"MEDIATION: BETTER ACCESS TO JUSTICE"

Madhup Gupta (500017838)

R760211022

Submitted under the guidance of: Dr. Ashish Verma

This dissertation is submitted in the partial fulfilment if the degree of B.B.A.,LL.B. (Hons)

College of Legal Studies

University of Petroleum and Energy Studies

Dehradun

2016

DECLARATION

I declare that the dissertation titled "MEDIATION: BETTER ACCESS TO JUSTICE" is the outcome of my own work conducted under the supervision of Dr. Ashish Verma, at College of Legal Studies, University of Petroleum and Energy Studies, Dehradun.

I declare that the dissertation comprises only of my original work and due acknowledgments has been made in the text to all other material used.

Signature

Madhup Gupta

Date:

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the research work entitled "MEDIATION: BETTER ACCESS TO JUSTICE" is the work done by Madhup Gupta under my guidance and supervision for the partial fulfilment of the requirement of B.B.A., LL.B. (Hons.) degree at College of Legal Studies, University of Petroleum and Energy Studies, Dehradun.

Signature
Dr. Ashish Verma
Designation
Date:

ABSTRACT

Mediation in its contemporary incarnation is an **Alternative Dispute Resolution** process where a specially trained mediator facilitates the parties in arriving at an amicable settlement through a structured process involving different stages viz. introduction, joint session, caucus and agreement. Mediation has distinct advantages - it is **cost effective** and **expeditious**, it enables the parties to devise creative tailor-made solutions, results in a **win-win situation** thereby preserving relationships and is confidential.

Mediation is a **facilitative** procedure in which debating parties connect with the help of a fair-minded outsider, the **Mediator**, who offers them to attempt to some assistance with arriving at a concurred determination of their question. The Mediator has no power to settle on any choices that are tying on them, however utilizes certain strategies, methods and abilities to help them to negotiate a concurred determination of their question without adjudication

Mediation has emerged as the frontrunner in the Alternative Dispute Resolution revolution which is gaining momentum. At the post **litigation** stage mediation is perhaps the most preferred mode of dispute resolution especially for complicated, multifaceted and long standing disputes.

Mediation, at the pre litigation stage, however has not made much headway on account of lack of statutory framework, albeit we have a range of institutional and ad hoc options available for pre litigation mediation also.

Keywords: Mediation, Alternative Dispute Resolution, Cost effective, expeditious, win-win situation, facilitative, Mediator, litigation.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT'S

I would like to take this opportunity to express my heartfelt gratitude to my mentor Mr. Ashish Verma for helping me in deciding such a current and smouldering topic: "*Mediation: Better access to justice"* that not only helped me in this dissertation, but also in overall knowledge on various Alternative Dispute Mechanism. It really proved to be enlightening for me to research on this topic as it gave me a crystal clear knowledge of the concept of Mediation.

Besides, helping me in providing information, he has been with me in taking every step for completing this Dissertation and has made my concept clear regarding this topic with various illustrations. Thus, it gave me immense pleasure to present my gratitude by studying and assembling various materials on this topic which really proved to be a great experience.

Madhup Gupta

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

"Litigation has not kept up with modern, fast moving society… there have been revolutionary changes in the business practices since the basic court structure was adopted from English Common Law… Compared to modern business, Civil Courts have changed very little… Alternative dispute resolution gives the lawyers an opportunity to use new processes, encourages problem solving attitude and openness to compromise"

-Robert Coulson[1]

It can be watched that almost every group, nation, and society has an extensive history of utilizing different option strategies for dispute resolution. A large portion of these techniques imparted procedural components to the procedure that has been ambulated as contemporary intervention. In India, as in different nations, the inception of Mediation is darkened by the absence of a reasonable authentic record. What's more, there is an absence of authority records of indigenous procedures of debate determination because of colonization in India in the course of recent years. There is scattered data, put forward beneath, that can be assembled by following Mediation in an exceptionally basic structure back to old times in the post-Vedic period in India. Tribal groups rehearsed various sorts of question determination methods for quite a long time in various parts of the world, including India. In China Mediation supported by government has been utilized on an across the board premise to determine disputes in light of old social standards of tranquil concurrence.

Settlement of contrasts in a genial way is the corridor sign of progress. In old India, intervention framework has been overflowing in one structure or the other. It has continued in our towns and has moreover been secured in its standard structure in our tribal locales. So far as formal suit system is concerned, Mediation, alongside different strategies for Alternative Disputes Resolution, has been statutorily seen by the Code of Civil Procedure (Amendment) Act, of 1999 which presented Section 89 thereto.

A thought about the colossal quality that intervention infolds in it can be had by independently treating the quantity of special elements grouped under the Mediation

[1] "President of American Association."

rubric. These components incorporate severability, adaptability, party-self-sufficiency, agreement, self-reflection, safeguarding of connections or tranquil end of connections, and so on. It cultivates friendly and more beneficial between individual communications in the long haul, in this way keeping the reasons for strife in the general public. The advantages of such procedures as intervention are further perceived from the way that understood legitimate identities, for example, Mahatma Gandhi, Abraham Lincoln and Nani Palkhiwala, have dependably supported the thought of settling cases out of court. In the expressions of Guatam Budhha, "Superior to a thousand empty words is single word that gives peace", which even is reflected in the well known Sanskrit cite "Santosham Paramam Sukham". Mediation is one of the modes for achievement of 'Peace'.

People are not known not up their hands in hopelessness when any test emerges. To counter the difficulties of always expanding pendency in courts, late strategies included in case and so forth., new systems which are more casual savvy and expedient have been searched for and every one of these methods have come to be known by a succinct expression Alternative Dispute Resolution. Seekers of justice are in millions and it is turning out to be somewhat troublesome for the Courts to adapt up to the steadily expanding cases with the present foundation and labour. Courts are obstructed with cases. There is not kidding issue of congestion of dockets. As a result of the perpetually expanding number of cases the Court framework is under awesome weight. Hence, if there was at the limit a perpetual component or apparatus to settle the matters at a pre-trial stage, numerous matters would not discover their way to the Courts. So also, if there are perpetual gatherings to which Courts might allude cases, the heap of cases could be removed the Courts.

The arrangement of administering justice in India has been censured for a few reasons for the most part in view of the immense pendency of cases in courts which brings about deferral of Justice. In India, the quantity of cases documented in the courts has demonstrated an immense increment lately bringing about pendency and deferrals because of which there is requirement for option debate determination strategies. It is in this setting a Resolution was embraced by the Chief Ministers and the Chief Justices of States in a gathering held in New Delhi on fourth December 1993 under the Chairmanship of the then Prime Minister and directed by the Chief Justice of India.

It said: "The Chief Ministers and Chief Justices were of the assessment that Courts were not in a position to manage the whole weight of Justice framework and that various debate are most appropriate to determination by option modes, for example, assertion, Mediation and transaction. They accentuated the attractive quality of disputants using elective question determination which gave procedural adaptable technique, time and financially savvy and kept away from the anxiety of a routine Litigation System".

In a creating nation like India with major financial changes under path inside of the structure of the standard of law, techniques for swifter determination of debate for diminishing the weight on the courts and to give intends to quick determination of question, there is no better choice however to endeavour to create elective methods of question determination (Alternative Dispute Resolution) by building up offices for giving settlement of debate through Arbitration, Conciliation, Mediation and Negotiation.

STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

It is rightly said that justice delayed is justice denied and as we are aware Indian legal system has been criticised for delay there are instances where it takes life time of litigants to have a final verdict in such situation people are losing faith in legal system it also promote frivolous litigation and it is quite often used as means of harassment of opposite party to compel him to agree to some unreasonable and unjust demand. Through dissertation author would try to answer as how far mediation can be used as effective tools to redress this issue.

The basic premise of any legal system stands on principle of rule of law but the legal status to mediation still stands in dark as there is no law regarding the process of mediation the only basis which exist is section 89 of code of civil procedure which in fact itself have grey areas so there is need to have analysis on legal status of mediation as alternative dispute redressal mechanism and its alignment with section 89 of code of civil procedure.

In mediation the role of mediator is facilitative in nature but through in-depth study and internship experiences author have come across the problem that though there are some standards set by the apex court of country regarding role of mediator there still exists some lacuna as there are no means to keep check as whether that standards are followed or not.

Though mediation is party centred process still the role of advocates in the process cannot be ignored as lawyers were against this process because of the obvious reasons that it will effect on their profession and income so the question of eliminating this issue is of great concern as the role of advocates in mediation is of great importance as they are the one who can seek the best interest of their clients in accordance of law also suggest the clients on best negotiation possible.

The other burning issue involve as to what kind of cases should be referred to mediation as the question is not whether mediation is better or litigation is better the question should be which type of process is more suited for particular type of dispute as the matters related to public interest at large cannot be governed by the process of mediation so this issue should be addressed.

As the importance of this process is well accepted there is need to resolve or address the above issues which in turn can make mediation as one of the most effective ADR mechanism.

SCOPE OF RESEARCH

The research aims to seek as to how far mediation is effective tool to ADR mechanism as to find out how far it can be used for effective resolution of disputes its merits and what are its constrains.

The question which process is more suited for a particular type of dispute is of great concern as criminal cases involving public interest, cases affecting a large number of persons, matters relating to taxation and administrative law has to be decided by court by adjudicatory process. Even among civil litigation, cases involving fraud, forgery, coercion, undue influence have to be necessarily decided through adjudicatory process by courts and not by negotiations. So research aims analyse the categories of cases for which the process of mediation is suited and what are the cases which cannot be resolved or referred to mediation and the scope of this process in case of family, rent , and lease matters and in particularly to establish the importance of mediation in matrimonial cases.

The role of mediator and advocates in process of mediation is of important nature and research aims to describe the extend of this importance and as to what kind of communication and other skills must be possessed by the mediator and what should be the attitude of lawyers towards process of mediation.

RESEARCH QUESTION'S

- How far mediation can be used as an effective tool to overcome pitfall of litigation?
- What is position of process of mediation in accordance with law?
- What is extend of frequency with which ADR is utilized for resolution of disputes?
- How far mediators justify the facilitative role assigned to them?
- What is importance of role of advocates in process of mediation?
- What kinds of cases are best suited for mediation and what kind of disputes cannot be resolved by mediation?
- How far there is need to revitalise the ADR mechanism?
- Should mediation be the part of juvenile criminal justice system for non-violent offenders?

HYPOTHESIS

The hypothesis of the author is based on that the Mediation is a valuable dispute resolution tool because the means of reaching an agreement can be as varied as the disputes that need to be resolved. Mediation procedures can be tailored to a variety of factors: the personality of the mediator; the nature of the dispute; the time or resources available; and the antagonism between the parties. The procedure can thus minimize contentiousness, cost, and resources. If it is unsuccessful, the parties can always resort to the courts or other means of dispute resolution. In short, mediation is a valuable weapon against delay, cost, and injustice.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In consonance with the most of the research work and for ease of reading, this study is based upon doctrinal research with in depth study of the subject exploring primary and secondary source being the relevant legislative enactments, law books, reference to case laws and it is based on an abundance of court's decision and arbitral awards respectively. The researcher had also made comparative analysis on all the aspect of the legal rules and provision pertaining to the research topic and has discussed and compared the same with the help of Indian and English case laws, detailing other related cases relevant to the subject of study. The researcher had made an honest attempt to study elaborately and in detail the various aspects involved in the different ways to analyse the purpose of mediation for an approach to speedy justice with the help of valuable quotes of eminent jurists.

A doctrinal research means a research that has been carried out on a legal proposition or propositions by way of analysing the existing statutory provisions and cases by applying the reasoning power. Doctrinal research involves analysis of case law, arranging, ordering and systematizing legal reasoning or rational deduction. Ascertaining a legal rule for the purpose of solving problem is one of the purposes of the traditional legal research. This has been achieved by the original sources of low. The Act of parliament and the Acts passed by the legislature fall under this category of legislation. The case laws decided by the Supreme Court and High court which are binding on lower courts fall under the category of precedents.

SURVEY OF EXISTING LITERATURE

i. MEDIATION – Realizing the potential and designing implementation strategies by Dr. Justice Dhananjaya Y. Chandrachud Judge High Court at Bombay

This article explains as to how far the mediation can help to reduce pendency of cases further article states as to what are the roles of mediator, advocate, parties in process of mediation and how the outcome should be as to align it with legal enforceability it try to explain the shift in the focus of the legal profession as mediation does not eliminate the role of advocates but in fact demand the effective participation on part of advocates.

ii. MEDIATION – Need of hour by Hon'ble Mr. Justice S.B. Sinha former judge, Supreme Court of India.

This article bring our focus to the elements which are essential for good governance of the mediation process so it is desirable to deliberate upon the various issues connected with effective implementation of mediation throughout the country so that mediation can be accepted as effective tool to dispute resolution hence various issues regarding mediation are discussed especially in Indian context . As the concept of mediation which is prevailing in different legal system may not be relevant for Indian context as the culture, social, economic problems of Indians are entirely different with that of other nations. Further this article place emphasis on importance of judicial reforms and role of High courts in building effective mediation process.

iii. Concept and process of mediation by Mediation and Conciliation Project Committee, Supreme Court of India.

Mediation and Conciliation Project Committee of Supreme Court of India through this article explains the meaning, concept and understanding of mediation it further deals with the differences between judicial process, arbitration and mediation.

It explain in details the stages of mediation and what is to be done by mediator in different stages is also laid down a kind of guidelines are provided for having

effective mediation process as its well accepted that mediation is an effective ADR mechanism its advantages are also laid down through this article.

iv. Mediation training manual of India by Mediation and Conciliation Project Committee, Supreme Court of India.

This Manual is the product of a team work and intellectual exercise of the experts it facilitate and help guide mediation in growing not as an alternative dispute resolution mechanism, but as another effective mode of disputes resolution. This manual aimed for benefit of the trainers, mediators, referral judges, litigants and common man and all those who strive to achieve peace through mediation. It is compact code on mediation explaining nearly all the issues related to mediation and gives the effective understanding for effective implementation of mediation process.

This manual explains the meaning, process and stages of mediation in detail along with basic concepts of conflict dispute and differences.

In words of Joseph Grynbaum, "an ounce of mediation is worth a pound of arbitration and a ton of litigation!" so it also explain the merits of mediation over litigation as well as mediation it gives instruction as to what should be the role of mediator, advocate, and parties in process of mediation and also lays down the manner for training of mediators.

v. Advantages and Disadvantages of Mediation in Probate, Trust, and Guardianship Matters by Mary F. Radford Professor of Law, Georgia State University

As we all know Common law does not guarantee privacy or confidentiality in settlement discussions. Sometimes people do not want to disclose their private family matters in public and hence do not give the clear details during the court proceedings which result in confusion to judge and delay in decision this paper gives the in-depth analysis of advantages and disadvantages of Mediation in Probate, Trust, and Guardianship matters as one of the basic objective of

mediation is to keep relations intact which are often destroyed in judicial process this paper on the same line helps to understand this aspect of mediation process.

vi. MEDIATION- An introduction by Hon'ble Mr. Justice R.V. Raveendran judge, Supreme Court of India.

In this article attempt has been made to explain different kind of dispute resolution mechanism first being adjudication and second through the process of negotiation in case of adjudication decision is given by third party which is binding on all the parties to dispute whereas in case of negotiation the parties themselves reach to settlement with help of neutral third party so this article enumerates the merits of mediation over litigation further it discuss the different negotiation mechanism for dispute resolution and the process involved in each of them.

vii. Research paper on Confidentiality in Mediation by Lauren Bradshaw published on 0ctober 25,2011

This paper reviews into details the relevant literature regarding confidentiality in mediation. It is imperative to note that confidentiality has been proven to have significant outcomes in certain states, such as California State. Several literatures have common arguments concerning confidentiality of mediation and its success in law.

