

RAJASTHAN

1. STATE FACTSHEET

Information Commissioner	M D Kaurani
Total Number of Cases Analysed by Us (as provided to us)	2,005
Pendency as on January 1, 2008	515
Pendency as on December 31, 2008	1,041
Time Taken Between Filing of Appeal and First Hearing	Not Available
Total Funds Spent by the Commission (FY 2008-09)	Rs. 52,56,000

2. STATE OF RECORDS:

We have received copies of 2,017 orders from them, though the Commission says there are 2,106 orders.

3. PERFORMANCE OF INFORMATION COMMISSION ON VARIOUS PARAMETERS

a) DISPOSALS: An average of 167 cases per month

- The pendency of Rajasthan Information Commission increased from 515 as of January 1, 2008 to 1,041 as on December 2008. As Rajasthan has one information commissioner, the pendency of MD Karuni was also 1,041 as on December 2008.
- During the calendar year 2008, Rajasthan's Information Commission or Commissioner disposed 2005 cases.

b) PRO-DISCLOSURE FACTOR: 82%

Total Number of Orders Analysed	2005
Orders in Favour of Disclosure	1,650 (82%)
Orders in which information was partially or fully denied	335 (17%)
Remanded Back	20
Rank of Commission	13
Rank of Commissioner	50

c) EFFECTIVENESS: 20-30%

This parameter refers to how many of the pro-disclosure orders were complied with as a percentage. Total number of orders favouring disclosure was 1650.

- 20-30% of the orders were complied with.
- The compliance is a less than the national average of 30 to 40%, and is much less than the best 90 to 100%.

d) DETERRENCE IMPACT: 2.0%

Commission Rank: 14
Commissioner Rank: 36

- Number of cases in which show cause notices issued: 94
- 22 of these notices were dropped after hearings (i.e. 23% of show cause notices).
- Penalty was imposed in 33 cases (i.e. 2% of pro-disclosure cases).
- Show cause notices remained pending in 83% cases at the end of the year.

The Commission directed information to be provided in 1,650 cases. However, the Commission asked the reasons for this delay only in 94 cases. In rest of the cases the officials were not even asked to explain the reasons for delay.

e) OVERALL PUBLIC SATISFACTION (OPS): 20-30%

So, if 100 people approach Punjab Information Commission, pro-disclosure orders were given in 82 cases. Out of these, 20-30% finally got information.

4. GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

- In the state of Rajasthan, despite a pro-disclosure factor of 82%, only 20-30% people finally get satisfactory information, which is very low.
- Moreover, the penalty imposed in the state is very low which could be a reason for the low public satisfaction.
- One good practice followed by the state commission was that the many appellants received compensation from the public authority, unlike other states.

5. STATUS OF COMMISSION AND COMMISSIONER BY PARAMETERS

Name	Pro-disclosure Factor (Rank)	Effectiveness (Band)	Deterrent Impact (Rank)	Overall Public Satisfaction (Band)
MD Kaurani	82.3% (50 th)	20-30%	2% (36 th)	20-30%
Rajasthan Commission	82.3% (13 th)	20-30%	2% (14)	20-30%