



Khurram Baig<sup>1</sup>, Ali Raza Laghari<sup>2</sup>, Ansar Abbas<sup>3</sup>, Ali Naeem<sup>4</sup>

## Abstract

This study examined Pakistan and the UK's legal systems, from their structure to where they get laws from, to how they make decisions and the wider effects this has on society. These countries have very different histories, cultures, and institutions, which gives a good opportunity to compare them both individually and relative to each other. The researchers did so by laying down case law, statutory law, and constitutional principles through doctrinal analysis. Pakistan's blend of Islamic law and common law means it does well at preserving human rights, but it struggles with judiciary corruption and a backlog. On the other hand, in the UK's use of common law, quick decisions are made, but under pressure from an increasing workload, access to justice is becoming difficult in general. In order to do so successfully, the researchers think it's important to first improve access to justice by reforming legal aid and infrastructure as well as fighting corruption within the profession itself. The next focus of the researchers should be on making things more efficient by using technology better and helping people understand how the system works through publicized reforms and initiatives. Lastly, this study will be useful for any future comparative research or cross-country cooperation looking into legal systems across countries.

**Keywords:** Legal Systems, Comparative Analysis, Pakistan, United Kingdom, Judicial Processes

## 1. Introduction

A legal system is a comprehensive network of rules, institutions, processes and customs that guide a society. It's made up of the principles and guidelines that regulate how people act toward one another in their personal relationships and business dealings. A legal system is what keeps the peace when people disagree or when someone has been wronged, providing an avenue for them to settle disputes and holding others accountable. A typical legal system consists of things like laws, court decisions, administrative regulations and traditional practices that all come together to set expectations for behavior and help enforce them. Although every legal system is built for the same purpose of ensuring justice, fairness and stability, it looks quite different from country to country due to cultural traditions or political circumstances (Buchen, C. 2024).

The phrase "legal system" refers to an intricate arrangement of laws, practices and organizations that control a society's actions. It specifies how humans must interact with each other while governing their communities on multiple levels. This framework resolves quarrels between people by offering clarity over who's right or wrong when it comes to specific matters. Even more important, it holds people accountable for their actions if they go against what's fair or just (Fauzia et al., 2023).

The comparative study of legal systems is important to understand the intricacies of different legal frameworks in various socio-political backgrounds. In this case, looking at Pakistan and the UK offers an interesting analysis. While Pakistan's legal system is influenced by its colonial past as a post-colonial state, the UK has a long-standing tradition of common law from being a former colonial power. Looking into these two systems not only helps us understand their differences structurally but also shows how historical legacies, cultural norms and socio-political factors impact their development.

Pakistan's legal system blends Islamic law with colonial traditions and modern legislative enactments. Its British colonizers have left their mark on its legal framework shown through its adherence to common law principles, the structure of its judiciary and the adoption of English as the language for proceedings (Ahmed, 2019). However, besides these remnants from colonization, Pakistan integrating Islamic law (Sharia) and customary practices adds another layer to its sources and traditions (Malik, 2023).

On the other hand, the UK's system stems from centuries of building upon common law principles which have evolved into a robust framework today. The country's statutes, case law and constitutional conventions make up its system with parliamentary sovereignty at its core along with rule of law and judicial independence (Gillespie, 2013). Furthermore, the UK's legal landscape saw significant reforms in recent years like incorporating European Union laws during their membership (Partington, M. 2018).

### 1.1. Purpose and Objectives of the Study

The purpose of this study is to compare legal systems in Pakistan and the UK. By understanding their structural frameworks, legal sources, judicial processes, access to justice mechanisms and socio-legal implications, the researchers can gain insights into the complexities and challenges of developing laws across various contexts.

### 1.2. Significance and Scope of Comparative Analysis

The comparative analysis look at the legal systems in Pakistan and the UK is an invaluable exercise for scholars. Comparing the two allows them to understand how these nations, with their different histories, cultures and institutions, manage complex legal frameworks. By scrutinizing their similarities and differences in structural frameworks, legal sources, judicial processes and socio-legal implications we can also inform reforms, draft policies and encourage cross-border collaboration. This could be useful for implementing better justice, protecting human rights and strengthening our global rule of law.

