

Digital Justice and Women's Access to Justice in India: A Socio-Legal Analysis of E-Courts, Digital Exclusion, and Algorithmic Governance

Ramanpreet Kaur^{*1}, Dr. Sukhdev Singh², Dr. Nitin Singh³

¹ Research Scholar, Department of Political Science, Guru Kashi University, Talwandi Sabo, Punjab, India, Email:- happydhillon583@gmail.com,

² Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, Guru Kashi University, Talwandi Sabo, Punjab, India, Email:-sukhdevgahlot@gmail.com,

³ Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Guru Kashi University, Talwandi Sabo, Punjab, India, Email:-singhnitin569@gmail.com

***Corresponding Author**

Ramanpreet Kaur

Research Scholar, Department of Political Science, Guru Kashi University, Talwandi Sabo, Punjab, India, Email:- happydhillon583@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Digitisation has transformed the architecture of judicial administration and legal remedy provision in India. Digitisation projects such as electronic filing, video conferencing, mobile case tracking, and artificial intelligence pipelines that are being developed as part of the e-Courts Integrated Mission Mode Project are intended to address some of the long-standing problems such as geographical constraints, process frictions, and institutional backlog. However, the availability of technology alone does not guarantee equality-based legal empowerment. Indian women face structural disadvantages when it comes to their ability to access and use technology due to differential ownership of hardwares, limited access to data, low technical literacy, linguistic disempowerment, and intense surveillance in patriarchal familial arrangements. In this paper, we carry out a socio-legal critical assessment of the issues pertaining to the nexus of digitisation of courts, gender disparities, and legal technologies in India. This paper questions the neutrality of procedure and seeks to demonstrate why digitised court systems have the potential to exacerbate structural disenfranchisement of women trying to obtain civil, criminal, and family law remedies. This is how this article formulates an analytical framework based on six dimensions, namely material access, cognitive ability, spatial and communicational autonomy, procedural confidentiality, systemic fairness of algorithms, and accountability with a human-in-the-loop. Going further than just implementing infrastructure, digital justice needs to implement procedural citizenship.

Keywords: Digital justice, gender digital divide, e-Courts India, access to justice, artificial intelligence, algorithmic accountability, legal capacities.

INTRODUCTION

Judicial systems around the world are under tremendous pressure from two distinct fronts: that of heavy backlog and need for transparency in their engagements. In India, the process of institutional modernization can be exemplified through the e-Courts Integrated Mission Mode Project. This project, led by the e-Committee of the Supreme Court of India, has involved digitization of court registries, creation of the National Judicial Data Grid (NJDG), virtual courtroom hearings, and piloting algorithms for case load management and multi-lingual translation. The standard narrative that is used to justify these initiatives is one of efficiency: e-case portals, virtual hearings, and automatic filings ease the burden that comes with the logistics of legal processes.

Though, there lies an inherent socio-legal paradox in the basic idea of procedural modernization the presence of technology does not necessarily guarantee procedural access. The belief that digitization means equal access to information presumes a detached and autonomous plaintiff who enjoys unfettered physical access to equipment, digital literacy skills, financial independence, and absolute privacy in space. In the context of Indian socio-economy, this presumption is faulty when divided through the lens of gender. Research suggests that access to the mobile phone and the internet is inherently gendered and depends on caste, class, education level, and geography. Economic instability and patriarchal beliefs prevent women from owning their phones.

In cases where legal systems transition into digital-by-default and digital-first systems without tackling the pre-existing social hierarchies, the danger exists that they will disenfranchise the very people who need protection most. Where an institution is seeking justice for a woman seeking matrimonial maintenance, protection from domestic violence, custody, or property partition, mere connectivity does not suffice. What is required in such cases is unrestricted communication with the legal advocate, confidentiality from abusive domestic individuals, linguistic comprehension of technological systems, and safety. The use of intermediary technology in accessing such resources as male relatives, cyber cafes, or rogue operators negates the independence of litigants and violates constitutional privacy rights. This paper provides an overarching socio-legal analysis of digital justice in India

through a gender perspective. This paper extends the conventional administrative approach to analysis of e-courts by bringing together three distinct academic traditions: socio-legal justice theories, digital divide literature, and algorithmic accountability studies. The analysis focuses on structural barriers throughout the process of litigation and identifies a six-fold approach including accessibility, capability, autonomy, privacy, justice, and accountability.

