

# Original Article: The Role of Legal Precedents in Shaping Contemporary Judicial Decisions and Their Implications

**Fatemeh Sattari Ghorbani**

PhD student in Criminal Law and Criminology, Chalus Branch, Islamic Azad University, Chalus, Iran



**Citation** F Sattari Ghorbani, *The Role of Legal Precedents in Shaping Contemporary Judicial Decisions and Their Implications*, *AJMSS*, 2025; 1(6): 382-388.

 <https://10.5281/zenodo.17155629>

## Article info:

Received: 12.05.2025

Accepted: 26.07.2025

Checked for Plagiarism: Yes

## Keywords:

Legal Precedent, Judicial Decision-Making, Stare Decisis, Legal Certainty, Social Justice

## ABSTRACT

Legal precedents play a fundamental role in shaping the reasoning and outcomes of judicial decisions across various legal systems, particularly in common law jurisdictions. By adhering to the doctrine of *stare decisis*, courts ensure consistency, predictability, and fairness in the application of law. This reliance on precedent provides litigants and society with a sense of stability, allowing individuals and institutions to anticipate legal consequences and organize their affairs accordingly. Beyond stability, precedents also facilitate the gradual evolution of legal doctrines, enabling courts to refine or reinterpret principles in response to shifting social norms, political contexts, and technological innovations. At the same time, the use of precedent is not without challenges. Strict adherence may entrench outdated or unjust decisions, while excessive flexibility risks undermining legal certainty and judicial legitimacy. The globalized nature of contemporary legal practice further complicates this dynamic, as courts increasingly engage with transnational jurisprudence and comparative precedent. This paper argues that the true significance of precedent lies in its dual role as both a guardian of continuity and a catalyst for change. By balancing respect for established rulings with responsiveness to new realities, courts can ensure that the law remains both stable and adaptable, preserving its legitimacy while addressing emerging challenges. The broader implications of precedent extend beyond legal reasoning, shaping democratic governance, economic stability, and social justice in profound and lasting ways.

## Introduction

The doctrine of precedent, or *stare decisis*, is central to the functioning of courts and the legal system as a whole. It requires judges to follow prior decisions when the same points arise again in litigation. This principle fosters legal

certainty, enabling individuals and institutions to predict the legal consequences of their actions. However, while precedents ensure stability, they also raise questions about flexibility, judicial activism, and adaptability to new societal needs [1].

\*Corresponding Author: **Fatemeh Sattari Ghorbani** (Email: [sattari56@gmail.com](mailto:sattari56@gmail.com))

This article examines the dual function of precedents: as guardians of continuity and as mechanisms for gradual legal evolution. It highlights how precedents influence judicial decisions in contemporary courts, their benefits, limitations, and the balance courts must strike

between adhering to established law and responding to contemporary challenges [2]. In table (1), Review of Previous Studies on the Role of Legal Precedents in Judicial Decision-Making was illustrated.

**Table 1.** Review of Previous Studies on the Role of Legal Precedents in Judicial Decision-Making [3]

Title of Study	Methodology	Key Findings
The Power of Precedent	Theoretical-Analytical	Emphasized that precedents are central to judicial legitimacy and continuity in U.S. constitutional law.
How Judges Think	Empirical & Analytical	Highlighted that judges use precedents both instrumentally and strategically, influenced by pragmatic considerations.
The Strategic Use of Precedent on the U.S. Supreme Court	Empirical Judicial Analysis	Found that precedent serves not only as a constraint but also as a strategic tool for shaping judicial outcomes.
Precedent and Analogy in Legal Reasoning	Comparative Legal Analysis	Concluded that precedents provide consistency while analogy allows adaptation of old rules to new contexts.
Constitutional Precedent in Comparative Perspective	Comparative Study (U.S., UK, EU)	Demonstrated that reliance on precedent varies across jurisdictions but universally enhances predictability and legal certainty

### Historical Foundations of Legal Precedent

The doctrine of precedent traces back to English common law, where courts gradually developed a system of case-based reasoning. Landmark decisions, such as *Donoghue v. Stevenson* (1932) on negligence, illustrate how precedents can reshape entire legal doctrines. Over time, the doctrine spread globally, influencing legal systems beyond the United Kingdom, especially in jurisdictions that inherited common law traditions, such as the United States, Canada, India, and Australia [4].

