

which also falls in the earthquake zone.

SHRI JAGMOHAN: Sir, this aspect is taken care of by the other Ministry and not by the Ministry of Urban Development and Poverty Alleviation. But I am quite sure that while working out the designs for these dams, the earthquake element has been taken into consideration. If you want more details, we will intimate the concerned Ministry about this.

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: Mr. Chairman, Sir, the question which I proposed to put has already been put by Shri Dipankar Mukherjee. However, I want to seek the opinion of the hon. Minister on one point. As per the IS code 1893, the whole country is divided into five zones, depending on the intensity of the earthquake. Sir, as per this classification, the Deccan Plateau is least susceptible to earthquakes. But the recent earthquakes. In Latur and other areas proved the data, which had been earlier provided in this regard, wrong. So, I would like to know whether the Minister can conduct a new survey or study so that these areas can be re-classified, and, accordingly, the precautionary measures that need to be taken in this regard can be communicated to the concerned State Governments.

SHRI JAGMOHAN: Sir, the vulnerability zone depends on the fault-line underneath the earth. It does not depend on a particular area. For example, in the Bhuj area, there is a fault-line that created the problem, but the neighbouring areas may not be in the same zone. So, it is all based on the geological surveys and technical data. In this earthquake also, we have collected the data, and we are making a new documentation. It is part of our proposal.

### **Cases pending in courts**

\*62. SHRI RAMACHANDRA KHUNTIA: Will the Minister of LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that cases are pending in courts for long time because there is delay in appointment of Judges in different courts;

(b) if so, the total number of cases pending in Supreme Court, High Courts and Lower Courts, Labour Courts and Industrial Tribunals as on date; and

(c) whether Government would frame action plan for timely posting of all Judges and to dispose all cases within a fixed time frame?

THE MINISTER OF LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI ARUN JAITLEY): (a) to (c) A Statement is laid on the Table of the House.

**Statement**

(a) Pendency of cases in different courts is arising from various complex factors. These, *inter-alia*, include non-filling up of vacancies of judges, inadequate judge strength, increased institution of cases on account of awareness of the rights on the part of the citizens, enactment of numerous laws, radical change in the pattern of litigation, frequent adjournment of cases, rise in population, lawyers' strike etc.

(b) The number of cases pending in the Supreme Court, High Courts, Lower Courts, CGIT cum Labour Courts is as given in Statement-I.

(c) No time frame can be fixed for posting of judges and for disposal of cases. Appointment of judges to the Supreme Court and High Courts are made in accordance with the provisions in the Constitution of India and the Memorandum of Procedure adopted in this regard. Appointment are made in consultation with the constitutional authorities. Minister for Law, Justice and Company Affairs has been addressing the Chief Justice of India, Chief Justices of the High Courts, Chief Ministers and Governors of States periodically on the need to initiate proposals for appointments six months before the vacancies arise.

Appointment of judicial officers in Subordinate Judiciary are made by the State Governments in consultation with their respective High Courts under Articles 233 and 234 of the Constitution. State Governments and the High Courts have been addressed periodically on the need to fill up all vacant posts, and create more posts where necessary.

Expeditious steps are being taken to fill up the vacant posts of the Presiding Officers in CGIT cum Labour Courts after observing all formalities.

**Statement-I**

*Number of cases pending in Supreme Court, High Courts, Lower Courts and CGIT cum Labour Courts*

	Number of cases pending	As on
Supreme Court	21,936	1.2.2001
High Court	34,33,385	30.6.2000
Lower Courts	2,01,86,913	31.12.1998
CGIT cum Labour Courts	10,074	31.12.2000

