

PHASE IV AND PHASE V OF THE ACTION PLAN FOR ARREARS
REDUCTION IN DISTRICT JUDICIARY (APAaR-DJ)

3.2.4. Phase IV: July 2025 – December 2025

a. **More than 30, 20-30 and 10 years old cases**

For States with High Arrears viz. Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, West Bengal, Maharashtra and Odisha:

Dispose of all cases over 30 years old (including remaining cases which could not be disposed of in Phase III).

Dispose of cases which are between 20–30 years old (including remaining cases which could not be disposed of in Phase III). Endeavour should be made to dispose all such matters during Phase IV.

For States with Pre-Set Targets of 80% and 50% (as set in Phase II):

Continue efforts to dispose of any remaining 20–30 year old cases. Set additional locally tailored targets for disposal of cases that are 10 years old.

For Other States:

Ensure that all cases older than 10 years are resolved (including remaining cases which could not be disposed of in Phase III), with progress tracked and finalized by the end of Phase IV.

b. **Identification and Disposal of 50 Oldest Cases in Courts**

In courts with fewer than 50 cases over 10 years old, or with no such cases, the District Case Management Committee (DCMC) shall:

(i) Identify the 50 oldest pending cases (including remaining cases which could not be disposed of in Phase III). Out of these 50 cases, the focus should be on and 25 criminal cases and 25 civil cases, excluding execution petitions.

(ii) Continue to publicly notify the identified cases on court notice boards and to the Bar Association.

(iii) Dispose these cases by the end of December 2025, provided they are not stayed by higher courts. This approach is expected to ensure that even in courts

with a lower volume of extremely old cases, the oldest cases still receive priority and efforts made for timely resolution.

c. **Reiteration of Phase II Targets in Exclusive Courts for the Fourth Phase**

In the fourth phase of action plan, High Courts may set the targets that were initially set in Phase II, in the following manner:

- Family Courts: 100 oldest cases
- Commercial Courts: 100 oldest cases
- Juvenile Justice Boards: 100 oldest cases
- POCSO Courts: 50 oldest cases
- Courts exclusively handling offences against women: 50 oldest cases
- Courts handling Prevention of Corruption Act cases: 25 oldest cases
- Courts handling Negotiable Instruments Act cases: 300 oldest cases
- Land Acquisition Cases (LAC): 200 oldest cases
- Motor Accident Claims Tribunal (MACT) matters: 100 oldest cases

The above targeted matters be monitored and the progress of case disposal in these courts be followed up to identify bottlenecks and areas for improvement.

d. **Execution Petitions:**

(i) In compliance of directions given in *Periyammal (Dead Thr. Lrs.) v. V. Rajamani And Anr. Etc. 2025 INSC 329*, the High Courts must identify and prepare a list of execution petitions pending for more than 6 months from the date of filing. Such cases must be prioritised and disposed of expeditiously. Principal District and Sessions Judges may also consider redistribution of the execution petitions to give effect to the directions given above.

(ii) If no execution petitions older than 6 months are pending, continue focus on resolving the oldest 20 execution petitions to ensure timely enforcement of judgments. This targeted approach is to ensure that even in courts with a relatively lesser backlog, the oldest and potentially most delayed execution petitions are prioritised, facilitating timely enforcement of judgments and effective administration of justice.

e. **Framing of issues**

In civil cases, where framing of issues has been pending more than one month after pleadings are complete, continued efforts should be made to expedite framing of issues in such cases. To implement this objective, courts may establish timelines for framing of issues, monitor progress and track the time taken to frame issues and adjust the timeline as needed to ensure efficient and effective case disposal.

f. **Framing of charges**

Similarly in criminal cases, continued efforts should be made to expedite framing of charges within one month where charges are required to be framed as per law. Expediting framing of charges enables the trial to proceed in a timely manner, reducing delays and promoting efficient justice delivery. It also ensures that the rights of the accused are protected, including the right to a speedy trial and adequate preparation to defend himself/herself. Further, delay in framing of charges may affect the sanctity of evidence on account of unavailability of witnesses, gaps in memory due to lapse of time etc. which may ultimately impact the outcome of the trial.

g. **Disposal of Interim Applications**

Expedite the disposal of interim applications in civil suits that have been pending for over three months (including remaining applications which could not be disposed of in Phase III). Continuous efforts to dispose of interim applications at the earliest would ensure the timely progress of the main case, help prevent delays in the trial process, facilitate the delivery of justice by addressing interim issues and contribute to reducing the pendency of cases.

h. **Addressing delay in service of summons/notices**

Identify and prepare a list of civil cases pending for more than 5 years on account of non-service of summons/notices. Such matters should be prioritised

and focus shall be on effecting service on the parties/witnesses. The District Case Management Committee (DCMC) may collaborate with all the stakeholders including officials from Revenue department, to effectuate service of summons/notices.

