Access to Criminal Justice*

Research focus: Strategies to Strengthen the Capacity of Criminal Justice Framework in India

ABSTRACT

"Law should not sit limply, while those who defy it go free and those who seek its protection lose hope".[1]

No matter where we are, what we do as the case may be or what so ever post we hold, we all are affected by the crime. The students can be exploited by their seniors in hostels or any mischief can happen with their colleagues. Generally speaking there is always a chance of being a victim of crime in our life. As citizens we form government to maintain the law and order for pursuing Justice for people and by representing people in parliament to safeguard the access to "criminal justice". The aim of this paper is to examine the fundamental principles of "criminal jurisprudence", including the "constitutional provisions" relating to criminal jurisprudence, to understand the current situation of criminal justice delivery system in India and various reforms which are required to strengthen the criminal justice delivering. Further the paper deals with the `right to legal aid in India and its constitutional authority` and it elucidates how the Indian courts have broadened the scope of criminal justice Human Rights. Therefore the Thrust of the paper is to understand the status of criminal justice system in India, how to strengthen it and the status of legal aid in Indian criminal justice delivery system.

Introduction:

The human is a social animal and in explicit words the animal needs to be taught to behave better for being the part of the society, like a dog is taught to behave well, not to bark or growl unnecessarily and especially not to bite the people around him, and all this is being learnt by the dog just because of the fear of that hunter which is slitting the air and then makes a heavy blow over his skin and that fear of hunter makes that dog a good dog, an obedient dog. In same way for the human being a hunter is there in form sanctions, which actually stops him from

*Karan Singh Shekhawat.Student B.ALL.B(Hons),UFYLC,University of Rajasthan,Jaipur

1 Jennison v. Baker, 1 All ER, 997 (1972).

committing a crime, but still because of the sanctions the tons of criminal offenses are committed. The aim of the hunter/sanction is not to stop him from committing the crime but to prevent the society from being harmed. And the person who is harmed is entitled for the justice and the justice is not for the victim but also for accused and the rest of the society.

Criminal Justice system of any country is the basis of establishing peace and tranquility. It includes not only the judicial system but the investigating machinery as well.[2]For the great access to the CJ the state shall need the three organs Judiciary, Police and Prison and these three organs have to work without violating the HR, in India the Constitution of this state itself protects the HR in form of FR and the judiciary of the state is bound to safeguard rights of the citizens under Article 32 and 226 of COI[3].

SUPPORTIVE FEATURES IN INDIAN LEGAL FRAMEWORK

When one speaks of the CJS one may need to look at the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Fortunately for us in India, the Universal Declaration of HR was made in the context of history when COI was being drafted and discussed. Most of its basic principles have therefore not only crept into the Constitution but incorporated in its soul too. If one looks into our Constitution the provisions in the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights are seen reflected in Part III[4] of the Constitution and the Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights are reflected in Part IV[5]. Also, it is interesting to see that just like the Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights is made flexible so far as its implementation is made subject to the capacity of the States, Part IV

2ChaudharyShruti, Indian CJS and HR, International Journal of Advance Research and Development,271-274,2018,https://www.ijarnd.com/manuscripts/v3i1/V3I1-1206.pdf

3 Constitution of India.

4FR under the COI

5Directive Principles of State Policy under the COI

of the Constitution is also made flexible. The provisions in the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (IPC) and the Criminal Procedure Code, 1898 (old CrPC) are actually Pre-Covenant. Still they reflect the basic principles of English jurisprudence-fundamental principles of the common law. The various provisions in the I.P.C and Cr.P.C specifying the duties, liabilities and protection of Civil Servants are indicative of this protective nature of the law in favour of officials. The provisions in the IPC on the right of private defence, the provision in CrPC laying down the prior requirement of sanction for prosecution, etc. are indicative of this trend[6].

