

**GOVERNMENT OF INDIA  
MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE  
(DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE)**

*eCourt*

**RAJYA SABHA  
UNSTARRED QUESTION No.2148  
TO BE ANSWERED ON THURSDAY, THE 11<sup>th</sup> JULY, 2019**

**e-Courts Mission Mode Project**

**2148. SHRI PRABHAKAR REDDY VEMIREDDY:**

**Will the Minister of LAW AND JUSTICE be pleased to state:**

- (a) the details of district and subordinate courts in the country, State and district-wise;
- (b) when the e-Courts Project was conceived and what were the goals set;
- (c) whether it is a fact that only 16,000 district and subordinate courts have been computerized at the end of 2017-18 and, if so, the reasons therefor; and
- (d) the number of courts in which video conferencing has been operationalized so far, district-wise?

**ANSWER**

**MINISTER OF LAW AND JUSTICE, COMMUNICATIONS  
AND ELECTRONICS & INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY  
(SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD)**

- (a): As per the information made available by State Governments /High Courts on the web-portal hosted on the website of Department of Justice, sanctioned and working strength of Judicial Officers in District and Subordinate Courts is 23,199 and 17,757 respectively. State-wise details of sanctioned and working strength of Judicial Officers in District and Subordinate Courts is given in Statement at Annexure-I.

(b) : The eCourts Mission Mode Project Phase-I was implemented during 2011 - 2015. At the end of Phase-I, out of the total target of computerisation of 14,249 district and subordinate courts, sites for all 14,249 courts (100%) were made ready for computerisation, out of which LAN was installed at 13,643 courts, hardware was provided in 13,436 courts and software was installed in 13,672 courts. Laptops were provided to 14,309 judicial officers and change management exercise was completed in all the High Courts. Over 14,000 Judicial Officers were trained in the use of UBUNTU-Linux Operating System and more than 4,000 court staff have been trained as System Administrators in Case Information System (CIS).

The eCourts Mission Mode Project Phase-II is being implemented for a period of four years (2015-19) or until the project is completed, whichever is later. The target set out under the project is computerization of 16,845 courts, which has been completed. Against the financial outlay of Rs.1670 crores for this Phase, the Government has released a sum of Rs. 1248 crore as on date to various organizations involved in the implementation of the project. This includes a sum of Rs. 955.86 crore released to all High Courts, out of which a sum of Rs.716.45 crore has been utilized.

(c) As per information received from eCommittee of the Supreme Court of India, 16089 courts have been computerized at the end of 2017-18. Further, as on date, 16845 courts have been computerized, as against working strength of 17,757 Judicial Officers in the District and Subordinate Courts.

(d) As per information received from eCommittee of the Supreme Court of India, funds have been released for procurement of Video Conference Systems under eCourts Project to 3477 Court Complexes. Video Conferencing facility has already been operationalised between 488 Court Complexes and 342 corresponding jails. High Court wise details of Court Complexes and corresponding jails where Video Conferencing facility is operational is at **Annexure-II**

----

**ANNEXURE-I****Sanctioned and Working Strength of Judicial Officers in District and Subordinate Courts:**

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of State / UT</b>	<b>Sanctioned Strength</b>	<b>Working Strength</b>
1	Andaman and Nicobar	12	12
2	Andhra Pradesh	574	542
3	Arunachal Pradesh	32	26
4	Assam	430	344
5	Bihar	1847	1174
6	Chandigarh	30	30
7	Chhattisgarh	468	397
8	D & N Haveli	3	3
9	Daman & Diu	4	4
10	Delhi	758	535
11	Goa	50	44
12	Gujarat	1506	1135
13	Haryana	658	485
14	Himachal Pradesh	167	154
15	Jammu and Kashmir	310	233
16	Jharkhand	676	454
17	Karnataka	1307	1104
18	Kerala	537	465
19	Lakshadweep	3	3
20	Madhya Pradesh	2021	1524
21	Maharashtra	2147	1981
22	Manipur	55	40
23	Meghalaya	97	39
24	Mizoram	64	46
25	Nagaland	33	27
26	Odisha	917	739
27	Puducherry	26	11
28	Punjab	675	588
29	Rajasthan	1337	1132
30	Sikkim	25	19
31	Tamil Nadu	1174	887
32	Telangana	413	344
33	Tripura	120	88
34	Uttar Pradesh	3416	1989
35	Uttarakhand	293	228
36	West Bengal	1014	931
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>23,199</b>	<b>17,757</b>

