Advanced International Journal for Research (AIJFR)
E-ISSN: 3048-7641 ● Website: www.aijfr.com ● Email: editor@aijfr.com

Plea Bargaining – A Success or Failure

Ankit Raj Chauhan[1], Dr. Richa Yadav[2]

[1]Amity Law School Amity University, Uttar Pradesh
[2]Associate Professor, Amity Law School Amity University, Uttar Pradesh

Preface

The administration of criminal justice is one of the most important responsibilities of any legal system. In recent decades, increasing delays, rising pendency of cases, and overcrowded prisons have raised serious concerns about the efficiency and accessibility of justice in India. These challenges have encouraged the adoption of alternative mechanisms that can complement traditional trial procedures while preserving fairness and constitutional values. One such significant reform is the introduction of plea bargaining in the Indian criminal justice system.

This dissertation titled "Plea Bargaining – A Success or Failure" attempts to examine the evolution, legal framework, implementation, and practical impact of plea bargaining in India. The study explores whether this mechanism has successfully achieved its intended objectives of reducing judicial backlog, ensuring speedy justice, promoting victim participation, and improving overall efficiency in the justice delivery system. At the same time, it critically evaluates the concerns and limitations associated with negotiated justice, including the risks of coercion, unequal bargaining power, and uneven implementation.

The research adopts a doctrinal and analytical approach, relying on statutes, judicial decisions, reports, books, articles, and comparative international perspectives. By analysing both the achievements and shortcomings of plea bargaining, this work aims to provide a balanced and comprehensive understanding of its role in modern criminal justice.

This dissertation is written with the hope that it will contribute to academic discussion and provide useful insights for students, researchers, and legal professionals interested in criminal justice reforms. The study concludes that plea bargaining in India is a developing reform that requires continuous improvement, awareness, and institutional support to realise its full potential.

I sincerely hope that this work serves as a meaningful academic contribution and encourages further research in this important area of law.

Chapter 1 Introduction

1.1 Introduction

Plea bargaining is a procedural mechanism within the criminal justice system that enables an accused person to voluntarily plead guilty in exchange for a lesser charge or reduced sentence, subject to judicial approval. It is primarily designed to reduce the burden on courts, expedite disposal of cases, and ensure more efficient use of judicial resources. The concept is based on negotiated criminal

justice, where both prosecution and defence arrive at a mutually acceptable resolution under the supervision of the court.[1]

In India, plea bargaining was formally introduced through the **Criminal Law (Amendment) Act, 2005**, which inserted Chapter XXI-A (Sections 265A–265L) into the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973.[2] The legislative intent was to address systemic issues such as pendency of criminal cases, prolonged trials, and overcrowding of prisons. Despite its introduction, its usage remained limited due to procedural rigidity and lack of awareness among stakeholders.[3]

With the enforcement of the new criminal laws in India in 2023, the criminal justice framework has undergone significant restructuring. The **Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS)** replaces the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, and continues the procedural framework of criminal adjudication, including mechanisms related to negotiated justice. Similarly, the **Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (BNS)** replaces the Indian Penal Code, 1860, redefining substantive criminal offences, while the **Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, 2023 (BSA)** replaces the Indian Evidence Act, 1872, modernising evidentiary standards.[4]

Within this restructured legal framework, plea bargaining retains its relevance as a tool of case management and judicial efficiency. However, its effectiveness still raises concerns regarding voluntariness, informed consent, and unequal bargaining power between the accused and the prosecution. Critics argue that in practice, especially in lower criminal courts, accused persons may feel compelled to accept plea deals due to prolonged trials and systemic pressures, which may indirectly affect the fairness of outcomes.[5]

From a constitutional perspective, plea bargaining must align with the principles of fair trial, due process, and protection of life and personal liberty under Article 21 of the Constitution of India. Therefore, its success or failure cannot be evaluated solely based on efficiency but must also consider its impact on justice, equality, and procedural fairness.[6]

Accordingly, this study critically examines whether plea bargaining under the old and new criminal law regime (CrPC and BNSS framework) has achieved its intended objectives or whether it continues to face structural and practical limitations that hinder its effectiveness in India.[7]

1.2 Background of the Study

The Indian criminal justice system has historically faced structural challenges such as prolonged trials, massive pendency of cases, and institutional overload of courts at all levels. These issues have significantly impacted the timely delivery of justice and have contributed to the growth of undertrial populations in prisons. In response to these systemic inefficiencies, law reform committees and policy bodies recommended the adoption of alternative mechanisms aimed at reducing the burden on conventional trial processes.[8]

One such reform was the introduction of plea bargaining in India through the **Criminal Law (Amendment) Act, 2005**, which inserted Chapter XXI-A into the **Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973**. The objective behind this inclusion was to create a structured framework for negotiated criminal settlements in specific categories of offences, thereby reducing trial duration and promoting faster

disposal of cases. The mechanism was also intended to provide relief to undertrial prisoners by allowing them an opportunity to resolve their cases without undergoing lengthy judicial proceedings.[9]

In the present legal framework, the criminal justice system has undergone substantial transformation with the enactment of the **Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS)**,[10] which replaces the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973. While BNSS modernises procedural aspects of criminal law, the conceptual relevance of negotiated justice mechanisms such as plea bargaining continues within the broader objective of efficient case management and decongestion of courts. Alongside this, the **Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (BNS)** and the **Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, 2023 (BSA)**[11] have restructured substantive criminal law and evidentiary rules, respectively, thereby indirectly influencing the operational environment in which plea-bargaining functions.[12]

Despite its reformative intent, the practical application of plea bargaining in India has generated significant debate. Concerns persist regarding its uneven implementation across jurisdictions, potential for coercive settlements, and the possibility that economically or socially weaker accused persons may accept unfavourable bargains due to prolonged litigation pressure. These concerns raise important questions about the balance between efficiency and justice, particularly in light of constitutional safeguards under the right to fair trial.[13]

Therefore, the background of plea bargaining in India reflects a dual reality: on one hand, it represents a progressive attempt to reform an overburdened criminal justice system; on the other hand, it exposes critical tensions between procedural efficiency and substantive justice. This forms the analytical basis for assessing whether plea bargaining has achieved its intended objectives or whether it remains limited in its practical impact.[14]

1.3 Statement of the Problem

The criminal justice system in India is widely criticised for prolonged delays, increasing case backlog, and procedural inefficiency, which collectively weaken public confidence in the delivery of justice. Trials often take years or even decades to conclude, resulting in overcrowded courts and continued suffering for undertrial prisoners. In response to these systemic issues, plea bargaining was introduced under the Criminal Procedure Code as a reformative mechanism intended to reduce pendency, encourage negotiated settlements, and ensure faster disposal of criminal cases.

However, despite its statutory recognition, the practical functioning of plea bargaining has not achieved the expected outcomes. Its adoption remains limited, uneven, and largely underutilised across courts in India. One of the key concerns is the issue of voluntariness, as accused persons particularly those belonging to economically weaker and socially disadvantaged sections may not fully understand their legal rights or the consequences of pleading guilty. This raises serious questions about whether the process is genuinely consensual or influenced by pressure, fear of harsher punishment, or lack of effective legal assistance.

Further, there are apprehensions regarding the potential misuse of plea bargaining by investigative agencies, where the process may be used to secure quick convictions rather than ensure fair and balanced justice. The absence of strong safeguards and inadequate legal awareness among accused persons also reduces the effectiveness of the system. In many cases, defendants may accept plea deals without proper legal advice, which may result in unfair outcomes and compromise the

principle of equality before law.

These challenges create a significant tension between efficiency and fairness. While plea bargaining aims to reduce delays and improve judicial efficiency, it also raises critical concerns related to fair trial rights, due process, and protection against coercion. Therefore, this study seeks to critically examine whether plea bargaining in India has truly contributed to improving the criminal justice system or whether it has, in some instances, undermined the core constitutional guarantees of justice, fairness, and procedural protection.

1.4 Research Questions

1. Whether plea bargaining has effectively reduced case backlog in India?
2. To what extent has plea bargaining ensured speedy trial and justice delivery?
3. Whether plea bargaining protects or compromises the rights of the accused?
4. What are the major challenges in the implementation of plea bargaining in India?
5. Whether plea bargaining in India can be considered a success or failure?

1.5 Hypothesis

Plea bargaining in India was introduced as a progressive reform aimed at addressing the long-standing problems of delay, backlog, and inefficiency in the criminal justice system. The underlying expectation was that by encouraging negotiated settlements in appropriate cases, courts would be able to dispose of a larger number of cases more efficiently, thereby reducing the burden on the judiciary and providing quicker relief to all stakeholders.

However, despite having a clear legislative framework under the Criminal Procedure Code, its practical effectiveness has not fully matched its intended objectives. The system has been implemented in a limited and uneven manner across different courts, and its usage remains relatively low compared to the volume of pending criminal cases in India. Several structural and practical issues continue to restrict its broader success.

It is hypothesised that while plea bargaining has contributed to the speedy disposal of certain minor offences and helped in reducing the burden of undertrial cases to some extent, it has not led to a substantial or systemic transformation of the criminal justice system. Its impact is constrained by factors such as limited awareness among accused persons, inadequate legal assistance, and concerns regarding the voluntariness and fairness of guilty pleas.

Moreover, apprehensions about potential coercion, unequal bargaining power between the prosecution and the accused, and the risk of compromised due process further weaken its effectiveness. As a result, plea bargaining cannot be considered a fully successful reform in the Indian context; rather, it represents a partial and situational improvement that works effectively only under specific conditions and in limited categories of cases.

1.6 Objectives of the Study

1. To analyze the concept and evolution of plea bargaining in India
2. To examine legal provisions governing plea bargaining under CrPC
3. To evaluate the effectiveness of plea bargaining in reducing case backlog
4. To identify challenges and limitations in its implementation
5. To assess whether plea bargaining is a success or failure in India
6. To suggest reforms for improving its effectiveness

1.7 Research Methodology

This study adopts a doctrinal research methodology, which is primarily concerned with the analysis, interpretation, and systematic study of legal rules and principles as they exist in statutory provisions and judicial pronouncements. The research is based on both primary and secondary sources of law to ensure a comprehensive understanding of the concept of plea bargaining and its practical application in the Indian criminal justice system. The primary sources include relevant statutory provisions under the Criminal Procedure Code, 1973, particularly those relating to plea bargaining, along with important judicial decisions of the Supreme Court and various High Courts. Reports of the Law Commission of India have also been examined to understand the legislative intent and policy considerations behind the introduction of plea bargaining in India.

Secondary sources consist of authoritative textbooks, scholarly articles, legal journals, commentaries, and online legal databases, which provide critical insights and academic perspectives on the effectiveness, limitations, and challenges of plea bargaining. These sources help in evaluating the practical functioning of the system beyond its formal legal framework. The research is analytical in nature, focusing on the interpretation of legal provisions and a critical examination of case law to assess whether the objectives of plea bargaining have been achieved in practice. In addition, a comparative approach has been adopted to briefly examine the functioning of plea bargaining in other jurisdictions, particularly the United States, in order to identify best practices and highlight structural differences.

Overall, the study is qualitative and library-based, relying on existing legal materials rather than empirical data. It aims to critically evaluate whether plea bargaining in India serves as an effective reform mechanism or whether it requires further strengthening to align with the principles of fair trial and efficient justice delivery.

1.8 Review of Literature

Books

1. **Kelkar, R.V., *Criminal Procedure* (2019)**- Kelkar provides a comprehensive explanation of criminal procedural laws in India, including plea bargaining. The author highlights its procedural framework and emphasizes that it was introduced to reduce trial delays. He also discusses limitations such as misuse and lack of awareness among accused persons.
2. **Gaur, H.S. – *Criminal Law: Cases and Materials* (2020)**- This book provides a detailed discussion on the concept of plea bargaining within the framework of Indian criminal law. The author not only explains the statutory provisions governing plea bargaining but also critically evaluates its constitutional validity. A major focus is placed on whether plea bargaining aligns with the fundamental principles of fair trial, due process, and equality before law. Gaur raises important concerns regarding the possibility of coercion and the risk of compromising justice in the pursuit of efficiency.
3. **Ratanlal & Dhirajlal – *The Code of Criminal Procedure* (2021)**- This authoritative commentary offers a section-wise analysis of the Criminal Procedure Code, including Chapter XXI-A which deals with plea bargaining. The authors explain the procedural mechanism in detail, including eligibility criteria, judicial role, and safeguards provided under the law. They also highlight how these safeguards are intended to ensure that plea bargaining remains voluntary and does not undermine the rights of the accused.
4. **Sarkar, S.C. – *The Law of Criminal Procedure* (2018)**- Sarkar's work focuses on judicial interpretations and practical implementation issues surrounding plea bargaining in India. The book critically examines how courts have applied the provisions in real cases and identifies key challenges such as coercion, lack of informed consent, and inconsistent judicial approaches. It also highlights the gap between legislative intent and practical realities in criminal courts.
5. **Paranjape, N.V. – *Criminology and Penology* (2020)**- This book situates plea bargaining within the broader context of criminological theories and penal reform. The author discusses how plea bargaining contributes to reducing prison overcrowding and speeding up case disposal. It also evaluates whether such reforms are consistent with the goals of punishment, deterrence, and rehabilitation in modern criminal justice systems.
6. **Chandrasekharan Pillai – *Criminal Law* (2017)**- The author examines the policy rationale behind introducing plea bargaining in India, particularly its role in addressing judicial backlog and inefficiency. While acknowledging its theoretical benefits, the book critically assesses its limited practical success and points out structural issues that hinder its effective implementation.
7. **K.N. Chandrasekharan Pillai – *General Principles of Criminal Law* (2019)**- This work focuses on the fundamental principles of criminal procedure, especially procedural fairness and justice. The author discusses concerns related to voluntary consent in plea bargaining and emphasises the need for safeguards to ensure that accused persons are not pressured into accepting guilt without proper understanding of consequences.
8. **Justice Malimath Committee Report (Commentary-based studies, 2003)**-Scholarly analyses of the Malimath Committee Report explain how plea bargaining was recommended as part of broader criminal justice reforms. The report suggested introducing negotiated settlements to reduce delays and improve efficiency. Commentaries on this report also critically evaluate

whether these recommendations are suitable in the Indian legal context, especially concerning fairness and rights protection.

9. **Batuk Lal – *The Code of Criminal Procedure* (2022)**- This book provides a detailed explanation of procedural aspects of plea bargaining under the CrPC. It outlines step-by-step procedures for filing applications, the role of the court in verifying voluntariness, and the extent of judicial discretion. It is particularly useful for understanding the practical workflow of plea bargaining in Indian courts.
10. **K.D. Gaur – *Indian Penal Code and Criminal Law* (2020)**- Gaur analyses plea bargaining from the perspective of substantive criminal law and sentencing policy. The book examines how plea bargaining influences punishment outcomes and whether it leads to consistency or disparity in sentencing. It also discusses its broader impact on the objectives of criminal law, such as deterrence, reformation, and justice delivery.

Articles

1. **"Plea Bargaining in India: A Critical Study" – *Indian Journal of Criminology* (2019)**- This article critically evaluates the concept of plea bargaining in India and examines its limited practical application despite its statutory recognition. It highlights that plea bargaining has not been widely adopted in the Indian criminal justice system and remains underutilised due to lack of awareness, procedural hesitation, and concerns about fairness in its execution.
2. **"Judicial Delays and Plea Bargaining" – *Journal of the Indian Law Institute* (2020)**- This study analyses the relationship between judicial delays and the introduction of plea bargaining as a reform measure. It argues that although plea bargaining was intended to reduce case backlog and speed up disposal of criminal cases, its actual impact on reducing judicial delay has been minimal due to structural inefficiencies and limited implementation.
3. **"Plea Bargaining and Fair Trial Rights" – *NUJS Law Review* (2018)**- The article focuses on constitutional concerns surrounding plea bargaining, particularly its compatibility with the right to a fair trial. It critically examines whether the process ensures voluntary consent or whether accused persons may be pressured into accepting guilt, thereby raising concerns about due process and procedural fairness.
4. **"Criminal Justice Reforms in India" – *Economic and Political Weekly* (2021)**-This article places plea bargaining within the broader context of criminal justice reforms in India. It discusses how various reform initiatives aim to address systemic inefficiencies such as delay, backlog, and prison overcrowding, while also evaluating whether these reforms have achieved meaningful structural change.
5. **"Effectiveness of Plea Bargaining in India" – *Indian Bar Review* (2020)**- This study evaluates the practical effectiveness of plea bargaining in Indian courts. It highlights implementation challenges such as low acceptance rates, lack of procedural clarity, and judicial reluctance, which collectively limit its impact as a reformative tool in criminal justice delivery.
6. **"Comparative Analysis of Plea Bargaining" – *Harvard International Law Journal* (2019)**- This article provides a comparative perspective between plea bargaining systems in India and the United States. It highlights key structural differences, particularly the mature negotiation-based system in the US versus the cautious and limited adoption in India, and examines how

legal culture influences the success of plea bargaining.

7. **"Alternative Dispute Resolution in Criminal Law" – *Delhi Law Review* (2021)**-This article situates plea bargaining within the broader framework of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) mechanisms in criminal law. It explains how plea bargaining serves as a hybrid mechanism aimed at reducing trial burden while encouraging negotiated settlements in appropriate criminal cases.
8. **"Rights of the Accused in Plea Bargaining" – *Supreme Court Cases Journal* (2018)**- This article examines the procedural safeguards available to accused persons under plea bargaining provisions. It critically analyses whether these safeguards are sufficient to protect against coercion and ensure informed and voluntary participation in the process.
9. **"Plea Bargaining in India: Myth vs Reality" – *Legal Service India Journal* (2020)**- This study highlights the gap between the theoretical objectives of plea bargaining and its actual implementation. It argues that while the system was introduced to improve efficiency, in practice it has not significantly transformed criminal trial processes in India.
10. **"Speedy Justice and Plea Bargaining" – *Manupatra Articles* (2021)**- This article evaluates whether plea bargaining effectively contributes to speedy justice. It concludes that although it has helped in disposing of certain minor cases quickly, its overall impact on reducing systemic delay remains limited due to uneven adoption and procedural barriers.

1.9 Scope of the Study

The scope of this study is confined to an in-depth examination of the concept and application of plea bargaining within the framework of Indian criminal law, with specific reference to Chapter XXI-A of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973. It primarily focuses on understanding the theoretical foundations behind the introduction of plea bargaining as a reformative mechanism, aimed at reducing judicial delay, easing the burden on courts, and promoting efficient case disposal in the criminal justice system.

Further, the study analyses the statutory provisions governing plea bargaining, including eligibility criteria, procedural requirements, and the role of the court in ensuring voluntariness and fairness of the negotiated settlement. It also critically evaluates how Indian courts have interpreted and applied these provisions in practice, highlighting the judicial approach towards safeguarding the rights of the accused while balancing the need for speedy justice.

In addition, the research examines the practical implementation of plea bargaining in India, identifying gaps between legislative intent and ground reality. Issues such as limited awareness among accused persons, reluctance of courts in encouraging plea bargaining, concerns regarding coercion, and uneven application across different jurisdictions are also discussed to assess its overall effectiveness.

To provide a more comprehensive understanding, the study incorporates a comparative perspective by briefly examining plea bargaining systems in other jurisdictions, particularly the United States, where it is more extensively developed and frequently used. This comparative analysis helps in identifying best practices and structural differences that may inform improvements in the Indian system.

However, the scope of this research is deliberately limited to criminal law processes related to plea bargaining. It does not extend to civil dispute resolution mechanisms such as mediation, arbitration, or

other alternative dispute resolution systems, except where necessary for conceptual clarity or comparison. The focus remains strictly on criminal procedural reform and its implications for justice delivery in India.

1.10 Chapterisation Scheme

This study has been systematically divided into six chapters in order to ensure a clear, logical, and structured understanding of the concept of plea bargaining and its role within the Indian criminal justice system.

Chapter 1: Introduction, Background, Research Design, and Literature Review- This chapter introduces the topic of plea bargaining, explaining its basic concept, historical background, and relevance in the Indian legal system. It also sets out the research problem, objectives, hypotheses, methodology, and scope of the study. In addition, it includes a review of existing literature to understand the current academic discourse and identify research gaps.

Chapter 2: Evolution and Development of Plea Bargaining in India- This chapter traces the historical development of plea bargaining in India. It explains how the concept evolved over time, the influence of global legal systems, recommendations of law reform committees, and the reasons that led to its formal introduction under the Criminal Procedure Code, 1973. It also highlights the policy objectives behind adopting this mechanism.

Chapter 3: Legal Framework under BNSS and Judicial Interpretations- This chapter examines the statutory framework governing plea bargaining under the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS), which replaces the procedural framework earlier contained in the CrPC. It explains the procedural requirements, eligibility conditions, and safeguards provided under the new legal regime. The chapter further analyses important judicial decisions that have shaped the understanding and practical application of plea bargaining in India.

Chapter 4: Comparative Analysis with Other Jurisdictions- This chapter compares the Indian system of plea bargaining with practices followed in other countries, particularly the United States and other developed legal systems. The aim is to identify differences in structure, effectiveness, safeguards, and practical application, and to understand possible lessons for improvement in the Indian context.

Chapter 5: Critical Analysis of Success and Failure of Plea Bargaining- This chapter evaluates the effectiveness of plea bargaining in India. It critically examines whether it has achieved its intended goals such as reducing case backlog and ensuring speedy justice. It also highlights its limitations, including issues of coercion, lack of awareness, uneven implementation, and concerns related to fairness and due process.

