



OPEN ACCESS

Key Words

Inexpensiveness, affordability, judiciary, justice system of Pakistan, courts

Corresponding Author

Ali Aslam
Department of Political Science,
Islamia University of Bahawalpur,
Pakistan

Received: 5 September 2022

Accepted: 21 October 2022

Published: 25 October 2022

Citation: Ali Aslam, Syeda Fakhar-e-Zahra, Tayyabah Aslam and Sajjad Nawaz Khan, 2022. The Perception Against Inexpensiveness of the Judicial System of Pakistan. Pak. J. Social Sci., 19: 36-43, doi: 10.59218/makpjss.2022.36.43

Copy Right: MAK HILL Publications

The Perception Against Inexpensiveness of the Judicial System of Pakistan

¹Ali Aslam, ¹Syeda Fakhar-e-Zahra, ²Tayyabah Aslam and ³Sajjad Nawaz Khan

¹Department of Political Science, Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Pakistan

²Department of Political Science, Islamic International University of Islamabad, Pakistan

³Department of Management Sciences, Islamia University Bahawalpur, Bahawalpur, Punjab, Pakistan

ABSTRACT

This study critically examines the affordability of Pakistan's judicial system. This desk-cum-qualitative study tries to comprehend why Pakistan's court system is not typically seen as being affordable to the common man. For this study, twelve in-depth unstructured interviews with pertinent specialists were undertaken. The purpose of the study is to comprehend why the idea regarding Pakistan's judicial system being expensive has developed. According to the study, the perception that the judiciary is expensive has been fostered by the way it handles criminal and civil cases, the role played by the lawyer community, the false belief that the justice is free of monetary cost, the lack of adequate funding for the judiciary and the class divide in Pakistan. Finally, the report also provides suggestions for the betterment of the Judicial system of Pakistan.

INTRODUCTION

One of the key requirements of a judicial system is that it should be inexpensive. The person seeking justice shouldn't have to pay any fee. Oppressed people find relief via an affordable Justice process. The most vulnerable members of society, the poor, should receive justice without being asked for payment. Justice becomes a commodity in which only those who can afford it may rely on a justice system when people must pay enormous quantities of money for it. According to Torres^[1], "Where justice is not free of cost, the rich and powerful exploit the poor people, resulting in the egregious violation of human rights." Because the destitute avoid going through the legal system due to the cost, it leads to injustice across society.

Even though a free legal system is essential for a society's well-being, access to it remains a pipe dream for a sizable portion of the population in Pakistan. Pakistan's constitution promises a low-cost justice system; however, the government offers hardly any financial assistance to the poor. The procedures to acquire relief are so difficult and time-consuming that nobody considers going through all the hassle to get aid in the few regions where the state promises to help the needy^[2]. In criminal proceedings, the state provides counsel but because they are frequently regarded as ineffective, people wind up paying for their own pricey lawyers. These problems worsen the price of the legal procedures and give the impression that Pakistan's court system is neither free nor even inexpensive.

The study will explain why the legal system is not often regarded as being affordable. The third pillar of a state is generally regarded as its judicial system. The study will provide a comprehensive analysis of the judicial system's shortcomings regarding its expensiveness and make recommendations for improvement.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The judicial system is not a commodity with a cost in and of itself. Sadly, it can be seen that to attain justice, there must be several transactions with different costs to be paid. The cost covers both monetary and non-monetary expenses. All of these charges have an impact on the availability of justice. The monetary expenses include the lawyer's fees, travel expenses, court costs, stamp paper costs, bribery, as well as many other miscellaneous costs. On the other hand, the lengthy process, emotional stress and the impossibility of winning the case are examples of non-financial costs. Complex and expensive judicial procedures result in flawed justice and have an impact on how justice is delivered.

Access to fair justice is not at all free, even though it is one of the basic human rights in independent nations. Even though access to justice is a crucial component of any community and enhances democratic institutions, economic development and society's culture, it is also extremely expensive. Both society and the nation's economic growth are improved by having access to a fair and free legal system^[3].

