

CHAPTER 18

CASE MANAGEMENT – RESPONSIBILITIES OF A JUDGE

“A sense of confidence in the courts is essential to maintain the fabric of ordered liberty for a free people and three things could destroy that confidence and do incalculable damage to society: that people come to believe that inefficiency and delay will drain even a just judgment of its value; that people who have long been exploited in the smaller transactions of daily life come to believe that courts cannot vindicate their legal rights from fraud and over-reaching; that people come to believe the law in the larger sense cannot fulfil its primary function to protect them and their families in their homes, at their work, and on the public streets.”

—Warren Burger¹

The phrase ‘case management’ means, comprehensive system of management of time and events of the suit/criminal case from the time of registration of the case till its disposal. To be precise, it is the effective control of workload of the court, including the early disposal of the cases, reduction of time consumed and so on. Case management system is an innovative mechanism which enables as well as empowers the Judges in delivering timely and qualitative justice. Developed countries like the United Kingdom, the United States and Australia adopt various methods of case management such as, creating different tracks for different types of cases before it is finally decided by the Judges. In India, pendency of cases, lack of adequate resources for establishing more courts and the procedure involved therein does not permit adopting similar multi-track system. Every system has certain limits of performance based on the capacity of the infrastructure and its components. Too much of overload tends to result in mediocre performance, quality deterioration, system breakdown and ultimate collapse. In view of huge pendency of cases, courts are to plan and improve the techniques to dispose of the cases without unreasonable delay with the limited resources and the available infrastructure and facilities. That needs improved efficiency and suitable case management techniques. It is the district judiciary where lakhs of litigants come into contact with justice delivery system. It is therefore necessary that the problems faced by these courts in coping up with the workload with the available infrastructure has to be addressed.

1. Warren Burger, United States Supreme Court Justice, “What’s Wrong with the Courts: The Chief Justice Speaks Out,” *U.S. News & World Report* (vol. 69, no. 8, 24.08.1970) 68, 71 (address to ABA meeting, 10.08.1970).

Courts are faced with the problem of mounting arrears. According to an approximate working, it will take substantially long time to clear pending cases not to talk of those which are to be filed. Reasons are manifold: – (i) Inadequate Judge strength; (ii) Judicial vacancy position; (iii) Antiquated judicial procedures; (iv) Lack of infrastructure; (v) Non-cooperation from the lawyers and repeated adjournment of cases; (vi) Lack of cooperation from the police and other stakeholders; (vii) Misuse of the system by frivolous litigation; and (viii) Lack of supporting staff and essential infrastructure. That apart, there are lot of unnecessary litigations wasting court's precious time in calling work and completion of other procedural formalities. Huge delays in deciding the cases has not only led to frustration among the citizens but to fear that if one approaches the court, it takes long time for its disposal involving time and energy and resources.

Notwithstanding the shortcomings within the existing framework, Judges can certainly make a mark in the system and bring out substantial impact in reducing the pendency/disposing old cases within particular timeframe, by smart use of technology and taking proactive steps within the framework of guidelines. Competence or quality of service is a product of knowledge, improved methods of case management by use of technology and we need to apply them in the day-to-day work. Through effective Case Management, it is possible to reduce the workload to manageable limits. Court management and judicial capability does not only mean the ability to contain docket explosion; but it means Judge's competence and skill to use the available resources, smart use of technology, trained in organising Lok Adalats, mediation and conciliation, coordination with the Bar, fairness to all stakeholders and readiness to take up the responsibility and commitment to the Institution. The Judge must have pragmatic wisdom and court and case management skills to bring about the change, and then it is possible to reduce the workload to manageable limits.

Having been a part of justice delivery system for about three decades and having been associated with the State Judicial Academy in the State of Tamil Nadu and Jharkhand and the continuing education for the Judges, in this chapter I would highlight some of the methods and skills which a Judge can adopt in the Case Management and make suggestions for smart use of District Court Case Information System (CIS) and JustIS app. The suggestions that are made are based on various circulars issued by the High Court of Madras and the High Court of Jharkhand, the procedure which I have followed as a trial Judge, the experiences of other Judges with whom I had interaction and other judicial officers who are smartly using the technology.

