RESEARCH PAPER

An Overview of Dispute Resolution Systems and the Various Methods Used in India to Settle Conflicts, Along with Their Advantages and Disadvantages

Nalla Rajasekhar, M.A.,LL.M.,MSc,BLISc,MEd [1], Pro K Sitamanikyam.,M.A.,M.L.,PhD.,LL.D[2]

[1] Research Scholar, Dr B R Ambedkhar College of Law, Andhra University, Visakhaptnam

[2] Principal, Dr B R Ambedkhar College of Law, Andhra University,Visakhapatnam

ABSTRACT

Disputes are an inherent feature of human interaction, arising from competing interests within society. The effective resolution of such disputes is fundamental to the preservation of social order, justice, and institutional legitimacy. Traditionally, the adjudicatory function has been vested in courts operating through formalized procedures and governed by established legal principles. However, the increasing volume of litigation, coupled with procedural rigidity and systemic delays, has significantly undermined the efficiency of the conventional judicial process. These challenges have necessitated the exploration and institutionalization of alternative mechanisms capable of delivering timely and effective justice.

In this context, Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) has emerged as a vital complement to the formal legal system. Despite its contemporary prominence, ADR is not a novel construct in the Indian context; rather, it is deeply rooted in indigenous traditions of consensual dispute settlement. ADR encompasses a diverse spectrum of processes, ranging from adjudicatory mechanisms such as arbitration, which yield binding outcomes, to facilitative processes like mediation, conciliation, and ombudsman schemes, which emphasize party autonomy and negotiated settlements.

The increasing adoption of ADR reflects a paradigm shift from adversarial litigation toward cooperative and interest-based dispute resolution. By promoting procedural flexibility, confidentiality, cost-efficiency, and participatory decision-making, ADR not only alleviates the burden on courts but also enhances access to justice and fosters the preservation of social and commercial relationships. This paper critically examines the evolution and framework of dispute resolution mechanisms in India, with particular emphasis on ADR processes, evaluating their effectiveness, advantages, and inherent limitations in the contemporary legal landscape.

Key Words: Social Science, Law, Literature, Humanity, Conflicts, Formalization, Administration, Speedy Resolution, Traditions, ADR, Adjudication, Arbitration, Mediation, Conciliation, Ombudsman.

How To Cite This Article: Rajasekhar N, Sitamanikyam K. An Overview Of Dispute Resolution Systems And The Various Methods Used In India To Settle Conflicts, Along With Their Advantages And Disadvantages. Int J Drug Deliv Technol. 2026;16(25s):994-1000. Doi: 10.25258/ijddt.16.25s.117

I. Historical Development to the Law of Arbitration in India:

International commercial arbitration as a method of dispute resolution can be traced back to medieval times, when trade expanded both within India and across borders. In India, the legal framework governing domestic arbitration was earlier contained in three separate statutes: the Arbitration Act, 1940; the Arbitration (Protocol and Convention) Act, 1937; and the Foreign Awards (Recognition and Enforcement) Act, 1961. These laws remained in force until the introduction of the Arbitration and Conciliation Ordinance, 1996, after which they were repealed, leaving a single comprehensive statute in operation[1].

The need for reform arose mainly because the Arbitration Act, 1940 was widely criticized for causing significant delays in arbitral proceedings, defeating the very purpose of speedy dispute resolution. This led to a complete restructuring of arbitration law in India. The Arbitration and

[1] P.C. Rao and Wiliam Sheffield, "*Alternate Dispute Resolution-What it is & How it works*", 19 (Universal Law Publishing Co. Pvt. Ltd. 1997)

Conciliation Act, 1996 was enacted to address these shortcomings and to provide a unified legal framework covering both domestic and international arbitration.

Moreover, there was a strong need to align Indian arbitration law with globally accepted standards. The 1996 Act was therefore modelled on the UNCITRAL Model Law on International Commercial Arbitration, which successfully integrates principles from both common law and civil law systems and is intended for universal application under the guidance of the United Nations. The Act also reflects the rules and practices of the International Chamber of Commerce, ensuring its compatibility with internationally recognized arbitration procedures.

