

**INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR
DISPUTE RESOLUTION**

ISSN NO.: 2583-8989

**RESOLUTION IS
JUSTICE!**

VOLUME 2 ISSUE 1

**SPEED, COST AND SIMPLICITY: ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE
RESOLUTION (ADR) AS THE BACKBONE OF THE INCLUSIVE
JUSTICE SYSTEMS**

J. Asfar Ibrahim¹

ABSTRACT:

Access to justice remains an ongoing challenge across legal systems due to delays, high litigation costs, procedural complexity, and overburdened courts. In this context, Alternative Dispute Resolution (hereinafter ADR) has emerged as a transformative mechanism capable of addressing these systemic inefficiencies. This paper examines how the core principles of speed, cost effectiveness, and procedural simplicity position ADR as the backbone of inclusive justice systems in both developing and developed jurisdictions. The study analyses various ADR mechanisms such as arbitration, mediation, conciliation, and online dispute resolution and evaluates their role in enhancing accessibility, particularly for marginalized and economically weaker sections of society. By reducing procedural formalism and encouraging party autonomy, ADR promotes timely and affordable dispute resolution while preserving fairness and confidentiality. This paper also explores India's evolving ADR framework, including recent legislative and judicial initiatives, and situates it within a comparative international perspective. Furthermore, the paper highlights the growing integration of technology in ADR processes, such as virtual hearings and digital platforms, which further strengthen inclusivity by overcoming geographical and infrastructural barriers. However, it also critically examines challenges such as power imbalances, lack of awareness, enforceability concerns, and ethical implications in technology driven ADR. The paper concludes that while ADR is not a replacement for formal adjudication, it is an indispensable complement to traditional justice delivery systems. By embedding speed, cost efficiency, and simplicity into dispute resolution, ADR has the potential to democratize justice and serve as a sustainable solution for achieving inclusive and effective access to justice in the modern legal landscape.

¹ The author is a LLM student at School of Law, Joy University, Vadakangulam Tirunelveli, TamilNadu.

Keywords: Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR), Access to Justice, Arbitration, Mediation, Online Dispute Resolution (ODR), Legal Technology, Inclusive Justice.

INTRODUCTION

Access to legal remedies is one of the essential principles of the supremacy of law and a major feature of democratic governance. Nevertheless, traditional court, based justice delivery systems everywhere are increasingly incapable of meeting the needs of modern societies. Judicial delays, soaring litigation expenses, procedural formalism, and infrastructural constraints have in combination reduced the public trust in formal adjudication. In India alone, millions of cases are pending at different levels of courts, resulting in justice being delayed and frequently denied². In such a situation, ADR has become a realistic and people, oriented solution to the crisis of conventional justice systems. ADR methods mainly focus on consensual resolution, party autonomy, flexibility, and time, effectiveness. By inter alia providing speed, low expense, and procedural simplicity, ADR is essential in connecting the justice gap and thus putting dispute resolution within the reach of the different societal groups. This article maintains that ADR is not just a substitute for litigation but rather constitutes the core of inclusive justice systems. The paper, through a doctrinal and analytical method covers the gradual changes, extent, and the effectiveness of ADR in promoting access to justice with a special emphasis on India and international comparative practices.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK: ACCESS TO JUSTICE AND ADR

Access to justice is an essential component of the rule of law and is the condition without which realization of legal rights would not be effective. In the past, access to justice was created in a very limited manner, namely as the possibility of the recourse to a court and other formal adjudicatory bodies. Nevertheless, the restrictive notion has turned out to be insufficient in solving issues arising from the complex nature of societies of our time, where systemic delays, high costs, procedural rigidity, and unequal power relations are frequently encountered, thus, these factors tend to limit the possibility of access to legal remedies in a substantial way. Furthermore, Cappelletti and Garth define access to justice as the

²Law Comm'n of India, 245th Report on Arrears and Backlog: Creating Additional Judicial (Wo)man power (2014).

ability of people to invoke and acquire suitable reliefs not only from formal but also from informal institutions and, at the same time, be in agreement with the tenets of fairness and human rights³. The wider meaning of the term changes the focus from mere institutional access to the quality, efficiency, and effectiveness of justice delivery. Thus, according to this advanced approach, contemporary justice systems ought to be evaluated regarding their capacity to offer legal remedies that are timely, affordable, accessible, and user, friendly, especially towards the vulnerable groups of society.

