

Ensuring Justice: A Study of Speedy Trial Jurisprudence and Empirical Insights, with Special Reference to the State of Jharkhand

Sachin Indiwari

Research Scholar, Faculty of Legal Studies, Radha Govind University –Ramgarh, Jharkhand

ABSTRACT



Sachin Indiwari

Delayed justice poses a significant challenge within the Indian legal system, particularly pronounced in Jharkhand. This state grapples with unique socio-economic and cultural factors that compound existing systemic issues. High rates of land disputes, tribal conflicts, and Naxalite activities further burden an already overwhelmed judiciary. Jharkhand's courts are plagued by substantial case backlogs, exacerbated by a shortage of judges and inadequate infrastructure, which impedes timely case resolution. Land disputes, particularly involving marginalized tribal communities, often lead to protracted legal battles due to complexities in navigating the legal process. To address these challenges, targeted reforms are essential. Increasing the number of judges and establishing specialized courts dedicated to handling specific case types, such as land disputes and tribal matters, could alleviate backlog pressures. Additionally, enhancing legal education and awareness programs tailored to the diverse needs of Jharkhand's population would empower individuals to access justice more effectively. Embracing technological advancements to digitize court procedures and facilitate virtual hearings could significantly enhance efficiency, particularly in remote and underserved regions of the state. Furthermore, promoting alternative dispute resolution mechanisms like mediation and arbitration could expedite case resolutions and reduce the burden on conventional courts.

Keywords: Jharkhand, Delayed justice, Legal system, Backlogs, Judicial reform

INTRODUCTION

The maxim "justice delayed* is justice denied" resonates deeply in legal philosophy, underscoring the essential need for prompt justice delivery. This principle is especially pertinent in criminal trials, where timely resolution is crucial to uphold the rights of the accused and maintain societal order. In Jharkhand, much like other regions of India, the challenge of delayed justice persists as a significant impediment to the legal system's integrity. Criminal cases often remain unresolved for years, imposing severe consequences on individuals, families, and the broader community. The prolonged duration of court cases not only contravenes the fundamental rights guaranteed by the Indian Constitution, particularly under Article 21 regarding the right to life and personal liberty, but also obstructs the state's mandate to ensure equitable access to justice. Multiple factors contribute to these delays, including overloaded courts, procedural intricacies, insufficient infrastructure, and systemic inefficiencies. These issues collectively prolong the judicial process and hinder timely case resolutions. The repercussions of delayed justice are profound and pervasive. For individuals awaiting trial, extended periods of incarceration without resolution not only deprive them of their liberty but also erode their confidence in the legal system's ability to deliver justice. Many detainees endure prolonged stays in overcrowded jails, often without being convicted, due to the sluggish pace of judicial proceedings. Consequently, justice delayed becomes tantamount to justice denied, as the passage of time diminishes the significance and impact of any eventual verdict. Furthermore, the adverse effects of delayed justice extend beyond the immediate parties involved in legal proceedings. Economic growth is impeded, and the nation's development goals are thwarted by the uncertainty and inefficiency associated with protracted court cases. Investors are deterred, business activities are hampered, and a climate of legal ambiguity persists. In a state like Jharkhand, which aims to attract investments and foster economic progress, the backlog of pending criminal cases poses a substantial obstacle to advancement. To effectively address the issue of delayed justice, a comprehensive strategy is imperative. This approach should encompass enhancing the judiciary's capacity and efficiency, streamlining legal procedures, investing in upgraded infrastructure, and promoting alternative dispute resolution mechanisms. Additionally, fostering greater collaboration among stakeholders—such as judiciary, law enforcement agencies, and government bodies—is essential to expedite the resolution of pending cases and restore confidence in the legal system. By tackling these underlying issues systematically, Jharkhand can move towards a more responsive and equitable justice system that upholds the principles of fairness, efficiency, and timely access to justice for all its citizens.