SHRI RAMACHANDRA KHUNTIA: Mr. Chairman, Sir, as has been admitted by the Government, the two factors, namely, non-filling up of vacancies

of judges and inadequate judge strength are primarily responsible for pendency of cases in courts. But I am surprised to read para (c) of the reply where the Government has categorically said that no time-frame can be fixed for posting of judges and for disposal of cases. Sir, delay in deciding cases means denial of justice to the poor. So, I want to know: How many posts in the Supreme Court and the different High Courts are, at present, lying vacant, and whether any time-frame has been fixed for filling up the vacant posts? Sir, is six months' time not enough to fill up these posts? I want to know whether the Government will be able to fill up these posts within six months? Part (b) of my question is: Is there any yardstick for determining the number of judges in different courts, and whether it is determined as per the cases or as per the population? Part (c) of my question is: How many undertrial prisoners are rotting in different jails all over the country, and how much expenditure is incurred on these undertrial prisoners in a day? I want to know whether the total expenditure that is being incurred on these undertrial prisoners is much more than the amount may be enough for setting up of extra or additional courts to dispose of these cases in time.

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: Sir, in the three layers of the judicial hierarchy, as far as the Supreme Court is concerned, presently, there are two vacancies of judges. As against the strength of 26 judges, there are 24 judges today. As far as the different High Courts are concerned we have just created 49 more posts, thus taking the total strength to 647. Out of these, there are 186 vacancies. Sir, with regard to the appointment of 59 new judges, there are proposals which are under consideration at some stage or the other. But, with regard to 127 judges, we have not even received the first proposal from the High Courts. As far as the subordinate courts are concerned, the total number of judge strength is 12,105, and the number of vacancies is about 1400. The second part of the question is, how do we determine the judge strength in each case. Sir, this is determined on two bases as far as the High Courts are concerned, where the issue really arises; and this strength is determined with regard to the number of cases which are filed every year, the number of cases which are disposed of every year, and also the number of cases which are pending beyond a certain number of period of time. For the old cases which are pending, we create posts of, what is known as, additional judges, and depending on the filing and the disposal, we create the posts required in each case. The third part is related to the number of undertrials in Indian prisons. According to the figures, which we have collected from the States, the number is approximately 1.8 lakhs; persons who have still not been convicted, and who are still in prisons.

At the rate of, approximately, Rs. 55 per day, the total amount spent by the State Governments on undertrials each year is Rs. 361 crores.

SHRI RAMACHANDRA KHUNTIA: Mr. Chairman, Sir, my second supplementary is:

(a) whether any quota has been fixed for judges for disposing of cases per year, and if so, whether the disposals of cases by judges individually are reviewed;

(b) whether the Central Government is only writing for appointment, so far as the other courts are concerned, or whether it is pursuing the matter; and

(c) whether the appointment of judges in different courts and benches is delayed because there is a provision for filling up 50 per cent of the posts by promotion and 50 per cent by direct recruitment and these two decisions are to be implemented simultaneously. Is it the reason that the appointment of judges is delayed?

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: Sir, as far as the higher courts in the country are concerned, there is no number or figure fixed for a judge, which he has to dispose of every year. I have the figure of how much disposal has taken place. For example, in the Supreme Court, today, the number of cases pending per judge is about 833. For the High Courts, the figure is much more. It is approximately 5,000 because the arrears have mounted.

We have also the figures that the learned Member wants, about the number of cases disposed of, on an average, per judge every year. As far as the subordinate courts are concerned, there is a figure that is fixed by the High Courts in each State, the number of cases that they are to dispose of. So, both the Government and the Chief Justice of India have been repeatedly writing to the High Courts to start initiating the process of filling up of vacancies, wherever they arise. Under the memorandum of procedure, the process is actually to commence six months before a vacancy arises so that by the time the vacancy arises, the consultation process is completed and we are in a position to make the appointment. But I regret that this has almosts not been done in any case.

As far as the reason for the delay is concerned-this reason for delay is mostly in relation to appointment of judges in the High Courts the broad percentage of which members of the Bar and members of the subordinate judiciary are appointed is currently 60:40 and not 50:50 as the hon. Member indicated. This percentage is not one of the reasons why the delay occurs. There are

several procedures that have been mentioned. The vacancy has to be initiated by the High Court. After it is initiated by the High Court, the Government has to process the names with comments and to send the proposal to the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court Collegium, after consultation makes a recommendation. Various constitutional authorities then discuss it. Meanwhile, the Chief Ministers and the Governors of the States have also to be consulted. As indicated, for instance, today, there are 186 vacancies, and the predominant delay is in the matter of initiating the process of filling up. Out of 186, in 127 cases, the process has not even been started. It has to be initiated by the High Courts.

