

Examining the Efficiency and Effectiveness of Alternative Dispute Resolution in Reducing Judicial Burden

Dr. Neha Maggo¹, T. Vennela Jaahnavi²

¹Assistant Professor, School of Law, IIMT, affiliated to Guru Gobind Singh Indraprastha University

²B.A.LL.B. (Hons.), (3rd Year), School of Law, IIMT, affiliated to Guru Gobind Singh Indraprastha University

Abstract

Globally, the judiciary is dealing with an enormous backlog of cases that compromises the efficient administration of justice, especially in a populous country like India. Over 4.5 crore cases are still waiting in Indian courts as of 2025. This situation is made worse by a low judge-to-population ratio, which causes major delays, financial losses, and a high percentage of undertrial inmates. In this situation, effective and amicable substitutes for conventional litigation are provided by Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) procedures such as arbitration, mediation, conciliation, and Lok Adalats. The efficiency and efficacy of ADR in lowering judicial load are evaluated in this study using a qualitative doctrinal and comparative methodology. It is based on academic literature, judicial decisions, and statutory provisions. With global settlement rates in court-annexed programs approaching 60–80%, the results show that alternative dispute resolution (ADR), especially mediation, has significant potential to reduce court congestion. However, in India, despite the mandate under Section 89 of the Civil Procedure Code, ADR settlement rates remain low due to implementation issues. The study indicates that ADR can dramatically reduce pending cases provided it is supported by stronger institutional structures, increased knowledge, and judicial encouragement. To provide prompt and accessible justice, ADR must be more successfully incorporated into the judicial system.

Keywords: alternative dispute resolution, judicial backlog, arbitration efficiency, mediation effectiveness, party autonomy

1. Introduction

In contemporary legal landscapes worldwide, the judiciary confronts a formidable challenge posed by mounting case backlogs that impede the delivery of swift justice and erode public confidence in legal institutions. India is a prime example of this dilemma; by late 2025, the number of pending cases in district courts, high courts, and the Supreme Court had skyrocketed to over 4.5 crore, despite coordinated reform initiatives and record disposal rates in the highest court.¹ With an average resolution time of years or even decades for complex issues, high courts record 26.85 lakh pending matters, a figure made worse by the COVID-19 interruptions and a persistent dearth of judges, just 22 per million inhabitants.²

Published: 29 April 2026

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.70558/SPIJSH.2026.v3.i4.45704>

Copyright © 2026 The Author(s). This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0).

This systemic overload not only inflates litigation costs but also hampers economic productivity, as unresolved commercial conflicts stifle business and investment. Similar trends may be seen around the world in nations like Brazil and South Africa, where court delays are similar to India's problems.³ This highlights a global burden on adversarial systems that are unprepared for the volume of disputes that occur today.

This overworked framework is exactly what makes Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) necessary. ADR includes a range of non-litigious procedures that put efficiency, confidentiality, and party control first, such as arbitration for legally binding rulings by impartial experts, mediation for facilitated negotiations leading to voluntary settlements, conciliation as a mediator-driven variation, and institutionalized forums like Lok Adalats in India. By rerouting cases that are amenable, these methods can settle conflicts in 30 to 90 days and, in more developed systems, produce settlement rates of up to 50 to 70%.

Judicial encouragement plays a pivotal role. In the famous English case of *Halsey v. Milton Keynes General NHS Trust*⁴, for example, the Court of Appeal stated that an irrational refusal to mediate could result in unfavorable cost consequences, pushing parties toward alternative dispute resolution (ADR) and reducing judicial caseloads.⁵ This idea serves as an example of how courts can use their power to encourage the use of ADR without using force.⁶

This paper's main goals are to: analyze how well alternative dispute resolution (ADR) works to speed up resolutions and reduce backlogs; evaluate its efficacy in terms of cost, flexibility, and enforceability; compare international best practices with the Indian experience; and pinpoint enduring issues along with practical suggestions. The study sheds light on ADR's potential to change the way justice is delivered by addressing these. The structure of the paper ensures a thorough, logical progression toward understanding ADR's crucial role in judicial relief: a literature review surveys scholarly evolution; methodology describes the doctrinal approach; the core analysis explores ADR's facets with illustrative precedents; findings synthesize insights; the conclusion reiterates import; and recommendations chart reform paths.