### 1.3. Methodology and Approach

In conducting a comparative study of the legal systems of Pakistan and the UK employing a doctrinal analysis methodology is fundamental. Doctrinal analysis involves the systematic examination and interpretation of legal texts, including statutes, case law,

<sup>1</sup> PhD Scholar Gillani Law College, Bahauddin Zakariya University, Multan, Pakistan, [mkb5729@gmail.com](mailto:mkb5729@gmail.com)

<sup>2</sup> Corresponding Author, Lecturer Department of law, TIMES, Institute, Multan Pakistan, [lagharialiraza20@gmail.com](mailto:lagharialiraza20@gmail.com)

<sup>3</sup> LLM Scholar Hajevri Law College, TIMES, Institute Multan, Advocate High Court, Senior Partner of The Legal Solutions and Analysis (LSA), Law Firm, Multan, Pakistan, [lala.anas.1357@gmail.com](mailto:lala.anas.1357@gmail.com)

<sup>4</sup> LLM Scholar, Advocate High Court, Managing Partner Goreja Law Associates, Pakistan, [ali.goreja9@gmail.com](mailto:ali.goreja9@gmail.com)

constitutional provisions, and other legal documents, to identify and compare legal principles, rules, and doctrines across jurisdictions.

#### **1.4. Overview of the Legal systems in Pakistan**

Firstly, the legislation in Pakistan is about the laws made by the federal and provincial legislatures. The president or governors can also make some on special occasions. The Parliament is the main lawmaking body on a federal level, with its two houses—the National Assembly (lower house) and the Senate (upper house). They can pass laws on subjects listed in the Federal Legislative List, while provincial legislatures have authority over things listed in the Provincial Legislative Lists (Khan & Chaudhry, 2024). Pakistan's legal system functions under two different types of laws: statutory laws and Islamic law (Sharia). The Parliament and provincial assemblies create statutory laws, which govern criminal, civil, administrative, and constitutional areas of law. In matters of personal status and family law specifically, Islamic laws come from Quranic injunctions and Sunnah (traditions of Prophet Muhammad) and are then put into action through legislation like the Muslim Personal Law (Shariat) Application Act (Iqbal et al., 2023).

The process of making a bill into an act of law entails introducing it to one house in parliament, passing it by a 2/3<sup>rd</sup> majority of members, then sending it to another house. The second house passed the bill with a 2/3<sup>rd</sup> majority. The second house may return to the first house for any amendments, corrections, etc. It then goes through readings, debates, and voting before being approved by the president or governors (in the provincial assembly) when they give their assent to it. There's also permission for immediate implementation through ordinances if the necessary circumstances arise. However, these need subsequent approval by the proper legislative bodies later (Mufti, M. 2023).

The judiciary system is something that makes Pakistan's legal system unique due to its independence and role as guardian of the constitution and protector of fundamental rights. At its highest level is the Supreme Court of Pakistan, a nine-member organization equipped to hold original jurisdiction over cases while also offering appellate jurisdiction on appeal from high courts across Pakistan. Each province holds its own High Court with similar authorities as well as subordinate courts like district courts for criminal cases and session courts for civil ones (Alam et al., 2023)

#### **1.5. Overview of the Legal System in the UK**

First and foremost, let's talk about the UK legislative process. Parliament is responsible for this process, and there are two houses in it: the House of Commons and the House of Lords. It has the power to make new laws or change existing ones, which is called enacting, amending, or repealing them. Any law passed by parliament is referred to as an Act of Parliament. A bill is some idea for a new law that's been written down on paper, so every act started its life as a bill. The first stage in making a bill into an Act of Parliament is getting it through both the House of Commons and Lords (Barkay et al., 2024).

When a bill has been approved by both houses, it goes to the monarch for royal assent. Once given royal assent, a bill becomes law and is known as an Act of Parliament. Acts are the highest form of law in the UK and cover all kinds of areas like criminal law or constitutional law (Fleming & James, 2024). Acts are not just things that hold weight in court, though; common law does too! Common law includes principles developed over time by judges during cases, and legal decisions made in courts also help define what common law actually looks like. Questions about Brexit aside, EU laws were enforced across Europe until recently, with legislation being sent back into countries' own legislatures once agreed upon at a European level (Coggon, J. 2024).

The UK judiciary stands as an independent institution alongside both the executive (government) and legislative (parliament) branches. At its peak lies the Supreme Court, which opened its doors in 2009, taking over for the Appellate Committee of the House of Lords, which was previously utilized to handle civil appeals from England, Wales, and Northern Ireland, as well as criminal appeals from England and Wales. The Supreme Court hears civil and criminal cases of the utmost public importance, serving as the final decision-maker in these matters (Gilani et al., 2024).