\*\*\*\*

**Annexure – II****Status of Delivery and Installation of the Video Conference Equipments provided in Phase-I.**

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>High Court</b>	<b>Courts Complexes</b>	<b>Jails</b>
1	Bombay	39	37
2	Calcutta	19	18
3	Chhattisgarh	87	28
4(a)	Gauhati (Arunachal Pradesh)	2	2
4(b)	Gauhati (Assam)	39	30
4(c)	Gauhati (Mizoram)	8	7
4(d)	Gauhati (Nagaland)	11	12
5	Himachal Pradesh	16	0
6	Jammu & Kashmir	11	13
7	Jharkhand	10	10
8	Kerala	9	7
9	Madhya Pradesh	50	46
10	Madras	23	8
11	Manipur	12	2
12	Meghalaya	5	3
13	Orissa	43	42
14	Punjab & Haryana	19	15
15	Rajasthan	35	33
16	Sikkim	4	2
17	Telangana & Andhra Pradesh	22	16
18	Tripura	2	2
19	Uttarakhand	22	9
	<b>Total</b>	<b>488</b>	<b>342</b>

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA  
MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE  
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

*Desk Side*

**RAJYA SABHA  
UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 2150**

**TO BE ANSWERED ON THURSDAY, THE 11.07.2019**

**Appointment and transfer of judges**

**2150. DR. SANJAY SINH:**

Will the Minister of **LAW AND JUSTICE** be pleased to state:

- (a) the details of procedure adopted for appointment of High Court and Supreme Court of India judges/CJs;
- (b) the details of collegium recommendations for appointment of High Court and Supreme Court judges/CJs and transfer of High Court judges/CJs received during the last three years;
- (c) the details of procedure adopted by the Ministry after receiving such collegium recommendations; and
- (d) the details of collegium recommendations regarding appointment of High Court and Supreme Court judges/CJs and transfer of High Court judges/CJs, pending before the Ministry and the reasons for each such pendency?

**ANSWER**

**MINISTER OF LAW AND JUSTICE, COMMUNICATIONS AND  
ELECTRONICS & INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY**

**(SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD)**

(a) to (d): The Judges of the Supreme Court are appointed by the President under Article 124 (2) and Judges of the High Courts are appointed under Article 217 (1) and 224 (1) of the Constitution as per the procedure laid down in the Memorandum of Procedure (MoP) prepared in 1998 pursuant to the

Supreme Court Judgment of October, 6<sup>th</sup>, 1993 (Second Judges case) read with the advisory opinion of October, 28<sup>th</sup>, 1998 (Third Judges case).

Based on the Collegium recommendation the following appointment of Judges have been made in the Supreme Court and High Courts during last three years.

<b>Appointment/Transfer of Judges</b>	<b>2017</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>2019</b>	<b>Total</b>
Judges appointed in the Supreme Court	05	08	06	19
Judges appointed in the High Courts	115	108	31	254
Appointment of Chief Justices	08	25	05	38
Transfer of Chief Justices	--	03	02	05
Additional Judges made Permanent in High Courts	31	115	31	177
Additional Judges given fresh term	05	02	05	12
Transfer of Judges	05	19	08	32

At present, out of 203 names recommended by High Court Collegiums for appointment as Judges of various High Courts, 35 names have been submitted and pending with the Supreme Court Collegium. Further, 12 names recommended by Supreme Court Collegium have been referred back by the Government to Supreme Court for reconsideration. 8 names deferred by Supreme Court Collegium and 148 proposals including those names reiterated by Supreme Court Collegium are under various stages of processing with the Government, as per the procedure prescribed in the MoP.

In addition to above, two proposals for appointment of High Court Judges as Chief Justices of High Courts are under various stages of processing as per provisions of MoP.

\*\*\*\*

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA  
MINISTRY OF LAW & JUSTICE  
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

RAJYA SABHA

MM

UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 2151  
TO BE ANSWERED ON THURSDAY, THE 11<sup>th</sup> JULY, 2019

Setting up of new courts

2151. SHRIMATI VIJILA SATHYANANTH:

Will the Minister of LAW AND JUSTICE be pleased to state:

- (a) whether it is a fact that Government is considering to provide both financial and technical supports for setting up of new courts in the country;
- (b) if so, the details thereof;
- (c) whether one of the reasons for piling up of cases in the States was lack of new courts; and
- (d) if so, the details thereof?

ANSWER

MINISTER OF LAW AND JUSTICE, COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS &  
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY  
(SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD)

(a) & (b): The new courts at District and below District / Subordinate (Tehsil / Taluka) level are established by the respective State Governments in consultation with the concerned High Courts, as per their need and resources. Central Government has, *however*, been administering a Centrally Sponsored Scheme (CSS) for Development of Infrastructure Facilities for Judiciary by providing financial assistance to State Governments / UTs in the prescribed fund sharing pattern between Centre and States. The Scheme is being implemented since 1993-94. It covers the construction of court halls and court complexes and residential accommodations for Judicial Officers of District and Subordinate Judiciary. Central Government has so far sanctioned Rs. 6,986.50 crore since the inception of the Centrally Sponsored Scheme (CSS) for Development of Infrastructure Facilities for Judiciary in 1993-94. Out of this, Rs. 3,542.20 crore (50.70%) have been sanctioned to the States and UTs since April, 2014. Central Government has

formulated norms and specification of court halls to be constructed under Scheme for implementation throughout the country for future and circulated them to all concerned. The Central Government has approved continuation of the Scheme beyond the 12<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan period *i.e.* from 01.04.2017 to 31.03.2020 with an estimated additional outlay of Rs.3,320 crore.

