

Jurisdiction of the King in Royal Regulations: A comparative Study

Dr.Sami Ahmad Mahmoud Alomari
Jadara university . jordan

Abstract-*This research deals with a very significant topic related to constitutional law, in order to identify the total jurisdictions of the King in the constitutions of four countries with royal political systems: Jordan, Spain, Japan and Norway, and to investigate the comparison between these constitutions, The purpose of this research is to identify the terms of reference of the King approved by the comparative constitutions, in addition, to clarify how the king deposed the judges in the constitutions comparison, and then the statement of the King's authority to issue amnesty and reduction in the comparative constitutions, The importance of this research in contemporary time lies on the existence of the text of the separation of powers in the constitutions, which most of the constitutions seek to dedicate and work through. To achieve this, the study relied on the descriptive analysis method and the comparative approach. This research was divided into two sections, The first section dealt with the King and the independence of the judiciary under the principle of separation of powers. The second section is about the relationship of the King to the judicial authority in the mentioned countries. The study showed that the King's jurisdictions in the compared constitutions focus on the appointment and dismissal of judges, the issuance of amnesties and the reduction of sentences, and there are some differences in the jurisdictions of the King among the constitutions of the four countries. In light of this, the study suggested a number of recommendations that contribute to the development of comparative country constitutions to be more in harmony with each other with regard to the jurisdiction of the King.*

Keywords: *constitutional law, separation of powers, jurisdiction, Royal political systems.*

I-Introduction:

The idea of separation of powers has been discussed from ancient times by many philosophers such as Aristotle, Polybius, and others. However, the actual application of this separation and the independence of the judiciary from the executive branch, such as the head of state, as the king, is relatively new.

For many centuries the judicial bodies were almost without any independence. The judicial task was in the hands of the king. He is responsible for the judiciary. He is also the judge. The role of the king in the exercise of the judiciary has gradually decreased. However, kings can still influence the courts, appoint and dismiss judges, and other forms of interference into jurisdiction⁽¹⁾.

In contemporary political systems, the monarchy still exists in many countries, including Jordan, Spain, Japan, and Norway. The Jordanian Constitution states: "The Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan is an independent, sovereign Arab state and its system of government is parliamentary monarchy"⁽²⁾. The Spanish constitution states: "The Spanish government is a parliamentary monarchy"⁽³⁾. While the Japanese constitution states: "The emperor is the symbol of the state and the unity of the people."⁽⁴⁾ The same Constitution states: "The imperial throne is hereditary."⁽⁵⁾ In Norway, The Constitution of Norway states: "The Kingdom of Norway is a free, independent, indivisible and inalienable Realm. Its form of government is a limited and hereditary monarchy."⁽⁶⁾

Thus, the current study is intended to identify the jurisdictions of the monarch in these four monarchies, through two topics: The first topic is: The King and the Independence of the Judiciary under the Principle of Separation of Powers, and in the second topic: The King's relationship to the Judiciary in the mentioned Countries.

¹ Ginter, Jaan, Judicial Independence and/ or (?) Efficient Judicial Administration, Juridica International, No. XVII, 2010, p 109.

² Jordan's Constitution of 1952 and its Amendments of 2016, Article (1)

³ Spain's Constitution of 1978 and its Amendments of 2011, Article (1).

⁴ Japan's Constitution of 1946, Article (1).

⁵ Japan's Constitution of 1946, Article (2).

⁶ Norway's Constitution of 1814 and its Amendments of 2014, Article (1).

II-The First Chapter: King and the independence of the judiciary under the principle of separation of powers.

Ancestors recognized the danger of absolute power and considered it to be an absolute evil. Montesquieu wrote in 1752 In his book "Spirit of Laws", "There is as yet no liberty if the power of judging be not separated from legislative power and the executive power"⁽¹⁾

Thus, the principle of separation of powers has become one of the most prominent pillars of governance in contemporary countries and in democratic ones in particular, in view of the independence of the authorities, the non-interference of one authority over the other and the guarantees of injustice, tyranny, arbitrariness, dictatorship or greatly reduce it to the least.⁽²⁾ Accordingly, this subject is intended to define the jurisdiction under the principle of separation of powers, and the nature of the King's jurisdiction accordingly, as follows:

