

Andhra Pradesh

1. STATE FACTSHEET

State Chief Information Commissioner	C.D. Arha
State Information Commissioners	R.Dileep Reddy A.Subba Rao K.Sudhakara Rao
Total Number of Cases Analysed by Us (as provided to us)	1685
Pendency as on January 1, 2008	741
Pendency as on December 31, 2008	1867
Time Taken Between Filing of Appeal and First Hearing	Data not available
Total Funds Spent by the Commission (FY 2008-09)	Rs. 1,82,49,500

2. STATE OF RECORDS:

The Commission claims to have passed 3043 orders. They said all their orders are on their website. However, we found only 1699 orders on their site. We wrote to the Commission and also spoke to them. They have maintained that all their orders are uploaded on their website.

3. PERFORMANCE OF INFORMATION COMMISSION ON VARIOUS PARAMETERS

a) DISPOSALS: An average of 35 cases per commissioner per month

- The pendency of cases on 1.01.2008 was 741. It increased to 1867 by the end of the year (on 31.12.2008).
- During calendar year 2008, Andhra Pradesh Information Commission disposed 1685 cases. There were 4 commissioners working for 12 months each. So, it comes to roughly 35 cases per commissioner per month.

b) PRO-DISCLOSURE FACTOR: 32%

Rank: 25

Total Number of Orders Analysed	1685
Orders in Favour of Disclosure	541(32%)
Orders in which information was partly or fully denied	786 (47%)
Remanded Back	358
Rank	25

c) EFFECTIVENESS: 20 to 30%

How many of the pro-disclosure orders were complied with?

- 20 to 30% orders were complied with.
- Compliance is lower than the national average of 30 to 40%.

d) DETERRENCE IMPACT: 0

Rank: 22

- Number of cases in which show cause notices issued: 39
- 9 of these notices were dropped after hearings (i.e. 23 % of show cause notices)
- Penalty was not imposed in any case.
- Show cause notices remained pending in 77% cases at the end of the year.

The Commission directed information to be provided in 541 cases. However, the Commission asked the reasons for delay only in 39 cases. In rest of the cases, the officials were not even asked to explain the reasons for the delay.

e) OVERALL PUBLIC SATISFACTION (OPS): Less than 10%

So, if 100 people approach Andhra Pradesh Information Commission, pro-disclosure orders were done in 32 cases. Out of these, less than 10 % finally got information.

4. RANKING OF COMMISSIONERS BY PARAMETERS

Name	Pro-disclosure Factor	Effectiveness (%)	Deterrent Impact	Overall Public Satisfaction (%)
C.D. Arha	18 (85 th)	10-20	0 (57 th)	0-10
R. Dileep Reddy	68 (69 th)	NA	0 (57 th)	NA
A.Subba Rao	48 (79 th)	20-30	0 (57 th)	10-20
K.Sudhakara Rao	66 (71 th)	40-50	0 (57 th)	20-30

INFORMATION COMMISSIONERS

Andhra Pradesh

1. C.D Arha

Disposals: Roughly 86 cases per month

- The Commissioner had a pendency of 467 cases.
- The time taken between filing of appeal and first hearing to come up in the commission was 3 months.

Pro-disclosure Factor: 18

Rank: 85

Total Number of Orders Analysed	1030
Orders in Favour of Disclosure	186 (18%)
Orders in which information was partly or fully denied	496(48%)
Remanded Back	348
Rank	85

Effectiveness: 10 to 20%

How many of pro-disclosure orders were complied with?

- 10 to 20% pro-disclosure orders were complied with.
- It is much lower than the national average of 30 to 40%.

Deterrence Impact: 0

Rank: 57

- Number of cases in which show cause notices issued: 7 (4% of pro-disclosure cases)
- All the 7 show cause notices issued were dropped subsequently.
- Penalty was not imposed in any case.

The Commissioner directed information to be provided in 186 cases. However, he asked reasons for the delay only in 7 cases. In rest of the cases, the officials were not even asked to explain the reasons for delay.

Overall Public Satisfaction: 0 to 10%

So, if 100 people approached this Commissioner, pro-disclosure orders were done in 18 cases. Out of these, less than 10% finally got information.

2. R. Dileep Reddy

Disposals: Roughly 3.1 cases per month

- The Commissioner had a pendency of 467 cases.
- Time taken between filing of appeal and first hearing was not available.

Pro-disclosure Factor: 68%

Rank: 69

Total Number of Orders Analysed	37
Orders in Favour of Disclosure	25 (68%)
Orders in which information was partly or fully denied	12(32%)
Remanded Back	0
Rank	69

Effectiveness:

The effectiveness could not be calculated due to insufficient data.

Deterrence Impact: 0

Rank: 57

- Dileep Reddy did not issue any show cause notice in any case.

Overall Public Satisfaction

The overall public satisfaction could not be calculated due to insufficient data.

3. A. Subba Rao

Disposals: Roughly 35.8 cases per month

- The Commissioner had a pendency of 467 cases.
- Time taken between filing of appeal and first hearing is not available.

Pro-disclosure Factor: 48%

Rank: 79

Total Number of Orders Analysed	430
Orders in Favour of Disclosure	206 (48%)
Orders in which information was partly or fully denied	214(50%)
Remanded Back	10
Rank	79

Effectiveness: 20 to 30%

How many of pro-disclosure orders were complied with?

- 20 to 30% pro-disclosure orders were complied with.
- It is lower than the national average of 30 to 40 %.

Deterrence Impact: 0

Rank: 57

- Number of cases in which show cause notices issued: 21 (10% of pro-disclosure cases)
- Of these 2(10%) Show cause notices were dropped subsequently.
- Penalty was not imposed in any case.

The Commissioner directed information to be provided in 206 cases. However, he asked reasons for the delay only in 21 cases. In rest of the cases, the officials were not even asked to explain the reasons for delay.

Overall Public Satisfaction: 10 to 20%

So, if 100 people approached this Commissioner, pro-disclosure orders were given in 48 cases. Out of these, 10 to 20% finally got information.

4. K. Sudhakar Rao

Disposals: Roughly 15.7 cases per month

- The Commissioner had a pendency of 467.
- Time taken between filing of appeal and first hearing data not available.

Pro-disclosure Factor: 66

Rank: 71

Total Number of Orders Analysed	188
Orders in Favour of Disclosure	124 (66%)
Orders in which information was partly or fully denied	64(34%)
Remanded Back	0
Rank	71

Effectiveness: 40 to 50 %

How many of pro-disclosure orders were complied with?

- 40 to 50% pro-disclosure orders were complied with.
- It is slightly higher than the national average of 30 to 40%.

Deterrence Impact: 0

Rank: 57

- Number of cases in which show cause notices issued:11 (9% of pro-disclosure cases)
- Though no show cause notice was dropped, no penalty has been imposed either.

The Commissioner directed information to be provided in 124 cases. However, he asked reasons for the delay only in 11 cases. In rest of the cases, the officials were not even asked to explain the reasons for delay.

Overall Public Satisfaction: 20 to 30 %

So, if 100 people approached this Commissioner, pro-disclosure orders were given in 66 cases. Out of these, 20 to 30% finally got information.