Accordingly confidentiality in mediation is an important aspect and should be accorded much attention. Mediators should strive in ensuring that strict adherence to confidentiality is maintained. When a family mediator decides to breach confidentiality between him and the client, when a client poses physical harm to the other, the family mediator should be at the forefront of ensuring that strict principles of mediation are followed, thus an informed decision is made. Confidentiality in the mediation process that has been widely successful in California should make significant ways to other States.

viii. Need to revitalise ADR mechanism by Hon'ble Mr. Justice A. M. Khanwikar judge, Bombay High Court.

The well-known adage - justice delayed is justice denied this is not just a trite but the general impression of the current state of Indian judicial system as we know the influx of cases is higher than rate of disposal of cases this paper reviews the need to revitalise the ADR mechanism so to overcome this delay in disposal of cases further this paper deals with the issue related to delay in disposal of cases such as filing of frivolous cases in order to harass the opposite party.

ix. ADR- Mechanism and Effective Implementation by Hon'ble Justice S.B. Sinha former judge, Supreme Court of India.

This article make sincere attempt to explain the concept of dispute which precedes litigation as for better understanding of the process of mediation it is necessary to comprehend the concept of dispute and conflict and it also deal with the issue as to should mediation be made part of juvenile criminal justice system further this article aims to address the pitfalls of section 89 of code of civil procedure which resulted in ineffective implementation of ARD mechanism and also address the inherent drawbacks of the process of litigation and explains some key concepts regarding process of mediation.

CHAPTER 1.1: MEANING DEFINITION AND UNDERSTANDING OF MEDIATION

"Mediation" is a facilitative procedure in which "debating parties connect with the help of a fair-minded outsider, the Mediator, who offers them to attempt to some assistance with arriving at a concurred determination of their question. The Mediator has no power to settle on any choices that are tying on them, however utilizes certain strategies, methods and abilities to help them to negotiate a concurred determination of their question without adjudication."[2]

"Mediation is negotiation done with the help of a third party. The Mediator, rather than the Arbitrator or judge, has no energy to force a result on questioning gatherings.

Notwithstanding the absence of "teeth" in the Mediation handle, the inclusion of a Mediator adjusts the flow of Negotiations. Contingent upon what is by all accounts blocking (an) agreement, the middle person might endeavour to energize trade of data, give new data, offer the gatherings to see each other's perspectives, some assistance with letting them realize that their worries are comprehended; advance a gainful level of passionate expression; manage contrasts in observations and enthusiasm in the middle of transactions and constituents (counting legal counsellor and customer); help arbitrators practically, evaluate different options for settlement, learn (frequently in independent sessions with every gathering) about those premium the gatherings are hesitant to uncover to each other and concoct arrangements that meet the key premiums of all Parties."[3]

'Mediation' is a way of settling issues by a third party who helps both sides to come to a consensus, which each considers acceptable. Mediation can be 'evaluative' or 'facilitative'.

Appropriately Mediation is Party –Centred deliberate and Negotiated process where an unbiased outsider encourage the procedure by specific correspondence and transaction

[2] "'ADR Principles and Practice' by Henry J. Brown and Arthur L. Mariot (1997, 2nd Ed. Sweet & Maxwell, Lord on Chapter 7, p 127)"

[3]" 'Dispute Resolution' (Negotiation, Mediation and other processes' by Stephen B. Goldberg, Frank E.A. Sander and Nancy H. Rogers (1999, 3rd Ed. Aspine Law & Business, Gaithesburg and New York)(Ch. 3, p. 123)"

systems so as gatherings can agreeably resolve their debate. In Mediation, the gatherings hold the privilege to choose for themselves whether to settle the debate and the terms of any settlement.

Procedure of intervention is casual, which implies that it is not represented by the stringent guidelines of proof and methodology however is does not imply that it is an easygoing procedure as Mediation itself is organized and formalized, with obviously identifiable stages with some reach out of adaptability in them.

Mediation includes immediate and dynamic support of gatherings in determination of their debate. In spite of the fact that backers, middle people, and different members likewise have immediate and dynamic parts in Mediation however parties assume the key part during the time spent intervention. Any gathering might pull back from the procedure at any stage before its end even without allocating any explanation behind the same.

Mediation generally is a helped arrangement process it address both the legitimate and fundamental reasons for debate appropriately intervention is centred around the certainties, law, and hidden enthusiasm of the gatherings individual, social, family, business and group interest. Subsequently the objective of Mediation is to discover agreeable arrangements that really fulfil the need, wants and the enthusiasm of the gatherings.

Mediation is a casual and adaptable debate determination process. The Mediator's part is to direct the gatherings toward their own particular determination. Through joint sessions and separate councils with gatherings, the Mediator offers both sides some assistance with defining the issues plainly, see each other's position and draw nearer to determination.

Frequently, Mediations begin with a joint session used to set the standard procedures and a motivation. The joint session additionally characterizes the issues and decides the gatherings' positions.

For the most part, amid the procedure, parties move to discrete assemblies. The Mediator will convey messages offers, counter offers, inquiries, requests, and proposition between both sides to offer the gatherings some assistance with moving closer to determination.

The Mediator has no power to choose the settlement or even urge the Parties to settle. Mediation is non-tying, until gatherings concede to a determination. On the off chance that the matter does not settle, the petitioner has protected the privilege to seek after courts once more.

CHAPTER 1.2: HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

Mediation is not something new to India. Hundreds of years before the British arrived, India had used a framework called the Panchayat framework, whereby regarded town older folks helped with determining group question. Such customary Mediation keeps on being used even today in towns. Likewise, in pre-British India, intervention was well known among businesspeople. Fair and regarded specialists called Mahajans were asked for by business affiliation individuals to determine question utilizing a casual strategy, which consolidated Mediation and Arbitration.

Another type of right on time question determination, utilized by one tribe right up 'til the present time, is the utilization of panchas, or savvy persons to determine tribal debate. Here, questioning individuals from a tribe meet with a pancha to show their grievances and to endeavor to work out a settlement. On the off chance that that is unsuccessful, the debate is submitted to an open gathering went to by every intrigued individual from the tribe. In the wake of considering the cases, guards, and hobbies of the tribe in awesome point of interest, the pancha again endeavors to settle the debate. In the event that settlement is unrealistic, the pancha renders a choice that is tying upon the gatherings. The pancha's choice is made as per the tribal law and in addition the long-go hobbies of the tribe in keeping up amicability and flourishing. All procedures are oral; no record is made of the procedures or the result. In spite of the absence of lawful power or authorizes, such Mediation procedures were consistently utilized and normally acknowledged by Indian disputants.

Mediation bears a striking likeness, in a few regards, to the antiquated debate determination forms. In intervention the gatherings are urged to take an interest specifically all the while. The extended system of dialog in Mediation comprises of both the material law and the basic hobbies of the gatherings. The go between, a specialist during the time spent debate determination, controls the procedures, much like a tribal head serving in the part of peacemaker. In any case, under the antiquated strategies if intervention fizzled, the same individual was approved to render a coupling choice.

After the British antagonistic arrangement of prosecution was followed in India, discretion was acknowledged as the sanctioned Alternative Dispute Resolution strategy is still the frequently used Alternative Dispute Resolution technique. Mediation (as is currently seen all around and dissimilar to the old strategies, which is by definition non-tying, and urges the gatherings to willfully achieve an assertion that addresses every one of the gatherings' issues) has just in the previous couple of years started to get comfortable to attorneys and judges by and large, with the exception of in conventional group settings an aside from where Mediation has been court-coordinated or statutorily-endorsed, for example, in the intra-administrative debate between government organizations and endeavors, in labor question and openly utility administrations debate. So when we look at the US and Indian framework, throughout the last twenty (20) years, American legal advisors and judges have warmly held onto Mediation as an essential device for determining clashes in court and out of court, while Indian legal counselors and judges are still watchfully analyzing intervention, talking about whether and in which sorts of cases Mediation ought to be utilized – like what was going on in the US in the 1980's.

CHAPTER 1.3: NATURE OF DISPUTES SUITABLE FOR MEDIATION

The alluding Judge ought to assess all the vital elements which in his tact will encourage a fruitful Mediation. For instance, on the off chance that it is a more seasoned situation where the gatherings have a lower passionate speculation, and it includes quantum issues between instructed venture, and it includes quantum issues between instructed defendants, these components would emphatically propose that the matter ought to be alluded for Mediation. There might be different components which, in the judge's experience, put forth a defence suitable for a effective Mediation. Nonetheless, no case ought to be sent to Mediation simply to clear a Judge's docket; it will just defer determination, result in a fizzled experience, and wind up back on the Judge's date-book's referral Judge ought to choose proper cases for Mediation. A referral Judge before selecting the cases proper for the Mediation ought to consider taking after variables:-

1. Part characteristic
2. Case characteristic
3. Consent
4. Conference with parties
5. Schedule set for the trial
6. Points to be considered

Most by far of cases are suitable for intervention – even misrepresentation cases. Mediation ought to dependably be considered, however particularly when:

- the expense of the prosecution will be lopsided to the case;
- the gatherings are gridlocked in settlement transactions;
- the complexities of law, actuality or the relationship between the gatherings are liable to draw out procedures;
- the gatherings wish to settle their question in private.

Mediation is most likely not suitable when:

- there is an imperative purpose of law in question which ought to be tried by the courts, or a business or lawful point of reference should be set;
- synopsis judgment is accessible rapidly and proficiently;
- the gatherings require crisis injunctive or ensured help - be that as it may, in these cases the basic issues could be intervened later;
- settlement exchanges are now in progress and gaining ground;
- the state of mind of one of the gatherings is such that an intervention has no practical prospect of accomplishment.

Mediation is accessible in most non-criminal matters. Nonetheless, some peaceful criminal cases, similar to those including verbal provocation, regularly bring about an effective determination amid intervention. Claims that don't include a lawful issue are additionally great contender for intervention. For instance, a question with a neighbour over an infringing bramble or the splendour of their open air lights is not really the kind of case that merits a claim. In this kind of circumstance, it might be insightful to look for Mediation to end the contention.

Mediation cases regularly include strife emerging in separation and kid care issues and in question between relatives, neighbours, business accomplices, landowners and inhabitants, and worker's guilds and administration. In a few purviews, intervention is obligatory when it includes kid guardianship issues and conflicts with neighbours.

CHAPTER 1.4: TYPES OF MEDIATION

1. COURT-REFERRED MEDIATION

It applies to cases pending in Court and which the Court would consider the matter for alternative dispute mechanism under Section 89 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908.It may or may not refer the matter to mediation. In case the court does not refer the matter to mediation it has to give reasoning for the same.

2. PRIVATE MEDIATION

In private Mediation, qualified arbiters offer their administrations on a private, expense for-administration premise to the Court, to individuals from the general population, to individuals from the business area furthermore to the administrative division to determine debate through Mediation. Private Mediation can be utilized as a part of association with debate pending in Court and pre-prosecution question.

There is different style of mediation as well. In addition to the fact that it is critical to locate the right go between for your case, it is additionally vital to locate the right intervention style for your case. Numerous middle people will utilize more than one style of mediation.

Facilitative Mediation: It is the first style of Mediation. Facilitative arbiters try to "encourage" the arrangement between the members. The objective is to help everybody accomplish their hobbies and to come to a solid (durable) understanding. Facilitative middle people have a tendency to trust that members can achieve enduring assertions if sufficiently given data, time and backing. The facilitative middle person as a rule does not remark on what might happen if the case went to court (at any rate not at first). As a rule, facilitative arbiters tend to originate from all foundations (lawful, emotional well-being, and so forth.).

Evaluative Mediation: It is concerned basically with achieving an arrangement. This style of Mediation concentrates more on expected court result and less on the gatherings' advantage. Evaluative intervention might be a decent decision on the off chance that you simply need to "complete it." If trial is coming up the lawyers might recommend utilizing an evaluative go between with the trust of achieving an

arrangement and staying away from trial. Frequently evaluative arbiters will have a lawful foundation.

Account Mediation. Account mediation is a moderately new style of mediation that spotlights on making another "story" or another "account" to comprehend and reshape the contention. Story Mediation is a certain technique for intervention so make sure to inquire as to whether your go between has preparing in the account style. Regularly story arbiters will have a psychological well-being foundation.

Transformative Mediation. Transformative Mediation is a developing type of Mediation that concentrates first on repairing the relationship and afterward on the determining the question. Like account intervention, transformative Mediation is a particular style of intervention. Regularly transformative go betweens will have a psychological wellness foundation.

The Toolbox Approach. A few arbiters fit unequivocally into one of the above Mediation styles. Different go betweens take a "tool compartment" approach and utilize whatever style appears to be most proper right now

CHAPTER 2: STAGES IN PROCESS OF MEDIATION

Mediation is a not a static procedure in this the Mediator helps the gatherings to settle at agreement for determining the issue between them. While doing this, the arbiter utilizes the four practical phases of intervention, in particular,

• Introduction and Opening Statement

• Joint Session

• Separate Session

• Closing

These four useful stages are utilized as a part of a casual and supple way so that the Mediation process picks up vitality, taking after a particular and unsurprising course as delineated beneath.

1. Introduction
2. Understanding the issue
3. Deeper comprehension of hobby and requirements of the gatherings
4. Defining the issue
5. Creating alternative
6. Evaluating alternative
7. Settlement/non-settlement

Each of the above stages has a key pre-basic in the movement of the Mediation process which ought to be refined before moving to the accompanying stage.

The Mediator has no energy to pick the settlement or even impel the get-togethers to settle. Mediation is non-tying, until gatherings agree on a determination. If the matter does not settle, the solicitor has protected the benefit to look for after mediation process.

CHAPTER 2.1: INTRODUCTION AND OPENING STATEMENT

In the principal stage Mediator need to hold up under at the top of the priority list the accompanying goals in order to continue with the procedure further:

• Establishing Neutrality

• Create a mindfulness and comprehension of the procedure among gatherings

• Develop relationship of common comprehension and trust with the gatherings

• Gain trust and certainty of gatherings

• Establish a situation that is fitting to helpful transactions

• Motivate the gatherings for a friendly settlement of the question

• Control over the procedure

At the beginning of the Mediation handle, the middle person should guarantee that the gatherings and/or their direction are available.

There is no particular seating course of action. Nonetheless, it is essential that the seating game plan consider the accompanying:

• The Mediator can have eye-contact with every one of the gatherings and he can encourage successful correspondence between the gatherings.

• Each of the gatherings and his guidance are situated together.

• All persons present feel calm, protected and agreeable.

• To start with, the middle person presents himself by giving data, for example, his name, regions of specialization if any, and number of years of expert experience.

• Then he outfits data about his arrangement as arbiter, the task of the case to him for intervention and his experience if any in effectively interceding comparative cases before.

• Then the Mediator announces that he has no association with both of the gatherings and he has no enthusiasm for the debate.

• He additionally communicates trust that the question would be genially determined. This will make trust in the gatherings about the go between's fitness and unbiased attitude.

• Thereafter, the arbiter asks for every gathering to present himself. He might evoke more data about the gatherings' and might uninhibitedly communicate with them to comfort them.

• The Mediator will then demand the direction to present themselves.

• The Mediator will then affirm that the vital gatherings are available with power to arrange and settle on settlement choices

• The Mediator will talk about with the gatherings and their direction whenever limitation or planning issues

• If any lesser insight is available, the middle person will inspire data about the senior backer he is working for and guarantee that he is approved to speak to the customer.

