

The background of the journal cover features a top-down view of a desk. On the left, a pair of black leather brogue shoes is partially visible. In the center, an open notebook with lined pages and a silver pen lies on a light-colored wooden surface. To the right, a black leather bag with a zipper and a black leather watch with a silver dial are also visible. A large, semi-transparent white rectangular box is centered over the image, containing the journal's title and ISSN information.

INTERNATIONAL LAW  
JOURNAL

---

**WHITE BLACK  
LEGAL LAW  
JOURNAL**  
**ISSN: 2581-  
8503**

*Peer - Reviewed & Refereed Journal*

The Law Journal strives to provide a platform for discussion of International as well as National Developments in the Field of Law.

[WWW.WHITEBLACKLEGAL.CO.IN](http://WWW.WHITEBLACKLEGAL.CO.IN)

## DISCLAIMER

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored, transmitted, translated, or distributed in any form or by any means—whether electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, scanning, or otherwise—without the prior written permission of the Editor-in-Chief of *White Black Legal – The Law Journal*.

All copyrights in the articles published in this journal vest with *White Black Legal – The Law Journal*, unless otherwise expressly stated. Authors are solely responsible for the originality, authenticity, accuracy, and legality of the content submitted and published.

The views, opinions, interpretations, and conclusions expressed in the articles are exclusively those of the respective authors. They do not represent or reflect the views of the Editorial Board, Editors, Reviewers, Advisors, Publisher, or Management of *White Black Legal*.

While reasonable efforts are made to ensure academic quality and accuracy through editorial and peer-review processes, *White Black Legal* makes no representations or warranties, express or implied, regarding the completeness, accuracy, reliability, or suitability of the content published. The journal shall not be liable for any errors, omissions, inaccuracies, or consequences arising from the use, interpretation, or reliance upon the information contained in this publication.

The content published in this journal is intended solely for academic and informational purposes and shall not be construed as legal advice, professional advice, or legal opinion. *White Black Legal* expressly disclaims all liability for any loss, damage, claim, or legal consequence arising directly or indirectly from the use of any material published herein.

## ABOUT WHITE BLACK LEGAL

*White Black Legal – The Law Journal* is an open-access, peer-reviewed, and refereed legal journal established to provide a scholarly platform for the examination and discussion of contemporary legal issues. The journal is dedicated to encouraging rigorous legal research, critical analysis, and informed academic discourse across diverse fields of law.

The journal invites contributions from law students, researchers, academicians, legal practitioners, and policy scholars. By facilitating engagement between emerging scholars and experienced legal professionals, *White Black Legal* seeks to bridge theoretical legal research with practical, institutional, and societal perspectives.

In a rapidly evolving social, economic, and technological environment, the journal endeavours to examine the changing role of law and its impact on governance, justice systems, and society. *White Black Legal* remains committed to academic integrity, ethical research practices, and the dissemination of accessible legal scholarship to a global readership.

## AIM & SCOPE

The aim of *White Black Legal – The Law Journal* is to promote excellence in legal research and to provide a credible academic forum for the analysis, discussion, and advancement of contemporary legal issues. The journal encourages original, analytical, and well-researched contributions that add substantive value to legal scholarship.

The journal publishes scholarly works examining doctrinal, theoretical, empirical, and interdisciplinary perspectives of law. Submissions are welcomed from academicians, legal professionals, researchers, scholars, and students who demonstrate intellectual rigour, analytical clarity, and relevance to current legal and policy developments.

The scope of the journal includes, but is not limited to:

- Constitutional and Administrative Law
- Criminal Law and Criminal Justice
- Corporate, Commercial, and Business Laws
- Intellectual Property and Technology Law
- International Law and Human Rights
- Environmental and Sustainable Development Law
- Cyber Law, Artificial Intelligence, and Emerging Technologies
- Family Law, Labour Law, and Social Justice Studies

The journal accepts original research articles, case comments, legislative and policy analyses, book reviews, and interdisciplinary studies addressing legal issues at national and international levels. All submissions are subject to a rigorous double-blind peer-review process to ensure academic quality, originality, and relevance.

Through its publications, *White Black Legal – The Law Journal* seeks to foster critical legal thinking and contribute to the development of law as an instrument of justice, governance, and social progress, while expressly disclaiming responsibility for the application or misuse of published content.

