

Unknown Speaker 0:01

Hello, everyone, and welcome to today's discussion on the transcription of court proceedings hosted by Dutch. We have with us today a distinguished panel of speakers to talk to us about the pros and cons of transcribing court proceedings. What the international experience has taught us, and what protocol two safeguards we might need to put into place before we go ahead and implement a system for transparent court proceedings. First, on the panel, we have Mr. Joshua mystery, Mr. mystery is a litigated Supreme Court and the High Court of Bombay. His areas of expertise include international law, social and public interest litigation and service law. He is also the founder of international legal Alliance, a virtual global network of lawyers. Next we have with us Miss apama hepar Miss Hebert is a litigator, the Karnataka High Court and a partner at key at the bank of offices of Keystone partners. Her areas of expertise includes constitutional and administrative law, contractual disputes, breach of confidentiality and privacy or data protection. Lastly, we have with us today Mr. amrish telogen. Mr. Killa. Chang is a businessman by background, but has vast experience as a litigant before various programs. Most notably, he filed an intervention application in the Supreme Court to move the code to record calls to rate to improve transcription services for all companies across India. I welcome all our panelists to this discussion. Without further ado, let me jump right into the topic itself for today, which is the transcription of the sequence. I think if there's one thing that the covid 19 pandemic has taught us all is that we need to begin to embrace the use of technology more and more, especially in the Justice sector. Specifically, it has pushed us even further to make greater use of technology over the past few months to facilitate access to justice for litigants. And while the Supreme Court has been an advocate of using technology, whether it be live streaming court proceedings or anything translation of door Committed to one Angular languages. I think one of the areas that is yet to be complete is yet to completely catch on and be implemented is the idea of transcribing court proceedings to the use of technology. The Supreme Court in the case of swapnil party had, among its many recommendations recommend is the practice of allowing court proceedings to be transcribed to provide access to litigants who could not attend court proceedings for the day. This simple practice can be leveraged to bring about significant changes from the manner of presenting legal arguments to holding lawyers accountable to litigants, and even for applicants to use when case is going to be for them. It could even help judges when they go about writing their judgments or orders. And it can even help litigants who are unfamiliar with the records work to review the transcript and understand what's been happening in court. It can also help journalists who report on cases and help them understand better what happened on this particular team. By manual transcription, or fleet has largely been the norm and its limitations are unfortunately as many countries the limitations of the justice system itself. Traditionally, the stenographer takes down notes of what he or she is needed to take down, but does not really record the entire proceeding itself. So what automatic transcription will help with is it will help our judges it will help lawyers litigants, see the transcript and make notes. And I'm able to enable them to review testimony that has happened during the proceedings, and also allows him to focus on the proceeding the death rather than making notes for the entire proceedings. And with the advent of technology, audio and video recording of proceedings has been made much simpler, it can be even as simple as allowing a court staff to record the entire proceeding on their phone. So these these recordings can then be used by several tools that are now widely available in the market to convert them into transcripts. And the quality of such transcriptions have also been seen to be quite good economic costs about 80 to 90% of the work that a good staff has to do in transcribing the proceedings. And the automated transcripts can work as a first draft, which can then be amended by code stuff after after reading and can then be finalized. And

nowadays, a lot of farm video conferencing facilities are also an English recording of the audio so that that can also need the transcription. So a lot has been done on this transfer. The purpose of this discussion is to know more and hear from our panel on what they think about the way forward with your transcription. So I first want to miss them. Miss Teresa, I the first question for yourself. You've been an advocate of transcription services for quite some time now. How do you think that the judges and in specific the digestive sector can stand to gain a benefit from

