EVOLUTION OF ANCIENT INDIAN JUDICIAL SYSTEM

Asst. Prof. Nilam Pansare[1], Dr. Satish Mane[2] & Asst. Prof. Deepika Patil[3]

ABSTRACT

This research paper critically examines the ancient Indian judicial systems, philosophical base, institutional structure and procedure which is deep rooted in the universal principle of Dharma. Far from primitive, ancient Indian jurisprudence was a combination of spiritual ethics and legal reasoning with variety of society drawn from sources like the Vedas, Smritis, Arthashastra, customary laws, and royal edicts. The present study speaks about hierarchical court system - from family (kula) to royal (Sasita) courts - exploring features such as judicial independence, ethical qualifications for judges, codified procedure and community based dispute resolution. A comparative analysis with modern Indian Judiciary vividly reveals constant continuities, especially in decentralized justice, legal ethics and recognition of customary law. This paper illustrates the impact of ancient jurisprudence on contemporary constitutional interpretation and reforms, evident in judicial pronouncements and ADR systems like gramnyayalay and Lok Adalats. Ultimately, it concludes that India's ancient legal system is incorporated into the modern judicial system, as its soul, culture, and spirituality are seen while delivering justice.

Keywords: Dharma, Judiciary, Vyavahara, Ancient India, Modern Judiciary, Legal History

[1] Asst. Prof., Bharati Vidyapeeths Yashwantrao Chavan Law College, Karad
[2] I/c Principal, Bharati Vidyapeeths Yashwantrao Chavan Law College, Karad
[3] Asst. Prof., Bharati Vidyapeeths Yashwantrao Chavan Law College, Karad

1. Introduction

India's legal heritage is amongst the oldest and systematic judicial traditions in human history having subcontinents rich civilization. India's early legal system was remarkably advanced having spiritual beliefs, cultural values and philosophical outlook at its base which is vivid that ancient law was at primitive stage. Law was not merely an instrument for state control but an expression of Dharma - eternal principle of cosmic order, moral duty and righteous conduct guiding every aspect of life.

Ancient Indian jurisprudence is unpopular in world due to its holistic approach to justice. Judicial decisions were not confined to rigid rules but aimed at achieving fairness, upholding ethical values and maintaining social harmony. This ancient philosophy act as an alternative of modern legal system dominated by strict positivism uniting law, morality and spirituality into a unified whole. This perspective disproves that per-colonial India was lacking genuine legal institutions.

Many researchers reveal that India had a well developed dispute resolution system dating back to the Neolithic period (around 5000 BCE). Maine religious text and archaeological evidence highlights well structured legal and judicial institutions, fair procedure, various branches of laws as civil, criminal and personal which proves mature legal conscience long before colonial rule. These insights defeats the colonial myths of India's legal backwardness.

This study used doctrinal research to explore these ancient legal principles, their philosophical foundations, institutional structure and well settled procedure. Beyond historical analysis, it shows meaningful influence on modern Indian judicial interpretations which continues to influence contemporary law. Through various landmark cases, courts have referenced this ancient wisdom. The paper restores India's legal heritage in global jurisprudence and unconditionally highlights its ongoing relevance to modern legal thought.

2. Dharma and The Idea of Justice

In The "Indian Judicial System: A historical survey", justice S. S. Dhavan paints a vivid picture of ancient judiciary that impress even modern legal minds. Far from being primitive, the system boasted judges renowned for their wisdom, fairness and independence- qualities that remain aspirational today. Same like today, hierarchical court system with chief justice (pradvivaka)

presiding over lower benches and appeals were well established right. Basic principles of judicial proceeding which we follow today were available such as formal pleadings, evidence based hearing and reasoned judgment. The accused enjoyed presumption of innocence, systematic stages were present in civil cases and doctrine of res judicata (preventing retrial of settled matters) were already in play. Panel of judges were available for hearing matters except the king which was apex head. To deliver justice without favour or fear was the guiding principle.

