

# The Argument against Fact-track Courts

### Why in news?

 $n\n$ 

The Supreme Court has directed the government to set up fast-track courts to exclusively deal with cases involving politicians holding public office.

 $n\n$ 

#### How was the directive received?

 $n\n$ 

\n

• The SC directive was in response to a PIL petition that sought to weed out criminals in politics at the earliest.

\n

 While the government agreed to set-up 12 special courts for the same, some voiced dissent in the parliament as this would single out politicians from the rest.

\n

- Civil society at large sees the intention of the government to introduce greater accountability and to depoliticise criminal accusations is worthy.
- $\bullet$  But there is also concern that the fast-track courts have been largely ineffective and unconvincing.  $\mbox{\sc have}$

 $n\$ 

## What are the specifics of fast-track courts?

 $n\n$ 

\n

- $\bullet$  The first such fast-track courts were introduced in 2000, following a suggestion from the Eleventh Finance Commission.  $\mbox{\sc h}$
- At that point, 1,734 fast-track courts were set up to help clear pending cases, which were choking the judicial system.
- Despite tenure being extended in 2005 and yet again in 2010, they did not

make as much headway as was hoped in fixing the problem of pendency.  $\$ 

- $\bullet$  Also, existing fast-track courts been found to be more susceptible to having their verdicts overturned on appeal.  $\ensuremath{\backslash} n$
- So, expanding their number and scope would look like institutionalising the miscarriage of justice.
- Also, there are already multiple experiments with fast-track courts that have not materially changed the quality of justice available in India.
- $\bullet$  Experience aside, fast-track courts can be questioned even in terms of principle as Justice should have no favourites.  $\mbox{\sc h}$

 $n\n$ 

### What needs to be done?

 $n\n$ 

\n

 Setting up fast-track courts whenever a particular problem is brought to its notice enables the government is ducking its responsibility to reform overall judicial reform.

۱n

- $\bullet$  The regular justice system to work more swiftly and surely and all cases need to be addressed speedily.  $\ensuremath{\backslash} n$
- $\bullet$  Administrative reform of the courts and professionalization of their management is an important first step. \n
- $\bullet$  Judicial appointments should be stepped up, and funding should not be as constrained as is the case at present.  $\ensuremath{\backslash n}$

 $n\n$ 

 $n\n$ 

### **Source: Business Standard**

\n

