ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 11| November 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

THE EFFICACY OF ONLINE DISPUTE RESOLUTION (ODR) IN OVERCOMING JURISDICTIONAL BARRIERS IN INDIA

N. Yogeshwaran
4TH Year, 7TH Semester, 85221032

ABSTRACT

Technological transformation is a vital component that cannot be removed from the concept of justice that is still updated in the modern era. ODR is a practical plan of action to supplement the litigatory processes that have been traditionally exercised in India, a country of long pendency and territorial diversity. In general, ODR maximizes the use of communication and information technologies to support negotiation, mediation, and arbitration via virtual platforms.

This article performs a jurisdiction-wise study on the effectiveness of ODR to conquer India-bound jurisdictional divisions through first of all an analysis of its law, next the liturgical and last court approval. By citing recent researches and policy directions, it puts forward the view that ODR is quite capable to annihilate the problems of territorial jurisdiction and accessibility, and also delays in the procedure, but the achievement of it fully requires more legislative confirmation, unification of procedures and equivalence of the supply of resources. The short EU and Singapore examples show how geospatial integration of ODR is linked to worldwide trends. The article argues that India`s digitally-based justice system, if adequately supported by statutorily coherent reforms and providing access for all, has the potential of making ODR the key of fair, borderless dispute resolution.

KEY WORDS: *Online Dispute Resolution (ODR), Jurisdiction, Access to Justice, Mediation, Arbitration, Digital Courts, Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR), Consumer Protection, E-Daakhil, Legal Technology.*

INTRODUCTION

The merging of law and technology has in a very fundamental way changed the ways in which disputes are solved in different countries. To overcome inefficiencies in a system riddled with one of the largest judicial backlogs in the world, India has prominently been putting into practice technological innovations such as e-filing, virtual hearings, and ODR. With the continued digitalization of trade and a rapid surge of e-commerce transactions, the demand for cross-border dispute resolution mechanisms has accordingly increased.

What is usually called ODR, i.e., the use of information technology for dispute resolution outside the court, is essentially the next step of the Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) concept, coming to the help of parties in the virtual world. In essence, it is negotiation, mediation, and arbitration conducted through the internet, whereby disputants can settle conflicts without having to show up physically or be limited by territory. It was the pandemic which basically acted as a propellant and this massive change had to be carried out in a very short time in courts and arbitral institutions.

Though India's journey with ODR has just begun, it is indicative of a vibrant institutional landscape growing at a landscape growing at a fast pace. Developments such as e-Daakhil portal set up under the Consumer Protection Act, 2019, private ODR platforms like SAMA and Presolv360 and NITI Aayog-supported government projects manifest the state's zeal for creating a digital justice ecosystem. However, the most basic questions remain: Whether ODR can really cross the geographical jurisdictional barriers? Are the digital proceedings carried out in different states and sectors legally binding? Moreover, do online platforms offer as much procedural fairness and accessibility as the traditional ones?

These questions lie at the heart of this paper. This paper by looking at statutory frameworks, judicial precedents, and comparative best practices tries to figure out if ODR in India has gone beyond territorial and procedural boundaries of a federal judicial system thereby accomplishing its ultimate goal.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

- How significantly can ODR remove or at least lessen the jurisdictional barriers of India's dispute-resolution system?
- What are the main legal and procedural obstacles that limit ODR from being cross-jurisdictionally enforceable?
- To what extent does ODR provide access to justice to the parties that are in different states or regions of India?
- In which ways comparative international experiences could help India to find the best solutions for ODR jurisdictional issues?

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

- To evaluate the impact of ODR in lessening the local and geographical impediments of India's dispute resolution system.
- To thoroughly examine the legislative, institutional, and policy framework that regulates the use of ODR.
- To gain a deeper understanding of problems related to the enforceability of rights, uniformity of procedures, and disparities in the infrastructure.
- To set up policy proposals that increase the trust of the public in ODR and coordinate it with other areas of law in India.
- To the extent of limited comparative inputs, foreign jurisdiction examples can be used as a benchmark for India's progress.