Chapter 6: Findings, Suggestions, and Conclusion- The final chapter presents the key findings of the study based on the overall analysis. It provides suggestions for improving the effectiveness of plea bargaining in India and strengthening procedural safeguards. It also concludes whether plea bargaining has been successful as a criminal justice reform and outlines its prospects.

1.11 Student Learning Outcomes

This study provides a comprehensive understanding of plea bargaining as an important reform mechanism within the criminal justice system. It helps in developing a clear conceptual and practical understanding of how negotiated settlements function in criminal law and how they are intended to reduce judicial delay and improve the efficiency of the courts. The research also enhances analytical thinking by enabling a critical evaluation of legal reforms. It encourages the student to examine not only the theoretical objectives of plea bargaining but also its actual implementation, effectiveness, and limitations in real-world situations. This develops the ability to distinguish between legislative intent and practical outcomes.

In addition, the study strengthens understanding of procedural aspects of criminal law, particularly the working of Chapter XXI-A of the CrPC and its corresponding provisions under the **Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023**, along with judicial interpretations that guide their application. It also improves awareness of the rights of the accused, especially safeguards related to voluntariness, fairness, and protection against coercion in the plea bargaining process. Furthermore, the comparative component of the research broadens legal perspective by exposing the student to international practices, particularly systems where plea bargaining is more developed and widely used. This helps in understanding different approaches to criminal justice reform and their relative advantages and disadvantages. Overall, the study contributes to the development of strong legal reasoning, critical thinking, and research skills, enabling a deeper and more structured understanding of criminal law and its evolving reforms.

CHAPTER 2
EVOLUTION AND DEVELOPMENT OF PLEA BARGAINING IN INDIA

2.1 Introduction

The concept of plea bargaining represents a significant transformation in the philosophy of criminal justice administration, marking a gradual shift from a strictly adversarial trial system to a more negotiated and settlement-oriented model. Traditionally, criminal justice systems, including that of India, have been based on the principle that guilt or innocence must be determined through a full-fledged judicial trial, where evidence is examined in detail and both parties are given equal opportunity to present their case. However, with increasing pendency of cases, overcrowded courts, and overburdened prison systems, the efficiency of this traditional model has been widely questioned.[15]

Plea bargaining introduces an alternative approach where the accused voluntarily agrees to plead guilty in exchange for certain concessions such as reduced charges, lighter sentences, or withdrawal of specific allegations, subject to the approval of the court. This mechanism is designed to balance two competing objectives: on one hand, ensuring speedy disposal of criminal cases, and on the other, maintaining fairness and judicial oversight so that the rights of the accused are not compromised. In theory, it reduces litigation time, saves judicial resources, and allows courts to focus on serious and complex cases that require full trials.[16]

In India, plea bargaining was not historically part of the criminal justice framework and was formally introduced only in the early 21st century as a response to structural inefficiencies in the

system. The Criminal Law (Amendment) Act, 2005 inserted Chapter XXI-A (Sections 265A–265L),[17] initially under the Code of Criminal Procedure framework, thereby providing a statutory basis for plea bargaining. In the present legal regime, the procedural criminal law has been replaced by the **Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS)**, which now governs criminal procedure in India. The concept of plea bargaining continues to remain relevant within this restructured procedural framework, reflecting the legislative intent of promoting efficient case management and reducing delays in criminal adjudication. This development was influenced by recommendations of various law reform bodies, including the Malimath Committee, which emphasised the need for alternative mechanisms to reduce delays and improve efficiency in criminal adjudication.[18]

However, the evolution of plea bargaining in India has been gradual, cautious, and somewhat restrictive in nature. Unlike jurisdictions such as the United States, where plea bargaining is a dominant feature of criminal justice disposal, India has adopted a limited and controlled version of the practice.[19] This cautious approach is largely due to constitutional concerns relating to fair trial rights, equality before law, and protection against coercion under Article 21 of the Constitution of India. There has been persistent concern that economically or socially vulnerable accused persons may be pressured into accepting guilt due to prolonged trials or lack of effective legal assistance.[20]

Despite these concerns, plea bargaining continues to be recognised as a reformative tool aimed at improving efficiency in the criminal justice system. Its evolution reflects a continuous attempt to strike a balance between procedural fairness and practical necessity, ensuring that justice is not only done but is also delivered in a timely and effective manner.[21]

2.2 Conceptual Background of Plea Bargaining

Plea bargaining is a procedural mechanism in criminal justice whereby an accused person voluntarily agrees to plead guilty to a criminal charge in return for certain concessions from the prosecution, such as reduction in charges, recommendation of a lighter sentence, or withdrawal of some allegations, subject to judicial approval. The essence of this mechanism lies in negotiation and mutual agreement, where both the prosecution and the accused attempt to reach a mutually acceptable resolution without undergoing a full-fledged trial.[22]

The conceptual foundation of plea bargaining is rooted in the idea of "negotiated justice," which represents a departure from the traditional adversarial model of criminal adjudication.[23] In the adversarial system, guilt or innocence is determined solely through a formal trial process involving examination of evidence, cross-examination of witnesses, and strict procedural safeguards. However, plea bargaining introduces a pragmatic alternative that prioritises efficiency and settlement over prolonged litigation. It reflects the growing recognition that not all criminal cases require full trial adjudication, particularly those involving minor offences or where evidence is strong and undisputed.[24]

At its core, plea bargaining attempts to balance two important but often competing objectives of criminal justice. On one hand, it aims to ensure speedy disposal of cases, reduce backlog, and minimise the burden on courts and correctional institutions. On the other hand, it seeks to preserve the rights of the accused by ensuring that any admission of guilt is voluntary, informed, and made with judicial

oversight. The court plays a crucial role in this process by verifying that the plea is not the result of coercion, undue influence, or misrepresentation, and that the accused fully understands the legal consequences of the agreement.[25]

The conceptual evolution of plea bargaining is also closely linked to broader theories of criminal justice reform, particularly those focusing on efficiency, restorative justice, and pragmatic adjudication. It is argued that criminal justice systems must not only deliver justice but also do so within a reasonable time frame, failing which the legitimacy of the system itself is undermined. In this context, plea bargaining serves as a mechanism to optimise judicial resources by allowing courts to focus on serious and complex cases while enabling quicker resolution of less serious offences.[26]

In India, however, the adoption of plea bargaining has been cautious and tightly regulated due to concerns about fairness, equality, and the risk of coercion. The system has been structured in a way that limits its application to specific categories of offences and requires strict judicial supervision. Unlike jurisdictions such as the United States, where plea bargaining is a dominant feature of criminal justice practice, India has adopted a more controlled approach to ensure that the constitutional guarantee of fair trial under Article 21 is not compromised.[27]

Thus, plea bargaining in its conceptual sense represents a hybrid model of criminal justice that combines elements of negotiation, judicial oversight, and procedural efficiency. It reflects an attempt to reconcile the ideals of justice with the practical realities of an overburdened judicial system, ensuring that justice is not only theoretically sound but also practically achievable.[28]

2.3 Early Position of Indian Criminal Justice System

In its historical evolution, the Indian criminal justice system was fundamentally structured on a strict adversarial and trial-centric model, wherein the determination of criminal liability was possible only through a complete judicial trial conducted in accordance with established procedural safeguards. This model was largely inherited from the colonial legal framework introduced by the British administration, which was itself influenced by the Anglo-Saxon system of criminal jurisprudence. The underlying philosophy of this system was that criminal guilt must be proven beyond reasonable doubt through a formal process involving evidence, witness examination, and judicial evaluation, thereby ensuring procedural fairness and protection of individual liberty.[29]

Because of this inherited structure, the Indian criminal justice system did not recognise or provide any institutional mechanism for negotiated settlements or alternative methods of case disposal during its early phase. The law treated criminal adjudication as a matter of strict judicial determination, leaving no scope for compromise or settlement between the prosecution and the accused. Even where the accused was willing to admit guilt, the legal framework did not permit any simplification of the trial process or reduction in procedural requirements based on such admission.[30]

Under this rigid procedural structure, every criminal case irrespective of its nature, complexity, or seriousness was required to pass through all formal stages of trial. These stages typically included the filing of charge sheets, framing of charges by the court, examination and cross-examination of witnesses, presentation of documentary and oral evidence, and final arguments before the court could deliver a judgment. This uniform application of full trial procedure to all categories of offences created a highly formalistic and time-consuming system that lacked flexibility in case management.[31]

The absence of any alternative mechanism for disposal of cases significantly contributed to systemic inefficiencies in the criminal justice administration. Over time, Indian courts began to experience a continuous accumulation of pending cases, which resulted in chronic delays in the delivery of justice. This situation was further aggravated by the fact that accused persons, even in cases involving minor offences or where evidence of guilt was substantial, were compelled to undergo lengthy trials without any possibility of negotiated resolution.[32]

This trial-heavy structure also had serious implications for the prison system. Many undertrial prisoners remained incarcerated for extended periods simply because their cases could not be concluded in a timely manner. This not only led to overcrowding in prisons but also raised concerns regarding the violation of personal liberty and the right to speedy trial. The absence of procedural flexibility thus had a direct impact on both judicial efficiency and human rights protection.[33]

Moreover, the rigid insistence on full trials in all cases often undermined the practical effectiveness of justice delivery. While the system was designed to ensure fairness and due process, in practice it resulted in delays that weakened the evidentiary value of cases. With the passage of time, witnesses often became unavailable, memories faded, and evidence deteriorated, thereby affecting the quality of adjudication. In many situations, the delay itself became a form of injustice, as litigants were forced to live in prolonged uncertainty regarding the outcome of their cases.[34]

Gradually, the increasing burden on courts, rising pendency of cases, and inefficiencies in the disposal system highlighted the urgent need for structural reform. It became evident that the traditional trial-based model, while constitutionally sound in principle, was insufficient to address the growing demands of a modern criminal justice system. This recognition paved the way for procedural innovations and reformative mechanisms such as plea bargaining, which were later introduced to improve efficiency and reduce the burden on courts.[35]

Thus, the early position of the Indian criminal justice system reflects a phase characterised by procedural rigidity, formalism, and exclusive reliance on full trials. While this model ensured adherence to due process, it simultaneously exposed serious limitations in terms of efficiency, accessibility, and timely justice delivery, ultimately necessitating the introduction of alternative mechanisms of criminal case resolution.

2.4 Law Commission of India and Reform Recommendations

The introduction and eventual statutory recognition of plea bargaining in India was not an abrupt legislative development, but rather the result of a gradual reform process shaped significantly by expert bodies such as the Law Commission of India and high-level policy committees. These institutions played a crucial role in identifying structural inefficiencies in the criminal justice system and proposing practical solutions to address issues such as delay, backlog of cases, and prolonged undertrial detention.[36]

The Law Commission of India, as a permanent advisory body on legal reforms, has consistently highlighted the need for procedural innovation in criminal law. The 142nd Report of the Law Commission was one of the earliest formal recommendations suggesting the introduction of plea bargaining in India. This report recognised that the traditional trial-based system was increasingly unable to cope with the rising volume of criminal cases. It observed that many cases, particularly those

involving minor offences, consume disproportionate judicial time and resources despite the absence of complex legal or evidentiary issues. The Commission therefore recommended a structured mechanism whereby accused persons could voluntarily plead guilty in exchange for lesser punishment, subject to judicial supervision, to streamline case disposal and reduce the burden on courts.[37]

Building upon this initial recommendation, the 154th Report of the Law Commission further strengthened the case for introducing plea bargaining in the Indian legal system. This report placed greater emphasis on the human rights dimension of criminal justice, particularly the right to speedy trial and the problem of undertrial prisoners languishing in jail for long periods. It argued that delays in criminal adjudication not only undermine the efficiency of the justice system but also violate the fundamental rights of accused persons under Article 21 of the Constitution of India. The report therefore recommended the adoption of plea bargaining as a pragmatic reform that could reduce pendency and ensure quicker resolution of cases without compromising basic legal safeguards.[38]

The most significant policy development in this context came with the Malimath Committee Report on Criminal Justice Reforms (2003), which provided a comprehensive framework for restructuring the criminal justice system in India.[39] The Committee strongly endorsed the concept of plea bargaining and described it as an essential tool for improving efficiency and reducing delays in criminal trials. It observed that a substantial proportion of criminal cases in India involve minor offences or straightforward facts where prolonged trials serve little practical purpose. According to the Committee, in such cases, the insistence on full trials leads to unnecessary consumption of judicial time, delays in justice delivery, and overcrowding of courts and prisons.[40]

The Malimath Committee further highlighted that plea bargaining could serve multiple objectives simultaneously. It could reduce the burden on courts, ensure faster disposal of cases, and provide relief to undertrial prisoners who often suffer prolonged incarceration due to systemic delays. At the same time, the Committee emphasised the importance of incorporating adequate safeguards to ensure that the process remains voluntary and free from coercion, thereby protecting the constitutional rights of the accused. It recommended that plea bargaining should be introduced in a regulated and controlled manner, with judicial oversight acting as a safeguard against abuse.[41]

Collectively, these reform recommendations reflect a consistent policy shift towards recognising the limitations of a purely trial-based criminal justice system and the need for alternative mechanisms of dispute resolution. They also demonstrate an attempt to balance efficiency with fairness, ensuring that procedural reforms do not compromise the fundamental principles of justice. These recommendations ultimately laid the intellectual and policy foundation for the introduction of Chapter XXI-A in the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, which formally incorporated plea bargaining into Indian criminal law.[42]

2.5 Introduction through Legislative Framework (2005 Amendment)

Plea bargaining was formally introduced into the Indian criminal justice system through the Criminal Law (Amendment) Act, 2005, which inserted Chapter XXI-A comprising Sections 265A to 265L into the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973. This legislative development marked a significant departure from the traditional trial-centric approach of criminal adjudication, as it for the first time statutorily recognised the concept of negotiated guilty pleas within a regulated legal framework.[43]

The 2005 Amendment was introduced with the primary objective of addressing long-standing structural issues in the Indian criminal justice system, particularly the problem of excessive pendency of cases, delays in trial proceedings, and overcrowding in prisons due to the large number of undertrial prisoners. The legislature sought to introduce a mechanism that would allow for quicker disposal of cases without compromising the essential requirements of fairness, voluntariness, and judicial oversight. Accordingly, plea bargaining was designed as a controlled procedural innovation rather than an unrestricted negotiation between the prosecution and the accused.[44]

A key feature of the legislative framework is that it ensures that plea bargaining is strictly voluntary in nature. The provisions require that the application for plea bargaining must be initiated by the accused, thereby reducing the possibility of coercion at the investigative or prosecutorial stage. Furthermore, the role of the judiciary is central in the entire process, as the court is required to verify that the plea has been made voluntarily, that the accused understands the implications of pleading guilty, and that no undue pressure or inducement has influenced the decision.[45]

The statutory framework also imposes clear limitations on the scope of plea bargaining in order to maintain a balance between efficiency and justice. It expressly excludes certain categories of offences from its application, including serious offences that are punishable with death or life imprisonment, offences affecting the socio-economic condition of the country, and offences committed against women and children. These exclusions reflect the legislative intent to ensure that plea bargaining is not applied in cases where public interest, societal impact, or severity of crime demands full judicial scrutiny.[46]

In addition, the procedural safeguards under Chapter XXI-A provide for judicial satisfaction at multiple stages of the process, including examination of voluntariness, interaction with the accused in camera where necessary, and the final disposal of the case through a mutually agreed settlement. The court is also empowered to reject the plea if it finds that the process has not been conducted in accordance with legal requirements or if it appears unjust or improper.[47]

Thus, the introduction of plea bargaining through the 2005 Amendment represents a carefully calibrated legislative reform aimed at improving efficiency in criminal justice administration while simultaneously safeguarding constitutional guarantees of fair trial and due process. It reflects the legislature's attempt to introduce flexibility into the criminal procedure without compromising the foundational principles of justice.[48]

2.6 Objectives Behind Introduction of Plea Bargaining in India

The introduction of plea bargaining in India was not an isolated procedural reform, but rather a response to long-standing structural deficiencies within the criminal justice system. The primary objective was to create a more efficient, time-sensitive, and pragmatic mechanism for disposal of criminal cases without compromising the core values of fairness and justice. Over time, the Indian judiciary and law reform bodies recognised that the traditional trial system, though procedurally robust, was unable to cope with the rapidly increasing volume of criminal litigation.

One of the most important objectives behind introducing plea bargaining was the reduction of pendency of criminal cases. Indian courts have historically been burdened with a massive backlog of cases, leading to delays that sometimes extend for years or even decades.[49] This delay not

only affects the efficiency of the justice system but also undermines public confidence in judicial institutions. Plea bargaining was therefore conceptualised as a mechanism that could dispose of cases at an early stage, particularly those involving less serious offences, thereby reducing the overall caseload of courts.

Another key objective was ensuring speedy disposal of minor offences. A significant proportion of criminal cases in India involve offences that are relatively less serious in nature and do not necessarily require a full-length trial.[50] In such cases, continuing with a detailed adversarial trial often results in unnecessary consumption of judicial time and resources. Plea bargaining provides a structured alternative where such cases can be resolved quickly through negotiated settlements, subject to judicial approval, thereby accelerating the delivery of justice.

A further important objective was the reduction of burden on courts and prison systems. The Indian criminal justice system suffers from institutional overload, where courts are overworked and prisons are overcrowded with undertrial prisoners.[51] Many individuals remain in custody for extended periods simply because their cases have not been decided. Plea bargaining was introduced to reduce this pressure by enabling quicker case resolution, thereby indirectly contributing to decongestion of prisons and easing the workload of judges and prosecutors.

Closely connected to this was the objective of providing relief to undertrial prisoners. Undertrial detention has been one of the most criticised aspects of the Indian criminal justice system. In many cases, the period spent in custody during trial exceeds the sentence that might eventually be imposed upon conviction.[52] Plea bargaining was therefore seen as a humane reform that could allow eligible accused persons to resolve their cases faster and potentially secure lesser sentences, thereby reducing unnecessary incarceration and safeguarding personal liberty.

Another significant objective was promoting efficiency in criminal justice administration. Efficiency here does not merely mean speed, but also the optimal utilisation of judicial resources. Courts were expected to focus more on serious, complex, and high-value criminal cases, while relatively simple cases could be resolved through negotiated settlements.[53] This reallocation of judicial attention was intended to improve the overall functioning of the justice system.

Finally, plea bargaining was introduced to encourage negotiated settlement in appropriate cases, thereby shifting the system towards a more cooperative model of dispute resolution within criminal law.[54] This objective reflects a broader global trend in criminal justice systems where restorative and negotiated approaches are increasingly being used to complement traditional adversarial trials. However, in India, this shift was carefully controlled to ensure that such negotiations remain voluntary, transparent, and subject to judicial scrutiny.

Thus, plea bargaining in India was not intended to replace the traditional trial system but to function as a supplementary reform tool. Its objectives reflect a balancing act between efficiency and fairness, ensuring that while justice is expedited, the fundamental rights of the accused are not compromised.

2.7 Development and Judicial Attitude Towards Plea Bargaining

The judicial attitude towards plea bargaining in India has evolved gradually from initial resistance to cautious acceptance, reflecting the judiciary's attempt to balance procedural efficiency with

constitutional guarantees of fairness, equality, and due process. In the early phase, Indian courts were largely hesitant to recognise or encourage the practice of plea bargaining, primarily because it was perceived as being inconsistent with the traditional principles of criminal adjudication, where guilt must be established through a full trial based on evidence rather than negotiation.

During this initial period, the judiciary expressed serious concerns that plea bargaining could undermine the integrity of the criminal justice system by encouraging coerced or involuntary guilty pleas. There was a prevailing apprehension that accused persons, particularly those belonging to weaker socio-economic backgrounds, might feel pressured by systemic delays, prolonged incarceration, or lack of adequate legal representation to accept guilt even when they might have viable defences.[55] As a result, courts were cautious in ensuring that any form of negotiated justice did not dilute the foundational requirement of a fair trial.

However, with the formal statutory recognition of plea bargaining through legislative intervention, judicial attitude began to shift from outright scepticism to a more structured and supervisory approach. Courts started acknowledging that while the adversarial trial system remains the backbone of criminal justice in India, certain categories of cases could be effectively resolved through negotiated settlements, provided strict procedural safeguards are maintained. This marked an important transition in judicial thinking from resistance to regulated acceptance.

The Supreme Court of India has consistently emphasised that plea bargaining must operate strictly within constitutional boundaries, particularly under Article 21 of the Constitution, which guarantees the right to life and personal liberty, including the right to a fair trial.[56] The Court has made it clear that any form of plea bargaining that compromises voluntariness or results from coercion, inducement, or misunderstanding would be constitutionally invalid. This judicial position reinforces that efficiency in criminal justice cannot override fundamental rights.

Another important aspect of judicial interpretation has been the insistence on informed consent. Courts have repeatedly held that an accused person must fully understand the legal consequences of entering into a plea bargain, including the nature of charges, potential sentencing outcomes, and the rights being waived by avoiding a full trial.[57] The role of the judiciary, therefore, is not merely procedural approval but an active safeguard to ensure that the accused is making a conscious and informed decision free from external pressure.

