



Speedy justice in India: Challenges, reforms, and the road ahead

Dr. Md Junaid

Department of Law, Aligarh Muslim University Centre Murshidabad, West Bengal, India

Abstract

The Indian judicial system, known for its intricate nature and backlog of cases, has struggled for a long time to provide prompt justice to its citizens. The pursuit of a fast and efficient legal process has been a top priority for both the Indian government and the judiciary. Administering justice isn't just about convicting the guilty and acquitting the innocent; it also involves ensuring a fair and speedy trial. It's widely acknowledged that a speedy trial is essential, as justice cannot be truly served without it. This principle has been endorsed in numerous international agreements and conventions. In India, the delays in the judicial system are substantial, and urgent action is needed from all levels and branches of government to address them. While the delays can be attributed to various factors such as the complexity of cases and the type of evidence required, lawyers are also believed to contribute to these delays. This research paper explores the obstacles that impede the speedy delivery of justice in India, highlights recent reforms, and puts forward suggestions to expedite the judicial process. It also evaluates whether the regular courts in India are suitable for delivering speedy justice and examines the cost involved in administration of justice through regular courts. The rapid dispensation of justice is a major concern in a thriving nation like India. Enhancing the timely delivery of justice is a crucial developmental challenge because, without justice, other public goods and services cannot be effectively provided or accessed. Additionally, our Constitution mandates that the state must ensure that the legal system promotes justice based on equal opportunities and that no citizen is denied the chance to seek justice.

Keywords: judiciary, disposition, speedy justice and victims

Introduction

Speedy justice is a fundamental tenet of any democratic society, ensuring that citizens can access justice in a timely manner. In India, the quest for swift and efficient justice has been a longstanding concern. Over the years, the Indian judiciary has grappled with mounting case backlogs, procedural delays, and a lack of resources, which have contributed to a significant delay in the disposal of cases.

The fundamental human right to pursue Speedy justice is a direct consequence of the fundamental principles of the criminal justice system, which include: "*Justice delayed is justice denied, justice withheld is justice withdrawn, and justice should not only be done but should also appear to have been done*" Criminal justice is fundamentally about the right to a speedy trial, and there can be no debate that justice delayed is justice denied. Although the right to a quick trial is not expressly listed as a basic right in the Indian Constitution, it is implied by the scope of Article 21 (Sharma, 1999). Every person has a fundamental right under Article 21 to not have their life or freedom taken away from them unless doing so follows the legal process. Additionally, the process must be rational, equitable, and just. The process cannot be fair unless this guarantees a swift trial to determine the accused's guilt. People desire justice, pure, unpolluted, rapid, and inexpensive, and they have every right to obtain it, but in reality, there are deplorably long delays in the dispensation of justice, and the demand for speedy justice cannot be reached because, as stated, if justice is not administered quickly, men persuade themselves that there is no such thing as justice (Chattaraj, 2011) [3]. While a case is filed against someone, the alleged offender is taken into custody by the court, and due to the facts of the case, when the case goes to trial, the alleged offender continues to live as a prisoner (Sarathe, n.d).

Living as an innocent prisoner for a crime one didn't commit can be a harrowing experience, marked by prolonged legal battles that may even outlast one of the parties involved. Engaging in the legal process continuously demands considerable financial resources, time, and emotional energy (Gupta, 2015) [7]. Prison violence poses a real and imminent threat to these incarcerated individuals, including those who are innocent, subjecting them to physical and emotional suffering and, tragically, sometimes resulting in their demise within prison walls. The right to a speedy trial, one of the most ancient and debated principles in American law, holds immense significance. It stands as a landmark decision, firmly establishing the right to a prompt trial as a fundamental human entitlement. In essence, it guarantees that anyone facing criminal accusations is entitled to a just, efficient, and timely trial. This pivotal ruling sets a precedent that can serve as an example for other nations, emphasizing the importance of ensuring that all individuals accused of crimes are afforded their right to a speedy trial.

