ILE MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL [IF SCORE – 7.58]

VOLUME 4 AND ISSUE 2 OF 2025

APIS – 3920 – 0007 | ISSN - 2583-7230

Published by

Institute of Legal Education

https://iledu.in

PRE-LITIGATION MEDIATION IN DIVORCE MATTERS: A CRITICAL ANALYSIS

AUTHOR - PRAGYA MATHUR, STUDENT AT AMITY UNIVERSITY, MUMBAI

BEST CITATION - PRAGYA MATHUR, PRE-LITIGATION MEDIATION IN DIVORCE MATTERS: A CRITICAL ANALYSIS, ILE MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL, 4 (2) OF 2025, PG. 175-185, APIS – 3920-0007 | ISSN - 2583-7230

Abstract

Pre-litigation mediation[185] is a useful substitute for regular divorce litigation, with the benefits of cost-effectiveness and less conflict. With the use of a neutral mediator, couples can work together to address issues like custody, support, and property, and typically result in better outcomes. While communication and relationship maintenance are facilitated by mediation, issues such as high-conflict levels and domestic violence require specialized methods. This discussion explores the advantages of compulsory pre-litigation mediation in reducing court backlog and enhancing quality of resolution, as well as its limitations and the critical factor of party willingness for effective results.

[185] According to The Mediation Act 2023, "pre-litigation mediation" means a process of undertaking mediation, as provided under section 5, for settlement of disputes prior to the filing of a suit or proceeding of civil or commercial nature in respect thereof, before a court or notified tribunal under sub-section (2) of section 5

ILE MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL [IF SCORE – 7.58]
VOLUME 4 AND ISSUE 2 OF 2025
APIS – 3920 – 0007 | ISSN - 2583-7230
Published by
Institute of Legal Education
https://iledu.in

Introduction

Pre-litigation mediation in divorce cases is a remarkable alternate dispute resolution[186] method for the purpose of handling the intricacies of matrimonial disputes prior to escalation as full-blown litigation. Divorce is a traumatic, both emotional and financial, procedure, most likely entailing hostile matters including custody of the child, settlement of properties, and maintenance by spouse. Normal adversarial proceedings just amplify the antagonisms that escalate the misery into extended psychological anguish and ruined relations. Pre-litigation mediation in this context presents a more cooperative, cost-saving, and time-effective way of resolving conflicts amicably.

Mediation is a process where a neutral third party assists in communication between divorcing spouses to enable them to come to mutually acceptable agreements. In contrast to litigation, which is adversarial in nature, mediation focuses on cooperation and self-determination. It enables parties to retain control over the outcome while creating an atmosphere of open communication and mutual respect. This method is especially useful in cases with children, as it focuses on their well-being and promotes co-parenting arrangements that cause minimal disruption to their lives.

One of the main benefits of pre-litigation mediation is that it minimizes the cost burden of divorce. Litigation tends to have very high legal costs, court fees, and consultant's advice, which are well beyond the means of many. Mediation, however, tends to be less costly and accessible. Moreover, it avoids time and procedural delays, which are a feature of litigation in courts. This effectiveness not only reduces the emotional burden on the parties but also enables them to get on with their lives sooner. A further important advantage of mediation is that it is confidential. In contrast to court proceedings, which form part of the public record, mediation sessions are confidential and private. This helps to ensure sensitive information is kept safe and leads parties to freely negotiate without worrying about public exposure. In addition, mediation allows for the maintenance of relationships through the reduction of hostility and increased understanding. This is particularly crucial in situations where continued interaction between the parties is required, such as co-parenting children.

While it has many benefits, pre-litigation mediation is not without its complications. One of the biggest issues is the problem of power imbalance between parties. Economic disadvantage, educational disparity, or emotional susceptibility can destroy the impartiality of the mediation process. In such instances, the danger exists that one party will dominate the negotiations or seek to influence the outcome in their favor. Mediators should be keen on addressing these imbalances so that both parties have equal voice in the process.

