Plea Bargaining in Criminal Justice Systems: A Comparative Study of India, the United States, and Australia

Simran

University of Delhi, New Delhi, India

[1]*Date of Receiving:25 August 2024*
Date of Acceptance:27 September 2024
Date of Publication: 09 October 2024

Abstract

A comparison and contrast of the approaches of plea bargaining that are used in the criminal justice systems of the United States of America, Australia, and India is shown in this article. The article goes into the subject of plea bargaining and discusses the ways in which it may be employed to enhance the efficiency of the court system, reduce the number of pending trials, expedite the process of justice for those who have been accused, and save money for the state. In reaction to prolonged pre-trial detentions and chronic case pendency, India enacted a statutory plea-bargaining chapter in 2005 (which went into effect in 2006). The United States of America, on the other hand, was an early user of the approach via its legal precedents, and it is now the norm for case resolution, which results in the majority of criminal convictions. In spite of the fact that there is no clear legislative structure for plea bargaining in Australia, early guilty pleas are made easier by the discretion of the prosecution and informal agreements. The study sheds light on significant differences across the three nations in terms of the levels of institutionalization, legal frameworks, and implementation strategies. There are a number of ethical difficulties that are addressed by it, including coercion, unfair bargaining power, and compromised justice. In conclusion, the paper advocates for legislative amendments, procedural safeguards, and more transparency in order to provide plea bargaining with the potential to become an acceptable and effective component of the contemporary criminal justice systems.

Keywords: *Plea Bargaining; Criminal Justice System; India; United States; Australia; Comparative Legal Study; Judicial Efficiency; Case Backlog; Pre-trial Detention; Prosecutorial Discretion*

1. Introduction

The practice of plea bargaining, which involves negotiated agreements in which the accused consents to plead guilty in exchange for concessions such as reduced charges or sentence reductions, is an essential component of many criminal justice systems across the world. The reduction of case backlogs and the acceleration of the conclusion of criminal proceedings are the primary objectives of this initiative.[2] Plea bargains, which were originally introduced in the United States in the 1800s, ultimately became the usual technique of determining criminal cases, replacing full trials as the preferred approach. Because they are responsible for around 90 percent of all convictions in the United States at the present time[3], plea bargains continue to be an essential component of the American criminal justice system. In India, the Criminal Law (Amendment) Act, 2005, which codified plea bargaining as Chapter XXI-A in the Code of Criminal Procedure (CrPC), was adopted into law and eventually went into force in the year 2006. This was done with the intention of addressing the backlog of cases as well as the widespread issue of convicts who are awaiting trial yet end up spending an excessive amount of time in jail[4]. On the other hand, Australia does not have a legislation

[1]*How to cite the article:* Simran (October 2024); Plea Bargaining in Criminal Justice Systems: A Comparative Study of India, the United States, and Australia; *International Journal of Law, Management and Social Science*, Vol 8, Issue 4, 1-17.
[2] Alschuler, A. W. (1979). Plea bargaining and its history. *Columbia Law Review, 79*(1), 1–43.
[3] Bibas, S. (2004). Plea Bargaining Outside the Shadow of Trial. *Harvard Law Review, 117*(8), 2463–2547.
[4] Kumar, A. (2021). Plea Bargaining: A Comparative Analysis Between USA and India. *Indian Journal of Law and Legal Research, 3*(2), 78–90.

that specifically controls plea bargaining practices. Instead, it is dependent on informal processes that are entrenched in the traditions of common law and the discretion of the prosecutor[5].

2. Methodology

This article employs a doctrinal comparative method anchored in primary legal sources, appellate case law (e.g., Brady, Bordenkircher, Lafler, Frye; Barbaro; Olbrich), statutes and rules (CrPC ch. XXI-A; Fed. R. Crim. P. 11; Criminal Procedure Act 2009 (Vic); Criminal Procedure Act 1986 (NSW); Crimes (Sentencing Procedure) Act 1999 (NSW)), and prosecutorial policies (notably the OPP Victoria Policy), supplemented by law-reform and bench-book materials. A parallel policy analysis compares institutional design across jurisdictions using a fixed set of variables: eligibility scope, who initiates negotiations, procedural stage, the court's role (colloquy, sentence indication, acceptance/rejection criteria), transparency and victim participation, the form of negotiated benefit (discount grids vs. practice-based concessions), remedies for plea-stage ineffective assistance, and data transparency. A limited empirical synthesis triangulates official administrative statistics and evaluations (e.g., USSC federal plea percentage, BJS state-level plea rates, and BOCSAR's EAGP evaluations) to see whether doctrinal claims match outcomes. Selection prioritizes the most authoritative, current tools (official reporters and government publications); cases are included for precedential weight, and policies for jurisdiction-wide impact. All comparisons are normalised to this common analytic frame, and each assertion in the body is linked to the exact laws or paragraphs from which it is derived.

3. Comparative Scope and Purpose

This research compares and contrasts the three criminal justice systems in three countries: India, USA, and Australia. It focuses on the practice of plea bargaining. One of its goals is to

- Research the origins and evolution of plea bargaining as it pertains to the law in each country.
- Procedures, stakeholder participation, and implementation scope should be examined.
- Think about the pros and drawbacks of plea bargaining from an ethical and practical standpoint.
- Propose changes that safeguard the rights of the accused while also ensuring efficiency and justice.

It is vital to examine and contrast the various types of plea bargaining in order to evaluate the possible constitutional, procedural, and cultural ramifications of these strategies.

4. Historical Evolution

Rather than being formalised by law, the practice of plea bargaining developed spontaneously in the courts of the United States. During the early part of the 20th century, it received a boost from the prosecutions that took place during the Prohibition period.[6] Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, which finally institutionalised the practice, contains the provisions that regulate the acceptance of guilty pleas. The practice was further legitimised by two major Supreme Court judgements, Missouri v. Frye[7] and Lafler v. Cooper[8], which brought attention to the constitutional need that criminal defendants have access to effective legal representation during plea negotiations.

It is only very lately that the concept of plea bargaining has acquired hold in India, due to modifications in the national legislation. In its 142nd and 154th reports, the Law Commission of India recommended the use of plea bargaining as a means of reducing the amount of time that was wasted and increasing the amount of efficiency that was achieved.[9] The only circumstances in which the Criminal Procedure Code allows for plea bargaining are those in which the punishment is shorter than seven years. This is the case with the exception of offences that are harmful to the

[5] Flynn, A., & Freiberg, A. (2018). *Pleas and Sentencing in Australia.* Thomson Reuters.
[6] Langbein, J. H. (1978). *Torture and Plea Bargaining. University of Chicago Law Review, 46*(1), 3–22. *Missouri v Frye*, 566 U.S. 134 (2012).
[7] *Missouri v. Frye*, 566 U.S. 134 (2012).
[8] *Lafler v. Cooper,* 566 U.S. 156 (2012).
[9] Law Commission of India. (1996). *154th Report on the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973.*

socioeconomic position of the nation, crimes committed against women or children, and offences that are punished by death or life imprisonment.

