



---

## Impact of Judicial Delay on Access to Justice in India: A Critical Study

**Pradeep Nagar**

Research Scholar, Department of law, MDU, Rohtak

---

**DOI : <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20623338>**

---

### ARTICLE DETAILS

**Research Paper**

**Accepted:** 21-05-2026

**Published:** 10-06-2026

#### **Keywords:**

*judicial delay, litigation, Supreme Court, High Courts, Subordinate Courts*

---

### ABSTRACT

Access to justice is a foundational matrix of any civilized democratic polity, constitutionalized under the Indian paradigm as an integral component of the right to life and personal liberty. However, the contemporary Indian administration of justice faces a structural crisis: persistent, systemic judicial delay. With millions of cases pending across various tiers of the judiciary, the constitutional promise of swift justice remains out of reaches for many. This research paper critically evaluates the multifaceted impact of judicial delay on access to justice in India. It examines the institutional, procedural, and socio-economic causes behind the growing backlog of cases, and assesses the consequences for vulnerable litigants, economic development, and public trust in the rule of law. By analyzing key statutory provisions and constitutional case law, this study emphasizes that justice delayed is not merely justice denied, but represents a continuous violation of fundamental rights. Finally, the paper proposes structural, legislative, and technological reforms designed to improve systemic efficiency and restore institutional accountability.

---

### 1. Introduction

The rule of law requires an accessible, predictable, and efficient mechanism for resolving legal disputes. In the constitutional architecture of India, access to justice is recognized as a fundamental right under Articles 14 and 21, as well as a directive principle under Article 39A. However, the formal legal system is burdened by a chronic, systemic challenge: judicial delay and an accumulating backlog of cases.



Judicial delay is more than an administrative issue; it is a structural barrier that undermines the enforceability of rights, weakens legislative intent, and disproportionately affects marginalized communities. When a legal system takes decades to resolve basic civil or criminal matters, the concept of access to justice loses its practical meaning. Litigants face ongoing financial drain, emotional exhaustion, and prolonged uncertainty. This crisis compromises the institutional legitimacy of the third pillar of the state.

This paper analyzes the systemic causes of judicial delay in India, examines its direct impact on access to justice, reviews relevant judicial responses, and outlines structural reforms necessary to build an efficient, responsive legal framework.

## 2. Theoretical and Constitutional Matrix of Access to Justice

### 2.1 The Constitutional Commitments

The Indian Constitution treats access to justice not as a passive privilege, but as an active, mandatory guarantee.

- **Article 14:** Assures equality before the law and equal protection of the laws. Systemic delay introduces inequality into the legal process, as wealthy litigants possess the financial resilience to endure prolonged litigation, whereas economically marginalized individuals are often forced into unfavorable settlements or must abandon their claims entirely.
- **Article 21:** The Supreme Court has expanded the scope of the right to life and personal liberty to include the explicit right to a speedy trial. If a trial is drawn out over an unreasonable period without justification, the state violates the core principles of due process.
- **Article 39A:** Inserted via the 42nd Amendment, this Directive Principle mandates that the State ensure the legal system promotes justice on a basis of equal opportunity. It requires the state to provide free legal aid to ensure that justice is not denied to any citizen by reason of economic or other disabilities.

### 2.2 The Jurisprudential Imperative

From a jurisprudential standpoint, access to justice consists of four essential dimensions:

1. **Identifiability:** The public must be aware of their legal rights and the avenues available to enforce them.
2. **Physical Proximity:** Dispute resolution forums must be geographically accessible.



3. **Affordability:** The financial costs of litigation must not be prohibitive.
4. **Timeliness:** Disputes must be resolved within a reasonable timeframe to prevent the remedy from losing its utility.

Judicial delay undermines this fourth dimension, destabilizing the entire structure. If the legal process remains slow, improvements in legal awareness, physical access, or affordability cannot deliver meaningful justice.

### **3. Anatomy of the Crisis: Causes of Judicial Delay in India**

The accumulation of pending cases across India's Supreme Court, High Courts, and Subordinate Courts stems from a combination of institutional, procedural, and cultural factors.

#### **3.1 Deficient Judge-to-Population Ratio and Infrastructure Shortfalls**

One of the primary institutional drivers of delay is the low judge-to-population ratio in India. While the Law Commission of India recommended increasing the ratio to 50 judges per million people, the actual figure remains significantly lower.

This issue is compounded by persistent delays in filling judicial vacancies across both High Courts and Subordinate Courts. The lower judiciary, which handles the largest volume of initial filings, frequently operates without its full complement of judges, leading to crowded dockets. Furthermore, subordinate courtrooms often lack basic infrastructure, such as modern digital recording systems, efficient case-management software, and adequate research assistance.

