

2019

LOK SABHA REPLIES

**MONSOON SESSION, 2019
[1ST SESSION OF
SEVENTEENTH LOK SABHA]**

**[17TH JUNE, 2019 TO 26TH
JULY, 2019]**

INDEX

Sl.No.	Question No.	Question Type	Date	Subject	Division	Page No.
1.	74	Starred	26.06.2019	Fast Track Courts	Justice.II	1
2.	674	Unstarred	26.06.2019	Monitoring the Performance of Judges	NM	11
3.	688	Unstarred	26.06.2019	Free Legal Assistance to Poor	LAP	13
4.	718	Unstarred	26.06.2019	Task Force to Expedite Justice	NM	19
5.	757	Unstarred	26.06.2019	Appointment of Retired Judges	Justice.I	21
6.	764	Unstarred	26.06.2019	Lok Adalats	LAP	23
7.	792	Unstarred	26.06.2019	Annual Performance Review Index		41
8.	821	Unstarred	26.06.2019	Corruption in Judicial Service	NM	43
9.	856	Unstarred	26.06.2019	Land Related Disputes	NM	45
10.	1818	Unstarred	03.07.2019	Time Frame for Disposal of Criminal Cases	NM	47
11.	1823	Unstarred	03.07.2019	Disposal of Court Cases	NM	53
12.	1827	Unstarred	03.07.2019	Family Courts	Justice.II	57
13.	1875	Unstarred	03.07.2019	eCourts Mission Mode Project	eCourts	59
14.	1925	Unstarred	03.07.2019	Vacant Posts in Lower Judiciary	NM	67
15.	1939	Unstarred	03.07.2019	Contempt Cases	NM	71
16.	1943	Unstarred	03.07.2019	Setting up of Circuit Bench	Appointments Division	73
17.	1965	Unstarred	03.07.2019	Land Dispute Cases	NM	75
18.	1981	Unstarred	03.07.2019	Justice Clock System	eCourts	79
19.	2011	Unstarred	03.07.2019	Pending Court Cases	NM	85
20.	2029	Unstarred	03.07.2019	Judicial Impact Assessment	NM	87
21.	249	Starred	10.07.2019	Shortage of Judges	Appointments Division	89
22.	2734	Unstarred	10.07.2019	Affordable Justice	LAP	93
23.	2755	Unstarred	10.07.2019	Setting up of Benches of High Court	Appointments Division	97
24.	2774	Unstarred	10.07.2019	Constitution of Anomalies	Ad.II(Coord)	103

Sl.No.	Question No.	Question Type	Date	Subject	Division	Page No.
25.	2835	Unstarred	10.07.2019	Reservation in Judicial Recruitment	NM	105
26.	2864	Unstarred	10.07.2019	Family Courts	Justice.II	111
27.	2874	Unstarred	10.07.2019	Under Trials	LAP	117
28.	2880	Unstarred	10.07.2019	Gram Nyayalayas	JR Desk	119
29.	2881	Unstarred	10.07.2019	Nyaya Mitra Scheme	A2J	121
30.	2886	Unstarred	10.07.2019	Pending Cases in Supreme Court	NM	123
31.	2940	Unstarred	10.07.2019	Posts in Higher Judiciary	Appointments Division	129
32.	2943	Unstarred	10.07.2019	Increase in the Number of Courts	NM	133
33.	3904	Unstarred	17.07.2019	Threats Faced by Witnesses	A2J	135
34.	3915	Unstarred	10.07.2019	Special District Courts	Justice.II	139
35.	3944	Unstarred	10.07.2019	Pending Court Cases	NM	143
36.	3953	Unstarred	10.07.2019	Corruption in Judiciary	NM	145
37.	3991	Unstarred	10.07.2019	Sanctioned Posts of Judges	Appointments Division	147
38.	4002	Unstarred	10.07.2019	Appointments of Chief Justices in High Courts	Appointments Division	149
39.	4022	Unstarred	10.07.2019	Pending Cases in Family Courts	Justice.II	151
40.	4070	Unstarred	10.07.2019	Filing of Petition in Hindi	Justice.I	153
41.	4090	Unstarred	10.07.2019	Fast Track Courts	Justice.II	155
42.	443	Starred	24.07.2019	Translation of SC Judgements	Justice.I	157
43.	452	Unstarred	24.07.2019	Fast Track Courts	Justice.II	159
44.	5052	Unstarred	24.07.2019	Performance of Schemes Launched	A2J	169
45.	5053	Unstarred	24.07.2019	Filling of Posts in Subordinate Judiciary	NM	173
46.	5110	Unstarred	24.07.2019	Court Language	Justice.I	177
47.	5177	Unstarred	24.07.2019	Special Courts for SC/ST	Justice.II	179
48.	5197	Unstarred	24.07.2019	Infrastructure in Courts	JR Desk	183
49.	5205	Unstarred	24.07.2019	Strength of Judges in High Courts	Desk Side	185
50.	5219	Unstarred	24.07.2019	Legal Awareness	LAP	191
51.	5239	Unstarred	24.07.2019	Motor Accidents Claims Tribunals	NM	193
52.	5248	Unstarred	24.07.2019	Family Courts	Justice.II	195