Related Termonologies

Justice

To gain a deeper understanding of the necessity for "Speedy Justice," it's essential to begin by grasping the essence of justice itself. The emphasis here is on the requirement for "Speedy Justice" rather than hurriedly disposing of cases. The term 'Justice' holds profound significance, encompassing various interpretations such as truth, morality, righteousness, equality, equity, impartiality, legality, and more (Dhyani, 1997) [5]. Defining 'Justice' in absolute terms is a challenging endeavor; instead, it is a relative and evolving concept. According to Lord Wright, the most satisfactory definition of justice is that it should appear just and fair to a reasonable person (Keeton, 1930)

[8]. To truly embody the principles of justice and fairness, it becomes imperative that justice is dispensed expeditiously. Without a reasonable and timely delivery of justice to the concerned individuals, the concept of justice loses its true meaning and significance.

Personal Liberty

Furthermore, the need for "Speedy Justice" finds its basis in an individual's assertion of their Right to Life, which includes the inviolability of their person, as well as their Right to Dignity. The concept of the "Right to Speedy Justice" is firmly rooted in one of humanity's fundamental instincts: "Personal Liberty." In every civilized society, Personal Liberty stands as one of the most cherished aspirations. "Liberty" is regarded as one of humanity's most treasured inheritances, for life becomes devoid of meaning and worth without it. To relinquish liberty is to renounce one's humanity, to surrender the very rights inherent to being human (Ehrlich & Ziegert, 2017) [6]. A life without liberty lacks honour and dignity, rendering it devoid of significance and purpose. This is precisely why liberty is described as the essence of a civilized and respectable existence (Khanna, 1978). Under Article 21 of the Indian Constitution, "Personal Liberty" is a comprehensive term. In the case of 'Meneka Gandhi V Union of India' (AIR 1978 SC 597), the Honourable Supreme Court of India expanded the scope of the term "Personal Liberty" to its broadest extent. The court asserted that the expression "Personal Liberty" in Article 21 possesses the widest possible amplitude and encompasses a multitude of rights that collectively constitute an individual's personal liberty.

Fair Trial

A criminal trial that fails to guarantee the "Right to Speedy Justice" cannot be considered a just and equitable trial. The notion of a fair trial is all-encompassing and encompasses the accused individual's entitlement to seek a prompt trial (Torrey, 1990) [19]. When it comes to the concept of a fair trial, the aspect of Speedy Justice can be broken down into four primary dimensions:

1. The investigation or enquiry officer shall attain promptness in investigations.
2. The adjudicating authority should receive all relevant materials which the individual wishes to produce against his opponent.
3. The judiciary should give an opportunity to the accused to rebut these material and information.
4. The judiciary should conclude its determination of guilt or innocence and the passing of the appropriate sentence with promptitude.

Speedy Trial

A "Speedy Trial" refers to a reasonably expedited legal proceeding that adheres to all the essential aspects of a fair trial. It involves the prosecution commencing the trial promptly and conducting it with due diligence (Vanderbilt, 1953) [20]. The Right to Speedy Justice encompasses all stages of the criminal justice system, including the investigation, inquiry, trial, appeal, revision, and retrial. In essence, it covers everything from the initial accusation to the final verdict – these two points representing the starting and ending points of the journey an accused person must inevitably undergo when faced with allegations.

In a broader context, "Speedy Trial" implies resolving a case within a "Reasonable Time." However, it should not be confused with the expedited proceedings observed in situations like the "Khomeini Trial," where proceedings are conducted secretly and rapidly, leading to immediate execution without any right of appeal (Mathew, 1976) [12]. While the adage "justice delayed is justice denied" underscores the importance of timely justice, it's equally vital to exercise caution against excessive speed or haste, as this would merely replace one problem with another (Khanna, 1990) [10]. In essence, we must strike a balance between ensuring speedy trial and upholding the principles of justice and fairness. One of the leading case of speedy trial is followed as under:

In the landmark case of *Hussainara Khatoon vs. Home Secretary, State of Bihar*, the judiciary delivered a groundbreaking judgment that emphasized the critical importance of timely justice as an integral element of a fair trial, thereby expanding the scope of Article 21 of the Indian Constitution. This case also shed light on the significance of providing free legal aid to the economically disadvantaged sections of society to ensure their right to be represented in a court of law by an advocate, as enshrined in Article 39A.

