

# Jharkhand

## 1. STATE FACTSHEET

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>State Chief Information Commissioner</b>                     | R.B. Gupta   |
| <b>State Information Commissioners</b>                          | Bajjnath Mishra<br>Gangotri Kujur<br>Harishankar Prasad<br>Harishchandra Patra Munda<br>Praful Kumar Mahto<br>Shrishtidhar Mahto |
| <b>Total Number of Cases Analysed by Us (as provided to us)</b> | 897  |
| <b>Pendency as on January 1, 2008</b>                           | 326  |
| <b>Pendency as on December 31, 2008</b>                         | 502  |
| <b>Time Taken Between Filing of Appeal and First Hearing</b>    | 2 months   |
| <b>Total Funds Spent by the Commission (FY 2008-09)</b>         | Rs 1,68,95,262   |

## 2. STATE OF RECORDS:

Several letters and phone calls later, we made a visit to the office of information commission in Ranchi to collect copies of 897 orders. In response to our letter to confirm that there were no more orders, they informed us in September that there were 1415 orders. We have, however, limited our analysis to 897 orders.

## 3. PERFORMANCE OF INFORMATION COMMISSION ON VARIOUS PARAMETERS

a) **Disposals: An average of 12 cases per commissioner per month**  
**Pendency: 502 by the end of 2008**

b) **PRO-DISCLOSURE FACTOR: 83.4%**

**Rank: 12**

|   |                  |
|---|------------------|
| <b>Total Number of Orders Analysed</b>                        | 897              |
| <b>Orders in Favour of Disclosure</b>                         | 748 (83%)        |
| <b>Orders in which information was partly or fully denied</b> | 149 (17%)        |
| <b>Remanded Back</b>  | 0                |
| <b>Rank</b>   | 12 <sup>th</sup> |

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

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

**d) DETERRENCE IMPACT: 0.13%**

**Rank: 22**

- The commission passed 748 pro-disclosure orders, which means it determined that the RTI application had been wrongly stonewalled. However, it issued show-cause notices in only 2 cases, letting off most of the PIOs lightly.
- The commission imposed penalty in only one case, showing a very weak will to penalise the officers who violate the rights of information seekers.

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

If 100 people approached Jharkhand Information Commission, pro-disclosure orders were passed in 83 cases. Out of these, only 30 to 40 people were fortunate to finally get the information requested.

**4. RANKING OF COMMISSIONERS BY PARAMETERS**

| Name                             | Pro-disclosure Factor (rank) | Effectiveness | Deterrent Impact (rank) | Overall Public Satisfaction |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <b>R.B. Gupta</b>                | 68.6% (68 <sup>th</sup> )    | 40-50%        | 0% (57 <sup>th</sup> )  | 30-40%                      |
| <b>Baijnath Mishra</b>           | 76.9% (62 <sup>nd</sup> )    | 20-30%        | 0% (57 <sup>th</sup> )  | 10-20%                      |
| <b>Gangotri Kujur</b>            | 100% (1 <sup>st</sup> )      | 70-80%        | 0% (57 <sup>th</sup> )  | 70-80%                      |
| <b>Harishankar Prasad</b>        | 92.3% (24 <sup>th</sup> )    | 50-60%        | 0% (57 <sup>th</sup> )  | 50-60%                      |
| <b>Harishchandra Patra Munda</b> | 90.7% (28 <sup>th</sup> )    | 40-50%        | 0% (57 <sup>th</sup> )  | 30-40%                      |
| <b>Praful Kumar Mahto</b>        | 94.2% (19 <sup>th</sup> )    | 20-30%        | 0% (57 <sup>th</sup> )  | 20-30%                      |
| <b>Shrishtidhar Mahto</b>        | 97.1% (17 <sup>th</sup> )    | 30-40%        | 0% (57 <sup>th</sup> )  | 30-40%                      |