In the country of Australia, there is no such thing as a formal plea negotiating procedure. Instead, its plea rules are determined by the standards of the prosecutor and the discretion of the judge. Although there are provisions in place to reduce sentences in order to encourage early guilty pleas, New South Wales has a front-loaded pathway, but short of a system that is equivalent to those that are in place in India or the United States. Different states and territories have different legal cultures and institutional traditions, which might have an effect on how the court participates in charge talks and makes decisions about pleas.

5. Judicial Efficiency and System Stress

A well-known benefit of plea bargaining is that it alleviates the strain that is placed on court systems that are already operating at capacity. According to Bibas (2004), the system would most likely implode if every single case in the United States proceeded to trial without any form of plea deal being reached. In addition, India is coping with a significant backlog of cases, this time including crimes, there are more than fifty million cases that are still waiting to be heard.[10] In order to reduce the amount of work that judges and prosecutors have to do and to expedite the processing of cases that are not as serious, the Indian legislature decided to implement the practice of plea bargaining. However, despite the fact that they are not legally codified, informal plea bargains have the potential to expedite the resolution of criminal cases in the courts of Australia. In contrast, Flynn and Freiberg (2018) point out that this lack of formality may result in issues with consistency and openness. They say this might be a concern[11].

6. Ethical and Procedural Concerns

Although it has its advantages, plea bargaining presents a number of moral challenges. Some people think it might be unfair since it can make defendants feel pressured to plead guilty in order to escape harsher punishments. Some worry that defendants from under-represented groups or with lower levels of education won't completely grasp the gravity of their plea deals. Problems like these are worse in India since people don't know their procedural rights and there is a lack of equality in access to lawyers. The absence of official regulations in Australia causes significant variation in plea processes among jurisdictions, which raises concerns about fairness and uniformity.

7. Objectives

1. To compare how plea bargaining is implemented and the legal systems in Australia, the US, and India.

2. To assess how well plea bargaining ensures justice and lessens the hardship of a trial, as well as its ethical consequences.

7.1 The Evolution of Plea Bargaining in the United States

Because the United States Constitution does not specifically mention plea bargaining, the majority of the credit for its development in the United States goes to the decisions made by the courts. It was the judicial system that first gave permission for it. New York was one of the many states that sought to make plea bargaining illegal, but in the end, they were forced to come to terms with the court system's acceptance of both the notion and the practice of plea bargaining. In cases where the courts have given their silent approval, such as People v. Brown, [12]the following occurred: the defendant went to the trial judge, pleaded guilty during the summary trial, and the appellate court reprimanded the trial judge while acknowledging the defendant's bargained guilty plea. This was the case in cases where the courts have given their silent approval. Following that, in the case of Bayliss v. People[13], the court once again gave permission for a plea bargain. However, this time, the court stipulated that the defendant, the prosecutor, and the trial judge all be present in order to verify that the defendant was not exposed to undue

[10] National Judicial Data Grid. (2022). Case Statistics: India. Retrieved from https://njdg.ecourts.gov.in
[11] National Judicial Data Grid. (2022). Case Statistics: India. Retrieved from https://njdg.ecourts.gov.in
[12] *People v. Brown*, 54 Mich. 15, 19 N.W. 571 (1884).
[13] *Bayliss v. People*, 46 Mich. 221, 9 N.W. 257 (1881).

influence or coercion. Due to the fact that the defendant in United States v. Bayaud[14] was unsuccessful in all of his attempts to negotiate a lower sentence with Washington State, the federal court decided that he was not able to back out of the arrangement that he had made with the district attorney. Consequently, the plea deal is a structured contract that has grown over time in the United States as a consequence of the legislature's tougher sanctions for even small infractions. This has led to the increase in the number of plea bargains. As a consequence of this, the reaction of the court to the legislature has been to negotiate a voluntary agreement between the state and the accused in order to secure a punishment that is fair for all parties.

7.2 Plea Bargaining's Development in India

With the passage of Chapter XXI-A in the Criminal Law (Amendment) Act, 2005, which went into effect on July 5, 2006, the concept of plea bargaining emerged as a relatively novel concept in the Indian parliament.[15] The United States of America was primarily responsible for the development of the practice of plea bargaining, but it was eventually introduced to India. As one of the reasons for the second adoption of plea bargaining, the Law Commission said in its report 142 that the accused were often spending time in jail prior to the beginning of their trials. This is one of the reasons why the law commission adopted the practice. Should they have been found guilty of that crime, the length of time they would have spent in jail would have been substantially more severe than it would have been otherwise. [16]In spite of challenges such as illiteracy and pressure from the prosecution, the Law Commission reaffirmed in its report 154 its conviction that plea bargaining had to be introduced in order to relieve the suffering of the accused who were detained and to solve the backlog in the disposition of criminal cases. [17]In accordance with the recommendations of the 174th Law Commission, which were reiterated by the 177th Law Commission, the criminal judicial system in India need to include the arrangement of plea bargains. [18]The conclusions reached by preceding law commissions were eventually validated by a report that was finally delivered to parliament by the committee that Justice V.S. Malimath was in charge of. This is due to the fact that plea bargains will assist in the process of reducing the backlog of criminal cases and will speed up the process of case disposal within the criminal justice system. In India, plea bargaining is only permitted for offenses punishable by jail for up to seven years. It is not available for offences damaging the country's socioeconomic state, crimes against women or children under the age of fourteen, or if the accused is a habitual offender.[19] [20]

7.3 Plea Bargaining Development in Australia

Australia lacks a unified national statute on plea discussions; state and territory policies and practice directions govern charge bargaining and sentence indications, subject to judicial oversight. In this particular instance, there was no formal agreement; nonetheless, the Australian court often started with a guilty plea. This was the case in the case of Ada Selman, where the accused had previously pleaded guilty to the allegations before the police court. [21]Due to the negative socio-political conditions that prevailed in the middle of the twentieth century, the Australian courts did not publicly admit plea bargaining until the 1970s or 1980s. [22] [23]The establishment of the guilty plea process on the basis of judicial interpretation was the impetus for the development of the practice of plea bargaining. [24]

---

[14] *United States v. Bayaud*, 23 F. 721 (S.D.N.Y. 1883).
[15] Government of India. (1973). *Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973* (Act No. 2 of 1974), ch. XXI-A, s. 265A. https://legislative.gov.in/
[16] *Law Commission of India. (1956). Parliamentary legislation relating to sales tax (Report No. 2).* Retrieved September 30, 2022, from Bare Acts Live: https://www.bareactslive.com/
[17] 4th Law Commission Report, (E-Parliament Library of Lok Sabha) rep.
[18] Joseph RA (Plea bargaining: A means to an end - manupatra).
[19] Government of India. (1973). *Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973* (Act No. 2 of 1974), ch. XXI-A, s. 265A. https://legislative.gov.in/
[20] Committee on Reforms of the Criminal Justice System. (2003). *Report of the Committee on Reforms of the Criminal Justice System*. Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India. Retrieved September 15, 2021, from https://www.mha.gov.in/sites/default/files/2022-08/criminal_justice_system%5B1%5D.pdf
[21] Steinberg, The Transformation of Criminal Justice, 76.
[22] Flynn, A., & Fitz-Gibbon, K. (2011). Bargaining with defensive homicide: Examining Victoria's secretive plea bargaining system post–law reform. *Melbourne University Law Review, 35*(3), 905–932; Westling, W. T. (1976). Plea bargaining: A forecast for the future. *Sydney Law Review, 7*(3), 424–432;
[23] Ferdinand, Boston's Lower Courts; Vogel, "Social Origins."; Coercion to Compromise.
[24] Cockburn, "Trial by the book? Fact and theory in the criminal process, 1558-1625", 72-73.