Under it sit a variety of courts and tribunals used for different purposes. For example, the High Court of England and Wales (and equivalents in Scotland and Northern Ireland) is where you'll find lots of complex civil disputes being heard. Meanwhile, serious criminal offenses (as well as appeals to decisions made in magistrates' courts and cases sent over from other jurisdictions) are handled by the Crown Court. Less severe criminal infractions make appearances at Magistrates' Courts, alongside certain civil proceedings and preliminary hearings (Hanretty & Graham, 2024).

## **2. Historical Evolution of Legal Systems in Pakistan and the UK**

### **2.1. Pakistan Perspective**

Legal development in Pakistan can be a difficult concept to wrap your head around. There is so much history to it all that you'd have to go back centuries and read through stacks of old papers, if that's even possible. But we'll try to spare you some time by quickly breaking it down here (Habib, 2020). At the moment, there are three main influences on the legal system: Islamic law (Sharia), English common law and local customary practices. During the colonial period, British India adopted Britain's legal system which was based on English common law principles. This included parliamentary sovereignty an independent judiciary, and common law supremacy. When Pakistan gained independence in 1947, they kept most of this intact when they left Britain's rule (Iqbal & Iqbal, 2020).

Once independence was achieved however the challenge of building a justice system that catered to its diverse population, halting different religions and ethnic groups over time, they took steps toward integrating Islamic thinking while keeping English principles. They released their Objectives Resolution in 1949, where Islam was declared key to state affairs. Three years later in 1956, when their Constitution was launched, Islam became the state religion but modern legal concepts were still infused with those of Islamic thought (Wachani & Saeed, 2021).

The past century has seen them publish several constitutions such as one in 1962 and another in 1973 which have been amended multiple times since then. Pakistan currently operates under a federal parliamentary system established by the Constitution created in 1973. This constitution gave citizens' rights and powers were divided between branches. Throughout time other legislation was passed to allow the incorporation of Islamic laws into society such as the Muslim Personal Law (Sharia) Application Act which applies Sharia principles to issues such as marriage, divorce and inheritance for Muslims (Kapoor, 2021).

International law applications have also shaped parts of Pakistan's legal structure including human rights norms and globalization policies. Although there are good intentions today for modernizing the legal system, promoting the rule of law and enhancing access many issues have come in the way including a lack of enforcement, corruption, and a large judicial backlog (Khan & Alam, 2020).

## **2.2. The UK Perspective**

The historical development and influences that common law has gone through in the UK are hard to follow. It's a long story, so let's break it down.

Anglo-Saxon Origins: The law of the earliest known people to live there, the Anglo-Saxons, was not uniform across regions. Different tribes had their own laws and customs.

Norman Conquest and Feudalism: In 1066, William the Conqueror won England and imposed his own laws on it, along with feudalism that centralized power under him (Norrie et al., 2023)

Emergence of Common Law: Customary practices and judicial decisions were recognized as sources for new laws. Judges would go all over England to decide cases based on those principles (Chouaibi et al, 2022).

Influence of Royal Courts: The King's Bench court roamed around all of England to make sure that justice was being delivered equally everywhere (Hanretty, C. 2020).

Role of Legal Professionals: With the Inns of Court, legal professionals started practicing more often (Saundry & Urwin, 2021).

Parliamentary Supremacy and Statutory Law: Parliament became powerful enough to make statutes that supplemented or replaced common law principles from hundreds of years ago (Gilani et al., 2023).

Expansion of Legal Principles: Some judges may have stretched their imaginations too far trying to interpret or reason with common law principles during this time. But some important doctrines, such as negligence or privacy rights, were established later on because they did (Olawuyi, 2020).

Modernization and Codification: Over these two centuries, some goals for legal reform, like streamlining procedures or increasing efficiency, were introduced into how courts operated (Yeung & Bygrave, 2022).

Influence of European Union Law: From 1973 until 2020, UK law had been heavily influenced by EU legislation such as directives, regulations, etc., which affected domestic legislation and judicial decisions greatly (Barnard, 2022).

Contemporary Developments: As things progressed in human rights, technology, culture, etc., common law in the UK evolved too. Changes in constitutional and commercial law have been made since then (Næss, 2023).

## **3. Separation of Powers in Pakistan and the UK**

Separation of powers is fundamental principles in both Pakistan and the UK ensuring the proper functioning of their respective legal and political systems.