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 11| November 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The limitations of jurisdiction, which are mainly due to the strictly territorial nature of the limits, forum selection, and procedural mandates, have been challenge the efficient administration of justice in India for a long time. Conventional court procedures need the persons concerned to be physically present, must follow the local procedural rules, and require that the jurisdiction is territorial, as, for instance, the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 stipulates. As a result, the people who are located in the most distant places or in various states of the country are encountering a tough and costly vindication of their rights.

On the one hand, ODR promises to break through these barriers by providing remote participation, digital submission of evidence, and online adjudication. On the other hand, the shift from traditional territorial jurisdiction to virtual jurisdiction is causing complex problems to emerge. To begin with, there is still considerable doubt about the legal support that ODR outcomes may receive, especially when trans-state awards or settlements are involved. In addition, the lack of uniform procedural rules for e-service, authentication, and digital signatures makes it difficult for due process guarantees to be respected. Moreover, the presence of infrastructural differences - for example, lack of digital literacy, language problems, and uneven broadband access - results in new types of exclusion even though the physical barriers are removed.

Given these circumstances, this research project is intended to find out whether India's ODR system is able to overcome jurisdictional boundaries and thereby create a level playing field or whether, on the contrary, it simply reproduces existing inequalities in a digital format.

LITERATURE REVIEW

1.Ravitej Chilumuri, Mihika Jalan & Pranjal Agarwal, *Online Dispute Resolution in India: Current Position and the Way Ahead*, 2 NUJS J. on Disp. Resol. 2 (2022).

Chilumuri, Jalan, and Agarwal compare the situation of ODR in India before and after the COVID-19 pandemic. They state that online hearings only are not enough because of a lack of legal provisions for ODR agreements and awards which make it difficult to enforce them in different jurisdictions. According to the authors, it would be appropriate to have a single integrated legislative framework consisting of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, the Information Technology Act, 2000, and procedural rules dealing with e-service, authentication, and virtual evidence. Their work is to show that there is a conflict between traditional territorial jurisdiction and virtual participation which is the main subject of this research. Unfortunately, their article is mainly about arbitration, and they hardly give any insight into mediation-based ODR or consumer-level disputes.

2. Gauri Swarup Bansal, *Channelizing Online Dispute Resolution in the Indian Model of ADR*, 6 Int'l J. Legal Multidisciplinary & Humanities 3565 (2023).

In his study, Bansal offers critical analysis regarding the incorporation of ODR within the larger body of India's ADR system.[4] The author postulates that even though ODR eases the process of accessing justice and cheapens cost, its fragmented nature is a result of disproportionate technological infrastructure and lack of procedural uniformity in states.[5] The paper continues with references to jurisdictional ambiguities created by the interplay of traditional forums and digital environments for conciliation, where parties equally struggle to ascertain what jurisdiction claims competency in matters of online disputes. Bansal suggests there should be harmonized procedural standards, judicial recognition of digital awards, and an accreditation mechanism for ODR providers. The significance of this work is that it sits in the middle of jurisdictional concerns especially with respect to how ODR enforcement is impacted by various competing concerns given India's federal framework.

3. Akash Gupta & Apoorva Dixit, *Data Privacy and Implications for India's Online Dispute Resolution Economy*, Int'l J. Econ. Practices & Theories (2025).

Gupta and Dixit consider the impact of data protection regulations on the use of ODR (Online Dispute Resolution) systems in India and center their case around the passage of the Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023.[7] "Data jurisdiction" - which indicates the issue of which state has control over digital information - according to them, is a new problem for cross-border ODR.[8] Their article suggests that in the absence of clear rules for storage, transfer, and retention of digital evidence, it may be possible to contest ODR outcomes as breaches of data sovereignty principles. This study expands the concept of jurisdiction from merely geography to aspects of digital governance, thus giving more theoretical backing to the current research. However, the authors concede that there is only a limited number of studies on the compliance of ODR platforms, which in turn, leads to questioning the effectiveness of the implementation.