3.2.5 Phase V: January 2026 – June 2026

a. **Complete disposal of 30 years and 20-30 years old cases**

In the states of Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, West Bengal, Maharashtra and Odisha, focus shall be on final disposal of any remaining cases over 30 years and 20–30 years that could not be disposed of in the earlier phases, to bring down the number to zero.

In all other states, focus shall be to bring down the backlog of cases older than 10 years, if any remaining after Phase IV to zero.

The High Courts may allocate necessary resources to facilitate efficient disposal of cases. Progress of cases may be tracked and strategies adjusted in accordance with the special requirements.

b. **Identification and Disposal of 50 Oldest Cases in Courts**

In courts with fewer than 50 cases over 5 years old, or with no such cases, the District Case Management Committee (DCMC) shall:

(i) Identify the 50 oldest pending cases (including remaining cases which could not be disposed of in Phase IV). Out of these 50 cases, the focus should be on and 25 criminal cases and 25 civil cases, excluding execution petitions.

(ii) Continue to publicly notify the identified cases on court notice boards and to the Bar Association.

(iii) Dispose these cases by the end of June 2026, provided they are not stayed by higher courts.

c. **Reiteration of Phase IV Targets in Exclusive Courts for the Fifth Phase**

Continue to enforce and, if necessary, adjust the targets set in Phase IV for exclusive courts viz Family Courts, Commercial Courts, Juvenile Justice

Boards, POCSO Courts, Courts exclusively handling offences against women, Courts handling Prevention of Corruption Act cases, Courts handling Negotiable Instruments Act cases, Land Acquisition Cases and Motor Accident Claims Tribunal matters). For an effective implementation of the plan, the District Case Management Committee (DCMC) may:

1. Set up mechanisms to track progress and identify areas for improvement.
2. Collaborate with stakeholders, including Bar Associations, Legal Services Authorities and law enforcement agencies.
3. Provide training and support to court personnel.
4. Regularly review progress and adjust strategies as per the unique needs.

d. **Continued efforts qua Execution Petitions**

(i) In compliance of the judgment in *Periyammal (Dead Thr. Lrs.) v. V. Rajamani And Anr. Etc. 2025 INSC 329*, the High Courts must continue identifying and preparing a list of execution petitions pending for more than 6 months from the date of filing. Such cases must be prioritised and disposed of expeditiously. Principal District and Sessions Judges may also consider redistribution of the execution petitions to give effect to the directions given above.

(ii) If no execution petitions older than 6 months are pending, focus shall be on identifying and disposing of the 20 oldest execution petitions.

The expeditious disposal of execution petitions is crucial for timely enforcement of judgments, reduces the likelihood of further litigation and disputes, protects the rights of decree-holders and ensures they receive the benefits of the court's judgment, enhances public trust in the justice system by demonstrating its effectiveness and improves the overall efficiency of the judicial system.

e. **Framing of Issues**

In continuation of Phase IV, endeavour shall be made, as a matter of routine, to frame issues in civil cases within one month of completion of pleadings.

f. **Framing of Charges**

In continuation of Phase IV, endeavour shall be made, as a matter of routine, to frame charges within one month where charges are required to be framed as per law.

g. **Disposal of Interim Applications**

Expedite the disposal of any remaining interim applications in civil suits from Phase III that have been pending for over three months. Continuous efforts to dispose of interim applications at the earliest would ensure the timely progress of the main case, help prevent delays in the trial process, facilitate the delivery of justice by addressing interim issues and contribute to reducing the pendency of cases.

OTHER STEPS TO BE TAKEN IN PHASE IV & V

a. **One-time physical verification and reconciliation of data**

Comprehensive Physical Verification Process:

Identify Pending Cases: Compile a list of all pending cases across District Courts and Special Courts.

Physical Verification: Conduct a thorough physical verification of each case, ensuring that all documents, orders, and judgments are present and accounted for.

Update Existing Records: Update the existing records to reflect the current status of each case, including any changes or developments on the NJDG Portal.

Reconciling Discrepancies:

Identify Discrepancies: Identify any discrepancies in the status/stage of case as in the physical files and the existing records on the NJDG Portal.

Reconcile Discrepancies: Reconcile the discrepancies by verifying and correcting incorrect information and dating undated cases

The objectives of this comprehensive physical verification process are to

Ensure Accuracy: Ensure the accuracy of the status/stage of the pending cases.

Improve Transparency: Improve transparency and accountability in the judicial process.