Mediation can also prove inappropriate for highly conflictual cases or those that include domestic violence. In these situations, the adversarial aspects of the litigation may serve to better protect vulnerable parties. Also, a lack of standardized processes among jurisdictions can result in variability in the conduct of mediation. This lack of standardization is the reason why strong training and accreditation schemes for mediators need to be in place to ensure high professionalism and impartiality standards are consistently met. Ethical issues are also raised when pre-litigation mediation takes place. Lawyer-mediators have been in the midst of controversy over such issues as possible conflicts of interest and impartiality. Lawyer-mediators face the tightrope between enlightening parties to their rights in law and avoiding bias. Issues of confidentiality only add to the complexity, in particular relating to the admissibility of data revealed under mediation in further proceedings.

[186] Alternative dispute resolution (ADR) refers to the different ways people can resolve disputes without a trial. Common ADR processes include mediation, arbitration, and neutral evaluation. These processes are generally confidential, less formal, and less stressful than traditional court proceedings.

In the world today, pre-litigation mediation has become widely used as a quality method of divorce dispute resolution. In India, for instance, legal frameworks like Section 89 of the Code of Civil Procedure and more recent advancements such as the Mediation Act 2022 have institutionalized mediation as a mechanism for Alternative Dispute Resolution of matrimonial cases. Indian courts have enthusiastically promoted pre-litigation mediation in disputes such as in K. Srinivas Rao v. D.A. Deepa Case[187], viewing it as a possible time-saver and also as a tool for promoting reconciliation.

In the same vein, South Africa's Mediation in Certain Divorce Matters Act (1987) instituted family advocates to protect children's interests in the event of divorce. Still, there are fears that mediators may not effectively deal with imbalances of power while remaining neutral. In Europe, England and Wales have rolled out compulsory Mediation Information and Assessment Meetings (MIAMs) for family conflicts relating to children or money. Italy has embraced comprehensive mandatory mediation to help decongest courts. These efforts reflect the increasing popularity of ADR but also call attention to shortcomings in awareness among disputants and consistency in accrediting mediators.

Psychologically, pre-litigation mediation addresses the emotional aspects of divorce by promoting cooperation and emphasizing future needs over past hurts. Research has shown that adversarial litigation aggravates psychological distress by prolonging conflict and preventing adaptation to post-divorce life. Mediation promotes psychological healing by supporting healthier relationships and limiting long-term emotional damage.

Finally, pre-litigation mediation is a transformative method of resolving divorce disputes by emphasizing cooperation over conflict. Although it has many advantages—cost effectiveness, time efficiency, confidentiality, and maintenance of relationships—it is also confronted with challenges in the form of power disparities, moral questions, and applicability to high-conflict cases. As more societies adopt ADR tools like pre-litigation mediation, continuous efforts are necessary to streamline its framework and guarantee fair results for all concerned in divorce cases.

THE HISTORICAL CONTEXT AND EVOLUTION OF PRE-LITIGATION MEDIATION

Ancient Roots and Traditional Practices

Mediation, as a non-confrontational method of dispute resolution, has deep roots in ancient civilizations, predating formal legal systems as we know them today. In its embryonic form, it often took place in community gatherings where village elders or community leaders acted as peacemakers, helping disputing parties reach common ground, not just for resolution but to ensure societal harmony. India, for instance, has a long history of community-based mediation through village panchayats (councils), which aligns with a traditional, collaborative legal culture. Similarly, ancient China relied on the principle of 'He', or harmony, underscoring the importance of mediation. In some contexts, traditional figures like priests were seen as mediators or middlemen, ideally positioned to intervene early and prevent conflict escalation.

Early Formalization and Integration

The move towards more formal alternative dispute resolution (ADR) mechanisms, including mediation, began to crystallize in the 20th century. This was driven by various factors, including the growing need to alleviate court backlogs and provide more efficient, cost-effective, and private dispute resolution methods. Scholarly efforts in the US and Canada began to explore dispute mediation as an adjunct and alternative to the adversarial processing of disputes in family courts.