(c) & (d): Timely disposal of cases in courts depends on several factors which, *inter-alia*, include availability of adequate number of judges and judicial officers, supporting court staff and physical infrastructure, complexity of facts involved, nature of evidence, co-operation of stake holders *viz.* bar, investigation agencies, witnesses and litigants and proper application of rules and procedures. However, as per the latest information made available by State Governments / High Courts on the web-portal hosted on website of Department of Justice, 19,101 court halls and 16,790 residential accommodations are available for Judicial Officers of District and Subordinate Courts under this scheme against the working strength of 17,785 Judicial Officers in District and Subordinate Courts of the country. In addition, 2,883 court halls and 1,896 residential units are under construction.

\*\*\*\*\*



GOVERNMENT OF INDIA  
MINISTRY OF LAW & JUSTICE  
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

NM

RAJYA SABHA

UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. †2152  
TO BE ANSWERED ON THURSDAY, THE 11<sup>th</sup> JULY, 2019

Cases pending in High Court of Gujarat

†2152. SHRI NARANBHAI J. RATHWA:

Will the Minister of LAW AND JUSTICE be pleased to state:

- (a) the number of pending cases in the High Court of Gujarat at present and the cases that have been pending for 15 years or more;
- (b) whether it is a fact that people in Gujarat are not getting justice in time on account of pending cases;
- (c) the reaction of Government in this regard; and
- (d) the number of judges employed in the High Court of Gujarat during the last three years, year-wise and the shortage of courts experienced along with the details of efforts made to overcome it?

ANSWER

MINISTER OF LAW AND JUSTICE, COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS &  
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY  
(SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD)

(a) : As per information made available by Registrar General of Gujarat High Court, 1,23,478 cases are pending in the High Court of Gujarat, out of which 3,159 are pending for 15 years or more.

(b) : Timely disposal of cases in courts depends on several factors which, *inter-alia*, include availability of adequate number of judges and judicial officers, supporting court staff and physical infrastructure, complexity of facts involved, nature of evidence, co-operation of stake holders viz. bar, investigation agencies, witnesses and litigants and proper application of rules and procedures.

(c) : The Government is fully committed to speedy disposal of cases and reducing pendency and has, in conjunction with the judiciary, taken many corrective steps.

Pursuant to the Joint Conference of the Chief Ministers of the States and Chief Justices of the High Courts held in 2015, where it was resolved that all High Courts would constitute Arrears Committee, the *then* Minister of Law and Justice had written to the Chief Justices of the High Courts requesting them to appraise the Government of the steps being taken by them to address the issue of pendency *especially* regarding cases pending for more than 5 years. As per the available information, all High Courts have established Arrears Committees. Progress made by the High Courts in reducing pendency was taken up for consideration again in the Conference of Chief Justices of High Courts held in April 2016. Based on the reports submitted by the Arrears Committee of various High Courts, it was, *inter-alia*, resolved that (i) all the High Courts shall assign top most priority for disposal of cases which are pending for more than five years; (ii) High Courts where cases are pending for more than five years shall facilitate their disposal in mission mode; (iii) High Court shall progressively thereafter set a target of disposing of cases for more than four years; (iv) While prioritizing the disposal of cases pending in the district courts for more than five years, additional incentives for the Judges of the district judiciary could be considered where feasible; and (v) Efforts shall be made for strengthening case-flow management rules. It was further resolved that the Chief Justices of the High Courts will set up a Cell / Committee for monitoring the implementation of the resolutions passed in the Chief Justices Conferences and each High Court shall create a mechanism for submitting progress report to the Supreme Court. Accordingly, Arrears Committees have been functioning in all High Courts and in District Courts.

Further, the Government has taken several initiatives to provide an ecosystem for faster disposal of cases by the judiciary. The National Mission for Justice Delivery and Legal Reforms established by the Government has adopted a coordinated approach for phased liquidation of arrears and pendency in judicial administration through various strategic initiatives, *including* improving infrastructure for courts, leveraging Information and Communication Technology (ICT) for better justice delivery, and filling up of vacant positions of Judges in High Courts and Supreme Court.

(d) : Details of number of Judges appointed in High Court of Gujarat during last three years are given below:

Year	Number of Judges appointed in the High Court of Gujarat.
2016	5
2017	--
2018	4
2019 (till 08.07.2019)	3

Filling up of vacancies in High Courts is a continuous and collaborative process, between the Executive and the Judiciary. It requires consultation and approval from various Constitutional Authorities. Initiation of proposal for appointment of Judges in the High Courts vests with the Chief Justice of the High Court concerned. While every effort is made to fill up the existing vacancies expeditiously, vacancies in High Courts do keep on arising on account of retirement, resignation or elevation of Judges and also the increase in the strength of Judges.