2. RESEARCH OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK

1.1 Research Question

To critically analyze the socio-legal processes whereby the e-Courts initiative of India influences women's access to courts.

To determine and chart the barriers that exist structurally, socio-family, economically, and technologically that prevent women from accessing digital judicial forums on their own.

To analyze the dangers inherent in using artificial intelligence software in judicial processes, especially issues related to algorithmic discrimination, process secrecy, and privacy breaches.

To design a gender-based policy theory that integrates digitization of the courts with equality and human dignity guaranteed in the constitution.

2.2 Methodological Framework

The research design takes the form of a socio-legal analysis which incorporates an interdisciplinary methodology that takes a critical stance towards existing frameworks. The conventional approach to law research usually considers legal rules independently and measures their efficiency without regard to social hierarchy and power dynamics. In turn, this review paper merges formal institutional legal theory with practical observations of digital sociology, feminist jurisprudence and human-computer interactions.

Three theoretical constructs underlie the concept of the research:

Approach to Capabilities: The definition of accessibility according to Sen and Nussbaum is based not only on the presence of the digital infrastructure for the person, but on her capacity to utilize technology in order to create the actual legal agency.

Digital Inequality Multi-Layer Model: Based on the stratified models of the digital divide by Hargittai, assessing first-level material access, second-level skills and cognitive competencies, and third-level transformation of digital activity into socio-legal effects.

Algorithm Studies and Procedural Justice: Using sociotechnical system theories in order to measure possible embedding of historical biases in automated procedural algorithms within court environments.

This review encompasses peer-reviewed articles, institutional reports from the Supreme Court e-Committee, white papers on policies, and statutory frameworks like the Information Technology Act (2000) and the Digital Personal Data Protection Act (2023). Literature was categorized along thematic intersections, such as digital courts, gender-based structural inequality, surveillance, data security, algorithmic bias, and procedural due process.

3. THE DIGITALIZATION OF THE INDIAN JUDICIARY: ARCHITECTURE AND AMBITIONS

The modernization of the judicial system in India is done within the framework of the multi-phase e-Courts Integrated Mission Mode Project. Initially designed to help solve the issue of excessive backlog, delayed procedures, and geographical costs, the project has been working systematically on the restructuring of court systems along several critical dimensions:

Core Information Infrastructure: The introduction of CIS in the District Courts and High Courts has facilitated a standard system for the tracking of cases. The public NJDG offers real-time information on cases' life cycle, their orders, and the scheduling of hearings.

Remote Adjudication Channels: The virtual courts and remote hearings, which developed during the COVID-19 pandemic, allowed setting administrative ways to handle commercial traffic, summary, and civil/criminal motions through remote video connections.

Institutional Assistance Initiatives: In light of the fact that technological access remains uneven across all sectors of society, Phase II and Phase III included physical e-Sewa Kendras at court premises.

Automation Pipeline Emerging: The third phase focuses on the implementation of cloud computing, open APIs, and artificial intelligence. These policies include tools for natural language processing, such as SUPACE (Supreme Court Portal for Assistance in Court's Efficiency) for case management, along with SUVAS (Supreme Court VidhikAnuvaad Software) for multilingual judicial documents translation.

It is evident from these policies that there is an institutional strategy to transform paper-based and place-bound court rooms into digital systems. But, their design takes the standardized and gender neutral user for granted.