* Law Commission of India (Report No. 245)

Present situation of Justice System in India

As of September 15, 2021, there were 4.5 crore pending cases in Indian courts, an increase of 23 cases per minute over two years. High[†] Courts in states like Rajasthan, Madras, and Punjab & Haryana have significantly higher pendency rates compared to Patna and Calcutta, despite the latter having higher populations. Some High Courts, such as those in Allahabad, Odisha, Ladakh, and Jammu & Kashmir, showed a drop in pending cases, offering a glimmer of hope. The Supreme Court currently has 32 judges, with two vacancies, while High Courts have 465 sanctioned judge vacancies, comprising 42% of the total 1098 sanctioned judicial vacancies. Five High Courts, including those in Rajasthan, Delhi, Odisha, Telangana, Patna, and Rajasthan, have over 50% vacancies. Meghalaya and Manipur are the only two High Courts currently vacant. Despite efforts like fast track or family courts, the high number of vacancies and pending cases continue to burden the judiciary.

Reasons Underlying the Delay in Criminal Cases

The backlog of criminal cases in India presents[‡] a multifaceted challenge with significant implications for the nation's legal system, social fabric, and economic development. Various factors contribute to this backlog, ranging from systemic flaws within the legal framework to the sheer size of the population and the prevalence of frivolous litigation. Understanding these factors is crucial for devising effective solutions to address the issue and ensure timely justice delivery. Here's an in-depth exploration of the factors contributing to the backlog of criminal cases in India and their implications:

1. Luxurious Litigation

One significant factor contributing to the backlog of criminal cases is the phenomenon of luxurious litigation. This term, coined by Chief Justice NV Ramana, refers to the practice of parties with financial means obstructing and delaying the judicial process by filing numerous lawsuits across different courts. Frivolous lawsuits that could be resolved through mediation or alternative dispute resolution mechanisms often end up prolonging the legal proceedings, adding to the workload of the judicial system. The prevalence of such litigation reflects a lack of accountability and ethical conduct among certain litigants, exacerbating the backlog of cases.

2. Lack of Infrastructure in Subordinate Courts

Another critical factor contributing to case backlogs is the inadequate infrastructure in subordinate courts across the country. Despite the authorized number of judicial officers being substantial, the

[†] Judicial system in India - iPleaders

[‡] <https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/readersblog/thelegalaudience/criminal-trial-delays-an-overview-44908/#:~:text=The%20following%20points%20are%20to%20be%20considered%20as,of%20courts%20for%20people%20in%20isolated%20geographic%20areas.>

availability of courtrooms falls short of meeting the demand. This shortage of infrastructure poses significant challenges for judges in conducting hearings and expediting case proceedings. Moreover, delays in holding hearings further exacerbate the backlog, hindering the court's ability to resolve lawsuits in a timely manner.

3. Inefficiencies

Research conducted by the Vidhi Centre for Legal Policy at the Delhi High Court has highlighted the prevalence of inefficiencies within the judicial system, particularly concerning delays in case resolution. Inefficiencies, often attributed to both court proceedings and the conduct of attorneys, contribute to prolonged legal proceedings and exacerbate the backlog of cases. Factors such as court adjournments, counsel's absence, and procedural delays impede the smooth functioning of the judicial process, leading to delays in justice delivery.

4. Pending Cases per Judge

The unequal distribution of pending cases among judges in different states further compounds the issue of backlog. High Courts in states like Rajasthan have a significantly higher number of pending cases per judge compared to states like Sikkim. This disparity in caseloads reflects the strain on judges and underscores the need for equitable distribution of cases to ensure timely justice delivery. The overwhelming workload faced by judges hampers their ability to resolve cases promptly, contributing to delays in the legal system.

5. Time Consumption of Cases

The protracted duration of court proceedings is another factor contributing to the backlog of criminal cases. Frivolous lawsuits and unnecessary litigation consume valuable court time that could be allocated to urgent cases or matters involving individuals awaiting trial. Streamlining the judicial process and discouraging frivolous litigation is essential to optimize the utilization of court resources and expedite case resolution.

