

ADVOCACY



TMV's Lokmanya Tilak Law College's

QUARTERLY eMAGAZINE

Volume V

Issue 19 (Oct-Dec 2025)

Legal Frontiers: Issues, Rights and Reforms

EDITOR

Asst. Prof. Vaishnavi Nirmal

FACULTY IN-CHARGE

Asst. Prof. Vidhya Shetty

Articles invited for the next issue, interested candidates
can mail your articles on advocacytmv@gmail.com

DISCLAIMER

Facts and opinions in articles published in the online e-Magazine “Advocacy” are solely the personal statements of respective authors. Authors are responsible for all contents in their article(s) including accuracy of the facts, statements, citing resources, and so on. Online e-Magazine “Advocacy” and editors disclaim any liability of violations of other parties’ rights, or any damage incurred as a consequence to use or apply any of the contents of eMagazine “Advocacy”. Material submitted to e-Magazine “Advocacy” must be original and not published or submitted for publication elsewhere. Author is responsible to get permission from previous publisher or copyright holder if an author is re-using any part of paper (i.e. figure or figures) published elsewhere, or that is copyrighted. The editors consider all material in good faith and that the e-Magazine “Advocacy” have full permission to publish every part of the submitted material including illustrations.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SR. NO.	ARTICLES
1	UNIFORM CIVIL CODE: A STUDY OF LEGISLATIVE INACTION AND EMERGING LEGAL GAPS IN INDIA
2	DATA PRIVACY AND THE DIGITAL PERSONAL DATA PROTECTION ACT, 2023: CONTEMPORARY CHALLENGES IN INDIAN LAW
3	PROPERTY RIGHTS AND LEGAL ISSUES BETWEEN HUSBAND AND WIFE AFTER DIVORCE: AN ANALYTICAL STUDY
4	JUSTICE DELAYED IS JUSTICE DENIED: AN ANALYSIS OF JUDICIAL DELAYS IN INDIA
5	ACCESS TO JUSTICE AND LEGAL AID IN INDIA: BRIDGING THE GAP BETWEEN LAW AND REALITY

UNIFORM CIVIL CODE: A STUDY OF LEGISLATIVE INACTION AND EMERGING LEGAL GAPS IN INDIA

-PRANALI DATTATRAYA ANBHULE

"Equality before law is meaningful only when the law treats every citizen equally."

India proudly celebrates its diversity. Different religions, cultures, languages, and traditions form the essence of our national identity. Yet, when it comes to personal laws governing marriage, divorce, inheritance, succession, maintenance, and adoption, citizens are governed by different legal systems based on their religion. This legal diversity has sparked one of the most significant constitutional debates in independent India—the implementation of a **Uniform Civil Code (UCC)**.

Article 44 of the Constitution directs the State to endeavor to secure a Uniform Civil Code for all citizens. More than seven decades after the Constitution came into force, however, this constitutional vision remains unrealized. The continued existence of religion-based personal laws has created legal inconsistencies, unequal rights, and uncertainty in the administration of justice.

The Constitutional Promise

The idea of the Uniform Civil Code is not new. The framers of the Constitution envisioned a secular civil law applicable to every citizen, irrespective of religion. Accordingly, Article 44 was placed among the Directive Principles of State Policy, reflecting the long-term aspiration of achieving legal uniformity while respecting India's cultural diversity. At the same time, the Constitution protects religious freedom under Articles 25 and 26. This creates a delicate constitutional balance between two equally important ideals—**equality before law** and **freedom of religion**. The challenge lies in ensuring that personal laws do not undermine constitutional guarantees of equality, dignity, and justice.

Why Has the Uniform Civil Code Not Been Implemented?

Despite repeated discussions and judicial observations, successive governments have hesitated to enact a comprehensive Uniform Civil Code. Personal laws are closely associated with religious

identity, making legislative reform politically and socially sensitive. The absence of consensus regarding the structure and scope of a UCC has further delayed reform. Questions continue to arise:

- Should existing personal laws be completely replaced?
- Should they merely be harmonized?
- Can legal uniformity coexist with cultural diversity?

As a result, Article 44 has remained largely aspirational rather than operational.

The Growing Legal Vacuum

The prolonged delay in implementing a Uniform Civil Code has resulted in a significant legal vacuum. Although personal laws exist, they often function independently, leading to inconsistent legal standards across communities.

Some of the major legal gaps include:

Gender Inequality- Many personal laws continue to contain provisions that adversely affect women in matters relating to divorce, maintenance, inheritance, and guardianship. Although courts have intervened in several instances, these decisions provide only case-specific relief rather than comprehensive reform.

Unequal Civil Rights- Citizens belonging to different religious communities often receive different legal treatment despite facing identical legal issues. Such disparities challenge the constitutional promise of equality before law.

Fragmented Judicial Development- In the absence of legislative action, courts have frequently attempted to address gaps through constitutional interpretation. While judicial intervention has promoted justice in individual cases, it cannot substitute for a comprehensive statutory framework.

Constitutional Ambiguity- The continuing conflict between equality rights and religious autonomy has produced inconsistent judicial outcomes. Courts are often required to balance competing constitutional principles without adequate legislative guidance.

Judiciary: Filling the Legislative Gap

The Supreme Court has repeatedly highlighted the importance of a Uniform Civil Code. In ***Shah Bano***, the Court emphasized that a common civil code would strengthen national integration and ensure gender justice. Similarly, in ***Sarla Mudgal***, the Court observed that the absence of a UCC encourages legal inconsistencies and conflicting obligations. More recently, ***Shayara Bano*** reaffirmed that personal law practices inconsistent with constitutional values cannot remain immune from judicial scrutiny. These judgements demonstrate judicial commitment towards constitutional ideals but also reveal the limitations of relying solely on litigation to achieve systemic reform.

