WWW.IJRPR.COM

International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews

Journal homepage: www.ijrpr.com ISSN 2582-7421

Harnessing Blockchain for Judicial Administration in India

Ashish Kumar[1], Dr. Radhey Shyam Jha[2]

[1]Student, B.B.A. LL.B. (Hons.), Law College Dehradun, Uttaranchal University, Dehradun, Uttarakhand, India.
[2] Head of Department and Associate Professor, Law College Dehradun, Uttaranchal University, Dehradun, Uttarakhand, India.
DOI : https://doi.org/10.55248/gengpi.6.0425.1342

ABSTRACT

Persistent systemic problems plague the judiciary in India, such as a backlog of more than 4.5 million cases, delays in procedures, and rampant corruption, which all alienate the public from justice. This study investigates the possible paradigm shift that a decentralized and tamper-proof ledger system could bring to judicial administration by looking into the idea of blockchain technology to study how an unchanging decentralized approach found in private ledgers can bring about a dramatic turn into judicial functions. The study analyzes how the court records can be secured by using the features of blockchain technology, thereby understanding how it can automate the routine tasks through smart contracts and real-time tracking of case progress. To shed light on the aspects drawn from the global examples like Estonia and China, and domestic initiatives such as the Judiciary Chain of NIC, the research evaluates the current Indian legal frameworks, specifically the Information Technology Act, 2000, and the Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023, in determining their provisions considering blockchain application in judicial contexts. Legal ambiguities, tech hurdles, and infrastructural discriminations, particularly the rural digital divide, stand identified as significant challenges. Among others, such policies include law reforms recognizing evidence from blockchain, capacity building for juheors, and investments to put up scalable infrastructure through energy-efficient consensus mechanisms. It demands a phase-wise, collaborative approach to success through government leadership, judicial oversight, and private sector innovation into the future. With appropriate implementation, pendency will come down significantly, reduce manipulation and improve transparency. The study imagines a blockchain-enabled judiciary by 2030 in line with the Digital India initiative, with an efficient, secure, and equitable justice delivery. The Indian judiciary, which dwells in a house of case backlog, is conditioned by these terms: judicial administration, blockchain, smart contracts, legal framework, digital justice and judiciary chain.

Keywords: Blockchain, Judicial Administration, Indian Judiciary, Case Backlog, Smart Contracts, Legal Framework, Digital Justice, Judiciary Chain

Introduction

At its core, Blockchain technology is decentralized and an immutable ledger system and keeps data in a network of computers such that once data is added, no one member can change it without the agreement of all members. Traditional databases are controlled by a central authority, while a blockchain shares control among members by ensuring that transactions and data are secured in blocks linked chronologically through cryptographic techniques. Originally, this technology was developed as infrastructure for some cryptocurrencies such as Bitcoin; however, it has ultimately grown to be a most powerful tool across several domains including but not limited to governance, health, and judicial administration, rather than just finance.[1] Blockchain is redefining the future of India's judiciary by transforming its future prospects through possible systemic inefficiencies, which have so happened, for the last many years, to increase the whole system's burden and as such make public trust in the entire system more difficult.

Since judicial administration uses blockchain to combat inefficiencies and opacity that are inherent in legal systems all over the world, including India's, the relevance of blockchain becomes clear. With a tamper-proof record of judicial processes like filing cases, submission of evidence, and issuance of court orders, blockchain would ensure transparency and accountability at all stages of the procedure.[2] No more reliance on intermediaries; therefore, the opportunity for corruption has gone. Smart contracts facilitate the automation of routine undertakings like case scheduling and deposit refunds. Thus, for a nation such as India, which suffers from hindrances to justice like delays and mistrust, blockchain assures a modernized channel that can be in concert with global efficiency and integrity standards.

There seem to be quite interesting challenges to the Indian judiciary, which indicate the need for such a technological intervention. According to the current estimation, there are more than 4.5 million cases filed in multiple courts today-this figure signifies an annual compounding rate of 2.8% in pending cases between 2010 and 2020.[3] This congestion delays justice and makes it a poor public confidence practice. Corruption further adds to the misery. Irreference of records, forging of papers, and manipulating the process are examples of how this problem is rooted in the core of this institution. It also creates a backlog of matter in case management through manual and primitive dated systems, widening the scope for error and manipulation of

[1] Satoshi Nakamoto, “Bitcoin: A Peer-to-Peer Electronic Cash System”, available at: https://bitcoin.org/bitcoin.pdf (last visited on February 24, 2025).
[2] World Intellectual Property Organization, "China Leverages the Blockchain to Advance the Development of ‘Smart Courts’", *WIPO Magazine*, 2022.
[3] Artificial Intelligence and Blockchain: The Tools of Modern Era for Speedy Justice, available at: https://www.legalserviceindia.com/legal/article-10136-.html (last visited on February 25, 2025).

verification of documents and evidence. Even though there is still the magnanimous e-Courts project, it hasn't been able to keep pace with the continued increase in workloads while attempting to adopt such new technologies that the 21st century has to offer in Supreme Courts, High Courts, and District Courts.

This article seeks to investigate the potential of Blockchain to reform India's judicial administration.[4] At the same time, it intends to appraise the audience on how blockchain can be accommodated by identifying what legal frameworks could permit its validation in the establishment, institutional mechanisms for its adoption, as well as policy imperatives to propel their implementation. Indeed, there is much at stake: whatever judiciary that adopts blockchain can potentially do its work well in reducing case backlogs, cut down on avenues for corruption, and become the world's example for technology-driven justice. The sections that follow will elaborate on these perspectives, with an analysis of conceptual ways and also concrete means of adoption of blockchain in India.

