

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS



Open Access, Refereed Journal Multi-Disciplinary
Peer Reviewed

www.ijlra.com

DISCLAIMER

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored, transmitted, or distributed in any form or by any means, whether electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without prior written permission of the Managing Editor of the *International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis (IJLRA)*.

The views, opinions, interpretations, and conclusions expressed in the articles published in this journal are solely those of the respective authors. They do not necessarily reflect the views of the Editorial Board, Editors, Reviewers, Advisors, or the Publisher of IJLRA.

Although every reasonable effort has been made to ensure the accuracy, authenticity, and proper citation of the content published in this journal, neither the Editorial Board nor IJLRA shall be held liable or responsible, in any manner whatsoever, for any loss, damage, or consequence arising from the use, reliance upon, or interpretation of the information contained in this publication.

The content published herein is intended solely for academic and informational purposes and shall not be construed as legal advice or professional opinion.

**Copyright © International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis.
All rights reserved.**

ABOUT US

The *International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis (IJLRA)* (ISSN: 2582-6433) is a peer-reviewed, academic, online journal published on a monthly basis. The journal aims to provide a comprehensive and interactive platform for the publication of original and high-quality legal research.

IJLRA publishes Short Articles, Long Articles, Research Papers, Case Comments, Book Reviews, Essays, and interdisciplinary studies in the field of law and allied disciplines. The journal seeks to promote critical analysis and informed discourse on contemporary legal, social, and policy issues.

The primary objective of IJLRA is to enhance academic engagement and scholarly dialogue among law students, researchers, academicians, legal professionals, and members of the Bar and Bench. The journal endeavours to establish itself as a credible and widely cited academic publication through the publication of original, well-researched, and analytically sound contributions.

IJLRA welcomes submissions from all branches of law, provided the work is original, unpublished, and submitted in accordance with the prescribed submission guidelines. All manuscripts are subject to a rigorous peer-review process to ensure academic quality, originality, and relevance.

Through its publications, the *International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis* aspires to contribute meaningfully to legal scholarship and the development of law as an instrument of justice and social progress.

PUBLICATION ETHICS, COPYRIGHT & AUTHOR RESPONSIBILITY STATEMENT

The *International Journal for Legal Research and Analysis (IJLRA)* is committed to upholding the highest standards of publication ethics and academic integrity. All manuscripts submitted to the journal must be original, unpublished, and free from plagiarism, data fabrication, falsification, or any form of unethical research or publication practice. Authors are solely responsible for the accuracy, originality, legality, and ethical compliance of their work and must ensure that all sources are properly cited and that necessary permissions for any third-party copyrighted material have been duly obtained prior to submission. Copyright in all published articles vests with IJLRA, unless otherwise expressly stated, and authors grant the journal the irrevocable right to publish, reproduce, distribute, and archive their work in print and electronic formats. The views and opinions expressed in the articles are those of the authors alone and do not reflect the views of the Editors, Editorial Board, Reviewers, or Publisher. IJLRA shall not be liable for any loss, damage, claim, or legal consequence arising from the use, reliance upon, or interpretation of the content published. By submitting a manuscript, the author(s) agree to fully indemnify and hold harmless the journal, its Editor-in-Chief, Editors, Editorial Board, Reviewers, Advisors, Publisher, and Management against any claims, liabilities, or legal proceedings arising out of plagiarism, copyright infringement, defamation, breach of confidentiality, or violation of third-party rights. The journal reserves the absolute right to reject, withdraw, retract, or remove any manuscript or published article in case of ethical or legal violations, without incurring any liability.

JUDICIAL DELAY AND THE RIGHT TO SPEEDY TRIAL **UNDER ARTICLE 21: A CRITICAL EXAMINATION**

AUTHORED BY - MRS.POOJA DINESH JADHAV

Abstract

Judicial delay has become a major impediment to the effective functioning of the Indian criminal justice system. Although the right to a speedy trial has been judicially recognized as an essential component of Article 21 of the Constitution of India, persistent procedural and institutional delays continue to erode personal liberty, compromise fair trial guarantees, and weaken public trust in the justice delivery mechanism. This study critically explores the phenomenon of judicial delay, its underlying causes, and its constitutional ramifications, with particular emphasis on the right to speedy trial under Article 21. By examining leading judicial precedents, statutory provisions, and empirical findings, the paper identifies the disconnect between constitutional principles and real-world enforcement. It further proposes legal, administrative, and structural reforms aimed at minimizing systemic delays and strengthening the practical realization of the right to speedy trial.

