Family Court Adjudication: Balancing Expediency with Justice

Muhammad Rehan Samad

Abstract

The global family justice system is currently undergoing a critical period of evolution to address an unprecedented challenge: balancing the need for prompt resolution of cases with the need to ensure substantive and procedural justice. This research paper aims to explore the complex nature of this issue by examining the effects of the waiting child phenomenon and the negative effects of the aggressive drive for expediency. Whereas the emerging issue of the limitation of judicial scrutiny, potentially created by the aggressive drive for expediency, alongside the limitation of parental due process rights, is also discussed. The study assesses the efficacy of Australia's Less Adversarial Trial (LAT) inquisitorial strategy and the UK's Public Law Outline (PLO) techniques for specialized case management. The difficulties posed by the growing number of lengthy wait times brought on by the notable rise in Self-Represented Litigants (SRLs) are also assessed in this research. The report's final section addresses potential future modifications to the family law system, such as hiring triage teams, training judges, and utilizing technology-based triage portals.

1. Introduction

The subject is delicate, and family court are unique tribunals. MCCP cases differ from all other criminal and civil lawsuits in that they have the potential to change people's lives. The interests of the kid and the parents' desire to continue their family are particularly pertinent in MCCP proceedings [1]. familial courts must analyze complicated familial circumstances in order to act in the child's best interests. As a result, the objective of a prompt conclusion is undermined. Studies [2] have so far shown that thorough scrutiny and speed cannot coexist. A child may have

a very difficult time during this period of uncertainty, which is prolonged by delays in family matters.

Additionally, it postpones finding a way to give a child a stable home of some sort. To address this issue and accomplish the objective of prompt resolution, a number of organizations have devised strategies for carefully handling such cases. However, there have been arguments that the legal system might get clogged as a result of this case acceleration.
A perfect storm is going to hit family law, given the complexity of families and the growing number of self-represented litigants. The paper will address these concerns while taking into account current case management, the function of backlogs, potential future modifications, and technological developments. In the end, it is challenging to assess if decision-making may be expedient without producing outcomes that are reasonable and fair for all stakeholders.

2. The Theoretical Tension: Speed vs. Fairness

Perhaps the best illustration of this phenomenon within family law is the problem of how to strike a balance between the need to make a judgment quickly and the need to fully assess the child's condition. This does not seem to be in line with parents' rights to a fair trial and due process, even though some research suggests that making a decision quickly, which guarantees stability, is beneficial for the child [2]. It should be mentioned, however, that the court always needs to be cautious in order to maintain public trust and an efficient justice system. Child protection cases are the biggest example of the difficulty that exists when one is required to balance the need for speed and thoroughness [2], [5].

The right to self-defense is a right that parents have, and the state is required to protect the child. It does appear to be a conflicting system. Since the 1980s, the court seems to have prioritized

expediency over thoroughness. This would indicate that the case is being resolved quickly, even if not all the facts or additional information are available. Even though parents may not entirely know what is happening, the court may be more focused on reaching a quick resolution that satisfies all parties to meet this deadline [2]. Some changes have been made to this process, like the early assessment, pre-court guidelines, and case management, to reduce the problem of delay. This might be a good thing if this process is made efficient and fair at the same time. There is an issue with this process. It would be good if this case were settled before proceedings in court, under pre-proceedings. However, at this point, the infant would be suffering because of this. At this point, there is a problem of giving too much power to the courts over the experts, who might be working for this case [6], [2].

3. The Effects of Delays on Children's Well-Being (The Waiting Child)

One such idea is the "waiting child," which is a key component of the case for speeding up the procedure in family law proceedings. This refers to children who are "stuck" in the system, not knowing whether tomorrow would bring adoption, a family packed with blood relations, or returning home to their parents, with choices on the outcomes unresolved for months, if not years. Studies and case law frequently show that delays in making final decisions have a negative impact on children, as does the difficulty in obtaining permanent placements for them [3].

