
PROCEDURAL MODERNISATION UNDER BNSS: AN ANALYTICAL STUDY OF SUMMONS AND WARRANT TRIALS

Pratyaksh Sharma, School of Law, Delhi Metropolitan Education, Noida, Affiliated with Guru Gobind Singh Indraprastha University, Delhi, India.

ABSTRACT

The introduction of the Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS), was a water-shed moment which bought a paradigm shift in criminal procedural law in India, replacing the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (CrPC). This research paper undertakes a systematic and in depth analysis of the procedural modernisation that has been done in the new statute particularly focusing upon the trial processes for summons and warrant cases under the BNSS. The study outlines the new streamlined provisions for summons cases, emphasizing on expedited justice for less serious offences and minimizing the procedural delays. For warrant trials, the paper sheds light upon the strengthened safeguards for serious crimes, the integration of technology for case management, and the ever evolving mechanisms for higher transparency, efficiency, and protection of rights. Substantial reforms, such as the likes of electronic summons, digital documentation, introduction of strict timelines, and adaptable trial structures including the conversion of summons cases to warrant procedures, are critically examined. The paper evaluates these innovations in the context of legal fairness as well as efficiency, identifying both advancements and implementation challenges. By comparing the BNSS framework with the earlier CrPC regime, the analysis offers deep insights into the fluidity of Indian criminal proceedings to the demands of modern justice, ultimately showing the radical impact and limitations of the procedural modernisation drive under the BNSS.

Keywords: BNSS (Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023), Procedural Modernisation, Summons, Criminal Justice Reform, Efficiency and Fairness.

INTRODUCTION

The sanctioning of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS) marked a major transformation in India's criminal procedural law, marking the end of the CrPC and beginning a regime shaped for the present day modern judicial needs. The BNSS is prepared in order to modernise the administration of justice, introducing technological integration such as the likes of e-FIR's, electronic summons, and digital evidence management, aligning the Indian criminal procedure code with the world-wide accepted standards.¹

The key changes that were made included strict, enforceable timelines for the investigations and trials to combat systematic judicial delays. The police now must file charge sheets within a span of 90 days for most of the crimes and courts are compelled to deliver judgements within a period of 45 days of the completion of the trial. The statute further implants victim - centric measures, mandatory forensic investigations for serious offences, and heightened transparency and efficiency via digitised procedures.²

This shift which is introduced by BNSS acknowledge that not all criminal offences require similar judicial attention or procedural complexity. For summons cases which typically involve less serious offences the new statute i.e. BNSS prioritises expedited justice by smoothening procedures, curtailing superfluous steps, and leveraging electronic summons and digital documentation to reduce delays. These reforms are intended to reduce the pendency of minor (not so serious) cases and enhance the overall productivity of justice.

In contradiction to this, for warrant trials, which address serious crimes, BNSS implements stringent safeguarding mechanisms with the aim of protecting the rights of both the victims and the accused. These include strengthened evidentiary requirements, mandatory digital records, and technology-driven case management tools to ensure higher transparency and traceability all through the process.

Central to both types of trials is the statute's integration of technology, structures that are adaptable for changing procedures when the gravity of the case shifts, and reforms bringing up

¹ S. Jayashree & M. S. Vizhal, "Modernizing Criminal Procedures: BNSS 2023 and Its Positive Legal Repercussions", *International Journal of Innovative Research in Technology (IJIRT)*, Vol. 12, Issue 2, July 2025, ISSN 2349-6002.

² Sowmya H. A., "A Comparative Study of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 and the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973: Continuity, Change, and Constitutional Balance", *Indian Journal of Integrated Research in Law (IJIRL)*, Vol. V, Issue III, ISSN 2583-0538.

greater amount of accountability and efficiency. This bifocal approach expedites justice where necessary and appropriate but also raises the overall standards of fairness and protection of rights in prosecuting serious and heinous offences, embodying BNSS's commitment to modern legal values and operational effectiveness.

While having many pros, the BNSS also brings its fair share of implementation challenges, such as infrastructural gaps, training requirements for legal personnel, and new privacy considerations emerging from the technological advancements. procedural overhaul thus show both radical progress and also ongoing challenges aligning India's justice system with the expectations of modern governance.³

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This research undertakes a doctrinal approach, focusing on an intricate and in-depth analysis of statutory provisions, legislative debates, case laws and secondary literature related to the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS) and the old Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (CrPC). The study methodically examines the text of the BNSS, relevant sections related to summons and warrant trials, key governmental publication and academic critiques to find out the nature and extent of the procedural modernisations.