The Government makes sure that everyone either rich or poor, has the same rights so that nobody takes advantage of injustice. It safeguards those with limited resources. It increases the public's degree of faith in the legal system. Thanks to the free legal system, these citizens are given all the tools necessary to combat crime. Due to the high cost of the legal system, a large number of people continue to favor low-cost justice procedures like the panchayat and jirga systems^[2]. Court processes are not cost-effective for the low-income sector which increases the probability for them to rely on other less costly alternatives such as Jirga system or other community level justice. As has already been said, one of a state's primary responsibilities is to deliver justice to the populace as soon as possible without placing an undue cost on them. As a general rule of equity, "justice should be without any expense of any kind"^[4].

Due to their poverty in their various communities, 4 billion individuals live without legal protection worldwide. These people are easily duped by their employment, expelled from their homes and tortured by strong, intimidating individuals. The nation's economy can be destroyed by local corruption because of the absence of judicial accountability. To fight crime, corruption diverts resources that could be employed or were most required elsewhere. Massive delays in court proceedings encourage individual criminal activity and poor are incarcerated in large numbers while they wait days, months, or even years, for their initial trial. People forgo employment possibilities and turn to crime to sustain their families.

According to research by an Australian Institute, 83% of respondents from all over the world said that only the wealthy could pay to have the law guarantee their rights. According to 43% of respondents Dennis^[5], they can only afford a decent lawyer if they have no other choice.

From the reasoning above, it may be inferred that justice should be free because a sum of money that may seem insignificant to a rich man may be too much for a poor man to pay. Justice becomes a commodity that only the wealthy and powerful can purchase when it is sold against the money. The clients of justice desire uncorrupted, inexpensive and speedy justice

without any delay. However, it will not be extravagant to say that the existing criminal justice system in Pakistan is decaying the confidence of justice seekers^[6].

Perception of the inexpensiveness of the judicial system in Pakistan: Despite receiving recognition on a global scale, the majority of Pakistanis still consider access to free justice to be a pipe dream^[2]. Citizens of Pakistani have a constitutional right to unrestricted and impartial justice. However, there is still a perception that citizens should only resort to litigation in serious property disputes since it is a time-consuming and expensive process. Instead of seeking legal assistance, they would rather remain silent and abandon their lands. Furthermore, the delivery of justice as well as democracy in Pakistan was wrecked by the exceptional interference of invisible forces and their interest in the country's judicial system^[7].

The early abrupt changes in the government, planted and grew a culture to compel the courts to bow down against the political executives. On many occasions, the courts coordinated with the executives, which resulted in a constitutional violation and fundamental rights were affected. This support of courts to political executives encouraged unconstitutional actions to be taken repeatedly^[8]. When the justice system is synonymous with 'Might is Right' or when the legal process is lengthy, unavailable, or full of interruptions then justice cannot be obtained. To maintain rule of law in a society, law must be in conformity with the needs of society.

Giving people access to fair and free justice is one of the nation's most important duties. If it doesn't, it can be said that the nation is flawed and that its judicial system is riddled with errors. For those with low incomes, access to fair and free justice in Pakistan is both challenging and expensive^[9]. According to a study of Pakistan's judicial system, the country's government has shown little interest in or investment in the judiciary, which has resulted in inadequate funding. In Pakistan's judicial system, colonial practices are still prevalent and hurt court performance^[10,11].

According to a case study published in Dawn, a 55 year-old woman's case study, in which she sued her ex-husband over a property dispute, gained attention. She claims that after considering all of her alternatives, she chose to seek legal assistance. She mentioned that she had three different lawyers working for her to present her case. They all collected their payments in advance but never showed up. Just by entering a legal dustup, she lost Rs. 650,000. The fourth one required Rs. 250,000 over two payments. Half before and half after the case's final resolution. This

illustration clarifies Pakistan's system of incompetent and costly justice. The experts claim that these pains can only be alleviated by the efforts of all parties involved.

Two additional case studies that highlighted Pakistan's expensive justice system were covered in an analysis that was published in the Express newspaper in 2014. In the first case study, Hari SwaiBheel sued landlord Abdul Waheed Leghari for Rs 10,000 in the Sinjhor, Sanghar Tenancy Tribunal, alleging that Leghari had wrongfully deducted the sum from his rent as Leghari's tenant. It took him seven months to make his case. Each trip to the Tribunal would cost him Rs. 300, which also covered the cost of a rented motorbike, fuel and food. The Assistant Commissioner would occasionally fail to appear; other times, his case might be heard last. The situation necessitated at least two visits per month.

