

2026

RAJYA SABHA REPLIES

**2nd PART OF BUDGET SESSION,
2026
270th SESSION OF RAJYA SABHA
[09th March, 2026
to
02th April, 2026]**

INDEX

Sl.No.	Question No.	Question Type	Date	Subject	Division	PageNo.
1.	215	Starred	12.03.2026	Increasing FTSCs	J-II	1-3
2.	2297	Unstarred	12.03.2026	Fiscal and Administrative impact of prolonged stay orders	NMJR-I	4-5
3.	2352	Unstarred	12.03.2026	Pendency of Cases	NMJR-I	6-9
4.	2353	Unstarred	12.03.2026	Free Access to Justice	LAP	10-11
5.	2354	Unstarred	12.03.2026	Modernization of Court Infrastructures	e-Court	12-15
6.	2355	Unstarred	12.03.2026	Infrastructure Development	NMJR-II	16-19
7.	2356	Unstarred	12.03.2026	Pendency Cases Under FTSCs	J-II	20
8.	2357	Unstarred	12.03.2026	Appointments in Courts	Appts.	21-23
9.	2358	Unstarred	12.03.2026	Improving Justice Delivery	NMJR-I	24-26
10.	2359	Unstarred	12.03.2026	Appointment of Judges	Appts.	27-28
11.	2360	Unstarred	12.03.2026	e-Court Mission Mode Project	e-Court	29-40
12.	2361	Unstarred	12.03.2026	Improving efficiency of Judiciary	NMJR-I	41-43
13.	289	Starred	19.03.2026	Use of Artificial Intelligence in Legal System	e-Court	44-46
14.	3113	Unstarred	19.03.2026	Pendency of Cases	NMJR-I	47-51
15.	3152	Unstarred	19.03.2026	Cases Recused by Judges	NMJR-I	52
16.	3153	Starred	19.03.2026	Pendency of Cases in Higher Judiciary	NMJR-I	53-56
17.	3154	Starred	19.03.2026	Complaints Received Against Judges	Appts.	57-58
18.	3155	Starred	19.03.2026	Use of AI in Legal Framework	e-Courts	59-60
19.	3156	Starred	19.03.2026	Denial of Legal Representation	LAP	61-62
20.	3157	Unstarred	19.03.2026	Establishing Benches of Odisha High Court	Appts.	63

Sl.No.	Question No.	Question Type	Date	Subject	Division	Page No.
21	3158	Unstarred	19.03.2026	Use of Local Language in High Courts	J-I	64-65
22	3159	Unstarred	19.03.2026	E-Seva Kendras	E-Court	66-68
23	3160	Unstarred	19.03.2026	Expansion of Court Infrastructure	NMJR-II	69-70
24	3161	Unstarred	19.03.2026	Strengthening Delivery of Justice	NMJR-I	71-72
25	411	Unstarred	02.04.2026	Judicial Infrastructure in Uttar Pradesh	NMJR-II	73-74
26	414	Unstarred	02.04.2026	Enforcement of Virtual Courts and hybrid hearing	e-Courts	75-77
27	4437	Unstarred	02.04.2026	e-Notarisation	Notary Cell (DoLA)	78
28	4438	Unstarred	02.04.2026	Undertrial Prisoners	LAP	79-81
29	4440	Unstarred	02.04.2026	Implementation of Reservation Provisions	Admn IV (DoLA)	82-84
30	4441	Unstarred	02.04.2026	Reservation and Representation in Judiciary	Apptts.	85-86
31	4442	Unstarred	02.04.2026	Legal Aid Services in Haryana	LAP	87-88
32	4443	Unstarred	02.04.2026	Pending Cases in Lower Courts in Bihar	NMJR-I	89-91
33	4444	Unstarred	02.04.2026	Freezing Period for Judges	J-I	92
34	4445	Unstarred	02.04.2026	Hindi Names of laws and Acts	Leg.I (LD)	93
35	4446	Unstarred	02.04.2026	Pending Cases in Courts	NMJR-I	94-97
36	4447	Unstarred	02.04.2026	Guidelines for Disposal of Pending Cases	NMJR-I	98-100
37	4448	Starred	02.04.2026	Constitutional Validity of Legislation	Leg.I (LD)	101-102

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

RAJYA SABHA
STARRED QUESTION NO. 215
ANSWERED ON – 12/03/2026

INCREASING FTSCs

JS(J-11)
✓ 215 SHRI UJJWAL DEORAO NIKAM:

Will the Minister of *Law and Justice* be pleased to state:

- (a) the number of Fast Track Special Courts (FTSCs), including exclusive POCSO courts, presently functioning, State/UT-wise;
- (b) whether the funds allocated under the Centrally Sponsored FTSC Scheme, including from the Nirbhaya Fund, have been fully utilised, and if not, the details of under-utilisation and the corrective steps taken, State/UT-wise;
- (c) whether Government proposes to increase the number of FTSCs, in view of pendency of sexual offence cases; and
- (d) if so, the details thereof, including the number of additional courts proposed and the time-frame fixed therefor?

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) to (d): A Statement is laid on the table of the House.

**STATEMENT REFERRED TO IN REPLY TO PARTS (a) to (d) OF THE RAJYA SABHA
STARRED QUESTION NO. 215 FOR ANSWER ON 12/03/2026 REGARDING
'INCREASING FTSCs'**

(a) to (d): A Centrally Sponsored Scheme for the establishment of Fast Track Special Courts (FTSCs), including exclusive POCSO (ePOCSO) Courts was launched in October, 2019. These courts are dedicated to the time-bound trial and disposal of pending cases related to rape and crimes under the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences (POCSO) Act, 2012. This Scheme has been extended twice, with the latest extension up to 31st March 2026, for establishment of 790 courts. As per the information made available by the High Courts, as of 31.01.2026, 774 FTSCs, including 398 exclusive POCSO (e-POCSO) Courts were functional in 29 States/UTs. The State/UT-wise details of functional Fast Track Special Courts (FTSCs), including exclusive POCSO courts, are provided at **Annexure**.

The FTSCs have been set up and operationalized under the Nirbhaya Fund. The Department has released a sum of ₹1210.91 crore to the States/UTs since its inception to ensure the smooth functioning of the courts. The funds are released on the pattern of Centrally Sponsored Scheme (Central share: State share :: 60:40, 90:10) to cover the salaries of one Judicial Officer along with 7 support Staff and a Flexi Grant for meeting the day-to-day expenses. The funds are reimbursed to the States/UTs after receipt of the expenditure statements from them. During the current financial year, funds to the tune of ₹176.36 crore have been released to the States/UTs.

The number of FTSCs required to be established is determined at the time of approval of the Scheme.

STATEMENT REFERRED TO IN REPLY TO PART (a) OF RAJYA SABHA STARRED QUESTION NO. 215 FOR ANSWER ON 12.03.2026 REGARDING 'INCREASING FTSCs'.

State/UT-wise details of functional Fast Track Special Courts (FTSCs), including exclusive POCSO courts

Sl. No.	State/UT	Functional Courts	
		FTSCs including exclusive POCSO	Exclusive POCSO
1	Andhra Pradesh	16	16
2	Assam	17	17
3	Bihar	54	48
4	Chandigarh	1	0
5	Chhattisgarh	15	11
6	Delhi	16	11
7	Goa	1	0
8	Gujarat	35	24
9	Haryana	18	14
10	Himachal Pradesh	6	3
11	J&K	4	2
12	Karnataka	30	16
13	Kerala	55	14
14	Madhya Pradesh	67	56
15	Maharashtra	37	0
16	Manipur	2	0
17	Meghalaya	5	5
18	Mizoram	3	1
19	Nagaland	1	0
20	Odisha	44	23
21	Puducherry	1	1
22	Punjab	12	3
23	Rajasthan	45	30
24	Tamil Nadu	20	20
25	Telangana	36	0
26	Tripura	3	1
27	Uttarakhand	4	0
28	Uttar Pradesh	218	74
29	West Bengal	8	8
	TOTAL	774	398

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

RAJYA SABHA
UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 2297
ANSWERED ON 12/03/2026

JS(NMJR-1) FISCAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE IMPACT OF PROLONGED STAY ORDERS

✓2297 DR. AJEET MADHAVRAO GOPCHADE:

Will the Minister of *Law and Justice* be pleased to state:

- (a) whether Government has assessed the fiscal and administrative impact of prolonged and indefinite stay orders granted by courts and tribunals, which stall Government recoveries, delay infrastructure and development projects, lock up substantial public revenue and adversely affect effective governance and justice delivery;
- (b) whether Government proposes to frame rules or introduce legislation prescribing a defined validity period for stay orders, with mandatory periodic judicial review and reasoned extension; and
- (c) whether such a framework is under consideration to prevent misuse of interim relief, safeguard public finances, and ensure timely adjudication while preserving the right to legal remedy?

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) to (c): The Department has not conducted any specific assessment of the fiscal and administrative impact of prolonged and indefinite stay orders granted by courts and tribunals, which stall Government recoveries, delay infrastructure and development projects, lock up substantial public revenue and adversely affect effective governance and justice delivery. However, the Government is fully committed for speedy disposal of cases and reducing pendency and has taken several initiatives to provide an ecosystem for faster disposal of cases by the judiciary which includes, inter-alia, amalgamation of latest technologies for increasing access to Justice and greater transparency under the e-Courts Mission Mode Project and supplementing of the resources of the State Governments/UTs for providing suitable infrastructure facilities for the District and Subordinate Judiciary under the Centrally Sponsored Scheme for Development of Infrastructure Facilities for Judiciary. The Digital Justice System under the e-Courts Mission Mode Project has expedited and

simplified judicial processes and has also improved transparency and accessibility in the justice delivery system.

Further, the Department of Legal Affairs, Ministry of Law and Justice, has framed the 'Directive for the Efficient and Effective Management of Litigation by Government of India', which is an integrated approach in reinforcing the goal of good governance and ensuring public welfare and timely dispensation of justice. The Directive seeks to introduce effective measures to simplify legal processes, prevent unnecessary litigation, address inconsistencies in notifications and orders, minimize unwarranted appeals, streamline inter-departmental coordination in litigation, ensure greater public accountability in arbitration matters, and establish a strong Knowledge Management System (KMS) to improve overall efficiency. The Department of legal Affairs, Ministry of Law and Justice has also developed the Legal Information Management and Briefing System (LIMBS), a web-based portal designed to effectively monitor court cases involving the Union of India. These measures are to proactively take action towards disposal of all pending court cases.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

RAJYA SABHA
UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 2352
ANSWERED ON 12/03/2026

PENDENCY OF CASES

JS(NMTR-1)

✓2352 # SHRI TEJVEER SINGH:

Will the Minister of *Law and Justice* be pleased to state:

- (a) the number of pending cases in the High Courts and subordinate courts in the country and the major reformative and administrative steps taken by Government to reduce pendency of cases during the last three years;
- (b) the number of courts wherein e-filing, virtual hearings and digital record systems have been implemented under the e-Courts Mission Mode Project so far, State-wise; and
- (c) the details of central assistance provided for strengthening judicial infrastructure and filling vacant posts of judges?

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): As per information available on National Judicial Data Grid (NJDG), as on 09.03.2026, 64,01,789 cases are pending in High Courts and 4,95,49,089 cases are pending in subordinate courts.

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

Under the Centrally Sponsored Scheme namely Fast Track Special Courts (FTSCs) Scheme, 774 Fast Track Special Courts (FTSCs) including 398 exclusive POCSO (ePOCSO) Courts are functional across 29 States/UTs for the expeditious disposal of pending cases of Rape and POCSO Act, and have collectively disposed of 3,66,124 cases since their inception, as on 31.12.2025. The financial outlay under the scheme is Rs. 1952.23 crore with Rs. 1207.24 crore as Central Share to be incurred from Nirbhaya Fund on the CSS pattern. The Central Government, as on 02.03.2026, has released a total amount of Rs. 1,210.92 crore to States/UTs for the operationalization of FTSCs since the inception of the Scheme in 2019.

To strengthen the criminal court based legal services, the Department of Justice through NALSA is implementing a Central Sector Scheme, namely, the Legal Aid Defense Counsel System (LADCS) Scheme, which involves full time engagement of Legal Aid Defense Counsels (LADCs) with supporting staff at district level. As on December 2025, Legal Aid Defense Counsel (LADC) offices are functional in 680 districts across the country. LADCS Scheme has been approved for the period of 3 financial years 2023-24 to 2025-26) with a total financial outlay of Rs. 998.43 crore and up to January 2026, Rs. 643.755 crore has been released to NALSA for LADCS Scheme. The details of criminal cases assigned and disposed of by LADCs during the last three years are as follows: -

Financial Year	Criminal Cases assigned	Criminal Cases disposed	Disposal Rate
2023-24	3,36,830	2,12,505	63%
2024-25	5,32,413	3,72,750	70%
2025-26 (Dec. 2025)	3,93,614	2,86,326	73%
Total	12,62,857	8,71,581	69%

Further, 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 date, 660.36 crores pages of court records have been digitized in the High Courts and District Courts. More than 3.97 crore hearings have taken place through Video conferencing and live streaming is functional in several High Courts. The number of e Sewa Kendras (facilitation centres) has increased to 2,444 across High Courts and District Courts.

(b): The details of Courts where e-filing, virtual hearings, and digital record systems have been implemented under the e-Courts Mission Mode Project so far is at **Annexure**.

(c): The primary responsibility for development of infrastructure facilities for District & Subordinate Courts in the states, including facilities essential for persons, rests with the State Governments/UTs. To augment the resources of the State Government/UTs, the Union Government has been implementing a Centrally Sponsored Scheme (CSS) for the Development of Infrastructure Facilities for Judiciary in the District & Subordinate Courts by providing financial assistance to the State/UT governments in the prescribed fund sharing between Centre and States. There are five components of the Scheme against which Central assistance is granted to the States/UTs, viz. (i) Court Halls, (ii) Residential Units, (iii) Lawyers' Halls, (iv) Toilet Complexes and (v) Digital Computer Rooms. Since inception of the scheme, total amount of Rs. 12,681.07 crores (as on 28.02.2026) has been released to States/UTs under the Scheme, out of which Rs. 9,236.76 crore has been released w.e.f. 2014-15. For the current FY 2025-26, an amount of Rs. 629.66 crore has been released to States/UTs.

Filling up of the vacancy in the higher Judiciary is a continuous, integrated and collaborative process between the executive and the judiciary. It requires consultation and approval from various Constitutional Authorities both at State and Central level which are obtained in accordance with the

MoP. The recommendations also have to be considered in the light of such other reports as may be available to the Government in respect of the names under consideration. The recommendations of the High Court Collegium, the State Governments and the Government of India are then forwarded to the Supreme Court Collegium (SCC) for advice. Only those persons whose names have been recommended by the SCC are appointed as Judges of the High Courts.

Further, filling up of vacant positions of the judicial officers in District and Subordinate courts is the responsibility of the High Courts and State Governments concerned. As per the Constitutional framework, in exercise of powers conferred under the proviso to Article 309 read with Articles 233 and 234 of the Constitution, the respective State Government, in consultation with the High Court, frames the rules and regulations regarding the appointment and recruitment of Judicial Officers. The Hon'ble Supreme Court vide order passed in January 2007 in the Malik Mazhar Sultan case, has inter-alia stipulated certain timelines, which are to be followed by the States and the respective High Courts for recruitment of judges in District and Subordinate Courts.

STATEMENT REFERRED TO IN REPLY TO PART (B) OF RAJYA SABHA UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 2352 FOR ANSWER ON 12.03.2026 REGARDING 'PENDENCY OF CASES'

S.No	Name of High Court	E-Filing total count as on 31.01.2026, Total Cases Submitted			Number of cases dealt with (virtual hearings) on video conferencing as on 31 st January 2026			No. of pages digitized as on 31.01.2026		
		High Courts	District Courts	Total	High Courts	District Courts	Grand Total	High Court	District Courts	Total
1	Allahabad*	0	12,531	12,531	2,49,209	67,10,672	69,59,881	58,19,35,116	1,75,86,65,405	2,34,06,00,521
2	Andhra Pradesh	23,736	44	23,780	4,22,512	14,59,891	18,82,403	3,62,30,680	18,33,14,688	21,95,45,368
3	Bombay	4,05,326	25,87,820	29,93,146	98,343	3,22,291	4,20,634	9,21,83,862	26,37,314	9,48,21,176
4	Calcutta	12,265	2,621	14,886	1,83,302	1,92,522	3,75,824	5,99,58,081	0	5,99,58,081
5	Chhattisgarh	894	3,363	4,257	1,05,246	4,68,030	5,73,276	28,25,324	2,44,45,025	2,72,70,349
6	Delhi*	0	16,63,101	16,63,101	3,22,201	76,05,823	79,28,024	23,50,99,015	10,75,60,093	34,26,59,108
7	Gauhati – Arunachal Pradesh	0	0	0	3,620	8,837	12,457	5,06,407	1,26,322	6,32,729
8	Gauhati – Assam	40,764	50,098	90,862	2,67,826	5,53,598	8,21,424	2,97,53,593	15,58,31,203	18,55,84,796
9	Gauhati – Mizoram	0	0	0	4,297	13,581	17,878	12,61,775	21,45,738	34,07,513
10	Gauhati – Nagaland	0	0	0	1,508	1,284	2,792	0	0	0
11	Gujarat	64,650	10,303	74,953	4,20,550	2,38,090	6,58,640	20,56,046	20,98,653	41,54,699
12	Himachal Pradesh	3,655	1,09,090	1,12,745	1,86,441	2,03,751	3,90,192	81,71,391	14,55,412	96,26,803
13	Jammu & Kashmir	29,942	2,11,933	2,41,875	2,65,397	6,01,494	8,66,891	4,12,67,215	2,71,14,636	6,83,81,851
14	Jharkhand	70	1,375	1,445	2,25,518	7,51,716	9,77,234	3,10,02,847	31,56,964	3,41,59,811
15	Karnataka	10,360	4,15,537	4,25,897	12,79,932	1,94,764	14,74,696	5,38,81,928	4,70,33,448	10,09,15,376
16	Kerala*	0	10,93,024	10,93,024	3,17,949	7,59,988	10,77,937	8,38,48,233	1,86,11,454	10,24,59,687
17	Madhya Pradesh*	0	18,045	18,045	7,00,733	11,87,344	18,88,077	24,90,04,956	68,21,95,995	93,12,00,951
18	Madras	1,44,535	22,86,703	24,31,238	15,34,057	4,89,890	20,23,947	21,38,11,184	17,83,78,424	39,21,89,608
19	Manipur	7,546	30,146	37,692	55,340	19,086	74,426	58,94,989	57,94,737	1,16,89,726
20	Meghalaya	39	1	40	6,944	78,682	85,626	12,11,210	38,20,961	50,32,171
21	Orissa	34,988	78,437	1,13,425	3,61,055	3,71,119	7,32,174	5,33,13,761	17,63,75,480	22,96,89,241
22	Patna	7,32,678	57,660	7,90,338	2,78,263	33,11,160	35,89,423	2,41,60,047	2,68,10,068	5,09,70,115
23	Punjab & Haryana	1,22,131	1,51,344	2,73,475	6,56,708	38,02,334	44,59,042	29,65,31,164	65,06,22,740	94,71,53,904
24	Rajasthan	1,36,084	5,918	1,42,002	2,55,986	2,70,243	5,26,229	13,71,87,927	4,10,95,234	17,82,83,161
25	Sikkim	3,896	6,742	10,638	927	17,916	18,843	11,83,569	54,22,642	66,06,211
26	Telangana	10,528	52,753	63,281	15,34,185	2,02,503	17,36,688	13,08,90,654	7,90,39,244	20,99,29,898
27	Tripura	4,472	36,109	40,581	22,556	43,532	66,088	54,61,690	5,63,244	60,24,934
28	Uttarakhand	341	1,01,854	1,02,195	91,348	52,778	1,44,126	2,51,82,755	1,54,92,800	4,06,75,555
	Total	17,88,900	89,86,552	1,07,75,452	98,51,953	2,99,32,919	3,97,84,872	2,40,38,15,419	4,19,98,07,924	6,60,36,23,343

Note: - * Allahabad, Delhi, Kerala and Madhya Pradesh are using their own e-filing application for High Court.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

RAJYA SABHA
UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 2353
ANSWERED ON – 12/03/2026

FREE ACCESS TO JUSTICE

JS (LAP)

✓ 2353 SHRI BHUBANESWAR KALITA:

Will the Minister of *Law and Justice* be pleased to state:

- (a) the achievements of strengthening access to justice through Legal Services Authorities during the last three years;
- (b) the impact of legal awareness camps and programmes conducted across the country; and
- (c) the scope and outcome of the Legal Aid Defense Counsel System (LADCS) in providing free criminal defence to the eligible beneficiaries?