2. Literature Review

In academic discourse, Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) is portrayed as a fundamental evolution in dispute management, anchored in historic consensual traditions but rejuvenated for modern demands, rather than just an accessory to litigation. Researchers from a variety of jurisdictions highlight the empirical benefits of alternative dispute resolution (ADR) in reducing court backlogs. Extensive studies using regression analyses show that mediation has a greater impact on backlog reduction than arbitration, with coefficients showing a 35% greater congestion drop than arbitration's 25%. High satisfaction (70–90%) and compliance rates are highlighted in international literature, which attributes success to party empowerment and procedural informality. Critics point out that results may favor stronger parties in power-imbalanced situations, therefore precautions are necessary.⁷

From religious mediations and Indian panchayats to formalized frameworks after World War II, the evolution of alternative dispute resolution (ADR) is well chronicled. Over 80 adoptions were influenced by the UNCITRAL Model Law (1985), which standardized arbitration.⁸ This was expedited by important U.S. jurisprudence: *Mitsubishi Motors Corp. v. Soler Chrysler-*

Plymouth Inc.⁹ upheld the New York Convention's pro-enforcement stance and limited forum-shopping by firmly enforcing international arbitration agreements in antitrust disputes.¹⁰ In addition, state-law obstacles to class-waiver arbitration were eliminated in *AT&T Mobility LLC v. Concepcion*¹¹, which prioritized efficiency above collective actions and indicated a shift in policy toward economical private ordering.¹²

In the UK, Lord Woolf's 1996 Access to Justice report catalyzed Civil Procedure Rules integrating ADR mandates, while Indian scholarship lauds CPC amendments yet laments implementation shortfalls, with mediation settlements at a mere 1-2% amid procedural distrust.¹³

Persistent study gaps include longitudinal backlog implications and equity indicators in developing contexts, emphasizing the necessity for hybrid models that combine ADR and technology.¹⁴

3. Methodology

This study uses a qualitative doctrinal approach, which comprises a methodical explanation and interpretation of the legal precedents, norms, and principles that regulate alternative dispute resolution. In addition to secondary materials like judicial glosses and commentaries, doctrinal analysis analyzes fundamental sources including the Code of Civil Procedure (CPC) Section 89, the Arbitration and Conciliation Act 1996, the New York Convention 1958, and UNCITRAL texts. A comparative lens highlights similarities and differences between India's framework and worldwide exemplars, such as Singapore SIAC Rules, UK CPR, and U.S. Federal Rules.

The approach focuses on normative review utilizing the IRAC paradigm: identifying issues, articulating rules (statutory/judicial), applying to facts, and drawing conclusions. To ensure recent data up to 2026, sources were carefully selected from reputable databases such as SCC Online, and peer-reviewed papers. Although it recognizes its limits in capturing practitioner nuances, this approach fits the paper's goal of doctrinal clarity over statistical modeling. Ethical considerations prioritize objective analysis, avoiding advocacy.

4. ADR (Alternative Dispute Resolution)

Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) refers to a variety of approaches for settling conflicts outside of typical court proceedings, such as using neutral third parties or direct party efforts to reach voluntary settlements. It seeks to reduce expenses, time, and adversarial stress in comparison to trials, while preserving relationships through techniques such as mediation, arbitration, negotiation, and conciliation. ADR applies in civil, commercial, familial, labor, and international disputes, which are often mandated by courts or contracts.¹⁵

4.1 Types of ADR

- i. Arbitration: An arbitrator hears evidence and renders a binding ruling similar to a court verdict; it is formal yet private, and speedier than trials.
- ii. Mediation: A neutral mediator facilitates discussion, identifies challenges, and assists parties in developing their own solutions; it is non-binding and relationship-focused.

