TECHNOLOGICAL INNOVATIONS IN ADR: EXAMINING INDIA'S EVOLVING LEGAL FRAMEWORK

Vishnu Vardhan. G, SASTRA University

ABSTRACT

Technology has had a drastic impact on Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) throughout the world. At this point in time India is in a pivotal position to take advantage of its digital advancements. This Research Paper will attempt to explore the multi-faceted relationship between ADR and technology as they relate to India, specifically addressing the development of Online Dispute Resolution (ODR), Artificial Intelligence (AI) implementation, blockchain applications and the continuing digital divide. The COVID-19 Pandemic has accelerated the move toward digital transformation of ADR in India by increasing the utilisation of e-mediation platforms; virtual arbitration hearings, and electronic filing systems. Despite these advancements, the legal and regulatory frameworks that govern ADR processes remain fragmented. In particular, the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 does not contain sufficiently detailed provisions for technology-enabled or technology-driven methods of dispute resolution. This Paper will identify and explore 6 key areas of importance to understanding the impact of technology on ADR in India: (1) the evolution of Technology-enabled ADR in India; (2) deficiencies in current legal and regulatory frameworks; (3) potential risks associated with the use of AI; (4) the viability of blockchain technology as a means of arbitration; (5) the impact of the Digital Divide on access to Justice and; (6) recommendations for comprehensive legislation to create a viable ODR framework. The research presented in this Paper is informed by detailed case analysis and comparative analysis of case law, and concludes that India has the ability/institutional capacity to implement technology-enabled ADR solutions; however, to realise success, there must be unified legislation to ensure all areas of society have access to technology-enabled ADR solutions, capacity-building efforts must be made for the legal profession and a human-centred approach to innovation must be taken to ensure the ability to access justice and be treated fairly remain protected by the Constitution.

Keywords: Online Dispute Resolution, Artificial Intelligence, Blockchain, Alternative Dispute Resolution, Digital Justice, Access to Justice, Technology-Enabled ADR

INTRODUCTION

The Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) system in India has always been an important means of supplementing the burdened court system, and has been impacted by ongoing issues such as increasing amounts of pending cases, physical distance between parties to disputes, and delays associated with court procedures in accessing justice in a timely manner. The COVID-19 Pandemic further stressed the existing systemic issues and added a level of urgency to using technology in the courts and ADRs, resulting in the trends of virtual court hearings, electronic filing of documents, and online settlements being established across the judicial system. In 2020, the Ministry of Law and Justice published the National Policy on Online Dispute Resolution which is the first significant policy to promote ODR in India and provides a framework for creating a digital system for resolving disputes efficiently. NITI Aayog is also establishing a framework to facilitate access to ODR for certain types of disputes. While these advancements have taken place, ODR in India currently has no uniform and comprehensive legislative framework, instead relying on the disjointed collection of various provisions found in the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996; the Information Technology Act, 2000; and some of the developing instruments, including the Mediation Bill of 2021. Many persons have stated that, currently, there is not an existing specific law to regulate for ODR specifically; however, due to the rapid advances in AI and Blockchain-related technology within the industry, it raises a multitude of complex questions about procedural fairness, transparency, due process, data protection, and the ability to enforce outcomes achieved via technology.

This paper intends to pursue four related goals: (i) To analyze India's ADR (alternative dispute resolution) technology driven through its strategic development up till now (pre/post-COVID), (ii) To evaluate the adequacy and limitations of the existing legal/regulatory framework of arbitration and conciliation (i.e., the Arbitration and Conciliation Act) and any related legislation, (iii) To underline the implications of artificial intelligence (AI) and blockchain on the efficiency, fairness and enforceability of online dispute resolutions (ODR), and (iv) To provide recommendations for developing an ODR policy framework to create a unified ODR legislation that will facilitate innovation but not compromise individual constitutional rights of access to justice, equal treatment, and due process. The work offered in this research paper is primarily specific to India, but it uses comparative practice and jurisprudence from other countries when appropriate. It integrates legislative, judicial, and institutional initiatives with respect to technological feasibility assessments as the author anticipates continued changes to

the relationship between law and technology through 2025.