\*\*\*\*\*



GOVERNMENT OF INDIA  
MINISTRY OF LAW & JUSTICE  
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

NM

RAJYA SABHA

UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. †2153  
TO BE ANSWERED ON THURSDAY, THE 11<sup>th</sup> JULY, 2019

Vacancies in courts

†2153. SHRIMATI CHHAYA VERMA:  
SHRI VISHAMBHAR PRASAD NISHAD:  
CH. SUKHRAM SINGH YADAV:

Will the Minister of LAW AND JUSTICE be pleased to state:

- (a) the number of posts of judges lying vacant in various subordinate courts throughout the country, State-wise;
- (b) the number of posts of judges lying vacant in High Courts, State-wise;
- (c) whether the Ministry would ensure to fill the posts before it becomes vacant;
- (d) to what extent court proceedings are impacted due to vacant posts of judges; and
- (e) whether people have to face delay in justice due to under availability of judges?

ANSWER

MINISTER OF LAW AND JUSTICE, COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS &  
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY  
(SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD)

(a): As per information made available by State Governments / High Courts on the web-portal hosted on the website of Department of Justice, sanctioned and working strength of Judicial Officers in District and Subordinate Courts are 23,235 and 17,785 respectively, leaving 5,450 posts of Judicial Officers of District and Subordinate Courts vacant. Details of State / UT-wise sanctioned and working strength and vacancies of Judicial Officers are given in a Statement at **Annexure - I**.

(b): Approved and working strength of Judges in various High Courts is 1,079 and 676 respectively, leaving 403 posts of Judges in various High Courts vacant. High Court-wise details of approved / working strength and vacancies of Judges are given in a Statement at **Annexure - II**.

(c) : Under Article 235 of the Constitution of India, the administrative control over the members of district and subordinate judiciary in the States vest with the concerned High Court. Further, in exercise of powers conferred under proviso to Article 309 read with Articles 233 and 234 of the Constitution, the respective State Government, in consultation with the High Court, frames the Rules and Regulations regarding the issues of appointment, promotion, reservations *etc.* of Judicial Officers in the State Judicial Service. Therefore, Central Government has no role in this regard.

The following steps have been taken by the Government to facilitate filling of vacancies in lower judiciary:-

- (i) In September, 2016, Union Minister of Law & Justice wrote to the Chief Ministers of States and the Chief Justices of High Courts to enhance the cadre strength of the District and Subordinate Courts and provide physical infrastructure to the State judiciary. The same was reiterated in May, 2017. In August, 2018, in the context of increasing pendency of cases, the Union Minister of Law & Justice has written to all Chief Justices of High Courts to monitor the Status of the vacancies regularly and to ensure proper coordination with the state Public Service Commission to fill up vacant posts as per time schedule prescribed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the Malik Mazhar Sultan case..
- (ii) The filling up of vacancies is also being monitored by the Supreme Court in a *suo-motu* Writ Petition (Civil) No. 2 of 2018.
- (iii) A series of meetings were held by Secretary, Department of Justice with Registrars General of all High Courts and Law Secretaries of all State Governments / UTs *through* Video Conferencing in the month of January, 2018, July, 2018 and November, 2018 to follow up on filling up posts of Judicial Officers in District and Subordinate Courts.
- (iv) The Department of Justice has hosted a web-portal on its website for reporting and monitoring of sanctioned and working strength, and vacancies of Judicial Officers of District and Subordinate Courts on monthly basis.

(v) In order to facilitate regular filling up of these vacancies in a smooth and time-bound manner, the Department of Justice *vide* its letter dated 28<sup>th</sup> April, 2017 suggested creation of a Central Selection Mechanism to the Hon'ble Supreme Court. The Hon'ble Supreme Court *suo motu* converted the Government's suggestions into a Writ Petition on 09<sup>th</sup> May, 2017 and directed all State Governments (including Union Territories) to file their responses and suggestions by way of affidavits to the Supreme Court Registry.

Filling up of vacancies in High Courts is a continuous and collaborative process, between the Executive and the Judiciary. It requires consultation and approval from various Constitutional Authorities. Initiation of proposal for appointment of Judges in the High Courts vests with the Chief Justice of the High Court concerned. While every effort is made to fill up the existing vacancies expeditiously, vacancies in High Courts do keep on arising on account of retirement, resignation or elevation of Judges and also the increase in the strength of Judges.

(d) & (e): Timely disposal of cases in courts depends on several factors which, *inter-alia*, include availability of adequate number of judges and judicial officers, supporting court staff and physical infrastructure, complexity of facts involved, nature of evidence, co-operation of stake holders *viz.* bar, investigation agencies, witnesses and litigants and proper application of rules and procedures.

In the case of *Imtiyaz Ahmed versus State of Uttar Pradesh and others*, the Supreme Court had asked the Law Commission of India to evolve a method for scientific assessment of the number of additional courts required to clear the backlog of cases. In 245<sup>th</sup> Report (2014), the Law Commission observed that filing of cases *per capita* varies substantially across geographic units as filings are associated with economic and social conditions of the population. As such the Law Commission did not consider the judge population ratio to be a scientific criterion for determining the adequacy of the judge strength in the country. The Law Commission found that in the absence of complete and scientific approach to data collection across various High Courts in the country, the "*Rate of Disposal*" method,

to calculate the number of additional judges required to clear the backlog of cases as well as to ensure that new backlog is not created, is more pragmatic and useful.

