

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

LOK SABHA

STARRED QUESTION NO. ‡*211

TO BE ANSWERED ON WEDNESDAY, 26TH DECEMBER, 2018.

Judges to Population Ratio

**‡*211. SHRI SHARAD TRIPATHI:
ADV. JOICE GEORGE:**

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

- (a) whether any norms have been laid down regarding the ratio of the number of Judges to the total population of the country and if so, the details thereof along with the present ratio in this regard;**
- (b) whether the ratio of Judges vis-avis population is very low in our country in comparison to the developed countries and if so, the details thereof;**
- (c) the details of the present per judge average endorsement ratio of cases and for the last three years along with the steps taken by the Government to ensure effective functioning of judicial system for the quick disposal of pending cases;**
- (d) whether as a result of low judge to population ratio, scores of cases heard every day lead to a large number of adjournments, transfer of cases from one judge to another and increasingly long queues of people waiting outside courtrooms having less chance of their cases being heard and if so, the details thereof; and**
- (e) whether the Government has noted that delays in courts cost India's economy trillions of rupees every year and if so, the details thereof ?**

ANSWER

**MINISTER OF LAW AND JUSTICE AND ELECTRONICS AND
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY**

(SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD)

(a) to (e): A Statement is laid on the Table of the House.

**STATEMENT REFERRED TO IN REPLY TO PARTS (a) to (e) of
LOK SABHA STARRED QUESTION NO. †*211FOR ANSWER
ON 26TH DECEMBER, 2018.**

1. Judge-population ratio:

1.1 In the case of *Imtiyaz Ahmed versus State of Uttar Pradesh and others*, the Supreme Court had asked the Law Commission of India to evolve a method for scientific assessment of the number of additional courts required to clear the backlog of cases. In 245th report (2014), the Law Commission observed that filing of cases *per capita* varies substantially across geographic units as filings are associated with economic and social conditions of the population. As such the Law Commission did not consider the judge population ratio to be a scientific criterion for determining the adequacy of the judge strength in the country. The Law Commission found that in the absence of complete and scientific approach to data collection across various High Courts in the country, the “*Rate of Disposal*” method, to calculate the number of additional judges required to clear the backlog of cases as well as to ensure that new backlog is not created, is more pragmatic and useful.

1.2 In August 2014, the Supreme Court asked the National Court Management System Committee (NCMS Committee) to examine the recommendations made by the Law Commission and to furnish its recommendations in this regard. NCMS Committee submitted its report to the Supreme Court in March, 2016. The report, *inter-alia*, observes

that in the long term, the judge strength of the subordinate courts will have to be assessed by a scientific method to determine the total number of “*Judicial Hours*” required for disposing of the case load of each court. In the interim, the Committee has proposed a “*weighted*” disposal approach *i.e.* disposal weighted by the nature and complexity of cases in local conditions.

1.3 As per the direction of the Hon’ble Supreme Court in its Order dated 02.01.2017, the Department of Justice has forwarded a copy of interim report of the NCMS Committee to all the State Governments and High Courts to enable them to take follow up action to determine the required Strength of district and subordinate judiciary.

2. Steps taken by the Government to ensure effective functioning of judicial system for the quick disposal of pending cases:

The Government is fully committed to speedy disposal of cases. The Government has taken several initiatives to provide an ecosystem for faster disposal of cases by the judiciary. The National Mission for Justice Delivery and Legal Reforms established by the Government has adopted a coordinated approach for phased liquidation of arrears and pendency in judicial administration through various strategic initiatives, including improving infrastructure for courts, leveraging Information and Communication Technology (ICT) for better justice delivery, and filling up of vacant positions of Judges in High Courts and Supreme Court. The

major achievements during the last four years under various initiatives to make the functioning of subordinate judiciary more efficient are as follows:

(i) Improving infrastructure for Judicial Officers of District and

Subordinate Courts: As on date, Rs.6,623.87 crores have been released since the inception of the Centrally Sponsored Scheme (CSS) for Development of Infrastructure Facilities for Judiciary in 1993-94. Out of this, 3,179.57 crores (which are 48% of the total amount released till date) have been released to the States and UTs since April, 2014. The number of court halls has increased from 15,818 as on 30.06.2014 to 18,731 as on date and number of residential units has increased from 10,211 as on 30.06.2014 to 16,539 as on date under this scheme. In addition, 2,906 court halls and 1,754 residential units are under construction. The Central Government has approved continuation of the Scheme beyond the 12th Five Year Plan period *i.e.* from 01.04.2017 to 31.03.2020 with an estimated additional outlay of Rs.3,320 crore.

(ii) Leveraging Information and Communication Technology

(ICT) for improved justice delivery: Number of computerised District & Subordinate courts has increased from 13,672 to 16,755 registering an increase of 3,083 during 2014 to 2018. National Judicial Data Grid (NJDG) provides citizens with online information about case filings, case status and electronic copies of

orders and judgments from district and subordinate courts that have already been computerized. Information regarding 10.80 crore cases including more than three crore pending cases and more than 7.91 crore orders / judgments are available on this portal. eCourts services such as details of case registration, cause list, case status, daily orders & final judgments are available to litigants and advocates through eCourts web portal, Judicial Service Centres (JSC) in all computerised courts, eCourts Mobile App, email service, SMS push & pull services. eCourts Project has been consistently amongst the top 5 Mission Mode Projects of country.

(iii) Filling up of vacant positions in Supreme Court, High Courts and judicial officers in District and Subordinate Courts: During May 2014 – November 2018, 25 Judges were appointed in Supreme Court; 423 new Judges were appointed and 362 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 1079 currently. Sanctioned and working strength of Judicial Officers in District and Subordinate Courts has been increased as follows:

As on	Sanctioned Strength	Working Strength
31.12.2013	19,518	15,115
30.09.2018	22,644	17,509

Minister of Law & Justice vide letter dated 14th August, 2018 has written to the Chief Justices of High Courts and Chief Ministers of States to monitor the status of vacancies in the district and subordinate courts regularly and to ensure proper coordination with the State Public Service Commission so that the examination and the interviews are conducted in accordance with the time schedule prescribed by the Supreme Court in the Malik Mazhar Sultan case.

(iv) Reduction in Pendency through / follow up by Arrears

Committees: Further, in pursuance of resolution passed in Chief Justices' Conference held in April, 2015, Arrears Committees have been set up in 24 High Courts to clear cases pending for more than five years. Arrears Committees have been set up under District Judges too. Arrears Committee has been constituted in the Supreme Court to formulate steps to reduce pendency of cases in High Courts and District Courts.

(v) Nyaya Mitra Scheme: In order to reduce cases pending in courts for over 10 years, the Government launched the Nyaya Mitra Scheme in April 2017. Under the Scheme, retired judicial officers are engaged and designated as '*Nyaya Mitra*' to facilitate expeditious disposal of the cases pending over 10 years. In the first Phase, 15 Nyaya Mitra have been engaged in 15 Districts of Rajasthan, West Bengal, Bihar, Uttar Pradesh and Tripura.

(vi) **Emphasis on Alternate Dispute Resolution (ADR):** Commercial Courts, Commercial Division and Commercial Appellate Division of High Courts (Amendment) Act, 2018 has been enacted on 20th August, 2018 whereby mandatory pre-Institution mediation mechanism has been introduced for settlement of commercial disputes. Amendment to the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 by the Arbitration and Conciliation (Amendment) Act 2015 is done to expedite the speedy resolution of disputes by prescribing timelines. The Arbitration and Conciliation (Amendment) Bill, 2018 passed by the Lok Sabha on 10.08.2018 seeks to set up Arbitration Council of India (ACI) to *inter-alia* grade arbitral institutions, accredit arbitrators and impart training and award certificate in the ADR field.

