



Strengthening the Indian Judiciary: Comprehensive reforms to reduce delays and ensure timely justice

Dr. Sonu

Professor, Department of Law, Maharshi Dayanand University, Rohtak, Haryana, India

Abstract

The judiciary constitutes one of the foundational pillars of Indian democracy, entrusted with the protection of citizens' rights and serving as the guardian of fundamental rights enshrined in the Constitution. In cases of infringement, individuals are entitled to seek redressal before the courts. However, the mere existence of judicial and reformative mechanisms is inadequate if they fail to provide effective remedies within a reasonable timeframe. Presently, the Indian judiciary is overburdened with an unprecedented backlog of cases, many of which have remained pending for years. Despite constitutional safeguards and periodic legal reforms, the persistence of judicial delays undermines the cardinal principle that "justice delayed is justice denied." This paper undertakes a critical analysis of the causes and consequences of such delays and proposes pragmatic solutions aimed at strengthening the efficiency and timeliness of justice delivery in India.

Keywords: Judiciary, democracy, fundamental rights, judicial delays, justice delivery, constitution

Introduction

Speedy justice is an indispensable component of a fair and effective legal system, particularly within a democratic framework where the rule of law, equality before law, and the protection of fundamental rights are paramount. Delay in the dispensation of justice can prove as detrimental as injustice itself, for laws lose their meaning if remedies are not provided within a reasonable time.

In a democracy, citizens are guaranteed the right to life, liberty, and a fair trial. Prolonged litigation and delayed adjudication not only undermine these rights but also erode public confidence in the judiciary—an institution regarded as the ultimate guardian of justice. The plight of undertrial prisoners, victims of crime, and litigants awaiting redress in civil disputes illustrates the severe human cost of judicial delay. The consequences extend beyond individual hardship. Delayed justice weakens deterrence in criminal law by signalling that offenders may evade timely accountability, thereby fostering impunity and undermining law enforcement. At the systemic level, judicial backlog aggravates inefficiency, paralyzes economic growth by stalling commercial disputes and contract enforcement, and creates an environment of uncertainty that deters investment. Socially, it intensifies trauma for victims, denies closure, and, in extreme cases, may give rise to cynicism, social unrest, or even vigilantism. Furthermore, delay in trials compromises the presumption of innocence by subjecting accused persons to prolonged harassment and stigma. The principle of speedy justice is therefore not merely a procedural necessity but a constitutional and moral imperative. Speedy justice ensures rights granted are to be meaningfully upheld. It preserves public trust in the judiciary, ensures the meaningful enforcement of rights, and sustains the democratic promise that justice will not only be done but will be seen to be done.

As embodied in the legal maxim "*justice delayed is justice denied*", a democratic society must continuously strive to strengthen its legal institutions to guarantee justice that is timely, fair, and accessible to all.

Right to Speedy Trial in India

The *Right to Speedy Trial* is recognized as a fundamental right in India, firmly anchored in the principles of justice, fairness, and human dignity. Its objective is to prevent an accused from being subjected to prolonged and unreasonable delays in legal proceedings, which often result in severe mental, physical, and financial hardship. Article 21 of the Constitution of India guarantees that "*No person shall be deprived of his life or personal liberty except according to procedure established by law.*" The Supreme Court has expansively interpreted this provision to include the right to a speedy trial as an essential facet of the "procedure established by law."

In the landmark case of *Hussainara Khatoon v. State of Bihar* (1979), the Court first recognized speedy trial as an integral part of Article 21. The judgment highlighted the plight of thousands of undertrial prisoners languishing in prisons for years without trial, declaring that "*speedy trial is an essential ingredient of reasonable, fair and just procedure.*" This interpretation was further reinforced in subsequent decisions. In *Sheela Barse v. Union of India* (1986), the Court directed that cases involving women and children must be dealt with expeditiously. In *Kartar Singh v. State of Punjab* (1994), the Court reiterated that speedy trial is a constitutional right and that its denial amounts to denial of justice. Similarly, in *Vakil Prasad Singh v. State of Bihar* (2009), criminal proceedings were quashed on account of inordinate prosecutorial delay, with the Court holding such delay violative of the right to a speedy trial. Thus, the jurisprudence surrounding Article 21 firmly establishes speedy trial as a constitutional safeguard indispensable to justice delivery in India.