7.4 Plea Bargaining's Legal Framework

7.4.1 India

Chapter XXI-A of the Criminal Procedure Code (CrPC) is where the topic of plea bargaining is discussed or handled. The most important provision for the process of plea bargaining is outlined in Section 265A. To begin, plea negotiating is accessible to offences that have a potential term of less than seven years in jail. However, socioeconomic offences, crimes against women and children, and crimes for which the death penalty is applicable are not eligible for this kind of plea bargaining.

In accordance with the provisions of subclause (2) of this section, the central government is granted the ability to compile a list of unlawful offences that are not eligible for plea bargaining. The counsel for the accused may commence the process of plea bargaining; once this occurs, it is the attorney's responsibility to convince the prosecutor of the benefits of the arrangement. In line with Section 265B of the Criminal Procedure Code, an accused individual has the ability to submit a request to engage into a plea bargain while the case is still ongoing, providing that they provide an affidavit with their request. In the aftermath of this, the court will communicate with the public prosecutor, and the accused will be questioned in private throughout the process of negotiating in order to show that they are willing to participate.

The next provision is found in subsection (4) of section 265B, which asks the court to provide the public prosecutor and the accused some time to achieve a consensus. However, the rule does not define how much time the parties should have to form a consensus. A person who has been convicted of the same offence twice is not permitted to engage into a plea bargain, since this clause bans them from doing so.

Additionally, in accordance with Section 265C and Section 265D of the Criminal Procedure Code, the court is obligated to record the manner in which the parties concerned, including the accused, the prosecutor, the victim, and the investigating officer, are content with the settlement. Additionally, the judge, the prosecution, and the accused are required to sign this report at a meeting that takes place on the premises of the court. The report that has been prepared by the judicial officer who is presiding over the meeting is something that all of the parties and participants are obligated to sign.

On the other hand, the accused has the ability, as outlined in Section 265E, to have any time spent in custody credited against the total amount of time they are required to serve in jail. As soon as the court announces its judgement in line with Sections 265F and 265G, it is considered to be final and binding, and the accused is no longer able to appeal the decision to a higher court.

According to Section 265H, the court has the jurisdiction to give bail to the accused, as well as all other powers relating to the trial of charges and other matters relevant to the case, while it is also responsible for disposing of the case. Furthermore, in accordance with Section 265I of the Criminal Procedure Code, an accused individual may be entitled to deduct any time spent in jail during the course of a criminal investigation, inquiry, or trial in order to comply with Section 428 of the Criminal Procedure Code.

As a result, Section 265J is an overriding provision that stipulates that the plea bargaining agreement cannot be in contradiction with any other laws or sections of the code that are now in existence. According to Section 265K, the statements that the accused person provides in an application for plea bargaining shall only be utilised for the reasons that are mentioned in Chapter XXI-A, and not for any other reason. In accordance with the provisions of Section 2(k) of the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2000, as stated in Section 265L, Chapter XXI-A does not apply to children or juveniles.

7.4.2 USA

Within the United States of America, the judicial precedents are the ones who are responsible for the invention of plea bargaining and its continued importance. Because of the severe criminal justice system and high conviction rate in the United States, plea bargaining has developed throughout the years. As a consequence of this, persons who have been accused of a crime would prefer negotiate or enter into a deal with the state than face a trial in front of a jury. Despite the fact that the Sixth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America enshrines the idea of a fair trial, the language does not directly address plea agreements. Most bargains resolve with guilty pleas (and, where permitted, *nolo contendere*). Courts must ensure the plea is knowing, voluntary, and supported by a factual basis (Fed. R. Crim. P. 11); this indicates that they do not desire to fight the allegations that have been brought against them. Only then can a plea bargain be considered legitimate. According to the legislation that was first established in the Fox Case, the right to engage into a plea bargain did not belong to the accused but rather to the court, which had the authority to decide whether or not to allow the prosecution and defence to continue with the arrangement. [25]Due to the fact that the accused is, in effect, making an implicit confession when they enter a plea of nolo contendere, the court is required to discover the reasons for the plea before it can make a decision about the sentence. [26]In the Bordenkircher Case, the Supreme Court of the United States upheld a life sentence and upheld the validity of plea bargaining, reasoning that the accused has the right to accept or reject the prosecution's offer or demand, but also noting that the accused may be subject to coercion to accept a lesser sentence. [27]In *Brady v. United States*, the Supreme Court held that a defendant's guilty plea is not rendered involuntary merely because it was motivated by a desire to avoid a possible death sentence. The validity of the plea turns on whether it was entered knowingly and voluntarily with the advice of competent counsel and supported by an adequate factual basis. This puts judicial oversight at the center of plea practice: where courts play a significant role, the key question is whether their procedures effectively police coercion and ensure voluntariness.[28]

7.4.3 Australia

Considering the strong nature of Australia's legal system, a significant percentage of defendants in the Court of Petty Sessions enter guilty pleas on their own behalf. At this time, many defendants in criminal cases in Australia are having difficulty obtaining even the most basic legal help, and the nation does not have a statutory framework in place to facilitate plea bargaining. [29]A plea bargain is a process that, according to the customary law of Australia, starts with a proposal from the defence, continues with a meeting between the prosecution and the defence to discuss the particulars of the case, and ends in the submission of the issue to the court after an agreement has been reached. On the other hand, however, this procedure is not specifically addressed by Australian law. The decision about whether or not to accept the agreement is now in the hands of the court. However, the court must still consider a number of factors, including whether or not the actions of the accused were criminal, whether or not the prosecution has sufficient evidence to support its case, and whether or not it will spare a witness from the stress of testifying in court, whether that witness is a victim, a vulnerable witness, or someone who wants the initial charge dropped. One of the elements that pervades all of the other considerations is the public interest norm. [30]

7.5 Practical Implementation and Stakeholder Roles

Despite the fact that the practice of plea bargaining can be traced back to legislative frameworks, the manner in which it is implemented and the roles that significant stakeholders in the criminal justice system play have a significant impact on its implementation. All parties involved in the plea bargaining process, including prosecutors, defence attorneys, judges, and the accused themselves, have a stake in the outcome of the process and have the potential to influence its uniformity, efficiency, and fairness. On the other hand, the system of plea

[25] *Fox v. Scheidt,* 363 US 807.
[26] *Lott v. US*, 367 US 421.
[27] *Bordenkircher v. Hayes*, 434 US 357 (1978).
[28] *Brady v. United States*, 397 US 742 (1970).
[29] Asher Flynn and Arie Freiberg, *Plea Negotiations: An Empirical Analysis* (1st edn, Australian Institute of Criminology 2018).
[30] Office of Public Prosecutions, '*Plea Negotiations and Charge Bargaining*' (Office of Public Prosecutions, 30 August 2021).

bargaining in India and Australia is more loosely limited by legislation and prosecutorial discretion, while in the United States, there is a significant amount of institutionalisation taking place.