(vii) **Initiatives to Fast Track Special Type of Cases:** The Fourteenth Finance Commission endorsed the proposal of the Government to strengthen the judicial system in States which included, *inter-alia*, establishing Fast Track Courts for cases of heinous crimes; cases involving senior citizens, women, children *etc.*, and urged the State Governments to use the additional fiscal space provided in the form of enhanced tax devolution from 32% to 42% to meet such requirements. At present, 708 such Fast Track Courts are functioning across the country. To fast track criminal cases involving elected MPs / MLAs, twelve (12) Special

Courts have been set up in eleven (11) States (Andhra Pradesh, Telangana, Kerala, Karnataka, Tamil Nadu, Maharashtra, Madhya Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, West Bengal and NCT of Delhi) and proportionate funds have been released to these States by the Government.

(viii) A series of meetings were held with Registrars General of all High Courts and Law Secretaries of all State Governments / UTs through Video Conferencing in the month of January, 2018, July, 2018 and November, 2018 to follow up on filling up posts of Judicial Officers in District and Subordinate Courts. The Department of Justice has hosted a web-portal on its website for reporting and monitoring of sanctioned and working strength, and vacancies of Judicial Officers of District and Subordinate Courts on monthly basis.

ELEVENTH POSITION IN THE ADMITTED LIST

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

(NOTE FOR SUPPLEMENTARIES)

LOK SABHA STARRED QUESTION NO. *211 ASKED BY SHRI SHRI SHARAD TRIPATH AND ADV. JOICE GEORGE, HON'BLE MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT, TO BE ANSWERED ON 26TH DECEMBER, 2018 REGARDING 'JUDGES TO POPULATION RATIO'.

INDEX

Sr. No.	Topic / Subject / Issue	Page no.
1	Reply of the Lok Sabha Starred Question No.*211	1-8
2	Judge – Population Ratio	9
3	120 th Report of the Law Commission of India	9-
4	245 th Report of the Law Commission	10-12
5	Pendency of Cases in the Hon'ble Supreme Court	12
6	Pendency of Cases in the Hon'ble High Courts	12
7	Pendency of Cases in District and Subordinate Courts	13
8	Important Legislative Amendments for Expeditious Disposal of Cases	14-17
9	Reforms Implemented under Enforcing Contract Parameter	18-22
10	Sanctioned Strength / Working Strength and Vacancies in District and Subordinate Courts as on 30.09.2018	23
11	Central Recruitment Mechanism	24
12	All India Judicial Service – Number of High Courts / State Governments in favour or against.	25-28
13	Authorities conducting examination for Judicial Officers	29-30
14	Malik Mazhar Sultan Case	31
15	Imtiyaz Ahmed Case	32-33
16	Progress of eCourts Project	34-38
17	Centrally Sponsored Scheme for Development of Infrastructure Facilities	39-40
18	Special Fast Track Courts	41-42
19	Gram Nyayalayas	43
20	Special Court for Lawmakers	44-45
21	Cases disposed by Lok Adalat during last 3 years	46
22	Grants release / expenditure incurred during last 5 years by NALSA	47
23	Access to Justice – Government of India and UNDP (SAJI)	48-49
24	Access to Justice-North Easterns and Jammu & Kashmir	50-51
25	Tele-Law Service	52
26	Nyaya Mitra	53
27	Pro Bono Legal Services	54
28	Bio-data on the Hon'ble Member of Parliament	55-56

ELEVENTH POSITION IN THE ADMITTED LIST

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

(NOTE FOR SUPPLEMENTARIES)

LOK SABHA STARRED QUESTION NO. *211 ASKED BY SHRI SHRI SHARAD TRIPATH AND ADV. JOICE GEORGE, HON'BLE MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT, TO BE ANSWERED ON 26TH DECEMBER, 2018 REGARDING 'JUDGES TO POPULATION RATIO'.PURPORT OF THE QUESTION:

**†*211. SHRI SHARAD TRIPATHI:
ADV. JOICE GEORGE:**

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

- (a) whether any norms have been laid down regarding the ratio of the number of Judges to the total population of the country and if so, the details thereof along with the present ratio in this regard;**
- (b) whether the ratio of Judges vis-avis population is very low in our country in comparison to the developed countries and if so, the details thereof;**
- (c) the details of the present per judge average endorsement ratio of cases and for the last three years along with the steps taken by the Government to ensure effective functioning of judicial system for the quick disposal of pending cases;**
- (d) whether as a result of low judge to population ratio, scores of cases heard every day lead to a large number of adjournments, transfer of cases from one judge to another and increasingly long queues of people waiting outside courtrooms having less chance of their cases being heard and if so, the details thereof; and**
- (e) whether the Government has noted that delays in courts cost India's economy trillions of rupees every year and if so, the details thereof ?**

Reply to the above question:

1. Judge-population ratio:

1.1 In the case of Imtiyaz Ahmed *versus* State of Uttar Pradesh and others, the Supreme Court had asked the Law Commission of India to

evolve a method for scientific assessment of the number of additional courts required to clear the backlog of cases. In 245th report (2014), the Law Commission observed that filing of cases *per capita* varies substantially across geographic units as filings are associated with economic and social conditions of the population. As such the Law Commission did not consider the judge population ratio to be a scientific criterion for determining the adequacy of the judge strength in the country. The Law Commission found that in the absence of complete and scientific approach to data collection across various High Courts in the country, the “*Rate of Disposal*” method, to calculate the number of additional judges required to clear the backlog of cases as well as to ensure that new backlog is not created, is more pragmatic and useful.

1.2 In August 2014, the Supreme Court asked the National Court Management System Committee (NCMS Committee) to examine the recommendations made by the Law Commission and to furnish its recommendations in this regard. NCMS Committee submitted its report to the Supreme Court in March, 2016. The report, *inter-alia*, observes that in the long term, the judge strength of the subordinate courts will have to be assessed by a scientific method to determine the total number of “*Judicial Hours*” required for disposing of the case load of each court. In the interim, the Committee has proposed a “*weighted*” disposal approach *i.e.* disposal weighted by the nature and complexity of cases in local conditions.

1.3 As per the direction of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in its Order dated 02.01.2017, the Department of Justice has forwarded a copy of interim report of the NCMS Committee to all the State Governments and High Courts to enable them to take follow up action to determine the required Strength of district and subordinate judiciary.

2. Steps taken by the Government to ensure effective functioning of judicial system for the quick disposal of pending cases:

The Government is fully committed to speedy disposal of cases. The Government has taken several initiatives to provide an ecosystem for faster disposal of cases by the judiciary. The National Mission for Justice Delivery and Legal Reforms established by the Government has adopted a coordinated approach for phased liquidation of arrears and pendency in judicial administration through various strategic initiatives, including improving infrastructure for courts, leveraging Information and Communication Technology (ICT) for better justice delivery, and filling up of vacant positions of Judges in High Courts and Supreme Court. The major achievements during the last four years under various initiatives to make the functioning of subordinate judiciary more efficient are as follows:

- (i) **Improving infrastructure for Judicial Officers of District and Subordinate Courts:** As on date, Rs.6,623.87 crores have been released since the inception of the Centrally Sponsored Scheme (CSS)

for Development of Infrastructure Facilities for Judiciary in 1993-94. Out of this, 3,179.57 crores (which are 48% of the total amount released till date) have been released to the States and UTs since April, 2014. The number of court halls has increased from 15,818 as on 30.06.2014 to 18,731 as on date and number of residential units has increased from 10,211 as on 30.06.2014 to 16,539 as on date under this scheme. In addition, 2,906 court halls and 1,754 residential units are under construction. The Central Government has approved continuation of the Scheme beyond the 12th Five Year Plan period *i.e.* from 01.04.2017 to 31.03.2020 with an estimated additional outlay of Rs.3,320 crore.