Keywords:

Judicial Delay, Speedy Trial, Article 21, Criminal Justice, Indian Courts

1. Introduction

The principle that delayed justice amounts to denied justice underscores the foundational importance of timely adjudication in a democratic legal system. In India, prolonged judicial proceedings—especially in criminal cases—have resulted in thousands of undertrial prisoners remaining incarcerated for years without final determination of guilt. Such delays undermine the very purpose of criminal justice and violate fundamental principles of fairness.

Article 21 of the Constitution guarantees protection of life and personal liberty, subject only to lawful procedure. Over time, judicial interpretation has broadened the scope of Article 21 to include substantive rights such as dignity, fairness, and the right to a speedy trial. However, the lack of enforceable timelines, coupled with procedural inefficiencies and infrastructural constraints, has diluted the effectiveness of this constitutional safeguard.

This paper critically evaluates judicial delay in India and its implications for the right to speedy trial, analyzing doctrinal developments, judicial trends, and institutional shortcomings.

2. Literature Review

Academic scholarship on judicial delay highlights both systemic and procedural factors contributing to prolonged litigation. Upendra Baxi argues that judicial inefficiencies disproportionately burden marginalized populations, effectively transforming legal safeguards into instruments of hardship. Justice V.R. Krishna Iyer consistently advocated a rights-oriented criminal procedure, emphasizing that extended pre-trial detention violates constitutional ethics.

The Law Commission of India, through multiple reports including the 77th, 239th, and 245th Reports, has identified case backlog, inadequate judge strength, and procedural complexity as primary contributors to trial delays. Comparative legal research further reveals that unlike jurisdictions such as the United States and the United Kingdom, India lacks mandatory statutory deadlines for criminal proceedings.

While courts have affirmed speedy trial as a constitutional right, critics note that judicial remedies remain discretionary and inconsistent, resulting in uneven enforcement across cases.

3. Research Methodology

This research employs a doctrinal and analytical approach. Primary legal materials include constitutional provisions, Supreme Court and High Court judgments, and statutory enactments such as the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973. Secondary sources comprise scholarly writings, Law Commission reports, academic commentaries, and empirical legal studies. The analysis critically examines judicial reasoning and evaluates the effectiveness of existing legal mechanisms in addressing judicial delay.

4. Findings

The research identifies several key observations:

The right to a speedy trial is constitutionally recognized under Article 21, yet lacks standardized enforcement criteria.

Prolonged judicial delays contribute to extended pre-trial detention, undermining the presumption of innocence.

Courts have avoided imposing rigid timelines due to practical and logistical constraints, weakening the enforceability of the right.

Legal remedies for violation—such as bail or quashing of proceedings—are applied inconsistently.

Structural shortcomings, including insufficient judicial manpower and procedural misuse, remain inadequately addressed.

5. Discussion

The Supreme Court's landmark ruling in *Hussainara Khaton v. State of Bihar* (1979) marked the first explicit recognition of the right to a speedy trial, exposing the plight of undertrial prisoners detained beyond the maximum prescribed sentence.

In *A.R. Antulay v. R.S. Nayak* (1992), the Court formulated guiding principles to determine violations of the right to speedy trial, including duration of delay, reasons for postponement, conduct of parties, and prejudice suffered. However, it deliberately refrained from imposing strict deadlines, preferring a flexible, case-specific approach.

Later, in *P. Ramachandra Rao v. State of Karnataka* (2002), the Court rejected the imposition of fixed statutory or judicial timelines, citing concerns about potential injustice. While this preserves judicial discretion, it has also weakened accountability and diluted enforceability.

Judicial delay thus reflects a persistent conflict between constitutional ideals and administrative realities, turning the right to speedy trial into an aspirational rather than guaranteed protection.

6. Conclusion

Judicial delay presents a serious challenge to the constitutional promise of liberty enshrined in Article 21. Although Indian courts have played a significant role in recognizing the right to a speedy trial, the absence of enforceable standards and accountability mechanisms has limited its practical impact. Addressing this issue requires coordinated reforms, including legislative action, institutional accountability, technological modernization, and procedural simplification.

Timely justice is not merely a procedural convenience but a constitutional imperative. Strengthening the right to speedy trial is essential for preserving the rule of law, restoring public faith in the judiciary,

and safeguarding human dignity within the criminal justice framework.

7. References

Constitution of India, Article 21

Hussainara Khatoon v. State of Bihar, (1979) 3 SCC 532

A.R. Antulay v. R.S. Nayak, (1992) 1 SCC 225

P. Ramachandra Rao v. State of Karnataka, (2002) 4 SCC 578

Law Commission of India, 77th Report on Delay and Arrears in Trial Courts Law Commission of India, 239th Report on Expeditious Investigation and Trial Upendra Baxi, The Crisis of the Indian Legal System, Oxford University Press

V.N. Shukla, Constitution of India, Eastern Book Company