Learning from Other Jurisdictions

Several countries have successfully implemented uniform civil laws while preserving cultural diversity.

- **France** follows a secular civil code applicable to all citizens irrespective of religion.
- **Turkey** replaced religion-based personal laws with a unified civil code through gradual legal reforms.
- Within India itself, **Goa** continues to follow a common civil code that governs marriage, divorce, and succession with limited exceptions.

These experiences demonstrate that legal uniformity and cultural diversity need not be mutually exclusive.

The Way Forward

The implementation of a Uniform Civil Code need not be abrupt. A gradual, consultative, and inclusive approach can achieve constitutional objectives without disrupting social harmony.

Key reforms may include:

- Gradual harmonization of personal laws.
- Elimination of discriminatory provisions affecting women.
- Codification of uncodified personal laws.
- Wider public consultation involving all stakeholders.
- Promotion of legal awareness and constitutional literacy.
- Adoption of best practices from successful domestic and international models.

Such reforms would strengthen legal certainty while respecting India's pluralistic social fabric.

CONCLUSION

The debate on the Uniform Civil Code extends far beyond questions of religion. At its core lies the constitutional commitment to equality, justice, and secular governance. The continued absence of a comprehensive Uniform Civil Code has created legal fragmentation, inconsistent rights, and uncertainty in civil law administration. While judicial intervention has provided important safeguards, sustainable reform ultimately requires legislative action. The challenge before India is not whether legal reform is necessary, but how it can be implemented in a manner that preserves diversity while ensuring equal justice for every citizen. A carefully designed, inclusive, and phased Uniform Civil Code has the potential to bridge the existing legal vacuum and transform the constitutional vision of Article 44 into a practical reality—strengthening both the rule of law and the ideals of a modern democratic nation.

References

Ambedkar, B. R. (1949). *Constituent Assembly Debates* (Vol. VII). Constituent Assembly of India.

Government of India. (1950). *The Constitution of India*. Ministry of Law and Justice.

Jain, M. P. (2024). *Indian constitutional law* (9th ed.). LexisNexis.

Law Commission of India. (2018). *Consultation Paper on Reform of Family Law*. Government of India.

Paras Diwan. (2021). *Modern Hindu law* (24th ed.). Allahabad Law Agency.

Seervai, H. M. (2019). *Constitutional law of India: A critical commentary* (4th ed., Vol. 1). Universal Law Publishing.

Supreme Court of India. (1985). *Mohd. Ahmed Khan v. Shah Bano Begum*, (1985) 2 SCC 556.

Supreme Court of India. (1995). *Sarla Mudgal v. Union of India*, (1995) 3 SCC 635.

Supreme Court of India. (2003). *John Vallamattom v. Union of India*, (2003) 6 SCC 611.

Supreme Court of India. (2017). *Shayara Bano v. Union of India*, (2017) 9 SCC 1.

Supreme Court of India. (2018). *Indian Young Lawyers Association v. State of Kerala*, (2019) 11 SCC 1.

Supreme Court of India. (2018). *Joseph Shine v. Union of India*, (2019) 3 SCC 39.

DATA PRIVACY AND THE DIGITAL PERSONAL DATA PROTECTION ACT, 2023: CONTEMPORARY CHALLENGES IN INDIAN LAW

- Dipali Nilkanth Kumbhar

INTRODUCTION

The digital revolution has fundamentally transformed the way personal information is collected, stored, processed, and shared. Every online transaction, social media interaction, digital payment, hospital visit, or government service generates vast amounts of personal data. India, now home to nearly one billion internet users, has emerged as one of the world's largest digital economies. While this transformation has improved accessibility, innovation, and governance, it has also exposed citizens to increasing risks of data breaches, surveillance, identity theft, profiling, and misuse of personal information.

Recognizing these challenges, Parliament enacted the **Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023 (DPDP Act)**, India's first comprehensive legislation dedicated to protecting digital personal data. The Act seeks to balance three competing interests—individual privacy, economic growth through digital innovation, and the legitimate needs of the State. However, despite being a

landmark legislative development, it has generated significant debate among constitutional scholars, legal experts, journalists, technology companies, and civil society organizations. Questions continue to arise regarding whether the Act adequately protects the constitutional right to privacy, whether it grants excessive powers to the government, whether it sufficiently regulates emerging technologies such as Artificial Intelligence (AI), and whether it compromises transparency by weakening the Right to Information framework.

This article examines the evolution of privacy jurisprudence in India, explores the key provisions of the DPDP Act, analyzes its constitutional and practical challenges, and considers the future of data protection in an increasingly AI-driven digital society.

From Constitutional Silence to the Right to Privacy

Unlike many modern constitutions, the Constitution of India does not expressly recognize the right to privacy. For several decades, Indian courts adopted a restrictive approach. Early decisions such as *M.P. Sharma v. Satish Chandra* (1954) and *Kharak Singh v. State of Uttar Pradesh* (1962) refused to acknowledge privacy as an independent fundamental right.

The constitutional position changed dramatically with the landmark judgement of the Supreme Court in **Justice K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India (2017)**. A unanimous nine-judge bench declared that privacy forms an integral part of the rights guaranteed under Articles 14, 19, and 21 of the Constitution.

The Court recognized that privacy extends far beyond physical space. It includes:

- bodily privacy,
- decisional autonomy,
- informational privacy, and
- protection against arbitrary state intrusion.