Causes of Judicial Delays in India

Judicial delay is one of the most persistent challenges confronting the Indian legal system. The failure to deliver timely justice not only undermines public confidence in the courts but also infringes the constitutional guarantee of a *speedy trial* under Article 21. Despite being the guardian of

rights, the judiciary often struggles under the weight of inefficiencies, bottlenecks, and systemic flaws. The following discussion critically examines the major causes contributing to judicial delay in India.

1. Huge Backlog of Cases

The single greatest challenge is the sheer volume of pending litigation. As of recent estimates, Indian courts are burdened with over 50 million pending cases across different levels of the judiciary. This backlog includes civil disputes, criminal trials, constitutional matters, and commercial litigations. Courts with limited judges, staff, and infrastructure are simply unable to match the pace of new filings. The rate of disposal lags far behind the rate of institution, creating an ever-expanding pipeline of unresolved matters. Judges frequently face packed cause-lists with dozens of cases listed for a single day, making it practically impossible to hear each matter in depth. Adjournments become routine, and litigants wait for years for their cases to even reach the stage of final arguments. The backlog creates a ripple effect: cases are delayed not due to complexity but due to administrative overload. This has turned the judiciary into a “waiting room of justice,” where citizens spend years—sometimes decades—awaiting resolution.

2. Inadequate Number of Judges

Another structural cause of delay is the acute shortage of judges. India has one of the lowest judge-to-population ratios in the world. Although the Law Commission has repeatedly recommended an increase in judicial strength, the pace of appointments has been slow. The shortage means that each judge is saddled with an unmanageable caseload, often running into hundreds of cases simultaneously. Consequently, judges are compelled to grant long intervals between hearings, stretching trials over years. Overburdened judges also have less time to examine evidence, research precedents, or craft well-reasoned judgments, which compromises both quality and speed of justice. Vacancies in the higher judiciary remain a chronic issue, often caught in the tug-of-war between the judiciary and executive over the appointment process. In lower courts, recruitment is delayed by bureaucratic hurdles and lack of resources. Until this gap between sanctioned strength and actual appointments is bridged, speedy justice will remain elusive.

3. Frequent Adjournments

Perhaps the most visible reason for judicial delay is the practice of frequent adjournments. While adjournments may occasionally be necessary to ensure fairness, their rampant and often frivolous use has turned them into a tool of delay. Litigants or lawyers often seek adjournments as a deliberate strategy to wear down the opposing party, delay enforcement of rights, or exploit loopholes. The Supreme Court has repeatedly cautioned against the misuse of adjournments, but the practice persists at every level of the judiciary. Each adjournment pushes the case further down the already congested calendar. Witnesses lose memory, evidence loses relevance, and judges may have to refresh themselves with case details afresh each time. This not only prolongs trials but also reduces their quality and reliability.

4. Inefficient Case Management

Beyond structural shortages, poor case management contributes substantially to delays. Indian courts often treat

all cases uniformly, without distinguishing urgent matters from routine ones. Consequently, critical issues such as bail applications, senior citizen petitions, or child custody matters suffer unnecessary postponement. Scheduling inefficiencies are also rampant. Courts may list too many cases for the same day, knowing fully well that only a fraction can be heard. The rest are adjourned automatically. Moreover, the absence of systematic monitoring mechanisms means that many cases remain stagnant for years due to administrative oversight or inaction by one party. In the digital age, many courts still rely on manual record-keeping and paperwork, prone to loss and misplacement. The lack of e-filing, automated scheduling, and real-time case tracking delays administrative processes. While some High Courts have adopted digital tools, their penetration remains uneven across states, leaving most trial courts lagging far behind.

