ENHANCING JUSTICE THROUGH INTEROPERABILITY: A CAPABILITY APPROACH PERSPECTIVE ON THE INDIAN CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM

By Rumi Ahmed

I. Navigating the meaning of Administration of Justice

The term "administration of justice" can be employed in various contexts in justice system. Since a precise and universal definition of justice is not possible, therefore meaning of the phrase "administration of justice" is also evolving in nature and becoming more inclusive. It is imprecise what the boundaries of justice administration are, whether it is an organizational function that deals with management of the police, courts, and prisons, a judicial function that deals with adjudication, or a combination of all three.

In Article 225 [1] of the Constitution of India, the administration of justice is discussed in relation to the concurrent list and the jurisdiction of High Courts. Article 225 enumerates judges' authority to administer justice independently of the courts' jurisdiction and legal code. It gives an inclusive list consisting of the power to make the rules of the court and regulate the sittings of the court. A reading of Article 225 seems to suggest that to realise that justice seems to be done, the machineries of justice need to be well balanced and for that operability of the machineries viz., the Court, the police, the prison, including the forensic authorities must be in optimum.

The 14th Report of First Law Commission of India, published in 1958, report titled "Reforms of Judicial Administration" was established to make reform, recommendations, defined the role of the Administration of Justice as a thorough investigation into our legal system :(a) the operation and effect of laws, substantive as well as procedural, with a view to eliminating unnecessary litigation, speeding up the disposal of cases, and making justice less expensive,

[1] Subject to the provisions of this Constitution and to the provisions of any law of the appropriate Legislature made by virtue of powers conferred on that Legislature by this Constitution, the jurisdiction of, and the law administered in, any existing High Court, and the respective powers of the Judges thereof in relation to the administration of justice in the Court, including any power to make rules of Court and to regulate the sittings of the Court and of members thereof sitting alone or in Division Courts, shall be the same as immediately before the commencement of this Constitution: Provided that any restriction to which the exercise of original jurisdiction by any of the High Courts with respect to any matter concerning the revenue or concerning any act ordered or done in the collection thereof was subject immediately before the commencement of this Constitution shall no longer apply to the exercise of such jurisdiction."

were among its four components. (b)The organization of courts, both civil and criminal; (c) the recruitment of the judiciary; and level of the bar and of legal education." The administration of justice is intended to address organizational efficiency whenever it is utilized in conjunction with reforms.[2]

Interestingly, the court often uses the expression administration of justice in contempt of court cases. Section 2(c)(iii) of the Contempt of Courts Act 1971 defines "criminal contempt" as any publication which interferes or tends to obstruct, the administration of justice in any other manner. In ***Sivakumar*** v. ***A. Radhakrishnan***[3], Contempt Petition No. 1135 of 2020, the Madras High Court held that "Acts of giving false information would definitely interfere with the administration of justice and would fall within the expression "the administration of justice in any other manner" in Section 2(c) (iii) of the Contempt of Courts Act. In ***Baradakanta Mishra***v ***Registrar of Orissa High Court***[4] the Supreme Court made an inquiry into the meaning of the phrase 'administration of justice'.

> *47. We have not been referred to any comprehensive definition of the expression "administration of justice". But historically, and in the minds of the people, administration of justice is exclusively associated with the Courts of justice Constitutionally established. Such courts have been established throughout the land by several statutes. The Presiding Judge of a court embodies in himself the court, and when engaged in the task of administering justice is assisted by a complement of clerks and ministerial officers whose duty it is to protect and maintain the records, prepare the writs, serve the processes etc. The acts in which they are engaged are acts in aid of administration of justice by the Presiding Judge. The power of appointment of clerks and ministerial officers involves administrative control by the Presiding Judge over them and though such control is described as administrative to distinguish it from the duties of a Judge sitting in the seat of justice, such control is exercised by the Judge as a Judge, in the course of judicial administration. Judicial administration is an integrated function of the Judge and cannot suffer any dissection so far as maintenance of high standards of rectitude in "judicial administration is concerned. The whole set up of a court is for the purpose of administration of justice, and the control which the*

2.https://lawcommissionofindia.nic.in/https-cdnbbsr-s3waas-gov-in-s3ca0daec69b5adc880fb464895726dbdf-uploads-2023-06-2023060150-pdf/pdf/ accessed on 29-06-2025

[3] *Sivakumar* vs. *A. Radhakrishnan* 2022 MANU TN 2539

[4]*Baradakanta Mishra vs. Registrar of Orissa High Court*. 1974 MANU SCC374374.