7.6 United States: Prosecutor-Dominated but Negotiation-Heavy

It is now common practice in the United States to settle criminal charges via a process known as plea negotiating rather than going to trial. According to BJS (2022),[31] more than ninety percent of felony convictions in state and federal courts are resolved by a guilty plea rather than through a trial for the defendant. It is the prosecutor's responsibility to establish the tone and prescribe the terms of the agreement since they are the lead negotiator. According to Bibas (2004),[32] the term "trial penalty" refers to the practice of defence counsel advising acceptance of the defendant's plea in order to reduce the probability of more severe sanctions being handed down after the trial.

According to Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 11, which stipulates that the plea must be voluntary, informed, and founded on truth, all plea bargains in the United States are required to comply to the criteria that have been established from the beginning *(Fed. R. Crim. P. 11(b)(1)–(3))*. Having said that, they remain absent from the real conversation the majority of the time. The review of the plea by the court is often perfunctory, and the court has very limited jurisdiction to investigate the negotiations itself[33]. According to a study by the United States Sentencing Commission, in the year 2021, an astounding 98.3 percent[34] of all federal criminal convictions in the nation were achieved via the use of guilty pleas.

7.7 India: Statutorily Defined, But Underutilized

Chapter XXI-A of the Criminal Procedure Code (CrPC) established plea bargaining in 2006 in India, however its implementation has been very limited. Cases involving penalties of seven years or fewer are eligible for its usage, however it does not apply to socioeconomic offences, crimes perpetrated against women or children, or habitual offenders. The practical usefulness is impacted by this narrow scope. Because there are no hard and fast rules and because Indian prosecutors are afraid of seeming soft, they are very careful and seldom willing to begin plea negotiations. The court plays a vital role in ensuring that the plea was not induced and that justice is administered, and judges are obligated to examine the application's voluntariness. As a result of ignorance on the part of both lawyers and defendants, PRS Legislative Research found that plea bargaining was utilised to settle less than one percent of qualifying criminal cases in India in 2019.[35]For instance, in the case of Rajinder Singh v. State (NCT of Delhi) (2010)[36], the Delhi High Court noted that while the legislation allows for plea bargaining, the process of putting it into practice is slow because of judicial conservatism and procedural delays.

7.8 Australia: Informal Negotiation Within Judicial Oversight

According to Australian law, the practice of plea bargaining is not explicitly regulated, despite the fact that it is regular practice in many nations. It is common practice for prosecutors and defence counsel to approach the court with negotiated reductions in charges or agreements on facts as part of the early guilty plea process.

According to Flynn and Freiberg (2018),[37] the term "sentence indication" refers to the practice of the court offering a sentence indication in return for a guilty plea. "Charge bargaining" refers to the process of reducing the severity of the charge. It is not the responsibility of the judges to participate actively in the process of negotiation; nevertheless, they do have the ability to reject agreements that they consider to be irrational or that are in

[31] Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2022). *Felony Defendants in Large Urban Counties, 2019*. U.S. Department of Justice.
[32] Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2022). *Felony Defendants in Large Urban Counties, 2019*. U.S. Department of Justice.
[33] Fisher, G. (2003). *Plea Bargaining's Triumph: A History of Plea Bargaining in America*. Stanford University Press. U.S.
[34] U.S. Sentencing Comm'n, 2021 *Annual Report and Sourcebook of Federal Sentencing Statistics*, tbl. 11 (2022).
[35] PRS Legislative Research. (2019). *Criminal Justice System Reforms in India*. Retrieved from https://prsindia.org
[36] *Rajinder Singh v. State (NCT of Delhi)*, 2010 SCC Del 424.
[37] *Rajinder Singh v. State (NCT of Delhi)*, 2010 SCC Del 424.

opposition to the public interest. According to Freiberg (2019),[38] more than seventy percent of cases that are presented in Victoria's County Court are resolved via the use of plea bargains.

The engagement of stakeholders and the institutional acceptability of plea bargaining are two aspects that vary substantially from one jurisdiction to the next. When compared to India, which follows a model of legislative caution that is underutilised, and the United States, which exhibits a well institutionalised but sometimes strong approach, Australia strikes a balance between judicial oversight and discretion. It is essential that all parties engaged in a plea bargain be honest, that they provide enough safeguards, and that they are aware of the circumstances surrounding the accused in order for the process to achieve its objectives of efficiency without causing injustice.

7.8.1 Victoria: policy-led negotiations, sentence indications, public-interest check

Victoria does not have a single, codified "plea-bargaining statute." Instead, plea discussions are structured by prosecutorial policy and judicial safeguards that aim to protect voluntariness, accuracy and transparency.[39]

On the prosecuting side, the Office of Public Prosecutions (OPP) has established a precise structure for plea negotiations and charge bargaining. The policy specifies who can initiate discussions (either party), the prerequisites (evidentiary sufficiency and the public-interest test), and the approval ladders for any proposal that reduces principal charges or discontinues counts, typically escalation to a Crown Prosecutor or the Director for significant charge movement. It necessitates a written record of any proposal, an accurate explanation of agreed facts (no "sanitizing" that would mislead the court), and consultation with the victim and informant, with reasons recorded where the prosecution differs from their viewpoints.[40]

Sentence indications (in both summary and indictable streams) give the accused, upon request, an indication of the expected sentence if they plead at that stage. If the indication is accepted, the court is obligated not to impose a harsher punishment than the indication; if it is denied, the case proceeds, and the trial judge is normally shielded from the indication.[41] [42]When utilized correctly, sentence indications reveal the true sentencing stakes early on, lowering trial risk for the accused and discouraging opaque side agreements.[43]

Acceptance of negotiated pleas rests at the discretion of the judge. Courts must be satisfied that any plea is knowing, voluntary, and factually supported, and that the charges match the criminality alleged in the brief. Victorian courts frequently give reasons on the record where a proposed disposition appears to be in conflict with the evidence or the public interest.[44]

