



A Critical Examination Of Justice Negotiation: Alternative Dispute Resolution In India's Patriarchal Criminal Justice System

¹ SEHANAZ.T, ² JECINTHA BENADICTA.Y ³RISHABHAVARTHINI.E

II nd YEAR LL.M. DEPARTMENT OF
CRIMINAL LAW AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE ADMINISTRATION,
THE CENTRAL LAW COLLEGE, SALEM,

Abstract: This paper calls into question the inclusion of the ADR mechanisms under restorative justice and transformative justice principles within the Indian criminal justice system as one of the pathways toward transformative justice. It argues that ADR runs counter to the retributive state-centered model and promotes a more holistic victim-oriented and reparative approach. It emphasizes the growth of statutory and judicial connotations to mediation and compounding of certain offences under the Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS) and important decisions of the Supreme Court, which intend to ease up the burdened judicial system, weighing in favour of victim empowerment, authentic accountability of the offender, and healing of the community. Besides, the analysis does engage into some serious challenges and limitations, including coercion with power imbalances inherently present (i.e., domestic violence), lack of a cohesive legislative framework, institutional resistance, and cultural bottlenecks. It cautions against the unqualified use of ADR for serious crimes, emphasizing that RJ must be tied with TJ's concern for structural inequalities to be truly transformative. Pragmatic recommendations for reforms into policies, capacity development, and robust safeguards for victims are used as a conclusion, arguing that if done correctly through a comparative international lens, a hybridized use of ADR holds promise to transform the Indian criminal justice system into something more efficient, fair, and oriented toward healing rather than punishment.

Index Terms - Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR), Restorative Justice, Transformative Justice, Indian Criminal Law, Victimology, Judicial Backlog, Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), Mediation.

I. INTRODUCTION

With the unprecedented death of more than 5 crores cases spanning various courts, the Indian judiciary stands ever so heavily burdened, thus killing timely justice¹. Combined with delays on account of an institutional backlog and the adversarial and accusatory nature of traditional criminal proceedings, ADR mechanisms have ignited urgent interest as a means of transformative justice. The integration of ADR, especially restorative and transformative justice models, into Indian criminal law represents a paradigm shift from a purely punitive approach to one that is more holistic and healing-centered. This paper critically analyzes the conceptual basis, legal framework, benefits, challenges, and future considerations of integrating ADR mechanisms into the criminal justice system in India, offering a comprehensive evaluation of their potential to change society's response to harm, conflict, and violation.

¹ 'ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION IN INDIA. EFFECTIVENESS, CHALLENGES, AND THE ROAD AHEAD'
<<https://defactolawjournal.org/papers/alternative-dispute-resolution-in-india-effectiveness-challenges-and-the-road-ahead/>>
accessed 25 August 2025.

While ADR has been historically linked to civil and commercial disputes, its relevance to criminal law represents a deep set change in legal philosophy-an approach that places dialogue, accountability, and reparation "before the stare" of mere punishment². This analysis establishes the fact that when used properly, under due safeguards, restorative pathways may offer redress to certain fundamental shortcomings of the traditional criminal justice system, at the same time endorsing India's constitutional values of justice, dignity, and equality. That said, such integration needs to acknowledge that integration comes with a high price requiring a lot of tough implementation due to adverse power imbalances, resistance at various institutions, and cultural resistance-all major current impediments to the potential of ADR in the criminal domain.³

II.HISTORICAL BACKGROUND:

History is a complex interplay of Indian and colonial legacies that crowning the integration of ADR in the Indian criminal justice system. Traditionally, in many communities in India, there were panchayats and informal localized and consensus-driven mechanisms of dispute resolution, including criminal disputes, emphasizing restoration and healing of relationships rather than on punishment for wrongs. The adversarial system, however, was introduced by the British colonizers and codified in the Indian Penal Code (1860) as well as the Code of Criminal Procedure (1898), such that a state-based, punishment-centric model gave little space to victim-centered or community participation resolutions. An already huge backlog of cases was further amplified during post-independence times, thus denying access to justice for many. ADR was reexamined by Indian lawmakers and the judiciary as a result of this institutional failure and the late 20th century global resurgence of interest in restorative justice models. Early steps included the creation of Lok Adalats and the inclusion of mediation in the CrPC through amendments. The new Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita's (BNSS) more formal recognition of mediation and compounding in criminal cases was made possible by a series of progressive Supreme Court rulings in the 2000s and 2010s, such as *Gian Singh v. State of Punjab*, which sparked the crucial change. In order to address the shortcomings of its inherited colonial legal system past, the current discourse on ADR thus represents a contemporary, organized attempt to recover India's restorative roots.⁴

III. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK: RESTORATIVE JUSTICE, ADR, AND TRANSFORMATIVE JUSTICE:

3.1 OUTLINING IMPORTANT IDEAS

The term "alternative dispute resolution" (ADR) refers to a number of methods for settling conflicts outside of the conventional court system, such as negotiation, arbitration, conciliation, and mediation. ADR emphasizes communication between victims and offenders to address harm and find mutually agreeable solutions, with a focus on restorative outcomes rather than retributive punishment in the criminal context⁵. The fundamental idea is that crime is a violation of relationships and people as well as the state, and that healing is necessary instead of just punishment.

According to the philosophy of restorative justice (RJ), crime is not just about breaking the law but also about harming people and relationships. It places a strong emphasis on repairing harm by involving all parties in inclusive processes, including victims, offenders, community members, and justice officials. RJ procedures usually entail facilitated meetings in which victims share their experiences, offenders take responsibility, and participants work together to decide how to make amends. Recognized as the cornerstone of RJ, the Indigenous paradigm of peacemaking views justice as ingrained in a holistic worldview in which wellbeing and justice are inseparable.

By specifically addressing the systemic injustices and power dynamics that underpin harm and violence, transformative justice (TJ) goes beyond restorative approaches. TJ, which emerged from anti-violence movements in the late 1990s and early 2000s spearheaded by Black women, women of color, and

² Md Imran Wahab IPS, 'Mediation in Criminal Cases: Legal Perspectives | Md. Imran Wahab, IPS Writes | Virtuosity Legal' (7 August 2025) <<https://virtuositylegal.com/mediation-in-criminal-cases-legal-perspectives-md-imran-wahab-ips-writes/>> accessed 25 August 2025.

³ 'Growing Justice - Cameron Rasmussen & Sonya Shah - Inquest' <<https://inquest.org/growing-restorative-transformative-justice/>> accessed 25 August 2025.

⁴ Khurana And Khurana, 'Evolution of Alternate Dispute Resolution: Indian Perspective' (*Khurana And Khurana*, 27 February 2024) <<https://www.khuranaandkhurana.com/2024/02/27/evolution-of-alternate-dispute-resolution-indian-perspective/>> accessed 25 August 2025.

⁵ 'ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION IN INDIA. EFFECTIVENESS, CHALLENGES, AND THE ROAD AHEAD' (n 1).

queer communities, aims to address harm without depending on state institutions (police, prisons), which are perceived as sources of violence themselves. TJ is aware of the connections between structural and interpersonal violence, which calls for solutions that prioritize the needs of marginalized communities while addressing both aspects at the same time.⁶

3.2 PHILOSOPHICAL DIFFERENCES AND SIMILARITIES

Despite their frequent confusion, RJ and TJ have different roots and foci. "RJ gave me the tools and TJ gave me the politics," as one practitioner put it. While TJ offers political analysis that directly challenges state systems and structural oppression, RJ offers relational approaches that are centered on healing, accountability, and community building. While TJ continues to take an abolitionist stance against the carceral systems, RJ has occasionally been criticized for being co-opted by state systems.