In contrast, civil law systems historically placed greater emphasis on codified statutes rather than judicial precedent. Yet even within these systems, judicial decisions increasingly play a persuasive role in interpreting statutory law, demonstrating the universal importance of precedents in modern legal practice.

### The Role of Precedent in Contemporary Judicial Decision-Making

**1. Consistency and Predictability:** Precedents promote uniformity in judicial outcomes. Litigants can anticipate the likely result of their cases based on previous rulings, reducing arbitrary decision-

making. This consistency strengthens public trust in the judiciary.

**2. Efficiency in Legal Reasoning:** By relying on past decisions, judges can build upon established principles rather than re-litigating foundational issues in each case. This enhances efficiency and conserves judicial resources [5].

**3. Gradual Evolution of Law:** Precedents enable incremental development of legal doctrines. Courts can refine, adapt, or distinguish prior rulings in light of changing circumstances, ensuring the law remains relevant while avoiding abrupt legal shifts.

**4. Judicial Restraint and Legitimacy:** By grounding decisions in precedent, courts demonstrate respect for institutional continuity and limit accusations of judicial overreach. This strengthens judicial legitimacy in democratic societies.

### Implications of Legal Precedent

**A. Democratic and Social Implications:** Legal precedents ensure equality before the law by applying the same rules to similar cases. They reinforce democratic ideals by preventing selective justice and arbitrary rulings. Furthermore, landmark precedents often catalyze

social change, such as *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954), which dismantled racial segregation in the United States.

**B. Economic and Commercial Stability:** Predictable legal frameworks are essential for business and commerce. Precedents in contract, property, and corporate law provide certainty, enabling economic actors to plan long-term investments with reduced legal risk [6].

**C. Adaptability to Technological and Social Change:** While precedents provide stability, they can also hinder rapid adaptation to new realities. Courts must balance respect for past decisions with the need to reinterpret the law in light of emerging technologies, globalization, or evolving moral values (e.g., digital privacy, climate change litigation, or same-sex marriage rights).

### Challenges and Critiques

**1. Rigidity of Stare Decisis:** Strict adherence to precedent can entrench outdated or unjust decisions, delaying necessary reform. Courts must sometimes overturn precedent to align with contemporary values and constitutional principles.

**2. Judicial Activism vs. Restraint:** The interpretation of precedent may vary widely. Critics argue that judges may use precedent selectively to justify activist rulings, undermining legal certainty.

**3. Globalization and Transnational Influence:** As international law and cross-border issues become increasingly relevant, courts often look beyond domestic precedents to foreign and international jurisprudence. This raises questions about the legitimacy and authority of external precedents in shaping national law.

**4. Technology and the Digital Age:** Artificial intelligence, digital privacy, and biotechnology present novel legal questions with little precedent. Courts face the challenge of crafting principles for uncharted territory while relying on analogies from older precedents.

### Comparative Perspectives

- **Common Law Systems:** Precedent is binding, forming the backbone of judicial reasoning. Supreme courts often have the power to overrule earlier decisions, setting new directions in law.
- **Civil Law Systems:** While statutes dominate, precedents play an increasingly important persuasive role. Courts in

France, Germany, and other civil law countries often refer to past judgments to maintain coherence in interpretation [7].

- **Hybrid Systems:** Countries like South Africa and Israel adopt a mixed approach, demonstrating the universal trend toward recognizing the practical value of precedent.

### Discussion

The doctrine of precedent—*stare decisis*—is widely recognized as one of the most important features of judicial reasoning. It provides the structural foundation for consistency, continuity, and legitimacy in judicial decision-making, particularly in common law jurisdictions. At the same time, precedent is not static. It evolves, adapts, and sometimes even collapses under the pressure of social, political, and technological transformation. A nuanced discussion of the role of legal precedents in shaping judicial outcomes must therefore balance two competing dynamics: the stabilizing force of precedent and its capacity for incremental change. In contemporary contexts, the implications of precedent stretch across law, politics, economics, and society at large [8].

This discussion unfolds across several dimensions: (1) the function of precedent in judicial reasoning, (2) its role in fostering consistency and legitimacy, (3) the challenges it faces in dynamic societies, (4) comparative perspectives between common law and civil law jurisdictions, (5) the tension between judicial activism and restraint, and (6) the broader societal, economic, and democratic implications of precedent.