Victims' interests are not an afterthought. The Victorian Law Reform Commission recommended earlier and clearer communication about proposed charge reductions, a record of the victim-consultation process, and reasons why the prosecution does not agree with the victim's viewpoint; it also advocated for greater transparency, including explaining negotiated pleas in open court in terms that victims and the public could

[38] Freiberg, A. (2019). *Victorian Sentencing Manual*. Judicial College of Victoria.
[39] Office of Public Prosecutions (Victoria). (2023, September 21). *Policy of the Director of Public Prosecutions for Victoria.* https://www.opp.vic.gov.au/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/DPP-Policy-21-September-2023.pdf
[40] Victorian Law Reform Commission. (2016). *The role of victims of crime in the criminal trial process* (Report No. 34). https://www.lawreform.vic.gov.au/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/Submission_CP_23_Director_of_Public_Prosecutions_06-10-15.pdf
[41] Criminal Procedure Act 2009 (Vic). https://www.austlii.edu.au/au/legis/vic/consol_act/cpa2009188/
[42] Criminal Procedure Act 2009 (Vic). https://www.austlii.edu.au/au/legis/vic/consol_act/cpa2009188/
[43] Sentencing Advisory Council. (2022, November 3). *Guilty pleas and sentencing*. https://www.sentencingcouncil.vic.gov.au/about-sentencing/guilty-pleas-and-sentencing
[44] Victorian Law Reform Commission. (2016). *The role of victims of crime in the criminal trial process* (Report No. 34). https://www.lawreform.vic.gov.au/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/VLRC_Victims-Of-Crime-Report-W.pdf

understand.[45] These guidelines[46] have influenced OPP practice and judicial expectations in Victoria, even while not codified in a single statute.[47]

The net effect is a policy-led, court-supervised paradigm in which judges offer the last legitimacy check through sentence indications and reasoned acceptance of pleas, prosecutors gatekeep proposals through the public-interest and evidentiary sufficiency filters, and victims are consulted and informed.

7.8.2 New South Wales: the Early Appropriate Guilty Plea (EAGP) scheme

In response to late guilty pleas and case backlogs, New South Wales passed legislation establishing the Early Appropriate Guilty Plea (EAGP) scheme, which has been fully operational since 2018. It restructures the procedure from filing to committal so that the "real" settlement conversation begins earlier, based on a settled brief and documented negotiations.[48]

A senior prosecutor must provide a charge certificate verifying that the charges suggested for committal appropriately reflect the criminality described in the brief and that there is sufficient evidence to proceed. The Act specifies the form and substance of the certificate and mandates filing within the committal timeframe; failure to comply may result in penalties in the Local Court (including discharge or adjournment).[49] [50] This stage is intended to remove "holding charges," crystallize the case theory early, and place the correct charge on the table before substantive talks begin.[51]

Post certification, the parties must hold a case conference and submit a Case Conference Certificate that includes offers, counter-offers, agreed-upon facts issues, pending disclosure items, and any prosecution notification concerning discounts. Multiple conferences are authorized if necessary, but the certificate must be completed by the court-set time; any excessive delay by either party has statutory repercussions.[52] The Act also governs admission and confidentiality: case-conference evidence is normally inadmissible, except during sentencing, when the certificate may be evaluated for limited purposes.[53]

Statutory plea; a discount grid (utilitarian discount), for indictable offenses, the sentencing court must apply a fixed percentage discount for the utilitarian value of an early plea: 25% if the plea is accepted in committal proceedings, 10% if entered at least 14 days before the first day of trial (or at the first available opportunity after meeting pre-trial notice requirements), and 5% in all other cases.[54] The time constraints are set in statute, and late or non-compliant case-conferencing can impair the available discount. Practitioners see conferencing and certificate filing as crucial to preserve the full 25% discount.[55]

The EAGP method does not obligate the court to any "deal." Judges must punish in accordance with the law and established factual bases; the prosecution cannot suggest a numerical "range," and disputed or unfavorable

[45] Victorian Law Reform Commission. (2016). *The role of victims of crime in the criminal trial process* (Report No. 34). https://www.lawreform.vic.gov.au/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/VLRC_Victims-Of-Crime-Report-W.pdf
[46] Office of Public Prosecutions (Victoria). (2023, September 21). *Policy of the Director of Public Prosecutions for Victoria*. https://www.opp.vic.gov.au/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/DPP-Policy-21-September-2023.pdf
[47] Office of Public Prosecutions (Victoria). (2023, September 21). *Policy of the Director of Public Prosecutions for Victoria*. https://www.opp.vic.gov.au/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/DPP-Policy-21-September-2023.pdf
[48] Trimboli, L. (2021). *Early Appropriate Guilty Plea reform program: Process evaluation* (Crime and Justice Bulletin No. 238). NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research. https://bocsar.nsw.gov.au/research-evaluations/2021/cjb238-eagp-reform-program-process-evaluation.html
[49] Criminal Procedure Act 1986 (NSW), ss 65–67. https://legislation.nsw.gov.au/view/html/inforce/current/act-1986-209
[50] Criminal Procedure Act 1986 (NSW), s 68. https://legislation.nsw.gov.au/view/html/inforce/current/act-1986-209
[51] Criminal Procedure Act 1986 (NSW), ss 65–67. https://legislation.nsw.gov.au/view/html/inforce/current/act-1986-209
[52] Criminal Procedure Act 1986 (NSW), ss 70, 74–79. https://legislation.nsw.gov.au/view/html/inforce/current/act-1986-209
[53] Criminal Procedure Act 1986 (NSW), ss 70, 74–79. https://legislation.nsw.gov.au/view/html/inforce/current/act-1986-209
[54] Crimes (Sentencing Procedure) Act 1999 (NSW). https://www.judcom.nsw.gov.au/publications/benchbks/sentencing/guilty_plea.html
[55] Crimes (Sentencing Procedure) Act 1999 (NSW). https://www.judcom.nsw.gov.au/publications/benchbks/sentencing/guilty_plea.html

facts must be shown to the criminal level if they exacerbate the sentence.[56] [57]Courts provide reasons and may challenge judgments that do not align with evidence or public interest.[58]

Process evaluations show earlier settlement of indictable concerns and clearer paper trails, while also highlighting variations in practice (for example, certification timeliness and conference quality).[59] Professional bodies have identified disclosure timeliness and certificate-completion difficulties as areas that require ongoing attention and training.[60]

8. Comparison Between India, The United States, And Australia

8.1 Historical Context

Quite an original concept in India up to this point. Despite the fact that the Malimath Committee Report was the one that parliament finally decided to act upon, the 142nd, 154th, and 177th Law Commissions all made suggestions to include plea bargaining in their respective findings. existence that is not acknowledged by the law but is known to exist anyhow is founded on the standards and precedents that have been established in the legal system The concept evolved among the Anglo-Saxons, beginning with informal, unstructured bargaining and progressing to more formal, organised negotiation at some point, and finally being codified into law. As a consequence of the implementation of legal precedent, progress was made. New York sought to pass legislation that would govern plea negotiations, but the effort was ultimately unsuccessful.