Practical experience revealed that, despite the inclusion of clauses providing for dispute resolution in foreign jurisdictions and the application of foreign substantive law, parties continued to approach Indian courts frequently. This raised concerns about the effectiveness of arbitration clauses in such agreements. Such a trend was perceived as discouraging to foreign investors and posed a potential obstacle to the full realization of India's economic reforms. In response, the 1996 legislation was carefully designed to address these uncertainties by introducing mechanisms aimed at reducing judicial interference, minimizing delays, and ensuring fairness in dispute resolution.

In India, parties have access to various alternative mechanisms for resolving disputes, such as arbitration, conciliation, mediation, and negotiation. At a conference held in New Delhi on 4 December 1993, chaired by the then Prime Minister and attended by the Chief Justice of India, it was acknowledged that the judiciary alone could not handle the growing volume of cases. It was observed that many disputes could be more effectively resolved through alternative methods. The participants highlighted that such mechanisms offer flexibility, reduce costs and time, and help avoid the pressures associated with traditional court proceedings. The Government of India later replaced the Arbitration Act of 1940 by enacting the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, which came into force on 22 August 1996.This legislation was modelled on the framework developed by UNCITRAL for international commercial arbitration, ensuring alignment with global standards[2] .

Litigation often fails to provide satisfactory outcomes. It can be both time-consuming and costly, and even after a judgment is delivered, the adversarial nature of court proceedings may persist, leading to prolonged disputes through appeals. In contrast, alternative dispute resolution encourages a more cooperative approach between parties. As a result, ADR has gained increasing acceptance in India. Many disputes are resolved informally without resorting to courts, and even those that enter the judicial system often find resolution through ADR methods due to delays in formal proceedings. Understanding these alternatives is essential before deciding on the appropriate course of action for dispute resolution. In everyday life, many disputes are settled informally, without involving lawyers or turning to the formal legal system. Even when matters do reach the courts, the process of arriving at a final decision can be lengthy and time-consuming. Because of this, a large number of disputes both within and outside the court system are increasingly resolved through alternative mechanisms collectively known as Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR). Before choosing how to address a conflict, it is useful to understand the various options that ADR provides, as these methods often offer quicker, more flexible, and less adversarial ways of resolving disputes[3].

II. Origin of Alternative Dispute Resolution:

In recent years, Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) has gained significant recognition both in the legal field and in the world of commerce. Its rise is largely due to the limitations of traditional litigation lengthy procedures, high costs, and the inefficiencies of the court system. Over time, ADR managed to overcome initial resistance because it offered a more practical solution: quicker, less expensive, and more accessible dispute resolution. Its impact has been especially noticeable in the commercial sector, where growing global competition demanded faster and more flexible ways to handle conflicts. At the same time, it strengthened awareness around consumer rights and the need for better

[2] Avtar Singh, "*Law of Arbitration & Concilition*", 12- 13 (Eastern Book Company, 2005).
[3] S. R. Myneni, "*Alternate Dispute Resolution Arbitration & Conciliation Act, 1996*" 10 (Asia Law House, 2012)

protection mechanisms. The formal legal system, however, struggled to keep pace with these changing demands and complexities of modern commerce. As a result, ADR emerged as an effective and reliable tool for resolving disputes, both within countries and at the international level[4] .

Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) provides a way for parties to settle their disputes when they are unable to initiate or sustain negotiations on their own. This process typically involves a neutral third party who facilitates communication and helps the parties move toward a resolution. Unlike the traditional adversarial system followed in courts, this method is more flexible, and the outcome reached is generally not legally binding unless the parties agree otherwise. Over time, ADR has emerged as a preferred option compared to litigation and even arbitration in certain situations. There are many types of disputes that courts are not well-equipped to handle effectively. For instance, conflicts involving family-run businesses, internal disagreements among stakeholders, or issues affecting individuals connected to such enterprises often require a more sensitive and tailored approach. In these cases, preserving relationships and addressing shared interests becomes more important than simply declaring a legal winner. Because of this, ADR is sometimes referred to as "Appropriate Dispute Resolution" or "Amicable Dispute Resolution," emphasizing its focus on cooperation rather than confrontation.