Children do not perceive time in the same way that adults do. A year, for example, may be regarded a reasonable waiting period for an adult, but it may be half a child's life, especially during early developmental phases when individuals go through key stages of maturity. Furthermore, due to the lengthy waiting period, children in foster care are typically placed in various homes. This may have an effect on the ability to form stable emotional relationships. It is probable that this will result in future emotional and psychological problems. In this way, Willcox et al. defined "the

waiting child" as the concept itself, emphasizing that waiting is not only uncomfortable, but also perceived as unfair because it denies them the opportunity to experience the stability required for healthy growth and development [3].

Authorities have been compelled by these problems to set even stricter deadlines for family matters. The Tri-borough study's findings, which taught a number of UK specialists to concur that care cases could be resolved in 26 weeks, have produced some extremely compelling data. The findings demonstrated that prompt dispute resolution is both desirable and achievable with improved cooperation between the courts and local authorities [5]. However, the pursuit of speed has its drawbacks. The first major issue is "drift," in which instances appear to stall in the system with little or no progress. This might occur due to a lack of resources, frequent delays, or inadequate case management procedures [6].

Delays in family processes can have serious repercussions, as is the case in the United States. Critics of the high wait times for adoption and decision-making are calling for increased accountability and stringent time limitations [3]. San Diego County is an intriguing case study to investigate, since it implemented a fast-track pilot program for civil cases in the 1980s that proved to be quite efficient in terms of efficiency, simplifying, and expediting processes. Over a decade, the percentage of cases settled within one year increased from 19% to 76%. However, similar fast-track approaches were not first applied to family issues since they were thought to be too sensitive and complex to be hastened. Nonetheless, the success of fast-track techniques in civil cases is said to have encouraged their use in family law cases, with the suggestion that strict time limits for court dates be imposed, with any delay allowed only in exceptional and justifiable circumstances [6].

4. Procedural Justice: Due Process, Parental, and Child Rights

Furthermore, the definition of justice in family court includes not just obtaining the "right" outcome, but also attaining justice in the process. This is embodied in the concept of procedural justice. Studies have identified several essential court qualities that contribute to maintaining this level of justice, even when efficiency is sought [2].

A key aspect of procedural justice is that the court must protect procedural safeguards by issuing unambiguous rulings that respect the rights of all parties involved. This has important consequences for preserving trust in the family justice system [2On the other hand, fast decisions are more likely to occur when a court is rushing through a lot of cases. The decisions are rendered without providing a suitable explanation for their reasoning. For example, judges in urban American courts are referred to to decide up to 100 cases in a single day, giving each case only a few minutes. The court cannot take such cases into consideration [7].

Another significant characteristic of procedural justice is the ability of individuals to participate in the legal process. This means that parents will have access to legal advice and representation, especially during the early phases of the case. Legal representation allows individuals to understand and respond to the charges levied against them. In practice, this is not possible due to the heavy workload of lawyers representing parents in court. Additionally, there is no access to resources. Studies, notably those involving Asian American families in the US child welfare system, have highlighted this [8].

The concept of procedural fairness differs slightly when dealing with children. It is the ability to ensure the child's voice is heard. Some programs, such as the Australian-based Child Responsive Program, seek to achieve this by making timely judgments and demonstrating true regard for the

child's rights. They achieve this by ensuring that the child's voice is involved in court decision-making, as advocated by the international community [6].

According to study, if an individual believes he or she has been treated fairly and has had an opportunity to be heard, he or she is more likely to accept the decision, even if it is unfavorable [3]. This demonstrates that efficiency gains should not be at the expense of fairness. Any initiatives to improve process efficiency should include methods to maintain fairness [5],[2].

5. Case Management and ADR Models

The challenge of balancing the demands of speed and thoroughness is increasingly being addressed through the use of active case management and Alternative Dispute Resolution. The procedures described above aim to expedite the evaluation process while also promoting settlements outside of the courtroom, decreasing strain on the court, while ensuring the process is followed.

5.1 The UK's 26-Week Limit and the Public Law Outline

The United Kingdom's program, which is based on the Children and Families Act 2014's 26-week time constraint for care procedures, is widely regarded as the most ambitious attempt to ensure that family justice is quick and efficient. The effort is the result of the Family Justice Review and is based on research undertaken by the Tri-borough pilot, which showed that cases may be processed rapidly without jeopardizing justice [2], [9].