Importantly, the judgement acknowledged that in the digital age both governments and private corporations possess unprecedented capacities to collect, analyze, and monetize personal information. Consequently, any limitation on privacy must satisfy constitutional requirements of

legality, necessity, proportionality, and procedural safeguards. This historic judgement laid the constitutional foundation for India's modern data protection framework.

Why India Needed a Comprehensive Data Protection Law

Before 2023, India's legal framework for data protection was fragmented. Personal data was governed primarily through limited provisions of the **Information Technology Act, 2000** and the **Information Technology (Reasonable Security Practices and Procedures and Sensitive Personal Data or Information) Rules, 2011**. These provisions proved inadequate for several reasons. They primarily regulated private entities while leaving government agencies largely outside their scope. They offered limited remedies to affected individuals, lacked an independent regulatory authority, and failed to address rapidly evolving technologies such as artificial intelligence, biometric surveillance, facial recognition, and algorithmic profiling. Several high-profile incidents—including large-scale data breaches, unauthorized sharing of biometric information, cyber frauds, misuse of social media data for political profiling, and leaks involving banking and healthcare institutions—demonstrated the urgent need for stronger legal safeguards.

As India's digital economy expanded through online banking, UPI transactions, Aadhaar-linked services, e-governance, and AI-powered platforms, personal data emerged as one of the country's most valuable economic resources, making comprehensive regulation indispensable.

The Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023: A Landmark Reform

The DPDP Act represents India's first dedicated legislation regulating digital personal data. It applies to the processing of digital personal data within India and also extends to entities located outside India if they offer goods or services to individuals residing in India.

The Act introduces several important legal concepts. It identifies individuals as **Data Principals**, organizations determining the purpose of data processing as **Data Fiduciaries**, and entities processing data on behalf of fiduciaries as **Data Processors**. It also introduces the concept of **Consent Managers**, enabling individuals to manage and withdraw consent more efficiently. At the heart of the legislation lies a consent-based framework. Personal data should ordinarily be processed only after obtaining free, informed, specific, and unambiguous consent. Individuals

must be informed about what information is being collected, why it is required, how it will be used, and the rights available to them.

The Act also grants several rights to individuals, including:

- the right to access personal information,
- the right to correct inaccurate data,
- the right to erase personal data,
- the right to seek grievance redressal, and
- the right to nominate another person to exercise these rights in case of death or incapacity.

Organizations processing personal data are required to maintain security safeguards, ensure data accuracy, delete information once its purpose has been fulfilled, and report data breaches. Significant Data Fiduciaries face additional compliance requirements, including appointment of Data Protection Officers, periodic audits, and impact assessments. The Act also prescribes substantial monetary penalties, with fines extending up to **250 crore** for serious violations.

The Constitutional Debate

Despite its progressive objectives, the DPDP Act has attracted substantial constitutional criticism. Perhaps the most controversial feature is the broad exemption granted to government agencies. The Central Government may exempt public authorities from the operation of the Act on grounds such as sovereignty, security of the State, or maintenance of public order. Critics argue that these exemptions do not adequately satisfy the constitutional standards laid down in the *Puttaswamy* judgement. Since the Act does not require prior judicial authorization or independent oversight before granting exemptions, concerns have been raised regarding the possibility of excessive state surveillance and arbitrary collection of personal information.

Another concern relates to the **Data Protection Board of India**. Although the Board has been established to adjudicate disputes and impose penalties, its members are appointed by the Central Government. Since the Government also exercises significant administrative control over the Board, questions have been raised regarding its institutional independence. Many scholars

believe that an effective privacy regulator should function independently, similar to supervisory authorities established under the European Union's data protection regime.

Privacy versus Transparency

One of the most debated consequences of the DPDP Act concerns its interaction with the **Right to Information Act, 2005**. The Act amended Section 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act by expanding the exemption relating to personal information. Under the earlier framework, even personal information could be disclosed where a larger public interest justified disclosure. The amended provision makes it easier for public authorities to refuse requests by classifying information as personal data. This development has generated concern among journalists, transparency advocates, and civil society organizations. They argue that information relating to public officials, public expenditure, educational qualifications, or official misconduct could now become more difficult to obtain, thereby weakening democratic accountability.

The constitutional balance between the right to privacy and the public's right to know is therefore likely to remain one of the defining legal debates surrounding the DPDP Act.

Artificial Intelligence: The Next Privacy Challenge

Artificial Intelligence has introduced entirely new dimensions to data protection law. Modern AI systems depend upon enormous quantities of personal information, including biometric identifiers, browsing history, financial records, healthcare information, voice recordings, images, and behavioural patterns. Yet the DPDP Act contains no dedicated framework regulating AI. Several important legal questions therefore remain unanswered. Can personal information be used to train AI models without fresh consent? Who bears responsibility when an AI system makes discriminatory decisions? Should individuals have a legal right to understand how automated decisions affecting them were reached?

These questions assume greater significance because AI is increasingly used in banking, recruitment, policing, healthcare, education, and insurance. Algorithmic bias, facial recognition errors, predictive policing, and deepfake technologies have already demonstrated the risks associated with uncontrolled AI development. Many experts therefore advocate separate AI

legislation requiring algorithmic transparency, impact assessments, human oversight, and stronger consent mechanisms.

Cross-Border Data Transfers

In today's interconnected digital economy, personal information frequently travels across national boundaries. The DPDP Act permits cross-border transfers of personal data except to countries specifically restricted by the Central Government. While this flexible approach may facilitate international trade and technological innovation, it also raises concerns regarding enforcement. If an Indian citizen's data is misused by a foreign company, determining jurisdiction, applicable law, and available remedies may become extremely difficult. Strong international cooperation and harmonization with global privacy standards will therefore be essential for effective enforcement.

