within any part of the territory of India, if such restrictions are required in the public interest.[4]

The provision reflects the constitutional recognition that national economic interests may sometimes require restrictions. For example, Parliament may adopt measures intended to address national economic emergencies, protect essential supplies, regulate strategic commodities or maintain an orderly national market.

The expression "public interest" gives Parliament considerable legislative space, but it does not make constitutional scrutiny irrelevant. A restriction imposed under Article 302 must remain within the constitutional framework and cannot be used arbitrarily to destroy the fundamental structure of economic unity contemplated by Part XIII.

6. Article 303: Prohibition of Discrimination

Article 303 addresses discriminatory legislative treatment of States. Clause (1) declares that neither Parliament nor a State Legislature shall have power to make any law giving preference to one State over another, or making or authorising discrimination between one State and another, by virtue of any entry relating to trade and commerce.

Article 303(2), however, recognises an exception. Parliament may make a law giving preference or authorising discrimination if such action is declared by law to be necessary for dealing with a situation arising from scarcity of goods in any part of India.[5]

The provision reflects the constitutional concern that States should not engage in economic protectionism against one another. In a federal country with substantial differences in resources and production, discriminatory trade barriers could undermine national economic integration.

At the same time, the scarcity exception acknowledges that extraordinary economic circumstances may require differential treatment for legitimate national reasons.

7. Article 304: Restrictions by State Legislatures

Article 304 is particularly significant because it defines the circumstances in which State Legislatures may impose restrictions affecting trade, commerce and intercourse.

Article 304(a) permits a State Legislature to impose taxes on goods imported from other States or Union Territories, provided that similar goods manufactured or produced within that State are subject to the same tax and that the imported goods are not discriminated against.[6]

The purpose is to prevent discriminatory taxation against goods originating outside the State. A State may tax goods entering its territory, but it cannot use taxation as a disguised instrument of economic protectionism.

Article 304(b) permits a State Legislature to impose reasonable restrictions on the freedom of trade, commerce or intercourse with or within that State when such restrictions are required in the public interest. However, a Bill or amendment for this purpose cannot be introduced or moved in the State Legislature without the previous sanction of the President.[7]

Thus, Article 304 creates a constitutional balance. States retain regulatory authority, but that authority is subject to substantive and procedural limitations.

8. Article 305: Saving of Existing Laws and State Monopolies

Article 305 preserves certain existing laws and laws relating to State monopolies. The provision ensures that the constitutional guarantee under Article 301 does not automatically invalidate every existing legislative arrangement or State monopoly.

The provision is important because the Constitution does not establish an unrestricted free-market model. It recognises that the State may, in certain circumstances, participate directly in economic activity and may create or maintain monopolistic arrangements where constitutionally permissible.[8]

Consequently, Part XIII should not be understood as a constitutional prohibition upon governmental regulation or State participation in commerce. Its principal objective is to prevent unjustified barriers that fragment the national economic space.

9. Article 306 and Its Repeal

Article 306 originally dealt with the power of certain States in Part B of the First Schedule to impose restrictions on trade and commerce. The provision was subsequently repealed by the Constitution (Seventh Amendment) Act, 1956.[9]

Although Article 306 no longer has operative force, its historical presence illustrates the transitional nature of the Indian constitutional framework during the early years of the Republic. The reorganisation of States and constitutional changes after independence required corresponding modifications to the scheme of internal trade.

10. Article 307: Constitutional Authority

Article 307 authorises Parliament to establish an authority for carrying out the purposes of Articles 301, 302, 303 and 304. Parliament may confer upon such an authority the powers and duties considered necessary.[10]

The provision demonstrates that the Constitution contemplated an institutional mechanism for maintaining the objectives of economic freedom. Although Article 307 itself does not

[4] mobile Transport (Rajasthan) Ltd. v. State of Rajasthan, AIR 1962 SC 1406.
[5] The Constitution of India, art. 302.
[6] Id., art. 303
[7] Id., art. 304(a).
[8] Id., art. 304(b).
[9] Id., art. 305.
[10] Constitution (Seventh Amendment) Act, 1956, s. 29 and Sch.

establish such an authority, it provides Parliament with constitutional authority to create one.
The provision also reflects the practical character of Part XIII. Constitutional freedom relating to trade requires not only judicial protection but also appropriate institutional and legislative mechanisms.