- iii. Conciliation: A conciliator actively suggests settlement terms and rebuilds trust; it is more interventionist than mediation but non-binding.
- iv. Negotiation: Parties directly discuss and bargain to obtain a voluntary, non-binding agreement; it is informal, free of charge, and completely controlled by the disputants.
- v. Adjudication: A neutral offers a swift, interim binding ruling on important matters; they are frequently employed in the construction industry to ensure timely decisions.¹⁶
- vi. Lok Adalat: India's forum for obligatory but consensual settlements; court-annexed, speedy, and no appeals against awards.

These methods encourage quicker, more economical solutions.¹⁷

4.2 Differences

Negotiation is the fastest process, but it is also the riskiest if negotiations fail because it depends only on the autonomy of the parties and does not involve any outside input. Mediation offers structured guidance without requiring binding conclusions, making it perfect for keeping relationships. Conciliation includes proactive recommendations from the neutral, mending divides more interventionally than mediation, but both are non-binding, unlike arbitration. Compared to final arbitration decisions, adjudication provides swift interim binding rulings on specific problems, which are typically provisional and suitable for urgent disputes like construction.¹⁸

5. Main Analysis

5.1 Efficiency of ADR in Reducing Judicial Burden

ADR's effectiveness in speeding up conflict resolutions is one of its most alluring features; this is a vital counterbalance to the drawn-out processes that traditional courts suffer from. While civil lawsuits in India can drag on for three to ten years because of appeals and adjournments, alternative dispute resolution (ADR) procedures usually end in 30 to 180 days, allowing parties to use their resources more effectively. This is well supported by empirical data: studies show that mediation successfully diverts cases, and statistical models demonstrate notable backlog reductions—far exceeding the inertia of litigation. For example, since their establishment, India's Lok Adalats have resolved more than 10 crore cases, offering a scalable methodology for mass decongestion.¹⁹

Judicial policy reinforces this efficiency.²⁰ The Court of Appeal outlined criteria for determining mediation reasonableness in *Halsey v. Milton Keynes General NHS Trust*²¹, ruling that unjustified rejections are subject to financial penalties. This "Halsey principle" has spread throughout Commonwealth jurisdictions, encouraging the use of alternative dispute resolution (ADR) and experimentally reducing dockets in adopting courts by 15% to 20%.

5.2 Cost-Effectiveness of ADR

Beyond speed, streamlined processes that avoid lengthy hearings, an abundance of discovery, and pleadings are what make alternative dispute resolution (ADR) so cost-effective. ADR costs 40–60% less in India than litigation, which typically costs ₹5–20 lakh per case and includes court and lawyer fees. This is mostly due to shorter procedures and fewer middlemen.

Economic models verify that parties invest more in alternative dispute resolution (ADR), resulting in long-lasting agreements and reducing litigation relapse.²²

This was demonstrated by the U.S. Supreme Court in *AT&T Mobility LLC v. Concepcion*²³, which invalidated California regulations prohibiting class-waiver arbitration on the grounds that individual proceedings prevent the "professionalization of outrage" that would inflate class costs, thereby favoring accessible private resolution.

5.3 Flexibility and Party Autonomy

In contrast to the rigidity of courts, alternative dispute resolution (ADR) is known for its flexibility, which allows parties to choose arbitrators from specialized pools, tailor rules, and hold informal procedures. 80%+ voluntary compliance rates show that this autonomy increases satisfaction. Tribunals adjust to the intricacies of disputes, ranging from technical values to relational mends.²⁴

*BG Group plc v. Republic of Argentina*²⁵ upheld party-delegated authority by giving tribunals the discretion to decide jurisdictional requirements such as local litigation exhaustion.²⁶ In a similar vein, the "one-stop shop" presumption was adopted in *Fiona Trust & Holding Corp. v. Privalov*²⁷, which interpreted terms broadly to include all problems and prevent piecemeal litigation.