Practical Challenges Ahead

The success of any legislation ultimately depends upon effective implementation. India continues to face several practical challenges. Digital literacy remains limited, and many users routinely accept lengthy privacy policies without understanding their implications. Small businesses and start-ups often lack the financial and technical capacity required for compliance. Cybersecurity infrastructure also remains uneven across sectors. Additionally, the gradual implementation of the DPDP Act through subordinate rules has created uncertainty regarding compliance obligations and enforcement timelines.

The Way Forward

India's privacy framework can be strengthened through several important reforms. Government exemptions should be subjected to independent judicial or parliamentary oversight to ensure compliance with constitutional principles of proportionality. The Data Protection Board should be made institutionally independent through a transparent appointment process. The public interest exception under the RTI Act should be preserved to maintain governmental accountability. India should also introduce dedicated legislation regulating Artificial Intelligence, particularly high-risk applications involving automated decision-making. Additional rights—

such as the right to data portability, protection against automated decisions, and a broader right to be forgotten—would further align Indian law with global best practices. Finally, greater public awareness, stronger cybersecurity infrastructure, and international cooperation will be essential to ensure meaningful protection of personal data.

CONCLUSION

The Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023 marks a defining moment in India's journey toward recognizing informational privacy as a constitutional value. It establishes an important legal foundation for regulating personal data in an increasingly digital society. Nevertheless, significant concerns remain regarding government exemptions, institutional independence, transparency, cross-border enforcement, and the regulation of emerging technologies such as Artificial Intelligence. The future of data protection in India will ultimately depend upon how courts, legislators, regulators, businesses, and citizens respond to these evolving challenges. Privacy is no longer merely a personal concern—it is central to democracy, human dignity, economic development, and constitutional governance. As India continues its digital transformation, the law must ensure that technological progress is accompanied by robust safeguards that preserve individual autonomy, promote accountability, and uphold the constitutional promise of liberty and dignity in the digital age.

References

Privacy in the Digital Era, B.N. Srikrishna Committee Report, Government of India, 2018.

Constitution of India, Government of India (as amended).

Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023.

Information Technology Act, 2000.

Information Technology (Reasonable Security Practices and Procedures and Sensitive Personal Data or Information) Rules, 2011.

General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR).

Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India.

M.P. Sharma v. Satish Chandra.

Kharak Singh v. State of Uttar Pradesh.

Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Aadhaar-5J.) v. Union of India.

Shreya Singhal v. Union of India.

Anuradha Bhasin v. Union of India.

Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology (MeitY), Annual Reports and policy documents.

NITI Aayog, *Responsible AI for All: Strategy for India*.

Internet Freedom Foundation, publications on privacy and surveillance.

Centre for Internet and Society, research reports on data protection and privacy.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), *OECD Privacy Guidelines*.

United Nations, *The Right to Privacy in the Digital Age*, General Assembly Resolutions.

PROPERTY RIGHTS AND LEGAL ISSUES BETWEEN HUSBAND AND WIFE AFTER DIVORCE: AN ANALYTICAL STUDY

-Amol Mulye

Introduction: When Divorce Ends a Marriage but Begins a Financial Battle

Marriage in India has traditionally been viewed as much more than a contractual relationship. It is deeply rooted in religious beliefs, cultural values, and social expectations. While marriage signifies companionship and shared responsibilities, divorce often exposes the economic realities underlying the institution. Once a marriage dissolves, disputes over property, financial security, maintenance, and ownership frequently become the most contentious issues between spouses.

Unlike many Western jurisdictions where matrimonial property is treated as a joint asset to be divided equitably upon divorce, India continues to follow the doctrine of separate ownership. Property generally belongs to the individual in whose name it is acquired unless joint ownership can be established. Consequently, a spouse—particularly a homemaker—who has devoted years

to raising children, managing the household, and supporting the family's welfare may leave the marriage without any proprietary interest in assets accumulated during the marriage.

Although Indian law offers remedies through maintenance, permanent alimony, and protection of a woman's *stridhan*, it does not provide a comprehensive legal framework for the equitable division of matrimonial property. This creates a significant gap between constitutional ideals of equality and the practical realities faced by divorced spouses. As gender roles evolve, more women participate in the workforce while many continue to shoulder unpaid domestic responsibilities. These changes require a legal framework that recognises both financial and non-financial contributions within marriage.

This article examines India's legal position on property rights after divorce by analysing statutory provisions, landmark judicial decisions, comparative international practices, and emerging challenges posed by the digital economy. It argues that while Indian courts have strengthened women's proprietary rights over *stridhan* and improved maintenance jurisprudence, the absence of clear rules governing marital assets continues to undermine substantive gender justice.

Understanding the Indian Legal Framework

One of the defining characteristics of Indian matrimonial law is the absence of a comprehensive matrimonial property regime. Property disputes after divorce are governed through a combination of personal laws, secular legislation, and judicial interpretation rather than a single codified statute.

Historically, Hindu law recognised the concept of *stridhan*, comprising gifts, jewellery, money, and movable property received by a woman before, during, or after marriage. Ancient Hindu jurists regarded *stridhan* as the woman's exclusive property over which neither her husband nor his family possessed any legal ownership. This principle continues to receive strong judicial protection. The Hindu Marriage Act, 1955, provides only limited remedies concerning property. Section 27 empowers courts to make orders regarding property jointly presented to both spouses at or around the time of marriage. However, its scope is extremely narrow. It does not extend to assets acquired independently during marriage, investments made by one spouse, or property accumulated through the combined efforts of the family. Sections 24 and 25 of the Hindu

Marriage Act address interim maintenance and permanent alimony respectively. These provisions aim to prevent financial hardship after divorce by considering factors such as the parties' income, standard of living, health, and financial needs. Courts retain considerable discretion while determining the amount, resulting in varying outcomes across similar cases.