CIS and JustIS App: – The implementation of the e-Courts Project and CIS for District Courts and JustIS App for Judges has become a boon for the Judges and the courts for effective case management. The updated version of the unified CIS for District Courts has made data analysis more rational. This unified CIS version 3.1 is based

upon Core-Periphery module to satisfy the local needs of a State. Although, the CIS for District Courts (Core) is one product for the entire nation, it has been customised in such fashion so that it becomes unique for each State. Case workflow management is simplified by the effective use of *CIS for District Courts* and the case management of each case is easily achievable. Under CIS software, the total pendency of the cases year-wise, stage-wise, case type-wise of the courts in the district are available. CIS for District Courts also facilitates *vertical and horizontal integration* by integrating it with High Court CIS or transferring cases from one court to another court or from one court establishment to another court establishment. By such facility of integration, there is minimal effort of data entry at the time of filing of appeal or revision and a permanent joint is created between trial case and appeal case. CIS for District Courts also provide for 'Pre-Trial module' for entry data regarding remand proceedings and disposal of bail or other pretrial applications.

For facilitating Judicial Officers of District Judiciary to have effective control of their respective courts by resorting to case and court management, another mobile application JustIS App has been released with specialised tools. Every Judicial Officer of District Judiciary has been given unique 'JO Code' and the same is attached with their respective court. With JustIS app, a Judicial Officer of District Judiciary can have access to data of his own court by using his unique JO Code. JustIS App facilitates the judicial officer of a District Judiciary to manage his court and cases and implement case management effectively; (i) to use calendar tool for adjourning cases and to quickly view the overview cases kept along with stages on the selected date; (ii) to have complete information of the court in the Dash Board with drill-down facility with respect to the day's listed cases, undated cases, Institution and Disposal in current month and total pendency in the court; (iii) to check the age of cases denoted by different colour codes which could help a judicial officer to manage his daily cause list effectively by giving priority to cases of urgency or time-bound cases and old cases.

Cause List – CIS: – The court staff are facilitated to use CIS for uploading the daily proceedings, preparation of cause list, updating the data as to the day-to-day proceedings, make entry as to disposal of cases, uploading of orders and judgments. From the data available in CIS, the cause list shall be drawn in a scientific manner showing the listing of cases under different heads: – (i) special list cases/preemptory hearing; (ii) part-heard cases; (iii) cases listed for arguments; (iv) bail applications; and (v) cases listed for completion of formalities. The Judge should monitor the listing of cases for the next day before the cause list is out.

Calendar option is inbuilt in CIS and JustIS App which is a real-time management/court management. It is really a digital arm for the officers to take control of the cases and the case management. By the effective use of CIS and JustIS app, the case-flow

management is simplified and the officer would be in a position to know the stage of cases posted on a particular day. By smart use of technology, the officer can plan and well organise the case load per day in his court. By use of JustIS app, number of cases posted for a day can be controlled effectively so that the officer can focus attention on the matters based on priority. With CIS and JustIS app, case-flow management is achievable and the Judges become better in case management in his own court in less time and resources.

Once a Judge is posted in a particular place, even from the beginning of the tenure in a particular court, the Judge must start to work with strong determination. With CIS – District Court and JustIS app, the Judge must take note of the actual pendency, status of the cases, part-heard cases and old cases. The Judge must make a plan and a road map for himself as to how he will go about with the pending cases. The plan may be in that order namely: – (i) immediate disposal of part-heard cases left by the predecessor; (ii) give priority to cases where the accused are arguing in prison; (iii) take out the year-wise pendency of cases and try to take out the old cases; (iv) take a list of the pending Interlocutory Applications and endeavour to dispose them; (v) collect a list of cases stayed by the higher courts and ascertain their present status. Verify the status of those stayed cases from the CIS – District Courts and High Court CIS and talk to the District Judge/High Court Administrative Judge regarding stay cases. The strong determination and the confidence with which the Judge starts the work, will magnetise the staff members and they will render all cooperation to the Judge. This will make the work of the Judge easier taking along with him the support of staff members.

