SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.688| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 10 | Issue: 7 | July 2025 - Peer Reviewed Journal

EVALUATING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF INDIA'S CRIMINAL JUSTICE MECHANISMS

Bonala Kishan
Research Scholar (Ph.D.), Department of Law, University College of Law, Kaktiya University, Warangal – 506009

ABSTRACT

The criminal justice system (CJS) in India serves as the primary framework for maintaining the rule of law, ensuring accountability, and delivering justice to citizens. However, growing concerns regarding delay in justice delivery, low conviction rates, police excesses, lack of accountability, and public mistrust have raised critical questions about its effectiveness. This article offers a comprehensive evaluation of India's criminal justice mechanisms, analyzing their structural, legal, and procedural dimensions. The article begins by outlining the constitutional and statutory framework that governs the Indian CJS, highlighting the roles of key institutions such as the police, prosecution, judiciary, legal aid bodies, and correctional services. It further explores measurable indicators of effectiveness, including timeliness of trials, accessibility, fairness of procedures, conviction rates, and public perception. The study identifies persistent challenges such as judicial backlog, inadequate police reform, weak forensic infrastructure, underfunded legal aid, and systemic discrimination. In addition to domestic analysis, the article adopts a comparative perspective by examining best practices from jurisdictions like the United Kingdom, United States, and South Africa. Judicial innovations and recent reforms in India, including digitization of courts, fast-track tribunals, and the Witness Protection Scheme, are critically examined to assess their impact. The article concludes with a set of policy recommendations that call for institutional reform, better resource allocation, modernization of legal processes, and a shift toward a rights-based, citizen-centric model of justice delivery. By evaluating the effectiveness of the criminal justice system holistically, this study emphasizes the urgent need for systemic transformation to uphold constitutional values and restore public confidence.

KEYWORDS: *Criminal Justice System, Legal Reform, Judiciary, Police Accountability, Legal Aid, Human Rights, Rule of Law, Access to Justice*

INTRODUCTION

The criminal justice system (CJS) is a foundational pillar of any democratic society. It encompasses the mechanisms, institutions, and processes established by law to investigate crimes, prosecute offenders, adjudicate disputes, and rehabilitate or punish those convicted. In India, the criminal justice system is rooted in the Constitution and codified through various legislations such as the Indian Penal Code (IPC), the Code of Criminal Procedure (CrPC), and the Indian Evidence Act. The system comprises key components including the police, prosecution, judiciary, legal aid services, and correctional institutions. Together, they are tasked with the crucial responsibility of delivering justice in a timely, fair, and effective manner. The Indian CJS today faces widespread criticism for its inefficiency, delay in justice delivery, low conviction rates, under-trial overpopulation, police excesses, and lack of victim sensitivity. These issues not only hinder access to justice but also undermine public trust in the rule of law. With over five crore cases pending across courts in India and more than 75% of the prison population comprising under-trials, the crisis of justice delivery has reached alarming proportions. This has led to growing debates on the relevance, responsiveness, and capacity of India's criminal justice institutions to serve the needs of a changing society.

In recent years, the Indian judiciary has taken proactive steps to address some of these issues through landmark judgments, while the executive has initiated certain reforms such as the e-Courts project, Fast Track Special Courts (FTSCs), and the Witness Protection Scheme, 2018. Yet, systemic challenges persist, including lack of institutional coordination, inadequate police reform, politicization of law enforcement, and outdated procedural laws. Moreover, vulnerable populations—such as women, Dalits, tribals, and the poor—often face discrimination and exclusion within the system, raising questions about its inclusivity and equity.

This article seeks to conduct a critical evaluation of the effectiveness of India's criminal justice mechanisms. It examines the legal and institutional framework, identifies key performance indicators, explores challenges and gaps, and draws comparative insights from other jurisdictions. The article also reviews recent judicial and policy trends and concludes with targeted recommendations to strengthen the criminal justice process. By analyzing both structural and procedural dimensions, this study aims to highlight the urgent need for comprehensive, citizen-centric, and rights-based reforms in India's criminal justice architecture. In doing so, it contributes to the broader discourse on legal reform, rule of law, and access to justice in contemporary India.

SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.688| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 10 | Issue: 7 | July 2025 - Peer Reviewed Journal

Legal and Institutional Framework

India's criminal justice system is structured around a combination of constitutional mandates, statutory provisions, and judicial precedents. The system is designed to uphold the rule of law, protect individual rights, punish wrongdoers, and rehabilitate offenders. Understanding the legal and institutional foundations of this system is essential to evaluating its effectiveness.