Specific legislative and judicial developments started incorporating mediation into family law:

187 AIR 2013 SUPREME COURT 2176

- In Canada, an official guardian was required to investigate and report in every divorce involving children in Ontario as early as 1949.
- The Australian Family Law Act of 1975 provided courts the power to appoint "marriage counsellors" when child custody was in dispute, with the Family Court offering counseling services since its inception in 1976.
- In the UK, Section 41 of the Matrimonial Causes Act 1973 allowed courts to establish satisfactory proposals for children's futures before granting a divorce decree, and the Matrimonial Causes Rules 1977 permitted referral to a court welfare officer for investigation and report on a child's welfare. UK courts could request such reports since 1977. A pilot scheme for a "conciliation conference" in London began in January 1983.
- California became the first state in the US to require compulsory mediation over custody as early as 1981.
- The South African Divorce Act of 1979 introduced the "no-fault principle," making divorce less adversarial in terms of establishing grounds, although fault remained relevant for issues like custody and property. The Mediation in Certain Divorce Matters Act, 1987, in South Africa, was seen as heralding a "new era of mediation" in their law.
- In India, the codification of mediation began later. The Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, was India's first legislative attempt to recognize and structure mediation, though it clubbed it with conciliation.

The Rise of Pre-Litigation and Mandatory Mediation

The late 20th and early 21st centuries saw a significant resurgence and promotion of mediation, increasingly focusing on its potential *before* litigation commences. This shift was fueled by the desire to avoid the costs and acrimony of litigation and preserve relationships, particularly crucial in family disputes. Mediation became viewed not just as an alternative but as a preferred initial route to settlement.

Several countries began implementing measures encouraging or mandating preliminary mediation attempts:

- In the UK, rapid developments occurred since 1993, including expansion of lawyer-provided mediation and a move towards "all issues" mediation. Notably, Mediation Information and Assessment Meetings (MIAMs) were made mandatory (with exceptions) in family matters concerning children and finances before a party can take the case to court.
- Norway implemented preliminary mandatory mediation for separating couples with children under 16 concerning custody and visitation rights, initially requiring at least one hour of attempted mediation before court proceedings could be initiated.
- Italy reintroduced mandatory mediation attempts, primarily aimed at reducing the significant backlog in the court system.
- Germany saw mediation and conciliation being tried in court starting in 2002.
- Online divorce mediation platforms emerged in countries like the US and the Netherlands (e.g., Rechtwijzer in 2015).

India's Recent Legislative Shift

While India had traditional roots and earlier legislative/judicial encouragement of mediation, the formal legal framework specifically promoting *pre-litigation* mediation gained significant momentum more recently. The Indian judiciary became a strong proponent. The Supreme Court, in cases like *K. Srinivas Rao v. D.A. Deepa* (2013), strongly emphasized the merits of pre-litigation mediation for family problems, noting that early mediation increases the probability of success and ordering all family courts to establish and publicize pre-litigation clinics at their mediation centers.

The most significant development is the enactment of the recent Mediation Act, 2023. This Act provides a robust legal framework and mandates that certain disputes, which do not require urgent interim relief, must first attempt pre-litigation mediation before approaching the court. This represents a clear legislative push to formalize and prioritize mediation as the initial step in resolving many disputes, building upon India's traditional conciliatory culture.

In essence, the evolution shows a global trend from informal community-based practices to formal integration into legal systems, increasingly emphasizing the mandatory nature of attempting mediation *before* litigation, particularly in family law, driven by the recognition of its benefits in efficiency, cost, and preserving relationships compared to the adversarial nature of traditional court proceedings. India's recent Act places it among the jurisdictions specifically mandating such preliminary attempts.

HOW DOES PRE-LITIGATION MEDIATION WORKS IN DIVORCE MATTERS

Pre-litigation mediation is the process of attempting to resolve a dispute through mediation *before* entering the formal court system. It is considered a proactive approach to address disputes at their early stages, with the aim of preventing them from adding to court backlogs. Avoiding litigation is cost-effective and prevents courts from being burdened with too many cases. Additionally, mediation before litigation helps relationships between disputants remain as good as possible, increasing the chances of an amicable settlement, whereas court litigation tends to cause relationships to deteriorate due to its adversarial character.