Moreover, the research adopts a comparative approach to evaluate the particular reforms introduced by the BNSS, and comparing them with the old statute i.e. CrPC to show innovations and their implications in the practical world. The doctrinal review is aided by a review of case law, commentaries, and articles written by scholars, making sure a holistic perspective on the procedural alterations made by the introduction of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS).

The methodology adopted is therefore fundamentally comparative and analytical, structured in a way to assess both the advancements and challenges present in the new procedural regime, with specific focus on the implications for delivery of justice, transparency, and efficiency in the Indian criminal procedural law.

³ Rudransh Sharma, "Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 & Reforms in Criminal Procedure: Towards Speedy Justice?" *International Journal of Civil Law and Legal Research*, Vol. 5, Issue 1, 2025, pp. 150–156, E-ISSN 2789-8830.

CLASSIFICATION OF CRIMINAL CASES UNDER BNSS, 2023

The Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS) puts forward a very structured classification of criminal cases to make sure clarity in the criminal justice system. The main classifications are as follows:

Cognisable and Non-Cognisable Offences

Cognisable offences defined under section 2(1)(g) of BNSS, 2023 are more serious offences, which allow police to investigate and arrest the person without having a warrant (e.g. murder, rape), whereas on the other hand non-cognisable offences defined under section 2(1)(o) of BNSS, 2023 are offences which are not that serious and require a magistrates or courts prior permission for investigation or arrest. An FIR is registered for cognisable offences, on the other hand only a complaint can be filed for non-cognisable offences.⁴

Bailable and Non-Bailable Offences

In bailable offences, the accused person has a right to be released on a bail, while on the other hand in the case of non-bailable offences, bail is granted at the complete discretion of the honourable court. This distinction is very important for protecting individual liberty in serious offences.⁵

Compoundable and Non-Compoundable Offences

Certain offences allow the parties to compromise among themselves which enable them to avoid prosecution (compoundable), whereas on the other hand non-compoundable offences are more severe and parties in case of non-compoundable offences have to go through the full trial process.

Summons and Warrant Cases

BNSS clarifies cases on the basis of the severity of the punishment that is being given:

⁴ Marri Chenna Reddy Human Resource Development Institute, "General Provisions of BNSS" (2024), available at <https://mcrhrdi.gov.in/2024/splfc2024/week9/11%202024%20General%20Provisions%20of%20BNSS.pdf> (Last visited on Dec 21, 2025).

⁵ Faculty of Law, University of Delhi, "Law of Crimes-II Revised CM" (2020), available at <https://lawfaculty.du.ac.in/userfiles/downloads/LLBCM/LB%20203%20-%20Law%20of%20Crimes-II%20Revised%20CM.pdf> (Last visited on Dec 21, 2025).

Summon cases include those offences which are punishable with imprisonment of up to two years and follow a simple and expedited trial procedure.⁶

Warrant cases involve offences which are punishable with death, life imprisonment, or imprisonment which is exceeding two years and require more rigorous safeguarding mechanisms during trial (e.g. formal charge framing, possibility of discharge).⁷

Sessions and Summary Trials

Sessions trials are those trials that are reserved for the most serious of the offences, tried by the sessions courts with detailed and elaborated procedures, while on the other hand summary trials deal with offences which are minor in nature, ensuring that a swift resolution is reached through simplified processes.⁸

This classification which is done under the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS) enhances the legal handling as per the gravity and the nature of the offences, aiding both expedited justice for minor cases and a robust defence mechanism for serious crimes.⁹

SUMMONS CASES

Summons cases under the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS) are those cases which involves offences which are punishable with imprisonment for a period of up to two years. Such cases generally deal with crimes which are less serious in nature, aiming for expeditious resolution and minimal procedural complexity.¹⁰

Key features of summons cases are as follows:

- No need for formal charge framing; instead, the substance of the accusation is conveyed to the accused.

⁶ Uttam IFS, "Different Types of Trial" (July 2024), available at <https://uttamifs.com/wp-content/uploads/2024/07/different-types-of-trial.pdf> (Last visited on Dec 21, 2025).