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Justice-II

LOK SABHA

STARRED QUESTION NO.74

TO BE ANSWERED ON WEDNESDAY, THE 26TH JUNE, 2019

Fast Track Courts

†*74. SHRI AJAY NISHAD:

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

- (a) the details of Fast Track Courts (FTCs) functioning in the country, State/UT-wise;
- (b) the number of cases disposed of during the last three years along with the number of cases pending in these courts at present, State/UT-wise;
- (c) the total funds allocated and spent for setting up of these courts during each of the last three years and the current year, State/UT-wise;
- (d) whether the Government proposes to set up more FTCs in the country; and
- (e) if so, the details thereof, State/UT-wise?

ANSWER

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

(SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD)

(a) to (e): A statement is laid on the Table of the House.

STATEMENT REFERRED TO IN REPLY TO PARTS (a) TO (e) OF THE LOK SABHA STARRED QUESTION NO.74 FOR 26TH JUNE, 2019 REGARDING FAST TRACK COURTS

(a): Setting up of subordinate courts including Fast Track Courts (FTCs) comes within the domain of the State Governments which in consultation with the respective High Courts set up such courts. A statement indicating State-wise number of FTCs reported functional is enclosed as **Annexure-I**.

(b): The information on the number of cases disposed of during the last three years and the number of cases presently pending in these courts, as made available by the High Courts, is at **Annexure-II**.

(c)-(e): An amount of Rs.870 crore was released to the State Governments for FTCs during a period of 11 years from 2000-01 to 2010-2011 and Central funding was discontinued beyond **31.03.2011**. The Central grants released to the States for FTCs from 2000-2001 to 2010-2011 is given as **Annexure-III**. The Central Government decided to provide funds upto a maximum of Rs.80 crore per annum on a matching basis upto **31.03.2015** from the 13th Finance Commission Award for meeting expenditure on salaries of the 10% additional positions of Judges being created in the subordinate Judiciary following the direction of Supreme Court in the case of Brij Mohan Lal Vs. Union of India. The State Governments and Chief Justices of the High Courts were requested to utilize these positions for creation of FTCs also.

The 14th Finance Commission (14th FC) endorsed the proposal of the Union of India to strengthen the judicial system in States which includes, inter-alia, establishing **1800** FTCs for a period of five years for cases of heinous crimes; cases involving senior citizens, women, children, disabled and litigants affected with HIV AIDS and other terminal ailments; and civil disputes involving land acquisition and property/rent disputes pending for more than five years at a cost of **Rs.4144 crore** which is enclosed as **Annexure-IV**. The 14th FC had urged the State Governments to use the additional fiscal space provided by the Commission in the tax devolution to meet such requirements. The Union Government has urged the State Governments to allocate funds for the activities mentioned in the 14th FC recommendations from their State budgets from the Financial Year 2015-16 onwards and to strengthen the existing coordination and monitoring mechanism between the State Governments and the Judiciary for effective implementation of the recommendations of the 14th FC.