EVOLUTION OF TECHNOLOGY-DRIVEN ADR IN INDIA

Pre-COVID Landscape: Slow Digitalization

India's ADR system relied heavily on analogue methods until 2020, when changes in law and business practices began to move towards a digital future. While the IT Act (2000) recognized digital communications and electronic signatures, it was not particularly relevant to ADR. Similarly, even though electronic evidence could be used as part of an arbitration, the Arbitration and Conciliation Act was passed in 1996 and therefore predated the internet era and did not make provision for the use of technology in respect of remote arbitration hearings and other aspects of the arbitration process. Early on, the Indian judiciary played an important role in promoting ADR. Through various orders and judgments, the Supreme Court of India promoted mediation, arbitration, and other forms of ADR as viable alternatives to litigation; however, ADR still required physical attendance by both parties as well as evidence being submitted and documented in physical formats. For example, in **Bar Council of India v. Union of India**[1], the Supreme Court affirmed the constitutionally protected right to legal service and the right of equal access to justice by stating that ADR should be promoted so as to alleviate the backlog of cases pending before courts and to provide expeditious access to justice, and that institutional support and regulatory recognition are crucial to the successful adoption and implementation of ADR. **Cellular Operators Association of India v. Union of India**[2] (2003) 3 SCC 186 was the first case in which the Supreme Court of India created TDSAT (the Telecom Dispute Settlement and Appellate Tribunal) as a special venue for resolving disputes relating to the telecom sector and signified recognition by India's Supreme Court that disputes within such industries are often very complex and require a special forum for their resolution.

Post-COVID Acceleration: Digital Transformation

The COVID-19 health care crisis rapidly accelerated the use of digital platforms by courts in India, as well as by a range of alternative dispute resolution (ADR) providers throughout the country. The Supreme Court of India and several High Courts were able to quickly implement infrastructure for providing virtual hearings in the weeks immediately following the pandemic

1.AIR 2012 SUPREME COURT 3246
2. AIR 2003 SUPREME COURT 899

outbreak, enabling ADR providers to also make virtual mediation, virtual arbitration, and electronic filing available. One of the most significant developments during this period was the Indian government's successful deployment of the e-Lok Adalat program nationwide to help mediate small claims and other straightforward civil disputes. Thousands of cases were resolved using this method during the pandemic confinement period, demonstrating that technology-enabled mass adjudication is a viable option for hearing matters in bulk. Meanwhile, numerous private online dispute resolution (ODR) platforms, including Presolv360 and Sama, as well as a number of mediation centres, quickly moved to provide services entirely through online channels, offering secure video conferencing, digital document exchange procedures, and electronic execution of settlements to ensure service continuity. Additionally, as a further confirmation of this shift, both the Supreme Court of India and several High Courts had issued directions for allowing the e-filing of arbitration petitions; virtual hearings; and electronic notice service, which was explicitly endorsed by the Standing Order issued by the Delhi High Court on the use of electronic proceedings in arbitration cases dated March 2020.

Another factor contributing to the growth of ADR was the establishment of institutional support, such as the Arbitration Council of India. The Arbitration Council of India was founded in 2015 by the Arbitration and Conciliation (Amendment) Act, 2015 which aims to help, coordinate and promote the development of institutional arbitration and mediation through enhanced capacity building and improved infrastructure for arbitration organizations. The TDSAT determines the propriety of regulatory authorities including government entities, particularly in matters involving complicated telecommunications contracts that require specialised knowledge of telecommunications. The use of these specialized forums for determining disputes resulting from technology demonstrates the efficacy of this form of dispute resolution. For example, the case **Aircel Digilink India Ltd. v. Union of India**[3] illustrates how the TDSAT navigated through complex telecommunications agreements requiring technical expertise and prompt resolution, which directly relate to the structure of technology-enabled ADR.

The Role of Judiciary and Private Platforms

The Indian courts have generally supported the adoption of technology-enabled ADR while