In family and marital matters, the sources indicate that mediation is ideally attempted early, such as just after the respondent has been served and before written statements or objections are filed. The Supreme Court of India has emphasized the merits of pre-litigation mediation in the context of family problems and ordered family courts to establish and publicize pre-litigation clinics at all mediation centers. India's recent Mediation Act mandates that certain disputes, specifically those that do not necessitate urgent interim relief, should not be taken to court without first attempting to resolve them through pre-litigation mediation.

Divorce mediation generally is a formal process whereby separating couples, with the help of an impartial third party (the mediator), negotiate their own settlement terms. It is about helping people who have already decided to end their marriage. Unlike the adversarial system, mediation employs principles of cooperation and conflict resolution. The process provides an opportunity for separating couples to negotiate their own agreement and avoid going to court.

Here's how the mediation process typically works, whether before or after litigation has started, with a focus on the pre-litigation context where applicable:

1. **Initiation:** Parties may voluntarily agree to mediate, or increasingly, in some jurisdictions, there may be a mandatory preliminary step. In England and Wales, for example, a Mediation Information and Assessment Meeting (MIAM) is compulsory (with some exceptions) for family matters concerning children and finances following separation before a case can go to court. In Austria, courts may order participation in an initial discussion about mediation in child custody and access rights matters. Norway requires preliminary mandatory mediation for separating couples with minor children regarding custody and visitation rights before court action. The new Mediation Act in India mandates an attempt at pre-litigation mediation for certain disputes.

2. **Mediator Selection and Orientation:** The parties select a mediator, or one may be appointed. An orientation session may occur where the mediation rules are explained.

3. **Information Gathering:** The couple may complete detailed budget forms as preparation. Full and frank disclosure of all financial and other relevant information is required. The mediator might interview each party separately to understand facts and concerns but gives no legal advice during separate sessions.

4. **Joint Sessions:** The couple meets with the mediator. Both parties present their perspectives, issues, and desired outcomes. Issues open for discussion typically include parenting arrangements, the family home, money matters, property, and financial support.

5. **Negotiation and Problem Solving:** The mediator facilitates negotiation, helping the parties define issues, develop relevant information, understand their choices, and negotiate the agreement. The focus shifts from anger and differences to solving the future and what each party needs, especially considering the children's interests. Anger is acknowledged, but the dialogue is directed away from blaming or non-productive arguments about the past. Mediators are trained to detect and manage "gaming" tactics or delays.

6. **Seeking Advice:** Parties are encouraged to seek professional advice on the long-term tax and legal consequences of proposals, as the mediator does not offer legal advice. In the Family Mediation Association model, there was a provision for selecting an impartial advisory attorney who would oversee the process. The mediator should advise parties of the advantages of seeking independent legal counsel.

7. **Agreement Drafting:** Options are developed and agreed upon. If the parties reach an agreement, it is reduced to writing. This mediated agreement may be incorporated into a legal deed by a solicitor.

8. **Closure:** The mediation concludes with a signed agreement or an understanding that alternative remedies will be sought if mediation failed.

Key characteristics and benefits of pre-litigation mediation in divorce:

- **Voluntary & Confidential:** Mediation is generally voluntary (though preliminary steps may be mandated) and confidential. The mediator typically only reports success or failure to the court, not details of the discussions.
- **Party Control:** Parties retain the power of decision-making and take responsibility for resolving their own differences.
- **Focus on Interests:** The emphasis is on reconciling the interests and needs of the parties rather than vindicating legal rights.
- **Efficiency:** It is generally much faster and cheaper than lawyer-litigated divorce.
- **Relationship Preservation:** Being non-confrontational, it helps preserve personal relationships, which is critical for co-parenting after divorce.
- **Higher Compliance:** Since the resolution is mutually agreed upon, there's a higher likelihood of compliance compared to court-imposed judgments.
- **Adaptability:** The process can be adapted based on the nature of the dispute and the needs of the parties.