The Mediator's Opening Statement

The opening articulation is an imperative period of the intervention process. The middle person clarifies in a dialect and way comprehended by the gatherings and their insight, the accompanying:

• Concept and procedure of Mediation

• Stages of Mediation

• Role of the Mediator

• Role of supporters

• Role of Parties

• Advantages of Mediation

• Ground standards of Mediation

The Mediator should highlight the accompanying imperative parts of intervention:

• Voluntary

• Self-determinative

• Non-adjudicatory

• Confidential

• Good-confidence cooperation

• Time-bound

• Informal and adaptable

• Direct and dynamic investment of gatherings

• Party-focused

• Neutrality and absence of prejudice of go between

• Finality

• Possibility of settling related question

• Need and pertinence of discrete sessions

The Mediator might clarify the accompanying guidelines of intervention:

• Ordinarily, the gatherings/insight might address just the go between

• While one individual is talking, others might abstain from hindering

• Language utilized might dependably be gracious and deferential

• Mutual regard and regard for the procedure might be kept up

• Mobile telephones might be exchanged off

• Adequate open door might be given to all gatherings to exhibit their perspectives

At last, the middle person might affirm that the gatherings have comprehended the intervention process and the standard procedures and should give them a chance to get their questions if any, illuminated.

CHAPTER 2.2: JOINT SESSION

In this stage Mediator need to hold up under as a top priority the accompanying goals in order to continue with the procedure further:

• Gather data by asking open finished inquiry

• encourage chance to the gatherings to hear the points of view of alternate gatherings

• Understand points of view, connections and sentiments of the gatherings

• Understand actualities and the issues and in addition snags and conceivable outcomes

• Ensure that every member have been given chance of being listened

METHODOLOGY

The Mediator ought to welcome gatherings to clarify their case, clarify their view points, vent feelings and express sentiments with no interference or unsettling influence. To start with, the offended party/applicant ought to be permitted to clarify or express his/her case/claim in his/her own particular words. Second, insight would from there on present the case and clarifies the lawful issues included for the situation. Third, litigant/respondent ought to be allowed to clarify his/her case/claim in his/her own words. Fourth, advice for litigant/respondent ought to be permitted to clarify the case and express the lawful issues included for the situation.

The Mediator ought to make an air as to empower and advance correspondence, and viably oversee intrusions and upheavals by gatherings to the procedure.

The Mediator might request that open finished inquiries get extra data when he finds that truths of the case and sentiment of the gatherings have not been plainly distinguished and appreciated by all present. The arbiter would then compress the certainties, as fathomed by him, to each of the gatherings to demonstrate that the middle person hosts comprehended the instance of both gatherings by listening to them with full consideration.

Parties might react to each other on position and focuses and further might ask brief inquiries to alternate gatherings. The middle person might follow the zones of assention and difference between the gatherings and the issues which are to be determined.

The Mediator ought to have control over the procedures and guarantee that the gatherings don't' 'assume control over' the session by forceful conduct, intrusions or such other undesirable behaviour.

Amid or on culmination of the joint session, the arbiter might independently meet every gathering with his insight, normally beginning with the offended party/solicitor. The timing of holding the different session might be chosen by the arbiter at his tact having respect to the profitability of the on-going joint session, quiet of the gatherings, loss of control, gatherings getting to be dull or ask for by any of the gatherings. There can be a few separate sessions. The Mediator could return back to a joint session at any phase of the procedure on the off chance that he feels the need to do as such.

CHAPTER 2.3: SEPARATE SESSION

Goals:-

• Understand the question at a more profound level

• Provide a gathering for gatherings to further vent their feelings

• Provide a gathering for gatherings to uncover private data which they don't wish to impart to different gatherings

• Understand the fundamental hobbies of the gatherings

• Help gatherings to sensibly comprehend the case

• Shift gatherings to an answer discovering state of mind

• Encourage gatherings to create alternatives and discover terms that are commonly worthy System

(i) RE - AFFIRMING CONFIDENTIALITY

Amid the different session each of the gatherings and his insight would converse with the arbiter in certainty. The middle person ought to start by re-asserting the classified way of the procedure.

(ii) GATHERING FURTHER INFORMATION

The different session gives a chance to the middle person to assemble more particular data and to catch up the issues which were raised by the gatherings amid the joint session. In this phase of the procedure:-

• Parties vent individual sentiments of torment, hurt, outrage and so forth.,

• The Mediator distinguishes enthusiastic components and recognizes them;

• The Mediator investigates delicate and humiliating issues;

• The Mediator recognizes positions taken by gatherings and the intrigues they look to ensure;

• The Mediator distinguishes why these positions are being taken (need, concern, what the gatherings would like to accomplish);

• The Mediator distinguishes zones of question in the middle of gatherings and what they have already settled upon;

• Common hobbies are distinguished;

• The Mediator distinguishes every gathering's differential needs on the diverse parts of the debate (needs and objectives) and the likelihood of any exchange off is found out.

• The Mediator figures issues for determination.

(iii) REALITY - TESTING

In the wake of social event data and permitting the gatherings to vent their feelings, the Mediator makes a judgment whether it is important to test or test the conclusions and impression of the gatherings and to open their brains to alternate points of view. The Mediator can then, with a specific end goal to advance the procedure, take part in Reality-Testing. Reality-testing might include any or the majority of the accompanying:

(a) A nitty gritty examination of particular components of a case, resistance, or a point of view;

(b) An ID of the truthful and lawful premise for a case, barrier, or point of view or issues of verification thereof;

(c) Consideration of the positions, desires and appraisals of the gatherings in the connection of the conceivable result of suit;

(d) Examination of the fiscal and non-financial expenses of suit and proceeded with strife;

(e) Assessment of witness appearance and believability of gatherings;

(f) Inquiry into the odds of winning/losing at trial; and

(g) Consequences of inability to achieve an assention.

Methods of Reality-Testing

Reality-Testing is frequently done in the different session by:

1. Asking viable inquiries,

2. Talking about the qualities and shortcomings of the particular instances of the Parties, without rupture of privacy, and/or

3. Considering the results of any inability to achieve an assention (BATNA/WATNA/MLATNA investigation).

(I) ASKING EFFECTIVE QUESTIONS

Middle person might ask parties addresses that can accumulate data, clear up actualities or adjust view of the gatherings with respect to their comprehension and appraisal of the case and their desires.

Cases of viable inquiries:

• OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS like 'Let me know more about the circumstances paving the way to the marking of the agreement'. 'Offer me some assistance with understanding your association with the other party at the time you entered the business'. 'What were your explanations behind incorporating that term in the agreement?'

• CLOSED QUESTIONS, which are particular, cement and which bring out particular data. For instance, 'it is my understanding that the other driver was going at 60 kilometers for every hour at the season of the mischance, is that privilege?' 'On which date the agreement was marked?' 'Who are the temporary workers who fabricated this building?'

• QUESTIONS THAT BRING OUT FACTS: 'Let me know about the foundation of this matter'. 'What happened next?'

• QUESTIONS THAT BRING OUT POSITIONS: 'What are your legitimate cases?' 'What are the harms?' 'What are their barriers?'

• QUESTIONS THAT BRING OUT INTERESTS: 'What are your worries in light of the current situation?' 'What truly matters to you?' 'From a business/individual/family

point of view, what is most essential to you?' 'Why do you need separation?' 'What is this case truly about?' 'What do you want to fulfill?' 'What is truly driving this case?'

(II) DISCUSSING THE STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF THE RESPECTIVE

INSTANCES OF THE PARTIES

The Mediator might approach the gatherings or insight for their perspectives about the qualities and shortcomings of their case and the other side's case. The go between might make inquiries, for example, 'How would you think your behavior will be seen by a Judge?' or 'Is it conceivable that a judge might see the circumstance in an unexpected way?' or 'I comprehend the qualities of your case, what do you believe are the powerless focuses regarding proof?' or 'What amount of the truth will surface eventually case take to get a definite choice in court?' Or 'What amount of cash will it take in lawful charges and costs in court?

(III) CONSIDERING THE CONSEQUENCES OF ANY FAILURE TO REACH AN AGREEMENT (BATNA/WATNA/MLATNA ANALYSIS).

BATNA Õ Best Alternative to Negotiated Agreement

WATNA Õ Worst Alternative to Negotiated Agreement

MLATNA Õ Most Likely Alternative to Negotiated Agreement

One method of reality-testing utilized as a part of the procedure of Negotiation is to consider the distinctive different options for an arranged settlement. In the setting of intervention, the choices are 'the best', 'the most noticeably bad' and 'the most' likely result if a question is not determined through arrangement in Mediation. As a component of reality-testing, it might be useful to the gatherings to analyze their options outside Mediation (particularly prosecution) in order to contrast them and the alternatives accessible in Mediation. It is likewise useful for the arbiter to talk about the results of neglecting to achieve an assention e.g., the impact on the relationship of the gatherings, the impact on the matter of the gatherings and so on.

While the gatherings regularly wish to concentrate on best results in case, it is imperative to consider and talk about the most noticeably bad and the in all likelihood results too. The go between requests the perspectives of the promoter/party about the

conceivable result in case. It is beneficial for the middle person to work with the gatherings and their backers to go to an appropriate comprehension of the best, the most noticeably bad and the in all probability result of the debate in case as that would help the gatherings to perceive reality and in this manner define practical and workable recommendations.

On the off chance that the gatherings are achieving a hobby based determination without any difficulty; a BATNA/WATNA/MLATNA investigation need not be depended on. Be that as it may if gatherings are in trouble at transaction and the go between suspects hard bartering or inflexible stands, BATNA/WATNA/MLATNA investigation might be presented.

By utilizing the above systems, the middle person helps the gatherings to comprehend the truth of their case, surrender their inflexible positions, distinguish their certifiable hobbies and needs, and move their center to critical thinking. The gatherings are then urged to investigate a few innovative choices for settlement.

(iv) BRAIN STORMING

Conceptualizing is a method used to produce alternatives for assention.

There are 2 stages to the conceptualizing process:

1. Making alternatives

2. Assessing alternatives

1. Making alternatives:- Parties are urged to unreservedly make conceivable choices for assention. Choices that seem, by all accounts, to be unworkable and unreasonable are likewise included. The go between stores judgment on any choice that is created and this permits the gatherings to break free from an altered personality set. It energizes innovativeness in the gatherings. Middle person abstains from assessing every choice and rather endeavours to create however many thoughts for settlement as could be expected under the circumstances. All thoughts are composed down with the goal that they can be deliberately inspected later.

2. Assessing choices:- After developing choices the following stage is to assess each of the choices produced. The target in this stage is not to scrutinize any thought but rather

to comprehend what the gatherings find adequate and not satisfactory about every choice. In this procedure of analyzing every alternative with the gatherings, more data about the fundamental hobbies of the gatherings is acquired. This data further discovers terms that are commonly satisfactory to both sides. Conceptualizing requires horizontal thinking more than direct suspecting.

Horizontal considering: Lateral deduction is inventive, creative and instinctive. It is non-straight and non-conventional. Go betweens use parallel deduction to create alternatives for understanding.

Straight considering: Linear deduction is consistent, customary, and discerning and truth based. Go betweens use straight thinking to dissect truths, to do reality testing and to comprehend the position of gatherings.

(v) SUB-SESSIONS

The different session is regularly held with every one of the individuals from one side to the question, including their supporters and different individuals who accompany the gathering. Be that as it may, it is interested in the middle person to meet them separately or in gatherings by holding sub-sessions with just the promoter (s) or the gathering or any member(s) of the gathering.

A Mediator might likewise hold sub-session(s) just with the promoters of both sides, with the assent of gatherings. Amid such sub-session, the supporters can be more open and approaching with respect to the positions and desires of the gatherings. â If there is a dissimilarity of enthusiasm among the gatherings on the same side, it might be beneficial for the go between to hold sub-session(s) with gatherings having normal enthusiasm, to encourage arrangements. This kind of sub-session might encourage the distinguishing proof of hobbies furthermore keep the likelihood of the gatherings with disparate intrigues, joining together to stand up together.

CHAPTER 2.4: CLOSING

Amid the end stage there can be two circumstances as there can be a settlement or there can be no settlement.

A. If there is a settlement:

Once the gatherings have settled upon the terms of settlement, the gatherings and their supporters re-collect and the go between guarantees that the accompanying steps are taken:

1. Go between orally affirms the terms of settlement; 2. Such terms of settlement are decreased to composing;

3. The understanding is marked by all gatherings to the assention and the insight if any speaking to the gatherings;

4. Middle person likewise might append his mark on the consented to arrangement, affirming that the understanding was marked in his/her vicinity;

5. A duplicate of the consented to arrangement is outfitted to the gatherings;

6. The first consented to arrangement sent to the referral Court for passing fitting request as per the understanding;

7. To the extent practicable the gatherings concur upon a date for appearance in court and such date is suggested to the court by the arbiter;

8. The Mediator thanks the gatherings for their investment in the intervention and, compliments all gatherings for achieving a settlement.

THE WRITTEN AGREEMENT SHOULD:

- clearly indicate every material term consented to;
- be drafted in plain, exact and unambiguous dialect;
- be brief;
- use dynamic voice, beyond what many would consider possible. Should state unmistakably WHO WILL DO, WHAT, WHEN, WHERE and HOW (detached

voice does not plainly distinguish who has a commitment to perform an undertaking according to the understanding);

- use dialect and expression which guarantee that neither of the gatherings feels that he or she has 'lost';
- ensure that the terms of the assention are executable as per law;
- Be complete in its recitation of the terms;
- avoid lawful language, quite far utilize the words and expressions utilized by the gatherings;
- quite far state in positive dialect what every gatherings consents to do;
- quite far, maintain a strategic distance from questionable words like sensible, soon, co-agent, successive and so on;

(B) Where there is no settlement

• If a settlement between the gatherings couldn't be achieved, the case would be come back to the referral Court simply reporting "not settled". The report won't appoint any purpose behind non-settlement or fix obligation on any one for the non-settlement. The announcements made amid the intervention will stay secret and ought not be uncovered by any gathering or promoter or go between to the Court or to any other individual.

• The Mediator ought to, in an end articulation, thank the gatherings and their guidance for their support and endeavours for settlement.

CHAPTER 3: ROLES OF DIFFERENT STAKEHOLDERS

Mediation is a procedure in which an unbiased and nonpartisan third individual, the go between, encourages the determination of a debate without recommending what ought to be the arrangement. It is a casual and non-antagonistic procedure expected to encourage debating gatherings to achieve a commonly adequate arrangement.

The part of the go between is to uproot obstructions in correspondence, help with the ID of issues and the investigation of alternatives and encourage commonly worthy assertions to determine the debate. Nonetheless, a definitive choice rests exclusively with the gatherings. An arbiter can't drive or force a gathering to settle on a specific choice or in whatever other way debilitate or meddle with the gathering's privilege of self-determination.

CHAPTER 3.1: ROLE OF MEDIATOR

(A) FUNCTIONS OF A MEDIATOR

The elements of a go between are to - :

(i) Facilitate the procedure of intervention; and

(ii) Assist the gatherings to assess the case to land at a settlement

(i) FACILITATIVE ROLE

A Mediator encourages the procedure of intervention by-

• making a favorable domain for the intervention process.

• clarifying the procedure and its guidelines.

• encouraging correspondence between the gatherings utilizing the different correspondence strategies.

• recognizing the impediments to correspondence between the gatherings and uprooting them.

• gathering data about the debate.

• recognizing the fundamental hobbies.

• keeping up control over the procedure and controlling centered examination.

• dealing with the collaboration between gatherings.

• helping the gatherings to create alternatives.

• persuading the gatherings to concur on commonly worthy settlement.

• helping gatherings to lessen the understanding into composing.

(ii) EVALUATIVE ROLE

A Mediator performs an evaluative part by-

• helping and managing the gatherings to assess their case through reality - testing.

• helping the gatherings to assess the choices for settlement.

(B) MEDIATOR AS DISTINGUISHED FROM CONCILIATOR AND ADJUDICATOR

(i) Mediator and Conciliator

The facilitative and evaluative parts of the middle person have been now clarified. The evaluative part of arbiter is restricted to the capacity of aiding and controlling the gatherings to assess their case through reality testing and helping the gatherings to assess the choices for settlement. Be that as it may, during the time spent appeasement, the conciliator himself can assess the instances of the gatherings and the choices for settlement with the end goal of recommending the terms of settlement.