GOVERNMENT AND LEGISLATURE

Govts tend to think of crime in form of war, Few election manifestos are free of promises to intensify this fight. Few Govts seem to be winning it. Crime has yet to receive the full 'HR treatment'. The only area of crime which is reflected in HR provisions of Constitutions is usually the investigation and trial of offences and offenders. Perhaps precisely because the prevention- and punishment-of crime is taken to be one of the reasons why human beings enter into the social contract reflected in Constitutions, it is never thought necessary to spell out, even in DPSP, a duty on the part of the State to do so. The British Indian legislative measures such as the (I.P.C, 1860), the Criminal Procedure Code, 1898, and the Indian Evidence Act, 1872 (IEA) did contain sporadic provisions that envisaged to protect certain interests of the accused. But the real recognition to the basic human right principles came about only after the enactment of the COI

6S. 99, IPC, in material part, lays down: "There is no right of private defence against an act which does not reasonably cause the apprehension of death or of grievous hurt, if done, or attempted to be done, by a public servant acting in good faith under colour of his office, though that act may not be strictly justifiable by law. There is no right of private defence against an act which does not reasonably cause the apprehension of death or of grievous hurt, if done, or attempted to be done, by the direction of a public servant acting in good faith under colour of his office, though that direction may not be strictly justifiable by law. There is no right of private defence in cases in which there is time to have recourse to the protection of the public authorities."S. 197, CrPC in material part says:"When any person who is or was a Judge or Magistrate or a public servant not removable from his office, save by or with the sanction of the Govt, is accused of any offence alleged to have been committed by him while acting or purporting to act in the discharge of his official duty, no Court shall take cognizance of such offence except with the previous sanction—
(a)in the case of a person who is employed or, as the case may be, was at the time of commission of the alleged offence employed, in connection with the affairs of the Union, of the Central Govt;
(b)in the case of a person who is employed or, as the case may be, was at the time of commission of the alleged offence employed, in connection with the affairs of a State, of the State Govt."

and subsequent legislative trends reflected in the (Cr.P.C) and the (POHRA,1993). Thus, there are two distinct categories of legislative measures that accord recognition to human right principles, namely, measures enshrined in the Constitution and the measures enshrined in other general or special HR legislation. The Parliament has been empowered by the Constitution to enact laws for the country. The main objective of such laws is to maintain law and order in the society and to ensure the welfare of the citizens. However, when this power is misused by the legislature by enacting draconian laws which gives arbitrary powers in the hands of the administration and the police, it results in the oppression of the innocent. .

ADMINISTRATION OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE AND THE CRIMINAL LAW SYSTEM IN INDIA: LEGISLATIVE FRAMEWORK

In its quest for a just and fair trial of an accused, CJS in India not only guarantees certain safeguards to, and confers a set of rights- constitutional and statutory-on an accused[7] but also rigorously implements, with utmost zeal for reformation and re-socialization of offenders, its penal system[8]. However, it does not exhibit its equal concern to victims of crimes when it comes to re-compensating them for the 'loss' incurred or physical, mental or emotional 'injury' sustained by them. There is neither a comprehensive legislation nor well-designed statutory scheme or a policy statement in India either allowing a crime victim to seek compensation from offender and /or State or to participate, as a matter of right, in CJDS and CJ process. He does not have any material say in the matters pertaining to investigation of the crime, trial and sentencing

