

Punjab

1. STATE FACTSHEET

State Chief Information Commissioner	Ranjan Kashyap
State Information Commissioners	Kulbir Singh Lt Gen (Retd) P K Grover P P S Gill P K Verma R K Gupta Ravi Singh Rupan Deol Bajaj Surinder Singh
Total Number of Cases Analysed by Us (as provided to us)	3,207
Pendency as on January 1, 2008	Not Available
Pendency as on December 31, 2008	Not Available
Time Taken Between Filing of Appeal and First Hearing	Not available (these dates are not mentioned in orders)
Total Funds Spent by the Commission (FY 2008-09)	Not Available

2. STATE OF RECORDS:

They said all their orders are on website, which we downloaded for our analysis.

3. PERFORMANCE OF INFORMATION COMMISSION ON VARIOUS PARAMETERS

a) DISPOSALS: An average of 33 cases per commissioner per month.

- Despite letters, an RTI application, several phone calls and a personal visit to Chandigarh, we were not provided with the figures of pendency at Punjab Information Commission
- During calendar year 2008, Punjab Information Commission disposed 3,207 cases. There were 8 commissioners working for 12 months each. So, it comes to roughly 33 cases per commissioner per month.

b) PRO-DISCLOSURE FACTOR: 93%

Rank: 4

Total Number of Orders Analysed	3,207
Orders in Favour of Disclosure	2,969 (~93%)

Orders in which information was partly or fully denied	224 (7%)
Remanded Back	14 (negligible percentage)
Rank	

c) EFFECTIVENESS: 40 to 50%

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

- 40 to 50% orders were complied with.
- Compliance, though close to the national average of 30-40%, is much less than the best 90-100%.

d) DETERRENCE IMPACT: 1%

Rank: 16

- Number of cases in which show cause notices issued: 284
- 121 of these notices were dropped after hearings (i.e. 43% of show cause notices)
- Penalty was imposed in 45 cases (i.e. 1% of pro-disclosure cases).
- Show cause notices remained pending in 42% cases at the end of the year.

The Commission directed information to be provided in 2,969 cases. However, the Commission asked the reasons for this delay only in 284 cases. In rest of the cases the officials were not even asked to explain the reasons for delay.

e) OVERALL PUBLIC SATISFACTION (OPS): 40 to 50%

So, if 100 people approach Punjab Information Commission, pro-disclosure orders were passed in 93 cases. Out of these, only 40 to 50% people finally got information.

4. GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

- Punjab follows an important practice of “continuing mandamus” i.e. they generally do not close a case till an appellant reports satisfaction i.e. after directing the PIO to provide information, they continue fixing hearings for compliance.
- Despite this, only 40 to 50% orders out of all pro-disclosure orders passed by the commission were complied with. This makes one wonder why the compliance is so low if the case is not closed without the appellant reporting satisfaction. Compliance often results in several hearings—sometimes spanning several months. This is because the commission is very lax in imposing penalties. Repeated compliance hearings tire out an appellant, leading to attrition. So, when an appellant does not turn up for a hearing, the case is closed with a remark that since the appellant is not appearing, it appears he has already received satisfactory information. (Though some commissioners are sensitive and still keep the case open and try to get appellant’s viewpoint).

- The Punjab Information Commission remanded back negligible number of cases (just 14 of 3,207 orders). Even if the appellant directly approached the commission in a complaint without filing any first appeal, the case was entertained.
- Punjab appears to be soft on officials. Penalties were imposed in just 1% pro-disclosure cases. They prefer to award compensation instead of penalty.
- In many cases, penalty amounts are not calculated as per formula prescribed in RTI Act. An arbitrary penalty amount is imposed on the officer.

7. RANKING OF COMMISSIONERS BY PARAMETERS

Name	Pro-disclosure Factor (Rank)	Effectiveness (Band)	Deterrent Impact (Rank)	Overall Public Satisfaction (Band)
Kulbir Singh	89% (31 st)	40 to 50%	3% (25 th)	30 to 40%
P K Grover Lt Gen (Retd)	94% (17 th)	50 to 60%	1% (42 nd)	40 to 50%
P P S Gill	96% (9 th)	40 to 50%	2% (37 th)	40 to 50%
P K Verma	88% (42 nd)	30 to 40 %	0 (57 th)	30 to 40%
R K Gupta	95% (13 th)	40 to 50%	3% (26 th)	40 to 50%
Ravi Singh	97% (8 th)	50 to 60%	3% (22 nd)	50 to 60%
Rupan Deol Bajaj	94% (21 st)	30 to 40%	2% (32 nd)	20 to 30 %
Surinder Singh	95% (11 th)	40 to 50%	0.3% (55)	40 to 50%
Combined Benches of Punjab	88% (40 th)	30 to 40%	0 (57)	30 to 40%

INFORMATION COMMISSIONERS (Punjab)

1. KULBIR SINGH

Disposals: Roughly 28 per month

- Pendency figure of Punjab Information Commission is not available.
- Time taken between filing of appeal and first hearing was not available because these dates are not mentioned in their orders.