(ii) Leveraging Information and Communication Technology (ICT)

for improved justice delivery: Number of computerised District & Subordinate courts has increased from 13,672 to 16,755 registering an increase of 3,083 during 2014 to 2018. National Judicial Data Grid (NJDG) provides citizens with online information about case filings, case status and electronic copies of orders and judgments from district and subordinate courts that have already been computerized. Information regarding 10.80 crore cases including more than three crore pending cases and more than 7.91 crore orders / judgments are available on this portal. eCourts services such as details of case registration, cause list, case status, daily orders & final judgments are available to litigants and advocates through eCourts web portal,

Judicial Service Centres (JSC) in all computerised courts, eCourts Mobile App, email service, SMS push & pull services. eCourts Project has been consistently amongst the top 5 Mission Mode Projects of country.

(iii) Filling up of vacant positions in Supreme Court, High Courts and judicial officers in District and Subordinate Courts: During May 2014 – November 2018, 25 Judges were appointed in Supreme Court; 423 new Judges were appointed and 362 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 1079 currently. Sanctioned and working strength of Judicial Officers in District and Subordinate Courts has been increased as follows:

As on	Sanctioned Strength	Working Strength
31.12.2013	19,518	15,115
30.09.2018	22,644	17,509

Minister of Law & Justice vide letter dated 14th August, 2018 has written to the Chief Justices of High Courts and Chief Ministers of States to monitor the status of vacancies in the district and subordinate courts regularly and to ensure proper coordination with the State Public Service Commission so that the examination and the interviews are conducted in accordance with the time schedule prescribed by the Supreme Court in the Malik Mazhar Sultan case.

(iv) Reduction in Pendency through / follow up by Arrears Committees: Further, in pursuance of resolution passed in Chief

Justices' Conference held in April, 2015, Arrears Committees have been set up in 24 High Courts to clear cases pending for more than five years. Arrears Committees have been set up under District Judges too. Arrears Committee has been constituted in the Supreme Court to formulate steps to reduce pendency of cases in High Courts and District Courts.

(v) Nyaya Mitra Scheme: In order to reduce cases pending in courts for over 10 years, the Government launched the Nyaya Mitra Scheme in April 2017. Under the Scheme, retired judicial officers are engaged and designated as '*Nyaya Mitra*' to facilitate expeditious disposal of the cases pending over 10 years. In the first Phase, 15 Nyaya Mitra have been engaged in 15 Districts of Rajasthan, West Bengal, Bihar, Uttar Pradesh and Tripura.

(vi) Emphasis on Alternate Dispute Resolution (ADR): Commercial Courts, Commercial Division and Commercial Appellate Division of High Courts (Amendment) Act, 2018 has been enacted on 20th August, 2018 whereby mandatory pre-Institution mediation mechanism has been introduced for settlement of commercial disputes. Amendment to the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 by the Arbitration and Conciliation (Amendment) Act 2015 is done to expedite the speedy resolution of disputes by prescribing timelines. The Arbitration and Conciliation (Amendment) Bill, 2018 passed by the Lok Sabha on 10.08.2018 seeks to set up Arbitration Council of

India (ACI) to *inter-alia* grade arbitral institutions, accredit arbitrators and impart training and award certificate in the ADR field.

(vii) Initiatives to Fast Track Special Type of Cases: The Fourteenth

Finance Commission endorsed the proposal of the Government to strengthen the judicial system in States which included, *inter-alia*, establishing Fast Track Courts for cases of heinous crimes; cases involving senior citizens, women, children *etc.*, and urged the State Governments to use the additional fiscal space provided in the form of enhanced tax devolution from 32% to 42% to meet such requirements. At present, 708 such Fast Track Courts are functioning across the country. To fast track criminal cases involving elected MPs / MLAs, twelve (12) Special Courts have been set up in eleven (11) States (Andhra Pradesh, Telangana, Kerala, Karnataka, Tamil Nadu, Maharashtra, Madhya Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, West Bengal and NCT of Delhi) and proportionate funds have been released to these States by the Government.

(viii) A series of meetings were held with Registrars General of all High

Courts and Law Secretaries of all State Governments / UTs through Video Conferencing in the month of January, 2018, July, 2018 and November, 2018 to follow up on filling up posts of Judicial Officers in District and Subordinate Courts. The Department of Justice has hosted a web-portal on its website for reporting and monitoring of

sanctioned and working strength, and vacancies of Judicial Officers
of District and Subordinate Courts on monthly basis.

Based on the Population as per Census 2011 and sanctioned strength of Judges / Judicial Officers in Supreme Court, High Courts and District & Subordinate Courts, the judge - population ratio in the country works out to be around **19.63 Judges / Judicial Officers per million population** as calculated below:

Population based on Census 2011	121,01,93,422
Sectioned Strength of Judges of Supreme Court as on 17.12.2018	31
Sanctioned Strength of Judges of High Court as on 17.12.2018	1,079
Sanctioned Strength of Judges of District and Subordinate Courts as on 30.09.2018	22,644
Total	23,754
Population Per Judge as per Sanction Strength	50,947
Judge-Population Ratio (As per sanctioned Strength) i.e.(Judges per one million (Ten lakh) of population)	19.63

120th Report of the Law Commission of India:-

The Law Commission, in its 120th report submitted in 1987, examined the problem of understaffing of judiciary and recommended 50 Judges per million of population gradually in five years (*and should not exceed ten years*) instead of 10.5. The Commission also recommended that by the year 2000, India should command at least the ratio that the U.S. commanded in 1981 *i.e.* 107 Judges per one million of population. The present requirement of number of judges is much greater, looking to the spate of litigation, population explosion and other factors. The inadequate judge strength is a major cause of delay in disposal of cases.

Judge Population Ratio (120th Report of Law Commission of 1987):-

Sr. No.	Country	Judges per one million of population
1.	United States	107.00
2.	Canada	75.20
3.	England	50.90
4.	Australia	41.60
5.	India	10.50

245th Report of the Law Commission:-
(Methods for determining adequate requirement of Judicial Officers)

In February 2012, the Supreme Court issued directions in the case of *Imtiyaz Ahmad v. State of Uttar Pradesh*¹ requesting the Law Commission of India to give its recommendations with regard to the measures to be taken in terms of creating additional courts and other allied matters, including providing a rational and scientific definition of ‘arrears’ and ‘delay’. The Law Commission examined these issues in detail and submitted its recommendations to the Supreme Court through its 245th report titled “Arrears and Backlog: Creating Additional Judicial (Wo)manpower”. The Law Commission has examined the different methodologies for computing adequacy of judge strength and found that the commonly used judge-population ratio was NOT an appropriate metric. This was based on the finding that there is no objective number by reference to which the adequacy of the judge to population ratio of a State can be determined. The filings per capita are associated with economic and social conditions and these vary substantially across different States. In the words of the Law Commission - “*the justice needs of different societies thus vary, and no universal standard can be prescribed in this regard*”.

After considering the judge-population ratio and several other methods *such as* the judge-filing ratio, the ideal case load method and time-based methods, the Law Commission found the ‘RATE OF DISPOSAL METHOD’ to be the most pragmatic and useful option in the present scenario. The formula for determining appropriate judicial strength using the rate of disposal method involves the following steps:

¹ *Imtiyaz Ahmad v. State of U.P. and Ors*, AIR 2012 SC 642.

- An assessment of the present efficiency levels of the subordinate judiciary in different States, being the current rate at which judges dispose cases.
- Using the rate of disposal per judge to determine the number of judges that would be required to ensure a breakeven situation - where the number of disposals equals the number of new cases being instituted.
- Using the rate of disposal per judge for assessing the number of judges that would be required to dispose of the backlog of cases. For the purposes of its calculations, the Law Commission defined backlog to mean cases that have been pending for more than one year. It, however, noted that this time period can be modified to suit the needs of different courts.

The Supreme Court, in its order dated 1st May, 2014, had issued notice to 13 States² and 12 High Courts³ asking them to file their responses to the Law Commission's report including the method adopted by the Commission for determining the need for creating new courts and the time frame within which they would be able to achieve the target. It has also asked High Courts to examine location of the additional courts and the available infrastructure that would be required. In the same order the Court has also asked the Law Commission to formalize its recommendations with regard to the remaining States.