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): The National Legal Services Authority (NALSA) was constituted under the Legal Services Authorities (LSA) Act, 1987 to provide free and competent legal services to the weaker sections of the society including the beneficiaries covered under Section 12 of the LSA Act, 1987, which aims to ensure that the opportunities for securing justice are not denied to any citizen by reason of economic or other disabilities. In addition, NALSA has also formulated various schemes for the implementation of preventive and strategic legal service programmes, which are implemented by the Legal Services Authorities at various levels i.e. State, District and Taluka level. Details of persons benefitted through Legal aid and advice under various activities/programmes undertaken by Legal Services Authorities during the last three years are as follows:-

Year	Number of Beneficiaries
2023-24	15,50,164
2024-25	16,57,527
2025-26 (upto January 2026)	16,60,249
Total	48,67,940

The details of cases/issues settled through Lok Adalats are as under:

Year	State Lok Adalat	Permanent Lok Adalat	National Lok Adalat*
2023-24	12,07,103	2,32,763	8,53,42,217
2024-25	13,44,814	2,37,980	10,45,26,119
2025-26 (upto January, 2026)	7,24,681	2,32,940	14,84,25,050
Total	32,76,598	7,03,683	33,82,93,386

*Data in respect of National Lok Adalat pertains to the calendar year of 2023, 2024 and 2025.

(b): The legal awareness camps/programs are held across the country by Legal Service Authorities in regard to various laws and schemes relating to children, labourers, victims of disaster, SC and ST, persons suffering from disability, etc. The Legal Services Authorities also prepare booklets and pamphlets in simple language on various laws, for distribution amongst the people. The details of legal awareness camps/programs organized by Legal Service Authorities across the country during the last three years are as under:

Year	Number of Legal Awareness Camps / Programs organised	No. of Persons attended
2023-24	4,30,306	4,49,22,092
2024-25	4,62,988	3,72,32,850
2025-26 (upto January 2026)	4,91,990	4,04,59,246
Total	13,85,284	12,26,14,188

(c): The Government of India is implementing a Central Sector Scheme namely; Legal Aid Defense Counsel System (LADCS) Scheme through NALSA since FY 2023-24, which aims to provide legal aid with regard to criminal cases to the beneficiaries eligible under Section 12 of the LSA Act, 1987. As on 31st December 2025, LADC offices are functional in 680 districts across the country. Details of cases assigned and disposed of by the Legal Aid Defense Counsels (LADCs) since inception (FY 2023-24) are as follows:-

Year	Cases Assigned	Cases Disposed
2023-24	3,36,830	2,12,505
2024-25	5,32,413	3,72,750
2025-26 (upto December 2026)	3,93,614	2,86,326
Total	12,62,857	8,71,581

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

RAJYA SABHA
UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 2354
ANSWERED ON - 12/03/2026

JS(e-Courts)

MODERNIZATION OF COURT INFRASTRUCTURES

✓2354 SHRI MILIND MURLI DEORA:
DR. K. LAXMAN:

Will the Minister of *Law and Justice* be pleased to state:

- (a) the transformative impact of e-Courts Mission Mode Project in making the justice delivery system more accessible, efficient and transparent through widespread digitization of case records, virtual hearings and online services;
- (b) the expansion of this digital infrastructure to courts across the country, including all levels of judiciary in Telangana and its tangible benefits for litigants, lawyers and judicial officers;
- (c) the progress under the National Judicial Infrastructure Authority (NJIA) towards building modern, citizen-friendly and inclusive court complexes; and
- (d) how these technological and infrastructural interventions are contributing to the broader goal of reducing case backlogs and enhancing public trust?

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): The e-Courts Mission Mode Project is being implemented in a phased manner across the country with the objective of strengthening the use of Information and Communication Technology (ICT) in the judicial system. The project has introduced various measures such as video conferencing, virtual courts, e-filing, e-payments, digitisation of court records, upgraded case management systems and monitoring of cases through the National Judicial Data Grid (NJDG). These measures have contributed to making justice delivery system more accessible, efficient and transparent by enabling public access to case related information, streamlining

case management through digital workflows, and reducing procedural delays through e-filing and video conferencing. Some key initiatives under the eCourts Project as on 31.01.2026 are as under:

- (i) Over 660.36 crore pages of court records including legacy records have been digitized across Courts to ensure faster retrieval, secure storage and seamless digital workflows.
- (ii) 30 Virtual Courts have been established to enable online adjudication of traffic challans. Virtual Courts have received 10.13 crore challans and challans amounting to Rs. 1002.73 crore were paid.
- (iii) Video Conferencing (VC) facilities have been expanded across 3,240 court complexes and 1,272 jails. Courts have conducted over 3.97 crore hearings through video conferencing, facilitating remote hearings of undertrials, witnesses and lawyers.
- (iv) Live streaming of court proceedings is operational in 11 High Courts.
- (v) E-filing and e-payments systems have been implemented to allow online filing of cases and digital payment of court fees and fines. More than 1 crore cases have been filed through the e-filing platform and the e-payments system has processed transactions for court-fee worth Rs. 1,404 crore and fine worth Rs. 75 crore.
- (vi) NJDG provides public access to case data, statistics of courts across the country and has been upgraded with an improved dashboard, functioning as a monitoring tool, to identify, manage and reduce pendency of cases.
- (vii) CIS 4.0 has been implemented in all courts, with enhanced usability, privacy safeguards and integration with national platforms such as NJDG, e-filing, virtual courts and ICJS.
- (viii) The S3WaaS platform hosts 730 District Court websites, ensuring secure and accessible web infrastructure.
- (ix) Real-time digital services have expanded significantly, with case updates being sent to lawyers and litigants through SMS Push and Pull (over 4 lakh SMS sent daily), email (over 6 lakh sent daily) and the multilingual e-Courts services portal (with 35 lakh hits daily).
- (x) The e-Courts Services mobile app (3.59 crore downloads) provides the lawyers and litigants relevant information about case status, cause lists etc.
- (xi) The JustIS app (22,133 downloads) is a management tool for the judges assisting them to effectively organise and monitor their judicial business.
- (xii) 48 e-Sewa Kendras are functional across all High Courts and 2,396 e-Sewa Kendras across District Courts.

- (xiii) Under National Service and Tracking of Electronics Processes (NSTEP) system, the courts have processed 7.29 crore e-processes.
 - (xiv) Digital Courts 2.1 is a customized application for paperless Courts with facility of translation and transcription using AI. It enables judges to access all case related documents, pleadings, and evidence digitally.
- (b): As per data available on National Judicial Data Grid (NJDG), digital infrastructure under the eCourts Project has been expanded across 22,774 courts nationwide, including 580 courts in the State of Telangana.

In the State of Telangana, the eCourts project is being implemented under the guidance of the High Court of Telangana in all district and subordinate courts. Under Phase-III of the eCourts project, funds have been allocated for provision of computer hardware and digital infrastructure, including servers, networking equipment, hardware and internet connectivity in the courts in Telangana.

The initiatives under eCourts project have improved efficiency for all stakeholders in the justice delivery system across the country including the State of Telangana. Litigants have benefitted from virtual hearings of cases, online access to case information, online availability of court orders, and online tracking of case progress. Advocates have benefitted from hybrid court hearings enabling virtual appearance, convenient e-filing of cases, online access to case bundles, and digital cause lists with automated notifications. Judicial officers have benefitted from digital case flow management through applications such as JustIS, access to data analytics dashboards and video conferencing integration with jails and remote locations.

(c): The Government of India has been implementing a Centrally Sponsored Scheme (CSS) for the Development of Infrastructure Facilities since 1993-94. Through this Scheme, the Government of India supplements the resources of the State Governments, who have the primary responsibility for the development of judicial infrastructure. There are five components covered under the scheme, viz., court halls, residential units, lawyers' halls, digital computer rooms and toilet complexes. There is no proposal for the establishment of a National Judicial Infrastructure Authority.

(d): The interventions under the eCourts project have enhanced efficiency in the justice delivery system by improving case management, e-filing, hearing through video conferencing, real-time monitoring of pendency and disposal, facilitating faster service of processes etc. The adoption of digital platforms, data analytics and interoperable systems is contributing to better

utilisation of judicial resources, faster resolution of disputes and improved access to justice for litigants.

The facilities created under eCourts project have significant impact on judicial performance between 2014 and 2025, with 169% increase in annual case institution (from 0.98 crore to 2.64 crore) and 207% increase in annual case disposal (from 0.81 crore to 2.49 crore) by the courts in the country.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

RAJYA SABHA
UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 2355
ANSWERED ON – 12/03/2026

INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPEMNT

JS(NMJR-11)

✓2355 SHRI RAGHAV CHADHA:

Will the Minister of *Law and Justice* be pleased to state:

- (a) the quantum of funds allocated and utilised for judicial infrastructure development during the last five years, year-wise and State-wise;
- (b) whether it is a fact that shortages of courtrooms, judges, staff and basic facilities persist and if so, the reasons therefor supported by vacancy data, courtroom-to-population ratio and facility audit reports;
- (c) the steps taken to ensure uniform infrastructure standards across States, including benchmarks, monitoring mechanisms and compliance statistics;
- (d) the details on progress in e-Courts, digitisation and technology integration, with usage and coverage data; and
- (e) the gaps in implementation which are identified through independent inspections, with corrective actions and timelines?

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): The quantum of funds allocated and utilised for judicial infrastructure development during the last five years, year-wise and State-wise is at **Annexure-I**.
- (b): The primary responsibility for development of infrastructure facilities for District and Subordinate Courts rests with the State Governments/UTs. However, to augment the resources of States/UTs, Central Government has been implementing a Centrally Sponsored Scheme (CSS) for the Development of Infrastructure Facilities for Judiciary in the District and Subordinate Courts since 1993-94, by providing financial assistance in the prescribed fund sharing pattern between the Centre and States/UTs. The Scheme covers five components, namely, Court Halls, Residential Units for Judicial Officers, Lawyers' Halls, Toilet Complexes and Digital Computer Rooms.

As on 28.02.2026, against the sanctioned strength of 25,894 judges and working strength of 21,027 judges, 22,712 Court Halls are available. At present, the judge-to-population ratio in the country works out to be approximately 22 Judges per million population.

(c): The norms and specifications of court infrastructure have been calculated based on recommendations of the National Court Management Systems Committee (NCMS) of the Supreme Court in the Baseline Report on Court Development Planning System, existing norms and practice being followed by State Governments concerned and CPWD/PWD norms.

Effective monitoring mechanisms are also in place for time bound and sustainable infrastructure developments in the States/UTs. There is a Central Level Monitoring Committee in the Department of Justice, chaired by Secretary (Justice) and a High Court Level Monitoring Committee in the State, chaired by the Chief Justice of the respective High Courts to review the physical and financial progress of the projects under the Scheme. Additionally, an online monitoring mechanism namely 'Nyaya Vikas' portal has also been developed for collection of data on progress and time bound completion of judicial infrastructure projects.

(d): Under the eCourts Project, approximately 1.07 crore cases have been filed through e-filing and e-payments system has processed transactions for court-fee worth Rs. 1,404 crore. 660.36 crore pages of court records have been digitized. Under the National Service and Tracking of Electronics Processes (NSTEP) system, the courts have processed 7.26 crore e-processes, out of which 2.09 crore e-processes have been successfully delivered. Video Conferencing facilities have been expanded across 3,240 court complexes and 1,272 jails, facilitating remote hearings of under-trials, witnesses and lawyers. Litigants can access case information in respect of over 35.17 crore orders on National Judicial Data Grid (NJDG) platform as on date.

Additionally, a web-based initiative namely "Digital Courts" has been developed for making courts paperless. JustIS app developed for judges (22,133 downloads) assists in the monitoring of pendency and disposal of cases at fingertips. Further, the Free and Open-Source Software based Case Information System (CIS) Version 4.0 is in operation to digitally manage cases filed in courts.

(e): The Centrally Sponsored Scheme (CSS) for the Development of Infrastructure Facilities for Judiciary in the District and Subordinate Courts is regularly appraised/audited by Department Related Parliamentary Standing Committee (DRPSC), internal audit reports and third party evaluation report carried out under the aegis of NITI Aayog at the time of extension of the Scheme. The gaps in implementation of the Scheme, as and when highlighted through the recommendations of various reports are suitably considered while drafting the guidelines for the Scheme. Similarly, to mitigate fund related gaps like parking of funds by the States/UTs, new fund release system namely SNA-SPARSH has been introduced for 'Just-in-time' release of funds. For proper monitoring of projects under the Scheme, the States/UTs are also regularly asked to geo-tag the projects in real time and update the progress on the Nyaya Vikas Portal.

STATEMENT REFERRED TO IN REPLY TO PART (a) OF THE RAJYA SABHA UNSTARRED QUESTION NO.2355 FOR ANSWER ON 12/03/2026

Rs. in Crore

Sl. No.	States	F.Y 2021-22		F.Y 2022-23		F.Y 2023-24		F.Y 2024-25		F.Y 2025-26*	
		Allocated	Utilised	Allocated	Utilised	Allocated	Utilised	Allocated	Utilised	Allocated	Utilised
1	Andhra Pradesh	0.00	0.00	22.50	22.50	49.82	49.82	0.99	0.99	30.98	20.92
2	Bihar	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	67.45	67.45	107.81	107.81	75.28	63.82
3	Chhattisgarh	0.00	0.00	60.00	60.00	6.69	6.69	45.35	45.35	41.52	35.93
4	Goa	3.20	3.20	25.00	25.00	1.53	1.53	14.27	14.27	3.51	1.23
5	Gujarat	0.00	0.00	6.22	6.22	95.62	95.62	51.34	51.34	57.83	48.36
6	Haryana	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	20.10	20.10	0.00	0.00	36.48	17.75
7	Himachal Pradesh	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	6.00	6.00	13.62	13.62	10.25	10.25
8	Jharkhand	6.00	6.00	16.51	16.51	40.81	40.81	14.57	14.57	22.54	17.52
9	Karnataka	27.00	27.00	82.01	82.01	133.16	133.16	73.92	73.92	34.14	31.11
10	Kerala	50.00	50.00	0.00	0.00	7.00	7.00	45.89	45.89	22.95	22.76
11	Madhya Pradesh	55.00	55.00	125.00	125.00	104.00	104.00	42.69	42.69	70.91	61.79
12	Maharashtra	18.00	18.00	100.00	100.00	119.53	119.53	118.36	118.36	28.06	28.06
13	Odisha	0.00	0.00	31.49	31.49	30.88	30.88	51.48	51.48	30.57	30.25
14	Punjab	16.50	16.50	12.50	12.50	18.42	18.42	0.00	0.00	12.31	11.75
15	Rajasthan	41.50	41.50	71.66	71.66	80.41	80.41	58.35	58.35	70.24	60.66
16	Tamil Nadu	35.66	35.66	133.85	133.85	0.00	0.00	61.27	61.27	39.15	37.10
17	Telangana	0.00	0.00	26.61	26.61	0.00	0.00	1.96	1.96	9.95	9.20
18	Uttarakhand	80.00	80.00	0.00	0.00	13.75	13.75	46.14	46.14	4.18	3.38
19	UttarPradesh	219.00	219.00	0.00	0.00	102.96	102.96	174.12	174.12	36.05	35.42
20	West Bengal	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	18.00	18.00	22.22	22.22	26.10	18.56
Total (A)		551.86	551.86	713.35	713.35	916.13	916.13	944.34	944.34	663.00	565.82
North Eastern States (B)											
1	Arunachal Pradesh	4.09	4.09	32.38	32.38	0.00	0.00	6.24	6.24	1.33	1.33
2	Assam	27.40	27.40	25.00	25.00	40.00	40.00	40.75	40.75	33.59	20.68
3	Manipur	0.00	0.00	12.85	12.85	0.00	0.00	3.71	3.71	2.89	0.52
4	Meghalaya	28.02	28.02	50.00	50.00	33.72	33.72	35.79	35.79	5.40	5.40
5	Mizoram	9.50	9.50	0.00	0.00	8.85	8.85	13.57	13.57	11.22	11.22
6	Nagaland	13.27	13.27	0.00	0.00	4.39	4.39	4.00	4.00	1.00	0.00
7	Sikkim	0.00	0.00	2.27	2.27	2.70	2.70	0.00	0.00	3.42	3.24
8	Tripura	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	40.49	40.49	20.00	20.00	16.68	6.13
Total(B)		82.28	82.28	122.50	122.50	130.15	130.15	124.06	124.06	75.53	48.52
Union Territories (C)											
1	A&N Islands	0.46	0.46	0.00	0.00	0.49	0.49	0.075	0.075	0.00	0.00
2	Chandigarh	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3	D & Nagar Haveli	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
4	Daman & Diu	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
5	Delhi	30.00	30.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	16.50	16.50	10.00	0.87
6	Jammu & Kashmir	20.00	20.00	12.60	12.60	12.00	12.00	31.50	31.50	10.00	7.45
7	Ladakh	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.40	1.40	6.925	6.925	7.00	7.00

8	Lakshadweep	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
9	Puducherry	0.00	0.00	9.55	9.55	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	0.00
	Total	50.46	50.46	22.15	22.15	13.89	13.89	55.00	55.00	32.00	15.32
Grand Total (A+B+C)		684.60	684.60	858.00	858.00	1,060.17	1,060.17	1,123.40	1,123.40	770.53	629.66

*As on 28.02.2026

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

RAJYA SABHA
UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 2356
ANSWERED ON – 12/03/2026

PENDING CASES UNDER FTSCs

J5(J-11)
✓2356 SHRI PRAKASH CHIK BARAIK:

Will the Minister of *Law and Justice* be pleased to state:

- (a) the year-wise number of pending cases under Fast Track special Courts (FTSCs) during the last five years; and
(b) the year-wise number of cases disposed during that period?

