

# Orissa

## 1. STATE FACTSHEET

State Chief Information Commissioner	D N Padhi IAS (Retd.)
State Information Commissioners	Jagadananda Radhamohan
Total Number of Cases Analysed by Us (as provided to us)	643
Pendency as on January 1, 2008	2305
Pendency as on December 31, 2008	3973
Time Taken Between Filing of Appeal and First Hearing	13 months
Total Funds Spent by the Commission (FY 2008-09)	Rs. 27,767,000

## 2. STATE OF RECORDS:

The Commission provided us with copies of all their orders in a CD.

## 3. PERFORMANCE OF INFORMATION COMMISSION ON VARIOUS PARAMETERS

### a) DISPOSALS: An average of 36 cases per commissioner per month

The commission had a pendency of 3973 cases by the end of 2008.

### b) PRO-DISCLOSURE FACTOR: 85.1%

**Rank: 11**

Total Number of Orders Analysed	643
Orders in Favour of Disclosure	547 (~85%)
Orders in which information was partially or fully denied	80 (12%)
Remanded Back	16
Rank of Commission	11

### c) EFFECTIVENESS: 40-50%

This parameter refers to how many of the pro-disclosure orders were complied with as a percentage. A total of 548 orders were passed favouring disclosure.

- Of this, only 40 to 50% of the orders was complied with.
- Compliance, though slightly greater than the national average 30 to 40%, is much less than the best 90 to 100%.

**d) DETERRENCE IMPACT: 11.1%**

**Rank: 4**

- Number of cases in which show cause notices issued: 82
- 17 of these notices were dropped after hearings (i.e. 21% of show cause notices)
- Penalty was imposed in 61 cases (i.e. 11% of pro-disclosure cases).
- Show cause notices remained pending in 5% cases at the end of the year.

The Commission directed information to be provided in 547 cases. However, the Commission asked the reasons for this delay only in 82 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 Orissa Information Commission, pro-disclosure orders were given in 547 cases. Out of these, 30 to 40% people finally got information.

**4. STATUS OF COMMISSIONERS BY PARAMETERS**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Pro-disclosure Factor (Rank)</b>	<b>Effectiveness (Band)</b>	<b>Deterrent Impact (Rank)</b>	<b>Overall Public Satisfaction (Band)</b>
<b>DN Padhi</b>	85.3% (48 <sup>th</sup> )	50-60%	10.5 (5 <sup>th</sup> )	30-40%
<b>Jagadananda</b>	82.2% (51 <sup>st</sup> )	20-30%	1.14 (45 <sup>nd</sup> )	20-30%
<b>Radhamohan</b>	82.1 (52 <sup>nd</sup> )	30-40%	0 (57 <sup>th</sup> )	30-40%
<b>Combined Benches of Orissa</b>	88.2 (39 <sup>th</sup> )	40-50%	29.33 (1 <sup>st</sup> )	40-50%

**INFORMATION COMMISSIONERS**  
**(ORISSA)**

## 1. D.N. Padhi

**Disposals: Roughly 42 cases per month**

- Pendency of 1987 by the end of 2008

**Pro-disclosure Factor: 85.3%**

**Rank: 48**

<b>Total Number of Orders Analysed</b>	423
<b>Orders in Favour of Disclosure</b>	361 (85%)
<b>Orders in which information was partially or fully denied</b>	54 (13%)
<b>Remanded Back</b>	8
<b>Rank of Commission</b>	48

**Effectiveness: 40-50%**

Total number of orders given in favour of disclosure was 361.

- Of this, only 50 to 60% pro-disclosure orders were complied with.
- It is slightly more than the national average of 30 to 40% but much less than the best 90-100%.

**Deterrence Impact: 11.1%**

**Rank: 5**

- Number of cases in which show cause notices issued: 48 (13% of pro-disclosure cases)
- Of this, 8 (roughly 17% of show cause notices issued) were dropped subsequently.
- Penalty was imposed in 38 cases (~11% of pro-disclosure cases).

The Commission directed information to be provided in 361 cases. However, the Commission asked the reasons for this delay only in 48 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 ~85% cases. Out of these, 30 to 40% people finally got information.

## 2. Jagadananda

### Disposals: Roughly 38 per month

- As of January 1, 2008, the pendency of Orissa State Commission was 2503, which increased to 3973 by December 31, 2008. Therefore, calculating on that basis, the pendency of Jagdananda was 1987 cases.

**Pro-disclosure Factor: 82.2%**

**Rank: 51**

<b>Total Number of Orders Analysed</b>	107
<b>Orders in Favour of Disclosure</b>	88 (~82%)
<b>Orders in which information was partially or fully denied</b>	14 (13%)
<b>Remanded Back</b>	5
<b>Rank of Commission</b>	51

### Effectiveness: 20-30%

The total number of pro-disclosure orders of Jagdananda was 88.

- Of this, 20 to 30% pro-disclosure orders were complied with.
- It is less than the national average of 30 to 40% and much less than the best Of 90-100%.

### Deterrence Impact: 1.1%

**Rank: 46**

- Number of cases in which show cause notices issued: 5 (6% of pro-disclosure cases)
- Of this, 3 (roughly 60% of show cause notices issued) were dropped subsequently.
- Penalty was imposed in 1 case (~1% of pro-disclosure cases).

The Commission directed information to be provided in 88 cases. However, the Commission 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 ~82% cases. Out of these, 20-30% people finally got information.

### 3. Radhamohan

#### Disposals: Roughly 28 per month

As of January 1, 2008, the pendency of Orissa State Commission was 2503, which increased to 3973 by December 31, 2008. Therefore, calculating on that basis, the pendency of Radhamohan was 1987.

**Pro-disclosure Factor: 82%**

**Rank: 52**

<b>Total Number of Orders Analysed</b>	28
<b>Orders in Favour of Disclosure</b>	23 (82%)
<b>Orders in which information was partially or fully denied</b>	3 (11%)
<b>Remanded Back</b>	2
<b>Rank of Commission</b>	52

#### Effectiveness: 30-40%

The total number of pro-disclosure orders of Radhamohan was 23.

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

#### Deterrence Impact: 0

**Rank: 57**

- Despite a low compliance rate, the commissioner did not issue any show cause notice. Therefore, he ranks at the bottom of the list in terms of deterrence impact.

#### Overall Public Satisfaction: 30-40%

So, if 100 people approached this Commissioner, pro-disclosure orders were done in ~82% cases. Out of these, only 30 to 40% people finally got information.

### 4. Combined Benches of Orissa

**Pro-disclosure Factor: 88%**

**Rank: 40**

<b>Total Number of Orders Analysed</b>	85
<b>Orders in Favour of Disclosure</b>	75 (~88%)
<b>Orders in which information was partially or fully denied</b>	9 (11%)
<b>Remanded Back</b>	1
<b>Rank of Commission</b>	39

**Effectiveness: 40-50%**

Total number of pro-disclosure orders: 75

- Of this, only 40 to 50% pro-disclosure orders were complied with.
- It is slightly more than the national average of 30 to 40% but much less than the best 90 to 100%.

**Deterrence Impact: 29.33%**

**Rank: 1**

- The combined benches of Orissa held the number one spot in terms of penalties imposed.
- Number of cases in which show cause notices issued: 29 (39% of pro-disclosure cases)
- Of this, 6 (roughly 21% of show cause notices issued) were dropped subsequently.

The Commission directed information to be provided in 75 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: 40 to 50%**

So, if 100 people approached this Commissioner, pro-disclosure orders were done in 75% cases. Out of these, only 40 to 50% people finally got information.