In the second case study, Sabahat Bibi, a local of a Karachi industrial district, was the subject. The biggest nightmare of her life came true when her six-year-old daughter, who had gone outside to play, was carried inside by a neighbor who claimed she had fallen. Her sexual attack was not realized by her parents for a very long time. The incident marked the beginning of a four-year ordeal that included calling the police, who directed them to one of Karachi's three hospitals authorized to conduct medical-legal examinations, treating the traumatized child for two months in several hospitals and pursuing the case in court with a lawyer who demanded Rs. 11,000 but never showed up.

The NGO War Against Rape (WAR) provided the troubled family with assistance and free legal services to ensure that the offender was prosecuted. To deal with the events that followed the rape and the filing of the lawsuit in court, Bibi ultimately incurred expenses totalling more than Rs150,000 despite WAR's assistance.

Numerous in-depth analyses and assessments describing the expensive course of justice for Pakistan's low-income background litigants appropriately put the aforementioned real-life testimonies into perspective. Regular litigation may incur court costs, attorney fees and other ancillary costs. The amount of court's fee is determined by the circumstances of the case. The starting cost for a lawyer or law firm is Rs 20,000 without any monetary cap. Additionally, there are no restrictions on ancillary costs, which broadly include transportation costs, additional paperwork, costs associated with acquiring evidence and even paying the court reader to postpone the hearing date^[12,13].

The so-called "miscellaneous expenses," which are infrequently discussed, make up a significant portion of the overall cost, regardless of whether one receives free legal assistance or hires a professional. These put

the most dent in the complainant's wallet due to their direct and indirect relation to the case, especially for those from low-income backgrounds. But there has never been a method found to deal with this issue.

Take into account the costs Bibi incurred while pursuing justice for the rape of her daughter. While she stayed at home to care for their four children, her carpenter husband earned Rs 3,000 per week. The parents rushed to the police to report their daughter's rape and the officers instructed them to get a medico-legal certificate. They informed Bibi that they were out of fuel and that the couple would have to make their transportation arrangements of their daughter. The daughter had to be brought to the hospital because of the emotional and physical harm that had been done to her.

According to Bibi, her daughter would frequently spend weeks in the hospital as she continued to fall ill as a result of the severe rape. The parents spent Rs. 200 every day for the entire time their daughter was in the hospital, assuming an average bus charge of Rs. 50 per person per day. In addition to that, there were expenses for tests and medications. At least two trips to the court each month were required during the four years of the trial, with an additional Rs. 500 per day required for travel and food costs. The landlord ordered Bibi's family to leave the rental home when word of the daughter's rape spread because he did not want any police visits or other Disputes at his location. The family had to move every six months during that time because no landlord would let them stay. This was on top of the family receiving threats from the rapist and his family members, who kept stopping by their home and kids' schools.

They currently pay Rs5,000 for a modest room in Karachi, where Bibi works as a domestic worker and earns Rs. 7,000 per month. Bibi is forced to work in low-paying jobs because she wants to remain close to her region so that she can personally pick up and drop off her daughter from school and tuition, ensuring she is in safe hands. This is true even if the offender has been punished and the feeling of insecurity has lessened. She claims that despite the free legal assistance provided by an NGO, she still had to pay more than Rs. 150,000 out of her cash to deal with the occurrences. Things are similarly upsetting for those who reside in remote areas and are involved in High Court or District Court litigation and Sessions tribunals. The cost of travel can range from Rs 300-1,000 or even Rs. 2,000 for every trip, depending on how far the courts in the relevant area are. Unaware of the intricate case procedures, litigants frequently find themselves turned away if the judge or other pertinent court personnel are not present, wasting their time and journey.

Clerks further take advantage of poor complainants on the court's ground by charging them five times for copies of orders and other notices. For claims as minor as Rs. 10,000, even those requesting settlements from tenancy tribunals face difficulties. At least one year is spent on the hearings. The total cost of these applications, which includes numerous trips to the Assistant Commissioner's office and a lawyer's fee that might start at Rs 20,000, also includes paperwork and transportation for the lawyer^[14].