Additional protection is provided under the Hindu Adoptions and Maintenance Act, 1956, which recognises a wife's right to maintenance under specified circumstances. Beyond personal laws, Section 144 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (formerly Section 125 of the Code of Criminal Procedure) offers a secular remedy allowing financially dependent wives, children, and parents to claim maintenance irrespective of religion. The Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005, further strengthens women's residential rights by recognising their right to reside in the shared household, even where ownership rests exclusively with the husband or his relatives. However, this legislation primarily protects residence rather than ownership.

Collectively, these laws provide fragmented financial protection but stop short of recognising marriage as an economic partnership where both spouses contribute to the acquisition of family wealth.

The Judicial Recognition of Women's Property Rights

In the absence of comprehensive legislation, Indian courts have played a crucial role in protecting women's financial interests after divorce. The Supreme Court's landmark judgement in *Pratibha Rani v. Suraj Kumar* firmly established that *stridhan* remains the absolute property of the wife. The Court rejected the argument that a husband automatically acquires rights over jewellery or gifts received during marriage and held that any dishonest retention of such property may amount to criminal breach of trust. This principle was reaffirmed in *Rashmi Kumar v. Mahesh Kumar Bhada*, where the Supreme Court emphasised that a husband merely holds *stridhan* in trust for his wife. Failure to return it upon demand constitutes a legal wrong capable of attracting criminal liability. Recent judicial developments have also recognised the economic value of unpaid domestic labour. In *Kirti v. Oriental Insurance Co. Ltd.*, although arising under motor accident compensation law, the Supreme Court acknowledged that homemakers make substantial economic contributions through unpaid household work. This reasoning has

influenced family law by reinforcing the principle that non-financial contributions deserve legal recognition. Similarly, *Rajnesh v. Neha* significantly transformed maintenance proceedings by prescribing detailed guidelines regarding financial disclosure, assessment of income, and determination of maintenance. The Court sought to reduce inconsistencies between different courts while ensuring fairness to both spouses. Despite these progressive decisions, courts remain constrained by the existing statutory framework. Judges may award maintenance or recognise *stridhan*, but they cannot ordinarily divide marital property merely because one spouse contributed indirectly through homemaking or caregiving. Consequently, judicial creativity often operates within narrow legislative boundaries.

Why the Existing System Falls Short

The greatest weakness of the Indian legal framework lies in its continued adherence to the doctrine of separate property. Ownership depends primarily upon legal title rather than the shared efforts that characterise most marriages. This approach disproportionately affects homemakers. A spouse who sacrifices career opportunities to raise children, manage household finances, and support the earning spouse contributes significantly to the family's economic well-being. Yet such contributions rarely translate into legal ownership of matrimonial assets. Maintenance, while important, cannot substitute for property rights. Monthly maintenance remains subject to judicial discretion, modification, enforcement challenges, and prolonged litigation. Property ownership, by contrast, provides long-term financial stability and economic independence. Another practical difficulty concerns enforcement. Even after obtaining favourable court orders regarding maintenance or return of *stridhan*, many women face years of litigation before actual compliance occurs. Hidden assets, delayed proceedings, repeated appeals, and evidentiary difficulties continue to undermine effective relief. The growing complexity of modern financial arrangements further exposes legislative shortcomings. Investments in mutual funds, digital wallets, cryptocurrencies, demat accounts, online businesses, and intellectual property frequently escape conventional disclosure mechanisms. Family courts often lack specialised expertise to identify and value these emerging forms of wealth.

As India's digital economy expands, matrimonial disputes increasingly involve assets that traditional family law never contemplated, making reform both necessary and urgent.

References

- Basu, D. D. (2023). *Introduction to the Constitution of India* (27th ed.). LexisNexis.
- Diwan, P. (2022). *Modern Hindu Law* (26th ed.). Allahabad Law Agency.
- Government of India. (1955). *The Hindu Marriage Act, 1955*.
- Government of India. (1956). *The Hindu Adoptions and Maintenance Act, 1956*.
- Government of India. (2005). *The Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005*.
- Government of India. (2023). *The Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023*.
- Rao, M. S. (2020). *Law Relating to Maintenance and Matrimonial Relief*. Eastern Book Company.
- Sarkar, S. C. (2022). *Sarkar on Hindu Law*. LexisNexis.
- Singh, A. (2021). Property rights of women after divorce under Indian family law. *Journal of the Indian Law Institute*, 63(2), 145–168.
- The Constitution of India.
- Pratibha Rani v. Suraj Kumar*, (1985) 2 SCC 370.
- Rashmi Kumar v. Mahesh Kumar Bhada*, (1997) 2 SCC 397.
- Rajnesh v. Neha*, (2021) 2 SCC 324.
- Kirti v. Oriental Insurance Co. Ltd.*, (2021) 2 SCC 166.
- B.P. Achala Anand v. S. Appi Reddy*, (2005) 3 SCC 313.
- S.R. Batra v. Taruna Batra*, (2007) 3 SCC 169.
- European Union. (2016). *Regulation (EU) 2016/679 (General Data Protection Regulation)*. (For comparative discussion on financial disclosure and digital assets.)
- United Kingdom. (1973). *Matrimonial Causes Act, 1973*.
- United Kingdom. (1996). *Family Law Act, 1996*.
-

JUSTICE DELAYED IS JUSTICE DENIED: AN ANALYSIS OF JUDICIAL DELAYS IN INDIA

-Minal Narke

An Analysis of Judicial Delays in India

"Justice delayed is justice denied." This timeless legal maxim captures one of the greatest challenges confronting the Indian justice delivery system. Justice is meaningful only when it is delivered fairly **and** within a reasonable time. When legal remedies are delayed excessively, they lose their value, causing justice to become merely theoretical rather than practical.