The concept of Dharma in ancient India crossed religious boundaries. Manu didn't use the word Hindu. Instead Dharma was universal moral framework applicable to believers atheists and all communities a like. Manusmriti says the Vedas as the supreme source of Dharma, declaring any law contradicting them as adharma (unrighteous). Kings were duty bound to ensure laws also respected local customs. Text's wordings provides, "Justice, when violated destroys, when upheld, it preserves. Therefore, never violate justice, lest justice's violation destroys us." In this principle lies the genius of ancient Indian jurisprudence -It blended spiritual wisdom with practical governance creating a state control system where ethical duty (Dharma) and legal authority worked in harmony to strengthen society.

3. Sources of Ancient Indian Jurisprudence

Ancient India had a well-developed legal system based on different sources. These are religious preachings, ideas of learned scholars, local customs and traditions and rules made by king. These helped to give real justice by giving fair and flexible justice system to meet the needs of different people and situations.

A) Shruti :The Divine Foundation

The Vedas, known as Shruti or "that which was heard, " constituted the most authoritative source of ancient Indian jurisprudence. These sacred texts, particularly the Rig Veda, established Dharma as the fundamental principle governing both cosmic order and human conduct. The concept of Dharma included moral values social duties and religious principle, not just legal rules. The veda's emphasized Rita (cosmic order) and Satya (truth) which guided people to live honestly and helpto ensure justice in society.

B) Smriti: Practical Legal Learning

The Smriti literature means, ” that which was remembered” explained and organised the principles of the Vedas into practical laws. Legal luminaries such as Manu, Yajanvalkya and Narada wrote dharmshastra to guide people and judges in legal matters. Manusmriti texts provided valuable rules on civil disputes, criminal laws and punishments and also personal laws. It was considered important legal text in ancient India although some ideas are debated today.The Smriti's text were flexible because they adopted legal rules which were useful to changing social conditions while considering basic principle of Dharma. Smritis also emphasized that judges should be virtuous and follow ethical principles while deciding litigations.

Well known Smritis and their Principles

Manusmriti- The Manusmriti or Mānava-Dharmaśāstra became one of the most influential texts in the history of Hindu legal thought. It addresses social duties, family relations, property, offences, punishment and the responsibilities of rulers. It is important as a historical source, but its provisions must be read critically because ancient social classifications and penalties cannot simply be carried into a modern constitutional framework.

Yajnavalkya and Other Jurists-Yajnavalkya Smriti is particularly significant for its systematic treatment of legal procedure. The broader Dharmaśāstra tradition also includes Narada and other juristic voices. Their importance lies not only in the rules they state but in the development of legal categories, procedural reasoning and methods of interpreting competing norms.

C) Custom: The living law

Achara or customs and traditions were an important source of law in ancient India. Local customs governing marriage, inheritance, trade and community relations were treated as written law provided they are in confirm with the spirit of Dharma. This permitted different regions and communities to follow their own customary laws while remaining the part of same unified legal system. Courts always respected and enforced these customs whenever they were well established. This made the legal system flexible and helped to maintain unity in cultural diversity. This feature continues in India's personal system today also.

D) **Rajshasana: Royal orders**

In ancient India, kings were exercising power to legislate through Raj shasana (Royal orders) especially when existing laws did not deal with a particular issue. These Royal edicts ensured to solve new problems and meet the changing circumstances. The edicts of emperor Ashoka are good examples of such royal orders. They promoted the principles of Dharma while also addressing the needs of people. This system made the legal framework more flexible allowing for innovation in consonance with Dharma.