The part of an arbiter is not to give judgment on the benefits of the case or to offer counsel to the gatherings or to propose answers for the gatherings.

(ii) Mediator and Adjudicator

An arbiter is not an adjudicator. Adjudicators like judges, authorities and managing officers of tribunals settle on the choice on the premise of pleadings and proof. The adjudicator takes after the formal and strict principles of substantive and procedural laws. The choice of the adjudicator is tying on the gatherings subject to advance or modification. In settling, the choice is taken by the adjudicator alone and the gatherings have no part in it.

In Mediation the arbiter is just a facilitator and he doesn't propose or settle on any choice. The choice is taken by the gatherings themselves. The settlement understanding came to in intervention is tying on the gatherings. In court alluded intervention there can't be any advance, or update against the pronouncement went on the premise of such settlement understanding. In private intervention, the gatherings can consent to regard such settlement assention as an appeasement understanding which then will be administered by the procurements of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996.

(C) QUALITIES OF A MEDIATOR

It is fundamental that a go between must have certain essential qualities which include:

i. complete, certifiable and unrestricted confidence during the time spent Mediation and its adequacy.

ii. capacity and duty to make progress toward greatness in the craft of intervention by continually redesigning aptitudes and information

iii. affectability, sharpness and capacity to see, acknowledge and regard the necessities, intrigues, desires, feelings, slants, temper and outlook of the gatherings to intervention.

iv. most noteworthy measures of genuineness and honesty in behavior and conduct.

v. nonpartisanship, objectivity and non-judgmental.

vi. capacity to be a mindful, dynamic and patient audience.

vii. a quiet, wonderful and lively men.

viii. tolerance, industriousness and diligence.

ix. great relational abilities.

x. liberality and adaptability.

xi. compassion.

xii. imagination.

(D) QUALIFICATIONS OF MEDIATORS

The Supreme Court of India in "*Salem Advocate Bar Association V Union of India*[4]", endorsed the Model Civil Procedure Mediation Rules arranged by the Committee headed by Justice M.J.Rao, the then Chairman, Law Commission of India. These Rules have as of now been received by the vast majority of the High Courts with adjustments as indicated by the prerequisites of the State concerned. According to the Model Rules the accompanying persons are qualified and qualified for being enrolled in the board of middle people:-

(a)(i) Retired Judges of the Supreme Court of India;

[4] (2005) 6 SCC 344

(ii) Retired Judges of the High Court;

(iii) Retired District and Sessions Judges or resigned Judges of the City Civil Court or Courts of proportionate status;

(b) Legal professionals with no less than fifteen years remaining at the Bar at the level of the Supreme Court or the High Court or the District Courts of proportional status;

(c) Experts or different experts with no less than fifteen years standing; or resigned senior administrators or resigned senior officials;

(d) Institutions which are themselves specialists in Mediation and have been perceived accordingly by the High Court, gave the names of its individuals are endorsed by the High Court at first or at whatever point there is change in enrollment.

(E)ETHICS AND CODE OF CONDUCT FOR MEDIATORS

1. Maintain a strategic distance from irreconcilable circumstance

A middle person must abstain from interceding in situations where they have direct individual, proficient or budgetary enthusiasm for the result of the debate. In the event that the go between has any roundabout interest (e.g. he works in a firm with somebody who has an enthusiasm for the result or he is identified with somebody who has such an interest) he will undoubtedly uncover to the gatherings such aberrant enthusiasm at the most punctual open door and he should not intervene for the situation unless the gatherings particularly consent to acknowledge him as middle person in spite of such circuitous hobby.

Where the go between is a supporter, he might not show up for any of the gatherings in admiration of the question which he had interceded. A go between ought not build up or try to set up an expert association with any of the gatherings to the question until the expiry of a sensible period after the finish of the Mediation procedures.

2. Mindfulness about skill and expert part limits

Middle people have an obligation to know the points of confinement of their skill and capacity keeping in mind the end goal to abstain from tackling assignments which they are not prepared to handle and to correspond authentically with the gatherings about their experience and experience. Go betweens must abstain from giving different sorts of expert support of the gatherings to intervention, regardless of the possibility that they are authorized to give it. Despite the fact that, they might be capable to give such administrations, they will be trading off their viability as middle people when they wear two caps.

3. Hone Neutrality

Go betweens have an obligation to stay impartial all through the intervention i.e. from start to finish. Their words, way, mentality, non-verbal communication and procedure administration must mirror an unprejudiced and fair approach.

4. Guarantee Voluntariness

The Mediators must regard the deliberate way of Mediation and must perceive the privilege of the gatherings to pull back from the intervention at any stage.

5. Look after Confidentiality

Mediation being secret in nature, an arbiter might be devoted to the relationship of trust and privacy forced on him as a go between. The go between ought not unveil any matter which a gathering requires to be kept private unless;

a. the go between is particularly offered authorization to do as such by the gathering concerned; or

b. the go between is required by law to do as such.

6. Do no damage

Go betweens ought to abstain from directing the intervention process in a way that might hurt the members or compound the debate. A few individuals experience the ill effects of enthusiastic aggravations that make Mediation conceivably harming mentally. A few individuals come to intervention at a stage when they are not prepared to be there. A few individuals are ready and ready to take an interest, however the middle person handles the procedure in a way that aggravates the gatherings' enmity towards each other instead of determining. In such circumstances, the go between must alter the procedure (e.g. meet the gatherings independently or meet the advice just) and if fundamental pull back from Mediation when it gets to be obvious that intervention, even as altered, is wrong or unsafe.

7. Advance Self-determination

Supporting and empowering the gatherings in Mediation to settle on their own choices (both exclusively and altogether) about the determination of the debate as opposed to forcing the thoughts of the go between or others, is key to the intervention process. Arbiter ought to guarantee that there is no mastery by any gathering or individual keeping a gathering from making his/her own particular choice.

8. Encourage Informed Consent

Settlement of debate must be founded on educated assent. In spite of the fact that, the middle person may not be the wellspring of data for the gatherings, go between ought to attempt to guarantee that the gatherings have enough data and information to evaluate their choices of settlement and the distinct options for settlement. On the off chance that the gatherings need such data and information, the go between might propose to them how they may get it.

9. Release Duties to outsiders

Pretty much as the middle person ought to do no damage to the gatherings, he ought to additionally think about whether as a proposed settlement might hurt other people who are not taking an interest in the intervention. This is more critical when the outsiders prone to be influenced by an intervened settlement are kids or other powerless

individuals, for example, the elderly or the sick. Since outsiders are not specifically included all the while, the middle person hosts an obligation to approach the gatherings for data about the conceivable effect of the settlement on others and urge the gatherings to consider the enthusiasm of such outsiders moreover.

10. Responsibility to Honesty and Integrity

For a middle person, genuineness implies, in addition to other things, full and reasonable divulgence of :

a. his capabilities and related knowledge;

b. immediate or backhanded hobby if any, in the result of the debate;

c. any expenses that the gatherings will be charged for the intervention; and

d. some other part of the intervention which might influence the gathering's readiness to take an interest all the while.

Genuineness additionally implies coming clean when meeting the gatherings independently, e.g. on the off chance that gathering "A" secretly unveils his base desire and gathering "B" asks the middle person whether he knows the adversary's base desire, saying "No" future untrustworthy. Rather, the middle person could say that he hosts examined numerous things with get-together "An" on a classified premise and, hence, he is at freedom to react to the inquiry, pretty much as he would be blocked from uncovering to party "A" specific things what was told by gathering 'B'. While interceding independently and secretly with the gatherings in a progression of private sessions, the Mediator is in an extraordinary and special position. He should not mishandle the trust the gatherings put in him, regardless of the fact that he trusts that twisting reality will advance the reason for settlement.

Aside from the charge/compensation/honorarium, if any, recommended under the guidelines, the Mediator might not look for or get any sum or blessing from the parties to the Mediation either before or after the finish of the Mediation process.

Where the go between is a legal officer he should not Mediate any question included in or associated with a case pending in his Court.

CHAPTER 3.2: ROLE OF ADVOCATES

A lawyer's duty is to advice the clients of all available option to resolve the dispute – not just litigation option[5].

"it is now incumbent for the lawyers to stop shopping just in the corner shop , where only litigation is available , and to take clients through the shopping centre , where a whole range of ADR is available."[6]

Pre mediation part

Likewise with case and assertion, satisfactory arrangement is essential to a fruitful intervention, and lawyers can set up their customers by talking about the accompanying:

What is mediation and how the procedure is directed. They might balance intervention with different procedures commonplace to the customer. They ought to bring up that intercession is basically a critical thinking process that has as its objectives a careful dialog of all issues in debate, the trading of data, thoughts and proposition and the chance to look for innovative answers for the question.

The contrasts between intervention, prosecution or unassisted arrangements, and lawyers might investigate whether taking an interest in intercession is liable to be a positive and productive activity.

The part of the arbiter, as a director of the procedure, a facilitator of arrangements and an aide in the push to secure a full settlement. Specifically, lawyers underline that, in intercession, customers for the most part talk all alone sake and are straightforwardly included in settling on choices as for the question. Be that as it may, the estimation of lawyers at intercessions ought not be marked down as they frequently help with advancing the procedure.

Lawyers ought to additionally illuminate their customers of the open door for private exchanges either with the middle person or with the lawyer and customer as it were.

---

[5] *"Spencer, Liability of lawyers to advice on Alternative Dispute Resolution Options (1998) 9 Australian Dispute resolution Journal 292 at 301."*

[6] *"GB Robertson The Lawyer Role In Commercial ADR(1987) law institute journal 1148 cited in Spencer."*

Concerning the issues in question, lawyers and customers ought to examine open doors for determining the debate, the scope of conceivable results, the issues on which the customer might have more prominent or lesser adaptability for settlement and the base terms and conditions the customer will acknowledge. Lawyers ought to likewise have a straight to the point examination of the distinct option for settlement and, specifically, the cost, time and dangers of prosecution.

As they would in prosecution or intervention, lawyers must guarantee that all reports and different materials crucial to a complete examination and determination of the issues are readied, assessed and accessible at (or some of the time traded before) intercession. Determining the debate will depend in huge measure on the culmination of data accessible.

Amid Mediation

The best move in the lawyer's part and obligations emerges once intervention starts. Amid intervention, lawyers commonly help their customers in a portion of the accompanying ways:

They recognize the customer's focal part and, specifically, don't represent the customer; rather, lawyers offer counsel, direction and data.

They don't test or interview the other party, fight with the other lawyer or, in different ways, treat intervention like case.

Lawyers keep up a steady, agreeable attitude and show responsibility to the intercession process by words and conduct. They don't regard intercession as an ill-disposed procedure or as a methods for finding reality; rather, they recognize the significance of hunting down arrangements. Lawyers help with characterizing the issues to be determined.

They give standardizing data, for the most part in private, about the advantages and dangers of particular recommendations.

They go about as an operators of reality, helping the customer to adjust the dangers of tolerating or dismissing settlement offers and the potential difficulties of showing the case to an outsider for choice and also the time, push and cost of a trial.

Lawyers deal with the procedure by requesting breaks, for chances to talk secretly with the customer or for a private meeting with the go between.

They help customers to convey by outlining examinations or illuminating matters that are confounding or where miscommunication is avoiding productive critical thinking, or more awful, prompting expanded clash.

They offer customers some assistance with staying concentrated on the current issues, the data introduced and alternatives for settlement and additionally try to avoid panicking as they manage disappointment over the pace of advancement or feeling overpowered by direct encounter with the other party.

Lawyers urge customers to discover innovative arrangements that will resolve the question. The draft records as required.

Those lawyers who view intercession really as an open door for their customers to partake effectively in dialogs about, and settlement of, their own debate are esteemed partners all the while.

Now and again, the movement from support to exhortation cooperation can be cumbersome and unsettling for some lawyers. Perceiving that their customers advantage from this community oriented part, and that go betweens welcome their helpful cooperation, lawyers ought to use intercession as they would whatever other question determination process—admirably and with due respect for their specific part in benefitting as much as possible from its interesting qualities. In dealing with the move to intervention backing, lawyers might profit by extra instructive projects and courses where they can figure out how to utilize their insight, experience and abilities in backing of their customers' cooperation in this supportive and productive procedure.

The move from trial backing to intervention promotion might be testing, yet the prizes are justified regardless of the venture of time and vitality.

CHAPTER 3.3: ROLE OF PARTIES

The greater part of common litigators trusts that they are acquainted with the Mediation process. Very regularly, nonetheless, lawyers, and a few Mediators, view intervention and settlement gatherings as compatible. This perspective misses the refinement between these two techniques for question determination. In the conventional setting of settlement meetings, lawyers have truly "spoke to" their customers in settlement arrangements by introducing the customer's case, supporting the customer's position and by and large playing the dynamic part. This model of dynamic investment by the lawyer and aloof cooperation by the gathering emerges from the part of support filled by the lawyer in the case process by and large.

Compelling Mediation contrasts drastically from a legal settlement meeting since it uses a model of dynamic investment by all members, particularly the gatherings. This article talks about the reasons served by lawyers permitting the dynamic support by their customers in Mediation. The thesis additionally investigations the correct part of the "gathering" in Mediation, and how the sort of question might direct the level of action. This article will investigate the advantages of gathering interest to the transaction process, from the arbiter's perspective, clarifying how Mediation is totally not quite the same as the conventional model of settlement meetings.

Mediation is a way to determine debate that the gatherings couldn't resolve without the mediation of an outsider. In a perfect world, the gatherings, and their lawyers, would take an interest in intervention before a claim is recorded. At times, early Mediation is unrealistic or down to earth.

Regularly, accordingly, the recording of a claim is the underlying stride toward Mediation. A fruitful Mediation is more than a "settlement gathering" paying little heed to at what arrange the intervention process happens. Generally, lawyers, gatherings and judges felt that if everybody left a settlement meeting despondent yet the case determined, the outcome was no doubt "a great settlement." The objective of Mediation, in any case, is and ought to be a way to a settlement that the gatherings will recognize as "a reasonable determination."

PARTY PARTICIPATION HELPS CONTRIBUTE TO REACHING A FAIR RESOLUTION

A middle's first experience with the case, from the gatherings' point of view, is through listening to every side recounting its side of the story. A viable go between who is a dynamic audience will make inquiries of both sides to expound, clear up, and affirm every side's position. By being drawn into the Mediation process at this early stage, the gatherings will feel like the procedure is happening for their advantage. Then again, if the dialog in the early stages is between the arbiter and lawyers, with the gatherings playing a detached part, then the gatherings don't get to be put resources into the procedure, eventually making settlement more troublesome.

A more tasteful determination to the gatherings is prone to be come to if lawyers urge their customers to effectively take part in the Mediation. This methodology is best when the lawyer strides once more from the customary position of supporter, and, rather, expect the more detached part of advisor who urges the customer to recount their story. More imperative, this methodology is best when all gatherings are available.

Dynamic narrating additionally requires dynamic listening by the gatherings, which is an idea the gatherings must be urged to guarantee ahead of time they will do. The middle person must work to make every gathering feel like they will have a complete chance to remark or counter the account of the other party. An opening session directed in this style instantly includes the gatherings in the process and permits every side the open door "to recount its story."

The gatherings ought to likewise be allowed by direction to answer questions postured by the Mediator about their position working on this issue. While a few levels of addressing might be more qualified to private sessions between the gatherings and the middle person, general inquiries of an authentic nature will bring about various advantages from the procedure. By inspiring truths which uncover the issues, the go between will be in a position to limit the issues to those which are hindering the procedure of question determination and to guarantee that the gatherings comprehend the issues and dangers identified with those issues. By comprehension the issues and dangers, the gatherings will be more managable to the procedure of transaction.