Constitutional Foundations

The Constitution of India provides the normative bedrock for the criminal justice system. Key constitutional provisions include:
Article 14: Guarantees equality before the law and equal protection of the laws.
Article 20: Protects against ex post facto laws, double jeopardy, and self-incrimination.
Article 21: Enshrines the right to life and personal liberty, which has been expansively interpreted by the judiciary to include the right to a fair trial and access to justice.
Article 39A: Directs the state to provide free legal aid and promote justice on the basis of equal opportunity.

These provisions collectively establish the rights of the accused, victims, and citizens at large, forming the foundation upon which legal procedures and protections are built.

Core Legal Instruments

The primary statutes governing the Indian criminal justice process are:

- Indian Penal Code, 1860 (IPC): Defines offenses and prescribes punishments.
- Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (CrPC): Lays down the procedure for investigation, arrest, trial, bail, sentencing, and appeals.
- Indian Evidence Act, 1872: Regulates the admissibility and evaluation of evidence in courts of law.

Other relevant laws include the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, Protection of Children from Sexual Offences (POCSO) Act, Prevention of Corruption Act, and the Juvenile Justice Act, among others. Together, these legislations provide the legal backbone for crime control and justice delivery in India.

Institutional Components of the Criminal Justice System

a) Police

The police are the frontline agency responsible for the prevention, detection, investigation, and control of crime. Under the CrPC, the police have powers to arrest, interrogate, and produce accused persons before magistrates. Despite their crucial role, India's police force is often criticized for poor training, political interference, custodial torture, and lack of sensitivity toward victims—especially women and marginalized communities.

b) Prosecution Services

Public prosecutors play an intermediary role between investigation and adjudication. Ideally, they must act as officers of the court, ensuring justice rather than merely securing convictions. However, in practice, the prosecution system is marked by delays, lack of independence from the executive, and insufficient coordination with investigating agencies.

c) Judiciary

The judiciary interprets laws, adjudicates criminal cases, and safeguards constitutional rights. It comprises:

- Trial Courts: Magistrates and Sessions Courts
- Appellate Courts: High Courts and the Supreme Court

Judicial independence is a hallmark of the Indian system. Yet, case pendency, shortage of judges, procedural rigidity, and uneven access remain pressing concerns. As of 2025, over 4 crore criminal cases remain pending in various courts across the country.

d) Legal Aid and Access to Counsel

Legal aid is a constitutional and statutory right under Article 39A and the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Institutions like NALSA and state legal services authorities are tasked with providing free legal aid to marginalized and indigent accused persons. Nonetheless, limited awareness, understaffing, and inadequate quality of representation reduce the system's effectiveness.

e) Correctional Institutions

Prisons are meant to serve as institutions for punishment and reform. However, India's correctional system is plagued by overcrowding (with over 75% under-trial inmates), poor living conditions, delayed trials, lack of rehabilitation services, and custodial violence. These factors significantly affect the human rights of prisoners and challenge the reformative goals of the CJS.

Role of Oversight and Auxiliary Bodies

Several institutions support and oversee the functioning of the criminal justice system:

- National Human Rights Commission (NHRC): Monitors custodial violence and prison conditions.
- Law Commission of India: Recommends reforms in criminal law and procedure.

SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.688| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 10 | Issue: 7 | July 2025 - Peer Reviewed Journal

- Forensic Science Laboratories (FSLs): Assist investigations with scientific evidence.
- Civil Society and Media: Act as informal watchdogs and platforms for public discourse on justice issues.

Key Indicators of Effectiveness

The performance of a criminal justice system can be meaningfully assessed only through concrete, measurable indicators. These indicators reflect how well the system upholds the principles of fairness, accountability, access, and deterrence. In the Indian context, certain key parameters provide insight into the system's capacity to deliver justice efficiently and equitably.

Timeliness of Justice (Pendency and Delay)

One of the most glaring issues plaguing the Indian criminal justice system is the enormous backlog of cases. According to the National Judicial Data Grid (NJDG), more than 4 crore criminal cases are pending across various courts in India as of 2025. Trial delays often extend for years, even decades, undermining the principle that "justice delayed is justice denied." Causes of delay include shortage of judges, frequent adjournments, outdated procedural laws, and poor coordination between police and prosecution. **Impact**: Delayed justice adversely affects victims, erodes public confidence, and leads to prolonged incarceration of under-trial prisoners, thereby violating fundamental rights under Article 21.