At their best, though, both frameworks are dedicated to:

1. Non-punitive reactions to injury that aim for reconciliation and responsibility
2. Community-based strategies as opposed to formalized state oversight
3. Resolving the underlying causes of violence and avoiding its recurrence
4. Putting the needs and opinions of those most harmed first

The integration of both frameworks could result in more robust approaches to justice in India, utilizing TJ's structural analysis to address underlying inequalities and RJ's practical tools for dialogue and facilitation.⁷

IV. INDIAN CRIMINAL LAW'S LEGAL FOUNDATION FOR ADR

4.1 STATUTORY CLAUSES

The main source of India's legal framework for alternative dispute resolution (ADR) in criminal cases is the combination of the offenses provisions found in Section 320 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (CrPC), which are now incorporated into the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS). Through this process, some criminal charges can be resolved amicably between parties with the consent of the court. The framework for compounding makes a distinction between:

1. Compoundable offenses are those that can be committed without a judge's approval, such as adultery and criminal trespass.
2. Non-compoundable offenses are those that need a judge's approval to be compromised, like theft and assault.
3. Serious crimes that cannot be compounded, such as rape or murder, are known as non-compoundable offences.⁸

TABLE: TYPES OF CRIMINAL CASES SUITABLE FOR ADR IN INDIA

SUITABLE FOR ADR	NOT SUITABLE FOR ADR
Matrimonial disputes (cruelty, domestic violence)	Heinous crimes (murder, rape, terrorism)
Cheque bounce under Section 138 NI Act	Crimes against the State
Minor assaults and brawls	Habitual offenders
Criminal intimidation (non-aggravated)	Serious bodily harm
Defamation and trespass	Offences with large-scale public impact

⁶ 'Growing Justice - Cameron Rasmussen & Sonya Shah - Inquest' (n 3).

⁷ *ibid.*

⁸ IPS (n 2).

4.2.JUDICIAL PRECEDENTS

With a number of significant rulings that have radically changed the legal landscape, the Indian judiciary has played a very progressive role in extending the application of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) to criminal matters. With the landmark ruling in **Gian Singh v. State of Punjab (2012)**⁹, the Supreme Court acknowledged the inherent authority of High Courts under Section 482 of the CrPC (now Section 528 of the BNSS) to halt criminal proceedings, including those for non-compoundable offenses, based on a post-settlement compromise between the parties, so long as it served the interests of justice. This marked the beginning of this judicial evolution in earnest. Building on this basis, the Court in **Narinder Singh v. State of Punjab (2014)**¹⁰ established extensive guidelines, instructing High Courts to take into account a wide range of factors when assessing such settlement petitions, including the gravity of the offense, its wider societal impact, and the sincere intentions of the parties. In the case of **K. Srinivas Rao v. D.A. Deepa (2013)**¹¹, the Court specifically called for mediation to be the preferred pre-trial procedure for settling matrimonial disputes, even those involving serious allegations under Section 498A of the IPC (now Section 85 BNS), further solidifying this line of law. In **Dayawati v. Yogesh Kumar Gosain (2017)**¹², the Delhi High Court subsequently issued comprehensive guidelines, firmly supporting court-referred mediation for criminal cases with civil or matrimonial components. When taken as a whole, these cases create a strong legal principle: when a settlement actually advances justice, especially for offenses where the general welfare is unaffected, courts have the authority to both accept mediation results and stop mediation proceedings. The Supreme Court has regularly referred cases to its Mediation and Conciliation Center in order to guarantee the legitimacy of such settlements, frequently requiring monetary deposits as a precaution to confirm the petitioners' sincere intentions.

