

Uttarakhand

1. STATE FACTSHEET

State Chief Information Commissioner	R.S. Tolia
Total Number of Cases Analysed by Us (as provided to us)	1048
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	2.5 months
Total Funds Spent by the Commission (FY 2008-09)	Rs. 85,77,479

2. STATE OF RECORDS:

The commission provided us copies of all the orders passed by them in a CD. The commission informed (through their letter) that the CD contained orders passed in 557 appeals and 600 complaints during 2008. However, the CD actually contained only 452 orders. On approaching the commission again, we were informed that all the 600 complaints received in the commission were remanded back to the First Appellate Authority. They also enclosed a prototype of a standard order, through which all 600 complaints were remanded back to the First Appellate Authority without a hearing. They sent us another CD for the orders in balance appeals. However, this CD also contained only 452 orders. Therefore, we have analyzed orders in only 452 appeals and have put 600 complaints under the heading “remanded back”.

3. PERFORMANCE OF INFORMATION COMMISSION ON VARIOUS PARAMETERS

a) DISPOSALS: Roughly 87 cases per month

- Despite letters, an RTI application and several phone calls, we were not provided with the figures of pendency.
- During the calendar year 2008, Uttarakhand Information Commission disposed 1,048 cases. Uttarakhand has only one commissioner – R.S. Tolia—since its inception. His disposal rate comes to about 87 cases per month.

b) PRO-DISCLOSURE FACTOR: 35%

Commission Rank: 24
Commissioner Rank: 83

Total Number of Orders Analysed	1,048
Orders in Favour of Disclosure	364 (~35%)

Orders in which information was partly or fully denied	50 (5%)
Remanded Back	634 (60%)
Rank	24

c) EFFECTIVENESS: 30-40%

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

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

d) DETERRENCE IMPACT: 9 %

Commission Rank: 6
Commissioner Rank: 11

- Number of cases in which show cause notices issued: 56 (15% of pro-disclosure cases)
- 24 of these notices were dropped after hearings (i.e. 43% of show cause notices)
- Penalty was imposed in 31 cases (i.e. 9% of pro-disclosure cases).
- Show cause notices remained pending in 2% cases at the end of the year.

The Commission directed information to be provided in 364 cases. However, the Commission asked the reasons for this delay only in 56 cases. In rest of the cases, the officials were not even asked to explain the reasons for delay.

e) OVERALL PUBLIC SATISFACTION (OPS): 10-20%

So, if 100 people approach Uttarakhand Information Commission, pro-disclosure orders were given in 35 cases. Out of these, only 10-20% finally got information.