A.Section 1:The nature of the jurisdiction under the principle of separation of powers

The concept of separation of powers refers to exercise the core functions and responsibilities of each authority independently of other powers. This chapter requires that the characteristics of sovereignty, which are different from one another, be assigned to different individuals or bodies, independent of one another, so that the legislative power is vested in Parliament, and the implementation of the law is vested in the executive branch, while the judiciary is vested in the judiciary.⁽³⁾

The independence of the judiciary is a natural result of the principle of separation of the three powers, which is imposed by the nature of the judiciary in States that want to provide guarantees to litigants for judges to perform their functions fairly and merit and freedom, where the independence of the judiciary is defined as non-interference in the judgments stemming from its knowledge, understanding, conscience and independence, non-intervention in trial proceedings, and the imposition of the law on cases considered, amended or repealed by any other legislative or executive authority.⁽⁴⁾

The principle of judicial independence refers to the process by which legislators delegate the judicial power to courts and establish institutional frameworks against political interference in judicial decisions, to ensure broad jurisdiction over the work of judicial bodies.⁽⁵⁾ Since, the judiciary has the right to administer its own affairs, such as appointing judges, Judicial process. As it has the jurisdiction.⁽⁶⁾

The concept of jurisdiction refers to the appointment of the judicial authority as the holder of jurisdiction to adjudicate disputes.⁽⁷⁾ Jurisdiction has also been defined as the authorization of the guardian or his deputy to the judicial authority in general, special or appointed cases, within a specific time and place, In a dispute settlement chapter.

Jurisdiction is defined as the authorization of the guardian or his deputy to the judicial authority to adjudicate in public, private or appointed cases, within a specific time and place, or as amount of jurisdiction in the adjudication of a dispute.⁽⁸⁾ However, the principle of separation of powers with the implication of the independence of the judiciary and its jurisdiction in adjudicating disputes without interference from other authorities, such as the head of state, in modern countries, it takes into account one of the interpretations: absolute separation of powers between authorities and flexible separation of powers.⁽⁹⁾ So that, the absolute separation refers to the establishment of a firm and decisive division between the three authorities that prevents any cooperation between them, every authority with a specific jurisdiction is not interfered with by other authorities, The Constitution of the United States of America in 1787 and the French Constitution of 1971 took this term in their account.

On the other hand, The flexible separation stems from the fundamental idea that the unity of the state must be maintained, which requires the establishment of links between the authorities, as long as these powers are nothing but gears in one machine that is the State.⁽¹⁰⁾ The idea of flexible separation is based on the principle that the sovereignty of the state is one principle It is an integral part, but this sovereignty has legislative, executive and judicial functions, each of which has its own functions, but there must be coordination and cooperation, and there is no contradiction between these powers. These powers have harmonious and complementary functions. Dominant and applicable in most political systems Modern democracy, especially property policy systems.

The concept of flexible separation is based on the principle that the sovereignty of the State is a single and indivisible principle. However, this sovereignty has legislative, executive and judicial functions, each of which has its own functions, but

¹ Gumpert, Hon. E, Judicial Independence: A Cornerstone of Democracy Which Must Be Defended, United States American College of Trial Lawyers, 2006, p1

² Al-Barishi, Isma'il Muhammad, The Principle of Separation of Powers: A Reading in Islamic Jurisprudence and the Jordanian Constitution, Dirasat Journal - Shari'a and Law Studies, Volume 43, No. 3, 2016, p. 121.

³ Murad, Hassan, Contemporary Political Systems, Beirut, Lebanon, Dar Al-Qalam, 2009, pp. 72-73.

⁴ Frehat, Eman Azbi, The Principle of Separation of Powers in the Jordanian Constitutions and their Amendments 1928 - 2011: Historical Study, Journal of Humanities, Volume 43, No. 2, 2016, p. 794.

⁵ Helmke, G& Rosenbluth, F, Regimes and Rule of Law: Judicial Independence in Comparative Perspective, Annul Review of Political Science, No. 12, 2009, p 349.

⁶ Nollgast, Michael, Nollgast, Conditions for Judicial Independence, Journal of Contemporary Legal Issues, Vol. 15, No. 105, 2006, p 106.