Blockchain Technology in Legal Context: A Global and Local Perspective

According to many, the idea of storing, securing, and administering data has undergone a radical change and developed into sharing, with key features that have so much to distinguish it from traditional storage, immutability, decentralization, and transparency, along with the factors of cryptography. Instead of storing data in a centralized database controlled by a single individual, a blockchain distributed data logs into a node of all the network, making it unnecessary for any single point of failure or control. One recorded data is immutable and can only be modified through consensus by the network while all transactions can be seen in real time by all participants. Its integrity of data is encrypted through high-end cryptography making blockchain a solid tool where trust and accountability are required. Originally designed to underwrite Bitcoin, its scope has widened and is now touted as a revolutionary technology for a wide variety of fields, including judicial administration.

At the most basic level, the blockchain works on an organized algorithm. Data is grouped in "blocks" with the list of transactions or records. These blocks are then linked in a time sequence using cryptographic "hashes"—the unique digital fingerprints that ensure the whole chain's integrity. The hash of a block will change if that block is modified. The break in the hash will alert the network to the changes. Consensus mechanisms like Proof of Work or Proof of Stake determine how nodes verify the legitimacy of freshly created blocks, thus ensuring decentralized trust without any intermediaries. This architecture lends itself well to secure recording, something that an increasing number of jurisdictions around the world are beginning to exploit.[5]

Creates global lessons on how blockchain can be applied in judicial administration. Estonia's e-justice example is instructive in securing court records and enabling digital access to judicial services by the use of blockchain. For instance, with its KSI technology, Estonia can administer cases easily, minimize administrative costs, and provide citizens with access to transparent proceedings in court by integrating blockchain. Through the application of blockchain, the Supreme People's Court of China has also introduced technology that enforces judicial transparency and can link more than two billion pieces of evidence on a blockchain platform by 2022. Coming under China's "smart courts" scheme, this development exemplifies blockchain's capability to preserve evidence integrity and fast-forward case resolution in a large judicial system. These examples show how blockchain can modernize processes in legal domains, which, then, India could adopt.

In India, there is great potential for blockchain in tackling age-old judicial issues. An even more pressing concern is corruption, which could be appreciably curbed by blockchain's impenetrable records. This will obviously reduce opportunities for document forgery or undue influence being asserted upon the executive and judiciary. In this regard, perhaps land disputes could cut down on litigation if property records would be made immutable under blockchain, as fraudulent claims could be thus nipped. Instead of the case being tracked by more-or-less manual processes, real-time tracking updates via blockchain would empower litigants and courts to monitor case progress in a transparent fashion. Security of records such as evidence or court orders on a blockchain would effectively arrest the tampering, thereby increasing trust in the judicial outcome. With over 4.5 million pending cases, these implementations may alleviate systemic burdens significantly.[6]

The core relevance of blockchain for the judicial needs of the country lies in eliminating inefficiencies and linking access to justice. The Indian judiciary consists of the Supreme Court, 25 High Courts and a vast number of District Courts. The services of these organs have become slow due to obsolete case management. Use of the automation potential of Blockchain, say through smart contracts, which are agreements coded on the blockchain and can complete operations automatically, could perhaps diminish many mundane activities, such as hearing scheduling or depositing interests on judicial proceedings to cash, in the task of human error. The other great value adds for blockchain technology for the judicial services will be making the processes transparent and verifiable. This can be a bridge between the citizen and the judiciary—a critical piece in a country where rural people often access justice through long distances and face corruption. India is already sending signals of readiness to experiment with the technology through initiatives such as the National Informatics Centre's (NIC) Judiciary Chain, which houses 7.93 million documents.[7]

---

[4] National Judicial Data Grid, "Pending Cases Statistics", available at: https://njdg.ecourts.gov.in/njdgnew/?p=main/pend_dashboard (last visited on February 25, 2025).

[5] Neha Kukrety, Pitresh Kaushik, "Blockchain Technology and Legal Framework in India: A Systematic Review", 1 *Journal of Indian Legal Studies* 142 (2023).

[6] Apurva Agarwal, "BLOCKCHAIN TECHNOLOGY, LEGAL FRAMEWORK AND ITS APPLICATION IN THE LEGAL SYSTEM", available at: https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/blockchain-technology-legal-framework-its-application-apurva-agarwal/ (last visited on February 25, 2025).

[7] Blockchain: The India Strategy – Part I, available at: https://www.niti.gov.in/sites/default/files/2020-01/Blockchain_The_India_Strategy_Part_I.pdf (last visited on February 25, 2025).

Nevertheless, maximization of this potential will, by its very nature, hinge on circumstantial factors. For instance, there is the digital divide in India whereby rural areas are disadvantaged in terms of internet access, and this factor severely contraindicates mass adoption. The energy-hungry nature of some blockchain consensus mechanisms, like Proof of Work, may again destabilize the infrastructure of a developing country. Somewhere between the extremes, a hybrid choice, with some public blockchains being more private than others, can give the right balance of security and efficiency according to Indian requirements. Countries such as Estonia and China show that blockchain has great potential to build judicial administration, if political will and funding are present. For India, this presents an opportunity for aligning with its professed intent of Digital India for efficient distribution justice.