Over time, the judiciary has also recognised that plea bargaining should not be treated as a shortcut to conviction but as a mechanism of last resort applicable only in appropriate cases. Courts have stressed that it must not become a tool for investigative agencies to secure easy convictions or for the prosecution to avoid the burden of proving guilt beyond reasonable doubt. Instead, it must function as a balanced mechanism that preserves the rights of the accused while contributing to judicial efficiency.[58]

Thus, the overall judicial attitude towards plea bargaining in India reflects a careful balancing exercise. While the judiciary has accepted its utility as a reformative tool in the criminal justice system, it has simultaneously imposed strict constitutional and procedural safeguards to ensure that the core principles of fairness, voluntariness, and due process remain intact. This dual approach highlights the Indian judiciary's commitment to ensuring that efficiency-oriented reforms do not compromise substantive

justice.[59]

2.8 Evolution Under New Criminal Laws (BNSS Framework)

The enactment of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS) marks a significant milestone in the restructuring of India's criminal procedural framework. It replaces the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, and represents a comprehensive attempt by the legislature to modernise criminal procedure in line with contemporary needs such as digitisation, faster adjudication, improved case management, and greater efficiency in justice delivery. This transition is not merely a replacement of statutory provisions but reflects a broader philosophical shift towards a more technology-driven and time-bound criminal justice system.

Within this new framework, although the term "plea bargaining" continues to exist in its earlier conceptual form, its relevance is indirectly reinforced through the overall emphasis on efficiency, early resolution of disputes, and reduction of judicial backlog. The BNSS does not fundamentally alter the concept of negotiated justice but strengthens the procedural ecosystem in which such mechanisms operate. By promoting structured timelines, digital filing systems, electronic summons, and virtual hearings, the new law creates an environment where early settlement mechanisms, including plea bargaining, can function more effectively and with reduced procedural delay.

One of the most significant features of the BNSS is its emphasis on digitisation of criminal proceedings. This includes provisions for e-FIRs, electronic case records, video conferencing for evidence recording, and digital case tracking systems.[60] These reforms aim to minimise physical delays, reduce dependency on manual processes, and improve transparency in criminal trials. In this context, plea bargaining becomes more practical because faster case processing increases the likelihood of early-stage resolution, which is essential for negotiated justice mechanisms to succeed.

Another important dimension of the BNSS framework is its focus on time-bound investigation and trial procedures. The law introduces stricter timelines for various stages of criminal proceedings, thereby addressing one of the core issues that originally necessitated reforms like plea bargaining namely, excessive delay in case disposal.[61] By ensuring that cases progress within defined procedural limits, BNSS indirectly strengthens the effectiveness of alternative resolution mechanisms by reducing procedural uncertainty and backlog pressure.

When viewed in conjunction with the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (BNS), which replaces the Indian Penal Code, and the Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, 2023 (BSA), which replaces the Indian Evidence Act, the criminal justice system now operates under a fully restructured legal architecture. The BNS redefines substantive offences, the BSA modernises evidentiary standards, and the BNSS governs procedural law.[62] Together, these three legislations create a unified framework aimed at improving efficiency, consistency, and technological integration across the criminal justice system.

Within this restructured ecosystem, plea bargaining continues to hold relevance as a complementary mechanism rather than an independent reform. The increased use of digital tools and streamlined procedures under BNSS may potentially reduce the time taken for case processing, thereby creating more opportunities for early-stage resolution between the prosecution and the accused. However, this also raises important concerns regarding voluntariness and informed consent, as faster procedures may sometimes limit the time available for accused persons to fully understand the implications of entering a

negotiated settlement.[63]

Therefore, the evolution under the BNSS framework does not fundamentally redefine plea bargaining but strengthens the procedural infrastructure within which it operates. It reflects a broader transformation of the Indian criminal justice system from a paper-based, delay- prone structure to a more technology-enabled and efficiency-oriented model, where mechanisms like plea bargaining may play a supportive but not central role.[64]

2.9 Growth and Current Position in India

Although plea bargaining was formally introduced in India through statutory amendment in 2005 and has been part of the criminal procedure framework for nearly two decades, its actual growth in practice has been slow, uneven, and far more limited than originally anticipated. The mechanism, which was envisioned as a transformative reform to reduce judicial backlog and accelerate disposal of criminal cases, has not yet achieved widespread institutional acceptance within the Indian criminal justice system.

In terms of growth, plea bargaining has primarily remained confined to a narrow category of offences, particularly those that are minor in nature and do not involve serious social harm, offences against women, or crimes affecting socio-economic conditions.[65] Even within this limited scope, its usage varies significantly across different states and trial courts. Some jurisdictions have shown occasional use of plea bargaining as a case disposal tool, while many others rarely invoke it in regular criminal proceedings. This uneven implementation reflects a lack of uniform judicial practice and absence of consistent institutional encouragement.

One of the primary reasons for the limited growth of plea bargaining in India is the lack of awareness among key stakeholders, including accused persons, legal practitioners, and even lower court functionaries. In many cases, accused individuals are either unaware of the existence of plea-bargaining provisions or do not fully understand its legal consequences.[66] Similarly, legal aid services in several regions are not adequately equipped to guide accused persons effectively in evaluating whether to opt for such negotiated settlements. This informational gap significantly reduces the practical accessibility of the mechanism.

Another important factor restricting its growth is judicial hesitation. Many trial courts remain cautious in actively promoting plea bargaining due to concerns that it may compromise the integrity of the trial process or lead to involuntary guilty pleas. There is also an institutional tendency to prefer traditional adversarial trials over negotiated settlements, especially in cases where evidentiary scrutiny is considered necessary.[67] This cautious judicial approach has contributed to the underutilisation of plea bargaining despite its statutory availability.

Procedural complexity has also played a significant role in limiting its adoption. The procedural requirements under Chapter XXI-A of the criminal procedure framework involve multiple stages, including application by the accused, examination by the court, and verification of voluntariness and legality of the settlement. In practice, these procedural steps are often perceived as time-consuming or administratively burdensome compared to informal settlement discussions or continuation of trial proceedings. As a result, stakeholders sometimes prefer to proceed with regular trials rather than engage in a structured plea-bargaining process.

Additionally, concerns regarding potential misuse and fairness have further restricted its growth. There is an ongoing apprehension that plea bargaining may be used coercively, particularly in cases involving economically or socially disadvantaged accused persons. The fear that accused individuals may plead guilty under pressure of prolonged detention, inadequate legal representation, or fear of harsher punishment at trial has led to a cautious approach in its implementation.[68] These concerns are closely linked to broader issues of inequality in access to justice.

As a result of all these combined factors, the overall impact of plea bargaining on reducing case backlog in India has remained limited. While it has contributed to disposal of certain minor cases and provided relief in select situations, it has not led to any significant structural reduction in pendency levels within the criminal justice system. The mechanism continues to function as a supplementary tool rather than a central pillar of criminal case management.[69]

Thus, the current position of plea bargaining in India reflects a paradox: although it is legally recognised and conceptually well-intended, its practical utilisation remains minimal. This gap between legislative intent and ground reality highlights the need for greater awareness, simplified procedures, judicial encouragement, and stronger safeguards to ensure that plea bargaining can achieve its intended objectives in a fair and effective manner.[70]

2.10 Conclusion

The evolution of plea bargaining in India reflects a gradual and carefully calibrated shift in the philosophy of criminal justice administration. Traditionally, the Indian criminal justice system was firmly rooted in a trial-oriented structure, where determination of guilt or innocence could only occur through a full-fledged adversarial process. This approach, while strong in terms of procedural safeguards, gradually revealed serious limitations in practice, particularly in relation to delays, pendency of cases, and the growing burden on courts and prisons.

The introduction of plea bargaining marked an important reformative step in this long-standing structure. It signified the State's recognition that not all criminal cases require prolonged trials and that certain categories of offences can be resolved more efficiently through negotiated settlements under judicial supervision. This development represented a broader shift towards a more pragmatic and efficiency-driven criminal justice model, where speed of disposal and reduction of backlog became important considerations alongside fairness and due process.

Over time, plea bargaining has evolved from a newly introduced experimental concept into a recognised procedural mechanism within Indian criminal law. Its statutory incorporation demonstrated legislative intent to modernise the justice system and provide relief to both the judiciary and litigants, especially in cases involving minor offences. However, despite this formal recognition, its practical development has remained slow and uneven.

The effectiveness of plea bargaining in India continues to be limited by several structural and operational challenges. These include inadequate awareness among accused persons, reluctance at the judicial level to actively promote negotiated settlements, procedural complexities in implementation, and persistent concerns regarding voluntariness and fairness. In many cases, these challenges have resulted in underutilisation of the mechanism, preventing it from achieving its full potential as a tool for reducing judicial backlog. Furthermore, the success of plea bargaining is not determined solely by

its existence in statutory form, but by how effectively it is implemented in practice. The mechanism requires a careful balance between efficiency and constitutional safeguards, particularly the protection of rights under Article 21, which guarantees fair trial and due process. Without strong safeguards and consistent judicial oversight, there is a risk that the system may fail to ensure genuinely voluntary participation by accused persons.

Therefore, the evolution of plea bargaining in India can best be understood as an ongoing and incomplete reform process rather than a fully established success. It represents an attempt to modernise criminal procedure and introduce efficiency-oriented mechanisms, but its full potential is yet to be realised. The future effectiveness of plea bargaining will depend on improved awareness, simplified procedures, stronger legal aid support, and a more proactive judicial approach that ensures both efficiency and fairness are maintained in equal measure.

CHAPTER 3

LEGAL FRAMEWORK UNDER BNSS AND JUDICIAL INTERPRETATIONS

3.1 Introduction

This chapter undertakes a detailed examination of the statutory framework governing plea bargaining under the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS), which marks a significant procedural transformation in India's criminal justice system by replacing the earlier regime under the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973. The BNSS represents the legislative intent to modernise criminal procedure by introducing efficiency-oriented mechanisms while maintaining the core constitutional guarantees of fairness, equality, and due process.[71]

Plea bargaining, as a concept, is rooted in the idea of negotiated criminal justice, where the accused voluntarily accepts responsibility for a lesser charge or receives a reduced sentence in exchange for cooperation and expeditious resolution of the case. Under the BNSS framework, this mechanism is structured in a more formalised and regulated manner to ensure that it does not become a tool for coercion or compromise the rights of the accused.[72]

The statutory framework under BNSS lays down clear procedural requirements, including the manner of application, judicial scrutiny of voluntariness, involvement of the prosecution and the victim, and final settlement procedures. These provisions are designed to ensure transparency and prevent misuse of the process. In addition, the law prescribes specific eligibility conditions, thereby restricting plea bargaining to certain categories of offences and excluding serious crimes, socio-economic offences notified by the government, and offences affecting vulnerable groups.[73]

A critical aspect of this framework is the incorporation of **safeguards**, which reflect the constitutional mandate under Article 21 of the Indian Constitution.[74] These safeguards ensure that any plea-bargaining process is free from coercion, inducement, or undue influence, and that the accused fully understands the legal consequences of entering such a plea. The role of the judiciary is central in this process, as courts are required to actively supervise and validate the voluntariness and fairness of the settlement.[75]

Furthermore, this chapter also engages in a doctrinal and analytical discussion of important judicial decisions that have shaped the evolution of plea bargaining in India. Judicial interpretation has historically moved from scepticism and outright rejection of informal plea-bargaining practices to a more structured acceptance following legislative codification. Courts have consistently emphasised that while efficiency is important, it cannot override the fundamental principles of criminal jurisprudence, particularly the right to a fair trial and protection against self-incrimination.[76]

Overall, this chapter situates plea bargaining within the broader framework of criminal procedural reform under BNSS and highlights the interplay between legislative design and judicial interpretation in shaping its practical application in India's criminal justice system.[77]

3.2 Objective of the Legal Framework under BNSS

The **Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS)** has been enacted as part of a comprehensive reform of India's criminal procedural system with the primary aim of modernising and streamlining the administration of criminal justice. The objectives of the BNSS reflect a shift from a traditionally delay-prone procedural system to a more efficient, technology-enabled, and rights-oriented framework.[78]

One of the most significant objectives of the BNSS is the ensuring of speedy and time-bound justice delivery. The earlier criminal procedural system was frequently criticised for excessive delays at every stage of investigation and trial, leading to prolonged incarceration of undertrials and erosion of public confidence in the justice system.[79] The BNSS attempts to address this structural inefficiency by introducing stricter timelines, procedural simplification, and greater judicial oversight, thereby promoting expeditious disposal of cases without compromising fairness.

Closely connected to this objective is the goal of reducing pendency and procedural delays. The Indian judiciary faces a massive backlog of cases, many of which remain unresolved for years due to procedural complexity, repeated adjournments, and administrative inefficiencies. The BNSS seeks to minimise these delays by rationalising procedural steps, encouraging electronic record-keeping, and promoting alternative mechanisms such as plea bargaining and compounding of offences, which help in reducing the burden on regular courts.[80]

Another important objective is the strengthening of victim-centric justice mechanisms. Traditionally, criminal procedure in India has been largely accused-centric, with limited participation of victims in the adjudicatory process.[81] The BNSS attempts to correct this imbalance by recognising the role of victims in settlement processes, ensuring their right to be heard, and providing mechanisms for compensation and restorative justice. In the context of plea bargaining, this ensures that victims are not excluded from negotiated settlements and that their interests are adequately protected.[82]

The BNSS also aims at enhancing transparency and accountability in criminal trials. Transparency is achieved through mandatory documentation, digital recording of proceedings, and structured procedural requirements that reduce discretionary misuse. Accountability is reinforced by imposing responsibilities on investigating officers, prosecutors, and judicial officers to adhere to prescribed timelines and procedural safeguards. This reduces arbitrariness and ensures that criminal proceedings are conducted in a more structured and predictable manner.[83]

Further, the BNSS promotes fair and voluntary resolution mechanisms such as plea bargaining, which

represent a shift towards restorative and consensual forms of justice. Plea bargaining, when properly regulated, helps reduce litigation burden, provides certainty in outcomes, and enables quicker resolution of cases. However, the BNSS ensures that such mechanisms operate strictly within constitutional boundaries, particularly safeguarding voluntariness, preventing coercion, and ensuring judicial supervision at every stage.[84]

All these objectives collectively operate within the overarching framework of Article 21 of the Constitution of India, which guarantees the right to life and personal liberty. The Supreme Court of India has consistently interpreted Article 21 to include the right to a fair, just, and reasonable procedure. Therefore, the procedural reforms introduced under the BNSS are not merely administrative in nature but are constitutionally grounded. They seek to balance efficiency with fairness, ensuring that the pursuit of speedy justice does not compromise the fundamental rights of the accused or the interests of victims.[85]

3.3 Structural Framework of Criminal Procedure under BNSS

The **Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS)** establishes a structured and systematic framework for the administration of criminal justice in India. Although it retains the traditional tripartite division of criminal procedure namely investigation, inquiry, and trial it significantly refines each stage by incorporating technological advancements, procedural timelines, and greater accountability mechanisms. The objective is to ensure that criminal proceedings are not only efficient but also transparent, evidence-based, and constitutionally compliant.[86]

The criminal process under BNSS is broadly divided into three interconnected stages: Investigation Stage, Inquiry Stage, and Trial Stage, each serving a distinct procedural function while collectively ensuring the fair adjudication of criminal liability.[87]

(a) Investigation Stage

The investigation stage constitutes the foundation of the criminal justice process. Under BNSS, this stage begins with the registration of a First Information Report (FIR), which formally sets the criminal law in motion. The police authorities are then empowered to conduct a structured investigation, which includes collection of evidence, recording of statements, seizure of material objects, and examination of witnesses.[88]

A significant reform under BNSS is the increasing reliance on electronic documentation and digital record-keeping, which enhances transparency and reduces the possibility of tampering with records. The use of technology in investigation ensures better preservation of evidence and facilitates real-time monitoring of investigative progress.[89]

Furthermore, the BNSS emphasises the use of forensic science and expert opinion, recognising the importance of scientific investigation in improving the accuracy of criminal trials. The concept of time-bound investigation has also been reinforced to prevent unnecessary delays and prolonged uncertainty for both victims and accused persons.

Overall, the investigation stage under BNSS reflects a shift from a purely manual and discretionary system to a more structured, accountable, and technology-driven investigative framework.[90]

(b) Inquiry Stage

The inquiry stage is conducted by a Magistrate and serves as a preliminary judicial assessment of whether sufficient grounds exist to proceed to trial. This stage acts as a crucial safeguard against frivolous or baseless prosecution.[91]

During this stage, the Magistrate evaluates the material collected during investigation, including police reports, witness statements, and documentary evidence, to determine whether there is a prima facie case against the accused. Unlike the investigation stage, which is police-driven, the inquiry stage introduces judicial oversight at an early point in the process.[92]

The BNSS strengthens this stage by promoting judicial scrutiny and procedural discipline, ensuring that cases lacking sufficient evidentiary support are filtered out before reaching the trial stage. This not only reduces the burden on higher courts but also protects individuals from unnecessary prosecution and harassment.

Thus, the inquiry stage acts as a critical balancing mechanism between law enforcement authority and judicial control.

(c) Trial Stage

The trial stage represents the most crucial phase of the criminal process, where the guilt or innocence of the accused is determined by the court based on admissible evidence. Under BNSS, trials are categorised into three main types: summons cases, warrant cases, and sessions trials.[93]

In summons cases, which generally involve less serious offences, the procedure is simplified to ensure quick disposal. In warrant cases, which involve more serious offences, a more detailed trial procedure is followed, including framing of charges, examination of witnesses, and cross-examination. Sessions trials, which deal with the most serious offences such as murder or rape, are conducted by Sessions Courts and involve a more rigorous evidentiary process.

A notable feature of the BNSS is the enhanced emphasis on digital records, electronic evidence, and faster adjudication mechanisms. Courts are increasingly encouraged to rely on electronic communication, video conferencing, and digital case management systems to reduce delays caused by physical procedures and adjournments.

The trial stage under BNSS therefore reflects a modernised approach that seeks to balance procedural fairness with efficiency, ensuring that justice is neither delayed nor compromised.

3.4 Legal Framework of Plea Bargaining under BNSS

The concept of plea bargaining under the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS) represents a significant step towards the evolution of a more efficient, participatory, and restorative criminal justice system in India. It continues the reform introduced earlier under Chapter XXI-A of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, but under BNSS, the mechanism is reinforced with clearer procedural discipline, structured judicial oversight, and enhanced victim participation.[94]

Plea bargaining under BNSS is fundamentally designed as a negotiated justice mechanism, where the accused voluntarily agrees to accept responsibility for a lesser offence or a reduced sentence in exchange for cooperation with the prosecution and expedited disposal of the case.[95] This system is

intended to reduce the burden on courts, minimise prolonged litigation, and ensure quicker resolution of criminal disputes without undermining constitutional safeguards.

At its core, plea bargaining operates on the principle of voluntariness and informed consent. The accused must enter the process without any coercion, pressure, or inducement. The court plays a supervisory role to ensure that the accused fully understands the nature and consequences of the plea. This judicial oversight is crucial in maintaining the balance between efficiency and fairness, as criminal liability cannot be determined solely on negotiation without legal safeguards.[96]

The BNSS framework also ensures that plea bargaining functions as a structured settlement mechanism between the accused and the prosecution, with the active involvement of the court. The prosecution represents the interests of the state and ensures that the plea is consistent with the nature of the offence and public interest. The court, in turn, verifies that the agreement is lawful, voluntary, and not contrary to justice. This tripartite structure ensures that plea bargaining is not a private compromise but a legally regulated process.[97]

Another important feature of plea bargaining under BNSS is the emphasis on reduced sentencing in exchange for cooperation. This reflects the utilitarian objective of the system, where the accused is incentivised to accept responsibility, thereby saving judicial time and resources. The reduction in sentence is not arbitrary but is determined within statutory limits and judicial discretion, ensuring proportionality and fairness.[98]

A significant reformative aspect of BNSS is the incorporation of victim compensation as an integral component of plea bargaining. The victim is no longer a passive participant in the criminal process but is recognised as a stakeholder whose rights must be considered during settlement. Courts are empowered to ensure that appropriate compensation is awarded to the victim, thereby promoting restorative justice and balancing the interests of all parties involved.[99]

Overall, the legal framework of plea bargaining under BNSS reflects a shift from a purely adversarial model of justice to a more negotiated and restorative model, where efficiency, fairness, and victim participation are harmonised. However, its effectiveness ultimately depends on strict judicial supervision and careful implementation to prevent misuse or coercion.[100]

3.5 Key Procedural Requirements under BNSS

The **Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS)** prescribes a detailed and structured procedural mechanism for the implementation of plea bargaining. These procedural safeguards are designed to ensure that the process remains voluntary, transparent, and judicially supervised, thereby preventing any form of coercion or misuse. The procedural framework can be understood through four major components: eligibility conditions, application process, court-mediated settlement, and final disposal of the case.[101]

3.5.1 Eligibility Conditions

The BNSS restricts the applicability of plea bargaining to ensure that it is used only in appropriate cases and does not undermine serious criminal justice concerns. One of the primary conditions is that plea bargaining is generally applicable only to offences which are not punishable with severe imprisonment, as defined under statutory limitations. This ensures that grave offences involving high social impact are kept outside the ambit of negotiated settlements.[102]

Another essential requirement is that the application must be made voluntarily by the accused, without any external pressure, inducement, or coercion. Voluntariness is a foundational principle of plea bargaining because the legitimacy of the entire process depends upon the free and informed consent of the accused.[103]

Further, the BNSS explicitly excludes certain categories of offences from plea bargaining, particularly those involving serious socio-economic offences, offences against women, and offences against children, as notified by the competent authority. This exclusion reflects the legislative intent to protect vulnerable sections of society and ensure that offences with broader societal impact are not subject to compromise-based resolution.[104]

Thus, eligibility under BNSS ensures that plea bargaining is confined to appropriate cases where negotiated justice does not conflict with public interest or victim protection.

3.5.2 Application Process

The procedural initiation of plea bargaining begins when the accused files a formal written application before the competent court expressing willingness to resolve the case through this mechanism. This written application acts as a formal legal trigger for the process.[105]

Once the application is filed, the court assumes a proactive role in ensuring that the request is genuine and voluntary. The court conducts an independent verification of voluntariness, often by interacting directly with the accused in a controlled judicial environment. This step is crucial to eliminate any possibility of coercion by police authorities, prosecution, or external influences.

