

# Madhya Pradesh

## 1. STATE FACTSHEET

<b>State Chief Information Commissioner</b>	P P Tiwari
<b>State Information Commissioners</b>	D C Jugran Iqbal Ahmed Mahesh Pandey
<b>Total Number of Cases Analysed by Us (as provided to us)</b>	1633
<b>Pendency as on January 1, 2008</b>	2893
<b>Pendency as on December 31, 2008</b>	3841
<b>Time Taken Between Filing of Appeal and First Hearing</b>	12 months
<b>Total Funds Spent by the Commission (FY 2008-09)</b>	<b>Rs 96,96,000</b>

## 2. STATE OF RECORDS:

Despite of several letters, several phone calls and one visit to Bhopal, we could obtain copies of 1,633 orders against a total of 2161 orders claimed to be passed by the commission.

## 3. PERFORMANCE OF INFORMATION COMMISSION ON VARIOUS PARAMETERS

### a) DISPOSALS: An average of 27 cases per commissioner per month.

- During calendar year 2008, Madhya Pradesh Information Commission disposed of 1633 cases. There were 4 commissioners working for 12 months each.
- Cases pending on 1.12.08 were 2893 and on 31.12.08 were 3841.

### b) PRO-DISCLOSURE FACTOR: 88.6%

**Rank:7**

<b>Total Number of Orders Analysed</b>	1633
<b>Orders in Favour of Disclosure</b>	1477(~89%)
<b>Orders in which information was partly or fully denied</b>	184 (~11%)
<b>Remanded Back</b>	2(negligible percentage)
<b>Rank</b>	7

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

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

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

**d) DETERRENCE IMPACT: 0.2%**

**Rank: 21**

- Number of cases in which show cause notices issued: 272
- 21 of these notices were dropped after hearings (i.e. 8% of show cause notices)
- Penalty was imposed in 3 cases (i.e. 0.2% of pro-disclosure cases).
- Show cause notices remained pending in 91% cases at the end of the year.

The Commission directed information to be provided in 1477 cases. However, the commission asked the reasons for this delay only in 272 cases. In rest of the cases the officials were not even asked to explain the reasons for delay.

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

So, if 100 people approach Madhya Pradesh Information Commission, pro-disclosure orders were done in 89 cases. Out of these, 30 to 40% finally got information.

**4. RANKING OF COMMISSIONERS BY PARAMETERS**

Name	Pro-disclosure Factor (Rank)	Effectiveness (Band)	Deterrent Impact (Rank)	Overall Public Satisfaction (Band)
<b>P.P.Tiwari</b>	95% (18 <sup>th</sup> )	30-40%	0.40 (54 <sup>th</sup> )	30-40%
<b>D.C. Jugran</b>	87% (45 <sup>th</sup> )	30-40%	0 (57 <sup>th</sup> )	30-40%
<b>Mahesh Pandey</b>	93% (22 <sup>th</sup> )	40-50%	0.54 (51 <sup>th</sup> )	40-50%
<b>Iqbal Ahmed</b>	78.1% (61 <sup>th</sup> )	20-30%	0 (57 <sup>th</sup> )	10-20%
<b>Combined Bench</b>	88.9% (38 <sup>th</sup> )	Insufficient data	0 (57 <sup>th</sup> )	Insufficient data

# INFORMATION COMMISSIONERS

## Madhya Pradesh

### 1. P.P. Tiwari

**Disposals: Roughly 53 per month**

- Time taken between filing of appeal and first hearing is 11 months.
- Pendency of 960 by the end of 2008

**Pro-disclosure Factor: 95%**

**Rank: 18**

<b>Total Number of Orders Analysed</b>	531
<b>Orders in Favour of Disclosure</b>	502 (95%)
<b>Orders in which information was partly or fully denied</b>	28 (5%)
<b>Remanded Back</b>	1
<b>Rank</b>	18

**Effectiveness: 30 to 40%**

How many of pro-disclosure orders were complied with?

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

**Deterrence Impact: 0.4%**

**Rank:54**

- Number of cases in which show cause notices issued: 101 (20% of pro-disclosure cases)
- Of this 5 (roughly 5% of show cause notices issued) were dropped subsequently.
- Penalty was imposed in 0.4% of pro-disclosure cases.

The Commission directed information to be provided in 502 cases. However, the Commission asked the reasons for this delay only in 101 cases. In rest of the cases the officials were not even asked to explain the reasons for delay.

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

So, if 100 people approached this Commissioner, pro-disclosure orders were done in 95 cases. Out of these, 30 to 40 % finally got information.