7The COI, the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (CrPC) and the Indian Evidence Act, 1872 (IEA) confer certain rights and privileges on an accused and provide for certain safeguards such as: protection against arrest and detention (Ss. 56, 57, 167, CrPC Art. 22 (2), Constitution }; right to know grounds of arrest (Ss. 50, 173, CrPC Art. 22 (1), Constitution}; right to consult and to be defended by a lawyer of one's own choice (Ss. 303, 304, , CrPC Art. 22 (1), Constitution}; presumption of innocence throughout the trial (Ss. 102, 105, Indian Evidence Act}; right against ex post facto laws (Art. 20 (1)), Constitutional}; right to public trials (Sec. 327, CrPC); right to trial in his presence {Sec. 273, CrPC}; right to cross examine prosecuting witness (Ss. 137, 138, 143, 145, Indian Evidence Act); protection against self-incrimination (Ss. 313, 315 (1), Cr.PC and art. 30 (3), Constitution}; right to bail (Ss. 389, 436, 437, 438, Cr.PC); Right against double-jeopardy (Ss. 219, 221, 300, Cr.PC) and Art. 20 (2), Constitution}; right to legal aid (Sec. 304, Cr.PC and Art. 39, Constitution); protection of life and personal liberty (Art. 21, Constitution) which includes right to speedy trial as a fundamental right. See, generally, Chaturvedi A.N. : Rights of Accused under Indian Constitution, (Deep & Deep, New Delhi, 1984)

8See generally Bhusan Vidya: Prison Administration in India, (S. Chand, Delhi, 1970); Datir: Prison as a Social System (Popular, 1978); Chandra K. : The Indian Jail: A Contemporary Document (Vikas, 1983), and Chandra D.: Open Air Prisons (Vohra, Allahabad, 1984)

of the offender.

THE POLICE IN CRIMINAL JUSTICE

Police in democratic societies governed by rule of law is indeed a difficult and challenging assignment. Given the fact that Indian Police has been developed in the past to serve the objects of colonial rule and are not yet provided the autonomy, resources and training of professionalization in a democratic milieu, their performance has not entirely been disappointing.

There are several institutions of CJ; the role of the Police cannot be overemphasized. The Police are the centre of administration for two reasons, firstly, it is the protector of ‘law and order’ and secondly, it is also the ‘finder of truth’ in all situations of violation of norms. But the police are the most vulnerable institution for violating HR of the people, though it is ‘the institution’ for protecting the life and liberty of the people. There are many questions in this context. Should the function of investigation be placed in the hands of the Rule of Law police force without having the confusion of coalition between the ‘application of force’ and ‘obtaining information’? Is investigation a definite skill function? Why should the Criminal Procedure Code empower the ‘officer in charge’ of a police station to conduct investigation, if it is a skill function? Why did the Code not provide any ‘minimum skill base’ for entrusting anyone with the power to investigate? Why can we not design an independent model of investigation and prosecution? In case prosecution fails to prove that those arrested did not kill the people in the Best Bakery, whose is the responsibility to bring those who did to justice? What accountability can be reposed on the routine supervisor who does not have power of auditing the investigation? If investigation is to collect facts, how is the prosecutor served unless the prosecutor has a continuous link with the investigator and the investigator has an understanding form him of the needs of the prosecutor to prove the facts? How does the separation between the investigation and prosecution serve CJ administration? How can one ensure continuity in the constant flux of personnel in police administration? If on an average CJ requires about four to five years from ‘FIR to decision making’ and if within that period three to four postings are made in the system of investigation and justice delivery machinery, what would remain of the standard set of justice? If witnesses were examined after three to four years, what would be the thickness of the dust

deposited on the memory-lane? If confession to a police officer is not admissible but 'discovery in view of the confession' is admissible, what signal does the law give to the investigating machinery, which is after all, the police force? There are a lot of such macro-micro level questions, which have not been taken up by the Malimath Committee[9]. If the fundamentals of a system are weak how do you save the system-structure from the command of a stick? Once there was a 'model' of an independent regulatory system distant from the Govt, talked about for distancing the police administration from the political process so that police as a CJ institution is not politicized to the determent of the people. There was also an argument for converting the police into a police profession. What happened to these ideas in the Committee? Professor N.R. Madhava Menon, who was also a member of the Justice Malimath Committee, gave an inventory of grounds of popular dissatisfaction. His indication on internal reform as well as external reform is well taken. But what about reform of the PD especially as an institution of CJ? The idea of an independent regulatory authority seems to be very romantic and quite extraordinary. Under the existing system, the investigating police officer hardly gets any legal assistance and advice from the prosecuting agency, which has no accountability to any of one for the failure of cases in the Court of law. The success of CJS largely depends upon success of police as law enforcement agency. The recommendation of Law Commission of India and National Police Commission, for full-fledged new set up of the prosecuting agency as legal adviser of PD with proper career advancement up to the level of Addl. DGP in the State by making suitable amendment in Cr.P.C and Police Act will help to improve the efficiency of AG of police by proper interaction and co-ordination with prosecuting agency at all levels. In all custodial crimes what is of all real concern is not only infliction of body pain but the mental agony which a person undergoes within the four walls of police station or lock-up. Whether it is physical assault or rape in police custody, the extent of trauma, a person experiences is beyond the purview of law.