4.Khush Dalbir, *Institutionalizing Online Dispute Resolution (ODR) in Indian Public Governance: A National Policy Blueprint*, 8 Int'l J. Legal Multidisciplinary & Humanities 932 (2025)

Dalbir's article, driven by policy considerations, looks at ODR (online dispute resolution) from a public administration viewpoint. It argues that mechanisms for handling citizen grievances against the state (like CPGRAMS and state ombudsman portals) are so biased and lack the procedural requirements for real dispute resolution that they should not be considered neutral. The author suggests a centrally located ODR authority under the Ministry of Law and Justice to secure inter-state coordination, uniform procedures, and binding awards. Such a structure would, in effect, resolve the problem of fragmented jurisdiction in administrative redress. Dalbir's work is instrumental in widening the ODR conversation to governance of the public sector, besides just handling commercial disputes. However, the article's substantial dependence on policy suggestions instead of case data restricts its empirical depth.

5. **Shivanshu Pal, *Access to Justice in the Digital Era: A Comparative Study of ODR Implementation in India vis-à-vis International Best Practices*, Int'l J. Fundamental & Multidisciplinary Research (2025).**

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 11| November 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

Pal investigates the differences in the ODR system in India as compared to the European Union, the United States, and Singapore. The paper points to the absence of a well-developed legal framework in India, especially with respect to cross-border enforceability and uniform technological standards. Based on the EU consumer ODR Regulation 524/2013 and the Singapore Community Justice Centre model, Pal infers that India's local challenges continue because of institutional fragmentation. The comparative perspective of the study helps to understand India's situation in the context of worldwide trends, which emphasizes the necessity of harmonized digital dispute protocols. Nevertheless, it scarcely interacts with the Indian statutes or judicial decisions, hence, there is still some potential for further elaboration of the context.

Chapter 1: Conceptual Framework of Online Dispute Resolution (ODR)

Online Dispute Resolution (ODR) actually quite simply derives from the merger of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) techniques and digital technologies. Traditionally, forms of ADR included arbitration, conciliation, mediation, and negotiation-these attempted to lessen the backlog in the courts and offer a more flexible and consensual forum through which parties could settle disputes.1 At the beginning of the twenty-first century, however, the unparalleled growth of digital transactions and cross-border commerce more easily rendered traditional ADR ill-equipped to deal with disputes that went beyond geographical boundaries.

ODR is defined as the resolution of disputes using information and communication technologies, especially the internet, for the purposes of interaction between the conflicting parties.3 It includes every type of dispute resolution: whether negotiation, mediation, or arbitration; all conducted electronically, through portals, videoconferences, document-sharing platforms, and even digital signing of settlements.

The United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL) defines ODR as a "mechanism for the resolution of disputes via electronic communications and other forms of information technology based processes". Its inception was borne out of the need to resolve e-commerce and consumer disputes but has over time developed into a multidisciplinary frame for civil, commercial, and some even family law disputes.

In theory, ODR is intended to constitute procedural justice by ensuring meaningful participation, neutrality, and respect in the process within which disputants enter.7 ODR really aligns with Article 39A of the Constitution in India that mandates equal access to justice, thus operationalizing accessing a constitutional goal: accessibility, reducing barriers related to time and space, and therefore, allowing remote participation.

Conveniently, it is in this that asynchronous communications are possible. This means parties in different time zones or regions may interact without difficulty related to location.9 Coupled with automated negotiation and AI-assisted case management, these develop much more efficient and cheaper resolutions of disputes. However, concerns are raised as to procedural fairness, enforceability, and data security concerning the adoption of ODR as these directly cross paths with the concept of jurisdiction within a digital environment.

