

GENERAL FEEDBACK FOR ESSAYS

Content (40%)

Your interpretation should be in depth, comprehensive and academic. Always address the asked part. It should be evident in your outline, which should be self-explanatory in nature. Essays/Outlines that give related information without addressing the asked part do not qualify.

The whole essay should be relevant. Even if 1-2 arguments more than they deliver it. are irrelevant the essay will not pass.

Distribution of topic should be according to the demand of the topic statement. if there is one scoring point it should be given more weight, if there are 2 or more scoring points all should be given equal weight.

All claims made in the essay must be substantiated. Out of 15-17 arguments at least 9-10 should be academically backed with proper references. The rest should be backed by either case studies or generally known information.

Evidence must be authentic and come from proper and authentic academic sources. Newspapers do not qualify as an academic source. Illustrations and vague mentions of events do not qualify as academic evidence. Essays that are lacking in evidence do not qualify.

LANGUAGE (25%)

Focus on enhancing your grammar as any essay with 4-5 grammatical mistakes does not pass.

Your essay must be in the tone and tense of the topic statements. Essays that fail to comply do not pass.

Your sentence structure should be simple, yet clear and diversified.

Vocabulary used should be simple, clear and concise. Expression should always be formal and academic.

You are never to write in 1st and 2nd person pronouns.

You must always use the given keywords and your topic for your thesis statements and main headings in your outline.

STRUCTURE (20%)

Your essay must follow the selected pattern and that structure should be maintained throughout.

INTRODUCTION: The introduction is the longest paragraph of the essay, at least 200 words. It should start with a hook, must give the glimpse of what's to come and must have a thesis statement. Besides hook, your introduction should not have any sort of information and reference. Avoid definitions in introduction.

BODY PARAGRAPHS: Approximately 150 words at most and all the body paragraphs must be consistent in length. Should follow the proper structure of an academic paragraph i.e. it must have a topic sentence, supporting point, evidence and concluding sentence. The topic sentence and concluding sentence must align with each other. There should be no new information in the concluding sentence. One paragraph represents one subheading in the outline and consists of one idea.

CONCLUSION: Must start with the concluding phrase. There should be no new information in the conclusion. It should recap the arguments. Conclusion does not have any examples and information. If you are ending it on a hopeful note, remember that solutions and hope are not the same.

COHERENCE (15%)

Fast-track Judicial Forums
compromise Justice more than they deliver it.
very poor presentation

Outline
1. Introduction
• Rationale behind their established court
• Thesis statement: While fast-track Judicial Forums aim to reduce backlog they often compromise procedural fairness, judicial independence and substantive justice more than they deliver effective outcomes.

2. Objectives of fast-track Judicial Forums
• Speedy disposal of cases
• Reduction of case backlog
• Enhancing public confidence on justice system

3. Difference between speed and Justice
• Importance of due process and fair trial

Main heading where you specify your stance

- International legal standards (Article 14 ICCPR, Article 10 UDHR)

4- Quality of Judgments and risk of successful Justice

- Impact of hurried trials on judicial reasoning
- Wrongful convictions and appeals
- Statistical evidence and examples

5- Impact on Judicial Independence

- Executive influence and performance target
- Temporary appointment and insecure tenure
- Politicization of fast-track courts

6- Conclusion

- Reaffirmation of Thesis
- Balanced way forward

You have not discussed what's asked in the topic

The points does not discuss how fast track judicial forums compromise justice more than they deliver it.

Essay and outline do not match

The Essay

Attention grabber??

Justice is not merely about the speed; it is about fairness, accuracy, and legitimacy. Over the past few decades, judicial systems across the world have faced mounting pressure due to growing case backlogs, procedural delays and declining public trust. In response, governments have increasingly turned to fast-track judicial forums in solution to expedite case disposal and restore confidence in the justice delivery mechanism. These courts are designed to resolve cases fastly by adopting simplified procedures and strict timelines. However, the pursuit of speed often comes at the significant cost. While fast-track courts may succeed in delivering quick verdicts, they frequently undermine due process, judicial independence, and quality of justice. This essay argues that fast-track judicial forums compromise justice more than they deliver it, as efficiency driven mechanisms erode procedural safeguards, increase the risk of successful justice and weaken the foundational principles of the rule of law.

Unnecessary detail, why the forums are created and how they are created is not relevant to the context.

