

Karnataka

1. STATE FACTSHEET

State Chief Information Commissioner	K.K. Mishra
State Information Commissioners	H.N. Krishna K.A.Theppeswamy
Pendency as on January 1, 2008	1,882
Pendency as on December 31, 2008	4,887
Time Taken Between Filing of Appeal and First Hearing	Data not available
Total Funds Spent by the Commission (FY 2008-09)	Data not available

2. STATE OF RECORDS:

Karnataka Information commission provided us with all the orders in copy.

3. PERFORMANCE OF INFORMATION COMMISSION ON VARIOUS PARAMETERS

a) DISPOSALS: Roughly 168 cases per commissioner per month

- The pendency of Karnataka State Information Commission on January 1, 2008 was 1882. It increased to 4,887 as on December 31, 2008.
- During the calendar year 2008, Karnataka Information Commission disposed 6041 cases. There were three commissioners working for 12 months each. So, it comes to roughly 168 cases per commissioner per month.

b) PRO-DISCLOSURE FACTOR: 91.1%

Rank: 5

Total Number of Orders Analysed	6,041
Orders in Favour of Disclosure	5,506 (91%)
Orders in which information was partly or fully denied	526 (9%)
Remanded Back	9
Rank	5

c) EFFECTIVENESS: 50-60%

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

- 50 to 60% orders were complied with.

- Compliance is higher than the national average of 30 to 40% but less than best 90-100%.

d) DETERRENCE IMPACT: 1.11%

Rank: 18

- Number of cases in which show cause notices issued: 1,402
- Of these notices, 57 were dropped after hearings (4% of show cause notices).
- In 2008, the state information commission imposed 61 penalties.
- Show cause notices remained pending in 92% cases at the end of the year.

The Commission directed information to be provided in 5,506 cases. However, the Commission asked the reasons for this delay only in 1,402 cases. In rest of the cases, the officials were not even asked to explain the reasons for the delay.

e) OVERALL PUBLIC SATISFACTION (OPS): 50-60%

So, if 100 people approach the Information Commission, pro-disclosure orders were given in 91 cases. Out of these, only 50-60% finally got information.

4. RANKING OF COMMISSIONERS BY PARAMETERS

Name	Pro-disclosure Factor (Rank)	Effectiveness (Band)	Deterrent Impact (Rank)	Overall Public Satisfaction (Band)
K.K.Misra	95.7% (11 th)	50-60%	1.22% (44 th)	50-60%
K.A. Thippeswamy	96.0 % (10 th)	50-60%	0.81% (47 th)	50-60%
H.N. Krishna	79.7% (57 th)	50-60%	1.50% (40 th)	40-50%
Combined Bench of Karnataka	92% (26 th)	Insufficient Data	0 (57 th)	Insufficient Data

INFORMATION COMMISSIONERS (Karnataka)

1. K.K. Misra

Disposals: Roughly 158 cases per month

- The Commissioner had a pendency of 1,629 at the end of 2008.
- Time taken between filing of appeal and first hearing 4 months.

Pro-disclosure Factor: 96%

Rank: 11

Total Number of Orders Analysed	1,891
Orders in Favour of Disclosure	1,810 (96%)
Orders in which information was partly or fully denied	78 (4%)
Remanded Back	0
Rank	11

Effectiveness: 50-60%

How many of pro-disclosure orders were complied with?

- 50- 60 % pro-disclosure orders were complied with.
- It is slightly higher than the national average of 30 to 40 %, but less than the best (90-100%).

Deterrence Impact: 1.2%

Rank: 44

- Number of cases in which show cause notices issued: 267(15% of pro-disclosure cases)
- Of these 14 Show cause notices were dropped subsequently.
- Penalty was imposed in 22 cases.

The Commissioner directed information to be provided in 1,810 cases. However, the Commissioner asked the reasons for this delay only in 267 cases. In rest of the cases the officials were not even asked to explain the reasons for delay.

Overall Public Satisfaction: 50-60%

So, if 100 people approached this Commissioner, pro-disclosure orders were done in 96 cases. Out of these 40-50 finally got information.

2. H.N. Krishna

Disposals: Roughly 146 cases per month

- The Commissioner had a pendency of 1,629 at the end of 2008.
- Time taken between filing of appeal and first hearing was four months.

Pro-disclosure Factor: 79.7%

Rank: 57

Total Number of Orders Analysed	1,753
Orders in Favour of Disclosure	1,398 (~80%)
Orders in which information was partly or fully denied	355 (20%)
Remanded Back	0
Rank	57

Effectiveness: 50-60%

How many of pro-disclosure orders were complied with?

- 50- 60% pro-disclosure orders were complied with.
- It is slightly higher than the national average of 30 to 40%, but less than the best (90-100%).

Deterrence Impact: 1.5%

Rank: 40

- Number of cases in which show cause notices issued: 673 (48% of pro-disclosure cases)
- Of these 18 (3%) of the show cause notice were dropped.
- Penalty was imposed in 21 cases.

The Commissioner directed information to be provided in 1,398 cases. However, the Commissioner asked the reasons for this delay only in 673 cases. In rest of the cases the officials were not even asked to explain the reasons for delay.

Overall Public Satisfaction: 40-50%

So, if 100 people approached this Commissioner, pro-disclosure orders were given in 80 cases. Out of these, 40-50% finally got information.

3. K.A. Thippeswamy

Disposals: Roughly 193 cases per month

- The Commissioner had a pendency of 1,629 at the end of 2008.
- Time taken between filing of appeal and first hearing was four months.

Pro-disclosure Factor: 96%

Rank: 10

Total Number of Orders Analysed	2,310
Orders in Favour of Disclosure	2,218 (96%)
Orders in which information was partly or fully denied	87(4%)
Remanded Back	5
Rank	10

Effectiveness: 50-60%

How many of pro-disclosure orders were complied with?

- 50 to 60% pro-disclosure orders were complied with.
- It is higher than the national average of 30 to 40%, but lower than the best (90-100%).

Deterrence Impact: 0.8%

Rank: 47

- Number of cases in which show cause notices issued: 450 (20% of pro-disclosure cases)
- Of these 24 (5%) show cause notices were dropped subsequently.
- Penalty was imposed in 18 (1% of the pro-disclosure orders) cases.

The Commissioner directed information to be provided in 2,218 cases. However, the Commissioner asked the reasons for this delay only in 450 cases. In rest of the cases, the officials were not even asked to explain the reasons for delay.

Overall Public Satisfaction: 50 to 60%

So, if 100 people approached this Commissioner, pro-disclosure orders were given in 96 cases. Out of these, 50 to 60% finally got information.

4. Combined benches of Karnataka

Pro-disclosure Factor: 92%

Rank: 26

Total Number of Orders Analysed	87
Orders in Favour of Disclosure	80 (92%)
Orders in which information was partially or fully denied	6 (7%)
Remanded Back	1
Rank	27

Effectiveness:

The effectiveness could not be calculated due to insufficient data.

Deterrence Impact: 0**Rank: 57**

- Number of cases in which show cause notices issued: 12 (15%)
- Of this 1 (8%) cases were dropped after hearing.
- Penalty was not imposed in any of the cases.

The bench directed information to be provided in 80 cases. However, the bench asked the reasons for this delay only in 12 cases. In rest of the cases the officials were not even asked to explain the reasons for delay.

Overall Public Satisfaction:

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