⁷ Jabour, Muhammad, Rules for the Distribution of Jurisdiction in Criminal Matters in Jordanian Law: A Comparative Study, Al-Balqa Journal for Research and Studies, Volume 10, No. 1, 2003, p.

⁸ Al-Ghamdi, Nasser bin Mohammed, Jurisdiction in Islamic Jurisprudence with an Application of the Current Application in Saudi Arabia, Riyadh-Saudi Arabia, Al-Rashid Library, 2000, p. 41.

⁹ Murad, Contemporary Political Systems, op. Cit., P. 81.

¹⁰ Kandah, Abdullah Said, The Principle of Separation of Powers, Al-Andalus Journal of Human and Social Sciences, vol. 5, no. 18, 2018, p. 125.

it must prevail in coordination and cooperation. Conflicts and clashes between these authorities are eliminated. These powers have become harmonious and integrated functions. This idea - the flexible separation - has become dominant and applied in most modern democratic political systems, especially royal political systems.⁽¹⁾

B. Section 2 : The nature of the king's jurisdiction in Monarchy

In the monarchy regimes, the head of state assumes his duties by means of inheritance for life or as long as he is competent, regardless of the title given to this president, whether it is king, Prince, Sultan, Emperor, Caesar, King, Shah, Wali or else. This type of governance is the oldest prevalent form of regimes in most of the world until the French Revolution.⁽²⁾

The monarchy is divided into absolute and constitutional monarchies. In the first, the king retains all powers over in his hands without being shared by another authority, The king is the head of the three authorities. While In the constitutional monarchy, the people exercise power through three independent bodies. In which the king is bound by a council or councils elected by the people. Thus, the jurists of constitutional law have classified the constitutional monarchies within free systems, since the king in this system is far from absolutism.⁽³⁾

In most modern monarchies, the supreme president -the king- grants no real power but the cabinet, and the kings are generally protected and unreliable. The responsibility rests with the Council of Ministers, which exercises power on behalf of the king. Who owns and does not govern.⁽⁴⁾

The constitutional legislator defines the general rules governing the relationship between the authorities in the monarchical systems as in other political systems, such as the relationship between the head of state and those authorities, such as the judiciary. The role and competence exercised by the head of state in influencing the other authorities - the judiciary - varies from a constitution to another, depending on the position of the constitution from the beginning of the separation between the authorities, whether they take the idea of separation or absolute flexibility between the authorities.⁽⁵⁾

In the constitutions of comparison, the Jordanian Constitution stipulates that: "The King is the Head of the State and is immune from every liability and responsibility."⁽⁶⁾ The Spanish Constitution states: "The King is the Head of State, the symbol of its unity and permanence. He arbitrates and moderates the regular functioning of the institutions, assumes the highest representation of the Spanish State in international relations, especially with the nations of its historical community, and exercises the functions expressly conferred on him by the Constitution and the laws. 3- The person of the King is inviolable and shall not be held accountable."⁽⁷⁾ And in the Japanese Constitution "The advice and approval of the Cabinet shall be required for all acts of the Emperor in matters of state, and the Cabinet shall be responsible therefor."⁽⁸⁾ Norwegian Constitution states "The King's person is sacred; he cannot be censured or accused. The responsibility rests with his Council."⁽⁹⁾

Of all the above, the four political regimes - Jordan, Spain, Japan, and Norway - appear to be royal regimes in which the king is considered the head of state and is immune from any liability, which raises the question: Does the king have any jurisdictions in these monarchies? It is the question which the next part of the study seeks to answer.

III. The Second Chapter : Relationship of the King to the Judiciary in Countries in comparison

To discuss the relationship between the King and the judiciary, and then to reveal the extent of the jurisdiction of the king in the given countries, it is necessary to begin to recognize the extent of the constitutions consecration of these countries to the principle of independence of the judiciary, in order to determine the extent of the king's jurisdiction in the Judiciary. All of this is explained below:

Section 1 : The independence of the Judiciary in the four Countries Constitutions

As mentioned above, the principle of separation of powers refers to the independence of the judiciary, which in turn points to the non-intervention of other authorities, including the authority of the King, in jurisdiction. By reference to the constitutions of the mentioned countries, the Jordanian Constitution states: " Judges are independent, and they are not subject to any authority, in their jurisdiction, other than that of the law".⁽¹⁰⁾ In the Spanish Constitution we find the following text ' Justice emanates from the people and is administered on behalf of the King by judges and agistrates members of the Judicial Power who shall be independent, shall have fixity of tenure, shall be accountable for their acts and subject only to the rule of

1 Mamdouh, Fouad, Political Systems and Constitutional Law, Alexandria, Egypt, Al Ma'aref Establishment, 1997, p. 134.

2 Shukri, Ali Yousuf, Principles of Constitutional Law, D., Safa Publishing House, Publishing and Distribution, 2011, p. 126.