Chapter 2: Jurisdictional Barriers in Traditional Dispute Resolution in India

Jurisdiction-territorial, subject-matter, and pecuniary-is central to India's legal hierarchy. Under Sections 15-20 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908, jurisdiction is territorially defined by place and subject matter or where the cause of action arises. While this framework delivers a degree of predictability, it also introduces rigidness in an era when digital transactions transcend physical boundaries.

Contracts in traditional litigation are governed by the principle of lex loci contractus (law of the place where the contract is made). However, in online transactions, the place of contract formation is often indeterminate because offers and acceptances occur electronically at multiple locations. The Supreme Court in Bhagwandas Goverdhandas Kedia v. Girdharilal Parshottamdas recognized that contracts concluded via instantaneous communication, such as telephone or email, raise complex questions about the "place" of acceptance. Such ambiguities multiply in ODR contexts, where digital communication occurs through global servers or cloud platforms.

Another important jurisdictional hindrance is the separate court systems in all states in India. Each High Court and subordinate court carries a separate territorial jurisdiction; hence a dispute between parties in two different states sometimes necessitates the physical appearance in a distant forum, furthering their costs and making them less willing to litigate.

Procedural delays have also formed an obstacle to timely justice, with case backlogs of more than 50 million cases at all levels of Indian courts. ADR mechanisms such as arbitration and mediation were established to ease this situation, though these methods too are according to territorial mandates and physical hearings.

Thus, the Indian justice system depends entirely on territorial jurisdiction, presenting three major issues: 1) travel and communication costs incurred in reaching the forum; 2) multiple proceedings across the states involved; and 3) procedural duplication in enforcement. ODR, with its potential to transcend geography, emerges as a tool for recalibrating this system toward more functional efficiency and universal access to justice.

Chapter 3: Legal and Institutional Framework of ODR in India

From existing legislative and judicial precedents, ODR derives its legitimacy and not from any independent codified law. With an underlying bedrock of procedural law popularly called the Arbitration and Conciliation Act is the one from 1996. The consideration of parties having the rights to designate their arbitration procedures under Section 19, such as online hearing, can therefore be taken to indirectly legitimize ODR.

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 11| November 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

Likewise, the Information Technology Act, 2000 provides legal recognition to electronic records, contracts and signatures, fulfilling the evidential requirements for online proceedings. The Consumer Protection Act, 2019 introduced the e-Daakhil portal to allow electronic filing and hearing of matters before consumer fora, which is the first statutory ODR framework in India.

Legitimacy of ODR has been further strengthened by some judicial decisions. The Supreme Court, in Sujata Mukherjee v. Prashant Kumar Mukherjee, noted that procedural innovations are valid as long as they do not violate natural justice principles. It further reiterated the same in Punjab National Bank v. O.C. Krishnan by encouraging use of technology in the quest for speedy justice.

NITI Aayog's 2020 ODR Policy Plan envisaged a multi-layer ODR ecosystem comprising private ODR providers (SAMA, Presolv360, CADRE), sectoral regulators, and judicial oversight. These platforms now handle disputes ranging from consumer grievances to microfinance defaults, and show fairly high settlement rates.

However, some gaps do remain. There is no comprehensive ODR law developed in India that defines jurisdictional competence, procedural rules, and enforcement modalities. Digital exclusion and lack of awareness have also created impediments to its acceptance by the masses. The absence of standard accreditation criteria for ODR providers also puts into question their neutrality and procedural consistency.

While, on paper, the Indian legal framework creates space for ODR, in practice, its institutionalization remains half done. Harmonization of laws, standardization of procedures, and capacity-building would be the key to moving ODR from an experimental tool to a solid model of justice delivery.