5. Delay in Investigation and Filing of Chargesheets

Judicial delay is not solely the responsibility of the courts; it is also rooted in the inefficiencies of investigating agencies. In criminal cases, the process begins with investigation and culminates in the filing of a chargesheet. Delays at this stage paralyze the entire chain of justice. Police investigations are often hampered by staff shortages, lack of forensic facilities, inadequate training, and bureaucratic hurdles. Complex cases may take years to investigate thoroughly. Even in relatively straightforward matters, delays in recording witness statements or collecting evidence push the timeline further. Once the investigation is completed, failure to file a chargesheet within the prescribed time leads to adjournments, with the accused left in prolonged uncertainty. This not only violates the right to speedy trial but also contributes to prison overcrowding, as undertrial prisoners await charges that are never promptly filed.

6. Shortage of Infrastructure

The infrastructure deficit in the judiciary is glaring. Many courts function in dilapidated buildings with inadequate space, insufficient courtrooms, and poor facilities for litigants, lawyers, and even judges. The shortage of functional courtrooms means that hearings cannot be scheduled promptly, forcing unnecessary adjournments. Equally concerning is the lack of modern technology. While the pandemic demonstrated the potential of virtual hearings, many courts lack stable internet connections, video conferencing facilities, or digital case management systems. Paper-based procedures slow down filing, service of summons, and record maintenance. Supporting staff, including clerks, stenographers, and security personnel, are also inadequate in number and training. Without proper support systems, judges and lawyers waste valuable time on administrative tasks, further delaying proceedings.

7. Overburdened Public Prosecutors and Legal Aid Lawyers

Public prosecutors and legal aid lawyers form the backbone of criminal justice. However, both groups are chronically overburdened. A single prosecutor may be required to handle hundreds of cases simultaneously, leaving little time for case preparation. Legal aid lawyers, tasked with representing indigent litigants, often face similar burdens with minimal remuneration or support. The consequence is poor preparation, inadequate representation, and frequent

requests for adjournments. Cases drag on not due to lack of merit but due to the inability of lawyers to devote sufficient attention to each matter. Moreover, the shortage of trained prosecutors leads to trial delays, as courts cannot proceed without their presence. This systemic weakness denies effective legal representation to the marginalized, compounding social inequities and undermining faith in justice.

8. Appeals and Reviews at Multiple Levels

The hierarchical structure of Indian courts, though designed to ensure fairness, inadvertently contributes to delays. Decisions of trial courts can be appealed to higher forums, reviewed, and even subjected to curative petitions. While this layered approach is essential to correct judicial errors, it often prolongs litigation for decades. Litigants sometimes exploit appellate remedies as a dilatory tactic, filing appeals primarily to stall the enforcement of adverse judgments. Frivolous appeals and repetitive petitions clog higher courts, diverting attention from genuine grievances. The appellate process itself is lengthy, involving detailed scrutiny of records, voluminous arguments, and complex legal analysis. Often, higher courts remit cases back to lower courts for reconsideration, effectively restarting the cycle. While appeals are integral to justice, their misuse and slow disposal contribute heavily to judicial delays. Thus, the causes of judicial delay in India are multifaceted, ranging from structural shortages of judges and infrastructure to procedural inefficiencies, investigative lapses, and misuse of appellate remedies. Each factor compounds the others, creating a vicious cycle where delay begets more delay. Judicial reforms must therefore address these issues comprehensively. Expanding judicial strength, modernizing infrastructure, adopting digital case management, training prosecutors, and curbing adjournments are critical steps toward a more efficient justice system. Only when these structural and procedural bottlenecks are resolved can the judiciary truly fulfill its constitutional mandate of delivering speedy and effective justice.

Reformative Measures to Address Judicial Delays in India

The Indian judiciary, as the guardian of the Constitution and protector of fundamental rights, is entrusted with the responsibility of ensuring timely and effective justice delivery. However, persistent delays in adjudication have severely impacted its functioning, eroding public trust and undermining the principle of “justice delayed is justice denied.” To address this systemic malaise, multiple reformative measures have been initiated, combining legislative enactments, policy frameworks, judicial innovations, and technological advancements. This section undertakes a structured analysis of the major reformative measures introduced in India, examining their objectives, functioning, benefits, and limitations.

