

**GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE**

**RAJYA SABHA
UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 1389
ANSWERED ON 11/12/2025**

PENDING CASES

1389. SHRI PRAMOD TIWARI:

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

- (a) the number of cases pending across all courts in the country including pending trials in district and subordinate judiciary;
- (b) the reasons for delays in disposal of cases including cases pending before the Supreme Court and High Courts;
- (c) the reasons cited by the National Judicial Data Grid (NJDG) for pendency of cases; and
- (d) the steps taken for speedy trial of pending cases?

ANSWER

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

(SHRI ARJUN RAM MEGHWAL)

(a) & (b): As per information available on the National Judicial Data Grid (NJDG), the details of pending cases in the Supreme Court, High Courts and District & Subordinate Courts as on 08.12.2025 are as under:

Sl. No.	Name of Court	Pending Cases
1.	Supreme Court	90,897
2.	High Courts	63,63,406
3.	District and Subordinate Courts	4,84,57,343

However, the data of pending trials is not maintained centrally.

The disposal of cases is within the exclusive domain of the judiciary. Pendency of cases in courts arise due to several factors which inter alia, include complexity of the facts involved, nature of evidence, co-operation of stakeholders, viz., bar, investigation agencies, witness and litigants, besides the availability of physical infrastructure, supporting court staff, etc.

(c): The National Judicial Data Grid (NJDG) has been upgraded with an improved dashboard for functioning as a monitoring tool to identify, manage and reduce pendency of cases. It provides timely inputs for making policy decisions to reduce case pendency. It also facilitates better monitoring of court performance and identification of systemic bottlenecks for efficient resource management. The NJDG serves as National Judicial Data Warehouse and improves transparency by providing the consolidated figures of civil and criminal cases instituted, disposed and pending duly segregated into varied categories. Further, the data uploaded and collated on the portal can be accessed and analysed to show category-wise, year-wise, month-wise and State-wise disposal of cases across institutions and across the original/appellate/execution stages of a litigation.

The data can also be analysed by reasons for delay which may include:

Delay Reasons		
Sr. No	Short Name(Displayed on NJDG)	Delay Name
1	Parties not interested	Parties not interested - Infructuous litigation
2	Accused absconding	One or more accused absconding/not appearing
3	Stayed by SC	Stayed by Supreme Court
4	Stayed by HC	Stayed by High Court
5	Stayed by DC	Stayed by Court other than Supreme Court or High Court (District Court/Other Court)
6	Stayed for reasons	Stayed for other reasons
7	LRs not on record	LRs or new parties could not be brought on record
8	Misc. applns blocked	Miscellaneous application delaying the process of the main case
9	Awaiting documents	Awaiting for documents
10	Witness	Difficulty in securing presence of important witness
11	Execution of Decree	Obstructions in service of process in execution of decree
12	Record unavailable	Record not available for the reason
13	Frequent appeals	Frequent challenge to interim/interlocutory orders
14	Counsel not available	Non availability of Counsel
15	More witness	Number of witness is more than 20

(d): The Central Government is committed for speedy disposal of cases and reducing pendency as mandated under Article 21 of the Constitution and has taken several initiatives to provide an ecosystem for faster disposal of cases by the judiciary:

- i. The National Mission for Justice Delivery and Legal Reforms was set up in August, 2011, with the twin objectives of increasing access to justice by reducing delays in the system and enhancing accountability through structural changes and by setting performance standards and capacities.
- ii. Under the Centrally Sponsored Scheme for Development of Infrastructure Facilities for District and Subordinate Courts, a sum of Rs. 12,358.15 crore have been released since the inception of this Scheme in 1993-94. The number of Court halls has increased from 15,818 (as on 30.06.2014) to 22,606 (as on 31.10.2025) and the number of residential units has increased from 10,211 (as on 30.06.2014) to 20,008 (as on 31.10.2025), under this Scheme.
- iii. The Phase-III of the eCourts Project (2023-2027) approved on 13.09.2023 with an outlay of Rs.7,210 crore to make justice delivery progressively more robust, easy and accessible. Till 30.09.2025 , 579.53 crores pages of court records have been digitized in the High Courts and District Courts. More than 3.81 crore hearings have taken place through Video conferencing and live streaming is functional in 11 High Courts. The number of e Sewa Kendras (facilitation centres) has increased to 1987 across High Courts and District Courts.
- iv. The Government has been filling up vacancies of Judges in the Supreme Court of India and the High Courts from time to time. From 01.05.2014 to 26.11.2025, 72 Judges have been appointed in the Supreme Court. 1156 new Judges were appointed and 819 Additional Judges were made permanent in the High Courts during the same period. The sanctioned strength of Judges of the High Courts has increased from 906 in May, 2014 to 1122 till date. Filling up of vacancies in District and Subordinate judiciary falls within the domain of the State/UT Governments and High Courts concerned.
- v. Arrears Committees have been set up in all 25 High Courts and the District Courts as well to clear cases pending for more than five years.
- vi. Fast Track Courts have been established for dealing with cases of heinous crimes, cases involving senior citizens, women, children, etc. Further, ten Special Courts are functional in nine (9) States/UTs to fast-track criminal cases involving elected MPs / MLAs.

- vii. As on 30.09.2025, 773 Fast Track Special Courts (FTSCs) including 400 exclusive POCSO (ePOCSO) Courts are functional in 29 States/UTs under the Centrally Sponsored Scheme for the expeditious disposal of pending cases of Rape and POCSO Act.
- viii. The Government has also amended The Negotiable Instruments (Amendment) Act, 2018, The Commercial Courts (Amendment) Act, 2018, The Specific Relief (Amendment) Act, 2018, The Arbitration and Conciliation (Amendment) Act, 2019 and The Criminal Laws (Amendment) Act, 2018 with a view to reduce pendency.
- ix. Alternate Dispute Resolution methods have been promoted. The Commercial Courts Act, 2015 was amended in August, 2018 making Pre-institution Mediation and Settlement (PIMS) mandatory in case of commercial disputes. Amendment to the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 has been made by the Arbitration and Conciliation (Amendment) Act 2015 for expediting the speedy resolution of disputes by prescribing timelines.
- x. Lok Adalat is an important Alternative Disputes Resolution Mechanism available to common people, where the disputes/ cases pending in the court of law or at pre-litigation stage are settled/ compromised amicably. Under The Legal Services Authorities (LSA) Act, 1987, an award made by a Lok Adalat is deemed to be a decree of a civil court and is final and binding on all parties and no appeal lies against it before any court. National Lok Adalats are organized simultaneously in all Taluks, Districts and High Courts on a pre-fixed date.
- xi. The Government launched the Tele-Law programme in 2017, which provides an effective and reliable e-interface platform connecting the needy and disadvantaged sections seeking legal advice and consultation with panel lawyers via video conferencing, telephone and chat facilities available at the Common Service Centres (CSCs) situated in Gram Panchayats and through Tele-Law mobile App. Pro bono culture and pro bono lawyering have been institutionalized in the country. Pro Bono Panel of advocates has been established in 23 High Courts. Pro Bono Clubs have been started in 109 Law Schools to instil Pro Bono culture in budding lawyers.