Chapter 4: Comparative Perspectives and Lessons for India

It is noteworthy that from a global perspective, ODR has been institutionalized in a few jurisdictions. The European Union has established a centralized ODR platform for consumer disputes under Regulation (EU) No. 524/2013, thereby ensuring uniform procedures for all states and cross-border enforceability. All member states' compulsory participation of traders in this so-called mediation, along with a strictly standardized approach to both complainants and respondents in grievance-handling, has contributed to the success of the platform.

With the establishment of its Community Justice Centre (CJC) and Singapore International Mediation Centre (SIMC), Singapore now serves as an ODR hub for the region, introducing technology into mediation and arbitration. Digital mediation offered by SIMC combines confidentiality, procedural transparency, and judicial recognition, so that settlements reached online are enforceable under Singapore's Mediation Act 2017.

At the international level, UNCITRAL Technical Notes on ODR (2017) give non-binding guidelines that emphasize accessibility, fairness, due process, and confidentiality. These principles serve as a prototype for harmonizing domestic ODR systems.

India is advanced and on the right trials but has a more fragmented approach. The lessons derived from the EU and Singapore point out three priorities:

1.Centralizing ODR administration so that jurisdictional confusion is avoided.
2.Ensuring statutory recognition of legal enforceability of online settlements.
3.Developing a digital infrastructure that is equivalently usable by rural and urban populations.

With these principles incorporated, India could build an ODR ecosystem that solves domestic and also cross-border disputes smoothly.

Chapter 5: Findings, Challenges, and Barriers to Policy Recommendations

This chapter synthesizes the findings of the research and evaluates the efficiency of Online Dispute Resolution (ODR) to address jurisdictional barriers in India. This analysis indicates the ODR has made remarkable advances towards the democratization of access to justice, but is rather unequal and uneven because of institutional fragmentation, technological differences, and lack of a comprehensive legislative framework. The section will further divide itself into three parts: (a) empirical and conceptual findings, (b) analysis of the key challenges, and (c) policy recommendations with details for reform.

Key Findings

1. Jurisdictional Fluidity and Accessibility

Perhaps the most dramatic finding is that ODR erases traditional territory constraints. In conventional litigation, jurisdiction is connected with the geography defined by the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (CPC) with particular sections related to 15-20. ODR works on the idea of considering virtual presence as against physical locality. The situation now permits parties residing in different cities or even states to be engaged in resolving any dispute without requiring their physical attendance.

Platforms like SAMA, Presolv360, and CADRE show that more than 70% of all ODR cases in India have parties from different jurisdictions. This explains how ODR helps to avoid the cost and delays arising from jurisdictional obstacles. These platforms also instill the flexibility of procedures, allowing asynchronous communications to smooth over differences between disputants in language and time zone.

2. Efficiency and Cost-Effectiveness

Data gathered by NITI Aayog (2020) allows ODR mechanisms to cut down resolution time by as much as 60% and costs by nearly 50%, as compared to offline arbitration or mediation. Such efficiency is attributed to workflow automation, online documentation, and low logistical expenses. By favouring procedural justice, such cost effectiveness also allows for the growth of small-value claims, which had once been too expensive to litigate, with the opening of online forums.

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 11| November 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

Moreover, algorithmic negotiation tools and AI-based case triaging, introduced by the ODR platforms, would ensure that streamlining processes conducted digitally never outsmarted humans in being the final arbiters of disputes. Thus, mixing technology with ADR principles is indeed fulfilling a constitutional mandate under Article 39A of the Indian Constitution concerning access to justice.

3. Institutional Growth and Private Participation
Rapid institutionalization of ODR has been witnessed in India through the exertions of the public as well as the private sectors. The e-Daakhil system, instituted under the Consumer Protection Act of 2019, receives thousands of complaints yearly, conducts hearings online, and delivers digital settlements. Meanwhile, private providers such as SAMA and Presolv360 have extended ODR services to the banking, insurance, and e-commerce sectors.

