

# Chhattisgarh

## 1. STATE FACTSHEET

<b>State Chief Information Commissioner</b>	A.K. Vijayavargia
<b>State Information Commissioners</b>	Anil Joshi
<b>Total Number of Cases Analysed by Us (as provided to us)</b>	1272
<b>Pendency as on January 1, 2008</b>	1146
<b>Pendency as on December 31, 2008</b>	984
<b>Time Taken Between Filing of Appeal and First Hearing</b>	3-4 months
<b>Total Funds Spent by the Commission (FY 2008-09)</b>	Not available

## 2. STATE OF RECORDS:

After a lot of dilly dallying and rejection of our RTI application, Chhattisgarh information commission provided us with 1,272 orders. The commission subsequently sent us a letter, very late in the day, stating that A.K.Vijayavargia alone had passed around 2269 orders! We have analyzed only 1,272 orders received from them.

## 3. PERFORMANCE OF INFORMATION COMMISSION ON VARIOUS PARAMETERS

### a) Disposals: An average of 91 cases per commissioner per month.

The information commission had a pendency of 984 by the end of 2008, which means a pendency of 492 per commissioner per month.

### b) PRO-DISCLOSURE FACTOR: 95.3%

**Rank: 2**

<b>Total Number of Orders Analysed</b>	1272
<b>Orders in Favour of Disclosure</b>	1212 (~95%)
<b>Orders in which information was partly or fully denied</b>	60 (5%)
<b>Remanded Back</b>	0
<b>Rank</b>	2

**c) EFFECTIVENESS: 30 to 40%**

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

**d) DETERRENCE IMPACT: 4.46%**

**Rank: 8**

- Show-cause notices were issued in 209 cases, but subsequently dropped in 154 of them after hearings (i.e. ~74% of show cause notices)
- Penalty was imposed in 54 cases (i.e. 4% of pro-disclosure cases).

The Commission passed 1212 pro-disclosure orders, which assumes delay or stonewalling on the part of PIOs in providing information. However, the Commission served show-cause notices to the PIOs in only 209 cases.

**e) OVERALL PUBLIC SATISFACTION (OPS): 30 to 40%**

Out of 100 people who approached Chhattisgarh Information Commission, 95 people got pro-disclosure orders and only 30 to 40 people were fortunate to finally obtain the information requested.

**4. RANKING OF COMMISSIONERS BY PARAMETERS**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Pro-disclosure Factor (rank)</b>	<b>Effectiveness</b>	<b>Deterrent Impact (rank)</b>	<b>Overall Public Satisfaction</b>
<b>A.K. Vijayavargia</b>	94.8% (15 <sup>th</sup> )	30-40%	4.2% (18 <sup>th</sup> )	30-40%
<b>Anil Joshi</b>	100% (1 <sup>st</sup> )	30-40%	3.4 (21 <sup>st</sup> )	30-40%

# INFORMATION COMMISSIONERS (Chhattisgarh)

## 1. A.K. Vijayavargia

**Disposals: 104 cases per month**

**Pro-disclosure Factor: 94.8%**

**Rank: 15**

<b>Total Number of Orders Analysed</b>	1149
<b>Orders in Favour of Disclosure</b>	1089 (94.8%)
<b>Orders in which information was partly or fully denied</b>	60 (5%)
<b>Remanded Back</b>	0
<b>Rank</b>	15 <sup>th</sup>

**Effectiveness: 30 to 40%**

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

**Deterrence Impact: 4.2%**

**Rank: 18**

- Show-cause notices were issued in 180 cases (17% of pro-disclosure cases), but subsequently withdrawn in 133 of them, or about 74% of show cause notices issued.
- Penalty was imposed in only 46 cases (~4% of pro-disclosure cases).

Vijayavargia passed pro-disclosure orders in 1,089 cases, which means that the information had not been provided by the PIO within the prescribed time. However, show-cause notices were served in only 180 cases.

**Overall Public Satisfaction 30 to 40%**

If 100 people approached this Commissioner, pro-disclosure orders were passed in 95 cases. Out of these, only 30 to 40 people finally got the information requested.

## 2. Anil Joshi

**Disposals: 62 cases per month**

**Pro-disclosure Factor: 100%**

**Rank: 1**

<b>Total Number of Orders Analysed</b>	29
<b>Orders in Favour of Disclosure</b>	29 (100%)
<b>Orders in which information was partly or fully denied</b>	0
<b>Remanded Back</b>	0
<b>Rank</b>	1 <sup>st</sup>

**Effectiveness: 30 to 40%**

- Only 30 to 40% pro-disclosure orders were complied with.
- Anil Joshi's range of effectiveness is equal to national average (30 to 40%) but much less than the best (90 to 100%).

**Deterrence Impact: 3.4%**

**Rank: 21**

- Joshi passed 29 pro-disclosure orders, but issued show-cause notices in only 6 cases (21% of pro-disclosure cases); he subsequently dropped show-cause notices in 5 of those cases.
- Penalty was imposed in only one case (~3% of pro-disclosure cases).

**Overall Public Satisfaction: 30 to 40%**

If 100 appellants/complainants approached Anil Joshi, all of them got pro-disclosure orders, but only 30 to 40 of them finally got the information requested.