Needs for Judicial Reforms

India, as the largest democracy globally, upholds the Three Pillars of Democracy: legislative, executive, and judicial[§] branches. However, the public's faith in the legal system is diminishing, necessitating foundational changes to ensure prompt justice delivery as the nation transitions into a developed economy. Justice D.Y. Chandrachud, advocating for modern communication in the judiciary, warns against the resistance to technological advancements. Communication is crucial for the judiciary to integrate into society seamlessly, especially considering the widespread use of

[§] Need for reforms in the Indian judiciary - iPLEaders

English in Indian courts, which can alienate the average citizen.

To address these challenges, several reforms are proposed:

1. Establishing timelines for case resolution and adhering to time frames.
2. Ensuring accessibility to justice and delivering social justice for victims.
3. Transparent selection processes for High Court justices to uphold transparency and meritocracy.
4. Telecasting Public Interest Litigation (PIL) hearings live to prevent abuse.
5. Updating the Dress Code for lawyers to reflect India's climate and ancient practices.
6. Establishing additional courts in district courts to expedite case resolution.
7. Providing resources and infrastructure for revenue courts to support struggling farmers.
8. Requiring Senior Advocates to take on pro bono cases for the underprivileged.
9. Transitioning courts permanently to virtual mode to enhance accessibility and reduce costs and corruption.

Implementing these reforms is critical to revitalizing public trust in the legal system and ensuring justice for all citizens of India.

Case study on state of Jharkhand

In the diverse cultural landscape of Jharkhand, legal proceedings often center around complex matters such as land conflicts, opium-related crimes, violations of the Arms Act, Naxalite involvement, and issues concerning** Scheduled Tribes (ST) and Scheduled Castes (SC). Many individuals affected by these cases hail from tribal backgrounds, navigating the legal system amidst a backdrop of limited awareness and occasional coercion. To address these challenges effectively, there is a pressing need for a legal framework that acknowledges the distinct hurdles encountered by tribal communities and embraces an adaptable and collaborative strategy.

Jharkhand district Ramgarh

In the case of Criminal Appeal - 43/2022, heard in the Court of Principal District and Sessions Judge, Ramgarh, presided over by Sri Brajesh Kumar Gautam, significant legal proceedings unfolded. Registered on 26-10-2022 and finally decided on 10-02-2023, this appeal pertained to a conviction and sentencing order dated 28.09.2022, in G.R. Case No. 2590/2011 (Mandu PS Case No. 176/2011) by A.C.J.M., Ramgarh. The appellant, identified as Suraj Kumar @ Suraj Kumar Mahto, aged 34, residing in Village- Katiya, PS Patratu, District Ramgarh (Jharkhand), appealed against his conviction under sections 498A and 494 of the IPC. These sections dealt with offenses related to cruelty towards a married woman and bigamy, respectively^{††}. The appellant was initially handed a three-year term of simple imprisonment and a fine of Rs. 10,000 for the offense under section 498A, and a six-year term of simple imprisonment with an additional fine of Rs. 10,000 for the offense

** Case analysis of State of Jharkhand v. Lalu Prasad Yadav - iPleaders

†† <https://www.multidisciplinaryjournal.net/assets/archives/2018/vol3issue5/3-5-21-637.pdf>

under section 494, along with a provision for further imprisonment in case of non-payment of the fine.

The appeal primarily revolved around two pivotal issues: firstly, the sufficiency of evidence presented by the prosecution to establish the charges beyond a reasonable doubt, and secondly, the trial judge's alleged error in finding the appellant guilty and imposing the aforementioned sentences. The case originated from a complaint filed by Pramila Devi, the appellant's spouse, accusing him and others of various offenses. The trial court formally charged the appellant with violations under sections 341, 323, 498A, 424 of the Indian Penal Code, as well as section 34 of the Prevention of Witch (DAAIN) Practices Act. However, there was an administrative error in specifying the section for the charge of bigamy, which should have been section 494 of the IPC. Following the trial, the A.C.J.M., Ramgarh, acquitted the other accused and found the appellant guilty under sections 498A and 494 of the IPC. However, upon careful consideration, the appellate court overturned the trial court's judgment. The appellant, Suraj Kumar @ Suraj Kumar Mahto, was acquitted of the accusations under sections 498A and 494 of the IPC. Consequently, he was released from his bail obligation and set free.