However, this institutional variance has also led to fragmentation and inconsistency. There are no standardized accreditation criteria for prospective ODR service providers, leading to different levels of procedural law that govern divergent sets of party expectations, and practices in the enforcement of the agreements made. The absence of centralized monitoring on such operations also invites serious doubts unto data privacy, neutrality, and procedural fairness.

4. Theoretical Implications
Jurisprudentially, ODR signals a paradigm shift from territory jurisdiction in favour of universal proceduralism. Increasingly, it seems to demonstrate a shift from lex loci contractus to lex digitalis. I would contend this conceptual change breaks with the classical assumption that jurisdiction must coincide with geography.

Major Challenges
These positive developments notwithstanding, several hurdles still hinder the full efficacy of ODR in overcoming jurisdictional barriers in India. Such impediments include legal, institutional, technological, and socio-cultural impediments.

Absence of a Comprehensive Legal Framework:
As it stands, India does not yet have any statute specifically governing ODR. The Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, and Information Technology Act, 2000, can be said to give some level of recognition to electronic processes. However, neither of these laws defines ODR nor prescribes uniform standards. Thus, complete ambiguity arises with respect to the legal validity and enforceability of ODR settlements. Similarly, questions relating to procedural clarity chiefly arise concerning venue, applicable laws, and jurisdiction in cross-border disputes.

Unlike the EU Regulation (EU) No. 524/2013 and Singapore Mediation Act of 2017, the Indian perspective remains interpretative. Such a gap invites the possibility of inconsistent interpretations by the courts and reduces investor and consumer confidence.

Digital Divide and Infrastructure Deficit
Digital dislocation remains a main hindrance. We see the continued poor existence of internet connections and bandwidth by rural India with minimal digital literacy, thereby seeing ODR at present serving urban digitals, leaving out large sections of the population from its portals. The efforts at narrowing the digital divide will thus only result in haphazard access to justice, choir statutes on inclusivity as seen in Article 14 and Article 39A of the Constitution.

Data Privacy and Cybersecurity
Another challenge is the securing of personal and case-sensitive data transmitted on ODR platforms. The Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023, although protective, enunciates only general data protection principles and does not cater specifically to confidentiality along the dispute resolution process. Besides, data protection in ODR crisscrosses the issues of cross-border data storage, transfer, and applicable privacy standards under international law.

Acceptability of Judicial Institutions
Judicial conservatism-and the lack of a technological culture-foreseeing ODR implementation. Most judges and lawyers consider online hearings as inferior or incapable of earning the trust accorded to evidentiary hearings in a brick-and-mortar court. An accompanying judicial inertia, without standardized training, undermines ODR's acceptance in court anxillary systems.

Enforcement of Online Settlements
While the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 recognizes conciliatory settlements as maintaining the status of an arbitral award under section 30, it is uncertain that digitally signed settlements fall under its solution. Absence of such certainty deters any party from trusting ODR results, especially for high-stake disputes.

Policy Recommendations
Empirical and comparative insights have led to the formulation of the following recommendations aimed at increasing the effectiveness of ODR in India:

Adoption of a Comprehensive ODR Law
India must adopt a law specifically dealing with ODR, amalgamating arbitration, mediation, and information technology provisions. An ODR statute may define the following:
1. Jurisdictional competence of ODR tribunals;
2. Procedures and evidentiary standards;
3. Enforceability of online settlements; and
4. Recognition of digital evidence and e-signatures.
The law will bring legal certainty and uniformity in accordance with international best practices.

Creation of a National ODR Authority (NODRA)
A national ODR Authority should be established under the Ministry of Law and Justice, which will:
1. Accredit and monitor ODR platforms;
2. Formulate technical and ethical standards;
3. Maintain a national ODR database; and

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 11| November 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

Facilitate court-annexed ODR integration. This model parallels the EU ODR Contact Points and Singapore's Mediation Accreditation Scheme, rendering both administrative oversight and professional responsibility.