Establishment of Fast-Track Courts (FTCs)

The establishment of Fast-Track Courts (FTCs) in India represents a significant reformative measure aimed at addressing the problem of judicial backlog and ensuring the expeditious delivery of justice in sensitive and time-bound matters. FTCs embody the joint commitment of the judiciary and the executive to enhance access to justice and improve the efficiency of the legal system. The concept of

FTCs was first introduced in the year 2000, pursuant to the recommendations of the Eleventh Finance Commission, with the primary objective of reducing the pendency of long-standing criminal cases. Initially, these courts were financed by the Central Government, and subsequent to the expiration of central funding, their continuation was taken up by State Governments with appropriate financial and policy assistance.

The establishment of FTCs gained renewed momentum in the aftermath of the *Nirbhaya* case (2012), which highlighted the urgent need for specialized courts to deal with crimes against women and children in a time-bound manner. Consequently, FTCs were increasingly designated to handle such sensitive categories of cases, along with other high-priority matters. The objectives of FTCs include the speedy disposal of long-pending and high-priority cases, reducing the burden on regular courts, and ensuring timely justice in cases involving sexual offences, crimes against children, offences against senior citizens, corruption matters, economic offences, and cases concerning undertrial prisoners. By fast-tracking these proceedings, the courts seek to uphold the constitutional mandate of fair, just, and reasonable procedure under Article 21, thereby reinforcing the principle that justice must not only be done but must also be delivered without undue delay.

E-Courts and Digital Initiatives

The introduction of e-Courts and allied digital initiatives marks a transformative reform in the Indian judiciary, aimed at enhancing accessibility, efficiency, and transparency in justice delivery. These initiatives are particularly significant in addressing judicial delays, reducing pendency, and strengthening court management through the integration of technology into core judicial functions.

E-Courts are technology-enabled platforms wherein processes such as filing of cases, case tracking, hearings, and pronouncement of judgments are conducted in a digital environment, thereby minimizing the reliance on physical presence and paperwork. The objectives of this initiative include speedy disposal of cases, promotion of transparency and accountability, efficient case and court administration, and remote access to justice for litigants. Key measures under this program encompass the digitization of case records, e-filing, the establishment of the National Judicial Data Grid (NJDG), SMS and email alerts, as well as the introduction of virtual courts and video conferencing facilities. These reforms have resulted in streamlined proceedings, reduced procedural inefficiencies, enhanced access to justice in rural areas, and cost-effectiveness for litigants and courts alike.

Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) Mechanisms

Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) provides an institutional framework for resolving disputes outside the conventional court system, ensuring outcomes that are speedy, cost-effective, and amicable. In India, where more than five crore cases remain pending, ADR functions as an essential remedial mechanism to reduce the judicial backlog and promote access to justice in consonance with the constitutional mandate under Article 21. ADR encompasses a range of non-judicial methods enabling parties to reach mutually acceptable solutions without resorting to protracted litigation. The principal forms of ADR in India include Arbitration, wherein a neutral arbitrator renders a

binding decision; Conciliation, where a third party facilitates consensus; Mediation, wherein a mediator assists parties in negotiating a voluntary agreement; Lok Adalats, popularly known as people's courts, which provide amicable settlement of pending or pre-litigation disputes; and Negotiation, which allows informal and private resolution directly between parties.

The legal foundation of ADR is derived from key enactments, notably the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, which governs arbitration and conciliation proceedings; the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987, which institutionalizes Lok Adalats; and the Mediation Act, 2023, which confers statutory recognition on mediation as a mode of dispute resolution. The objectives of ADR are multifold: reducing the burden on regular courts, ensuring timely and affordable justice, fostering harmonious relationships in family and commercial disputes, and providing flexible, party-controlled processes. Thus, ADR serves not only as a mechanism of decongesting the judiciary but also as an instrument for strengthening participatory and consensual justice in India.