The mediation process, if utilized effectively, ought to give a gathering to the gatherings to "have their day in court." They will be permitted to "vent" and to recount their story to an unbiased why should willing listen without condemning. They will have the chance to tell the other side their position, in the vicinity of and under the supervision of a prepared go between. This procedure is regularly the main huge stride to opening the psyches of the gatherings to progress in the direction of settlement.

Then again, if either or both insight expect the part of solid promotion in the underlying phases of the intervention, by demanding introducing his or her customer's case to the go between as a supporter, the gatherings might accept a comparative stance of resoluteness. Unbendability hinders the procedure of transaction, and regularly brings about one side or the other leaving with emotions that the procedure, and the outcome, was not reasonable.

Another fundamental advantage to the vicinity and cooperation of all gatherings in Mediation is the chance to "conceptualize" for innovative settlement alternatives when an impasse is come to. Lawyers regularly take a gander at more conventional types of settlement in financial terms. Notwithstanding, the gatherings themselves might offer inventive arrangements which can at last result in a determination of a question that permits them to leave feeling that they have achieved a reasonable settlement.

Consider, for instance, a situation where a debate emerges between two neighbors over a wall isolating their property. The question may include a conceivable prescriptive easement, or security. Frequently these sorts of debate require tolerance, innovativeness and constancy to achieve a reasonable determination. In a customary setting, money related alleviation may be the most evident target. Nonetheless, the gatherings themselves might, amid the procedure, express concerns and premiums which can't be remunerated by cash. One gathering or the other may recommend a conceivable situation for settlement which is "outside of the crate," that gives a springboard to the gatherings to adequately arrange a determination that works for them two.

In a customary setting, financial help would frequently be the point of convergence of settlement. Be that as it may, a workable arrangement which was started by one of the

gatherings permits the gatherings to settle with respect, and to accomplish their objective in a way which seems reasonable. This at times, if at any time, happens if the majority of the gatherings are not present and assuming a dynamic part in all features of the Mediation, or in the event that they depend on their lawyers to show their case from a position in view of financial quality.

THE PRESENCE OF ALL PARTIES AT MEDIATION IS NECESSARY FOR EFFECTIVELY UTILIZING PARTY-PARTICIPATION

Counsel for the gatherings in Mediation must view intervention as an opportunity to see the story that will be told at trial by all sides, and the way in which it will be told. Thus if no other, all gatherings ought to be available, regardless of whether they are repaid by protection. Los Angeles Superior Court Local Rule 12.15 requires that the gatherings, and on account of an element an agent with power to determine the debate, "might by and by show up at the principal intervention session, and at any resulting session unless pardoned by the middle person." However, in individual harm cases we have frequently seen just the adjustor present at Mediation hearings, and here and there even the adjustor might just show up by telephone, if allowed by the arbiter. In this way, just the offended party is physically present at the listening to, a circumstance which regularly brings about no determination on the grounds that no mediation can happen under these circumstances.

Mediation gives the gathering witness the chance, in a less formal setting, to recount his or her story. By urging a gathering to go to Mediation, and to recount his or her story in his or her own particular words, counsel has a chance to watch how the customer presents himself or herself to a trier of reality, and how well he or she handles the weight. Experienced trial lawyers realize that witnesses can respond eccentrically when they first affirm in court.

In mediation where the respondent is reimburse by protection, the vicinity and dynamic contribution of the litigant is still critical. The adjustor might be meeting its safeguarded surprisingly. The litigant's vicinity gives the adjustor the chance to assess his or her validity direct. In littler cases the respondent is frequently not ousted and the lawyers don't meet safeguarded litigants until near the season of trial or at trial. By requiring the guaranteed respondent's vicinity at intervention, a middle person will be setting the stage for the result of a reasonable determination.

Similarly critical, we frequently see offended parties in individual damage activities who need more than simply financial remuneration. A straightforward conciliatory sentiment, or affirmation of some obligation, regularly goes far to lessening a generally nonsensical settlement request. In a wide range of cases, the offended party is regularly inspired as much by displeasure as a yearning to get money related remuneration. At the point when an offended party is given the chance to hear the litigant's side of the story from the respondent, a definitive result is defusion of a percentage of the resentment. By then, one of the real obstructions to a financial settlement is wiped out if not fundamentally decreased. That can just happen if the respondent is available and is permitted to recount their story at the intervention.

The same contemplations apply to the Defense and their technique at Mediation. An eloquent respondent who introduces a conceivable clarification for the barrier's position on risk and/or harms might empower the offended party and offended party's guidance to reevaluate a generally non-debatable settlement position that would constrain the case to trial.

PARTY PARTICIPATION WILL NOT JEOPARDIZE THE ATTORNEY/CLIENT RELATIONSHIP IF ATTORNEYS SET THE STAGE FOR THEIR CLIENT TO PARTICIPATE ACTIVELY

What part can the lawyer play in this procedure, without endangering his or her part as the customer's supporter? A compelling presentation of a case requires a customer who has been legitimately arranged before the intervention initiates. Advice ought to set up their customers for the procedure by practicing their story with the goal that they can plainly express their perspective while seeming sensible. Customers need to comprehend that in an intervention they can express concerns, outrage and different feelings which may not be proper when affirming at trial. Working with the customer to adequately exhibit the truths most great to their side, while as yet permitting the customer the opportunity to "vent," permits the lawyer to form the customer's story from a position of promotion. On the off chance that the customer is appropriately arranged to present his or her story briefly and adequately, the Mediation allows insight to inspire the other party, and/or the safety net provider, both with the story itself and the way the customer recounts the story.

At the point when done in the private setting of Mediation, the advantages of this methodology far exceed any drawback. Numerous cases settle in Mediation on the grounds that the contradicting party at long last comprehends the issues once he or she hosts listened to the next get-together clarify for himself or herself the truths, without the twist or stance of lawful contention. Once in a while the way that a lawyer is exhibiting the truths, instead of the gathering, will bring about the contradicting gathering to disregard the presentation in light of the fact that the storyteller is "a legal advisor." Stereotypes don't vanish basically on the grounds that the setting should be classified and nonpartisan.

As an extra advantage, a well-spoken gathering gives an accomplished go between a significant apparatus to utilize when caucusing with the contradicting gathering and his or her insight and different persons who might impact settlement. For instance, experienced resistance lawyers realize that an offended party who introduces a very much arranged story can be an imposing enemy at trial. Confirmation at an affidavit might indicate how well the offended party responds to antagonistic addressing. Be that as it may, intervention exhibits an alternate point of view - in particular, how well the gathering is liable to do on direct examination. Appropriate arrangement and directing by the lawyer is basic to achievement in this period of mediation.

The path in which the offended party shows their story, regardless of the possibility that actualities and other data are exhibited which would somehow be unacceptable at trial, is additionally vital to the go between in encircling the issues. The gatherings will probably achieve a typical objective of settlement if the arbiter can outline the issues similarly the gatherings view them. By listening specifically to the gatherings recount their story, as opposed to having the story separated through the legal counselors, the go between can better center the gatherings on the issues the gatherings consider critical. At times, as promoters, lawyers miss the issues which are basic to their customer, issues which are frequently not the legitimate issues which will be heard at trial. In any case, the gatherings' issues are regularly those which obstruct question determination, especially when the expense of case achieves monetarily straining points of confinement.

Mediation, especially in a complex multiparty case, can be a strenuous affair. The go between can keep the gatherings concentrated on the procedure by effectively

captivating them at the beginning and keeping them included all through the session. While listening to the gatherings' stories, when all is said in done, is essential, an arbiter is frequently the individual to diffuse the enmity between an offended party and respondent, which regularly drives the prosecution to levels which might appear to be generally difficult.

No less critical, counsel must consider their own advantage in the result of prosecution contrasted with the hobbies of their customers. While nobody would question that an innate irreconcilable circumstance can come about where a customer is searching for more impalpable cures, (for example, the expression of remorse or other non-financial cures) the lawyer might be assessing the money related estimation of the case in view of a charge course of action or fiscal contemplations, for example, costs. Every lawyer must measure the benefit of permitting the customer to express their objectives that they would like to accomplish through prosecution against the money related premiums of the lawyer. A compelling lawyer can impart those issues to an arbiter, secretly if important, who will then be in the position to help the gatherings in achieving a settlement which includes those objectives without trading off the relationship between the lawyer and his or her customer. A reasonable determination on account of those standards will happen if the customer is permitted to convey what needs be or herself to the Mediator.

A FAIR RESOLUTION MEANS A SATISFIED CLIENT

The significance of dynamic gathering interest in the Mediation process can't be downplayed. The objective of Mediation ought to be an outcome that advantages the gatherings. Without the immediate investment of the gatherings, cases are less inclined to settle, and the gatherings are more averse to be fulfilled by the procedure, whether the case settles or not. At last, a miserable customer is one who may not come back to the lawyer later on, and one who might in the end be included in yet another claim, this time over the expenses charged by the lawyer. Successfully utilizing the customer as a part of Mediation is the way to achieving a reasonable result in question determination.

CHAPTER 4: STATUTORY PROVISIONS INSIGHT AND CONNECTIVITY WITH THE PROCESS OF MEDIATION

CHAPTER 4.1: LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND OF MEDIATION

The Concept of Mediation is antiquated and profound established in our nation. In long time past days question used to be determined in a Panchayat at the group level. Panchs used to be called Panch Parmeshwar.

Presently we have developed into a nation of 125 crore individuals and with liberalization and globalization, there is gigantic financial development. This has prompted blast of suit in our nation. Despite the fact that our legal framework is one of the best on the planet and is profoundly regarded, yet there is parcel of feedback because of long defers in the determination of debate in a court of law. Presently a legit prosecutor is careful about drawing nearer the court for a choice of his question. Subsequently, we have swung to Alternative Dispute Resolution systems.

The Supreme Court of India has begun the procedure of changes in the Indian Judicial System. Justice A.H. Ahmedi, the then Chief Justice of India in the year 1966 welcomed the Institute for the Study and Development of Legal Systems (ISDLS), USA to take an interest in a national appraisal of the overabundance in the common courts. Studies were made in appreciation of the reasons for postponement in the common ward in our nation.

The governing body by the Civil Procedure Code (Amendment) Act, 1999, corrected section 89 of the Code of Civil Procedure with impact from 1.7.2002 whereby Mediation was conceived as one of the methods of settlement of question. The alteration in Section 89 was made on the suggestion of the Law Commission of India and the Justice Malimath Committee. It was suggested by the Law Commission that the court might require participation of gatherings to the suit or continuing to show up in individual with a perspective to touch base at a genial settlement of the question in

the middle of them and make an endeavor to settle the debate agreeably. Equity Malimath Committee prescribed making it mandatory for the Court to allude the question, after issues are encircled, for settlement either by method for Arbitration, Conciliation, Mediation or Judicial Settlement through Lok Adalat. It is just when the gatherings neglect to get their debate settled through any of the Alternative Dispute Resolution techniques that the Suit could continue promote. Hence Section 89 has been acquainted with advance option strategies for debate determination.

Justice R.C. Lahoti, the then Chief Justice, Supreme Court of India constituted a Mediation and Conciliation Project Committee (then led by Justice N. Santosh Hegde). A Pilot Project on Mediation was started in Delhi in the month of August, 2005. The primary bunch of Senior Additional District Judges were bestowed Mediation Training of 40 hours length of time. The prepared go betweens began legal Mediation from their chambers toward the end of August, 2005. From that point, 24 more Additional District Judges have been prepared as arbiters amid the month of September and November, 2005.

A lasting Mediation Center with every single present day facilities was built up at Tis Hazari court complex (Central Hall, third Floor, Room No. 325) in October, 2005 and Mediation Centre at Tis Hazari was introduced by Justice Y.K. Sabharwal, Judge, Supreme Court of India/Chairman, NALSA on October 24, 2005.

Legal Mediation was begun at Karkardooma Court Complex in the month of December, 2005 and a prosecutor cordial and present day Mediation Centre was built up in May, 2006. Eleven more Additional District Judges have been prepared as go betweens amid the month of June, 2006. A Mediation Centre at Karkardooma Court was introduced by Justice S.B. Sinha, Judge, Supreme Court of India on May 5, 2006. New Complex of Delhi Mediation Centre, Karkardooma was additionally introduced by Justice Madan B. Lokur, Judge, Supreme Court of India/Member, Mediation and Conciliation Project Committee on December 14, 2015.

In this way four more Mediation Centers were built up at Rohini, Dwarka, Saket and Patiala House Courts Complex. A Mediation Center at Rohini Court was initiated by Justice R.V. Raveendran, Judge, Supreme Court of India on October 12, 2009. A Mediation Center at Dwarka Court was initiated by Justice A.P. Shah, the Chief Justice, High Court of Delhi on February 9, 2010. A Mediation Centre at Saket Court

was introduced by Justice D. Murgesen, the Chief Justice, High Court of Delhi on 30th April, 2013. A Mediation Centre at Patiala House Court was introduced by Justice J.S. Khehar, Judge, Supreme Court of India and Chairman, Mediation and Conciliation Project Committee, on May 22, 2015.

CHAPTER 4.2: ANALYSIS OF SECTION 89 OF CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE

The principal sub – Section might be given to a study managing the authoritative foundation relating to Section 89.In this sub –section an endeavour to follow the verifiable development or advancement of Section 89 should be tried. For the purpose of clarity, the analyst wishes to partition the same into three distinctive subs sections.

PRE AMENDMENT SCENARIO

The germs of a solid and powerful option discussion for debate determination were sown path in 1989. It was from that point forward that the administrators have been trying [through fluctuated amendments] to get a framework that met the prerequisites of the galactic development in suits. It is just through such corrections that Section 89 got developed. The present segment might attempt to discover a connection between these revisions and how have they drove in the advancement of the present Section 89 in the 2002 Act in entirety and substance. At the end of the day the present segment principally thinks about this very development process. To consider the same three bits of enactments have been chosen by the creator that would unmistakably demonstrate the awareness of the administrators to ponder upon a powerful option cure. They being

- Code of Civil Procedure 1859

- Code of Civil Procedure 1908

- Arbitration Act 1940

An investigation of the same should help the peruses to comprehend the development of the Section 89 and its procurements in a verifiable and an all encompassing viewpoint.

CIVIL PROCEDURE CODE, 1859

The story behind the production of a solid Alternative question gathering began route in 1959. With the correction of the Civil Procedure Code, 1859 the administrators had initially tried to establish the frameworks of a straightforward yet powerful

administration of ADR. In the perspective of the scientist this is by all accounts the principal enactment that called for and comprehended the fluctuate hugeness of option methods of settlement. In this Section 312 to 317 identified with Alternative Dispute Resolution.

CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE 1908

Again in the Code of Civil Procedure 1908 there existed procurements that empowered the gatherings to the common suit to look for reference of question for Alternative Dispute Resolution. Furthermore such procurements additionally enabled the courts to elude the debate for discretion, have control over arbitral procedures and mediate on the legitimacy of honours.

THE ARBITRATION ACT, 1940

Through legitimate and administrative advancement forms with respect to the same, the Arbitration Act, 1940 appeared. It revoked these procurements of Code of Civil Procedure as it existed in the 1908 Act and rather re-created them with slight changes by method for Sec.21 and Sec.24. However in perspective of the creator the 1940 Act likewise contained procurements like the old Act qua the reference of debate for Alternative Dispute Resolution.

PRINCIPLE INTENTION BEHIND AMENDMENTS-SINCE 1859 TO 1940:

A brief reference to the principle Intention behind such revisions is of prime centrality at this crossroads. The prime reason was that such changes was that through these alterations the officials primarily expected to accommodate a straightforward, expedient and less costly option arrangement of debate determination. Another fundamental expectation in the psyche of the administrators was to diminish the weight of the Courts. However this neglected to deliver wanted results as was normal.