The need of the hour is to give top priority to police reform by amending, replacing and throwing out the antiquated, obsolete Police Act of 1861 which was enacted by the colonial rulers immediately after the 1857 revolt against British Rule in India with a view to make the police an efficient instrument for prevention and detection of crime. The Act suffered from many lacunae

9K. Deepalakshmi,The Malimath Committee's recommendations on reforms in the CJS in 20 points, The HinduUpdated: January 17, 2018 19:38 IST

and inadequacies. It does not take cognizance of an important ingredient of democratic governances that Independent India has constitutionally established as a modern nation, namely, accountability. In the words of Mr. G.P. Joshi, former director, bureau of Police Research and Development, “The Police Act is outdated, not meant for a sensitive and democratically accountable police force, and therefore, needs to be replace. Service-oriented functions are missing from its character.”

JUDICIARY IN CRIMINAL JUSTICE

Though the basic legal framework for HR with CJ administration is provided by a wide range of legislative measures of diverse kinds, but in recent times the judiciary, particularly at the appellate level, has played a vital role in not only vigorously enforcing HR measures but also giving creative interpretations leading to broadening and evolving new concepts of HR. Such judicial role is a marked feature of the post- emergency period JP, particularly emanating from the SC. In this vein it would be useful to refer to certain judicial enunciations that go in to make the character of contemporary CJ administration. Such enunciations relate to certain vital processes of CJ administration.

a) POWER TO ARREST: THE LIMITATIONS

The Cr.P.C confers fairly extensive powers of arrest mainly to the police, which exercises powers of arrest in pursuance to a warrant, or as a part of general powers under Sections 41, 42 and 151of the Code. Often the conferment of such wide powers becomes the cause for abuse and invasion of the liberties of citizens who might become victims either because they dare to offend the authorities or because their arrest can yield some monetary benefit or just because they are too weak and powerless to oppose, in any way, the designs of those who enjoy power. The SC in Joginder Kumar v. State of U.P.[10] fully appreciated the dynamics of misuse of the power to arrest. This to be the primary agency that can challenge the abuse of power of arrest.

10 1994 AIR 1349, 1994 SCC (4) 260

b) ENSURING HUMANE CONDITIONS OF INVESTIGATION

The worst violations of HR take place in the mode of investigation, when the police under pressure to secure the most clinching evidence often resort to third-degree methods and torture. Cases of police torture and custodial deaths are increasingly coming to light nowadays. Courts have not only exposed the seamy side of police investigation process but have in several cases dished out exemplary punishments to ensure humane conditions of investigation. In Gauri Shankar Sharma v. State[11]three members of the police force were charged with custodial death in the course of a dacoit investigation. It was revealed that the dead was taken into custody without recording arrest in the general diary, on the actual day of arrest, and this way the injuries given in the duration of investigation were shown to have been incurred in the pre-arrest period. The SC not only restored the conviction under Sec. 304 but in the words of Justice Ahmadi (as he then was) observed:

"The offence is of a serious nature aggravated by the fact that a person who is supposed to protect the citizen and not to misuse his uniform and authority committed it to brutally assault them while in his custody. The punishment is such as would deter others from indulging in such behavior."