Pro-disclosure Factor: 90%

Rank: 31

Total Number of Orders Analysed	327
Orders in Favour of Disclosure	294 (90%)
Orders in which information was partly or fully denied	32 (10%)
Remanded Back	1
Rank	31

Effectiveness: 40 to 50%

How many of pro-disclosure orders were complied with?

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

Deterrence Impact: 3%

Rank: 25

- Number of cases in which show cause notices issued: 50 (17% of pro-disclosure cases)
- Of this 24 (roughly 48% of show cause notices issued) were dropped subsequently.
- Penalty was imposed in 8 (~3% of pro-disclosure cases) cases.

The Commissioner directed information to be provided in 294 cases. However, the Commissioner asked the reasons for this delay only in 50 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 90 cases. Out of these, 30 to 40% finally got information.

2. RAVI SINGH

Disposals: Roughly 28 per month

- Pendency figure of Punjab Information Commission was not available.
- Time taken between filing of appeal and first hearing was not available because these dates are not mentioned in their orders.

Pro-disclosure Factor: 97%

Rank: 8

Total Number of Orders Analysed	336
Orders in Favour of Disclosure	326 (97%)
Orders in which information was partly or fully denied	10 (3%)
Remanded Back	0
Rank	8

Effectiveness: 50 to 60%

How many of pro-disclosure orders were complied with?

- 50 to 60% pro-disclosure orders were complied with.
- Though it is more than the national average of 30 to 40% but much less than the best 90 to 100%.

Deterrence Impact: 3%

Rank: 22

- Number of cases in which show cause notices issued: 54 (17% of pro-disclosure cases)
- Of this 16 (roughly 30% of show cause notices issued) were dropped subsequently.
- Penalty was imposed in 10 (~3% of pro-disclosure cases) cases.

The Commissioner directed information to be provided in 326 cases. However, the Commissioner asked the reasons for this delay only in 54 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 done in 97 cases. Out of these, 50 to 60% people finally got information.

3. LT. GEN. (RETD.) P.K. GROVER

Disposals: Roughly 36 per month

- Pendency figure of Punjab Information Commission was not available.
- Time taken between filing of appeal and first hearing was not available because these dates are not mentioned in their orders.

Pro-disclosure Factor: 95%

Rank: 17

Total Number of Orders Analysed	334
Orders in Favour of Disclosure	316 (95%)
Orders in which information was partly or fully denied	18 (5%)
Remanded Back	0
Rank	17

Effectiveness: 50 to 60%

How many of pro-disclosure orders were complied with?

- 50 to 60% pro-disclosure orders were complied with.
- Though it is more than the national average of 30 to 40%, it is much less than the best 90 to 100%.

Deterrence Impact: 1%

Rank: 42

- Number of cases in which show cause notices issued: 28 (9% of pro-disclosure cases)
- Of this 14 (roughly 50% of show cause notices Issued) were dropped subsequently.
- Penalty was imposed in 4 (~1% of pro-disclosure cases) cases.

The Commissioner directed information to be provided in 316 cases. However, the Commissioner asked the reasons for this delay only in 28 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 95 cases. Out of these, 40 to 50% people finally got information.

4. P.P.S. GILL

Disposals: Roughly 37 per month

- Pendency figure of Punjab Information Commission was not available.
- Time taken between filing of appeal and first hearing was not available because these dates are not mentioned in their orders.

Pro-disclosure Factor: 96%

Rank: 9

Total Number of Orders Analysed	359
Orders in Favour of Disclosure	346 (96%)
Orders in which information was partly or fully denied	13 (4%)
Remanded Back	0
Rank	9

Effectiveness: 40 to 50%

How many of pro-disclosure orders were complied with?

- 40 to 50% pro-disclosure orders were complied with.
- Though it is slightly more than the national average of 30 to 40%, it is much less than the best 90 to 100%.

Deterrence Impact: 2%

Rank: 37

- Number of cases in which show cause notices issued: 26 (8% of pro-disclosure cases)
- Of this 5 (roughly 19% of show cause notices Issued) were dropped subsequently.
- Penalty was imposed in 7 (~2% of pro-disclosure cases) cases.

The Commissioner directed information to be provided in 346 cases. However, the Commissioner asked the reasons for this delay only in 26 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 96 cases. Out of these, 40 to 50% finally got information.

5. P.K. VERMA

Disposals: Roughly 65 per month

- Pendency figure of Punjab Information Commission was not available.
- Time taken between filing of appeal and first hearing was not available because these dates are not mentioned in their orders.

Pro-disclosure Factor: 88%

Rank: 42

Total Number of Orders Analysed	773
Orders in Favour of Disclosure	678 (88%)
Orders in which information was partly or fully denied	93 (12%)
Remanded Back	2
Rank	42

Effectiveness: 30 to 40%

How many of pro-disclosure orders were complied with?