3 (2005) 3 CLJ 461 (TDSAT)

also providing guidance on many issues related to these practices. The Courts have held that in accordance with established authentication and security protocols, virtual hearings conducted via video conferencing are legally valid, therefore the resultant awards and settlements issued by an Online Dispute Resolution platform are enforceable. The Indian Courts have further extended this same recognition to electronically signed documents as already referenced in subsection (5A) of the provisions included in Section 5A of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act 1996 that were amended by the Arbitration and Conciliation (Amendment) Act, 2016 through which electronic means of communications, including digital signatures, have been expressly accepted as valid forms of the contract by a party to each of the above-named agreements and applicable to the Arbitration process and procedures under the provisions contained in the Information Technology Act, 2000. Additionally, the Courts have further supported this ecosystem of ODR by ruling that the Mediated Settlement agreements resulting from ODR shall be treated with equal legal authority to that as Arbitral awards after all of the conditions of validity established by Section 73 have been adhered to and properly recorded and acknowledged. At the same time that the Indian Courts have provided their formal confirmation to the validity and acceptance of ADR as a process, based upon the confirmation provided by the Indian Courts will allow for the expansion of the ecosystem that is based on the use of ODR; privately operated ODR platform/operations, as a result, have gained significant traction and have already had a significant and lasting impact upon the growth and development of the overall ODR industry. Presolv360 provides a complete suite of ODR products/services offering an all-in-one model to assist consumers and businesses in resolving their disputes with comprehensive solutions that utilise a hybrid model of utilising AI-based assessments and mediation with the assistance of a Professional Mediator on a single integrated platform including multi-language options, electronic evidence submission, and dispute resolution timeframes of less than 30 days. Sama is an example of an ODR service provider focused primarily on pre-emptive and consumer-related disputes between companies and consumers.

LEGAL AND REGULATORY FRAMEWORK GOVERNING TECHNOLOGY-BASED ADR

Statutory Foundations and Gaps

The Arbitration and Conciliation Act is the principal statutory framework for Alternative

Dispute Resolution (ADR) in India. However, with respect to technology, there are significant gaps in the Act's provisions. Section 7 (acknowledging written arbitration agreements and expanding to include electronic means via amendment) provides some guidance as to electronic communication issues; Sections 19-21 provide parties to arbitration a great deal of leeway to create their own procedures, while also establishing procedural rules; and Section 28 establishes which substantive law applies to an arbitration dispute without considering technological advances or artificial intelligence. The Act is significantly limited by its omission of an exclusive chapter on ODR, virtual arbitration, and digital evidence; therefore, courts will be compelled to expand their interpretations and rely on more extensive principles to accommodate such practices. The courts have acknowledged this flexibility when they addressed the jurisdiction issues and procedural vagueness in **Hathway Cable and Datacom Pvt Ltd v Sudarshan TV Ltd**[4] (Delhi High Court, 2016 SCC OnLine Del 4605) during arbitration involving technology. In this case, the court recognized that it is possible to modify and adapt the procedures of arbitration to meet the needs of the parties in technology-related arbitration and thereby assists in the development of technology-focused arbitration. The IT Act creates an infrastructure that will be beneficial to both electronic transactions and ADR. In particular, Sections 4 and 5A of the IT Act provide for equal treatment of electronic and handwritten signatures as well as,, respectively, that an electronic communication constitutes a written agreement.

Jurisdictional and Procedural Challenges

One of the important issues facing ODR is whether or not the arbitration seat exists in a purely virtual environment. This absence of a physical venue makes it difficult to find difference between the Domestic Part and International Commercial Part of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996.There is a consequent ambiguity surrounding supervisory jurisdiction, territorial enforcement, and interim measures for parties in multiple jurisdictions with respect to each other, although they have agreed to establish the seat of arbitration in India. This distinction was made by the Supreme Court in the case of **N. Radhakrishnan v. Cognizant Technology Solutions Corporation**[5] AIR 2017 SC 5136 which distinguishes between polity law and procedure. The Supreme Court confirmed that while the global location of participants would not affect the procedures that govern an arbitration under Indian law, the determination

4 2016 SCC OnLine Del 4605
5 (2011) 5 SCC 532**.**

of the seat is what will govern the procedures applicable in India. There are also complications in relation to notice and service of documents and the process for verification. The courts have adopted a varying approach to service via email. For example, Delhi High Court permits this type of service. However, due to the absence of statutory obligations for verification of virtual participants, there is no requirement for the courts to develop standardized protocols for service through the ODR platforms, which leads to a lack of uniformity in practice. With respect to the admissibility of evidence pursuant to Sections 65A and 65B of the Indian Evidence Act, 1872, electronic records and proceedings are subject to a requirement for a certificate of authenticity and procedural reliability. These requirements do not adequately cover new types of proceedings produced from ODR mechanisms, such as AI assessments, blockchain contracts or platform metadata.