Justice delayed or made inaccessible due to economic or procedural barriers weakens public trust in legal institutions and, as a result, the most marginalized and vulnerable groups of society are affected disproportionately⁴. For this reason, access to justice has to be seen as a holistic concept, which includes procedural fairness, participation in decision, making, and equity in outcomes. ADR mechanisms are very close to this redefined concept of access to justice. In contrast to traditional adversarial litigation, which is often focused on legal technicalities and winner, takes, all outcomes, ADR is based on cooperation, dialogue, and problem, solving⁵. Arbitration, mediation, conciliation, and negotiation are processes that provide great flexibility to the parties as they can not only decide the outcome but also the procedure. This aspect of party autonomy elevates procedural justice since it helps to establish transparency, dignity, and respect for one another⁶. Besides that, ADR mechanisms lessen procedural formalism and move parties towards interest, based solutions instead of adjudication based strictly on rights. Through focusing on consensual resolution, ADR yields sustainable outcomes that retain the relations and, thus, limit the number of future disputes⁷. The flexibility of ADR also enables it to reflect the cultural, social, and economic aspects of the given situation thus, it is especially effective in pluralistic societies. Therefore, ADR within the conceptual framework of access to justice is not simply a substitute for litigation but a device that reinforces justice

³Mauro Cappelletti & Bryant G. Garth, *Access to Justice: The Worldwide Movement to Make Rights Effective* (Sijthoff&Noordhoff 1978).

⁴U.N. Dev. Programme, *Access to Justice: Practice Note* (2004).

⁵*Law Comm'n of India*, 129th Report on Urban Litigation—Mediation as an Alternative to Adjudication (1988).

⁶Arbitration and Conciliation Act, No. 26 of 1996, sec.19 (India).
Mediation Act, No. 32 of 2023 (India).

⁷Carrie Menkel-Meadow, *Mediation and Its Applications for Good Decision Making* (2001).

delivery. By combining efficiency, affordability, and fairness, ADR is completing the justice system⁸.

SPEED AS A PILLAR OF INCLUSIVE JUSTICE.

ADR is largely credited for one of its most impactful advantages, the speed with which conflicts get settled. Restoration through the court is commonly a long process of several stages that involve pleadings, issues being framed, witness examinations, arguing, and appeals. Adjourments and procedural delays are frequent occurrences thus extending cases over many years. Thus, justice becomes slow and inefficient, thereby depriving the public of trust in the judicial system. ADR mechanisms are operating within flexible procedural frameworks that are aimed at achieving quick and efficient dispute resolution. Unlike courts comparison with courts, ADR forums are not required to adhere to rigorous procedural rules. Due to this adaptability, disputes can be settled in a much shorter time period and the justice of the parties is still maintained. Arbitration is a leading ADR mechanism that focuses on timely resolution. According to the Indian Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, statutory time limits have been put in place so that there will be no unnecessary delays in arbitral proceedings⁹. For example, arbitral awards are required to be delivered within a specified time, thus ensuring efficiency and certainty of the parties involved.

This legal framework is a clear reflection of the legislative intention to position arbitration as a quicker alternative to litigation. However, mediation and conciliation are far more rapid methods since they are voluntary and interest, based processes. Court, annexed mediation centres in India have effectively shown how mediation can settle disputes quickly and thus, save courts from being clogged with cases that drag on for years¹⁰. These processes revitalize the communication between the disputing parties, which is essential as cooperation and practical settlement become possible, hence disputes get resolved within a few weeks or months. The Law Commission of India in its report also considers mediation as an efficient method to tackle the problem of delay and the heavy burden of courts¹¹. The speed of dispute resolution is not just a comfortable feature; it is deeply connected to the very

⁸*Salem Advocate Bar Ass'n v. Union of India*, (2005) 6 S.C.C. 344 (India).