### **3.1. Pakistan Perceptive**

Executive Branch: The executive branch in Pakistan is led by the head of government, called the Prime Minister. This person has all the authority and power that come with it. They take care of implementing laws, creating policies, and working through government issues (Ranjah, 2023).

Legislative Branch: In Pakistan, they have a bicameral legislature. That means there are two separate assemblies in this branch, the National Assembly and the Senate. The purpose of this branch is to make laws and scrutinize the policies set forth by those above them (Ali, J. 2023).

Judicial Branch: The Supreme Court leads this branch as its head honcho. It's actually pretty ironic how powerful they are considering it's also supposed to serve as an appeal for lower courts. Nonetheless, interpreting laws and overseeing fundamental rights is their main responsibility (Hussain 2011).

### **3.2. The UK perception**

Executive Branch: The executive branch of the UK is led by the Prime Minister, who is the head of government and has executive authority on behalf of the Crown. The Prime Minister leads the Cabinet and carries out government policies (Okeke, 2023).

Legislative Branch: The UK Parliament holds supreme legislative power and consists of two houses: the House of Commons and the House of Lords. Parliament makes laws, examines government actions, and represents voters' interests (Horsley, 2022).

Judicial Branch: Independent and unbiased in nature, the judicial system of the UK is headed by the Supreme Court, which serves as the highest court for appeals and constitutional matters. It comprises judges responsible for interpreting laws, resolving conflicts, and maintaining the rule of law (Huchhanavar, 2023).

## **4. Judicial Independence in Pakistan and the UK**

In every civilized nation, the Constitution is considered to be the supreme law of the land. The judiciary exercises judicial review for being a custodian of the Constitution. To be a custodian of the Constitution, it is necessary for the judiciary to be independent. The Constitution guarantees judicial independence by providing methods of appointment, tenure, dismissal, and jurisdiction for judges (Mehmood, 2020). The question of whether or not the judiciary is independent has been debated for centuries. It's a

fascinating topic that changes its shape and color from generation to generation. The decision is situational and based on issues faced by the judiciary. For example, the International Commission of Jurists' Centre for the Freedom of Judges and Lawyers (2004) has stated that "the judiciary finds itself under tremendous pressure in many countries, particularly where there are political and constitutional problems, armed conflicts, or post-conflict instability." Similarly, counter-terrorism efforts have also increased pressure on courts in many countries. Independent Judiciary plays a vital role in human rights protection. An autonomous judiciary protects the interests of citizens as well as federation units. Federation structures cannot flourish unless a court with complete structural independence emerges (Khan & Zubair 2023).

The judicial system of Pakistan is said to be free from outside influence, but that is not always true in practice. Politicians have had a history of putting their hands where they don't belong, which doesn't bode well for accountability or delays in getting justice served properly (Akhtar et al., 2022). On the other hand, judicial independence is core to the UK's legal system, with judges appointed based on merit while being safe from external pressures. This framework enables the judiciary to operate freely from control exerted by the executive or legislative branch, ensuring fairness in dispensing justice (Frost et al., 2022). In the UK, the rule of law and the separation of powers are two essential elements in any liberal democracy, and judicial independence guarantees these aspects. The separation of powers theory does not necessitate a complete division between the branches; it only needs checks and balances. Its target is to build a system where no branch can trespass into others within its own branch. This implies that the judiciary can effectively check other branches and oversee constitutional power checks without being influenced by their executive or legislative counterparts (Kotby, 2023).

In the UK, judicial independence refers to the insulation of the judiciary and judges from external pressures from the rest of the government, and private sources also simply refer to the ability of a court to make decisions that are not influenced by political pressure from outside the judiciary. The former lord chancellor of England, Lord Mackay, said, "Judicial independence requires that judges can discharge their judicial duties in accordance with the judicial oath and the laws of the land without interference, improper influence, or pressure from any other individual or organization." (Kotby, 2023). And it doesn't stop there. Lord Irvine, LC, states: "The independence of the judiciary is a cornerstone of Britain's constitutional arrangements; that is, if judges depend on the goodwill of their government for their continuing employment, they may find themselves unable to resist political or other improper influence in individual cases. Judges must have security of tenure. They must be able to undertake their responsibilities and exercise their discretion without fear or favor. Their appointments and careers must be developed based on objective criteria to avoid any suggestion of favoritism or preferment in return for favors rendered (Kotby, 2023).