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 the information made available by the High Courts, the year-wise number of cases disposed and pending in Fast Track special Courts (FTSCs) during last five years are as under:

Calendar Year	Cases Disposed during the year (Jan. – Dec.)	Pending Cases at the end of the year
2021	36,470	1,84,943
2022	64,053	1,98,208
2023	76,349	2,02,175
2024	85,595	2,04,122
2025	66,500	2,45,579

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

RAJYA SABHA
UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 2357
ANSWERED ON-12/03/2026

APPOINTMENTS IN COURTS

JS (APPTs.)

✓ 2357 DR. JOHN BRITTAS:

Will the Minister of *Law and Justice* be pleased to state:

- (a) the sanctioned strength and vacancies of judges in High Courts and Supreme Court, as on date;
- (b) the number of proposals currently pending with Supreme Court collegium or Government;
- (c) the vacancies of judges in High Courts which are yet to be recommended by High Court collegiums to Government;
- (d) the number of women judges and judges hailing from SC, ST and OBC communities in Supreme Court and High Courts, as on date, State-wise and category-wise; and
- (e) the details of current representation of SC, ST and OBCs in the non-judicial staff of Supreme Court and High Courts, as on date, category-wise?

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) to (e): As on 06.03.2026, against the sanctioned strength of 34, 33 Judges are working in the Supreme Court of India. In High Courts, against the sanctioned strength of 1122, 810 Judges are working and 312 posts of Judges are vacant in various High Courts. Against these vacancies, 132 proposals for appointment of High Court Judges are at various stages of processing between the Government and the Supreme Court Collegium. The recommendations against 180 vacancies are yet to be received from the High Court Collegiums.

Appointment of Judges to the Supreme Court and High Courts is made under Articles 124, 217 and 224 of the Constitution of India, which do not provide for reservation for any caste or class of persons. Therefore, category-wise data pertaining to representation of any caste or class of persons among the Judges of Supreme Court and the High Courts is not centrally available. However, the Government is committed to enhancing Social Diversity and since 2018, the recommendees for the post of High Court Judges are required to provide the details of their social background in the prescribed format (prepared in consultation with the Supreme Court). Based on the information provided by the recommendees, out of 849 High Court Judges appointed since 2018 till 06.03.2026, 33 Judges belong to SC category, 17 belong to ST category and 104 Judges belong to OBC category. As on 06.03.2026, 01 woman Judge is working in the Supreme Court and 114 women Judges are working in various High Courts.

As per the Memorandum of Procedure (MoP), the responsibility for initiation of proposals for appointment of Judges in the Supreme Court vests with the Chief Justice of India, while the responsibility for initiation of proposals for appointment of Judges in High Courts vests with the Chief Justice of the concerned High Court. However, the Government is committed to enhancing social diversity in judiciary and has been requesting the Chief Justices of High Courts that while sending proposals for appointment of Judges, due consideration be given to suitable candidates belonging to Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, Other Backward Classes, Minorities and Women to ensure social diversity in the appointment of Judges in High Courts. Only those persons who are recommended by the Supreme Court Collegium, are appointed as Judges of the Supreme Court and High Courts.

Article 146(1) of the Constitution of India provides that *“Appointments of officers and servants of the Supreme Court shall be made by the Chief Justice of India or such other Judge or officer of the Court as he may direct. Provided that the President may by rule require that in such cases as may be specified in the rule, no person not already attached to the Court shall be appointed to any office connected with the Court, save after consultation with the Union Public Service Commission”*.

Also, the staff of the High Courts are to be appointed as per Rules made by the High Courts in accordance with the powers conferred by Article 229(2) of the Constitution, which provides that *“the conditions of service of officers and servants of a High Court shall be such*

as may be prescribed by rules made by the Chief Justice of the Court or by some other Judge or officer of the Court authorised by the Chief Justice to make rules for the purpose”.

The information regarding non-judicial staff in the Supreme Court and High Courts is not centrally maintained.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

RAJYA SABHA
UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 2358
ANSWERED ON – 12/03/2026

IMPROVING JUSTICE DELIVERY

JS(NM JR-1)

✓2358 DR. ASHOK KUMAR MITTAL:

Will the Minister of *Law and Justice* be pleased to state:

- (a) whether Government has assessed the impact of prolonged judicial vacancies on pendency and access to timely justice across courts and if so, the details thereof and if not, the reasons therefor;
- (b) whether existing mechanisms ensure transparency and accountability in appointments to constitutional and quasi-judicial bodies and if so, the details thereof and if not, the reasons therefor;
- (c) whether legal reforms introduced in recent years have reduced litigation burdens and if so, the details thereof and if not, the reasons therefor; and
- (d) the timelines and measurable targets to address systemic delays in the justice delivery system?

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): 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.

Appointment of Judges of the Supreme Court and High Courts is made under Articles 124, 217 and 224 of the Constitution of India and according to the procedure laid down in the Memorandum of Procedure (MoP) prepared in 1998 pursuant to the Supreme Court Judgment of October 6, 1993 (Second Judges case) read with their Advisory Opinion of October 28, 1998 (Third Judges case). As per the MoP, the responsibility for initiation of proposals for appointment of Judges in the Supreme Court vests with the Chief Justice of India, while the responsibility for initiation of proposals for

appointment of Judges in the High Courts vests with the Chief Justice of the concerned High Court, in consultation with two senior-most puisne Judges of the High Court.

Filling up of the vacancy in the higher Judiciary requires consultation and approval from various Constitutional Authorities both at State and Central level which are obtained in accordance with the MoP. The recommendations also have to be considered in the light of such other reports as may be available to the Government in respect of the names under consideration. The recommendations of the High Court Collegium, the State Governments and the Government of India are then forwarded to the Supreme Court Collegium (SCC) for advice. Only those persons whose names have been recommended by the SCC are appointed as Judges of the High Courts. Thus, the constitutional framework, the Memorandum of Procedure, multi-institutional consultations collectively act as mechanisms to ensure transparency and accountability in judicial appointments.

Further, filling up of vacant positions of the judicial officers in District and Subordinate courts is the responsibility of the High Courts and State Governments concerned. As per the Constitutional framework, in exercise of powers conferred under the proviso to Article 309 read with Articles 233 and 234 of the Constitution, the respective State Government, in consultation with the High Court, frames the rules and regulations regarding the appointment and recruitment of Judicial Officers. The Hon'ble Supreme Court vide order passed in January 2007 in the Malik Mazhar Sultan case, has inter-alia stipulated certain timelines, which are to be followed by the States and the respective High Courts for recruitment of judges in District and Subordinate Courts.

(c) & (d): The Government has 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.

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. The details of the cases disposed of in Lok Adalats from 2016 to Dec 2025 are as under:

Lok Adalat	Pre-litigative cases settled	Pending cases settled
National Lok Adalat	33,80,76,089	8,45,59,866
State Lok Adalats	39,33,548	67,03,159
Permanent Lok Adalats (cases relating to public utility service)	14,58,389	-

Further addressing systemic delays in the justice delivery system requires a structured approach and 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 which includes, inter-alia, amalgamation of latest technologies for increasing access to Justice and greater transparency under the e-Courts Mission Mode Project and supplementing of the resources of the State Governments/UTs for providing suitable infrastructure facilities for the District and Subordinate Judiciary under the Centrally Sponsored Scheme for Development of Infrastructure Facilities for Judiciary.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

RAJYA SABHA
UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 2359
ANSWERED ON – 12/03/2026

APPOINTMENT OF JUDGES

JS (APPTS.)
✓ 2359

DR. SASMIT PATRA:

SHRI MOHAMMED NADIMUL HAQUE:

Will the Minister of *Law and Justice* be pleased to state:

- (a) the number of recommendations received from the collegium for appointment and elevation of judges to the Supreme Court and High Courts during the last five years, year-wise;
- (b) the number of such recommendations cleared, returned or pending with Government, along with the average and maximum time taken at each stage of processing; and
- (c) whether any timelines have been prescribed for each stage of the appointment process and if so, the extent to which such timelines have been adhered to?

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) to (c): As on 06.03.2026, against the sanctioned strength of 1122 Judges, 810 Judges are working and 312 posts of Judges are vacant in various High Courts. Against these vacancies, 132 proposals for appointment of High Court Judges are at various stages of processing between the Government and the Supreme Court Collegium.

Appointment of Judges to the Supreme Court and High Courts is made under Articles 124, 217 and 224 of the Constitution of India and according to the procedure laid down in the Memorandum of Procedure (MoP) prepared in 1998 pursuant to the Supreme Court Judgment of October 6, 1993 (Second Judges case) read with their Advisory Opinion of October 28,

1998 (Third Judges case). As per the MoP, the responsibility for initiation of proposals for appointment of Judges in the Supreme Court vests with the Chief Justice of India, while the responsibility for initiation of proposals for appointment of Judges in the High Courts vests with the Chief Justice of the concerned High Court, in consultation with two senior-most puisne Judges of the High Court. As per the MoP, the High Courts are required to make recommendations at least 06 months before the occurrence of a vacancy. For appointments to the High Courts, the views of concerned State Government are obtained in accordance with the MoP. The recommendations also have to be considered in the light of such other reports as may be available to the Government in respect of the names under consideration. The recommendations of the High Court Collegium, the State Governments and the Government of India are then forwarded to the Supreme Court Collegium (SCC) for advice.

Appointment of Judges in the higher judiciary is a continuous, integrated and collaborative process between the executive and the judiciary. It requires consultation and approval from various Constitutional Authorities both at State and Central level. Only those persons whose names have been recommended by the SCC are appointed as Judges of the High Courts.

From 01.01.2020 till 06.03.2026, 37 Judges have been appointed to the Supreme Court and 660 Judges have been appointed to various High Courts. Further, 381 names have been remitted to the High Courts during the same period.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

RAJYA SABHA
UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 2360
ANSWERED ON - 12/03/2026

E-COURTS MISSION MODE PROJECT

JS (e-courts)
✓ 2360 SHRI NARAYANA KORAGAPPA:
SHRI MANAN KUMAR MISHRA:
SHRI ADITYA PRASAD:
SHRI GHANSHYAM TIWARI:
DR. PARMAR JASHVANTSINH SALAMSINH:
SHRI KESRIDEVSINH JHALA:

Will the Minister of *Law and Justice* be pleased to state:

- (a) the status of implementation of e-Court Mission Mode Project;
- (b) the number of operational e-courts in the country, State-wise;
- (c) the number of operational e-courts in Odisha, Rajasthan and Karnataka, district-wise; and
- (d) the details of funds released and utilized under the project, State-wise?

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): The e-Courts Mission Mode Project is being implemented in a phased manner across the country with the objective of strengthening the use of Information and Communication Technology (ICT) in the judicial system. Phase I (2011 – 2015) was primarily focused on basic computerization and internal connectivity in courts. As a result, 14,249 Courts were computerized and Local Area Network (LAN) was installed at 13,683 courts.

Phase II (2015 – 2023) focused on ICT facilitation of judicial services to citizens. The components included computer hardware, computerization of District State Legal Authority (DSLAs)/ Taluka Legal Services Committees (TLSCs), Wide Area Network (WAN) connectivity, trainings of stakeholders, establishment of eSewa Kendra, etc. An advanced CIS software, National Judicial Data Grid (NJDG) and systems for digital filing and payments were

developed, which revolutionized the way public accessed the services provided by the judiciary.

The e-Courts Project is currently in Phase III (2023-2027). During the last year, the e-Courts project has seen continued progress through expansion of e-filing, e-payments, increased adoption of virtual and hybrid hearings, digitisation of court records, strengthening of Case Information System, and enhanced public access to case information through the NJDG etc. Some key initiatives and achievements under the eCourts Project as on 31.01.2026 are as under:

- (i) Over 660.36 crore pages of court records including legacy records have been digitized across Courts to ensure faster retrieval, secure storage and seamless digital workflows.
- (ii) 30 Virtual Courts have been established to enable online adjudication of traffic challans. Virtual Courts have received 10.13 crore challans, out of which 9.05 crore were disposed and 97.72 lakh challans were paid amounting to Rs. 1002.73 crore.
- (iii) Video Conferencing Rules has been implemented in all the High Courts and District Courts.
- (iv) Video Conferencing (VC) facilities have been expanded across 3,240 court complexes and 1,272 jails. Courts have conducted over 3.97 crore hearings through video conferencing, facilitating remote hearings of undertrials, witnesses and lawyers.
- (v) Live streaming of court proceeding is operational in 11 High Courts.
- (vi) E-filing and e-payments systems have been implemented to allow online filing of cases and digital payment of court fees and fines. Approximately 1.07 crore cases have been filed through the e-filing platform and the e-payments system has processed transactions for court-fee worth Rs. 1,404 crore and fine worth Rs. 75 crore.
- (vii) NJDG provides public access to case data, statistics of courts across the country and has been upgraded with an improved dashboard, functioning as a monitoring tool, to identify, manage & reduce pendency of cases.
- (viii) Case Information System (CIS) 4.0 has been implemented in all courts, with enhanced usability, privacy safeguards and integration with national platforms such as NJDG, e-filing, virtual courts and Interoperable Criminal Justice System (ICJS).
- (ix) The S3WaaS (Secure, Scalable and Suganya Website as a Service) platform hosts 730 District Court websites, ensuring secure and accessible web infrastructure.
- (x) Real-time digital services have expanded significantly, with case updates being sent to lawyers and litigants through SMS Push and Pull (over 4 lakh SMS sent daily), email

(over 6 lakh sent daily) and the multilingual e-Courts services portal (with 35 lakh hits daily).

- (xi) The e-Courts Services mobile app (3.59 crore downloads) provides the lawyers and litigants relevant information about case status, cause lists etc.
- (xii) The JustIS app (22,133 downloads) is a management tool for the judges assisting them to effectively organise and monitor their judicial business.
- (xiii) 48 e-Sewa Kendras are functional across all High Courts and 2,396 e-Sewa Kendras across District Courts.
- (xiv) The National Service and Tracking of Electronics Processes (NSTEP) system has been implemented for electronic service and tracking of summons and notices using mobile-based and GPS-enabled delivery mechanisms. Under NSTEP, the courts have processed 7.29 crore e-processes, out of which 2.11 crore e-processes have been successfully delivered.
- (xv) Digital Courts 2.1 is a customized application for paperless Courts with facility of translation and transcription using AI. It enables judges to access all case related documents, pleadings, and evidence digitally, marking a significant leap toward a paperless court ecosystem.

(b): The details of number of operational eCourts in the country, State-wise, is at **Annexure-I**.

(c): The details of number of operational eCourts in Odisha, Rajasthan and Karnataka, District-wise, is at **Annexure-II**.

(d): The details of funds released and utilized of Phase II and Phase III under the e-Courts Project, High court-wise and year-wise, are at **Annexure-III** and **Annexure-IV** respectively. The implementing agency during Phase I was NIC (National Informatics Centre), therefore funds were not released to the High Courts.

STATEMENT REFERRED TO IN REPLY OF RAJYA SABHA UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 2360 FOR 12.03.2026 REGARDING E-COURTS MISSION MODE PROJECT

Details of number of operational eCourts in the country, state-wise:

S No	State	Total Districts	Total Court Complexes	Total Establishments
1	Andaman and Nicobar	4	4	4
2	Andhra Pradesh	13	195	368
3	Arunachal Pradesh	28	28	28
4	Assam	34	80	201
5	Bihar	38	83	268
6	Chandigarh	1	1	3
7	Chhattisgarh	25	93	204
8	Delhi	11	12	51
9	Goa	2	16	15
10	Gujarat	33	338	467
11	Haryana	22	61	158
12	Himachal Pradesh	11	53	127
13	Jammu and Kashmir	20	83	169
14	Jharkhand	24	24	132
15	Karnataka	31	206	547
16	Kerala	14	192	600
17	Ladakh	2	6	10
18	Lakshadweep	1	3	6
19	Madhya Pradesh	51	237	277
20	Maharashtra	41	510	721
21	Manipur	9	22	39
22	Meghalaya	14	18	61
23	Mizoram	3	12	26
24	Nagaland	11	12	34
25	Odisha	30	155	316
26	Puducherry	4	4	15
27	Punjab	22	68	200
28	Rajasthan	44	336	1098
29	Sikkim	6	11	34
30	Tamil Nadu	38	277	832
31	Telangana	33	125	263
32	The Dadra And Nagar Haveli And Daman And Diu	3	4	3
33	Tripura	8	21	68
34	Uttarakhand	13	92	190
35	Uttar Pradesh	74	224	584
36	West Bengal	23	92	277

Total	741	3,698	8,396
--------------	------------	--------------	--------------

(Source: eCommittee, SCI)

STATEMENT REFERRED TO IN REPLY OF RAJYA SABHA UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 2360 FOR 12.03.2026 REGARDING E-COURTS MISSION MODE PROJECT

Details of number of operational eCourts in Odisha, district-wise

S No	District	Total Establishment
1	Anugul	13
2	Balangir	15
3	Balasore	15
4	Bargarh	13
5	Bhadrak	7
6	Boudh	6
7	Cuttack	21
8	Deogarh	4
9	Dhenkanal	12
10	Gajapati	5
11	Ganjam	32
12	Jagatsinghpur	6
13	Jajpur	9
14	Jharsuguda	5
15	Kalahandi	12
16	Kandhamal	8
17	Kendrapada	8
18	Keonjhar	11
19	Khurda	11
20	Koraput	9
21	Malkangiri	5
22	Mayurbhanj	13
23	Nabarangpur	5
24	Nayagarh	12
25	Nuapada	9
26	Puri	10
27	Rayagada	10
28	Sambalpur	9
29	Sonepur	10
30	Sundargarh	11
	Total	316

(Source: eCommittee, SCI)

Details of number of operational eCourts in Rajasthan, district-wise

S No	District	Total Establishment
1	Ajmer	36
2	Alwar	39
3	Balotra	11
4	Banswara	22
5	Baran	25
6	Barmer	14
7	Beawer	15
8	Bharatpur	30
9	Bhilwara	41
10	Bikaner	27
11	Bundi	26
12	Chittorgarh	38
13	Churu	27
14	Dausa	24
15	Deeg	20
16	Dholpur	24
17	Didwana Kuchaman	20
18	Dungarpur	17
19	Ganganagar	41
20	Hanumangarh	32
21	Jaipur District	33
22	Jaipur Metro I	30
23	Jaipur Metro Ii	25
24	Jaisalmer	14
25	Jalore	19
26	Jhalawar	28
27	Jhunjhunu	30
28	Jodhpur District	20
29	Jodhpur Metro	18
30	Karauli	22
31	Khairtal Tijara	23
32	Kota	32
33	Kotputli Behror	16
34	Merta Nagaur	19
35	Pali	33
36	Phalodi	10
37	Pratapgarh	18
38	Rajsamand	24
39	Salumber	7
40	Sawai Madhopur	22
41	Sikar	36
42	Sirohi	21
43	Tonk	31