The appellate court identified problems with the formulation of charges and highlighted the insufficiency of evidence to establish the claimed offenses beyond a reasonable doubt. As a result, the appellant's conviction and sentencing were reversed. The court emphasized the importance of adhering to proper legal procedures and stressed the necessity of providing substantial evidence in criminal trials to avoid unjust convictions resulting from inadequate or defective proof.

Jharkhand district Deoghar

In Criminal Appeal No - 59/2023, heard by Sessions Judge Diwakar Pandey in Deoghar, the appellant challenged the decision and punishment handed down by Smt. Sandhya Prasad, a Judicial Magistrate First Class, in relation to G. R. Case No - 478/2012 stemming from Deoghar (T) P.S. Case No - 144/12, dated 23.06.23.

The appellant was convicted of violating Section 25(1-B)a of the Arms Act and sentenced to two years of Rigorous Imprisonment, along with a fine of ₹7,000. Additionally, a provision was made for a three-month prison sentence and a fine as per Section 357(3) of the Criminal Procedure Code if the appellant failed to fulfill their obligations. Upon review of the lower court's record, it became evident that the prosecution relied primarily on the testimony of police witnesses to establish the appellant's guilt. However, while police testimony is generally considered credible, the court must scrutinize it carefully due to potential biases. The prosecution's case centered on the recovery of a domestically manufactured firearm from a co-defendant, Kishan Rajwar, who had since passed away. The prosecution alleged that the appellant was aware of Rajwar's possession of the firearm. Nonetheless, a discrepancy arose as the appellant was acquitted of one charge under the Arms Act but convicted



under another provision. The conviction under Section 25(1-B)a of the Arms Act hinges on proving unlawful possession of firearms, a burden the prosecution failed to meet convincingly. None of the witnesses, including the informant and members of the raiding party, testified to finding firearms in the appellant's possession. Furthermore, the prosecution's case was weakened by the failure to examine the Investigating Officer and present the seized firearms as evidence during the trial.

Literature review

[1] *Melcarne, A., and Ramello, G. B. (2021)* In recent decades, many governments have prioritized enhancing judicial performance to improve the business climate. This initiative, often prompted by recommendations from international organizations, has led to efforts to expedite case resolution by streamlining judicial procedures. However, while these reforms aim to provide faster justice, there has been less consideration of their potential drawbacks, particularly in terms of potentially sacrificing quality for speed, which contradicts the well-established legal principle that delayed justice equals denied justice.

This study seeks to contribute to existing empirical literature on this topic by proposing two alternative methods to better understand the relationship between judicial performance and quality. Through an analysis of data from 171 countries spanning from 2003 to 2016, researchers uncovered compelling evidence suggesting a significant negative correlation between court proceeding delays and the quality of justice in these countries. Although the limitations of this institutional empirical analysis caution against interpreting the findings as evidence of causality, the evidence presented indicates that countries with faster judicial systems may not necessarily experience a decline in justice quality. This finding supports the aforementioned principle, at least in descriptive terms.

[2] *Gould, J. B. (2008)* Two new studies were published about serious crimes and legal procedures. These studies looked at how states' legal systems affect the way serious criminal cases are reviewed after someone is convicted. The essays looked at the latest findings to see how things have changed since the last time laws about this were updated across the country. They wanted to understand why different courts treat these cases differently. These recent studies showed that it now takes longer to finish reviewing serious criminal cases in federal courts than it did ten years ago. They also found that how these cases are handled can vary a lot depending on where they are being reviewed. The main reasons for these differences seem to be related more to how states deal with legal matters than how federal courts do. Federal courts not only have to deal with the aftermath when states don't review cases properly, but they also need to make sure they look at serious cases very carefully to make sure everyone gets a fair deal, not just in words but in reality.

