

# Assam

## 1. STATE FACTSHEET

<b>State Chief Information Commissioner</b>	R.S.Mooshahary
<b>State Information Commissioners</b>	B.K. Gohain
<b>Pendency as on January 1, 2008</b>	Not Available
<b>Pendency as on December 31, 2008</b>	42
<b>Time Taken Between Filing of Appeal and First Hearing</b>	4 months
<b>Total Funds Spent by the Commission (FY 2008-09)</b>	Rs. 27,05,000

## 2. STATE OF RECORDS:

Initially, the Commission said records up to 10.9.08 were destroyed in fire. Later, on our request, the commission sent us 230 orders stating that these were the only orders passed by the Commission during the entire 2008.

## 3. PERFORMANCE OF INFORMATION COMMISSION ON VARIOUS PARAMETERS

### a) DISPOSALS: An average of 19 cases per commissioner per month

The Commission replied to our letter stating that records pertaining to the year 2008 had been destroyed in a fire, therefore we are assuming orders that they had sent to us is the total number of orders disposed by them in 2008.

### b) PRO-DISCLOSURE FACTOR: 98%

**Rank: 1**

<b>Total Number of Orders Analysed</b>	230
<b>Orders in Favour of Disclosure</b>	226
<b>Orders in which information was partly or fully denied</b>	4 (2%)
<b>Remanded Back</b>	0
<b>Rank</b>	1

### c) EFFECTIVENESS: 40-50%

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

- 40 to 50% orders were complied with.
- Compliance, though slightly more than the national average 30 to 40%, is much less than the best 90 to 100%.

**d) DETERRENCE IMPACT: 0.44%****Rank 19**

- Number of cases in which show cause notices issued: 29
- 22 of these notices were dropped after hearings (i.e. 76% of show cause notices)
- Penalty was imposed in 2 cases
- Show cause notices remained pending in 17% cases at the end of the year.

The Commission directed information to be provided in 226 cases. However, the Commission asked the reasons for this delay only in 29 cases. In rest of the cases the officials were not even asked to explain the reasons for delay.

**e) OVERALL PUBLIC SATISFACTION (OPS): 40 to 50 %**

So, if 100 people approach Punjab Information Commission, pro-disclosure orders were done in 98 cases. Out of these, 40 to 50% finally got information.

**4. RANKING OF COMMISSIONERS BY PARAMETERS**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Pro-disclosure Factor</b>	<b>Effectiveness</b>	<b>Deterrent Impact</b>	<b>Overall Public Satisfaction</b>
<b>B.K. Gohain</b>	98(5 <sup>th</sup> )	30 to 40 %	0(57 <sup>th</sup> )	30-40%
<b>Combined Bench of Assam</b>	99(4 <sup>th</sup> )	60 to 70 %	1.25(43 <sup>rd</sup> )	60-70%

\* As the number of orders passed by Mooshahary in single bench was just 4, they have been combined with the orders passed by the combined bench.

# INFORMATION COMMISSIONERS (Assam)

## 1. B. K. Gohain

### Disposals: Roughly 19 per month

- Pendency was 42 cases as of 31.12.2008
- Time taken between filing of appeal and first hearing is 4 months.

### Pro-disclosure Factor: 98%

**Rank: 5**

<b>Total Number of Orders Analysed</b>	149
<b>Orders in Favour of Disclosure</b>	146 (98%)
<b>Orders in which information was partly or fully denied</b>	3 (2%)
<b>Remanded Back</b>	0
<b>Rank</b>	5

### Effectiveness: 30 to 40%

How many of pro-disclosure orders were complied with?

- 30 to 40% pro-disclosure orders were complied with.
- It is equal to national average to 30 to 40% but much less than the best, i.e 90 to 100%.

### Deterrence Impact: 0

**Rank: 57**

- Number of cases in which show cause notices issued: 10(7% of pro-disclosure cases)
- Of this 6(roughly 60% of show cause notices issued) were dropped subsequently.
- Only one penalty was imposed that too was subsequently withdrawn.

The Commissioner directed information to be provided in 146 cases. However, the Commission asked the reasons for this delay only in 10 cases. In rest of the cases the officials were not even asked to explain the reasons for delay.

### Overall Public Satisfaction: 30 to 40%

So, if 100 people approached this Commissioner, pro-disclosure orders were done in 98 cases. Out of these, 30 to 40 % finally got information.

## 2. Combined bench of Assam (R.S. Mooshahary and B.K Gohain)

**Pro-disclosure Factor: 99%**

**Rank: 4**

<b>Total Number of Orders Analysed</b>	81
<b>Orders in Favour of Disclosure</b>	80(99%)
<b>Orders in which information was partly or fully denied</b>	1 (1%)
<b>Remanded Back</b>	0
<b>Rank</b>	4

**Effectiveness: 60 to 70%**

How many of pro-disclosure orders were complied with?

- 60 to 70% pro-disclosure orders were complied with.
- It is above national average to 30 to 40% but less than the best i.e 90to 100%.

**Deterrence Impact: 1.3%**

**Rank: 43**

- Number of cases in which show cause notices issued: 19(24% of pro-disclosure cases)
- Of this 16(roughly 84% of show cause notices issued) were dropped subsequently.
- Only one penalty was imposed in entire 2008.

The Commission directed information to be provided in 80 cases. However, the Commission asked the reasons for this delay only in 19 cases. In rest of the cases the officials were not even asked to explain the reasons for delay.

**Overall Public Satisfaction: 60 to 70%**

So, if 100 people approached this Commissioner, pro-disclosure orders were done in 99cases. Out of these, 60to 70% people finally got information.