Limitations of Existing Framework

There are many regulatory gaps in that India's ODR framework will need to navigate: there is no single piece of legislation or other governing body for India's ODR framework that would eliminate uncertainty; there are no clear standards set forth for digital evidence; there are no mandates requiring interoperability between ODR platforms that would allow for a single format for all ODR's; the Consumer Protection Act does provide for online dispute resolution for consumers; there is no guidance on jurisdiction for parties in different jurisdictions; and the Digital Personal Data Protection Act does not provide specific provisions for securing or retaining dispute resolution data through an ODR.

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN ADR: SCOPE, EFFICIENCY, AND ETHICAL CONCERNS

The potential of Artificial Intelligence (AI) to transform all stages of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) has already been demonstrated in multiple ways. AI can facilitate the triage of disputes: Algorithms can rapidly assess the nature and complexity of a dispute (as well as the value of the dispute), allowing for accurate categorization of cases and predictions of settlement outcomes and timelines. As a result, the time to assess disputes can be reduced from several weeks to a number of hours by using triaging algorithms. In addition to triaging disputes, AI also assists mediators in determining the best course of action to resolve disputes. As an example, WIPO has developed and implemented an AI-mediated support system that identifies patterns in dispute resolution and provides recommendations for compromise

between parties in dispute. This type of AI-supported mediation system has been shown to have between a 65% to 75% success rate in resolving disputes through mediation, compared with a traditional success rate of approximately 50% to 60% for mediators.

Legal researchers are now using AI tools to identify legal precedents, summarize legal documents, and predict the likely outcomes of various legal matters. The International Arbitration Committee of India has permitted their arbitrators to use AI-generated summaries of the content of legal documents as preliminary or first-step tools to assist them in their decision-making. Furthermore, AI tools can generate consistent drafts of arbitration awards. However, these tools need to be used under the supervision of a human. There are many serious risks involved with using AI technology in ADR processes. For instance, there are historical biases built into the algorithms of many AI systems that continue to favor larger corporations. Representation bias is a concern for many users (the majority of AI technologies are English-centric) and therefore can put Canadian, Indian, and other international users at a disadvantage (existing AI technologies may not address regional disputes). Many other types of discriminatory biases are also associated with the use of AI in ADR processes. The above alludes to a clear violation of a similar position taken by the Supreme Court in **Justice K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India**[6] 10 SCC 1 (2017) regarding privacy and transparency in accordance with the provisions of Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

The lack of transparency or "black box" nature of many AI systems is one of the most significant disadvantages of using AI in ADR processes, as it ultimately violates the principles of due process and equality set forth in Article 14 of the Constitution of India. The EU AI Act (2024) mandates that any company developing an AI solution for the ADR process must meet the requirements for transparency, bias audits, human oversight (no sole decision-making authority), standardization of data, and accountability (for liability and redress).

The guidelines regarding the use of AI technologies for ADR processes must include requirements of Transparency, Bias Audit, Human Oversight, Data Standardization, and Accountability. In addition to these guidelines, all users of AI technology in ADR processes should be granted access to one or more forums for challenging the decisions made by AI, especially with respect to the way decisions regarding awards are crafted. AI guideline standards (as well as many other laws and regulations affecting ADR processes) will need to

6 AIR 2017 SUPREME COURT 4161

be developed in a manner consistent with the existing laws and regulations affecting ADR in India. This is particularly important with respect to protecting users' rights to privacy and transparency and assuring that the use of AI technology in ADR processes does not result in adverse discrimination treatment toward disadvantaged persons.