Enhance Efficiency: Enhance the efficiency of court proceedings by reducing delays and errors.

Validate Records: Validate existing records, providing a reliable and trustworthy database for future reference

b. Identification of cases pertaining to those incarcerated for more than 1/3rd of the maximum term of imprisonment

Data from Jails to be called qua the undertrials who have already served 1/3rd of the maximum period of imprisonment, so that these cases may be expedited for disposal. To achieve this objective, following measures be adopted:

1. Identification of eligible undertrials: Identify undertrials who have served 1/3rd of the maximum period of imprisonment for their alleged offence.

2. Data collection: To identify undertrials as mentioned above, following data qua these undertrials be called from Jails:

- Date of filing of case
- FIR details
- Charges
- Duration of imprisonment
- Stage of trial

3. Expedited disposal: This data may be used to expedite the disposal of cases, potentially through priority listing, fast-track trials, bail hearings, plea bargaining etc.

c. Augmenting Infrastructure of Forensic Science Laboratories

Efforts should be made to ensure adequate infrastructure facility for Forensic Science Laboratories is present in proportion to the requirement of the courts at every level. To achieve this objective, efforts should focus on:

1. Assessing court requirements: Assessing the number and type of cases requiring forensic analysis, and estimating the corresponding infrastructure needs.

2. Infrastructure development: Developing and upgrading FSL infrastructure, including:

- Laboratory space and equipment
- Staffing and training
- Technology and software

3. Capacity building: Building the capacity of FSLs to handle increased workloads and complex cases.

4. Quality assurance: Implementing quality assurance measures to ensure the accuracy and reliability of forensic analysis.

d. Addressing Shortages of Public Prosecutors

Endeavour should be made by all High Courts to expeditiously fill up the vacancies as and when they arise. To achieve this, the High Courts may:

1. Monitor vacancies: Regularly monitor vacancies and anticipate upcoming vacancies due to retirement or expiry of contract. The High Courts may establish a system to track vacancies and anticipated vacancies.

2. Expedited filling of vacancies: Make every effort in collaboration with State governments and other stakeholders to fill vacancies promptly, avoiding delays and ensuring continuity in judicial functioning.

e. Continuation of Other Steps which were taken in Phase I, II & III.

The steps qua redistribution of cases due to non-availability of judicial officers, Lok Adalat & Mediation, Unready Cases, Record with Appellate/Revisional

Courts, Stayed cases, Merit-based resolution of oldest/targeted cases, expedited handling of appeal/revision in targeted cases in higher courts, use of JustIS App/NJDG, use of virtual hearings in targeted cases, addressing the shortage of public prosecutors in courts, utilization of 'urgent case' feature in CIS for Action Plan cases, priority for cases involving individuals with terminal illness or senior citizens, minimizing adjournments and shorter dates in Targeted Cases and tailored case resolution targets for diverse districts be also continued for Phase IV and Phase V.

- f. **Regular Meetings with District Judiciary:** The High Courts may hold regular meetings with all the Principal District Judges (through Video Conferencing) and ensure that there is no artificial disposal of cases and adjournments are granted where reasonable cause is shown.
- g. **Monitoring and Continuous Feedback:** The High Courts to take review of compliance of APAaR (DJ) as issue of inequitable distribution of cases still persists. The High Courts may forward their suggestions qua enhancing effectiveness of APAaR(DJ).
- h. **Regular DCMC Meetings:** It should be ensured that regular meetings of District Case Management Committees be convened to review progress, reassign targets as needed and resolve bottlenecks hindering case disposal.
- i. **Inter-Agency Coordination:**
 - (i) Hold refresher meetings with senior police officers and Public Prosecutors.
 - (ii) Reaffirm appointment of a designated Nodal officer (including from the Revenue Department for decree proceedings) to oversee case-specific challenges, in case such Nodal officer has not been appointed.
 - (iii) Coordinate with State Governments to address vacancies and performance issues qua Public Prosecutors/Additional Public Prosecutors/Assistant Public Prosecutors through targeted training programs in Judicial Academies.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- (i) To comply with the mandate of ***Periyammal (Dead Thr. Lrs.) v. V. Rajamani And Anr. Etc. 2025 INSC 329***, the High Courts may consider setting slightly higher unit criteria for disposal of execution petitions.
- (ii) The High Courts may consider incentivising the disposal of targeted cases (both civil and criminal) by granting higher units qua disposal of such cases.
- (iii) One-time physical verification of cases may be carried out during the short vacations of the Courts (Diwali, Holi vacations etc.) with the aim of completing the process by May 2026.
- (iv) Disposal of the cases should be in accordance with law. Even in targeted cases, adjournments should not be refused wherever genuine causes are shown.