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

Deterrence Impact: 0

Rank: 57

- Number of cases in which show cause notices issued: 27 (4% of pro-disclosure cases)
- Of this 19 (roughly 70% of show cause notices issued) were dropped subsequently.
- Penalty was not imposed in any of the cases.

The Commissioner directed information to be provided in 678 cases. However, the Commissioner asked the reasons for this delay only in 27 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 88 cases. Out of these, 30 to 40% people finally got information.

6. R.K. GUPTA

Disposals: Roughly 24 per month

- Pendency figure of Punjab Information Commission was not available.
- Time taken between filing of appeal and first hearing was not available because these dates are not mentioned in their orders.

Pro-disclosure Factor: 95%

Rank: 13

Total Number of Orders Analysed	283
Orders in Favour of Disclosure	269 (95%)
Orders in which information was partly or fully denied	14 (5%)
Remanded Back	0
Rank	13

Effectiveness: 40 to 50 %

How many of pro-disclosure orders were complied with?

- 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: 3%

Rank: 26

- Number of cases in which show cause notices issued: 24 (9% of pro-disclosure cases)
- Of this, 10 (roughly 42% of show cause notices Issued) were dropped subsequently.
- Penalty was imposed in 7 (~3% of pro-disclosure cases) cases.

The Commissioner directed information to be provided in 269 cases. However, the Commissioner asked the reasons for this delay only in 24 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 95 cases. Out of these, 40 to 50% people finally got information.

7. RUPAN DEOL BAJAJ

Disposals: Roughly 28 per month

- Pendency figure of Punjab Information Commission was not available.
- Time taken between filing of appeal and first hearing was not available because these dates are not mentioned in their orders.

Pro-disclosure Factor: 94%

Rank: 21

Total Number of Orders Analysed	331
Orders in Favour of Disclosure	311 (94%)
Orders in which information was partly or fully denied	19 (6%)
Remanded Back	1
Rank	21

Effectiveness: 30 to 40%

How many of pro-disclosure orders were complied with?

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

Deterrence Impact: 2%

Rank: 32

- Number of cases in which show cause notices issued: 47 (15% of pro-disclosure cases)
- Of this, 11 (roughly 23% of show cause notices Issued) were dropped subsequently.
- Penalty was imposed in 8 (~2% of pro-disclosure cases) cases.

The Commissioner directed information to be provided in 331 cases. However, the Commissioner asked the reasons for this delay only in 47 cases. In rest of the cases the officials were not even asked to explain the reasons for delay.

Overall Public Satisfaction: 20 to 30%

So, if 100 people approached this Commissioner, pro-disclosure orders were done in 94 cases. Out of these, 20 to 30% finally got information.

8. SURINDER SINGH

Disposals: Roughly 24 per month

- Pendency figure of Punjab Information Commission was not available.
- Time taken between filing of appeal and first hearing not available because these dates are not mentioned in their orders.

Pro-disclosure Factor: 95%

Rank: 11

Total Number of Orders Analysed	279
Orders in Favour of Disclosure	266 (95%)
Orders in which information was partly or fully denied	13 (5%)
Remanded Back	0
Rank	11

Effectiveness: 40 to 50%

How many of pro-disclosure orders were complied with?

- 40 to 50% pro-disclosure orders were complied with.
- It is almost equal to the national average of 30-40% but much less than the best 90 to 100%.

Deterrence Impact: 0

Rank: 55

- Number of cases in which show cause notices issued: 15 (6% of pro-disclosure cases)
- Of this 11 (roughly 73% of show cause notices issued) were dropped subsequently.
- Penalty was imposed only in 1 case.

The Commissioner directed information to be provided in 266 cases. However, the Commissioner asked the reasons for this delay only in 15 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 95 cases. Out of these, 40 to 50% people finally got information.

9. COMBINED BENCHES OF PUNJAB

Pro-disclosure Factor: 88%

Rank: 40

Total Number of Orders Analysed	185
Orders in Favour of Disclosure	163 (88%)
Orders in which information was partly or fully denied	12 (6%)
Remanded Back	10 (5%)
Rank	40

Effectiveness: 30 to 40%

How many of pro-disclosure orders were complied with?

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

Deterrence Impact: 0

Rank: 57

- Number of cases in which show cause notices issued: 13 (8% of pro-disclosure cases)
- Of this, 11 (roughly 85% of show cause notices issued) were dropped subsequently.
- No penalty was imposed in any of the cases.

The Commissioner directed information to be provided in 163 cases. However, the Commissioner asked the reasons for this delay only in 13 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 88 cases. Out of these, 30 to 40% people finally got information.

10. RANJAN KASHYAP

His figures are the same as the Combined Bench figures, as he has not passed any order individually.