4. DECONSTRUCTING THE GENDER DIGITAL DIVIDE IN INDIA

In discussing the constraints within which digital justice operates, it is impossible to dissociate these constraints from the socio-economic determinants of technology uptake in India. The understanding of women's interactions with digital legal systems must include an examination of the gender digital divide on the following levels:

4.1 Level One Gender Digital Divide: Physical and Infrastructural Instability

First-level digital divide refers to inequities in access to devices that provide Internet connectivity. Empirical studies reveal that there exist gender digital divides when it comes to the ownership of cellphones and mobile Internet usage. Women in poorer rural and peri-urban communities are less likely to have their own connected cell phones due to structural differences in family organization. It is usually men who purchase, maintain, and formally own any connected devices in their households. Under conditions of resource scarcity, connected devices are assigned primarily to men for either job or education-related purposes.

4.2 Second Level Divide: Literacy, Language Barriers, and Usability

Second level divides include distinctions between users' abilities and competencies when using technology. Just because someone is able to use instant messaging tools does not mean that he or she has the mental capacity to operate secure portals, drop down menus, or upload court documents through the process of authentication. This is especially true for people in India, where language and literacy play a role in the difficulty of operating these portals. Court management systems, electronic filing systems, and document tracking databases are predominantly created using English with legalese terminology. This leaves many non-English speaking women without any means of accessing these portals.

4.3 Third-Level Divide: Achieving Substantive Legal Effect

The third-level divide relates to the varying rates of return on digital use in relation to whether the use of the digital technology will result in actual legal empowerment. While a woman litigant may be successful in gaining access to technology and overcoming language problems, sociological factors may inhibit her interaction from resulting in an independent legal solution. Substantive justice depends on the ability of the litigant to use legal information independently, without threats of violence or community retribution.

5. CRITICAL VULNERABILITIES IN THE DIGITIZED JUSTICE LIFECYCLE FOR WOMEN

The intersection of gendered digital inequalities with institutional court processes generates structural points of failure throughout the litigation lifecycle:

Litigation Stage	Digitized Operational Pipeline	Structural Vulnerability for Female Litigants
Pre-Litigation & Legal Literacy	Web portals, online aid directories, informational chatbots.	Algorithmic misinformation; linguistic exclusion; monitored search histories exposing vulnerable litigants to domestic retaliation.
Case Initiation & e-Filing	Dedicated portals (e-Filing 3.0), digital signatures, and online court fees.	Reliance on commercial intermediaries for scanning, token generation, and fee payments; loss of narrative and factual autonomy.
Virtual Hearings & Appearance	Video conferencing platforms, remote evidence management.	Lack of private physical space; domestic coercion during proceedings; intimidating and technical procedural dynamics.
Tracking & Ongoing Monitoring	NJDG database tracking, automated SMS alert frameworks.	Devices controlled by adverse household members; intercepted notices; missed statutory deadlines and hearings.
Deliberation & Adjudication	Automated docketing, predictive case management, AI assistance.	Institutional reproduction of socio-legal biases; automated marginalization of intersectional claims.

5.1 Pre-Litigation Stage: Information Asymmetry and Exploitative Role of Intermediaries

Litigation process commences with the identification of a legally wrongful act and ways by which the litigant can pursue justice in court. While e-Courts provides a list of judgments, cause lists and legal procedure through their website, the information is provided through a directory based on legal procedures rather than user-friendly

language. Since many women do not have the technical skills to access this information, they have to depend upon the informal and unregulated intermediaries like cyber cafe owners, unauthorized petition writers and even family members who have a different motive altogether. These intermediaries charge for simple procedures, make transcription mistakes and often violate the privacy of sensitive personal narratives such as domestic violence, maintenance proceedings or property issues.

5.2 Filing Stage: Procedural Bottleneck of e-Filing Structure

Switching to compulsory or incentivized filing (e-Filing 3.0) adds additional logistical difficulties for disadvantaged litigants. The requirements include:

Multi-page, high resolution compilation of PDF with stringent limits on file size.

Digital signature facility such as hardware token or Aadhar enabled electronic signatures.

Online payment gateways through individual's bank accounts and debit card or even UPI facilities.

