International Journal of Engineering, Management and Humanities (IJEMH)
Volume 3, Issue 1, pp: 165-167 www.ijemh.com

Evolution of ADR Mechanism in India

Mr. PULKIT AGGARWAL
VANSHIK DATTA
A3211119265
BA.LLB(H)
2019-24

Date of Submission: 13-02-2022 Date of Acceptance: 28-02-2022

Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) may be a technique for resolving a dispute between two parties outside of the normal system . This approach of conflict settlement has now been adopted as a tool to help courts of justice in resolving issues as quickly as possible. the essential purpose of courts is to dispense justice to those that appear before them. The courts have an obligation to resolve litigation during a fair amount of your time , which may be a hallmark of a functioning justice delivery system.

The Indian judiciary is one among the world's oldest legal systems, but it's also well-known that it's growing ineffective in handling pending cases, with Indian courts congested with long unresolved cases. things is that, despite the establishment of over thousand means courts that have already resolved many cases, the matter is way from fixed, as pending cases still compile . Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) are often a helpful tool in such a situation since it settles disagreement during a peaceful manner with a result that's accepted by both parties.

ADR may be a non-judicial alternative to litigation that has mediation, arbitration, conciliation, negotiation, judicial settlement, and the other procedure of settling a dispute that's not governed by court regulations. ADR is becoming a more prevalent means of resolving disagreements between parties, particularly in commercial issues, as time goes on.

Before British came in and established their rule, arbitration thrived in India within the sort of panchayats. The League of countries met in 1923 and adopted the Geneva Convention. The Geneva Convention also included arbitration clauses. The primary dedicated arbitration provision was Section 89 of the Civil Procedure Code of 1908, which provided for arbitration, but it had been repealed by Section 49 and Schedule III of the Arbitration Act of 1940. By promulgating legislation within the three presidential towns of Calcutta, Bombay, and Madras, British administration gave the law of arbitration legislative form. The Bengal Resolution Act of 1772 and therefore the Bengal Regulation Act of 1781 gave parties the choice of submitting their differences to an arbitrator who was appointed by mutual accord and whose decision was binding on both parties. These were in effect until the Civil Procedure Code of 1859, and that they were extended to the Presidency towns in 1862.

Though arbitration prevailed in India, within the sort of panchayats before the British came in and established their authority. In 1923, the League of countries gathered and agreed to the Geneva Convention . The Geneva Convention also contained clauses for arbitration. the primary arbitration dedicated provision within the Civil Procedure Code, 1908 which had Section 89 providing for arbitration but an equivalent was repealed by Section 49 and Schedule III to the Arbitration Act, 1940. Before enactment of the Arbitration Act, 1940, the British enacted Arbitration (Protocol and Convention) Act, 1937 wherein the Preamble of the Act stated that India was signatory as a State to the Protocol on arbitration as established by League of countries . The League of countries intended to bring the planet closer through trade which made it realise the importance of arbitration. As a result, the Protocol on Arbitration Clauses, 1923 came into existence. there have been several lacunae within the Protocol, hence, a requirement for amendment was felt. The League of countries came up with another Convention for Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards which was lacking within the 1923 Convention. This Convention of 1927 is additionally referred to as the Geneva Convention of 1927. This Convention formed the idea for other enactment i.e. the Arbitration (Protocol and Convention) Act, 1937. Section 3 of the Arbitration

International Journal of Engineering, Management and Humanities (IJEMH)
Volume 3, Issue 1, pp: 165-167 www.ijemh.com

(Protocol and Convention) Act, 1937 refers to the existence of the Arbitration Act, 1899. The Arbitration Act, 1940 came into picture repealing all the previous laws governing arbitration. The Arbitration (Protocol and Convention), 1937 did not achieve its objective. Then after several years of labor , in 1958, the planet came up with a convention i.e the New York Convention, which remains running its course till date. Then, the Arbitration Act, 1940 was repealed and replaced by the Arbitration Act, 1960. The New York Convention inspired another legislation within the Foreign Awards (Recognition and Enforcement) Act, 1961 which was lacking within the Arbitration Act, 1960. In 1981, in Nanak Foundation v. Rattan Singh, Desai, J. observed with regards to the 1961 Act that the arbitration system has become ineffective. the purpose was that even in cases if the arbitrator passed an arbitral award, the parties used the provisions of the Act to challenge the award. This observation presented the 1961 Act as a further layer which party may choose or not, before the litigation process. The lacunae within the provisions of the 1961 Act, made it redundant and other people ended up approaching the courts for litigation. Arbitration as a process was meant to be cost effective and time efficient, but the 1961 Act failed miserably to realize this objective. This Act would be further repealed and replaced by the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996. In 1985, United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL) presented a comprehensive model for arbitration. this Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 is predicated thereon UNCITRAL model. The Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 has been subjected to 2 more amendments in 2015 and 2019.