In August 2014, the Supreme Court asked the National Court Management System Committee (NCMS Committee) to examine the recommendations made by the Law Commission and to furnish its recommendations in this regard. NCMS Committee submitted its report

² Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Delhi, Gujarat, Himachal Pradesh, Jammu and Kashmir, Jharkhand, Karnataka, Kerala, Haryana, Punjab, Maharashtra, Sikkim and Uttarakhand

³ High Courts of Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Delhi, Gujarat, Himachal Pradesh, Jammu and Kashmir, Jharkhand, Karnataka, Kerala, Punjab and Haryana, Bombay and Uttarakhand

to the Supreme Court in March, 2016. The report, *inter-alia*, observes that in the long term, the judge strength of the subordinate courts will have to be assessed by a scientific method to determine the total number of “*Judicial Hours*” required for disposing of the case load of each court. In the interim, the Committee has proposed a “*weighted*” disposal approach *i.e.* disposal weighted by the nature and complexity of cases in local conditions. As per the direction of the Hon’ble Supreme Court in its Order dated 02.01.2017, the Department of Justice has forwarded a copy of interim report of the NCMS Committee to all the State Governments and High Courts to enable them to take follow up action to determine the required Strength of district and subordinate judiciary.

(i) Pendency of Cases in the Hon’ble Supreme Court

Year	Institution	Disposal	Pendency
2009	77,151	71,179	55,791
2010	78,280	79,509	54,562
2011	77,090	73,133	58,519
2012	76,917	68,744	66,692
2013	76,742	77,085	66,349
2014	89,164	92,722	62,791
2015	78,444	82,092	59,272
2016	79,246	75,979	62,537
2017	56,104	63,053	55,588
As on 30.04.2017			60,745
As on 14.07.2017			58,438
As on 31.07.2017			58,254
As on 30.07.2018			54,996
As on 01.12.2018			56,994

(ii) Pendency of Cases in the Hon’ble High Courts

Year	Institution	Disposal	Pendency
2009	17,79,482	15,93,369	40,60,709
2010	18,64,975	16,77,863	42,49,344
2011	19,47,009	17,84,282	43,22,198
2012	19,07,033	17,86,170	44,34,191
2013	20,16,338	17,72,917	44,62,705
2014	18,23,031	17,34,542	41,53,957
2015	16,88,449	15,80,911	38,70,373
2016	16,91,830	15,39,315	40,15,147

As on 31.03.2017			40,63,293
As on 20.12.2018			49,22,671

(iii) Pendency of Cases in District and Subordinate Courts

Year	Institution	Disposal	Pendency
2009	1,69,65,198	1,60,98,779	2,72,75,953
2010	1,80,04,311	1,76,59,558	2,77,51,181
2011	1,79,78,676	1,85,96,866	2,69,86,307
2012	1,81,49,248	1,81,97,153	2,68,89,203
2013	1,86,78,542	1,87,83,546	2,68,38,861
2014	1,89,57,097	1,90,19,658	2,64,88,405
2015	1,85,58,178	1,78,97,555	2,70,19,955
2016	1,91,42,647	1,80,28,672	2,74,97,436
2017			2,61,24,130
2018			2,92,10,715

IMPORTANT LEGISLATIVE AMENDMENTS FOR EXPEDITIOUS DISPOSAL OF CASES

1. **Negotiable Instruments (Amendment) Act, 2018:** With a view to address the issue of undue delay in final resolution of cheque dishonour cases so as to provide relief to payees of dishonoured cheques and to discourage frivolous and unnecessary litigation which would save time and money, the Negotiable Instruments (Amendment) Act, 2018 was enacted on 2nd August, 2018 so as to:
 - a. Empower the Court to order payment of interim compensation of upto 20% of the cheque amount, by the drawer of the cheque to the complainant, in cases where the accused does not plead guilty in a summary trial or summons case.
 - b. Empower the appellate court to direct deposit of a minimum of 20% of cheque amount in appeal by the drawer against conviction, within a period of sixty days. This amount can be released to the complainant and has to be returned to the accused if the appeal is allowed.
2. **Commercial Courts, Commercial Division and Commercial Appellate Division of High Courts (Amendment) Act, 2018 enacted on 20th August, 2018:**
 - a. Constitute commercial courts at the district level in States where the High Courts have ordinary original civil jurisdiction.
 - b. Specified value reduced from Rs 1 crore to Rs 3 lakhs and in

States where the High Courts have ordinary original civil jurisdiction, the maximum pecuniary jurisdiction of the district courts shall be specified by the High Courts.

- c. Introduction of pre-institution mediation and settlement mechanism introduced for all commercial cases. Mediation shall be conducted through authorities under the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987.
- d. Case Management Hearing (Pre-Trial Conference): Order XV A of the Code of Civil Procedure and Section 15 (4) of the Commercial Courts Act, 2015 provides for case management hearings in commercial cases including transferred suit or application.

3. Specific Relief (Amendment) Act, 2018 enacted on 1st August, 2018:

- a. Specific performance of contracts has been made the rule by curbing the discretionary power of courts.
- b. Substitute performance of contracts by third parties has been encouraged.
- c. Granting of injunctions by courts in disputes relating to infrastructure contracts are minimised.

4. Arbitration and Conciliation (Amendment) Bill, 2018: Passed by Lok Sabha on 10th August, 2018 and pending for consideration and passing before Rajya Sabha. It seeks to amend the Arbitration and

Conciliation Act, 1996 so as to:

- a. Establish an independent body called the Arbitration Council of India (ACI) for the promotion of arbitration, mediation, conciliation and other alternative dispute redressal mechanisms. Its functions include: (i) framing policies for grading arbitral institutions and accrediting arbitrators, (ii) making policies for the establishment, operation and maintenance of uniform professional standards for all alternate dispute redressal matters, and (iii) maintaining a depository of arbitral awards (judgments) made in India and abroad.
- b. Empower the Supreme Court and High Courts to designate arbitral institutions, which parties can approach for the appointment of arbitrators, in case of disagreement between the parties on appointment of an arbitrator. Hitherto, in such cases the parties could request the Supreme Court, or the concerned High Court, or any person or institution designated by such Court, to appoint an arbitrator. For international commercial arbitration, appointments will be made by the institution designated by the Supreme Court. For domestic arbitration, appointments will be made by the institution designated by the concerned High Court.
- c. Provide that the written claim and the defence to the claim in

an arbitration proceeding should be completed within six months from the date the arbitrator receives the appointment.

Reforms Implemented under the Enforcing Contract Parameter

1. Commercial Courts, Commercial Division and Commercial Appellate Division of High Courts (Amendment) Act, 2018 enacted on 20th August, 2018:

- a. Constitute commercial courts at the district level in States where the High Courts have ordinary original civil jurisdiction.
- b. Specified value reduced from Rs 1 crore to Rs 3 lakhs and in States where the High Courts have ordinary original civil jurisdiction, the maximum pecuniary jurisdiction of the district courts shall be specified by the High Courts.
- c. Introduction of pre-institution mediation and settlement mechanism introduced for all commercial cases. Mediation shall be conducted through authorities under the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987.
- d. Case Management Hearing (Pre-Trial Conference): Order XV A of the Code of Civil Procedure and Section 15 (4) of the Commercial Courts Act, 2015 provides for case management hearings in commercial cases including transferred suit or application.

2. Specific Relief (Amendment) Act, 2018 enacted on 1st August, 2018

- a. Specific performance of contracts has been made the rule by curbing the discretionary power of courts.
- b. Substitute performance of contracts by third parties has been

encouraged.

- c. Granting of injunctions by courts in disputes relating to infrastructure contracts are minimised.

3. Assigning New Cases to Judges randomly through an automated system

- Software under Case Information System 3.0 under the eCourts Mission has been launched on 14th August, 2018 and has been positioned for use in subordinate courts.