**SHRI FALI S. NARIMAN:** Sir, I have just one or two points. Picking up the last point first, I think, I need to congratulate the Minister for drawing the attention of the Chief Justices and the Governors to the need to initiate proposals for appointments six months before the vacancies arise.

But there need be no vacancy at all in the High Courts, because even if this is not done, I am sure that the Constitution provides for continuance of judges who are due for retirement at 62 in the High Courts, on an *ad hoc* basis at the request of the Chief Justice or the Chief Justice of India. A mere letter from one of them would be sufficient to induce at least some of the judges who are still able and willing to do their work to continue so that there need be no vacancy.

Second, I don't think that enough has been done for pushing cases. Judges have not to take cases in hand and push them along. The delay in disposals, I am afraid, has much to do with the litigant and his lawyer, as with any other process or procedure. Speaking with some experience in this, I would respectfully suggest that we must explore the ways and means to rather induce judges to push cases along, notwithstanding the protests of the persons who appear for the litigants, notwithstanding the difficulties of some litigants and so on. The idea is of court management. I personally think that a large number of cases, especially in lower courts, should be so disposed of.

The third and the last thing I wish to say is that so far, there is no attempt at all levels by judges to interpose any litigation as they do in the civil cases. We are still in the common law tradition. The Judge decides like an umpire, with adversarial lawyers saying one thing on the one side and another thing on the other. There must be more intervention by the Judges. I know this from my experience in commercial cases in the High Court. For instance, we used to have Judges who were commercially-minded. They would say, "Well, please go out

and try to settle this. This requires to be settled." The moment the Judge says, "Please settle this", by and large, it sets the ball rolling. Then, people do go out and settle the cases. And settling cases means, they go out of the system.

Last but not the least I say this — because it is not very popular in the place where I practice — that there should be more Benches of the Supreme Court in other parts of the country. I am afraid, this does not meet with the approval of the Justices, of the past and present, of the Supreme Court. But I do wish to say this with all humility at my command that it is very unfair to expect a litigant in the far south, in the far east, in the far west to come to Delhi and spend some time, go back, take his lawyer back; literally it costs hundreds and thousands of rupees. I would, therefore, very strongly recommend — you don't have to build buildings, Supreme Courts, all over the country — two or three Judges of the Supreme Court can go and sit in the existing High Courts. These High Courts could accommodate them on certain dates of the week, on certain days of a month or two months. I believe, that would have an additional effect because the Judges of the highest court would meet the Judges of the High Court; in turn, they would meet with the lawyers of that courts and they would acquire a much better base to recommend the appointments or consider whether the appointments of certain persons should or should not be made to various courts. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: Sir, the hon. Member, with his very vast experience, has made some very valuable suggestions. I must confess, I share some of the view which the hon. Member has already placed. It is also the view of the Government. We have again taken up this whole issue of creation of Benches of the Supreme Court, with the Supreme Court.

As far as the matter of settlement of cases outside the court is concerned, the Civil Procedure Code (Amendment) Bill has been introduced in Parliament in the last session. This Bill is under consideration before the Standing Committee. There is already a specific provision to attempt to settle all cases even outside the judicial process by various conciliatory fora. There are also suggestions in that procedural law to bind down the time-limit of each state of a case so that there is no element of discretion so that a case could be finished, or, every state of the case could be finished within the period which is defined.

Regarding the appointment of *ad hoc* Judges, yes, *ad hoc* Judges have been appointed in the past. But, after the 1993 and 1998 judgements of the Supreme Court, the proposal for that issue also to be initiated by the judiciary.