3 Shukri, Principles of Constitutional Law, op. Cit., Pp. 126-127.

4 Khazraji, Thamer Kamel, Modern Political Systems and Public Policies: A Contemporary Study in the Management Strategy of the Authority, Amman-Jordan, Dar Majdalawi Publishing and Distribution, 2004, p.

5 Shatanawi, Faisal, and Hatalmeh, Salim, The Head of State's Power to Object to Laws in the Jordanian Constitutional System: A Comparative Study, Dirasat-Shari'a and Law Studies, Volume 42, No. 2, 2015, p. 399.

6 Jordan's Constitution of 1952 and its Amendments through 2016, Article (30).

7 Spain's Constitution of 1978 and its Amendments through 2011, Article (56).

8 Japan's Constitution of 1946, Article (3).

9 Norway's Constitution of 1814 and its Amendments of 2014, Article (5).

10 Jordan's Constitution of 1952 and its Amendments of 2016, Article (97).

law."⁽¹⁾ while in the Japanese Constitution:" The whole judicial power is vested in a Supreme Court and in such inferior courts as are established by law.No extraordinary tribunal shall be established, nor shall any organ or agency of the Executive be given final judicial power."⁽²⁾Also the Norwegian Constitution states that "State authorities must ensure the independence and impartiality of courts and judges." ⁽³⁾

As shown above, all these constitutions of the four countries have recognized and explicitly admitted the independence of the judiciary and the inadmissibility of interference by other authorities, including the authority of the king, who is the head of state and its symbol.

B.Section 2.The second Topic: the constitutionality of the powers of the judicial monarch

In examining the constitutions of the four countries, we find some of the king's jurisdictions are relevant to the work of the judiciary, specifically the appointment and removal of judges and the issuance of amnesty, the jurisdictions of the king, which differ from one constitution to another in the constitutions of the four countries, In terms of the appointment of judges, the Jordanian Constitution contains the following:"The King shall exercise his powers without a royal decree signed by the Prime Minister and the Minister or Ministers concerned in the following cases (d) Appointing the chair of the Judicial Council and accepting his resignation. (e) Appointing the chair of the Constitutional Court and its members and accepting their resignations."⁽⁴⁾ It also stated:"1-Judges of the Civil and Sharia Courts shall be appointed and dismissed by a Royal Decree in accordance with the provisions of the laws.3- Without prejudice to Paragraph (1) of this Article, the Judicial Council shall solely have the right to appoint civil judges in accordance with the provisions of the law"⁽⁵⁾⁽⁶⁾.In the Spanish Constitution we find the following text" The General Council of the Judicial Power shall consist of the President of the Supreme Court, who shall preside it,and of twenty members appointed by the King for a five-year period"⁽⁷⁾ it also specifies" The President of the Supreme Court shall be appointed by the King, on the General Council of the Judicial Power proposal in the manner to be laid down by the law."⁽⁸⁾

In the same Spanish Constitution,we find the following text:"The State's Public Prosecutor shall be appointed by the King on the Government's proposal after consultation with the General Council of the Judicial Power."⁽⁹⁾

It also states that:"1.Justice emanates from the people and is administered on behalf of the King by judges and magistrates members of the Judicial Power who shall be independent,shall have fixity of tenure, shall be accountable for their acts and subject only to the rule of law. 2. Judges and magistrates may only be dismissed, suspended, transferred or retired on the grounds and subject to the safeguards provided for by the law."⁽¹⁰⁾