A similar picture is painted by family courts. A strong case requires a lot of documentary evidence, which may include certifications, receipts and witness testimonials; all processes that involve significant costs in addition to the lawyer's fee and other court costs. According to a woman interviewed for a National Commission on the Status of Women research titled as *The Impact of Family Laws on the Rights of Divorced Women in Pakistan*, "I spent all my savings, which were about one million, to win custody of my kids. As of right now, I am helpless and without resources to continue and the costs of litigation were substantially higher than my dower amount"^[14].

These things may deter people from using litigation to obtain what they need which is justice. Litigation is rarely favoured over informal processes like "Jirgas" and out-of-court agreements. As a result, the idea spreads that Pakistan's court system is exceedingly expensive and by no means free. Justice Baqar regretted that the judiciary had fallen short of expectations. Delays and pendency remain at all-time high across all courts in the country. He added, "It is imperative that we remove impediments in the path of expeditious and inexpensive justice and build dams against unnecessary delays in adjudication with sincerity of commitment and a single-minded focus on fulfilling our constitutional role". President Dr. Arif Alvi stated that people deserved speedy and inexpensive justice but in reality, there were long delays in the dispensation of justice which violated the basic fundamental rights and had many social implications like mental as well as physical pain to the affected and unrest in the society^[14].

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study is qualitative in nature. Desk research was done as the study's first stage. After the desk study was finished, extensive unstructured interviews were held. Interviews with professionals in the legal system, the administrative system and the field of political science were taken. These interviews were mostly utilized to confirm the results of the desk study and to delve deeper into the problem. Personnel with sufficient knowledge of the field's current real-world

situation were used for the interviews for the thesis's section on the judicial system. To observe the administrative shortcomings of the court system, experts in the field of administration were also approached for interviews. Finally, interviews with political science professionals who had the best understanding of judicial institutions were performed to look into the ideological foundation of the contemporary judicial system. There were 12 interviews in total.

The research's descriptive methodology is based on both primary and secondary sources of information. The descriptive investigation itself contributes to a better understanding of the phenomenon. This study's design is cross-sectional because it involves three sample groups: lawyers, judges and political scientists. In-depth interviews were used to gather the data. This study uses only qualitative research methods, including interview methodology. To put it another way, it might be said that this study is specifically qualitative and interpretive.

Limitations of research: In this study, the sample size is only 12 respondents:

- Some people didn't provide accurate and satisfactory information
- Unintentional non-cooperation of the target group/respondents in providing necessary information, as they were busy is also a remarkable limitation of the study
- The results could be unreliable due to the small sample size
- All the interviews were conducted in different cities in Punjab. No other province was visited. The opinion of people may differ in other parts of Pakistan

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Thematic analysis-why Pakistan's justice system is not considered to be inexpensive: A low-cost justice system is promised by Pakistan's constitution. The reality on the ground, however, paints a different image. Given that Pakistani justice is expensive, if not outright expensive, there is a widespread misconception that justice there is neither cheap nor free. Even the upper middle class in Pakistan is thought to find justice to be expensive. The interviewees give many justifications for Pakistan's pricy judicial system.

The state approaches criminal and civil matters in different ways. The judicial system has two different categories of cases: Criminal cases and civil cases. According to the law, the state is responsible for administering justice in criminal proceedings.

Therefore, the state prosecutes such situations rather than private parties. On the other side, the person accused of the offense handles the defence. If the defendant wants a lawyer, the state provides one, or he can locate one on his own. However, the state is prosecuting and the chosen attorneys are state prosecutors. It is, therefore, free in that sense. However, despite everything due to these regulations, the legal system is not seen as being inexpensive.

One of the respondents claimed that the state has responsibility for the prosecution of criminal offenses around the globe. Dispensing criminal justice and carrying out such justice is one of the fundamental duties of the state. As a result, there are no associated costs. However, the majority of the time, the accused prefers to have his attorney which involves the cost of this attorney. In criminal proceedings, the defendant is required to pay the attorney's fees. He can always initiate a case to recover damages if the prosecution was done incorrectly. So, it is a possibility. On occasions, in Pakistan, it has been reported that a person with a good case lacks the funds to pay the court costs. In this situation, the state must assist that person. The legislation must make provisions for the poor. He will have to present evidence of the offense in court. Then the state selects a council on his behalf. However, the procedure is so drawn out and difficult that few people dare to complete it. According to respondent 2, most people opt to work with a lawyer of their choosing. As a result, individuals begin to think that the judicial system is exceedingly expensive due to the expense they must incur.