Current State and Challenges of Indian Judiciary: A Detailed Overview

A major pillar of a democratic society, the Indian judiciary follows a hierarchy comprising the Supreme Court, High Courts, and District Courts. The Supreme Court, established under Article 124 of the Constitution, is the highest court which decides constitutional matters and hears appeals from the lower courts. As of 2025, there exist 25 High Courts supervising a few states or union territories for the purpose of putting into practice appeals, writs, and original cases. Below High Courts are more than 600 District Courts, which form the bedrock of the system, settling civil or criminal cases in their local jurisdictions. The layered structure affords access to justice to India's vast and diverse population; however, it is fraught with multiple operational hurdles that adversely affect the surplus functions of the judiciary.[8]

The judiciary's primary functions are adjudication, case management, and evidence handling. Adjudication means settling disputes through the legal process where judges interpret laws and pronounce judgments. Case management involves scheduling hearings, following cases through the court system, and maintaining records-a nearly digitally based process thanks to the e-Courts project launched in 2005. Evidence handling is very critical in ensuring fair trials. This embalms collecting, testing, and safeguarding documents and testimonies, often within strict procedural rules outlined in the Evidence Act, 1872. These are functions meant to deliver justice, but they reveal deep flaws in the working of the system that cannot bring timely and just outcomes.

The backlog of cases is indeed one of the most pressing challenges. The latest estimates suggest that over 4.5 million cases remain pending across the Indian courts, while the annual increase in pendency was estimated at 2.8% between 2010 and 2020. The Supreme Court alone had over 80,000 pending cases in 2023, while the High Courts and District Courts had millions more. The backlog is an outcome of various reasons: lack of judges (with a judge-to-population ratio of 21 per million against a recommended 50), poor infrastructure, and procedural delays. For litigants, this means years of wait, which often aggravates the dispute and destroys faith in the judicial process.

Corruption acts as a force multiplier in adding to these grievances as it manifests itself through tampering of records and undue delays. Instances of forged documents, alteration of court orders, and bribery tend to attract media interest, especially in land dispute cases and criminal cases where stakes are high. A 2019 survey conducted by Transparency International labeled India's judiciary among moderately corrupt institutions, with rural litigants to a high degree vulnerable owing to lack of oversight. Such malpractices delay and tarnish justice, as tampering with records undermines the evidentiary foundation of cases. Due to the manual aspect of many judicial processes, real human intervention, and manipulation occur with ease.[9]

Obsolescence is one of the indexes by which inefficiency emanates. As seen in e-Courts that have been digitized, manual processes are still being used in most courts to file, track and verify documents Document verification, which is one of the pillars of legal proceedings, is fraught with errors and predisposed to fraud because the records are paper-based and will not undergo real-time authentication Case management gets hit with the same problems: scheduling conflicts and lost files contribute to delays. For example, a research done in 2022 found 15 percent of High Court delays to be due to missing or incomplete records These inefficiencies place extra strain on an already overburdened system, making justice unavailable to most citizens, particularly those living in rural areas where technology has not yet fully reached.

Blockchain technology provides a definite solution to the problems mentioned by enhancing real-time tracking features, tamper-proof records, and automation. In case backlog, with the real-time tracking of case progress via blockchain, the court and litigants could keep track of updates in a decentralized ledger. Such transparency could shorten the period of delays by presenting instant visibility into bottlenecks, like pending approvals or adjourned hearings. The judiciary chain run by the National Informatics Centre (NIC), with 7.93 million documents by 2023, presents such an opportunity for a secure platform for judicial records. From their collection, if cases are prioritized in the courts, integrating blockchain with already existing systems like e-Courts might reverse the trend of 2.8% pendency.[10]

To address corruption, blockchain's tamper-proof nature ensures that once a record—be it a court order, evidence, or filing—is entered, it cannot be altered without network consensus This immutability could deter tampering, as any attempt would be detectable across the blockchain, enhancing accountability. For instance, land records secured on blockchain could eliminate fraudulent claims, a common source of litigation Pilot projects in states like Telangana, using blockchain for land registries, offer a blueprint for judicial applications

---

[8] Indrasish Majumder, "An In-Depth Analysis of the Challenges Faced by the Judiciary in India", available at: https://lawctopus.com/clatalogue/clat-pg/analysis-of-the-challenges-faced-by-the-judiciary-in-india/ (last visited on February 25, 2025).

[9] Ranjan Gogoi, "Challenges facing the Indian Judiciary – Identification and Resolution", available at: https://www.tnsja.tn.gov.in/article/Challenges%20to%20the%20Indian%20Judiciary%20-%20Ranjan%20Gogoi.pdf (last visited on February 25, 2025)

[10] Major Challenges Faced by the Indian Judiciary: Navigating Towards Justice and Efficiency, available at: https://edzorblaw.com/2024/08/06/major-challenges-faced-by-the-indian-judiciary-navigating-towards-justice-and-efficiency/ (last visited on February 25, 2025).

To an end, blockchain solutions to inefficiency through automation. Smart contracts would allow the automatic execution of routine tasks (e.g., scheduling hearings and releasing judicial deposits) and thus minimize the chance for human error and delay Document verification could just take a few seconds instead of days through cryptographic authentication, in reaction to its from the outside world Well, the concerns of scalability and cost of the infrastructure remain, but hybrid models-mixing public-private feature-could be the answer to India's requirements of justice in terms of security and efficiency.[11]

Legal Frameworks for Blockchain in India: Analyzing the Regulatory Landscape

The need for a supportive legal system dictates the application of blockchain technology in India's judicial administration. Today, this way out consists of a passage between certain existing laws and adaptable digital innovations, hence the combination of sector laws. No bill on blockchain has been on the shelf since March 2025, but it should be recalled that the Information Technology Act of 2000 and the Digital Personal Data Protection Act of 2023 act as the permissive bases for integrating blockchain with other sectors. However, some gaps in precision and applicability with respect to the judicial context necessitate specific changes in the law to ensure that the advantages of blockchain, such as the establishment of tamper-proof records and automation, are acknowledged and enforceable.[12]

India's principal legislative framework for digital transactions has also set the stage for blockchain adoption in the form of the Information Technology Act, 2000 (IT Act). Although it aimed to facilitate e-commerce and e-governance, it defined that electronic records and digital signatures are legally valid as per Sections 4 and 5 of the Act. Blockchain secures an electronic ledger with its cryptographic hashes, which is equal to the definition thereby suggesting that such records could be accepted in courts as judicial records kept on the blockchain. This also means that Section 65B further educates us concerning the admissibility of electronic evidence provided it can be produced with certification requirements which could be streamlined by immutable nature of the blockchain. But, because the IT Act was enacted before the advent of blockchain, there are no provisions making any specific reference to decentralized systems. Hence, there remains a lack of clarity regarding the status of such systems judiciously.