⁹Arbitration and Conciliation Act, No. 26 of 1996, sec. 29A (India).

¹⁰*Salem Advocate Bar Ass'n v. Union of India*, (2005) 6 S.C.C. 344 (India).

¹¹*Law Comm'n of India*, 129th Report on Urban Litigation—Mediation as Alternative to Adjudication (1988).

idea of justice. Justice delayed is very often justice denied, especially for the economically weaker sections of the society. People with limited financial means simply cannot afford the kind of litigation which lasts for years, requires multiple court appearances, and is accompanied by high legal expenses. The delay only strengthens the side of the more powerful parties who have the luxury of prolonging disputes. The timely resolution of disputes is, therefore, essential to protect substantive equality, that is real and practical equality, rather than formal equality. Accordingly, ADR is a strong instrument for the advancement of inclusive justice as it contributes to the substantial alleviation of the delays. It allows for quicker relief, reduces the suffering, and ensures that justice is available to all, regardless of their economic or social background. Hence, speed is a key factor of an inclusive and efficient justice system.

COST, EFFECTIVENESS AND ECONOMIC ACCESSIBILITY

One of the most significant factors limiting access to justice in traditional court systems is the high cost of litigation. Litigation is financially demanding in various ways, including court fees, ¹²lawyer fees, charges for documentation, transportation costs, and repeated visits to the court. In addition, parties often lose time and income while attending the lengthy proceedings. All these factors together make litigation extremely expensive, especially for the economically weaker sections of society, small businesses, workers, and rural communities. When justice becomes so costly, it is nearly impossible for people to access it, thus undermining the entire concept of a justice system.

In such a scenario, ADR becomes a crucial element that provides a cost, effective solution to disputes. The ADR processes are intended to be simpler, less formal, and faster as compared to regular court procedures. Since ADR mechanisms do not have to go through a lengthy hearing or multiple procedural stages, the total expenditure is substantially less. Lower court visits, shorter duration, and simplified procedures reduce the cost of resolving disputes naturally.

Mediation is often singled out as the cheapest method of dispute resolution among the different mechanisms of ADR. Hence, mediation includes a neutral third party (called a mediator). The Indian court, the mediation centres attached to the courts, and community

¹²*Law Comm'n of India*, 129th Report on Urban Litigation—Mediation as Alternative to Adjudication (1988).

mediation programmes have therefore established a mode of accessible dispute resolution that is especially effective in family disputes, labour conflicts, neighbourhood issues, and consumer grievances. Such institutions mostly function on a free of cost basis or with a very low fee, thus making justice accessible to all. On the other hand, Arbitration although at times more costly than mediation, is still financially advantageous in commercial disputes because it shortens the litigation expenses and provides certainty. The Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 intends to guide the arbitration practice in such a way that it will be efficient and as short as possible which in turn, leads to time, bound proceedings and also guarantees that the procedure is economically viable¹³. A quicker settlement would mean a lighter financial burden on the parties as opposed to years of courtroom litigation. From a wider economic standpoint, ADR does not only benefit the individuals but also the justice system and the State. When disputes get resolved through ADR, the number of cases in courts decreases hence, judges get to focus on serious and complex matters. This situation helps the government to have a saving on judicial expenditure. Consequently, it advances the overall efficiency of the justice delivery system¹⁴. ADR, in effect, not only improves individual access to justice but also enhances institutional efficiency. Fairness and equality are at the core of cost, effectiveness, which is not just a financial advantage. When justice is affordable, marginalized individuals and weaker economic groups are real beneficiaries of the system¹⁵. Affordable justice is a measure that prevents powerful parties from using financial resources to delay or dominate disputes. Hence, economic accessibility is a way to ensure that justice is not only for those who can afford it but is available to everyone. So, ADR is a significant instrument in the formation of an inclusive justice system as it provides low, cost efficient, and accessible dispute resolution mechanisms. By lessening financial obstacles and economic burdens, ADR reinforces the principle of justice being attainable, practical, and fair to all members of society.