⁷ Karan Patel, "Trial Procedure for Warrant Cases under the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023," Legal Bites, available at <https://www.legalbites.in/bharatiya-nagarik-suraksha-sanhita/trial-procedure-for-warrant-cases-under-the-bharatiya-nagarik-suraksha-sanhita-2023-1146641> (Last visited on Dec 21, 2025).

⁸ Bureau of Police Research & Development, "Summary Trials", available at <https://bprd.nic.in/uploads/pdf/202402061002241874042SummaryTrials.pdf> (Last visited on Dec 21, 2025).

⁹ *Supra* note 5 at 2.

¹⁰ *Supra* note 6 at 4.

- Procedures are simplified in order to save judicial time and make sure speedy justice is served.
- The discretion to convert summons trials into warrant trial if the gravity of the offence, evidence, or case complexity so demands lies with the magistrate.
- The process although respects the principal of natural justice, but at the same time avoids unnecessary delays and formality.
- E-summons, digital notices, and submission of statements electronically play a significant role in severely reducing procedural delays which were very common in the erstwhile criminal procedural code (CrPC) and support modern case management.

Key Case Laws

Asia Metal Corporation (HUF) v. State & Anr. (2006) DLT 545:¹¹ In this case the High Court of Delhi clarified on the point that in summons cases, the Magistrate cannot discharge the accused at the pre-charge stage, as there is no provision which exists for discharge in these matters. The order of discharging the accused person without trial was set aside and thus, aligning with the need for proceeding in line with the summary procedures.

Municipal Council, Raipur v. State of MP:¹² The honourable Supreme Court upheld that Magistrates can discharge the accused person in summons cases if the complaint does not disclose an offence, fortifying judicial discretion to minimise and avoid unnecessary trials.

WARRANT CASES

Warrant cases, which are defined under the Section 2(1)(z) of BNSS, 2023 include serious offences which are punishable with death, life imprisonment, or terms exceeding two years. The procedures in case of warrant cases are more detailed and elaborate, with strong safeguards:

- A written charge must be framed against the accused person, guaranteeing clarity of

¹¹ *Asia Metal Corporation (HUF) v. State & Anr. (2006) DLT 545.*

¹² *Municipal Council, Raipur v. State of MP AIR 1969 SC 24.*

allegations (Sections 261-266, BNSS).

- The accused person has the right to seek for discharge within a period of 60 days of receiving the material documents (police reports, statements, etc.) in case no *prima facie* case exists (Section 262).
- Only after the charges are framed does the trial move to the evidence stage, with full right to a legal counsel and opportunity to disprove the prosecution evidence.
- The main focus remains on fairness and protection of the legal rights, especially given the heavier sentence involved.
- The use of technology is involved in case of document sharing, e-evidence, and digital monitoring, which improves accountability and transparency.

Key Case Laws

Kasireddy Upender Reddy v. State of Andhra Pradesh (2025 INSC 768):¹³ In this case the honourable Supreme Court held that when an arrest is made with a warrant, reading the warrant to the person who is detained is a sufficient ground for arrest under BNSS, 2023 under sections 47 and section 48. This judgement sheds light on the legal sufficiency and procedural conformity for arrests in warrant cases, confirming constitutional safeguards.

Adalat Prasad v. Rooplal Jindal & Ors. (2004):¹⁴ The honourable Supreme Court held that a Magistrate can't recall summons issued in a warrant case until and unless there is a clear-cut provision ensuring the sanctity and finality of summoning process and giving legal remedies via revision or higher courts.

The above mentioned case law has been followed up by the Supreme Court in the case of **Subramanium Sethuraman vs State of Maharashtra & Anr; AIR 2004 SC 4711**. In this case, while confirming the ratio of Adalat Prasad's case (supra), the honourable court held that

“As observed by us in Adalat Prasad’s case the only remedy available to an aggrieved accused to challenge an order in an interlocutory stage is the extraordinary remedy under Section 482

¹³ *Kasireddy Upender Reddy v. State of Andhra Pradesh* 2025 INSC 768

¹⁴ *Adalat Prasad v. Rooplal Jindal & Ors.* (2004) SCC (Cri) 1927.

of the Code and not by way of an application to recall the summons or to seek discharge which is not contemplated in the trial of a summons case.”