The details of funds allocated by the State/UT Governments and their expenditure for setting up and running these courts during each of the last three years and the current year State/UT-wise is not maintained at Central Government level.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Justice-II

LOK SABHA

STARRED QUESTION NO.74

TO BE ANSWERED ON WEDNESDAY, THE 26TH JUNE, 2019

Fast Track Courts

†*74. SHRI AJAY NISHAD:

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

- (a) the details of Fast Track Courts (FTCs) functioning in the country, State/UT-wise;
- (b) the number of cases disposed of during the last three years along with the number of cases pending in these courts at present, State/UT-wise;
- (c) the total funds allocated and spent for setting up of these courts during each of the last three years and the current year, State/UT-wise;
- (d) whether the Government proposes to set up more FTCs in the country; and
- (e) if so, the details thereof, State/UT-wise?

ANSWER

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

(SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD)

(a) to (e): A statement is laid on the Table of the House.

STATEMENT REFERRED TO IN REPLY TO PARTS (a) TO (e) OF THE LOK SABHA STARRED QUESTION NO.74 FOR 26TH JUNE, 2019 REGARDING FAST TRACK COURTS

(a): Setting up of subordinate courts including Fast Track Courts (FTCs) comes within the domain of the State Governments which in consultation with the respective High Courts set up such courts. A statement indicating State-wise number of FTCs reported functional is enclosed as **Annexure-I**.

(b): The information on the number of cases disposed of during the last three years and the number of cases presently pending in these courts, as made available by the High Courts, is at **Annexure-II**.

(c)-(e): An amount of Rs.870 crore was released to the State Governments for FTCs during a period of 11 years from 2000-01 to 2010-2011 and Central funding was discontinued beyond **31.03.2011**. The Central grants released to the States for FTCs from 2000-2001 to 2010-2011 is given as **Annexure-III**. The Central Government decided to provide funds upto a maximum of Rs.80 crore per annum on a matching basis upto **31.03.2015** from the 13th Finance Commission Award for meeting expenditure on salaries of the 10% additional positions of Judges being created in the subordinate Judiciary following the direction of Supreme Court in the case of Brij Mohan Lal Vs. Union of India. The State Governments and Chief Justices of the High Courts were requested to utilize these positions for creation of FTCs also.

The 14th Finance Commission (14th FC) endorsed the proposal of the Union of India to strengthen the judicial system in States which includes, inter-alia, establishing **1800** FTCs for a period of five years for cases of heinous crimes; cases involving senior citizens, women, children, disabled and litigants affected with HIV AIDS and other terminal ailments; and civil disputes involving land acquisition and property/rent disputes pending for more than five years at a cost of **Rs.4144 crore** which is enclosed as **Annexure-IV**. The 14th FC had urged the State Governments to use the additional fiscal space provided by the Commission in the tax devolution to meet such requirements. The Union Government has urged the State Governments to allocate funds for the activities mentioned in the 14th FC recommendations from their State budgets from the Financial Year 2015-16 onwards and to strengthen the existing coordination and monitoring mechanism between the State Governments and the Judiciary for effective implementation of the recommendations of the 14th FC.

The details of funds allocated by the State/UT Governments and their expenditure for setting up and running these courts during each of the last three years and the current year State/UT-wise is not maintained at Central Government level.

ANNEXURE-I

STATEMENT REFERRED TO IN REPLY TO PART (a) OF THE LOK SABHA STARRED QUESTION NO. 74 TO BE ANSWERED ON 26.06.2019

Sl. No.	Name of the State/UT	No. of FTCs 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
	Total	581

ANNEXURE-II

STATEMENT REFERRED TO IN REPLY TO PART (b) OF THE LOK SABHA STARRED QUESTION NO. 74 TO BE ANSWERED ON 26.06.2019

Sl. No.	Name of the State/UT	No. of FTCs functional (as on 31.03.2019)	Cases disposed off in FTCs during 2016	Cases disposed off in FTCs during 2017	Cases disposed off in FTCs during 2018	Cases pending in FTCs
1.	Andhra Pradesh	21	1861	2615	2504	5364 as on 30.04.2019
2.	Assam	03	-	2990	2314	2042 as on 31.05.2019
3.	Maharashtra	77	30153	35046	32807	79436 as on 31.03.2019
4.	West Bengal & Andaman and Nicobar	88	12351	15482	16358	46678 as on 31.05.2019
5.	Chhattisgarh	23	-	3840	3862	4989 as on 31.05.2019
6.	Manipur	04	675 cases disposed during last three years			311 as on 31.03.2019
7.	Bihar	45	-	5889	11525	20092 as on 31.05.2019
8.	Delhi	14	1295	1487	1559	4363 as on 31.03.2019
9.	Haryana	05	-	-	166	801 as on 30.04.2019
10.	Sikkim	02	-	03	09	11 as on 31.03.2019
11.	Tripura	03	897 cases disposed during last three years			1085 as on 31.03.2019
12.	Uttar Pradesh	206	-	456477 cases disposed of during 2017 and 2018		425442 as on 31.05.2019