The Digital Personal data Protection Act, 2023, is the latest statute in India governing data protection and aims to augment regulatory frameworks concerned with privacy and security-the prime phenomena of blockchain applications. The DPDP is effective in 2023 and states that certain fiduciaries should see to data accuracy, security, and restriction of purpose-ideas that can be substantiated through the transparency and immutability of blockchain. Thus, under such a DPDP Act, Personal data processed on blockchain could apply the consent and retention norms required under the legislation for judicial purposes, such as evidence management. Nevertheless, its mandate on centralized data controllers seems to conflict the decentralized architecture of blockchain systems, thereby posing questions of responsibility in permissionless networks. This difficulty demonstrates the importance for specific in-house amendments taking into account the unique qualities of blockchain.[13]

Besides the aforementioned laws, SEBI and RBI have issued sector-specific regulations to signify India's tentative leap into the use of blockchain technology. SEBI is studying blockchain for securities settlements, making a point about its applications in terms of transparency, while RBI has a regulatory sandbox for testing financial solutions based on blockchain. Although these regulations are meant for the financial industries, their principles—for instance, secure record-keeping and auditability—have potential applications in pending laws and their judicial implementation. The Judiciary Chain developed by the National Informatics Centre (NIC), containing 7.93 million documents, is based on using similar attributes of blockchain, which indicates adaptability across sectors. But these guidelines are de facto parallelistic and not digestible into a framework for judicial governance.

There still exist huge voids in specific blockchain laws regarding its usage by the courts. Some governments have been bold enough to come out with an opinion about the engagement of blockchain technology in courts; for instance. such as China, which issued Supreme Court opinions in 2022 on blockchain evidence, whereas India doesn't have one-size-fits-all policy towards the application of courts. The IT Act's generalized ambiguous definitions fail to extend to many blockchain-specific issues such as smart contracts and decentralized consensus while overlooking judicial exemptions for public interest data within the ambit of the DPDP Act's privacy focus.

Two main issues develop with application of existing laws on blockchain in a judicial setting: one is legal recognition of evidence in the form of a blockchain and the other of smart contracts. In the case of evidence, Section 65B of the IT Act can more or less be stretched to accommodate blockchain records, since it does state that they be tamper-proof. However, there are currently no court precedents on this. Even as an air conditioner the 2021 Delhi High Court ruling states that electronic records be taken broadly lit as possible, it does not have the explicit blockchain stamp.

A proposed reform is the only solution for yarn to fill those gaps. The first amendment relates to the current IT Act so that the term "admissible evidence" would include the definition of blockchain record with some specified standards for hashes and timestamps to be in accordance with Section 65B requirements. This will legitimize case files and evidence logs for international practices like that of Estonia's KSI blockchain. Second, the DpDP Act has provisions addressing judicial blockchain data, which has to be exempted from these stringent consent conditions, balancing privacy and public access like the GDPR exposures in the EU. Third, a new legislative framework or judicial guidelines should define smart contracts' enforceability,

---

[11] Shubham Tripathi, Md Zaid Hussain, "Judicial Administration and Challenges", available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/373632324_Judicial_Administration_and_Challenges (last visited on February 25, 2025).

[12] Aashita Dawer, "Analysing Judicial Efficiency of Indian Courts", available at: https://csep.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/Analysing-Judicial-Efficiency-of-Indian-Courts-_F-1-1.pdf (last visited on February 25, 2025).

[13] Blockchain & Cryptocurrency Laws and Regulations 2025 – India, available at: https://www.globallegalinsights.com/practice-areas/blockchain-cryptocurrency-laws-and-regulations/india/ (last visited on February 25, 2025).

amend the Contract Act to include automated agreements, and address liability in case of coding errors. These reforms will involve a lot of the Ministry of Law and Justice, NIC, and tech experts for making feasibility ground clear.

India can additionally incorporate a sandbox approach for blockchain pilot projects in select courts like the SEBI and RBI have done. NIC's Judiciary Chain presents a clear example in that way, confirming the use of blockchain for document security. Legal recognition of such pilot projects would create case law clarifying applicability and addressing scalability concerns. Hybrid blockchains, combining public transparency with private data protection, would be required to ensure privacy compliance under the DPDP Act.[14]

Policy Imperatives: Driving Adoption

The successful integration of blockchain into India's judicial administration rests on a strong policy formation-a multi-faceted endeavor that requires government leadership, technological innovation, and institutional collaboration. As of March 2025, India's progress in blockchain adoption, seen in initiatives like the National Informatics Centre's Judiciary Chain, shows great potential; however, a strategic policy framework is required to scale this technology across the judiciary. This section outlines the critical imperatives: funding and incentives for government, utilization of recent initiatives, standardization, collaboration, skilling of personnel, and the ideals behind a blockchain-led justice ecosystem.