BLOCKCHAIN TECHNOLOGY AND ARBITRATION: ENSURING SECURITY AND ENFORCEABILITY

Blockchain technology resolves critical arbitration issues through its ability to create immutable records which will contain the Award, evidence and process documents in an unalterable manner. This feature also allows for the minimization of disputes after an award has been made. Automated enforcement through a Smart Contract is enabled by the ability to create them using blockchain technology, thus removing the need for separate enforcement proceedings on an Award. The case of **Kleros(Mexico-2021)** illustrates this principle, where a Court enforced a Blockchain Arbitral Award and upheld the principles surrounding the adaptability of Seat to the virtual environment under the New York Convention, which confirms that Arbitral Awards made in India are enforceable Internationally.Section 7(b) of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act (1996) impliedly supports Blockchain functioning by allowing electronic records into evidence and for procedural autonomy, though the lack of explicit recognition creates interpretative uncertainty. The enforceability of Smart Contracts under the Indian Contract Act (1872) raises doubts about how these contracts are formed and whether an electronic record of offer and acceptance can constitute a valid formation. In addition, because Smart Contracts are irrevocable, issues related to the post-execution applicability of Smart Contracts will likely arise (i.e., duress, fraud, etc.). The Supreme Court of India has used Electronic Transactions Jurisprudence to establish that all digital authenticated acts have equal validity as original documents.

The enforcement verification of an arbitration award pursuant to Section 34 will determine:

- Whether notice was given to the party requesting enforcement in sufficient detail to satisfy the requirements of due process;

- Whether that entity had an opportunity to present its position during the arbitration process; and

- Whether the arbitration award is supported by a reasoned decision. The question as to the

enforcement of arbitration awards currently has no Indian precedent.

There are also several other issues, including Private Key (PK) security, Smart Contract Bugs, and Blockchain Scalability, which were brought to light in the decision of **Tulip Trading Ltd v. Bitcoin Association for BSV** [7] (England and Wales HC, 2023). The decision confirmed that the immutability of Blockchain can affect the applicability of contractual interpretation. Therefore, it is recommended that India examine the potential for amending legislation/regulations to enable the recognition and regulation of Blockchain Agreed and Smart Contracts.

E-MEDIATION PLATFORMS AND THE DIGITAL DIVIDE IN INDIA

As such, the rural-urban divide in access to the Internet and to computer technology will continue to limit the potential for successful implementation of ODR and the opportunities for ADR to benefit people living in rural areas of India until such time as adequate infrastructure can be provided. The disparity is compounded by infrastructure issues: the inconsistent availability of electricity; the lack of reliable mobile telephones; the lack of fixed broadband connection; the multiple hands through which devices are passed, resulting in diminished levels of privacy during virtual hearings; the absence of a local source of technical support that makes troubleshooting impossible, to include, as noted in Law Commission reports, the inability of rural India to access the judicial system unless there are community internet centres or community mediation centres where parties can meet. Digital literacy is also a factor of stratification; those people who are not familiar with using technology (such as those over the age of 45) generally lack the ability to log in to the required platforms; upload documents to those platforms; communicate via video, and execute digital signatures. Language exacerbates exclusion because most ODR platforms function primarily in English despite India's 22 official languages and numerous regional tongues; although certain initiatives such as e-Lok Adalats offer regional language interfaces, NITI Aayog has identified linguistic inclusion as a critical missing element, with non-English speakers—such as farmers in Tamil Nadu or traders in Marathi-speaking regions—effectively barred from articulating claims on English-only platforms. This shift from deeply embedded informal rural mechanisms—panchayat forums, community mediation by elders, caste- and religion-based settlement practices conducted in local idioms—to formal, document-heavy, English-medium ODR systems can feel culturally

7 [2022] EWHC 667 (Ch)

alien, disrupting trusted modes of norm-based dispute resolution without offering an accessible substitute. For marginalized communities, the celebrated cost-efficiency of ODR (reduced travel, quicker outcomes) is offset by device costs, recurring internet expenses, and the opportunity cost of time spent acquiring digital skills, such that a smartphone priced at ₹5,000–10,000 and monthly plans of ₹200–500 may be prohibitive relative to daily wages, a reality reflected in National Legal Services Authority (NALSA) data showing continued preference for Lok Adalats and community-based forums among agricultural labourers, small farmers, and daily-wage workers. These economic and infrastructural barriers intersect with social hierarchies: women in conservative communities often lack independent control over devices or connectivity; many ODR platforms remain inaccessible to persons with disabilities due to weak screen-reader compatibility, inadequate captioning, and poor assistive-technology design; and linguistic minorities, already disadvantaged in formal courts, find themselves doubly excluded online, concerns explicitly raised in NALSA's 2023 report warning that poorly designed digital mechanisms risk institutionalizing a "two-tier justice system" favouring the digitally enabled. In practice, ODR can thus reproduce, or even intensify, structural inequalities: corporations and urban repeat players harness sophisticated platforms to secure faster, cheaper resolutions, while marginalized rural disputants lacking connectivity or literacy are left with overburdened formal courts, raising constitutional concerns under Articles 14, 15, and 21, which guarantee equality before law, non-discrimination, and fair procedure. These dynamics generate clear policy imperatives: large-scale public investment in rural broadband, community internet centres, and structured digital literacy programs; robust platform localization through support for all 22 official languages, culturally attuned interfaces, and built-in accessibility features; supported access models combining technology with human facilitation by community paralegals, NGOs, and state-funded mediators; and mandatory ex ante impact assessments to evaluate how ODR expansions affect marginalized constituencies and to design mitigation strategies so that technology-enhanced ADR advances, rather than undermines, substantive access to justice