5.4 Enforceability of ADR Outcomes

The credibility of ADR is supported by strong enforcement. 149 states' rewards must be recognized under the New York Convention, subject to specific justifications like public policy. Arbitration awards have few appeals and are enforceable as decrees.

Despite statutory claims, *Mitsubishi Motors Corp. v. Soler Chrysler-Plymouth Inc.*²⁸ upheld an international award, giving separability and competence-competence doctrines precedence. In *Cable & Wireless plc v. IBM United Kingdom Ltd*²⁹, court actions for non-compliance were stayed and adherence to increasing ADR tiers was mandated.

5.5 Global Best Practices

In the United States, court-annexed ADR, which is required in several federal districts, combines early neutral evaluation and mediation, resulting in 60-80% agreements and persistent decreases in civil pendency through thorough tracking.³⁰ With active judicial case management and Halsey sanctions driving more than 50% of referral settlements, the UK's Woolf Reforms integrated alternative dispute resolution (ADR) into Civil Procedure Rules (CPR) Part 1. Asia-Pacific disputes are drawn to Singapore as an arbitration hub through SIAC, whose 2023 statistics (663 cases, 85% growth) show effective regulations³¹, emergency arbitrator procedures, and third-party finance.³²

5.6 Challenges and Limitations

Despite its benefits, ADR has obstacles. Uptake is hampered by widespread ignorance, particularly among Small and Medium-sized Enterprises (SMEs) and rural litigants. Equity is undermined by power imbalances, such as those between corporations and individuals, because

weaker parties fear force. Only private conflicts are eligible for referral; criminal or constitutional issues are not.³³ Cynicism about enforceability and mediator quality is reflected in India's low mediation rates (1-2%), which call for corrective training and supervision.³⁴

5.7 Indian Context

With Section 89 of the Code of Civil Procedure (CPC), (inserted via the 1999 amendment and effective from July 1, 2002) which gave courts the authority to refer cases following the 129th Law Commission Report with the goal of institutionalization, India's ADR journey became more intense.³⁵ *Salem Advocate Bar Association v. Union of India*³⁶ maintained constitutional validity, highlighting ADR's non-derogation from adjudication rights and directing rule-making for seamless referrals.³⁷

Referral mechanics were improved in *Afcons Infrastructure Ltd. v. Cherian Varkey Construction Co.*³⁸, the Supreme Court of India clarified how courts should refer cases to ADR and the extent of Section 89 CPC and categorized disagreements into groups:

- i. ADR-appropriate (e.g., commercial, contractual, marital, partition conflicts)
- ii. Not appropriate for alternative dispute resolution (ADR) (e.g., significant fraud, criminal offenses, public law disputes, trust-related issues)

It also emphasized that whereas arbitration requires an existing arbitration agreement, mediation and conciliation require permission.

In *Bharat Aluminium Co. v. Kaiser Aluminium Technical Services Inc. (BALCO)*³⁹, The five-judge Constitution Bench ruled that only arbitrations held in India are subject to Part I of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, which contains interventionist provisions like Section 9 for interim relief and Section 34 for setting aside awards.

Foreign Seat Excludes Intervention: If the arbitration seat is located outside of India, Indian courts cannot exercise jurisdiction to set aside the award, even if the agreement is subject to Indian law.

Prospective Overruling: The Court used the prospective overruling concept, which means that arbitration agreements signed on or after September 6, 2012 are the only ones covered by the BALCO ruling. The earlier *Bhatia International* verdict, which permitted wider court intervention, continued to apply to agreements made before to this date.

Territoriality Principle: The ruling brought India into compliance with the UNCITRAL Model Law, guaranteeing that the controlling court is determined by the "seat" of arbitration.

In *SBP & Co. v. Patel Engineering Ltd*⁴⁰ (2005) 8 SCC 618, arbitral primacy was maintained by limiting judicial pre-award roles to prima facie examination. The problematic extraterritorial extension of Part I of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 in *Bhatia International v. Bulk Trading S.A.*⁴¹ was eventually corrected by BALCO to avoid "Bhatia overhang" and conform to global minimalism.