In fact, the government has a critical role to play in the adoption of blockchain technologies, starting from funding it in research and development (R&D). The transformation within the judiciary requires investments in infrastructure, pilot projects, and software development, and cannot be funded only by government budgetary provisions. This kind of national funding can help facilitate progress. The MeitY has already allocated funds for blockchain R&D, and of course, the development of applications for the judiciary remains a greenfield area. Incentives such as tax breaks for companies developing judicial blockchain applications or grants for the courts piloting these technologies could speed up adoption. All such funding could be similar to those Rs. 300 crore ear marked for e-Courts which can then be redirected to blockchain projects, guaranteeing that finances are matched with the ambition of technology.

The above-mentioned activities provide impetus for such a shift. The IRDAI and SEBI regulatory sandboxes test blockchain applications in finance and serve as examples for judicial experimentation. In its sandbox since 2019, IRDAI has been investigating secure data-sharing applications, while SEBI has in 2021 used a sandbox to test blockchain applications for securities settlement. The NIC has been showcasing application-oriented use cases for judiciary-like projects involving blockchain, such as the Judiciary Chain in which 7.93 million documents were hosted by 2023.[15] This project is part of the NIC's five-blockchain ecosystem supporting the securing of court records and potentially being expanded into case management through policy support. The initiatives indicate readiness on India's part, but there is no meaningful policy to integrate them into the judicial landscape.

For scaling up in India’s diversified judicial setup, standardization of the blockchain is very critical in this respect. Interoperability protocols should allow various motorcycle platforms - Judiciary Chain for instance - to interoperate with legacy systems such as these systems reduce the likelihood of maintaining data silos. Further data protocols to specify formats for case files, evidence logs, and smart contracts will create the required consistency, enabling sharing of records between the High Courts and Districts Courts. The Bureau of Indian Standards should take charge of this effort, from christening the standards to perhaps their adoption, while drawing from extant global standards, especially ISO/TC 307 on blockchain. Without any standardization, however, these fragmented implementations are bound to render blockchain inefficient in fulfilling its very promise of a one-stop unified transparent justice delivery system.

Involvement of technology companies, universities, and judiciary would add the third frontier. Like the tech giants such as Infosys and TCS experimenting with blockchain, these could also team up with courts to develop custom-built solutions, for example, smart contracts for dispute resolution. Academic institutions such as the IITs may convert their research on scalability and security for contribution to India's blockchain ecosystem. The judiciary itself, through bodies like the Supreme Court's e-Committee, must direct the purpose of such an effort towards satisfying legal as well as operational requirements. Successful global models such as Estonia's public-private blockchain collaborations hold up a mirror to India, while pilot projects in a few High Courts working together might fine-tune some of these synergies for innovating sufficiently grounded in judicial need.

The training of users for familiarization and subsequent adoption is the lifeblood of the process. Such training should extend to the judiciary and lawyers. Judges, clerks, and advocates require some appreciation of the basics of blockchain-how it secures records, tracks cases, and enforces smart contracts-so as to chip in their share toward harnessing its advantages. There could be blockchain modules introduced at the National Judicial Academy, while perhaps such legal continuing education in legal technology could become a requirement for bar councils. The training that NIC offers to its staff for blockchain projects could be extended to cover judicial personnel. Without this building of capacity, technology stands the risk of being under-utilized, as staff would revert to using their more familiar manual processes whenever the assistance of the system is called for.

The policy vision should focus on the creation of a blockchain-enabled justice ecosystem wherein transparency, efficiency, and accessibility would form the basis for the administration of justice. This would entail a vision for the long-term goal of digitizing all court records on blockchain, automating routine work through smart contracts, and allowing real-time tracking of cases for litigating parties Building on India’s Digital India initiative aimed at using technology to transform public services, by the year 2030, a full-fledged implementation could assist in clearing the backlog of 4.5 million cases, combating corruption, and making justice more accessible, especially to the rural population. This national-level policy framework

[14] Triveni P, Jaikishen, et.al., "Analysis of blockchain law and regulations", 68 *ITM Web of Conferences* 01010 (2024).
[15] Shashank Bhardwaj, "NIC India hosts 8 million Govt. documents on five blockchains" *Forbes India*, March 7, 2024.

should presumably be housed either in MeitY or the Ministry of Law and Justice to enable effective coordination for the implementation of funding, standards, and training.[16]

There were several complications that would need consideration in order to scale this vision, such as infrastructure costs and the digital divide. Blockchain has huge energy requirements, an example being the Proof of Work model for Bitcoin; sustainable and eco-friendly alternatives such as Proof of Stake must be pursued, especially because India is pushing for renewable energy. Rural courts are usually offline, and investments in connectivity will be required, possibly through BharatNet. The incentives could push laws to develop inclusively there. Regular audits of these blockchain systems, mandated by the policy, will keep up the trust quotient, assuring security measures against violations indicated earlier.

Case Studies and Pilot Projects: Learning from Practice

The prospect for judicial administration to be transformed continues to be illuminated through real-life practical examples where pilot projects or case studies have been undertaken on the feasibility and challenges of this technology. National informatics centre's Judiciary Chain stands as an example of such a national initiative in India, with the examples of cases from China or Estonia providing external learning opportunities. Such cases will have some key lessons such scalability, transparency, and user trust for India to apply and adapt successful models to local needs with respect to the application of blockchain in its judiciary, by March 2025.