According to Professor Peter Solomon, judicial independence should be understood as a means of encouraging the appearance and reality of impartial adjudication. But Professor Peter H. Russell adds that such independence concerns relationships between potential sources of pressure and the judge, not any particular kind of behavior on the part of the judges (Kotby, 2023).

The independence of the judicial decision-making process doesn't just mean that the other branches of government can't interfere with it. In order for it to work, other bodies need to have respect for and comply with judicial decisions. These rulings are made by people, not gods, but they should be treated like they were sacred by all parts of the government and their offshoots: law enforcement, corrections, social entities, and educational entities. Even if those groups don't agree with a decision or think it is wrong in some way, they must treat it as holy because this respect is vital for the rule of law to stand. To help judges get more involved in administering the judicial branch and to make sure institutions stay independent from political sway, judges could be given more rights. These include being able to directly appoint administrative staff and discipline them when necessary (Warraich et al., 2023).

## **5. Models of Judicial Appointments in the context of Pakistan and the UK**

### **5.1. Pakistan perceptive**

Pakistan has seen different models of judicial appointments, ranging from politicized to professionalize. The first is the 'politicized structure,' where the President or a minister decides all appointments without input from the judiciary or legal community. It's possible that under Article 203-C (2) of the Constitution of Pakistan 1973, the President had to consult with the Chief Justice before making appointments, but there was no clarity on whether he was required to accept the Chief Justice's advice (Habib, 2020).

The 'judicialized structure' involves more consultation with judges and lawyers. For example, Articles 177 and 193 of the Constitution provide for appointment of Chief Justices and other judges by the President after consultation with the Chief Justice of Pakistan. Article 48(1) obliges the President to act on aid and advice of cabinet or Prime Minister, subject to certain exceptions validating his discretion in some matters (Habib, 2020). The third model is 'professionalization,' which uses independent commissions to appoint judges based on merit. This system was meant bring transparency in appointments when it was introduced through Article 175A via unanimous adoption by Parliament in 18th Constitutional Amendment during PPP tenure in power between Feb-2008 and Mar-2013.

Regardless of its professed model, however, both executive and judiciary have always used each such structure at different times to serve their desired outcome – i.e., favoring those who are aligned politically-compliant and even close relatives/ acquaintances & expelling those who aren't. Though professionalization is widely considered a good change for reforming ailing state institutions like police & bureaucracy etc., recent use by Supreme Court under chief justice Gulzar Ahmad does not seem true-implementation but selective-picking from judicialization structure used during previous regimes. In order to contain Chief justices' dominance over Judicial Commission & Parliamentary Committee which were given powers & responsibilities so as to reduce his own say/power over appointments process; strengthen role of Parliamentary Committee having said that, none of these

models is perfect. All have failed to institutionalize merit-based criteria in the appointment process by incorporating it in the Constitution. And all have been misused by the executive and judiciary (Habib, 2020).

Even though tenure security has been ensured through a constitutional amendment (Article 209(7)), judges who are seen as less favored by senior justices have often been ousted without following due procedure. Besides, diversity is not even remotely factored in – e.g., any women or non-Muslims have ever become a judge of SC & 3 out of 4 High Courts. However, PBC in past had elected first female president and then again appointed second female chairperson for it; but such important positions and appointments remain missing from constitutional bodies excluding Parliament itself; even legal community has never focused on gender diversity!

## **5.2. The UK perspective**

First and foremost, in England before the CRA of 2005, the executive wielded enormous influence over the appointment process. In particular, the Prime Minister had substantial power to recommend candidates for higher judicial positions such as Law Lords and Lord Justices of Appeal, ordinarily after consulting with the Lord Chancellor. For lower judicial appointments, which included High Court Judges and Circuit Judges, candidates were put forward by the Lord Chancellor. Consequently, this arrangement meant that important figures in the executive branch played significant roles in shaping the judiciary (Habib, 2020).

Secondly, as judges took on a broader range of cases there were increased concerns surrounding their ability to make independent decisions due to political influences. These concerns aligned with a growing need to ensure that qualifications and character came first when making these appointments rather than political considerations. Various groups including but not limited to The Institute for Public Policy Research pointed out that it was important for these appointments to be made impartially so as not to erode public trust in judges or undermine any perception of politicization. With this information at hand it was becoming more clear that reforms would have to take place (Habib, 2020).