The procedural conditions involved herein impose considerable hurdles for rural and economically marginalized women, who have a much smaller chance of possessing individual digital bank accounts and token-based authenticators.

5.3 Adjudication: Spatial Instability and Challenges of Virtual Hearings

The advantages of virtual court proceedings, in terms of cost savings in travel time and money, as well as avoidance of the tension-filled atmosphere of the physical courtroom, are widely extolled. However, for women who are participating in proceedings regarding domestic disputes, child custody, and sexual assault cases, the virtual hearing brings other challenges:

Space and Communication Compromise: Remote appearances involve the use of private physical space. Women who live in cramped or shared housing cannot make virtual appearances away from the eyes of their family members. Making an appearance at a virtual hearing while pursuing protection under matrimonial or domestic violence laws would amount to exposing oneself to immediate threats that would affect testimonies.

Compromised Confidentiality between Client and Advocate: Physical hearings enable confidential real-time discussions between client and advocate. Video conference setups, however, lack sufficient means to enable private communications during hearings between a litigant and their attorney. This would isolate vulnerable litigants from their advocates during hearings.

Demeanor Misinterpretations: Angles of camera, poor lighting, poor microphone quality, and packet drops are some technical issues that can distort emotions and tone of voice. Adjudicators may misinterpret the demeanors of litigants on account of bandwidth latency as signs of hesitation, evasiveness, or indifference.

6. EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES, ALGORITHMIC GOVERNANCE, AND SYSTEMIC BIAS

With the Indian judicial system entering Phase III of the e-Courts initiative, digitization is moving beyond basic information management systems towards automated case management, predictive analytics, and NLP processes. While touted as objective technologies to eliminate systemic delay, the integration of algorithmic decision support into courtrooms poses significant socio-legal issues.

6.1 Fallacy of Algorithmic Neutrality

By nature, machine learning is an inductive process wherein operational rules and correlations are derived based on past training data. However, judicial history is not an objective account of pure justice; it is one of socio-economic, institutional, and gendered biases for many decades built up in the legal system.

Should algorithms be trained on the historic database on the quantum of maintenance, custody cases, or criminal sentencing, they will embed the existing biases into their computations under the guise of objective analysis. Triage or risk assessments through automation will serve only to perpetuate a traditional socio-legal baseline and patriarchal norms on women's economic necessities, parenthood, and moral character.

6.2 Black-Box Systems and the Erosion of Due Process

The current generation of deep learning models typically function as “black boxes,” which means they are opaque in terms of the logic of the operation, the weights of the correlations, and inference processes involved. This creates a problem for the very principles of natural justice, namely:

The Principle of Ratio Decidendi: Judicial procedures should require a court to provide clear reasons for its decisions, giving the party concerned the opportunity to challenge them.

The Right to Question Evidence and Inferences: When a decisional system produces a risk, admissibility or predictive priority assessment, it is impossible for those affected to question the reasoning behind such a score because of lack of access to the relevant code and evidence.

6.3 Linguistic Disparities in Legal NLP

Projects such as SUVAS provide an insight into the potential of legal translation technology. However, there are many problems faced by Indian NLP pipelines when dealing with complex vernacular language. There are hundreds of languages in India along with contextual idiomatic usage and sociocultural nuances. Formal machine translation programs will usually misinterpret contextual vernacular statements especially when cases of domestic violence, harassment due to dowry, and sexual assault are concerned. Automated semantic mistranslations will

affect the credibility of witnesses, change the timelines involved and will negatively impact the evidentiary status of the litigant.

7. INFORMATIONAL PRIVACY, SURVEILLANCE, AND DATA PROTECTION

Migration of sensitive litigation documents to networked digital databases entails serious informational risks to women litigants.

7.1 Surveillance Beyond the Physical Court and Search Ability of Records

In the past, physical court records were subject to practical obscurity. Although court records were in principle public documents, their retrieval entailed the necessity of visiting a specific registry, applying for access and paying a fee for it. The transition to digital records and openness of the NJDG database has removed this practical obscurity.