In August 2014, the Supreme Court asked the National Court Management System Committee (NCMS Committee) to examine the recommendations made by the Law Commission and to furnish its recommendations in this regard. NCMS Committee submitted its report to the Supreme Court in March, 2016. The report, *inter-alia*, observes that in the long term, the judge strength of the subordinate courts will have to be assessed by a scientific method to determine the total number of "Judicial Hours" required for disposing of the case load of each court. In the interim, the Committee has proposed a "weighted" disposal approach i.e. disposal weighted by the nature and complexity of cases in local conditions.

As per the direction of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in its Order dated 02.01.2017, the Department of Justice has forwarded a copy of interim report of the NCMS Committee to all the State Governments and High Courts to enable them to take follow up action to determine the required Strength of district and subordinate judiciary.

\*\*\*\*\*



## Annexure - I

Statement referred to Rajya Sabha Unstarred Question No. †2153 for reply on 11<sup>th</sup> July, 2019 regarding Vacancies in courts.

Sanctioned / Working Strength and Vacancies of Judicial Officers in District and Subordinate Courts.

Sr. No.	Name of State / UT	Sanctioned Strength	Working Strength	Vacancies
1.	Andaman and Nicobar	12	12	0
2.	Andhra Pradesh	597	537	60
3.	Arunachal Pradesh	32	26	6
4.	Assam	430	344	86
5.	Bihar	1847	1174	673
6.	Chandigarh	30	30	0
7.	Chhattisgarh	468	397	71
8.	D & N Haveli	3	3	0
9.	Daman & Diu	4	3	1
10.	Delhi	758	535	223
11.	Goa	50	44	6
12.	Gujarat	1506	1135	371
13.	Haryana	658	485	173
14.	Himachal Pradesh	167	154	13
15.	Jammu and Kashmir	312	233	79
16.	Jharkhand	676	453	223
17.	Karnataka	1307	1104	203
18.	Kerala	537	465	72
19.	Lakshadweep	3	3	0
20.	Madhya Pradesh	2021	1524	497
21.	Maharashtra	2147	2025	122
22.	Manipur	55	40	15
23.	Meghalaya	97	39	58
24.	Mizoram	64	46	18
25.	Nagaland	33	27	6
26.	Odisha	917	737	180
27.	Puducherry	26	11	15
28.	Punjab	675	588	87
29.	Rajasthan	1348	1130	218
30.	Sikkim	25	19	6
31.	Tamil Nadu	1174	887	287
32.	Telangana	413	341	72
33.	Tripura	120	88	32
34.	Uttar Pradesh	3416	1989	1427
35.	Uttarakhand	293	228	65
36.	West Bengal	1014	929	85
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>23,235</b>	<b>17,785</b>	<b>5,450</b>

\*\*\*\*\*

## Annexure - II

Statement referred to Rajya Sabha Unstarred Question No. †2153 for reply on 11<sup>th</sup> July, 2019 regarding Vacancies in courts.

Details of Approved / Working Strength and Vacancies of Judges in High Courts

Sl. No.	Name of the Court	Approved Strength			Working Strength			Vacancies		
		Pmt.	Addl	Total	Pmt.	Addl	Total	Pmt.	Addl	Total
1.	Allahabad	76	84	160	58	48	106	18	36	54
2.	Andhra Pradesh	28	09	37	13	0	13	15	09	24
3.	Bombay	71	23	94	62	05	67	09	18	27
4.	Calcutta	54	18	72	20	22	42	34	-04	30
5.	Chhattisgarh	17	05	22	08	07	15	09	-02	07
6.	Delhi	45	15	60	40	0	40	05	15	20
7.	Gauhati	18	06	24	16	03	19	02	03	05
8.	Gujarat	39	13	52	28	0	28	11	13	24
9.	Himachal Pradesh	10	03	13	09	01	10	01	02	03
10.	Jammu & Kashmir	13	04	17	09	0	09	04	04	08
11.	Jharkhand	19	06	25	14	05	19	05	01	06
12.	Karnataka	47	15	62	20	12	32	27	03	30
13.	Kerala	35	12	47	27	07	34	08	05	13
14.	Madhya Pradesh	40	13	53	33	0	33	07	13	20
15.	Madras	56	19	75	43	15	58	13	04	17
16.	Manipur	04	01	05	04	0	04	0	01	01
17.	Meghalaya	03	01	04	02	0	02	01	01	02
18.	Orissa	20	07	27	14	0	14	06	07	13
19.	Patna	40	13	53	30	0	30	10	13	23
20.	Punjab & Haryana	64	21	85	43	07	50	21	14	35
21.	Rajasthan	38	12	50	24	0	24	14	12	26
22.	Sikkim	03	0	03	03	0	03	0	0	0
23.	Telangana	18	06	24	10	01	11	08	05	13
24.	Tripura	04	0	04	03	0	03	01	0	01
25.	Uttarakhand	09	02	11	09	01	10	0	01	01
<b>Total</b>		<b>771</b>	<b>308</b>	<b>1079</b>	<b>542</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>676</b>	<b>229</b>	<b>174</b>	<b>403</b>