These developments support the pro-ADR judiciary, although pendency still exists, requiring vigorous execution.

6. Findings

According to doctrinal and empirical evaluations, the analysis unequivocally demonstrates that alternative dispute resolution (ADR) is a powerful tool for judicial decongestion, with arbitration's finality and mediation's speed working together to reduce backlogs by significant margins. Although obstacles like asymmetry define universality, faster deadlines, cost parity, and growing global/Indian acceptability confirm effectiveness.⁴²

7. Conclusion

This study reinforces the importance of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) in improving court efficiency and effectiveness, particularly in jurisdictions with high case backlogs, such as India, where the pendency surpasses 4.5 crore cases as of 2025. Doctrinal and comparative analysis reveals that alternative dispute resolution (ADR) is a better and more practical alternative to traditional litigation, providing quicker, more affordable, and more adaptable dispute settlement procedures. Arbitration and mediation, in particular, considerably cut resolution time and costs while also contributing to docket decongestion through high global settlement rates.

The findings demonstrate ADR's ability to reduce judicial backlogs, improve party autonomy, and ensure enforcement via established international frameworks. Comparative analysis from countries like Singapore, the United States, and the United Kingdom shows how successful institutional arbitration models and court-annexed ADR systems are. On the other hand, despite statutory assistance under Section 89 of the Civil Procedure Code, India's comparatively low ADR success rates highlight the need for improved implementation, awareness, and institutional capacity.

Beyond efficiency, ADR promotes economic growth by facilitating prompt business dispute settlement and boosting investor confidence. In the future, there is a lot of promise for integrating digital technologies, such as Online Dispute Resolution (ODR), AI-assisted procedures, and hybrid court-ADR models. To fully realize ADR's potential and guarantee a more responsive and robust justice delivery system, institutional frameworks must be strengthened, mandatory referrals must be encouraged, and capacity-building must be funded.

8. Recommendations

Budgetary allotments and uniform training should be used by governments to stimulate ADR centers. It is essential to raise public awareness through campaigns and curriculum integration. Courts should follow Halsey's lead by requiring referrals and penalizing refusals. Legislative improvements, such as uniform codes and equity measures, will maintain momentum.

References

-
- ¹ Bhattar R. (2026, March 22). *22 judges per million, 26 lakh cases pending: India's judicial gap widens despite years of reform*. ThePrint. Retrieved April 23, 2026, from <https://theprint.in/judiciary/22-judges-per-million-26-lakh-cases-pending-indias-judicial-gap-widens-despite-years-of-reform/2885551/>