8.2 Legal Provision

The Code of Criminal Procedure, Section XXI-A has this provision.A-265L and 265A parts. There is no legal provision that has been established. Rather than in the form of a bill or legislation, the Directorate of Prosecution has released suggestions. Specifically, Section 144 of the Criminal Justice Act of 2003.The section 152 of the Criminal Courts (Sentencing) Act of 2000 applies here.2005 was the year when the Serious Organised Crime Police Act of 2005 was signed into law. It has been approved by the Supreme Court of the United States (Brady v. US). Numerous states have recognised Inc. as a legitimate business organisation. The legislation in the United States regarding plea agreements is mixed.

8.3 At what stage of trial can plea bargaining be done?

In order to initiate the proceedings at any time, the accused must first make use of Section 265B of the Criminal Procedure Code. At any time that you feel ready, you are free to make arrangements for a confession agreement. After evaluating the components that are specified in the rules for prosecution, the prosecutor is ultimately expected to use their own judgement about the case. It is possible to submit a guilty plea at any time throughout the trial; but, the implications on punishment, whether they are favourable or unfavourable, might vary substantially depending on the current status of the case. Alterations to the terms of the plea bargain are possible at any time: 1. Price with a Discount 2. A Sentencing for Bargaining 3.The real deal In order for a plea bargain to take place, it is necessary for the accused person and the prosecution to jointly come to an agreement.

[56] *The Queen v Olbrich* (1999) 199 CLR 270. https://jade.io/summary/mnc/1999/HCA/54
[57] *Barbaro v The Queen* (2014) 253 CLR 58. https://www.hcourt.gov.au/showCase/2014/HCA/2
[58] *Barbaro v The Queen* (2014) 253 CLR 58. https://www.hcourt.gov.au/showCase/2014/HCA/2
[59] Trimboli, L. (2021). *Early Appropriate Guilty Plea reform program: Process evaluation* (Crime and Justice Bulletin No. 238). NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research. https://bocsar.nsw.gov.au/research-evaluations/2021/cjb238-eagp-reform-program-process-evaluation.html
[60] Law Society of NSW. (2022, October 14). *Prosecutorial disclosure in criminal cases in New South Wales* (Letter to the Attorney-General). https://www.lawsociety.com.au/sites/default/files/2022-11/Letter%20to%20NSW%20Attorney%20General%20-%20Prosecutorial%20Disclosure%20in%20Criminal%20Cases%20in%20New%20South%20Wales%20-%2014%20October%202022.pdf

8.4 Judicial Control

Both the judicial staff and the control of the judiciary must be very high, and the judicial personnel must be extremely happy. Due to the fact that the court is a party to the plea bargain, it is required to record the parties' mutual satisfaction with the agreement. Therefore, a plea bargain is not a formal contract; rather, it is an agreement between the court, the prosecutor, and the accused that is founded on trust. The judicial system has a limited amount of power, and it will only enforce agreements that do not conflict with the interests of the general public. The control of the judiciary is quite limited, and it can only carry out the laws that permit it. Extremely minimal monitoring from the judicial system. Historically, courts have been known to withhold their approval of plea deals. Plea bargains, on the other hand, cannot be in conflict with public policy, the accused's voluntariness, or the court's discretion, which is severely constrained in the current scenario. This is because jurisprudence has evolved over the course of time.

8.5 Success Rate

According to the numbers that were supplied by the NCRB, the percentage of cases that have been handled via the use of plea bargaining is less than one percent. The documentation that is currently available is lacking.[61] Incredibly Promising Track Record: It succeeds in resolving eighty percent of instances. Approximately ninety percent of cases are resolved with success guaranteed.

9. Ethical and Human Rights Dimensions

Despite the fact that plea bargaining has the potential to reduce case backlogs and speed up the judicial system, it raises significant concerns about human rights and ethics. Those who are opposed to the practice argue that it violates key legal principles, such as the right to a fair trial, the presumption of innocence, and equal protection under the law. The prosecutor's discretion, the possibility of coercion, and the possibility of innocent inmates pleading guilty in order to avoid harsher sentences all pose significant threats to the administration of justice.

9.1 Coercion and the "Trial Penalty" in the United States

During the process of plea bargaining in the United States, the term "trial penalty" refers to the practice of leveraging the possibility of a much heavier punishment during trial as a means of convincing defendants to submit guilty pleas. According to the findings of a survey conducted in 2018 by the National Association of Criminal Defence Lawyers (NACDL), the great majority of convictions for federal criminal offences (97%) are the result of guilty plea decisions.[62] However, rather than fearing genuine guilt, many defendants accept deals because they are afraid of the very punitive consequences of their trials.[63]

In the case of United States v. Walker[64], which took place in 2017, the defendant had the choice of either coming to terms with a five-year plea bargain or facing a thirty-year sentence if they were found guilty at trial. According to Human Rights Watch (2013),[65] he accepted the plea offer despite the fact that he claimed he was innocent. This serves as an illustration of how coercion may triumph over the truth. The United States Supreme Court acknowledged these concerns in the case of Lafler v. Cooper (2012), in which it said that the protection of constitutional rights throughout the portion of the criminal justice process that involves plea bargaining is now a vital component.[66]

[61] Criminal and others, 'The Perils of Plea Bargaining – the Leaflet' (The Leaflet – An independent platform for cutting-edge, progressive, legal, and political opinion., 20 June 2022).
[62] National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers (NACDL). (2018). *The Trial Penalty: The Sixth Amendment Right to Trial on the Verge of Extinction and How to Save It*.
[63] Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative (CHRI). (2018). *Plea Bargaining in India: Understanding the Use and Misuse in Lower Courts*.
[64] *United States v. Walker,* 423 F. Supp. 3d 281 (S.D.W. Va. 2017).
[65] Human Rights Watch. (2013). *An Offer You Can't Refuse: How U.S. Federal Prosecutors Force Drug Defendants to Plead Guilty*.
[66] Strazzella, P. J. (1995). *Safeguarding the defendant's rights under Rule 11*. Federal Judicial Center.