V.ADVANTAGES OF INCLUDING ADR IN CRIMINAL CASES

5.1 HEALING AND EMPOWERMENT OF VICTIMS

Victims are frequently marginalized in traditional criminal proceedings, reduced to the status of witnesses as the state takes charge of the case. ADR procedures combat this disempowerment by emphasizing the needs, preferences, and experiences of victims. By means of mediated communication, victims benefit:

1. Voice and validation: Chances to communicate needs, worries, and harms to offenders directly
2. Clarity and answers: Recognizing the cause of the offense and answering any unanswered questions
3. Negotiating suitable restitution, community service, or apology as well as material and symbolic reparations
4. Finding emotional closure and healing can help trauma survivors recover.

Compared to traditional court procedures, research shows that victims who take part in restorative processes report higher satisfaction rates and a stronger sense of justice.

5.2 REHABILITATION AND OFFENDER ACCOUNTABILITY

ADR promotes true accountability in contrast to punitive methods, which frequently cause defensiveness, by motivating offenders to:

1. Recognize harm: Have frank conversations about the human costs of their behavior.
2. Accept accountability: Admit wrongdoing voluntarily as opposed to being coerced by adjudication
3. Make amends: Rather than taking punishment passively, actively contribute to making things right.
4. Gain empathy by comprehending the effects on victims' lives, which may help lower recidivism.

⁹ (2012) 10 SCC 303

¹⁰ (2014) 6 SCC 446

¹¹ (2013) 5 SCC 226

¹² (2017) 16 SCC 736

This participatory accountability is consistent with research showing that rehabilitative strategies outperform strictly punitive ones in reducing reoffending.

5.3 ACCESS TO JUSTICE AND SYSTEM EFFICIENCY

Justice delays caused by India's enormous case backlog effectively prevent resolution, especially for underserved communities. ADR procedures have many benefits.

Timely resolution: Rather than taking years, cases are frequently settled in a matter of weeks or months.

Cut costs: Parties pay less and the court spends less.

Decongestion of the docket: Allocating court resources to more complicated cases that need to be decided

Accessibility: Less formal, more intuitive processes that reduce barriers for disadvantaged parties

Millions of cases have been settled by Lok Adalats, according to the National Legal Services Authority (NALSA), proving that ADR can have a significant impact.¹³

VI. CRITICAL OBSTACLES AND RESTRICTIONS IN INCLUDING ADR IN INDIAN CRIMINAL LAW

Although promising, the incorporation of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) into the Indian criminal justice system is beset with serious obstacles and restrictions that jeopardize its effectiveness and morality. The risks arising from power disparities, ingrained institutional and cultural barriers, and the inherent structural limitations of the ADR model itself when applied to criminal cases can all be broadly grouped into these obstacles.

6.1 RISKS OF COERCION AND POWER INEQUALITIES

The possibility of coercing vulnerable parties is arguably the most serious and morally complex issue, especially when it comes to domestic abuse, sexual assault, or crimes where the victim and the perpetrator have a history of unequal power dynamics. This risk is frequently increased by the patriarchal social structure in India, where victims may feel under pressure to accept subpar settlements for reasons other than their own safety and justice. Social and economic dependencies are one way that this pressure shows up, particularly when victims are financially dependent on the offender for housing and food, which calls into question whether they truly consent to a compromise. In addition, patriarchal family and social pressures frequently put "family honor" and flimsy reconciliation ahead of the victim's security and welfare, pressuring them to settle even in extreme situations. The judiciary cautiously acknowledged this dynamic in cases such as **Prabha Tyagi v. Kamlesh Devi (2022)**¹⁴, where the Supreme Court cautioned against automatically dismissing cases under Section 498A IPC (now Section 85 BNS) based only on a compromise. The court emphasized the need to carefully examine the circumstances surrounding the settlement to make sure it is voluntary and not the product of undue pressure or influence. Systemic biases, in which mediators, despite their best efforts, may unintentionally give preference to more powerful or privileged parties, and informational asymmetries, in which parties who are not aware of the law may make poor decisions that jeopardize their rights. Strong safeguards must be put in place to mitigate these risks, but they aren't yet available in a standardized format. In **State of Tamil Nadu v. R. Vasanthi Stanley (2015)**¹⁵, the Supreme Court subtly emphasized this necessity by requiring judicial review of compromises, emphasizing that some crimes are too horrible to be resolved privately. Therefore, mandatory independent legal advice for victims, victim advocates present at all times, and strict judicial oversight to confirm the fairness and voluntariness of any agreement prior to quashment are all necessary protective measures.