11. Judicial Development: From Atiabari to Jindal Stainless

The interpretation of Article 301 has undergone significant development through judicial decisions.
In Atiabari Tea Co. Ltd. v. State of Assam, the Supreme Court adopted the doctrine that a law having a direct and immediate effect upon the movement of trade could attract Article 301 scrutiny.[11]This approach treated Article 301 as imposing a constitutional limitation upon legislative power.
The decision in Automobile Transport (Rajasthan) Ltd. refined the approach by distinguishing restrictions from regulatory measures that facilitate trade.[12] This distinction was particularly significant because taxation and regulatory measures are unavoidable features of modern governance.
Subsequently, a larger constitutional debate arose concerning the treatment of taxes under Part XIII. The Supreme Court's Constitution Bench decision in Jindal Stainless Ltd. v. State of Haryana fundamentally clarified the position. The Court held that a non-discriminatory tax does not, merely because it affects trade, constitute an infringement of Article 301.[13]
The Court rejected the earlier compensatory-tax doctrine and clarified that the word "free" in Article 301 does not mean freedom from taxation as such. The central constitutional concern under Article 304(a) is discriminatory taxation against imported goods.[14]
This development is important because it brings greater clarity to the relationship between fiscal federalism and the constitutional freedom of trade.

12. Taxation and the Constitutional Market

Taxation is essential for the functioning of both Union and State governments. If every tax having an economic effect upon trade were treated as an unconstitutional restriction, the fiscal powers of governments would be severely compromised.
The modern constitutional position therefore focuses particularly upon discrimination rather than the mere existence of a tax. In Jindal Stainless, the Supreme Court held that non-discriminatory taxes do not automatically violate Article 301.[15]
This approach recognises the distinction between legitimate revenue measures and protectionist taxation. A State cannot impose a tax on goods from another State merely to make them commercially less competitive than locally produced goods. At the same time, a generally applicable and non-discriminatory tax is not unconstitutional simply because it affects economic activity.
The principle strengthens both economic integration and fiscal federalism.

13. Contemporary Relevance

The constitutional guarantee under Articles 301 to 307 has acquired renewed importance in an increasingly integrated Indian economy. The growth of e-commerce, digital markets, logistics networks, interstate supply chains and service-sector activities has reduced the practical significance of traditional geographical boundaries.
The constitutional idea of a common economic space is therefore broader today than it was when the Constitution came into force. Trade is no longer confined to the physical movement of goods by roads, railways and waterways. Services, digital transactions, capital and technology now constitute essential components of commercial activity.
The constitutional framework must consequently be interpreted in a manner that protects economic integration while allowing reasonable regulation in the public interest.
The introduction of the Goods and Services Tax regime has also strengthened the idea of a common national market by replacing several indirect taxes with a coordinated tax structure. While GST operates under a separate constitutional framework, its broader objective of reducing cascading taxes and facilitating interstate trade is consistent with the constitutional aspiration of economic integration.

14. Freedom of Trade and Federalism

Articles 301 to 307 occupy an important position in Indian federalism. The Constitution divides legislative powers between the Union and States, but economic integration requires that these powers not be exercised in a manner that fragments the national market.
Part XIII therefore establishes constitutional limits upon economic protectionism. States retain substantial powers to regulate trade within their territories, but those powers are subject to constitutional safeguards against discrimination and unjustified restrictions.
The provisions demonstrate that Indian federalism is not merely a division of political authority. It also seeks to maintain economic unity. The national market is consequently protected through a combination of constitutional freedom, legislative competence and judicial review.