c) RESTRICTIONS ON INDISCRIMINATE PROSECUTION AND FABRICATION OF FALSE EVIDENCE

Though prosecution and investigation are the functions of two distinct wings of the CJ administration, often the AG develops a commonality of interest with the prosecution and, at times, resorts to foul and underhand means to forge evidence to somehow secure convictions. This tendency becomes most pronounced in cases having political or communal overtones. Dilawar Hussain v. State[12] provides an apt example of the partisan role of investigation and

11 1990 AIR 709, 1990 SCR (1) 29

12 (1991) 1SCC 253: 1991 SCC (Cri) 163.

prosecution agencies. This case relates to the outbreak of communal violence in Gujarat, in which 8 members of one community were allegedly killed by a mob belonging to another community. Keeping in mind the sentiments of the population, strong punitive action was resorted to by arresting 2000 members of the mob. Reacting to the whole process of arrest, detention and prosecution, Justice R.M. Sahai (speaking for B.C. Ray and S.R. Pandian, JJ.) observed:

"Still was the manner in which the machinery of law moved. From accusation in the charge-sheet that accused where the number part of unlawful assembly of 1500 to 2000 came down to 150 to 200 in evidence and the charge was framed against 63 under the TADA and various offences including Section 302 under the IPC. Even from them 56 were acquitted either because there was no evidence, or if there was evidence against some, it was not sufficient to warrant their conviction. What an affront to FR and human dignity. Liberty and freedom of these persons were in chains for more than a year, for no reasons."[13]

d) NEW RATIONALIZATION OF A RIGHT TO BAIL

Right to bail is an important guarantee concerning the personal liberty of the accused. The late seventies' euphoria concerning this right has considerably died down in the eighties and nineties in the wake of terrorism and new forms of criminality like dowry violence, atrocities against SCs and STs and sexual crimes against women, etc. However, there have still been some leading judicial decisions in recent times that aim at balancing the liberty of the accused with the prosecution interest of making the accused available for investigation and trial.

In Hitendra Vishnu Thakur v. State of Maharashtra[14] the SC, while construing Section 20 (4) (bb) of the TADA in the light of Section 167 of the Cr PC, held that:

13 See generally Bhusan Vidya: Prison Administration in India, (S. Chand, Delhi, 1970); Datir: Prison as a Social System (Popular, 1978); Chandra K. : The Indian Jail: A Contemporary Document (Vikas, 1983), and Chandra D.: Open Air Prisons (Vohra, Allahabad, 1984)

14 1994 AIR 2623, 1994 SCC (4) 602

"With the amendment of clause (b) of sub-section (4) of Section 20 read with the proviso to sub-section (2) of Section 167 of Cr PC an indefeasible right to be enlarged on bail accrues in favour of the accused if the police fails to complete the investigation and put up a challan against him in accordance with law under Section 173 Cr.P.C."[15] The liberal bail right conferred even in TADA cases in Hitendra Vishnu Thakur case has been reconsidered by the Full Bench in Sanjay Dutt v. State through CBI.[16]

