

Himachal Pradesh

1. STATE FACTSHEET

State Information Commissioner	P S Rana
Information Commission	S S Parmar
Total Number of Cases Analysed by Us (as provided to us)	272
Pendency as on January 1, 2008	40
Pendency as on December 31, 2008	48
Time Taken Between Filing of Appeal and First Hearing	2-4 months
Total Funds Spent by the Commission (FY 2008-09)	Rs 50,84,003

2. STATE OF RECORDS:

They have provided us with copies of all their orders in CD and hard copies.

3. PERFORMANCE OF INFORMATION COMMISSION ON VARIOUS PARAMETERS

a) DISPOSALS: An average disposal of 11 cases per commissioner per month

- The pendency of Himachal Pradesh state information commission was 40 as of January 1, 2008. It increased to 48 cases by the end of December 30, 2008. This is quite high when compared with the total number of cases in the state.
- During the calendar year 2008, Himachal Pradesh Information Commission disposed off 272 cases.

b) PRO-DISCLOSURE FACTOR: ~89%

Rank 7

Total Number of Orders Analysed	272
Orders in Favour of Disclosure	241 (89%)
Orders in which information was partially or fully denied	21(8%)
Remanded Back	10
Rank of Commission	7

c) EFFECTIVENESS: 30-40%

This parameter refers to how many of the pro-disclosure orders were complied with as a percentage. Total number of orders favouring disclosure was 241 in Himachal Pradesh.

- Of this, only 30-40% orders were complied with.
- The compliance is equal to the national average of 30 to 40%, but is much less than the best 90 to 100 %

d) DETERRENCE IMPACT: 0.4%

Rank: 20

- Himachal has a very low deterrence impact of only 0.4%, which is negligible.
- Number of cases in which show cause notices issued: 7
- 1 of these notices was dropped after hearings (i.e. 14% of show cause notices)
- Penalty was imposed in only 1.
- Show cause notices remained pending in 71% cases at the end of the year.

The Commission directed information to be provided in 241 cases. However, the Commission asked the reasons for this delay only in 7 cases. In rest of the cases the officials were not even asked to explain the reasons for delay.

e) OVERALL PUBLIC SATISFACTION (OPS): 30-40%

So, if 100 people approach Himachal Information Commission, pro-disclosure orders were given in 89% cases. Out of these, 30-40% finally got satisfactory information.

4. GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

- The state of Himachal Pradesh has a negligible deterrence impact of only 0.4%, which is almost negligible. Given a low public satisfaction of only 30-40%, this could be a reason for the low compliance rate.

5. STATUS OF COMMISSION AND COMMISSIONER BY PARAMETERS

Name	Pro-disclosure Factor (Rank)	Effectiveness (Band)	Deterrent Impact (Rank)	Overall Public Satisfaction (Band)
Himachal Pradesh Commission	88.6 % (7 th)	30-40%	0.41 (20 th)	30-40%
PS Rana	89.8% (33 th)	40-50%	0 (57 th)	30-40%
SS Parmar	87.9% (41 th)	30-40%	0.65 (49 th)	20-30%

INFORMATION COMMISSIONERS **(HIMACHAL PRADESH)**

1. P.S. Rana

Disposals: Roughly : 8 cases per month

- Time taken between filing of appeal and first hearing was 2 months for Himachal State Commission.
- Pendency of 24 cases by the end of 2008

Pro-disclosure Factor: 90%

Rank: 33

Total Number of Orders Analysed	98
Orders in Favour of Disclosure	88 (~90%)
Orders in which information was partially or fully denied	9 (9%)
Remanded Back	1
Rank of Commission	33

Effectiveness: 40-50%

Out of the total number of orders analysed, 88 cases were in favour of disclosure.

- Of this, only 40-50% of orders were complied with.
- It is slightly more than the national average of 30 to 40%)but much less than the best 90 to100%.

Deterrence Impact: 0

Rank: 57

- Number of cases in which show cause notices issued: 2 (2% of pro-disclosure cases)
- No penalty was imposed and all show cause notices remain pending by the end of the year 2008.

The Commissioner directed information to be provided in 88 cases. However, the Commissioner asked the reasons for this delay only in 2 cases. In rest of the cases the officials were not even asked to explain the reasons for delay.

Overall Public Satisfaction 30-40%

So, if 100 people approached this Commissioner, pro-disclosure orders were done in ~90 cases. Out of these, 30-40% people finally got information.

2. S.S. Parmar

Disposals: Roughly: 15 cases per month

- Pendency of 24 cases by the end of 2008
- Time taken between filing of appeal and first hearing was one month.

Pro-disclosure Factor: 88%

Rank: 41

Total Number of Orders Analysed	174
Orders in Favour of Disclosure	153 (88%)
Orders in which information was partially or fully denied	12 (7%)
Remanded Back	9
Rank of Commission	41

Effectiveness: 30-40%

Out of the total number of orders analysed, 153 cases were in favour of disclosure.

- Of this, only 30-40% of orders were complied with.
- It is equal to the national average (30 to 40%) but much less than the best 90 to 100

Deterrence Impact: 0.65

Rank: 49

- Number of cases in which show cause notices issued: 5 (3% of pro-disclosure cases)
- Of this, 1 (roughly 20% of show cause notices issued) were dropped subsequently.
- Penalty was imposed in 1 case (~1% of pro-disclosure cases).

The Commissioner directed information to be provided in 153 cases. However, the Commissioner asked the reasons for this delay only in 5 cases. In rest of the cases the officials were not even asked to explain the reasons for delay.

Overall Public Satisfaction: 20-30%

So, if 100 people approached this Commissioner, pro-disclosure orders were done in ~88 cases. Out of these, 20-30% people finally got information.