India's Judiciary Chain operated by NIC is representative of an application of blockchain in the judiciary system. Launched under the Centre of Excellence in Blockchain Technology, this setup has secured 7.93 million government documents, including judicial records, over five blockchain platforms by 2023. Judiciary Chain is an implementation of hybrid blockchain technology, which allows the public to have full transparency while private access has access controls, creating a tamper-proof environment for the storage of documents, including orders and filings, associated with court cases. Being part of a larger blockchain ecosystem of NIC, the project aims at increasing record integrity and accessibility, where judicial records constitute a large chunk of its corpus. It supports integration with e-Courts by providing a secure backend for digitized case files, thereby reducing the chances of fraud in document management. Pilot testing is still going on for this project, but the successful hosting of millions of records indicates that this system has the potential for scaling, albeit further support is needed in terms of policy to extend the implementation to real-time case-tracking or evidence management.[17]

Globally, the blockchain initiatives for judicial transparency that China is using provide a powerful model. Integration of blockchain into the 'smart courts' model of the Supreme People's Court of China has continued from 2018 and, by now, boasts over 2 billion pieces of evidence in storage by 2022. In this regard, the 2022 judicial opinion emphasizes the fact that this system utilizes the technology of blockchain to timestamp and hash evidence for authenticity across courts. This pioneering trial application, the Hangzhou Internet Court, has handled disputes purely based on blockchain storage records, for which it has reduced verification time from days to minutes. With the sole centralized but blockchain-secured network of thousands of courts, China's model includes scalability to transparency where litigants can access the online verification of evidence. This model is proof that the country can keep large judicial systems, which sets a relevant reference for India's current backlog of 4.5 million cases.

Greater is the case for Estonia's digital records system. Since 2008, Estonia has used its Keyless Signature Infrastructure (KSI) blockchain to ensure public-private e-justice records, such as court filings and judgments. This public-private blockchain jointly developed with Guardtime timestamps all judiciary data, ensuring immutability and enabling citizens to access records through the e-Estonia portal. By 2023, Estonia's system processed over a million legal documents annually and supported a fully digital judiciary with little to no backlog. Its success lies in scalability: handling relatively a small but tech-savvy population and that citizens trust the system because it has transparent access and government backing. Estonia's lightweight, energy-efficient blockchain does wonderful things compared to China's power-hungry model and offers options for India depending on the infrastructure capacity.[18]

These cases speak volumes, for they elucidate some key lessons. Scalability is one of these lessons. NIC's Judiciary Chain has demonstrated that blockchain technology can handle millions of documents, while that of China can scale to billions. It appears that India might be able to adapt hybrid models for its vast judiciary. Transparency—which we see in China's evidence verification as well as in the Estonian case of public access—serves to enhance accountability and hence to deal with corruption issues in India. The trust of users is built through Estonia's citizen-friendly portal and NIC's secure hosting, and this trust is extremely relevant for litigant confidence in a system troubled by lack of trust. Yet these remain a formidable challenge: on the one hand, China's centralized control completely violates the spirit of decentralized systems like blockchain, while on the other hand, the whole Estonian experience may not be transferrable to India given its larger complications.

The application to the India would be to localise the models according to the local context. The Judiciary Chain of ICT possibly could evolve from electronic storage of documents into real-time tracking of cases with respect to evidence management, similar to the Chinese model but localized on the e-Courts platform of India. A hybrid blockchain similar to the ones in NIC and Estonia would address transparency to litigants, yet privacy of sensitive

---

[16] **Indian state to adopt blockchain in governance**, available at: https://www.ledgerinsights.com/indian-state-maharashtra-blockchain-in-government/ (last visited on February 25, 2025).

[17] **Judiciary Chain (JC)**, available at: https://blockchain.gov.in/Home/Product?product=JudiciaryChain (last visited on February 25, 2025).

[18] Garima Singh, "Indian Government Blockchain Frameworks and Use Cases: Revolutionizing Public Services", available at: https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/indian-government-blockchain-frameworks-use-cases-public-garima-singh-l8nkf/ (last visited on February 25, 2025).

judicial information in conformity to the Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023. Scalability involves investment in infrastructure, leveraging Digital India initiative for extending connectivity to rural courts. Further, it could also ensure that time stamping, as observed in China, can prevent corrupt practices like manipulation of land records. User-centric design, as in Estonia, suits the diverse geography and diversity in population of India even better.

India's adaptation must face distinct challenges. The digital divide—40% of rural areas have no access to reliable internet—imposes a phased approach, starting with the urban High Courts. Blockchain applications will put heavy energy requirements on India, and energy efficiency could be garnered relying on Estonia's KSI model rather than China's heavier setups toward India's renewable energy goals. On the other hand, discussed earlier, policy support must finance pilots like the Judiciary Chain's scaling, ensuring compatibility with preexisting systems. With technical assistance from the private sector, as was done in Estonia, development could be ramped up; simultaneously, training of judicial staff—much like NIC did—assures usability.[19]

Try out piloting blockchain in certain select High Courts like Delhi or Bombay for case management with evidence logs and then scale it based on improvements. China uses evidence integrity with the security that can be used for India's 4.5 million pending cases; Estonia's would inform public dashboards showing the status of cases. Such a change needs legal recognition of the blockchain record, as suggested in Section 4, and standardized protocols as from Section 6.

Challenges and Recommendations: Navigating Obstacles

The waiver of benefits is assured in incorporating blockchain into India's judicial administration, but it is as yet not without challenges that are enormous at their dimensions from the legal, technical, and societal perspectives as of March 2025. These objections, from hazy acceptance of evidence to indiscriminate limitations regarding the infrastructure, need to be addressed before the merits of blockchain can be realized in enhancing the levels of transparency and efficiency in the workings of the judicial system. This segment will analyze these challenges with recommendations on how to address them while ensuring a fair and pragmatic approach to adoption.