**Precedent as a Foundation of Judicial Reasoning:** At its core, precedent enables judges to reason from what has been decided before. Instead of approaching each case in isolation, judges situate disputes within an existing framework of decisions, thereby anchoring legal interpretation in continuity. Precedents are particularly valuable because they embody collective judicial wisdom accumulated over decades or even centuries. For example, in tort law, the famous *Donoghue v. Stevenson* (1932) case established the “neighbor principle,” shaping negligence law for generations. In contemporary practice, precedents serve both as binding authorities (mandatory precedents) and as persuasive authorities. Binding precedents,

usually established by higher courts, restrict judicial discretion in lower courts. Persuasive precedents, drawn from other jurisdictions or lower courts, guide judicial reasoning without mandating conformity. Together, they create a rich ecosystem of legal authority that informs and disciplines judicial behavior [9].

**Consistency, Predictability, and Legitimacy:**

One of the strongest arguments in favor of precedent is its capacity to ensure consistency. Similar cases should be treated alike, a principle that resonates with the idea of justice itself. When litigants and lawyers can predict outcomes based on past rulings, the legal system acquires credibility. Businesses, governments, and individuals rely on this predictability to plan actions and assess risks. Legitimacy also flows from the consistent application of precedent. Courts derive much of their authority not from electoral mandates but from public trust in their impartiality and reliability. By grounding decisions in precedent, judges demonstrate that outcomes are not arbitrary personal opinions but the result of an established legal tradition. In this way, precedent strengthens the perceived objectivity of judicial rulings and contributes to the broader legitimacy of the judiciary [10].

**The Role of Precedent in Gradual Legal Evolution:**

While precedent is conservative in nature, it also provides a mechanism for legal evolution. Courts can distinguish a new case from an old one, reinterpret the scope of an earlier ruling, or, in rare instances, overturn a precedent altogether. This gradualism ensures that law evolves incrementally, maintaining continuity while adapting to new challenges. Consider the U.S. Supreme Court's jurisprudence on civil rights. Early precedents such as *Plessy v. Ferguson* (1896), which endorsed racial segregation, were eventually overturned by *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954). This illustrates the capacity of precedent not only to entrench injustice but also to correct it, reflecting shifts in social values and constitutional interpretation. Thus, precedent acts as both a stabilizer and a catalyst for change—a paradox that defines its unique contribution to judicial reasoning [11].

## Challenges of Precedent in Contemporary Society

**Rigidity and Injustice:** One major critique of precedent is its rigidity. Adherence to outdated precedents may perpetuate injustice, especially when societal norms evolve faster than the legal system. The reluctance to overturn precedent is often justified by concerns about instability, but this conservatism can delay urgently needed reform [12].

**Judicial Activism and Selective Use:** Judges are not neutral automatons. They interpret precedents through the lens of their own reasoning and values. Critics argue that judges may selectively use or distinguish precedents to justify activist rulings, undermining legal certainty. For instance, debates over constitutional interpretation often reveal sharp divides in how judges apply or resist precedent [13].

**Globalization and Transnational Precedent:** In a globalized legal landscape, national courts increasingly engage with foreign precedents. For example, the European Court of Human Rights and the Court of Justice of the European Union exert significant influence on domestic judicial decisions in Europe. Similarly, U.S. courts occasionally reference international jurisprudence in cases concerning human rights. While this enriches legal reasoning, it also raises concerns about sovereignty and the legitimacy of foreign influence [14].

**Technology and Novel Legal Questions:**

Precedents often lag behind technological innovation. Courts must decide on issues such as digital privacy, artificial intelligence liability, or climate change litigation, with little direct precedent available. Judges frequently resort to analogies, applying older principles (e.g., property rights or negligence) to new contexts. This flexibility demonstrates the resilience of precedent but also highlights its limitations in rapidly changing domains.

## Comparative Perspectives

**Common Law Jurisdictions:** In common law systems such as the United States, the United Kingdom, Canada, and Australia, precedent is binding and central to judicial reasoning. The doctrine of *stare decisis* obliges lower courts to follow higher court rulings. However, supreme courts retain the power to overrule their own precedents, thereby steering legal evolution [15].