India, the world's largest democracy, prides itself on an independent judiciary and a Constitution committed to justice, liberty, equality, and the rule of law. Yet, the effectiveness of this constitutional promise is increasingly challenged by mounting judicial delays. Millions of pending cases across subordinate courts, High Courts, and the Supreme Court have transformed delayed justice into one of the most pressing legal issues of our time. The Supreme Court has repeatedly recognized that the **Right to Speedy Trial** is an integral part of the **Right to Life and Personal Liberty under Article 21 of the Constitution**. Nevertheless, overburdened courts, shortage of judges, procedural complexities, frequent adjournments, and inadequate infrastructure continue to slow the administration of justice.

"Justice must not only be done—it must be done without unreasonable delay."

Understanding the Principle

The maxim **"Justice Delayed is Justice Denied"** is deeply rooted in jurisprudence. It signifies that justice loses its effectiveness when delivered after an unreasonable lapse of time. Delay causes legal remedies to lose their significance, imposes financial and emotional burdens on litigants, and weakens public confidence in the legal system.

Within the Indian constitutional framework, this principle derives its strength from **Article 21**, which guarantees the right to life and personal liberty. Through judicial interpretation, the Supreme Court has expanded Article 21 to include the **Right to Speedy Trial**, making timely justice a constitutional obligation rather than merely an administrative objective.

Why Does Justice Get Delayed?

Judicial delay is not the result of a single problem but a combination of structural and procedural challenges.

☛☛ Massive Backlog of Cases

Perhaps the most visible challenge is the enormous number of pending cases before Indian courts. Every year, new cases are instituted faster than existing ones are disposed of, creating an ever-growing backlog that delays justice for millions.

☛☛ Shortage of Judges

India continues to have a comparatively low judge-to-population ratio. Existing judges handle an overwhelming number of cases, making timely disposal increasingly difficult. Although judicial vacancies are periodically filled, appointments have not kept pace with the rising volume of litigation.

☛ Complex Legal Procedures

The legal process itself contributes significantly to delays. Civil and criminal proceedings involve multiple stages—filing, pleadings, evidence, witness examination, arguments, and judgement. While these procedures ensure fairness and due process, they often prolong litigation unnecessarily when not managed efficiently.

☛ Frequent Adjournments

Repeated adjournments remain one of the principal reasons for delayed justice. Whether caused by absence of counsel, lack of preparation, or strategic litigation, unnecessary adjournments prolong proceedings and add to the already burdened judicial system.

❑ Inadequate Infrastructure

Many courts continue to function with inadequate courtrooms, insufficient staff, poor record management systems, and limited technological support. Although initiatives like the **e-Courts Mission** have modernized several courts, implementation remains uneven across the country.

Landmark Judgements that Strengthened Speedy Justice

Hussainara Khatoon v. State of Bihar (1979)

This historic judgement transformed the constitutional understanding of speedy justice. The Supreme Court held that the **Right to Speedy Trial** forms an essential part of **Article 21**. Thousands of undertrial prisoners detained for years without trial were released following this decision, making it a milestone in Indian constitutional jurisprudence.

A.R. Antulay v. R.S. Nayak (1992)

The Court clarified that every delay does not automatically violate constitutional rights. It laid down important factors for determining whether delay infringes the right to speedy trial:

- Length of delay
- Reasons for delay
- Conduct of parties
- Prejudice suffered by the accused

The judgement emphasized a balanced and flexible approach rather than rigid timelines.

P. Ramachandra Rao v. State of Karnataka (2002)

Reaffirming Article 21, the Supreme Court held that speedy justice is indispensable but cautioned against prescribing fixed deadlines for every criminal trial. Justice must remain both **speedy** and **fair**.

The Human Cost of Delayed Justice- Judicial delay affects every stakeholder in society.

Undertrial Prisoners- Thousands remain incarcerated for years while awaiting trial, often spending more time in prison than the maximum punishment prescribed for the alleged offence.

Victims- Victims are denied timely closure and are compelled to repeatedly relive traumatic experiences during prolonged trials.

Businesses- Commercial disputes that remain unresolved for years discourage investment, increase litigation costs, and adversely affect economic growth.

Society- Perhaps the greatest consequence is the gradual erosion of public confidence in the judiciary. When justice is excessively delayed, citizens begin to lose faith in the legal system itself.

Justice delayed does not merely inconvenience citizens—it undermines democracy.

Reforms Towards Speedier Justice- Recognizing these challenges, several reforms have been introduced to modernize India's justice delivery system.

Fast-Track Courts- Special courts have been established to expedite trials involving serious offences and vulnerable victims.

Digital Judiciary- The **e-Courts Project** has introduced online filing, virtual hearings, digital records, and video conferencing to improve efficiency and transparency.

Judicial Appointments- Increasing judicial strength remains essential for reducing pendency and ensuring timely disposal of cases.

Better Case Management- Strict regulation of adjournments, prioritization of urgent matters, and effective scheduling can significantly improve judicial efficiency.

Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR)- Encouraging mediation, arbitration, and conciliation can substantially reduce the burden on traditional courts.

Learning from Global Best Practices

Several countries have successfully addressed judicial delays through institutional reforms.

- **Singapore** follows strict case management with mandatory timelines.
- **Germany** emphasizes mediation and alternative dispute resolution before litigation.
- Both jurisdictions maintain higher judge-to-population ratios and greater technological integration.