First, legal hurdles include ambiguous recognition of the evidence generated from or traced via blockchain technology. Electronic records with certification are admissible under certificates provided by the Information Technology Act, 2000, but due to the decentralized nature of blockchain, the judicial acceptance has no clear precedent in this regard. The courts, so far, have not ruled whether a blockchain hash could count as a system of proof for authenticity, which poses uncertainty for evidence logs or case files. Further complications come from privacy concerns. The Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023 (DPDP Act), which mandates stringent consent and data security protocols, conflicts with the transparency of blockchain since data is viewable by network participants. Judicial records hung with high sensitivity would be exposed on public blockchains; private peer-to-peer models represent an incomplete solution for transparency goals. Therefore, judicial use of blockchains remains a tentative proposition without legal clarity.

Among the technological hurdles are scalability, energy usage, and infrastructure—all of which grow larger and larger. Scalability with regard to the judiciary is of utmost importance for India. With over 4.5 million cases pending, the systems must be able to work with millions of transactions daily. Whereas NIC's Judiciary Chain oversees 7.93 million documents, moving towards real-time tracking of cases across thousands of courts would need high-intensity computing power for scaling. Energy consumption complicates matters. Blockchain protocols such as Bitcoin's Proof of Work stand accused of hungrily consuming electrics—estimates put it at 91 TWh annually—an installation that is unsustainable in the Indian energy grid. Even though supposedly leaner mechanisms with consensus powers called Proof of Stake might be used for the blockchains, they require such resources that exert pressure on the rural courts with an often unreliable energy supply. This shortfall in infrastructure only aggravates the problem. Most district courts have inadequate high-bandwidth internet connections and do not possess contemporary hardware; therefore, it blocks the deployment of blockchain outside urban areas. If not wholly strategically addressed, these obstacles to technology will negate whatsoever efficiency might have been gained.[20]

The social challenges further obstruct the adoption: the digital divide and lack of awareness. There exists a conspicuous digital divide in India: 40 percent of rural areas lack access to reliable internet while only 50 percent of the population is considered digitally literate. With a sizable part of judicial users being rural litigants, their lack of access to blockchain-based systems may serve to further entrench the access-to-justice gaps. Public awareness matters just as equally. The technicality of words like "hashes" and "smart contracts" may act as an alienating factor, potentially leading to confusion pressing litigants and legal practitioners with less knowledge of how it works. Adoption could possibly fail due to lack of trust in the technology, because this was evident during the initial days of e-Courts when the technology was poorly understood. Marginalized groups may find themselves at risk of exclusion due to these social barriers, thus sabotaging the equalizing potential of blockchain.

An integrated approach is required to tackle these challenges. Concerning legal challenges, it is first imperative to make amendments in the IT Act to recognize blockchain records as admissible evidence in court. Guidelines could also state that cryptographic hashes fulfill the mandates of Section 65B borrowing from the eminent judicial blockchain decisions of China. To tackle the challenge of privacy, mandatory use of hybrid blockchains should be

---

[19] Tayyab Alyas, Qaiser Abbas, et.al., "Multi blockchain architecture for judicial case management using smart contracts", 15 *Scientific Reports* 8471 (2025).

[20] Kamlesh Nagware, “E-Governance with Blockchain: A Case Study of India”, available at: https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/e-governance-blockchain-case-study-india-kamlesh-nagware-p2ptf/ (last visited on February 25, 2025).

undertaken, where the public can access non-sensitive data while the sensitive data are made to available only to authorized users. An exemption under the DPDP Act can be evoked for judicial data that need exposure for the public interest, giving a parallel account to provisions under the EU GDPR. Besides, consistent legal audits of blockchain systems would be assurance enough for regulatory compliance and nurture the confidence of judiciary.

Scalability, from a technological perspective, has solutions in lightweight consensus mechanisms such as Proof of Stake and Delegated Proof of Stake, which Ethereum's 2022 upgrade demonstrated by reducing energy consumption by 99%. Pilot projects enlarging Judiciary Chain to select High Courts could first test scalability before it goes live nationwide. Energy consumption calls for the blockchain to dovetail with India's renewable energy goals—solar-powered nodes in rural courts with backing by the Ministry of New and Renewable Energy could be a way of offsetting costs. The infrastructure investment must also prioritize rural connectivity through the BharatNet project, equipping courts with hardware and internet that'll be needed for blockchain operations. This work could be accelerated with public-private partnerships with tech firms like TCS.[21]

Socially, bridging the digital divide has to be a phased process, starting from urban courts and scaling progressively to rural courts as connectivity improves. Internet access for litigants, subsidized along the lines of Digital India's rural outreach, may enhance inclusivity. Moreover, awareness campaigns led by the Supreme Court's e-Committee would help demystify blockchain via workshops and online portals for judges, advocates, and the citizenry. The National Judicial Academy may add blockchain literacy to its training programs, while bar councils make tech education compulsory as the National Informatics Centre is doing with staff upskilling. Transparency in the reporting of blockchain benefits, such as lower delays in case resolution on dashboards, could enhance trust, as in Estonia's e-justice system.

Furthermore, it could be inferred that consulting with the blockchain judicial task force, which is set to operate under the ministry of law and justice, would bear the implementation, coordination of policies, and monitoring of outcomes with respect to blockchain application. Regular audits by third-party technical experts could also help mitigate security and privacy risks, thus forming an assurance of the integrity of the system. Incentivizing the adoption of blockchain by courts through budgetary allocations or recognitions would foster uptake, whereas collaboration with academia, e.g. IITs, could help tailor solutions to suit the Indian context.