Conviction and Acquittal Rates

India's low conviction rates, especially in heinous crimes like rape and murder, raise serious questions about the effectiveness of investigations and prosecutions. As per NCRB data:

- Conviction rate for IPC crimes in 2022 stood at around 44%
- In rape cases, the rate is often below 30%

Such statistics reflect poor quality of evidence, lack of witness protection, procedural lapses, and sometimes deliberate sabotage of trials. They indicate a need for both forensic modernization and prosecutorial reform.

Access to Legal Aid and Representation

Legal representation is a cornerstone of fair trial rights. Under the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987, India provides for free legal aid to eligible individuals. Yet, surveys by NALSA and civil society groups show that many under-trial prisoners remain unaware of this right, or receive inadequate representation due to lack of trained legal aid lawyers. This disproportionately affects marginalized groups—such as the poor, Dalits, tribals, and religious minorities—creating systemic inequities and eroding the universality of the right to justice.

Fairness and Due Process

Fairness in the criminal process requires:

- Respect for procedural rights
- Non-coercive investigation
- Judicial neutrality
- Equal treatment before the law

Instances of custodial torture, forced confessions, and denial of bail reflect the persistence of arbitrary and coercive methods, especially at the pre-trial stage. Additionally, gender and caste bias in police investigations and trials compromise the impartiality of justice delivery. The failure to implement D.K. Basu guidelines and frequent violations of Article 22 protections for arrested persons further highlight lapses in ensuring due process.

Victim and Witness Protection

Victims and witnesses often face threats, intimidation, or social stigma, which prevents them from cooperating with the justice system. In politically sensitive or organized crime cases, witnesses frequently turn hostile due to lack of protection.Although the Witness Protection Scheme, 2018, was a major step forward, its implementation remains weak and inconsistent across states. Similarly, victim compensation schemes exist but suffer from bureaucratic delays and underfunding. Effective justice requires both victim-centric and witness-friendly processes—ensuring safety, dignity, and access to support services.

Prison Conditions and Under-Trial Population

A major indicator of systemic inefficiency is the over-representation of under-trial prisoners. As per the Prison Statistics India 2022:

- Over 75% of the prison population in India are under-trials
- Many have spent longer in prison than the sentence prescribed for their offence

Poor legal aid, delays in investigation, and non-availability of bail contribute to this crisis. Overcrowding, inadequate health care, lack of vocational training, and custodial deaths reflect the grim state of prison administration, undermining the rehabilitative goals of incarceration.

SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.688| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 10 | Issue: 7 | July 2025 - Peer Reviewed Journal

Public Trust and Perception

Ultimately, the effectiveness of the criminal justice system is also a matter of public trust. Surveys and research reports indicate declining confidence in police integrity, court efficiency, and the state's ability to protect victims. Perceived corruption, class and caste bias, and sensational media trials contribute to growing disillusionment. Restoring faith in the system requires a culture of accountability, transparency, and citizen engagement, which is currently lacking in many areas.

Challenges Facing the Criminal Justice System

Despite a robust constitutional and legislative foundation, India's criminal justice system faces deep-seated challenges that hinder its ability to deliver timely, fair, and effective justice. These challenges are institutional, procedural, and socio-political in nature, cutting across all arms of the justice delivery mechanism—police, prosecution, judiciary, legal aid, and correctional institutions.

Judicial Backlog and Infrastructure Deficiency

One of the most pressing issues is the chronic backlog of cases. With over 5 crore pending cases, the judiciary is overburdened at every level—from trial courts to the Supreme Court. Factors contributing to delay include:

- Shortage of judges (India has a judge-to-population ratio of around 21 per million, far below global standards)
- Frequent adjournments and procedural complexities
- Inadequate infrastructure (e.g., lack of courtrooms, digitization, and trained staff)

The consequence is a justice system that moves slowly, thereby eroding public faith and violating the right to speedy trial under Article 21.

Ineffective Police Reforms and Accountability

India's police force, which forms the entry point of the criminal justice system, suffers from political interference, poor training, lack of autonomy, and abuse of power. Despite recommendations from various commissions (e.g., the National Police Commission and the Supreme Court's directives in Prakash Singh v. Union of India), police reforms remain largely unimplemented. Issues such as custodial torture, third-degree methods, illegal detention, and biased investigations persist, especially against marginalized groups. The absence of an independent complaints mechanism further limits accountability.