The bench, composed of Justice P.N. Bhagwati, Justice R.S. Pathak, and Justice A.D. Koshal, ruled in favor of the petitioner. In their judgment, they ordered the immediate release of the under-trial prisoners, stating that the lists of under-trial prisoners provided by the State of Bihar revealed that many of them had been in jail for durations longer than the maximum term they could have been sentenced to if convicted.

This revelation exposed a deeply troubling state of affairs and reflected a complete lack of regard for human rights. It laid bare the insensitivity within our legal and judicial system, which appeared indifferent to the immense suffering and injustice resulting from the unjustified deprivation of personal liberty. The judgment expressed bewilderment at how the State Government could have been oblivious to the prolonged incarceration of these under-trial prisoners, even though their trials had not commenced. The judiciary in the State of Bihar also came under scrutiny for not addressing the issue of thousands of under-trial prisoners languishing in jails without their trials starting.

In essence, the judgment in the *Hussainara Khatoon* case highlighted the pressing need for speedy justice, emphasized the importance of free legal aid for the underprivileged, and criticized the systemic failures that allowed such injustices to persist within the Indian legal and judicial framework.

Concept of Speedy justice: in Reality

Speedy justice is always been the sine qua non of criminal jurisprudence. It is an important safeguard to prevent undue and oppressive incarceration. It minimises anxiety and concern accompanying the accusation. It also limits the possibility of impairing the ability of an accused to defend himself. There also remains a keen societal interest in providing speedy justice. The right of speedy justice has been actuated in the recent past. The courts also, in series of decisions, have opened new vistas of fundamental rights.

The concept of a speedy trial was initially incorporated into the Virginia Declaration of Rights in 1776. This concept subsequently made its way into the Sixth Amendment of the United States Constitution, which ensures that "in all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a

speedy and public trial." Notably, the United States also enacted the Speedy Trial Act in 1974, which sets specific time limits for key events in criminal cases, such as filing information, issuing indictments, and arraignments.

Similar provisions regarding the right to a speedy trial can be found in Canadian laws. This right is also recognized as a common law principle, with its origins traceable back to the Magna Carta. This perspective is held in the United Kingdom, the United States, Canada, and New Zealand, although it is not accepted in Australia.

However, whether as a common law right or otherwise, the right to a speedy trial does not guarantee an absolute remedy but is subject to well-established guidelines developed through judicial decisions. Additionally, under Article 14 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights of 1966, the right to a speedy trial is protected. Likewise, Article 3 of the European Convention on Human Rights and the Sixth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution both recognize it as a fundamental right.

So far as India is concerned, the right to speedy trial is an integral and essential part of the fundamental right to life and liberty enshrined in Article 21 of the Constitution of India. The Supreme Court, while delivering its constitutional bench judgment in the case of Abdul Rehman Antulay Vs. R.S. Nayak declared that right to speedy trial is implicit in Article 21 of the Constitution and, thus, constituted a fundamental right of every person accused of a crime. In Hussainara Khatoon (I) V. Home Secretary, State of Bihar [(1980) 1 SCC 81], the Supreme Court observed:

Now obviously procedure prescribed by law for depriving a person of his liberty cannot be 'reasonable, fair or just' unless that procedure ensures a speedy trial for determination of the guilt of such person. No procedure which does not ensure a reasonably quick trial can be regarded as 'reasonable, fair or just' and it would fall foul of Article 21. There can, therefore, be no doubt that speedy trial, and by speedy trial we mean reasonably expeditious trial, is an integral and essential part of the fundamental right to life and liberty enshrined in Article 21.

In reality, the right to Speedy Justice is often one of the most overlooked aspects of the Criminal Justice System. The importance of swift justice has been recognized in societies throughout history and at all stages of their development. Delayed justice has consistently been regarded as one of the most significant issues afflicting human societies in all civilized systems. The problem of legal delays is not a recent phenomenon; it has existed as long as the law itself. It has been a persistent issue in every judicial system, including the Roman, Greek, English, and American systems (Bajpayee, 1978)^[1].