KEY COMPARATIVE TABLE

Feature	Summons Case	Warrant Case
Nature of Offence	Punishable for a period of up to 2 years.	Punishable with a period of more than 2 years, life imprisonment, or death.
Charge Framing	Charge framing is not required	Written charges are required
Trial Duration	Trial duration is shorter and faster	Longer, more elaborate and detailed process.
Conversion	Summons case can be converted to a warrant case if seriousness is found.	Warrant cases cannot be converted into a summons case
Discharge Provision	Discharge provision is not applicable	The accused person can seek discharge.

TRIAL OF SUMMONS CASE

The trial of summons cases is governed majorly by Sections 274 to 282 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS), chapter XXI. These provisions modernise the trial process for summons cases with the aim of judicial effectiveness and efficiency without compromising fairness.

Key Features and Procedure

Substance of the Accusation to be Stated (Section 274): When the person who is accused appears or is brought before the Magistrate, the Magistrate must absolutely clearly mention the particulars of the offences, ensuring that the accused person understands the very nature of the allegations. Unlike warrant cases, no written formal charge is framed at this particular stage, showing the simplified procedure for minor offences.¹⁵

¹⁵ Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (Act 46 of 2023), s. 274.

Plea Recording and Guilty Plea Convictions (Section 275 - 276): The Magistrate records whether the accused pleads guilty or not. In case the accused person pleads to be guilty, the Magistrate may convict them and pass sentence as per their discretion. Provisions also allow for a conviction in case the accused is absent if they show the desire to plead guilty and pay fines via authorised and legitimate means.¹⁶

Presentation and Examination of Evidence (Section 277 - 279): In case the accused person pleads to be not guilty, the Magistrate hears evidence from the prosecution and defence. Witnesses can be summoned, and the accused person may cross-examine. The Magistrate has the authority to summon witnesses which is conditional on deposit of reasonable expenses for their attendance. In case the complainant or the prosecution fail to appear, the Magistrate may acquit the accused until and unless the absence is legally excused.¹⁷

Withdrawal and Stopping Proceedings (Section 280 - 281): The complainant may withdraw the complaint prior to the conclusion, resulting in acquittal of the accused person. In addition to this, the Magistrate has the authority and the power to put a stop to the proceedings at any stage for recorded reasons, safeguarding against unjust continuation of trials.¹⁸

Acquittal or Conviction (Section 278): After evaluating the evidences and hearing the arguments, the Magistrate must either convict or acquit the accused person. The judgement must be a reasoned one and should be recorded in writing, ensuring transparency and legal sufficiency.¹⁹

Conversion to Warrant Case Procedure (Section 282): If during the trial the complexity or severity of the offence demands, the Magistrate may convert the trial to a warrant case, invoking the more stringent and stricter procedural safeguards which are applicable to serious offences. Witnesses which are already examined may be recalled, ensuring no procedural gaps remain present.

The BNSS trial framework for summons cases hits the right balance between reducing judicial backlog and upholding the accused person's right to a fair trial through simplified yet diligent

¹⁶ Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (Act 46 of 2023).

¹⁷ *Supra* note 17 at 7.

¹⁸ *Supra* note 17 at 7.

¹⁹ Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (Act 46 of 2023), s. 278.

and robust procedures, strengthened by provisions for electronic summons and digital case management.²⁰

TRIAL OF WARRANT CASES

Warrant cases given in the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS) are delegated for offences which are serious in nature punishable with death, life imprisonment, or imprisonment which exceeds a period of two years. Because of the gravity of the offence involved, warrant trials are governed by rigorous and comprehensive safeguard mechanisms designed to uphold constitutional rights and ensure a fair process for adjudication.²¹

Classification and Legal Basis

Warrant cases defined under Section 2(1)(z) of BNSS, are tried as per the provisions mentioned in Chapter XX (Sections 261 to 273). This chapter replaces the erstwhile CrPC provisions and details trials both for cases which are instituted upon police reports and those which are based upon complaints or other sources.

Trial Process

Compliance with Section 230 (Section 261 BNSS): At the very early stage, the Magistrate confirms that the accused person has been given the relevant prosecution documents like the police reports, FIRs, witness statements, and confessions within a time period of 14 days of their first appearance, making sure that the accused is sufficiently informed of the charges.