# INFORMATION COMMISSIONERS (Jharkhand)

## 1. R.B. Gupta

**Disposals: About 23 per month**

**Pendency: Not available**

**Pro-disclosure Factor: 68.6%**

**Rank: 68**

|   |                  |
|---|------------------|
| <b>Total Number of Orders Analysed</b>                        | 191              |
| <b>Orders in Favour of Disclosure</b>                         | 131 (69%)        |
| <b>Orders in which information was partly or fully denied</b> | 60 (31%)         |
| <b>Remanded Back</b>  | 0                |
| <b>Rank</b>   | 68 <sup>th</sup> |

**Effectiveness: 40 to 50%**

- Only 40 to 50% pro-disclosure orders were complied with.
- The Effectiveness of R.B. Gupta as information commissioner is above the national average (30 to 40%), but much less than the best (90 to 100%).

**Deterrence Impact: 0**

**Rank: 57**

- 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 46 (~4% of pro-disclosure cases) cases.

Gupta made 131 pro-disclosure orders, but refrained from issuing show-cause notices or using any penal provision against the PIOs. His Deterrence Impact, as a result, is zero.

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

If 100 people approached R.B. Gupta, pro-disclosure orders were passed in 69 cases. Out of these, only 30 to 40 people finally got the information requested. Gupta denied information partly or fully in 31% of cases.

The national average OPS is 20 to 30%.

## 2. Baijnath Mishra

**Disposals: 43 per month**

**Pro-disclosure Factor: 76.9%**

**Rank: 62**

|   |                  |
|---|------------------|
| <b>Total Number of Orders Analysed</b>                        | 216              |
| <b>Orders in Favour of Disclosure</b>                         | 166 (77%)        |
| <b>Orders in which information was partly or fully denied</b> | 50 (23%)         |
| <b>Remanded Back</b>  | 0                |
| <b>Rank</b>   | 62 <sup>nd</sup> |

**Effectiveness: 20 to 30%**

- Only 20 to 30% of the pro-disclosure orders of Bajjnath Mishra were complied with.
- The effectiveness of Bajjnath Mishra is less than the national average (30 to 40%) and way below the best (90 to 100%).

**Deterrence Impact: 0**

**Rank: 57**

- Bajjnath Mishra passed 166 pro-disclosure orders, which means the PIOs had been in violation of the RTI Act, but did not issue any show-cause notice.
- Mishra did not penalise a single PIO.

**Overall Public Satisfaction: 10 to 20%**

If 100 people approached this Commissioner, pro-disclosure orders were passed in 77 cases. Out of these, only 10 to 20 people finally got the information requested.

### **3. Gangotri Kujur**

**Disposals: Roughly 8 per month**

**Pro-disclosure Factor: 100%**

**Rank: 1**

|   |                 |
|---|-----------------|
| <b>Total Number of Orders Analysed</b>                        | 41              |
| <b>Orders in Favour of Disclosure</b>                         | 41 (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: 70 to 80%**

- 70 to 80% of the pro-disclosure orders passed by Kujur were complied with.
- The Effectiveness of Kujur is much more than the national average (30 to 40%) but is below the best (90 to 100%).

**Deterrence Impact: 0**

**Rank: 57**

- Kujur passed pro-disclosure orders in 100 per cent cases, which established violation of RTI Act, but did not issue any show-cause notice. .

**Overall Public Satisfaction: 70 to 80%**

All people who approached Kujur got pro-disclosure orders. Seventy to eighty of those people finally got the information requested.

#### **4. Harishankar Prasad**

**Disposals: About 41 per month**

**Pro-disclosure Factor: 92.3%**

**Rank: 24**

|   |                  |
|---|------------------|
| <b>Total Number of Orders Analysed</b>                        | 26               |
| <b>Orders in Favour of Disclosure</b>                         | 24 (92.3%)       |
| <b>Orders in which information was partly or fully denied</b> | 2 (8%)           |
| <b>Remanded Back</b>  | 0                |
| <b>Rank</b>   | 24 <sup>th</sup> |

**Effectiveness: 50 to 60%**

- 50 to 60% of the pro-disclosure orders passed by Prasad were complied with.
- The Effectiveness of Prasad is more than the national average (30 to 40%) but is much below the best (90 to 100%).