The concept of the "Right to Speedy Justice" is rooted in natural rights and was subsequently acknowledged and refined by historical documents such as the Magna Carta in 1215 AD. The Magna Carta asserted that "To no man will we deny, to no man will we sell, or delay, Justice or Rights." This idea was subsequently incorporated into various national constitutions and "Bill of Rights" documents, including the Petition of Rights (1627), Bill of Rights (1689), Massachusetts Constitution (1780), and the French Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen (1789), among others.

The Sixth Amendment of the United States Constitution explicitly states that "In all Criminal Prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the Right to Speedy and Public Trial."

This concept has been further solidified and given universal significance through various international and regional declarations and conventions.

The denial of Right to Speedy Justice i.e. delays express out as one of the major reasons for this negative opinion about our Judicial System. However the problem of delays continues and it assumed gigantic proportions. Delay culminates a sense of injustice; long periods of denials emanates uncertainty, the problem of judicial delays seemed of have reached such a climax of notoriety that no one can escape from its vice (Bhatia, Singh & Singh, 1995)^[2]. The mourning arrears in the courts inordinate delays in the administration of justice and the high cost of litigation have today undermined people's faith in the judiciary and threatened the very survival of the system.

The Parliamentary Standing Committee on Home Affairs found that, the position of Subordinate Courts is more alarming, as there is a backlog of over 2 crore cases pending. Some of them are pending for as long as 25 to 30 years, of these, there are, 1.32 crore criminal cases pending for trial (Venkatesan, 2002)^[21].

The above explanation of the factual situation makes it quite clear that despite many efforts by the Legislature, the Executive and the Judiciary, the pendency of cases in the courts is piling up with every passing day. The problem of judicial delays has become an unceasing, unaffected and unsolvable problem though several intellectuals have done their level best to suggest suitable solutions, but are in vain.

Constitutional Perspective

Constitutional law, being the fundamental and foundational law of the land, holds exceptional significance. Every branch of the state aspires to serve the people of India while upholding both the explicit wording and the underlying principles of the Constitution. The Constitution of India has articulated a common objective for all its components, which is to ensure that all citizens of India enjoy Justice - encompassing the social, economic, and political realms - as well as Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity. At the core of constitutionalism lies the enduring principle of the "rule of law," which comprises three essential facets: the "rule of law" itself, "rule under law," and "rule according to law" (Rao, N.D., Wade & Phillips, 1965). As mentioned previously, even though the Constitution of India does not expressly or separately codify the right to speedy justice, it implicitly acknowledges it as a fundamental objective of the legal system.

Right to Speedy Justice and Indian judicial System

"There is perhaps no better measure of a government's quality than the effectiveness of its judicial system, as nothing more directly impacts the well-being and security of the average citizen than their belief in the prompt and certain administration of justice." - Lord James Bryce in Modern Democracies.

The trust in a judicial system hinges on its ability to deliver accessible, swift, and cost-effective justice to all without discrimination. Speedy justice should instill a sense of security among citizens, assuring them that those who transgress the laws of the country will face consequences and that their legitimate grievances will be addressed, thereby dissuading them from resorting to vigilantism and taking matters into their own hands. This feeling of security

is crucial for maintaining public order and tranquillity, which are essential for societal progress.

Despite the intent for justice to be "simple, speedy, inexpensive, effective, and substantial," it remains elusive for many Indians. One of the primary reasons for this is the persistent issue of delays in the dispensation of justice. This problem is not new to the Indian judicial system; it has existed for a long time but has now reached alarming proportions.

On one hand, this backlog of cases places tremendous strain on the judicial system, and on the other, it erodes citizens' confidence in the Indian judicial system. Even the Law Commission of India, in its seventy-seventh report, recognized the backlog of cases as a major concern. The recurring conflict between the need for speedy trials and the reality of delayed trials has confounded legal policymakers, legislators, researchers, and the courts themselves. In this struggle, the courts often find themselves in the role of mere observers (AIR 1991 SC 2176).