Weak and Dependent Prosecution System

Prosecutors play a crucial role in ensuring that justice is served, not just in securing convictions. However, in India:

- Prosecutors are often under the control of the executive, leading to conflicts of interest in politically sensitive cases.
- There is a lack of independence, training, and specialization, particularly in handling complex cases like cybercrime, financial fraud, or sexual violence.

This weakens the prosecutorial arm and contributes to poor conviction rates and prolonged trials.

Outdated Procedures and Limited Use of Forensics

The Code of Criminal Procedure (CrPC), originally drafted in colonial times, remains largely unchanged in structure, despite a radically transformed legal landscape. It emphasizes formalism over efficiency and delays over expeditious justice. Additionally, the forensic infrastructure in India is underdeveloped, with a limited number of accredited labs, outdated technology, and massive backlogs in evidence analysis. This leads to poor-quality investigations and undermines the credibility of evidence in court.

Underfunded and Underutilized Legal Aid System

Although legal aid is a constitutional right under Article 39A, it remains ineffective in practice. Key challenges include:

- Lack of awareness among eligible individuals, especially rural and marginalized populations
- Insufficient training and remuneration for legal aid lawyers
- Poor quality of representation compared to private counsel

The result is a dual-speed system where the rich access justice quickly while the poor languish for years.

Prison Overcrowding and Custodial Violence

India's prisons are overcrowded, with over 75% of inmates being under-trial prisoners, many of whom remain incarcerated for petty offences or due to inability to secure bail.

Issues include:

- Poor hygiene, inadequate medical facilities, and lack of mental health services
- Delays in trial and absence of parole reforms
- Frequent reports of custodial deaths, sexual abuse, and torture

Despite the Supreme Court's guidelines and NHRC oversight, the prison system continues to violate the reformative theory of punishment enshrined in Indian jurisprudence.

SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.688| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 10 | Issue: 7 | July 2025 - Peer Reviewed Journal

Discrimination and Social Exclusion

The criminal justice system in India disproportionately affects vulnerable groups. Dalits, Adivasis, Muslims, and women often face discriminatory treatment at every stage—from arrest and investigation to trial and sentencing.

Reports from civil society and legal aid organizations reveal:

- Higher rates of arbitrary arrests and denial of bail
- Stereotyping and bias in police FIRs and charge sheets
- Hostile courtrooms for survivors of sexual and caste-based violence

This undermines the constitutional promise of equality before the law (Article 14) and equal protection under the law.

Lack of Inter-Institutional Coordination

The criminal justice system functions as a chain, but its components—police, prosecution, judiciary, and corrections—often work in silos. There is minimal coordination in:

- Sharing case files and evidence
- Scheduling hearings
- Monitoring implementation of bail, parole, or compensation orders

This fragmentation leads to duplication, delay, and miscarriage of justice.

Recent Reforms and Judicial Trends

In recent years, India's criminal justice system has witnessed several reform initiatives and judicial interventions aimed at addressing long-standing inefficiencies, human rights violations, and access barriers. Although many of these measures are in their early stages or unevenly implemented, they represent significant steps toward a more accountable and responsive justice system. This section outlines some of the major developments across judicial, executive, and technological domains.

Landmark Judicial Interventions

Indian courts, particularly the Supreme Court, have played a proactive role in filling legislative and administrative voids in the criminal justice process.

D.K. Basu v. State of West Bengal (1997): This case laid down guidelines to prevent custodial torture and arbitrary arrest, including mandatory procedures for arrest and detention, such as informing relatives and producing detainees before a magistrate within 24 hours. These safeguards have since become part of the procedural canon under Article 21.

Prakash Singh v. Union of India (2006): The Court issued binding directives for police reform, including the establishment of State Security Commissions, fixed tenures for senior officers, separation of investigation and law-and-order functions, and the creation of Police Complaints Authorities. However, implementation has been patchy, with many states yet to comply fully.

Mahender Chawla v. Union of India (2018): The Supreme Court approved the Witness Protection Scheme, 2018, giving it the status of law under Article 141. The scheme categorizes threats and provides for identity concealment, relocation, and police protection—crucial in high-profile or sensitive criminal trials.

Suo Motu Writ Petition (In Re: Inhuman Conditions in 1382 Prisons): The Court directed state governments to improve prison conditions, decongest jails, provide mental healthcare, and protect undertrial rights. These directives reaffirmed the reformative and rehabilitative objectives of incarceration.