4. Ancient India's Judicial Hierarchy: A system ahead of its time

The ancient India's judicial system was well organized that was closely similar with modern judicial institutions. Kautilya's Arthshastra and Katyayana Smriti reveals clear hierarchy of courts ensuring justice at different level from villages to the king's court. At the local level, Kula (family courts) were established where disputes were first settled within the family or community. Respected family elders decided cases related to inheritance, marriage and family disputes. Shreni courts are headed by merchants and artisans dealing with trade and business disputes by using customs and rules of their profession. This system ensured dispute resolution system quickly and fairly. Village assemblies, known as gana acted as local courts that resolved civil and minor criminal disputes according to local customs and traditions. Above gana, there were adhikrita courts, established by the king which dealt with more serious and complex cases requiring formal legal decisions. Apex court was the sasita or Kings court presided over by king and his chief judges to hear appeals and major legal matters. The Mauryan Empire established courts at various administrative level to ensure justice to all. Sthaniya courts handled cases from 800 villages whereas sangrahana courts was dealing with cases from smaller clusters of ten villages. These courts were administered by panels of ministers and jurists. Like modern circuit courts, they brought access to justice to people of different regions.

Judicial appointments in ancient India where based on rigorous qualifications emphasizing both legal knowledge and moral integrity. Judges had to master substantive law (Dharma), procedural law (vyavahara), rules of evidence (pramanjana) and logic (tarka). In addition to these they also had ethical virtues and freedom from greed. These qualifications ensured fair justice and public confidence. The principle of independence of judiciary was known to ancient India before the formal doctrine of separation of powers emerged in modern days. Dharma (moral law) was considered supreme that the king, rulers and judges had to follow law and

deliver justice without fear or favour. Judicial misconduct including bribes or inappropriate communications with litigants was punished severely reflecting importance of judicial integrity. Ancient India also had advocates called niyogis who assist people for fair representation in court by charging regular fees and ethical rules. Ancient Indian courts followed properly fair procedure along with spiritual and ethical considerations by creating balanced system that respected both letter and spirit of law. While deciding cases careful examination of evidence on whom burden of proof lies and gave reasoned judgments. Oaths and ordeals were used to determine the truth where as in modern courts we rely on scientific methods and investigation instead.

In sum, the ancient Indian judicial system was a royal authority whereas legal courts were dealing with most of disputes. Dharma was supreme over all systems. Modern Indian legal thinking is influenced by the Dharma and show the interplay between law, ethics and good governance.

5. Procedure and Evidence

The court process in ancient India was precise and clear. An aggrieved person had to submit a pratijana (plaint) to the court which clearly and systematically explained facts of the case. The defendant then filed an Uttara (written statement) to answer the claims made against him. During hearing of case judges had authority to issue asedha (injunctions) to prevent further harm while the case was being decided. The proper procedure ensured to resolve disputes methodically and fairly.

Both parties had to pay court fees. The losing party paid 5% of claimed amount as court fees while the winner contribute an equal share. This discourage false and frivolous lawsuits and encouraged people to approach the courts with genuine disputes. Trias were concluded on the principles of dharmashastras, to find out the truth. The burden of proof rested on the person making accusation. Witnesses were playing pivotal role and could appear voluntarily or be summoned by the court when necessary. Their testimonies were examined to ensure fair and just decision to uphold the integrity of justice.

Judgements in ancient India where remarkable return in a document called Jaya Patra. The contents of Jaya Patra included claims of both parties evidence recorded legal issues in question arguments of both parties loss applied judges opinions when there was more than one judge

final decision and the courts official seal. Judges had to decide cases on the basis of justice fairness and good conscience. Detail judgements ensured transparency and acted as precedent for future cases.

Dharma-danda synthesis - Moral order and enforcement

According to V Saathiya, the ancient Indian legal system balanced Dharma (moral law) and danda (punishment). Dharma provided the principles of right and wrong Danda served as an instrument for enforcement through proper punishment. This system show that justice required both moral values and its effective implementation. To do real and fair justice, honest and responsible rulers and judges are needed. The ancient Indian law made a combination of morality, customs, good governance and Royal authority to create a strong and balanced legal system