> *judge exercises over his assistants has also the object of maintaining the purity of administration of justice. These observations apply to all courts of justice in the land whether they are regarded as superior or inferior courts of justice.*
>
> *48. Courts of justice have, in accordance with their Constitutions, to perform multifarious functions for due administration of justice. Any lapse from the strict standards of rectitude in performing these functions is bound to affect administration of justice which is a term of wider import than mere adjudication of causes from the seat of justice.*

According to Justice Palekar, the tasks performed by legally established courts constitute the administration of justice. It is a part of the judge's integrated role and encompasses both judicial administration and dispute resolution. The goal of court administration is to guarantee that individuals can obtain justice. This includes appointing court officials and managing their work in creating writs, serving procedures, and keeping records. The judge's disciplinary authority and oversight of the work of court officers and subordinate judges, including their conduct and demeanor, are included. The entire set up of the court and all powers exercised by a judge are for administration of justice. The case ***Baradakanta Mishra*** **vs.*Registrar of Orissa High Court*** [5]seems to add another dimension to our understanding of the phrase – it seems that administration of justice encompasses not only managerial or organizational function – it includes the entire gamut of function a judge performs, that includes controlling function, disciplinary function, appointment function and adjudication.

The term "administration of justice" refers to a wide range of institutions, procedures, and standards to administer criminal, administrative, and civil justice in a fair and effective manner. A fair trial, the presumption of innocence, the independence and impartiality of the judiciary, and the right to a remedy are only a few of the many regulations that apply to the administration of justice. The candour of the state's arrest, investigation, pretrial detention, and trial proceedings including collection of evidence and sentencing, all fall within the domain of administration of justice. Consequently, various actors, such as judges, lawyers, court clerks, police, penitentiary officials, and policy makers play vital roles in achieving fairness in the

[5] Ibid. 2

administration of justice. Administration of justice is not adjudication of cases but management of the processes that make adjudication functional and effective.

The substantive and procedural legislation make up the majority of the statutory law framework, which serves as the legal foundation for the Criminal Justice Administration. The Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita 2023 (formerly the Indian Penal Code, 1860) and numerous other penal statutes covering a variety of topics make up the majority of the substantive law, whereas the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (formerly the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973) and the Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam (formerly the Indian Evidence Act, 1872) make up the majority of the procedural law. Beside these, the police, the court, the prosecution, the forensic science laboratories and the rehabilitation providers are the other deciding factors of criminal justice administration.

A Constitution Bench of the Supreme Court in *Anita Khushwa vs. Pushpa Sadan*[6] in a matter of Transfer Petitions filed in Supreme Court from 2008-2014 (judgment delivered on July 19, 2016) has not only affirmed earlier declarations that 'access to justice' is a fundamental right under Article 21, but has made an effort to identify the various components of access to justice. CJI TS Thakur, speaking for the Bench, declared that access to justice is not only to be found in Article 21 but also under Article 14. The CJI further identified four facets of access to justice- a) the state must provide an effective adjudicatory mechanism; b) the mechanism so provided must be reasonably accessible in terms of distance; c) the process of adjudication must be speedy; and d) the litigant's access to the adjudicatory process must be affordable. Access to justice is a fundamental human right.

The primary responsibility of Criminal Justice System is to prevent and control crime, which generally demands the steps including arrest, investigation, trial, conviction, sentencing, punishment/treatment, and rehabilitation. The police, courts, and correctional facilities are the three primary parts of the criminal justice system. The police are the executing agency, and the courts interpret the laws. Laws originate on the legislative floor and the legislature plays a significant role in the criminal justice system as the legislature establishes fundamental guidelines through legislation.

[6] *Anita Khushwa* vs. *Pushpa Sadan*. 2016. Supreme Court. MANU 8SCC 509

According to Sustainable Development Goal Extended Report 2024[7], in its indicator 16.3.2 of Goal 16 viz., Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions, unsentenced detainees as a proportion of overall prison population ensuring fair access to justice remains crucial, as one out of three prisoners in the world are unsentenced. Inadequate conditions for unsentenced detainees underscore the importance of proper prison resources for rehabilitation, reduced recidivism, and societal welfare. The global prison population is still on the rise, but growth is slowing down. According to the latest global UNODC estimates, there were 11.5 million individuals in detention worldwide in 2022. This represents approximately 144 prisoners per 100,000 populations. Despite an overall increase of the number of prisoners during this period from 11.1 to 11.5 million individuals, the growth of the prison population was slower than the world population between 2015 and 2022.