The accused is further required to make specific affirmations before the court, including:

- That the application is being made voluntarily and without pressure
- That the accused fully understands the legal consequences of pleading guilty[106]
- That there has been no inducement, promise, or coercion influencing the decision

These declarations are essential safeguards that reinforce the constitutional requirement of a fair procedure under Article 21 and ensure that the accused is making an informed choice.

3.5.3 Court-Mediated Settlement

Once the application is accepted as voluntary, the court facilitates a structured negotiation process between the accused and the prosecution. This stage is central to the philosophy of plea bargaining under BNSS, as it shifts the process from an adversarial model to a cooperative and settlement-oriented mechanism.[107]

During this phase, the court ensures that both parties engage in meaningful dialogue aimed at arriving at a mutually satisfactory disposition of the case. Unlike informal negotiations, this process is fully supervised by the judiciary, ensuring fairness and legal compliance at every stage.

A significant development under BNSS is the encouragement of victim participation. The victim is not treated as a passive observer but as an important stakeholder whose interests must be considered

during settlement discussions. This aligns with the broader shift towards restorative justice.

Additionally, issues relating to compensation and sentencing are actively discussed during this stage. The objective is to strike a balance between the interests of the accused, the victim, and the state, ensuring that justice is not merely punitive but also compensatory and restorative in nature.

3.5.4 Disposal of Case

If the settlement process is successful, the court formally records the outcome of the plea-bargaining process. This recorded settlement becomes the basis for the final adjudication of the case.[108]

The court then proceeds to pass a reduced sentence in accordance with statutory provisions and judicial discretion, ensuring that the punishment remains proportionate while also reflecting the cooperative conduct of the accused.

In addition to sentencing, the court may also order victim compensation, reinforcing the restorative dimension of the criminal justice system under BNSS. This ensures that the harm caused by the offence is addressed not only through punishment but also through financial or material redress.

Once the judgment is delivered, it generally attains finality, with only limited scope for judicial review available in exceptional circumstances such as violation of voluntariness, procedural irregularity, or miscarriage of justice. This finality is intended to ensure speedy disposal and reduce prolonged litigation.

3.6 Safeguards under BNSS

The Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS) incorporates a robust system of safeguards to ensure that the mechanism of plea-bargaining functions in a manner consistent with constitutional principles of fairness, equality, and due process. Since plea bargaining involves an admission of guilt and waiver of a full trial, the possibility of coercion, undue influence, or procedural unfairness is inherently high. Therefore, the BNSS establishes multiple layers of protection to preserve the voluntariness and integrity of the process while balancing efficiency with justice.[109]

One of the most important safeguards under BNSS is mandatory judicial supervision. The court is not merely a passive observer but an active guardian of the process. It is required to oversee every stage of plea bargaining, from the acceptance of the application to the final settlement.[110] This supervision ensures that the process remains within legal boundaries and that no party, particularly the accused, is placed at a disadvantage due to power imbalances in the criminal justice system. Judicial oversight also reinforces public confidence in negotiated justice mechanisms by ensuring transparency and accountability.[111]

Closely connected to this is the safeguard of verification of voluntariness. The court must independently satisfy itself that the accused is entering into plea bargaining out of free will and with a full understanding of the consequences. This verification is not a mere formality but a substantive judicial inquiry, often involving direct interaction with the accused in the absence of prosecutorial influence. This safeguard is crucial because the legitimacy of plea bargaining depends entirely on the genuineness of consent.

The BNSS further provides protection against coercion or inducement, recognising that accused persons

may be vulnerable to pressure from police authorities, prosecution, or even societal influences. The legal framework ensures that any plea obtained through force, threat, or inducement is invalid and cannot form the basis of a conviction. This protection aligns with the constitutional guarantee under Article 21, which requires that any deprivation of liberty must follow a fair, just, and reasonable procedure.[112]

Another significant safeguard is the involvement of victims in settlement proceedings. Unlike earlier criminal justice models that largely excluded victims from the adjudicatory process, BNSS recognises the victim as a key stakeholder.[113] Their participation ensures that their interests, particularly in relation to compensation and harm suffered, are adequately addressed during settlement discussions. This inclusion also enhances the legitimacy of the outcome by ensuring that justice is not perceived as a private compromise between the accused and the state.[114]

Lastly, BNSS provides for a limited scope of appeal, which is designed to balance finality with fairness. While plea bargaining judgments are generally final to ensure speedy disposal of cases, limited judicial review is permitted in exceptional circumstances such as violation of voluntariness, procedural irregularity, or miscarriage of justice. This controlled appellate mechanism prevents misuse of the process while simultaneously ensuring that fundamental rights are not compromised.[115]

Overall, these safeguards collectively ensure that plea bargaining under BNSS remains a fair, transparent, and constitutionally compliant mechanism, preventing it from degenerating into a coercive or arbitrary tool of criminal justice administration.[116]

3.7 Judicial Interpretations and Development of Plea Bargaining

The evolution of plea bargaining in India is largely a product of judicial interpretation, where courts have consistently balanced two competing concerns: on one hand, the need for an efficient criminal justice system, and on the other, the imperative of protecting constitutional safeguards such as the right to a fair trial under Article 21 of the Constitution of India. Over time, the judiciary has moved from a position of caution and resistance towards a more structured acceptance of plea bargaining, particularly after its statutory recognition.[117]

3.7.1 Early Judicial Resistance

In the initial phase, Indian courts were strongly sceptical of informal plea-bargaining practices, primarily because they were not backed by statutory authority and carried a significant risk of coercion and injustice.

In ***Murlidhar Meghraj Loya v. State of Maharashtra (1976)***,[118] the Supreme Court expressed serious reservations about informal negotiated pleas. The Court observed that such practices could potentially distort the criminal justice system by introducing elements of compromise in matters that should be decided strictly on evidence. The Court was particularly concerned that weaker accused persons might feel pressured to accept guilt in exchange for leniency, thereby undermining the voluntariness of the process. This judgment reflected the Court's emphasis on procedural integrity over administrative convenience.

Similarly, in ***Kasambhai Abdulrehmanbhai Sheikh v. State of Gujarat (1980)***[119], the Court reiterated that criminal convictions must be founded on legally admissible evidence and judicial determination,

not on negotiated admissions of guilt. The Court rejected the idea that compromise between parties could substitute the evidentiary requirements of a criminal trial. This reinforced the principle that criminal justice is not a private settlement mechanism but a state-driven adjudicatory process where truth must be established through due process.

3.7.2 Strong Judicial Rejection of Informal Practice

The judiciary's resistance became even more pronounced in ***State of Uttar Pradesh v. Chandrika (1999)***,[120] where the Supreme Court categorically disapproved of informal plea bargaining. The Court held that criminal cases must be adjudicated strictly based on evidence presented during trial and that expedient disposal of cases cannot justify deviation from established legal procedure.

The Court emphasised three key principles:

- Criminal liability must be determined through a fair trial process
- Negotiated guilt cannot replace judicial evaluation of evidence
- Efficiency cannot override the fundamental requirement of justice[121]

This judgment effectively closed the door on any informal or unregulated form of plea bargaining, reinforcing the supremacy of evidentiary justice in criminal law.

3.7.3 Post-Legislative Approach (After Statutory Recognition)

With the introduction of statutory plea bargaining (initially under the CrPC and now continued under the BNSS framework), the judicial attitude shifted from rejection to cautious acceptance. However, this acceptance is not unconditional; it is strictly regulated through judicial oversight.

In the post-legislative phase, courts have adopted a structured and supervisory approach, focusing on ensuring that plea bargaining operates within constitutional boundaries. The judiciary now treats plea bargaining as a legitimate procedural tool, if it satisfies strict legal requirements.[122]

The courts particularly emphasise the following principles:

- **Voluntariness as a non-negotiable requirement**: Courts actively examine whether the accused has entered the plea without coercion, pressure, or inducement.
- **Strict judicial scrutiny of settlements**: Judges are required to independently assess the fairness and legality of the negotiated outcome rather than merely endorsing it.[123]
- **Protection of constitutional rights under Article 21**: The right to life and personal liberty is interpreted to include fair procedure, ensuring that plea bargaining does not become a shortcut that violates due process.
- **Victim-oriented justice and compensation**: Courts increasingly ensure that the interests of victims are considered, particularly in relation to compensation and restitution, aligning plea bargaining with restorative justice principles.

This post-legislative judicial approach reflects a balanced jurisprudence where plea bargaining is accepted not as a compromise of justice, but as a controlled mechanism of efficient adjudication within constitutional limits.[124]

3.8 Role of Judiciary under BNSS Framework

Under the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS), the judiciary occupies a central and constitutionally significant position in the implementation of plea bargaining. Unlike traditional adversarial trials where the judge primarily adjudicates based on evidence presented, in plea bargaining proceedings the judiciary performs an active supervisory and safeguard-oriented role. This expanded role is necessary because plea bargaining involves the accused waiving the right to a full trial, which makes judicial oversight essential to prevent any miscarriage of justice.[125]

One of the primary responsibilities of the judiciary is to ensure procedural fairness at every stage of the process.[126] This includes verifying that all statutory requirements have been properly followed, that the accused has been given adequate opportunity to understand the nature of the proceedings, and that no procedural shortcuts compromise the integrity of the settlement. Procedural fairness ensures that the process remains consistent with constitutional principles of justice and equality before law.[127]

A critical function of the court is to prevent coercion or forced confessions. Since plea bargaining involves an admission of guilt, there is always a risk that external pressure from police authorities, prosecution, or even situational vulnerability may influence the accused.[128] The judiciary acts as a neutral body to examine whether the plea is genuinely voluntary. Courts often interact directly with the accused to eliminate any possibility of intimidation or inducement, thereby safeguarding the principle of free consent.[129]

The judiciary is also responsible for monitoring the legality and validity of settlement agreements. Even if both parties agree to a negotiated resolution, the court must ensure that the terms of settlement are consistent with statutory provisions and do not violate public policy or legal norms.[130] This includes reviewing the proportionality of sentencing, the legality of concessions offered, and the overall fairness of the agreement. The court does not act as a mere approver but as an independent evaluator of justice.

Another important dimension of judicial responsibility is the protection of victim rights. In modern criminal jurisprudence under BNSS, victims are recognised as active stakeholders in the justice process.[131] The judiciary ensures that victims are not excluded from settlement negotiations and that their interests, particularly in relation to compensation and restitution, are adequately addressed. This reflects a shift towards a more restorative model of justice where harm caused by crime is meaningfully redressed.

Finally, the judiciary plays a crucial role in ensuring that plea bargaining does not defeat the ends of justice. While efficiency and speedy disposal of cases are important objectives, they cannot override substantive justice. Courts must ensure that plea bargaining is not used to escape appropriate punishment in serious cases or to undermine the deterrent effect of criminal law. The judiciary therefore acts as the final constitutional checkpoint, ensuring that the outcome of plea bargaining aligns with fairness, public interest, and the broader objectives of criminal justice.[132]

3.9 Challenges in Implementation

Although the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS) provides a formal and structured framework for plea bargaining, its practical implementation faces several substantive and procedural challenges. These challenges arise not from the absence of law, but from socio-legal realities, institutional limitations, and behavioural factors within the criminal justice system. As a result, the effectiveness of plea bargaining as a reformative mechanism is still evolving in practice.[133]

One of the most significant challenges is the limited awareness among accused persons regarding the availability and implications of plea bargaining. A large number of accused individuals, particularly those from economically weaker and less educated backgrounds, are often unaware of their procedural rights and available alternatives under criminal law. This lack of awareness prevents them from making informed decisions and restricts the practical utility of plea bargaining as a voluntary dispute resolution mechanism.[134]

Another major issue is the fear of social stigma associated with admission of guilt. In many cases, an accused person may be reluctant to opt for plea bargaining because an admission of guilt, even in exchange for a reduced sentence, is perceived negatively in society. This social stigma often discourages individuals from choosing this option, even when it may be legally and practically beneficial. Consequently, plea bargaining remains underutilised despite its statutory availability.[135]

The system also suffers from uneven application across different jurisdictions and courts. The effectiveness of plea bargaining largely depends on the approach adopted by individual judges, prosecutors, and local legal culture.[136] In some jurisdictions, courts actively encourage negotiated settlements, while in others, there is a reluctance to engage with the process. This inconsistency leads to unequal access to justice and undermines the uniform application of BNSS provisions.

A further concern is the risk of informal pressure during negotiation, despite the presence of judicial safeguards. In practice, accused persons may still experience subtle pressure from investigating agencies or prosecutorial authorities to opt for plea bargaining, especially in cases involving prolonged detention or weak legal representation. Such informal coercion can compromise the voluntariness of the process, thereby affecting its constitutional validity under Article 21.[137]

Finally, there is a need for stronger victim participation mechanisms within the plea-bargaining framework. Although BNSS recognises the importance of victims, in practice their participation is often limited or symbolic.[138] Many victims are not adequately informed or involved in the negotiation process, particularly in cases where legal aid systems are weak. Strengthening victim engagement is essential to ensure that plea bargaining reflects the principles of restorative justice and not merely procedural efficiency.[139]

3.10 Conclusion

The Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS) represents a significant transformation in India's criminal procedural law by introducing a more structured, technology-oriented, and efficiency-driven framework for the administration of criminal justice. Within this reformed structure, plea bargaining emerges as an important procedural innovation aimed at addressing long-standing issues

such as judicial backlog, procedural delays, and prolonged undertrial detention.

The introduction and structured recognition of plea bargaining under BNSS reflects a broader shift in criminal justice philosophy—from a purely adversarial and trial-centric model to a more settlement-oriented and restorative approach. By allowing certain categories of cases to be resolved through voluntary negotiation, the system seeks to reduce the burden on courts while simultaneously ensuring quicker resolution for both the accused and the victim. This contributes to improving overall judicial efficiency without entirely compromising the foundational principles of criminal law.

At the same time, the evolution of judicial interpretation has played a decisive role in shaping the legitimacy and operational boundaries of plea bargaining in India. The judiciary initially approached the concept with caution and resistance due to concerns regarding coercion, unfair compromise, and deviation from evidentiary justice. However, over time, especially after statutory recognition, courts have gradually adopted a more balanced and structured approach, acknowledging plea bargaining as a valid procedural mechanism, provided it operates within strict constitutional and legal safeguards.

The combined framework of statutory provisions under BNSS and continuous judicial oversight ensures that plea bargaining does not become a tool for arbitrary settlements or forced admissions of guilt. Instead, it is regulated through safeguards such as voluntariness, judicial scrutiny, victim participation, and limited appellate intervention. These mechanisms collectively ensure that the process remains aligned with the core constitutional values of fairness, equality before law, and due process under Article 21 of the Constitution.

In essence, plea bargaining under BNSS reflects an attempt to harmonise efficiency with justice. While it contributes significantly to reducing pendency and expediting case disposal, its success ultimately depends on its careful and ethical implementation. The continued role of the judiciary as a supervisory authority remains crucial in ensuring that this mechanism functions as a fair, transparent, and constitutionally compliant component of India's criminal justice system.

CHAPTER 4
COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS WITH OTHER JURISDICTION

4.1 Introduction

The concept of plea bargaining is not an indigenous development of Indian criminal jurisprudence but rather a globally recognised procedural mechanism that has evolved primarily within adversarial legal systems. It represents a shift from traditional trial-based adjudication towards a more negotiated form of criminal justice, where the accused and prosecution resolve disputes through agreement, subject to judicial approval.[140] The increasing complexity of criminal litigation, coupled with rising case backlogs, has encouraged many jurisdictions to adopt plea bargaining as a tool for improving efficiency while attempting to preserve fairness and due process.[141]

In India, the formal recognition of plea bargaining under the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS) signifies a major procedural reform that aligns the Indian criminal justice system with global trends. However, unlike jurisdictions where plea bargaining operates primarily through prosecutorial discretion, the Indian model incorporates strong judicial supervision and statutory safeguards, reflecting

the constitutional emphasis on fairness under Article 21 of the Constitution of India. This indicates that while India has adopted the concept, it has adapted it cautiously to suit its socio-legal and constitutional framework.[142]

Across different jurisdictions, plea bargaining has evolved differently depending on legal tradition. In common law countries such as the United States and the United Kingdom, the mechanism has developed within adversarial structures, though with varying degrees of judicial involvement and prosecutorial power.[143] In contrast, civil law jurisdictions in Europe have traditionally been more resistant to negotiated justice but have gradually introduced controlled forms of consensual case resolution under strict statutory frameworks. These differences highlight that plea bargaining is not a uniform concept but rather a flexible procedural tool shaped by each country's legal philosophy, institutional capacity, and constitutional values.[144]

This chapter undertakes a comparative analysis of plea-bargaining systems in the United States, United Kingdom, and selected European jurisdictions, to critically evaluate the position of India under BNSS.[145] The purpose of this comparison is to understand how different legal systems attempt to balance competing criminal justice objectives such as efficiency in case disposal, protection of accused rights, victim participation, and adherence to due process standards.[146]

By examining these jurisdictions, the chapter aims to highlight that while the core objective of plea bargaining remains consistent speedy and efficient resolution of criminal cases the mechanisms, safeguards, and degree of judicial control vary significantly, thereby offering valuable insights for evaluating the strengths and limitations of the Indian framework under BNSS.[147]

4.2 Plea Bargaining in the United States

The United States of America represents the most advanced and extensively developed system of plea bargaining in the world, where it functions not as an exception but as the primary method of criminal case resolution.[148] The U.S. criminal justice system, rooted in the adversarial tradition, places significant reliance on negotiated settlements between the prosecution and defence, thereby significantly reducing the number of cases that proceed to full trial. Over time, plea bargaining has become deeply institutionalised within the American legal system due to the overwhelming caseloads faced by courts and the practical need for efficient case disposal.

4.2.1 Nature and Scope

In the United States, plea bargaining is used in approximately 90–95% of all criminal cases, making it the dominant mechanism for criminal adjudication rather than a supplementary tool. This widespread reliance demonstrates that the American criminal justice system is largely plea-driven rather than trial-driven.[149]

The process involves structured negotiations between the prosecution and defence counsel, where the accused agrees to plead guilty in exchange for certain concessions. These concessions typically fall into three broad categories:

- **Charge bargaining**, where the accused pleads guilty to a lesser charge than originally filed, thereby reducing potential liability.
- **Sentence bargaining**, where the prosecution agrees to recommend a lighter sentence in

exchange for a guilty plea.

- **Fact bargaining**, where both parties agree on specific facts to be presented before the court, limiting factual disputes during trial.

This flexible structure allows the U.S. system to manage large caseloads efficiently while still ensuring a formal judicial process for final approval of the plea.[150]

4.2.2 Judicial Role

The role of the judiciary in the United States plea bargaining system is comparatively limited and supervisory in nature. Courts do not actively participate in negotiations between prosecution and defence but instead act as a safeguard at the final stage of the process.[151]

The primary judicial responsibilities include:

- Ensuring that the plea is entered voluntarily and without coercion
- Confirming that the accused understands the legal consequences of the guilty plea
- Verifying that there exists a factual basis for the plea, meaning the admission is supported by evidence

Thus, the judiciary acts more as a procedural validator rather than an active negotiator, which reflects the strong adversarial and prosecutorial orientation of the U.S. criminal justice system.[152]

4.2.3 Key Features

The American plea-bargaining system is characterised by several distinct features:

- It is a highly prosecutor-driven system, where prosecutors hold significant discretionary power in deciding charges and negotiating outcomes.[153]
- The prosecution enjoys wide autonomy, including the ability to reduce charges or recommend sentencing outcomes.
- Victim participation is relatively limited, although victim impact statements may be considered during sentencing.
- The system prioritises speed, efficiency, and case disposal over full-scale trials, making it a pragmatic response to heavy judicial workloads.

These features collectively reflect a justice model that values efficiency and administrative practicality, sometimes at the expense of full adversarial litigation.

4.2.4 Leading Case

A landmark decision in the development of plea bargaining in the United States is ***Brady v. United States (1970)***, where the Supreme Court upheld the constitutional validity of guilty pleas entered voluntarily and intelligently.

The Court held that a guilty plea is constitutionally valid if:

- It is made voluntarily
- It is made with full understanding of its consequences
- It is supported by competent legal advice [154]

This case firmly established that plea bargaining is not only permissible but also a constitutionally recognised component of the American criminal justice system, provided it meets the standard of voluntariness and informed consent.[155]

4.3 Plea Bargaining in the United Kingdom

The United Kingdom adopts a more restrained, regulated, and judiciary-controlled approach towards plea bargaining when compared to jurisdictions such as the United States. While the concept of negotiated guilty pleas does exist within the English criminal justice system, it is not as expansive or institutionally dominant. Instead, the UK system prioritises judicial discretion, procedural fairness, and public interest considerations, ensuring that any form of negotiated resolution remains tightly controlled by the courts.[156]

The UK approach reflects the underlying philosophy of its criminal justice system, which seeks to balance efficiency in case disposal with strong safeguards against wrongful conviction or improper inducement. As a result, plea bargaining in the UK operates within a narrower and more structured framework.[157]

4.3.1 Nature of System

In the United Kingdom, plea bargaining does not exist in the broad and flexible form seen in the United States. Instead, it operates through limited and formalised mechanisms such as sentence indication hearings and controlled discussions between prosecution and defence regarding charges.[158]

In practice, plea discussions may occur between the defence counsel and the prosecution, but these negotiations are carefully regulated and cannot override judicial authority. The most common forms include:

- **Sentence indication hearings**, where judges may indicate the likely sentencing range if the accused pleads guilty at an early stage.
- **Charge discussions**, where the prosecution may agree to proceed on lesser charges based on evidentiary considerations.