Criminal justice was initiated either by royal decree or citizen complaint and treated with utmost seriousness. Crimes were classified on the basis of severity as minor offenders (Apradhas), serious offences (Pathakas), and threats to state security (Chalas). This classification was permitted, ensuring reasonableness in punishments and the gravity of crime. The philosophy behind punishment (Danda) was to maintain social order. Ancient texts such as the Mahabharata emphasised punishment as a shield protecting the basic rights of life, moral order (Dharma), prosperity(Artha) and personal fulfilment (Kama). The forms of punishment ranging from verbal warning (*Vagdanda*) public censure (*Dhigdanda*) to fines (*Dhanadanda*), physical penalties (*Angaccheda*), in most severe cases capital punishment (*Vadhadanda*). The convicted persons respond to guidance, some require correction and few must be removed from society to protect society. Ancient criminal judicial system stated that it's not a primitive code but sophisticated judicial procedure based on Dharma and morality. The clear documentation, shared accountability, evidence-based trials, detailed judgments, and proportionate punishment are relevant to modern justice systems.

6. Community Justice and KHAP Panchayat

The KHAP Panchayat is a traditional, caste-based community organization that has existed for over 800 years, primarily in the northwestern regions of India such as Haryana, western Uttar Pradesh, parts of Rajasthan, and Punjab. The term "Khap" denotes a cluster of villages, often belonging to the same gotra (clan), predominantly of the Jat community. These Khaps are

governed by an informal body of elders or leaders, known as the Panchayat, which serves to resolve disputes and maintain social discipline within the community.

The origins of Khap Panchayats date back to around the 12th or 13th century CE, functioning independently of state control. They operated based on customary laws and social norms rather than written legal codes. Their decisions often reflected conservative moral codes, especially on matters related to marriage, family honor, property rights, and clan conduct. Over time, these Panchayats became known for their strict opposition to intra-gotra and inter-caste marriages, issuing extrajudicial dictates and sometimes supporting actions such as honour killings, which brought them into direct conflict with constitutional law.

In modern India, KHAP Panchayats are not legally recognized, and their interference in personal liberty has been strongly condemned by the judiciary. In Lata Singh v. State of U.P. (2006), the Supreme Court ruled that adult individuals have the right to marry as per their will, and interference by extra-constitutional bodies like Khap Panchayats is illegal. More explicitly, in Shakti Vahini v. Union of India (2018), the Court held that any assembly intended to interfere in the consensual marriage of two adults is illegal and mandated the government to take preventive action. Despite this, Khap Panchayats still wield significant influence in rural society, especially where modern judicial institutions are inaccessible or viewed with scepticism.

7. Judicial System during the Mughal Empire (1526–1857 CE)

The Mughal Empire, which ruled large parts of India from 1526 to 1857 CE, developed a hierarchical and organized judicial system largely based on Islamic law (Sharia), alongside administrative decrees issued by the Emperor. The Emperor (Badshah) was the supreme judicial authority. His court functioned as the highest appellate and constitutional body, and he had the power to appoint judges, issue royal decrees (farmans), and override any judicial decision.

At the top of the judiciary was the Qazi-ul-Quzat (Chief Qazi), who supervised all lower courts and reported directly to the Emperor. Below him, Qazis were appointed in provinces and towns to adjudicate both civil and criminal cases, particularly among Muslims. These Qazis based their judgments on the Hanafi school of Islamic jurisprudence, and often consulted Muftis, who issued legal opinions (fatwas) to assist in the decision-making process. In addition, Kotwals

were appointed in towns and cities as local magistrates and police officers, responsible for maintaining public order and investigating criminal matters.

The Mughal legal system also incorporated non-Muslim customs to an extent. In matters involving Hindus, local village Panchayats and community leaders (such as Brahmins or elders) were often allowed to apply customary laws to resolve disputes, especially in rural areas. Moreover, Zamindars landholding elites sometimes acted as informal adjudicators within their domains. Revenue-related disputes were generally settled by Diwans, the financial officers in the Mughal administration.

Although no codified criminal law existed, the judicial process was documented through court records, fatwas, and royal farmans. The Mughal judiciary functioned with a blend of centralized Islamic legal principles and decentralized customary law, depending on the social and religious identity of the litigants. Over time, particularly under Emperor Akbar (1556–1605), there was a deliberate effort to introduce legal pluralism, such as the abolition of jizya (a tax on non-Muslims) and tolerance of non-Islamic practices in civil matters.