S No	District	Total Establishment
44	Udaipur	38
	Total	1098

(Source: eCommittee, SCI)

Details of number of operational eCourts in Karnataka, district-wise

S No	District	Total Establishment
1	Bagalkot	19
2	Ballari	12
3	Belagavi	41
4	Bengaluru	22
5	Bengaluru Rural	21
6	Bidar	14
7	Chamrajnagar	10
8	Chikkaballapur	14
9	Chikkamagaluru	16
10	Chitradurga	14
11	Dakshina Kannada	26
12	Davangere	14
13	Dharwad	23
14	Gadag	13
15	Hassan	21
16	Haveri	17
17	Kalaburagi	19
18	Kodagu	13
19	Kolar	13
20	Koppal	12
21	Mandya	20
22	Mysuru	28
23	Raichur	14
24	Ramanagara	12
25	Shivamogga	22
26	Tumakuru	25
27	Udupi	13
28	Uttara Kannada	22
29	Vijayanagar	13
30	Vijayapura	15
31	Yadgir	9
	Total	547

(Source: eCommittee, SCI)

STATEMENT REFERRED TO IN REPLY OF RAJYA SABHA UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 2360 FOR 12.03.2026 REGARDING E-COURTS MISSION MODE PROJECT

Details of funds released under Phase II of the e-Courts project, High court-wise and year-wise:

(Rs. in crore)

S. No.	High Court	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	Total
1	Allahabad	31.14	20.88	20.57	8.07	15.04	13.79	0.00	109.48
2	Andhra Pradesh	1.96	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.96
3	Bombay	30.39	38.25	47.22	0.52	0.00	8.86	0.00	125.24
4	Calcutta	12.14	9.17	10.72	0.13	0.00	4.93	0.00	37.09
5	Chhattisgarh	3.82	6.03	9.34	1.33	4.44	2.34	0.00	27.31
6	Delhi	5.87	5.41	8.97	3.54	0.00	3.00	0.00	26.80
7	Gauhati (Arunachal Pradesh)	0.59	4.33	1.37	2.85	0.98	1.52	1.26	12.90
8	Gauhati (Assam)	5.19	25.47	8.13	8.70	13.68	6.11	3.49	70.77
9	Gauhati (Mizoram)	0.71	3.01	2.47	0.15	0.51	0.72	0.30	7.87
10	Gauhati (Nagaland)	0.77	2.31	1.83	0.71	0.70	0.83	0.84	7.99
11	Gujarat*	11.23	18.32	29.06	10.73	0.00	3.48	0.00	72.82
12	Himachal Pradesh	1.79	3.21	4.05	0.13	0.00	2.00	0.00	11.19
13	Jammu & Kashmir and Ladakh	1.84	5.29	10.59	0.26	0.00	1.00	0.00	18.98
14	Jharkhand	3.20	5.09	2.92	4.53	5.53	2.98	0.00	24.25
15	Karnataka	11.86	17.43	22.04	0.61	9.15	4.29	0.00	65.38
16	Kerala	5.53	8.32	14.73	4.61	0.00	2.83	1.58	37.61

S. No.	High Court	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	Total
17	Madhya Pradesh	9.73	23.93	22.51	0.39	11.21	6.28	0.00	74.05
18	Madras	10.24	24.62	25.45	5.11	0.00	4.73	0.00	70.15
19	Manipur	0.53	4.24	1.19	0.65	0.61	1.30	0.76	9.27
20	Meghalaya	0.19	3.26	3.65	0.62	0.92	2.32	2.23	13.17
21	Orissa	7.57	7.71	12.70	1.59	13.46	3.37	0.00	46.41
22	Patna	8.04	26.41	8.72	0.13	7.08	5.44	0.00	55.82
23	Punjab & Haryana	11.63	17.92	11.54	8.49	0.00	4.55	0.00	54.13
24	Rajasthan	9.97	23.04	25.05	3.01	1.29	10.58	1.62	74.56
25	Sikkim	0.18	1.80	1.40	0.80	1.61	1.01	0.77	7.58
26	Telangana & Andhra Pradesh**	13.90	14.31	33.95	8.13	0.00	0.00	0.00	70.29
27	Telangana	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.79	0.00	1.79
28	Tripura	1.20	4.38	2.86	1.77	2.24	4.44	0.96	17.86
29	Uttarakhand	2.98	2.66	4.60	0.13	0.00	1.28	0.00	11.65
Total (in Cr.)		202.23	326.79	347.65	77.71	88.44	107.74	13.81	1164.37

* Gujarat High Court surrendered Rs.13.12 Cr. Total utilization included surrendered funds.

** Funds released to erstwhile Andhra Pradesh and Telangana High Court; shared in the ratio of 58:42 respectively.

Note: In addition to the funds released to High Courts, Rs 180.57 crore were released to NIC for providing technical support, Rs 293.68 crore to BSNL for WAN (Wide Area Network) connectivity, Rs 13.50 crore to eCommittee, SCI under Change Management and Rs 16.31 crore for miscellaneous expenditure (salary, office expenses, publicity, etc).

STATEMENT REFERRED TO IN REPLY OF RAJYA SABHA UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 2360 FOR 12.03.2026 REGARDING E-COURTS MISSION MODE PROJECT

Details of funds released under Phase III of the e-Courts project, High court-wise and year-wise:

(Rs. in crore)

S. No.	High Court	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26
1	Allahabad	95.87	51.78	119.92
2	Andhra Pradesh	25.44	31.74	18
3	Bombay	69.54	83.19	104.32
4	Calcutta	16.73	27.65	9.50
5	Chhattisgarh	16.27	24.17	49.74
6	Delhi	17.89	48.19	17.90
7	Gauhati (Arunachal Pradesh)	2.03	9.76	2.26
8	Gauhati (Assam)	24.97	33.85	3.65
9	Gauhati (Mizoram)	3.12	6.22	2.48
10	Gauhati, Kohima (Nagaland)	1.79	3.91	3.41
11	Gujarat	27.72	73.21	48.89
12	Himachal Pradesh	6.06	6.89	7.63
13	Jammu & Kashmir and Ladakh	6.52	14.53	14.48
14	Jharkhand	10.59	29.22	7.65
15	Karnataka	32.37	67.40	48.22
16	Kerala	15.40	32.62	51.60
17	Madhya Pradesh	22.90	77.31	59.14
18	Madras	90.69	91.75	113.20
19	Manipur	11.12	7.54	2.16
20	Meghalaya	3.33	8.50	3.83
21	Orissa	6.77	53.24	16.09
22	Patna	32.43	89.55	57.61
23	Punjab And Haryana	14.58	26.01	18.95
24	Rajasthan	19.80	34.72	60.88
25	Sikkim	1.71	8.98	2.51

S. No.	High Court	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26
26	Telangana	22.03	28.57	29.44
27	Tripura	0.53	7.05	8.79
28	Uttarakhand	13.68	19.95	29.57
	Total	611.88	997.49	911.82*

** As on 03.03.2026*

Note: In addition to the funds released to High Courts, Rs. 185.06 crore have been released to NIC for providing technical support, Rs 54.79 crore to BSNL for WAN (Wide Area Network) connectivity, Rs 7.51 crore to eCommittee, SCI under Change Management, Rs 0.28 crore to IIT Madras for development of e-Learning platform, and Rs 9.60 crore for miscellaneous expenditure (salary, office expenses, publicity, etc).

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

RAJYA SABHA
UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 2361
ANSWERED ON 12/03/2026

IMPROVING EFFICIENCY OF JUDICIARY

JS(NMTR-1)

✓ 2361 # SHRI SANJAY KUMAR JHA:

Will the Minister of *Law and Justice* be pleased to state:

- (a) whether Government has taken any new initiatives to improve the efficiency of judiciary and speedy disposal of cases:
- (b) whether the judicial process has been expedited and simplified through the digital justice system (e-courts) and if so, the details thereof; and
- (c) whether these efforts have increased the transparency and accessibility of the justice delivery system and if so, the details thereof?

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): Disposal of cases pending in various courts lies within the domain of the judiciary. No fixed time frame has been prescribed for disposal of various kinds of cases by the respective courts. Timely disposal of cases in courts depends on several factors which, inter-alia, include 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, litigants and proper application of rules and procedures. However, the Government is fully committed for speedy disposal of cases and reducing pendency as mandated under Article 21 of the Constitution. The Government has taken several initiatives to provide an ecosystem for faster disposal of cases by the judiciary which, inter-alia, includes amalgamation of latest technologies for increasing access to justice and greater transparency under the e-Courts Mission Mode Project and supplementing of the resources of the State Governments/UTs for providing suitable infrastructure facilities for the District and Subordinate Judiciary under the Centrally Sponsored Scheme for Development of Infrastructure Facilities for Judiciary.

(b) & (c): The Digital Justice System under the e-Courts Mission Mode Project has expedited and simplified judicial processes and has also improved transparency and accessibility in the justice delivery system. The details are as follows:

Phase I, initiated in 2011 with an outlay of ₹935 crore, primarily focused on establishing the foundational digital infrastructure of the judiciary. It achieved computerization of 14,249 District and Subordinate Courts, installation of Local Area Network (LAN) in 13,683 courts, and software enablement of 13,672 courts for digital case management, video conferencing facilities in 493 courts and 347 jails.

Building upon this groundwork, Phase II, implemented from 2015 to 2023 with an outlay of ₹1,670 crore, expanded the scope from basic computerization to providing citizen-centric digital services. The number of computerized courts rose to 18,735, representing a 31.5% increase over Phase I. Video conferencing facilities expanded more than fivefold, covering 3,240 courts (a 557% increase) and 1,272 jails (a 266% increase), reflecting the growing reliance on digital hearings. WAN connectivity reached 99.5% of court complexes, ensuring robust network access. This phase also saw the introduction of key platforms such as the Free and Open-Source Case Information System (CIS), the National Judicial Data Grid (NJDG) as a transparent online repository of case data, and the establishment of eSewaKendras to provide front-end facilitation services to citizens and lawyers.

The Government has demonstrated its commitment in modernizing judiciary with advanced digital infrastructure by significantly increasing the budget of Phase III (2023–2027) to ₹7,210 crore. This phase envisions transforming Indian courts into Digital and Paperless Courts by digitizing legacy and current case records, expanding video conferencing to all courts, jails, and hospitals, and extending online courts beyond traffic violations. It also aims for universal saturation of eSewaKendras, creation of a state-of-the-art cloud-based data repository for storing digitized court records and applications, and deployment of emerging technologies such as Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Optical Character Recognition (OCR) for case analysis and forecasting.

Currently, over 660.36 crore pages of court records have been digitized, and 2,444 eSewaKendras have been established to enhance citizen service delivery. Courts have conducted over 3.97 crore hearings through video conferencing facilities. Approximately 1.07 cr. cases have been filed electronically through the eFiling platform. Live streaming of court proceedings has expanded to four additional High Courts, Uttarakhand, Calcutta, Telangana, and Meghalaya, making it 11. All eCourts portals are now hosted on the NIC's cloud infrastructure, and district court websites have been migrated to the Secure, Scalable, and Sugamya Website as a Service (S3WAAS) platform.

Further, the Case Information System (CIS) has been upgraded to version 4.0, introducing enhanced objectivity, transparency, and speed in case management. Advanced AI-based tools are

being integrated into judicial workflows, such as the AI/ML-enabled defect identification module developed by the Supreme Court in collaboration with IIT Madras, and the Legal Research and Analysis Assistant (LegRAA) developed by NIC's Centre of Excellence under the guidance of the eCommittee. The Digital Courts platform enables judges to access all case-related documents, pleadings, and evidence digitally, marking a significant leap toward a paperless court ecosystem.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

RAJYA SABHA
STARRED QUESTION NO. 289
ANSWERED ON – 19/03/2026

JS(e-courts)

USE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN LEGAL SYSTEM

✓ 289 DR. KANIMOZHI NVN SOMU:

Will the Minister of *Law and Justice* be pleased to state:

- (a) whether Government proposes to integrate Artificial Intelligence (AI) into judiciary and law enforcement in the country;
- (b) if so, whether any special policies or guidelines are being prepared for use of ethical AI in legal system and if so, the details thereof;
- (c) the manner in which AI is being utilized to reduce the pendency of cases in Indian courts and improve their working efficiency; and
- (d) the manner in which the law enforcement agencies would ensure accountability and transparency in the use of AI technologies?

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) to (d): A statement is laid on the Table of the House.

STATEMENT REFERRED TO IN REPLY TO PARTS (a) TO (d) IN RESPECT OF RAJYA SABHA STARRED QUESTION NO. 289 FOR REPLY ON 19.03.2026 REGARDING 'USE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN LEGAL SYSTEM'

(a) to (d): Artificial Intelligence (AI) is being integrated in the judiciary and law enforcement systems in the country to support data-driven processes and improve efficiency in the criminal justice system. The Inter-Operable Criminal Justice System (ICJS) project, based on the principle of 'one data one entry', aims to achieve seamless information exchange across all the pillars of criminal justice system and digitally link the databases of police (CCTNS), e-Courts, e-Prisons and e-Prosecution and e-Forensics. Data between the Case Information System (CIS) under e-Courts and other pillars of ICJS are shared within the ambit of data sharing matrix approved by the eCommittee of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India.

As part of the National e-Governance Plan, Phase-III of the eCourts Mission Mode project is under implementation for Information and Communication Technology (ICT) enablement of courts and to enhance the judicial productivity, both qualitatively & quantitatively, making the justice delivery system accessible, cost effective, reliable and transparent. Under this project, Rs. 53.57 crore have been earmarked for the component "Future Technological Advancements" to integrate modern technologies for smoother user experience.

To explore the use of AI in judicial domain, the Supreme Court of India constituted an AI Committee, which is responsible for conceptualizing, implementing and monitoring use of AI in the judiciary. However, no formal policy or guidelines exist for adopting AI tools in judicial processes, as AI-based solutions remain in the controlled pilot phase and authorities use AI only within the areas approved in the DPR of eCourts Phase III. Besides, formulation and regulation of operational frameworks in this regard will be governed by the rules of business and policies of the concerned High Courts.

The Supreme Court of India in collaboration with IIT Madras is testing the prototypes of AI and ML tools for curing document defects, meta data extraction and integration with the electronic filing module and the case management software, namely Integrated Case Management & Information System (ICMIS). An AI based tool called Legal Research Analysis Assistant [LegRAA] has been developed to aid judges in legal research and document analysis. Another AI based tool called Digital Courts 2.1 has been developed to assist Judges and Judicial Officers in managing the court in paperless manner by providing a single window for all case-related information and tasks. The platform includes voice-to-text (ASR-SHRUTI) and translation (PANINI) functionalities to assist the judges with order and judgment dictation.

Judiciary is aware that integrating AI into judicial processes poses key challenges such as algorithmic bias, language and translation issues, data privacy and security concerns, and the need for manual verification of AI-generated outputs. Both LegRAA and Digital Courts 2.1 take care of the issues of data privacy and ethical safeguards by using Court's own data i.e. judgments and orders passed by the Supreme Court, High Courts and District Courts. Further, these tools are to be made available internally to judicial officers, thereby ensuring data privacy. In addition, the eCommittee, Supreme Court of India has formed a Sub-Committee of six High Court judges with technical experts to recommend secure connectivity and authentication mechanism for data and privacy protection, assess the digital infrastructure and service delivery systems under the eCourts Project to strengthen data security.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

RAJYA SABHA
UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 3113
ANSWERED ON – 19/03/2026

PENDENCY OF CASES

JSC(NMJR-I)
✓ 3113 DR. SASMIT PATRA:

Will the Minister of *Law and Justice* be pleased to state:

- (a) the number of cases pending in the Supreme Court, High Courts and District/Subordinate Courts as on date, State-wise and court-wise and the number of cases pending for more than five years;
- (b) the vacancies of judges at each level and the steps taken to fill them up;
- (c) the measures undertaken to reduce pendency, including e-courts, virtual hearings, fast-track courts and ADR mechanisms;
- (d) the allocation and utilization of funds for judicial infrastructure; and
- (e) whether any time-bound roadmap has been prepared for reducing the pendency substantially and the details thereof?

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): The number of cases pending in the Supreme Court, High Courts and District/ Subordinate Courts as on date, State-wise and court-wise and the number of cases pending for more than five years are at **Annexure I & II**.

(b): The vacancies of judges at each level, as on 13.03.2026 are as under:

Sl. No.	Court	Vacancy Position
1.	Supreme Court	1
2.	High Courts	316
3.	District & Subordinate Courts	4,887

Appointment of Judges of the Supreme Court and High Courts is made under Articles 124, 217 and 224 of the Constitution of India and according to the procedure laid down in the Memorandum of Procedure (MoP) prepared in 1998 pursuant to the Supreme Court Judgment of October 6, 1993 (Second Judges case) read with their Advisory Opinion of October 28, 1998 (Third Judges case). As per the MoP, the responsibility for initiation of proposals for appointment of Judges in the Supreme Court vests with the Chief Justice of India, while the responsibility for initiation of proposals for appointment of Judges in the High Courts vests with

the Chief Justice of the concerned High Court, in consultation with two senior-most puisne Judges of the High Court.

Filling up of the vacancy in the higher Judiciary is a continuous, integrated and collaborative process between the executive and the judiciary. It requires consultation and approval from various Constitutional Authorities both at State and Central level which are obtained in accordance with the MoP. The recommendations also have to be considered in the light of such other reports as may be available to the Government in respect of the names under consideration. The recommendations of the High Court Collegium, the State Governments and the Government of India are then forwarded to the Supreme Court Collegium (SCC) for advice. Only those persons whose names have been recommended by the SCC are appointed as Judges of the High Courts.

Further, filling up of vacant positions of the judicial officers in District and Subordinate courts is the responsibility of the High Courts and State Governments concerned. As per the Constitutional framework, in exercise of powers conferred under the proviso to Article 309 read with Articles 233 and 234 of the Constitution, the respective State Government, in consultation with the High Court, frames the rules and regulations regarding the appointment and recruitment of Judicial Officers. The Hon'ble Supreme Court vide order passed in January 2007 in the Malik Mazhar Sultan case, has inter-alia stipulated certain timelines, which are to be followed by the States and the respective High Courts for recruitment of judges in District and Subordinate Courts.