EFFECTIVE USE OF COURT’S TIME

Calling Work: – Most of the Courts time is wasted in calling work. In the Civil Courts throughout the country, the first fresh few hours are consumed only for the ‘calling work’; Most of those matters listed for calling work are only for verification of service of notices, appearance of parties, Interlocutory Applications, filing of written statements, filing of draft issues and so on. In some of the courts, where the pendency is very heavy, the calling work takes the entire forenoon session. In some sessions courts, more than about one to two hours are spent hearing bail applications and passing bail orders. The Judge by engaging himself in calling work for long time, loses his freshness and not much time is left to take up cases for trial and regular hearing.

The time taken for calling work must be reduced to the barest minimum. Calling work time is not to be wasted in hearing the Interlocutory Applications. When the Judge feels that lengthy arguments are about to be advanced, the matter is to be passed over and taken up later. Using the calendar option inbuilt in CIS and JustIS App which is a real-time organiser of case management, stage of the cases for ‘written statement’,

‘issues’ and ‘not in the list’ can easily be grouped and can be adjourned group-wise at one go. By smart use of technology, the Judge can substantially reduce the time of the calling work and spend much judicial time on regular hearing matters.

Avoid Unnecessary Adjournments: – Grant of adjournment must be guided strictly by the provisions of Order XVII of Civil Procedure Code (CPC). Order XVII has been amended by the CPC, Amendment Act, 1999 (w.e.f. 01.07.2002). In terms of proviso to Order XVII Rule 1 CPC, the number of adjournments is restricted to three only during the hearing of the suit. It has become obligatory for the court to record reasons for adjournment of the hearing of the suit. As per Order XVII Rule 1 Sub-Rule (2) CPC, the court may also impose actual or higher cost as the court deems fit. Unless some drastic measures are taken in restricting the adjournments, the problem of delay in disposal of cases cannot be sorted out.

Restriction for Adjournment in Criminal Cases: – Section 309 Criminal Procedure Code (CrPC) envisages that when the examination of witnesses has begun, the same shall be continued from day to day until all the witnesses in attendance have been examined. An adjournment beyond the next day, when all the witnesses in attendance have not been examined, is to be allowed only when necessitated and for reasons to be recorded. Section 309 CrPC proviso to subclause (1) (amended by Amendment Act 2013) provides that when the enquiry or trial relates to an offence under Section 376A to 376D of the IPC, the inquiry or trial shall, as far as possible, be completed within a period of two months from the date of filing of the chargesheet. Section 309 proviso to subclause (2) (added by Amendment Act 2008) provides that no adjournment shall be granted at the request of a party, except where the circumstances are beyond the control of that party. The proviso added to subclause (2) provides for a kind of discretion to the court as far as adjournment of a proceeding is concerned. As per second proviso to subsection (2) of Section 309 CrPC, the fact that pleader of a party is engaged in another court shall not be ground for adjournment. The underlying object of the provisos is to discourage adjournments. Speedy trial is imbibed in Section 309 CrPC. The courts are to strictly follow the same and the provisos thereon in its letter and spirit.

Lawyers must not be asking for adjournment, unless it is absolutely necessary. One party is always interested in delaying the disposal of cases, thereby adopting all possible methods for getting the case adjourned. The Apex Court had taken judicial notice of certain disturbing tendencies in *Swaran Singh*² wherein it observed, “It is the game of unscrupulous lawyers to get adjournments for one excuse or the other till a witness is won over or is tired. Not only that a witness is threatened; he is abducted; he is maimed;

2. *Swaran Singh v. State of Punjab* (2000) 5 SCC 668.

he is done away with; or even bribed. There is no protection for him. In adjourning the matter without any valid cause a court unwittingly becomes party to miscarriage of justice.”