**STATEMENT REFERRED TO IN REPLY TO PARTS (c) AND (d) OF THE LOK SABHA
STARRED QUESTION NO.74 FOR 26.06.2019**

Central Grants released to States for Fast Track Courts from 2000-01 to 2010-11 (Rs. In lakh)

Sl. No	Name of the state	Released from 2000-01 to 2004-05 *	Central Grant released by Department of Justice						Grand Total
			2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	Andhra Pradesh	2250.00	550.50	412.80	412.80	142.40	-	1096.00	4864.50
2	Arunachal Pradesh	52.69	19.20	14.40	14.40	14.40	14.40	14.40	143.89
3	Assam	530.10	128.00	96.00	96.00	91.20	96.00	96.00	1133.30
4	Bihar	4766.40	960.30	720.00	720.00	720.00	720.00	720.00	9326.70
5	Chhattisgarh	791.10	198.40	129.60	129.60	148.80	148.80	129.60	1675.90
6	Goa	125.10	32.00	24.00	24.00	19.20	14.40	24.00	262.70
7	Gujarat	3226.68	1062.80	1355.90	571.20	580.80	-	777.60	7574.98
8	Haryana	422.31	102.40	33.60	67.20	38.40	76.80	67.20	807.90
9	Himachal Pradesh	108.59	57.60	43.57	0	38.40	43.20	43.20	334.56
10	J & K	300.60	-	-	-	-	-	-	300.60
11	Jharkhand	2319.30	569.80	226.00	190.17	249.60	196.80	192.00	3943.67
12	Karnataka	2431.80	595.40	610.80	230.40	182.40	446.40	441.60	4938.80
13	Kerala	815.25	198.40	148.80	148.80	148.80	148.80	148.80	1757.65
14	Madhya Pradesh	2223.90	422.50	215.40	259.80	312.00	316.80	316.80	4067.20
15	Maharashtra	4352.40	1197.20	1101.60	782.40	417.60	412.80	537.60	8801.60
16	Manipur	90.00	12.80	9.60	9.60	9.60	9.60	9.60	150.80
17	Meghalaya	90.00	19.20	14.40	0	28.80	-	28.80	181.20
18	Mizoram	90.00	19.20	17.68	14.40	14.40	14.40	14.40	184.48
19	Nagaland	54.90	12.80	18.18	9.60	9.60	9.60	9.60	124.28
20	Orissa	1866.60	262.40	196.80	158.40	158.40	168.00	168.00	2978.60
21	Punjab	746.10	115.20	48.00	51.20	0	163.20	81.60	1205.30
22	Rajasthan	2238.05	531.40	753.64	398.40	398.40	398.40	398.40	5116.69
23	Sikkim	29.70	-	-	-	-	-	-	29.70
24	Tamil Nadu	1151.90	313.70	235.20	235.20	0	470.40	235.20	2641.60
25	Tripura	73.80	19.20	3.80	0	0	11.56	0	108.36
26	Uttar Pradesh	6319.80	288.00	3075.69	495.52	1161.60	1161.60	1094.40	13596.61
27	Uttarakhand	1173.60	1549.80	216.00	129.60	0	-	99.62	3168.62
28	West Bengal	3972.60	761.80	571.20	571.20	571.20	571.20	571.20	7590.40
	Total	42613.27	10000.00	10292.66	5719.89	5456.00	5613.16	7315.62	87010.60

*Grants released to the States from 2000-01 to 2004-2005 by Ministry of Finance

ANNEXURE-IV**STATEMENT REFERRED TO IN REPLY TO PARTS (d) and (e) OF THE LOK SABHA
STARRED QUESTION NO.74 TO BE ANSWERED ON 26.06. 2019**

Funds proposed for establishment of 1800 Fast Track Courts for a period of five years (2015-2020) under Grants-in-Aid as endorsed by the 14th Finance Commission.