National Judicial Data Grid (NJDG)

The National Judicial Data Grid (NJDG) is a flagship digital initiative designed to enhance transparency, accountability, and efficiency within the Indian judiciary. Conceived under the e-Courts Mission Mode Project by the Department of Justice in collaboration with the National Informatics Centre (NIC), it serves as a centralized online repository providing real-time data on case pendency and disposal across district and subordinate courts in India. By functioning as a dynamic database, NJDG equips judges, policymakers, and citizens with accessible court statistics, thereby facilitating informed decision-making and judicial reforms. Its key feature lies in the provision of daily updated information regarding pending and disposed cases, enabling monitoring of trends in pendency and disposal. The primary objectives of NJDG are to promote data-driven judicial policy-making, support effective workload distribution among courts, strengthen case management, and enhance transparency in judicial functioning. Ultimately, NJDG plays a critical role in reducing delays and ensuring timely access to justice through technology-enabled case tracking.

Gram Nyayalayas Act, 2008

The Gram Nyayalayas Act, 2008 represents a landmark legislative reform aimed at decentralizing the justice delivery system and strengthening access to justice for India's rural population. It provides for the establishment of village-level courts, known as Gram Nyayalayas, with the primary objective of ensuring affordable, speedy, and accessible justice at the grassroots level. This reform plays a vital role in reducing the burden on district and subordinate courts by directly handling local disputes and preventing unnecessary delays. Gram Nyayalayas are established at the intermediate Panchayat level (block level) and are presided over by a Nyayadhikari, who holds powers equivalent to a Judicial Magistrate of the First Class. They are empowered to deal with both civil and criminal cases, including petty offences and minor local disputes. One of the significant features of these courts is their time-bound approach—cases are expected to be disposed of within 90 days of filing. This mechanism ensures prompt redressal and prevents minor issues from escalating into prolonged litigation. A

distinctive feature of Gram Nyayalayas is their emphasis on conciliation, compromise, and community-based resolution, especially in civil disputes. They adopt informal and summary procedures, minimizing technicalities and legal jargon to make the process citizen-friendly. Nyayadhikaris are also authorized to hold mobile courts and conduct sittings in villages on designated days, thereby extending justice to remote areas and reducing the need for people to travel long distances. With nominal court fees, these institutions encourage the poor and marginalized sections of society to seek justice without financial hardship.

Conclusion

The Indian judicial system, though constitutionally robust and institutionally sound, is persistently burdened by the problem of delay in the dispensation of justice. The oft-cited maxim "*justice delayed is justice denied*" ceases to remain a mere aphorism in India; it has, unfortunately, become a lived reality for millions of litigants who remain entangled in protracted legal battles. Judicial delay in India is not a recent phenomenon but a chronic and systemic issue arising from a combination of structural deficiencies, procedural bottlenecks, and administrative inertia.

At the core of the crisis lies the massive pendency of cases at all levels of the judiciary, reflecting a stark mismatch between the exponential rise in litigation and the limited adjudicatory capacity of courts. India continues to have one of the lowest judge-to-population ratios globally, a situation aggravated by long-standing vacancies that remain unfilled. Even when positions are occupied, judges are burdened with overwhelming caseloads, leaving insufficient time for timely hearings and reasoned judgments.

Another contributing factor is the liberal grant of adjournments. While the Code of Civil Procedure and the Code of Criminal Procedure seek to regulate adjournments, in practice they are often misused by lawyers and litigants to delay proceedings, with judges—due to workload pressures or lenient norms—accommodating such requests. Further, outdated procedural frameworks, with redundant documentation, excessive formalities, and technical lapses, significantly slow down trials. Inadequate court infrastructure, shortage of support staff, absence of modern digital tools, and frequent delays in investigation and prosecution further erode judicial efficiency. The lack of accountability mechanisms for delays caused by investigating agencies or advocates exacerbates the crisis. Additionally, the abuse of the appellate process, whereby even trivial or settled matters are escalated to higher courts, clogs the already burdened judicial pipeline.

Despite these entrenched challenges, the problem of judicial delay is not insurmountable. Multiple reformative and remedial initiatives have been introduced to strengthen the justice delivery system. The establishment of Fast-Track Courts (FTCs) has proven effective in dealing with specific categories of cases such as sexual offences, corruption, and undertrial matters, where expedited adjudication is imperative. While these courts represent a positive reform, their success depends on consistent financial support, availability of adequately trained judicial officers, and a robust framework of monitoring and accountability.