PROCEDURAL SIMPLICITY AND PARTY AUTONOMY

The procedural simplicity of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) is another great point of its arsenal, which makes justice more accessible, less intimidating, and easier to participate in. Procedures of a traditional court are regulated by rules of evidence, legal

¹³ Arbitration and Conciliation Act, No. 26 of 1996, s. 29A (India).

¹⁴ *Salem Advocate Bar Ass'n v. Union of India*, (2005) 6 S.C.C. 344 (India).

¹⁵ U.N. Dev. Programme, *Access to Justice: Practice Note* (2004).

formalities, and the practices of the courtroom which are of a strict and rigid nature. These procedures, on the one hand, serve the function of judicial discipline, on the other, they tend to become incomprehensible for ordinary people. As a consequence, many individuals get a feeling of estrangement from the system of justice. ADR, on the other hand, aims at being simple, flexible, and user, friendly.

Procedural simplicity implies that the steps of ADR are not bound by detailed technical rules as in a court case. The focus here is much more on the substance than on the form. Hearings are informal, there is limited documentation, and the process is generally conversational rather than adversarial. This informality, also, among other things, produces a relaxed atmosphere, which is the reason why parties have the chance to openly vocalize their problems, their expectations, and even their interests. It also helps alleviate psychological stress, particularly in certain kinds of conflicts, e. g., family disputes, labour matters, and community issues¹⁶.

The principle of party autonomy, which is closely associated with procedural simplicity, is the central point of ADR. Party autonomy denotes that the disputing parties have the opportunity to decide the major aspects of the dispute resolution process. They can, for instance, select the forum, the neutral third party (such as an arbitrator or mediator), the location of the proceedings, language and even the rules or laws applicable¹⁷. While courts have predetermined processes that parties have to follow, ADR gives the feeling of possession and power to individuals.

Party autonomy is even more significant in mediation and conciliation as the parties directly engage in determining the outcome. Negotiated arbitration is a method of conflict resolution in which parties to a dispute work out a solution that satisfies both of them, instead of a judge imposing a decision on them. This method brings about more cooperation, less hostility, and a higher degree of satisfaction with the final agreement¹⁸. It is also in line with restorative justice, which gives equal importance to relationships and harmony besides legal rights. Procedural simplicity and party autonomy also enhance fairness and inclusiveness. When the procedures are simple, individuals without legal knowledge can also

¹⁶U.N. Dev. Programme, *Access to Justice: Practice Note* 5–7 (2004).

¹⁷Arbitration and Conciliation Act, No. 26 of 1996, sec. 19 (India).

¹⁸Carrie Menkel-Meadow, *Negotiation and Mediation: From Conflict to Consensus* (2001).

understand the process. This lessens the reliance on lawyers and the costs of legal proceedings. It has also the effect of empowering marginalized communities, women, workers, and small litigants to seek justice confidently. Simple procedures facilitate transparency as parties have a clear understanding of what is happening at each stage. The Supreme Court of India has, in numerous instances, stressed the significance of ADR in making justice accessible by reducing formalism and promoting consensual processes¹⁹. ADR is also recognized globally as a flexible justice tool that can accommodate different social, cultural, and economic contexts. Consequently, procedural simplicity and party autonomy conjointly make ADR not only efficient but also democratic and inclusive.

ADR MECHANISMS AND THEIR ROLE IN INCLUSIVE JUSTICE

ADR covers different mechanisms that were created to handle varied types of disputes more flexibly and effectively. These mechanisms are arbitration, mediation, conciliation, negotiation, and online dispute resolution (ODR). Individually and collectively, they play a significant role in strengthening the system of inclusive justice by offering accessible, efficient, and people, friendly ways of resolving conflicts.