(Rs. in crore)

S.No	Name of the State	No. of FTCs proposed	Funds proposed
1.	Andhra Pradesh	47	108.21
2.	Telangana	37	85.18
3.	Assam	36	82.88
4.	Arunachal Pradesh	0	0.00
5.	Mizoram	07	16.12
6.	Nagaland	03	6.91
7.	Bihar	147	338.43
8.	Chhattisgarh	28	64.46
9.	Gujarat	174	400.59
10.	Himachal Pradesh	13	29.93
11.	Jammu & Kashmir	21	48.35
12.	Jharkhand	50	115.11
13.	Karnataka	95	218.72
14.	Kerala, Lakshadweep	41	94.39
15.	Madhya Pradesh	133	306.20
16.	Maharashtra, D&N, Daman & Diu	204	469.67
17.	Goa	05	11.51
18.	Manipur	03	6.91
19.	Meghalaya	04	9.21
20.	Orissa	63	145.04
21.	Punjab	50	115.11
22.	Chandigarh	02	4.61
	Haryana	48	110.51
23.	Rajasthan	93	214.11
24.	Sikkim	01	2.3
25.	Tamil Nadu, Puducherry	89	204.91
26.	Tripura	09	20.72
27.	Uttar Pradesh	212	488.08
28.	Uttarakhand	28	64.46
29.	West Bengal, A&N Islands	94	216.42
30.	Delhi	63	145.05
	Total	1800	4144.11

N M

**GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF LAW & JUSTICE
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE**

LOK SABHA

UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 674

TO BE ANSWERED ON WEDNESDAY, THE 26TH JUNE, 2019.

Monitoring the Performance of Judges

674. SHRI ADHIR RANJAN CHOWDHURY:

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

- (a) whether there is any mechanism available to monitor the work performance of Judges and if so, the details thereof;**
- (b) whether the Government is considering the setting up of work performance commission to monitor the performance of Judges and if so, the details thereof and if not, the reasons therefor; and**
- (c) the steps taken by the Government to involve a scientific method of performance appraisal of judicial officers by setting a measurable performance standard?**

ANSWER

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

(a) to (c): The performance evaluation of Judges in the Supreme Court and the High Courts is a matter in the domain of the Supreme Court and the High Courts. The administrative control over District and Subordinate Judiciary vests with the concerned High Court as per provisions contained in the Constitution of India. As per information available, various High Courts have framed their own rules and guidelines for giving credit to judicial officer for disposal of various categories of cases which are included in the performance appraisal of judges of subordinate judiciary.

The Supreme Court has constituted National Court Management System (NCMS) Committee. A Sub Committee of the NCMS Committee has looked into the issue of developing a National Framework of Court Excellence to set measurable standards of performance for courts and a monitoring mechanism to measure these performance parameters. The Sub-Committee has submitted its report to the NCMS. There is no proposal at present to set up a Performance Appraisal Commission by the Government.

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

LAP

LOK SABHA

UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 688

TO BE ANSWERED ON WEDNESDAY, THE 26TH JUNE, 2019

Free Legal Assistance to Poor

†688. SHRI RAMCHARAN BOHRA:

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

- (a) whether the Government provides financial assistance to States/Union Territories to give free legal assistance to poor and undertrial prisoners;
- (b) if so, the criteria fixed for this purpose;
- (c) the details of funds provided/utilised for this purpose during each of the last three years, States/Union Territorywise;
- (d) whether the Government proposes to amend the present norms so that proper utilisation of the said funds can be ensured and if so, the details thereof; and
- (e) the other steps taken/being taken by the Government to provide free legal assistance to poor and undertrial prisoners in the country?

ANSWER

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

- (a) & (b) Central Government provides financial assistance to State Legal Services Authorities (SLSAs) through National Legal Services Authority (NALSA) to carry out the functions as provided under the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. These functions include providing free legal services to all entitled categories of persons, including poor and undertrial prisoners, under section 12 of the said Act. NALSA

allocates funds out of the grants-in-aid received from Central Government to various SLSAs to achieve the objectives of the said Act. In addition, grants or donations could be made to the SLSAs by the respective State Government.