Conclusion: A Call to Action

The judicial administration in India is set to be revolutionized by the blockchain technology, within which it is a tool to add more transparency and efficiency to a system long tagged not very effective. This technology, with its decentralized, immutable facets discussed in detail in this article, has the potential to address chronic challenges in the Indian judiciary: four-and-a-half million cases still pending, rampant corruption, and outdated methods-of delivery of justice coming into a new era. This concluding note synthesizes what blockchain can do, distills its salient findings from legal, institutional, and policy perspectives, issues a call for joint action, and envisions a modern, blockchain-enabled judiciary capable of redefining access to justice in India.

The transformative potential of blockchain technology in judicial administration arises from the security of records, automation capabilities, and development of trust. Its ability to facilitate tamper-proof storage of case files, evidence, and court orders would reduce corruption, which permeated land records and forgery of documents. The real-time tracking of case progress, established through pilot projects like NIC's Judiciary Chain hosting 7.93 million documents, has a real chance of minimizing delays-a critical issue in tackling the increasing case pendency by 2.8% annually from 2010 to 2020. Routine tasks such as scheduling hearings and making disbursements of judicial deposits can be streamlined through the automation of smart contracts, being self-executing contracts coded on blockchain-each of which can break the inefficiency of man-made systems. The e-justice system of Estonia and the smart courts of China provide real-life examples of how blockchain provides transparency and efficiency; these could serve as models for the modernization of the Indian judiciary. In a nation where delays in justice often translate to denial of justice, the promise of blockchain is both urgent and deep.

The key findings in this analysis paint a mixed backdrop for opportunity and challenge. First, legal support does exist; however, it needs to improve further. The Information Technology Act, 2000, and Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023, establish the environment for the acceptance of electronic records and data security, but they lack specific provisions for the admissibility of blockchain evidence or smart contracts. It is imperative to amend these Acts to clarify the admissibility and privacy exemptions in order to put the judicial application of blockchain on a firm footing. Next, the integration at the institutional level seems feasible. The Judiciary Chain of NIC and examples worldwide, such as China with 2 billion records of evidence, show that blockchain can safeguard judicial data and scale it to bigger systems. Nevertheless, integrating it with the legacy systems of e-Courts and dealing with scalability remain challenges. And thirdly, the policy matter comes next. Given the government funding; standardization; and training based on initiatives like SEBI's regulatory sandbox, these are highly needed to spur adoption. Still, there does not exist a cohesive national strategy. The above findings indicate that while tools and will exist, deliberate action will be required to fill the gaps.

They require a joint effort across all government sectors, including the judiciary and the tech sector; such synchrony is paramount for the success of the blockchain. However, it has to be led by the government through MeitY (Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology) and the Ministry of Law and Justice, funding research and pilot projects on blockchain applications. The National Blockchain Strategy, launched in 2021, sets aside some funds for R&D, but judicial applications should be prioritized, perhaps with a budget outlay of Rs. 500 crores I.e. e-Courts. The judiciary should lead the harmonization by engaging the Supreme Court's e-Committee; starting with pilots in High Courts like Delhi or Bombay for case tracking and evidence management. Judicial leadership can set standards, insisting that blockchain be in compliance with the law. The technology sector-firms like Infosys

[21] Kostas Demertzis, Konstantinos Rantos, et.al., "A Secure and Privacy-Preserving Blockchain-Based XAI-Justice System", 14 *Information* 477 (2023).

and TCS, that know the inside and out of blockchain-will partner to produce scalable and India-centric solutions, including hybrid blockchains that strike a balance between transparency and privacy. The academics, including IITs, will further this by way of research, as they had previously done with contributions to blockchain. Such collaboration, following the example of Estonia, can take the pilots into a nationwide architecture. Without such united efforts, fragmented efforts can endanger progress.

Envisioning the year 2030, where the Indian judiciary is modern and blockchain-enabled, justice is expected to be quickly delivered, secured, and available at every doorstep. Envisage a system where every case filing is pasted into the digital format instantly, visible to litigants through public dashboards, a system that reduces the 4.5 million backlogs through efficient tracking. The very fact that evidence is stored immutably destroys the opportunities of forgery, thereby restoring trust in a system deeply affected by corruption. Smart contracts automate everything that is routine so that judicial time and resources can be freed up for more complex adjudication. Rural litigants isolated by distance and delays will be able to access justice through blockchain-empowered e-Courts aided by BharatNet connectivity efforts. This vision is in sync with the Digital India program of tech-led governance, and sets India's stand to be a world leader in judicial innovations. By 2030, an integrated blockchain ecosystem has all the potential to address pending cases by 50%, reduce cases of corruption by 50%, and increase access for rural areas by 100%, which is doable with determined sustained effort.

Realizing this requires overcoming challenges outlined earlier—legal ambiguity, infrastructure gaps, and digital illiteracy. Clear guidelines, as proposed, will legitimize blockchain records Investment in scalable, energy-efficient infrastructure, like Proof of Stake systems, will ensure rural reach Awareness campaigns and training, led by the National Judicial Academy, will build capacity across judges, clerks, and litigants Regular audits, mandated by a Blockchain Judicial Task Force, will maintain system integrity These steps, rooted in global lessons from China and Estonia, adapt blockchain to India’s unique scale and diversity

In conclusion, blockchain is not a magic wand; instead, it is an agent of change: the promise of better transparency and efficiency is beyond doubt, but it will take a lot of guts to make it happen politically. While the government has to fund and strategize, the judiciary needs to adopt and adapt, while the technology sector needs to innovate and collaborate. Thereby, with this teamwork, they will be able to create a judiciary that provides justice not as some abstract ideal but as something in the here and now. India's legal system, with all its traditions, can land right into a blockchain-enabled, just, and exemplary world.