

## Understanding Special Courts

### What is the issue?

\n\n

\n

- It is assumed that special courts are a panacea for judicial efficiency.
- But the system needs a reassessment to understand its actual working efficacy, for it to be more rational in number and functioning.

\n

\n\n

### What are special courts?

\n\n

\n

- Special courts have existed in the subordinate judiciary since before Independence.
- A special court is one which is to deal with special types of cases under a shortened and simplified procedure.
- They are established under a statute meant to address specific disputes falling within that statute.
- Over 25 special courts were set up between 1950 and 2015 through various Central and State legislations.

\n

\n\n

### What are fast track courts?

\n\n

\n

- Fast track courts on the other hand were the result of recommendations made by the 11th Finance Commission.
- 11th FC advised the creation of 1,734 such courts to deal with the judicial

backlog.

\n

- They were actualised though an executive scheme as opposed to a statute of the legislature in case of special courts.

\n

- Moreover these are meant to be set up by the State governments in consultation with the respective high courts.

\n

\n\n

## What are the concerns with special courts?

\n\n

\n

- **Understanding** - Special courts are a significant means of addressing the specificities of certain statutes and judicial backlog.

\n

- However, there is little if any evaluation of how this system works and a vacuum exists in research and analysis of special courts.

\n

- This has led to inconsistencies in legislation and operation, which is more pronounced by the Parliament.

\n

- Central legislations from Special Criminal Courts (Jurisdiction) Act, 1950 to the Prevention of Money Laundering (Amendment) Act, 2012 prove this point.

\n

- **Ambiguities** - The Special Courts case clearly uses the phrase “established under statute”, meaning the establishment of a new court.

\n

- However statutes use terms like “constitute”, “create”, “designate”, “notify”, “appoint”, etc leading to ambiguities of its stature.

\n

- The anomaly is that these terms have not been defined or procedurally explained.

\n

- Moreover, certain legislations state that the government “may” set up special courts, while other say the government “shall”.

\n

- However, going by the definition, the answer as to whether a law requires a special court or not should only be either yes or no.

\n

- Leaving options such as “may”, add to the ambiguities.

\n

- **Clarity** - For States and high courts, this leads to uncertainties in operation and setting up such courts.

\n

- There is lack of clarity in specifics like:

\n

\n\n

\n

- i. Do they require new buildings?

\n

- ii. Should more judicial officers be hired?

\n

- iii. If a judge is designated under a special statute, should those matters be added to or replace her roster?

\n

\n\n

\n

- This also creates confusion with respect to appointments, budgetary allocation, infrastructure, and listing practices.

\n

- **Purpose** - There are more special courts under the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 than SC/ST (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989.

\n

- However the former is said to have a tenth of the number of registered cases as the latter (2015).

\n

- This points to the unclear legislative intent for creating special courts.

\n

\n\n

## **What is the way forward?**

\n\n

\n

- The SC should address the constitutional status, and analyse policy questions pertaining to the need and efficiency of special courts.

\n

\n\n

\n

- There are over 2.8 crore cases in the subordinate judiciary, which is the highest out of the three tiers of the judiciary.

\n

- The working of special courts has to be studied critically.

\n

- Parameters such as the frequency and number of effective hearings and calculating the number of pending cases need to be developed.

\n

- These are essential to check the growing number of special courts being established without definite purposes.

\n

- In all, it is important to determine whether or not this special courts system is in fact helpful in addressing the judicial backlog.

\n

\n\n

\n\n

**Source: The Hindu**

\n