(c) A statement showing funds allocated by NALSA to different SLSAs and funds utilized by SLSAs during the last three years is at Annexure-I.

(d) Does not arise in view of (a) above.

(e) In April, 2017, Government has launched three legal empowerment initiatives, namely, Tele-Law, Pro Bono legal services and Nyaya Mitra. Tele-law scheme has been launched in 1800 gram panchayats in 11 States of the country for providing free legal advice to marginalized persons under section 12 of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Other persons can obtain legal advice on payment of Rs.30 only. The facility is available at Common Service Centres (CSCs) where legal advice is provided through video conferencing or telephone chat with a Panel Lawyer. Tele-Law Mobile Application & Tele-Law Dashboard for facilitating last mile connectivity was launched in February, 2019.

Under Pro Bono legal services scheme, free legal aid including legal representation, is provided to marginalized persons under section 12 of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. 533 advocates have been registered for providing pro bono legal services. Nyaya Bandhu Mobile Application to connect registered Pro Bono Advocates with registered Applicants was launched in February, 2019.

In addition, NALSA also provides free and competent legal services to under trial prisoner and convicts through legal services clinics opened in jails. About 11,800 Remand Advocates have been appointed in Magisterial Courts and Session Courts for providing legal services to arrestees in criminal courts. Further, awareness camps / programmes are conducted in jails at regular intervals to make prisoners aware about free legal aid and their legal rights including right to bail. Regular visits are made by functionaries of Legal Services Authorities to jails to identify prisoners who require legal

aid and advice. Apart from the above measures, Under Trial Review Committee headed by District Judge have also been set up in all the Districts to review the cases of all under trials who have completed half of the maximum sentence provided for the offences they are charged with.

11

Annexure-I

Statement as referred to in reply to Part (c) of Lok Sabha Unstarred Question No. 688 for 26.06.2019 raised by Shri Ramcharan Bohra, MP regarding Free Legal Assistance to Poor.

Details of funds allocated by National Legal Services Authority to State Legal Services Authorities and utilized during the last three financial years viz 2016-17, 2017-18 and 2018-19.

S. No	Name of the State Authority	Amount of Funds Allocated (in lakhs) Rs.	Funds utilised (in lakhs) Rs.	Amount of Funds Allocated (in lakhs) Rs.	Funds utilised (in lakhs) Rs.	Amount of Funds Allocated (in lakhs) Rs.	Funds utilised (in lakhs) Rs.
		2016-17	2016-17	2017-18	2017-18	2018-19	2018-19
1	Andhra Pradesh	400	493.41	400	529.3	400	418.93
2	Arunachal Pradesh		85.83	100	227.32	100	225.34
3	Assam	200	288.7	550	579.36	600	360.33
4	Bihar		123.36		392.71	250	428.73
5	Chhattisgarh	300	284.32	400	511.96	800	794.90
6	Goa	100	69.34		68.35		82.94
7	Gujarat	100	375.54	350	368.81	350	385.58
8	Haryana	732.96	494.46	700	959.09	850	950.43
9	Himachal Pradesh	400	429.34	100	487.86	400	468.18
10	J & K	200	185.52	200	368.43	450	503.50
11	Jharkhand	800	293.57	100	633.24	700	753.56
12	Karnataka	722	322.05	700	828.56	850	984.92
13	Kerala	800	590	800	955.59	1050	1263.18
14	Madhya Pradesh		476.23	400	595.35	300	442.47
15	Maharashtra	700	356.96	100	735.03	600	597.55
16	Manipur	100	235.42	300	425.39	350	333.89
17	Meghalaya		26.56		92.2		25.16
18	Mizoram	250	264.07	200	437.23	400	335.29
19	Nagaland	450	260.26	300	396.61	300	417.19
20	Orissa	530	429.7	800	907.32	700	682.04
21	Punjab	600	563.3	800	999.23	950	1209.85
22	Rajasthan	750	546.35	800	1161.04	1800	1804.04
23	Sikkim	100	28.63		120.55		123.43
24	Tamil Nadu	600	398.75	700	762.35	600	707.98
25	Telangana	250	190.4	200	357.68	200	347.48
26	Tripura	250	327.13	500	445.25	300	444.42
27	Uttar Pradesh	300	295.38	600	550.61	100	349.88
28	Uttarakhand	200	106.16	100	261.32	200	224.16