Potential drawbacks or limitations of mediation, whether pre-litigation or otherwise, include the risk of wasted time, effort, and money if the discussions fail. If the mediator is unskilled, the mediation may be incomplete or favor one spouse. There is also a risk of exploitation if one party is dominant, submissive, or hides assets, emphasizing the need for well-trained and competent mediators and potentially independent legal advice throughout the process. The sources suggest the concept of mediation is not suitable where there is violence or abuse.

ILE MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL [IF SCORE – 7.58]
VOLUME 4 AND ISSUE 2 OF 2025
APIS – 3920 – 0007 | ISSN - 2583-7230
Published by
Institute of Legal Education
https://iledu.in

HOW DOES MEDIATION EFFECTIVELY REDUCE COURT BACKLOGS AND ENHANCE ACCESS TO JUSTICE?

Reducing Court Backlogs

Mediation helps alleviate the burden on traditional court systems which often face severe overcrowding of dockets and courtrooms. It is viewed as a viable alternative to litigation that keeps cases out of the courtroom.

Here's how mediation contributes to reducing backlogs:

- **Explicit Focus on Settlement:** Unlike conventional divorce where settlement is a by-product of trial preparation, mediation's explicit objective is to achieve a settlement. This avoids the need for extensive trial preparation.
- **Time Efficiency:** Mediation is generally much faster than lawyer-litigated and negotiated divorce. Mediation sessions can conclude within 60 to 90 days from referral, whereas litigation can stretch for years or even decades. Examples from the sources show a decade-long property dispute resolved in three sessions and another case resolved in four sessions over two months. This expeditious process ensures disputes don't linger.
- **High Settlement Rates:** Statistics indicate high success rates in mediation. Across India, approximately 65% of cases referred to mediation centers have been settled. In Delhi courts between 2005-2023, 199,918 cases were settled through mediation. The Bangalore Mediation Centre reported a 66% settlement rate from 2007-2020, with 54,515 cases settled. This substantial number of resolved cases directly reduces the burden on the traditional court system.
- **Handling Case Volume:** The relatively low number of cases pending for mediation at centers like Delhi indicates an efficient system adept at handling new referrals, minimizing delays, and expediting the resolution process.
- **Reduced Need for Trial Preparation:** For the family lawyer, mediation reduces the need for the rigors of trial practice, as there is no uncertainty, trial preparation, or chance of losing fights.
- **Mandatory Mediation Attempts:** In some European jurisdictions, mandatory mediation attempts are introduced specifically to combat case overloads, as seen in Italy where they were reintroduced to relieve overburdened courts and benefit the economy. Where mandatory mediation is successful, it reduces the court caseload.

Enhancing Access to Justice

Mediation enhances access to justice by providing an alternative that addresses some of the inherent limitations of the traditional adversarial judicial system. It offers a more accessible, inclusive, and holistic justice delivery mechanism.

Key ways mediation enhances access to justice include:

- **Cost-Effectiveness:** Mediation is generally less expensive than traditional litigation. It involves no court fees, and the shorter process results in reduced legal fees. This economic aspect helps make justice accessible to all strata of society, not just the affluent. It is seen as a less expensive alternative to litigation.
- **Accessibility:** Mediation can increase reach, particularly in remote and rural areas, through flexible methods like mobile clinics and outreach programs, ensuring justice isn't confined to urban courtrooms. Community mediation, which leverages local leaders, enhances cultural sensitivity and trust, further improving accessibility at the grassroots level.
- **Party Control and Autonomy:** Mediation is a voluntary, non-binding process where a neutral third party facilitates discussions but does not impose a decision. Parties retain control over the outcome, deciding for themselves under the mediator's guidance. They agree to work together to find a mutually

acceptable solution, allowing them some control over the outcome. This empowerment helps parties become rational and responsible in reaching compromises.