The Japanese Constitution stipulates:"The Emperor shall appoint the Chief Judge of the Supreme Court as designated by the Cabinet."⁽¹¹⁾ And it also stated " Judges shall not be removed except by public impeachment unless judicially declared mentally or physically incompetent to perform official duties. No disciplinary action against judges shall be administered by any executive organ or agency"⁽¹²⁾ 2-The appointment of the judges of the Supreme Court shall be reviewed by the people at the first general election of members of the House of Representatives following their appointment,and shall be reviewed again at the first general election of members of the House of Representatives after a lapse of ten (10) years, and in the same manner thereafter.3-In cases mentioned in the foregoing paragraph, when the majority of the voters favors the dismissal of a judge, he shall be dismissed."⁽¹³⁾

In the Norwegian Constitution, there is no text authorizing the King to appoint or dismiss judges, not even the President of the Court of Cassation, nor the President of the Supreme Court,what we find is this text"1-The judges of the Court of Impeachment comprise six members elected by the Storting and the five longest-serving, permanently appointed members of the Supreme Court, including the President of the Supreme Court. The Storting elects the Members and their deputies for a period of six years.A Member of the Council of State or of the Storting may not be elected as a Member of the Court of Impeachment.In the Court of Impeachment the President of the Supreme Court shall preside. 4-Any person sitting in the Court of Impeachment who has been elected by the Storting shall not lose his seat in the Court if the period for which he is elected expires before the Court of Impeachment has concluded the proceedings in the case. Nor shall a Justice of the Supreme Court who is a Member of the Court of Impeachment lose his seat in the Court, even if he resigns as a Member of

1 Spain's Constitution of 1978 and its Amendments through 2011, Article 117.

2 Japan's Constitution of 1946, Article (76).

3 Norway's Constitution of 1814 and its Amendments of 2014, Article (95).

4 Jordan's Constitution of 1952 and its Amendments through 2016, Article (40 / d + e).

5 Jordan's Constitution of 1952 and its Amendments through 2016, Article (98 .1 + 3).

6 Article (13) of the Jordanian Judicial Independence Law No. (26) of 2017 states: "Appointment in judicial posts shall be carried out by a decision of the Council on the recommendation of the President. The decision shall be accompanied by the Royal Decree. ", And in conjunction with the text of the law with the text of Article (98/1) of the Jordanian Constitution, it turns out that the decisive decision in the appointment and removal of the regular judges belongs to the King.

7 Spain's Constitution of 1978 and its Amendments through 2011, article 122/3.

8 Spain's Constitution of 1978 and its Amendments through 2011, Article 123.2.

9 Spain's Constitution of 1978 and its Amendments through 2011, Article 124.4.

10 The Spain's Constitution of 1978 and its Amendments of 2011, Article 117 (1 + 2).

11 Japan's Constitution of 1946, Article (6).

12 Japan's Constitution of 1946, Article (78).

13 Japan's Constitution of 1946, Article (79,2-3)

the Supreme Court."⁽¹⁾ With regard to the Supreme Court, the Norwegian Constitution provided " The Supreme Court shall consist of a President and at least four other Members."⁽²⁾

Among these constitutional texts of the four countries, it appears that the Jordanian Constitution gave the King jurisdiction over appointing the President of the Judiciary Council and the President and members of the Constitutional Court, accepting their resignations, appointing and dismissing the judges of the regular and legitimate courts.

The Spanish Constitution gave the king jurisdiction over the appointment of the president and members of the General Council of the Judiciary, the appointment of the President of the Supreme Court and the appointment of the Attorney General. However, this Spanish Constitution did not empower the King to dismiss these judges.

The Japanese Constitution allowed the King to appoint a Chief Justice of the Supreme Court only, without being able to dismiss him, while the Norwegian Constitution did not give the King any jurisdiction over the appointment or dismissal of judges.

With regard to the King's competence to issue a general or special amnesty and to commute the sentence of those sentenced, the Jordanian Constitution provided for " The King has the right to the special pardon and to remit the sentence, but the general pardon shall be determined by a special law."⁽³⁾

And in the Spanish Constitution " It is incumbent upon the King:i. To exercise the right of clemency in accordance with the law, which may not authorize general pardons."⁽⁴⁾

In the Japanese Constitution we notice the following text" The Emperor, with the advice and approval of the Cabinet, shall perform the following acts in matters of state on behalf of the people: Attestation of general and special amnesty, commutation of punishment, reprieve, and restoration of rights."⁽⁵⁾