The UK initiative has several key components:

i. **Public Law Outline (PLO):** The PLO provides a system with a process in place to settle disagreements at the Issues Resolution Hearing (IRH), particularly when there is no big conflict to address. As a result, disagreements are now resolved six weeks earlier on average [10].

ii. **Early Case Management Hearings (CMH):** This technique has supplanted the traditional initial hearing. These hearings must take place within 12 to 18 days of the start of the proceedings, assisting in setting the pace early in the case [4].

iii. **Judicial Continuity:** Another important aspect of system reform is having a single judge manage a case from beginning to end. This has helped minimize recurring delays caused by a new judge needing time to become acquainted with a case, and has been linked to a three-week faster decision-making pace on average [10].

Notwithstanding these advancements, some have questioned the 26-week limit. One of these is the great emphasis on speed, which can sometimes overwhelm depth in decision-making. There are some worries that courts are no longer aggressively reviewing care plans, and their primary attention is on long-term care, with no detailed assessment of other aspects of the case. This creates a sense of urgency to achieve deadlines, which is more important than attaining the optimal outcome for the child[4]. A further critique leveled at the PLO is that, while it has aided in the timeliness of decision-making, there are evidence that it has resulted in a shift in the character of court-issued care orders. There has been a drop in significant care orders, such as adoption, but an increase in less serious care orders, such as supervision orders. This suggests that time restrictions are influencing outcomes in some circumstances [10].

5.2 Australia's Less Adversarial Trial and Child Responsive Program

Australia has adopted a different strategy by reconsidering how family trials are handled in the first place, in contrast to the UK, which places a strong emphasis on the necessity of adhering to the statutory time constraints. The Family Court of Australia's Less Adversarial Trial (LAT) and Child Responsive Program (CRP), which represent a substantial move towards the inquisitorial form of process, serve as examples of this [11].

This kind of surgery has a number of characteristics. First off, the court has a bigger say in how the matter is handled. In contrast to the other models, where the judiciary merely renders a decision, this approach of the judicial plays a critical role in managing the case by specifying the primary problems and ensuring that the witnesses who are experts are only offering pertinent evidence. This guarantees that the adversarial component, which is so prevalent in family matters, is reduced [6][11].

Next, the CRP makes sure that the kids involved in the case are more than just participants. The youngster meets with specially trained family counsellors, and their opinions are considered from the beginning. This guarantees that the child's voice is properly considered. The third feature of the LAT paradigm is that the way the case's evidence is employed is more flexible. The LAT paradigm places greater emphasis on the information the court needs to make an informed decision that will be in the child's best interest than other models, which strictly conform to pertinent legislation[11].

Promising results have been obtained from preliminary research on these enhancements. They appear to promote parents' engagement with the process and keep the focus on the child's needs. At the same time, the approach aims to reduce the emotional toll that litigation can impose on families, particularly in cases of high conflict. In most cases, it has also been related to positive results in terms of how families cope following the resolution of the conflict.

5.3 ADR and Diversionary Processes

The purpose of alternative dispute resolution (ADR) and other diversionary procedures, such mediation and pre-proceedings protocols, is to settle issues before they are brought to court. For instance, a multi-site study carried out in the UK found that 25% of the cases were successfully resolved using the pre-proceedings technique prior to the courtroom. But, as was already noted,

it's crucial to remember that not every alternative dispute resolution process works. For instance, research has shown that while diversionary methods are useful in clearing the backlog of cases in the courtroom, they may also cause delays in the resolution of the cases that are ultimately brought to court.

The drive to resolve the litigation is also fraught with difficulties. For instance, it was observed that judges in Ontario, Canada, who were very committed to resolving cases, frequently had a bad attitude about litigation. When women are mistreated, for instance, power problems may arise.

