



## Raising the Retirement Age for Judges

### What is the issue?

\n\n

\n

- India needs to consider enhancing the retirement age of judges.

\n

- This would bring a whole lot of benefit to our judicial system.

\n

\n\n

### How does India's judiciary compare with others?

\n\n

\n

- **Age** - Retirement age of 70 for judges is common in most countries like - Belgium, Denmark, Ireland, the Netherlands, Norway and Australia.

\n

- Countries like the U.S., Greece and Austria appoint judges to their highest courts (or constitutional courts) for life.

\n

- Currently, the retirement age for judges in India is 60 in lower courts, 62 in High Courts (HC) and 65 in the Supreme Court (SC).

\n

- **Ratio** - The judge-population ratio in India is among the lowest in the world at 19.66 judges per million (10 lakh) people as of today.

\n

- Contrasting this, in 2016, the U.K. had 51 judges per million people, the U.S. had 107, Australia had 41, and Canada had 75.

\n

\n\n

### What is the key problem constraining the Indian Judiciary?

\n\n

\n

- **Data** - Over 3.3 crore cases are classified as backlogs within our judiciary, and more than 2.84 crore cases are pending in the subordinate courts alone.  
\n
- Further, “National Judicial Data Grid” notes that over 43 lakh cases are pending before the HCs, and 57,987 cases are pending before the SC.  
\n
- Lakhs of cases are pending as arrears before the 24 High Courts in India for periods as long as 10-20 years.  
\n
- **Implication** - Pendency does not only weaken the justice redress system, but it also makes the rule of law a distant dream.  
\n
- Notably, more and more litigants now enter the justice redress system without the faintest hope of seeing closure in their lifetimes.  
\n
- **Future** - As the Indian economy grows, the ratio of litigation to population is expected to increase exponentially.  
\n
- Notably, advanced economies such as Australia, Canada, France, the U.S., the U.K., and Japan have much higher litigation-to- population ratios.  
\n
- COnsidering the current case load, our judiciary is likely to face an enormous case load that can be of catastrophic proportions.  
\n

\n\n

## What is the solution?

\n\n

\n

- **What** - It is necessary to increase the number of judges in the pool to enable the judiciary to deal with the enormous pendency of cases.  
\n
- It would be desirable for India to emulate the west and consider increasing the retirement age for judges in the HCs and SC.  
\n

\n\n

\n

- **Moves** - Venkatachaliah Report in 2002 (that reviewed the working of the Constitution) had recommended for increasing the retirement age of judges.  
\n
- In this context, Constitution (114th Amendment) Bill to rise the retirement

age of HC judges to 65 was introduced in 2010, but never got passed.

\n

- Considering the situation, the bill needs to be revived and the

\n

\n\n

### **What are the advantages of increasing retirement age?**

\n\n

\n

- Indian law permits retired judges to chair tribunals till the age of 70, which is proof of the persisting competence of experienced judges.

\n

- Retiring them early while their services can continue to benefit the mainstream judiciary is akin to losing experienced judges before their prime.

\n

- Enhancing retirement age will ensure the continued presence of experienced talent pool in the judiciary for longer periods.

\n

- Further, to better the ratio of judge-to-population, newer judges can also be appointed without displacing the experienced ones.

\n

- It will help in reducing arrears and would further be able to take on the impending “litigation explosion” that usually comes with economic growth.

\n

- It will also render post-retirement assignments unattractive and thereby strengthen the rule of law and the independence of the judiciary.

\n

\n\n

\n\n

**Source: The Hindu**

\n



**IAS PARLIAMENT**  
*Information is Empowering*  
A Shankar IAS Academy Initiative