Unknown Speaker 5:00

So yeah, thank you. The justice system basically is supposed to be an open system. It is a most of the courts, especially our higher courts, as opposed to the courts of record. Now, what is typically happened, at least in India is that when you go to court and especially as a litigator, what you realize is at the end of the day, whatever you argued in court is not sort of verbatim being captured in a court proceeding. And as you said, you know, the stenographer only takes down what the judge tells him to take down over a period of time that is led to lots of issues. Lots of sort of case law that You've stated in court, or arguments that you've done, just don't you know, get get recorded. This is then coupled with the fact that benches keep changing that. So that's another problem. And then just judgments are reserved, sometimes, you know, for administrative reasons they come up, maybe after, you know, 10 months, 11 months, and by which time that particular job is completely forgotten. Yes, he or she may have made notes and all that is fine, but what has actually transpired on those days is gone. I mean, I've had several, you know, appointments as a minus and I have to say that probably even from somebody's perspective was supposed to assist the cost, there is an issue, because you've sort of by the time you're appointed, right, in the beginning, it's okay. But if you sort of join the proceeding later and you're supposed to assist the court, quite often you see, order saying matter heard, and so on, so Dave, adjust to so and so date That's it. But what transpired in court can never be sort of brought back. And I think this is the simplest thing is to have your speech to text. And and, you know, the on every day basis, you you have that attached to the court proceedings. Yes, we must also remember that a transcript is not an order of the court. So that is different. And, but it is a great tool to rely upon. And I think, you know, people have said that judges keep diaries and notebooks and they sort of, you know, give it to each other, and things like that, but again, that is that's neither here nor there. This is a very well established sort of format, which is, you know, available. And I always say that while we were researching For this, we found that this was a common law system which was available. And in 19 08, there is a judgment of the Bombay High Court, which is completely transcribed, wherein there was obviously no computerization. And we've seen the same thing happening even with the legislature, where they used to be recorded every word of what happens, you know, there is the parliament, the assembly or Municipal Council, so that this is the process and and the absolutely no doubt it, at least in my mind that a lot of issues that a court faces today will be taken out from it if the judges have transcription available to them. Right.

Unknown Speaker 8:48

Okay, so that actually takes me to Mr. ganache and then so as a litigant, how do you feel the transcripts could help litigants or even the media who report on cases that are there before the courthouse Do you think they stand to benefit? And is there any situation where you feel this might not?

Unknown Speaker 9:09

transcription is absolutely mandatory. And one of the most important things that would be in a Derekwiaa judicial system, because right now, you know, the whole system is in what I call chaos, you know, because it is so heavily overloaded right now. And so, you know, the first thing that it does is brings in transparency and accountability. I think these two points are the most important for a litigate because, you know, after all, a litigant is going to court because he has got issues that have to be dealt with that you know, troubles and he needs to know that you know, the system is working properly, it's transparent and whatever is happening in court is kept, record is kept so that for current that even the future and you know, Today, for example, I'll give you an example. You see a mobile node in any court and it's a civil court or criminal court, where you have, you know, judges who have 100 patters on their board, right? And so what happens is, how does the judge determine what's good? First of all, which matter is going to hear because from nine o'clock 10 o'clock to five o'clock in court, after that he takes 100 matters back home, he's got a family life, he's got all these issues that he has to deal with. And then plus he has to read papers and prioritize which matters have to be heard, because they're always 100 matters. Right? And then when the matter comes up in court, you have situations where you know, normally the opposing counsel, one of the few tricks that are normally used is to take a gentleman's to take dates. So even if a matter starts getting heard, halfway down, hearing, you know, because of paucity of time and low, they adjourn the matters and then by the next time junction writes, he said the next time the matter comes around, which could be a couple of months down the road, either the judges changed or lawyers have changed. So where is the continuity? I mean, how does a judge continue with a case when he doesn't have a clear record in front of him or what happened the last time you said what? So this, according to me is a very important thing, because it will bring in continuity into the system where you know, you have a flow, and also more importantly, statements that are made by lawyers, typically, many lawyers, either they change by the next day, or they make statements which they change by the next day. So the judge who's sitting there, even if it's the same judge, you know, two months down the road, he is not going to remember what was spoken in detail, because, you know, it's just the system doesn't allow him to do that. So, transcription would, you know, resolve all these issues, because there is a clear record in front of him who said what, who mentioned What it also brings in, in a kind of a weird discipline, because lawyers will be careful on the statements that they make, because everything is now being recorded and you're not going to be able to turn around the next date and try and change the statement or make alternative statements because what you said is already been recorded. So, I think that's these are the few issues that transcription will definitely sought out. And then also this is a civil then on the other side, you have a criminal justice system, in which if you look around the courts in India today, the lower court, there are lakhs of people languishing in prisons, because of reasons such as not having a lawyer but having representation or the case is not coming on board, I think because you know, just the workload is so heavy. So you know, you many times what you see in the criminal justice system is under trials are brought to court. They give their attendance and then they go back because their cases can be heard because then another 200 matters that have just landed up before that judge and he's a human being and you cannot expect it Do you know what is what