15 S173. Report of police officer on completion of investigation.
(1) Every investigation under this Chapter shall be completed without unnecessary delay.
(2) (i) As soon as it is completed, the officer in charge of the police station shall forward to a Magistrate empowered to take cognizance of the offence on a police report, a report in the form prescribed by the State Govt, stating-
(a) the names of the parties;
(b) the nature of the information;
(c) the names of the persons who appear to be acquainted with the circumstances of the case;
(d) whether any offence appears to have been committed and, if so, by whom;
(e) whether the accused has been arrested;
(f) whether he has been released on his bond and, if so, weather with or without sureties;
(g) Whether he has been forwarded in custody under section 170.
(ii) The officer shall also communicate, in such manner as may be prescribed by the State Govt, the action taken by him, to the person, if any, by whom the information relating to the commission of the offence was first given.
(3) Where a superior officer of police has been appointed under section 158, the report shall, in any case in which the State Govt by general or special order so directs, be submitted through that officer, and he may, pending the orders of the Magistrate, direct the officer in charge of the police station to make further investigation,
(4) Whenever it appears from a report forwarded under this section that the accused has been released on his bond, the Magistrate shall make such order- for the discharge of such bond or otherwise as he thinks fit.
(5) When such report is in respect of a case to which section 170 applies, the police officer shall forward to the Magistrate along with the report-
(a) all documents or relevant extracts thereof on which the prosecution proposes to rely other than those already sent to the Magistrate during investigation;
(b) The statements- recorded under section 161 of all the persons whom the prosecution proposes to examine as its witnesses.
(6) If the police officer is of opinion that any part of any such statement is not relevant to the subject- matter of the proceedings or that its disclosure to the accused is not essential in the interests of justice and is inexpedient in the public interest, he shall indicate that part of the statement and append a note requesting the Magistrate to exclude that part from the copies to be granted to the accused and stating his reasons for making such request.
(7) Where the police officer investigating the case finds it convenient so to do, he may furnish to the accused copies of all or any of the documents referred to in sub- section (5).
(8) Nothing in this section shall be deemed to preclude further investigation in respect of an offence after a report under sub- section (2) has been forwarded to the Magistrate and, where upon such investigation, the officer in charge of the police station obtains further evidence, oral or documentary, he shall forward to the Magistrate a further report or reports regarding such evidence in the form prescribed; and the provisions of sub- sections (2) to (6) shall, as far as may be, apply in relation to such report or reports as they apply in relation to a report forwarded under sub-section (2).

16 (1993) 5SCC 410.

e) POLICE REMAND: THE LIMITATION

Realising that the worst kinds of HR violations take place in the course of police remand courts have been unduly sensitive to police request for remand. In C.B.I v. Anupam J. Kulkarni[17] the SC refused to hand over the accused to the police on remand after his initial custody in judicial remand. Giving reasons for such a view Justice K. Jaychand Reddy {A.M. Ahamdi, J. (as he then was) concurring} laid down:

"There cannot be any detention in police custody after the expiry of first fifteen days even in a case where some more offences either serious or otherwise committed by him in the same transaction come to light at a later stage."[18] Giving the reasons for such a rule the court observed:

"The proviso to Section 167 is explicit on this aspect. The detention in police custody is generally unfavored by law. The provisions of law lay down that such detention can be allowed only in special circumstance and that can be only by a remand granted by a Magistrate for reasons judicially scrutinized and for such limited purposes as the necessities of the case may require."[19]

Similarly, the SC in UOI v. Thamisarasi[20] disfavored the continued remand detention beyond the tenure of 90 days even in a case of arrest under the Narcotics Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985. The Court ruled that the limitation witnessed in Section 37 (1) (b) of the NDPS Act applied only in case of bail on merit but not in cases of bail on default in filing complaint within the period specified in Section 167 (2) of the Cr.P.C. For a sound functioning it is therefore it is required that there must be an efficient judicial system and one of the factors for providing

17 1992 AIR 1768, 1992 SCR (3) 158

18(1992) 3SCC 141.

19CBI v. Anupam J. Kulkarni, (1992) 3SCC 141 at 155

20(1995) 4SCC 190.

requisite efficiency in ensuring adequate strength.[21]

PRISON IN CRIMINAL JUSTICE

When the accused are found guilty in the trail. By the court then they are turned to the correctional authority (ie. Prison). Early on, when society lacked the resources necessary to build and maintain prisons, exile and execution were efficient forms of punishment. The most publicly visible form of punishment in the modern era is the prison. Prisons may serve as detention centers for prisoners after trial. For restrictingf the accused, jails are used. Early prisons were used primarily to contain criminals and little thought was given to living conditions within their walls. In America, the Quaker movement is commonly credited with establishing the idea that prisons should be used to reform criminals. This can also be seen as a critical moment in the debate regarding the purpose of punishment.