As a result, the prisoner-to-population rate in 2022 (142 prisoners per 100,000 population) was smaller than in 2015 (150 prisoners per 100,000 population). Due to the emergency release of prisoners and fewer conviction rates in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, the global prisoner-to-population rate was temporarily even lower in 2022 (141 prisoners per 100,000 populations). To ameliorate the situation, Government and judiciary have from time to time come up with specific mechanisms which include the Legal Aid Defense Counsel System (LADCS), the Support to Poor Prisoners Scheme, measures to streamline the transmission of bail orders, and the establishment of Under-Trial Review Committees (UTRCs). While legal aid services are not the only solution to tackle overcrowding in prisons, it is critical in ensuring every prisoner is guaranteed their right to legal representation. Global prison conditions are falling short of the commitments contained in the United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners (the Nelson Mandela Rules), which recommend that "Member States continue to endeavour to reduce prison overcrowding and, where appropriate, resort to non-custodial measures as alternatives to pretrial detention, to promote increased access to justice and legal defense mechanisms, to reinforce alternatives to imprisonment and to support rehabilitation and social reintegration programmes." Improved access to justice is looked-for to realize all 17 of the Sustainable Development Goals; without it, country's prosperity, peace, inclusion, and fairness will remain out of reach.

[7] India Justice Report: https://indiajusticereport.org/ accessed on 28-06-2025

Data can help to maintain Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 16 which stands for peace, justice and strong institutions. SDG 16 focuses on promoting peaceful and inclusive societies, ensuring access to justice for all, and building effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels. Data compiled timely, consistently, and compiled year on-year in one place in relation to justice delivery process provides the basis for policy makers to frame future directions, guidelines and identify priorities within a complex set of interdependent operations.

Digital initiatives like e-court and e-Prison records offer potential for improved data utilisation. But a fragmented ecosystem of data sources makes cross-referencing and correlation difficult and delayed, hindering the ability to draw meaningful conclusions and to decide on which to base overall policy or pinpoint main points that need urgent and prior intervention. Weak institutions in terms of accessibility and inclusivity breed injustice overall. Persistent institutional deficits hinder the fair application of law, creating a system where some individuals or groups are more vulnerable to unfair treatment, while others may enjoy impunity. Over time, when the system is unable to address this pattern of inconsistent application of the law it erodes public trust and leads to an implicit acceptance that the rule of law is not a priority.

Beyond regular appeals that arrest must be a measure of last resort, that liberty is paramount, and that bail not jail is the golden rule, each of these mechanisms has the potential to positively impact the rights of under trials and reduce the burden on prison administration and hence an improved criminal justice system. Problems of inadequate funding, constraints of resources viz., shortage of judges, court staff, lack of correctional facilities and facilitators, less no of modern technology driven forensic laboratories; disparities in levels of implementation across states, lack of consistent monitoring and accountability for non- compliance and most importantly lack of coordination between the justice administration agencies and hence the inability to reach out to beneficiaries are the major concerns for the effective functioning of each mechanism and its ability to achieve the overarching goal of reducing under-trial detention and promoting a more just and equitable criminal justice system.

The state's efforts to reduce the backlog of cases are likely to be more successful if it concentrates on reforming not only the court system but also the police and prosecutorial procedures, witness production, summons and warrant serving, custodial procedures, and incarceration both during and after sentencing. According to the India Justice Report 2025[8], the

7. id

national average occupancy rate in jails is over 131%. About 76% of prisoners are under trials, many of whom are in jail due to their inability to afford bail. Bureaucratic hurdles and slow communication between courts and prison authorities can prevent timely fulfillment of bail conditions. Similarly, an efficient support system and access legal aid can assist the prisoners in navigating the bail process. Responsible implementation of interoperable justice system will enhance accessibility, accountability, and openness of the legal system, and ultimately protect the human rights and fortify the rule of law and hence results effective and efficient administration of justice.