Slower resolution and criminal Cases

The issue of expeditious case resolution is particularly acute in criminal cases compared to civil ones. Achieving a speedy trial in criminal cases, seen as an essential element of the right to a fair trial, has remained a distant aspiration. A legal procedure that fails to ensure a trial and resolution within a reasonable timeframe cannot be deemed just, fair, or reasonable. The right to a speedy trial lies at the core of criminal justice, and it's undeniable that justice delayed equates to justice denied. Their mission remains incomplete as long as there are individuals enduring tears and suffering (Sachar, 1999) ^[14].

Speedy addressing criminal offenses has been a fundamental objective of the criminal justice system, as excessive delays can thwart the pursuit of justice. The common sayings "Justice hurried is Justice buried" and "Justice delayed is justice denied" capture this sentiment (Sourdin & Burstyner, 2014). Therefore, the pursuit of speedy justice should not come at the expense of legal justice. It is imperative to strike a reasonable balance between the need for expediency and the need for justice.

The expeditious handling of cases benefits both the prosecution and the accused. For the prosecution, it prevents issues such as the disappearance of witnesses and evidence. For the accused, it ensures that if they are innocent, they do not suffer needlessly for an extended period. Consequently, the right to speedy justice possesses a unique nature distinct from other constitutional rights of the accused.

The constitution of India, 1950 does not specifically guarantee the right to speedy justice, however it is extended in article 21 i.e. right to life of the constitution to provide speedy justice to the citizens. This extending is purely a judicial effort. There have been many cases where the judges have made emphasis on the right to speedy justice:-

***State of Maharashtra v. Champa Lal* ^[1]:**

The court held that if the accused himself is responsible for the delay, he could not take advantage of this right. The court said that a delayed trial is not necessarily an unfair trial.

***Delhi Administration Vs Sunil Batra* ^[2]:**

The court held that the practice of keeping under trials with convicts in jails offended the test of reasonableness in article

19 and fairness in article 21. Justice Krishna Iyer giving a major decision held that integrity of physical person and his mental personality is an important right of the prisoner and must be protected from all kinds of atrocities.

***State of Bihar Vs Vakil Prasad Singh* ^[3]:**

The court has emphasized the need for speedy investigation and trial of constitutional protection enshrined in article 21 of the constitution.

***State of Jammu and Kashmir Vs Moti Lal Saraf* ^[4]:**

In order to make the administration of criminal justice effective, vibrant and meaningful, the union of India, the state government, and all concerned authorities must take necessary steps immediately so that the important constitutional right of the accused of a speedy trial does not remain only on papers or is a mere formality.

***Archana Guha Vs Santosh DE V* ^[5]:**

Prosecution was pending against the accused for the last 14 years. Since the accused was not responsible for the delay, the proceedings were quashed. Also in the second appeal, there was an unexplained delay for 8 years and the court held that it infringed the right to speedy trial.

***State of Bihar Vs Raghubir Singh V* ^[6]:**

The court held that the infringement of right to speedy trial could not be inferred merely from delay in police investigation. The court pointed out that the delay was due to the nature of the case and general situation prevailing in the country.

***State of Bihar Vs Mahendra Lal Das V* ^[7]:**

The prosecution merely failed to explain the delay of more than 13 years. Thus, the court quashed the proceedings keeping in view the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case.

***State of Karnataka Vs P. Ramachandra Rao* ^[8]:**

The seven judge constitutional bench observed that, The mental agony, expense and strain which a person proceeded against in criminal law has to undergo and which, coupled with delay, may result in impairing the capability or ability of the accused to defend himself have persuaded the constitutional courts of the country in holding the right to speedy trial a manifestation of fair, just and reasonable procedure enshrined in Article 21."

Challenges to Speedy Justice

Case Backlog

India's legal system is burdened with an overwhelming backlog of cases. The number of pending cases in various courts across the country has escalated, leading to significant delays in adjudication. Cases pending in various courts in the country have crossed the five-crore mark, Rajya Sabha was informed on Thursday. In a written reply, Law Minister Arjun Ram Meghwal said over 5.02 crore cases were pending in various courts -- the Supreme Court, the 25 high courts and subordinate courts. "As per data retrieved from the Integrated Case Management System (ICMIS) by the Supreme Court of India, as on July 1, there are 69,766 cases pending in the Supreme Court. "Total number of cases pending in the high courts and the district and subordinate courts as on July 14 are 60,62,953 and

4,41,35,357 respectively, as per information made available on National Judicial Data Grid (NJDG).