[3] *Shapiro, I. (2013)* It's argued that waiting four years for a decision on a constitutional claim is too long. But, it's important to know that this decision doesn't confirm a right that was previously denied without proper thought. This was the situation for Tom Palmer and others who were challenging a

law in the District of Columbia that banned carrying firearms for self-defense outside of one's home. This case, called *Palmer v. District of Columbia*, came after a Supreme Court ruling in 2008, which said the Second Amendment protects an individual's right to have and carry guns.

This case has been going on for almost four years without a decision. Both sides agree that the court can decide the issue just by looking at the law, without needing a trial. The way this case has been handled is unusual for a federal case. It started in August 2009, and a hearing was held in January 2010. Then, it was moved to a different judge in July 2011. There was supposed to be another hearing in August 2012, but it got delayed until October 2012. After that, the judge didn't take any further action. In August 2013, the plaintiffs' lawyer asked to speed up the process, and later that year, they asked a higher court to order a decision.

[4] *Casey et al. (2009)* The need to reduce the growing number of forensic exams in Digital Forensics Laboratories (DFLs) is urgent. In the past, DFLs would make copies of digital evidence and conduct thorough investigations for every case. But as more cases involve larger amounts of digital evidence, this method is becoming unsustainable. Researchers have suggested a new three-tiered approach to forensic exams to address this issue. This approach would help DFLs provide important findings quickly during different stages of an investigation, while also avoiding wasting resources on less important matters. The text explains the three tiers of forensic analysis with examples and appropriate tools. The researchers recognized that this problem isn't just technical, so they also updated training and set thresholds in DFLs. When deciding on the threshold, they considered factors like the chance of not finding evidence that could prove innocence and how serious the crime is. The paper ends by discussing the effects of expanding forensic exams on investigations.

[5] *Ayuba, M. R. (2019)* The study delved into the Marxist theory of law to provide a comprehensive understanding of the situation under examination. Through the utilization of quantitative methods such as questionnaires, and qualitative approaches including in-depth interviews and Focus Group Discussions, the researchers gathered data to illuminate the prevalent discontent among individuals regarding the efficacy of courts in administering justice within the Nigerian context. The findings underscored the multifaceted factors contributing to delayed justice within Nigerian courts, encompassing issues such as inadequate infrastructure and staffing, insufficient compensation and welfare for court personnel, political interference, judicial incompetence, and pervasive corruption among judges. Moreover, the study revealed that the overcrowding in Nigerian prisons stems largely from protracted judicial processes, resulting in a violation of the basic human rights of individuals awaiting trial, who constitute the majority of inmates. Of particular concern were the Arbitrary Trial Prisoners (ATPs), who, despite being acquitted after lengthy legal proceedings, endured the harsh realities of incarceration due to delays in the justice system. These findings underscore the urgent need for judicial reform, emphasizing the importance of ensuring judicial independence to uphold the

principles of impartiality and neutrality within the court system. From a legal perspective, the study advocates for measures to safeguard judicial independence, including the implementation of transparent and merit-based recruitment processes for judicial appointments, free from favoritism or nepotism. By prioritizing qualifications and skills in the selection of judges, the integrity and effectiveness of the justice system can be strengthened, thereby fostering public trust and confidence in the rule of law.

[6] *Bilal, M., & Khokhar, F. (2021)* The article argued that in Pakistan, justice has become an elusive concept, often associated with prolonged delays that effectively deny justice to many. It aimed to explore the reasons behind these delays in the justice system. Several factors contributing to these delays were identified, including complex procedures, outdated laws, the attitudes of judges and lawyers, and a backlog of unresolved cases in both higher and lower courts. The focus was on understanding the root causes of these delays and proposing solutions to address them, with the overarching goal of restoring justice in Pakistan. Additionally, the article examined how the accumulation of pending cases adversely affects individuals involved in legal proceedings and discussed the broader societal consequences of prolonged litigation. Ultimately, the article offered recommendations for improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the justice system in Pakistan, thereby ensuring timely access to justice for all.