can you do? So, I think you know, even here, a transcription system will help so much because this case is made out of statements, the police statements or whatever are the statements that are recorded abroad before the judge on which basis he can pass orders all the next time you can come through the investigation because already what has been said has been another place where I think it's a great use is for people who are differently abled. You know, today, differently abled people access into a courtroom anyways, so difficult. And in court, there's so much chaos that, you know, for them to be heard or seen, you know, it's very difficult and if you find it difficult, so you know, people who've got issues of sight or hearing or whatever, I mean, they should also have a system where whatever is been spoken on their behalf is recorded so that they are aware of what their litigations are, and you know what is going on in that matters. etc, etc. So, I think these are a couple of areas where I think transcription is absolutely vital.

Unknown Speaker 14:08

You know, and then of course, you have all these other issues such as, you know, increasing efficiency as Jamshed said, today, people take notes, you know, whether it's the lawyers Junior, or judges, I mean, they're wasting so much time doing this when in reality, they could have a proper document or a transcript in front of them, which, you know, just gives everything that has been spoken and you know, they go down to the word. So if you say from Good morning, till the time you conclude your, your

Unknown Speaker 14:35

statements, everything is recorded, so it makes it so much easier

Unknown Speaker 14:40

to, you know, conduct, proper courtroom cases and more importantly, to actually give justice to the people who are coming into the courts for us specifically for this. And as far as the media goes, I think, you know, the moment you have, again, transcripts and you have a recording of all the pieces And proceedings, that reporting will also change because now they have a reference point to be able to, you know, make the news articles are on and they will be no misinformation because everything is clearly recorded. So I think that will really change a lot of the because a lot of the media today you go, I'm making statements based on what their associates or someone has heard in the court, but they have no proper documentation, you know, which which are which they can rely upon. So I think that would make a big difference also, for their own reporting on so that the news comes out more accurate, you know, and weekly regard to wait may not help is, you know, you have certain cases such as, you know, exploitation of people, rape, divorced mother, I mean, these are the areas which really, you can't have transcription, or you can't have it out in the public preview. I mean, that's something a system will have to be worked out. Also, for example, cases regarding defense, Army Intelligence, you know, these are areas which are ultra sensitive. So I think the courts will have to come up with a system where you keep these cases out of the purview of I don't know whether transcription or whether you keep them out of the purview of public domain, because you know, sensitive, it's something that you really would want

out of the public domain. But other than that, there is no reason for transcription have to be a part of our system, which will really, really, in my opinion, it's a game changer. It completely changed the face of litigation.

Unknown Speaker 16:38

Right. Hey, thank you. So Miss hebat. Bernie, do you like Mr. Election mentioned, it's a game changer, no doubt, especially when it comes to judges for helping them offer litigants to understand what's happening in court. But what do you think? How do you think transcripts could help or litigating lawyer like yourself is there What do you think that lawyers benefit from such transcripts.