Interlocutory Applications: – Filing of number of Interlocutory Applications and pendency of the same result in delay in disposal of suits. Number of cases are pending due to filing of number of Interlocutory Applications. Officers need to be sensitised on these pending Interlocutory Applications. Mandatory time frame, thirty days as in the case of Order 39, Rule 1 CPC, should be fixed for disposal of these Interlocutory Applications. Interlocutory Application under CPC is normally filed at the time of presenting the suit: (i) Section 80(2) CPC: – Suit against governments; (ii) Order 1, Rule 8 CPC: – One person may sue on behalf of all in same interest; (iii) Order 32, Rules 1,2,3 CPC: – Minor to sue by next friend; (iv) Order 39, Rules 1,2 CPC: – Temporary injunction; (v) Order 38, Rule 5 CPC: – Attachment before judgment (furnish security for production of property). Interlocutory Application under CPC is normally filed during pendency of the Suit: (i) Order 1, Rule 10(2) CPC: – Court may add or strike parties; (ii) Order 5, Rule 20 CPC: – Substituted service; (iii) Order 6, Rule 17 CPC: – Amendment of pleadings; (iv) Order 11, Rule 15 CPC: – Inspection of documents referred to in pleadings or affidavit; (v) Order 13, Rules 1–10 CPC: – Production, impounding and return of document; (vi) Order 14, Rule 5 CPC: – Power to amend and strike out issues; (vii) Order 16, Rule 1(a) CPC: – Production of witnesses without summons; (viii) Order 18, Rule 17 CPC: – Recalling of witness; Order 22, Rule 2–4 CPC: – Substitution of legal representatives on death of a party; (ix) Order 26, Rule 9 CPC: – Commission to make local investigation; (x) Order 39, Rule 2A CPC: – Disobedience of temporary injunction; (xi) Order 40, Rule 1 CPC: – Appointment of receivers.

Various Interlocutory Applications stated above may be disposed of by the court by a brief order, keeping in view the latest principles of law laid down by the Supreme Court or by the respective High Courts. The Judicial Officer must have the principles ready in hand and as and when these Interlocutory Applications are taken up, dispose the same by a brief self-contained speaking order in the court itself. Though the order is brief, the order should be informed with reason so that the order is not further challenged before the appellate or revisional court.

SPECIAL LIST CASES/PREEMPTORY HEARING

After the issues are framed the suit is ripe for trial. At or before the settlement of issues, the documentary evidence in original where the copies thereof have been filed with the plaint or written statement. Once the issues are framed, the parties are to furnish the list of witnesses within fifteen days and obtain summons to such persons for their

appearance in court as witnesses. As per the amended provisions of Order 16, Rule 1(4) CPC, a time limit of five days from the date of presenting the list of witnesses has been fixed for making an application for summoning of witnesses. In the case of *Ramrameshwari Devi*³ it was held that, at the time of filing of the plaint, the trial court should prepare complete schedule and fix dates for all the stages of the suit, right from filing of the written statement till pronouncement of judgment and the courts should strictly adhere to the said dates and the said timetable as far as possible.

After the amendment to CPC in 2002, as per Order XVIII Rule 1 CPC examination-in-chief of a witness shall be on affidavit. The objective of the mandatory provision of Order XVIII Rule 1 CPC is for speedy trial and disposal of cases. During trial, courts must strictly follow the provisions of CPC in seeing that trial is not prolonged by irrelevant questions or raising some technical points. In conducting trial, both civil and criminal cases, court must play proactive role in not permitting irrelevant questions or unnecessary materials being brought in as evidence.

For listing of cases for special list, it is for the Judges to take up cases giving preference to old cases and at the same time ensuring disposal of number of cases as per the requirement of units/norms as fixed by the High Court. JustIS App and CIS would greatly facilitate listing of both old cases and some new cases. Before including the suit in the special list and fixing a preemptory hearing, the court should ascertain from the lawyers their readiness for getting along with the trial and how much time be required to enable them to get ready. Once the suits are shown in the special list, adjournments are not to be lightly granted by the courts in the suits included in the special list/fixed for hearing.