Application for Discharge (Section 262 BNSS): The accused person has the right by statute to apply for discharge within a time frame of 60 days in case no prima facie case emerges after reviewing the prosecution materials. The magistrate must also consider the application very fairly and record the reasons because of which discharge is granted or refused to be given.²²

Framing of Charges (Section 263): When the Magistrate finds prima facie grounds, that is

²⁰Tanya Singh, "BNSS Notes: Summons, Warrants, and Chap. 6, available at <https://www.scribd.com/document/789201161/BNSS-Notes-Summons-Warrants-and-Chap-6-20240925080311> (Last visited on Dec 21, 2025).

²¹ *Supra* note 7 at 4

²² MyJudix, "Warrant Trial under BNSS (Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita)," available at <https://www.myjudix.com/post/warrant-trial-under-bnss-bharatiya-nagarik-suraksha-sanhita> (Last visited on Dec 21, 2025).

when written charges are framed formally, and the accused person is called upon to plead guilty or not guilty. Charge framing solidifies the accusations and lay down the foundation of trial.²³

Trial and Evidence (Sections 264-266): In case the accused person pleads to be guilty, the Magistrate may have to record conviction and proceed to the sentencing stage. In case the accused pleads to be not guilty, the trial will proceed with detailed examination of the witnesses from the side of the prosecution and the defence, cross examinations, and evidence presentation. The testimony of witnesses may be recorded via audio-video electronic means to facilitate accessibility as well as efficiency.²⁴

Defence and Final Submission (Section 266): The accused may submit written statements, summon defence witnesses (bearing reasonable expenses), and produce documents and other evidence in defence of theirs, ensuring uniformity of opportunity alongside the prosecution.²⁵

Conclusion and Judgement (Section 271-273): The Magistrate must absolutely deliver a reasoned judgement of either conviction or acquittal and pass sentences where they are applicable. Provisions allow dismissal or acquittal if the evidence of the prosecution is not enough and the complainant or prosecution fails to appear, subject to legal safeguards.²⁶

Warrant trials under BNSS just as many other provisions of the Sanhita inculcate technology-supported features, which include the likes of electronic document sharing and case management systems, accelerating procedures while also maintaining transparency.

The warrant trials distinguish them from the summons trials by their formal charge shaming, extended procedural safeguards, and detailed and elaborated trial steps, showing the higher stakes that are involved in warrant cases.

Ram Harsh Das v. State of Bihar (Patna High Court, 1997):²⁷ In this case, the honourable Patna High Court studied warrant procedures in case of complex corruption allegations involving senior police officers. The honourable court stressed that *prima facie* evidence must be there prior to the commencement of the trial and ordered for expedited proceedings because

²³ Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (Act 46 of 2023), s. 263.

²⁴ *Supra* note 17 at 7

²⁵ Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (Act 46 of 2023), s. 266.

²⁶ *Supra* note 17 at 7

²⁷ *Ram Harsh Das v. State of Bihar* 1997 (2) eIRL (Pat) SC 27.

of prolonged pendency. This very case goes on to show the judicial application of warrant trial principles and the need for striking the right balance between procedural thoroughness with efficiency in trial.

JUDICIAL FINDINGS

Judicial interpretations has been absolutely pivotal in shaping the framework and the practical implementation of the BNSS, 2023, particularly in relation to summons and warrant cases. Courts have time and time again stressed on a balance between procedural efficiency and legal fairness, strengthening modernised trial processes while simultaneously safeguarding constitutional rights.

One of the very important and key judicial pronouncements influencing summons case trials is Asia Metal Corporation (HUF) v. State & Anr. (2006) in which, the Delhi High Court shed light on the fact that in summons cases under Section 274 of BNSS, the Magistrate does not have the authority and the power to discharge the accused person at the initial stage, as no such provision exists under the chapter governing such cases. The order for discharge at the initial stage was set aside, emphasising on the fact that a full trial is very much required except in cases of clear and obvious lack of cause or absence of offence in the complaint. This explanation asserts the legislative intent of ensuring that even proceedings which are rather simple remain absolutely just and thorough, until and unless the complaint is entirely unsustainable on its face.