#### **3.2 Procedural Bottlenecks within the Codes**

The procedural frameworks established under the Code of Civil Procedure (CPC), 1908, and the Code of Criminal Procedure (CrPC), 1973 (as updated by the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita), contain multiple stages that can be exploited to prolong litigation.

In civil matters, delays frequently occur during the initial stages of serving summonses to defendants, submitting written statements, and executing decrees. In criminal matters, proceedings are regularly slowed by delays in filing police chargesheets, difficulties in securing the attendance of witnesses, and bottlenecks within forensic laboratories, which extend the duration of pretrial detention.

#### **3.3 The Culture of Adjournments and Interlocutory Appeals**



A significant factor in prolonged litigation is the frequent use of unmeritorious adjournments. Despite statutory provisions intended to limit adjournments, courts regularly grant them on minor grounds, such as the unavailability of counsel or requests for additional preparation time.

Additionally, the legal strategy of filing interlocutory appeals against minor, non-final trial court orders can halt ongoing trial proceedings for years. This practice shifts the focus of the litigation upward to appellate courts, disrupting the continuity of the original trial.

### **3.4 The State as a Hyper-Litigant**

The Government of India and various state administrations represent the largest single category of litigants in the country, involved in a high percentage of all pending cases. Government departments frequently engage in appeals across multiple levels of the judiciary, even in routine matters with low financial stakes or settled legal principles. This continuous inflow of state-driven litigation consumes a substantial portion of public judicial resources.

## **4. The Socio-Economic Impact of Judicial Delay**

### **4.1 Vulnerable and Under-Trial Populations**

The human cost of judicial delay is most evident among prison populations, where a significant percentage of inmates consist of individuals awaiting trial. Many under-trial prisoners are marginalized individuals who lack the financial means to secure bail or hire private legal counsel.

Spending extended periods in pretrial detention for offenses carrying shorter maximum sentences represents a severe systemic failure. This dynamic converts the presumption of innocence into a punitive experience before any formal conviction occurs.

### **4.2 Economic Inefficiency and Distressed Commercial Assets**

From an economic perspective, slow contract enforcement increases transaction costs and financial risks across the market. Intellectual property disputes, land acquisition challenges, and insolvency proceedings can remain unresolved for years, locking up capital and stalling infrastructure projects.

International business assessments consistently identify slow judicial enforcement as a key challenge for contract resolution in India, which can deter foreign direct investment and complicate routine domestic commerce.



### 4.3 Erosion of Public Trust and the Rise of Extra-Legal Systems

When regular judicial forums require decades to resolve common property, family, or criminal disputes, public confidence in the rule of law declines. This institutional gap can lead individuals to turn to extra-legal alternatives, such as community-enforced settlements, unauthorized dispute resolution forums, or criminal elements to expedite collections or evictions. This shift weakens the state's role as the primary, authoritative forum for dispute resolution.

## 5. Judicial Jurisprudence on the Right to Speedy Justice

The Supreme Court of India has addressed the issue of judicial delay through extensive constitutional jurisprudence, elevating the right to a speedy trial to a fundamental constitutional guarantee.

### 5.1 Foundational Precedents

In the landmark case of *Hussainara Khatoon v. State of Bihar (1979)*, the Supreme Court reviewed the conditions of thousands of under-trial prisoners in Bihar who had been held in custody longer than the maximum terms allowed for their alleged offenses. Justice P.N. Bhagwati stated that a fair, just, and reasonable procedure under Article 21 must ensure a reasonably speedy trial, declaring that speedy trial is an essential component of the fundamental right to life and liberty.

This principle was expanded in *Abdul Rehman Antulay v. R.S. Nayak (1992)*, where a Constitution Bench issued comprehensive guidelines for evaluating delays in criminal proceedings. The Court ruled that the right to a speedy trial applies to all stages of a criminal case, including investigation, inquiry, trial, appeal, and revision. The judiciary established a balancing test to determine if a delay violates Article 21, directing courts to analyze the duration of the delay, the reasons provided by the state, the conduct of the accused, and the resulting prejudice to the individual.

### 5.2 Modern Judicial Directives

In *Kartar Singh v. State of Punjab (1994)*, the Supreme Court emphasized that prolonged delay unconstitutionally compromises the mental health and social standing of an accused individual. More recently, in *Hussain v. Union of India (2017)*, the Court issued specific operational timelines for subordinate judiciaries, directing trial courts to prioritize cases where defendants are in custody and complete old criminal trials within targeted timeframes.



In *Salem Advocate Bar Association v. Union of India (2005)*, the Supreme Court examined procedural reforms under the CPC, upholding strict limits on the number of adjournments permitted per case and endorsing the use of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) mechanisms to help manage case volumes.