29	West Bengal	300	245.56	200	549	900	769.78
30	And. & Nico. Islands		8.38		13.66		20.94
31	U.T. Chandigarh	100	68.98	200	162.2		163.54
32	D & Nagar Haveli		3.52		7.86		4.36
33	Daman & Diu		3.02		1.2		3.52
34	Delhi	775	535.28	700	777.92	1000	983.11
35	Lakshadweep		13.61		10.23		9.96
36	U.T.Puducherry		75.92	200	108.04		37.90
	TOTAL	11009.96	9495.01	11500	16787.85	15500	17658.46

Note: The unspent grant pertaining to any particular previous financial year is carried forward to the subsequent financial year for its utilisation.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF LAW & JUSTICE
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

MM
LOK SABHA

UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 718

TO BE ANSWERED ON WEDNESDAY, THE 26TH JUNE, 2019.

Task Force to Expedite Justice

†718. DR. RAMAPATI RAM TRIPATHI:

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

- (a) whether the Government has constituted any task force to expedite the process for providing justice;
- (b) if so, the details of the judicial impact assessment made by the Government along with the main features of the task force;
- (c) the follow up action taken by the Government for the implementation of the recommendations of the said task force;
- (d) whether the Government has made any assessment of the additional expenditure incurred on such task force; and
- (e) if so, the details thereof?

ANSWER

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

(a): A Task Force on 'Judicial Impact Assessment' was constituted by the Government on directions of Supreme Court of India in the matter of Salem Advocates Bar Association *versus* Union of India under the chairmanship of Justice M. Jagannadha Rao (Retd.), former Judge of Supreme Court and formerly Chairman, Law Commission of India. The Task Force submitted its report on 15th June, 2008, which was placed before the Supreme Court of India.

(b): The Terms of Reference of the Task Force *inter alia* included suggesting the methodology to assess the likely impact of legislation on the courts and also an appropriate framework so that every Bill introduced in Parliament be accompanied by a Judicial Impact Assessment which makes an assessment of financial requirements. The Task Force had *inter alia* recommended setting up of a Judicial Impact Office at the central level as well as at the state level for estimating the extra case load on the courts and extra expenditure to be met by the Central Government or the State Governments, as the case

may be, in respect of their respective legislations. It also recommended that sufficient funds must be allocated for the Judicial Administration in the country, particularly in regard to the infrastructure, expenditure on judicial officers and staff in the Subordinate Courts and High Courts to realize the objectives of Access to Justice and Speedy Justice. The report is available at [[http://doj.gov.in/sites/default/files /judicialimpactassessmentreportvol 1%20%201_0.pdf](http://doj.gov.in/sites/default/files/judicialimpactassessmentreportvol1%20%201_0.pdf)].

(c): The views of the State Governments and High Courts were solicited on the Report of the Task Force. Based on the feedback received from State Governments and High Courts, the matter regarding implementation of the Report of the Task Force was deliberated upon in the meeting of the Advisory Council of National Mission for Justice Delivery and Legal Reforms held in November 2012. It was, *inter-alia*, decided that the methodologies of Judicial Impact Assessment as recommended by the Task Force may be gone into further by a Committee of Experts to assess the practicability of their implementation in the given circumstances. During the Conference of Chief Ministers and Chief Justices held in New Delhi in April, 2013 this matter was included in the Action Taken Report. It was mentioned that expert opinions received so far have expressed practical difficulties in making assessment of the impact of legislation on the workload of judiciary and the practicability of the idea needs to be established before it is implemented. Accordingly, a Committee of Experts was constituted in September, 2013 to examine the issue of implementability of methodologies of Judicial Impact Assessment and suggest further action in this regard. The Committee in its report submitted on 9th January, 2015 concluded that Judicial Impact Assessment was neither feasible nor desirable as a method of proper budgetary planning and allocation of funds for the judiciary.

(d) and (e): Do not arise in view of (c) above.
