

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF LAW & JUSTICE
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
RAJYA SABHA
UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 119
ANSWERED ON 20/07/2023

PENDENCY OF CASES AND BURDENED JUDICIARY

119. SHRI TIRUCHI SIVA:

Will the Minister of LAW AND JUSTICE be pleased to state:

- (a) details of pending cases across different levels of the judiciary, including the Supreme Court, High Courts, and subordinate courts;
- (b) details of factors contributing to high pendency of cases, like vacancy of judicial positions, procedural delays, backlog of cases, and other systemic issues;
- (c) details of the measures taken by the Ministry to strengthen the judicial infrastructure and capacity, in terms of increasing the number of judges and support staff;
- (d) whether there is any coordination mechanisms in place to share best practices and streamline processes between the central and state judiciaries; and
- (e) if so, the details thereof?

ANSWER

**MINISTER OF STATE (INDEPENDENT CHARGE) OF THE MINISTRY OF LAW
AND JUSTICE; MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF
PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS; AND MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY
OF CULTURE**

(SHRI ARJUN RAM MEGHWAL)

(a): As per data retrieved from the Integrated Case Management System (ICMIS) by the Supreme Court of India, as on 01.07.2023, there are 69,766 cases pending in the Supreme Court. Total number of cases pending in the High Courts and the District and

Subordinate Courts as on 14.07.2023 are 60,62,953 and 4,41,35,357 respectively, as per information made available on National Judicial Data Grid (NJDG).

(b): Pendency of cases in courts can be attributed to several factors which, inter-alia, include non-availability of adequate number of judges and judicial officers, supporting court staff and physical infrastructure, complexity of facts involved, nature of evidence, co-operation of stake holders viz. bar, investigation agencies, witnesses and litigants and proper application of rules and procedures. Other factors that lead to delay in disposal of cases include, lack of prescribed time frame by respective courts for disposal of various kinds of cases, frequent adjournments and lack of adequate arrangement to monitor, track and bunch cases for hearing. However, the disposal of pending cases in courts is within the domain of the judiciary. Government has no direct role in the disposal of cases in courts.

Further, it is also informed that the Criminal Justice System functions on assistance by various agencies viz., Police, Prosecution, forensic Labs, Handwriting Experts and Medico-Legal experts. Delay in providing assistance by allied agencies also entails delay in disposal of cases.

(c): The Central Government is fully committed to strengthen justice delivery by augmenting judicial infrastructure and capacity. Under the Centrally Sponsored Scheme for Judicial Infrastructure, funds are being released to States/UTs for construction of court halls, residential quarters for judicial officers, lawyers' halls, toilet complexes and digital computer rooms for the District and Subordinate judiciary to ease the life of lawyers and litigants, thereby aiding justice delivery. The number of court halls has increased from 15,818 as on 30.06.2014 to 21,365 as on 30.06.2023, and number of residential units has increased from 10,211 as on 30.06.2014 to 18,846 as on 30.06.2023, under this Scheme.

The Central Government has been regularly filling up the vacancies in higher judiciary. From 01.05.2014 to 10.07.2023, 56 Judges were appointed in Supreme Court.

919 new Judges were appointed and 653 Additional Judges were made permanent in the High Courts. Sanctioned strength of Judges of High Courts has been increased from 906 in May, 2014 to 1114 currently. The sanctioned and working strength of judicial officers in District and Subordinate courts has increased as follows:

As on	Sanctioned Strength	Working Strength
31.12.2013	19,518	15,115
14.07.2023	25,246	19,858

However, filling up of vacancies of judicial officers in subordinate judiciary falls within the domain of the State Governments and High Courts concerned.

As far as increase in support staff is concerned, the matter falls within the jurisdiction of the respective State Government and High Courts. Central Government has no role in the same.

(d) & (e): The State Court Management Systems Committees (SCMSC) share the best practices and experiences of the State Court Management Systems Committees on a half-yearly basis mutually and with the National Court Management Systems Committee (NCMSC) of the Supreme Court. This includes implementation of action plans under Vision Statements taking into account the Baseline Report of the NCMS Committee. Such reviews are shared by SCMS Committee with all other SCMS Committees and also with NCMS Committee.