[7] *Toplak, J., & Brezovnik, B. (2019)* The article discussed a 2016 ruling by the European Court of Human Rights, which affirmed that the European Convention on Human Rights encompasses the right to access information held by public authorities. Despite international guidelines advocating for swift access to information, there was ambiguity regarding the definition of "rapid" and when delays in procedures infringed upon individuals' rights. By analyzing access to information cases in Slovenia and Croatia, the article revealed significant delays in the disclosure of information, indicating a lack of effective protection of rights in both countries. These delays were argued to violate the right to access information and freedom of expression. Proposed solutions aimed to streamline access to information procedures to ensure promptness, aligning with international standards. In both Slovenia and Croatia, legislative and practical hurdles hindered applicants' access to information. Moreover, the absence of mechanisms to compel authorities to disclose information posed challenges for applicants. Disparities in response times were observed, with the Slovenian Commissioner reacting promptly to administrative silence compared to delays by the Croatian Commissioner. Similarly, while the Croatian administrative court often decided within three months, the Slovenian counterpart took considerably longer, sometimes up to a year or more. The article highlighted the importance of addressing prolonged access to information procedures, emphasizing the potential benefits for government transparency and human rights protection in Europe. Pending deliberations at the European Court of Human Rights on this matter could have significant implications for upholding Convention rights.

[8] *Amirapu, A. (2021)* The aim of this study was to examine how efficient formal judicial institutions contribute to economic development and whether informal contracting arrangements can adequately replace them. To investigate this, the study focused on differences in contractual dependence among companies and variations in court efficiency across different states in India. Using theories from incomplete contracting literature, which suggests that transactions with relationship-specific investments require effective contract enforcement to prevent opportunism, the study employed an identification technique. It found a strong correlation between the effectiveness of state-level courts and the level of relationship specificity within industries, which had significant implications for India's formal manufacturing sector's future expansion. To minimize bias, the study incorporated state and industry fixed effects and conducted various robustness tests and placebo testing to eliminate alternative explanations and increase confidence in the proposed mechanism.

[9] *No, S. (2005)* A subcommittee meeting was called to discuss the topic of "Justice Delayed is Justice Denied: A Case for a Federal Employees Appeals Court." Chaired by Hon. Jon C. Porter, the meeting included Representatives Davis of Illinois, Norton, and Cummings. The subcommittee aimed to address concerns regarding whether the government provides equal justice under the law through its employee appeals system. Currently, jurisdiction for handling Federal employee appeals is distributed among several agencies, including the Merit Systems Protection Board, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, the Federal Labor Relations Authority, the U.S. Federal Courts, and the Office of Special Counsel. Critics argue that this decentralized structure hampers the fairness of the process. The subcommittee recognized that the existing system's structure presents significant challenges that cannot be adequately addressed without fundamental reform. Discussions centered on the need for a more streamlined and efficient appeals process to ensure fairness and timely resolution for federal employees.

[10] *Rosas, A. (2009)* The analysis focused on the procedural aspects of the European Court of Justice (ECJ), particularly the duration of case hearings related to the Area of Freedom, Security, and Justice. The chapter examined a newly developed expedited method enabling the Court to decide on cases within this area promptly. The conclusion emphasized the significance of balancing efficiency with thoroughness in court proceedings. Extended durations for hearings often signal poor case management rather than thorough consideration. The Area of Freedom, Security, and Justice provided additional impetus for the ECJ to closely monitor the duration of legal proceedings.

[11] *Ismail et al. (2011)* The study delved into the duration of court proceedings, a crucial factor affecting the quality of justice administration. Specifically, it explored the issue within divorce cases involving Muslim couples in Malaysian Shariah courts, where prolonged proceedings were identified as problematic. The research sought to investigate the presence and extent of delays in case management within the Shariah court system, highlighting their significance and underlying causes. Dissolution of marriage cases served as the focal point for the study's sample analysis.

[12] *Mrozla, T. J. (2018)*. The study aimed to investigate how the characteristics of patrol officers and complaints influenced the timeliness of police misconduct investigations. Additionally, it sought to understand the effect of investigation promptness on the outcomes and disciplinary actions resulting from complaint investigations, considering relevant factors related to both the officer and the complaint. Using data from a Midwestern local police agency spanning from 2006 to 2015, the study found that the nature of the complaint and the presence of specific police officers influenced the duration of the investigation. Furthermore, it revealed that the attributes of both officers and complaints were significant predictors of the outcomes of complaint investigations, including the disposition and disciplinary measures taken. The discussion centered on the policy implications arising from these findings, highlighting potential areas for improvement in police misconduct investigation procedures and the importance of considering various factors in determining investigation outcomes and disciplinary actions.