Unknown Speaker 17:03

Thanks for the so I completely agree that it's definitely something that greatly benefits the judicial. I mean, the Justice delivery system and faith in the system, and definitely benefits the litigants. Now, for litigating lawyers such as myself. There are some very obvious benefits. One is like Mr. Misty said, a real time record of everything that has happened in the past and in the present. This leads to of course, greater accountability of the judges, not just to the public at large but to lawyers and it will also lead to better behavior I believe, obviously, everything is being transcribed. There will not be loose comments and maybe derogate, restatements, which many lawyers face on the whole, very obvious discrimination between someone very senior and someone very junior. These are, you know, these are issues that young lawyers complain on. So hopefully, given that a judge is is aware that everything is being transcribed in real time will make them self regulate their behavior a lot. But I also see that as a possible negative thing. I don't know. If that will lead to too much self regulation of behavior by judges, whether they will then stop telling you what's on their mind and it will become more of a monologue. I don't know, maybe our judges. I mean, like the sound of their voice a lot. So I don't know if it'll ever come to that. But that is you can see that as a definite fallout from judges may not tell you a lot of times, I'm sure Mr. Musk will agree we, there's a feedback loop. So when you're arguing and the judges sort of thinking out loud, you take from that and you realize what kind of points are sticking with the demo and what you should concentrate on not concentrate on? Maybe some of that will be affected. But this is just me sort of trying to fish for what could happen. It's not really I don't see it as a big problem. I'm second I think transcribing in lower courts in Karnataka, of course, the original jurisdiction is with lower trial courts, not so much in Bombay and Delhi. So, the way witness testimonies are recorded are an absolute mess. Sometimes it's basically the witness relaying to the judge and answer the judge, paraphrasing that answer into a complete sentence and recording it as it were a flow. That's not really how witnesses give testimony. So a real time transcription I think can be a game changer in the way witness testimonies are recorded. I have seen it I have assisted in matters where I have had real time testimony of witnesses and it's far better. And sometimes in fact, in court, witnesses will give testimony in Canada it's paraphrased in English. You know, a lot can be lost in translation. I made a couple more points. This is I'm thinking something slightly specific kind of common. The other thing that happens a lot of times is even when lawyers are ready and willing to go on and buy those judges for reasons best known to them tend to join them. So I feel read in some of the adjournments that we see. And sometimes as it so happens, for instance, I'll give you an example. I have a matter where we've been ready to go on for, I think, a couple

of years now and the judge just Johnson. And when we applied for an order sheet, it was noted as if we had been seeking these adjournments over the over a period of two years. So obviously, that that example jumped to my mind immediately because I had to then send that to my client and explained to them that look, I did not ask. And then in fact, whatever was recorded was completely opposite to the emails I have been sending my client. So I see. Even the face of litigants just angry speculation said that their faith in the system will improve. Hopefully their faith in their lawyers will also improve with the then being able to have the time.

Unknown Speaker 21:05

Okay, so largely it looks like we're seeing more positives than the negatives at this point. But Mr. election, is there anything that we can learn from the international experience or what have other countries? His experience has been in terms of those who have adopted such transcription, transcription?