In the Norwegian Constitution, it was mentioned "The King shall have the right in the Council of State to pardon criminals after sentence has been passed. The criminal shall have the choice of accepting the King's pardon or submitting to the penalty imposed."⁽⁶⁾

Among these constitutional texts, One can recognize that, the king in the Jordanian and Spanish constitutions has the right to issue a special amnesty only. The general amnesty does not belong to the Jordanian monarch because this general amnesty requires a special law to issue it. The Jordanian constitution, However, it did not give the Jordanian king the competence to ratify that general amnesty if it was enacted. The Jordanian constitutional law didn't mention the right of the king to ratify the constitutional amnesty, while the Spanish Constitution did not allow the law to issue a general amnesty.

In the Japanese Constitution, it is not the king's power to issue a pardon or a public one, but the king's jurisdiction is limited to the approval of a general or public amnesty if one or both of them is issued, while the Norwegian Constitution has given the king jurisdiction over amnesty, but The constitution doesn't determine the nature of the amnesty whether it is public or private. The Norwegian constitutional legislator merely states: "The king has the right to issue amnesty to criminals after the issuance of sentences".

In comparison with the four constitutions, it appears that the Jordanian constitution alone gave the king an exclusive jurisdiction to reduce the sentence. While the Spanish and Norwegian constitutions did not give the king jurisdiction over the reduction of the sentence.

On the other hand, the Japanese constitution gave the king jurisdiction over the reduction of the sentence, not the reduction of punishment.

IV. Conclusion:

The present study is devoted to four jurisdictions of the king in the constitutions of : Jordan, Spain, Japan and Norway, through an analysis of the content of the constitutions of these countries and their comparison. The researcher has concluded and recommended the following:

Results :

The jurisdictions of the four Constitutions authorized the King to appoint and dismiss of judges, the issuance of pardon and the reduction of punishment.

1 Norway's Constitution of 1814 and its amendments of 2014, Article 86 (3 + 4).

2 Norway's Constitution of 1814 and its Amendments of 2014, Article 88.2.

3 Jordan's Constitution of 1952 and its Amendments through 2016, Article (38).

4 Spain's Constitution of 1978 and its amendments through 2011, Article 62 (i).

5 Japan Constitution of 1946, Article 7.

6 Norway's Constitution of 1814 and its Amendments of 2014, Article (20).

According to the King's over appointing Judges, The King's Jurisdiction in the Jordanian Constitution has jurisdiction over the appointment of the President of the Judiciary Council, the President and members of the Constitutional Court, the appointment of judges of the regular and legitimate courts. The Spanish Constitution, the King's jurisdiction over the appointment of the President and members of the General Council of the Judiciary, The appointment of the President of the Supreme Court and the appointment of the Attorney - General of the State. The Japanese Constitution authorized the appointment of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court only, while the Norwegian Constitution did not grant the King any jurisdiction over the appointment of judges.

In reference to the King's Jurisdiction over dismissing Judges, The Jordanian Constitution grant to the king the competence to accept the resignation of the President of the Judiciary Council and the President and members of the Constitutional Court. The Constitution also authorizes him to remove the judges of the regular and legitimate courts. The resignation of the President and members of the General Council of the Judiciary, the President of the Supreme Court and the Attorney - General of the State, while the Japanese and Norwegian constitutions did not authorize the King any competence to dismiss the judges or accept their resignations.

As regards to the King's terms of reference. The Jordanian and Spanish constitutions authorized the king to issue a pardon but the two constitutions; Jordanian and Spanish did not grant the King competence to issue the general amnesty. Although the Jordanian constitution allowed the law to issue a general amnesty, while the Spanish Constitution didn't. Note that the Jordanian Constitution, when allowing the law to issue a general amnesty, it did not provide for the Jordanian King to have jurisdiction to ratify it. The Norwegian Constitution gave the King jurisdiction over the amnesty, but it did not specify the nature of the amnesty whether it was public or private, while the Japanese Constitution did not confer on the King the competence to issue a pardon or a public one.

As for the king's jurisdiction to reduce the sentence, the Jordanian constitution allowed the king to reduce the sentence. The constitutions of Spain, Norway and Japan did not give the king jurisdiction over the sentence, but the Japanese constitution only gave the king the authority to ratify the punishment.