Once the trial in the special list case has begun, case should be heard from day to day. If the case is not over by that day for which it was posted in the special list, further hearing of it must be had on the succeeding working day or within a day or two. In the matter of taking up of cases for trial, preference should invariably be given for part-heard cases, and there should be no deviation from this. There is a growing tendency among the lawyers and litigants to leave the matter dismissed for default/leave the matter decreed ex-parte and later filing petitions to set aside the same. Take strict view when the special list suits are so left to be disposed of ex-parte and then filing application for restoration of the suit or to set aside the order. Such strict view would send signal to the Bar members and it would instill a sense of responsibility in others so far as specially listed suits are concerned.

3. *Ramrameshwari Devi and Others v. Nirmala Devi and Others* (2011) 8 SCC 249.

Criminal Cases: – Reference is not made to criminal cases as the procedure for different categories of criminal cases namely, summons case, warrant case, sessions case is different. Section 309 CrPC envisages speedy trial whether it is civil or criminal. Speedy disposal of the cases is the *sine qua non* of all the proceedings. In *Abdul Rehman Antulay*,⁴ the Supreme Court issued guidelines for the speedy trial of cases. The Supreme Court said that it is neither advisable nor practicable to fix any time limit for trial of offences. Whatever be the nature of the criminal case, the Judicial Officer must ensure speedy trial of cases by proper case management. Calendar option inbuilt in JustIS App and CIS is to be effectively used for organising the day's work in criminal court.

Argument Cases: – Once the evidence is closed, the matter may be adjourned to the next convenient date with short adjournment of one or two days for arguments. In simple suits like money suits and mortgage, arguments should be heard immediately after the evidence is closed, when the evidence is fresh in the mind. After the amendment of CPC in 2002, Order XVIII Rule 2 Sub-Rule (3A) CPC provides for the parties to file concise written arguments in support of their case and such written arguments shall form part of the record. Filing of written arguments would considerably save the time of the court, apart from assisting the Judges for answering the issues at the time of making the judgment ready. In criminal cases, arguments are to be heard and judgment to be pronounced within reasonable time. Lest, the officer might lose track of the facts and evidence, as in the meanwhile, other cases with different set of facts might be listed and the judge might lose the freshness of the matter.

PRONOUNCING JUDGMENT WITHOUT DELAY

Under Order 20 Rule 1 CPC (w.e.f. 01.07.2002), judgment is to be pronounced at once and where it is not practicable to do so, the court shall make an endeavour to pronounce judgment within thirty days from the date on which the hearing of the case was concluded. Where it is not practicable for the court to pronounce judgment within thirty days because of exceptional and extraordinary circumstances of the case, the court shall fix a day for the pronouncement of judgment which shall not ordinarily be beyond sixty days from the date on which the case was heard. As per Section 353(1) CrPC, judgment in a criminal case shall be pronounced in the open court immediately after the conclusion of the trial or on subsequent time for which due notice shall be given to the parties or their advocates. For pronouncing judgment in criminal cases/sessions cases, the courts must endeavour to pronounce the judgment within the time

4. *Abdul Rehman Antulay and Others v. R.S. Nayak and Another* (1992) 1 SCC 225.

frame fixed by the High Court. Immediately after the pronouncement of the judgment, the judgments/orders are to be uploaded in the CIS.

Under the aegis of the 13th Finance Commission Grant, all the Judicial Officers across the country have been provided with laptops and printers. This enables the Judicial Officer working in the District and Subordinate Courts to make ready the judgments on their own without depending upon the stenographers. Non-availability of a stenographer cannot be given as a reason for delay in pronouncement of judgments.