6. The Crisis: Backlogs and Self-Represented Litigants (SRLs)

In actuality, though, the majority of these systems are managing what could be considered a serious issue, which has been marked by an increase in backlogs and delays. The growing number of self-represented litigants, who make up the majority in family court cases, has previously made this issue worse. An astounding 80–90% of those involved in family court hearings are unrepresented, according to research. The decrease in funding for legal aid and the high expense of employing an attorney are the primary causes of this.

In the legal system, SRLs have created a new issue. This is because they are unable to understand the legal requirements because of their lack of industry expertise. The reason the hearings are taking longer than usual is because judicial officials and court employees are spending extra time regarding the procedures.

As a result, the backlogs result in actual wait times for those looking to resolve very private matters. For instance, the family law system in England and Wales is said to be overburdened by backlogs; in other words, no one receives justice in time to alleviate an already stressful situation.

Therefore, the presence of more SRLs has an additional impact, particularly in terms of outcomes. Individuals may struggle to present their argument convincingly, which could lead to a decision that is legally sound but never truly equitable.

7. Comparative Analysis: UK, Australia, and the United States

A comparison of these three countries—the US, Australia, and the UK—would clearly show that although the objectives are identical, the methods are considerably different. (Table I). Though they do it in different ways, all three systems aim to expedite the process and guarantee the child's welfare.

Table I. Comparative Analysis between the UK, Australia, and the United States

Jurisdiction	Model element	Evidence and observed effects
United Kingdom	Statutory 26-week target; Public Law Outline; Tri-borough pilot coordination.	Significant reductions in duration achieved (e.g., 26-week median in pilots). Concerns persist regarding the culture of speed and the quality of judicial scrutiny [2],[5],[9],[4].
Australia	Less Adversarial Trial (LAT); Child Responsive Program	Positive short-term impacts on co-parenting and child engagement. Focus is on

	(CRP); Inquisitorial techniques.	changing the process rather than just the timeline [6],[11].
United States	Localized Fast-Track pilots; problem-focused, evidence-based; Major backlog issues.	Evidence is more fragmented. Fast-track success in civil courts has not been universally applied to family law. Severe challenges with backlogs and representation for marginalized families [6],[3],[7],[8].

This is due to the UK model's heavy reliance on central regulations and stringent legal deadlines. Notably, the concept has shown to be very successful in this area. In contrast, Australia is emphasizing the experience of the procedure more. It aims to lessen the psychological and emotional impact of adversarial proceedings. In terms of the US model, it is a little challenging. With few resources and backlogs, it is both creative and difficult.

The fact that distraction does not always translate into quicker and better outcomes is a noteworthy characteristic that can be drawn from all of the models mentioned above. Pre-proceedings, like the UK model, may, in some circumstances, actually cause the process to be delayed for the kids who most need it. It must be noted that a well-coordinated system is important.

8. Future Reforms: Technology, Triage, and Specialized Training

All things considered, it points to the necessity of a successful reform process that incorporates both human competence and other facets of technology. Although it will expedite the process, it

should be more intelligent from the start.

Two areas that are being thoroughly examined are the creation of Family Court portals and technology-based triage systems. The objective is to make it easier and more effective for litigants, particularly self-represented ones who are unsure of where to begin.

The algorithms may, in theory, send certain cases straight to the judge's calendar, some to mediation, and still others to welfare evaluation. The ultimate objective is to employ technology to relieve judges of some of their workload so they may focus on the cases that require their attention. However, the Less Adversarial Trial program in Australia shows that technology by itself is insufficient. Judges must have extensive training in order to handle the intricacies of family law. In the future, a system that makes extensive use of both technology and human input is likely to be the most effective. For instance, a triage team comprising experts in social work, law, and alternative dispute resolution may be employed at the system's entrance point.

Particularly in the case of child protection, they will be in charge of making sure that cases are appropriately directed early on and that possible dangers are identified [6]. Ultimately, it is becoming evident that speed is not the only factor that determines success in family court. Delays should not be the only factor, even though they are a significant one. Future decisions will need to take public trust and procedural justice into account. In fact, if we are to claim that we are acting in the child's best interests, we must think of our system as being evaluated on how well we are assisting children in realizing their full potential and protecting parental rights rather than on speed.