¹³ IPS (n 2).

¹⁴ (2022) 10 SCC 469

¹⁵ (2015) 3 SCC 226

6.2 CULTURAL AND INSTITUTIONAL BARRIERS

ADR's successful integration into India's criminal justice system is hampered by significant institutional and cultural barriers in addition to interpersonal dynamics. The lack of a thorough legal framework is one of the main challenges. Criminal mediation, in contrast to civil mediation, is not specifically governed by a statute, which results in procedural ambiguity, uneven application across jurisdictions, and uncertainty regarding the enforceability of agreements. All parties involved are left in the dark by this legal void. This is accompanied by a serious lack of professionalization. There is a serious lack of mediators with the specialized training needed to manage the delicate issues of criminal cases. This training includes knowledge of criminal law, power dynamics in criminal contexts (particularly gender-based violence), and trauma-informed practices. These institutional flaws were specifically brought to light in the **246th Law Commission Report (2014)**, which cited a lack of standardized procedures and insufficient training facilities. This deficiency is made worse by a deeply ingrained adversarial legal culture among judges and attorneys, who frequently see litigation as the most acceptable and default course of action and consider alternative dispute resolution (ADR) to be a lesser or "soft" alternative. The comparatively low number of court referrals to mediation in criminal cases, unless specifically instructed by precedents from higher judiciary, reflects this cultural resistance. Last but not least, there is a serious problem with public perception. ADR is frequently regarded with suspicion and as "soft justice" that spares criminals the proper penalty, which erodes public trust in the procedure.

6.3 LIMITATIONS IN STRUCTURE

The ADR model's applicability to criminal cases is limited by certain inherent limitations. Public interest considerations give rise to a fundamental philosophical conflict. The foundation of criminal law is the idea that a crime is not just a personal grievance between people but also an offense against the state and society as a whole. There are justifiable worries that the state will neglect its duty to maintain public law and order and establish normative standards for appropriate conduct as a result of the complete privatization of justice through alternative dispute resolution (ADR). This tension has always been a problem for the judiciary. **Gian Singh v. State of Punjab (2012)**¹⁶ established the vital protection of "public interest" while also paving the way for the repeal of non-compoundable offenses. In **Gian Singh and Narinder Singh v. State of Punjab (2014)**¹⁷, the court made it clear that violent and serious crimes such as murder, rape, and public offenses are typically not amenable to compromise because their prosecution serves a larger public interest. In **State of Madhya Pradesh v. Laxmi Narayan (2019)**¹⁸, the Supreme Court reaffirmed this, drawing a clear line between crimes involving financial or civil disputes and crimes that are "serious and heinous" or have a "spreading effect on society," deeming the latter category impervious to compromise. Additionally, there are issues with enforceability; in contrast to court orders, mediated agreements in criminal cases do not have a clear statutory mechanism for enforcement, which raises questions about compliance. ADR is essentially unsuitable for cases involving severe violence, organized crime, repeat offenders, or circumstances with significant power disparities, among other obvious scope restrictions. Lastly, advocates of Transformative Justice (TJ) contend that current ADR mechanisms are inadequate for addressing structural and systemic oppression that leads to individual crimes, such as gender-based violence or caste. TJ points out that ADR functions inside the current framework and is unable to bring about the more extensive political and social change required to eliminate the underlying causes of this kind of violence on its own. Because of these structural limitations, it is necessary to choose cases very carefully and to understand that alternative dispute resolution (ADR) is not a cure-all and can only be used as a supplementary mechanism to traditional adjudication for a particular subset of less serious, mostly non-heinous criminal cases.