\*\*\*\*\*

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA  
MINISTRY OF LAW & JUSTICE  
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

RAJYA SABHA

JR Desk

UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 2933  
TO BE ANSWERED ON THURSDAY, THE 18<sup>TH</sup> JULY, 2019

Space crunch in subordinate courts

2933. DR. R. LAKSHMANAN:

Will the Minister of LAW AND JUSTICE be pleased to state:

- (a) whether Government is aware that many subordinate courts at district level are functioning in rented buildings and are also facing space crunch, which is adversely affecting their functioning;
- (b) if so, the details thereof;
- (c) whether Government has floated any scheme to construct buildings for court rooms to enable the subordinate courts to function in a spacial atmosphere;
- (d) if so, the details thereof; and
- (e) if not, the reasons therefor?

ANSWER

MINISTER OF LAW AND JUSTICE, COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS &  
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY  
(SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD)

(a) to (e) : It is the primary responsibility of the State Governments to provide Judicial Infrastructure / Court Rooms for District and Subordinate Courts. To augment the resources of State Governments, Union Government has been administering a Centrally Sponsored Scheme (CSS) for Development of Infrastructure Facilities for Judiciary by providing financial assistance to State Governments and Union Territory Administrations in the prescribed fund sharing pattern between Centre and States since the year 1993-94. It covers the construction of court halls and residential accommodations for Judicial Officers of District and Subordinate Courts.

Till 15.07.2019, Central Government has sanctioned Rs. 6,986.50 crore since the inception of the Centrally Sponsored Scheme (CSS) for Development of

Infrastructure Facilities for Judiciary in 1993-94. Out of this, Rs. 3,542.20 crore (50.70%) have been sanctioned to the States and Union Territory Administrations since April, 2014. The allocations are made subject to budget provision to the States and Union Territories.

As per information made available by State Governments / High Courts on the web-portal hosted on the web-site of Department of Justice, 19,186 court halls and 16,855 residential accommodations are available for Judicial Officers of District and Subordinate Courts as on date against the working strength of 17,987 Judicial Officers. In addition, 2,822 court halls and 1,856 residential units are under construction, at present.

\*\*\*\*\*

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA  
MINISTRY OF LAW & JUSTICE  
(DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE)

Jus. II

RAJYA SABHA

UNSTARRED QUESTION NO.2934

TO BE ANSWERED ON THURSDAY, THE 18<sup>th</sup> JULY, 2019

Proposal from Delhi for FTCs

2934. SHRI VIJAY GOEL:

Will the Minister of LAW AND JUSTICE be pleased to state:

- (a) whether the Ministry has received any proposal from the State Government of the NCT of Delhi for setting up of Fast Track Courts (FTCs);
- (b) if so, the details thereof;
- (c) the response of the Ministry thereto; and
- (d) the number of fast track courts operational in Delhi and the date of their establishment?

ANSWER

MINISTER OF LAW & JUSTICE, COMMUNICATIONS AND  
ELECTRONICS & INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

(SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD)

(a)-(d): Setting up of subordinate courts including Fast Track Courts (FTCs) lies within the domain of the State and Union Territory Governments who set up such courts as per their need and resources, in consultation with the concerned High Courts. As a component of its Memorandum submitted to the 14<sup>th</sup> Finance Commission (FC), in order to dispose of cases pertaining to heinous crimes involving women, children etc., the Union Government had proposed setting up of 1800 of FTCs at a proposed expenditure of Rs.4144 crore during the period 2015-20, including 63 FTCs at a proposed expenditure of Rs.145.05 crore for NCT of Delhi. The 14<sup>th</sup> FC had endorsed the proposal of the Central Government and urged the State Governments to use the additional fiscal space provided by the 14<sup>th</sup> Finance Commission in the tax devolution from 32% to 42%, for setting up these FTCs.

As per information received from the High Court of Delhi, there are a total of 14 Fast Track Courts operational in Delhi as on 31.03.2019.

1000

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA  
MINISTRY OF LAW & JUSTICE  
(DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE)

RAJYA SABHA

UNSTARRED QUESTION NO.2936

Jus-II

TO BE ANSWERED ON THURSDAY, THE 18<sup>th</sup> JULY, 2019

Appointment of female judges and prosecutors

2936. SHRIMATI KANTA KARDAM:

Will the Minister of LAW AND JUSTICE be pleased to state:

- (a) whether the crimes against women belonging to Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and single women are rising constantly and if so, whether Government proposes to establish special courts separately for the hearing of such cases and if so, the details thereof State/Union Territory-wise including Uttar Pradesh; and
- (b) the number and details of female judges and female Public prosecutors appointed/under consideration for appointment during the last three years for hearing of increasing cases of crimes against women and for providing them speedy justice?