Comprehensive case files containing names, residential addresses, financial documents, and reports of matrimonial disputes or sexual violence may usually be indexed and accessed via open search facilities. In order to escape an abusive situation, ensuring a safe and confidential place of abode for women is a crucial step. The indiscriminate publication of information related to litigation may make new addresses vulnerable to abusive husbands as it could be subject to surveillance and retaliatory violence.

7.2 Intercepted Communications through Shared Domestic Networks

Automated case tracking systems depend largely on SMS messages and email alerts. If the digital devices are either shared or directly monitored by spouses or in-laws in the domestic sphere, these could prove to be very dangerous for those women. Any automated message regarding hearing dates for domestic violence cases, alimony claims, or child custody applications could warn their family about these cases in advance.

7.3 Legislative Measures: The Digital Personal Data Protection Act (DPDPA), 2023

The legal framework concerning data protection in India is governed by DPDPA, 2023 which makes certain key exclusions applicable to judicial institutions. Section 17 provides a general exclusion for judicial functions and State instrumentalities:

The processing of personal information in order to pursue claims or enforce legal rights is mostly excluded from the typical requirements imposed on data fiduciaries.

Data processing by judicial authorities for adjudication purposes is not subject to important accountability measures, like the requirement for notice of consent, data minimization, and data erasure mandates.

While such exclusions help ensure that data protection policies do not hinder judicial processes, they nevertheless create important structural loopholes in the privacy protection of litigants. There are few legal ways for litigants to seek recourse when their private information is indexed improperly on the Internet.

8. Six Pillars of Analytical Framework of Gender Sensitive Digital Justice

In order to overcome these structural limitations, it is necessary to look beyond mere technological efficiency to re-conceptualize the idea of digital justice. Substantive procedural citizenship which is inclusive of genders calls for a balanced analytical framework based on six key pillars:

8.1 Material and Structural Accessibility

The digital platforms cannot be used as mandatory or exclusive means to seek relief. Courts have to ensure that the principle of "channel pluralism" prevails and the physical registries, paper forms, and physical court hearings must continue to be fully accessible and be of equal standing as digital platforms. The physical e-Sewa Kendras have to be developed beyond the apex complexes into rural taluk level courts. The centers must provide dedicated desks manned by female legal aid officers.

8.2 Cognitive and Operational Capability

The user interface must be designed using universal design thinking. The systems must move from complex English language based architectural designs to more accessible multilingual vernacular designs incorporating visual cues and voice-based workflows. Legal service authorities such as NALSA and DLSA must move beyond their conventional legal literacy camps to provide digital legal education to women about tracking cases.

8.3 Communicative and Litigious Autonomy

Architectures of the judiciary must ensure that litigants remain autonomous from domestic gatekeepers and predatory commercial intermediaries. Virtual courts will need to build in secure channels of communication that would allow litigants to have private conversations with their attorneys in real time. When domestic coercion is feared, courts must order litigants to appear through local institutional portals such as One Stop Centres (Sakhi Centres) or Taluk Legal Services Committee.

8.4 Information and Relationship Confidentiality

Systems for managing case information must implement automated privacy protections:

Automatically redact personal contact information, residence addresses and banking details from case records publicly available in electronic filing systems.

Block search engine indexing of sensitive categories of cases: matrimonial, child custody and sexual offense cases.

Notify system should allow customization of notification delivery channels so that litigants can choose safe face-to-face notification, single use password delivery, or authorized contact person other than adverse household member.

8.5 Algorithmic Fairness and Epistemic Justice

Any use of AI or machine learning in judicial triage, document processing, and legal research needs to be subject to mandatory socio-legal audits. Historical biases against women's economic and personal autonomy in training data need to be cleansed out. Algorithms need to be designed so that they are subject to legal review along with clear explanations about how they work, and they are prevented from answering key issues of credibility, motive, or liability.

