

Adoption of Information and Communication Technology in Judiciary on the Perspectives of Advocates

Nathiya K,

PhD Research Scholar, Department of Political Science & Public Administration, Annamalai
University, e-mail: nadhiyak1996@gmail.com

Dr. S. Prabhakaren,

Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science & Public Administration, Annamalai
University, e-mail: selvarajprabhakaren1975@gmail.com

Article Info

Page Number: 7279 - 7287

Publication Issue:

Vol 71 No. 4 (2022)

Abstract

In recent years, governments across the globe are keen to envisage the use of AI, Deep learning and machine learning methods with the objective of limiting the ill effects of improper waste segregation methods. The current state of technology makes it possible to create a system that can identify plastics and non-plastics automatically from its image. It is necessary to do a feature extraction method in order to take the distinct features of the plastic/non-plastic object that can define the properties of the object in order to provide a more accurate classification.

This study suggests an architecture that uses Mobilenet for feature extraction and the extracted features were classified using Support Vector machine classifier to separate waste items into plastic and non-plastic. Compared to a conventional CNN the proposed approach using Mobilenet requires less training parameters. The dataset employed in this work is a customized one exclusively compiled for this study. The proposed system of separating plastics from other materials requires less manual labour and can be used in smart garbage systems and for plastic segregation in industries.

Keywords: Mobilenet, Support Vector machine, Depth wise separable convolutional neural networks, classification, plastics and non-plastics.

Article History

Article Received: 25 March 2022

Revised: 30 April 2022

Accepted: 15 June 2022

Publication: 19 August 2022

E-Governance in India has steadily progressing from the computerization of all government developments to the e-governance initiatives that promotes the decentralization of services, citizen centricity, transparency and efficiency. This progress has been encouraged by the formulation of National e-governance plan (NeGP). This NeGP is a pioneer programme of Government of India which looks into the infrastructure development and facilitates and co-ordinates state-specific and central Mission Mode Programmes (MMPs) and some of the integrated programmes. There are 3 categories of mission mode projects and e-Court is one among them, the paper going to analyse the perception of advocates on the new era of ICT in judiciary.

Keywords: Information and Communication Technology, Advocate's, e-filing, services, judiciary.

Introduction

The use of ICT in judiciary was started in the form of e-court, it is one of the digital India project initiated by national e-governance plan under integrated mission mode project. E-committee was setup by Supreme Court of India to monitor the use of ICT in reforming Indian judicial administration; the committee came up with strategic plan for implementing ICT on 2005. The e-court project are implemented on three phase with the objectives of providing services to all the key stakeholders of judiciary and society with enhanced judicial productivity quantitatively and qualitatively, and to make justice system affordable, accessible, cost-effective, transparent and accountable by limiting the paper filing.

Phase I which initiated the development of infrastructure of ICT and its implementation in the judicial system, phase II coordinated ICT infrastructure in judicial system and phase III covers judicial process from filing to execution and all administrative activities via ICT.

The era of ICT in judiciary was a new technological phenomenon where the advocates, judicial officers and court staff should themselves adopt to new epoch. The e-court mission mode project was rolled out from Supreme Court and to across all the high court, district and subordinate courts of India. Lawyers play a crucial role in linking judiciary and litigants. As they are acting as linking bridge between the public and judiciary they should experience the e-court well in order to maintain their profession. This paper is to explore the awareness and perception of e-court among advocates. Quantitative research design is adopted, in order to seek the information from the advocate a questionnaire was made on google form and send via mail, 50 respondents are chosen by snowball sampling method and the data collected are presented in table with simple percentage analysis.

Objectives:

1. To explore the perspectives of advocates on computerization of judiciary

Table no: 1
Demographic profile of the respondents

Criterion	Classification	Number of Respondents with percentage
1. Gender	Male	29(58.0)
	Female	21(42.0)
	Total	50(100)
2. Age	< - 30	18(36.0)
	30 – 45	10(20.0)
	45 – 60	14(28.0)
	60 - >	8(16.0)
	Total	50(100)
3. Education	Degree	38(76.0)
	Post-graduate and above	12(24.0)
	Total	50(100)
5. computer literacy	Basic level IT	5(10.0)
	IT literate	4(8.0)
	Advanced level IT	-
	No knowledge of computer	38(76.0)
	Total	50(100)
6. type of court	Taluk court	8(16.0)
	District court	27 (54.0)
	High court	15 (30.0)
	Total	50 (100)
7. year of experience	1-5	18(36.0)
	5-10	17(34.0)
	More than 10	15(30.0)
	Total	50(100)

Source: computed from primary source

Table 01 deals with the demographic profile of the respondents. Total numbers of respondents are 50.