4. Electronic filing of Cases

- Launched on 14th August, 2018.
- Online registration of lawyers and litigants can be done.
- Lawyers/litigants can file cases from any part of India to any court on registration.

5. Electronic Service of Summons - National Service and Tracking of Electronic Processes (NSTEP)

- Launched on 14th August, 2018.
- Enables real-time status updates and tracking of summons.
- Tracks geographical co-ordinates of the process server at the moment of serving.

6. Electronic case management tools within subordinate courts for use by the Judges

- Access laws, regulations and case-law

- Automatic generation of hearing schedule for all cases on Judges Docket
- Send notifications to lawyers
- Track status of a case in judge's docket
- View and manage case documents (briefs, motions)
- Assistance with judgment writing
- Semi-automatic generation of court orders, and
- View court orders and judgments in a particular case.

7. Electronic case management tools within subordinate courts for use by the Lawyers

- Access laws, regulations and case-law
- Access forms to be submitted to the court
- Receive notifications
- Track the status of a given case
- View and manage case documents (briefs, motions)
- File briefs and documents with the Court, and
- Access court orders and decisions on a given case.

8. Regular Awareness Campaigns & Stakeholders Consultations to spread awareness about the initiatives and reforms undertaken

- 5 meetings of Task Force held in 2017 and 3 meetings held in 2018 under the Chairmanship of Secretary (Justice). 8th meeting of the Task Force was held on 28th November, 2018 and the High Courts of Delhi and Bombay were requested to take steps for setting up

Commercial Courts at district level and ensure Electronic Case and Court Management Tools for Judges and Lawyers.

- 6 meetings held in 2017 and 7 meetings held in 2018 to apprise lawyers, judges, and other stakeholders of Delhi about the available case management tools.
- 1 meeting held in 2017 and 2 meetings held in 2018 to apprise lawyers, judges, advocates and other stakeholders of Mumbai about the available case management tools.
- Awareness Campaigns specifically for lawyers / advocates in association with the Bar Associations are conducted in the Delhi District Court & Mumbai City Civil Courts.

9. Designate 16 courts in Mumbai & 75 courts in Delhi to deal with cases of commercial nature

- 16 Courts have been designated as commercial courts in Mumbai City Civil Courts by the High Court of Bombay.
- High Court of Delhi has notified 75 District/Additional District Judge's courts as commercial courts of which 74 are functional.

10. Publications and IEC material under eCourts:

- a. User Manual for eFiling procedure for High Courts and District Courts,
- b. User Manual on ePay,
- c. User Manual on NSTEP,
- d. Brochure on eCourts Services,

- e. Brochure on ePay,
- f. Brochure on NSTEP,
- g. 2 Pamphlets on eCourts Services (bilingual),
- h. User Manual for CIS 3.0

**Sanctioned Strength / Working Strength and vacancies in Subordinate
Courts as on 30.09.2018**

Sr. No.	Name of State / UT	Total Sanctioned Strength as on 30.09.2018	Total Working Strength as on 30.09.2018	Total Vacancy as on 30.09.2018
1	Andaman & Nicobar Islands	11	11	0
2	Andhra Pradesh and Telangana	987	890	97
3	Arunachal Pradesh	30	25	5
4	Assam	430	383	47
5	Bihar	1845	1223	622
6	Chandigarh	30	30	0
7	Chhattisgarh	452	397	55
8	Daman and Diu	4	4	0
9	Dadra and Nagar Haveli	3	3	0
10	Delhi	799	541	258
11	Goa	50	42	8
12	Gujarat	1506	1150	356
13	Haryana	651	489	162
14	Himachal Pradesh	159	149	10
15	Jammu & Kashmir	310	224	86
16	Jharkhand	676	460	216
17	Karnataka	1307	1076	231
18	Kerala*	496	433	63
19	Lakshadweep*	3	3	0
20	Madhya Pradesh	1872	1361	511
21	Maharashtra	2011	1844	167
22	Manipur	55	40	15
23	Meghalaya	97	39	58
24	Mizoram	67	46	21
25	Nagaland	33	26	7
26	Orissa	911	755	156
27	Puducherry	26	19	7
28	Punjab	674	530	144
29	Rajasthan	1337	1108	229
30	Sikkim	23	19	4
31	Tamilnadu*	1143	905	238
32	Tripura	115	75	40
33	Uttar Pradesh	3225	2037	1188
34	Uttarakhand	293	234	59
35	West Bengal	1013	938	75
Total		22644	17509	5135

*As on 30.06.2018

Central Recruitment Mechanism:

- The appointment of Judges and Judicial Officers in the District and Subordinate Courts falls within the domain of the High Courts and State Governments concerned in which the Central Government has no role.
- In order to facilitate regular filling up of these vacancies in a smooth and time-bound manner, the Department of Justice *vide* its letter dated 28th April, 2017 suggested certain options to the Hon'ble Supreme Court for creation of a Central Selection Mechanism.
- The Hon'ble Supreme Court *suo motu* converted the Government's suggestions into a writ petition on 09th May, 2017 and directed all State Governments (including Union Territories) to file their responses and suggestions by way of affidavits.
- The above matter is *subjudice* at present.

How many High Courts are in favour of constitution of AIJS and how many High Courts are not in favour of constitution of AIJS or has reservation on this issue.

Answer:

High Courts in favour of constitution of AIJS	
(i) Sikkim (ii) Tripura	2
High Courts, which are NOT in favaaour of constitution of AIJS	
(i) Andhra Pradesh (ii) Bombay (iii) Delhi (iv) Gujarat (v) Karnataka (vi) Kerala (vii) Madhya Pradesh (viii) Madras (ix) Manipur (x) Patna (xi) Punjab and Haryana	11
High Courts, which want changes in the proposal	
(i) Allahabad (changes in age & qualifications) (ii) Chhattisgarh (15% of total vacancies from the Bar) (iii)Himachal Pradesh (selection in consonance with recommendations of Shetty Commission)	6

(iv)Meghalaya (Officers of AIJS are given option for elevation to High Courts of three States)	
(v) Orissa (promotion to HJS to be included in AIJS)	
(vi)Uttarakhand (Changes in age, induction level, recruitment body, qualifications, allocation to States, Quota, Training)	
High Courts, which has intimated that the proposal is pending consideration	
(i) Jharkhand	2
(ii) Rajasthan	
High Courts, which did not respond on constitution of AIJS.	
(i) Jammu & Kashmir – 42 nd Amendment is not applicable to J & K.	3
(ii) Calcutta	
(iii)Gauhati	
Total	24

High Courts which want control over the officers of AIJS as per Article 235 of the Constitution of India.

- (i) Allahabad
- (ii) Kerala

How many States are in favour of constitution of AIJS and how many

States are not in favour of constitution of AIJS?