Executive Reforms and Policy Initiatives

Several executive-led reforms have aimed to improve justice delivery through digitization, infrastructure development, and access enhancement.

e-Courts Project: Launched under the National e-Governance Plan, the project seeks to digitize case records, enable online filings, and integrate court management systems. Many district and subordinate courts are now connected to the NJDG, allowing real-time case tracking.

Fast Track Special Courts (FTSCs): Established to ensure speedy disposal of sexual offence and POCSO cases, FTSCs have improved trial timelines but still face challenges related to infrastructure and judicial vacancies.

Legal Aid Services Expansion: Through the National Legal Services Authority (NALSA), the government has scaled up free legal aid services and Lok Adalats. NALSA's thematic legal literacy campaigns (e.g., for women, prisoners, and the disabled) aim to improve awareness and access.

SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.688| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 10 | Issue: 7 | July 2025 - Peer Reviewed Journal

Criminal Law Amendments: In response to public outrage over violent crimes, laws have been amended to expand definitions of sexual offences, increase punishment for rape, and introduce special procedures for child victims. However, critics warn against an overemphasis on punitive measures without systemic reform.

Use of Technology in Justice Delivery

Video Conferencing in Trials: Following *State of Maharashtra v. Praful B. Desai (2003)*, courts have widely adopted video conferencing for witness examination and remand proceedings, especially during and after the COVID-19 pandemic.

AI and Judicial Automation: The Supreme Court has introduced Supreme Court Vidhik Anuvaad Software (SUVAS) for translation and SUPACE, an AI tool for assisting judges in research and drafting. While promising, their integration into lower courts remains limited.

Digital FIRs and Online Complaints: Several states have introduced e-FIR and citizen portal services under the Crime and Criminal Tracking Network System (CCTNS), enhancing access and transparency in police processes.

Limitations and Continuing Concerns

Despite these positive trends, many reforms remain piecemeal and unevenly applied. Common concerns include:

- Lack of political will in implementing judicial directives (e.g., police reform)
- Digital divide limiting the impact of e-courts and legal aid technology
- Overburdened fast-track courts that often lack supporting staff and infrastructure
- Limited outreach of legal aid services in rural and marginalized communities
- Insufficient funding for reforms in forensic science, court digitization, and prison modernization

Policy Recommendations

The analysis of India's criminal justice system reveals a complex web of institutional inefficiencies, procedural delays, and systemic inequalities. Addressing these issues requires more than isolated reforms—it calls for a comprehensive, coordinated, and rights-based approach. This section outlines targeted policy recommendations aimed at improving effectiveness, transparency, and public trust in the criminal justice system.

Comprehensive Police Reform

1. All states must fully comply with the Supreme Court's directives on establishing State Security Commissions, Police Establishment Boards, and Police Complaints Authorities.
2. Improve police training in human rights, investigation techniques, gender sensitivity, and cybercrime.
3. Ensure operational independence while creating mechanisms for external accountability, such as independent review boards and civil society oversight.
4. Strengthen citizen-police collaboration to improve trust and local crime prevention.

Judicial Reforms and Infrastructure Development

- Raise the number of judges to meet the international benchmark of 50 judges per million population.
- Expand use of technology to streamline court procedures, automate scheduling, and reduce adjournments.
- Enhance transparency and speed in the appointment of judges through reform of the collegium system or an independent commission.
- Promote ADR mechanisms, Lok Adalats, and mediation centers to reduce burden on regular courts.

Independent and Professional Prosecution Services

- Create independent Directorates of Prosecution to ensure professionalism and neutrality, particularly in politically sensitive cases.
- Institutionalize training in handling complex cases such as financial crimes, cyber offences, and gender-based violence.
- Introduce a transparent performance and accountability framework for prosecutors.

Strengthening Legal Aid and Access to Justice

- Increase the presence of legal aid centers in rural, tribal, and under-served areas.
- Raise honorarium and provide specialized training to legal aid advocates.
- Use media, schools, and community outreach to inform people—especially marginalized groups—of their legal rights and remedies.
-

SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.688| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 10 | Issue: 7 | July 2025 - Peer Reviewed Journal

Forensic and Technological Modernization

- Upgrade and expand accredited forensic labs to reduce evidence processing delays and improve investigation quality.
- Develop standardized protocols for collection, preservation, and presentation of digital evidence.
- Scale up the use of AI tools like SUPACE and enhance the implementation of e-courts, including translation services and paperless filing.