Another commenter brought up the expensive property litigation, saying that it is unaffordable. They are led to believe that Pakistan's dispute settlement system is exceedingly expensive for regular people. The price of property litigation in civil disputes varies from province to province. For instance, the charge for property matters in the federal territory is 3000 Rs. In Punjab, the price is also \$15,000. Additionally, in contrast to criminal cases, litigants in civil cases do not receive financial assistance. There is a law in place that allows the court to give the poor individual defence in civil cases. Yet another respondent claims that in his ten years of expertise, he has never witnessed law being applied.

It is evident from the aforementioned considerations that the legal system's approach to providing for the poor is inadequate. People with significant property disputes may afford the court costs, but others with minor disputes cannot. The procedures in place to assist the poor are so convoluted and ineffective that they are unable to serve as a support system for them. People have a negative opinion of the court system of affordability because they don't receive affordable justice.

Relevance of lawyers: The fact that clients must cover the cost of the attorney is one reason why free justice is perceived negatively. If a citizen is willing, he or she may decide to represent themselves in court. However, due to complexities of legal system, that is not possible. For this reason, one must hire a lawyer. These solicitors frequently demand money from their customers under the guise that the administrative costs are excessive. To make more money, they give their customers false information about the costs of administrative proceedings. As a result, their clients begin to think that Pakistan's justice system is excessively pricey.

Legal education for people can lower the expense of defending a litigant's case as mentioned by a respondent. Legal education is a difficult and nearly unattainable task. No educational institution in the world instructs common people on how to present a case. People can, at best, be provided with a service that makes it simple for them to receive information regarding the costs of legal processes. The primary goal should be the development of morally upright and respectable lawyers through legal education. This negative view of the legal system is mostly due to lawyers who are overly obsessed with their financial success.

One respondent said that there are two different types of lawyers in Pakistan, according to one respondent. First type includes those who have received their schooling in other nations. They are very competent but charge a lot. They don't provide concessions on their fees at any cost. Locally educated lawyers constitute the second category. These solicitors are inclined to deceive clients into paying various case costs by employing a variety of dishonest techniques to steal their money.

The Government sends a list of the legal representatives it is paying in criminal cases. The Government pays its attorneys extremely little money. These attorneys are tasked with representing criminals who lack the funds to do so. Even when they defend such cases, these attorneys allege that they are not being well paid. They claim that certain cases required even 3-4 year efforts. For their work during this time, they were not compensated enough.

One commenter brought out a problem with Pakistan's common law system. He asserts that Pakistan's British-instituted common law system is still in force. It provides the defendant with numerous hearing opportunities. In addition to this, there is an appeal process where the conduct of the solicitors and parties is very important. The pressure organizations prevent the legislation on this from passing because they intentionally want justice to be delayed. This delay adds to the cost of justice. As a result, the opinion that the legal system is too cheaply constructed is dominant.

This is the problem with the legal system that allows attorneys and pressure groups with an interest in the case to drag it out. If the matter is not resolved, attorneys will continue to ask for money for their services. Sometimes the nature of cases becomes so complicated that one has to visit different cities which isn't free of cost. People sell their properties simply to obtain justice. In such a system, individuals would think that the cost of justice in the nation is very high.

Misconception about the free justice: Many respondents claimed that the widespread misunderstanding of the term "freedom" is one of the reasons why the judicial system is not seen as being free. The judicial system makes an effort to make justice free or inexpensive by compensating wrongdoers and levying fines on those who break the law. The people who win the case receive these fines as payment for their financial losses.

According to respondents one, parties are required to present their defences in every country, with the state offering a variety of assistance. One method is for the government to give the parties solicitors. The state offers the parties legal insurance in the second method. Another approach is for the state to compel arbitration. Accordingly, states advise people to resolve their disagreement amicably rather than initiating legal limbo, utilizing any decent man who is trusted by both parties. In certain nations, it is deemed mandatory. Arbitration is optional in Pakistan. Another option to cut costs in the court system is to find the wronged party because they began the cases dishonestly and with erroneous ideas. People are discouraged from going to court as a result. Even when people go to court, they attempt to conclude their cases quickly since the court places the cost of these items on the parties who default. They forbid the parties from acting independently without fear of repercussion. As a result, litigation is avoided and trials go quickly. There are no similar processes in Pakistan. As a result, the cost of justice rises and people eventually come to believe that the cost of justice is high in the nation.