Lastly, there was no shortage of support for an alternative professionalized model of judicial appointments from many skeptics who believed that political influence had pushed things too far into uncertainty and lack of transparency. This alternative proposed a United Kingdom Judicial Appointments Commission where judges hold most seats in order to keep an eye on proceedings. However there were worries about such a proposal being adopted due to its inherent lack of checks against undue influence from politics or lack of legitimacy if unelected officials were running the show. There was also some worry about what could happen if solely judges held all control over who got appointed since they are only one group out of many involved in the intricate process.. All these questions and uncertainties highlighted just how complex reforming this process would have been while still maintaining independence, accountability, and public confidence in judiciary systems currently set up across Britain (Habib, 2020).

## **6. Challenges and Issues**

Challenges regarding access to justice, judicial proceedings and delays, and corruption and honesty in the legal field are present in both Pakistan and the UK, although with nuanced differences in severity. In Pakistan, minimal legal aid services, geographical hurdles to acquiring legal help, and cultural stigmas all contribute to uneven opportunity in the justice system (Siddique, 2013). While Britain has its own set of problems, such as drops in legal aid allocations, high court fees, and incredibly complex legal systems that hinder accessibility, both countries have troubles with their court systems being overwhelmed by caseloads, which are compounded by an inefficient procedure system due to things like understaffed judiciaries. Corruption within the Pakistani legal profession is a major concern, with bribery, interference from politicians, and informal practices all chipping away at the integrity of their justice system. However, while professional misconduct does exist on some level in the UK industry (as it does everywhere), regulatory oversight measures keep it relatively low; even so, regulatory oversight can only go so far in preventing dishonesty like this. The need for equal access to justice, efficient proceedings, and an honest industry will always be a challenge for any country looking towards reform. This balancing act requires constant vigilance as well as new thoughts on how to maintain lawfulness while protecting people's rights (Partington, 2018).

## **7. Comparative Analysis**

The legal systems of Pakistan and the UK share many similarities but are also quite different in key ways. Both countries use a common law system as their legal foundation, the UK's having developed through the centuries from judicial precedent and laws made by Parliament, while Pakistan fuses Islamic law with common law principles. Similarly, both countries have constitutions, but Pakistan has a written constitution (Kapor, 2021) and the UK has an unwritten constitution (Trivedi, C. 2021). But the UK's is flexible and unwritten and relies on the statutes, conventions, and decisions of its courts to interpret it (Birkinshaw, 2020). Pakistan's is codified and contains explicit provisions based on Islamic law. The judiciary in each country operates on a hierarchical model (although in Pakistan there are separate courts for matters relating to Islamic law), and legal training involves an undergraduate degree followed by professional education (Redding, 2003).

Differences in access to justice due to funding for legal aid services and other infrastructure issues can be observed. Understanding these differences will give insight into how challenging it can be to create effective legal systems that work for different regions of the world. There are strengths and weaknesses unique to both countries' legal systems. In Pakistan, its strength lies in the cultural identity established through incorporating Islamic law principles (Shah, 2023) whereas the UK's strength lies in its robust rule of law framework that respects human rights (Pech & Grogan, 2020). Each system has its own setbacks, such as the significant judicial backlog in Pakistan, which causes major delays, or limited access to justice due to cuts both within legal aid funding and court fees, among others.

Both countries have an opportunity to learn from one another's achievements when it comes to addressing shared challenges as well as strengthening their own existing frameworks. Collaboration between legal professionals, policymakers, and civil society organizations could bring greater access to knowledge for all parties involved. This would result in sharing resources, expertise, and innovative approaches towards reforming their respective jurisdictions. Finally, embracing transparency, accountability, and integrity within each party could help maintain trust within one another as well as set a standard for professional conduct that should be followed across all aspects of any given judicial system.

## 8. Implications for Legal Reform and Development

Legal reform and development in Pakistan and the UK have far-reaching implications. There are a lot of different strategies to enhance access to justice, make the legal system more efficient, and keep the integrity of lawyers at its highest. One strategy is to prioritize legal aid reform in order to help marginalized individuals. Judicial infrastructure should be invested in as well, so that delays can be handled properly. Anti-corruption measures would also be essential for keeping the justice system clean. Legal education changes need to happen too in order to get ethical, competent lawyers ready for anything. Other strategies include promoting alternative dispute resolution mechanisms, utilizing technology solutions, implementing case management reforms, and empowering communities through legal literacy initiatives (Mehmood, 2020). Legal efficiency can be obtained through technology integration with legal processes and by giving communities power through legal literacy programs. Technology like virtual hearings or online disputes would minimize paperwork and give people better access to justice when they're remote or located somewhere underprivileged. Reforms to scheduling techniques will speed up court proceedings, which will reduce delays and increase efficiency. Lastly, empowering communities with these programs will allow individuals to navigate the legal system confidently (Shah, 2023).

