

## Enhancing Judicial Efficiency

### What is the issue?

\n\n

\n

- Our judicial system has been saddled with humongous backlogs.

\n

- The quality and efficiency of courts in India can be improved with simple tweaks and better data analytical tools.

\n

\n\n

### What is the current state of affairs?

\n\n

\n

- Chief Justice of India 'Dipak Misra' recently flagged the high pendency of cases in High Courts across India and demanded an action plan to dispose them.

\n

- While periodical review of arrears and addressing them is important, the manner in which judicial performance is measured also needs review.

\n

- For decades now, cases disposal rate has been the measure of court's performance, which is flawed, as it doesn't account for quality of adjudication.

\n

- Additionally, the disposal rate method also fails to differentiate the nature of dispute being heard and the intricate parameters involved in it.

\n

- To evolve a better metric for measuring performance and addressing backlogs, courts should start analysing its own historical case data.

\n

- This can then be followed up with focussed interventions to counter specific case types or stages at which the case pipeline is clogged.

\n

\n\n

## How is “case listing” causing backlogs?

\n\n

- \n
  - Thus far, the discourse on case pendency has largely revolved only around delayed appointments of judges and the numerous vacancies in courts.
- \n
  - But other factors like “case listing practices” are also found to have significantly influenced case movement and caused large pendency.
- \n
  - Currently, as much as 100 cases per day are sometimes allocated for judges, which might sound like an impressive work day on paper.
- \n
  - But the cases that actually reach the judicial table are rarely even close to that number, making the listing of cases a flawed measure of efficiency.
- \n
  - **The Malice** - Firstly, listing patterns are generally erratic, with the number of matters listed for the same courtroom ranging widely from 1 to 126 a month.
- \n
  - Secondly, a large number of cases listed in a day have invariably meant that matters listed towards the end of the day remained left over.
- \n
  - Thirdly, old pending matters barely made it to court and trends show that 91% of them remained unheard despite allocation of specific days for backlogs.
- \n
  - Notably, the main reason for this is said to be the numerous urgent matters that are tabled before judges and the loss of litigant interest with time.
- \n

\n\n

## What kind of changes can be done to the listing process?

\n\n

- \n
  - Case list preparation can be made more scientific if supported by a consistent study of the variance in the number of cases listed across courts.
- \n
  - In addition, the identifying the exact stages at which cases are clogging

the pipeline for the longest duration, and the nature of cases left over.

\n

- The case list could have cases methodically distributed by type and stage, and systematic limits can be placed on the weightage of each type of case.

\n

- This will also help in ensuring that only as many cases as can be reasonably heard will be listed on a daily basis.

\n

- Also, final hearings should ideally be heard at first in a day as it requires the complete attention of judges (currently, they are predominantly heard last).

\n

- Old cases must be disposed on a priority basis and it should be ensured that adjournments aren't granted for frivolous reasons.

\n

- Scientific listing of cases on these lines will eliminate discretionary powers of judges to decide on the number of cases to be allocated.

\n

\n\n

\n\n

**Source: The Hindu**

\n\n

\n\n

\n\n

\n