IMPEDANCES BY THE COURT - PRIME REASON FOR FAILURE:

It should however be noticed that the aforementioned honourable expectations did not saw the light of the day and only took on the position of a paper tigress. The essential explanation behind the same was the wide power given to Courts to meddle with the working of the arbitral gatherings at all the stages. This force additionally stretched out to the level of meddling with recompenses went by the mediators.

CONSEQUENCE OF COURT INTERFERENCES-FAILURE OF THE 1940 ACT:

The aforementioned reasons as disclosed above prompted the most understandable conclusions to the degree that the 1940 Act neglected to understand its items. This could be best clarified by the perspectives as communicated by the courts in the M/s. Master Nanak Foundation Vs M/s. Rattan Singh and Sons[7] wherein the Court went ahead to obviously clarify the unfortunate state of the option discussions of equity as existing in India.[8]

RECOMMENDATIONS BY VARIOUS BODIES:

The disappointment of the 1940 Act prompted the acknowledgment of the way that the present framework should be redone and changed. It arrives that we see proposals of the progressive Law Commissions proposing intense changes to the current law. Again it merits specifying the Justice Malimath Committee's Report. This report prescribed various ADR gatherings to lessen the substantial pendency of cases in the Courts. In this manner it is in this stage we see a developing cognizance towards building a more grounded lawful administration towards successful interchange fora. The arrangement creators are seen to have stepped in highlighting not just the lacunae in the current legitimate system additionally underlining on the need to structure another administration out and out. It is subsequently, in the supposition of the creator, this could be seen as a stage that could be arranged as the raison de atre for the establishment of Section 89. At the end of the day it is from here that the order of Section 89 began in full stream.

ADMINISTERING THE 1996 ACT:

In light of the aforementioned circumstances, the procedure of concocting another enactment got affixed. Also a few other national and International Policy choices taken by the Govt. of India made it basic for the Law producers to receive a totally new legitimate administration. It arrives that the creator wishes to highlight the

[7] AIR 1981 SC 2975.

[8] The court observes "Interminable, time consuming, complex and expensive court procedures impelled jurists to search for an alternative forum, less formal, more effective and speedy for resolution of disputes avoiding procedure claptrap However the way in which the proceedings under the ADR are conducted and without an exception challenged in courts has made lawyers laugh and legal philosophers weep..."

approach of liberalization in the field of industry and trade received by the Government of India that opened conduits for outside venture. It is essentially this that actuated the Government to take after UNCITRAL Model Law in drawing out the new establishment. The new sanctioning was as the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 that rehashed the 1940 Act. This Act tried to lessen the weight of the pending cases on courts. The establishment of his Act was seen as the upheaval that at last prompted the advancement of the present Section 89 C.P.C.

THE AMENDMENT PHASE

AN INVESTIGATION OF SECTION 89 C.P.C:

This subsection might try to think about in respect to what precisely was the alteration that was consolidated by the 1996 Act and how this was unique in relation to alternate authorizations in as much as it accommodated Court attached Mediation. Questions relating to the viability of the change might likewise be tended to.

C.P.C. CHANGES BROUGHT - AN ANALYSIS OF SECTION 89:

Parliament proclaimed a few corrections to the Civil Procedure Code of 1908 in the year 1999 to Section 27 and Section 100. One of the huge revisions for the reasons of our study was Section 89 that accommodated the settlement of question outside the Court. Section 89 essentially accommodated Court Annexed ADR. In entirety and substance in this the Court guides the gatherings to pick among a few ADR instruments, they being Lok Adalats, Arbitration Conciliation Mediation. On the off chance that the Court esteems it a fit case, the Court can, without the assent of gatherings, allude the question to such systems. On the off chance that the endeavour by the Mediator/Conciliator at settlement fizzles, the gatherings can about-face to the Court for transfer under the typical methods.

REASON FOR SECTION 89:

The prime reason for Section 89 was to attempt and see that the Court itself need not as a matter of course choose every one of the cases that are recorded in Court. Such a plan was however best, remembering the laws postpone and predetermined number of judges, that it got to be basic to make utilization of ADR Mechanism in the way as gave under Section 89. It is principally in view of the postponements brought about in

the transfer of cases notwithstanding the tedious method of the Courts furthermore the shortage of judges that the approach producers received for a Court Annexed ADR Mechanism in India.

HEAVY BURDEN OF CASES ON THE COURTS- IS SECTION 89 AN EFFECTIVE REMEDY?

The greatest failure of the FLS in India was that it couldn't accommodate expedient transfer of cases. The accumulation of cases expanded complex. It is in such manner that studies were directed by different bodies to highlight the disturbing rate at which cases are pending in the Courts. It merits saying the perceptions of The Parliamentary Standing Committee on Home Affairs 2001 that factually found the substantial accumulation of cases in the Indian Judicial System.[9] Another huge study in such manner is the Reports presented by the Indian Law Institute with joint effort with the Institute of Developing Economies, Japan In March 2001. This concentrate further contributed measurably towards the poor number of cases discarded by the locale and subordinate courts.[10] Thus the disturbing circumstance as for overwhelming accumulation of cases was no more a fiction yet a stark reality which was testing the very viability of the Indian Legal System and its future .To beat the issue of developing overabundance of cases The Law Commission of India 120th Report in 1988 prescribed different answers for defeat the disturbing rate at which cases were pending in the Courts everywhere throughout the nation. The nitwit arrangement as prescribed by the Law Commission was to just build the quantity of Judges. Suggested that the state ought to instantly build the proportion from 10.5 judges for each million of Indian populace to no less than 50 judges for every million inside of the time of next five years. In any case, the genuine situation remains entirely not the

---

[9] Condition of the High Court:
There were in 21 High Courts in the country, with 35.4 lakhs cases pending. Of the 618 posts of High Court judges there were 156 vacancies as on January 1, 2000
Condition of Subordinate Courts :
Condition of the subordinate Courts was even more alarming.There was a backlog of over 2 crores (20 million) cases for as long as 25 to 30 years. Of these, there were over 1.32 crores (13.2 million) criminal cases and around 70 lakhs (7 million) civil cases. The total number of subordinate judges in all the states and union territories in the country, as of September 1999 was 12,177.

[10] In 1998 was 1.36 crores (13.6 million)

same as what was really gone for. As indicated by studies led in such manner even in the year 2001, the proportion stays at 12 or 13 judges for each million populace.[11]

REDUCING THE BACKLOG OF CASES- THE BEST REMEDY AVAILABLE

Thus we see that the state of the Indian Judicial System concerning quality of judges is by all accounts in a disgraceful state. The quantity of judges is still beneath than what was suggested by the Law Commission route in 1988. Accepting that the poor quality of the legal would stay to be in this dreary state for a considerable length of time to come different components remaining ceteres paribes what else could be the answer for diminish the overwhelming weight of cases on the Courts. The arrangement straightforward lies in the presentation of a different method of Court added ADR component in the nation.

Henceforth, remembering all elements Section 89 is by all accounts the best response for diminishing the substantial weight of cases on the Courts wherein the Court is will undoubtedly choose every case itself. It rather can on the off chance that it considers it a fit case, can, without the assent of gatherings, allude the question to other option system as Arbitration, Mediation, Judicial Settlement, or Lok Adalats instruments. On the off chance that the endeavor by the Mediator/Conciliator at settlement fizzles, the gatherings can do a reversal to the Court for transfer under the ordinary strategies.

SECTION 89 C.P.C. – AN EFFECTIVE REMEDY OR A PAPER TIGRESS?

A few creators have brought up issues as for the viability of Section 89. They have raised questions that Section 89 in its present structures is a deficient code and does not accommodate an operational sponsorship. It arrives that Section 89 now and again as been known as a paper tigress in as much as it accommodates legitimate languages on paper, however the same does no hold water when connected in handy and genuine circumstances. To comprehend whether Section 89 really accommodates a successful and viable cure or is it simply a paper tigress that just looks great on paper we first need to comprehend the very structure of Section 89 in its full frame.

[11] While it is a debatable question in itself whether this data relating of the number of judges should be to the population as a whole or to the number of cases in the various courts, there is no gainsaying that judicial officers are not paid very well and work in deplorable conditions where basic infrastructure is unsatisfactory or inadequate.

A plain perusing of Section 89 should give that in the event that it appears to the Court that there exists a component of settlement that is adequate to the gatherings then the Court might figure terms of settlement and offer them to the gatherings for their perceptions. In the wake of getting the perceptions from the gatherings, the Court should reformulate the terms of settlement and allude the same for Arbitration, Conciliation, Judicial Settlement and Mediation. Consequently area 89 (1) accommodates a stepwise technique to be followed in such manner. They are:

- Existence of "elements of settlement".
- Such components of settlement must be pleasing to the gatherings.
- The court to figure terns of settlement.
- Observations of the gatherings recorded regarding such terms of settlement.
- After receipt of such perceptions the court to reformulate the terms of settlement.
- The matter to be alluded to option methods of debate settlement.

Again section 89 Sub-section (2) refers to different acts in relation to arbitration, conciliation or judicial settlement including settlement through Lok Adalats and Mediation.[12]

Sub Section 89 (2) (d) mulls over proper standards being surrounded concerning Mediation. It must be noted in such manner that n such principles have been detailed starting at this point. It is in this way watched Section 89 (2) (d) must be made operational to make change more successful. Thus we see that there still exists a degree for making Section 89 operation in all perspectives. Without legitimate method being recommended by law, the procurements should not have any impact at all. It must be expressed that in perspective of the creator it is precisely here that the issue as for Mediation rules in India exist. It is principally therefore that Section 89 is regularly termed as a paper tigress with respect to Section 89 (2) (d) which does not accommodate appropriate operational necessities for Mediation to work in India.

[12] In India the Arbitration and Conciliation Act 1996 governs the provisions of arbitration and conciliation. Judicial settlement for the purposes of Section 89 is through Lok Adalats. However, there is no statute for mediation in India.

DEMEANOR OF THE LEGAL COMMUNITY-SECTION 89 AMENDMENT

The lawyer‟s response was not under any condition great. The legal advisors turned to strikes to across the nation challenge against revisions to the Code of Civil Procedure. There were prime tumults in Tamil Nadu and Delhi High Courts. The supporters contended eagerly against the Inclusion of such alterations in the C.P.C. There were warmed level headed discussions between the Lawyer group and the law Minister with respect to such alterations.

AFTER EFFECT OF SUCH BOUNDLESS RESISTANCE:

As an aftereffect of this boundless resistance as to Inclusion of Section 89 including other C.P.C revisions, from the rehearsing bar, these changes small suspended uncertainly.

REINTRODUCTION OF SECTION 89 IN YEAR. 2002

However again in the year 2002, July the Parliament chose to put the corrections including Section 89 into full impact. This re-consideration of Section 89 into the C.P.C was essentially done to decrease the mind-boggling weight of pending cases on the courts as has as of now been talked about.

POST AMENDMENT SCENARIO

CONSTITUTIONAL CHALLENGE TO C.P.C. AMENDMENTS

The post amendment scenario in this regard finally saw the inclusion of Court Annexed Mediation in the Indian Legal System by virtue of Section 89 (2) (d). However, even after its inclusion it had to cross many hurdles. Following the effectuation of Section 89, in October, 2002 a Bar Association in Tamil Nadu brought a Constitutional Challenge in the In re Salem Bar Association Case.[13] The Salem Bar Association of Tamil Nadu challenged as ultra vires the amendments Introduced by Amendment Acts 46 of 1999 and 22 of 2002.

[13] (2003) 1 SCC 49.

SALEM BAR ASSOCIATION CASE- INTRODUCTORY OUTLINE

The instant case is a very significant instance wherein the very constitutionality of the C.P.C amendments including Section 89 was challenged in the Supreme Court. At the very outset when notice was issued the petitioner [Salem Advocate Bar Association] sought leave of the Supreme Court to withdraw the writ petition. By order 16-9-02, the prayer to withdraw the writ petition was declined, as the Court observed that the petition was filed in public interest. The Bench comprised of three judges of the Hon‟ble Supreme Court. However two lawyers were appointed Amicus Curie to assist the court in the matter.

OBSERVATIONS OF THE SUPREME COURT:

The court while delivering its judgment interestingly pointed out that neither Mr. Vaidyanathan nor Mr. K.S. Vishwanathan made any submission to the effect that any of the amendments made were without legislative competence or violative of any provisions of the Constitution. They on the other hand pointed out practical difficulties involved in implementing the Amendments of the C.P.C

PRACTICAL DIFFICULTIES IN IMPLEMENTING THE AMENDMENTS:

However, Mr. Vidyanathan drew the attention of the court to some of the amendments that have been made with a view to show that there may be some practical difficulties in implementing the same. The Bench dealt with sections 27 and 100A, Order 7 Rule 1 of the Civil Procedure Code (Amendment) Act, which were perceived to have practical difficulties in implementation. The Bench was appreciative of the practical difficulties in implementing Section 89, introduced through the Amendment Act.[14] Section 89 (2) (d) provides that the parties shall follow the procedure as may be prescribed. Hence section 89 (2) (d) contemplates appropriate rules being framed with regard to Mediation. Hence modalities have to be formulated so that Section 89 becomes operational in its full effect. In the absence of these finer modalities, Section 89 would become in operational and would be rendered the position of a paper tigress as discussed in the previous sections. However the Supreme Court upheld the

[14] Section 89: Settlement of Disputes outside the Court If it appears to the Court that there exist elements of a settlement in a dispute, the Court shall formulate the terms of settlement and refer the same to parties:

constitutional validity of the amendments made to the Civil Procedure Code (CPC) which came into force on July 1, 2002.

SC also appointed a five-member committee.[15] The Committee was to be headed by a sitting Judge of the Supreme Court.[16] The prime purpose of the Committee so formed was to ensure that "the amendments were made effective resulting in quicker dispensation of justice." Supreme Court gave Rao committee four months to seek comments and to report back. The Rao Committee drafted consultation papers including rules on Mediation and case management and circulated them to High Courts for comments. However these papers reached High Courts in late January. Thus there was no time left for adequate study and commentary. Chairman Rao thus asked for an extension till July to organize a National Conference on Mediation. The National Conference was a huge success which involved Chief Justices of each of the High Courts and two lower Court Judges, as well as prominent lawyers from the Bar.

At the end of this chapter, the researcher draws the following conclusions:

(a) India needs to pursue ADRs seriously. S. 89 of the CPC, while a step in the right direction is not enough. Comprehensive guidelines are required to push forward the ADR program.

(b) While it is necessary to take ADRs seriously, efforts must be taken to ensure that the quality of justice does not go down. As critical as one can be of traditional justice mechanisms, they have their merits. India must tread with caution the path of novelty.

(c) Access to justice is one of the issues which must be deliberated with greater vigour. The ADRs are an attempt to improve access to justice. They cannot be allowed to suffer from the same problems that traditional justice mechanisms (i.e. the Courts) suffer from. Efforts must be continuously taken to ensure that ADRs are not caught in legal quagmires.

---

[15] Other members of the Committee: Arun Jaitley, Kapil Sibal, C. S. Vaidyanathan and B V Subba Rao.

[16] He could be nominated by the Chief Justice of India. Former Supreme Court Justice Rao chaired the Committee.

CHAPTER 5: LIMITATIONS OF THE PROCESS OF MEDIATION

CHAPTER 5.1 CASES NOT AMENABLE TO MEDIATION

Mediation is suitable for about a wide range of question.

Mediation is suitable by and large despite the fact that it may not be suitable for each case. The invested individuals might be welcome to go to a preparatory meeting in which the Mediator will evaluate whether Mediation is suitable for their specific circumstances, or their legitimate counsellor might have the capacity to offer them some assistance with deciding .For situations where there is a real debate requiring the court to give a definitive alleviation, the gatherings might need to go for prosecution. Family question including kid misuse, aggressive behaviour at home, and so forth are not suitable for Mediation as a gathering's choice to go into a settlement might be unduly impacted.