The interviewee's explanation above does not address the question of "how can a poor person get a justice who does not have enough money to start a litigation process in the first place without the state's help?". It is hard for a poor man to get a justice who cannot begin the litigation process due to lack of money and as a result, injustice shall reign in society. Justice must be free of charge to produce a just society.

Another respondent said that there are laws in Pakistan to back up the aforementioned contention. According to those laws, when a judgment is rendered in a person's favour, the opposing party must provide

restitution and the court must take action against the losing party. However, the laws in Pakistan are so rusted and dusty that the judge's discretion rules and is frequently not even allowed to exercise it for a variety of reasons. Pakistan indeed has very few regulations about levying financial penalties on the party in default. These rules are rarely applied and the Pakistani court system is viewed as expensive as a result. In a similar vein, some people file legal action just to torment their adversary. Because courts rarely punish defaulters, they don't worry about it happening to them in their lawsuits. The court system now has to deal with more burden of cases.

One interviewee mentioned that there have previously been studies on successful cases conducted in the USA. In the end, it was discovered that the winners had the trait of investing more money in the case than the losers. The most affluent community is that of lawyers in the USA. It's because the lawyers demand millions of dollars for each case. In contrast, hiring a lawyer in Pakistan might cost as little as 500 Rs. or as much as 50 million.

This is a perfect example of how justice is a product of a capitalist society. The Pakistani constitution's article 37D guarantees swift and inexpensive justice. A low-cost justice implies that the state must cover some portion of the expense of the justice. However, since access to justice is intended to be a fundamental right for everyone, it is preferable if it is free. Unfairness will occur if justice is not free.

The lack of Proper funding for the judicial system: Five of the respondents stated that the biggest issue is that there is not enough money set aside for the court system and that it is not given the proper priority. Defence receives the majority of the nation's budget. Pakistan has evolved into a security state as a result. This has an impact on the social services. The three main social services provided in the nation are justice, health and education. Poor priorities have been set aside throughout the years, due to which all three of them have suffered in the past 72 years.

One of the respondents claimed that the budget for the legal system is insufficient. So, that is what is causing the issue with the cost of justice. The harmed party cannot receive compensation from the court's properly parties. It is unable to offer competent lawyers to the public. It cannot even update the facilities. Similarly, to this, another respondent claimed that the judicial system does not receive enough funding, which causes the legal process to drag on and increases the expense of justice, leading to the opinion that the judicial system is too expensive.

The court system indeed needs more funding to assist the underprivileged and a greater number of judges to speed up the resolution of disputes and

provide timely assistance to the underprivileged. However, it is difficult to comprehend why judges, who have limited resources, have a luxurious lifestyle and large salaries.

The class difference: The justice system could have been free, but the wealthy elites do not want that. One can understand why justice is so expensive if one sees law and order through the prism of Pakistan's historical political culture. People could have obtained justice for nothing if it had been free. If it had occurred, Pakistan's political elites would have had less influence overall. Notably, in the country's rural areas, the landlords have a lot of influence over the employee. Anytime they choose, they can expel them from their territory. The poor population of the nation receives no financial assistance; hence Pakistani justice is thought to be expensive. This occurs because powerful elites will it. It is unable to offer competent solicitors to the public. It cannot even update the facilities.

The court system indeed needs more funding to assist the underprivileged and a greater number of judges to speed up the resolution of disputes and provide timely assistance to the underprivileged. This is important to mitigate the class difference in society so the law is just for every citizen irrespective of his/her wealth status.