ADR is also particularly valuable in disputes that cross national boundaries. In such situations, relying solely on litigation can be complex and frustrating due to differences in legal systems, questions about which law applies, and difficulties in enforcing judgments. ADR offers a more practical and efficient way to handle these challenges, especially in matters related to private international law.

Even in commercial disputes, courts are bound to decide cases strictly based on the evidence presented and legal arguments made before them. This often leaves little room for considering broader business realities or preserving professional relationships. ADR, on the other hand, allows for solutions that are not only legally acceptable but also commercially sensible and mutually beneficial for the parties involved[5].

III. Concept of Alternative Dispute Resolution:

Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) refers to the effort to create processes that offer a practical substitute for the traditional court system in resolving disputes. The term "alternative" simply implies having a choice between different methods or approaches. In this context, it does not mean replacing courts with another formal court, but rather providing options that function outside the usual judicial procedures or alongside them as supportive, court-connected mechanisms. In essence, ADR offers people the flexibility to resolve conflicts in ways that are often more accessible, less formal, and better suited to their needs than conventional litigation.

IV. Meaning of 'Alternative Dispute Resolutions':

In a narrow sense, the term "Alternative Dispute Resolution" (ADR) refers to methods like negotiation, mediation, and conciliation, where the final outcome depends entirely on the agreement of the parties involved. In these processes, the parties retain control over the decision, while a mediator or conciliator simply helps guide discussions, identify common ground, and move toward a mutually acceptable solution without imposing any judgment.

In a broader sense, ADR also includes arbitration. Although arbitration differs because the arbitrator gives a binding decision, it is still considered an alternative to court litigation. Like other ADR methods, it helps parties resolve disputes outside the formal court system by clarifying issues, examining facts, and working toward a final resolution, even if the outcome is ultimately imposed[6].

Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) has emerged as a significant mechanism to address the inefficiencies of the traditional judicial system in India. While ADR is often projected as a solution to delays and backlog, its growing institutionalization raises important concerns regarding fairness, transparency, and access to justice.

[4] S. P. Gupta, "*The Arbitration & Conciliation Act with Alternate dispute resolution*", 10 (Allahabaad Law Agency, 2003)

[5] Avtar Singh, "*Law of Arbitration & Concilition*", 12- 13 (Eastern Book Company, 2005).

[6] S. P. Gupta, "*The Arbitration & Conciliation Act with Alternate dispute resolution*", 3 (Allahabaad Law Agency, 2003).

The transition from adversarial litigation to consensual dispute resolution reflects a broader shift from rights-based adjudication to interest-based settlement, but this transformation requires critical evaluation to ensure that efficiency does not undermine justice[7].

V. Alternative Dispute Resolution Techniques or Procedures:

Among ADR methods, arbitration and mediation/conciliation are the oldest and most widely recognized. While other techniques have been practiced for decades in countries like the United States, they are still developing in India.

- Negotiation:

Negotiation is the simplest and most common form of ADR. It involves the parties directly discussing their dispute and trying to reach a mutually acceptable solution. In many cases, people negotiate in everyday situations from personal matters to business dealings making it the most natural way to resolve conflicts. Negotiation can take different forms. At its best, it is cooperative, where both sides work toward a “win-win” outcome that benefits everyone. At times, it may become more competitive, with each party trying to gain an advantage. If negotiation is successful, the parties may record their agreement formally or simply act upon it. If it fails, they may turn to a neutral third party for assistance. For a negotiation to be effective, certain qualities are important. As noted by Shri P.M. Bakshi, a good negotiated settlement should reflect fairness, efficiency, wisdom, and stability. Above all, the outcome must feel fair to the parties involved, which is more likely when both have actively participated in the process.