- **Focus on Interests and Relationships:** Mediation primarily focuses on an immediate workable solution while taking into account emotions. It emphasizes reconciling the interests and needs of the parties rather than solely vindicating legal rights. Being non-confrontational, it helps preserve personal or business relationships that might be strained in litigation. This is particularly critical in family disputes.
- **Confidentiality:** Unlike public court proceedings, mediation ensures confidentiality. Discussions, proposals, and concessions remain private, which is crucial for sensitive information and helps preserve dignity.
- **Flexibility and Participation:** The process is flexible and can be adapted based on the nature of the dispute. It is also more participatory, allowing each party to present their argument in their own words.
- **Improved Compliance:** Since the resolution is mutually agreed upon by the parties, there is a higher likelihood of compliance compared to court-imposed judgments.
- **Emotional Benefits:** Mediation is generally less stressful than litigation. It is seen as promoting adaptive behavior, calming where litigation excites, and allowing parties to face the need for change without retreating into recrimination and blame. It can provide a sense of closure that is often elusive in prolonged litigation. Some sources suggest a trial can act as a catharsis, but mediation also provides an opportunity to express feelings.
- **Alignment with Collaborative Culture:** In places like India, mediation aligns with traditional, collaborative legal culture centered on village panchayats, promoting societal harmony and balance.

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF INDIA WITH OTHER COUNTRIES

India's Approach to Mediation in Matrimonial Disputes:

India has a long history of resolving disputes through community-based mediation, such as village panchayats, which aligns with a traditional, collaborative legal culture,. The formal legal framework has increasingly incorporated mediation, particularly in family law.

- **Legal Framework:** Section 89 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (CPC) was revised in 2002 to promote alternative dispute resolution (ADR)-. Specific acts like the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955, the Special Marriage Act, 1954, and the Family Courts Act mandate or allow courts to seek reconciliation or attempt dispute resolution in family cases. The recent Mediation Act, 2023, significantly bolsters pre-litigation mediation by mandating that certain disputes, which do not require urgent interim relief, must attempt pre-litigation mediation before going to court.
- **Judicial Emphasis**: The Indian judiciary has been a strong proponent of mediation. The Supreme Court, in cases like *K. Srinivas Rao v. D.A. Deepa*, has emphasized the merits of pre-litigation mediation for family problems. The Court noted that conflicts often arise for petty reasons resolvable without a lawsuit and that early mediation increases the probability of success. The Supreme Court ordered all family courts to establish and publicize pre-litigation clinics at their mediation centers. Justice Markanday Katju has also stated that attorneys should counsel clients to seek mediation for family disputes.
- **Nature of Mediation:** Mediation in India is a voluntary, non-binding process facilitated by a neutral third party. It aims for a mutually agreeable solution, focusing on interests and needs rather than solely legal rights,. It is often seen as a less expensive and faster alternative to litigation,, offering confidentiality.

- **Impact:** Statistical data from India indicates a significant number of cases resolved through mediation. For instance, across India, approximately 65% of referred cases are settled. Delhi Courts settled 199,918 cases through mediation between 2005 and 2023. The Bangalore Mediation Centre reported settling over 50,000 cases from 2007-2020. The low number of cases pending for mediation at these centers suggests efficiency in processing disputes.

Approaches in Other Countries (Comparative Analysis):

Several other countries have also implemented forms of mandatory or encouraged preliminary dispute resolution before litigation, particularly in family law.

- **England and Wales:** In England and Wales, a Mediation Information and Assessment Meeting (MIAM) is mandatory (with some exceptions) in family matters following separation concerning children and finances before a party can take the case to court. This meeting, with a qualified mediator, explores options for settling the case without court action and informs parties about ADR. MIAMs are considered necessary in family matters due to the involvement of non-legal issues and the centrality of the continuing relationship between parties. While a MIAM is a mandatory *step*, it is primarily an *information and assessment* session rather than mandatory mediation itself, though it aims to encourage mediation,.