Unknown Speaker 21:26

Of course, they do today you have the US and Canada, UK and Australia and all these. We have Malaysia, Singapore, even Nigeria, who have got actual transcription systems in place and use it extensively. And I think one of the biggest advantages really comes down to this transparency and a proper Permanent Court record, which gives you exactly what has transpired in a court of law for the current litigation. Well as for future reference, a lot of people use cases also for future efforts. So that fence in the Western world I mean, this is a extensively used, it's used every every case. And, you know, they have court recorders. Now they actually went back to the system of Portugal, which is more like stenographers. And you know, by the end of the day that they prepare a perfect record that document which is signed off and uploaded and in fact handed over to the concerned parties by the end of the day. So they can also use that for the next strategy for the next hearing as to what has been spoken what they need to do. The lawyers, the clients, everybody. So the West, it's a part of the norm. It's used on a daily basis in every case, and I think that makes a huge, huge difference. And you know, what they also do is, I think, for people who are in the legal aid tribunal process litigation, transcripts are given free. But otherwise, you've got to pay a nominal charge for buying a transcript. Right. And I think what also could be used in India, which is that, you know, you have a revenue model created or so like they do the West so that the costs come down. So, you know, there it's completely accepted as a way of life. I mean, you know, in fact, people get surprised when they hear from us. You don't have a system in place of transcription. So how do y'all function? You know, we've had people ask us this, so it really shows for them, it's the norm. So, unless jumpsuit rightly pointed out strangely, from the early 1900s in India in Mumbai, the Bombay High Court is a very famous trial Tilak trial, Madame de la

Unknown Speaker 23:53

sorry, Banga, Gertler,

Unknown Speaker 23:56

and 1908. And there is a problem script that you can pull out even today, if you Google it. So can you imagine that we actually had all these systems in place? Right. And we were doing transcription. I don't know where and how it went off the horizon in India, but it was there as far back as 1908. So, you know, it's something that really deserves merit that we actually have this place, but abroad, it's absolutely standard. Thank

Unknown Speaker 24:31

you, Miss Mr. Considering Mr. Collections is saying, in western countries, it appears that transcription is more or less the norm. But if we were to do something similar in India, what do you think the legal framework should look like? Especially for lawyers and litigants? And is there any safeguards that we should have in place to ensure that privacy is protected? Because clearly there are some cases of sensitive nature where we may not want the transcripts to be put out in public means so what would you do Would you think

Unknown Speaker 25:03

on this? Actually, that's like I have a few thoughts on what the high level concerns should be when you're making up a legal framework. I obviously don't know the right answer. I don't have enough data to understand what will work and what will not work. But there are some high level points as to what are the kind of issues that we are going to be looking at when we consider a legal framework. Now, of course, the first will be what will be transcribed like Mr. Platon was saying there will definitely be cases that may not should not be transcribed, that are very sensitive in nature that involve rape victims, child witnesses, things like that and Official Secrets. Now, you will obviously have to determine if there is a bucket of cases that where you can disable transcription altogether, or should you be transcribing everything and in fact, controlling access to such transcription? So that's the First question because both of them play into each other. Because the more sort of buckets you create where transcription itself can be disabled, you're sort of losing the plot instead, a very strict control on access can serve the very same purpose. You can also achieve it by you know, redacting names and removing whatever part of the information is sensitive. Now, second, obviously, will be how will you ensure accuracy of something like this, when you're looking at a legal regulatory framework, you need to ensure that the technology you're using because the more you start putting it out there, the more people will start come to rely on it? When you are relying on it. You don't want to be running behind figuring out whether it's accurate or not. So, what kind of technology will use what will be the minimum standards you need? Secondly, whether what level of manual oversight is needed to determine this technologies, so accuracy. You will also obviously have to then make some other procedural law changes to ensure reliability of these proceedings as both Mr. Mr. Thing Mr. collection was saying if you're going to be relying on these proceedings in subsequent proceedings, or they're going to be relying on it for the process of our fee, accuracy becomes crucial to determining how reliable these proceedings will be when you start to use them in a real life context. Second, then, coming from these two obviously, will be the powers of the judge or the Presiding Officer himself or herself in this matrix, whether they have the right to determine