Procedural Delays

Lengthy and intricate legal procedures contribute to the slow pace of justice delivery. The process of filing, hearing, and judgment can often take years, deterring litigants from seeking redress.

Lack of Infrastructure

Inadequate infrastructure, including insufficient courtrooms, judges, and support staff, exacerbates the problem. Courts are overwhelmed, leading to further delays.

Limited Access to Legal Aid

A large section of the Indian population lacks access to legal representation, resulting in delays as litigants navigate the complex legal system without assistance.

Inefficiencies in Case Management

The absence of efficient case management systems, use of outdated technology, and bureaucratic hurdles further contribute to delays.

Way Forward to Speedy Justice

Speedy justice is a critical aspect of any fair and effective legal system. To achieve speedy justice, several measures and reforms can be implemented:

- ***Case Management Systems:*** Implement modern case management systems that use technology to track cases, schedules, and deadlines. This can help reduce delays caused by paperwork and administrative inefficiencies.
- ***Fast-Track Courts:*** Establish specialized fast-track courts to deal with specific types of cases that require urgent attention, such as cases involving violence against women, corruption, or other heinous crimes.
- ***Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR):*** Encourage the use of ADR mechanisms like mediation and arbitration to resolve disputes outside of the traditional court system. ADR can be faster and more cost-effective.
- ***Clear Timelines:*** Set clear and reasonable timelines for different stages of the legal process, including filing of cases, hearings, and judgments. Failure to adhere to these timelines should have consequences for the responsible parties.
- ***Reducing Case Backlog:*** Implement strategies to reduce the backlog of pending cases, including hiring more judges, appointing additional court staff, and investing in infrastructure and technology.
- ***Simplify Legal Procedures:*** Streamline and simplify legal procedures to reduce the complexity and time-consuming nature of court processes. This can include reducing the number of adjournments and simplifying documentation requirements.
- ***Training and Capacity Building:*** Invest in the training and capacity building of judges, lawyers, and court staff to ensure they are well-equipped to handle cases efficiently.

- ***Online Court Proceedings:*** Expand the use of online platforms for court proceedings, including virtual hearings and e-filing, to save time and resources.
- ***Legal Aid:*** Ensure that everyone has access to legal representation, especially those who cannot afford it. Providing legal aid can help expedite cases by ensuring that they are properly prepared and presented.
- ***Community Engagement:*** Promote legal literacy and community engagement to reduce the number of frivolous cases and encourage early settlement of disputes at the local level.
- ***Regular Case Review:*** Periodically review the progress of cases to identify bottlenecks and inefficiencies. Courts can conduct internal audits to assess their own performance and make improvements.
- ***Legislative Reforms:*** Update and amend outdated laws to reflect modern realities and streamline legal processes.
- ***Specialized Courts:*** Establish specialized courts for specific types of cases, such as commercial courts, family courts, and labor courts, to ensure that judges have expertise in the relevant areas of law.
- ***Public Awareness Campaigns:*** Conduct public awareness campaigns to educate citizens about their rights and responsibilities within the legal system. This can help prevent unnecessary litigation.
- ***Interagency Collaboration:*** Foster collaboration among different agencies of the criminal justice system, such as the police, prosecution, and judiciary, to ensure a coordinated and efficient approach to justice.

Speedy justice is essential for upholding the rule of law and building trust in the legal system. Implementing these measures can help achieve a fair and efficient justice system that serves the needs of the people.

Further recommendations for Speedy Justice Case Management System

Implement a robust case management system using modern technology to track cases, manage schedules, and reduce unnecessary adjournments.

Training and Capacity Building

Invest in training for judges, lawyers, and court staff to improve efficiency in the judicial process.

Clearing Backlogs

Develop a comprehensive strategy to clear the backlog of cases, including the identification of priority areas.

Legal Education

Enhance legal education to produce skilled lawyers and legal professionals who can navigate the system effectively.