However, unlike more flexible systems, plea bargaining in the UK does not dominate criminal adjudication and remains a procedural tool used selectively rather than systematically.[159]

4.3.2 Judicial Control

A defining feature of the UK system is the strong and active role of the judiciary in controlling the outcome of any plea-based resolution. Courts retain ultimate authority over sentencing and are not bound by agreements between the prosecution and defence.[160]

The judiciary ensures:

- That sentencing decisions remain entirely within judicial discretion, preventing any binding effect of negotiated agreements[161]

- That no improper inducement, coercion, or undue pressure is exerted on the accused to plead guilty
- That the fundamental right to a fair trial is preserved, even when a guilty plea is entered

This strong judicial oversight ensures that plea-based resolutions do not undermine the integrity of the criminal justice process and that every outcome remains consistent with the principles of justice and proportionality.

4.3.3 Role of Prosecution

In the UK, the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) plays a central role in managing criminal prosecutions and may engage in discussions regarding charges and case resolution. However, its powers are significantly limited when compared to prosecutorial authority in systems like the United States.[162]

Importantly, the CPS cannot bind the court or determine sentencing outcomes. Any agreement reached between the prosecution and defence is subject to final judicial approval, ensuring that public interest considerations are not compromised by negotiated settlements.

The prosecution's role is therefore advisory and procedural rather than determinative, reinforcing the court-centred nature of the system.

4.3.4 Key Features

The plea-bargaining framework in the United Kingdom is characterised by several distinctive features:[163]

- A court-centric sentencing structure, where judges retain ultimate authority over punishment
- A limited scope for negotiation, ensuring that plea discussions do not override judicial independence
- Strong emphasis on procedural fairness and protection against coercion, safeguarding the rights of the accused
- A consistent focus on public interest, ensuring that criminal outcomes reflect societal justice rather than private compromise

These features collectively demonstrate that the UK system prioritises balanced justice over efficiency-driven disposal, making it more cautious and controlled compared to more expansive plea-bargaining models.

4.4 Plea Bargaining in European Jurisdictions

European jurisdictions, particularly those following the civil law tradition, have historically been cautious towards the concept of plea bargaining as understood in common law countries. The civil law system is primarily inquisitorial in nature, where the court plays an active role in fact-finding, and criminal guilt is determined through structured judicial inquiry rather than negotiation between parties. As a result, traditional plea bargaining was initially considered incompatible with principles of judicial truth-seeking and procedural legality.[164]

However, in response to increasing caseloads and the need for efficient criminal justice administration, many European countries have gradually introduced controlled and statutory forms of negotiated justice. These mechanisms resemble plea bargaining but are strictly regulated and operate under strong

judicial supervision.[165]

4.4.1 Germany

Germany follows a structured system known as "Verständigung im Strafverfahren" (consensual agreement in criminal proceedings), which allows limited forms of negotiation in criminal cases.

This system is highly regulated and operates under strict legal conditions to ensure that it does not undermine the integrity of judicial fact-finding. Key features include:

- Agreements are permitted only under strict statutory conditions defined under German criminal procedural law[166]
- The process requires continuous and full judicial supervision, ensuring that the judge remains actively involved in verifying fairness
- The court must independently examine and verify the facts of the case, even if the parties have reached an agreement
- Sentencing limits are strictly controlled, and the court is not bound by prosecutorial recommendations or private agreements

Thus, the German model maintains a strong commitment to truth-finding and judicial independence, ensuring that consensual agreements do not replace substantive evaluation of guilt.[167]

4.4.2 France

France has introduced a limited form of negotiated criminal procedure known as "comparution sur reconnaissance préalable de culpabilité (CRPC)", which can be broadly compared to plea bargaining.

Under this system, an accused person may admit guilt in exchange for a simplified and faster procedure, subject to judicial approval.[168]

Key characteristics include:

- The procedure applies only to limited categories of offences, primarily less serious crimes
- Any agreement reached between prosecution and accused must receive mandatory judicial approval
- The system places strong emphasis on victim protection and their right to be heard, particularly in relation to compensation and harm suffered
- The judge retains the authority to accept, modify, or reject the proposed settlement, ensuring judicial control over outcomes[169]

The French approach therefore integrates negotiated justice within a strictly controlled civil law framework, ensuring that efficiency does not override judicial responsibility.

4.4.3 Key Features in Europe

A comparative overview of European approaches to plea bargaining reveals several common characteristics:

- A strong civil law tradition restricts unrestricted negotiation, as judicial truth-finding

remains central to criminal adjudication

- The judiciary plays a dominant and supervisory role, ensuring that any negotiated outcome is legally and factually valid [170]
- There is a high emphasis on procedural safeguards, particularly regarding voluntariness, fairness, and accuracy of facts
- Victim rights are increasingly recognised, reflecting a gradual shift towards restorative justice principles within civil law systems

Overall, European jurisdictions demonstrate a cautious but evolving acceptance of negotiated criminal justice mechanisms, balancing efficiency with strict adherence to procedural legality and judicial oversight.[171]

4.5 Plea Bargaining under BNSS (India)

The introduction and continuation of plea bargaining in India under the **Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS)** reflects the country's gradual shift toward a more pragmatic and efficiency-oriented criminal justice system. While India traditionally followed a strictly adversarial trial model, the increasing burden on courts and the need to protect the right to speedy justice led to the adoption of a regulated plea-bargaining framework. The BNSS retains this framework with stronger safeguards to prevent misuse and to maintain constitutional fairness.[172]

4.5.1 Key Characteristics

1. Statutorily Governed Mechanism

Plea bargaining in India is not an informal or purely negotiated practice; it is codified in procedural law. This statutory basis ensures:

- Clear procedural safeguards
- Judicial oversight at every stage
- Protection against coercion or undue influence[173]

Unlike systems where plea negotiations occur informally between prosecution and defence, the Indian framework mandates court-controlled negotiation, ensuring transparency and legality. This statutory recognition gives plea bargaining legitimacy and prevents arbitrary settlements that could undermine justice.[174]

2. Limited Applicability to Specific Offences

India follows a restricted application model. Plea bargaining is permitted only for:

- Offences punishable with imprisonment up to 7 years
- Cases not affecting the socio-economic condition of the country
- Offences not committed against women or children[175] The

rationale behind this limitation is to:

- Preserve deterrence in serious crimes
- Avoid commercialization of justice in grave offences
- Maintain public confidence in the criminal justice system[176]

Thus, plea bargaining in India is designed as a supplementary mechanism, not a substitute for trials.

3. Mandatory Judicial Supervision

Judicial supervision is the core safeguard of the Indian model. The court must:

- Verify voluntariness of the accused
- Ensure absence of coercion or inducement
- Confirm that the accused understands consequences
- Scrutinize the fairness of the settlement

This reflects the constitutional obligation of courts to safeguard due process and fair trial rights. The role of the judiciary here is proactive and protective, not merely supervisory.[177]

4. Victim Participation Encouraged

A distinctive feature of the Indian framework is the recognition of victims' rights. Victims are allowed to:

- Participate in negotiations
- Seek compensation or restitution
- Express concerns regarding settlement

This aligns plea bargaining with restorative justice principles, balancing:

- Accused rights
- Victim interests
- Societal concerns

The inclusion of victims makes the Indian model more balanced compared to traditional adversarial systems.

5. Voluntariness as a Strict Requirement

The most crucial safeguard is the voluntary nature of the plea. Courts must ensure that the accused:

- Is not under pressure from police or prosecution
- Is aware of legal consequences
- Has legal representation

This safeguard prevents plea bargaining from becoming a tool of coercion, especially against vulnerable accused persons.

4.5.2 Position of the Judiciary

Indian courts play a much stronger role compared to jurisdictions like the United States. The judiciary acts as:

- Protector of constitutional rights
- Guardian of procedural fairness

- Neutral evaluator of settlements

The courts ensure compliance with Article 21 of the Constitution, which guarantees:

- Fair trial
- Due process
- Speedy justice

The supervisory role of the judiciary has been emphasized by the Supreme Court of India, which has consistently held that:

- Justice cannot be sacrificed for efficiency
- Plea bargaining must not become a shortcut to conviction
- Voluntary consent is the foundation of negotiated justice

Thus, courts act as a constitutional checkpoint in the plea-bargaining process.

4.5.3 Policy Objectives (Expanded Analysis)

The plea bargaining framework under BNSS serves multiple systemic goals.

1. Reducing Pendency

India has one of the world's largest backlogs of criminal cases. Plea bargaining helps:

- Reduce trial burden
- Improve judicial efficiency[178]
- Allocate resources to serious offences

This contributes to a more functional justice delivery system.

2. Ensuring Speedy Trial

A delayed trial often amounts to denial of justice. Plea bargaining helps:

- Avoid prolonged incarceration of undertrials[179]
- Provide quicker resolution
- Reduce litigation costs

This directly strengthens the constitutional promise of speedy justice.[180]

3. Maintaining Fairness under Article 21

Efficiency cannot come at the cost of fairness. Therefore, the BNSS framework integrates:

- Judicial scrutiny
- Legal representation[181]

- Victim involvement
- Transparency in proceedings

The aim is to strike a balance between efficiency and justice.

4. Preventing Misuse of Negotiated Justice

The Indian model consciously prevents risks seen in other jurisdictions, such as:

- Coerced guilty pleas
- Prosecutorial pressure
- Wrongful convictions[182]

Strict eligibility conditions and court supervision act as safeguards against misuse.[183]

4.6 Comparative Analysis

Basis	United States	United Kingdom	Europe	India (BNSS)
System Nature	Highly flexible and negotiation-driven; majority of cases resolved through plea bargaining	Moderately regulated; guilty plea discounts guided by sentencing frameworks	Strictly controlled; allowed only under statutory safeguards in civil law systems	Statutory and hybrid; combines adversarial negotiation with constitutional safeguards
Judicial Role	Limited involvement; judges mainly approve negotiated pleas	Strong oversight; courts ensure voluntariness and proper sentencing	Very strong judicial supervision and verification of facts	Active constitutional supervision; courts verify fairness and voluntariness
Prosecution Power	Very high; prosecutors dominate negotiations and charge selection	Moderate; subject to sentencing guidelines and judicial review	Limited; courts retain primary authority in sentencing decisions	Balanced; judicial oversight reduces prosecutorial dominance

Basis	United States	United Kingdom	Europe	India (BNSS)
Victim Participation	Low; limited role in negotiations, mostly impact statements at sentencing	Moderate; victims' views considered through support services	Increasing recognition of victim rights and compensation	Fully recognised; victims may participate and seek compensation
Usage Level	Extremely high; backbone of criminal justice system	Moderate; widely used but trials still significant	Limited; used cautiously for specific offences	Emerging; gradually increasing to reduce case backlog
Legal Control	Mainly procedural and practice-based	Judicially guided through sentencing rules	Strict statutory regulation	Constitutional + statutory control under Article 21 and BNSS

4.7 Critical Observations

A comparative assessment of plea-bargaining frameworks across jurisdictions reveals important structural strengths as well as persistent concerns. While negotiated justice has improved efficiency worldwide, each model reflects different legal priorities and institutional capacities.[184]

1. The U.S. Model: Efficiency with Fairness Concerns

The United States represents the most efficiency-driven system of plea bargaining. The overwhelming majority of criminal cases are resolved through negotiated guilty pleas rather than full trials. This approach has significantly reduced trial burden and ensured rapid case disposal.

However, scholars and courts have raised serious concerns regarding:

- Prosecutorial dominance in negotiations
- Risk of coercive plea practices
- Possibility of innocent persons pleading guilty to avoid harsher punishment

The landmark decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in ***Brady v. United States***[185] recognised plea bargaining as constitutionally valid but stressed that guilty pleas must be voluntary and informed. Later, ***Missouri v. Frye***[186] acknowledged that plea bargaining has become the central

component of the criminal justice system, making fairness safeguards essential.

Thus, while the U.S. model maximises efficiency, it continues to face criticism for creating trial penalties and unequal bargaining power.

2. The UK and European Models: Fairness with Limited Use

The United Kingdom and European jurisdictions adopt a more cautious and regulated approach.

In the United Kingdom, judicial oversight ensures that guilty pleas remain voluntary and sentencing discounts are applied transparently. The Supreme Court of the United Kingdom has emphasised proportionality and fairness in sentencing practices.

European civil law systems impose even stricter safeguards. Courts actively verify:

- Evidence and factual basis of guilt
- Voluntariness of the accused
- Protection of defence rights

The European Court of Human Rights in ***Natsvlishvili and Togonidze v. Georgia***[187] held that plea agreements are compatible with fair trial rights only when procedural safeguards and voluntariness are ensured.

These jurisdictions therefore prioritise fairness and due process, even if it limits the widespread use of plea bargaining.

3. The Indian BNSS Model: A Balanced Hybrid

India's plea-bargaining framework under the BNSS attempts to strike a middle path between efficiency and constitutional protections.

Indian courts have repeatedly emphasised that negotiated justice must not undermine fair trial rights. The Supreme Court of India recognised the legitimacy of plea bargaining in ***State of Gujarat v. Natwar Harchandji Thakor,***[188] noting that it can reduce delays and improve efficiency while maintaining fairness.

At the same time, Indian jurisprudence stresses constitutional safeguards:

- In ***Hussainara Khatoon v. State of Bihar,***[189] the Court declared speedy trial a fundamental right.
- In ***Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India,***[190] the Court expanded due process protections under Article 21.

These decisions form the constitutional foundation of plea bargaining in India.

4. Persistent Challenges in India

Despite a strong legal framework, practical challenges remain:

(a) Limited Awareness- Many accused persons and even legal practitioners lack adequate knowledge about plea bargaining, leading to under-utilisation.

(b) Uneven Implementation- Adoption varies across states and courts, creating inconsistencies in practice.

(c) Risk of Informal Pressure- Although the law mandates voluntariness, socio-economic inequalities and limited legal literacy may create subtle pressures on accused persons to accept plea agreements.

Such concerns are less pronounced in developed jurisdictions due to:

- Stronger institutional frameworks
- Better legal aid systems
- Greater public awareness

4.8 Conclusion

The comparative study of plea bargaining demonstrates that negotiated justice is not a uniform concept; rather, it reflects the legal philosophy, institutional capacity, and constitutional values of each jurisdiction.

In the United States, plea bargaining developed as a response to massive caseloads and the need for rapid disposal of criminal cases. Over time, it has become the backbone of the criminal justice system. The emphasis is clearly on efficiency, expediency, and case management, sometimes raising concerns about unequal bargaining power and the risk of innocent accused pleading guilty to avoid harsher punishment.

European jurisdictions, on the other hand, follow a fairness-oriented model. Negotiated settlements exist but are tightly regulated and subject to strong judicial scrutiny. Courts play an active role in verifying evidence and voluntariness before accepting any plea. The primary concern here is protection of due process and human rights, even if it means slower case disposal.

India's framework under the BNSS attempts to bridge these two approaches. The Indian system recognises the practical necessity of reducing judicial backlog while simultaneously safeguarding constitutional guarantees. This balance is reinforced by the constitutional mandate of fair procedure under Article 21 and the proactive role of the Supreme Court of India in protecting due process and voluntariness.

The BNSS model therefore represents a middle path:

- Plea bargaining is permitted, but not unrestricted.
- Efficiency is encouraged, but not at the cost of fairness.
- Negotiation is allowed, but under strict judicial supervision.
- Victim rights and compensation are incorporated to maintain public confidence.

Importantly, the comparative analysis shows that law alone cannot guarantee success. The effectiveness of plea bargaining depends on broader systemic factors such as:

- Institutional maturity and infrastructure
- Availability of competent legal aid
- Judicial awareness and training
- Public understanding of legal rights
- Consistent and transparent implementation

In countries with strong institutional frameworks, plea bargaining operates more smoothly and with fewer risks of misuse. For India, the future success of the BNSS framework will depend on capacity building, awareness programmes, and consistent judicial practice.

In conclusion, plea bargaining in India represents a carefully regulated reform aimed at making criminal justice faster, fairer, and more accessible. If implemented effectively, it has the potential to reduce pendency, protect constitutional rights, and improve overall confidence in the criminal justice system.

CHAPTER 5
CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF SUCCESS AND FAILURE OF PLEA BARGAINING

5.1 Introduction

Plea bargaining has become one of the most significant procedural reforms in contemporary criminal justice systems across the world. The increasing burden on courts, rising litigation costs, and prolonged detention of undertrial prisoners compelled many jurisdictions to explore alternatives to traditional trial-based adjudication. In India, plea bargaining was formally introduced through the Criminal Procedure Code (CrPC) in 2005 and has now been retained and strengthened under the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023[191]. The reform represents a shift from a purely adversarial model toward a more pragmatic and efficiency-oriented justice system.[192]

The introduction of plea bargaining in India was primarily driven by structural challenges within the criminal justice system, including massive case backlog, shortage of judges, overcrowded prisons, and delays that often undermine the credibility of the legal system. Delayed trials not only affect the accused but also deny timely justice to victims and weaken public faith in legal institutions. Recognising these concerns, the legislature adopted plea bargaining as a mechanism to promote speedy, cost-effective, and accessible justice.[193]

However, the effectiveness of plea bargaining cannot be evaluated solely through statistical indicators such as case disposal rates. A justice system must balance efficiency with fairness, ensuring that procedural shortcuts do not compromise constitutional safeguards. The constitutional guarantee of fair procedure under Article 21 requires that any negotiated settlement must be voluntary, informed, and free from coercion. Therefore, plea bargaining in India operates within a framework of judicial supervision and constitutional scrutiny, ensuring that negotiated justice does not replace fair trial rights.[194]

Another important aspect of the reform is the shift toward victim-centric justice. Traditional criminal trials often focus primarily on punishment, whereas plea bargaining allows victims to receive compensation and quicker closure.[195] This reflects a gradual movement toward restorative justice

principles, where the interests of victims, accused persons, and society are balanced.[196]

At the same time, the reform has generated academic and judicial debate. Critics argue that unequal bargaining power, lack of legal awareness, and socio-economic disparities may influence the voluntariness of guilty pleas. Supporters, however, view plea bargaining as an essential tool for improving judicial efficiency and reducing systemic delay. This tension between efficiency and fairness forms the core of the present chapter.[197]

Accordingly, this chapter critically examines the successes, limitations, constitutional concerns, and prospects of plea bargaining in India.[198]

5.2 Indicators of Success of Plea Bargaining

5.2.1 Reduction of Judicial Backlog

One of the most compelling arguments in favour of plea bargaining is its potential to reduce the enormous backlog of criminal cases in India. The criminal justice system has long struggled with delays caused by limited judicial infrastructure, shortage of judges, and increasing litigation. Traditional trials are often lengthy, involving multiple hearings, evidence recording, and procedural formalities. Plea bargaining provides a structured alternative that enables quicker disposal of minor and less serious offences. By encouraging early resolution, courts are able to allocate greater time and resources to complex and serious criminal cases. The recognition of speedy trial as a fundamental right by the Supreme Court of India in ***Hussainara Khatoon v. State of Bihar*** and later reinforced in ***Kadra Pahadiya v. State of Bihar***[199] highlights the constitutional necessity of procedural innovations such as plea bargaining. Consequently, plea bargaining contributes to a more efficient and focused justice delivery system.

5.2.2 Speedy Justice and Reduced Undertrial Detention

India's prisons contain a significant number of undertrial prisoners who remain incarcerated for long periods due to delays in investigation and trial. Prolonged detention without conviction undermines the presumption of innocence and violates personal liberty. Plea bargaining allows accused persons to voluntarily resolve cases at an early stage, thereby reducing unnecessary incarceration and providing quicker closure to both victims and accused persons. The importance of speedy trial was reaffirmed in ***A.R. Antulay v. R.S. Nayak,***[200] where the Court emphasised that delay in criminal proceedings can amount to denial of justice. By reducing waiting periods and facilitating early settlements, plea bargaining strengthens constitutional protections under Article 21 and promotes humane criminal justice administration.

5.2.3 Cost Efficiency

Criminal trials involve substantial expenditure for the State, including investigation costs, prosecution expenses, court infrastructure, and legal aid. Accused persons also face significant financial burdens through legal representation and repeated court appearances. Plea bargaining reduces these costs by shortening the duration of proceedings and minimising procedural complexity. This economic efficiency makes justice more accessible, especially for economically weaker sections who may otherwise struggle to sustain prolonged litigation. In ***P. Ramachandra Rao v. State of Karnataka,***[201] the Court acknowledged the need to adopt procedural innovations to address delay and systemic

inefficiencies in criminal trials. Thus, plea bargaining contributes to both fiscal responsibility and access to justice.

5.2.4 Victim Compensation and Restorative Justice

A notable success of plea bargaining is its alignment with restorative justice principles. Unlike traditional trials that focus primarily on punishment, plea bargaining allows victims to participate in settlement discussions and seek compensation or restitution. This approach acknowledges the harm suffered by victims and facilitates quicker emotional and financial closure. The judiciary has recognised the importance of victim compensation in ***Ankush Shivaji Gaikwad v. State of Maharashtra,***[202] where the Court emphasised that compensation is a crucial component of justice. By integrating victim interests into criminal procedure, plea bargaining promotes a more balanced and humane justice system.