Answer:

States in favour of constitution of AIJS	
(i) Haryana (proposal seems to be justified)	2
(ii) Mizoram	
States, which are NOT in favaaour of constitution of AIJS	
(i) Arunachal Pradesh	8
(ii) Himachal Pradesh	
(iii) Karnataka	
(iv) Madhya Pradesh	
(v) Maharashtra	
(vi) Meghalaya	
(vii) Nagaland	
(viii)Punjab	
States, which want changes in the proposal	
(i) Bihar (wants major changes)	5
(ii) Chhattisgarh (only 15% vacancies of ADJ to be filled through AIJS)	
(iii)Manipur (wants certain changes)	
(iv)Orissa (wants changes in the proposals)	
(v) Uttarakhand	

States, which did not respond on constitution of AIJS.	
(i) Tripura (ii) Goa (iii) Gujarat (iv) Jharkhand (v) Rajasthan (vi) Tamil Nadu (vii) Assam (viii) Andhra Pradesh (ix) Kerala (x) Sikkim (xi) Uttar Pradesh (xii) West Bengal (xiii) Telengana	13
State Government of J & K has mentioned that the 42 nd Amendment is not applicable to the State of J & K.	1
Total	29

**Statement on Authority conducting selection for appointment of
Judicial Officers/Judges to State Higher Judicial Services and Lower
State Judicial Services:**

Sr. No.	Name of State	Higher Judicial Service	Lower Judicial Service
1	Andhra Pradesh	High Court	High Court
2	Arunachal Pradesh	High Court of Gauhati	50% by High Court of Gauhati & 50% by State Public Service Commission
3	Assam	High Court	High Court
4	Bihar	High Court	State Public Service Commission
5	Chhattisgarh	High Court	State Public Service Commission
6	Delhi	High Court	High Court
7	Goa	High Court of Bombay	High Court of Bombay
8	Gujarat	High Court	High Court
9	Haryana	High Court	State Public Service Commission
10	Himachal Pradesh	High Court	State Public Service Commission
11	Jammu & Kashmir	High Court	State Public Service Commission
12	Jharkhand	High Court	State Public Service Commission
13	Karnataka	High Court	High Court

14	Kerala	High Court	High Court
15	Madhya Pradesh	High Court	State Public Service Commission
16	Maharashtra	High Court	State Public Service Commission
17	Manipur	High Court	High Court
18	Meghalaya	High Court	State Public Service Commission
19	Mizoram	High Court	State Public Service Commission
20	Nagaland	High Court	High Court
21	Orissa	High Court	State Public Service Commission
22	Punjab	High Court	State Public Service Commission
23	Rajasthan	High Court	High Court
24	Sikkim	High Court	High Court
25	Tamil Nadu	High Court	State Public Service Commission
26	Tripura	High Court	State Public Service Commission
27	Uttar Pradesh	High Court	State Public Service Commission
28	Uttarakhand	High Court	State Public Service Commission
29	West Bengal	High Court	State Public Service Commission

Malik Mazhar Sultan Case

Time Bound Filling up of Vacancies in District and Subordinate Courts.

- As per the Constitution, the selection and appointment of judges in subordinate courts is the responsibility of State Governments and the High Courts concerned.
- The Supreme Court, through a judicial order in Malik Mazhar case, has devised a process and time frame to be followed for the filling up of vacancies in subordinate judiciary.
- This order of January 2007 by the Supreme Court stipulates that the process for recruitment of judges in the subordinate courts would commence on 31st March of a calendar year and end by 31st October of the same year.
- The Supreme Court has permitted State Governments / High Courts for variations in the time schedule in case of any difficulty based on the peculiar geographical and climatic conditions in the State or other relevant conditions.

Imtiyaz Ahmed Case

In the case of Imtiyaz Ahmed *versus* State of Uttar Pradesh and others, the Supreme Court had asked the Law Commission of India to evolve a method for scientific assessment of the number of additional courts required to clear the backlog of cases. In 245th report (2014), the Law Commission has observed that filing of cases *per capita* varies substantially across geographic units as filings are associated with economic and social conditions of the population. As such the Law Commission did not consider the judge population ratio to be a scientific criterion for determining the adequacy of the judge strength in the country. The Law Commission found that in the absence of complete and scientific approach to data collection across various High Courts in the country, the “Rate of Disposal” method, to calculate the number of additional judges required to clear the backlog of cases as well as to ensure that new backlog is not created, is more pragmatic and useful. In May, 2014, the Supreme Court asked the State Governments and the High Courts to file their response to the recommendations made by the Law Commission.

In August 2014, the Supreme Court asked the National Court Management System Committee (NCMS Committee) to examine the recommendations made by the Law Commission and to furnish its recommendations in this regard. NCMS Committee submitted its report

to the Supreme Court in March, 2016. The report, *inter-alia*, observes that in the long term, the judge strength of the subordinate courts will have to be assessed by a scientific method to determine the total number of “*Judicial Hours*” required for disposing of the case load of each court. In the interim, the Committee has proposed a “*weighted*” disposal approach *i.e.* disposal weighted by the nature and complexity of cases in local conditions. As per the direction of the Hon’ble Supreme Court in its Order dated 02.01.2017, the Department of Justice has forwarded a copy of interim report of the NCMS Committee to all the State Governments and High Courts to enable them to take follow up action to determine the required Strength of district and subordinate judiciary.

Progress of eCourts Project

Phase – I (2011-2015):

1. Government implementing the e-Courts Mission Mode Project throughout the country for Information and Communication Technology enablement of district and subordinate courts.
2. Amount released – Rs. 251 crores
3. The target of computerisation of 14,249 district and subordinate courts was achieved.
4. Out of these, LAN was installed at 13,643 courts, hardware provided in 13,436 courts and software was installed in 13,672 courts.
5. Laptops were provided to 14,309 judicial officers and change management exercise completed in all High Courts.
6. Over 14,000 Judicial Officers were trained in the use of UBUNTU-Linux Operating System.
7. More than 4000 court staff were trained in Case Information System (CIS) as System Administrators.
8. Video Conferencing facility was operationalised between 488 court complexes and 342 corresponding jails.

Phase – II (2015-2019):

1. Rs. 1,084.71 crore released till date.
2. Computerisation of 16,755 district and subordinate courts completed [computer hardware, Local Area Network (LAN), and

installation of standard application software in district and subordinate courts].

3. The details of computerised district and subordinate courts under various High Courts are as under:

S. No.	Name of the High Court	No. of computerised subordinate courts
1.	Allahabad	2072
2.	Andhra Pradesh	1078
3.	Bombay	2079
4.	Calcutta	811
5.	Chhattisgarh	357
6.	Delhi	427
7.	Gauhati	496
8.	Gujarat	1108
9.	Himachal Pradesh	119
10.	Madhya Pradesh	1203
11.	Jammu And Kashmir	218
12.	Jharkhand	351
13.	Rajasthan	1,094
14.	Karnataka	897
15.	Kerala	486
16.	Madras	1032

S. No.	Name of the High Court	No. of computerised subordinate courts
17.	Orissa	534
18.	Patna	1025
19.	Punjab And Haryana	1018
20.	Sikkim	19
21.	Uttarakhand	186
22.	Tripura	69
23.	Manipur	37
24.	Meghalaya	39
	Total	16,755

4. New and user-friendly version of Case Information Software developed and deployed at all the computerized District and Subordinate Courts.
5. QR Code facility made operational in the software, which enables to check current status of the case.
6. The National Judicial Data Grid (NJDG) for District & Subordinate Courts created as an online platform which provides information relating to judicial proceedings/decisions of 16,755 computerized district and subordinate courts of the country.

7. The portal provides online information to litigants such as details of case registration, cause list, case status, daily orders, and final judgments.
8. Currently litigants can access case status information in respect of over 10.80 crore cases and more than 7.82 crore orders / judgments.
9. Litigant centric information can be obtained through the website of the eCourts portal by accessing using the URL:
<https://ecourts.gov.in>.
10. Case information is thus available speedily to the petitioners and respondents.
11. The eCourts portal and National Judicial Data Grid (NJDG) also serve as tools of efficient court and case management for judiciary which aids in disposal of pending cases.
12. Judicial Service Centres (JSC) established at all computerized subordinate courts to serve as a single window for filing petitions and applications by litigants/ lawyers, and for obtaining information on ongoing cases and copies of orders and judgments etc.
13. ECourts mobile app with the facility of QR Code was launched on 22.07.2017 for use of litigants and lawyers. Services under different captions viz. Search by CNR, Case Status, Cause List and My Cases are available on this application, which is available on both Google Play and Apple Store.

14. Furthermore, the facility of providing case information services through SMS has also been implemented and the process of disseminating system-generated SMSs is operational.
15. The case details can also be obtained by sending unique CNR number (Case Number Record) to a mobile number through SMS. Cause lists, judgements, case status etc. can be received in the litigants' mailbox on registration of email address.
16. Information Kiosks have been setup at all computerized court complexes for disseminating judicial information related to cause lists and other case related information to the lawyers and litigants.
17. eFiling application to enable the advocates, petitioners-in-person, etc., to file their cases on-line (at any time) has been launched in August, 2018.
18. About 163.53 crore electronic transactions have been recorded for eCourts through eTaal portal.
19. The eCourts transactions have thus emerged as one of the topmost accessed services of the Government of India.