The KHAP Panchayat and the Mughal judicial system reflect two different models of pre-modern justice in India one rooted in customary clan-based authority, and the other in a centralized imperial religious-legal framework. While Khap Panchayats still function in parts of rural India today albeit outside the scope of constitutional legality the Mughal system was replaced by British colonial legal institutions post-1857. Both systems, however, played a formative role in the historical evolution of India's judicial culture, especially in how religion, community norms, and state power interact in the delivery of justice.

8. Ancient and Modern Indian Judiciary: A comparative View

A comparison between the ancient and modern Indian judiciary shows that while both systems aimed to deliver justice, they differed significantly in their legal foundations, structure, procedures, and values. At the same time, certain principles such as fairness, impartiality, and the importance of an organized judicial system have continued across time. The ancient Indian judiciary was based on the concept of Dharma**,** which combined law with morality, ethics, and religious principles. Judicial decisions were guided by texts such as the Manusmriti*,* Arthashastra*,* the Vedas, and other Smritis. In contrast, the modern Indian judiciary derives its authority from the Constitution of India and laws enacted by Parliament, ensuring that justice

is administered according to constitutional principles and statutory provisions.

Judges in ancient India were generally Brahmin scholars, learned jurists, or royal appointees who were expected to possess legal knowledge and high moral character. Today, judges are trained legal professionals appointed through a constitutionally prescribed process based on legal qualifications, experience, and judicial competence, ensuring greater professionalism and institutional independence.

The court system in ancient India followed a hierarchical structure, beginning with village and family-level courts and progressing through higher judicial authorities to the king's court as the final appellate authority. Similarly, the modern judiciary has a well-defined hierarchy consisting of **District Courts, High Courts, and the Supreme Court of India**, with clearly established appellate mechanisms.

Judicial procedures also differ considerably. Ancient courts relied mainly on oral arguments, customs, moral principles, and religious practices**,** with less emphasis on written records. In contrast, the modern judicial system follows codified procedures, written pleadings, documentary evidence, and detailed statutory rules under procedural laws, ensuring greater consistency and transparency.

Access to justice has undergone a major transformation. In ancient India, access was often influenced by caste, gender, and social status, although local institutions provided dispute resolution within communities. Modern India guarantees **equality before the law under Article 14 of the Constitution**, ensuring that every individual has the right to seek justice regardless of caste, religion, gender, or economic background.

The appeals process has also become more structured. Ancient judicial decisions could be reviewed by higher authorities within the judicial hierarchy, but there was no uniform appellate framework. The modern judiciary provides a formal multi-tier system of appeals, allowing litigants to challenge decisions before higher courts, including the High Courts and the Supreme Court.

The philosophy of punishment has evolved significantly. Ancient Indian law prescribed fines, corporal punishments, exile, and even capital punishment**,** often depending on the gravity of the offence and the offender's social status. Modern criminal justice emphasizes reformation,

rehabilitation, and the protection of human rights, while ensuring that punishment is imposed through due process of law.

Legal representation has also changed over time. In ancient India, parties were sometimes assisted by Niyogis, who acted as informal legal representatives or advisers. In contrast, modern India has a well-regulated legal profession consisting of licensed advocates governed by the Advocates Act, 1961, ensuring professional standards and effective legal representation.

Overall, the modern Indian judiciary reflects a shift from a **Dharma-based, morality-oriented system** to a **constitutional, rights-based legal framework**. Nevertheless, the ancient emphasis on justice, judicial ethics, and impartial decision-making continues to influence the values and ideals of the contemporary judicial system.