- **Norway:** Preliminary mandatory mediation is a feature in family cases for separating couples with children under the age of 16 concerning custody and visitation rights. However, only one hour of attempted mediation is initially mandatory, though more can be added if a settlement seems likely. After the first hour, a certificate is issued, allowing parents to initiate court proceedings.

- **Austria:** In Austria, concerning child custody and access rights, the court *may* order participation in an initial discussion about mediation (a mediation information session) or another type of ADR if deemed in the child's best interests. This is a court-ordered measure, not a general pre-litigation requirement for all separating couples, and does not mandate participation in subsequent mediation.

- **Italy:** Mandatory mediation attempts were reintroduced in Italy primarily to combat case overloads in the court system. The list of cases subject to mandatory mediation is long. While not exclusively focused on family law, this illustrates a legislative strategy to push cases into ADR to reduce judicial backlog,

- **United States (California):** California was noted as the first state in the US to require compulsory mediation over custody as early as 1981. Community and court-annexed mediation programs are also prevalent in the US. Online divorce mediation using video conferencing has also been introduced in the US.

- **Britain (UK):** Beyond the MIAM requirement mentioned above, historically, UK courts could request reports from court welfare officers regarding children's welfare. A pilot scheme for a "conciliation conference" involving parties, lawyers, and children was also implemented. Private mediation is reported to be increasingly popular and tending to supersede public (court-connected) mediation in Britain.

- **Australia:** The Australian Family Law Act, 1975, provided courts with the power to appoint "marriage counsellors" when child custody is in dispute. The Family Court has offered counselling services since its inception in 1976.

Comparison:

- **Mandate:** India, with its new Mediation Act, explicitly mandates *attempted* pre-litigation mediation for certain non-urgent disputes, including family matters. This is similar in principle to mandatory preliminary steps in England & Wales (MIAMs) and Norway (1 hour attempt), but the scope and details of the mandate differ. England & Wales mandates an

information/assessment meeting specifically before court in post-separation family issues. Norway mandates a brief *attempt* at mediation for specific child issues. Austria's mandatory information session is *court-ordered* based on the child's best interest. Italy's mandatory mediation is broader, applying to a wide range of civil/commercial cases primarily for backlog reduction. California mandated custody mediation specifically.

- **Purpose:** While backlog reduction is a common goal, several countries, including India, England & Wales, and Norway, emphasize the unique nature of family disputes, involving ongoing relationships and non-legal issues, as a reason for promoting mediation specifically in this area.
- **Integration with Judiciary:** India shows strong judicial leadership in promoting pre-litigation mediation, including ordering the establishment of specific clinics within family courts. Court-annexed mediation is also significant. Some other countries also have court-connected services or processes, like court welfare officers in the UK/Australia, or court-ordered information sessions in Austria, but India's recent, comprehensive legislative and judicial push for *pre-litigation* family mediation appears particularly strong.
- **Cultural Context:** India's approach leverages its traditional collaborative culture, while Western countries often position ADR as an *alternative* to their historically adversarial systems.
- **Challenges:** India faces challenges with inconsistent quality, infrastructure, and public awareness, which can impact the effectiveness of widespread mandatory mediation. The success of mediation in other jurisdictions also varies based on factors like infrastructure and mediator quality,.

CONCLUSION

The historical context and evolution of pre-litigation mediation reveal a significant and growing global movement towards encouraging or requiring parties to attempt resolving disputes outside of court before initiating formal litigation. This trend is particularly prominent in family law matters.