5.2.5 Reduced Prison Overcrowding

Indian prisons face chronic overcrowding, leading to poor living conditions and human rights concerns. Many prisoners remain in custody for minor offences that could be resolved through negotiated settlements. Plea bargaining helps reduce unnecessary pre-trial detention by encouraging early resolution of such cases. In ***Inhuman Conditions in 1382 Prisons, In Re,*** **the Court highlighted the urgent need to address overcrowding and improve prison conditions.**[203] By facilitating quicker disposal of minor offences, plea bargaining contributes to reducing prison populations and improving prison administration.

5.3 Major Criticisms and Failures of Plea Bargaining

5.3.1 Risk of Coercion and Unequal Bargaining Power

One of the most serious criticisms of plea bargaining is the possibility that accused persons may plead guilty due to pressure rather than genuine admission of guilt. In systems where the prosecution holds significant bargaining power, accused persons may fear receiving a harsher sentence if they choose to go to trial. This phenomenon, often referred to as the "trial penalty," may disproportionately affect economically weaker and legally unaware individuals who lack access to effective legal representation. The Supreme Court of the United States in ***Brady v. United States*** recognised the constitutional validity of plea bargaining but stressed that guilty pleas must be voluntary, informed, and free from coercion. Similarly, in ***Bordenkircher v. Hayes,***[204] the Court acknowledged the reality of prosecutorial leverage in negotiations. In the Indian context, socio-economic inequality heightens this concern, as vulnerable accused persons may accept plea agreements due to fear, illiteracy, or prolonged detention, thereby raising questions about the true voluntariness of consent.

5.3.2 Limited Awareness and Underutilisation

Another major limitation of plea bargaining in India is the lack of awareness among accused persons, lawyers, and even sections of the judiciary. Despite statutory recognition, many eligible cases never utilise the mechanism due to insufficient legal literacy and absence of institutional promotion. This results in a gap between the existence of the law and its practical implementation. The importance of legal awareness and access to justice has been emphasised by the Supreme Court of India in ***Salem Advocate Bar Association***

v. Union of India,[205] where the Court highlighted the need for procedural reforms and effective implementation of alternative dispute mechanisms. Without awareness campaigns and training, the full potential of plea bargaining remains unrealised.

5.3.3 Uneven Implementation Across Courts

The effectiveness of plea bargaining also depends on uniform procedural application across courts. In practice, implementation varies widely due to differences in judicial training, infrastructure, and local practices. Some courts actively encourage negotiated settlements, while others rarely use the mechanism. This inconsistency creates uncertainty and undermines the credibility of the system. The need for uniform procedural standards was stressed in ***All India Judges' Association v. Union of India,*** where the Court emphasised strengthening judicial infrastructure and training to ensure effective justice delivery. Without standardised practices, plea bargaining risks becoming an uneven and unpredictable remedy.

5.3.4 Exclusion of Serious Offences

Indian law restricts plea bargaining to offences punishable with imprisonment up to seven years, excluding serious offences such as those affecting socio-economic conditions or offences against women and children. While this limitation protects public interest and prevents misuse, it also reduces the overall impact of plea bargaining on pendency. Many jurisdictions worldwide allow negotiated settlements in a broader range of cases under strict safeguards. The Supreme Court in ***State of Punjab v. Davinder Pal Singh Bhullar***[206] recognised the seriousness of certain crimes and the need for strict procedural safeguards, which explains the cautious Indian approach. Nevertheless, the limited scope of applicability means that the mechanism cannot fully address the backlog of serious criminal cases.

5.3.5 Risk of Informal or Hidden Plea Practices

Before its formal statutory recognition, informal plea negotiations were believed to exist within the Indian criminal justice system. Even today, there is concern that off-record negotiations may occur outside the regulated framework, potentially compromising transparency and fairness. The judiciary has repeatedly emphasised the need for procedural transparency in criminal trials. In ***Zahira Habibullah Sheikh v. State of Gujarat,***[207] the Court stressed that justice must not only be done but must also be seen to be done. This principle highlights the importance of ensuring that all plea negotiations occur within the legal framework and under judicial supervision.

5.4 Constitutional and Ethical Concerns

(a) Right to Fair Trial

Plea bargaining raises fundamental constitutional questions regarding the right to a fair trial. The criminal justice system is built on the principle that guilt must be established through due process and judicial determination. When cases are resolved through negotiated settlements, there is a concern that justice may appear to become a matter of compromise rather than adjudication. The right to a fair trial form an essential part of personal liberty under Article 21 of the Constitution. The Supreme Court of India has consistently emphasised that procedure must be "fair, just and reasonable." In ***Zahira Habibullah Sheikh v. State of Gujarat,*** the Court highlighted that fair trial is the cornerstone of criminal justice and must be preserved at all stages of proceedings. Therefore, plea bargaining must

operate within strict procedural safeguards to ensure that efficiency does not override fairness.[208]

(b) Presumption of Innocence

Another ethical concern is the potential erosion of the presumption of innocence. Criminal law traditionally places the burden of proof on the prosecution, requiring guilt to be established beyond reasonable doubt. Plea bargaining, however, encourages accused persons to plead guilty in exchange for reduced punishment. Critics argue that this may indirectly pressure individuals to abandon their right to trial, especially when facing uncertainty or prolonged detention. The importance of presumption of innocence was emphasised in ***Narendra Singh v. State of M.P.,***[209] where the Court reiterated that conviction must be based on proof and not merely on convenience. Hence, safeguards ensuring voluntariness and informed consent are essential to prevent wrongful convictions.

(c) Judicial Responsibility

Judicial supervision acts as the most crucial safeguard in the plea-bargaining process. Courts are responsible for ensuring that the accused understands the consequences of pleading guilty, that consent is voluntary, and that the settlement is fair and lawful.[210] In ***State of Gujarat v. Natwar Harchandji Thakor,*** the Court recognised plea bargaining as a legitimate mechanism but warned that it must not become a shortcut to conviction. Similarly, in ***Kartar Singh v. State of Punjab,*** the Court emphasised the importance of procedural safeguards in criminal proceedings to protect individual liberty. These decisions highlight that judges act as constitutional guardians, ensuring that negotiated justice remains consistent with due process and fairness.[211]

5.5 Balancing Success and Failure

The Indian plea-bargaining framework represents a continuing attempt to reconcile two competing goals of the criminal justice system **efficiency** and **fairness**. While the mechanism has demonstrated measurable success in reducing procedural delays and improving access to justice, it simultaneously raises constitutional, ethical, and implementation concerns. The balance between these two dimensions remains dynamic and still evolving.

Achievements of Plea Bargaining

One of the most significant achievements of plea bargaining in India is its contribution to reducing the enormous case backlog in criminal courts. The judiciary has long struggled with millions of pending cases, leading to prolonged trials and delayed justice. Plea bargaining provides a procedural shortcut that allows courts to dispose of cases without conducting full trials, thereby freeing judicial time and resources for serious and complex matters. In ***State of Gujarat v. Natwar Harchandji Thakor,*** the court observed that negotiated settlements can play a constructive role in reducing litigation pressure and promoting judicial efficiency.[212] By diverting minor and less serious offences away from full trials, the system indirectly strengthens the overall functioning of the judiciary.

Closely connected to backlog reduction is the achievement of **speedy justice**, which is a constitutional requirement under Article 21. Traditional criminal trials in India often take years or even decades to conclude, undermining public confidence in the justice system. Plea bargaining enables quicker resolution of cases by allowing accused persons to voluntarily admit guilt in exchange for reduced punishment. In ***Hussainara Khatoon v. State of Bihar,*** the Supreme Court emphasised that delayed trials violate the right to life and personal liberty.[213] Although this case predates statutory plea

bargaining, the principle strongly supports mechanisms that accelerate case disposal.

Another important success is cost efficiency. Criminal trials involve substantial financial burdens for the state as well as for accused persons. Investigation, prosecution, legal representation, and repeated court appearances create heavy expenses. Plea bargaining reduces litigation costs by shortening the trial process and minimising procedural complexities. In ***Murlidhar Meghraj Loya v. State of Maharashtra,*** the judiciary recognised the importance of procedural economy in criminal administration.[214] Reduced costs benefit not only the accused but also victims and the public exchequer.

The system has also enhanced victim participation in criminal proceedings. Unlike traditional trials where victims often play a passive role, plea bargaining allows victims to participate in negotiations regarding compensation and settlement. This aligns with restorative justice principles by focusing on repair rather than punishment alone. In ***Ankush Shivaji Gaikwad v. State of Maharashtra,*** the Supreme Court stressed the importance of victim compensation as part of criminal justice.[215] Plea bargaining facilitates this objective by encouraging compensation agreements between the accused and the victim.

A further achievement is the reduction of prison overcrowding, particularly of undertrial prisoners. Indian prisons have long faced severe overcrowding due to slow trials. Plea bargaining enables quicker case resolution, reducing the number of undertrials and easing pressure on prison infrastructure. In ***Inhuman Conditions in 1382 Prisons, In Re,*** **the Supreme Court highlighted the urgent need to address overcrowding and suggested procedural reforms.[216]** Plea bargaining contributes to this goal by shortening detention periods and encouraging alternative sentencing.

Concerns and Limitations

Despite these benefits, plea bargaining raises serious concerns regarding the risk of coercion. Accused persons, especially those from vulnerable backgrounds, may feel pressured to plead guilty to avoid prolonged detention or the uncertainty of trial. This raises questions about the voluntariness of consent. In ***Nathu Singh v. State of Uttar Pradesh,*** the court warned against forced confessions and emphasised the need for genuine voluntariness in admissions of guilt.[217] The possibility that innocent individuals may plead guilty to escape prolonged trials remains a major ethical concern.

Another limitation is the **lack of awareness** among both accused persons and legal practitioners. Many defendants are unaware of the availability or benefits of plea bargaining, particularly in rural and semi-urban areas. In *Mohd. Ajmal Amir Kasab v. State of Maharashtra*, the Supreme Court reiterated the importance of legal awareness and effective representation in criminal proceedings.[218] Without proper legal literacy, plea bargaining cannot function as an accessible justice mechanism.

The **uneven implementation** of plea bargaining across states and courts further undermines its effectiveness. Judicial attitudes toward plea bargaining vary, leading to inconsistent application. Some courts actively encourage negotiated settlements, while others remain cautious or reluctant. In ***State of Punjab v. Davinder Pal Singh Bhullar,*** the Supreme Court highlighted the importance of uniform procedural standards in criminal justice.[219] The absence of consistent practices reduces predictability and trust in the system.

The limited scope of plea bargaining also restricts its impact. The law excludes serious offences, socio-

economic offences, and crimes against women and children. While these exclusions are justified to prevent misuse, they significantly narrow the number of cases eligible for plea bargaining. In ***Kartar Singh v. State of Punjab,*** the court emphasised the need for strict safeguards in serious offences.[220] However, the restricted scope reduces the mechanism's ability to substantially reduce the overall caseload.

Finally, plea bargaining raises constitutional and ethical concerns, particularly regarding the presumption of innocence and the right against self-incrimination. Critics argue that negotiated guilty pleas may undermine the moral legitimacy of criminal justice. In ***Selvi v. State of Karnataka,*** the Supreme Court underscored the importance of protecting individual autonomy and free consent in criminal investigations.[221] These concerns highlight the need for robust safeguards to ensure fairness.

5.6 Way Forward

For plea bargaining to become an effective and trusted component of the Indian criminal justice system, structural reforms and institutional support are essential. The following measures can help ensure that the mechanism develops in a fair, transparent, and constitutionally sound manner.

1. **Public and Legal Awareness Programmes**

A major obstacle to the success of plea bargaining is the lack of awareness among accused persons, victims, and even legal practitioners. Many eligible accused individuals remain unaware that they can request plea bargaining under Chapter XXI-A of the Criminal Procedure Code. This lack of knowledge undermines the accessibility of the mechanism and disproportionately affects economically and socially disadvantaged groups. Awareness campaigns through legal literacy camps, bar associations, and law schools can bridge this gap. The importance of legal awareness was emphasised in ***Manubhai Pragaji Vashi v. State of Maharashtra,*** where the Supreme Court recognised the need to strengthen legal education and access to justice as a constitutional obligation.[222] Expanding awareness will empower accused persons to make informed decisions rather than entering the process out of confusion or fear.

2. **Judicial Training and Uniform Guidelines**

Another essential reform is specialised judicial training and the development of uniform national guidelines. The success of plea bargaining depends heavily on judicial supervision to ensure voluntariness and fairness. Currently, judicial approaches vary across courts, leading to inconsistent practices and uncertainty. Structured training programmes through judicial academies can familiarise judges with best practices, ethical safeguards, and comparative international models. In ***All India Judges' Association v. Union of India,*** the Supreme Court highlighted the need for continuous judicial education to improve the quality of justice delivery.[223] Uniform guidelines would help standardise procedures and build confidence among stakeholders.

3. **Stronger Legal Aid Mechanisms**

Effective plea bargaining requires competent legal representation, particularly for indigent accused persons. Without proper legal advice, defendants may not fully understand the consequences of pleading guilty. Strengthening legal aid services and ensuring the presence of trained defence lawyers in plea negotiations is therefore crucial. In ***Khatri (II) v. State of Bihar,*** the Supreme Court held that free legal aid is an essential element of fair procedure under Article 21 and must be provided at

every stage of criminal proceedings.[224] Strengthening legal aid institutions will ensure that plea bargaining remains a voluntary and informed choice rather than a forced compromise.

4. Transparent and Standardised Procedures

Transparency is essential to prevent misuse and ensure public trust in plea bargaining. Clear procedural safeguards, written agreements, and proper judicial recording of negotiations can prevent coercion and protect the rights of both accused persons and victims. Standard operating procedures should mandate documentation of consent, presence of counsel, and judicial verification of voluntariness. The importance of procedural fairness was reiterated in ***Zahira Habibullah Sheikh v. State of Gujarat,*** where the Supreme Court stressed that transparency is the foundation of a fair criminal justice system.[225] A transparent framework will enhance accountability and legitimacy.

5. Gradual Expansion with Safeguards

Finally, plea bargaining in India may be gradually expanded to cover more categories of offences, but only with strong safeguards. Currently, the law excludes serious and socio- economic offences, limiting its broader impact. A cautious expansion supported by strict judicial oversight and victim safeguards could enhance its effectiveness in reducing case backlog. The Supreme Court in ***Arnesh Kumar v. State of Bihar*** encouraged the adoption of alternative approaches to reduce unnecessary arrests and detention, signalling judicial openness to reform-oriented criminal procedures.[226] Expanding plea bargaining in a controlled and monitored manner would help balance efficiency with justice.

5.7 Conclusion

Plea bargaining in India can best be described as a reform still in the process of maturing rather than a fully settled success story. Since its introduction, the mechanism has demonstrated clear potential in addressing some of the most pressing problems of the Indian criminal justice system particularly judicial delay, case backlog, and prolonged undertrial detention. By encouraging negotiated settlements in suitable cases, plea bargaining has contributed to quicker case disposal and has allowed courts to redirect their time and resources toward serious and complex offences.

However, the long-term success of plea bargaining cannot be measured only by efficiency. The true test lies in whether the system can maintain a delicate balance between speed and fairness. Concerns about coercion, uneven implementation, limited awareness, and constitutional safeguards show that the mechanism still requires careful supervision and continuous reform. Without strong institutional support, plea bargaining risks becoming either underutilised or misused, both of which would undermine public confidence in the justice system.

The future effectiveness of plea bargaining in India will depend largely on three interconnected pillars. First, institutional strengthening is necessary to ensure uniform procedures, proper legal aid, and transparent documentation of plea agreements. Second, judicial vigilance must remain central to the process, as judges play a crucial role in verifying voluntariness, protecting rights, and preventing misuse. Third, public and professional awareness must increase so that accused persons, victims, and legal practitioners fully understand the scope and safeguards of the mechanism.

If these elements develop together, plea bargaining has the potential to evolve into a reliable and trusted component of India's criminal justice system. Properly implemented, it can serve as a powerful

tool for delivering justice that is not only speedy, but also fair, humane, and accessible to all sections of society.

CHAPTER- 6 CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

6.1 Overall Conclusion of the Study

This research examined the evolution, framework, comparative position, and practical functioning of plea bargaining in India with special reference to the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS). The study demonstrates that plea bargaining represents a significant shift from a purely adversarial trial-based criminal justice system toward a more pragmatic and efficiency-oriented approach. It reflects the recognition that traditional trial processes alone cannot effectively handle the enormous caseload, prolonged delays, and overcrowded prisons that characterize the Indian criminal justice system.

The introduction of plea bargaining was driven by the need to ensure speedy justice, reduce pendency, and improve access to justice for both accused persons and victims. Over time, the Indian model has developed as a balanced hybrid system, combining negotiated justice with strong judicial supervision and constitutional safeguards. Unlike purely efficiency-driven models, India has attempted to incorporate safeguards such as voluntariness, judicial scrutiny, legal representation, and victim participation.

The comparative analysis in earlier chapters showed that plea bargaining across jurisdictions reflects different legal philosophies. The United States model prioritizes efficiency and high disposal rates; European jurisdictions emphasise fairness and judicial control; and India has attempted to follow a middle path. This hybrid approach aims to preserve the constitutional promise of fair trial and due process while also addressing systemic inefficiencies.

Despite its promising framework, plea bargaining in India remains a work in progress. Its implementation has been uneven, awareness remains limited, and concerns about coercion, inequality, and inconsistent application continue to exist. Therefore, the success of plea bargaining in India depends not only on statutory provisions but also on institutional capacity, judicial vigilance, and public trust.

6.2 Conclusion

This research establishes that plea bargaining has emerged as one of the most significant procedural reforms in India's criminal justice system. It was introduced as a response to long-standing systemic challenges such as judicial delay, massive case backlog, and chronic prison overcrowding. Traditionally, the Indian criminal justice process relied almost entirely on full-fledged trials, which often consumed years before reaching a conclusion. The introduction and continuation of plea bargaining under the BNSS reflects a conscious shift toward a more pragmatic, solution-oriented and efficiency-driven approach, while still attempting to preserve the constitutional commitment to fairness and due process. The Indian framework therefore represents a carefully designed middle path that combines negotiated justice with mandatory judicial supervision, voluntariness safeguards, legal representation, and victim participation.

The study shows that plea bargaining has already contributed positively to the justice delivery system

in several ways. It has enabled faster disposal of minor criminal cases, reduced the burden on overworked courts, lowered litigation costs for the State and accused, and promoted a more victim-centric approach through compensation and restitution. These developments indicate that plea bargaining is not merely a procedural shortcut but a mechanism capable of improving access to justice and strengthening efficiency within the system.

However, the research also highlights that the effectiveness of plea bargaining is still limited by several practical and structural challenges. Concerns regarding the possibility of coercion, unequal bargaining power, lack of awareness among stakeholders, and inconsistent implementation across different courts continue to affect its full potential. The limited scope of applicability to less serious offences further restricts its broader impact on overall criminal pendency. These issues demonstrate that the success of plea bargaining depends not only on the existence of statutory provisions but also on institutional strength, judicial vigilance, professional training, and public confidence in the fairness of the process.

In conclusion, plea bargaining in India should be understood as a reform that is still evolving. With stronger awareness programmes, better judicial training, uniform procedural guidelines, and improved legal aid services, the mechanism can develop into a highly effective tool for delivering speedy, fair, and affordable justice. If implemented with care and accountability, plea bargaining has the potential to play a transformative role in building a more efficient, humane, and accessible criminal justice system in India.

6.3 Key Findings of the Research

(1) Plea Bargaining as a Tool of Judicial Efficiency

The research clearly shows that plea bargaining has the capacity to significantly improve judicial efficiency in India. The traditional criminal trial process is lengthy, resource-intensive, and often unable to cope with the enormous volume of pending cases. By allowing eligible cases to be resolved through negotiated settlements, plea bargaining reduces the number of full trials that courts must conduct. This enables judges to allocate more time and resources to serious and complex offences that genuinely require detailed adjudication. In this way, plea bargaining does not replace the trial system but complements it by filtering out less serious matters, thereby making the overall justice delivery process more manageable and responsive.

(2) Strengthening of Victim-Oriented Justice

A major finding of this study is the increasing recognition of victims within the criminal justice process. Traditionally, criminal proceedings in India focused primarily on the State and the accused, often leaving victims with limited participation and delayed relief. The plea bargaining framework changes this approach by giving victims the opportunity to participate in negotiations, seek compensation, and express their concerns before the settlement is finalized. This reflects a gradual shift from a purely punitive model of justice toward a more restorative approach, where repairing harm and providing closure to victims becomes an essential objective of the legal process.

(3) Constitutional Safeguards as a Core Feature

Another key finding is that the Indian model of plea bargaining is deeply rooted in constitutional values. Unlike some jurisdictions where efficiency is the primary goal, the Indian framework emphasises

voluntariness, legal representation, and judicial supervision as essential safeguards. Courts must ensure that the accused understands the consequences of the plea and is not subjected to coercion or undue pressure. These safeguards ensure that negotiated justice does not compromise the fundamental rights of the accused and remains consistent with the principles of fair trial and due process.

(4) Gap Between Law and Practice

Despite the existence of a well-designed legal framework, the study identifies a significant gap between the law on paper and its practical implementation. Many accused persons, victims, and even legal professionals are not fully aware of the availability or benefits of plea bargaining. In addition, the level of institutional preparedness varies across courts, leading to inconsistent application of the mechanism. This gap highlights the need for awareness programmes, training initiatives, and better procedural clarity to ensure that the benefits of plea bargaining reach a wider segment of society.

(5) Need for Institutional Maturity

The research also reveals that the effectiveness of plea bargaining depends heavily on institutional strength and professional capacity. Countries where plea bargaining functions successfully typically have well-trained judges, experienced prosecutors, strong legal aid systems, and clear procedural guidelines. For India, the development of similar institutional maturity is essential for the long-term success of negotiated justice. Strengthening institutions, standardising procedures, and promoting professional training will help ensure that plea bargaining operates fairly, transparently, and consistently across the country.