These experiences demonstrate that judicial efficiency requires not only legal reforms but also administrative innovation.

Conclusion

The principle "**Justice Delayed is Justice Denied**" remains as relevant today as ever. Delayed adjudication weakens constitutional guarantees, burdens litigants, and diminishes public faith in the rule of law. While India has undertaken significant reforms through fast-track courts, digitization, judicial appointments, and procedural improvements, much remains to be done. Ensuring timely justice demands sustained institutional commitment, adequate resources, and continuous modernization of the justice delivery system. A truly effective legal system is one that delivers justice **fairly, efficiently, and without unreasonable delay**. Only then can the constitutional promise of justice become a lived reality for every citizen.

References

1. Basu, D. D. (2023). *Introduction to the Constitution of India* (27th ed.). LexisNexis.
 2. Government of India. (1950). *The Constitution of India*.
 3. Law Commission of India. (2014). *Report No. 245: Arrears and Backlog—Creating Additional Judicial (Wo)manpower*.
 4. M.P. Jain. (2024). *Indian Constitutional Law* (9th ed.). LexisNexis.
 5. Supreme Court of India. (2023). *National Judicial Data Grid (NJDG)*.
 6. Vidhi Centre for Legal Policy. (2018). *Strengthening Case Management in Indian Courts*.
 7. *Hussainara Khatoon (I) v. Home Secretary, State of Bihar*, (1980) 1 SCC 81.
 8. *A.R. Antulay v. R.S. Nayak*, (1992) 1 SCC 225.
 9. *P. Ramachandra Rao v. State of Karnataka*, (2002) 4 SCC 578.
 10. *Anita Kushwaha v. Pushap Sudan*, (2016) 8 SCC 509.
 11. United Nations. (1966). *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR)*.
 12. World Bank. (2019). *Doing Business 2020: Comparing Business Regulation in 190 Economies*.
-

ACCESS TO JUSTICE AND LEGAL AID IN INDIA: BRIDGING THE GAP BETWEEN LAW AND REALITY

-ASMA SHRIKANT KSHIRSAGAR

The Constitution of India promises justice—social, economic, and political—to every citizen. It guarantees equality before law, protection of life and liberty, and free legal aid for those unable to afford legal representation. Yet, for millions of Indians, justice remains distant, expensive, and often inaccessible.

Imagine a woman in a remote village facing domestic violence but unaware that free legal assistance is available. Picture an undertrial prisoner spending years behind bars simply because he cannot afford a lawyer. Consider a daily wage worker abandoning a legitimate legal claim because attending repeated court hearings means losing his livelihood.

These are not isolated incidents; they reflect a larger reality. Access to justice is more than the existence of courts—it is about ensuring that every individual can effectively enforce their rights irrespective of economic status, gender, caste, literacy, or geography.

This article explores India's legal aid system, constitutional guarantees, judicial innovations, persistent challenges, and the reforms necessary to transform justice from a constitutional promise into a lived reality.

Justice as a Constitutional Promise

The framers of the Constitution understood that equality before law would remain meaningless if only the wealthy could afford justice. Consequently, access to justice finds support in multiple constitutional provisions.

Article 14 guarantees equality before law and equal protection of laws.

Article 21, through judicial interpretation, has evolved into one of the broadest guarantees of human rights, encompassing the right to fair trial, legal representation, and speedy justice.

Recognising that equality cannot exist without equal opportunity to approach the legal system, the **42nd Constitutional Amendment** introduced **Article 39A**, directing the State to provide free legal aid so that economic disabilities do not become barriers to justice.

Together, these provisions transform justice from a privilege into a constitutional commitment.

Legal Aid: Turning Rights into Reality

The constitutional vision received statutory recognition through the **Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987**, which institutionalised free legal aid across India.

The Act established a nationwide framework comprising:

- National Legal Services Authority (NALSA)
- State Legal Services Authorities
- District Legal Services Authorities
- Taluka Legal Services Committees

These institutions provide free legal representation, organise legal awareness programmes, conduct Lok Adalats, and assist vulnerable sections in accessing the legal system.

Eligible beneficiaries include:

- Women
- Children
- Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes
- Persons with disabilities
- Victims of trafficking
- Persons in custody
- Economically weaker sections

The objective is simple but profound: justice should never depend upon one's financial capacity.

When the Judiciary Became the Guardian of Access to Justice

Perhaps the greatest contribution to access to justice has come from judicial interpretation.

The turning point arrived with **Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India**, where the Supreme Court declared that any legal procedure affecting personal liberty must be fair, just, and reasonable.

This progressive interpretation fundamentally changed constitutional law.

Soon thereafter, in **Hussainara Khatoon v. State of Bihar**, the Supreme Court exposed the plight of thousands of undertrial prisoners who remained incarcerated solely because they lacked legal representation.

The Court emphatically held that **free legal aid is not charity—it is a Fundamental Right under Article 21**.

Later, **Khatri v. State of Bihar** expanded this principle further by requiring legal aid from the very first appearance before a magistrate rather than only during trial.

These judgements transformed access to justice from an aspirational goal into an enforceable constitutional guarantee.

Public Interest Litigation: Opening the Doors of Justice

One of India's greatest judicial innovations has been **Public Interest Litigation (PIL)**.

Traditional legal systems required only directly affected individuals to approach courts.

PIL changed this entirely.

Now, public-spirited individuals and organisations can seek justice on behalf of vulnerable communities unable to approach courts themselves.

Through PILs, Indian courts have addressed:

- Bonded labour
- Prison reforms

- Environmental protection
- Child rights
- Women's rights
- Human rights violations

PIL has democratized constitutional remedies and significantly expanded access to justice.