## 2. Mahesh Pandey

### Disposals: Roughly 26 per month

- Time taken between filing of appeal and first hearing is 14 months.
- Pendency of 960 by the end of 2008

**Pro-disclosure Factor: 93%**

**Rank: 22**

<b>Total Number of Orders Analysed</b>	197
<b>Orders in Favour of Disclosure</b>	184(93%)
<b>Orders in which information was partly or fully denied</b>	13(7%)
<b>Remanded Back</b>	0
<b>Rank</b>	22

### Effectiveness: 40 to 50%

How many of pro-disclosure orders were complied with?

- 40 to 50% pro-disclosure orders were complied with.
- It is just above national average (30 to 40%), but much less than the best 90-100%.

### Deterrence Impact: 0.5%

**Rank: 51**

- Number of cases in which show cause notices issued: 85 (46% of pro-disclosure cases).
- Of this 15 (roughly 18% of show cause notices issued) were dropped subsequently.
- Penalty was imposed in 0.4% of pro-disclosure cases.

The Commission directed information to be provided in 184 cases. However, the Commission asked the reasons for this delay only in 85 cases. In rest of the cases the officials were not even asked to explain the reasons for delay.

### Overall Public Satisfaction: 40 to 50%

So, if 100 people approached this Commissioner, pro-disclosure orders were done in 93cases. Out of these, 40 to 50 % finally got information.

### 3. Iqbal Ahmed

#### Disposals: Roughly 37 per month

- Time taken between filing of appeal and first hearing is 12 months.
- Pendency of 960 by the end of 2008

**Pro-disclosure Factor: 78%**

**Rank: 61**

<b>Total Number of Orders Analysed</b>	338
<b>Orders in Favour of Disclosure</b>	264(78%)
<b>Orders in which information was partly or fully denied</b>	74(22%)
<b>Remanded Back</b>	0
<b>Rank</b>	57

#### Effectiveness: 20 to 30 %

How many of pro-disclosure orders were complied with?

- 20 to 30% pro-disclosure orders were complied with.
- It is lesser than the national average (30 to 40%).

**Deterrence Impact: 0**

**Rank: 57**

- Number of cases in which show cause notices issued: 29 (11% of pro-disclosure cases).
- Penalty was not imposed in any of pro-disclosure cases.

The Commission directed information to be provided in 264 cases, However, the Commission asked the reasons for this delay only in 29 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 78 cases. Out of these, 10 to 20 % finally got information.

### 3. D.C. Jugran

#### Disposals: Roughly 30 per month

- Time taken between filing of appeal and first hearing is 14 months.

**Pro-disclosure Factor: 87%**

**Rank: 45**

<b>Total Number of Orders Analysed</b>	359
<b>Orders in Favour of Disclosure</b>	312(87%)
<b>Orders in which information was partly or fully denied</b>	47(13%)
<b>Remanded Back</b>	0
<b>Rank</b>	45

**Effectiveness: 30 to 40 %**

How many of pro-disclosure orders were complied with?

- 30to 40% pro-disclosure orders were complied with.
- It is equal to the national average (30to40%) but quite lesser than the best (90to100).

**Deterrence Impact: 0**

**Rank: 57**

- Number of cases in which show cause notices issued: 45 (14% of pro-disclosure cases).
- Penalty was not imposed in any case.

The commissioner directed to provide information in 359 cases. This means that the information had not been provided by the PIO within the prescribed time in these cases. However, the reason for delay was asked only in 45 cases. In the balance cases, the officials were not even asked to explain the reasons for delay.

**Overall Public Satisfaction 30 to 40%**

So, if 100 people approached this Commissioner, pro-disclosure orders were done in 87 cases. Out of these, 30 to 40 % finally got information.

## **5. Combined benches of Madhya Pradesh**

**Disposals: Roughly 17 per month**

- Time taken between filing of appeal and first hearing is 12 months.

**Pro-disclosure Factor: 89%**

**Rank: 38**

<b>Total Number of Orders Analysed</b>	208
<b>Orders in Favour of Disclosure</b>	185(89%)
<b>Orders in which information was partly or fully denied</b>	22(11%)
<b>Remanded Back</b>	1

<b>Rank</b>	36
-------------	----

**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 (6% of pro-disclosure cases).
- Penalty was not imposed in any of the pro disclosure cases.

The Commission directed information to be provided in 185 cases. However, the Commission 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 Satisfaction could not be calculated due to insufficient data.