

CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION

1. STATE FACTSHEET

State Chief Information Commissioner	Wajahat Habibullah
State Information Commissioners	A.N. Tiwari M.M. Ansari O.P. Kejariwal Annapurna Dixit S.N. Mishra ML Sharma Padma Balasubramaniam Shailesh Gandhi
Total Number of Cases Analysed by Us (as provided to us)	7,626
Pendency as on January 1, 2008	5,313
Pendency as on December 31, 2008	9,593
Time Taken Between Filing of Appeal and First Hearing	Not Available
Total Funds Spent by the Commission (FY 2008-09)	Rs 8,04,00,000

2. STATE OF RECORDS:

We were informed on phone that all their orders are on their website. We found only 7,343 orders on their site, which we analyzed. They claim to have passed 10,285 orders. We have learnt that a large number of cases are rejected by the registry of CIC on technical grounds. However, in response to our RTI query, they said that they do not maintain such data. Interestingly, in the previous year, they had revealed in response to an RTI query filed by another RTI activist that almost 63% cases received at CIC were rejected on technical grounds.

3. PERFORMANCE OF INFORMATION COMMISSION ON VARIOUS PARAMETERS

a) DISPOSALS: An average of 94 cases per commissioner per month

- Cases pending as on January 1, 2008: 5,313
- Cases pending as on December 31, 2008: 9,593
- During calendar year 2008, Central Information Commission disposed 7,626 cases. There were nine commissioners—four of them worked for 12 months, one for 9 months and four for 3 months each. So, it comes to roughly 110 cases per commissioner per month.

b) PRO-DISCLOSURE FACTOR: 65%**Rank: 20**

Total Number of Orders Analysed	7,626
Orders in Favour of Disclosure	4,938 (~65%)
Orders in which information was partly or fully denied	2,153 (28%)
Remanded Back	535 (7%)
Rank	20

c) EFFECTIVENESS: 20 to 30%

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

- 20 to 30% orders were complied with.
- Compliance, though close to national average of 30-40%, is much less than the best 90-100%.

d) DETERRENCE IMPACT: 2%**Rank: 15**

- Number of cases in which show cause notices issued: 890 (i.e. 18% of pro disclosure cases)
- 104 of these notices were dropped after hearings (i.e. 12% of show cause notices)
- Penalty was imposed in 92 cases (i.e. 2% of pro-disclosure cases).
- Show cause notices remained pending in 78% cases at the end of the year.

The Commission directed information to be provided in 4,938 cases. However, the Commission asked the reasons for this delay only in 890 cases. In rest of the cases the officials were not even asked to explain the reasons for delay.

e) OVERALL PUBLIC SATISFACTION (OPS): 10 to 20%

So, if 100 people approach Central Information Commission, pro-disclosure orders were done in 65 cases. Out of these, 10 to 20% finally got information.

4. RANKING OF COMMISSIONERS BY PARAMETERS

Name	Pro-disclosure Factor (Rank)	Effectiveness (Band)	Deterrent Impact (Rank)	Overall Public Satisfaction (Band)
Wajahat Habibullah	66.7% (70th)	50 to 60%	4.9% (17 th)	30 to 40%
A.N. Tiwari	41.1%	20 to 30%	6.09% (15 th)	0 to 10%

	(82nd)			
M.M. Ansari	71.7% (66 th)	10 to 20%	0.24% (56 th)	10 to 20%
O.P. Kejariwal	85% (49 th)	20 to 30%	2.4% (29 th)	20 to 30%
Annapurna Dixit	65.6% (72 nd)	30 to 40%	0 (57th)	10 to 20%
S.N. Mishra	48.3% (77 th)	10 to 20%	0 (57th)	0 to 10%
ML Sharma	81.1% (53 rd)	10 to 20%	0 (57th)	0 to 10%
Padma Balasubramaniam	46.5% (80 th)	20 to 30%	1.28% (41 st)	10 to 20%
Shailesh Gandhi	79.7% (57 th)	20 to 30%	0.78% (48th)	10 to 20%
Combined Bench	63.6% (73 rd)	NA	0 (57th)	NA

INFORMATION COMMISSIONERS **(Central Information Commission)**

1. A.N. Tiwari

Disposals: Roughly 73 per month

- Pendency figure of A.N. Tiwari was not available.
- Time taken between filing of appeal and first hearing is approximately 10 months.

Pro-disclosure Factor: 41%

Rank: 82

Total Number of Orders Analysed	878
Orders in Favour of Disclosure	361 (41%)
Orders in which information was partly or fully denied	425(48%)
Remanded Back	92 (10%)
Rank	82

Effectiveness: 20-30%

How many of pro-disclosure orders were complied with?

- 20-30% pro-disclosure orders were complied with.
- It is less than the national average 30-40% but much less than the best 90-100%.

Deterrence Impact: 6%

Rank: 15

- Number of cases in which show cause notices issued: 76 (21% of pro-disclosure cases)
- Of this 33 (roughly 43% of show cause notices issued) were dropped subsequently.
- Penalty was imposed in 23 (~6% of pro-disclosure cases) cases.