No overview of arguments

In Pakistan special courts and military courts were created to deal with terrorism and high-profile corruption cases. Similarly, the United Kingdom introduced fast-track asylum and immigration tribunals to deal with caseloads.

What is the point of this?
What part of outline does it reflect??

The objectives of fast-track courts include speedy delivery, reduction of backlog, deterrence, to ensure public confidence. fast-track courts ensure quick resolution of cases. They relieve pressure on regular courts, particularly in criminal cases by ensuring swift punishment. By making public confidence, these courts are creating perception of effective justice system. While these objectives are laudable in theory, their practical implementation often raises serious concerns regarding fairness and legality. A fundamental flaw in fast-track approach is the combination of efficiency with justice. Justice is a qualitative concept, whereas efficiency is quantitative.

Never start the paragraph with a piece of information.

The right to a fair trial
prescribed in Article 14 of
the International Covenant on
Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR)
and Article 10 of the
Universal Declaration of Human
Rights (UDHR), requires adequate
time and facilities of defence
and reasoned judgements.

Fast-track courts, by design,
restrict time for hearings,
cross-examination and legal
research. As a result, they
often deliver swift but
shallow justice, undermining
the very rights they are
meant to protect.

Procedural safeguards are
the backbone of any
judicial systems. Fast-track
forums frequently dilute these
safeguards by limiting adjournments
regardless of case complexity.
They are curtailing cross-
examination of witnesses.

Relying heavily on written
submissions. Also, pressuring
lawyers to conclude arguments
quickly. In Pakistan's anti-
terrorism courts, for instance,
trials are often completed
within weeks, leaving defence
councils insufficient time to
prepare.

No argumentation
and analysis.
Evidence is lacking.

According to Human Rights Commission of Pakistan (HRC), such practices increase the likelihood of false investigation and unreliable evidence being admitted. **conclude**.

Moreover, judicial reasoning suffers when judges are burdened with disposal targets. speedy trials do not necessarily produce accurate results. Judgements may lack detailed analysis and proper evaluation of evidence.

Significant percentage of convictions by fast-track courts were overturned on appeal due to procedural lapses and due to weak evidences.

This indicates that fast-track justice system often shifts the burden to appellate courts, thereby delaying final justice rather than ensuring it.

Judicial independence is compromised when judges are evaluated on the number of cases disposed rather than the quality of justice.

Many fast-track courts employ judges on temporary or contractual basis making them vulnerable to executive pressure.

No clear distinction between paragraphs.

In politically sensitive cases, fast-track courts are perceived as tools to legitimize predetermined outcomes. This perception damages the credibility of the judiciary and weakens public trust in the rule of law. Fast-track courts often prioritize high-profile or politically sensitive cases, while ordinary cases continue to face delays in regular courts. This creates a two-tier justice system: speedy justice for powerful and delayed justice for common citizens. Moreover, vulnerable groups such as poor, minorities and unrepresented accused are disproportionately affected. They lack the resources to adapt swift legal processes. According to World Justice Project Rule of Law Index (2023), countries with excessive reliance on special courts score lower on procedural fairness. In Pakistan, convictions in anti-terrorism courts are high, yet a large number of convictions are later overturned by higher courts due to due process violations.

Incoherent. Unclear when the point changed from judicial independence to prioritising political cases.

These figures demonstrates that fast-track courts address symptoms rather than structural causes of judicial delay.

These courts provide swift relief to victims. Enhance deterrence and reduce pendency.

Proponents argue that fast-track courts on the basis of above said facilities while these benefits exist they are often short-lived and superficial.

No said facilities mentioned

Speed without fairness leads to appeals, reversals and erosion of legitimacy, ultimately neglecting the intended gains.

Instead of relying excessively on fast-track forums, states should focus on increasing the number of judges, improving court infrastructure, adopting effective case management systems, such reforms strengthen the regular judiciary without compromising justice.

Lastly, fast-track judicial forums are a well-intentioned but flawed response to judicial inefficiency. By prioritizing speed over time substance, they compromise judicial safeguards, independence and

and the quality of justice. While they may deliver quick verdicts, they often fail to deliver true justice. True reforms lies not in accelerating justice at the expense of fairness but in strengthening institutions to ensure that justice is both timely and just. As the legal maxim rightly states, "Justice hurried is justice buried."

~~No
comment~~