what will be transcribed, whether they have the right to determine or to overrule any request to either transcribe or refrain from transcription. Should people have the ability to appeal such a decision? If the judges doubt the accuracy of transcription, should they be allowed to have oversight on it? It should be allowed to suggest corrections if there is a time limit. So these are the various issues that come in relation to the power of the Presiding Officer himself or herself to control the proceeding. Then, of course, the most important how will you regulate access to these transcription proceedings? Now, without a doubt, matters involving constitutional importance, your triple talaq or Yoda, all of those should be ideally open to everyone. They should be put up on the website, maybe and preview everyone because this is something that governs us all. And it's, it's closer to transcribing legislative proceedings, for instance. But what about private disputes now? Because I've done some fair bit of advice in relation to data privacy, privacy is not so simple in itself, because it's not a question of having a sensitive matter. Say I have a commercial dispute with someone and in the commercial dispute a lot of factors about how I run my business come to force. Now, each piece of information in and of itself may not be that relevant but put together if it forms a kind of picture and image of some who I am, what I'm doing, what my business is, etc. So there are data protection laws that are evolving and privacy, understanding, privacy is evolving to recognize that this itself is a right, because most, you know, the way data is governed most require a level of anonymization, which obviously a transcript may not be able to provide. Hence, it's very important in private in a private lives, how you control access, maybe it's only given to parties, or to councils or to any third parties, who can show that they have some form of interest in the transcription much like how orders and certified copies are regulated. Now, of course, private lists can also become a public importance because if an important question of law is answered in it, then maybe with consent you can consider making it public etc. But to me, this controlling access is very, very cool.

Unknown Speaker 30:01

In determining how private or public this information becomes, how we're the right of how the right of privacy will be governed in this matrix will be through control of access, in my opinion. Now, of course there are you can, you know, split up transcriptions, even by court, like the higher courts have transcription services, whereas the lower courts may not try certain tribunals may have certain tribunals may not, then obviously, next to the cost, as a cost as Mr. glargine said, My thoughts are the same that in case litigants are not able to pay for it, or in certain important instances that can be made free. But otherwise, the costs will likely have to be passed on to parties because, frankly, I mean, we're doing video conferencing hearings and sports don't even have paid video conferencing accounts. So I really don't see where the practically speaking where the cost for this is going to come from. And last, again, a facet of privacy. struction of records, how long will you be keeping these records for maybe 30 years, which is usually standard? Do litigants have a right to have these rights struck off because this is also another right in the area of privacy that's developing, which is called the right to be forgotten. So as part of that, right, maybe you also have the right to have every proceeding struck off. So these are, in my opinion, the broad framework of what any law that regulates this comprehensively should look like.

Unknown Speaker 31:28

That's helpful to know because I think one of the first things first steps would be to figure out a legal framework before going ahead with implementing such technology. With that I circled back to you Mr. mystery. I have a two part question. The first part is while Mesaba just spoke about the legal framework in which it should look like how do you think they should play out in practice? How do we go about implementing such technology? Do you think maybe we should start with some pilot projects, perhaps pilots in the trial court or maybe the Supreme Court, because it eliminates some of the problems of the given Angular languages. So how do you think we should go on to implement such technology? That's the first. The second one is clearly our likeness. Mr. Again pointed out and Mr. collection as well, there are concerns about costs. And there are also other concerns about how effective such technology may be and most with respect to trial codes by some part of the proceedings can be in the local vernacular languages. So how do you think we can overcome these some these factors, what are what are your thoughts?