¹⁶ (2012) 10 SCC 303

¹⁷ (2014) 6 SCC 349

¹⁸ (2019) 16 SCC 746

VII.COMPARITIVE STUDY UNITED STATES, CANADA, AND NEW ZEALAND:

India's ongoing judicial reforms benefit greatly from an examination of international criminal Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) models. Innovative strategies that prioritize community engagement and restorative principles are provided by nations such as the United States, Canada, and New Zealand. For example, Family Group Conferences (FGC), which incorporate Indigenous Māori customs and emphasize family involvement and group decision-making, are required in the majority of juvenile cases in New Zealand. In India's approach to youth justice, this model emphasizes the value of cultural adaptation and organized family involvement, especially when utilizing already-existing community structures like panchayats. Similarly, Canada's Alternative Measures Programs, which are based on Section 717 of the Criminal Code, emphasize restorative circles as a means of diversion for young people and first-time offenders. This underscores the necessity of a legislative basis to validate and standardize ADR procedures. The extensive use of Victim-Offender Mediation (VOM) in the United States, particularly for young offenders, shows the value of institutional collaborations and community volunteer involvement, and it offers India a way to democratize and decentralize its restorative justice systems.

European frameworks, on the other hand, provide sophisticated examples of victim-centric protections and wider applicability. Strong protections for victims are required by EU Directive 2012/29/EU, which promotes mediation only when it is secure, voluntary, and advantageous for the parties. Operating under this directive, Germany's Täter-Opfer-Ausgleich (Victim-Offender Reconciliation) system serves as an example of how regulatory standards can guarantee fairness and prevent coercion, which is an important lesson for India as it struggles with power disparities in ADR. The Netherlands goes one step further by implementing mediation, even for serious crimes, with the specific objectives of improving victim satisfaction and lowering recidivism. This strategy pushes back against the traditional limits of ADR's applicability and highlights recidivism reduction as a quantifiable result, encouraging India to think about extending ADR beyond minor infractions and giving empirical assessment of its long-term effects on public safety and rehabilitation top priority. All of these global models show that effective ADR integration necessitates not only cultural and community awareness but also robust legal support, victim protections, and a readiness to modify restorative principles to fit a variety of criminal cases.¹⁹

VIII.CONCLUSION:

One promising step toward more effective, compassionate, and restorative responses to crime is the incorporation of Alternative Dispute Resolution into Indian criminal law. By putting victim needs first, encouraging real accountability, mending social ties, and improving community involvement, restorative practices can overcome the basic drawbacks of traditional punitive methods when used appropriately and with sufficient safeguards. But in order to make this change, we must critically examine ADR's risks and limitations, especially with regard to power disparities, the possibility of coercion, and structural limitations. India's path to transformative justice must take into account the substantive difficulties of integrating ADR as well as its innovative potential. This calls for a well-rounded strategy that embraces the political ideal of transformative justice while utilizing the useful instruments of restorative justice, aiming for both structural and personal healing. 4. India has the chance to create contextually relevant models that incorporate both international best practices and local peacemaking traditions as legal systems around the world struggle with institutional backlogs and victim discontent.

ADR's effectiveness in criminal cases will ultimately be evaluated using deeper metrics, such as whether victims feel heard and healed, whether offenders show true accountability, whether communities become more resilient, and whether justice systems become more accessible and equitable. India can transition to a justice paradigm that prioritizes healing, understanding, and transformation for all those impacted by crime by accepting the potential and constraints of restorative pathways. This revolutionary idea recognizes that real justice involves more than just deciding who is at fault; it also includes the more difficult task of mending damaged relationships and lives.

¹⁹ 'Growing Justice - Cameron Rasmussen & Sonya Shah - Inquest' (n 3).