Victim and Witness Protection

- All states must operationalize the scheme with dedicated budgetary allocation, protection officers, and safe houses.
- Expand victim compensation schemes and provide psychological, medical, and legal assistance, especially for survivors of sexual and caste-based violence.
- Institutionalize in-camera trials, use of video conferencing, and gender-sensitized courtrooms for vulnerable victims and witnesses.

Prison and Correctional Reform

- Enforce Section 436A CrPC and ensure speedy bail and trial mechanisms.
- Improve hygiene, healthcare, vocational training, and mental health support in jails.
- Promote community service, probation, and parole to decongest prisons and encourage rehabilitation.

Institutional Coordination and Oversight

- Establish criminal justice coordination boards at the state and district level to ensure smooth interaction between police, prosecution, judiciary, and prison departments.
- Formulate a comprehensive national policy document that outlines the vision, principles, and roadmap for criminal justice reform over the next decade.
- Institutionalize roles for NGOs, academic bodies, and think tanks in policy monitoring and service delivery.

CONCLUSION

India's criminal justice system, while grounded in a strong constitutional and legal framework, faces a crisis of credibility, accessibility, and efficiency. The promise of justice enshrined in the Constitution is frequently undermined by judicial delays, procedural complexities, under-resourced institutions, and systemic discrimination. This gap between principle and practice continues to disproportionately affect the most vulnerable—undertrials, women, Dalits, tribals, and the economically disadvantaged—who struggle to assert their rights within a rigid and often hostile system. Throughout this article, we have explored the structural and procedural components of the criminal justice system, assessed its performance through key indicators such as conviction rates, legal aid availability, witness protection, and public trust, and examined the challenges that obstruct its proper functioning. From judicial backlog and lack of police accountability to ineffective prosecution and poor prison conditions, it is evident that India's criminal justice mechanisms need urgent and comprehensive reform.

Encouragingly, there have been some positive developments. Judicial interventions such as the D.K. Basu and Prakash Singh rulings, the introduction of the Witness Protection Scheme (2018), and executive initiatives like the e-Courts project signal a growing recognition of the system's failings and a willingness to adapt. Lessons from other jurisdictions—such as the UK's independent prosecution service, the US's technological investments, and South Africa's rights-based approach—offer valuable models that can be tailored to India's socio-legal landscape.

Yet, reforms must go beyond symbolic or reactive measures. What is needed is a systemic, institutional, and people-centric overhaul—one that empowers institutions, ensures independence and professionalism, and places victims and the marginalized at the heart of justice delivery. Inter-institutional coordination, better funding, decentralization, and community engagement will be vital for this transformation. In essence, the future of India's democracy rests on the strength of its justice system. A fair, transparent, and effective criminal justice process is not only a legal imperative but a moral and constitutional duty—one that demands the collective will of the legislature, judiciary, executive, and civil society to uphold the promise of justice for all.

REFERENCES

1. *National Crime Records Bureau (NCRB), 'Crime in India' Reports (2022–2023).*
2. *Supreme Court of India, D.K. Basu v. State of West Bengal, (1997) 1 SCC 416.*
3. *Supreme Court of India, Prakash Singh v. Union of India, (2006) 8 SCC 1.*
4. *Supreme Court of India, Mahender Chawla & Others v. Union of India, (2018) 14 SCC 615.*
5. *Supreme Court of India, Zahira Habibulla H. Sheikh v. State of Gujarat, (2004) 4 SCC 158.*
6. *Supreme Court of India, State of Maharashtra v. Praful B. Desai, (2003) 4 SCC 601.*
7. *Supreme Court of India, Sakshi v. Union of India, (2004) 5 SCC 518.*
8. *Law Commission of India, 198th Report on Witness Identity Protection and Witness Protection Programmes (2006).*

SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.688| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 10 | Issue: 7 | July 2025 - Peer Reviewed Journal

9. *National Legal Services Authority (NALSA) Reports and Legal Aid Guidelines (2022).*
10. *United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), 'Global Study on Legal Aid' (2016).*
11. *Ministry of Law and Justice, Government of India, 'e-Courts Mission Mode Project Reports'.*
12. *National Judicial Data Grid (NJDG), Statistics on Case Pendency (2023).*
13. *Centre for the Study of Developing Societies (CSDS), 'Status of Policing in India Report' (2022).*