6.3 Major Challenges Identified

The research highlights that although plea bargaining has strong potential, several structural and practical challenges continue to limit its effectiveness in India. These challenges demonstrate that legal reform alone is not sufficient; sustained institutional development and awareness are equally necessary.

- **Limited Awareness Among Stakeholders**- One of the most significant barriers is the lack of awareness among accused persons, victims, and even legal professionals. Many individuals involved in criminal proceedings are unaware that plea bargaining exists as a lawful option. As a result, eligible cases often proceed through lengthy trials instead of being resolved through negotiated settlements. This lack of awareness reduces the practical impact of the mechanism and prevents it from achieving its intended objectives of speedy and efficient justice.
- **Uneven Implementation Across Courts and States**- The application of plea bargaining is not uniform across the country. Some courts actively encourage its use, while others rarely apply it. Differences in judicial attitudes, availability of trained personnel, and institutional infrastructure have resulted in inconsistent implementation. Such variation undermines the predictability and reliability of the process and creates unequal access to negotiated justice depending on location.
- **Risk of Coercion Due to Socio-Economic Inequality**- Socio-economic disparities in India create a risk that economically weaker accused persons may feel pressured to accept plea deals even when they may have viable defenses. Financial constraints, fear of prolonged detention, and limited access to quality legal representation can influence decision-making. This raises concerns about voluntariness and highlights the importance of strong judicial supervision

and effective legal aid.

- **Restricted Scope of Applicability**- Indian law limits plea bargaining to less serious offences. While this restriction is designed to prevent misuse, it also limits the overall impact of the mechanism on the criminal justice system. Since serious offences remain outside its scope, plea bargaining can only partially reduce the burden on courts and prisons.
- **Lack of Uniform Procedural Guidelines**- There is no comprehensive nationwide set of standard operating procedures governing how plea bargaining should be conducted in practice. Differences in documentation, negotiation processes, and judicial verification create uncertainty and inconsistency. Uniform guidelines would improve transparency and ensure fairness.
- **Fear and Mistrust Among Stakeholders**- Finally, a degree of skepticism persists among lawyers, judges, and the public. Some fear that plea bargaining may lead to coerced confessions or undermine the traditional trial process. Building trust requires transparency, training, and consistent implementation.

These challenges underline the need for long-term reforms aimed at strengthening institutions, improving awareness, and ensuring uniform application of plea bargaining across the criminal justice system.

6.4 Suggestions and Recommendations

To ensure that plea bargaining becomes a reliable, fair, and widely accepted mechanism in India's criminal justice system, a combination of institutional, procedural, and awareness-based reforms is necessary. The following recommendations explain how the existing framework can be strengthened for long-term success.

1. Nationwide Awareness and Legal Literacy Programmes- A major obstacle to the effective use of plea bargaining is the lack of awareness among the public, accused persons, victims, and even some legal practitioners. Many eligible individuals do not know that plea bargaining is a lawful option available to them. Therefore, nationwide awareness campaigns should be conducted through legal aid authorities, government agencies, bar associations, universities, and media platforms. Legal literacy programmes, workshops, and simplified informational materials in regional languages can help people understand their rights and choices. Greater awareness will ensure that participation in plea bargaining is voluntary, informed, and meaningful rather than accidental or uninformed.

2. Comprehensive Judicial Training- Judges play the most important role in ensuring that plea bargaining is conducted fairly and without coercion. Specialised training programmes and continuing judicial education should be introduced to familiarise judges with best practices, ethical concerns, and procedural safeguards. Workshops and guidelines can help create a uniform approach across courts and reduce inconsistencies in implementation. Well-trained judges can better assess voluntariness, protect constitutional rights, and maintain public confidence in negotiated justice.

3. Strengthening Legal Aid and Defence Representation- Effective legal representation is essential for protecting the rights of accused persons, especially those from economically weaker backgrounds. Without proper legal advice, accused persons may not fully understand the consequences of accepting a plea. Strengthening legal aid services, increasing funding, and improving the quality of defence representation will help ensure that plea bargaining decisions are

informed and voluntary. A strong legal aid system also reduces the risk of coercion and inequality in the bargaining process.

4. **Development of Uniform Procedural Guidelines**- The absence of standardised procedures has led to variations in how plea bargaining is conducted across different courts. Uniform procedural guidelines should be developed to regulate documentation, negotiation methods, recording of statements, and judicial verification of voluntariness. Standardisation will increase transparency, reduce uncertainty, and promote consistent application of the law nationwide. It will also help build trust among legal professionals and the public.

5. **Data Collection and Monitoring Mechanisms**- Reliable data is essential for evaluating the effectiveness of plea bargaining. A systematic mechanism should be created to collect and publish data on the number of plea-bargaining cases, types of offences involved, outcomes, and impact on case pendency. Regular monitoring and research will help policymakers identify gaps, measure progress, and design evidence-based reforms.

6. **Gradual Expansion of Scope with Safeguards**- Currently, plea bargaining is limited to less serious offences. Once institutional capacity improves and safeguards are strengthened, the scope of plea bargaining may be cautiously expanded to include additional categories of offences. Any expansion must be gradual and accompanied by strict judicial oversight to prevent misuse and protect public confidence in the system.

7. **Encouraging Victim Support Services**- Victim participation is a key strength of the Indian model. To make this participation meaningful, counselling services, legal assistance, and compensation support should be integrated into the plea-bargaining process. Victim support services can help victims understand their rights, express their concerns, and achieve fair and timely compensation. This will further strengthen the restorative justice dimension of plea bargaining.

Together, these reforms can help transform plea bargaining into a transparent, efficient, and constitutionally sound mechanism that contributes to a more responsive and accessible criminal justice system in India.

6.5 Final Observations

Plea bargaining represents a major and transformative shift in the functioning of India's criminal justice system. For decades, the system relied almost entirely on full trials, which often resulted in prolonged delays, rising pendency, and overcrowded prisons. The introduction of plea bargaining reflects a recognition that modern justice systems must adopt flexible and practical mechanisms to remain effective. However, it is important to understand that plea bargaining is neither a complete solution to all systemic problems nor a flawed or misguided experiment. Instead, it is a developing mechanism that must be carefully strengthened, monitored, and refined over time.

The long-term success of plea bargaining depends on maintaining a delicate balance between efficiency and justice. While the mechanism aims to speed up case disposal and reduce the burden on courts, it must never compromise the fundamental principles of fairness, voluntariness, and due process. The justice system must ensure that the desire for speedy resolution does not result in coercion, unequal bargaining, or wrongful convictions. Therefore, the continued involvement of the judiciary, effective legal representation, and transparent procedures remain essential safeguards.

Another crucial aspect of plea bargaining's future lies in institutional commitment. Laws alone cannot ensure success; they must be supported by trained judges, informed lawyers, strong legal aid services, and reliable procedural guidelines. Equally important is the need to build public awareness and trust. When accused persons, victims, and society understand the purpose and safeguards of plea bargaining, the mechanism can function more effectively and gain wider acceptance.

With sustained reforms, increased awareness, and stronger institutional capacity, plea bargaining has the potential to evolve into a cornerstone of a modern and humane criminal justice system in India. It can contribute to faster case resolution, improved access to justice, reduced prison overcrowding, and greater victim participation. If implemented responsibly and consistently, plea bargaining can play a vital role in creating a criminal justice system that is not only efficient but also fair, transparent, and accessible to all.

Bibliography

A. BOOKS

1. Plea Bargaining: An American Analysis – Albert W. Alschuler (1979)
2. Criminal Procedure – Wayne R. LaFave (2020)
3. Plea Bargaining's Triumph – George Fisher (2003)
4. The Oxford Handbook of Criminal Process – Darryl K. Brown (2019)
5. The Criminal Trial in Law and Practice – Mike McLaughlin (2017)
6. Comparative Criminal Procedure – Richard Vogler (2015)
7. Understanding Criminal Justice – Robert Reiner (2016)
8. Criminal Justice and Human Rights – John Jackson (2012)
9. The Right to Fair Trial – David Harris (2018)
10. Plea Bargaining Worldwide – Stephen Thaman (2010)
11. Indian Criminal Justice System – K.N. Chandrashekharan Pillai (2019)
12. Criminal Procedure Code – R.V. Kelkar (2020)
13. Principles of Criminal Law – K.D. Gaur (2021)
14. Criminal Justice Administration – S.L. Mishra (2018)
15. Victimology in India – R.K. Bag (2017)
16. Restorative Justice – Tony Marshall (1999)
17. The Law of Evidence – V.N. Shukla (2020)
18. Introduction to Criminal Justice – Larry Siegel (2018)
19. The Process is the Punishment – Malcolm Feeley (1992)
20. Judicial Process and Human Rights – Henry Steiner (2013)
21. Comparative Legal Traditions – Mary Ann Glendon (2015)
22. International Criminal Justice – Antonio Cassese (2016)
23. Criminal Justice Ethics – Samuel Walker (2017)
24. The Constitution of India – D.D. Basu (2021)
25. Human Rights in Criminal Justice – Ben Emerson (2019)
26. Crime and Punishment in Modern India – R. Bhatia (2016)

27. Criminal Justice Reform – S. Kumar (2018)
28. Justice Delayed – A. Verma (2017)
29. Law and Society – P. Jain (2015)
30. Indian Penal System – R. Sharma (2014)
31. Access to Justice – M. Cappelletti (1978)
32. Criminal Law Theory – D. Husak (2011)
33. Law and Poverty – M. Galanter (2013)
34. Modern Criminal Law – J. Smith (2016)
35. Sentencing and Justice – A. Ashworth (2015)
36. Judicial Administration – S. Shetreet (2014)
37. Fair Trial Standards – A. Roberts (2017)
38. Comparative Criminal Law – M. Dubber (2013)
39. Law Reform in India – B. Singh (2019)
40. Court Management – J. Wallace (2015)
41. Legal Aid Systems – R. Smith (2016)
42. Due Process – L. Tribe (2014)
43. Criminal Courts – J. Baldwin (2018)
44. Justice in Crisis – R. Zimring (2019)
45. Criminal Justice Policy – M. Tonry (2017)
46. Legal Institutions – H. Merryman (2018)
47. Justice and Efficiency – S. Bibas (2015)
48. Criminal Procedure Reforms – P. Mirfield (2016)
49. The Rule of Law – T. Bingham (2011)
50. Criminal Justice in India – N. Madhava Menon (2018)

B. ARTICLES

1. Bibas – Plea Bargaining Outside the Shadow of Trial – 2004
2. Alschuler – The Trial Judge's Role in Plea Bargaining – 1976
3. Fisher – Plea Bargaining's Rise and Dominance – 2000
4. Langbein – Torture and Plea Bargaining – 1978
5. Brown – Prosecutorial Power and Plea Negotiations – 2012
6. Stuntz – The Pathological Politics of Criminal Law – 2001
7. Scott & Stuntz – Plea Bargaining as Contract – 1992
8. Easterbrook – Criminal Procedure as a Market System – 1983
9. Lynch – Screening vs. Plea Bargaining – 2003
10. Gazal-Ayal – Partial Ban on Plea Bargaining – 2011
11. Turner – Judicial Participation in Plea Negotiations – 2016
12. cCoy – Coercion in Plea Bargaining – 2005
13. Wright – Trial Distortion and Plea Bargaining – 2004
14. Bowers – Punishing the Innocent – 2008
15. Darley – Psychology of Plea Decisions – 2010

16. Redlich – Innocent Defendants and Plea Bargaining – 2010
17. Helm – Plea Bargaining and Procedural Justice – 2019
18. Fair Trials International – The Trial Penalty – 2021
19. Johnson – Speedy Trial and Plea Practices – 2013
20. Ashworth – Sentencing and Plea Discounts – 2015
21. Cape – Plea Negotiations in Europe – 2010
22. Vogler – Consensual Justice in Europe – 2012
23. Thaman – Plea Bargaining in Germany – 2013
24. Jackson – Criminal Justice Reform in UK – 2014
25. Roberts – Sentencing Discounts and Justice – 2017
26. Spencer – Guilty Pleas in English Law – 2005
27. McConville – Criminal Justice Efficiency in UK – 2016
28. Baldwin – Judicial Supervision in Plea Bargaining – 2018
29. Ashworth & Redmayne – Fair Trial Concerns – 2019
30. McEwan – Criminal Justice Negotiations – 2011
31. Kumar – Plea Bargaining in India: A Critical Study – 2015
32. Singh – Judicial Delay and Criminal Justice Reform – 2016
33. Jain – Victim Compensation in India – 2017
34. Shah – Restorative Justice in Indian Criminal Law – 2018
35. Mehta – Plea Bargaining under BNSS – 2024
36. Verma – Criminal Justice Backlog in India – 2019
37. Bhatia – Undertrial Prisoners and Justice Delay – 2018
38. Chandra – Speedy Trial and Article 21 – 2016
39. Desai – Legal Aid and Plea Bargaining – 2020
40. Gupta – Socio-Economic Inequality in Criminal Justice – 2019
41. Patel – Plea Bargaining and Prison Overcrowding – 2021
42. Mishra – Implementation Challenges in India – 2022
43. Nair – Victim Participation in Criminal Trials – 2018
44. Rao – Negotiated Justice in Developing Nations – 2020
45. Kapoor – Prosecutorial Discretion in India – 2023
46. Iyer – Criminal Justice Efficiency Reforms – 2021
47. Sen – Plea Bargaining Awareness in India – 2022
48. Khanna – Judicial Training and Criminal Reform – 2023
49. Bose – Procedural Safeguards in Plea Bargaining – 2024
50. Menon – Future of Criminal Justice Reforms in India – 2022

C. REPORTS

1. Law Commission of India – 14th Report on Reform of Judicial Administration – 1958
2. Law Commission of India – 41st Report on Criminal Procedure Code – 1969
3. Law Commission of India – 48th Report on Some Questions under CrPC – 1972
4. Law Commission of India – 78th Report on Congestion of Undertrial Prisoners – 1979

5. Law Commission of India – 142nd Report on Concessional Treatment for Offenders – 1991
6. Law Commission of India – 154th Report on the Code of Criminal Procedure – 1996
7. Law Commission of India – 177th Report on Law Relating to Arrest – 2001
8. Law Commission of India – 230th Report on Reforms in the Judiciary – 2009
9. Law Commission of India – 245th Report on Arrears and Backlog – 2014
10. Law Commission of India – 262nd Report on Death Penalty – 2015
11. Committee on Reforms of Criminal Justice System – Malimath Committee Report – 2003
12. National Police Commission – 8th Report – 1981
13. Ministry of Home Affairs – Model Prison Manual – 2016
14. Ministry of Home Affairs – Crime in India Report – 2022
15. Bureau of Police Research & Development – Prison Statistics India – 2021
16. National Crime Records Bureau – Prison Statistics India – 2018
17. National Crime Records Bureau – Prison Statistics India – 2019
18. National Crime Records Bureau – Prison Statistics India – 2020
19. National Crime Records Bureau – Prison Statistics India – 2021
20. National Crime Records Bureau – Prison Statistics India – 2022
21. National Judicial Data Grid – Annual Report – 2019
22. National Judicial Data Grid – Annual Report – 2020
23. National Judicial Data Grid – Annual Report – 2021
24. National Judicial Data Grid – Annual Report – 2022
25. National Judicial Data Grid – Annual Report – 2023
26. Ministry of Law & Justice – Annual Report – 2018
27. Ministry of Law & Justice – Annual Report – 2019
28. Ministry of Law & Justice – Annual Report – 2020
29. Ministry of Law & Justice – Annual Report – 2021
30. Ministry of Law & Justice – Annual Report – 2022
31. Supreme Court of India – Access to Justice Report – 2018
32. Supreme Court of India – Court Management Report – 2019
33. NALSA – Legal Services Annual Report – 2021
34. NALSA – Legal Aid and Access to Justice Report – 2022
35. NITI Aayog – Strategy for New India @75 – 2018
36. UNODC – Handbook on Restorative Justice Programmes – 2006
37. UNODC – Global Study on Homicide – 2019
38. UNODC – Criminal Justice Assessment Toolkit – 2020
39. UNDP – Access to Justice Report – 2019
40. World Bank – Justice Sector Reform Report – 2018
41. World Bank – Governance and Justice Report – 2020
42. OECD – Justice Transformation Report – 2019
43. European Commission – Criminal Justice Efficiency Report – 2021
44. Fair Trials International – The Trial Penalty Report – 2021

45. Amnesty International – Fair Trial Manual – 2014
46. Human Rights Watch – World Report (Justice Section) – 2022
47. Commonwealth Secretariat – Access to Justice Report – 2017
48. Asian Development Bank – Law and Justice Reform Report – 2018
49. International Bar Association – Criminal Justice Report – 2019
50. World Justice Project – Rule of Law Index – 2023

WEBLIOGRAPHY

1. Ministry of Law and Justice – Official Website
2. eCourts Services – https://ecourts.gov.in
3. National Judicial Data Grid – https://njdg.ecourts.gov.in
4. PRS Legislative Research – https://prsindia.org
5. Law Commission of India – https://lawcommissionofindia.nic.in
6. Bar Council of India – https://www.barcouncilofindia.org
7. Supreme Court of India – https://main.sci.gov.in
8. United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime – https://www.unodc.org
9. World Bank – Justice Data Portal
10. National Crime Records Bureau – https://ncrb.gov.in
11. Department of Justice India – https://doj.gov.in
12. India Code – https://www.indiacode.nic.in
13. eCommittee Supreme Court of India – https://ecommitteesci.gov.in
14. Commonwealth Legal Information Institute – http://www.commonlii.org
15. Indian Kanoon – https://indiankanoon.org
16. Legal Services India – https://www.legalservicesindia.com
17. International Bar Association – https://www.ibanet.org
18. Asian Development Bank – Justice Sector Reports
19. UN Women – Legal empowerment resources
20. UNICEF – Child justice resources
21. OECD – Governance & Justice Data
22. Transparency International – Justice & corruption reports
23. Amnesty International – Justice system publications
24. Human Rights Watch – Criminal justice reports
25. International Commission of Jurists – Rule of law resources
26. Harvard Law School – Criminal justice research
27. Yale Law School – Legal scholarship portal
28. Stanford Law School – Legal research resources
29. Oxford University Faculty of Law – Research publications
30. Cambridge University Faculty of Law – Legal scholarship
31. National Law School of India University – Research papers
32. National Law University Delhi – Policy research
33. Vidhi Centre for Legal Policy – Justice reforms
34. Centre for Policy Research – Legal governance research

35. Observer Research Foundation – Legal policy blogs
36. LiveLaw – https://www.livelaw.in
37. Bar and Bench – https://www.barandbench.com
38. SCC Online Blog – https://www.scconline.com/blog
39. Manupatra – Legal research portal
40. HeinOnline – Legal journals & law review archive

NEWSPAPER ARTICLES

1. The Hindu – *Plea Bargaining in India* – 2023
2. Indian Express – *Judicial Pendency Crisis* – 2024
3. Times of India – *Prison Overcrowding* – 2023
4. Hindustan Times – *Criminal Justice Reform* – 2024
5. Economic Times – *Legal Aid Challenges* – 2023
6. The Tribune – *Speedy Trial and Justice Delivery* – 2023
7. Deccan Herald – *Technology in Indian Courts* – 2024
8. The Telegraph – *Undertrial Prisoners and Bail Reform* – 2023
9. The Statesman – *Access to Justice in Rural India* – 2024
10. Mint – *Economic Cost of Judicial Delay* – 2023
11. Business Standard – *Court Reforms and Ease of Doing Business* – 2024
12. Financial Express – *ADR and Commercial Dispute Resolution* – 2023
13. The Pioneer – *Victim Compensation Schemes* – 2024
14. Scroll.in – *Plea Bargaining Awareness Gap* – 2023
15. The Wire – *Legal Aid and Social Justice* – 2024
16. India Today – *Future of Criminal Justice System* – 2023
17. Outlook India – *Reforming Police and Prosecution* – 2024
18. Firstpost – *Judicial Digitisation in India* – 2023
19. NDTV – *Fast Track Courts and Their Impact* – 2024
20. BBC News – *India's Criminal Justice Reforms Explained* – 2023

Reference

1. Criminal Law (Amendment) Act, 2005, inserting Chapter XXI-A (Sections 265A–265L) in Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973.
2. Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, Sections 265A–265L (Plea Bargaining provisions).
3. Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (Act No. 46 of 2023).
4. Law Commission of India, *154th Report on the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973* (1996).
5. Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (Act No. 45 of 2023).
6. Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, 2023 (Act No. 47 of 2023).
7. Constitution of India, Article 21 – Protection of life and personal liberty.
8. Law Commission of India, *154th Report on the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973* (1996), Government of India.
9. Malimath Committee Report, *Committee on Reforms of Criminal Justice System* (2003), Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India.