IX.RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. **Adopt a Dedicated Criminal Mediation Statute:** Create and approve a comprehensive law that regulates alternative dispute resolution (ADR) in criminal cases. To ensure national consistency and legitimacy, this statute should clearly define the scope (including the types of compoundable and non-compoundable offenses eligible), comprehensive procedures, mandatory mediator qualifications and ethical standards, and strong victim safeguards.
2. **Create Specialized ADR Divisions in District Courts:** ADR units should be established in criminal courts and manned by certified mediators who have received specialized training in criminal law, trauma, and power dynamics. This guarantees simple access and referral while institutionalizing the procedure.
3. **Establish a national certification program** that requires mediators to complete extensive training in addressing the particular difficulties of criminal cases, such as recognizing coercion, comprehending the psychology of victims and offenders, and negotiating power disparities based on caste and gender.
4. **Establish Pre-ADR Screening and Risk Assessment:** Create and put into use standardized, required risk-assessment instruments that judges and prosecutors can use to screen cases. In order to protect vulnerable victims, this would identify and exclude cases from the ADR process that involve severe domestic violence, persistent coercion, or extreme power imbalances.
5. **Make sure that all parties, particularly victims, have access to independent legal counsel** both prior to and throughout the ADR process by guaranteeing free legal aid and victim advocacy services. Make sure their involvement is completely voluntary and informed, and give them access to trained victim advocates for emotional support and process navigation.
6. **Integrate ADR Education into Legal Curricula:** Make criminal mediation and restorative justice principles modules required for law school courses and ongoing judicial training programs. This is essential to changing judges' and attorneys' deeply ingrained adversarial mentality.
7. **To dispel the myth that criminal alternative dispute resolution (ADR) is "soft justice,"** create and implement government-sponsored awareness campaigns to inform the public, law enforcement, and prosecutors about the advantages and proper application of ADR.
8. **Pilot Court-Linked Restorative Justice Programs:** Launch pilot programs in a few districts to test models that automatically refer some cases to conferencing or mediation following a guilty plea, with restorative outcomes influencing sentencing. This blends restorative principles with judicial oversight.
9. **Create a National Minor Offense ODR Platform:** To handle the resolution of minor, compoundable offenses (such as minor assault and cyber defamation), establish a safe, state-sponsored online dispute resolution platform. Especially in rural areas, this would significantly increase accessibility, lessen logistical burdens, and speed up resolutions.
10. **Contribute to Longitudinal Studies on Recidivism and Results:** To monitor the long-term effects of criminal alternative dispute resolution (ADR) in India, commission independent, empirical research in collaboration with law schools and policy think tanks. Compliance rates, victim satisfaction, cost effectiveness, and—most importantly—its effect on lowering recidivism in comparison to traditional prosecution should be considered key metrics.

X.REFERENCE:

1. 'ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION IN INDIA. EFFECTIVENESS, CHALLENGES, AND THE ROAD AHEAD' <<https://defactolawjournal.org/papers/alternative-dispute-resolution-in-india-effectiveness-challenges-and-the-road-ahead/>> accessed 25 August 2025
2. 'Growing Justice - Cameron Rasmussen & Sonya Shah - Inquest' <<https://inquest.org/growing-restorative-transformative-justice/>> accessed 25 August 2025
3. IPS MIW, 'Mediation in Criminal Cases: Legal Perspectives | Md. Imran Wahab, IPS Writes | Virtuosity Legal' (7 August 2025) <<https://virtuositylegal.com/mediation-in-criminal-cases-legal-perspectives-md-imran-wahab-ips-writes/>> accessed 25 August 2025
4. Khurana KA, 'Evolution of Alternate Dispute Resolution: Indian Perspective' (Khurana And Khurana, 27 February 2024) <<https://www.khuranaandkhurana.com/2024/02/27/evolution-of-alternate-dispute-resolution-indian-perspective/>> accessed 25 August 2025