Progress of CSS for Judicial Infrastructure (as on 20.12.2018)

Centrally Sponsored Scheme

S No	Information	Status
1	Total amount released since 1993-94.	Rs. 6,623 crore
2	Amount released since April, 2014.	Rs. 3,179 crore
3	BE 2017-18.	Rs. 621.20 crore
4	RE 2017-18.	Rs. 621.21 crore
5	Expenditure.	Rs. 621.21 crore
6	Number of Court Halls available in 2014.	15,625
7	Number of Court Halls available as on date.	18,731
8	Number of Court Halls under construction.	2,906
9	Number of Residential Units available in 2014.	13,532
10	Number of Residential Units available as on date.	16,539
11	Number of Residential Units under construction.	1,754
12	Amount of UC pending upto 2015-16.	Rs. 50.93 crore.
13	Amount of unspent balance for 2016-17.	Rs. 36.01 crore.
14	Amount of unspent balance for 2017-18.	Rs. 105.35 crore.
15	Amount of total unspent balance as on date.	Rs. 192.30 crore.
16	Online monitoring System.	Web-portal and Mobile app

		<p>is launched on 11.06.2018.</p> <p>Trainings were conducted on 12.06.2018, 13.07.2018, 14.08.2018 and 17.11.2018 (North-East). VC with nodal officers was held on 10.10.2018 and also in November, 2018. 23 States conducted training at user level. 16 States appointed Nodal Officer, Surveyors and Moderators. 25 States started entering details and 19 States started geo-tagging.</p>
17	Norms and Specifications	<p>Revised Guidelines and Norms and specification approved on 10.05.2018. Revised Guidelines alongwith Norms and Specifications are uploaded on website and circulated to State / UT for compliance.</p>

Special Fast Track Courts

Name of the States/UTs	Number of Fast Track Courts
Andhra Pradesh, Telangana	59
Assam, Arunachal Pradesh, Nagaland, Mizoram	3
Bihar	48
Chhattisgarh	23
Delhi	14
Goa	2
Gujarat	0
Haryana	0
Himachal Pradesh	0
Jammu & Kashmir	0
Jharkhand	0
Karnataka	0
Kerala	0
Madhya Pradesh	0
Maharashtra	100
Manipur	4
Meghalaya	0
Odisha	0
Punjab	0
Puducherry	0

Rajasthan	0
Sikkim	2
Tamil Nadu	72
Tripura	3
Uttar Pradesh	286
Uttarakhand	4
West Bengal	88
Total	708

Status of Gram Nyayalayas notified and operationalised by State

Governments

Sl. No.	State	Notified	Functional
1	M P	89	89
2	Rajasthan	45	45
3	Karnataka	2	0
4	Orissa	22	14
5	Maharashtra	39	24
6	Jharkhand	6	1
7	Goa	2	0
8	Punjab	2	1
9	Haryana	2	2
10	UP	104	4
11	Kerala	30	30
Total		343	210

Special Courts for Lawmakers:

The Supreme Court of India in its Order dated the 01st November, 2017 had directed the Union Government to prepare a scheme for setting up of Courts exclusively to deal with criminal cases involving political persons on the lines of Fast Track Courts (FTCs) which were set up by the Central Government for a period of five years and extended further, which Scheme has now been discontinued. A Scheme for setting up Special Courts to dispose of all the criminal cases involving political persons in a period of one year was submitted before the Supreme Court for implementation. The Supreme Court of India *vide* its Order dated 14.12.2017 has directed the Union Government to proportionately allocate the amount to be incurred to the different states in which the proposed Special Courts are planned to be located forthwith and thereafter the State Governments will make necessary arrangements of judicial officers, staff and infrastructure in consultation with the High Courts to ensure that the said Courts start functioning from 01.03.2018. Accordingly, following amount has been allocated for Special Courts for Lawmakers.

State	Amount Sanctioned	Number of Courts
Telengana	6500000	1
Tamilnadu	6500000	1
Karnataka	6500000	1
Bihar	6500000	1

Andhra Pradesh	6500000	1
Kerala	6500000	1
Maharashtra	6500000	1
Madhya Pradesh	6500000	1
Uttar Pradesh	6500000	1
West Bengal	6500000	1
Delhi	13000000	2
Total	78000000	12

Cases disposed by Lok Adalat during last three years

(I) National Lok Adalats

Year	No. of days National Lok Adalats held	Disposal of Pending Cases (lakh)	Disposal of Pre- Litigative Cases (lakh)	Total Disposal (lakh)	Settlement Amount (Rs crore)
2015	9	61.58	163.43	225.01	14,551
2016	10	49.77	55.21	104.98	9,164
2017	5	29.28	24.77	54.05	14,958
2018 (upto Nov.)	4	20.47	26.38	46.86	11,345

(II) Regular Lok Adalats

Year	Disposal of Pending Cases (lakh)	Disposal of Pre-Litigative Cases (lakh)	Total Disposal (lakh)	Settlement Amount (Rs crore)
2016-17	9.65	7.58	17.23	2443
2017-18	9.44	9.84	19.28	2122

(III) Permanent Lok Adalats (PLA)

Year	Number of PLA	Cases settled	Total settlement Amount (in Rs. crore)
2015-16	292	1,03,559	238.97
2016-17	271	93,555	160.83
2017-18	289	1,24,459	247.54

Grants released / expenditure incurred during last 5 years by NALSA

(Rs. Crore)

Year	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19 (upto Nov.)
Budget Estimate	142	145	142	100	80
Revised Estimate	137	93.94	83.95	100	-
Grant released / expenditure	82.65	67.97	63.67	100	80

Total: Rs.394 crore.

Access to Justice Project - Government of India and UNDP (SAJI)

The above project in partnership with UNDP which started in 2009 came to an end on 31.12.2017. The salient features of the project in Phase-I and II are given below

First Phase of the Project (2009-2012)

- Budget- INR 30 crore
- States -Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Jharkhand, Madhya Pradesh, Odisha, Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh.

Key Achievements

- Creation of Justice Innovation Fund for legal awareness in 70 districts across 7 states.
- Increased legal awareness for 15,00,000 people including 5,00,000 women.
- Over 3000 Paralegal Volunteers were trained;
- 60 Panel lawyers in Chhattisgarh, Jharkhand and Odisha trained through a fellowship programme.

Second Phase of the Project (2012-2017)

- Budget- INR 30 crore
- In Eight States- Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Jharkhand, Madhya Pradesh, Odisha, Rajasthan, Maharashtra and Uttar Pradesh.

Key Achievements

- Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh - Capacity Building of Resource Groups
SIRD, NLMA, CSC, community based volunteers, NALSA
- Madhya Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, Jharkhand, Odisha & Rajasthan –
Organized Legal awareness campaigns.
- Maharashtra – Establishment of Socio Legal Cells in Observation
Homes for strengthening Juvenile Justice system
- Odisha & Maharashtra – Establishment of Legal Aid Clinics in law
universities.
- Odisha – Enabling recognition and security of forest rights.
- Jharkhand & Chhattisgarh – Setting up of Voice Legal Information
Kiosks

ACCESS TO JUSTICE- NORTH EASTERN AND JAMMU & KASHMIR

Project states: Assam, Tripura, Sikkim, Manipur, Nagaland, Meghalaya, Arunachal Pradesh and Mizoram and Jammu and Kashmir.