[13] *Kumari, M. (2021)* The study examined the structure, functioning, and effectiveness of the Indian judiciary, with a particular focus on its impact on the country's democratic framework. It found that the Indian judicial system had become sluggish and disconnected from the needs of its citizens, resulting in widespread dissatisfaction among the populace. Various issues such as delays in judge appointments, lengthy court proceedings, and instances of corruption among court personnel were identified as contributing factors to the diminishing trust in the judiciary. Specific cases, including the Nirbhaya rape case, Priyanka Reddy's case, and the encounter of Vikas Dubey, were cited as examples where public sentiment favored extrajudicial actions, highlighting the loss of confidence in the legal system. The study delved into the root causes behind the delayed delivery of justice and suggested potential solutions to address these challenges.

[14] *Chattaraj, A. (2011)* The study compared past decisions of the Indian Supreme Court with the effectiveness of the American judicial system in speeding up trial proceedings. It underscored the importance of swift trials within the criminal justice system, emphasizing that any delay constituted a denial of justice. Additionally, the study warned that failure to promptly implement corrective measures would undermine the foundation of criminal trial jurisprudence.

[15] *Steinberg, C. (1992)* The paper delved into constitutional provisions, particularly the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution, which safeguards individuals from being deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. It also delved into the constitutional right to be protected against unreasonable searches and seizures, emphasizing the necessity of an adversary hearing to establish probable cause in specific civil cases. These provisions serve to limit governmental authority and shield individuals from potentially unjust actions by the state.

[16] *Stahn, C. (2014)* The article scrutinized the International Criminal Court's (ICC) third trial judgment concerning Germain Katanga, issued on March 7, 2014. It delved into both the procedural and substantive repercussions of the verdict, acknowledging its contributions to jurisprudence while

also highlighting contradictions, flawed interpretations, and evidentiary deficiencies. Judge Van den Wyngaert's significant dissent cast doubt on whether the decision met the 'beyond reasonable doubt' standard. The Katanga case underscored the ICC's challenges regarding fairness and trial management, prompting a reevaluation of the interplay between pre-trial and trial proceedings.

[17] *Sivagnanam, K. J.*, In the backdrop of the local government elections in Tamil Nadu in 2006, the paper shed light on the obstacles and prospects encountered by the newly elected state administration in ensuring social justice for Dalits in certain villages. The Kallars, the dominant caste, had hindered Dalit representation in reserved positions since 1996, resisting attempts to address this issue. The paper stressed that prolonged delays in delivering justice to these communities could lead to outright denial. It explored the hurdles posed by local power dynamics, the economy, society, and politics, underscoring the necessity for structural reforms in the social makeup of local governance.

[18] *Gibson, G. M. (2016)* The article delved into a historical incident involving the schooner Lord Nelson, constructed by William and James Crooks of Niagara in 1811. It was seized by the United States Navy in violation of American law, sparking a unique case in U.S.-Canada relations. The piece traced the legal journey, highlighting delays caused by actions (or lack thereof) from various entities, including American courts, Congress, the executive, Canadian provincial and national governments, the British government, wars, rebellions, crime, international disputes, and tribunals. After a lengthy process, the case concluded in 1930, resulting in compensation being awarded to twenty-five descendants of the Crooks brothers.