Arbitration

One of the most extensively recognized ADR mechanisms is arbitration, particularly in commercial and business disputes. It is a process where a dispute is referred to a neutral third party, an arbitrator, who after hearing both sides issues a legally binding decision called an "award." The main reasons for the popularity of arbitration are that it is faster than litigation, confidential, and offers procedural flexibility. The Arbitration and Conciliation Act 1996 India is a well, structured legal framework for arbitration and provides for the enforceability of awards²⁰. To a large extent, time limits have been set to prevent unnecessary delays, thus efficiency is more. On the other hand, in some situations, arbitration may be expensive due to the complexities of the case, hence it is better in high value disputes than in small individual disputes. Nevertheless, it is still very important in the alleviation of court congestion and the enhancement of business confidence.

¹⁹ *Salem Advocate Bar Ass'n v. Union of India*, (2005) 6 S.C.C. 344 (India).

²⁰ Arbitration and Conciliation Act, No. 26 of 1996 (India).

Mediation

Mediation is definitely one of the most humane and people, oriented methods of ADR. A neutral mediator facilitates communication between the parties, helps them understand each other's viewpoints, and finally, reach a solution that is acceptable to all parties. Mediation is a voluntary procedure, flexible, informal, and confidential. By no means does mediation aim at imposing a decision; instead, it gives power to the parties to devise the solution themselves. Therefore, mediation is particularly appropriate in family disputes, labour conflicts, community disagreements, and consumer disputes. Court, annexed mediation centres in India have been able to resolve thousands of cases at low cost successfully. The Mediation Act, 2023 has gone beyond that by providing more robust support to the institutional framework for mediation and, thus, encouraging a culture of dialogue and settlement²¹.

Conciliation

Conciliation resembles mediation a lot except for the fact that the conciliator takes a slightly more proactive role by suggesting possible solutions. It is of utmost importance in industrial and employment disputes where the objective is to keep the relationships going. Conciliation is an informal, cooperative, and less confrontational process than litigation. One of the most prominent and commonly referred to is arbitration. It is a process whereby a neutral third party called an arbitrator who studies the facts of the case and renders a decision termed as an award may be legally binding. The reason why arbitration is so largely embraced is mainly because it takes less time than litigation, maintains privacy, and grants considerable latitude as to the procedures to be adopted. The Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 in India lays down comprehensive provisions concerning arbitration and ensures the implementation of awards.

Negotiation

Negotiation is the most straightforward type of ADR in which the parties involved talk directly to each other, either with or without the help of a lawyer, to find a solution. It is a flexible, free, and party, driven process. Besides negotiation fosters autonomy, problem,

²¹Mediation Act, No. 32 of 2023 (India).

solving, and voluntary participation, it can be used for resolving conflicts at the personal, business, or community level.

Online Dispute Resolution (ODR)

Technology has given a new dimension to ADR through Online Dispute Resolution in recent years. ODR employs digital platforms to perform mediation, arbitration, and negotiation remotely. It is a great help to parties, e. g., those living in remote or rural areas, who hardly can access a physical forum. During the COVID, 19 pandemic ODR was indispensable in keeping justice systems operating²². ODR eliminates the need for travel, time efficient, and equalizes access, thus, it is a powerful tool for inclusive justice in the digital age. Nevertheless, concerns such as digital divide, data privacy, and technological literacy still need to be addressed. Hence, ADR is not merely an alternative; it is a necessary partner to the formal justice system that facilitates the creation of a more equitable, accessible, and humanized legal framework.

TECHNOLOGY, ETHICS, AND CHALLENGES.