Unknown Speaker 32:36

So, as my good friend amrish very rightly said, See, across we are not developing something that for the first time, this technology and everything has happened, laid out for years on end. I mean, one of the best examples of transcription and as well as you know, streaming etc, is International Court of Justice. I mean, this is fabulous how they've perfected this art. So typically there what happens is your every day's proceedings is recorded, the transcript is available not only to the litigant, the parties, but through the public at large Of course, yes, these are you know, involving two states and therefore, but the concept is is fantastic. So, that is available to you. The second thing is you get an instant translation, which is also a problem that we have in India especially because up to the it's only in the high court and Supreme Court that English is the, you know, the official language, your court what happens so, these are very, very easily sort of adaptable, you just you click on it and you and you get it. So, this is one aspect Think with regard to how it first and foremost you will need to because every single country, if you look at have had very detailed rules and regulations. So what is involved? It's virtually like, you know, an Act, which which sort of describes each, you know, electronic term, what it means what it shows you very, very great detail. I think he can happily adapt to any of these systems, Singapore, Canada, I believe in China has it. So, all that is available, so there's no problem on from the, you know, the legislative or the regulation aspect as well. Where should it start from? I think I'm going to give you a very different answer. I think it's should start from a moot court should start from law school. Okay, that's where it should really start from the next generation really get used to the system. And and in as far as the courts are concerned, it's very, very easy. What you do is and because what is it, you're just a simple, you know, you don't even need the video, which I mean, some people have, they say no, no, you know, video is offensive and we don't like to be seen and live streaming. But even that is over tax history. Now, the Supreme Court has said that in certain cases, live streaming is a must. And if you've heard, you know, the committee, and everyone is saying that, or we're probably going to get sort of a hybrid system. So, yes, you are going to be seen, you know, arguing your your cases, so you might as well get used to it. So that that part is not much of a problem and yes, so what happens typically is you record the audio That audio then gets automatically transcribed. And it's, you know, there are I mean, you know that there are readily available apps for that, of course, I think what the court will have to do is, you know, for the entire nation, they will have to bring about a system, which is then accessible to all from the lower court, lowest court to the to the Supreme Court. And I think, and one thing that I've always said about

technology, it takes no time to implement at all. So if today if you want to, you know, start with transcription, I think you can implement it throughout the country in a month's time. It's as simple as that. So there's no difficulty. You will, yes, the, your whole pool of great stenographers that we have today, can certainly be trained. The accuracy of apps are also now excellent. So, you know, that's that's not much of a problem. You know, I mean, I have done, you know, in an experiment, I've sat down and transcribed myself. And it's, it's amazing, you get about 85 to 90% accuracy in something. And I'm not a extremely technologically savvy lawyer. No. So it's it's simple. And I think the faster we we implemented, and the better it is for, you know, all concerned.

Unknown Speaker 37:33

You know, to I just take one more minute to, you know, answer an Obama's question on the concerns of, of, you know, lawyers litigants, and and, you know, on judges on on the privacy issue. I think even those have been beautifully taken care of, you know, I mean, I'm very familiar with what they do in Canada. If it If it is a private case, it is only the parties that get copies you have to apply for it. That's the important thing. And the transcript, actually, every day justice they review, you know, their their orders, they review the transcripts also. And in India, yes, we would have sometimes, you know, because of the use of language, a little bit of, you know, training, perhaps is required on that front for accuracy. But otherwise, I don't see it as a problem at all. I have always said, the faster we get on with it, the better it is, it's gonna clean up our system completely. Okay.

Unknown Speaker 38:45

That's very, that's very encouraging to me. So internationally, also, it's being done and they figured out clearly some ways to work around some of the concerns that I think all of us have the regard to having these transcripts put out in public or even recording them. sense. So it's I think it's a good way for us to learn and build on what we've already found out from the experiences. Before we wind up this discussion, I just like to go around to just see if anyone has any closing remarks to make. So maybe I'll start with Mr. Legend and any closing final remarks.

Unknown Speaker 39:22

Well, as Jim shed rightly said, the sooner we get on to this, the better it is for everybody. And, you know, I think there is a great need to bring in transparency and accountability into the judiciary. And I think for all the stakeholders, whether they're litigants or lawyers, or judges, I think this is going to be an invaluable tool for everyone concerned, to not only increase the efficiency, but then again, coming down is the accountability. I think, you know, one of the things in our judiciary, that's kind of missing a lot is transparency and accountability. And I think this will just Make the it's a complete game changer. And I think you know, in a couple of years you will see a lot of frivolous litigations of misuse of the judiciary completely disappear. And I think that's the need of the hour.

Transcribed by <https://otter.ai>