The Commissioner directed information to be provided in 878 cases. However, the Commissioner asked the reasons for this delay only in 76 cases. In rest of the cases the officials were not even asked to explain the reasons for delay.

Overall Public Satisfaction: 0-10%

So, if 100 people approached this Commissioner, pro-disclosure orders were given in 41 cases. Out of these, only upto 10% finally got information.

2. Annapurna Dixit

Disposals: Roughly 147 per month

- Pendency figure of Annapurna Dixit was not available.
- Time taken between filing of appeal and first hearing was approximately 7 months.

Pro-disclosure Factor: 66%

Rank: 72

Total Number of Orders Analysed	442
Orders in Favour of Disclosure	290 (66%)
Orders in which information was partly or fully denied	151 (34%)
Remanded Back	1

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 the national average 30-40% but much less than the best 90-100%.

Deterrence Impact: 0

Rank: 57

- Number of cases in which show cause notices issued: 41 (14% of pro-disclosure cases)
- Of this, no show cause notices were dropped subsequently.
- Penalty was not imposed in any cases.

The Commissioner directed information to be provided in 290 cases. However, the Commissioner asked the reasons for this delay only in 41 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 done in 66 cases. Out of these, 20 to 30% finally got information.

3. M.L. Sharma

Disposals: Roughly 85 per month

- Pendency figure of M.L. Sharma was not available.
- Time taken between filing of appeal and first hearing is approximately 11 months.

Pro-disclosure Factor: 81%

Rank: 53

Total Number of Orders Analysed	254
Orders in Favour of Disclosure	206 (81%)
Orders in which information was partly or fully denied	27 (11%)
Remanded Back	21 (8%)
Rank	

Effectiveness: 10-20%

How many of pro-disclosure orders were complied with?

- 10-20% pro-disclosure orders were complied with.
- It is less than the national average of 30-40% and much less than the best 90-100%.

Deterrence Impact: 0

Rank: 57

- Number of cases in which show cause notices issued: 8 (4% of pro-disclosure cases)
- Of this no show cause notices were dropped subsequently.
- Penalty was not imposed in any cases.

The Commissioner directed information to be provided in 206 cases. However, the Commissioner asked the reasons for this delay only in 8 cases. In rest of the cases the officials were not even asked to explain the reasons for delay.

Overall Public Satisfaction: 0-10%

So, if 100 people approached this Commissioner, pro-disclosure orders were given in 81 cases. Out of these, only upto 10% people finally got information.

4. M.M. Ansari

Disposals: Roughly 144 per month

- Pendency figure of M.M. Ansari was not available.

- Time taken between filing of appeal and first hearing is not available.

Pro-disclosure Factor: 72%

Rank: 66

Total Number of Orders Analysed	1,726
Orders in Favour of Disclosure	1,238 (72%)
Orders in which information was partly or fully denied	430 (25%)
Remanded Back	58 (3%)
Rank	

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 less than the national average of 30-40% and much less than the best 90-100%.

Deterrence Impact: 0

Rank: 56

- Number of cases in which show cause notices issued: 67 (5% of pro-disclosure cases)
- Of this, 2 (roughly 3% of show cause notices issued) were dropped subsequently.
- Penalty was imposed in 3 (0% of pro-disclosure cases) cases.

The Commissioner directed information to be provided in 1,238 cases. However, the Commissioner asked the reasons for this delay only in 67 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 72 cases. Out of these, 10 to 20% finally got information.

5. O.P. Kejariwal

Disposals: Roughly 85 per month

- Pendency figure of OP Kejariwal was not available.
- Time taken between filing of appeal and first hearing is approximately 10 months.

Pro-disclosure Factor: 85%

Rank: 49

Total Number of Orders Analysed	1,024
Orders in Favour of Disclosure	870 (85%)
Orders in which information was partly or fully denied	121 (12%)
Remanded Back	33 (3%)
Rank	

Effectiveness: 20 to 30%

How many of pro-disclosure orders were complied with?

- 20 to 30% pro-disclosure orders were complied with.
- It is less than the national average of 30-40% and much less than the best 90-100%

Deterrence Impact: 2%

Rank: 29

- Number of cases in which show cause notices issued: 119 (14% of pro-disclosure cases)
- Of this 16 (roughly 13% of show cause notices issued) were dropped subsequently.
- Penalty was imposed in 23 (~2% of pro-disclosure cases) cases.

The Commissioner directed information to be provided in 870 cases. However, the Commissioner asked the reasons for this delay only in 119 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 done in 85 cases. Out of these, 20 to 30% finally got information.

6. Padma Balasubramaniam

Disposals: Roughly 168 per month

- Pendency figure of Padma Balasubramaniam was not available.
- Time taken between filing of appeal and first hearing is approximately 7 months.