Pakistan and the UK have many opportunities for cross-jurisdictional cooperation in terms of reforming their systems together so they can both learn from one another, along with capacity building and problem-solving skills within this field. Facilitating knowledge sharing among professionals will help everyone exchange best practices, while training programs for workers that come from either country can promote cross-cultural understanding, thus making their jobs easier when working together on a project later down the line.

## 9. Conclusion

When comparing legal systems in Pakistan and the UK, it's clear that researchers are working with two cultures that share common legal roots. But when researchers dig deeper, they find that they couldn't be more different. The study highlights some of the challenges facing lawyers in both countries: access to justice, judicial backlog, corruption, just to name a few. Both systems have their good and bad traits; Pakistan has proven itself in defending constitutional rights, while the UK prioritizes rule of law and judicial independence. This research proves how complex these systems really are through nuanced insights. Future studies should focus on individual cases, long-term legal reform analysis, cross-cultural perspectives, and assessing legal initiatives for evidence-based policymaking. This will help scholars understand legal systems better and improve international justice and rule of law efforts.

## References

- Akhtar, M. N., Kasi, A., & Khan, Q. (2022). A review on the consequences over: Achieving Judicial Independence in Pakistan. *Pakistan Journal of International Affairs*, 5(3).
- Alam, K., Khan, I., Khan, Z., & Bibi, U. (2023). Analysis of Barriers, Causing Delay in Formal Judicial System of Pakistan: A Case Study of Malakand Division. *International Journal Of Human And Society*, 3(4), 109-114.
- Ali, J. (2023). Role of Legislatures in the Federations of Australia, Pakistan, and India: An In-depth Overview. *Pakistan Journal of Multidisciplinary Innovation*, 2(1), 11-23.
- Barkay, T., Davies, J., Pietropaoli, I., & Shamir, H. (2024). Anti-trafficking Chains: Analyzing the Impact of Transparency Legislation in the UK Construction Sector. *Law & Social Inquiry*, 1-32.
- Barnard, C. (2022). *The substantive law of the EU: the four freedoms*. Oxford university press.
- Birkinshaw, P. (2020). Brexit's Challenge to the UK's Unwritten Constitution. *Eur. Pub. L.*, 26, 29.
- Buchen, C. (2024). Institutional resilience: how the formal legal system sustains informal cooperation. *Journal of Institutional Economics*, 20, e1.
- Chouaibi, S., Chouaibi, J., & Rossi, M. (2022). ESG and corporate financial performance: the mediating role of green innovation: UK common law versus Germany civil law. *EuroMed Journal of Business*, 17(1), 46-71.
- Coggon, J. (2024). 11 Legal expertise and its subject matter within common law adjudication John Coggon. *Philosophy, Expertise, and the Myth of Neutrality*, 16.
- Fauzia, A., Hamdani, F., Rusdianto, R., & Mohamed, M. A. (2023). Implementation of the Omnibus Law Concept and Consolidated Texts: Amalgamation of the Common Law and Civil Law Legal Systems. *Journal of Law and Legal Reform*, 4(2), 235-254.
- Fleming, T. G., & James, L. (2024). Parliamentary Influence on Brexit Legislation, 2017–2019. *Parliamentary Affairs*, 77(1), 25-45.
- Frost, T., Huxley-Binns, R., Martin, J., & Mithani, S. (2022). *Unlocking the English legal system*. Routledge.