In 1987, before the enactment of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, the Govt enacted another legislation for resolving disputes i.e. the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. The proceedings under this Act are within the nature of conciliation and therefore the sitting Judge doesn't perform any adjudicatory function or there's no determination of rights. In P.T. Thomas v. Thomas Job ,the Court highlighted the advantages of the legal Services Authorities Act, 1987 as following: No court fee is charged and if any fee is already deposited, it's given back on settlement of disputes[1]. It is very elastic as far as procedural law is taken into account and speedy in resolution of dispute. there's no application of rigid traditional procedural laws just like the Civil Procedure Code, 1908 and therefore the Evidence Act, 1872 .The Act enables the parties to directly interact with Judges (retired Judges who are appointed by the authorities concerned). The proceedings can't be conducted in an adversarial manner almost like what's wiped out courts. The most important a part of this Act is that if the dispute is settled; it's like a decree and enforceability of a court. The settlement received by the parties isn't appealable. No civil appeal are often made up of this settlement[2]. In Bhargavi Constructions v. Kothakapu Muthyam Reddy, the Court ruled that the settlement are often challenged on limited grounds i.e. challenge on the grounds of fraud, through writ jurisdiction under Article 226 or Article 227 of the Constitution of India. [The idea behind bringing the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987 was "legal technicalities" doesn't get precedence over the resolution proceedings[3].

The Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 is another legislation which formally provides for the conciliation process. The conciliation process is mentioned partially III of the legislation. The legislation also adopted as its rule the United Nation Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL) Conciliation Rules. Section 66 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act provides that the proceedings wouldn't be bound by the Civil Procedure Code, 1908 and therefore the Evidence Act, 1872; little question this provision (and many other provisions) is for streamlining the conciliation procedures.

Section 18 of the Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises Development (MSME) Act, 2006, also provides for mandatory conciliation process by referencing the dispute with regards to payment due under Section 17 of the MSME Act. Section 18(2) provides that Sections 65 to 81 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 should apply to hunt conciliation as referred under Section 18(1) of the Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises Development (MSME) Act, 2006.

In 1996, the govt brought an amendment to Section 89 of the Civil Procedure Code, 1908 which gave scope to the court to formulate settlements, if it appears to the court that there's an opportunity of settlement between the parties and after receiving the referral from the parties to form amendments in such settlement and refer an equivalent to arbitration, Lok Adalat, conciliation

[1] (2005) 6 SCC 478, 486, para 19

[2] Order 7 Rule 11(*d*) of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908.

[3] Bar Council of India v. Union of India, (2012) 8 SCC 243

or mediation. Mediation in India is governed by the Mediation Rules of 2003.These proceedings are more informal in nature as compared to arbitration and conciliation. The role of the mediator is more of an individual who provides guidance and clears any misunderstanding that arises between the parties. The parties reach settlement on their own. Mediator regulates the settlement process. At the top of the method , a settlement is arrived between the parties instead of a choice . The Law Commission of India suggested establishment of economic courts, first, within the sort of creating division within the supreme court itself or establishing separate commercial courts. The second suggestion resulted within the passage of the Commercial Courts Act, 2015. In 2018, this day Government, in alignment of its policy of improving the convenience of doing business, came up with an amendment to the Commercial Courts Act, 2015. The President, in May 2018, promulgated an Ordinance which amended the Commercial Courts Act, 2015.

SECTION 89, CIVIL PROCEDURE CODE, 1908

In 2002, Indian Parliament brought an amendment to Section 89 of the Civil Procedure Code, 1908. The amendment brought during a different alternative dispute resolution mechanism in Section 89. The Bar at Salem wasn't satisfied by this and other amendments. In Salem Advocate Bar Assn.(I) v. Union of India, the constitutionality of Section 89 was challenged. The Court upheld the constitutionality of Section 89. The Court also observed that the supply of such provisions in foreign countries are very successful. The Court constituted a committee under the chairmanship of Justice M. Jagannadha Rao (Retired) to review the problem in workings of the amendments. The Court also ordered for the formulation of rules with regards to meditation and ADR. As per the Committee's recommendation, the Supreme Court ordered all the High Courts to formulate their own rules for ADR and mediation. The recommendations of the Committee were accepted by the Court in another judgment[4].

To Conclude, it be said that Human civilization has come an extended way forward as far as methods for dispute resolution cares . the event of ADR mechanisms has been prominently driven by the target of resolving the problems during a timely and price effective manner. The evolution of ADR mechanisms portrays an entangled scenario; and, one thing is certain that both legislature and judiciary has had a tough time in streamlining all the ADR mechanisms and rules regarding them. The history of ADR mechanisms started with the enactment of arbitration laws which evolved tons over time. With time the opposite ADR mechanisms knocked on the door of Indian Parliament and Parliament was prudent enough to include these new methods for dispute resolution. the govt also ensured that these methods are used on a selected basis especially industries, as an example , the Commercial Courts Act, 2015 and therefore the Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises Development Act, 2006. There has been discontent within the legal fraternity with regards to amendments in Section 89, which has been resolved supported the recommendations of Justice (Retd.) M. Jagannadha Rao Committee Report. this day Indian Government is taking further steps within the evolution of ADR mechanisms wherein it desires to form India a worldwide destination for arbitration and other dispute resolution methods.

[4] Salem Advocate Bar Assn. (II) v. Union of India, (2005) 6 SCC 344