The honourable Supreme Court, in its recent judgements, has again stressed on the necessity of front-loaded complaints and hybrid (physical/electronic) service of process in cheque bounce cases under the Section 223 of BNSS, 2023, smoothening the mechanism for early resolution to the dispute at hand and a fair and just trial. The honourable Court mandated that complainants must submit proper contact details, and that the accused person must raise real and substantive defences, not mere formal denials. These findings also support and endorse the usage of digital dashboards and managerial tools in magistrate courts, highlighting a judicial shift towards technological modernisation and procedural transparency in the case of summons

and summary trial.²⁸

For warrant cases, a significant and landmark decision was given by the Patna High Court in the case of Ram Harsh Das v. State of Bihar, 1997 (2) eIRL (PAT) SC 27 which is also mentioned above, in this case the court examined the necessity and importance of *prima facie* evidence before proceeding forward with trial proceedings, particularly in the cases related to corruption and conspiracy. The court held that the presence of credible materials collected during the investigation process is sufficient for the prosecution to proceed forward, and that quashing proceedings at the beginning should be avoided in case a *prima facie* case is made out. These findings show the clear demarcation between cognisance and commencement of trial, clearly establishes that personal appearance cannot be dispensed with and when a warrant is issued, and emphasise on the need for expeditious disposal of cases that remain longstanding for long time.

Recent High Court rulings have also addressed challenges that are being faced by states in transitioning to the new Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023 from the erstwhile Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973. For instance, the Punjab & Haryana and Kerela High Courts have held that BNSS's procedural provisions apply to all filings and all the appeals from July 1, 2024, regardless of whether the original crime occurred under the former CrPC, as long as such proceedings were initiated after the cut-off date is passed. This makes sure uniform application of the new statute and removes ambiguity and confusion in criminal litigation.

These ever evolving and changing judicial findings collectively confirm that Indian courts, both at the trial and the appellate levels, are very attentive and mindful of the legislature's intent to modernise criminal procedure while continually expanding the bar for fairness, timely justice, and the effective and efficient use of technology in trial management.

CONCLUSION

The Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNNS), 2023, embodies a seismic and landmark reform in India's criminal procedural law, replacing the erstwhile and colonial Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 with a new, modern and technology - driven framework. This paper

²⁸ Hammurabi & Solomon Partners, "Supreme Court Streamlines Section 138 NI Act: No Pre-cognizance Summons, Faster Trails" (Sept. 2025), available at <https://www.hammurabisolomon.in/post/supreme-court-streamlines-section-138-ni-act-no-pre-cognizance-summons-faster-trails> (Last visited on Dec 21, 2025).

tried to show how the BNSS introduces expedited trial procedures, particularly for summons cases, while at the same time strengthening safeguarding mechanisms for warrant trials addressing serious offences. By putting up such strict timeframes, integrating electronic summons and digital evidence management, and stressing upon transparency and victim protection, the BNSS aspires to notably reduce judicial delays and improve as well as enhance the overall fairness and efficiency of the criminal justice system.

In regard to Summons and Warrant cases, the BNSS very distinctly categorises offences to tailor the procedural implications accordingly and appropriately. Summons cases, which involve relatively small offences which are punishable with imprisonment for a period up to two years, benefit from streamlined and less formal trials designed to swiftly and efficiently adjudicate justice and reduce the court backlog. Contrary to this, warrant cases deals with serious offences with higher punishments, mandating formal charge framing, more detailed and elaborated trial procedures, and robust protection for both accused and victim alike. The statute permits conversion of summons cases to warrant trials when the facts of the case warrant increased procedural safeguarding mechanisms, reflecting to a more flexible and adaptive judicial process under the Sanhita. This approach enables the criminal justice system of the country to balance both efficiency and fairness effectively while also embracing technological modernisations.

Judicial explanations have aided and supported the BNSS's vision, asserting the procedural clarity and rights protections it codifies, while also simultaneously highlighting the importance of adaptable trial procedures that accommodate complexities related to specific cases. The balancing of speedy disposal for less serious offences with a more comprehensive and robust safeguarding mechanisms in place for grave crimes highlights the Sanhita's nuanced approach to ensuring justice.

Nevertheless, challenges and issues still persist in ensuring uniform implementation of the Sanhita across the various diverse jurisdictions, infrastructure adequacy to support digital innovations, and continuous judicial education to align with the new legal landscape.

The ongoing empirical assessment, technology upgrades, and stakeholder engagement will be very important to understand and realise the BNSS's potential to transform fully.

Ultimately, the BNSS embodies a progressive and much needed shift to an accessible,

accountable, and equitable justice system in India, setting a foundation for reforms which are to be introduced in the future that reverberate with the contemporary constitutional values and at the same time will also align with the international standards.