(c) to (e): 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 staff etc. However, 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 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 date, 660.36 crores pages of court records have been digitized in the High Courts and District Courts. More than 3.97 crore hearings have taken place through Video conferencing and live streaming is functional in several High Courts. The number of e Sewa Kendras (facilitation centres) has increased to 2,444 across High Courts and District Courts.
- ii. Under the Centrally Sponsored Scheme namely Fast Track Special Courts (FTSCs) Scheme, 774 Fast Track Special Courts (FTSCs) including 398 exclusive POCSO (ePOCSO) Courts are functional across 29 States/UTs for the expeditious disposal of pending cases of Rape and POCSO Act, and have collectively disposed of 3,71,849 cases since their inception, as on 31.12.2025. The financial outlay under the scheme is Rs. 1952.23 crore with Rs. 1207.24 crore as Central Share to be incurred from Nirbhaya Fund on the CSS pattern. The Central Government, as on 05.03.2026, has released a total amount of Rs. 1,210.92 crore to States/UTs for the operationalization of FTSCs since the inception of the Scheme in 2019.
- iii. 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. The details of the cases disposed of in Lok Adalats from 2016 to January 2026 are as under:

Lok Adalat	Pre-litigative cases settled	Pending cases settled	Total
National Lok Adalat	33,80,76,089	8,45,59,866	42,26,35,955
State Lok Adalats	39,40,715	67,10,194	1,06,50,909
Permanent Lok Adalats (cases relating to public utility service)	14,64,728	-	14,64,728

- iv. The primary responsibility for the development of infrastructure facilities for District and Subordinate Courts in the States/UTs, rests with the State/UT Governments. However, to augment the resources of the State /UT Governments, the Union Government has been implementing a Centrally Sponsored Scheme for the Development of Infrastructure Facilities for District and Subordinate Courts by providing financial assistance to the State/UT Governments in the prescribed fund sharing between Center and States since 1993-94. As on 28.02.2026, Rs. 770.53 crore were allocated and Rs. 629.66 crore were utilized for judicial infrastructure development across the country.

ANNEXURE-I**STATEMENT REFERRED TO IN REPLY TO PART (A) OF RAJYA SABHA UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 3113 FOR ANSWER ON 19.03.2026 REGARDING 'PENDENCY OF CASES'**

Number of cases pending, as on 13.03.2026, and the number of cases pending for more than five years, in the Supreme Court and High Courts			
		Pendency as on 13.03.2026	Cases pending for more than 5 years
Supreme Court of India		92,621	24,445
Sl No.	Name of the High Court		
1	Allahabad High Court	12,26,147	7,33,395
2	Bombay High Court	6,65,758	3,46,741
3	Calcutta High Court	2,04,445	1,11,239
4	Gauhati High Court	64,502	24,358
5	High Court for State of Telangana	2,36,590	1,03,050
6	High Court Of Chhattisgarh	75,994	25,151
7	High Court Of Rajasthan	6,73,553	2,93,502
8	High Court of Andhra Pradesh	2,48,934	1,16,331
9	High Court of Delhi	1,26,290	45,592
10	High Court of Gujarat	1,74,091	71,973
11	High Court of Himachal Pradesh	1,04,133	40,527
12	High Court of Jammu and Kashmir	43,314	13,930
13	High Court of Jharkhand	72,905	30,458
14	High Court of Karnataka	3,31,680	78,843
15	High Court of Kerala	2,47,671	1,07,493
16	High Court of Madhya Pradesh	4,78,434	2,55,972
17	High Court of Manipur	6,042	1,094
18	High Court of Meghalaya	1,785	100
19	High Court of Punjab and Haryana	4,20,452	2,34,216
20	High Court of Sikkim	297	16
21	High Court of Tripura	1,388	6
22	High Court of Uttarakhand	60,859	22,891
23	Madras High Court	5,53,854	2,05,621
24	Orissa High Court	1,63,591	69,359
25	Patna High Court	2,18,181	91,084
	Total	64,00,890	30,22,942

Source: National Judicial Data Grid (NJDG)

ANNEXURE-II**STATEMENT REFERRED TO IN REPLY TO PART (A) OF RAJYA SABHA UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 3113 FOR ANSWER ON 19.03.2026 REGARDING 'PENDENCY OF CASES'**

Number of cases pending, as on 13.03.2026, and the number of cases pending for more than five years, in the District & Subordinate Courts			
Sl No.	State/UT	Pendency as on 13.03.2026	Cases pending for more than 5 years
1	Andaman and Nicobar	8,627	4,254
2	Andhra Pradesh	9,76,082	1,54,956
3	Arunachal Pradesh	15,719	4,327
4	Assam	5,78,555	68,130
5	Bihar	37,19,519	20,85,650
6	Chandigarh	1,01,946	6,478
7	Chhattisgarh	5,16,848	43,774
8	Delhi	16,02,441	2,79,489
9	Goa	62,025	17,109
10	Gujarat	20,69,656	2,58,773
11	Haryana	15,46,857	2,21,443
12	Himachal Pradesh	6,23,427	81,154
13	Jammu and Kashmir	3,52,201	82,675
14	Jharkhand	5,73,546	1,62,249
15	Karnataka	24,36,610	4,28,675
16	Kerala	18,00,628	3,53,933
17	Ladakh	1,629	110
18	Lakshadweep	557	97
19	Madhya Pradesh	21,22,639	3,92,365
20	Maharashtra	60,60,201	17,42,851
21	Manipur	14,139	3,201
22	Meghalaya	16,671	5,810
23	Mizoram	7,343	545
24	Nagaland	3,940	1,129
25	Odisha	18,20,475	7,46,383
26	Puducherry	36,414	8,499
27	Punjab	9,77,912	65,405
28	Rajasthan	27,17,617	7,00,519
29	Sikkim	2,284	40
30	Tamil Nadu	17,63,798	2,78,994
31	Telangana	9,91,205	1,69,772
32	The Dadra And Nagar Haveli And Daman And Diu	8,359	1,770
33	Tripura	67,190	4,206
34	Uttar Pradesh	1,21,37,452	48,66,682
35	Uttarakhand	3,13,735	55,687
36	West Bengal	39,08,587	15,09,157
	Total	4,99,56,834	1,48,06,291

Source: National Judicial Data Grid (NJDG)

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

RAJYA SABHA
UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 3152
ANSWERED ON – 19/03/2026

CASES RECUSED BY JUDGES

JSCMMJR-I)
✓3152 SHRI SANJAY YADAV:

Will the Minister of *Law and Justice* be pleased to state:

- (a) the number of cases recused by HCs/SC's judges during the last five years and the reasons for those recusals;
- (b) whether seeking reasons for recusals is good for transparency, accountability and integrity of judiciary; and
- (c) if so, whether Government plans to frame any specific or formal rules governing recusals by judges?

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) to (c): Data related to number of cases recused by High Court/Supreme Court judges is not maintained by the Government. Case management procedures including recusal by judges fall within the domain of judiciary and reasons for recusal, if any, are recorded in the court proceedings.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

RAJYA SABHA
UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 3153
ANSWERED ON – 19/03/2026

PENDENCY OF CASES IN HIGHER JUDICIARY

✓3153 SHRI A. A. RAHIM:

Will the Minister of *Law and Justice* be pleased to state:

- (a) the number of pending cases in the Supreme Court and each High Court as on date, during the last five years, year-wise;
- (b) the number of civil and criminal cases pending separately in each of these courts;
- (c) whether the Ministry has identified specific reasons for the rise in judicial pendency, including vacancies of judges; and
- (d) the measures being taken to reduce pendency and ensure timely disposal of cases in the higher judiciary?

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): The number of pending cases in the Supreme Court and each High Court as on 09.03.2026, during the last five years, year-wise is at **Annexure I**.

(b): The number of civil and criminal cases pending in Supreme Court and High Courts, as on 09.03.2026, is at **Annexure-II**.

(c) & (d): Pendency of cases in courts arise due to several factors besides availability of adequate number of Judges and Judicial officers. These 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.

However, the Government is fully committed for speedy disposal of cases and reducing pendency as mandated under Article 21 of the Constitution. The Government has taken several initiatives to provide an ecosystem for faster disposal of cases by the judiciary which, inter-alia, includes amalgamation of latest technologies for increasing access to justice and greater transparency under the e-Courts Mission Mode Project and supplementing of the resources of the State Governments/UTs for providing suitable infrastructure facilities for the District and Subordinate Judiciary under the Centrally Sponsored Scheme for Development of Infrastructure Facilities for Judiciary.

Filling up of the vacancy in the higher Judiciary is a continuous, integrated and collaborative process between the executive and the judiciary. It requires consultation and approval from various Constitutional Authorities both at State and Central level which are obtained in accordance with the MoP. The recommendations also have to be considered in the light of such other reports as may be available to the Government in respect of the names under consideration. The recommendations of the High Court Collegium, the State Governments and the Government of India are then forwarded to the Supreme Court Collegium (SCC) for advice. Only those persons whose names have been recommended by the SCC are appointed as Judges of the High Courts.

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 28.02.2026, 72 Judges have been appointed in the Supreme Court. 1164 new Judges were appointed and 820 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.

ANNEXURE-I

**TATEMENT REFERRED TO IN REPLY TO PART (A) OF RAJYA SABHA UNSTARRED QUESTION
O. 3153 FOR ANSWER ON 19.03.2026 REGARDING 'PENDENCY OF CASES IN HIGHER JUDICIARY'**

Number of cases pending in the Supreme Court and each High Court, during the last five years, year-wise							
		2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	As on 09.03.2026
Supreme Court		70,239	78,797	80,674	82,496	92,101	92,755
Sr No.	High Court						
1	Allahabad High Court	10,24,931	10,34,695	10,66,874	11,39,915	12,18,984	11,93,346
2	Bombay High Court	5,91,536	6,36,907	6,67,961	6,95,578	6,64,979	6,62,050
3	Calcutta High Court	2,29,563	2,14,903	2,01,489	2,03,782	2,05,591	204633
4	Gauhati High Court	55,281	57,977	60,471	61,685	63,886	64,509
5	High Court for State of Telangana	2,40,314	2,37,872	2,31,980	2,30,343	2,33,834	2,36,507
6	High Court of Andhra Pradesh	2,22,637	2,40,375	2,47,901	2,45,735	2,49,088	2,48,859
7	High Court Of Chhattisgarh	81,613	91,714	90,518	84,629	76,337	75,351
8	High Court of Delhi	1,02,025	1,06,050	1,13,368	1,18,662	1,24,951	1,25,962
9	High Court of Gujarat	1,54,698	1,61,422	1,67,273	1,71,238	1,75,605	1,74,540
10	High Court of Himachal Pradesh	76,218	82,660	88,326	93,881	1,02,361	1,04,118
11	High Court of Jammu and Kashmir	47,371	43,575	42,934	43,296	43,039	43,190
12	High Court of Jharkhand	88,721	87,904	85,736	74,353	72,192	73,159
13	High Court of Karnataka	2,49,451	2,67,541	2,84,694	2,98,662	3,28,599	3,31,109
14	High Court of Kerala	2,28,019	2,41,902	2,54,878	2,51,150	2,50,602	2,47,718
15	High Court of Madhya Pradesh	4,11,909	4,33,447	4,49,347	4,66,125	4,80,537	4,78,761
16	High Court of Manipur	4,230	4,254	4,663	5,282	5,793	6,031
17	High Court of Meghalaya	1,581	1,183	1,124	1,252	1,739	1,783
18	High Court of Punjab and Haryana	4,52,548	4,49,860	4,44,200	4,34,641	4,23,466	4,21,054
19	High Court Of Rajasthan	5,42,658	5,93,601	6,00,434	6,16,341	6,82,725	6,71,842
20	High Court of Sikkim	180	164	180	207	272	296
21	High Court of Tripura	1,771	1,616	1,280	1,056	1,429	1,389
22	High Court of Uttarakhand	41,463	45,100	50,399	55,629	59,682	60,827
23	Madras High Court	5,99,825	5,86,964	5,74,292	5,59,584	5,46,285	5,53,144
24	Orissa High Court	1,93,123	1,59,578	1,46,540	1,45,205	1,58,915	1,63,527
25	Patna High Court	2,26,757	2,12,870	1,97,465	2,02,249	2,19,639	2,17,635
	Total	58,68,423	59,94,134	60,74,327	62,00,480	63,90,530	63,61,340

Source: National Judicial Data Grid

ANNEXURE-II**STATEMENT REFERRED TO IN REPLY TO PART (B) OF RAJYA SABHA UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 3153 FOR ANSWER ON 19.03.2026 REGARDING 'PENDENCY OF CASES IN HIGHER JUDICIARY'**

No. of civil and criminal cases pending in Supreme Court of India and High Courts				
		Civil	Criminal	Total
Supreme Court of India		73,056	19,699	92,755
S. No.	Name of High Court			
1	Allahabad High Court	6,17,265	5,76,081	11,93,346
2	Bombay High Court	5,46,634	1,15,416	6,62,050
3	Calcutta High Court	172454	32179	204633
4	Gauhati High Court	47,555	16,954	64,509
5	High Court for State of Telangana	2,04,131	32,376	2,36,507
6	High Court of Andhra Pradesh	2,06,581	42,278	2,48,859
7	High Court Of Chhattisgarh	52,888	22,463	75,351
8	High Court of Delhi	93,069	32,893	1,25,962
9	High Court of Gujarat	1,16,691	57,849	1,74,540
10	High Court of Himachal Pradesh	90,576	13,542	1,04,118
11	High Court of Jammu and Kashmir	33,869	9,321	43,190
12	High Court of Jharkhand	32,269	40,890	73,159
13	High Court of Karnataka	2,74,093	57,016	3,31,109
14	High Court of Kerala	2,00,587	47,131	2,47,718
15	High Court of Madhya Pradesh	2,83,994	1,94,767	4,78,761
16	High Court of Manipur	51,40	891	6,031
17	High Court of Meghalaya	1,351	432	1,783
18	High Court of Punjab and Haryana	2,55,401	1,65,653	4,21,054
19	High Court of Rajasthan	4,79,427	1,92,415	6,71,842
20	High Court of Sikkim	208	88	296
21	High Court of Tripura	1,106	283	1,389
22	High Court of Uttarakhand	33,735	27,092	60,827
23	Madras High Court	4,77,589	75,555	5,53,144
24	Orissa High Court	1,22,040	41,487	1,63,527
25	Patna High Court	1,14,535	1,03,100	2,17,635
Total		44,63,188	18,98,152	63,61,340

Source: National Judicial Data Grid

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

RAJYA SABHA
UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 3154
ANSWERED ON – 19/03/2026

COMPLAINTS RECEIVED AGAINST JUDGES

JSC (APPHS)
✓ 3154. SHRI P. WILSON:

Will the Minister of *Law and Justice* be pleased to state:

- (a) the details of complaints received against Judges since 2021, including the names of Judges concerned, nature of complaints and the action taken or status thereof, year-wise;
- (b) the internal procedure and mechanism adopted by the Supreme Court of India for receiving, examining and disposing of such complaints, the authorities involved and the year-wise number of complaints received and disposed of since 2021; and
- (c) the details of recommendations made by the Supreme Court Collegium that have been pending with Government for more than one year, including the names of recommended candidates, the dates of recommendation and the reasons for delay?

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) to (c): Independence of Judiciary is enshrined in the Constitution of India. The complaints received against Judges and Chief Justices of the High Courts are handled by the judiciary through an “in-house mechanism”. The Supreme Court of India, on 7th May, 1997, adopted two Resolutions namely (i) "The Restatement of Values of Judicial Life" which lays down certain judicial standards and principles to be observed and followed by the Judges of the Supreme Court and High Courts and (ii) "In-house procedure" for taking suitable remedial measure against Judges who do not follow the universally accepted values of judicial life including those in the Restatement of values of Judicial Life. As per the established “In-house procedure” for the Higher Judiciary, the Chief Justice of India is competent to receive

complaints against Judges of the Supreme Court and Chief Justices of the High Courts. Similarly, the Chief Justices of the High Courts are competent to receive complaints against the conduct of High Court Judges.

Filling up of the vacancy in the higher Judiciary is a continuous, integrated and collaborative process between the executive and the judiciary. As per the Memorandum of Procedure (MoP) prepared in 1998 pursuant to the Supreme Court Judgment of October 6, 1993 (Second Judges case) read with their Advisory Opinion of October 28, 1998 (Third Judges case), the responsibility for initiation of proposals for appointment of Judges in the Supreme Court vests with the Chief Justice of India, while the responsibility for initiation of proposals for appointment of Judges in the High Courts vests with the Chief Justice of the concerned High Court, in consultation with two senior-most puisne Judges of the High Court. As per the MoP, the High Courts are required to make recommendations at least 06 months before the occurrence of a vacancy. However, this time limit is rarely observed. For appointments to the High Courts, the views of concerned State Government are obtained in accordance with the MoP. The recommendations also have to be considered in the light of such other reports as may be available to the Government in respect of the names under consideration. The recommendations of the High Court Collegium, the State Governments and the Government of India are then forwarded to the Supreme Court Collegium (SCC) for advice. Only those persons whose names have been recommended by the SCC are appointed as Judges of the High Courts.

Through this continuous, integrated and collaborative process between the executive and the judiciary, 157 Judges were appointed in various High Courts during 2025.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

RAJYA SABHA
UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 3155
ANSWERED ON - 19/03/2026

USE OF AI IN LEGAL FARMWORK

JSle-Lawts)
✓3155 SHRI C. VE. SHANMUGAM:

Will the Minister of *Law and Justice* be pleased to state:

- (a) whether Government is aware that AI is being used in the legal framework to dispose of the cases quickly;
- (b) if so, the details thereof, including the guidelines for use of ethical AI in the legal system;
- (c) the manner in which AI is being used to reduce the pendency of cases and improve efficiency of courts in the country;
- (d) whether challenges are being faced in implementing AI in the legal system; and
- (e) if so, the details thereof and the strategy being adopted by Government to address the same?

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) to (e): As part of the National eGovernance Plan, Phase-III of the eCourts Mission Mode project is being implemented for Information and Communication Technology (ICT) enablement of the judiciary to make the justice delivery system accessible, cost effective, reliable and transparent.

Under eCourts Project Phase III, an amount of Rs. 53.57 crore has been earmarked for the component "Future Technological Advancements" to integrate modern technologies like Artificial Intelligence (AI) etc. for smoother user experience. An AI based software tool called Legal Research Analysis Assistant [LegRAA] has been developed to aid judges in legal research and document analysis. Another AI based tool called Digital Courts 2.1 has been designed to assist Hon'ble Judges and Judicial Officers by providing a single window for managing all case-related information and tasks. The platform includes voice-to-text (ASR-

SHRUTI) and translation (PANINI) functionalities to assist the judges with order and judgment dictation. At present, in the pilot phase of AI based solutions, the eCommittee of the Supreme Court of India reports no systemic bias, unintended content, or other issues.

The Supreme Court of India has constituted Artificial Intelligence Committee to explore the use of AI in the judicial domain. However, no formal policy or guidelines exist for adopting AI tools in judicial processes, as AI-based solutions remain in the controlled pilot phase and authorities use AI only within the areas approved in the DPR of eCourts Phase III. Besides, formulation and regulation of operational frameworks in this regard will be governed by the rules of Business and policies of the concerned High Courts.

Judiciary is aware that integrating AI into judicial processes poses key challenges such as algorithmic bias, language and translation issues, data privacy and security concerns. Both LegRAA and Digital Courts 2.1 take care of the issues of data privacy and ethical safeguards by using Court's own data i.e. judgments and orders passed by the Supreme Court, High Courts and District Courts. Further, these tools are to be made available internally to judicial officers, thereby ensuring data privacy. In addition, the eCommittee, Supreme Court of India has formed a Sub-Committee of six High Court judges with technical experts to recommend secure connectivity and authentication mechanism for data and privacy protection, assess the digital infrastructure and service delivery systems under the eCourts Project to strengthen data security.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

RAJYA SABHA
UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 3156
ANSWERED ON – 19/03/2026

JSLLAPJ

DENIAL OF LEGAL REPRESENTATION

✓3156 SHRI DORJEE TSHERING LEPCHA:

Will the Minister of *Law and Justice* be pleased to state:

- (a) whether Government is aware that tribal and women litigants often face denial of legal representation when their case is against the family members of an advocate registered in the same Bar Association, resulting in refusal by local advocates to accept the brief;
- (b) whether such situations amount to denial of access to justice despite the availability of legal aid provisions;
- (c) whether there exists any mechanism under the Legal Services Authorities framework to provide independent legal aid counsel from outside the concerned district or State; and
- (d) the steps taken/proposed to ensure impartial legal representation to vulnerable litigants in such circumstances?