SHRI ADHIK SHIRODKAR: Mr. Chairman, Sir, it would not be an exaggeration to say that, today, if an Ordinance is passed and all fresh filings are stopped for the next 15 years, the backlog will not be wiped out. Would the hon. Minister consider three suggestions? Number one, introduce an element of plea bargaining. Criminal cases which are the largest in number will immediately go down. There may be a case under section 323. Just simply, a man should be charged under section 307. The case will be over in 15 minutes.

Secondly, would the hon. Law Minister consider providing computers containing the latest laws, for the lower judiciary like the Magistrate Courts and Sessions Courts, because most of the time, the Judges do not have the facility of either a library or books in their homes? they are unable to grasp what is the latest on the subject. That takes time.

Last but not the least, would the hon. Law Minister consider appointing *ad hoc* Judges from those who have already retired as High Court Judges or Sessions Judges, for a fixed period of five years or three years, and allow them to sit in the same court by changing the timings of the court so that those who are experienced could wipe out the arrears, as early as possible?

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: Sir, the hon. Member has raised three suggestions or issues with regard to the changes about the Code of Criminal Procedure which would be substantially different from what we have done in regard to the Code of Civil Procedure. The Government has already appointed a Committee of Experts which has already started holding hearings all around the country to suggest suitable amendments to the Criminal Procedure law. This, certainly, is one of the suggestions which has already been made to the members of the Committee. I have had discussions with the members of the Committee. I am sure, once the experts' recommendations come, this hon. House will have an occasion to discuss this.

With regard to providing computers, as far as the judiciary is concerned, use of information technology in courts is also an important methodology by which you are able to fight the arrears. The Supreme Court was able to do it very successfully by using this. It is one court which has actually brought down 80 per cent of the arrears, from over one lakh to over 21,000 cases. This was one of the methodologies that they used. Most High Courts in the country have started using it. This year, on account of the resource crunch, we cannot do it in the first year in more places. But we are now taking steps to give a Central grant with regard to computerisation of the entire subordinate judiciary; in the first

instance, on an experimental basis, to the four major metros. Additionally, the proposal which we have given--and we have sanctioned the first part of the grant--is for setting up five fast-track courts in each district of the country which will deal with cases which have been pending for a long period of time. Within that grant, there is a specific grant which has been made for computerising those courts also because fast-track courts ought to be computerised and work on that basis.

Lastly, there is the suggestion which is repeatedly made with regard to *ad hoc* or retired judges being used to dispose of arrears. I think what we really have to work for is to make sure that regular judges are appointed in time. We cannot really take this plea that we are unable to appoint regular judges in time because we do not get recommendations in time and therefore, we must rely upon retired judges. There is no such study which has been completely done that merely by appointing retired judges, we are able to activate cases. It will also depend on the quality of judges whom we are eventually able to appoint.

**SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE:** The hon. Minister, in the course of his reply, has very correctly pointed out that in as many as 127 cases of vacancies, even the initial process has not yet been started. He has also referred to the problem which his Ministry is facing after the judgement of 1993 and 1998 in the Advocates- on-Record case. In this connection, I would like to know from him this, as he has given the pendency in High Courts as 34 lakh cases, 33,386 lakhs. Sometime back, when we examined the issue in the Parliamentary Standing Committee, we found that 30-40 per cent of the pending cases in the High Courts relate to one High Court which the hon. Minister is fully aware of. That High Court also has a reasonably high number of vacancies of Judges. In that context, I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether he can take some special initiatives, in respect of reducing the pendency of cases, and, if that particular High Court is tackled, the aggregate number of pendency of cases can be reduced substantially. In this connection, I would also like to know from the hon. Minister what steps he is going to take on the point which Mr. Nariman has made, which is about the setting up of Benches of the Supreme Court. If I remember correctly, twice, the Parliamentary Standing Committee has very strongly recommended the setting up of Benches of the Supreme Court, specially in the South and far-flung areas. But we are told, of course by his Ministry, that the Supreme Court is not agreeing because it is going to affect the integrity of the Supreme Court, we are unable to understand and appreciate that position. Therefore, I would like to know from the hon. Minister what steps the



Government is going to take to prevail upon the Supreme Court to meet these requirements by which the hardship of a large number of litigants will be ameliorated to a considerable extent.