Recommendations:

Based on the previous findings, the study recommends the following:

Amend the Jordanian Constitution by withdrawing the King's jurisdiction in appointing and dismissing the judges of the regular and Shari'a courts by entrusting this task to the law only, in order to comply fully with the provisions of Article (13) of the Jordanian Judiciary Independence Law No. 26 of 2017, as the previous Constitutions did with keeping the jurisdiction of the Jordanian monarch in appointing the President of the Judicial Council and the President and members of the Constitutional Court, and accepting their resignations.

2. To amend the texts of the Spanish and Japanese constitutions by giving the King jurisdiction over the removal of judges who have been granted jurisdiction by the Constitution in order to achieve a kind of judicial stability of the judiciary. In the case of imbalance, so that the process remains unstable, the king appoints and other parties to isolate the judges appointed by the king, and so on. Therefore, giving the king a competence in isolation keeps the process of appointment and dismissal limited to the king's jurisdiction only.

To amend the text of the Norwegian Constitution, specifying the nature of the King's jurisdiction to issue amnesty, whether a special pardon or general amnesty, since the competence of the Norwegian King should be strictly defined in this matter.

Conduct more comparative comparative studies to identify the jurisdictions of the King in constitutions other than the constitutions of the current countries of study, whether those constitutions of countries with monarchical or republical regimes, in order to provide a broad scientific basis for constitutional legislators to be relied upon to formulate constitutions that are in harmony with one another .

References:

1-Arabic References:

Al Barishi, Ismail Mohamed, The Principle of Separation of Powers: A Reading in Islamic Jurisprudence and the Jordanian Constitution, Dirasat Journal - Shari'a and Law Studies, Volume 43, No. 3, 2016, pp. 121-140.

Al-Ghamdi, Nasser bin Mohammed, Jurisdiction in Islamic Jurisprudence with an Application of the Current Application in Saudi Arabia, Riyadh-Saudi Arabia, Al-Rasheed Library, 2000.

Frehat, Eman Azbi, The Principle of Separation of Powers in the Jordanian Constitutions and its Amendments 1928 - 2011: Historical Study, Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, Volume 43, No. 2, 2016, pp. 773-803.

Jabour, Muhammad, Rules for the Distribution of Jurisdiction in Criminal Matters in Jordanian Law: A Comparative Study, Al Balqa Research and Studies Journal, Volume 10, Issue 1, 2003, pp. 159-209.

Kandah, Abdullah Said, The Principle of Separation of Powers, Al-Andalus Journal of Human and Social Sciences, vol. 5, no. 18, 2018, pp. 117- 152.

Khazraji, Thamer Kamel, Modern Political Systems and Public Policies: A Contemporary Study in the Management Strategy of the Authority, Amman-Jordan, Dar Majdalawi Publishing and Distribution, 2004.

Shatanawi, Faisal, and Hatamleh, Salim, The Head of State's Power to Object to Laws in the Jordanian Constitutional System: A Comparative Study, Dirasat-Shari'a and Law Studies, Volume 42, No. 2, 2015, pp. 399-410.

Shukri, Ali Yousef, Principles of Constitutional Law, DM, Dar Safa for Printing, Publishing and Distribution, 2011.

Murad, Hassan, Contemporary Political Systems, Beirut - Lebanon, Dar Al Qalam, 2009.

2- English references

Ginter, Jaan, Judicial Independence and/ or (?) Efficient Judicial Administration, Juridica International, No. XVII, 2010, pp 108-115.

Gumpert, Hon. E, Judicial Independence: A Cornerstone of Democracy Which Must Be Defended, United States American College of Trial Lawyers, 2006.

Helmke, Gretchen & Rosenbluth, Frances, Regimes and Rule of Law: Judicial Independence in Comparative Perspective, Annul Review of Political Science, No. 12, 2009, pp 345-368.

Nollgast, Michael, Nollgast, Conditions for Judicial Independence, Journal of Contemporary Legal Issues, Vol. 15, No. 105, 2006, pp 105-128.

3- Constitutions:

-The Japan's Constitution of 1946.

- Jordan's Constitution of 1952 and its amendments through 2016.

- Spain's Constitution of 1978 and its amendments through 2011.

- Norway's Constitution of 1814 and its amendments of 2014.