**Civil Law Jurisdictions:** In civil law systems such as France and Germany, statutes are paramount, and judicial decisions historically played a subordinate role. Yet, even here, precedent is increasingly influential. Courts often rely on past rulings to ensure coherence in interpretation, and higher courts may establish guiding jurisprudence that lower courts follow in practice, even if not formally binding.

**Hybrid Systems:** Many jurisdictions adopt hybrid approaches. South Africa, for example, blends common law traditions with constitutional supremacy, leading to a distinctive role for precedent. Israel also applies a strong form of precedent while incorporating comparative and international law. These hybrid systems highlight the adaptability of precedent across different legal cultures.

### Precedent and the Balance between Restraint and Activism

The role of precedent in shaping judicial outcomes is closely tied to debates over judicial activism and restraint. On one hand, strict adherence to precedent exemplifies restraint, limiting judicial discretion. On the other hand, willingness to reinterpret or overturn precedent reflects activism, allowing courts to act as agents of social change. The U.S. Supreme Court's recent decisions illustrate this tension. In some cases, such as *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization* (2022), the Court overturned established precedent (*Roe v. Wade*), triggering heated debates about the balance between continuity and judicial responsiveness to new political and moral landscapes. Such controversies underscore the high stakes involved in how courts handle precedent [16].

#### Broader Implications of Precedent

**Democratic Governance:** Precedent contributes to the rule of law, a cornerstone of democracy. By ensuring equal treatment of similar cases, precedents uphold principles of fairness and non-arbitrariness. Moreover, landmark precedents often serve as turning points in democratic development, reinforcing rights and liberties.

**Economic and Commercial Stability:** Predictable legal outcomes are vital for economic actors. Precedents in contract, property, and corporate law provide a framework within which businesses can operate confidently. Investors, corporations,

and governments rely on this predictability to reduce risk and foster growth [17].

**Social Justice and Human Rights:** Precedents can also drive social transformation. Landmark rulings on gender equality, freedom of speech, or LGBTQ+ rights demonstrate how precedent can reshape social norms. Yet, as seen in historical examples, precedent can equally entrench discrimination until societal and judicial willingness to change emerges [18].

**The Dynamic Future of Precedent:** As societies confront new challenges, the doctrine of precedent will continue to evolve. Globalization will enhance cross-jurisdictional dialogue. Technology will force courts to reinterpret old principles in unprecedented contexts. And political polarization will place unprecedented strain on judicial legitimacy. Ultimately, the strength of precedent lies in its balance: it preserves continuity while allowing for adaptation. Its future vitality depends on the ability of courts to respect the wisdom of the past without being bound by its limitations. The role of legal precedents in shaping contemporary judicial decisions cannot be overstated. Precedent provides consistency, legitimacy, and predictability, yet also enables gradual legal development. While it faces challenges of rigidity, judicial activism, globalization, and technological change, its enduring value lies in balancing continuity with adaptability. The broader implications of precedent extend well beyond the judiciary, influencing democracy, economic stability, and social justice. In contemporary society, the doctrine of precedent is not merely a technical rule of judicial reasoning; it is a dynamic institution that embodies the living tradition of law itself. Its implications will remain profound as courts navigate the complexities of the twenty-first century [19].

### Conclusion

The role of legal precedents in shaping contemporary judicial decisions remains one of the most defining features of modern legal systems. By embodying the doctrine of *stare decisis*, precedent serves as both a stabilizing force and a dynamic tool for legal evolution. It ensures that courts do not decide cases in isolation but within a framework of accumulated wisdom, thus preserving consistency, predictability, and fairness. These qualities are essential not only for

judicial legitimacy but also for the broader functioning of democracy, economic stability, and social trust in legal institutions. At the same time, the discussion has highlighted that precedent is not without its challenges. Its inherent rigidity may delay much-needed reforms or entrench unjust rulings, as history has often shown. The selective or strategic use of precedent by judges also raises concerns about judicial activism, potentially undermining legal certainty. In today's globalized and technologically complex world, courts must increasingly confront issues for which no direct precedent exists, forcing them to adapt old principles to novel contexts. This adaptability demonstrates the resilience of precedent, but also underscores the delicate balance courts must strike between respect for tradition and responsiveness to change.