The police are the first to receive information about a criminal incident from the eyewitness or the victim or from any anonymous and, as a result, begin investigating the crime. Before the judiciary takes notice of the crime, the prosecution follows the suit, carefully reviewing the police charge sheet and decides whether to accept the allegation of criminal activity or not. Finally, there are correctional organizations like probation and prisons. However, without any doubt, each element of criminal justice administration plays a unique role, yet they are all related to one another. Each component's primary functionaries' performance directly affects how well the other component's function. They affect and influence the efficiency of one another's functioning and is dependent on one another. In order to increase the effectiveness of the justice delivery system, the Inter-Operable Criminal Justice System (ICJS) was created. It combines the primary components of criminal justice, including the Police (CCTNS), Courts (e-Courts), Jails (e-Prisons), Forensic Lab (e-Forensic), and Prosecution (e-Prosecution).

In a ruling issued by the Hon'ble Delhi High Court on September 9, 2024, on ***Court on its own motion v. State***[9], a split bench made up of Justices Pratibha M. Singh and Amit Sharma stated that the police authorities seem to be employing several databases with incompletely updated data. According to the court, criminal dossiers that were formerly kept in hard copy are now kept electronically, and real-time data sharing has become more simpler thanks to technology advancements. The Court observed:

> "*I may note that previous involvement of the accused plays a vital role, when the court applies its mind to grant of bail/refusal of bail to the accused. Therefore, a serious responsibility lies on the shoulder of the SCRB/Delhi Police, to regularly update the database, pertaining to the accused person. In law, a person can be categorized as an*

[9] Court on its own motion v. State [2024] DHC 9210

under trial, as a convict/and in case of acquittal, there is no criminal record. If despite acquittal from courts, a system reflects a person as a criminal without indicating the fact of acquittal then, in my view, presumption of innocence goes for a toss. Therefore, heavy onus lies on the department to maintain its records in such a manner that the police cannot misuse the information fed in the system by selectively prejudice against the accused persons.

Therefore, there is a responsibility/duty on the authority maintaining such a database, to keep it updated so that correct particulars and information is produced before the court before arguments on bail application are being heard. Failing to do so may be denying a person a right to his reputation as well as to his liberty enshrined in Article 21 of Constitution of India. Therefore, State is under an obligation to keep such criminal databases updated and it is expected that the said exercise by carried out at the earliest, as also, periodically to ensure justice to one and all. Therefore, first of all, SHO concerned is directed to file a reply whether information regarding accused persons is periodically sent to the SCRB for updation or not."

In order to provide justice, accessible for everyone, the State is therefore required to maintain such criminal databases up to date, and it is expected that the aforementioned exercise be conducted on as soon as possible and on a regular basis As a result, the SHO in question must first respond to the question of whether or not information about the accused is routinely forwarded to the SCRB (State Crime Record Bureau) for updating.

II. Preventive Justice through Interoperability of the Criminal Justice System

Interoperability has been defined "in the broadest sense" as "the ability of people, organizations, and systems to interact and interconnect so as to efficiently and effectively exchange and use information. [10]What should we think about preventative measures that rely more on "technological management"—where the preventive strategy is centred on removing practical challenges—than on rules and orders in the context of a technology-driven algorithmic approach to criminal justice? Webster's online dictionary defines interoperability as "the ability to exchange and use information (usually in a large heterogeneous network made

[10]Baird SA, "Government Role in Developing an Interoperability Ecosystem," *Proceedings of the 1st international conference on Theory and practice of electronic governance* (ACM 2007) <https://doi.org/10.1145/1328057.1328073> accessed June 29, 2025.

up of several local area networks)"[11] The U.S Department of Defence (DoD) defines interoperability as "the condition achieved among communications-electronics systems or items of communications-electronics equipment when information or services can be exchanged directly and satisfactorily between them and/or their users. The degree of interoperability should be defined when referring to specific cases"[12] The Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE) defines interoperability as "the ability of two or more systems or components to exchange information and to use the information that has been exchanged."[13] Another definition of interoperability is proposed by the International Organization for Standardization/International Electro technical Commission (ISO/IEC) as "The capability to communicate, execute programs, or transfer data among various functional units in a manner that requires the user to have little or no knowledge of the unique characteristics of those units."[14] Interoperability has been defined "in the broadest sense" as "the ability of people, organizations, and systems to interact and interconnect so as to efficiently and effectively exchange and use information.[15]

The use of information technology in the judicial domain started with the preparation of 'National Policy and Action Plan for Implementation of ICT in the Indian Judiciary' by the e-Committee of Supreme Court of India. The Inter-operable Criminal Justice System (ICJS) is an initiative of the e-Committee[16]to enable seamless transfer of data and information among different pillars of the criminal justice system, like courts, police (through Crime and Criminal Tracking and Network Systems)[17], jails and forensic science laboratories, from one platform to

[11] 'Merriam-Webster: America's Most Trusted Dictionary' (*Merriam-Webster: America's Most Trusted Dictionary*) <www.merriam-webster.com/> accessed June 9 2025.