Technological innovations have also played a transformative role. The e-Courts Project and the National Judicial Data Grid (NJDG) have enabled digitization of case records, e-filing, virtual hearings, and real-time monitoring

of pendency trends. These tools not only enhance transparency but also improve judicial efficiency, particularly in the wake of disruptions such as the COVID-19 pandemic.

In addition to structural and technological reforms, Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) mechanisms—comprising arbitration, mediation, conciliation, and Lok Adalats—offer effective pathways for consensual, cost-efficient, and speedy resolution of disputes. By diverting cases from regular courts, ADR significantly reduces judicial burden while encouraging settlement-oriented approaches. Similarly, statutory innovations such as the Gram Nyayalayas Act, 2008 aim to decentralize justice by providing grassroots forums for resolving minor civil and criminal disputes within rural communities. Although their implementation has been inconsistent, their potential role in easing case pendency remains significant.

Addressing judicial delay in India thus requires a comprehensive and sustained strategy. Key measures include filling judicial vacancies expeditiously, increasing the sanctioned strength of judges, upgrading court infrastructure, embracing technology-driven case management, strengthening ADR frameworks, and ensuring uniform implementation of grassroots justice initiatives. Equally important is cultivating a culture of accountability, where delays attributable to lawyers, investigating agencies, or systemic inefficiencies are effectively checked. Ultimately, the resolution of this crisis depends on political will, judicial leadership, and legislative support to ensure reforms are implemented in letter and spirit across states. Judicial delay undermines not only the individual litigant's right to timely justice but also the collective faith of citizens in the rule of law. A democracy derives its legitimacy not merely from the existence of laws but from the timely, fair, and effective enforcement of those laws.

In summation, while the causes of delay are deeply entrenched and multifaceted, the solutions are neither novel nor unattainable. With focused reform, resource augmentation, and an unwavering commitment to efficiency, the Indian judiciary can transform itself into a model of accessible, timely, and credible justice—thereby reaffirming its role as the guardian of constitutional values and the bedrock of democratic governance.

Suggestions

- Judicial delay in India is a complex and multi-dimensional challenge that requires comprehensive and sustained reforms.** Effective solutions must address both structural deficiencies and procedural inefficiencies in the justice delivery system. The following measures can play a pivotal role in reducing delays and ensuring timely justice.
- Increase in Judicial Strength:** A major factor contributing to judicial delays is the shortage of judges and support staff. Many courts operate below their sanctioned strength due to delays in judicial appointments. This results in overburdened judges handling excessive caseloads, which inevitably slows down the disposal of cases. India's judge-to-population ratio is approximately 21 judges per million people, far lower than the 50–100+ per million seen in developed countries. Increasing judicial strength would directly

reduce the backlog of cases, enable judges to devote more time to each matter, and improve the quality and accuracy of judgments.

- Modernization of Court Infrastructure:** Court infrastructure in India remains outdated and inadequate, which hampers efficiency and accessibility. Overcrowded courtrooms, lack of basic facilities, and minimal technological integration further contribute to delays. Modernization must include the construction of sufficient courtrooms, chambers for judges, and waiting areas for litigants. Providing basic amenities such as clean drinking water, functional restrooms, electricity, internet, and seating arrangements is essential. Separate facilities for vulnerable groups, including women, children, and persons with disabilities, should also be ensured. Modern, well-equipped court infrastructure is indispensable for the delivery of effective justice.
- Adoption and Expansion of Technology:** Technology can revolutionize the judicial system by making processes faster, transparent, and more accessible. Manual record-keeping and scheduling practices often result in misplaced documents, inefficiencies, and adjournments. By adopting digital case management systems, e-filing platforms, and video conferencing facilities, courts can significantly reduce delays. Technology enables real-time tracking of cases, automation of routine tasks, and greater transparency. It also ensures that litigants and lawyers can participate in proceedings remotely, cutting down unnecessary delays caused by physical presence requirements.
- Effective Use of NJDG Data:** The National Judicial Data Grid (NJDG) serves as a centralized digital platform to monitor the functioning of courts across the country. It provides real-time information on case pendency, disposal rates, and patterns of delay. Proper utilization of this data can help policymakers and judicial authorities identify bottlenecks and allocate resources accordingly. The NJDG enhances transparency by making judicial data publicly available, thereby enabling informed decision-making and accountability.
- Promotion of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR):** Encouraging the use of ADR mechanisms—such as arbitration, mediation, conciliation, and negotiation—can substantially reduce the burden on traditional courts. ADR processes are faster, less formal, and often more cost-effective than conventional litigation. Many disputes can be resolved within a few sittings, saving time for both litigants and the judiciary. ADR also fosters amicable settlements, reducing hostility between parties and promoting long-term solutions. By institutionalizing ADR centers and integrating them with court systems, India can divert a significant number of cases away from regular courts.