Phase I (2012-17)

- Budget Rs. 30 crore
- Collaboration with National Literacy Mission Authority: provided legal literacy to 7 lakh adults in Assam, Tripura, Sikkim, Manipur, Nagaland, Meghalaya, Arunachal Pradesh and Mizoram.
- Collaboration with CSC e-Governance Services India Ltd: benefitting 2 lakh people at panchayat level in the project states.
- Capacity Building through NGOs.: Training to 2 lakh panel lawyers, para legal volunteers, Preraks, CSOs through its various programs in the states of Assam, Tripura, Sikkim, Manipur, Nagaland, Meghalaya, Arunachal Pradesh, Mizoram and Jammu & Kashmir.
- Synergy between tribal justice system and regular justice system: In Nagaland sensitization programs were held for Gaon Buras, Dobashis, and Village Council Members.
- Setting up of 46 Legal aid Clinics in Nagaland.

- Information, Education and Communication materials developed in 16 local dialects of North Eastern States including documentaries on local legislations.

Phase II (2017-20)

- Budget Rs. 46 crore
- Capacity Building of Panchayati Raj functionaries through State Institute of Rural Development in Tripura, Meghalaya, Manipur and Nagaland.
- Legal Aid clinics with State Legal Services Authority in Tripura, Manipur, Mizoram, Jammu & Kashmir.
- Establishing legal aid clinics for juveniles in Srinagar by central University of Kashmir.
- Legal literacy in Assam and Sikkim through State Resource center, Assam.

TELE-LAW SERVICE

- Collaboration between Department of Justice, CSC, SLSA under the aegis of NALSA
- Legal aid and advice through video conferencing and telephone facilities at the CSC to the marginalized communities by SLSA / CSC Panel lawyers
- To increase the flow of cases for Pre-Litigation advice and consultation
- 1800 CSCs in Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, North -Eastern states and J&K
- TELE-LAW can be accessed at <http://www.tele-law.in/>
- As on date, advice enabled in 42530 cases (marginalized persons : 15120 - women, 3522 - SCs and 5323 - STs)
- Cases relate, inter alia, to criminal matters, family and matrimonial disputes and land/property disputes.
- A monitoring dashboard has been designed to strengthen the scheme.

NYAYA MITRA

- **Objectives:** To reduce pendency of court cases pending for over 10 years.
- Covers 227 selected districts of 16 States that include Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Maharashtra, Gujarat, Rajasthan, West Bengal, Odisha, North East States and Jammu & Kashmir.
- Selected districts with 10 years of cases pending have been sourced from National Judiciary Data Grid (NJDG) database.
- Retired judicial officers designated as 'Nyaya Mitra' are engaged for each selected district at the CSC.
- In the first Phase 15 Nyaya Mitra's have been engaged.
- District Judges of corresponding Nyaya Mitras have been addressed / consulted over phone to utilize the services of Nyaya Mitras.
- Nyaya Mitras of Rajasthan, Gujarat and Tripura have been closely working with district judiciary.
- District Judges have been requested to give sitting space and to utilize the services for disposal of old cases.

Pro Bono legal services

- Department of Justice has created a web based platform (available at doj.gov.in), through which interested lawyers can register themselves to volunteer pro bono services for the under-privileged litigants, and Marginalized individuals can apply for legal aid and advice from the pro bono lawyers.
- 357 advocates from across the country have registered for volunteering pro bono services and 341 cases of marginalized applicants have been assigned to these advocates.
- The Department is developing a mobile application which will facilitate connections between beneficiaries and pro bono lawyers.

FACTS AT A GLANCE**DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE****(As on 21.12.2018)****1. Judges in Supreme Court**

Sanctioned Strength as on 17.12.2018	31
Working Strength as on 17.12.2018	27
Vacancies as on 17.12.2018	4
Appointments in 2016	4
Appointments in 2017	5
Appointments in 2018	8

2. Judges in High Courts

Sanctioned Strength as on 17.12.2018	1,079
Working Strength as on 17.12.2018	692
Vacancies as on 17.12.2018	387
New posts created since 2014	173
Appointments in 2016	126
Appointments in 2017	115
Appointments in 2018	108
Addl. Judges made Perm. in 2016	131
Addl. Judges made Perm. in 2017	31
Addl. Judges made Perm. in 2018	115

3. Judges in District and Subordinate Courts

Sanctioned Strength	22,644
Working Strength	17,509
Vacancies	5,135
Increase in sanctioned strength since 2014	3,126
Increase in working strength since 2014	2,394
Judge-Population ratio (Judge / million)	19.63

4. Pendency in Supreme Court

Pendency of Cases as on 01.12.2018	56,994
Reduction in pendency of cases since 2014	5,797

5. Pendency in 23 High Courts as per NJDG Data

Pendency of Cases as on 20.12.2018	49.22 lakh
---	-------------------

6. Pendency in District and Subordinate Courts of States / UTs as per NJDG Data

Pendency of Cases as on 20.12.2018	2.92 crore
---	-------------------

7. Judicial Infrastructure

Court Halls Available	18,731
Court Halls under construction	2,906
Total	21,637
Residential Units Available	16,539
Residential Units under construction	1,754
Total	18,293

8. Financial Assistance for Judicial Infrastructure

Year	(Rs. In crore)
Total sanction of Financial Assistance since 1993-94	6,623.87
Total sanction of Financial Assistance since 2014	3,179.57 (48 %)
Financial Assistance sanctioned in the year 2017-18.	621.21
Financial Assistance sanctioned in the year 2018-19.	523.63

9. eCourts Project Phase – II

Computerized Courts	16,755
Funds approved for Phase – II (2015-19)	Rs.1,670 crore
Funds released upto (2018-19)	Rs.1,084 crore
Increase in Computerized courts since 2014	3,528
Cases on NJDG	10.80 crore
Judgments on NJDG	7.91 crore
Video Conference Facility	488 court complexes and 342 jails.

10. Family Courts

Functional Family Courts as on 31.12.2017	511
Total cases pending in these Family Courts as on 31.12.2017	7,13,474
Functional Family Courts as on 30.09.2018	525
Total cases pending in these Family Courts as on 30.09.2018	7,61,352
Cases disposed in 2014	3.30 lakh
Cases disposed in 2015	4.21 lakh
Cases disposed in 2016	78 thousand

11. Fast Track Courts

Functional Fast Track Courts as on 31.12.2017	727
Total cases pending in these Fast Track Courts as on 31.12.2017	5,70,224
Functional Fast Track Courts as on 30.09.2018	708
Total cases pending in these Fast Track Courts as on 30.09.2018	6,45,688
Cases disposed in 2014	4.61 lakh
Cases disposed in 2015	3.84 lakh
Cases disposed in 2016	8.72 lakh

12. Ease of Doing Business

India's Rank in 2016 (Enforcing Contract Indicator)	178
India's Rank in 2017	172
India's Rank in 2018	164
India's Rank in 2019	163

13. Ease of Doing Business Overall Rank

India's Rank in 2017	130th
India's Rank in 2018	100th
India's Rank in 2019	77th (out of 190 economies)
Improvement in India's Rank in 2019 with respect to 2017	53 Points

14. Lok Adalat

Pending cases settled in national Lok Adalat from 2015 till date	161.12 lakh
Pending cases settled in Regular Lok Adalats during 2015-16 to 2017-18	87.22 lakh
Pre-litigative cases settled in Regular Lok Adalats during 2015-16 to 2017-18	104.47 lakh
Pre-litigative cases relating to public utility service settled in Permanent Lok Adalats during 2015-16 to June, 2018	3.41 lakh

15. Tele Law Scheme(launched on 20th April, 2017)

U.P., Bihar, J&K, Assam, Arunachal Pradesh, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Manipur, Tripura, Nagaland, Sikkim	1800 Gram Panchayats in 11 States
Total of number cases registered by PLVs & VLEs	47,793
Number of cases for which legal advice has been provided	42,530

16. Pro Bono Legal Services (launched in April, 2017)

Interested lawyers and litigants can register on the website to provide and avail pro-bono legal services as may be required.	www.doj.gov.in
Number of lawyers have registered on the portal	357
Total number of cases assigned for pro bono assistance	341