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: Sir, the first limb of the hon. Member's question relates to the factum of vacancies and all other steps which are required to be taken, particularly, at the High Court level, in order to expedite the disposal of cases. I must concede at this stage that this is one layer of the judicial system where, in fact, the arrears have been mounting at a faster speed. Even in the subordinate courts, they are broadly static at about a two crore figure. Here, in the last ten years, from about 19 to 20 lakhs, they are today about 34 lakhs, as the figure stands today. Therefore, they are increasing by lakhs, almost every year. There are several steps that the Government has in mind. Under the present process of appointment of judges, as it exists, the Government is doing its utmost, regularly, in fact, more than regularly, writing to each Chief Justice of the High Court, pointing out the number of vacancies, pointing out the date on which a potential vacancy is going to arise and requesting them to send their recommendation. But the figures speak for the facts as they exist.

As far as other steps are concerned, there are several steps which we have in mind to expedite the processes. The first is, in both the major branches of law, we have to simplify our procedure so as to expedite the life of each case itself. We have to compress the time taken in each case. As far as civil law is concerned, after detailed discussions with the hon. members of the Bar and also the Law Commission, we have already placed the changes before the Parliament. With regard to criminal law, changes are being considered. Secondly, we have also tried to identify areas in relation to which a larger number of cases are pending in courts. Each of those areas has been identified, and in a number of those areas, to start with, we are even amending the substantive law so as to compress the life of the case in relation to each substantive law. Thirdly, we have received a suggestion, which is under our consideration, to create a pre-litigative mechanism in several areas where people have remedies before independent fora within various authorities, particularly, in relation to Government and Government departments, where, instead of being pushed to go to courts, their grievances could be redressed within those bodies themselves, particularly, in the case of public utilities. The next step which we have already taken is to fund a Centrally-sponsored scheme the setting up of five fast-track courts in every district of the country where those cases which must have a priority of audience, are heard by the courts. Lastly, the step which

we have now initiated is a gradual process of use of IT in our judicial set-up so that this itself can expedite the entire process of judicial determination.

With regard to the second limb of the question which the hon. Member raised, we are in a process of again entering in consultation with the Supreme Court, and we have sent them the recommendations of the Standing Committee as also the views of the Government and also pressed for the need of setting up a Bench of the Supreme Court in South, particularly. We have argued, and I completely agree with the sentiments of the hon. Member that setting up of a Bench, in no way, affects the integrity or the stature of the Supreme Court. The powers and jurisdiction will remain the same. We have an example in several High Courts where you have more than two Benches of the High Court within the same State; it has, in no way, affected the dignity or stature of those High Courts where there is more than one Bench in those particular States.

SHRI RAJEEV SHUKLA: Sir, I would like to know from the hon. Law Minister whether the Government is considering any proposal to create an Indian Judicial Service, because, recently, the Attorney-General of India has made a statement asking for this kind of service.

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: Well, whenever these suggestions are made, we consider them. But there is no such proposal at an advanced stage of consultation.

SHRI S.R. BOMMAI: Sir, I appreciate the difficulty of the hon. Minister in answering the questions of the hon. Members. The remedy does not lie in requesting and bringing to the notice of the Government these things. There will be no solution. The only solution is by bringing judicial reforms or by having a Judicial Commission, which was promised by his predecessor in this House.

Unless the Executive has an effective say in the matter of appointment of judges, in the matter of transfer of judges and in the matter of creating benches, you cannot find a solution to the disposal of cases. I would like to know whether the Government is considering bringing in judicial reforms; and, particularly the appointment of a National Judicial Commission.