# **EFFICIENCY VS. JUSTICE: A CRITICAL ANALYSIS** **OF ORDER X OF THE CODE OF CIVIL** **PROCEDURE, 1908**

AUTHORED BY - ABHINEET ASHOK DANGE  
Manikchand Parade Law College, Chh.Sambhajinagar

## **Abstract**

The Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (CPC), serves as the backbone of civil litigation in India, aiming to ensure a fair, systematic, and efficient adjudicatory process. Among its various procedural mechanisms, Order X stands out as a provision designed to facilitate early judicial intervention by allowing courts to examine parties at the first hearing. The primary objective of this provision is to identify the real issues in dispute, record admissions, and explore the possibility of settlement through alternative dispute resolution (ADR).

While Order X appears to promote procedural efficiency and reduce delays, its application raises important concerns regarding fairness, judicial neutrality, and the protection of litigants' rights. The informal nature of examination and the wide discretion granted to judges may, in certain situations, risk prejudicing one party or influencing the course of litigation.

This paper critically evaluates whether Order X successfully balances efficiency with justice or whether it tends to prioritize speed over fairness. By analyzing statutory provisions, judicial interpretations, and practical implications, the paper argues that although Order X is an essential tool for case management, its effectiveness depends largely on cautious and principled judicial application.

## **Introduction**

The Indian civil justice system has long been criticized for its slow pace and mounting backlog of cases. Delays in adjudication not only undermine public confidence in the judiciary but also dilute the very essence of justice. It is often said that "*justice delayed is justice denied*," but equally important is the idea that "*justice hurried is justice buried*."

In response to these concerns, procedural reforms have sought to make civil litigation more efficient without compromising fairness. One such reform-oriented provision is Order X of the CPC, which empowers courts to actively engage with parties at the initial stage of proceedings.

Order X allows the court to:

- Ascertain admissions and denials,
- Clarify ambiguities in pleadings,
- Identify the core issues in dispute, and
- Encourage settlement through ADR mechanisms.

At first glance, this provision reflects a progressive shift toward **active judicial case management**, a concept widely recognized in modern legal systems. However, this shift also raises an important question:

- *Can increased judicial intervention at an early stage enhance efficiency without affecting the impartiality and fairness of the process?*

This paper seeks to explore this tension between efficiency and justice in the context of Order X CPC.

### Objectives of the Study

This research aims to:

1. Examine the scope and purpose of Order X CPC
2. Analyze its contribution to judicial efficiency
3. Evaluate its impact on fairness and procedural justice
4. Study key judicial pronouncements interpreting Order X
5. Suggest reforms to ensure a better balance between efficiency and justice

### Research Methodology

The study follows a **doctrinal research methodology**, relying on:

- Statutory analysis of the CPC
- Judicial decisions of the Supreme Court and High Courts
- Standard legal commentaries and textbooks
- Scholarly articles and Law Commission reports

### Legal Framework of Order X CPC

Order X deals primarily with the **examination of parties at the first hearing of a suit.**

#### Key Provisions

- **Rule 1:** Ascertainment of admissions and denials
- **Rule 1A:** Direction to opt for ADR

- **Rule 1B:** Appearance before ADR forum
- **Rule 1C:** Reporting back after ADR
- **Rule 2:** Oral examination of parties

The underlying objective is to ensure that litigation proceeds on clearly defined issues, thereby avoiding unnecessary delays and complications.

## Efficiency Perspective of Order X

Order X plays a significant role in enhancing procedural efficiency in several ways.

### 1. Early Identification of Real Issues

Civil pleadings are often lengthy and sometimes vague. By directly interacting with parties, the court can quickly identify what is actually disputed and what is not. This prevents unnecessary expansion of the trial.

### 2. Reduction of Delay

Once the issues are clearly framed at the beginning, the chances of adjournments and procedural confusion reduce significantly. This contributes to faster disposal of cases.

### 3. Encouragement of ADR

Order X (Rules 1A-1C) integrates ADR into the judicial process. Courts can direct parties toward mediation or arbitration, which often leads to quicker and mutually acceptable resolutions.<sup>1</sup>

### 4. Elimination of Frivolous Claims

Admissions made during examination may lead to partial or complete disposal of cases at an early stage, saving judicial time.

### 5. Judicial Case Management

Order X reflects a shift from a passive to an active judicial role, aligning Indian procedure with global trends in civil justice reform.

## Justice Perspective: Concerns and Limitations

Despite its advantages, Order X raises several concerns from the standpoint of justice.