In a family debate, where one or a greater amount of the gatherings are in an extremely aggravated enthusiastic or mental state, such that they can't speak to themselves or spotlight on the requirements of their youngsters, is not suitable for Mediation.

There are a couple of circumstances in which Mediation may not be the right process. Here are a few samples:

Intervention is improper for a question when one of the gatherings is resolved to build up a point of reference that will be tying on all future comparable exchanges. Most development cases don't fall into this classification.

Likewise a poor possibility for Mediation is a debate where a gathering trusts that changeless standards ought to administer the question. For instance, an administrative body might want to shield an administrative system or open approach issue against a lawful assault, instead of determination an individual test; a temporary worker attempting to keep a proposed government contract grant by testing enactment that

offers inclinations to neighbourhood organizations would likely find that its debate would not effectively be determined by Mediation. Intercession additionally can't work if an imperative gathering is truant from the table, for instance, the designer or engineer or a noteworthy subcontractor to the general temporary worker. A temporary worker might recognize outline imperfections in proprietor gave plans, however unless the architect is additionally occupied with settlement transactions, the remaining gatherings might be unable at last resolve the matter.

A silly claim is another sort of question that is not liable to be interceded effectively. Intervention requests that the debating gatherings be as educated about the nature and degree of the question as can sensibly be overseen. It additionally requires composed minds to impartially assess the dangers of seeking after option debate determination vehicles. A rash disputant is unrealistic to be occupied with taking part in trade off to put the matter to rest.

CHAPTER 5.2: MEDIATION AS PART OF JUVENILE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM

Following the time when adolescent wrongdoing turned into a different element from the criminal equity framework, it has been the objective of adolescent courts to restore youthful guilty parties in the trusts that they would not convey criminal conduct into adulthood. Starting in Cook County, IL in 1899, reactions to violations perpetrated by those under 18 were seen as fundamentally distinctive to wrongdoings submitted by grown-ups. Instead of rebuffing this gathering of youthful wrongdoers with imprisonment, there was an apparent requirement for something other than what's expected; something that took into consideration the reprobate to take in the blunder of his or her routes and to end up a profitable individual from his or her group. This theory of recovery has remained and today is executed the country over by each state through the advancement of discrete frameworks for adolescent and criminal equity.

Intercession, in view of its inalienable uniqueness, offers a reasonable and possibly very effective way to deal with adolescent equity. At the point when joined with an organized competency improvement program, this cross breed methodology is likely one of the best choices for the diminishment of recidivism. Lamentably be that as it may, the main utilization of our order to be found in quests of "misconduct and Mediation" is casualty – wrongdoer Mediation (which has been appeared to be fruitful in accomplishing its particular objectives when executed by qualified staff). Maybe before offering a more nitty gritty bookkeeping of the contention for Mediation in adolescent wrongdoing cases, a need emerges to recognize Mediation and mental treatment; and, between the requirement for the treatment and different intercessions in adolescent justice.

Mediation has been classically defined as "…the intervention of a third party between two or more sides in a dispute in an attempt to help them reach an agreement…."[17] Very simply, in this process, a Mediator will help the parties identify their interests in

[17] American Center for Conflict Resolution Institute (2003). Professional Mediation Certification Training Program. Brooklyn, NY. p47.

the dispute and the blockades to achieving their interests. After these interests and blockades are elucidated, agreements can be worked out between the parties. All of us who have been privy to mediate any matter can attest to the fact that these interests and blockades can vary as much as can the people in the Mediation. However, uncovering the underlying interests and blockades is the only manner in which Mediation can result in success.

Psychological treatment typically refers to a process of "…solving psychological problems by modifying people's behaviour and helping them gain a better understanding of themselves and their past, present, and future[18]." A psychologist, psychiatrist or counsellor will assist a patient in uncovering physical, cognitive or behavioural causes of maladjustment to the stresses of society or body. Once this is achieved, a world-view change in perspective can begin to grow through continued counselling and treatment or medication can be prescribed which will create biochemical changes in basic bodily functioning.

Accordingly Mediation should be part of the Juvenile criminal justice system for non-violent offenders, victim-offenders Mediation may be applied under the supervision of the criminal justice system caseworkers, which would help both side to humanize and rehabilitate each other. Mediation may be a part of family counselling. It is a way for members of the family who Me splitting into parts to know as to how to deal with the changes in roles, duties and opportunities and to face the same with emotional balance.it may also be a part of the civil court system where parties to law suits are added in settlement negotiations aimed at helping them find their own best interest. It may be a part of the community action. It may be employed in labour dispute seeking to improve any conflict and feeling in the workplace. It is, whoever, not always alternative to the formal justice system purported to be conducted by real human beings rather than lawyers.

[18] "Feldman, R.S. (2009). Essentials of Understanding Psychology, 8ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Higher Education. p487."

CHAPTER 6: ADVANTAGES OF MEDIATION

Mediation perhaps characterized as non-tying method in which a fair-minded outsider, the Conciliator or Mediator, helps the gatherings to a question in coming to a commonly tasteful and concurred settlement of the debate. Intercession is a procedure by which questioning gatherings drew in the help of a nonpartisan outsider to go about as a middle person. He is an encouraging delegate who has no power to settle on any coupling choices; however who utilizes different strategies, systems and aptitudes to help the gatherings to determine their debate by arranged assertion without arbitration. The Mediator is a facilitator who might in a few models of Mediation likewise give a non-tying assessment of the benefits of the question. In the event that required, however who can't settle on any coupling adjudicatory choices?

Mediation is the most every now and again embraced ADR Technique. It thinks about the arrangement and mediation of impartial third individual who helps the gatherings to come to an arranged settlement. He doesn't have the ability to arbitrate or force a grant. It is directed on a secret premise and without partiality to the lawful rights and cures of the gatherings. The procedure might need to go through a few stages like planning, joint sessions, private gatherings and last result.

Specialists in this field receive their own idealized styles. They vary in their fundamental steps. A great deal relies on the way of the question. The more muddled a matter, the more private gatherings would be important to clear the ground for a joint meeting.

A Mediator might embrace either a FACILITATIVE or EVALYATIVE methodology. Arbiters attempt to maintain a strategic distance from conclusions and judgments. They rather encourage and urge gatherings to open up their interchanges and unveil their hobbies and needs. In this procedure the Mediator gets the chance of finding the purposes of distinction and the range of discussion or question. He might then help the gatherings to cross over any barrier between them.

Now and again, a further step might get to be vital. The Mediator might host to take estimation of gatherings particular claims and set up an evaluation for the gatherings

utilization with the goal that they might comprehend their separate position. By this procedure he might accommodate the irreconcilable circumstance. The end point will then be that of the pacification.

Mediation might take the state of a smaller than normal trial. This is a more formal kind of Mediation practice. It is for the most part connected with an assessment sort of methodology. The legitimate position is exhibited by every gathering to a board of senior chiefs from every disputant organization. The meeting is directed by an unbiased executive who deals with the procedures. After the presentation, the officials dismiss and attempt to figure a settlement on the premise of the outline of the case as they have listened. The nonpartisan counsel stays accessible for dealing with anything that might at present be huge. He might do this by realizing further arrangements or undertaking further Mediation. He might then, is request to encourage settlement, tell the gatherings what might be the conceivable after effect of case or settlement.

Still another method of Mediation is CONSENSUS BUILDING. There are certain matters of general public interest, e.g. road building, canal digging or the location of a factory. They affect public in general and not just only one or two individuals. Pollution problems may have to be taken care of. A public consensus may become necessary. Mediators have to play their role for this purpose.

It is for the parties to prescribe their own Rules and other terms subedit to which their dispute is to be mediated. It may be difficult for the parties to settle such terms in advance. It may have to be done at the first meeting with the mediator. But even so it may be difficult to for see all the eventualities and provide for them. ADR Institutions and organizations carry with them model rules and regulations to which the parties can consent with or without modification.

A Mediation and hybrids process generally provides a framework of informal procedures in which a neutral person provides help and assistance to the parties to the dispute. He collects information from both sides under circumstances of confidentiality about the information. he tries to clarify things to the parties. He tries to sort out issues and to narrow them in that process to the extent possible. He facilitates dialogue. He may successfully bring the parties to the negotiation table or start a process of negotiations like correspondence or telephonic exchanges or other modes and means of communication. He may bring down the level of personal

conflicts. When the parties are so dispassionate, he may open up before them their options. The variety of options may help the parties to pick up an option which they find is most suited to the solution of their problem.

A practice of this kind is an art. It has very little display of law in it. There is no need for any legal content. If the compromise based on the solution is not against law, it will be enforceable by law like any other compromise agreement.

Mediation has become perhaps the most popular procedure in the ADR area. By the late 1980s and particularly beginning and continuing through the 1990s, Mediation has become an increasingly popular procedure in all types of civil cases. In fact, it is now probably the most popular form of ADR used by litigants in civil cases in the United States of America. Moreover, because of its flexibility, it is increasingly used not only in civil disputes but also criminal cases and in cases that are on appeal.

Mediation is a structured negotiation presided over by a facilitator with the skill, training and experience necessary to help the parties reach a resolution of their dispute. It is a process that is confidential, non-binding and geared to assisting the parties in structuring a mutually acceptable resolution to whatever dispute has prompted the Mediation. Because the process leaves control of the settlement in the hands of the disputants, and because it is oriented to producing solutions that accommodate the fundamental needs of each side, Mediation is a dispute resolution technique particularly appropriate for circumstances where the parties to the dispute have had or expect to have, a continuing relationship. It is also, however, well suited to disputes that do not involve such relationships. Mediation as a technique for resolving disputes first began in the area of family law, probably because the nature of the emotions involved often led to serious problems with positional bargaining and because the parties were often forced to have a continuing relationship because of children. Mediation in family law disputes was quickly recognized as a valuable tool, and courts and litigants soon realized that using Mediation was not limited to family disputes but could be extended to other civil disputes as well.

The reasons for Mediation's growing popularity in all areas of civil litigation are abundantly clear:

(a) Mediation is non-threatening. This is because it is non-binding and thus permits client control of the outcome.

(b) Mediation is relatively inexpensive, as most sessions last no more than one or two days.

(c) Mediation has a high percentage of success. Most mediators report 80 to 90 percent success rates.

One of the basic advantages of Mediation is its flexibility. A Mediation session can be designed in any way that the parties believe would be most useful to the resolution of their dispute. Before the Mediation actually begins, each side will submit a brief or statement to the mediator, which consists of a short summary of the party's position and includes any critical written material.

The Mediation begins with a joint session attended by the Mediator and all of the parties and their lawyers. The Mediator hears a presentation by each party outlining its particular view of the case and why it believes it is entitled to prevail in the dispute. After the Mediator has heard presentations from each side, the joint session is ended. The purposes for the joint session are several. First, it allows the Mediator to hear first-hand each party's statement of its position. Second, by accurately reciting back the positions to each of the parties, the Mediator can build credibility with both sides by demonstrating that he has truly understood any contentions. Finally and importantly, the joint session allows each side to hear the other side's arguments directly, without the „filtering' that typically occurs when cases are reported only through the lawyers. Following the joint session, the Mediation breaks into individual meetings where the Mediator meets with each side privately in an attempt to bridge the gaps that exist. It is in these private sessions where the Mediator spends substantial time candidly identifying with the parties what their true interests are and developing options that might satisfy those interests. At the same time, the Mediator is looking for common ground between the parties.

At the conclusion most cases are resolved. Because Mediation is so effective, it offers tremendous cost savings and other benefits to the parties involved. By resolving cases and getting them out of the court system, Mediation also reduces the burden on that system and promotes speed and efficiency in the processing of cases. The Mediator

has a diverse role to play. He will act as a link between the two contesting parties. He will ascertain the nature of real dispute and narrow down the areas of controversy. He will guide the parties in which direction they can arrive at a compromise or settlement.

CHAPTER 6.1: ADVANTAGES OVER LITIGATION

A. Privacy

If a matter ends up in court, the hearing is usually open to the public and becomes a matter of public record. Privacy is an advantage of Mediation that may be of particular importance in cases relating to family dispute. As these matters often involve family secrets and disputes that are embarrassing to the parties. The confidentiality of Mediation may encourage families to speak more openly and allow the true reasons for the disputes to emerge more quickly. Privacy is particularly important to those parties who value "not airing the family's dirty laundry" in public.[19] Additionally, parties who will continue to live or operate in the same social or business community may benefit from a "discreet conclusion" to their problems.[20]

Common law does not guarantee privacy or confidentiality in settlement discussions. However, it is not uncommon for state statutes to prohibit the introduction of evidence that the parties have tried (unsuccessfully) to reach a settlement. Many state statutes and ADR rules require that Mediations and other ADR proceedings be kept confidential. [21]

---

[19] Ms. Schmitz notes that this preference is particularly prevalent among the current generation of senior citizens. Suzanne J. Schmitz, Mediation and the Elderly: What Mediators Need to Know, MEDIATION Q., Fall 1998, at 71, 74.

[20] Nadine DeLuca Elder, A Mediation Primer for the Solo or Small Firm Practitioner, 4 GA. BJ.. 38 (Dec. 1998).

[21] For example, the Indiana ADR rules provide that "ADR processes will be subject to the same degree of confidentiality as is set out in Evidence Rule 408, supra n. 174," and state additionally:

Mediators shall not be subject to process requiring the disclosure of any matter discussed during the mediation, but rather, such matter shall be considered confidential and privileged in nature. The confidentiality requirement may not be waived by the parties, and an objection to the obtaining of testimony or physical evidence from mediation may be made by any party or by the mediators.

IND. R. A.D.R. 2.11. The Texas ADR Procedures Act requires that party communications during ADR process be kept confidential and that none of the participants (including the mediator/ facilitator) may be called upon to testify in court concerning the ADR proceeding. TEx. Civ. PRAC. & REM. CODE ANN. § 154.073 (West 1997). Hawaii's rules provide:

The Mediator shall not communicate any matters discussed at the conference to any court. Likewise, parties and attorneys are pro-hibited from informing the court of discussions or actions taken at the mediation. This rule does not require the exclusion of any evi-dence otherwise discoverable merely because it was presented in the course of the mediation. This rule also does not require exclusion of evidence that is offered for another purpose such as proving bias or prejudice of a witness, negating a contention of undue delay, or

B. Dealing with Emotional Aspects of Cases

Both the confidentiality and informal nature of Mediation give the parties the opportunity to deal with the emotional issues of a case. Family dispute may result in the tangible manifestation of long-standing family problems (e.g., sibling rivalry, perceived favouritism, jealousy over or disapproval of a marriage or other relationship)." Parties in these cases may sometimes seek no more than an "emotional" resuit- an apology perhaps, or an opportunity to vent anger over a situation they perceive as unfair**.**

C. Preservation of Relationships

Preservation of the family and other ongoing relationships is another advantage to Mediation. As in family matters where families live together could be irreparably shattered by bitter and prolonged litigation. In some of these cases, regardless of the outcome, it is vital that the relationship be preserved, as one family member may remain dependent on another for care-giving or financial assistance.

D. Control & Power Imbalances

In an ADR proceeding, particularly Mediation, the parties retain a great deal of control over the procedure and outcome of the case. In Mediation, the parties themselves design their own resolution and thus may be more likely to be committed to its success. Even in arbitration or other quasi-judicial proceedings, parties who have chosen to enter this type of dispute resolution may feel less at the mercy of a legal system that they do not understand**.**

A disadvantage of the parties retaining control is the potential for a more powerful party to overpower a weaker party. This power imbalance may manifest itself in a

---

proving an effort to obstruct a criminal investigation or prosecution.
HAW. R PROB. 2.1, App. A. RULE 7

variety of ways, thus challenging mediators to resist the urge to stereotype any given situation.