9. References to Ancient Principles in Modern Indian Jurisprudence

The judicial legacy of ancient India is more than a cultural artifact; it substantively informs contemporary legal practices in India. Core philosophical concepts such as *Dharma*, structural innovations like community-based justice, and foundational principles of judicial ethics have been actively referenced and integrated into constitutional interpretation, institutional frameworks, and judicial conduct within modern Indian jurisprudence.

a. Dharma as the Ethical Foundation of Constitutional Values

The ancient principle of *Dharma*—encompassing justice, duty, and righteousness—continues to serve as a moral compass in India's constitutional framework. The Supreme Court has invoked *Dharma* to articulate immutable constitutional values transcending transient political powers. In Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala[4], Justice Mathew emphasized that Indian law historically emanated from *Dharma*, a universal and pre-existing norm above the sovereign's will. Similarly, in Indira Nehru Gandhi v. Raj Narain[5], the Court reiterated *Dharma* as a safeguard against arbitrary state action, rooting constitutionalism in ethical governance.

b. Panchayat Justice and Decentralized Legal Authority

Ancient community-based judicial bodies such as Kula, Shreni, and Gana councils represent

[4] *Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala*, AIR 1973 SC 1461 (India).
[5] *Indira Nehru Gandhi v. Raj Narain*, AIR 1975 SC 2299 (India).

early grassroots legal mechanisms. These local assemblies administered justice in familial, professional, and village contexts, respectively. The modern Indian legal system institutionalizes this legacy through the Gram Nyayalayas Act, 2008 and Lok Adalats under the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Landmark cases like Bhim Singh v. Union of India[6] underscore the importance of accessible, speedy justice at the local level, reflecting the participatory ethos and efficiency characteristic of ancient village courts.

c. Codification and Legal Textualism

Ancient legal treatises such as the Manusmriti, Yajnavalkya Smriti, and Arthashastra pioneered systematic codification by organizing rules on duties, procedures, and penalties. This tradition of legal codification predates colonial influences and underpins modern statutory frameworks. The Supreme Court in Lily Thomas v. Union of India[7], acknowledged India's longstanding engagement with written legal principles, reinforcing the legitimacy and continuity of codified law in Indian jurisprudence.

d. Judicial Ethics and Independence

The ideal of judicial impartiality, courage, and deep legal expertise is rooted in ancient texts, which mandated judges be virtuous and loyal solely to justice. This tradition resonates in modern judicial ethics. For instance, Justice C.S. Karnan's[8]reaffirmed the judiciary's role as a moral compass and underscored the consequences of misconduct, echoing ancient prescriptions for judicial integrity. Moreover, the principle that even sovereign power is subordinate to law, found in ancient doctrines, parallels today's doctrine of separation of powers. In State of Bihar v. Bal Mukund Shah[9], the Supreme Court emphasized judicial independence as foundational to democracy.

f. Other Notable Judgments Reflecting Ancient Principles

- In Ram Krishna Dalmia v. Justice S.R. Tendolkar[10], the Court recognized impartial public administration as rooted in Indian tradition and *Dharma*.

[6] *Bhim Singh v. Union of India*, AIR 1981 SC 234 (India).
[7] *Lily Thomas v. Union of India*, (2000) 6 SCC 224 (India).
[8] *In re Justice C.S. Karnan*, (2017) 7 SCC 1 (India).
[9] *State of Bihar v. Bal Mukund Shah*, AIR 2000 SC 1296 (India).
[10] *Ram Krishna Dalmia v. Justice S.R. Tendolkar*, AIR 1958 SC 538 (India).

- Mohd. Ahmed Khan v. Shah Bano Begum[11] referenced Smriti texts emphasizing the sovereign's role in protecting vulnerable groups.

- State of Bihar v. Bihar Distillery Ltd[12]. invoked *Arthashastra* to justify state regulatory powers.

- Sarla Mudgal v. Union of India [13]drew on ancient principles supporting calls for a Uniform Civil Code, underscoring the sanctity of marriage.

10. Influence on Modern Jurisprudence

- **Decentralized Governance**: The Panchayati Raj system, empowering local self-governance, is a direct descendant of ancient village assemblies (*Gana*) and guild councils (*Shreni*), reinforcing grassroots dispute resolution.

- **Judicial Ethics and Integrity**: Ancient injunctions on judges' honesty, impartiality, and legal proficiency remain central to contemporary judicial conduct and public trust.