1. Gender wise distribution: among 50 respondents (29) 58 percent belongs to male gender and (21) 42 percent belongs to female gender. It is found that most of the respondents are male.
2. Age wise distribution: the age are categorised into four groups, among that (18) 36 percent belongs to below 30, (10) 20 percent belongs to 30-45 years of age, (14) 28 percent belongs to 45-60 years of age and (8) 16 percent belongs to above 60. It is evident that most of the respondents are below 30 years age group.
3. Education wise distribution: (38) 76 percent are degree holders and (12) 24 percent are post graduate and above. It shows that most of the respondents are degree qualification.
4. Computer literacy wise distribution: (5) 10 percent has knowledge of basic level IT, only (4) 8 percent are IT literate and (38) 76 of the respondents don't have any basic knowledge of computer. Hence it shows among 50 respondents only (9) 18 percent of respondents has knowledge of computer.
5. Court wise distribution: (8) 16 percent belongs to taluk court, (27) 54 percent belongs to district court and (15) 30 percent belongs to high court.
6. Experience wise distribution: (18) 36 percent are experienced between 1-5 years, (17) 34 percent are experienced with 5-10 years and (15) 30 are experienced with more than 10 years.

A) Perspectives of advocates on computerization of judiciary

1. Are you aware of the project for computerization of courts?

Table No: 2

Awareness	No of respondents with percentage
Yes	46(92.0)
No	4(8.0)
Total	50(100)

Source: computed from primary source

Table 2 depicts the awareness of the project of computerization of courts, among 50 respondents, (46) 92 percent of respondents are aware of the project where (4) 8 percent of the

respondents are unaware of the project. Hence it shows most of the respondents are aware of project of computerization.

2. Have you undergone any training method that are given below

Table No: 3

Training Method	No of respondents with percentage
Formal	7(15.2)
Basic/seminar	8(17.4)
Self	23(50.0)
None	8(17.4)
Total	46(100)

Source: computed from primary source

Table No. 3 shows the training method of the advocates they undergone to use e-court, (7) 15.2 percent of respondents are undergone formal training method, (8) 17.4 percent of the respondents are undergone basic training, (23) 50 percent of respondents are undergone self-training and (8) 17.4 percent of respondents are undergone none of the training. So, it shows that there is no proper training for the advocates to use ICT.

3. How are the following services being delivered in the court

Table No: 4

Services	No of respondents with percentage			
	Manual	Computerized	Both	Total
Filing of cases	38(82.6)	-	8(17.4)	46(100)
Cause list	10(21.7)	24(52.2)	12(26.1)	46(100)
Case status information	10(21.7)	28(60.9)	8(17.4)	46(100)
Delivery of orders/judgements	28(60.9)	8(17.4)	10(21.7)	46(100)

Source: computed from primary source

Table 4 shows how the services like, filing of cases, cause list, case status information, and delivery of judgement are delivered in court. In filing case (38) 82.6 percent of the respondents said it is done on manual where (8) 17.4 percent says it is done through both manual and computerized. In delivering cause list (10) 21.7 percent says it is manually (24) 52.2 percent says it is done through computerized and (12) 26.1 percent of the respondents says it is done by both way. In gathering

information about status of case, (10) 21.7 percent respondents says it is done manually, (28) 60.9 percent said it is computerized and (8) 17.4 percent says it is by both manual and computerized. In getting judgement copies (28) 60.9 percent says it is by manually, (8) 17.4 percent says it is computerized and (10) 21.7 percent says it is manually. Hence it shows that among the four services given above filing of case and delivery of judgement copies is not effectively computerized.

4. How do you access case-related information?

Table No: 5

Portals	No of respondents with percentage
District court portal	14(30.4)
e-court national portal	10(21.7)
Both	18(39.1)
Others	4(8.7)
Total	46(100)

Table 5 shows how the respondents accessing the case related information's, it seems that (14) 30.4percent of the respondents use district court portal, (10) 21.7 percent use e-court national portal, (18) 39.1 percent uses both district and e-court portal, and (4) 8.7 percent uses others to seek case related information. It shows that everybody aware about the web portal and using it effectively.

5. Please grade your level of satisfaction with computerized service delivery of the following services

Table No: 6

Services	No of respondents with percentage			
	Dissatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Total
Filing of cases	30(65.2)	12(26.1)	4(8.7)	46(100)
Tracking the case status	18(39.1)	15(32.6)	13(28.3)	46(100)
Availability of cause list online	30(65.2)	11(23.9)	6(13.0)	46(100)
Delivery of order/judgement	32(69.6)	10(21.7)	4(8.7)	46(100)

Source: computed from primary source

Table 6 shows the satisfaction level of respondents with the computerized service of court.