9. Conclusion

The family the criminal justice system is constantly trying to strike a balance between justice and speed. Time and budget limitations both have an impact on this procedure. While expediency may

lessen the negative effects of delay for certain children, it may also create new issues, according to the feeling of other nations including the US, UK, and Australia. There is an extremely high probability of moving too quickly, which could compromise due process or prevent the judiciary from carefully reviewing cases.

Children who are awaiting a ruling, however, have a right to a prompt, considerate, and cautious legal system. Establishing legal time restrictions, using technology to manage and filter cases, and shifting to a less adversarial trial format have all contributed to some progress toward a more effective justice system for children. Such an undertaking, however, cannot be completed in a vacuum. In order to ensure that judges receive proper training, that parents have the right to legal counsel, in addition to there is a solid commitment to justice which is on par with the commitment to efficiency, the court must have sufficient funding.

In the end, the need to expedite family court hearings raises ethical and administrative issues. Hasty judgments not only postpone justice but also jeopardize it. Developing a system that can manage all of these issues concurrently and recognize the importance of both making the proper decision and the delay caused by the child in limbo will be the real challenge for the future.

References

[1] R. George and R. Marsh, "Do we need physical family courts?," *J. Soc. Welf. Fam. Law*, vol. 46, no. 1, pp. 59–81, Jan. 2024, doi: 10.1080/09649069.2024.2305028.

[2] J. Dickens, C. Beckett, and S. Bailey, "Justice, speed and thoroughness in child protection court proceedings: Messages from England," *Child. Youth Serv. Rev.*, vol. 46, pp. 103–111, Nov. 2014, doi: 10.1016/j.childyouth.2014.08.010.

[3] J. Selwyn, "The adoption of looked after maltreated children in England: challenges,

opportunities and outcomes," *Dev. Pract. Child, Youth Fam. Work J.*, Dec. 2017.

[4] A. Bainham and S. Gilmore, "The English Children and Families Act 2014," *Victoria Univ. Wellingt. Law Rev.*, vol. 46, no. 3, pp. 627–648, Oct. 2015, doi: 10.26686/vuwlr.v46i3.4910.

[5] A. Diduck, "JohnEekelaar and MavisMaclean, Family Justice: The Work of Family Judges in Uncertain Times, Oxford: Hart Publishing2013, 238 pp, hb £35.00.," *Mod. Law Rev.*, vol. 77, no. 6, pp. 1036–1041, Nov. 2014, doi: 10.1111/1468-2230.12093_2.

[6] J. Heldman, "Court Delay and the Waiting Child," 2003. Accessed: Mar. 12, 2026. [Online]. Available: https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=3810011

[7] C. Huntington and C. Huntington, "Staging the Family," *N.Y.U. L. Rev.*, vol. 88, p. 589, Jan. 2013, Accessed: Mar. 12, 2026. [Online]. Available: https://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/faculty_scholarship/608

[8] "Crossing the Divide: Asian American Families and the Child Welfare System (2001) — CACF - Coalition for Asian American Children + Families." Accessed: Mar. 12, 2026. [Online]. Available: https://www.cacf.org/resources/crossing-the-divide-asian-american-families-and-the-child-welfare-system-2001

[9] C. Beckett, J. Dickens, and S. Bailey, "Concluding Care Proceedings within 26 Weeks: Report of the Evaluation of the Tri-borough Care Proceedings Pilot, Updated Version," May 2014.

[10] J. Masson, J. Dickens, K. Bader, L. Garside, and J. Young, "Achieving positive change for children? Reducing the length of child protection proceedings: lessons from England and Wales," *Adopt. Foster.*, vol. 41, no. 4, pp. 401–413, Dec. 2017, doi: 10.1177/0308575917730007.

[11] J. Faulks, “A Natural Selection?: The Potential and Possibility for the Development of Less Adversarial Trials by Reference to the Experience of the Family Court of Australia,” *Univ. West. Aust. law Rev.*, 2010.