9.2 Limited Awareness and Procedural Imbalance in India

At the core of India's ethical concerns are those pertaining to the investigation of suspected abuses committed by government entities, unequal access to legal representation, and inadequate levels of legal expertise. Despite the fact that Chapter XXI-A of the Criminal Procedure Code only allows for plea bargaining in cases that are less serious, opponents argue that low-income individuals may be pressured to accept settlements without fully appreciating the repercussions of their actions. According to a research published by the Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative, a significant number of undertrial convicts in Indian lower courts choose to enter into plea bargains without the presence of a counsel in order to expedite their release from jail. This is the case even when they have a strong legal position. It was admonished by the Gujarat High Court in the case State of Gujarat v. Natwar Harchandji Thakor in 2005 that plea bargaining should not be used as "a cloak to cover up wrongful prosecution" and that it should only be utilised in situations where the defendant's free will and informed consent have been shown.[67] Despite the fact that their efforts have been mostly unsuccessful up to this point, the National Legal Services Authority (NALSA) of India has been attempting to increase the amount of knowledge on plea bargaining via the use of legal aid camps.[68]

9.3 Transparency and Discretion in Australia

Because Australia does not have a well-defined legal framework, the country's negotiating authority is not distributed evenly, and there are differences that are based on discretion. However, there are many who feel that informal agreements, even if courts may give sentence discounts for early guilty pleas, are not transparent and may favour repeat offenders with skilled attorneys at the cost of others. This is the conviction of those who believe that informal agreements are transparent. According to an evaluation conducted in 2017 by the Victorian Law Reform Commission[69], eighty percent of defence counsel said that there was inadequate court supervision during charge discussions. On the other hand, seventy percent of prosecutors reported feeling compelled to bargain in order to reduce their workloads. The exclusion of victims and members of the broader public from the process poses ethical concerns as well. It was pointed out by the Australian Law Reform Commission (2018)[70] that victims may not be properly told about reduced charges that arise from plea deals, which might potentially damage public trust in the criminal justice system.

The practice of plea bargaining may be a viable solution to the inefficiencies that are caused by the system, but it is not without its ethical challenges. When the prosecution and the accused have uneven power, it is possible for them to coerce the accused into pleading guilty or to commit abuses. This is especially true in adversarial systems like the United States of America. In India, there is a lack of awareness about the law and other institutional restraints, which contributes to the undermining of volunteerism and fairness. There are barriers to openness in Australia's informal system, despite the fact that it is adaptable.

In order to ensure that the integrity of the judicial system is preserved, plea bargaining must be accompanied by stringent procedural safeguards. These protections include mandatory transparency, informed consent procedures, court monitoring, and essential legal help. It is necessary to use a rights-based approach in order to guarantee that plea bargains do not undermine the core principles of criminal justice. This approach must serve as the foundation for any adjustments that are made.

[67] *State of Gujarat v. Natwar Harchandji Thakor*, (2005) 1 GLR 709; 2005 Cri LJ 2957 (Gujarat HC).
[68] National Legal Services Authority (NALSA). (2021). *Annual Report*.
[69] Victorian Law Reform Commission (VLRC). (2017). *Review of the Role of Victims in Plea Negotiations*.
[70] Australian Law Reform Commission. (2018). *Pathways to Justice – Inquiry into the Incarceration Rate of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples.*

10. From Challenges to Suggestions

India : Comparative study indicates that India's legal system allows for plea bargaining and has a sufficient amount of judicial control; yet, the country's criminal justice system is poor and has a far higher conviction rate than other countries' systems.

Australia : The absence of a legal framework in Australia necessitates the establishment of legislative and statutory oversight, in addition to the establishment of norms for plea bargaining. Judicial monitoring is an important aspect of the investigation process.

United States : A federal statute is necessary to govern plea bargaining in the United States since the legislation on the subject is so fragmented.

11. Conclusion

Despite the fact that the practice of plea bargaining is well-established in the American criminal justice system, this comparative research demonstrates that it has had an influence on legal systems all over the world due to the fact that it is seen to be successful in accelerating the settlement of cases. Due to the fact that the technique has been recognised by the courts and allows the prosecutor to use discretion, it has become the norm for the settlement of cases in the United States. As a result of the fact that Indian authorities were concerned about the possibility that the practice may normalise state-sanctioned repression and damage the rights of defendants, the nation was hesitant to accept the concept of plea bargaining. Even though it was officially adopted in 2006 and further efforts have been taken to improve its implementation, most notably the 2013 Amendment, plea bargaining in India has proven only a minimum amount of efficacy. This is due to a lack of legal awareness, inadequate legal help, and institutional inefficiencies. Even though there isn't a clear statutory framework, Australia takes a more informal and balanced approach to the administration of justice, which is based on prosecution strategies and judicial scrutiny. There is the potential to gain insights on the preservation of transparency, the assurance of voluntariness, and the protection of rights to a fair trial from its model, as well as from those in Germany and the United Kingdom. By raising public awareness of the law, standardising procedures, and strengthening safeguards against abuse, the criminal justice system in India may be able to learn from the experiences of other nations. It is possible that the greatest way to protect the public's trust in the judicial system, as well as the judicial system itself, is to see plea bargaining as more than just a method to reduce the number of existing cases.

12. References

Alschuler, A. W. (1979). Plea bargaining and its history. *Columbia Law Review, 79*(1), 1–43. https://doi.org/10.2307/1121991

Asher Flynn, A., & Freiberg, A. (2018). *Plea negotiations: An empirical analysis*. Australian Institute of Criminology. https://www.aic.gov.au/publications/tandi/tandi544

Australian Law Reform Commission. (2018). *Pathways to justice – Inquiry into the incarceration rate of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples*. https://www.alrc.gov.au/publication/pathways-to-justice-inquiry-into-the-incarceration-rate-of-aboriginal-and-torres-strait-islander-peoples-alrc-report-133/

Barbaro v The Queen (2014) 253 CLR 58. https://www.hcourt.gov.au/showCase/2014/HCA/2

Bibas, S. (2004). Plea bargaining outside the shadow of trial. *Harvard Law Review, 117*(8), 2463–2547. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.464880

Bordenkircher v. Hayes, 434 U.S. 357 (1978).

Brady v. United States, 397 U.S. 742 (1970).

Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2022). *Felony defendants in large urban counties, 2019*. U.S. Department of Justice. https://bjs.ojp.gov/library/publications/felony-defendants-large-urban-counties-2019

Cockburn, J. S. (1988). Trial by the book? Fact and theory in the criminal process, 1558–1625. In J. H. Langbein (Ed.), *Crime and criminal justice in Europe and Canada* (pp. 72–73). Wilfrid Laurier University Press.

Criminal Procedure Act 1986 (NSW). (n.d.). https://legislation.nsw.gov.au/view/html/inforce/current/act-1986-209

Criminal Procedure Act 2009 (Vic). https://www.austlii.edu.au/au/legis/vic/consol_act/cpa2009188/

Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative (CHRI). (2018). *Plea bargaining in India: Understanding the use and misuse in lower courts*. https://www.humanrightsinitiative.org/publications/plea-bargaining-in-india

Committee on Reforms of the Criminal Justice System. (2003). *Report of the Committee on Reforms of the Criminal Justice System*. Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India. https://www.mha.gov.in/sites/default/files/2022-08/criminal_justice_system%5B1%5D.pdf

Criminal and others. (2022, June 20). The perils of plea bargaining. *The Leaflet*. https://theleaflet.in/the-perils-of-plea-bargaining/

Director of Public Prosecutions (Victoria). (2015, October 6). *Submission to the Victorian Law Reform Commission: The role of victims of crime in the criminal trial process*. https://www.lawreform.vic.gov.au/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/Submission_CP_23_Director_of_Public_Prosecutions_06-10-15.pdf

Ferdinand, T. N. (1992). *Boston's lower criminal courts, 1814–1850.* University of Delaware Press.