ANSWER

MINISTER OF LAW & JUSTICE, COMMUNICATIONS AND  
ELECTRONICS & INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

(SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD)

(a)-(b): Setting up of Special Courts and their functioning falls within the domain of the State and Union Territory Governments and respective High Courts who set up such courts as per the quantum and seriousness of crimes and their resources. The data on number and details of female judges and female prosecutors appointed/under consideration for appointment during the last three years for hearing of increasing cases of crimes against women and for providing them speedy justice is not maintained at Central Government level.

However, as per information received from High Courts, there are **581** Fast Track Courts dealing with crimes that are heinous in nature and which include crimes against women, children and other marginalized communities etc are functioning across the country. The State-wise details of such courts is provided in **Annexure-I**. Further, as per information received from the High Courts, a total of **702** Special Courts have been set up as per the provisions of The Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Amendment Act, 2015, the State-wise details of which are provided in **Annexure-II**.

10-11-12



ANNEXURE-I

Sl. No.	Name of the State/UT	No. of Fast Track Courts functional (as on 31.03.2019)
1.	Andhra Pradesh	21
2.	Assam	03
3.	Arunachal Pradesh	0
4.	Mizoram	02
5.	Nagaland	0
6.	Bihar	45
7.	Chhattisgarh	23
8.	Delhi	14
9.	Goa	0
10.	Maharashtra	77
11.	Gujarat	0
12.	Haryana	05
13.	Punjab	0
14.	Chandigarh	0
15.	Himachal Pradesh	0
16.	Jammu & Kashmir	0
17.	Jharkhand	0
18.	Karnataka	0
19.	Kerala & Lakshadweep	0
20.	Madhya Pradesh	0
21.	Manipur	04
22.	Meghalaya	0
23.	Odisha	0
24.	Rajasthan	0
25.	Sikkim	02
26.	Tamil Nadu	50
27.	Puducherry	0
28.	Tripura	03
29.	Uttar Pradesh	206
30.	Uttarakhand	0
31.	West Bengal & Andaman and Nicobar	88
32.	Telangana	38
33.	Daman & Diu	0
34.	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>581</b>

**ANNEXURE-II**

Sl. No.	Name of the State/UT	No. of Special Courts functional as per the provisions of The Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes (PoA) Act (as on 31.03.2019)
1.	Andhra Pradesh	13
2.	Assam	0
3.	Arunachal Pradesh	0
4.	Mizoram	02
5.	Nagaland	08
6.	Bihar	37
7.	Chhattisgarh	23
8.	Delhi	11
9.	Goa	02
10.	Maharashtra	170
11.	Gujarat	63
12.	Haryana	21
13.	Punjab	22
14.	Chandigarh	01
15.	Himachal Pradesh	0
16.	Jammu & Kashmir	0
17.	Jharkhand	24
18.	Karnataka	32
19.	Kerala & Lakshadweep	14
20.	Madhya Pradesh	50
21.	Manipur	0
22.	Meghalaya	0
23.	Odisha	94
24.	Rajasthan	35
25.	Sikkim	04
26.	Tamil Nadu	06
27.	Puducherry	0
28.	Tripura	05
29.	Uttar Pradesh	40
30.	Uttarakhand	13
31.	West Bengal & Andaman and Nicobar	0
32.	Telangana	10
33.	Daman & Diu	01
34.	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	01
	<b>Total</b>	<b>702</b>

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA  
MINISTRY OF LAW & JUSTICE  
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

RAJYA SABHA

NM

UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 2937  
TO BE ANSWERED ON THURSDAY, THE 18<sup>TH</sup> JULY, 2019

Commission for judicial reforms

2937. SHRI VIJAY PAL SINGH TOMAR:

Will the Minister of LAW AND JUSTICE be pleased to state:

- (a) whether Government proposes to fix any time-limit for disposal of criminal and civil cases in various courts in the country;
- (b) if so, the details thereof;
- (c) whether Government proposes to set up any commission or committee for judicial reforms, for speedy disposal of pending court cases and for opening of new benches of High Courts in various States in order to help the people in getting speedy justice and disposal of pending cases against them; and
- (d) if so, the details thereof and if not, the reasons therefor?

ANSWER

MINISTER OF LAW AND JUSTICE, COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS &  
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY  
(SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD)

(a): No, Sir.

(b): Does not arise.