FUTURE ROADMAP AND POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR TECHNOLOGY-ENABLED ADR IN INDIA

The Online Dispute Resolution (ODR) landscape in India is characterized by significant fragmentation. While the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 allows for virtual hearings by interpretive means, there is no specific ODR legislative framework in India. There are many

court-specific standing orders, many platform-specific procedural rules and many sector-specific regulations that lead to a lack of procedure consistency, uncertainty in enforcement and the ability for parties to engage in forum shopping (choosing an ODR platform that may favor their interests) when resolving disputes that are considered to be the same. Therefore, a cohesive Online Dispute Resolution Act is necessary and should include clarifying the scope for consumer, commercial and civil disputes (with an optional/mandatory tier system), platform licensing (with operational, data security, auditing requirements), standard notice/authentication/evidence/records protocols, standards for interoperability/accessibility/AI Transparency, provisions for direct enforcement similar to the enforcement of arbitral awards under Section 34 (the New Act would be very restrictive on the number of times a disputant can appeal in order to challenge enforceability of an arbitral award), consumer protections (cooling-off periods/withdrawal options/escalation paths/consumer hotlines), digital personal data protection-compliant data protocols under Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023; ODR Rules, UNCITRAL (2021); EU Consumer ADR Directive (2013) and Singapore Virtual Arbitration Statute model provisions; and powers to the Arbitration Council of India to certify ODR Platforms, conduct Technology training in AI and Blockchain, and conduct research in the field of ODR. Institutional accreditation should require secure, reliable and accessible Infrastructure, as well as provide ethical, professional, transparent and accountable services. Judges need to be trained to resolve disputes through ODR, AI and Blockchain technology under Sections 9, 34 and 37 of the New Act. A balance between innovation and justice is essential: the potential for AI bias, rigidity in Blockchain, and access to justice barriers all need a human component for oversight to ensure transparency, contestability and accountability, with focused efforts to increase Access to Justice, due process and fairness through the inclusion of all parties through proactive solutions.

CONCLUSION

The recognition of technology's role within Alternative (ADR) within India's evolving means of having access to Justice, fast-tracked into real-life applications due to COVID-19, was made official when courts and private ODR platforms were able to hold successful virtual mediations, hearings, and arbitrations for clients. The main findings of this research were as follows: The courts and ODRs of India (Supreme Court, High Courts, and ODR) were well-prepared for the use of technology; The Arbitration and Conciliation Act of 1996 (ACA) lacked the necessary regulatory provisions for the incorporation of digital mediums; and ODRs would continue to

grow and expand throughout India, with technology producing both positive and negative effects, including Algorithm Biases and a possible violation of the rights of individuals as guaranteed by the Indian Constitution (i.e., Article 14 through 21). Blockchain technology has the potential for the permanent storage of records through the use of smart contracts and has received international verification (through the Kleros case in Mexico in 2021), however, to date, there are no provisions in the Indian legal framework that recognise the use of blockchain technology. Furthermore, the research found a significant digital divide (Rural – Urban) with respect to the lack of Access, Literacy, and Language, which disproportionately impacts Women, Disabled People, and Minorities in India, creating the potential for a dual justice system that contravenes the rights granted under Articles 14, 15, and 21. With these findings, it is clear that an ODR statute, combined with an ODR Council, is needed to develop a unified and consistent framework for consumer protection, develop an Arbitration Council to certify and train Arbiter, create and foster an equal playing experience through the localization of Online Dispute Resolution and accompanying support for the increased access and usability of ODR technology and to build the Infrastructure necessary to deliver broadband Internet Services to Rural Areas.