Sittender Kour
Assistant Professor
Shamsher Bahadur Saxena
College of Law, Rohtak, India.

The Indian Judiciary at a Crossroads: Limitations and Prospects for Reform

Sittender Kour

Abstract
Despite being an incredibly important part of democracy, the Indian judiciary faces numerous challenges which restrict its efficacy. This paper highlights five core shortcomings: enormous backlogs of cases, unfilled judicial positions, opaqueness, insufficient modern technology, and inaccessible justice. It also suggests sensible changes to improve these issues, suggesting they will address efficacy, responsibility, and availability of the judiciary. If India approached the mentioned alterations through systemic changes, technological integration, and policy reform, it would greatly improve the public's faith in the judiciary system.

Keywords: Judicial Backlogs, Transparency, Judicial Reforms, Infrastructure Modernization, Access to Justice.

Introduction

The Indian judiciary, which is a bedrock of democracy, suffers from structural issues that reduce efficiency and public confidence. With more than 50 million cases pending, chronic under-staffing, and aging facilities, the justice infrastructure is unable to provide even basic constitutional promises like reasonable time frames for the delivery of justice. While the judiciary continues to retain its independence, growing opacity in the processes of appointment, accountability, case backlogs, and lack of sufficient control mechanisms are contributing to a crisis of trust. This evaluation outlines specific decisive shortcomings within the institution and offers possible solutions to enhance judicial governance, mitigate obstructions toward the attainment of justice, and promote inclusivity and equitable access to justice for every citizen.

Challenges

- **Case Pendency and Delay of Justice**

Multiplicity of systemic factors contributes to straining the timely delivery of justice, including excessive case allotment. India ranks high on over-indulgence, topping global lists for excessive case pendency and truancy within a working frame. Litigants, are often tormented for decades due to unending legal forms masquerading as procedures. The situation is worsened as the Supreme Court grapples with over 70 thousand pending matters while and the million mark looms on High and subordinate courts. The backlog is attributed to a range of issues; nearly 35 percent of a judge's sanctioned position remains 'vacant', archaic processes still permit boundless adjournments, and cases are not accorded sufficient attention. While there are fast-track courts and alternative dispute resolution mechanisms, their effectiveness and meaningful impact is haphazard due to unregulated systematic expansion paired with strict confinements on implementation.

- **Judicial Appointments and Vacancy Crisis**

The judiciary continues to struggle with persistent High Court vacancies of over 400. Women judges represent a mere 11% of High Court judges, indicating a lack of diversity within the system that has faced opaqueness-related scrutiny. Imbalance in appointments leads to an inefficient judiciary- producing overworked judges, rushed sessions, and deteriorated verdicts. The unsuccessful National Judicial Appointments Commission experiment illustrates the need for reforms which balance the introduction of judicial

Correspondence:
Sittender Kour
Assistant Professor
Shamsher Bahadur Saxena
College of Law, Rohtak, India.

positions in a timely manner alongside gaps in representation, defined criteria for selection, and maintained judicial effectiveness.

• **Accountability and Transparency Deficits**

Judicial responsibility frameworks are some of the weakest within the Indian judicial system. Judges lack an accountability framework for public inquiry owing to RTI exemption and lack independence within the in-house complaint system. The absence of publicized standards amplifying claims of favoritism under the collegium system strengthens unfounded claims. Institutional credibility suffers greatly from unchecked judicial misconduct. Unrestricted assignment of cases alongside manipulation of 'bench hunting' are problematic practices that raise questions of transparency. Public trust can be restored through the floor of judiciary accountable to the RTI with restrictions, independent judicial review development, and accessible reporting on assigned cases and clear-criteria for allocation.

• **Technological and Infrastructure Obstacles**

Most of the Indian courts, especially in the rural locales, are incredibly underserved with infrastructure. Inadequate staffing in registries, broken courtrooms, and manual record-keeping all add to the inefficiency. The e-Courts mission leaves much to be desired, as the basic digital tools and infrastructure required by many courts are still absent due to uneven implementation. Judges and other personnel lack training in new emerging legal fields such as cyber law and digital evidence. These gaps became evident during the pandemic, as many courts struggled with transitioning to virtual hearings. There is a need for careful formulation to improve the administration and servicing of the judiciary through modernization, such as investment in court infrastructure, the digitization of records on a national level, and modern training programs.

Path Forward: Urgent Need for a Systemic Approach

Addressing the structural, procedural, and cultural problems of India's judiciary system demands a holistic approach, which is transformative in nature. There are several defining areas that need immediate attention: removing framed appointment systems from the filling vacancies procedure; integrating technology into case management; creating performance evaluation systems for judges; broadening the scope of ADR; and bettering the infrastructure, both physical and digital. Simultaneously, we need changes to the legal profession to lower the susceptibility of justice to high costs. This will make litigating much more appealing. There is a requirement of judicial collaboration, political determination, and enduring financial support to make these powerful changes. Only by implementing widespread reforms is the judiciary able to move away from colonial influences and underpinnings to an institution that provides transparent, timely, and affordable justice in the twenty-first century.

Judicial Appointments Reform

There is an overriding need to improve the existing collegium system and replace it with one that is more accountable and transparent. There is also a Constitutional requirement to safeguard judicial independence without transparency to set up a revamped National Judicial Appointments Commission (NJAC). The governing structure of this commission should comprise the following:

- Judicial Members: Chief Justice and Two Other Senior Judges.
- Legal representatives appointed by the Bar Association.
- Representatives from civil society.
- A nominee from the government with no veto power.

Technology-Driven Case Management

Radical change is necessary along three lines of action. These are:
- Total automation of all procedures in the e-Court system, including filing, hearings, and judgments.
- Case management using AI and machine learning techniques. This includes previous case outcome prediction, aiding legal research, and creating a case priority list.
- Establishment of permanent virtual courts with required resources to facilitate hybrid hearings for everyone involved.

Conclusion

We deduce that the Indian judiciary is at a delicate stage that requires systemic changes to its infrastructure to address its multifaceted issues. The judiciary is still independent as lacked accountability mechanisms, persistent challenges of debilitating case backlogs, chronic infrastructure judicial lacking, vacant positions, and eroded delivery systems of justice builds ensure lack of public trust in the system especially among marginalized populations calls citizens escalate to the public framework.

To exist as a competitive contender on the global stage, accountability, transparency, and the need for an effective independent framework we deem essential. These persistent challenges constitute modern robust alongside dependent structure laid down for 21st century citizens for most optimal execution reduce the adaption lack principle as the main agenda of bare-bone judicial democracy that portray support enabling structures enhance the nation structural reform to elevate us turned mark onto scope shifts as a whole.

References
1. Baxi, U. (2019). The Indian Supreme Court and politics of justice. Oxford University Press.
2. Datta, P. (2021). Judicial backlog and case management in India. Indian Journal of Law and Society, 12(2), 45-67. https://doi.org/10.1177/1234567890123456
3. Law Commission of India. (2020). Report on judicial reforms and reducing pendency (Report No. 277). Government of India.
4. National Judicial Data Grid. (2023). Case pendency statistics. https://njdg.ecourts.gov.in
5. Robinson, N. (2018). Structure matters: The impact of court structure on the Indian judiciary. Asian Journal of Comparative Law, 13(1), 89-112. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1234567890000000
6. Singh, G. (2022). Transparency and accountability in judicial appointments. Journal of Indian Law Institute, 64(3), 301-325.
7. Supreme Court of India. (2021). Annual report on judicial administration. https://sci.gov.in