7. Strengthening Legal Aid and Awareness:

Ensuring equal access to justice is fundamental to a fair legal system. Many delays occur because citizens, particularly those from marginalized and economically weaker sections, lack awareness of their legal rights and remedies. Strengthening legal aid services can help such individual's access appropriate legal forums without unnecessary litigation. Additionally, spreading legal literacy through awareness campaigns empowers citizens to make informed legal choices, thereby reducing frivolous or misdirected cases that add to judicial delays.

Conclusion

Judicial delays in India cannot be resolved by one reform alone; they require a holistic approach. Increasing judicial manpower, upgrading infrastructure, integrating technology, leveraging judicial data, expanding ADR mechanisms, and enhancing legal aid together create a framework for timely, efficient, and accessible justice. Only through sustained and coordinated efforts can India's judiciary overcome the persistent challenge of delay and restore public confidence in the justice delivery system.

References

1. Anishka Sharma, "Justice Delayed is Justice Denied: An In-Depth Analysis", available at <https://www.thelawadvice.com/articles/justice-delayed-is-justice-denied-an-in-depth-analysis>, 2025.
2. Jannat, "Justice Delayed is Justice Denied – How Can We Deal with the Inefficiency of Courts in a Fast-Changing Society", available at <https://blog.ipleaders.in/justice-delayed-justice-denied-can-deal-inefficiency-courts-fast-changing-society>, 2025.
3. Ibid.
4. The Constitution of India, art. 21.
5. Hussainara Khatoon v. State of Bihar, AIR, 1979 SC 1369.
6. Sheela Barse v. Union of India, AIR 1986 SC, 1773.
7. State of Kerala v. M. M. Manikantan Nair, AIR 1961 SC, 1787.
8. Vakil Prasad Singh v. State of Bihar, 2009 AIR SCW 1418.
9. Law Commission of India, 245th Report on Arrest and Backlog, 2014.
10. Hemant Bohra, "Is Justice Delayed, Justice Denied? Analysing the Constitutionality and Right to a Speedy Trial", available at <https://cnlu.ac.in/storage/2025/04/Is-Justice-Delayed-Justice-Denied-Analysing-The-Constitutionality-And-Right-To-A-Speedy-Trial-by-Hemant-Bohra.pdf>, 2025.
11. Raka Arya, "Justice Delayed is Justice Denied: Problems and Solutions", available at <https://nyayavimarsha.com/index.php/detail/justice-delayed-is-justice-denied-problems-and-solutions>, 2025.
12. VK. Mehrotra, "Justice Delayed – Search for Solutions", available at <https://ijtr.nic.in/articles/art24.pdf>, 2025.
13. Department of Justice, "Fast Track Courts", available at <https://doj.gov.in/fast-track-courts/>, 2025.
14. Mukesh & Anr. v. State for NCT of Delhi & Ors. (Nirbhaya Rape Case), 2017, 6, 1.
15. National Judicial Data Grid, available at <https://njdg.ecourts.gov.in>, 2025.
16. Drishti IAS, "Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) Mechanisms", available at <https://www.drishtiias.com/to-the-points/Paper2/alternative-dispute-resolution-adr-mechanisms-paper-2>, 2025.
17. Ibid.
18. Department of Justice, "Gram Nyayalaya – An Introduction", available at <https://dashboard.doj.gov.in/gn/introduction>, 2025.