Mediation has ancient roots in community-based dispute resolution aimed at maintaining social harmony. Formal alternative dispute resolution (ADR) gained traction in the 20th century to address issues like court backlogs, costs, and the adversarial nature of litigation, which is seen as poorly suited to the psychological needs of divorcing families [. Early examples include provisions for marriage counsellors or investigations in family law in Canada, Australia, and the UK and California mandating custody mediation from 1981. South Africa's 1987 Act also marked a "new era of mediation"

The recent focus is on mandatory preliminary attempts at mediation *before* court action. Examples from Europe include:

- **England and Wales:** Require Mediation Information and Assessment Meetings (MIAMs) in most family cases before court application
- **Norway:** Mandate at least one hour of preliminary mediation for separating couples with children under 16 regarding custody and visitation
- **Italy:** Has reintroduced mandatory mediation attempts
- **Spain:** A 2020 Project proposes mandatory use of an ADR method, including mediation, before civil or commercial claims, requiring at least one mediation session if chosen [

These preliminary mandatory attempts aim to explore settlement possibilities. Crucially, nowhere in Europe are disputants *forced* to settle; the outcome remains voluntary, but they may be required to *attempt* mediation.

Mediation offers significant benefits compared to traditional litigation, such as being time-efficient, cost-effective, and providing confidentiality. It also offers greater party

control over the outcome and encourages a collaborative, win-win approach. Ethical considerations for lawyers acting as mediators or providing advice in mediated settlements are important, emphasizing transparency and avoiding conflicts of interest

In India, judicial encouragement paved the way for the Mediation Act, 2023, which provides a legal framework and mandates pre-litigation mediation for certain civil and commercial disputes (where urgent relief is not needed). This aligns with India's traditional collaborative culture. Statistics from centers like Delhi and Bangalore demonstrate mediation's success in settling a large volume of cases, thus helping to reduce court backlogs.

In conclusion, pre-litigation mediation is increasingly viewed globally as an effective mechanism to address the burdens and drawbacks of traditional litigation by promoting earlier, more efficient, and party-centred dispute resolution, supported by legislative mandates for attempts in many jurisdictions.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Crouch, Richard E. "Divorce Mediation and Legal Ethics." *Family Law Quarterly*, vol. 16, no. 3, Fall 1982, pp. 219-250. HeinOnline.
- Coogler, O. J., Weber, Ruth E., and Patrick C. McKenry. "Divorce Mediation: A Means of Facilitating Divorce and Adjustment." *The Family Coordinator*, vol. 28, no. 2, Apr. 1979, pp. 255-259. JSTOR.
- Greatbatch, David, and Robert Dingwall. "Argumentative Talk in Divorce Mediation Sessions." *American Sociological Review*, vol. 62, no. 1, Feb. 1997, pp. 151-170. American Sociological Association. JSTOR.
- Mahantesh G S, Mamatha R, Sunil Kumar L. "Mediation In Matrimonial Disputes: A Judicial Perspective." *Webology*, vol. 19, no. 2, 2022, p. 9018. http://www.webology.org.
- Margulies, Sam, and Anya Luchow. "Litigation, mediation and the psychology of divorce." *Journal of Psychiatry and Law*, vol. 20, no. 4, Winter 1992, pp. 483-504. HeinOnline.
- Mazza, Kevin M. "Divorce Mediation." *Family Advocate*, vol. 14, no. 4, Spring 1992, pp. 40-44. HeinOnline.
- Mowatt, J. G. "Divorce Mediation - The Mediation in Certain Divorce Matters Act, 1987." *Journal of South African Law*, vol. 1988, no. 1, 1988, pp. 47-56. HeinOnline.
- O'Connor, Pádraig. "Family Mediation." *The Furrow*, vol. 48, no. 10, Oct. 1997, pp. 537-541. The Furrow. JSTOR.
- Sardar, Huma. "Mediation as a Pre-Trial Dispute Resolution Mechanism: Evaluating Its Efficacy in Reducing Court Backlogs and Enhancing Access to Justice." *International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews*, vol. 4, no. 12, Dec. 2023, pp. 2799-2810. DOI: https://doi.org/10.55248/gengpi.4.1223.123515.
- van Rhee, C.H. "MANDATORY MEDIATION BEFORE LITIGATION IN CIVIL AND COMMERCIAL MATTERS: A EUROPEAN PERSPECTIVE." *Access to Justice in Eastern Europe*, vol. 4, no. 12, 2021, pp. 7–24. DOI: https://doi.org/10.33327/AJEE-18-4.4-a000082.