-
- ² Bhalla, V. (2026, February 19). Why Supreme Court pendency grew to 92,000 despite record disposal in 2025. *The Indian Express*. <https://indianexpress.com/article/legal-news/supreme-court-pendency-grew-despite-record-disposal-2025-10540543/>
- ³ *Vital stats*. (n.d.). PRS Legislative Research. Retrieved April 25, 2026, from <https://prsindia.org/policy/vital-stats/pendency-and-vacancies-in-the-judiciary>
- ⁴ *Halsey v Milton Keynes General NHS Trust*, [2004] EWCA Civ 576 (Eng. & Wales Ct. App. May 11, 2004)
- ⁵ Peschl, R. (2022, May 24). Halsey: the judicial anomaly threatening the UK mediation system. *The Legal Compass*. <https://www.thelegalcompass.co.uk/post/halsey-the-judicial-anomaly-threatening-the-uk-mediation-system>
- ⁶ *Halsey v Milton Keynes General NHS Trust, England and Wales Court of Appeal (Civil Division), Judgment, Law, casemine.com*. (n.d.). <https://www.casemine.com>. Retrieved April 23, 2026, from <https://www.casemine.com/judgement/uk/5a8ff71c60d03e7f57ea7a4f>
- ⁷ Eisenberg, D. T. *What we know (and need to know) about Court-Annexed Dispute Resolution*. DigitalCommons@UM Carey Law. Retrieved April 23, 2026, from https://digitalcommons.law.umaryland.edu/fac_pubs/1546/
- ⁸ Dr. Junaid, M. (2023). *The development and progression of alternative dispute resolution (ADR) in India*. *International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research*, 5(5), E-ISSN: 2582-2160
- ⁹ *Mitsubishi Motors Corp. v. Soler Chrysler-Plymouth Inc.*, 473 U.S. 614 (U.S. 1985)
- ¹⁰ Irvine, C. (2026, February 7). *Staggeringly low takeup and success rate for mediation in India - is this correct?* LinkedIn. https://www.linkedin.com/posts/charlie-irvine-9ab65b20_staggeringly-low-takeup-and-success-rate-activity-7425827719818616832-uYkS
- ¹¹ *AT&T Mobility LLC v. Concepcion*, 563 U.S. 333 (2011)
- ¹² Lokhande, A. A., Sakharam, K. G., Dr. Shwetali Patil & Nilesh S.K., *Impact of ADR on court congestion and case backlog*. (2023). *International Journal of Emerging Technologies and Innovative Research (IJETIR)*, 3(8), ISSN (Online) 2583-0554
- ¹³ LawTeacher. (n.d.). Woolf Reforms. *LawTeacher.net*. <https://www.lawteacher.net/free-law-essays/civil-law/woolf-reforms.php>
- ¹⁴ Yadav, G. (2025, November 8). *Alternative dispute resolution in India – significance and challenges – explained Pointwise*. Retrieved April 23, 2026, from <https://forumias.com/blog/alternative-dispute-resolution-in-india-significance-and-challenges-explained-pointwise/>
- ¹⁵ U.S. Department of Labor. (n.d.). *Alternative dispute resolution (ADR)*. Retrieved April 23, 2026, from <https://www.dol.gov/general/topic/labor-relations/adr>
- ¹⁶ *Discuss the different types of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) and their proceeding with special emphasis on common ADR mechanism*. | *The Lawyers & Jurists*. Retrieved April 23, 2026, from <https://www.lawyersnjurists.com/article/discuss-types-alternative-dispute-resolution-adr-proceeding-special-emphasis-common-adr-mechanism/>
-