(c) and (d): As regards judicial reforms and speedy disposal of pending court cases, the Central Government is fully committed to speedy disposal of cases in accordance with Article 21 of the Constitution. The Central Government has taken several initiatives to provide an ecosystem for faster disposal of cases by the judiciary. The National Mission for Justice Delivery and Legal Reforms established by the Government has adopted a coordinated approach for phased liquidation of arrears and pendency in judicial administration through various strategic initiatives, including improving infrastructure for courts, leveraging Information and Communication Technology (ICT) for better justice delivery, and filling up of vacant

positions of Judges in High Courts and Supreme Court. The major achievements during the last five years under various initiatives to make the functioning of judiciary more efficient are as follows:

(i) Improving infrastructure for Judicial Officers of District and Subordinate Courts:

As on date, Rs.6,986.50 crores have been released since the inception of the Centrally Sponsored Scheme (CSS) for Development of Infrastructure Facilities for Judiciary in 1993-94. Out of this, 3,542.20crores (which are 50.70% of the total amount released till date) have been released to the States and UTs since April, 2014. The number of court halls has increased from 15,818 as on 30.06.2014 to 19,186 as on date and number of residential units has increased from 10,211 as on 30.06.2014 to 16,855 as on date under this scheme. In addition, 2,822 court halls and 1,856 residential units are under construction. The Central Government has approved continuation of the Scheme beyond the 12<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan period *i.e.* from 01.04.2017 to 31.03.2020 with an estimated additional outlay of Rs.3,320 crore.

(ii) Leveraging Information and Communication Technology (ICT) for improved justice delivery:

Government has been implementing the e-Courts Mission Mode Project throughout the country for Information and Communication Technology enablement of district and subordinate courts. Number of computerised District & Subordinate courts has increased from 13,672 to 16,845 registering an increase of 3,173 during 2014 till date. New and user-friendly version of Case Information Software developed and deployed at all the computerized District and Subordinate Courts. QR Code facility made operational in the software, which enables to check current status of the case. National Judicial Data Grid (NJDG) provides citizens with online information about case filings, case status and electronic copies of orders and judgments from district and subordinate courts that have already been computerized. Information regarding 11.73 crore cases is available on this portal. eCourts services such as details of case registration, cause list, case status, daily orders & final judgments are available to litigants and advocates through eCourts web portal, Judicial Service Centres

(JSC) in all computerised courts, eCourts Mobile App, email service, SMS push & pull services. Information Kiosks have been setup at all computerized court complexes for disseminating judicial information related to cause lists and other case related information to the lawyers and litigants. eCourts Project has been consistently amongst the top 5 Mission Mode Projects of country.

- (iii): Filling up of vacant positions in Supreme Court, High Courts and District and Subordinate Courts: From 01.05.2014 to 30.06.2019, 31 Judges were appointed in Supreme Court. 454 new Judges were appointed and 366 Additional Judges were made permanent in the High Courts. Sanctioned strength of Judges of High Courts has been increased from 906 in May, 2014 to 1079 currently. Sanctioned and working strength of Judicial Officers in District and Subordinate Courts has been increased as follows:

As on	Sanctioned Strength	Working Strength
31.12.2013	19,518	15,115
15.07.2019	23,228	17,987

- (iv) Reduction in Pendency through / follow up by Arrears Committees: Further, in pursuance of resolution passed in Chief Justices' Conference held in April, 2015, Arrears Committees have been set up in High Courts to clear cases pending for more than five years. Arrears Committees have been set up under District Judges too. Arrears Committee has been constituted in the Supreme Court to formulate steps to reduce pendency of cases in High Courts and District Courts.
- (v) Emphasis on Alternate Dispute Resolution (ADR): Commercial Courts Act, 2015 (as amended on 20<sup>th</sup> August, 2018) stipulates mandatory pre-Institution mediation and settlement of commercial disputes. Amendment to the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 has been made by the Arbitration and Conciliation (Amendment) Act 2015 for expediting the speedy resolution of disputes by prescribing timelines.

(vi) Initiatives to Fast Track Special Type of Cases: The Fourteenth Finance Commission endorsed the proposal of the Government to strengthen the judicial system in States which included, *inter-alia*, establishing Fast Track Courts for cases of heinous crimes; cases involving senior citizens, women, children *etc.*, and urged the State Governments to use the additional fiscal space provided in the form of enhanced tax devolution from 32% to 42% to meet such requirements. At present, 581 such Fast Track Courts are functioning across the country. To fast track criminal cases involving elected MPs / MLAs, twelve (12) Special Courts were set up in eleven (11) States (Andhra Pradesh, Telangana, Kerala, Karnataka, Tamil Nadu, Maharashtra, Madhya Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, West Bengal and NCT of Delhi) and proportionate funds have been released to these States by the Government. The Criminal Law (Amendment) Act, 2018 has been enacted on 11.08.2018 to amend the Indian Penal Code, Indian Evidence Act, 1872, the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 and the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012.

As regards opening of new benches of High Courts in various States, there is no proposal to set up any commission or committee for opening of new benches of High Courts in various States. Benches are established in accordance with the recommendations made by Jaswant Singh Commission and judgment pronounced by the Apex Court in W.P. (C) No. 379 of 2000 and after due consideration of a complete proposal from State Government incorporating readiness to provide infrastructure and meet the expenditure, along with the consent of the Chief Justice of the High Court concerned who is authorized to look after day to day administration of the High Court and its Bench(es). The proposal should also have the consent of the Governor of the concerned State. The Government has been receiving requests from various quarters for establishment of High Court Benches in different regions. However, at present, there is no complete proposal from any State Government for establishment of High Court Bench(es).

\*\*\*\*\*