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) to (d): The National Legal Services Authority (NALSA) was constituted under the Legal Services Authorities (LSA) Act, 1987 to provide free and competent legal services to the weaker sections of the society including the beneficiaries covered under Section 12 of the LSA Act, 1987, which aims to ensure that the opportunities for securing justice are not denied to any citizen by reason of economic or other disabilities. In addition, NALSA has also formulated various schemes for the implementation of preventive and strategic legal service programmes, which are implemented by the Legal Services Authorities at various levels i.e. State, District and Taluka level.

NALSA has not come across the situation of denial of providing legal services to an eligible person. However, details of the persons under the category Women, SC and ST

benefited through legal services under Section 12 of the Legal Services Authorities (LSA) Act, 1987 during the last three financial years are as follows: -

Year	SC	ST	Women
2023-24	1,07,673	1,00,823	2,83,738
2024-25	1,29,402	1,28,440	3,16,151
2025-26 (upto January, 2026)	1,22,198	1,21,986	3,41,473

There is no bar that an advocate should be on the panel of a District Legal Services Authority (DLSA) from the same bar association. The National Legal Services Authority (Free and Competent Legal Services) Regulations, 2010 provides a robust framework for selection process of legal practitioners as panel lawyers, the process of removal of panel lawyers, monitoring and evaluating the quality and progress of legal aid services through constitution of Monitoring and Mentoring Committees (MMCs) within all the legal services institutions, viz. Supreme Court Legal Services Committee (SCLSC), High Court Legal Services Committees (HCLSCs), State Legal Services Authorities (SLSAs), District Legal Services Authorities (DLSAs) and Taluk Legal Services Committees (TLSCs).

As per Regulation 7(6) of the aforesaid Regulations, "In case the Member-Secretary or Secretary of the Legal Services Institution decides to provide legal services through a panel lawyer, the choice of the panel lawyer, if expressed by the applicant, may be considered". As per Regulation 8(15), "If a panel lawyer is desirous of withdrawing from a case, he shall state the reasons thereof to the Member-Secretary or the Secretary, as the case may be, and the panel lawyer may be permitted to do so by an order". As per Regulations 8(17), "If the panel lawyer engaged is not performing satisfactorily or has acted contrary to the object and spirit of the Act and these regulations, the Legal Services Institution shall take appropriate steps including withdrawal of the case from such lawyer and his removal from the panel". As per Regulation 11(5) and 11(8) of aforesaid Regulations, MMCs shall maintain a register for legal aid cases for monitoring the day-to-day progress of each case and the end results (success or failure) in respect of cases for which legal aid is allowed. This register is scrutinized every month by the Member Secretary or Secretary or Chairman, as the case may be and if the progress of the case is not satisfactory, the Committee may advise the Legal Services Institution to take appropriate steps.

This continuous follow up mechanism ensures accountability, transparency, and quality control in delivery of legal services to vulnerable litigants.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

RAJYA SABHA
UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 3157
ANSWERED ON – 19/03/2026

ESTABLISHING BENCHES OF ODISHA HIGH COURT

JS (APPTS.)

✓ 3157 SMT. SULATA DEO:

Will the Minister of *Law and Justice* be pleased to state:

- (a) whether Government proposes to establish additional benches of Odisha High Court in Western or Southern regions of the State; and
- (b) if so, the details thereof and if not, the reasons therefor?

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): The High Court Benches are established in accordance with the recommendations made by the Jaswant Singh Commission and judgment pronounced by the Apex Court in W.P. (C) No. 379 of 2000 and after due consideration of a complete proposal from the State Government, consenting to meet necessary expenditure and provide infrastructural facilities, along with the consent of the Chief Justice of the concerned High Court who is required to look after the day-to-day administration of the High Court. The proposal should also have the consent of the Governor of the concerned State.

At present, there is no complete proposal pending with the Government of India to establish additional benches of the Orissa High Court in Western or Southern regions of Odisha.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

RAJYA SABHA
UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 3158
ANSWERED ON – 19/03/2026

JS(J-I)

USE OF LOCAL LANGUAGE IN HIGH COURTS

✓3158 # SHRI GOVINDBHAI LALJIBHAI DHOLAKIA:

Will the Minister of *Law and Justice* be pleased to state:

- (a) whether Hindi is permitted for arguments and delivery of judgments in High Courts of several Hindi-speaking States; and
- (b) whether proposals from several States, including Gujarat, regarding use of local official language in High Courts are under consideration for approval?

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): The use of Hindi is permitted in the proceedings of the High Courts of Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, and Bihar. However, under the provisions of the Official Languages Act, 1963, any judgment, decree, or order delivered in a language other than English must be accompanied by an authorized English translation issued under the authority of the respective High Court.

(b): Government of India had received proposals from the Government of Tamil Nadu, Gujarat, Chhattisgarh, West Bengal and Karnataka to permit use of Tamil, Gujarati, Hindi, Bengali and Kannada in the proceedings of the Madras High Court, Gujarat High Court, Chhattisgarh High Court, Calcutta High Court and Karnataka High Court respectively. As per the decision of the Cabinet Committee dated 21 May 1965, the consent of the Hon'ble Chief Justice of India is required for any proposal relating to the use of a language other than English in High Courts. Accordingly, the advice of Chief Justice of India was sought on these proposals and it was

intimated that the Full Court of the Supreme Court after due deliberations, decided not to accept the proposals. A similar proposal received from the State government of Jharkhand regarding authorization of use of Hindi in the proceedings of Jharkhand High Court has been sent to the Chief Justice of India.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

RAJYA SABHA
UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 3159
ANSWERED ON - 19/03/2026

E-SEVA KENDRAS

JS(e-Courts)
✓3159 SHRI UJJWAL DEORAO NIKAM:
SHRI MAYANKKUMAR NAYAK:
DR. PARMAR JASHVANTSINH SALAMSINH:
DR. BHAGWAT KARAD:
SHRI ASHOKRAO SHANKARRAO CHAVAN:
DR. MEDHA VISHRAM KULKARNI:
SHRI BABUBHAI JESANGBHAI DESAI:
SHRI SADANAND MHALU SHET TANAVADE:
SHRI LAHAR SINGH SIROYA:

Will the Minister of *Law and Justice* be pleased to state:

- (a) the salient features of e-Seva Kendras;
- (b) the details of achievements made thereunder, so far;
- (c) the details of facilities being provided through such Kendras;
- (d) the details of such Kendras set up by Government, State wise, so far; and
- (e) the details of funds sanctioned, allocated and utilised for setting up such Kendras in States and UTs including the target set in this regard?

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) to (c): e-Sewa Kendras have been established under the eCourts Mission Mode Project as a One-Stop Digital Centre for the common litigant /advocates to cater to their eCourt related digital needs. The salient features of e-Sewa Kendras and facilities provided are as under:

- (i) Serve as facilitation centres established in the court complexes to bridge the digital divide for litigants and advocates and provide guided assistance for accessing the various online

services under the eCourts ecosystem, ensuring that citizens who lack adequate digital resources are not excluded.

- (ii) Facilitate adoption of e-filing, online payments (i.e. e-payment of court fees, fines and penalties), and virtual court services across all High Court jurisdictions including support for these services such as assistance with scanning of documents etc.
- (iii) Assist citizens in obtaining case status, cause lists, orders and judgments available on the eCourts portal and assist litigants and advocates during court hearings conducted through video conferencing.
- (iv) Provide guidance on free legal services available from the District Legal Services Authority and High Court Legal Services Committee.
- (v) Enable litigants and advocates to access various digital judicial services without requiring advanced technological resources or digital literacy.
- (vi) Act as an effective bridge between the judiciary and those sections of the population who do not possess adequate digital infrastructure, thereby advancing the eCourts Phase-III objective of 'access and inclusion'.

(d): e-Sewa Kendras have been established in the jurisdictions of all High Courts, covering District and Subordinate Courts across the States and Union Territories. e-Sewa Kendras are functional in all 28 High Court jurisdictions, with a total of 2,444 centres operational (48 in High Courts and 2,396 in District Courts). The State/UT-wise details of eSewa Kendras as on 31.01.2026 are at **Annexure – I**.

(e): Under eCourts Project Phase III, provision has been made for establishment of e-Sewa Kendras across court complexes with a financial outlay of ₹394.48 crore and a target of establishing centres in approximately 4,400 court complexes across the country. Funds are released to all High Courts on the recommendation of eCommittee, Supreme Court of India. A total of ₹257.35 crore has been sanctioned and ₹169.56 crore has been utilised as on date under the eCourts project for establishing e-Sewa Kendras across all States and UTs.

STATEMENT REFERRED TO IN REPLY OF RAJYA SABHA UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 3159 FOR 19.03.2026 REGARDING E-SEVA KENDRAS**Status of implementation of e-Sewa Kendras as on 31.01.2026:**

S. No.	High Court	Functioning e-Sewa Kendras in High Courts (A)	Functioning e-Sewa Kendras in District Courts (B)	Total (A+B)
1	Allahabad	2	111	113
2	Andhra Pradesh	4	34	38
3	Bombay	3	351	354
4	Calcutta	1	44	45
5	Chhattisgarh	1	23	24
6	Delhi	1	13	14
7	Gauhati – Arunachal Pradesh	1	29	30
8	Gauhati – Assam	2	78	80
9	Gauhati – Mizoram	1	8	9
10	Gauhati – Nagaland	1	11	12
11	Gujarat	1	195	196
12	Himachal Pradesh	1	22	23
13	Jammu & Kashmir	2	25	27
14	Jharkhand	2	62	64
15	Karnataka	3	75	78
16	Kerala	1	161	162
17	Madhya Pradesh	3	229	232
18	Madras	7	310	317
19	Manipur	1	21	22
20	Meghalaya	1	16	17
21	Orissa	1	183	184
22	Patna	1	92	93
23	Punjab & Haryana	1	123	124
24	Rajasthan	2	17	19
25	Sikkim	1	10	11
26	Telangana	1	98	99
27	Tripura	1	16	17
28	Uttarakhand	1	39	40
	Total	48	2396	2444

Source: eCommittee, Supreme Court of India.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

RAJYA SABHA
UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 3160
ANSWERED ON – 19/03/2026

EXPANSION OF COURT INFRASTRUCTURE

✓3160 SMT. GEETA ALIAS CHANDRAPRABHA:

Will the Minister of *Law and Justice* be pleased to state:

- (a) whether the Centrally Sponsored Scheme for Development of Judicial Infrastructure has contributed to the expansion of court facilities, modernization and digital enablement of courts across the country;
- (b) if so, the details of funds allocated, released and actually utilised in Uttar Pradesh under this scheme during the last three years, district-wise particularly for Auraiya; and
- (c) the steps taken to further strengthen judicial infrastructure, enhance digital facilities and improve access to justice in the State, particularly in districts like Auraiya?

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) to (c): The primary responsibility for development of infrastructure facilities for District and Subordinate Courts rests with the State Governments/UTs. However, to augment the resources of States/UTs, Central Government has been implementing a Centrally Sponsored Scheme (CSS) for the Development of Infrastructure Facilities for Judiciary in the District and Subordinate Courts since 1993-94, by providing financial assistance in the prescribed fund sharing pattern between the Centre and States/UTs. The Scheme covers five components, namely, Court Halls, Residential Units for Judicial Officers, Lawyers' Halls, Toilet Complexes and Digital Computer Rooms. The Scheme has contributed to the expansion and modernization of the court infrastructure across the country. From 15,818 Court Halls and 10,211 Residential Units in the year 2014, there has been an increase of 43.58% and 96.37% in the number of available Court Halls (22,712) and Residential Units (20,052) respectively as on 28.2.2026.

Details of funds allocated and utilized in the State of Uttar Pradesh (including the district of Auraiya) during for the last three years under the Scheme are as under:-

Financial Year	Allocated	Released	Utilized
2023-24	102.96	102.96	102.96
2024-25	174.12	174.12	174.12
2025-26 (as on 28.02.2026)	36.05	35.42	35.42

(Rs. in crore)

Effective monitoring mechanism are in place for time bound and sustainable infrastructure developments in the States/UTs. The States/UTs are required to geo-tag the on-going projects in real time and reflect it on Nyaya Vikas Portal, which is an online monitoring system developed with the technical assistance of National Remote Sensing Centre / ISRO for collection of data on progress and time bound completion of judicial infrastructure projects.

For digitization of the Courts, the e-Courts Mission Mode Project is being implemented in a phased manner across the country. Objective of the eCourts Project is to strengthen the use of Information and Communication Technology (ICT) in the judicial system. The Project is being implemented in close coordination with the eCommittee, Supreme Court of India. The interventions under the eCourts project have enhanced efficiency in the justice delivery system by improving case management, e-filing, hearing through video conferencing, real-time monitoring of pendency and disposal, facilitating faster service of processes etc. The adoption of digital platforms, data analytics and interoperable systems is contributing to better utilisation of judicial resources, faster resolution of disputes and improved access to justice for litigants.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

RAJYA SABHA
UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 3161
ANSWERED ON – 19/03/2026

TSCNMJR-I

STRENGTHENING DELIVERY OF JUSTICE

✓3161 DR. AJEET MADHAVRAO GOPCHADE:

Will the Minister of *Law and Justice* be pleased to state:

- (a) whether the Ministry has taken any action on the representation submitted for studying the legislations of Belize and Ireland aimed at ensuring timely delivery of justice and whether relevant legal insights or best practices from these jurisdictions have been examined for adoption;
- (b) whether Government has received any representation or proposal specifically focused on guaranteeing timely justice in the country; and
- (c) if so, the details thereof and the concrete steps taken or proposed to address this critical issue?

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): The Government from time to time receives representations and suggestions from various stakeholders regarding measures for ensuring timely delivery of justice and improving the efficiency of the justice delivery system. Such suggestions, including proposals relating to studying international best practices, are examined in consultation with the concerned stakeholders.

After extensive consultations and consideration of suggestions received from various stakeholders, three Bills, namely, the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita Bill, 2023, the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita 2023, and the Bharatiya Sakshya Adhinyam Bill, 2023, were passed by both the Houses of Parliament, assented to by the Hon'ble President of India and notified in the Gazette of India on 25th December 2023. The new Criminal Laws have come into force from 1st July, 2024. Details of provisions made in new criminal laws for expediting judicial process are as follows:-

- (1) **Faster and Fair Resolution:** The new laws promise a faster and fair resolution of cases, instilling confidence in the legal system. Crucial stages of investigation and trial like preliminary enquiry, further investigation, supply of document to the victim and accused, commitment of a case for trial, filing of discharge applications, framing of charges and pronouncement of judgment have been streamlined.

- (2) **Fast-Track Investigations:** The new laws prioritize the investigations for offences against women and children, ensuring timely completion.
- (3) **Adjournments:** Streamlined to avoid unnecessary delays in case hearings, ensuring timely justice delivery.
- (4) To significantly improve the speed, efficiency and transparency of the judicial process, applications like e-Summons, e-Sakshya and Nyaya-Shruti (VC) have been developed.

(c): The Government has taken several steps to strengthen the justice delivery system and reduce delays in courts. These include implementation of the e-Courts Mission Mode Project for digitization and technological enablement of courts, promotion of Alternative Dispute Resolution mechanisms, establishment of Fast Track Special Courts for expeditious trial of cases relating to rape and offences under the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012, and encouragement to States and High Courts for filling up vacancies in the subordinate judiciary.

Further, initiatives such as pre-institution mediation under the Commercial Courts Act, 2015, conduct of Lok Adalats under the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987, strengthening of legal aid through the Legal Aid Defense Counsel System, and expansion of digital services including e-filing, video conferencing and online case information systems are also being implemented to enhance access to justice and ensure timely disposal of cases.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

RAJYA SABHA
STARRED QUESTION NO. 411
ANSWERED ON - 02/04/2026

JUDICIAL INFRASTRUCTURE IN UTTAR PRADESH

JS(NMTR-11)

✓411 SHRI SANJAY SETH:

Will the Minister of *Law and Justice* be pleased to state:

- (a) the progress achieved in constructing modern, state-of-the-art subordinate court complexes and residential quarters for judicial officers in Uttar Pradesh;
- (b) whether the Centrally Sponsored Scheme (CSS) for judicial infrastructure has successfully reduced space constraints in the district courts of the State;
- (c) the details of central funds released and utilized by the State Government during 2025-26;
- (d) the details of integration of modern amenities, including dedicated witness protection rooms and childcare facilities, in new complexes; and
- (e) the steps taken to ensure 100 per cent uninterrupted power and high-speed internet connectivity for virtual hearings across all the courts in the State?

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

STATEMENT REFERRED TO IN REPLY TO PARTS (A) TO (E) IN RESPECT OF RAJYA SABHA STARRED QUESTION No. 411 FOR REPLY ON 02.04.2026 REGARDING “JUDICIAL INFRASTRUCTURE IN UTTAR PRADESH”.

(a) to (e): The primary responsibility for development of infrastructure facilities for District and Subordinate Courts rests with the State Governments/UTs. However, to augment the resources of States/UTs, Central Government has been implementing a Centrally Sponsored Scheme (CSS) for the Development of Infrastructure Facilities for Judiciary in the District and Subordinate Courts since 1993-94, by providing financial assistance in the prescribed fund sharing pattern between the Centre and States/UTs. The fund sharing pattern for the State of Uttar Pradesh is 60:40. The Scheme covers five components, namely, Court Halls, Residential Units for Judicial Officers, Lawyers' Halls, Toilet Complexes and Digital Computer Rooms. The Scheme has contributed to the expansion and modernization of the court infrastructure across the country. From 1535 Court Halls and 1111 Residential Units in the year 2014, there has been an increase of 90.94% and 127.18% in the number of available Court Halls (2931) and Residential Units (2524) respectively as on 28.2.2026. In the year 2025-26 funds to the tune of Rs.36.05 crore has been released to the State of Uttar Pradesh and that has been fully utilised by the State Government.

The norms and specifications of court infrastructure have been calculated based on recommendations of the National Court Management Systems Committee (NCMS) of the Supreme Court in the Baseline Report on Court Development Planning System, existing norms and practice being followed by State Governments concerned and CPWD/PWD norms. The planning and design of a court room is done by the building/infrastructure committees of the respective High Courts. Specific aspect regarding modern amenities, including dedicated witness protection rooms and childcare facilities, in new court complexes at the district level are issues within the domain of the respective State Governments and the concerned High Courts, which exercise supervisory jurisdiction over District Courts. As per information provided by the High Court of Allahabad, state-of-art Integrated Court Complexes have been established in six (06) Districts.