**Deterrence Impact: 0**

**Rank: 57**

- Like his colleagues at Jharkhand information commission, Prasad has not used any provision for deterring violation of RTI Act. He did not issue any show-cause notice.

**Overall Public Satisfaction 50 to 60%**

If 100 people approached this Commissioner, pro-disclosure orders were passed in 92 cases. Out of these, 50 to 60 people finally got the information requested.

#### **5. Harishchandra Patra Munda**

**Disposals: about 35 per month**

**Pro-disclosure Factor: 90.7%**

**Rank: 28th**

|   |             |
|---|-------------|
| <b>Total Number of Orders Analysed</b>                        | 118         |
| <b>Orders in Favour of Disclosure</b>                         | 107 (90.7%) |
| <b>Orders in which information was partly or fully denied</b> | 11 (9%)     |
| <b>Remanded Back</b>  | 0           |
| <b>Rank</b>   | 28th        |

**Effectiveness: 40 to 50%**

- Only 50 to 60% of the pro-disclosure orders passed by Prasad were complied with.
- The Effectiveness of Munda is more than the national average (30 to 40%) but is much below the best (90 to 100%).

**Deterrence Impact: 0**

**Rank: 57**

- Like his colleagues at Jharkhand information commission, Munda has not used any provision for deterring violation of RTI Act. He did not issue any show-cause notice.

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

If 100 people approached this Commissioner, pro-disclosure orders were passed in 90.7 cases. Out of these, 30 to 40 people finally got the information requested.

## **6. Praful Kumar Mahto**

**Disposals: Roughly 11 per month**

**Pro-disclosure Factor: 94.2%**

**Rank: 19**

|   |                  |
|---|------------------|
| <b>Total Number of Orders Analysed</b>                        | 52               |
| <b>Orders in Favour of Disclosure</b>                         | 49 (94.2%)       |
| <b>Orders in which information was partly or fully denied</b> | 3 (6%)           |
| <b>Remanded Back</b>  | 0                |
| <b>Rank</b>   | 19 <sup>th</sup> |

**Effectiveness: 20 to 30%**

- 20 to 30% of the pro-disclosure orders passed by Praful Kumar Mahto were complied with.
- The effectiveness of Mahto is less than the national average (30 to 40%) and is much below the best (90 to 100%).

**Deterrence Impact: 0**

**Rank: 57**

- Like his colleagues at Jharkhand information commission, Mahto has not used any provision for deterring violation of RTI Act. He did not issue any show-cause notice.

**Overall Public Satisfaction: 20 to 30%**

If 100 people approached this Commissioner, pro-disclosure orders were passed in 94 cases. Out of these, only 20 to 30 people finally got the information requested.

**7. Shrishtidhar Mahto**

**Disposals: Roughly 8 per month**

**Pro-disclosure Factor: 97.1**

**Rank: 17**

|   |                  |
|---|------------------|
| <b>Total Number of Orders Analysed</b>                        | 35               |
| <b>Orders in Favour of Disclosure</b>                         | 34 (97.1%)       |
| <b>Orders in which information was partly or fully denied</b> | 1 (3%)           |
| <b>Remanded Back</b>  | 0                |
| <b>Rank</b>   | 17 <sup>th</sup> |

**Effectiveness: 30 to 40%**

- 30 to 40% of the pro-disclosure orders passed by Shrishtidhar Mahto were complied with.
- The Effectiveness of Shrishtidhar Mahto is equal to the national average (30 to 40%) but is way below the best (90 to 100%).

**Deterrence Impact: 0**

**Rank: 57**

- Like his colleagues at Jharkhand information commission, Shrishtidhar Mahto has not used any provision for deterring violation of RTI Act. He issued only one show-cause notice.

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

If 100 people approached this Commissioner, pro-disclosure orders were passed in 97 cases. Out of these, 30 to 40% people finally got the information requested.