- **Codification of Laws**: The early systematic legal compilations inspired the development of foundational modern statutes like the Indian Penal Code and Civil Procedure Code, enabling structured adjudication.

- **Recognition of Customary and Personal Laws**: The pluralistic acceptance of diverse community-specific customs in ancient times is reflected today in India's accommodation of religious and personal laws.

- **Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR):** Modern mechanisms such as Lok Adalats and mediation find their philosophical antecedents in ancient consensual and reconciliatory dispute-resolution methods, emphasizing harmony over adversarial processes.

This continuum from ancient jurisprudence to contemporary legal practices illustrates how modern India's judiciary is deeply anchored in historical legal wisdom. It synthesizes time-tested ethical values, procedural rigor, and decentralized justice to create a uniquely Indian

[11] *Mohd. Ahmed Khan v. Shah Bano Begum*, AIR 1985 SC 945 (India).
[12] *State of Bihar v. Bihar Distillery Ltd.*, AIR 1997 SC 1511 (India).
[13] *Sarla Mudgal v. Union of India*, AIR 1995 SC 1531 (India).

legal identity that honours its rich past while addressing present-day challenges.

CONCLUSION

The ancient Indian judicial system based on universal principle of Dharma was a remarkably advanced and moral spiritual legal tradition. Dharma in the context of legal and constitutional history only means Vyavahara-dharma and Rajdharma evolve by the society through the ages which is binding both on the king and the people Unlike modern heavy procedural justice system it combined legal reasoning with moral values delivering justice with spirituality. It's stratified court system, strict judicial standards, respect for customs and impartial justice proved a socialized ancient judicial system far ahead of its time. This heritage continues to shape modern Indian law as seen in constitutional interpretation, decentralized dispute resolution and judicial ethics. Institutions such as Lok Adalats, Gram Nyayalayas, and the Panchayati Raj system prove that traditional judiciary system adopted for today's needs. Judicial integrity, impartiality, courage find its roots to ancient India. Inculcating this legacy India is not looking back but moving forward toward curturally and morally grounded justice system. India's ancient jurisprudence proves effective and inspire meaning reform and judicial excellence in the modern era.

Bibliography

Reference books

1) Kautilya, *The Arthashastra* (L.N. Rangarajan trans., Penguin Books 1992).

2) Manu, *Manusmriti* (G. Bühler trans., Sacred Books of the East vol. 25, Oxford Univ. Press 1886).

3) Yajnavalkya, *Yajnavalkya Smriti* (P.V. Kane ed., 1918).

4) Katyayana, *Katyayana Smriti*, in P.V. Kane, *History of Dharmaśāstra*, vol. 3 (Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute 1946).

5) S.S. Dhavan, *The Indian Judicial System: A Historical Survey*, Law Commission of India, available at https://lawcommissionofindia.nic.in/.

6) Patrick Olivelle, *Dharmasutras: The Law Codes of Ancient India* (Oxford Univ. Press 2000).

7) Robert Lingat, *The Classical Law of India* (J. Duncan M. Derrett trans., Univ. of California Press 1973).

8) B.N. Pandey, *Ancient Indian Legal Thought: A Reflection*, *BHU Law Journal* 7 (2008).

Research Papers

1) Dr. Shikha, *Evolution of Judicial System in Ancient India: An Analytical Study*, 4 Int'l J. Educ. & Sci. Rsch. Rev. 163 (2017), https://www.ijesrr.org.

2) Pooja Umashankar, *Study of the Judiciary and Administration in Ancient India with Special Reference to Manusmriti and Arthashastra and its Relevance in Present Indian System*, 5 Int'l J.L. Mgmt. & Hum. 534 (2022), https://doi.org/10.10000/IJLMH.112859.

3) V. Sathiya, *Judicial Institutions in Ancient India*, *Journal of Legal and Historical Studies* 45 (2010).

4) Rajendra Kumar, *Legal Systems in Ancient India*, *Indian Historical Review* 37(2): 223–240 (2010).