Comparative perspectives further reveal that the role of precedent varies across legal systems. In common law jurisdictions, it is binding and central, while in civil law systems, it is more persuasive but still influential. Hybrid systems illustrate the global trend toward recognizing precedent's practical value, regardless of formal doctrine. This convergence suggests that precedent has universal importance in contemporary legal practice, even if its authority is differently structured.

The implications of precedent extend far beyond legal reasoning. Precedents shape democratic governance by ensuring equality before the law, protect commercial and economic stability by creating reliable legal environments, and contribute to social justice by enabling courts to dismantle discriminatory practices and expand rights. Landmark precedents in constitutional and human rights law exemplify how judicial reliance on past decisions can both preserve and transform societies. Ultimately, the doctrine of precedent is neither static nor absolute. Its enduring value lies in its capacity to preserve continuity while allowing law to evolve in response to societal, political, and technological transformation. Courts must remain cautious not to treat precedent as an unyielding constraint but as a living tradition—one that respects the lessons of the past while engaging with the realities of the present and future. The true strength of precedent, therefore, is found in this dynamic balance, ensuring that the law remains legitimate, adaptable, and just in an ever-changing world.

## References

- [1] Anderlini, L. (2014). [Why stare decisis?](#) *Journal of Institutional Economics*, 10(3), 325–343.
- [2] Argenziano, R., & Smith, A. (2025). [Optimizing the application order under precedent-based decision systems.](#) *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 122(35), e2509985122.
- [3] Barnett, R. E. (2010). [Constitutional precedent.](#) *Cardozo Law Review*, 32(3), 1133–1172.
- [4] Clermont, K. M. (2024). [Systematizing stare decisis: Deference and hierarchical prediction.](#) *Law & Contemporary Problems*, 87(2), 45–78.
- [5] De Oliveira, M., & Broughton, G. L. (2019). [Vertical precedents in formal models of precedential constraint.](#) *Artificial Intelligence and Law*, 27(3), 253–277.
- [6] Devaney, J. G. (2022). [The role of precedent in the jurisprudence of the International Court of Justice: A constructive interpretation.](#) *Leiden Journal of International Law*, 35(2), 377–404.
- [7] Fallon, R. H. (2019). [Stare decisis and the Constitution: An essay on constitutional methodology.](#) *Harvard Law Review*, 133(2), 1–42.
- [8] Gerhardt, M. J. (2011). [The power of precedent.](#) *Oxford University Press*.
- [9] Gillman, H. (2002). [How political parties can use the courts to advance their agendas: Federal courts in the United States, 1875–1891.](#) *American Political Science Review*, 96(3), 511–524.
- [10] Hansford, T. G., & Spriggs, J. F. (2013). [The information dynamics of vertical stare decisis.](#) *Journal of Politics*, 75(4), 1005–1017.
- [11] Hitt, M. P., & Levin, D. (2016). [Measuring precedent in a judicial hierarchy.](#) *Law & Society Review*, 50(3), 655–686.
- [12] Knight, J., & Epstein, L. (2013). [The strategic use of precedent on the U.S. Supreme Court.](#) *Law & Society Review*, 47(2), 301–336.
- [13] Lamond, G. (2005). [Do precedents create rules?](#) *Legal Theory*, 11(1), 1–26.
- [14] Lamond, G. (2016). [Precedent and analogy in legal reasoning.](#) *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*, 36(1), 1–28.
- [15] Lewis, S. (2021). [Precedent and the Rule of Law.](#) *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*, 41(4), 873–896.
- [16] Lewis, S. (2023). [Towards a general practice of precedent.](#) *Jurisprudence*, 14(2), 202–220.

[17] Miceli, T. J., & Segal, J. A. (1994). [Reputation and judicial decision-making](#). *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 25(3), 325–352.

[18] Roscoe, E. (2022). [Stare decisis and information abundance in a common law system](#). *Review of Central & Eastern European Law*, 47(2), 123–145.

[19] Smejkalová, T. (2020). [Importance of judicial decisions as a perceived level of precedent](#). *Utrecht Law Review*, 16(1), 45–62.

---

This journal is a double-blind peer-reviewed journal covering all areas in Humanities and Social Science field. **AJMHSS** is published quarterly (12 issues per year) online and in print. Copyright © 2025 which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.