The internet connectivity for virtual hearings across all the courts in the country is covered under the e-Courts Project. As per information provided by the High Court of Allahabad, all court complexes in the State of Uttar Pradesh are equipped with high speed internet connectivity through a combination of Fibre To The Home (FTTH), Multiprotocol Label Switching (MPLS) and Internet Leased Line (ILL) networks. This hybrid model has ensured network redundancy and operational continuity, particularly during virtual hearings.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

RAJYA SABHA
STARRED QUESTION NO. 414
ANSWERED ON - 02/04/2026

ENFORCEMENT OF VIRTUAL COURTS AND HYBRID HEARINGS

JS(e-courts)

414. SHRI VIVEK K. TANKHA:

Will the Minister of *Law and Justice* be pleased to state:

- (a) in view of significant public expenditure on e-Courts and video-conferencing (VC) infrastructure and binding Supreme Court directions mandating VC/hybrid hearings, whether steps are taken to ensure uniform implementation across all the courts;
- (b) the reasons why High Courts continue to follow divergent and restrictive VC practices despite the mandate;
- (c) the details of measures being taken to ensure assured uptime, technical quality and litigant confidence;
- (d) the reasons why fragmented High Court-wise vendor contracts are permitted, defeating interoperability and economies of scale; and
- (e) the details of systemic deficiencies flagged by the Bar and litigants which are being addressed and within what timelines?

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

STATEMENT REFERRED TO IN REPLY TO PARTS (a) TO (e) IN RESPECT OF RAJYA SABHA STARRED QUESTION NO. 414 FOR REPLY ON 02.04.2026 REGARDING 'ENFORCEMENT OF VIRTUAL COURTS AND HYBRID HEARINGS'

(a) to (e): The e-Courts Mission Mode Project is being implemented in a phased manner across the country with the objective of strengthening the use of Information and Communication Technology (ICT) in the judicial system. The eCommittee, Supreme Court of India is the governing body that oversees the eCourts project and provides policy planning, strategic direction and guidance to the project for effective implementation of all components. The Chief Justice of India is the Patron-in-Chief of the eCommittee and currently, it is chaired by the second senior most judge of the Supreme Court of India.

During Phase I of the project, video conferencing (VC) facility was operationalized between 493 court complexes and 347 corresponding jails. Under Phase II, VC facilities were enabled between 3240 court complexes and corresponding 1272 jails. Under Phase III, Rs. 228.48 crore have been earmarked for enhancing and upgrading the available VC infrastructure in various establishments, including courts, jail and hospitals. Virtual hearings enhance access to justice by enabling lawyers, litigants and witnesses to participate remotely, saving time and costs, especially for those in remote locations. A total of 4.01 crore VC hearings were conducted in High Courts and District Courts till 28.02.2026.

To ensure uniform, effective and secure use of VC facilities, the Supreme Court formulated 'Model Rules for Video Conferencing for Courts' which were implemented in all the High Courts and District Courts. Thereafter, revised model 'Video Conferencing (Nyaya Shruti) Rules 2025' were formulated by the National Judicial Academy and approved by the Supreme Court. These rules were circulated amongst all High Courts for adoption. Currently, 21 High Courts have notified the Nyaya Shruti Rules to ensure uniform implementation of VC facilities and minimise divergent practices. While these model rules were issued to promote uniformity, the modalities governing VC and hybrid hearings are framed by the respective High Courts in exercise of their administrative powers, which may lead to procedural variations based on local requirements.

Under Phase-III of eCourts project, emphasis has been placed on strengthening bandwidth, improving platform stability and providing technical support to enhance uptime, service quality and litigant confidence. To strengthen VC capabilities across courts, 99.5% sites have been connected through Wide Area Network (WAN) with 10 Mbps to 100 Mbps bandwidth speed.

As informed by the eCommittee, Supreme Court of India, the procurement for VC infrastructure is carried out in accordance with applicable rules of the High Courts. The issues flagged by the Bar and litigants are periodically reviewed by the eCommittee in consultation with High Courts and corrective measures are implemented in a phased manner as per approved project timelines. Further, functioning of VC facilities is an administrative matter which falls strictly within the purview and domain of the High Courts and Central Government has no direct role to play in the matter.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE
DEPARTMENT OF LEGAL AFFAIRS

RAJYA SABHA
UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 4437
ANSWERED ON - 02/04/2026

e-NOTARISATION

4437. SHRI MASTHAN RAO YADAV BEEDHA:

Will the Minister of *Law and Justice* be pleased to state:

- (a) whether Government proposes to establish uniform standards and integrated legal framework for e-notarisation platforms nationwide, following court acceptance of digital notarisation and if so, the details thereof;
- (b) the details of any consultations or expert committees formed to assess security, authenticity and interoperability of e-notarised documents across States and courts;
- (c) the timeline and roadmap for amending existing laws and rules to legally recognise e-notarisation in all the jurisdictions; and
- (d) the measures envisaged for public awareness, training and safeguards against misuse or forgery in digital notarisation processes?

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): No such proposal is under consideration.

(b) to (d): Does not arise.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

RAJYA SABHA
UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 4438
ANSWERED ON - 02/04/2026

UNDERTRIAL PRISONERS

JS(LAP)

✓4438. SHRI MALLIKARJUN KHARGE:

Will the Minister of *Law and Justice* be pleased to state:

- (a) the number of undertrial prisoners currently lodged in jails across the country who have been awaiting trial or bail for one to two years, two to five years and more than five years, State/UT-wise;
- (b) whether aggregate data on pendency of bail applications across courts is maintained through the National Judicial Data Grid (NJDG) or any other mechanism and if so, the details of average time taken for disposal of bail applications, category-wise; and
- (c) the measures being undertaken by Government to assist courts in reducing prolonged undertrial detention?

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): National Crime Records Bureau (NCRB) compiles prison statistics reported to it by the States and Union Territories (UTs) and publishes the same in its annual publication "Prison Statistics India". As per the latest published data for the year 2023, State/UT wise number of undertrial prisoners confined for one to two years, two to five years and more than five years in the jails of the country as on 31.12.2023 are attached as **Annexure - A**. These data are readily available on National Crime Records Bureau website: <https://www.ncrb.gov.in/uploads/files/PSI-20231.pdf>.
- (b) and (c): 'Prisons and Prisoners' is a State-list subject under Entry 4 of List II of the Seventh Schedule to the Constitution of India. Therefore, the administration and management of prisons and prisoners is the responsibility of respective State Governments. Central Government has also been supplementing the efforts of State Governments in this regard.

Government is implementing a Scheme named "Support to Poor Prisoners". The guidelines and SOP for implementation of the Scheme, has provision for bail assistance amounting upto Rs. 1 lakh, prescribing timelines for case processing, and simplification of procedures for drawal and utilisation of funds. For implementation of the Scheme, the Ministry of Home Affairs (MHA) had provided an annual financial outlay of Rs. 20 crore for three financial years i.e. 2023-24, 2024-25 and 2025-26.

Further, National Legal Services Authority (NALSA) has taken initiatives for establishment of Under Trial Review Committees (UTRCs) in all the districts to recommend for release of eligible undertrial prisoners and convicts. Quarterly meetings are held by UTRCs across the country. The numbers of undertrial prisoners recommended by UTRCs and released during last three years are as under:

Year	No. of UTPs/ Convicts recommended for bail/ release	No. of inmates released pursuant to UTRCs recommendations
2023	73,274	34,232
2024	53,594	25,982
2025	40,434	22,523
Total	1,67,302	82,737

In addition to the above, Government has taken initiatives to operationalize bail reforms for reducing the number of undertrial prisoners in the country. Section 479 (1) of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS) provides that *"Where a person has, during the period of investigation, inquiry or trial under this Sanhita of an offence under any law (not being an offence for which the punishment of death or life imprisonment has been specified as one of the punishments under that law) undergone detention for a period extending up to one-half of the maximum period of imprisonment specified for that offence under that law, he shall be released by the Court on bail."*

The Proviso under Section 479 (1) of the BNSS provides further relief to first time offenders/undertrial prisoners and provides that *"where such person is a first-time offender (who has never been convicted of any offence in the past), he shall be released on bond by the Court, if he has undergone detention for the period extending up to one-third of the maximum period of imprisonment specified for such offence under that law"*.

Data on pendency of bail applications and its disposal across courts is not maintained through the National Judicial Data Grid (NJDG).

STATEMENT REFERRED TO IN REPLY TO RAJYA SABHA UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 4438 FOR ANSWER ON 02.04.2026 REGARDING 'UNDERTRIAL PRISONERS'.

The details of State/UT wise number of Undertrial Prisoners with duration of Confinement as on 31 st December, 2023				
Sl. No.	State/UT	1 to 2 Years	2 to 5 Years	Above 5 Years
1	Andman & Nicobar Islands	6	25	2
2	Andhra Pradesh	208	146	3
3	Arunachal Pradesh	25	20	3
4	Assam	682	561	147
5	Bihar	4,446	3,549	296
6	Chandigarh	112	70	9
7	Chhattisgarh	2,265	1,354	44
8	Delhi	2,503	2,442	497
9	Dadra & Nagar Haveli and Daman & Diu	23	40	10
10	Goa	99	172	22
11	Gujarat	1,712	1,870	464
12	Haryana	2,742	2,264	416
13	Himachal Pradesh	291	364	57
14	Jammu & Kashmir	827	1,388	275
15	Jharkhand	1,944	2,002	481
16	Karnataka	1,834	1,674	226
17	Kerala	248	100	8
18	Ladakh	12	7	2
19	Lakshadweep	0	0	0
20	Madhya Pradesh	3,573	2,735	115
21	Maharashtra	4,978	7,436	2,213
22	Manipur	107	37	18
23	Meghalaya	110	131	24
24	Mizoram	200	42	0
25	Nagaland	43	24	12
26	Odisha	1,963	1,961	414
27	Puducherry	43	21	0
28	Punjab	5,076	3,518	183
29	Rajasthan	2,520	3,025	464
30	Sikkim	35	21	0
31	Tamil Nadu	999	392	46
32	Telangana	141	82	9
33	Tripura	39	5	0
34	Uttar Pradesh	10,283	12,003	2,639
35	Uttarakhand	672	763	48
36	West Bengal	3,894	4,363	1,245
	Total	54,655	54,607	10,392

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE
DEPARTMENT OF LEGAL AFFAIRS

RAJYA SABHA
UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 4440
ANSWERED ON – 02/04/2026

IMPLEMENTATION OF RESERVATION PROVISIONS

4440. SHRI HARSH MAHAJAN:

Will the Minister of *Law and Justice* be pleased to state:

(a) whether reservation provisions for Scheduled Castes (SC), Scheduled Tribes (ST) and Other Backward Classes (OBC) are being implemented in the various departments/attached institutions under the Ministry;

(b) if so, the category-wise/institution-wise details regarding the total number of posts reserved for SC, ST and OBC categories in these institutions, the posts filled and those remaining vacant;

(c) whether Government is considering implementing any special drive or policy to expedite the filling of posts reserved for these categories; and

(d) if so, the details thereof and the progress made in this direction so far?

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) and (b): The reservation provisions for Scheduled Castes (SC), Scheduled Tribes (ST) and Other Backward Classes (OBC) are being implemented in the Department and its attached institutions. The category-wise/institution-wise details regarding the total number of posts reserved for SC, ST and OBC categories, the posts filled and those remaining vacant, are as under :

Department of Legal Affairs (including Law Commission of India)

Group	Total Number of reserved posts			No. of posts filled			No. of Posts vacant		
	SC	ST	OBC	SC	ST	OBC	SC	ST	OBC
Group 'A'	07	05	08	01	00	02	06	05	06
Group 'B'	08	03	09	03	02	06	05	01	03
Group 'C'	43	22	77	34	02	31	09	20	46

Note: Additionally, there are 4 officers belonging to SC category and 10 officers belonging to OBC category, presently serving in the Indian Legal Service (ILS), whose appointment in the Indian Legal Service, either through promotion or through direct recruitment, was against reserved vacancies.

Legislative Department

Group	Total Number of reserved posts			No. of posts filled			No. of Posts vacant		
	SC	ST	OBC	SC	ST	OBC	SC	ST	OBC
Group 'A'	07	06	19	03	04	14	04	02	05
Group 'B'	06	06	14	04	03	08	02	03	06
Group 'C'	08	04	12	07	02	09	01	02	03

Department of Justice

There is no direct recruitment in the Department of Justice. The employees in the Department are posted by the respective Cadre Controlling Authorities.

Income Tax Appellate Tribunal (ITAT)

Group	Total Number of reserved posts			No. of posts filled			No. of Posts vacant		
	SC	ST	OBC	SC	ST	OBC	SC	ST	OBC
Group 'A'	22	11	39	11	02	17	11	09	22
Group 'B'	31	12	30	25	04	26	06	08	04
Group 'C'	91	44	130	83	35	114	08	09	16

Indian Law Institute (ILI)

Group	Total Number of reserved posts			No. of posts filled			No. of Posts vacant		
	SC	ST	OBC	SC	ST	OBC	SC	ST	OBC
Group 'A'	01	00	02	00	00	00	01	00	02
Group 'B'	03	01	06	01	00	00	02	01	06
Group 'C'	06	03	11	01	01	02	05	02	09

- **(c) and (d):** Necessary action is taken on a continuous basis to fill up reserved vacancies through regular recruitment/promotion, as applicable, per extant instructions and in compliance with DoP&T guidelines.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

RAJYA SABHA
UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 4441
ANSWERED ON - 02/04/2026

RESERVATION AND REPRESENTATION IN JUDICIARY

JS (APPHS)

✓ 4441. SHRI HARSH MAHAJAN:

Will the Minister of *Law and Justice* be pleased to state:

- (a) whether there is any provision of reservation for Scheduled Castes (SC), Scheduled Tribes (ST) and Other Backward Classes (OBC) in the appointment of judges in various courts of the country such as the Supreme Court, High Courts, District and Sessions Courts etc.;
- (b) if so, the court-wise percentage of reservation prescribed for these categories;
- (c) if not, the reasons therefor; and
- (d) whether Government is considering introducing any policy or special measures to enhance social diversity and representation of these categories in the judiciary?

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) to (d): Appointment of Judges to the Supreme Court and High Courts is made under Articles 124, 217 and 224 of the Constitution of India, which do not provide for reservation for any caste or class of persons. Therefore, category-wise data pertaining to representation of Scheduled Castes (SCs), Scheduled Tribes (STs) and Other Backward Classes (OBCs) among the Judges of High Courts are not centrally

maintained. However, since 2018, the recommendees for the post of High Court Judges are required to provide details regarding their social background in the prescribed format (prepared in consultation with the Supreme Court). Accordingly, as per the information provided by the recommendees, out of 849 High Court Judges appointed since 2018, 33 belong to SC category, 17 belong to ST category and 104 belong to OBC category.

As per the Memorandum of Procedure (MoP), the responsibility for initiation of proposals for appointment of Judges in the Supreme Court vests with the Chief Justice of India, while the responsibility for initiation of proposals for appointment of Judges in the High Courts vests with the Chief Justice of the concerned High Court. However, the Government has been requesting the Chief Justices of High Courts that while sending proposals for appointment of Judges, due consideration be given to suitable candidates belonging to Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, Other Backward Classes, Minorities and Women to ensure social diversity in the appointment of Judges in High Courts. Only those persons, who are recommended by the Supreme Court Collegium, are appointed as Judges of the Supreme Court and High Courts.

As far as appointment of judicial officers in District and Subordinate Courts is concerned, under Article 235 of the Constitution of India, the administrative control over the members of district and subordinate judiciary in the States vests with the concerned High Court. In exercise of powers conferred under proviso to Article 309 read with Articles 233 and 234 of the Constitution, the respective State Governments, in consultation with the High Court, frame the Rules and Regulations regarding the issue of appointment, promotion, reservations and retirement of Judicial Officers in the State Judicial Service.

The number of Judicial Officers from the Scheduled Caste, Scheduled Tribe and Other Backward Classes communities serving in various District and Subordinate Courts is not centrally maintained.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

RAJYA SABHA
UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 4442
ANSWERED ON - 02/04/2026

LEGAL AID SERVICES IN HARYANA

JS(LAP)

✓4442. SMT. REKHA SHARMA:

Will the Minister of *Law and Justice* be pleased to state:

- (a) the steps taken to improve legal aid services in Haryana;
- (b) the number of beneficiaries under NALSA scheme; and
- (c) the details of awareness programmes conducted?

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) to (c): The National Legal Services Authority (NALSA) was constituted under the Legal Services Authorities (LSA) Act, 1987 to provide free and competent legal services to the weaker sections of the society including the beneficiaries covered under Section 12 of the LSA Act, 1987, which aims to ensure that the opportunities for securing justice are not denied to any citizen by reason of economic or other disabilities. In addition, NALSA has also formulated various schemes for the implementation of preventive and strategic legal service programmes, which are implemented by the Legal Services Authorities at various levels i.e. State, District and Taluka level.

Under the provision of Section 6 of the LSA Act, 1987, Haryana State Legal Services Authority (HALSA) has been constituted by the State Government. As per Section 7 of the LSA Act,

“(1) It shall be the duty of the State Authority to give to effect to the policy and directions of the Central Authority.

(2) Without prejudice to the generality of the functions referred to in subsection(1), the State Authority shall perform all or any of the following functions, namely:—

(a) give legal service to persons who satisfy the criteria laid down under this Act;

(b) conduct Lok Adalats, including Lok Adalats for High Court cases;

(c) undertake preventive and strategic legal aid programmes; and

(d) perform such other functions as the State Authority may, in consultation with the Central Authority, fix by regulations.”

HALSA has undertaken several proactive and result-oriented steps to improve legal aid services in Haryana with a focus on accessibility, efficiency and outreach. HALSA has strengthened access to legal aid through digital and telephonic initiatives, including the introduction of an online web portal of NALSA for filing and processing legal aid applications and the operationalization of dedicated helpline number (15100), manned by advocates and retainer lawyers, to provide immediate advice and assistance. During the year 2025, 9.01 lakh persons were benefitted through legal services under the various Schemes framed by NALSA under the LSA Act, 1987.

During the year 2025, HALSA has expended its outreach and legal awareness initiatives by organising legal literacy camps, awareness programmes and state-wide campaign, particularly targeting marginalised and vulnerable sections of society, including women, prisoners and rural communities. HALSA has developed and disseminated various awareness videos featuring eminent personalities and celebrities, making legal awareness more relatable and impactful for the general public. HALSA has conducted 34,325 legal awareness programmes in 2025 to make people aware of their entitlements as well as their duties under law.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

RAJYA SABHA
UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 4443
ANSWERED ON - 02/04/2026

JS(NMTR-1)
PENDING CASES IN LOWER COURTS IN BIHAR

✓4443. # SHRI SANJAY YADAV:

Will the Minister of *Law and Justice* be pleased to state:

- (a) the number of cases pending for more than three years in the lower courts of Bihar, the reasons therefor along with the percentage of pending cases;
- (b) the number of vacant posts of judges in those courts, the extent to which this percentage is less than the national average;
- (c) the number of judges required in lower courts, High Courts and Supreme Court and whether there is any standard for this;
- (d) the percentage of judges available in various courts per million population in the State; and
- (e) the details of steps taken by Government to deal with delays and shortage of judges?