E. Flexibility

Litigation suffers from two major restrictions that do not apply to Mediation. First, litigation assumes a result in which only one party is successful. Second, litigation limits the results to strict legal alternatives. Mediation allows the parties the opportunity to design solutions that meet their needs, while not necessarily adhering to technical legal principles. The parties may reach results that would be outside the confines of a typical judicial order. The flexibility of Mediation also allows the parties to construct a resolution they perceive as "fair," perhaps proving more satisfying than a formalistic legal resolution.

F. Efficiency

Reduced cost is often cited as one of the primary advantage of Mediation. Its informal process allows for meetings to occur more quickly and for decisions to be made, if not in the session itself, soon thereafter. This efficiency may result in decreased legal fees. 7 Court costs (court reporter, transcript, etc.) are avoided. Mediators may charge for their services,-' but many programs provide for minimal fee structures or even voluntary work by mediators.

While efficiency and low cost are often touted as benefits of Mediation, Professor Stulberg points out that care should be taken lest these benefits become "goals" and override the basic fairness of the process. He argues that the pressure to be efficient may cause a Mediator to restrict the parties' participation in the Mediation session, favouring legal counsel (over the parties themselves) due to the attorneys' training in presenting issues in a concise and "efficient" manner. This issue merits special consideration in Mediations that involve people who cannot participate in extended sessions, express their views clearly, or reach decisions quickly.

Beyond this issue of flexibility in time and cost, Mediation offers basic convenience, which may be of paramount importance for working parties or for family members who are not mobile. The proceeding is not confined to a specific courtroom at a specific date and time, but rather is subject to the needs of the participants.

CHAPTER 6.2: ADVANTAGES OVER OTHER MODES OF DISPUTE SETTLEMENT

To trace the advantage of Mediation over other ADR mechanism first we should trace the difference between Mediation and other means of dispute settlement which in turn will itself mark the advantages of Mediation. Accordingly advantages are:

- The parties have CONTROL over the Mediation as far as

1) its degree (i.e., the terms of reference or issues can be restricted or extended over the span of the procedures) and

2) its result (i.e., the privilege to choose whether to settle or not and the terms of settlement.)

- Mediation is PARTICIPATIVE. Parties get a chance to show their case in their own particular words and to straightforwardly take an interest in the transaction.

- The procedure is VOLUNTARY and any gathering can quit it at any stage on the off chance that he feels that it is not helping him. The self-deciding nature of Mediation guarantees consistence with the settlement came to.

- The technique is SPEEDY, EFFICIENT and ECONOMICAL.

- The technique is SIMPLE and FLEXIBLE. It can be adjusted to suit the requests of every case. Adaptable planning permits gatherings to go ahead with their everyday exercises.

- The procedure is led in an INFORMAL, CORDIAL and CONDUCIVE environment.

- Mediation is a FAIR PROCESS. The Mediator is unbiased, nonpartisan and free. The Mediator guarantees that previous unequal connections, if any, between the gatherings, don't influence the transaction.

- The procedure is CONFIDENTIAL.

- The process encourages better and successful COMMUNICATION between the gatherings which is pivotal for an imaginative and significant arrangement.

- Mediation keeps up/enhance/restore connections between the gatherings.

- Mediation dependably considers the LONG TERM AND UNDERLYING INTERESTS OF THE PARTIES at every phase of the debate determination process – in looking at choices, in creating and assessing choices lastly, in settling the question with spotlight on the present and the future and not on the past. This gives a chance to the gatherings to extensively resolve every one of their disparities.

- In Mediation the attention is on determining the debate in a MUTUALLY BENEFICIAL SETTLEMENT.

- A Mediation settlement regularly prompts the SETTLING OF RELATED/CONNECTED CASES between the gatherings.

- Mediation permits CREATIVITY in question determination. Gatherings can acknowledge innovative and non-traditional cures which fulfill their basic and long haul intrigues, notwithstanding disregarding their lawful qualifications or liabilities.

- When the gatherings themselves sign the terms of settlement, fulfilling their basic needs and hobbies, there will be consistence.

- Mediation PROMOTES FINALITY. The debate are put to rest completely lastly, as there is no degree for any claim or correction and further prosecution.

- REFUND OF COURT FEES is allowed according to controls on account of settlement in a court alluded Mediation

NOW WE CAN SUMMARIZE THE ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF MEDIATION AS FOLLOWS:

Fair Relief:

Instead of recompensing cash, in a few circumstances a court can grant fair alleviation which implies the court can arrange a gathering to act, or avoid from acting, certainly (e.g., request a producer to quit giving destructive chemicals a chance to saturate the ground water close to the plant).

Financial Damages:

The measure of cash which a gathering might be honoured in the event that she wins a suit. Financial harms can be further characterized into general harms, correctional harm, uncommon harms, considerable harms, and so on.

So if Mediation takes after no set technique, results in no guaranteed result, and can't constrain gatherings to concur unless those gatherings wish to do as such, what favourable circumstances are there to Mediation?

Mediation is generally economical. Seeing a case through trial is a costly suggestion.

Mediation is generally quick. There is no shortage of go betweens prepared and willing to help parties whose objective is to attempt to settle a matter. A brisk web inquiry will bring about many go betweens and Mediation sites, some having some expertise in specific sorts of cases and some more experienced and capable than others. Mediation does not keep running by a stopped up court calendar and sessions can be effectively booked at whatever time at the common accommodation of the gatherings and the go between, and can happen in an assortment of areas.

Mediation is moderately basic. There are no mind boggling procedural or evidentiary guidelines which should be taken after. While most would concur that a general standard of reasonableness applies, the greatest punishment a gathering can force for injustice is to leave the Mediation and take his risks in court.

Mediation permits the gatherings to update and change the extent of their contention. In a trial, beginning pleadings and tenets of method point of confinement the issues which a gathering can raise. In Mediation, as circumstances change so can the points up for discourse. This expanded adaptability makes it less demanding for moderators to go about as issue solvers rather than enemies.

Mediation takes into consideration adaptable arrangements and settlements. The alleviation accessible in court is generally taking into account financial harms, and

fair help is difficult to find. In Mediation, nonetheless, the gatherings can consent to a settlement requiring, or controlling, activity by one gathering which was not initially imagined as something advantageous to the next gathering.

Settlements came to in Mediation are more pleasing to both sides than court judgments. Since any settlement landed at through transaction is fundamentally consented to intentionally by both sides, commitments under the assention will probably be satisfied than commitments forced by a court.

This rundown is in no way, shape or form comprehensive, yet in any event exhibits a structure in which we can consider the benefits of Mediation. Also, there is a comparable rundown which can be built in which we can begin to consider a percentage of the normally said hindrances of Mediation.

Mediation does not generally bring about a settlement understanding. Gatherings may invest their energy and cash in Mediation just to observe that they should have their case settled for them by a court. Deciding on Mediation, in this way, exhibits something of a danger. Further, if Mediation falls flat, quite a bit of a gathering's "ammo" may have as of now been presented to the contradicting party, subsequently getting to be far less valuable in the resulting trial.

Mediation does not have the procedural and sacred assurances ensured by the government and state courts. The absence of custom in Mediation could be an advantage, as noted above, or a drawback. Intercession between gatherings of dissimilar levels of complexity and force, and who have unique measures of assets accessible, may bring about an unjust settlement as the less-very much situated gathering is overpowered and unprotected.

Lawful point of reference can't be set in Mediation. Numerous segregation cases, among others, are carried with the aim of securing fulfilment for the named offended party, as well as with the trust of setting another legitimate point of reference which will have a more extensive social effect. These cases are just "effective" if a high court (as a rule the United States Supreme Court) hands down an ideal choice on the fundamental issue. Intervention is subsequently not useful for such cases.

Mediation has no formal disclosure process. In the event that one of the gatherings to a debate can't completely address the case without first accepting data from the other

party, there is no real way to force revelation of such data. The gathering looking for revelation must depend rather on the other party's great confidence, which could conceivably be sufficient.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

A feasible legal is the premise of a solid popularity based base. Be that as it may, the mounting back payments of cases has debilitated the legal, and disabled the equity conveyance framework. The Right to Speedy trial‟, an essential key right, has in this manner been endlessly influenced. With the privileges of the regular individuals who are the customers of the equity conveyance framework being influenced, there is a more noteworthy likelihood of the law being taken in one's own hand as a way to guarantee access to shoddy, quick and unpolluted strategies for trial. It is essentially because of these established objectives and to guarantee that the equity itself is not postponed, and henceforth denied there is a dire need to redo the framework. The whole lawful calling, legal counsellors, judges, law teachers, has turned out to be so entranced with the incitement of court that they have a tendency to overlook that they should be healers of contentions. For some cases, trials by antagonistic challenges more often than not go the method for the old trial by fight and blood. The framework is too expensive, excessively agonizing. As healers of human clashes, the commitment of the legitimate calling is to give instruments that can create a worthy result in the most brief conceivable time, with the most limited conceivable cost and with at least weight on the members. The journey for more genial, monetary and quick settlement of question, prompted ADR gadgets including Arbitration, Negotiation, Conciliation and Mediation.

Mediation is an important debate determination instrument in light of the fact that the method for achieving an understanding can be as fluctuated as the question that should be determined. Intervention is better access to equity as the procedure is expedient, reasonable, casual, and party driven as here gathering themselves choose their confidence and predetermination which bring about win-win circumstance. Also procedure of intercession deal with relationship in the middle of gatherings and high level of security is keep up which help gatherings to examine their question all the more easily which is not in the situation of case. On the off chance that it is unsuccessful, the gatherings can simply turn to the courts or different method for debate determination. So, intervention is an important weapon against deferral, expense, and bad form.

Mediation in its contemporary incarnation is an ADR process where a uniquely prepared middle person encourages the gatherings in landing at an agreeable settlement through an organized procedure including diverse stages viz. presentation, joint session, gathering and assertion. Intercession has unmistakable favourable circumstances - it is financially savvy and speedy, it empowers the gatherings to devise inventive tailor-made arrangements, results in a win-win circumstance along these lines protecting connections and is secret.

Mediation has developed as the leader in the ADR unrest which is picking up force. At the post prosecution stage intercession is maybe the most favoured method of question determination particularly for entangled, multifaceted and long standing debate.

Mediation can thus be recognised as better access to justice**.**

Mediation should be part of the Juvenile criminal justice system for non-violent offenders, victim-offenders mediation may be applied under the supervision of the criminal justice system caseworkers, which would help both side to humanize and rehabilitate each other. Mediation may be a part of family counselling. It is a way for members of the family who Me splitting into parts to know as to how to deal with the changes in roles, duties and opportunities and to face the same with emotional balance.it may also be a part of the civil court system where parties to law suits are added in settlement negotiations aimed at helping them find their own best interest. It may be a part of the community action. It may be employed in labour dispute seeking to improve any conflict of feeling in the workplace. It is, whoever, not always alternative to the formal justice system purported to be conducted by real human beings rather than lawyers.

The processes of mediation need strengthening for proper impetus to the ADR mechanism in India. This culture towards peaceful mediation of disputes without the involvement of the rigidity of the court practices needs intensification. To fulfil the mandate of Section 89, some remedial steps are necessary and some techniques have to be adopted, so that the concept of mediation becomes acceptable to the litigating public.

I HAVE FEW SUGGESTIONS TO OFFER:

(a) Panel of completely qualified persons of known honesty from the fields of law, building and medications why should prepared go about as middle people and ought to be arranged. Bestowing extraordinary preparing to legal counsellors to help the procedure of mediation. Some senior backers can be asked to at any rate take up one such task in a month on ostensible charge.

(b) The gathering ought to be requested that select the person(s) to go about as the go between in the matter. The gatherings ought to be guaranteed that no charge would be payable them straightforwardly, in order to wipe out the conceivable trepidation in the gathering's brain of an unfavorable choice in the occasion of his having not paid the expense, requested by the middle person.

(c) The Mediator ought to be requested that choose the matter inside of a settled period.

(d) The procedures ought to be directed at a spot that requires certainty. The advancement of a few premises with sufficient foundation for intercession procedures, in private segment, close to the court premises, ought to be supported. In the option, court premises after court hours or on vacations might be utilized for directing these procedures.

(e) The budgetary bundle offered to the individual called upon to go about as arbiter ought to be adequately appealing.

(f) Growth of intercession focuses and far reaching exposure to these strategies. This has gigantic hugeness especially in guaranteeing that the provincial prosecutor's arte familiar with the advantage of these intercession gatherings.

To guarantee that the excellent object of Section 89 of the Code is accomplished it is important that therapeutic steps are taken, to make ADR more financially savvy, quick and less difficult, to be acknowledged as a technique for determination of debate. There is a pressing requirement for the same. The object of this segment is to advance option strategies for question determination. It can't be questioned that something exceptional must be done with a specific end goal to battle the blast of the overabundance cases.

Attorneys everywhere throughout the nation need to urge prosecutors everywhere to fall back on ADR as a compelling and rapid option for transfer of their cases in Courts. It will must be underscored and make defendants understand that postpone in transfer of their cases might sum to foreswearing of equity and, consequently, they ought to choose determination of their question outside the Court by falling back on one of the techniques for ADR gave under Section 89 CPC.

It is hoped that over time and with implementation of these suggestions and further exposure to creative solutions that can be achieved in ADR even with unwilling parties, Indian courts will accept that in certain cases, it is appropriate to compel one or more parties to settle their dispute via ADR.

As even non-metropolitan areas in India are carrying out experiments in arbitration and other ADR methods, one is not only optimistic but realistic in taking the view that arbitration and other ADR methods are bound to get more and more popular and the persons trained at an early date as an arbitrator, mediator or conciliator definitely have adequate returns with the satisfaction of having Gandhian satisfaction.

This dissertation would not be complete without the following quote by Abraham Lincoln, which inspired me to proceed with this topic.

"Discourage litigation. Persuade your neighbours to compromise wherever you can. Point out to them that a nominal winner is often a real loser-in fee, expenses and waste of time. As a peacemaker, the lawyer has a superior opportunity of being a good man. There will still be business enough."

-Abraham Lincoln (1809- 1865)[22]

[22] "As quoted in < http://www.quotationspage.com/search.php3?homesearch=lincoln&page=2>."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The sources used as references for this project are as follows:

- **BOOKS:**

1. Christopher W Moore on Mediation Process: Practical Strategies for Resolving Conflict (Revised) 2014 5th Ed.
2. Daniel Dana on Conflict Resolution 2011 1st Ed.
3. Jennifer E. Beer with Eileen Stief on The Mediators Handbook 2015
4. Mark D. Bennett and Michele S. G. Hermann on The Art of Mediation 3rd Ed
5. Robert A. Baruch Bush on The Promise of Mediation: The Transformative Approach to Conflict 2016
6. Sukumar Ray on Alternative Dispute Resolution 2011

- **ARTICLES:**

1. Mediation -Realizing the potential and designing implementation strategies by Dr. Justice Dhananjaya Y. Chandrachud Judge High Court at Bombay
2. Mediation- Need of hour by Hon'ble Mr. Justice S.B. Sinha former judge, Supreme Court of India.
3. Concept and process of mediation by Mediation and Conciliation Project Committee, Supreme Court of India.
4. Advantages and Disadvantages of Mediation in Probate, Trust, and Guardianship Matters by Mary F. Radford Professor of Law, Georgia State University
5. Mediation- An introduction by Hon'ble Mr. Justice R.V. Raveendran judge, Supreme Court of India.
6. Need to revitalise ADR mechanism by Hon'ble Mr. Justice A. M.
7. ADR ADR- Mechanism and Effective Implementation by Hon'ble Justice S.B. Sinha former judge, Supreme Court of India.

➢ WEBSITES:

1. Indian Kannon
2. Manupatra
3. Westlaw
4. Delhi High Court Mediation and Conciliation Centre

➢ NEWSPAPERS:

1. Times Of India
2. The Hindu