CONCLUSION

The fact that a person must spend significant amount of money before their disagreement is resolved, contributes to the idea that the legal system is expensive in Pakistan. The lawyers assist in defrauding the common people of their money by deceiving them. Similarly, to this, wealthy elites and interest groups do not want the legal system to be affordable because they fear losing control over the populace. The entire legal system is a sham if it denies the most oppressed citizens of the nation the opportunity to even seek redress. It is crucial to keep in mind that a country's justice system exists to uphold justice so that it can carry out its functions. If multitudes of helpless and impoverished individuals are not allowed to turn to the legal system for assistance when they are in need, justice cannot be upheld in any nation. In such cultures, justice is subordinate to the powerful. If justice is a commodity, it is difficult to administer it evenly to all parties. If justice must be purchased, it can only be obtained by those who have the financial means to do it. Even if there are still laws in place to give a destitute person justice, those laws are powerless. More funding from the government is needed for free legal aid. There are instances of this practice everywhere. Both the federal and provincial budgets set aside a sizable sum to cover

the costs of plaintiffs. The budget of Pakistan does not allocate significant money for this. Government should help low-income litigants. Justice requires time, effort and financial investment, it does not just happen on its own. And it is a fundamental duty of the state. The defense of the state is one of the fundamental roles of the government. The cost is covered by the Government. Managing the state's Government is another fundamental duty. That expense is also covered by the Government. Some changes have been witnessed inside the judicial structure for the betterment of this organ of the Government. Justice Umar Bandial, the Chief Justice of Pakistan has initiated some reforms at numerous levels of the apex court, specifically regarding the management system for Cases. This is to ensure speedy and in expensive justice. He also returned the luxury vehicles given to him as well as various judges. Several committees have been formed which are headed directly by judges. The judicial system of Pakistan has also introduced a proforma for the petitioners to apply for an early case hearing. Such steps should be encouraged by all organs of the Government to ensure unbiased and free justice for the people of Pakistan. The grass root level is where around half of the problems in the judicial system exist. A corruption-free mentality can be helpful in this regard. Only through education and character development society can get rid of corruption. Aside from this, Pakistan should look at other parts of the world where justice is practiced best and attempt to adopt such systems. The establishments are Reforming the institutions is more difficult. However, the direction must be appropriate and in line with the current situation.

REFERENCES

1. Torres, C.A., 1995. State and education revisited: Why educational researchers should think politically about education. *Am. Educ. Res. Assoc.*, 21: 255-331.
2. Khan, F.S., 2004. *Quest for Justice: Judicial System in Pakistan*. Network Publications, ISBN-25: 969880708X, 9789698807085, Pages: 56.
3. Hülle, S., S. Liebig and M.J. May, 2018. Measuring attitudes toward distributive justice: The basic social justice orientations scale. *Social Indic. Res.*, 136: 663-692.
4. Khan, H., 2001. Constitutional and political history of Pakistan., <https://oup.com.pk/academic-generalbooks/law/constitutional-and-political-history-of-pakistan.html>
5. Denniss, R., J. Fear and E. Millane, 2012. Justice for all., https://australiainstitute.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/IP8-Justice-for-all_4.pdf
6. Hassan, D.S., 2022. Pakistan social sciences review., <https://www.openaccessjournal.com/journal/135/Pakistan-social-sciences-review>
7. Armytage, L., 2003. Pakistan's law and justice sector reform experience. *Law Social Justice Global Dev. J.*, Vol. 2.
8. Akhtar, N., A. Kasi and Q. Khan, 2022. A review on the consequences over: Achieving judicial independence in Pakistan. *Pak. J. Int. Affairs*, Vol. 3 .10.52337/pjia.v5i4.653.
9. Kasuri, M.R., 2017. A speedy and inexpensive criminal justice system: Plea bargaining., https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4013298
10. Siddique, O., 2013. *Pakistan's Experience with Formal Law*. Cambridge University Press, ISBN-13: 9781139814508, Pages: 469.
11. Sakib, S.M.N., 2021. Corruption, development and income disparity in Pakistan., <https://ideas.repec.org/p/osf/socarx/3h2kp.html>
12. Khan, M.I., 2018. Transaction cost of justice in Pakistan: A case study of Peshawar high court. *Pakistan's Economy And The Way Forward*, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/331385664_TRANSACTION_COST_OF_JUSTICE_IN_PAKISTAN_A_CASE_STUDY_OF_PESHAWAR_HIGH_COURT.
13. Turk, M.A., 2021. The dilemma of justice system in formerly FATA of Pakistan: Challenges and prospects. *J. Law Soc. Policy*, 3: 112-130.
14. Khokhar, D.M., 2021. Justice delayed or denied: The myth of justice in Pakistan. *J. Law Social Stud.*, 3: 124-132.