[12] "Interoperability (US DoD Definition)" <https://www.militaryfactory.com/dictionary/military-terms-defined.php?term_id=2784> accessed June 9, 2025.

[13] Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (1990) IEEE Standard Computer Dictionary: A Compilation of IEEE Standard Computer Glossaries. IEEE Std 610, 1-217.

[14] International Organization for Standardization (ISO) and the International Electrotechnical Commission (IEC), "ISO/IEC. International Technology for Learning, Education, and Training." 9 .

[15]Ibid, 9

[16] Realising an overwhelming need for reforming the judicial sector in India by the adoption of new technologies and to devise a National Policy and Action Plan to implement ICT in courts, the then Chief Justice of India, Mr Justice R.C. Lahoti proposed the constitution of the e-Committee. The e-Committee was to assist in formulating a National Policy enabling the Indian judiciary to prepare itself for the digital age, to adapt and apply technologies and communication tools making the justice delivery system more efficient and thus benefitting its various stakeholders.

[17] Crime and Criminal Tracking Network and Systems (CCTNS) project, started in the year 2009, with a total approved outlay of Rs. 2000 Crore, aimed to inter-link all police stations under a common application software for the purpose of investigation, data analytics, research, policy making and providing Citizen Services such as reporting & tracking of complaints, request for antecedent verifications by Police etc. The project is being implemented with close collaboration between States and Union Government.

the other. With a focus on Integration of Crime and Criminal Tracking Networks and Systems (CCTNS) with e-Courts and e-Prisons database, and with other pillars of judiciary like Forensic Labs, Fingerprints and Prosecution, it aims to achieve "one data once entry" across all the pillars. The National Crime Record Bureau (NCRB)[18] in association with National Informatics Centre (NIC) is responsible to implement this project in two phases: Phase-I (2018-2022), Phase-II (2022-23 to 2025-26). Individual IT systems have been put into place and stabilized throughout Phase I of the project, even though record searches have been enabled on these systems. The "one data one entry" principle, which states that data entered once in one pillar may be accessed in all other pillars without requiring re-input in each pillar, is the foundation upon which Phase II of the system is being created.

With a total approved expenditure of Rs. 2000 crore, the Crime and Criminal Tracking Network and Systems (CCTNS) project began in 2009 with the goal of connecting all police stations under a single application software for investigation, data analytics, research, policymaking, and the provision of citizen services like complaint reporting and tracking, police antecedent verification requests, etc. The Union Government and the States are working closely together to implement the initiative. The e-Prisons application allows jail officials to verify inmates' identities using biometric information obtained at the time of admission. This allows Law Enforcement Agencies to do a PAN India search for inmates using ICJS. e-Prisons make it easier for residents to file grievances and seek visits online (e-Mulaqat). This gives the officials the authority to follow and keep an eye on the guests, grant the required visit permits, and prompt address of any related complaints. The ICJS project developed e-Forensics, an online case registration and tracking system that helps examiners provide the police and other stakeholders with timely, accurate, and trustworthy forensic reports in order to support and enhance the criminal justice system and increase public satisfaction. To help Public Prosecutors carry out their role as the State's advocate in court, the e-Prosecution application was created. The e-Prosecution application's primary goal is to digitize the public prosecutor's procedure, which is one of the cornerstones of the criminal justice system and guarantees fair and expeditious trials.

[18] NCRB was set up in 1986 based on the recommendations of the National Police Commission (1977-1981) and the Ministry of Home Affairs' Task Force (1985**)** to function as a repository of information on crime and criminals so as to assist the investigators in linking crime to the perpetrators.

All High Courts and lower courts can view the charge sheet and FIR metadata with the use of the ICJS platform. Police upload charge sheets, case diaries, and FIRs in PDF format so that the courts can use them. Among other things, the e-Committee is actively working on creating technical infrastructure for the storage and preservation of electronic records, establishing procedures for data validation, acknowledgement, user identification, and access, and standardizing data and metadata for information exchange.

High Courts have been asked to hire an IPS officer to help with data integration on the ICJS platform in order to guarantee the successful implementation of ICJS in each State. In order to guarantee that, in addition to the police, other state employees such as the Forest Department, Provident Fund Organization, Municipal Authorities, Labour Welfare Boards, Town Planning Authorities, and Food and Drug Administration are included in ICJS, High Courts are also asked to designate one Nodal Officer.