- Conciliation:

Conciliation refers to the process of bringing parties into harmony and helping them settle their disputes in a cooperative and amicable manner. It is a voluntary and generally non-binding method in which a neutral third party called a conciliator assists the parties in reaching a mutually acceptable agreement. In this process, the conciliator plays an active role by guiding discussions and, if needed, offering opinions on the merits of the case to help the parties move toward a settlement. However, the final decision always rests with the parties themselves. If they agree on a solution, it may be formalized and can become binding by mutual consent.

Unlike arbitration or litigation, conciliation is flexible and informal. Either party is free to withdraw from the process at any stage without giving reasons. The parties also retain full control over both the procedure and the outcome, making it a truly consensual approach to dispute resolution. In practice, many disputes are resolved through such amicable efforts even before reaching final judgment in courts. Often, with the support of judges or ADR professionals, parties arrive at a compromise, which is then recorded and becomes binding on them.

- Mediation:

Mediation is a method of resolving disputes with the help of a neutral third person, known as a mediator, who assists the parties in reaching a mutually acceptable solution. The mediator does not have the authority to impose a decision; instead, their role is to guide the discussion, improve communication, and help the parties find common ground. This process is voluntary and confidential, and it does not prevent the parties from exploring other legal options if needed. Mediation is often considered after negotiations fail but before moving to more formal processes like arbitration or litigation. It is especially useful in handling complex or sensitive disputes, as it helps rebuild communication and understanding between the parties.

Mediation plays a crucial role in areas such as family disputes, where ongoing relationships and future interactions like decisions regarding children or education need careful handling. By encouraging open dialogue, it allows parties to resolve not just the present issue but also manage future conflicts more effectively. Although mediation and conciliation are sometimes used interchangeably, there is a slight difference. A mediator focuses on facilitating discussion without giving opinions on the merits of the case, whereas a conciliator may offer suggestions or views. In both cases, however, the goal is the same: to help the parties reach an amicable settlement on their own.

[7] Marc Galanter, *Justice in Many Rooms*, 19 J. Legal Pluralism 1 (1981).

- Arbitration:

Arbitration is a widely used method of resolving disputes outside the traditional court system. It is a private and legally recognized process in which the parties present their case along with evidence and arguments to an independent and impartial third party known as an arbitrator. The arbitrator then gives a decision, called an award, which is binding on the parties. This process is based on an agreement between the parties, often made in writing, stating that any present or future disputes will be resolved through arbitration instead of litigation. Once a dispute arises and is referred to arbitration, the arbitrator examines the facts and decides the matter in a judicial manner[8].

One of the key features of arbitration is that it is more flexible and less formal than court proceedings. Hearings are usually conducted in private, and the procedure can be tailored according to the agreement between the parties. Unlike conciliation or mediation, where the parties control the outcome, in arbitration the final decision rests with the arbitrator. Arbitration has deep roots in India. In ancient times, disputes were often settled by village councils or panchayats. Over time, formal laws governing arbitration were introduced, especially during the British period. Eventually, the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 brought together and modernized the law relating to both domestic and international arbitration in India [9].

Many people prefer arbitration over litigation because it is generally faster, less expensive, and more efficient. It also allows parties to choose arbitrators who have expertise in the subject matter of the dispute, which can lead to more informed decisions. Arbitration is commonly used in areas such as commercial contracts, employment issues, real estate, and consumer disputes.

However, not all matters can be resolved through arbitration. Issues involving criminal offences, matrimonial disputes like divorce, insolvency, or matters affecting public rights are usually excluded. In simple terms, disputes involving private rights can be settled through arbitration, while those involving public rights cannot. Alongside arbitration, India has also developed other people-friendly mechanisms like Lok Adalats, which are informal courts set up to settle disputes quickly and reduce the burden on regular courts. These initiatives reflect the growing need for faster and more accessible justice, especially given the increasing number of cases and limited judicial resources[10].

- Lok Adalats:

Lok Adalats, often referred to as "people's courts," are set up with financial support from the government and function under the supervision of the judiciary. They have proven to be highly effective in resolving disputes related to motor accident claims, land acquisition, family matters, property issues, bank recoveries, workmen's compensation, and certain compoundable criminal cases[11].