Integration with the Judicial System

Judicial integration of ODR with pre-litigation and post-litigation is highly desirable. Section 89 of the CPC could be amended to include "online mediation and arbitration" as recognized systems of ADR explicitly. High Courts could, for instance, have e-ADR cells to direct appropriate cases to certified ODR platforms under judicial supervision while ensuring their independence.

Building Digital Literacy and Infrastructure

Priority in digital infrastructure development-including broadband connectivity, reasonably priced devices, and multilingual platforms-should be given by the government. Legal education institutions must incorporate ODR and cyber law into their syllabus preparations to mold future practitioners. Partnership with the private sector may also provide momentum in the eventuality of developing user-friendly ODR interfaces in languages spoken by the masses.

Data Protection & Ethical Governance

A specific set of data governance rules for ODR should be introduced to supplement the Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023. Named as:

1. Confidentiality of proceedings;
2. Encryption of case data;
3. Limited access to third parties; and
4. Retention of data within India's jurisdiction unless otherwise agreed by the parties.

“Code of Ethics for ODR Service Providers” should also be drawn up to ensure proper neutrality, competence, and transparency of ODR proceedings.

Harmonization with International Frameworks

With regard to cross-border dispute mechanisms, India should harmonize its ODR regime with the UNCITRAL Technical Notes on ODR, 2017, and cooperate with international organizations. This will enhance the acceptability of Indian ODR results in other jurisdictions, thereby increasing investor confidence in India's digital legal ecosystem.

Concluding Observation

In the final analysis, ODR must not be viewed simply as a technological convenience, but an actual restructuring of access to justice. The transition from territory-based jurisdiction to digital access represents a jurisprudential shift to inclusiveness and procedural equity. With suitable legislation, a responsible institutional framework, and infrastructural inclusivity, O.D.R. can be the protagonist in the great Indian digital justice revolution-a fine balancing act between innovation and constitutional fidelity.

CONCLUSION

The online progress of dispute resolution (ODR) in India has led to a deep change in thinking about justice and practice. Once constrained by territorial jurisdiction and procedural formalism, dispute resolution is now beginning to be redefined through the lenses of digital participation, technological accessibility, and procedural innovation. To quote from this study, ODR is not merely a digitizing of old-style mediation or arbitration; it also converts them into mechanisms capable of transcending geographical, linguistic, and temporal boundaries.

At its heart, ODR is the realization of Article 39A of the Constitution, by which the State is required to achieve equal access to justice for all. ODR mechanisms can be broken through the economic and logistical barriers that have traditionally made it difficult for marginalized litigants to gain access to justice when they are effectively put in place. Therefore, justice will be made more available to citizens in areas where the standard court system often does not reach. In fact, this has made ODR appear not as a luxury or comfort but as a constitutional necessity in a digitized democracy.

However, the Indian ODR ecosystem is only fragmented and embryonic. There is a lack of comprehensive legislative framework, minimal judicial outreach, infrastructural inequality, and even data protection concerns. These collectively put great restriction on it. These challenges clearly show the need for a cohesive statutory and institutional framework that aligns technology with due process. Comparatively, there is no significant variation in that principle from study jurisdictions such as the European Union and Singapore. Such legislative precision and central oversight would be critical to sustaining public trust in online dispute mechanisms.

On the parallel, the human angle of ODR is as important. There is efficiency brought by technology, but the essence of dispute resolution is awareness and trust in fairness. Thus, with India's movement into a hybrid justice model-pairing digital access with procedural safeguards-neutrality, voluntariness, and confidentiality must be held sacrosanct. ODR should not be an alternative but rather an additional empowerment that advocates would have in the judicial process.

It further establishes that ODR can reshape jurisdiction itself-specifically moving from the idea of physical place into a procedural construct of participation. Among other things that ODR achieves, it will overcome within the spatial limits and stretch and change the meaning of justice in today and the days to come. The underlying lex digitalis for ODR is not antithetical to sovereignty but, rather, is a modern mode by which the state expresses to its subjects the legitimacy of their authority through technology-induced inclusion.

