Polity & Governance · GS - II

Discuss the major causes and socio-economic consequences of judicial pendency in India. Suggest measures to ensure speedy and effective justice.

EXAM YEAR	PAPER	SUBJECT
DAILY PRACTICE 20/10/2026	GS - II	Polity & Governance

MARKS	WORD LIMIT
10	~150 words

Answer Hint

Judicial pendency, judicial vacancies, shortage of judges, inadequate court infrastructure, procedural delays, frequent adjournments, government litigation, access to justice, undertrial prisoners, e-Courts, Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR), Lok Adalats, Fast-Track Courts, judicial reforms.

Model Answer

1. Introduction

Judicial pendency is a major challenge facing the Indian justice system. Delays in resolving cases undermine timely justice, affect public confidence in the judiciary and weaken the effective enforcement of the rule of law.

2. Major Causes

1. Shortage of judges: Vacancies and increasing caseloads slow down case disposal.
2. Procedural delays: Complex legal procedures, repeated adjournments and prolonged hearings increase pendency.
3. Government litigation: Government departments and public institutions account for a substantial volume of litigation.

4. Inadequate infrastructure: Shortages of courtrooms, staff and technological facilities affect judicial efficiency.

3. Socio-Economic Consequences

1. Delayed justice undermines citizens' rights and access to justice.
2. Undertrial prisoners may remain in custody for prolonged periods.
3. Delayed resolution of commercial disputes can discourage investment and economic activity.
4. Public confidence in the judiciary may decline.

4. Measures to Reduce Pendency

1. Fill judicial vacancies promptly and strengthen court infrastructure.
2. Expand e-Courts, digital hearings and effective case-management systems.
3. Promote mediation, conciliation and Lok Adalats.
4. Reduce unnecessary adjournments and avoidable government litigation.
5. Prioritise cases involving undertrial prisoners and vulnerable groups.

5. Conclusion

Reducing judicial pendency requires more than increasing the number of judges. Procedural reforms, technological integration, alternative dispute resolution and administrative accountability are essential to ensure accessible, affordable and timely justice for all.