The ADR has been largely influenced by technology and globalization. Technology has moved beyond just being a tool to support the process; it is now an essential part of dispute resolution. Online Dispute Resolution (ODR), virtual hearings, AI, assisted platforms, e, filing, and digital documentation have been integrated into ADR processes, making them efficient, accessible, and inclusive. Nevertheless, several ethical and structural challenges, responsibility arise with technology that needs to be resolved to maintain fairness and trust.

Technology Integration in ADR

The most groundbreaking invention in the past few years has been the broadening of Online Dispute Resolution. ODR platforms allow mediation, arbitration, and negotiation to occur through video conferencing, digital evidence submission, and online communication tools. This has been instrumental in resolving issues in areas such as commercial disputes, consumer complaints, small value claims, cross border matters, and disputes involving parties

²²Richard Susskind, *Online Courts and the Future of Justice* (Oxford Univ. Press 2019).

living in different locations²³. Virtual hearings are time saving and cost less than traveling since participants from rural and remote areas can also avail of the service without the need to physically go to the respective location. The Indian judiciary and arbitration institutions resorted largely to virtual proceedings during the COVID19 pandemic, thereby demonstrating that technology can be instrumental in justice delivery even during crises²⁴. Artificial Intelligence tools are being tried worldwide to assist in document review, case management, data analytics, and drafting in ADR. Such innovations imply that technology can be a vehicle for Justice to reach more people and thus make dispute resolution better and more inclusive.

Ethical Dimensions in Technology, Driven ADR

On the other hand, the same technologies that strengthen ADR also raise a host of ethical concerns. The issue of confidentiality and data security is at the centre of who these are. ADR depends greatly on trust and the parties have to believe that their personal and commercial information will be kept confidential. Cybersecurity threats, hacking risks, and unauthorized data sharing can, therefore, cause ADR platforms to lose their trustworthiness²⁵. Hence, it is necessary to have robust data protection laws and a secure digital infrastructure in place.

Fairness and neutrality are two of the main ethical issues that have to do with the use of AI as well. If AI were to be used, chances are that the processes would be subjected to algorithmic bias and that the decision making would be lacking in transparency. Besides that, the gap in access to technology may lead to the parties from economically weaker or rural areas being disadvantaged which in turn, can be termed as a digital divide. Ethical ADR must guarantee that there are equal opportunities for all participants and that the most vulnerable are not exploited or unfairly influenced. The ethics of the neutral (mediator, conciliator, or arbitrator) also include ethical considerations. They must be impartial, avoid situations of conflict, respect confidentiality, and ensure consent of the parties. Professional training and ethical codes are therefore necessary to ensure the ethics of the ADR.

²³U.N. Comm'n on Int'l Trade Law, *Technical Notes on Online Dispute Resolution* (2016).

²⁴*In re Guidelines for Court Functioning Through Video Conferencing*, Suo Motu Writ (C) No. 5 of 2020, (2020) SCC Online SC 343 (India).

²⁵Richard Susskind, *Online Courts and the Future of Justice* (Oxford Univ. Press 2019).

Structural and Practical Challenges

ADR still faces structural challenges despite its benefits. Knowledge of ADR is still very low among common people, especially in rural areas. Many people still think that justice can only be achieved through the courts. The shortage of trained mediators and arbitrators as well as the lack of institutional support are factors limiting the full potential of ADR in some areas.

There is also the issue of the enforceability of the settlements and awards. Even if acts such as the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 and the Mediation Act, 2023 provide legal support, enforcement is sometimes delayed due to intervention of courts or procedural loopholes. In addition, power imbalances between parties such as in labour or consumer disputes may influence the voluntariness of consent and fairness of the settlements.

Lastly, although ADR encourages informality, there is always a need to strike a balance between flexibility and accountability. If it is not properly regulated, there might be risks of misuse, lack of professionalism, or inconsistency in quality of ADR results.