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): As per information available on the National Judicial Data Grid (NJDG), as on 25.03.2026, the number of cases pending for more than 3 years in the lower courts of Bihar are 24,93,657, which are approximately 67% of the total pending cases in Bihar i.e. 37,11,288.

Pendency of cases in courts arise due to several factors besides availability of adequate number of Judges and Judicial officers. These 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.

(b): As per the information available on the Nyaya Vikas Portal 2.0, as on 25.03.2026, there are 364 vacant posts of judges in the subordinate courts of Bihar out of the total sanctioned strength of 2025 which is about 17.9% while at the national level 4,887 posts are vacant out of the total sanctioned strength of 25,902 posts which is 18.86%.

(c) and (d): In its 120th report (1987), the Law Commission of India recommended that the State should increase the present ratio from 10.5 Judges per million of Indian population to at least 50 Judges per million of Indian population. 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 geographical 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 the “*Rate of Disposal*” method i.e. 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 to be more pragmatic and useful.

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.

The judge-to-population ratio in the District and subordinate courts of Bihar is 19.45.

(e): Filling up of the vacancy in the higher Judiciary is a continuous, integrated and collaborative process between the executive and the judiciary. It requires consultation and approval from various Constitutional Authorities both at State and Central level which are obtained in accordance with the MoP. The recommendations also have to be considered in the light of such other reports as may be available to the Government in respect of the names under consideration. The recommendations of the High Court Collegium, the State Governments and the Government of India are then forwarded to the Supreme Court Collegium (SCC) for advice. Only those persons whose names have been recommended by the SCC are appointed as Judges of the High Courts.

Further, filling up of vacant positions of the judicial officers in District and Subordinate courts is the responsibility of the High Courts and State Governments concerned. As per the Constitutional framework, in exercise of powers conferred under the proviso to Article 309 read with Articles 233 and 234 of the Constitution, the respective State Government, in consultation with the High Court, frames the rules and regulations regarding the appointment and recruitment

of Judicial Officers. The Hon'ble Supreme Court vide order passed in January 2007 in the Malik Mazhar Sultan case, has inter-alia stipulated certain timelines, which are to be followed by the States and the respective High Courts for recruitment of judges in District and Subordinate Courts.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

RAJYA SABHA
UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 4444
ANSWERED ON - 02/04/2026

FREEZING PERIODS FOR JUDGES

JS(J-1)

✓4444. SHRI ANIL KUMAR YADAV MANDADI:

Will the Minister of *Law and Justice* be pleased to state:

- (a) whether Government is proposing to bring in legislation to prescribe freezing period for judges of High Courts/Supreme Court to join political parties, Tribunals, Quasi-Judicial Bodies, being nominated to Parliament and any Government bodies after their retirement;
- (b) if so, the details thereof; and
- (c) if not, the reasons therefor?

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) to (c): As per Article 124(7) of the Constitution, a retired Judge of the Supreme Court is prohibited from pleading or acting in any court or before any authority within the territory of India. Similarly, Article 220 of the Constitution provides that a retired Judge of a High Court shall not plead or act in any Court or before any authority in India except the Supreme Court and the other High Courts. These restrictions are rooted in principle of judicial propriety and legal ethics ensuring that a person who has held the office of a judge does not appear before authorities where they may be in a position to influence decision making.

At the same time, various Parliamentary enactments provide that the post of Chairman of Tribunal/Commission may be filled up either by appointing a sitting Judge or a person qualified to be judge of the Supreme Court/High Court or retired judge from Supreme Court, High Court or the State Judicial Services. Retired Judges constitute a valuable pool of expertise, being well versed in adjudicatory processes and the administration of justice. Accordingly,

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE
LEGISLATIVE DEPARTMENT

RAJYA SABHA
UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 4445
ANSWERED ON - 02/04/2026

HINDI NAMES OF LAWS AND ACTS

4445. SMT. RAJATHI:

Will the Minister of *Law and Justice* be pleased to state:

- (a) whether Government has conducted any impact assessment on the difficulties faced by the legal fraternity and litigants in non-Hindi speaking States due to Hindi nomenclature of recently enacted laws;
- (b) whether the Legislative Counsels of the Ministry have opined against the use of Hindi titles;
- (c) whether Government has received any representations regarding difficulties faced and exclusion of non-Hindi speaking citizens from law-making and law-implementation process; and
- (d) whether Government is aware of comments made by relevant stakeholders including the judiciary against the imposition of Hindi titles?

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) to (d): It is the prerogative of the concerned Ministry/Department of the Government administering the subject matter of a legislative proposal to decide upon the short title of a legislation. Every Ministry/Department concerned with the subject matter, generally undertakes pre-legislative consultations with all stakeholders including State Governments on subjects of Concurrent List, on its legislative proposal and takes appropriate decision in respect of the same on the basis of its policy and inputs, suggestions and feedbacks received.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

RAJYA SABHA
UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 4446
ANSWERED ON - 02/04/2026

PENDING CASES IN COURTS

JS(NMJR-1)

✓4446. # SHRI MADAN RATHORE:

Will the Minister of *Law and Justice* be pleased to state:

- (a) whether Government is taking special measures to reduce the number of pending cases in courts;
- (b) the number of pending cases at present, High Court-wise, including Rajasthan;
- (c) the reforms undertaken to expedite judicial processes; and
- (d) whether any new scheme is in place for digitization of courts?

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): The disposal of the cases is within the exclusive domain of judiciary. However, the Government is fully committed for speedy disposal of cases and reducing pendency as mandated under Article 21 of the Constitution. The Government has taken several initiatives to provide an ecosystem for faster disposal of cases by the judiciary which, inter-alia, includes amalgamation of latest technologies for increasing access to justice and greater transparency under the e-Courts Mission Mode Project and supplementing of the resources of the State Governments/UTs for providing suitable infrastructure facilities for the District and Subordinate Judiciary under the Centrally Sponsored Scheme for Development of Infrastructure Facilities for Judiciary.

(b): As per information available on the National Judicial Data Grid (NJDG), the total number of pending cases, as on 25.03.2026, the High Court-wise, including Rajasthan is at **Annexure**.

(c): The Government of India has undertaken various reforms to expedite judicial processes:

- i. The Digital Justice System under the e-Courts Mission Mode Project has expedited and simplified judicial processes and has also improved transparency and accessibility in the justice delivery system.
- ii. Under the Centrally Sponsored Scheme namely Fast Track Special Courts (FTSCs) Scheme, 774 Fast Track Special Courts (FTSCs) including 398 exclusive POCSO (ePOCSO) Courts are functional across 29 States/UTs for the expeditious disposal of pending cases of Rape and POCSO Act, and have collectively disposed of 3,71,849 cases since their inception, as on 31.01.2026. The financial outlay under the scheme is Rs.

1952.23 crore with Rs. 1207.24 crore as Central Share to be incurred from Nirbhaya Fund on the CSS pattern. The Central Government, as on 27.03.2026, has released a total amount of Rs. 1,234.55 crore to States/UTs for the operationalization of FTSCs since the inception of the Scheme in 2019.

- iii. 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.
- iv. 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.
- v. 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.
- vi. 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.
- vii. Further, the Department of Legal Affairs, Ministry of Law and Justice, has framed the 'Directive for the Efficient and Effective Management of Litigation by Government of India', which is an integrated approach in reinforcing the goal of good governance and ensuring public welfare and timely dispensation of justice. The Directive seeks to introduce effective measures to simplify legal processes, prevent unnecessary litigation, address inconsistencies in notifications and orders, minimize unwarranted appeals, streamline inter-departmental coordination in litigation, ensure greater public accountability in arbitration matters, and establish a strong Knowledge Management System (KMS) to improve overall efficiency. The Department of legal Affairs, Ministry of Law and Justice has also developed the Legal Information Management and Briefing System (LIMBS), a web-based portal designed to effectively monitor court cases involving the Union of India. These measures are to proactively take action towards disposal of all pending court cases.

(d): The eCourts Mission Mode Project, under the National e-Governance Plan (NeGP), represents one of the most significant initiatives to modernize the Indian judiciary through technology. It seeks to make justice delivery faster, more transparent and accessible to all citizens. The project is being implemented in phases under the joint partnership of the Department of Justice, Ministry of Law & Justice and the eCommittee of the Supreme Court of India, in close coordination with the respective High Courts.

The Government has demonstrated its commitment in modernizing judiciary with advanced digital infrastructure by significantly increasing the budget of Phase III (2023–2027) to ₹7,210 crore. This phase envisions transforming Indian courts into Digital and Paperless Courts by digitizing legacy and current case records, expanding video conferencing to all courts, jails and hospitals and extending online courts beyond traffic violations. It also aims for universal saturation of eSewa Kendras, creation of a state-of-the-art cloud-based data repository for storing digitized court records and applications and deployment of emerging technologies such as Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Optical Character Recognition (OCR) for case analysis and forecasting.

Currently, over 660.36 crore pages of court records have been digitized and 2,444 eSewa Kendras have been established to enhance citizen service delivery. Courts have conducted over 3.97 crore hearings through video conferencing facilities. Approximately 1.07 cr. cases have been filed electronically through the eFiling platform. Live streaming of court proceedings has expanded to four additional High Courts, Uttarakhand, Calcutta, Telangana and Meghalaya, making it 11. All eCourts portals are now hosted on the NIC's cloud infrastructure and district court websites have been migrated to the Secure, Scalable and Sugamya Website as a Service (S3WAAS) platform.

Further, the Case Information System (CIS) has been upgraded to version 4.0, introducing enhanced objectivity, transparency and speed in case management. Advanced AI-based tools are being integrated into judicial workflows, such as the AI/ML-enabled defect identification module developed by the Supreme Court in collaboration with IIT Madras and the Legal Research and Analysis Assistant (LegRAA) developed by NIC's Centre of Excellence under the guidance of the eCommittee. The Digital Courts platform enables judges to access all case-related documents, pleadings and evidence digitally, marking a significant leap toward a paperless court ecosystem.

STATEMENT REFERRED TO IN REPLY TO PART (B) OF RAJYA SABHA UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 4446 FOR ANSWER ON 02.04.2026 REGARDING 'PENDING CASES IN COURTS'

Number of pending cases in High Courts, as on 25.03.2026		
Sr. No	Name of High Court	No. of pending cases
1	Allahabad High Court	12,26,425
2	Bombay High Court	6,61,062
3	Calcutta High Court	2,03,784
4	Gauhati High Court	64,575
5	High Court for State of Telangana	2,36,783
6	High Court of Chhattisgarh	75,525
7	High Court of Rajasthan	6,76,609
8	High Court of Andhra Pradesh	2,48,733
9	High Court of Delhi	1,26,647
10	High Court of Gujarat	1,73,459
11	High Court of Himachal Pradesh	1,04,070
12	High Court of Jammu and Kashmir	43,472
13	High Court of Jharkhand	72,532
14	High Court of Karnataka	3,31,494
15	High Court of Kerala	2,47,553
16	High Court of Madhya Pradesh	4,76,074
17	High Court of Manipur	6,060
18	High Court of Meghalaya	1,791
19	High Court of Punjab and Haryana	4,18,735
20	High Court of Sikkim	302
21	High Court of Tripura	1,389
22	High Court of Uttarakhand	61,083
23	Madras High Court	5,55,758
24	Orissa High Court	1,63,859
25	Patna High Court	2,18,963
	Total	63,96,737

Source: National Judicial Data Grid (NJDG)

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

RAJYA SABHA
UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 4447
ANSWERED ON - 02/04/2026

JS(NMTR-1) GUIDELINES FOR DISPOSAL OF PENDING CASES

✓ 4447. # SMT. DARSHANA SINGH:

Will the Minister of *Law and Justice* be pleased to state:

- (a) whether there are any guidelines issued by Government for disposal of cases pending for ten years and if so, the details thereof;
- (b) the current number of such cases, State-wise;
- (c) whether Artificial Intelligence (AI) or other technological tools are being utilized to reduce the burden of pending cases in courts; and
- (d) if so, the details of steps taken in this regard and the impact thereof?

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) and (b): Disposal of cases is within the exclusive domain of the judiciary. As such no guidelines have been issued by the Government for disposal of cases pending for ten years.

However, the Government is fully committed for speedy disposal of cases and reducing pendency as mandated under Article 21 of the Constitution. The Government has taken several initiatives to provide an ecosystem for faster disposal of cases by the judiciary which, inter-alia, includes amalgamation of latest technologies for increasing access to justice and greater transparency under the e-Courts Mission Mode Project and supplementing of the resources of the State Governments/UTs for providing suitable infrastructure facilities for the District and Subordinate Judiciary under the Centrally Sponsored Scheme for Development of Infrastructure Facilities for Judiciary.

The current number of cases, pending for ten years, is at **Annexure** .

(c) and (d): Artificial Intelligence (AI) is being utilized to reduce the burden of pending cases in courts and improve efficiency in the criminal justice system. The Inter-Operable Criminal Justice System (ICJS) project, based on the principle of 'one data one entry', aims to achieve seamless information exchange across all the pillars of criminal justice system and digitally link the databases of police (CCTNS), e-Courts, e-Prisons and e-Prosecution and e-Forensics. Data between the Case Information System (CIS) under e-Courts and other pillars of ICJS are shared within the ambit of data sharing matrix approved by the eCommittee of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India.

As part of the National e-Governance Plan, Phase-III of the eCourts Mission Mode project is under implementation for Information and Communication Technology (ICT) enablement of courts and to enhance the judicial productivity, both qualitatively & quantitatively, making the justice delivery system accessible, cost effective, reliable and transparent. Under this project, Rs. 53.57 crore have been earmarked for the component “Future Technological Advancements” to integrate modern technologies for smoother user experience.

To explore the use of AI in judicial domain, the Supreme Court of India constituted an AI Committee, which is responsible for conceptualizing, implementing and monitoring use of AI in the judiciary. However, no formal policy or guidelines exist for adopting AI tools in judicial processes, as AI-based solutions remain in the controlled pilot phase and authorities use AI only within the areas approved in the DPR of eCourts Phase III. Besides, formulation and regulation of operational frameworks in this regard will be governed by the rules of business and policies of the concerned High Courts.

The Supreme Court of India in collaboration with IIT Madras is testing the prototypes of AI and ML tools for curing document defects, meta data extraction and integration with the electronic filing module and the case management software, namely Integrated Case Management & Information System (ICMIS). An AI based tool called Legal Research Analysis Assistant [LegRAA] has been developed to aid judges in legal research and document analysis. Another AI based tool called Digital Courts 2.1 has been developed to assist Judges and Judicial Officers in managing the court in paperless manner by providing a single window for all case-related information and tasks. The platform includes voice-to-text (ASR-SHRUTI) and translation (PANINI) functionalities to assist the judges with order and judgment dictation.

The Digital Justice System under the e-Courts Mission Mode Project has expedited and simplified judicial processes and has also improved transparency and accessibility in the justice delivery system. Further, the Digital Courts platform enables judges to access all case-related documents, pleadings and evidence digitally, marking a significant leap toward a paperless court ecosystem.

STATEMENT REFERRED TO IN REPLY TO PART (B) OF RAJYA SABHA UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 4447 FOR ANSWER ON 02.04.2026 REGARDING 'GUIDELINES FOR DISPOSAL OF PENDING CASES'

Number of cases pending for 10 years, in District & Subordinate Courts, state-wise, as on 27.03.2026		
Sr. No	State/UTs	No. of cases pending for more than 10 years
1	Andaman and Nicobar	1,732
2	Andhra Pradesh	17,135
3	Arunachal Pradesh	1,630
4	Assam	10,331
5	Bihar	8,62,219
6	Chandigarh	412
7	Chhattisgarh	1,166
8	Delhi	40,972
9	Goa	4,254
10	Gujarat	60,529
11	Haryana	4,704
12	Himachal Pradesh	10,024
13	Jammu and Kashmir	20,137
14	Jharkhand	43,436
15	Karnataka	95,504
16	Kerala	43,589
17	Ladakh	10
18	Lakshadweep	26
19	Madhya Pradesh	31,796
20	Maharashtra	5,29,517
21	Manipur	764
22	Meghalaya	2,372
23	Mizoram	30
24	Nagaland	277
25	Odisha	2,95,382
26	Puducherry	2,479
27	Punjab	3,677
28	Rajasthan	75,966
29	Sikkim	3
30	Tamil Nadu	65,026
31	Telangana	19,148
32	The Dadra and Nagar Haveli and Daman and Diu	373
33	Tripura	711
34	Uttar Pradesh	22,37,931
35	Uttarakhand	6,882
36	West Bengal	7,66,149
	Total	52,56,293

Source: National Judicial Data Grid (NJDG)

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE
LEGISLATIVE DEPARTMENT

RAJYA SABHA
UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 4448
ANSWERED ON - 02/04/2026

CONSTITUTIONAL VALIDITY OF LEGISLATIONS

4448. DR. SASMIT PATRA:

Will the Minister of *Law and Justice* be pleased to state:

- (a) whether Government has undertaken any review or institutional mechanism to examine the constitutional validity of proposed legislations and executive actions in light of the Basic Structure doctrine evolved by the Supreme Court in *Kesavananda Bharati vs State of Kerala*;
- (b) whether instances have arisen during the last five years where laws enacted or executive measures taken by Government were subsequently struck down or read down by courts for violating fundamental constitutional principles;
- (c) the number of such cases and key constitutional grounds involved; and
- (d) the steps taken to strengthen constitutional vetting of legislative and executive proposals?

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): As per the Government of India (Allocation of Business) Rules, 1961, the Department of Legal Affairs has been allocated the mandate to advise Ministries/Departments on legal matters and feasibility of proposals from legal and constitutional angle including interpretation of the Constitution and the laws. References are also made to Ld. Attorney General for India and Ld. Solicitor General of India for advice on matters of significant constitutional implications. In case the *vires* of any law is challenged then as per the constitutional scheme, final determination of constitutional validity lies with the judiciary. The mandate of the Department does not cover vetting of Executive actions. However, the subordinate legislation are vetted by the Legislative Department.

As regards examination of the laws in light of the basic structure doctrine, it is relevant to mention that the Hon'ble Supreme Court through various judicial pronouncements has held that a statute can only be struck down or being violative of Part III or any other provision of the Constitution or for being without legislative competence. Recently, the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Anjum Kadari & Another vs Union of India & Others [2024 INSC 831]* has observed as follows:

"The reason is that concepts such as democracy, federalism, and secularism are undefined concepts. Allowing courts to strike down legislation for violation of such concepts will introduce an element of uncertainty in our constitutional adjudication".

The Bench further stated, *"Recently, this Court has accepted that a challenge to the constitutional validity of a statute for violation of the basic structure is a technical aspect because the infraction has to be traced to the express provisions of the Constitution. "*

(b) and (c): There is no database being maintained in this Department in this regard. Details of litigations related to concerned legislation are covered within the purview of the respective administrative Ministry/Department responsible for the specific subject matter.

(d): The officers of the Department perform the task of examining the draft legislations from a legal and constitutional angle. The officers are also sent for capacity building training from time to time.