In order to enforce the Criminal Procedure (Identification) Act, 2022 and any other amendments made to the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS) or other Acts during the project, the ICJS Project would also allow for improvements in technology and procedures needed throughout the criminal justice delivery system. As National Information Centre's technology partner, the National Crime Record Bureau is the Nodal Agency in charge of carrying out the project. The "Data Sharing Matrix," which was approved by the Supreme Court of India's e-Committee, serves as the foundation for the interconnected data flow in ICJS.

As a reformatory measure, ICJS tackles the areas viz., improving data quality by lowering data entry errors; facilitating smooth integration between the various data sets of Police, Prisons, Forensics, Prosecution, and Courts that are available in silos; increasing the efficacy and timeliness of investigations and, by extension, trials, because of easy access to data between the pillars of the justice administration system; facilitating the efficient use of the machine learning and artificial intelligence/data analytics techniques available for the investigations; facilitating the transition to "SMART Policing" and lowering reliance on paper records in decision-making. Furthermore, interoperability enhances collaboration across agencies which are the key for efficient administration. Different law enforcement organisations, both domestic and international, often need to work together in complex investigations, and when their systems can communicate effectively, data can be shared securely, efficiently and in real time, reducing the administrative constrictions.

III. Capability Approach in Indian Criminal Justice Administration

Institutions must play a significant part in any theory of justice, and any credible explanation of justice must include the selection of institutions.[19] In the Rawlsian theory of 'justice as fairness', the idea of fairness relates to persons (how to be fair between them) whereas the Amartya Sen's principles of justice apply to the choice over institutions (how to identify just institutions).[20]"Just institutions" according to Amartya Sen, significantly different from traditional approach of John Rawl. Sen emphasizes that focusing solely on establishing perfectly just institutions is not enough; the just institutions can be identified on the basis of the real-world impact of institutions on people's lives and addressing remediable injustices. Sen advocates for an outcome based "comparative assessment" of different social arrangements and not just aiming for an ideal, but rather evaluating which options leads to better outcomes. There are two things, considered important for the idea of effective justice delivery system – 1. There is visible economic growth for it is only upon economic growth, that a proportionately greater portion is available for welfare activities. 2. Citizens receive their fair share of social goods and services, with minimal short-changing in the delivery of what the state allocates to them. According to Amartya Sen, formal rights are useless until and unless they can be used in practice. "What matters for assessing justice is not the nature of institutions, but what lives people are actually able to lead."[21] Interoperable justice facilitates quicker, more dependable coordination, which cuts down on delays, duplication, and unlawful imprisonment. A system of interoperability can stop this from happening, for instance, when a bail order is not communicated to the jail authorities promptly. This will prevent a person from regaining his right to freedom.

The capabilities are subverted by ignorance or lack of access. "The importance of information cannot be overstated; deprivation may result from a lack of resources as well as from a lack of access to systems or knowledge."[22] People's talents are undermined by their inability to effectively participate in legal procedures due to a lack of understanding or access to services provided by the interconnected judicial system, such as legal assistance, case status

[19] Sen AK, *The Idea of Justice* (2009th edn, Harvard University Press 2009) 82
[20] Sen AK, *The Idea of Justice* (2009th edn, Harvard University Press 2009) 72
[21] Sen AK, *The Idea of Justice* (2009th edn, Harvard University Press 2009) 18
[22]Sen AK, *The Idea of Justice* (2009th edn, Harvard University Press 2009) 158

information, or digital records. This hinders their actual freedoms to pursue justice, defend their rights, and obtain significant legal entitlements, according to the capability approach.

When the legal aid system automatically notifies pro bono litigants of new cases involving vulnerable groups in society, such as women, children, the crippled, the impoverished, etc., it can guarantee the accused person's ability to defend themselves. Interoperability assures targeted interventions for victims, such as women, children, Dalits, and victims of acid attacks, by connecting case data with accessible protective, correctional, and welfare programs.

Artificial intelligence-enabled faster case tracking, digitalized records of synchronized bail and judgment, and streamlined procedures increase the effectiveness and predictability of justice—two factors that are essential for maintaining human dignity and security. Interoperability makes the system better overall by decreasing delays, enhancing access, and minimizing rights breaches, but does not pretend to be flawless. It's a move in the direction of Sen's main idea of more comparative fairness.

****