On number of occasions, the Supreme Court emphasised the need for pronouncement of judgment within reasonable time. In *R.C. Sharma*,⁵ the Supreme Court held that if there is excessive delay between the hearing of arguments and delivery of judgments, the confidence tends to be shaken. It was observed that justice must not only be done but must manifestly appear to be done. Emphasising pronouncement of judgment within reasonable time, in *Anil Rai*,⁶ the Supreme Court referred to number of judgments namely: –

“6. In *Bhagwandas Fatechand Daswani v. H.P.A. International* (2000) 2 SCC 13, this Court observed (at SCC p. 14, para 3) that ‘a long delay in delivery of the judgment gives rise to unnecessary speculation in the minds of parties to a case.’ This Court in various cases including *Hussainara Khatoon (I) v. Home Secy., State of Bihar* (1980) 1 SCC 81, *Hussainara Khatoon (IV) v. Home Secy., State of Bihar* (1980) 1 SCC 98, *Abdul Rehman Antulay v. R.S. Nayak* (1992) 1 SCC 225, *Kartar Singh v. State of Punjab* (1994) 3 SCC 569, *Raj Deo Sharma v. State of Bihar* (1998) 7 SCC 507, *Raj Deo Sharma (II) v. State of Bihar* (1999) 7 SCC 604 and *Akhtari Bi v. State of M.P.* (2001) 4 SCC 355 has in unambiguous terms, held ‘the right of speedy trial to be part of Article 21 of the Constitution of India.’”

In *Anil Rai*,⁷ the Supreme Court issued various guidelines for pronouncement of judgment within the time frame after the matter is reserved for judgment.

CASE-FLOW MANAGEMENT

In *Salem Advocate Bar Assn.*,⁸ while deliberating on the need for case-flow management rules, the Supreme Court constituted a committee headed by Justice M. Jagannadha Rao, former Judge of the Supreme Court of India for formulating rules as to the manner in which Section 89 CPC is to be operated. It was also observed that the committee

5. *R.C. Sharma v. Union of India and Others* (1976) 3 SCC 574.

6. *Anil Rai v. State of Bihar* (2001) 7 SCC 318.

7. *Anil Rai v. State of Bihar* (2001) 7 SCC 318.

8. *Salem Advocate Bar Association T.N. v. Union of India* (2005) 6 SCC 344.

may consider devising a model Case Management Rules. The committee submitted its report inter alia suggesting “Model Case Flow Management Rules” fixation of time limit for various categories of cases and the rules to be followed thereon. The Supreme Court expressed hope that the High Courts would be in a position to examine the aforesaid rules expeditiously and would be able to finalise the rules within a period of four months which will go a long way in dispensation of effective and meaningful administration of justice to the litigant public. The case-flow management rules were framed by the various High Courts on the basis of the recommendation provided by the Law Commission headed by Justice M. Jagannadha Rao.⁹

Most High Courts have framed their own rules for case-flow management. These rules provide a guide for the Judge to develop an efficient court management. The rule provides specific timelines for major stages of a case and seek to ensure that a case is disposed of in a time-bound manner. Case-flow management is dependent upon time guidelines to provide the goals for reducing delay in case processing. Case flow does not mean the flow of cases from institution to till disposal of cases only. Flow means continuous progression. Case-flow management is the supervision or management of the time and events necessary to move a case from initiation to disposition or adjudication. It includes management of the time and events necessary to move a case from the point of initiation (filing, date of the contest, or arrest) through disposition, regardless of the type of disposition. The primary purpose of case-flow management is to prevent delay in case processing, and it is used to implement and maintain case-flow management. For case-flow management to work, there must be active involvement of the stakeholders, members of the Bar, police, staff members and so on.

Grouping of Cases: – For effective case management, JustIS App is available to all the judicial officers exclusively for the courts. JustIS App has many features of pendency details of the court year-wise, stage-wise, case type-wise and disposal year-wise. It is really a digital arm for the officers to take control of the court and the case management. By smart use of technology, cases involved on the same points like Land Acquisition cases (arising out of the same award) and Motor Accident cases (arising out of the same accident) and such other cases involving the same points and same parties can be clubbed together which will considerably save the time of the court.