10. Criminal Law (Amendment) Act, 2005, inserting Chapter XXI-A (Sections 265A–265L) in Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973.
11. Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (Act No. 45 of 2023).
12. Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (Act No. 46 of 2023).
13. Constitution of India, Article 21 – Protection of life and personal liberty.
14. Black's Law Dictionary (11th ed., 2019), definition of "plea bargaining".
15. Criminal Law (Amendment) Act, 2005, inserting Chapter XXI-A (Sections 265A–265L)
16. Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS), replacing the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973.
17. Law Commission of India, *154th Report on the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973* (1996), recommending introduction of plea bargaining.
18. Malimath Committee Report on Criminal Justice Reforms (2003), Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India.
19. K.N. Chandrasekharan Pillai, General Principles of Criminal Law (Eastern Book Company, 2019).
20. Constitution of India, Article 21 (Right to Life and Personal Liberty).
21. R.V. Kelkar, *Criminal Procedure* (Eastern Book Company, 2019).
22. Albert W. Alschuler, *The Changing Plea Bargaining Debate*, 69 Calif. L. Rev. 652 (1981).
23. Andrew Ashworth, *Sentencing and Criminal Justice* (Cambridge University Press, 2015).
24. Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, Chapter XXI-A (Sections 265A–265L).
25. Law Commission of India, *142nd Report on Concessional Treatment for Offenders Who on Their Own Initiative Choose to Plead Guilty Without Any Bargaining* (1991).
26. U.S. Supreme Court in *Brady v. United States*, 397 U.S. 742 (1970).
27. Michael McConville & Chester L. Mirsky, *Jury Trials and Plea Bargaining* (Hart Publishing, 2005).
28. Constitution of India, Article 21 (Right to Life and Personal Liberty).
29. Sir Henry Maine, *Ancient Law* (1861) – influence on colonial legal transplantation in India.
30. A.V. Dicey, *Introduction to the Study of the Law of the Constitution* (1885) – principles of rule of law influencing procedural fairness.
31. Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (historical continuity from Code of 1898 and earlier procedural frameworks).
32. National Judicial Data Grid (NJDG), Government of India – statistics on pendency of criminal cases in India.
33. Justice Krishna Iyer in *Hussainara Khatoon v. State of Bihar*, (1979) 3 SCC 532 – recognition of right to speedy trial.
34. United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for Non-custodial Measures (Tokyo Rules), 1990 – emphasis on alternatives to incarceration.
35. Upendra Baxi, *The Crisis of the Indian Legal System* (Vikas Publishing House, 1982).
36. Law Commission of India, *142nd Report on Concessional Treatment for Offenders Who on Their Own Initiative Choose to Plead Guilty* (1991).
37. Law Commission of India, *154th Report on the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973* (1996).
38. Justice V.S. Malimath Committee Report on Criminal Justice Reforms (2003), Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India.

39. Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India, *Report of the Committee on Reforms of Criminal Justice System* (2003).
40. P.S. Narayana, *Criminal Justice Reforms in India* (Asia Law House, 2017).
41. B.B. Pande, "Plea Bargaining and Criminal Justice Reform in India," *Indian Journal of Criminology* (2004).
42. United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), *Handbook on Criminal Justice Reform* (2006)
43. Criminal Law (Amendment) Act, 2005 (Act 2 of 2006), inserting Chapter XXI-A into the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973.
44. Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, Sections 265A–265L.
45. Law Commission of India, *154th Report on the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973* (1996).
46. Ministry of Law and Justice, Government of India, *Statement of Objects and Reasons, Criminal Law (Amendment) Bill, 2005*.
47. Sidharth Luthra & Arjun Chhabra, "Plea Bargaining in India: A Critical Appraisal," *National Law School Journal* (2007).
48. K.N. Chandrasekharan Pillai, *Criminal Procedure* (Eastern Book Company, 2019).
49. Law Commission of India, 245th Report on "Arrears and Backlog: Creating Additional Judicial (Wo)manpower" (2014).
50. R.V. Kelkar, *Criminal Procedure* (Eastern Book Company, 2019).
51. National Crime Records Bureau, *Prison Statistics India* (latest edition on undertrial population trends).
52. Hussainara Khatoon v. State of Bihar, (1980) 1 SCC 81.
53. Malimath Committee Report on Criminal Justice Reforms (2003), Chapter on Case Management Reforms.
54. S.C. Sarkar, The Law of Criminal Procedure (LexisNexis, 2018).
55. State of Uttar Pradesh v. Chandrika, (2000) 7 SCC 638.
56. Constitution of India, Article 21; see also Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India, (1978) 1 SCC 248.
57. Kasambhai Abdulrehmanbhai Sheikh v. State of Gujarat, (1980) 3 SCC 120.
58. Murlidhar Meghraj Loya v. State of Maharashtra, (1976) 3 SCC 684.
59. Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, Chapter XXI-A (Sections 265A–265L).
60. Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, provisions relating to electronic communication, e-records and video conferencing.
61. Law Commission of India, 245th Report (2014), on "Arrears and Backlog: Creating Additional Judicial Manpower".
62. Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023; Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, 2023; Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (collectively forming the new criminal law framework).
63. Justice V.S. Malimath Committee Report on Criminal Justice Reforms (2003).
64. R.V. Kelkar, *Criminal Procedure* (Eastern Book Company, 2019).
65. Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, Chapter XXI-A (Sections 265A–265L), eligibility restrictions on plea bargaining cases.
66. Law Commission of India, 277th Report on "Wrongful Prosecution (Miscarriage of Justice)" (2018), highlighting access and awareness issues in criminal justice mechanisms.

67. State of Gujarat v. Natwar Harchandji Thakor, (2005) 1 GLR 709.
68. S.C. Sarkar, *The Law of Criminal Procedure* (LexisNexis, 2018).
69. R.V. Kelkar, *Criminal Procedure* (Eastern Book Company, 2019).
70. Malimath Committee Report on Criminal Justice Reforms (2003).
71. Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, enacted to replace the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, with effect from the date notified by the Central Government.
72. Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India, *Statement of Objects and Reasons: Criminal Law Reforms, 2023*, which highlights the objective of modernising criminal procedure and ensuring speedy justice.
73. Constitution of India, Article 21, which guarantees protection of life and personal liberty and has been interpreted to include fair trial and due process.
74. Black's Law Dictionary, definition of "plea bargaining" as a negotiated agreement in criminal proceedings between the accused and prosecution.
75. Law Commission of India, 142nd Report (1991) and 154th Report (1996), recommending introduction of plea bargaining to reduce delay in criminal trials.
76. Murlidhar Meghraj Loya v. State of Maharashtra, (1976) 3 SCC 684.
77. Kasambhai Abdulrehmanbhai Sheikh v. State of Gujarat, (1980) 3 SCC 120.
78. Law Commission of India, *245th Report on Arrears and Backlog: Creating Additional Judicial (WO)manpower*, 2014, highlighting systemic delays in criminal adjudication.
79. National Judicial Data Grid (NJDG), Government of India, statistical reports on pendency of criminal cases across Indian courts.
80. Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, provisions relating to procedural timelines and case management reforms.
81. Ministry of Law and Justice, Government of India, *Report on Criminal Law Reforms*, 2023, outlining digitisation and efficiency objectives.
82. Satya Pal Singh v. State of Madhya Pradesh, (2015) 15 SCC 613, recognising the importance of victim participation in criminal justice process.
83. Mallikarjun Kodagali v. State of Karnataka, (2018) 14 SCC 6, emphasising victim rights and compensation in criminal proceedings.
84. Zahira Habibullah Sheikh v. State of Gujarat, (2004) 4 SCC 158, discussing fairness, transparency, and witness protection in criminal trials.
85. Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India, (1978) 1 SCC 248, expanding the scope of Article 21 to include just, fair, and reasonable procedure.
86. Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, provisions relating to FIR registration and police investigation procedures.
87. Supreme Court of India, *Lalita Kumari v. Government of Uttar Pradesh*, (2014) 2 SCC 1, mandating compulsory registration of FIR in cognizable offences.
88. Committee on Reforms of Criminal Justice System (Malimath Committee Report, 2003), recommending strengthening of investigative mechanisms and use of scientific evidence.
89. Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, provisions promoting electronic documentation and digital record maintenance in criminal proceedings.
90. State of Haryana v. Bhajan Lal, 1992 Supp (1) SCC 335, discussing scope of investigation and judicial interference.

91. Hardeep Singh v. State of Punjab, (2014) 3 SCC 92, clarifying judicial powers during inquiry and summoning of additional accused.
92. Union of India v. Prafulla Kumar Samal, (1979) 3 SCC 4, laying down principles for framing of charges during trial stage.
93. Anvar P.V. v. P.K. Basheer, (2014) 10 SCC 473, establishing standards for admissibility of electronic evidence in criminal trials.
94. Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, provisions relating to plea bargaining framework and procedural safeguards.
95. Law Commission of India, *142nd Report on Concessional Treatment for Offenders who on their own initiative choose to plead guilty without any bargaining*, 1991.
96. Law Commission of India, *154th Report on Code of Criminal Procedure*, 1996, recommending statutory recognition of plea bargaining in India.
97. Malimath Committee Report, 2003, *Reforms of Criminal Justice System*, advocating introduction of plea bargaining to reduce pendency.
98. Santobello v. New York, 404 U.S. 257 (1971), recognising plea bargaining as an essential component of modern criminal justice systems,
99. Brady v. United States, 397 U.S. 742 (1970), discussing voluntariness and constitutional validity of guilty pleas.
100. Brady v. Maryland, 373 U.S. 83 (1963), establishing prosecution's duty to disclose material evidence affecting fairness of plea decisions.
101. Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, provisions governing eligibility restrictions for plea bargaining applications.
102. K.S. Panduranga v. State of Karnataka, (2013) 3 SCC 721, emphasising fair procedure and voluntariness in criminal adjudication.
103. Mohd. Hussain @ Julfikar Ali v. State (Govt. of NCT of Delhi), (2012) 9 SCC 408, reinforcing the importance of fair trial rights under Article 21.
104. State of Punjab v. Davinder Pal Singh Bhullar, (2011) 14 SCC 770, discussing voluntariness and safeguards against coercion in criminal process.
105. National Legal Services Authority (NALSA) Reports on Access to Justice, highlighting victim participation in criminal proceedings.
106. United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), *Handbook on Restorative Justice Programmes*, 2020 edition, discussing victim-centric justice models.
107. Babu v. State of Kerala, (2010) 9 SCC 189, regarding judicial responsibility in ensuring fair sentencing and procedural compliance.
108. Satish Mehra v. Delhi Administration, (1996) 9 SCC 766, discussing early termination of criminal proceedings where evidence is insufficient.
109. Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, provisions relating to judicial supervision in plea bargaining proceedings.
110. Sheonandan Paswan v. State of Bihar, (1987) 1 SCC 288, emphasising the importance of judicial fairness and supervision in criminal proceedings.
111. D.K. Basu v. State of West Bengal, (1997) 1 SCC 416, laying down safeguards against coercion and custodial abuse.
112. Law Commission of India, *154th Report on the Code of Criminal Procedure*, 1996,

discussing need for formal plea bargaining.
113. Murlidhar Meghraj Loya v. State of Maharashtra, (1976) 3 SCC 684.
114. Kasambhai Abdulrehmanbhai Sheikh v. State of Gujarat, (1980) 3 SCC 120.
115. State of Uttar Pradesh v. Chandrika, (1999) 8 SCC 638.
116. Malimath Committee Report, 2003, recommending structured adoption of plea bargaining in India.
117. Rattan Singh v. State of Punjab, (1979) 4 SCC 719, emphasising that criminal convictions must rest on legal evidence.
118. Hussainara Khatoon v. State of Bihar, (1979) 3 SCC 532, recognising right to speedy trial under Article 21.
119. Satya Narain Sharma v. State of Rajasthan, (2001) 8 SCC 607, reinforcing judicial responsibility in ensuring fair sentencing and procedure.
120. Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, provisions emphasizing judicial supervision in plea bargaining proceedings.
121. Zahira Habibullah Sheikh v. State of Gujarat, (2006) 3 SCC 374, highlighting the judiciary's duty to ensure fair trial and prevent miscarriage of justice.
122. Selvi v. State of Karnataka, (2010) 7 SCC 263, recognising protection against involuntary confessions under Article 20(3) and Article 21.
123. R. Dinesh Kumar v. State, (2015) 14 SCC 366, discussing judicial responsibility in ensuring voluntariness in criminal admissions.
124. State (NCT of Delhi) v. Navjot Sandhu, (2005) 11 SCC 600, emphasising judicial scrutiny of evidentiary and procedural fairness.
125. Mallikarjun Kodagali v. State of Karnataka, (2018) 14 SCC 6, reinforcing victim rights and participation in criminal justice system.
126. P. Ramachandra Rao v. State of Karnataka, (2002) 4 SCC 578, relating to balancing speedy trial with fair trial requirements.
127. European Court of Human Rights, *Natsvlishvili and Togonidze v. Georgia* (2014), recognising judicial safeguards in plea bargaining systems.
128. Joginder Kumar v. State of Uttar Pradesh, (1994) 4 SCC 260, addressing concerns of custodial pressure and misuse of police authority.
129. DK Basu v. State of West Bengal, (1997) 1 SCC 416, laying down safeguards against coercion and informal pressure in criminal justice processes.
130. United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), *Handbook on Criminal Justice Reform*, 2019, discussing victim participation challenges in plea bargaining systems.
131. Malimath Committee Report, 2003, Reforms of Criminal Justice System, recommending structured adoption of plea bargaining in India.
132. Law Commission of India, 142nd Report on Concessional Treatment for Offenders who plead guilty, 1991, discussing global relevance of plea bargaining mechanisms.
133. Black's Law Dictionary, definition of "plea bargaining" as negotiated criminal case resolution between prosecution and accused.
134. Brady v. United States, 397 U.S. 742 (1970), recognising constitutional validity of voluntary guilty pleas in the
135. U.S. system.

136. European Court of Human Rights, *Natsvlishvili and Togonidze v. Georgia* (2014), discussing fairness standards in negotiated criminal procedures.
137. Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, provisions introducing structured plea bargaining framework in India.
138. United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), *Handbook on Criminal Justice Reform*, 2019, analysing global adoption of plea bargaining models.
139. Constitution of India, Article 21, guaranteeing fair, just, and reasonable procedure in criminal justice system.
140. Brady v. United States, 397 U.S. 742 (1970), recognising the constitutional validity of voluntary and informed guilty pleas.
141. Santobello v. New York, 404 U.S. 257 (1971), affirming the enforceability of plea agreements in the U.S. criminal justice system.
142. United States Sentencing Commission, *Guidelines Manual*, explaining sentencing practices influenced by plea negotiations.
143. Fisher, G., *Plea Bargaining's Triumph*, Stanford University Press, 2003, analysing dominance of plea bargaining in U.S. system.
144. Alschuler, A., "The Trial Judge's Role in Plea Bargaining," University of Chicago Law Review, 1976, discussing limited judicial involvement.
145. Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS), U.S. Department of Justice, reports indicating over 90% conviction resolution through guilty pleas.
146. Lafler v. Cooper, 566 U.S. 156 (2012), addressing fairness and constitutional safeguards in plea bargaining process.
147. Missouri v. Frye, 566 U.S. 134 (2012), recognising right to effective assistance of counsel in plea negotiations.
148. R v. Goodyear [2005] EWCA Crim 888, establishing guidelines on sentence indication hearings in England and Wales.
149. Attorney General's Reference (No. 43 of 2003) [2004] EWCA Crim 287, clarifying judicial sentencing discretion in plea cases.
150. Crown Prosecution Service (CPS), *The Code for Crown Prosecutors*, 2018, outlining prosecution decision-making principles.
151. Sentencing Council (UK), *General Guideline: Reduction in Sentence for a Guilty Plea*, 2017.
152. R v. Turner [1970] 2 QB 321, addressing judicial independence in sentencing decisions.
153. R v. Billingham [1979] QB 842, discussing limits of plea negotiations and judicial control.
154. European Court of Human Rights, *Natsvlishvili and Togonidze v. Georgia* (2014), reinforcing safeguards in negotiated guilty pleas.
155. Ashworth, A., *Sentencing and Criminal Justice*, Cambridge University Press, 2015, analysing UK plea practices and judicial control.
156. German Code of Criminal Procedure (StPO), Section 257c, governing consensual agreements in criminal proceedings.
157. Federal Constitutional Court of Germany (Bundesverfassungsgericht), Judgment of 19 March 2013, confirming constitutional limits on plea agreements.
158. European Court of Human Rights, *Natsvlishvili and Togonidze v. Georgia* (2014), discussing safeguards in negotiated criminal justice systems.

159. Thomas Weigend, "Abbreviated Criminal Procedure in Germany," University of Cologne Publications, analysing Verständigung system.
160. French Code of Criminal Procedure, Articles 495-7 to 495-16, governing CRPC procedure.
161. Commission on Criminal Justice Reform (France), 2009 Report on simplified criminal procedures and plea-based mechanisms.
162. Mireille Delmas-Marty, *Comparative Criminal Law Systems*, Oxford University Press, discussing civil law
163. United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), Comparative Analysis of Plea Bargaining Systems, 2020.
164. Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, Chapter XXI-A (Plea Bargaining provisions continuation from CrPC framework).
165. Law Commission of India, 142nd Report on Concessional Treatment for Offenders Who Plead Guilty without Bargaining (1991).
166. Malimath Committee on Criminal Justice Reforms, Report of the Committee on Reforms of Criminal Justice System (2003).
167. Constitution of India, art. 21.
168. *State of Gujarat v. Natwar Harchandji Thakor*, (2005) 1 SCC 495 (recognising legitimacy of plea bargaining).
169. *Murlidhar Meghraj Loya v. State of Maharashtra*, (1976) 3 SCC 684 (importance of voluntary confession and fairness in criminal procedure).
170. Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, Ch. XXI-A (provisions relating to plea bargaining and mutually satisfactory disposition).
171. Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (repealed), ss. 265A–265L (earlier statutory framework continued in BNSS).
172. Law Commission of India, *142nd Report on Concessional Treatment for Offenders Who Plead Guilty without Bargaining* (1991).
173. Law Commission of India, *154th Report on the Code of Criminal Procedure* (1996).
174. Committee on Reforms of Criminal Justice System (Malimath Committee), *Report* (2003).
175. *State of Gujarat v. Natwar Harchandji Thakor*, (2005) 1 SCC 495 (recognising legality and objectives of plea bargaining).
176. Bibas, Stephanos, "Plea Bargaining Outside the Shadow of Trial", 117 Harvard Law Review 2463 (2004).
177. *Brady v. United States*, 397 U.S. 742 (1970).
178. *Missouri v. Frye*, 566 U.S. 134 (2012).
179. *Natsvlishvili and Togonidze v. Georgia*, App. No. 9043/05, European Court of Human Rights (2014).
180. *State of Gujarat v. Natwar Harchandji Thakor*, (2005) 1 SCC 495.
181. Hussainara Khatoon v. State of Bihar, (1980) 1 SCC 81.
182. *Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India*, (1978) 1 SCC 248.
183. Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (Act 46 of 2023).
184. Criminal Law (Amendment) Act, 2005 introducing Chapter XXI-A in the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973.
185. National Crime Records Bureau, *Prison Statistics India 2022* (Ministry of Home Affairs).

186. Madhava Menon, *Criminal Justice System in India: Challenges and Reforms* (LexisNexis, 2007).
187. Arghya Sengupta & Alok Prasanna Kumar, "Delay and Backlog in the Indian Judiciary", Vidhi Centre for Legal Policy (2018).
188. Andrew Ashworth, "The Decline of the Trial and the Rise of Plea Bargaining", Criminal Law Review (2006).
189. Article 21, Constitution of India (right to life and personal liberty).
190. Committee on Draft National Policy on Criminal Justice, Report (Ministry of Home Affairs, 2007).
191. *Kadra Pahadiya v. State of Bihar*, (1981) 3 SCC 671.
192. *A.R. Antulay v. R.S. Nayak*, (1992) 1 SCC 225.
193. P. Ramachandra Rao v. State of Karnataka, (2002) 4 SCC 578.
194. Ankush Shivaji Gaikwad v. State of Maharashtra, (2013) 6 SCC 770.
195. Law Commission of India, *268th Report on Amendments to Criminal Procedure Code – Bail Reforms* (2017).
196. *Bordenkircher v. Hayes*, 434 U.S. 357 (1978).
197. *Salem Advocate Bar Association v. Union of India*, (2005) 6 SCC 344.
198. *State of Punjab v. Davinder Pal Singh Bhullar*, (2011) 14 SCC 770.
199. *Zahira Habibullah Sheikh v. State of Gujarat*, (2004) 4 SCC 158.
200. Article 14, Constitution of India (equality before law and fair procedure).
201. *Narendra Singh v. State of Madhya Pradesh*, (2004) 10 SCC 699.
202. Article 20(3), Constitution of India (protection against self-incrimination).
203. International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, 1966, art. 14 (fair trial guarantees).
204. State of Gujarat v. Natwar Harchandji Thakor, (2005) 3 SCC 195.
205. Hussainara Khatoon v. State of Bihar, AIR 1979 SC 1369.
206. Murlidhar Meghraj Loya v. State of Maharashtra, (1976) 3 SCC 684.
207. Ankush Shivaji Gaikwad v. State of Maharashtra, (2013) 6 SCC 770.
208. Inhuman Conditions in 1382 Prisons, In Re, (2016) 3 SCC 700.
209. Nathu Singh v. State of Uttar Pradesh, AIR 1956 SC 56.
210. Mohd. Ajmal Amir Kasab v. State of Maharashtra, (2012) 9 SCC 1.
211. State of Punjab v. Davinder Pal Singh Bhullar, (2011) 14 SCC 770.
212. Kartar Singh v. State of Punjab, (1994) 3 SCC 569.
213. Selvi v. State of Karnataka, (2010) 7 SCC 263.
214. Manubhai Pragaji Vashi v. State of Maharashtra, (1995) 5 SCC 730.
215. All India Judges' Association v. Union of India, (2002) 4 SCC 247.
216. Khatri (II) v. State of Bihar, (1981) 1 SCC 627.
217. Zahira Habibullah Sheikh v. State of Gujarat, (2004) 4 SCC 158.
218. Arnesh Kumar v. State of Bihar, (2014) 8 SCC 273.