Court Procedures and Process Reengineering: Need, Scope and Limits

By: Shivaraj S. Huchhanavar, LL.M (JRF)
Faculty, National Judicial Academy
Only mistake we cannot afford to make is not to try!
Objectives of the Conference

6(v) the National Judicial Academy be requested to undertake a study of different practices and procedures in court proceedings and the need for unification of such procedures and practices in the High Courts. (Chief Justices’ Conference, 2016)
What is reengineering?

Process Reengineering is a *fundamental rethinking* and *radical redesigning* of court process and procedures in support of its mission, goals and objectives.
How and from where we shall begin?
What are the differences in the High Courts on a particular practice or procedure?
How it (such differences) helps High Court to meet its local felt necessity?

‘Uniformity should not be at the cost of utility’
How such procedure has become an impediment for better performance?
Can we perform better by improving/replacing/reengineering such procedures/practices?
What are your suggestions to improve such procedures or practices?
How improvement(s) you suggest will help system perform better?
Do you (we) think such improvements are also relevant to other High Courts?
What *new* we need to add (may be by overwriting or otherwise) to existing procedures/practices to attain our goals?

Make justice accessible, affordable and understandable to all with expedition, efficiency and efficacy.
Scheme/action plan for process reengineering.

**Step-1: Establishing the Foundation for change**

- Identify practices or procedures or processes that need change

- **Develop an appropriate governance** (a team to oversee the effort who can determine the scope, define expectation and determine resources etc. of reengineering activity)

- Make sure that reengineering goals are aligned with institutional goals
  
  “Justice accessible, affordable and understandable to all…”

- Build a momentum/support (by taking all the stakeholders into confidence that this exercise is not prejudicial and intends to benefit all)
Step-1: Establishing A Foundation for change

Reach out early to court users to know their expectations and if possible involve them in the change efforts (keep communicating with them of latest developments)

Build a core team for continual monitoring and mentoring the initial preparatory steps

Develop feasible alternative to existing procedures or process (if possible run a trial)
Step-II: Execution of planned change

1. Document and analyse "As is vs. To be" gap.
2. Set the benchmarks for new changes
3. Conduct gap analysis (what you desired to achieve and what are the outcomes of change)
4. Rework on the performance improvement by **building alternatives**
5. Identify and assess potential implementation barriers for such alternatives
6. Analyse the cost-benefit of alternatives
Either you make history or miss history, or be mocked by history! (Justice Krishna Iyer)