Conclusion

The case studies from Jharkhand's districts of Ramgarh and Deoghar illuminate the intricate dynamics of legal proceedings and underscore the pivotal role of evidence and procedural adherence in the delivery of justice. These cases exemplify how appellate scrutiny plays a crucial role in rectifying errors and ensuring fair trial outcomes. However, they also bring to light systemic challenges within the legal framework, including administrative lapses in charge formulation and deficiencies in evidence presentation. To effectively address these issues and alleviate delayed justice, comprehensive reforms are essential. This includes bolstering legal infrastructure, streamlining procedural frameworks, and implementing robust judicial oversight mechanisms. Moreover, tailored approaches that acknowledge the unique socio-economic realities of Jharkhand, particularly concerning tribal communities, are critical for promoting equitable access to justice. By prioritizing efficiency, transparency, and inclusivity in its legal processes, India can strengthen public trust in the judicial system and uphold the foundational principles of democracy and the rule of law. These reforms are crucial steps towards ensuring that every individual in Jharkhand receives timely and fair access to justice.

References

1. Melcarne, A., & Ramello, G. B. (2021). Is justice-delayed justice denied? An empirical approach. *International Review of Law and Economics*, 65, 105953.
2. Gould, J. B. (2008). Justice Delayed or Justice Denied? A Contemporary Review of Capital Habeas Corpus. *Justice System Journal*, 29(3), 273-287.
3. Shapiro, I. (2013). Justice Delayed Is Justice Denied.
4. Casey, E., Ferraro, M., & Nguyen, L. (2009). Investigation delayed is justice denied: proposals for expediting forensic examinations of digital evidence. *Journal of forensic sciences*, 54(6), 1353-1364.
5. Ayuba, M. R. (2019). Justice delayed is justice denied: An empirical study of causes and implications of delayed justice by the Nigerian Courts.
6. Steinberg, C. (1991). Justice Delayed is Justice Denied-The Abuse of Pre-Arrestment Delay. *NYL Sch. J. Hum. Rts.*, 9, 403.
7. Bilal, M., & Khokhar, F. (2021). Justice Delayed or Denied: The Myth of Justice in Pakistan. *Journal of Law & Social Studies (JLSS)*, 3(2), 124-132.
8. Governatori, G., & Rotolo, A. (2011, July). Justice delayed is justice denied: Logics for a temporal account of reparations and legal compliance. In *International Workshop on Computational Logic in Multi-Agent Systems* (pp. 364-382). Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
9. Toplak, J., & Brezovnik, B. (2019). INFORMATION DELAYED IS JUSTICE DENIED: LENGTHY PROCEDURES DENY THE RIGHT TO ACCESS INFORMATION. *Informatologia*, 52.
10. Amirapu, A. (2021). Justice delayed is growth denied: The effect of slow courts on relationship-specific industries in India. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 70(1), 415-451.
11. No, S. (2005). JUSTICE DELAYED IS JUSTICE DENIED: A CASE FOR A FEDERAL EMPLOYEES APPEALS COURT.
12. Rosas, A. (2009). Justice in haste, Justice denied? The European Court of Justice and the area of freedom, security and justice. *Cambridge Yearbook of European Legal Studies*, 11, 1-13.
13. Ismail, S. Z., Abdul Ghani Azmi, I., & Yaso, Z. (2011). Justice delayed is justice denied?: Divorce case management in Malaysian Shariah Court.
14. Mrozla, T. J. (2018). Is Justice Delayed Justice Denied? Examining the Timeliness of Completing Police Misconduct Investigations (Doctoral dissertation, North Dakota State University).
15. Kumari, M. (2021). Justice Delayed Is Justice Denied: Status Of Indian Judicial System. *NyaayShastra Law Review*, 2(1), <https-www>.
16. Chattaraj, A. (2011). Justice delayed-justice denied-the right to speedy trial in India. Available at SSRN 1919493.
17. Steinberg, C. (1992). " JUSTICE DELAYED IS JUSTICE DENIED" THE ABUSE OF PRE-ARRAIGNMENT DELAY. *NYLS Journal of Human Rights*, 9(2), 4.
18. Stahn, C. (2014). Justice Delivered or Justice Denied? The Legacy of the Katanga Judgment. *Journal of International Criminal Justice*, 12(4), 809-834.
19. Sivagnanam, K. J. Justice Delayed is Justice Denied.
20. Gibson, G. M. (2016). Justice Delayed is Justice Denied: The Lord Nelson Case. *Ontario History*, 108(2), 156-188.