### 1. Risk of Judicial Overreach

The power to examine parties directly may lead to situations where the judge unintentionally influences responses. This may affect the neutrality of proceedings.

### 2. Informal Nature of Examination

Unlike evidence recorded under oath, statements under Order X lack strict procedural

safeguards. This raises questions about their reliability and legal weight.

### 3. Possibility of Prejudice

Statements made without proper legal understanding may later be used against a party, leading to unfair outcomes.

### 4. Inequality Between Parties

Unrepresented or less informed litigants may be at a disadvantage during judicial questioning.

### 5. Lack of Uniform Application

The absence of detailed procedural guidelines leads to inconsistency in how different courts apply Order X.

## Judicial Interpretation and Case Analysis

1. Salem Advocate Bar Association v. Union of India<sup>2</sup>
2. **Issue:** Whether procedural reforms introducing ADR mechanisms compromise fairness.
3. **Held:** The Supreme Court upheld the validity of ADR provisions and emphasized that procedural reforms are essential for reducing delays.
4. **Analysis:**
5. The Court recognized that efficiency is a necessary component of justice but clarified that it should not override fairness. Order X, particularly Rules 1A-1C, was viewed as a tool to promote settlement without coercion. This case highlights the judiciary's attempt to balance efficiency with justice.
6. K.K. Velusamy v. N. Palanisamy<sup>3</sup>
7. **Issue:** Scope of procedural powers of courts.
8. **Held:** Courts have inherent powers to ensure justice, but such powers must not override procedural safeguards.
9. **Analysis:**
10. This case reinforces the idea that procedural provisions like Order X must be used cautiously. While efficiency is important, it cannot justify actions that may prejudice parties or bypass due process.
11. Kapil Corepacks Pvt. Ltd. v. Harbans Lal<sup>4</sup>
12. **Issue:** Whether examination under Order X can be treated as evidence.
13. **Held:** The Court clarified that Order X examination is only for clarification and not

a substitute for evidence.

#### 14. Analysis:

15. This judgment draws a clear boundary, ensuring that Order X does not encroach upon the trial process. It protects fairness by preventing misuse of statements made during preliminary examination.

### Efficiency vs. Justice: The Central Tension

The debate between efficiency and justice is not unique to Order X-it is a broader issue in procedural law.

Efficiency	Justice
Speedy disposal	Fair hearing
Reduced backlog	Protection of rights
Judicial control	Neutral adjudication

Order X attempts to reconcile these competing goals, but the balance is delicate.

- Efficiency without fairness leads to injustice.
- Fairness without efficiency leads to delay. The ideal system must achieve both.

### Critical Analysis

Order X is fundamentally a **progressive provision**, but its success depends on implementation.

#### Positive Aspects

- Encourages early clarity
- Saves judicial time
- Promotes settlement

#### Negative Aspects

- Risk of misuse
- Lack of safeguards
- Potential prejudice

The provision itself is not problematic; rather, its application determines whether it promotes justice or undermines it.

## Suggestions and Reforms

1. **Framing Clear Guidelines** - Judicial training and standardized procedures can reduce inconsistency.
2. **Recording of Proceedings** – Proper documentation ensures transparency and accountability.
3. **Protection of Litigants** - Courts should ensure that parties understand the implications of their statements.
4. **Structured Case Management** - Order X should be integrated into a broader framework of trial planning.
5. **Strengthening ADR Mechanisms** - Effective implementation of mediation and conciliation can reduce reliance on trial.

## Conclusion

Order X of the CPC represents an important step toward modernizing civil procedure in India. It acknowledges the need for efficiency in a system burdened with delays, but at the same time, it operates within a framework that must uphold fairness and justice.

The real challenge lies not in choosing between efficiency and justice, but in ensuring that both coexist. Order X has the potential to achieve this balance, but only when applied with care, restraint, and sensitivity.

Ultimately, justice must not only be done quickly-it must also be done fairly.

## References

1. Code of Civil Procedure, 1908, Order X, Rules 1A-1C.
2. *Salem Advocate Bar Ass'n v. Union of India*, (2005) 6 SCC 344 (India).
3. *K.K. Velusamy v. N Palanisamy*, (2011) 11 SEC 275 (India).
4. *Kapil Corepacks Pvt. Ltd. v. Harbans Lal*, AIR 2010 SC.
5. C.K. Takwani, *Civil Procedure* (Eastern Book Company).
6. Mulla, *The Code of Civil Procedure*.
7. Sarkar, *Law of Civil Procedure*.