## 6. Comprehensive Structural and Legislative Framework for Reform

Addressing the issue of judicial delay requires a coordinated strategy combining structural expansions, procedural changes, and technological integration.

### 6.1 Judicial Manpower and Administrative Restructuring

- **Filling Vacancies and Increasing Judge Strength:** The state must systematically reduce judicial vacancies by synchronizing appointments through transparent schedules. Increasing the total number of working judges remains necessary to balance incoming case volumes.
- **Establishing an All India Judicial Service (AIJS):** Implementing an AIJS under Article 312 could help standardize recruitment for the district judiciary. This system would attract top legal talent through a centralized, merit-based examination process, ensuring a steady supply of qualified judicial officers.
- **Dedicated Court Managers:** Introducing professional administrative court managers can relieve judges of routine operational tasks, such as scheduling, statistics tracking, and infrastructure management, allowing them to focus primarily on adjudication.
- **6.2 Procedural Modifications and Case Management**
- **Enforcing Strict Caps on Adjournments:** Trial courts must strictly apply Order XVII Rule 1 of the CPC, limiting adjournments to exceptional circumstances and imposing financial costs on parties seeking strategic delays.
- **Pre-Trial Case Management Conferences:** Introducing mandatory pre-trial conferences can help clarify core issues, establish agreed timelines for witness testimonies, and eliminate unexpected procedural filings before the formal trial begins.
- **National Litigation Policy Implementation:** The government should adopt a structured National Litigation Policy to curb unnecessary state appeals. Introducing internal departmental reviews before filing appeals can reduce the volume of routine government-driven litigation.
- **6.3 Technological Integration via the e-Courts Project**



- **Universal Electronic Filing and Virtual Courts:** Expanding digital filing systems and remote video-conferencing across all subordinate courts can reduce the time required for physical document processing and witness appearances.
- **AI-Driven Docket Management:** Utilizing artificial intelligence platforms can assist administrative staff in automatically categorizing cases, identifying related matters, and optimizing daily court calendars to minimize scheduling conflicts.
- **6.4 Expanding Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR)**
- **Mandatory Pre-Institution Mediation:** Section 12A of the Commercial Courts Act, 2015, demonstrates the value of mandatory pre-institution mediation for specific financial disputes. Extending this model to family, property, and routine contract disputes can divert a significant volume of cases away from traditional court dockets.
- **Empowering Lok Adalats and Gram Nyayalayas:** Providing regular funding and administrative support to Lok Adalats and rural Gram Nyayalayas allows simple, low-stakes disputes to be resolved through community consensus, preventing minor issues from entering higher court systems.

## 7. Conclusion

Systemic judicial delay remains a significant barrier to access to justice in India, affecting the practical exercise of fundamental rights. When legal disputes take decades to resolve, the formal justice system becomes unaffordable for marginalized populations, creates economic inefficiencies, and alters the constitutional balance of rights.

As affirmed by the Supreme Court from *Hussainara Khatoon* to modern directives, the right to a speedy trial is an essential component of Article 21. Resolving the backlog of cases requires moving past minor administrative adjustments toward structural updates. By increasing judicial appointments, enforcing procedural rules against unmeritorious delays, adopting modern digital tools, and institutionalizing alternative dispute resolution methods, India can build a more responsive, efficient legal framework. Securing timely justice is necessary to protect the fundamental rights of all citizens and preserve public trust in the rule of law.



**References:**

- <sup>1</sup> Bhagwati, P. N. (1985). Human Rights in the Criminal Justice System. *Journal of the Indian Law Institute*, 27(1), 1–22.
- <sup>1</sup> Sarkar, S. C. (2023). *Law of Criminal Procedure* (12th ed.). LexisNexis
- <sup>1</sup> Robinson, N. (2013). A Quantitative Analysis of the Supreme Court's Workload. *Indian Law Review*, 1(1), 71–103.
- <sup>1</sup> Hussainara Khatoon & Ors. v. Home Secretary, State of Bihar, (1980) 1 SCC 81 : AIR 1979 SC 1360.
- <sup>1</sup> Abdul Rehman Antulay & Ors. v. R.S. Nayak & Ors., (1992) 1 SCC 225.
- <sup>1</sup> Kartar Singh v. State of Punjab, (1994) 3 SCC 569.
- <sup>1</sup> Hussain v. Union of India, (2017) 5 SCC 702.
- <sup>1</sup> Salem Advocate Bar Association (II) v. Union of India, (2005) 6 SCC 344.
- <sup>1</sup> Baxi, U. (1982). *The Crisis of the Indian Legal System*. Vikas Publishing House.