The main aim of Lok Adalats is to encourage amicable settlements through conciliation. Members act as neutral facilitators, using persuasion and dialogue to help parties reach an agreement. This approach ensures that justice is delivered quickly, informally, and at a much lower cost compared to regular court proceedings. Their role in promoting a culture of settlement has been significant in strengthening ADR practices in India . Lok Adalats were given legal recognition under the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987, which formalized their functioning. They are particularly valuable in a country like India, where many people may lack awareness of their legal rights or access to formal legal systems. The judiciary has also supported their growth. For instance, in the case of Abdul Hasan and National Legal Services Authority v. Delhi Vidyut Board, the court emphasized the need to establish permanent Lok Adalats and held that their decisions would be binding on the parties, similar to a decree of a civil court[12] .

- Other ADR Techniques:

Apart from the commonly known methods, there are several other ADR techniques that are flexible and generally non-binding. Methods like expert determination, early neutral evaluation, and

[8] Ibid

[9] Ashwinie Kumar Bansal. " *Arbitration & ADR*", 5-7 (Universal Law Publishing Co. Pvt. Ltd. 2005).

[10] Ibid

[11] Ashwinie Kumar Bansal. " Arbitration & ADR", 31 (Universal Law Publishing Co. Pvt. Ltd. 2005)

[12] P.C. Rao and Wiliam Sheffield, "*Alternate Dispute Resolution-What it is & How it works*",

dispute review boards involve appointing an independent expert to assess the issue and guide the parties toward a solution. These approaches are especially useful in resolving disputes at an early stage before they escalate.

Partnering is another cooperative method where parties work together to solve shared problems with the help of a neutral facilitator. Similarly, facilitation involves a third party who helps improve communication and supports constructive dialogue between the parties.

In the case of a Claims Appeal Committee, disputes are reviewed by a panel of senior officials who are not directly involved in the matter. Their experience and neutrality help in reaching a fair resolution.

VI. Advantages of Alternative Dispute Resolution:

ADR offers several benefits over traditional court proceedings. It allows parties to explore creative and practical solutions that may not be available in formal legal systems. By encouraging open communication, ADR helps parties focus on their real interests rather than rigid positions, making it easier to reach a mutually acceptable outcome. It is particularly effective in resolving disputes such as consumer complaints, family matters, business conflicts, and construction issues. ADR is suitable in situations where:

a. parties want control over the final outcome,
b. a quick resolution is important,
c. maintaining or ending relationships peacefully matters,
d. confidentiality is required,
e. costs need to be minimized, or
f. disputes involve multiple issues or communication gaps.

Overall, ADR provides a more flexible, cost-effective, and less stressful way of resolving disputes while promoting cooperation and understanding between the parties.

- According to P.C. Rao, former Secretary-General of the International Centre for Alternative Dispute Resolution, ADR offers several practical advantages that make it an effective alternative to traditional litigation.

a. First, ADR can be used at any stage of a dispute—even when a case is already pending in court. However, using it early often brings the best results. It also helps narrow down the issues between parties, and in most cases (except binding arbitration), either party can withdraw at any time.

b. One of the biggest benefits of ADR is that it provides quicker and more cost-effective solutions compared to court proceedings. It allows disputes to remain private and encourages practical, business-oriented outcomes since the parties themselves control the process. In many cases, disputes can be resolved within a few days.

c. ADR procedures are flexible and not burdened by strict legal rules. Even if the process does not lead to a final settlement, it is still valuable, as it helps both sides better understand each other's position. Parties may choose to involve lawyers, who can assist in identifying key issues and guiding negotiations, though ADR can also function without them.

d. Another important advantage is that ADR reduces the burden on courts, allowing them to focus on cases that truly require judicial intervention. It also gives parties the freedom to choose neutral experts who have specialized knowledge relevant to the dispute.

e. Perhaps most importantly, ADR promotes amicable settlements. It helps preserve relationships, reduces hostility, and allows parties to move forward without prolonged conflict. It also saves time and effort by avoiding lengthy evidence procedures and adversarial hearings, which can often damage reputations and business relationships.

f. Additionally, ADR offers convenience parties can decide the time, place, and even the procedure to be followed. This level of control and flexibility makes ADR a highly practical and appealing option for resolving disputes[13].