Punishment (in the form of prison time) may serve a variety of purposes. First, and most obviously, the containment of criminals removes them from the general population and inhibits their ability to commit further crimes. A new goal of prison punishments is to offer criminals a chance to be rehabilitated. Many Liberal thoughts have led the new prisoners to be taught and provide the vocational training and a better established institution to learn and get rehabilitate in the society after completing the sentence. Religious institutions also have a presence in many prisons, with the goal of teaching ethics and instilling a sense of morality in the prisoners. If a prisoner is released before his time is served, he is released as a parole. This means that they are released, but the restrictions are greater than that of someone on probation.

There are numerous other forms of punishment which are commonly used in conjunction with or in place of prison terms. Monetary fines are one of the oldest forms of punishment still used today. These fines may be paid to the state or to the victims as a form of reparation.

21AIR 1998 Journal Section 17 at 20

CONCLUSION

The Govt. of any country has one major role to play in a democratic state that is to protect the rights of their citizens and to provide them better environment to live a progressive life. The parliament, executive and judiciary of our country has taken bold steps to secure the access to CJ in India. Indian judiciary which is well known locally and internationally for its progressive approach in providing justice which has led them to expand their powers not only to hear the pleas of masses but also making executive liable for their actions. The Law enforcement agencies having commitment to the public safety of our country compel us to provide the new and better approach for administration to act quickly and with certainty to support methods that work to reduce crime rates and to provide the better and quick access to CJ.

In conclusion it will be necessary to stress on the point that the India does not have the shortage of laws for securing the CJ but it lacks in commitment of agencies responsible for providing the justice and implementation of these provisions. Not only police and or judiciary is responsible for this but also every citizen should play their role in assisting the country in a better way and not just become the hindrance that justice can be secured to every section of the society.

SUGGESTION:

With a view to improving the relevant institutions for providing better access to CJ, States should consider

Taking the following measures:

- Promote specialization within each CJ agency
- Monitoring and oversight mechanisms (oversight and accountability)
- Ensure a gender-equitable representation in the CJ agencies,

Particularly at the decision-making and managerial levels.

- Promote effective training
- Minimize political use of police and external

Influence on police operations.

- Amend obsolete and outdated laws.
- Amend laws to make policing people friendly.
- Curb corruption, enhance transparency and accountability.
- Increase community involvement to step up crime prevention.
- The cases must be assigned according to the specialization of person. It also recommended by the Malimath Committee (24th November 2000) that assigning cases without considering specialization result in delay in deciding the cases.

REFRENCES

- M.P. Jain, Indian Constitutional Law,(Lexis Nexis Butterworths Wadhwa), 5th Edition, Reprint 2009.
- V.N. Shukla`s, Constitution of India, (Eastern Book Company, Mahendra P. Singh),11th Edition 20011.
- S.S. Srivastava, Criminology, Penology & Victimology, (Central Law Publication)
- Ram Ahuja, Criminology, (Rawat Publications)
- Ahmad Siddique, Criminology, 5th Edition, Eastern Law Publications
- Prof. N.V. Paranajape, Criminology, Penology & Victimology, Central Law Publication
- K. Deepalakshmi,The Malimath Committee's recommendations on reforms in the CJS in 20 points, The HinduUpdated: January 17, 2018 19:38 IST, https://www.thehindu.com/news/national/the-malimath-committees-recommendations-on-reforms-in-the-criminal-justice-system-in-20-points/article22457589.ece
- Anita Yadav, "Criminal Justice Reform In India: Need Of The Hour", published in Criminal Law Journal, Vol. 119, Part 1358, February 2013, page no. 29-32, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/280132676_Criminal_Justice_Reform_in_India_Need_of_the_Hour_published_in_Criminal_Law_Journal_Vol_119_Part_1358_February_2013_page_no_29-32
- ChaudharyShruti, Indian CJS and HR, International Journal of Advance Research and Development,271-274,2018, https://www.ijarnd.com/manuscripts/v3i1/V3I1-1206.pdf