Regarding filing of case (30) 65.2 percent of respondents are dissatisfied, (12) 26.1 percent respondents being neutral and (4) 8.7 percent are satisfied on computerized service. In tracking the case status through online (18) 39.1 percent are dissatisfied, (15) 32.6 percent says its neutral and (13) 28.3 percent are satisfied. Regarding availability of cause list online, (30) 65.2 percent of respondents dissatisfied, (11) 23.9 percent says its neutral and (6) 13.0 percent are satisfied. In getting judgement copies via online (32) 69.6 percent are dissatisfied, (10) 21.7 percent says its neutral and (4) 8.7 percent are satisfied. It shows that among the four services mentioned above most of the respondents shows their dissatisfaction for filing of case, availability of cause list and delivery of judgement copies through online.

6. Please indicate to what extend you think the use of ICT has enhanced the performance of the judiciary

Table No: 7

Use of ICT in performance of judiciary	No of respondents with percentage			
	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Total
Reduced backlog of cases	18(39.1)	18(39.1)	10(21.7)	46(100)
Reduced corruption	17(36.9)	18(39.1)	11(23.9)	46(100)
Quick delivery of services	16(34.8)	20(43.5)	10(21.7)	46(100)
Timely access to legal materials and judgement	10(21.7)	10(21.7)	26(56.5)	46(100)
Reduced the cost of litigation	5(10.9)	8(17.4)	33(71.7)	46(100)
Improved access to courts	23(50.0)	15(32.6)	8(17.4)	46(100)
Improved the quality of services offered in courts	18(39.1)	20(43.5)	8(17.4)	46(100)

Source: computed from primary source

Table 7 shows the agreement of respondents regarding performance of judiciary after ICT. In reducing backlog of cases by using ICT, (18) 39.1 percent of respondents agrees, (18) 39.1 percent neither agree nor agree, and (10) 21.7 percent of respondents disagrees. It shows that ICT can be used reduce the backlog of cases if it functions regularly. In reducing corruption by using ICT, (17) 36.9 percent agrees, (18) 39.1 percent neither agree nor disagree, and (11) 23.9 percent

disagrees. It shows that ICT can reduce the corruption moderately. In quick delivery of services using ICT, (16) 34.8 percent disagrees, (20) 43.5 percent neither agree nor disagree, and (10) 21.7 percent disagrees. It shows that sometimes the service delivered are not in a time. In timely accessing legal materials and judgement through online, (10) 21.7 percent agrees, (10) 21.7 percent neither agrees nor disagree and (26) 56.5 percent disagrees. It shows that most of the respondents disagree for timely accessing legal materials and judgments via online. In reducing cost of litigation after intervention of ICT, (5) 10.9 percent agrees, (8) 17.4 percent neither agree nor disagree, and (33) 71.7 percent disagrees. It shows that ICT has nothing to do with litigation cost. About the improvement in accessing court, (23) 50 percent agrees, (15) 32.6 percent neither agree nor disagree, (8) 17.4 percent disagrees. It shows most of the respondents agrees that there is improvement in accessing court after ICT. In improving the quality of services offered in e-court, (18) 39.1 percent agrees, (20) 43.5 percent neither agree nor disagree, and (8) 17.4 percent disagrees. It shows that most of the respondents believes that ICT offers quality services.

7. On the whole please rate the quality of e-judiciary

Table No: 8

Perceptions	No of respondents with percentage
Good	10(21.7)
Average	27(58.7)
Poor	9(19.6)
Total	46(100)

Source: computed from primary source

Table 8 shows the rating of respondents about the quality of e-judiciary. In that (10) 21.7 percent says it's good, (27) 58.7 percent says it is average and (9) 19.6 percent says it is poor. It shows that most of the respondents says quality e-judiciary is average.

Conclusion:

On the awareness and perception of advocates about e-court, the survey concludes that most of the advocates are aware of the e-court project, e-court portal and the court services offered via online. The dissatisfaction of respondents about some of the services are due to server problems, not updating timely, and their paucity of knowledge to deal with ICT. And the respondents

disagreement about the performance of judiciary by using ICT is because that implementation are done better, but using of ICT is not that much effective, and in some statement to enhance the performance of judiciary, ICT has nothing to do with it to change. So for effective use of ICT in judiciary the advocates should get proper and regular trainings, the initiatives taken by e-committee to change the judiciary to e-judiciary should be practised regularly. And advocates should come forward themselves to use e-initiatives of court without hesitation. The institutional framework itself should encompass a mandatory periodic training programme for the registered advocates as well as judicial officers.

Reference:

1. NCAER, Department of Justice Ministry of Law and Justice, 2015, Evaluation Study of e-courts Integrated Mission Mode Projects.
2. ShaliniSeetharam, SumathiChandrashekar, Vidhi centre, 2016, Ecourt in India from Policy Formulation to Implementation.
3. Siddharth Peter De Souza, July 10,2021, The Supreme Court of India's Vision for e-court; The Need to Retain Justice as a Public Service, The Hindu centre.