Part-heard Cases: – Utmost care should be taken to see that there is no accumulation of part-heard cases. With the calendar option inbuilt in JustIS App and CIS, the Judicial Officer should ensure that he is not overloaded with too many part-heard cases.

9. Ref: Jagannadha Rao Committee, “Consultation paper on Case Management,” at page no. 16, quoted in Approaches to Justice in India, a Report by DAKSH edited by Shruti Vidyasagar, Harish Narasappa and Ramya Sridhar Tirumalai published by EBC Publishing Pvt. Ltd., 1st Edition, 2017 under the chapter “Performance indicators: Working of Magistrates’ Courts in India” by Arunav Kaul page nos. 137 and 146.

Cases which are part-heard should be continued the next day as normal rule. It must be ensured that the part-heard cases are disposed of with the utmost expedition and there should in no case be an accumulation of part-heard cases. Once the trial is commenced every endeavour should be made to complete the case. Some Judges have the tendency of opening cases and after recording substantial evidence, leave the matter without concluding and pronouncing the judgment. This is one of the serious mismanagement of case management. The officer who has recorded the evidence had the opportunity of seeing and hearing the witnesses. 'Seeing and hearing' are the best aids in assessment of evidence. Hence it is always obligated upon the officer who recorded the evidence to endeavour to dispose the suit. In criminal cases, once the trial is taken up for hearing, the trial must proceed from day to day, until the evidence on both sides is completed.

Service of Summons: – Nstep (National Service and Tracking of Electronic Process): – Nstep is an electronic process tracking application that is merged with CIS software which shows how many processes were served, how many unserved and the service is also tracked through GPS. Nstep will help in effective and fast service of summons. Under Nstep, every process server will be given a smart phone which will receive the summon/process on allotment and they have to go to the addressee for serving. The smart phones are enabled with GPS, and the process server can be tracked for going to the said address. They have to receive the signature from the addressee digitally and once received it will be consumed in CIS and the court which issued can see immediately the status of the summons. Whether the process server had gone to the address or not and the correctness of the endorsement can be checked. This will also put an end to the frequent complaints received against the process servers.

Monitoring of the e-Courts System: – With the implementation of e-Courts and the data being aggregated to the system, system monitoring is very important. The Judge has to monitor the e-Courts system; CIS software has provided automatic system for updating the courts' day-to-day proceedings. The Judicial Officer must check whether data of day-to-day proceedings are uploaded in the system and also uploading of the judgments/orders passed. Above all, the officer must check the user of the system, in particular, the internet connectivity. A responsible court staff should be placed incharge to coordinate with all the sections and to ensure that the day-to-day data, judgments and disposal of Interlocutory Applications are uploaded then and there. The Judge must encourage the staff members also to develop the work culture and encourage them to work with the e-Court system and upload the data then and there.

NEED FOR TIME MANAGEMENT

Sixty seconds a minute, 1440 minutes a day; by proper time management, lot of activities could be combined. One has to organise oneself at the office, at home and during

travel. The stress is on both doing right things and on doing the things in the right manner. Let us be conscious about the precious value of time; seize and enjoy every moment of it. No idleness, no procrastination; never put off until tomorrow what you can do today. Good time management is an essential prerequisite for success in any sphere of activity. Proper case management and effective and efficient use of time would save the time of the court in taking up all the matters listed for the day.

NEED TO WORK HARD AND SMARTLY

All the above things may be easier said than implemented. For these reforms, what is required is a lot of judicial discipline on the part of the Judges. The Judge must work with discipline and with the sense of dedication. Discipline as he understands is not mere adherence to the circulars of the High Court and rules. It involves sacrificing one's comfort and interest for the sake of noble purpose of the Institution. Both Judges and lawyers have to change their mindsets. The Judge must take all possible steps to make out the existing resources more efficiently and thereby reduce the court congestion. Merely spending additional hours of working do not necessarily imply hard work. To work hard means, to work smartly, spending minimum time and energy and to do a specific job. It involves sacrificing one's comfort and the interest for the sake of the Institution and administration of justice.