VII. Limitations or Disadvantages of ADR:

While ADR is useful in many situations, it is not always the best option. It may be less effective when one party lacks the authority to make decisions,

[13] S. R. Myneni, "*Alternate Dispute Resolution Arbitration & Conciliation Act, 1996*" 10 (Asia Law House, 2012)

or when there is a clear imbalance of power between the parties. Similarly, if one side is intentionally trying to delay the process, ADR may not lead to meaningful results.ADR is also not suitable for disputes that involve important questions of law, public policy, or require a clear legal precedent. In such cases, a formal court decision is often necessary. It may also not work well when the dispute affects people who are not part of the process, or in serious matters such as criminal cases, claims involving bodily harm, or cases where strong legal defences are involved. In these situations, formal adjudication is usually more appropriate[14].

VIII. ADR and Access to Justice: A Socio-Legal Analysis:

ADR is frequently justified as a tool for improving access to justice. It reduces procedural complexity and cost, making dispute resolution more accessible[15].

However, scholars argue that ADR may lead to the **privatization of justice**, shifting dispute resolution from public courts to private forums lacking transparency[16].

From a socio-legal perspective, ADR presents a paradox:

- It enhances accessibility
- Yet may exclude weaker parties due to inequality in bargaining power

Thus, ADR must be evaluated not only in terms of efficiency but also **equity and inclusiveness[17]**.

IX. Emerging Trends and Challenges:

(a) Online Dispute Resolution (ODR)

With the rise of digital transactions, ODR has emerged as a modern extension of ADR, particularly relevant in cyber disputes[18].

(b) Commercialization of Arbitration

Institutional arbitration has become increasingly expensive, raising concerns about elitism and accessibility[19].

(c) Enforcement Issues

Despite legal reforms, enforcement of arbitral awards remains a challenge due to procedural delays and judicial intervention[20].

X. Conclusion:

ADR offers a flexible and practical approach to resolving disputes. The process can be informal, like a simple discussion, or more structured, similar to a private hearing depending on what the parties prefer. Unlike court proceedings, ADR allows parties to choose the applicable law, appoint a neutral expert, decide the time and place of hearings, and even determine the fees involved. Another key advantage is confidentiality, which is often not possible in open court proceedings. While litigation typically results in a win–lose outcome, ADR methods like mediation and conciliation aim for a win–win solution, where both parties agree on the outcome. This not only saves time and money but also reduces stress and helps maintain relationships.

ADR encourages better communication, builds trust, and often leads to more practical and lasting solutions. Because the parties are directly involved in shaping the outcome, they are more likely to comply with the agreement. There are also several hybrid forms of ADR, such as mini-trials, med-arb, summary jury trials, and court-annexed mediation, which combine features of different methods. These approaches are especially useful in resolving civil, commercial, industrial, and family disputes. Given its many advantages, ADR continues to grow as a preferred method of dispute resolution. Expanding its legal recognition and use can further strengthen access to quick, efficient, and amicable justice.

---

[14] S. R. Myneni, "*Alternate Dispute Resolution Arbitration & Conciliation Act, 1996*" 10 (Asia Law House, 2012)

[15] Cappelletti & Garth, *Access to Justice: The Worldwide Movement* (1978).

[16] Owen Fiss, *Against Settlement*, 93 Yale L.J. 1073 (1984).

[17] Upendra Baxi, *The Crisis of the Indian Legal System* (1982).

[18] UNCITRAL Technical Notes on Online Dispute Resolution (2017).

[19] Gary Born, *International Commercial Arbitration* (2014).

[20] Ministry of Law & Justice, Arbitration Amendments (2015, 2019).