Public Awareness

Promote awareness among citizens about their legal rights and avenues for redress, reducing frivolous litigation.

Conclusion

The primary objective of the judiciary and the judicial system is to ensure a fair and prompt trial within the shortest possible timeframe, allowing people seeking justice to receive it swiftly. The judicial process should be equipped to administer social justice and must align with constitutional norms. Timely and efficient decisions are crucial in preventing unjust outcomes and restoring the public's trust in the justice delivery system. Compliance with the principles of fair and speedy trials is a fundamental requirement. It is not solely the responsibility of the courts to provide fair and swift justice to the accused; it also falls upon other components of the criminal justice system, such as the police, public prosecutors, and defense counsel, to play their respective roles effectively. Simultaneously, the public has a duty to extend its utmost cooperation to the police and the courts to facilitate speedy investigations and trials. Without public cooperation, no agency can effectively carry out its responsibilities. Therefore, for the prompt delivery of justice to the accused, all these components must collaborate and work together. The executive branch has a critical role in expediting the criminal justice delivery system. It should safeguard witnesses and victims, support the prosecution effectively, and avoid political influence. Investigative agencies should be well-equipped to analyse and address crimes involving sophisticated methods. Additionally, the legislature needs to address specific areas that require immediate attention, as access to justice is a vital aspect of social justice.

References

1. Bajpayee B. Law's Delay. The Journal of the Bar Council of India,1978:1:70.
2. Bhatia KL, Singh G, Singh J. Delay: A riddle wrapped in a mystery inside an enigma. Journal of the Indian Law Institute,1995:37(1):42-72.
3. Chattaraj A. Justice delayed-justice denied-the right to speedy trial in India. Available at SSRN 1919493., 2011.
4. Delhi Judicial Service Association V State of Gujarat AIR 1991 SC 2176
5. Dhyani SN. Fundamentals of Jurisprudence: (the Indian Approach). Central Law Agency, 1997.
6. Ehrlich E, Ziegert KA. Fundamental principles of the sociology of law. Routledge, 2017.
7. Gupta S. Speedy justice-A tool for good governance. Asian Journal of Multidimensional Research (AJMR),2015:4(5):87-93.
8. Keeton GW. The elementary principles of jurisprudence, 1930.
9. Khanna HR. "Inagural address All India Seminar on Personal Liberty" KIJ,1978:4-1.
10. Khanna HR. Judicial and Administrative Reforms— Indian Experience. Indian Journal of Public Administration,1990:36(3):500-506.
11. Lord James Bryce (In Modern Democracies)
12. Mathew KK. SAPRU CENTENARY SUPPLEMENT. India Quarterly,1976:32(2):I-XXIII.
13. Rao PP. (N.D) "National Judicial Service Commission" Indian Bar Review,1976:15(1&2):198:2 22.
14. Sachar R. Judicial Reforms in India: Some Aspects. Indian Journal of Public Administration,1999:45(3):472-478.
15. Sarathe A. (n.d). Speedy Justice in India in View of Delays-An Analytical Study, 1999.
16. Sharma DP. Speedy Justice and Indian Criminal Justice System. Indian Journal of Public Administration, 45(3), 356-363, 1999.
17. Sourdin T, Burstyner N. Justice delayed is justice denied. Victoria University Law and Justice Journal,2014:4(1):46-60.
18. The National Judicial Data Grid, available at: http://njdg.ecourts.gov.in/njdg_public/main.php (Accessed 30 March 2018) Economic Times 2016, HC Judges get 5-6 Minutes to Decide a Case, available at: <http://economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/high-court-judges-get-just5-6-minutes-to-decide-cases-says-study/articleshow/51725395.cms> (Accessed 30 March 2018)
19. Torrey M. When will we be believed-rape myths and the idea of a fair trial in rape prosecutions. *Uc DaVis l. reV.*,1990:24:1013.
20. Vanderbilt AT. Essentials of a sound judicial system. *Nw. UL Rev.*,1953:48:1.
21. Venkatesan J. Penal Concern Over Backlog in Courts, in : The Hindu, New Delhi, 10th March, 2002, 7.
22. Wade & Philips– "Constitutional Law", 1965, 1.