Pro-disclosure Factor: 47%

Rank: 80

Total Number of Orders Analysed	1,513
Orders in Favour of Disclosure	704 (47%)
Orders in which information was partly or fully denied	740 (49%)
Remanded Back	69 (5%)
Rank	

Effectiveness: 20 to 30%

How many of pro-disclosure orders were complied with?

- 20 to 30% pro-disclosure orders were complied with.
- It is less than the national average of 30-40% and much less than the best 90-100%.

Deterrence Impact: 1%

Rank: 41

- Number of cases in which show cause notices issued: 190 (27% of pro-disclosure cases)
- Of this 2 (roughly 1% of show cause notices issued) were dropped subsequently.
- Penalty was imposed in 9 (~1% of pro-disclosure cases) cases.

The Commissioner directed information to be provided in 704 cases. However, the Commissioner asked the reasons for this delay only in 190 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 done in 47 cases. Out of these, 10 to 20% finally got information.

7. S.N. Mishra

Disposals: Roughly 50 per month

- Pendency figure of SN Mishra was not available.
- Time taken between filing of appeal and first hearing is not available.

Pro-disclosure Factor: 48%

Rank: 77

Total Number of Orders Analysed	151
Orders in Favour of Disclosure	73 (48%)

Orders in which information was partly or fully denied	39 (26%)
Remanded Back	39 (26%)

Effectiveness: 10-20%

How many of pro-disclosure orders were complied with?

- 10-20% pro-disclosure orders were complied with.
- It is less than the national average of 30-40% but much less than the best 90-100%.

Deterrence Impact: 0

Rank: 57

- Number of cases in which show cause notices issued: 9 (12% of pro-disclosure cases)
- Of this no show cause notices were dropped subsequently.
- No penalty was imposed in any case.

The Commissioner directed information to be provided in 73 cases. However, the Commissioner asked the reasons for this delay only in 9 cases. In rest of the cases the officials were not even asked to explain the reasons for delay.

Overall Public Satisfaction: 0-10%

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

8. Shailesh Gandhi

Disposals: Roughly 267 per month

- Pendency figure of Shailesh Gandhi was not available.
- Time taken between filing of appeal and first hearing is 9 months.

Pro-disclosure Factor: 80%

Rank: 57

Total Number of Orders Analysed	801
Orders in Favour of Disclosure	638 (80%)
Orders in which information was partly or fully denied	99 (12%)

Remanded Back	64 (8%)
----------------------	---------

Effectiveness: 20 to 30%

How many of pro-disclosure orders were complied with?

- 20 to 30% pro-disclosure orders were complied with.
- It is less than the national average of 30-40% and much less than the best 90-100%.

Deterrence Impact: 1%

Rank: 48

- Number of cases in which show cause notices issued: 200 (31% of pro-disclosure cases)
- Of this no show cause notices were dropped.
- Penalty was imposed in 5 (~1% of pro-disclosure cases) cases.

The Commissioner directed information to be provided in 638 cases. However, the Commissioner asked the reasons for this delay only in 200 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 done in 80 cases. Out of these, 10 to 20% finally got information.

9. Wajahat Habibullah

Disposals: Roughly 69 per month

- Pendency figure of Wajahat Habibullah was not available.
- Time taken between filing of appeal and first hearing is 8 months.

Pro-disclosure Factor: 67%

Rank: 70

Total Number of Orders Analysed	826
Orders in Favour of Disclosure	551 (67%)
Orders in which information was partly or fully denied	119 (14%)
Remanded Back	156 (19%)

Effectiveness: 50 to 60%

How many of pro-disclosure orders were complied with?

- 50 to 60% pro-disclosure orders were complied with.
- It is more than the national average of 30-40% but much less than the best 90-100%.

Deterrence Impact: 5%

Rank: 17

- Number of cases in which show cause notices issued: 180 (33% of pro-disclosure cases)
- Of this 51 (~28% of show cause notices issued) show cause notices were dropped subsequently.
- Penalty was imposed in 29 (~5% of pro-disclosure cases) cases.

The Commissioner directed information to be provided in 551 cases. However, the Commissioner asked the reasons for this delay only in 180 cases. In rest of the cases the officials were not even asked to explain the reasons for delay.

Overall Public Satisfactio: 30-40%

So, if 100 people approached this Commissioner, pro-disclosure orders were done in 67 cases. Out of these, 30 to 40 % finally got information.

10. Combined Benches

Pro-disclosure Factor: 64%

Rank: 73

Total Number of Orders Analysed	11
Orders in Favour of Disclosure	7 (64%)
Orders in which information was partly or fully denied	2 (18%)
Remanded Back	2 (18%)

Effectiveness:

- The effectiveness could not be calculated due to insufficient data.

Deterrence Impact: 0

Rank: 57

- The combined bench did not issue any show cause notice or penalty in any of the cases.

The bench directed information to be provided in 7 cases. Moreover, it did not ask for the reason of this delay in any of the case.

Overall Public Satisfaction:

- The Overall Public Satisfaction could not be calculated due to insufficient data.