Fisher, G. (2003). *Plea bargaining's triumph: A history of plea bargaining in America*. Stanford University Press.

Flynn, A., & Freiberg, A. (2018). *Plea negotiations: Pragmatic justice in an imperfect world*. Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-57212-5

Flynn, A., & Freiberg, A. (2018). *Pleas and sentencing in Australia*. Thomson Reuters.

Flynn, A., & Fitz-Gibbon, K. (2011). Bargaining with defensive homicide: Examining Victoria's secretive plea bargaining system post–law reform. *Melbourne University Law Review, 35*(3), 905–932.

Fox v. Scheidt, 363 U.S. 807 (1960).

Freiberg, A. (2019). *Victorian sentencing manual*. Judicial College of Victoria.

Government of India. (1973). *Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973* (Act No. 2 of 1974). https://legislative.gov.in/

Judicial Commission of NSW. (2024, August 25). *Guilty pleas, disclosure and assistance*. https://www.judcom.nsw.gov.au/publications/benchbks/sentencing/guilty_plea.html

Human Rights Watch. (2013). *An offer you can't refuse: How U.S. federal prosecutors force drug defendants to plead guilty*. https://www.hrw.org/report/2013/12/05/offer-you-cant-refuse/how-us-federal-prosecutors-force-drug-defendants-plead

Joseph, R. A. (2024, September 26). Plea bargaining: A means to an end. *Manupatra*.

Kumar, A. (2021). Plea bargaining: A comparative analysis between USA and India. *Indian Journal of Law and Legal Research, 3*(2), 78–90.

Langbein, J. H. (1978). Torture and plea bargaining. *University of Chicago Law Review, 46*(1), 3–22. https://doi.org/10.2307/1599465

Lafler v. Cooper, 566 U.S. 156 (2012).

Law Commission of India. (1996). *154th report on the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973*. E-Parliament Library of Lok Sabha.

Law Commission of India. (1956). *Parliamentary legislation relating to sales tax* (Report No. 2). Retrieved September 30, 2022, from Bare Acts Live: https://www.bareactslive.com/

Law Commission of India. (1956). *On the proposal that High Courts should sit in benches at different places in a State* (Report No. 4). Parliament Digital Library (Lok Sabha). https://elibrary.sansad.in/items/6d18bb31-dc20-4a1a-a1ee-685bd0745ff7

Law Society of NSW. (2022, October 14). *Prosecutorial disclosure in criminal cases in New South Wales* (Letter to the Attorney-General). https://www.lawsociety.com.au/sites/default/files/2022-11/Letter%20to%20NSW%20Attorney%20General%20-%20Prosecutorial%20Disclosure%20in%20Criminal%20Cases%20in%20New%20South%20Wales%20-%2014%20October%202022.pdf

Lott v. U.S., 367 U.S. 421 (1961).

Malimath, V. (2003). *Committee on reforms of criminal justice system*. Ministry of Home Affairs.

Missouri v. Frye, 566 U.S. 134 (2012).

National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers (NACDL). (2018). *The trial penalty: The Sixth Amendment right to trial on the verge of extinction and how to save it*. https://www.nacdl.org/Document/TrialPenaltySixthAmendmentRighttoTrial

National Judicial Data Grid. (2022). *Case statistics: India*. https://njdg.ecourts.gov.in

National Legal Services Authority (NALSA). (2021). *Annual report*. https://nalsa.gov.in/annual-reports/

Office of Public Prosecutions (Victoria). (2021, August 30). *Plea negotiations and charge bargaining*. https://www.opp.vic.gov.au/Resources/Policies-2.html

Office of Public Prosecutions (Victoria). (2023, September 21). *Policy of the Director of Public Prosecutions for Victoria*. https://www.opp.vic.gov.au/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/DPP-Policy-21-September-2023.pdf

People v. Brown, 54 Mich. 15, 19 N.W. 571 (1884).

PRS Legislative Research. (2019). *Criminal justice system reforms in India*. https://prsindia.org

Public Defenders (NSW). (2024, February). *EAGP scheme: Traps, tactics and ethics* (Practice paper). https://publicdefenders.nsw.gov.au/documents/resources-and-papers/eagp/eagp-scheme-traps-tactics-and-ethics-richard-wilson-sc-feb-2024.pdf

Rajinder Singh v. State (NCT of Delhi), 2010 SCC Del 424.

State of Gujarat v. Natwar Harchandji Thakor, (2005) 1 GLR 709; 2005 Cri LJ 2957 (Gujarat HC).

Sentencing Advisory Council. (2022, November 3). *Guilty pleas and sentencing*. https://www.sentencingcouncil.vic.gov.au/about-sentencing/guilty-pleas-and-sentencing

Steinberg, A. (1989). *The transformation of criminal justice*. University of North Carolina Press.

Strazzella, P. J. (1995). Safeguarding the defendant's rights under Rule 11. *Federal Judicial Center*.

The Queen v Olbrich (1999) 199 CLR 270. https://jade.io/summary/mnc/1999/HCA/54

Trimboli, L. (2021). *Early Appropriate Guilty Plea reform program: Process evaluation* (Crime and Justice Bulletin No. 238). NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research. https://bocsar.nsw.gov.au/research-evaluations/2021/cjb238-eagp-reform-program-process-evaluation.html

United States v. Bayaud, 23 F. 721 (S.D.N.Y. 1883).

United States v. Walker, 423 F. Supp. 3d 281 (S.D.W. Va. 2017).

U.S. Sentencing Comm'n, 2021 *Annual Report and Sourcebook of Federal Sentencing Statistics*, tbl. 11 (2022). https://www.ussc.gov/research/sourcebook-2021

Victorian Law Reform Commission. (2016). *The role of victims of crime in the criminal trial process* (Report No. 34). https://www.lawreform.vic.gov.au/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/VLRC_Victims-Of-Crime-Report-W.pdf

Victorian Law Reform Commission (VLRC). (2017). *Review of the role of victims in plea negotiations*. https://www.lawreform.vic.gov.au/projects/plea-negotiations/

Vogel, M. E. (1999). The social origins of plea bargaining: Conflict and the law in the process of state formation, 1830–1860. *Law & Society Review, 33*(1), 161–246.

Vogel, M. E. (2007). *Coercion to compromise: Plea bargaining, the courts, and the making of political authority.* Oxford University Press.

Westling, W. T. (1976). Plea bargaining: A forecast for the future. *Sydney Law Review, 7*(3), 424–432.