---

[11] The Constitution of India, art. 307.
[12] Atiabari Tea Co. Ltd. v. State of Assam, AIR 1961 SC 232.
[13] Automobile Transport (Rajasthan) Ltd. v. State of Rajasthan, AIR 1962 SC 1406.
[14]Jindal Stainless Ltd. v. State of Haryana, (2017) 12 SCC 1; see also Supreme Court of India, Constitution Bench judgment, 11 November 2016. The judgment clarified that a non-discriminatory tax does not per se constitute a restriction on the freedom guaranteed by Article 301.
[15] Jindal Stainless Ltd. v. State of Haryana, (2017) 12 SCC 1. The Supreme Court held that taxes simpliciter are not within the contemplation of Part XIII and that the word "free" in Article 301 does not mean freedom from taxation Ibid. The Constitution Bench further held that discriminatory taxes are prohibited under Article 304(a), whereas a non-discriminatory tax does not, by itself, infringe Article 301.

15. Critical Analysis

The strength of Part XIII lies in its attempt to balance competing constitutional values. Absolute freedom of trade would be unrealistic because governments must regulate markets, protect consumers, maintain public order and provide infrastructure. Conversely, unrestricted State regulation could create internal trade barriers and weaken the economic unity of India.

Articles 301 to 307 address this problem by creating a structured system. Article 301 establishes the general principle, Articles 302 to 304 identify permissible restrictions, Article 305 provides specific savings, Article 306 has been repealed, and Article 307 provides for an implementing authority.

Judicial interpretation has been equally important. The transition from the "direct and immediate effect" approach in Atiabari and the regulatory distinction in Automobile Transport to the modern taxation principles in Jindal Stainless demonstrates the adaptability of constitutional interpretation.

However, continuing judicial scrutiny remains necessary. In a changing economy, new forms of regulation may indirectly affect interstate trade. Digital commerce, environmental regulation, local procurement policies and state-specific economic incentives can potentially create new questions under Part XIII. The constitutional objective should therefore remain the prevention of discriminatory or protectionist barriers while preserving legitimate governmental regulation.

16. Conclusion

Articles 301 to 307 embody the constitutional commitment to maintaining economic unity within India. Article 301 provides the foundational guarantee of freedom of trade, commerce and intercourse, but that freedom is expressly subject to the remaining provisions of Part XIII.

The Constitution does not contemplate an economy free from all regulation. Instead, it seeks to ensure that legitimate regulation does not become a device for creating unjustified internal trade barriers. Articles 302, 303 and 304 establish carefully defined exceptions, while Article 305 protects specified existing laws and State monopolies. Article 307 provides Parliament with authority to create an institutional mechanism for implementing the purposes of Part XIII.

The jurisprudence beginning with Atiabari Tea Co., refined in Automobile Transport, and substantially clarified by the Constitution Bench in Jindal Stainless, demonstrates the Supreme Court's continuing effort to balance economic freedom, fiscal powers and federal autonomy.

The contemporary significance of Part XIII lies in its contribution to the idea of India as one economic space. As commerce increasingly transcends physical boundaries through digital platforms, interstate supply chains and service-based transactions, the constitutional principle of free commercial intercourse remains essential. The enduring objective should be to preserve a national market in which States retain legitimate regulatory powers but cannot transform their territorial boundaries into barriers to economic integration.

REFERENCES

1. Jain MP. Indian Constitutional Law. New Delhi: LexisNexis.
2. Seervai HM. Constitutional Law of India. New Delhi: Universal Law Publishing.
3. Shukla VN. Constitution of India. Lucknow: Eastern Book Company.
4. Basu DD. Introduction to the Constitution of India. New Delhi: LexisNexis.
5. Constitution of India. Part XIII. New Delhi: Government of India.
6. Atiabari Tea Co. Ltd. v. State of Assam. AIR 1961 SC 232.
7. Automobile Transport (Rajasthan) Ltd. v. State of Rajasthan. AIR 1962 SC 1406.
8. Jindal Stainless Ltd. v. State of Haryana. (2017) 12 SCC 1.

About the Author

Dr. Rafiul Ahmed is an Assistant Professor and Research Supervisor in the Department of Law at Arunodaya University, Arunachal Pradesh, India. He is engaged in teaching, research supervision, and academic activities in the field of law. His scholarly interests include legal studies, research methodology, contemporary legal issues, and interdisciplinary approaches to legal education.