- Gilani, S. R. S., Al-Matrooshi, A. M., & Qureshi, M. A. N. (2024). Supremacy of the Parliament and the Rule of Law in the UK: An Analysis. *Journal of European Studies (JES)*, 40(1), 15-15.
- Habib, R. I. (2020). Evolution and exercise of the power of judicial review of executive actions in Pakistan. *Review of Education, Administration & Law*, 3(1), 1-10.
- Hanretty, C. (2020). *A court of specialists: Judicial behavior on the UK Supreme Court*. Oxford University Press, USA.
- Hanretty, C., & Graham, L. (2024). 11 The United Kingdom Supreme Court. *Constitutional Review in Western Europe: Judicial-Legislative Relations in Comparative Perspective*, 264.
- Horsley, T. (2022). Constitutional functions and institutional responsibility: A functional analysis of the UK constitution. *Legal Studies*, 42(1), 99-119.
- Huchhanavar, S. (2023). *Judicial Conduct Regulation Regimes in India and the United Kingdom: A Comparative Study* (Doctoral dissertation, Durham University).
- Hussain, F. (2011). *The judicial system of Pakistan* (p. 19). Pakistan: Supreme Court of Pakistan.
- Iqbal, M., & Iqbal, K. (2020). Shariah and Evolution of fair Trial Rights in Pakistan. *Rahat-ul-Quloob*, 130-141.
- Iqbal, M., Bashir, N., & Ali, I. (2023). An Analysis of the Evaluation of Islamic Laws in Pakistan from 1988 to 1999. *Qlantic Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 4(4), 123-133.
- Kapoor, P. (2021). An Analytical study on the Constitution of Islamic Republic of Pakistan. *PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology*, 18(08), 1560-1572.
- Khan, M. A., & Alam, I. (2020). Viewing the invisibles: Panoramic Stratum of Children in Ancient civilizations, International law, and legal System of Pakistan. *Pakistan Vision*, 21(2), 207.
- Khan, M., & Chaudhry, M. N. (2024). Evaluation of Environmental Impact Assessment legislation in Pakistan. *Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal*, 1-18.
- Khan, S. H., & Zubair, M. (2023). Constitutionalism And Judicial Activism: Transforming Authority In Pakistan. *Russian Law Journal*, 11(4), 659-677.
- Kotby, M. (2023). *Judicial independence versus judicial impartiality: A comparative approach* (Doctoral dissertation, Middlesex University).
- Malik, A. A. (2023). Judicial Review and the Rule of Law in Pakistan. *Asian Journal of Comparative Law*, 18(3), 291-302.
- Mehmood, S. (2020). Judicial independence and development: Evidence from Pakistan.
- Mufti, M. (2023). Pakistan in 2022: A Year of Crisis and Instability. *Asian Survey*, 63(2), 213-224.
- Næss, H. E. (2023). Mega-Sporting Events, Human Rights, and Sustainable. *The Routledge Handbook of Mega-Sporting Events and Human Rights*.
- Norrie, A., Harris, C., Laynesmith, J. L., Messer, D. R., & Woodacre, E. (Eds.). (2023). *Norman to Early Plantagenet Consorts: Power, Influence, and Dynasty*. Springer Nature.
- Okeke, U. D. (2023). An Appraisal Of Comparative Operations Of Separation Of Powers. *Idemili Bar Journal*, 3.
- Olawuyi, D. (2020). Sustainable development and the water-energy-food nexus: Legal challenges and emerging solutions. *Environmental Science & Policy*, 103, 1-9.
- Partington, M. (2018). *Introduction to the English Legal System 2018-19*. oxford university press.
- Pech, L., & Grogan, J. (2020). Meaning and Scope of the EU Rule of Law. *RECONNECT*, June
- Ranjah, Z. U. (2023). *Separation of State Powers in Pakistan*. Pakistan Law House.
- Redding, J. A. (2003). Constitutionalizing Islam: Theory and Pakistan. *Va. J. Int'l L.*, 44, 759.
- Saundry, R., & Urwin, P. (2021). *Estimating the costs of workplace conflict* (pp. 1-27). Advisory, Conciliation and Arbitration Service (ACAS).
- Shah, Z., & Mahmood, A. K. (2023). Critical Analysis of Laws-Regulating Criminal Investigation in Pakistan. *Journal of Quranic and Social Studies*, 3(2), 184-212.
- Siddique, O. (2013). *Pakistan's experience with formal law: an alien justice*. Cambridge university press.
- Trivedi, C. (2021). The Unwritten Constitution Provides Greater Opportunities for Human Rights: A Comparative Analysis of the Constitution of India and UK. *Issue 4 Int'l JL Mgmt. & Human.*, 4, 1611.
- Wachani, J. U., & Saeed, S. (2021). Controversial status of Objective Resolution in the form of Article 2A in the constitutional history of Pakistan. *Pakistan Journal of International Affairs*, 4(2).
- Warraich, A., Shabbir, I., & Jamil, M. S. (2023). Exploring the Nexus between Judicial Activism and Good Governance: A Comparative Analysis. *Journal of Policy Research*, 9(2), 510-517.
- Yeung, K., & Bygrave, L. A. (2022). Demystifying the modernized European data protection regime: Cross-disciplinary insights from legal and regulatory governance scholarship. *Regulation & Governance*, 16(1), 137-155.