Lok Adalats: Justice Without Delay

Court litigation is often lengthy and expensive.

To overcome these barriers, India introduced **Lok Adalats**—People's Courts.

Lok Adalats provide:

- ✓ Speedy resolution
- ✓ Minimal procedural formalities
- ✓ No court fees
- ✓ Binding settlements

They have successfully resolved millions of disputes involving motor accident claims, family matters, labour disputes, and civil cases while reducing the burden on conventional courts. Their success demonstrates that justice need not always emerge from lengthy courtroom battles.

The Ground Reality: Why Justice Still Remains Out of Reach

Despite impressive constitutional guarantees, millions continue to struggle for justice. The reasons are numerous.

Poverty

Legal proceedings remain expensive. Travel expenses, documentation, repeated hearings, and loss of wages discourage poor litigants even where legal aid is available.

Lack of Legal Awareness

Many citizens simply do not know that free legal assistance exists. Without awareness, constitutional rights remain merely theoretical.

Poor Quality Legal Representation

One of the biggest criticisms of legal aid concerns quality. Many legal aid lawyers are:

- inadequately compensated,
- overburdened,
- inexperienced,
- lacking motivation.

Justice requires competent advocacy—not merely appointment of counsel.

Judicial Delays

India's courts continue to face enormous case backlogs. Justice delayed often becomes justice denied. Years of litigation discourage economically weaker litigants from pursuing legitimate claims.

Social Barriers

Justice is influenced not only by economics but also by society. Women, Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, and other marginalized communities frequently encounter discrimination, intimidation, and social pressure that discourage them from seeking legal remedies.

Digital Divide

The digitalization of courts promises efficiency. However, online hearings, e-filing, and digital documentation have simultaneously created new barriers for citizens lacking internet access or digital literacy. Technology should enhance justice—not restrict it.

Learning from Other Democracies

India's legal aid system compares favourably in terms of constitutional commitment but faces implementation challenges.

United Kingdom

The UK legal aid system emphasises:

- quality assurance,
- accountability,
- professional standards,
- periodic evaluation of legal aid providers.

Although budget cuts have reduced coverage, institutional efficiency remains noteworthy.

United States

The American Public Defender System guarantees legal representation in criminal cases. However, inadequate funding and excessive workloads often affect quality. The American experience demonstrates that constitutional guarantees alone cannot ensure effective justice without adequate investment. India possesses one of the world's broadest legal aid frameworks but must strengthen implementation, monitoring, and professional standards.

Beyond Law: The Institutions that Keep Justice Alive

Access to justice depends upon multiple institutions working together.

These include:

- Judiciary
- NALSA
- State Legal Services Authorities
- District Legal Services Authorities
- Taluka Committees
- NGOs

- Legal Aid Clinics
- Law Schools

Legal awareness camps, village outreach programmes, legal literacy drives, mediation centres, and Lok Adalats collectively form the backbone of India's legal aid ecosystem. Their effectiveness, however, depends upon adequate funding, coordination, and accountability.

The Road Ahead: Reforming India's Legal Aid System

The gap between constitutional ideals and practical realities can be narrowed through meaningful reforms.

Some immediate priorities include:

Strengthening Legal Aid Quality- Legal aid lawyers should receive better training, adequate remuneration, and periodic performance evaluation.

Improving Accountability- Independent monitoring mechanisms should assess the effectiveness of legal aid institutions and address complaints promptly.

Greater Financial Investment- Legal aid cannot succeed without adequate funding. Investment must increase in infrastructure, personnel, and awareness programmes.

Expanding Legal Literacy- Schools, universities, NGOs, and local governments should collaborate to improve public understanding of legal rights.

Inclusive Technology- Digital justice should be accompanied by digital literacy programmes and assisted legal access centres in rural areas.

Promoting Alternative Dispute Resolution- Greater use of mediation and Lok Adalats can provide faster and more affordable justice while reducing judicial backlog.

Justice Beyond the Courtroom

Access to justice is far more than the ability to enter a courtroom. It means the ability to understand one's rights, obtain competent legal assistance, navigate procedures without fear, and receive timely remedies. India has undoubtedly built an impressive constitutional and institutional framework. Judicial creativity, Public Interest Litigation, and Lok Adalats have transformed the legal landscape and strengthened democratic governance. Yet, constitutional promises alone cannot guarantee justice. True access to justice requires effective institutions, quality legal representation, public awareness, technological inclusivity, and sustained political commitment. As India continues to modernise its legal system, the challenge is no longer creating rights—it is ensuring that every citizen, irrespective of wealth, caste, gender, or geography, can actually exercise them. Only then will the constitutional promise of "**Justice for All**" become not merely an aspiration but an everyday reality.

References

1. Basu, D. D. (2023). *Introduction to the Constitution of India* (27th ed.). LexisNexis.
 2. Government of India. (1950). *The Constitution of India*.
 3. Government of India. (1987). *The Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987*.
 4. M.P. Jain. (2024). *Indian Constitutional Law* (9th ed.). LexisNexis.
 5. National Legal Services Authority (NALSA). (2023). *Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987 and NALSA Schemes*.
 6. Law Commission of India. (1987). *One Hundred and Twenty-Sixth Report on Government and Public Sector Undertaking Litigation Policy and Strategies*.
 7. *Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India*, (1978) 1 SCC 248.
 8. *Hussainara Khatoon (I) v. Home Secretary, State of Bihar*, (1980) 1 SCC 81.
 9. *Khatri (II) v. State of Bihar*, (1981) 1 SCC 627.
 10. *S.P. Gupta v. Union of India*, 1981 Supp SCC 87.
 11. United Nations. (1948). *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*.
 12. United Nations. (1966). *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR)*.
-