8.6 Human Accountability and Institutional Safeguards

The use of automated systems needs to be purely assistive and subordinated to human judicial decision-making. Litigants need to have an inalienable right to a judicial hearing before a human judge. Institutional procedures need to provide adequate pathways for challenging and reversing any automated decisions to ensure natural justice and procedural fairness.

9. POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS AND IMPLEMENTATION ROADMAP

These principles can only be translated into sustainable administrative practice through specific interventions in institutional and regulatory arenas:

Codification of Procedural Channel Pluralism: The Supreme Court e-committee needs to provide administrative guidelines to the High Courts and subordinate tribunals that ban the mandatory use of digital filing in family disputes, maintenance actions, and domestic violence cases.

Converting e-Sewa Kendras to Safe Access Points: Existing e-Sewa Kendras must be physically converted to have dedicated consulting areas. Female paralegal volunteers (PLVs) must be recruited by NALSA to provide scanning and file tracking services free of charge at all the district centers.

Standardized Court Hearing Safety: In cases where court proceedings in family law and domestic safety cases take place virtually, judges must verify that the litigant is participating on their own free will. In domestic safety disputes, litigants should be allowed to participate in court hearings from decentralized government offices like the Taluk Legal Services office, university legal aid office, or women's shelters.

Standardized Privacy and Redaction Measures: Automated redaction programs should be introduced into court management system databases for all published cause list, orders, and judgment databases in domestic disputes. There must be opt-out provisions for listing dockets in domestic safety disputes.

Independent Auditing of Judicial AI: Third phase AI systems will be audited through an independent algorithmic ethics board consisting of judges, technical experts, academics, and civil society. Any predictive algorithms, natural language processing algorithms, and case categorization tools shall be audited for any biases and the results made public.

10. CONCLUSION

The modernization of Indian legal institutions through technology is an epochal shift in the field of legal administration. Through the demolition of geographic constraints, the reduction of administrative delays in terms of paperwork, and the introduction of accessible digital portals, the e-Courts project offers genuine potential to democratize the process of legal redress. Yet procedural efficiency does not equate to substantive justice. The process of technological modernization without the eradication of pre-existing structural inequalities along lines of gender, class, and education can only serve to automate social inequality.

Indeed, legal processes are already inherently complex for women in India; however, if the usage of the court system demands technical skills and socio-familial autonomy that female litigant's lack, the project of digital justice will only perpetuate existing social disparity. The digitization of India's judicial system in order to realize the constitutional promises of equality, liberty, and human dignity enshrined in Articles 14 and 21 needs to go further than the mere digitalization of administrative processes. Judicial technologies have to be rooted in the real-life experiences of marginalized individuals. The use of a gender-sensitive approach to analysis: based on issues of accessibility, capability, autonomy, privacy, equity, and human accountability: will guarantee that the digitalization of justice benefits everyone.

REFERENCES:

1. Acilar, A., & Sæbø, Ø. (2022). Towards understanding the gender digital divide: A systematic literature review. *Global Knowledge, Memory and Communication*, 71(3), 233-249. <https://doi.org/10.1108/gkmc-09-2021-0147>.