Balancing Progress with Responsibility

Technological advancements in ADR must be accompanied by solid ethics, sound laws, proper training, and public information if they are to become the basis of inclusive justice. The executive, the judiciary schools, and lawyers have to collaborate in order to foster confidence in the trustworthiness of ADR tools. A joint effort of technology and morality, and a judicious implementation, can indeed make ADR a strong vehicle for delivering justice that is easy to access, just, and human rightsbased.

ADR AS A COMPLEMENTARY MECHANISM

Although ADR has become a strong instrument for providing quick, inexpensive, and peoplefriendly justice, it is still necessary to acknowledge that ADR is not intended to substitute the traditional court system. Rather, ADR is a complementary tool that collaborates with the formal courts to enhance the overall justice delivery framework. Courts still hold the position of being the ultimate protectors of law, constitutional rights, and rule of law. Nevertheless, ADR helps courts by lessening their load and by providing flexible procedures for conflicts that do not have to be decided by a strict judicial intervention.

There are certain disputes, for example, criminal offences that involve moral wrongdoing, constitutional matters, cases of public interest, and issues that require authoritative interpretation of law, which cannot be solved through ADR. They need judicial determination in order to ensure societal order, precedent, and the protection of fundamental rights. Hence, ADR is not appropriate for cases that involve serious violations of law, disputes that necessitate punishment, or situations in which the broader public interest is engaged.

Nevertheless, ADR substantially empowers the courts by means of prompt handling of those disputes which could be resolved amicably through mutual consent such as commercial disputes, family issues, labour conflicts, consumer inconveniences, and community disputes. Court, annexed mediation, Lok Adalats and institutional arbitration are examples of how ADR can closely collaborate with the judiciary. By resolving suitable disputes outside the court, ADR lessens the backlog, saves judicial time, and allows courts to concentrate on serious and complex matters. In addition, the judiciary and ADR are not operating in competition; rather, they support each other. Courts frequently send cases to mediation or arbitration, oversee the implementation of awards and settlements, and intervene as a safety net in case of ADR failure. Such a healthy integration increases public trust and strengthens access to justice.

Hence, ADR should be seen as a necessary supplement to the justice system giving more options to disputing parties, facilitating the flow of work, and making justice accessible to all while courts still carry out their central constitutional role. Together, they form a justice system that is balanced, responsive and people-oriented.

CONCLUSION

Access to justice remains one of the most important principles of a democratic and rule, based society. Unfortunately, prolonged delays, high litigation costs, procedural rigidity, and overwhelming court congestion have greatly diminished the effectiveness of traditional judicial systems. Against this backdrop, Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) has become a game, changing and feasible instrument that can help deliver justice in an accessible and inclusive way. By focusing on speed, low cost, flexibility, party involvement,

confidentiality, and problem, solving orientation, ADR both the efficiency and the quality of justice.

Judicial systems that are burdened by delays would greatly benefit from the use of alternative dispute resolution (ADR) methods, such as arbitration, mediation, conciliation, negotiation, and Online Dispute Resolution that would substantially reduce pendency and ensure timely outcomes. ADR not only substantially reduces judicial pendency but also ensures timely outcomes. Besides that, ADR presents numerous advantages to economically weaker sections, families, workers, consumers, and small businesses. It is a user, friendly venue where disputes can be resolved without going through years of litigation. Besides that, by avoiding confrontation and encouraging cooperation, ADR preserves relationships, promotes social harmony, and is in line with restorative approaches. Moreover, technological innovations have expanded the reach of ADR through digital platforms and virtual hearings, and thus, the problem of access to justice arises for those living in remote or rural areas who lack the necessary ethical safeguards and digital inclusion. Most importantly, ADR should not be seen as a mere substitute for courts. Certain kinds of disputes, especially those relating to constitutional or criminal issues, or cases that require an authoritative legal determination, should only be handled by courts. Therefore, Courts and ADR function as two complementary partners, where courts are in charge of legality and execution, and ADR is characterized by innovation and flexibility. ADR is capable of becoming a fundamental pillar of justice that is accessible to all, thereby enabling the legal system to be more responsive, fair, and focused on the people.