-
- ¹⁷ U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. (n.d.). *Types of ADR techniques*. Retrieved April 23, 2026, from <https://www.eeoc.gov/federal-sector/types-adr-techniques>
- ¹⁸ Singh, C. (2024, May 25) *A Look at Mediation in Comparison with Other Forms of ADR*. Jurists' Junction. Retrieved April 23, 2026, from <https://juristsjunction.wordpress.com/2024/05/25/a-look-at-mediation-in-comparison-with-other-forms-of-adr/>
- ¹⁹ Gupta, S.(2025). Effectiveness of ADR in reducing judicial backlog in India. In *International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research (IJFMR)* (Vol. 7, Issue 4, pp. 1–2). <https://www.ijfmr.com/papers/2025/4/50912.pdf>
- ²⁰ Lokhande, A. A., Sakharam, K. G., Dr. Shwetali Patil & Nilesh S.K., *Impact of ADR on court congestion and case backlog*. (2023). *International Journal of Emerging Technologies and Innovative Research (IJETIR)*, 3(8), ISSN (Online) 2583-0554
- ²¹ Peschl, R. (2022, May 24). Halsey: the judicial anomaly threatening the UK mediation system. *The Legal Compass*. <https://www.thelegalcompass.co.uk/post/halsey-the-judicial-anomaly-threatening-the-uk-mediation-system>
- ²² Deffains, B., Demougin, D., & Desrieux, C. (2017). *Choosing ADR or litigation*. *International Review of Law and Economics*, 49, 33–40. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.irl.2016.11.002>
- ²³ AT&T Mobility LLC v. Concepcion, 563 U.S. 333 (2011)
- ²⁴ Eisenberg, D. T. (n.d.). *What we know (and need to know) about Court-Annexed Dispute Resolution*. DigitalCommons@UM Carey Law. Retrieved April 23, 2026, from https://digitalcommons.law.umaryland.edu/fac_pubs/1546/
- ²⁵ BG Group Plc. v. Republic of Argentina – Case No. U.S. 12-138 (2014) – U.S. Supreme Court
- ²⁶ Aceris Law LLC. (2017, December 28). *BG GROUP PLC. v. REPUBLIC OF ARGENTINA – CASE NO. U.S. 12-138 (2014) – U.S. SUPREME COURT*. Aceris Law. <https://www.acerislaw.com/bg-group-plc-v-republic-argentina/>
- ²⁷ *Fiona Trust & Holding Corp v Privalov*, [2007] UKHL 40
- ²⁸ *Mitsubishi Motors Corp. v. Soler Chrysler-Plymouth Inc.*, 473 U.S. 614 (U.S. 1985)
- ²⁹ *Cable & Wireless Plc v IBM United Kingdom Ltd.* [2002] APPL.R. 10/11
- ³⁰ Blakely, T. W., & Kang, Y. (2024, May 15). *SIAC's 2023 Statistics Demonstrate Continued Expansion of its Global Reach and Steadfast Confidence in its Capabilities*. Morrison Foerster. Retrieved April 24, 2026, from <https://www.mofo.com/resources/insights/240515-siacs-2023-statistics-demonstrate-continued-expansion>
- ³¹ New Arbitration Rules of the Singapore International Arbitration Centre (SIAC) to Enter into Force. (2024, December 19). *Debevoise*. <https://www.debevoise.com/insights/publications/2024/12/new-arbitration-rules-of-the-singapore-internation>
- ³² Webb, R. S. (1994). *Court-annexed ADR—A dissent*. *North Dakota Law Review*, 70(2), Article 3. <https://commons.und.edu/ndlr/vol70/iss2/3>
-

- ³³ Yadav, G. (2025, November 8). *Alternative dispute resolution in India – significance and challenges – explained Pointwise*. Retrieved April 24, 2026, from <https://forumias.com/blog/alternative-dispute-resolution-in-india-significance-and-challenges-explained-pointwise/>
- ³⁴ Irvine, C. (2026, February 7). *Staggeringly low takeup and success rate for mediation in India - is this correct?* LinkedIn. https://www.linkedin.com/posts/charlie-irvine-9ab65b20_staggeringly-low-takeup-and-success-rate-activity-7425827719818616832-uYkS
- ³⁵ Bhati, P. (n.d.). *ADR and Section 89 of CPC*. White Code VIA Mediation & Arbitration Centre. Retrieved April 25, 2026, from <https://viamediationcentre.org/readnews/MTM1NA==/ADR-and-Section-89-OF-CPC>
- ³⁶ Salem Advocate Bar Association v. Union of India (2005) 6 SCC 344
- ³⁷ CaseMine. *Salem Advocate Bar Association v. Union of India: Pioneering reforms in civil procedure and alternative dispute resolution*. Retrieved April 24, 2026, from <https://www.casemine.com/commentary/in/salem-advocate-bar-association-v.-union-of-india:-pioneering-reforms-in-civil-procedure-and-alternative-dispute-resolution/view>
- ³⁸ Afcons Infrastructure Ltd. v. Cherian Varkey Construction Co. (2010) 8 SCC 24
- ³⁹ Bharat Aluminium Co. v. Kaiser Aluminium Technical Services Inc. (BALCO) (2012) 9 SCC 552
- ⁴⁰ SBP & Co. v. Patel Engineering Ltd (2005) 8 SCC 618
- ⁴¹ Bhatia International v. Bulk Trading S.A. (2002) 4 SCC 105
- ⁴² Gupta, S.(2025). Effectiveness of ADR in reducing judicial backlog in India. In *International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research (IJFMR)* (Vol. 7, Issue 4, pp. 1–2). <https://www.ijfmr.com/papers/2025/4/50912.pdf>