2. Adams-Prassl, J., Binns, R., & Kelly-Lyth, A. (2023). Directly discriminatory algorithms. *The Modern Law Review*, 86(1), 144-175. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2230.12759>
3. Barocas, S., & Selbst, A. D. (2016). Big data's disparate impact. *California Law Review*, 104(3), 671-732. <https://doi.org/10.15779/Z38BG31>
4. Barysè, D., & Sarel, R. (2024). Algorithms in the court: Does it matter which part of the judicial decision-making is automated? *Artificial Intelligence and Law*, 32, 117-146. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10506-022-09343-6>
5. Denvir, C., & Selvarajah, A. D. (2022). Safeguarding access to justice in the age of the online court. *The Modern Law Review*, 85(1), 25-68. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2230.12670>
6. Donoghue, J. (2017). The rise of digital justice: Courtroom technology, public participation and access to justice. *The Modern Law Review*, 80(6), 995-1025. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2230.12300>
7. Handa, M., & Ahuja, P. (2021). Thus far and no further? An inquiry into adoption of mobile phones by low income women in urban India. *Journal of Poverty*, 25(2), 173-192. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10875549.2020.1783423>
8. Hargittai, E. (2002). Second-level digital divide: Differences in people's online skills. *First Monday*, 7(4). <https://doi.org/10.5210/fm.v7i4.942>
9. Hargittai, E., & Hinnant, A. (2008). Digital inequality: Differences in young adults' use of the Internet. *Communication Research*, 35(5), 602-621. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093650208321782>
10. Jain, R. (2025). Who has ICT access in India? A gender-based analysis. *The Indian Economic Journal*, 73(3), 515-533. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00194662241260816>
11. Jain, R., & Chatterjee, T. (2024). Information and communication technology and female employment in India. *Information Economics and Policy*, 69, 101116. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.infoecopol.2024.101116>
12. Katsh, E., & Rabinovich-Einy, O. (2017). *Digital justice: Technology and the Internet of disputes*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780190464585.001.0001>
13. Kroll, J. A., Huey, J., Barocas, S., Felten, E. W., Reidenberg, J. R., Robinson, D. G., & Yu, H. (2017). Accountable algorithms. *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, 165, 633-705. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2765268>
14. Lythreath, S., Singh, S. K., & El-Kassar, A.-N. (2022). The digital divide: A review and future research agenda. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 175, 121359. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2021.121359>
15. Mittelstadt, B. D., Allo, P., Taddeo, M., Wachter, S., & Floridi, L. (2016). The ethics of algorithms: Mapping the debate. *Big Data & Society*, 3(2). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951716679679>
16. Mohan, D., Bashingwa, J. J. H., Tiffin, N., Dhar, D., Mulder, N., George, A., & LeFevre, A. E. (2020). Does having a mobile phone matter? Linking phone access among women to health in India: An exploratory analysis of the National Family Health Survey. *PLOS ONE*, 15(7), e0236078. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0236078>
17. Oltra Gras, I. (2021). Online courts: Bridging the gap between access and justice. *UCL Journal of Law and Jurisprudence*, 10(1), 24-51. <https://doi.org/10.14324/111.444.2052-1871.1214>
18. Potnis, D. (2016). Inequalities creating economic barriers to owning mobile phones in India: Factors responsible for the gender digital divide. *Information Development*, 32(5), 1332-1342. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0266666915605163>
19. Rule, C. (2020). Online dispute resolution and the future of justice. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*, 16, 277-292. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-lawsocsci-101518-043049>
20. Selbst, A. D., Boyd, D., Friedler, S. A., Venkatasubramanian, S., & Vertesi, J. (2019). Fairness and abstraction in sociotechnical systems. *Proceedings of the Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 59-68. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3287560.3287598>
21. Singh, S., Rahul, K., Paliwal, M., Wani, I. A., & Suri, S. (2025). Gendering the digital divide: A systematic review of women's digital inclusion challenges and emerging research directions. *Digital Transformation and Society*, 4(4), 503-531. <https://doi.org/10.1108/DTS-04-2025-0083>
22. Singh, S., Singh, S., & Kumar, A. (2019). Women and ICT: A study on access and perceptions in North India. *Indian Journal of Human Development*, 12(3), 401-419. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0973703018818588>

23. Sung, H.-C. (2020). Can online courts promote access to justice? A case study of the Internet Courts in China. *Computer Law & Security Review*, 39, 105461. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clsr.2020.105461>
24. Vyas, L. S. (2025). Digital revolution and the gender divide: Factors affecting mobile phone use in India. *Information, Communication & Society*, 28(3), 471-491. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2024.2420034>
25. Wachter, S., Mittelstadt, B., & Floridi, L. (2017). Why a right to explanation of automated decision-making does not exist in the General Data Protection Regulation. *International Data Privacy Law*, 7(2), 76-99. <https://doi.org/10.1093/idpl/idx005>