For ODR to really put its promise into practice, it should rather pro-act than react: one National ODR Authority (NODRA) has to be created, coupled with the enactment of an ODR Enabling Act as a precondition for integrating such processes into the judicial and administrative framework, thereby ensuring transparency and confidence in its use. Legal education and continuing judicious training will have to change to align with this digital paradigm so the professionals are legally and technologically literate.

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 11| November 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

Step aside, most important: ODR should be citizen-centric. Accessibility of digital justice is dependent upon using local languages in their respective regions, affordability for minor value suits, and being open to the rural population. The ongoing government initiatives - Digital India Mission and e-Courts Project - must be integrated with the expansion of ODR to achieve the goal of transforming the promise of "justice at one click" into real life for all citizens.

In sum, ODR: efficacy in overcoming jurisdictional barriers in India does not solely depend on technology but normative commitment to democratizing justice. The future of dispute resolution in India lies in adopting ODR both as a technological innovation and constitutional expression of equality, accessibility, and fairness. If nurtured through cohesive legislation, institutional oversight, and ethical design, ODR can become the basis upon which a digitally inclusive legal order is built - one that guarantees that justice, in the truest sense, is not bound by territory but delivered through technology.

REFERENCES

1. *Arbitration and Conciliation Act, No. 26 of 1996, INDIA CODE (1996).*
2. *Code of Civil Procedure, No. 5 of 1908, INDIA CODE (1908).*
3. *Consumer Protection Act, No. 35 of 2019, INDIA CODE (2019).*
4. *Digital Personal Data Protection Act, No. 22 of 2023, INDIA CODE (2023).*
5. *Constitution of India, arts. 14, 39A.*
6. *Bhagwandas Goverdhandas Kedia v. Girdharilal Parshottamdas, AIR 1966 SC 543 (India).*
7. *European Commission, Evaluation of the ODR Regulation (2022).*
8. *Ethan Katsh & Janet Rifkin, Online Dispute Resolution: Resolving Conflicts in Cyberspace (Jossey-Bass 2001).*
9. *Gauri Swarup Bansal, Channelizing Online Dispute Resolution in the Indian Model of ADR, 6 Int'l J. Legal Multidisciplinary & Humanities 3565 (2023).*
10. *Khush Dalbir, Institutionalizing Online Dispute Resolution in Indian Public Governance, 8 Int'l J. Legal Multidisciplinary & Humanities 932 (2025).*
11. *Law Commission of India, 245th Report on Arrears and Backlog: Roadmap for Clearance (2014).*
12. *Ministry of Electronics & Information Technology, Digital India Progress Report (2024).*
13. *NITI Aayog, Designing the Future of Dispute Resolution: The ODR Policy Plan for India (2020).*
14. *National Sample Survey Office, Household Social Consumption on Education in India (NSS Report No. 585, 2021).*
15. *Presolv360, Impact Assessment Report (2023).*
16. *Regulation (EU) No. 524/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 May 2013 on Online Dispute Resolution for Consumer Disputes, 2013 O.J. (L 165) 1.*
17. *SAMA, Annual Report (2024).*
18. *Singapore Mediation Act 2017 (Act 1 of 2017) (Sing.).*
19. *Tom R. Tyler, Procedural Justice and the Rule of Law: Fostering Legitimacy in Legal Institutions, 30 Crime & Just. 283 (2003).*
20. *UNCITRAL, Technical Notes on Online Dispute Resolution (2017).*
21. *United Nations Commission on International Trade Law, UNCITRAL Model Law on International Commercial Mediation and International Settlement Agreements Resulting from Mediation (2018).*
22. *World Bank, Doing Business 2020: Comparing Business Regulation in 190 Economies (2020).*