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: Sir, the Government has—and it is also the agenda of the NDA—very categorically promised the setting up of a National Judicial Commission which would deal with the areas which the hon. Member has referred to. I have also checked up ...*(Interruptions)*... I have also checked up that most political parties, in their manifestoes and agendas, have supported this suggestion. Therefore, Sir, there is a broader national consensus which is emerging in that connection. There are some areas which have to be discussed,

for arriving at a broader consensus, particularly, with regard to the composition of this authority. We have already a Commission which is reviewing this and which is also conducting a debate all over the country. I do expect their recommendations in this regard in the near future and I am sure, when the recommendations come, this hon. House will have an occasion to discuss this. As far as this Government is concerned, in its agenda, it is committed to the idea of setting up a National Judicial Commission to deal with these matters.

**श्रीमती जमना देवी बारुपाल :** मैं आदरणीय सभापति महोदय के माध्यम से एक प्रश्न करना चाहती हूँ कि न्यायालयों में इतने लम्बे प्रकरण चल रहे हैं जिसको एक गरीब आदमी अपने हक में फैसला सुन ही नहीं पाता है। जैसे राजस्थान में बीकानेर में 1948 में एक गृह भूमि के पैसे यू. आई. टी. में जमा करवाएँ और 1948 से लेकर आज 2001 आ गया, न कोर्ट ने फैसला दिया और न हाईकोर्ट ने फैसला दिया। तो इस तरह से किसानों को, अनुसूचित जाति के लोगों को 50-50 वर्ष तक अगर फैसला नहीं मिले तो वे कैसे जी पाएँगे अपने अधिकारों के बारे में। मैं आपसे एक निवेदन करूँगी? कि इतने लम्बे प्रकरण न चलाकर के किसी तरह से चाहे और जजों की नियुक्तियाँ करें या और कुछ करें लेकिन इस तरह से गरीबों को नहीं तड़पा करके साल और दो साल के बीच में उस गरीब आदमी को अपने हक का जो भी, जैसा भी फैसला हो, वैसा फैसला उसको सुना दिया जाए ताकि वह परेशान न हो। मेरी आपसे यह एक हार्दिक रिक्वेस्ट है।

**श्री अरुण जेटली :** सभापति महोदय, माननीय सदस्या ने जो चिंता रखी है कि न्यायाधिक प्रक्रिया बहुत लम्बी चलती है और कई बार तो पचास वर्षों से अधिक मुकदमा चलता है जिसका उन्होंने उदाहरण भी दिया है। मैं पहले आदरणीय प्रणब मुखर्जी के प्रश्न के उत्तर में बतला चुका हूँ कि इस संबंध में सरकार के समक्ष जो सुझाव आए हैं उनको मद्देनजर रखकर इस दिशा में सरकार विचार कर रही है कि किस प्रकार से हर मुकदमे का जीवन हम लोग छोटा कर पाएँ। मैंने वह कदम बताए हैं, मैं माननीय सदस्या को अलग से भी विशेष रूप से बतला सकता हूँ।

**श्री गांधी आजाद :** धन्यवाद महोदय। मंत्री जी के उत्तर के 'ग' भाग में आया है कि उच्चतम न्यायालय और उच्च न्यायालयों में न्यायाधीशों की नियुक्ति भारत के संविधान और इस संबंध में अपनाई गई प्रक्रिया ज्ञापन में दिए गए उपबंधों के अनुसार की जाती है। नियुक्तियाँ संवैधानिक प्राधिकारों से परामर्श करके की जाती हैं। मैं मंत्री महोदय से जानना चाहता हूँ कि उच्चतम न्यायालय और उच्च न्यायालयों में न्यायाधीशों की नियुक्तियों में अनुसूचित जाति, अनुसूचित जनजाति और पिछड़े वर्गों का आरक्षण है या नहीं और यदि आरक्षण है तो उसका ब्यौरा क्या है और यदि नहीं तो उसका कारण क्या है?

**श्री अरुण जेटली :** संविधान में जो प्रावधान है उसमें उच्चतम न्यायालय और उच्च न्यायालयों में जो नियुक्तियाँ होती हैं उसमें आरक्षण का कोई स्पष्ट प्रावधान नहीं है। लेकिन प्रावधान न होने के

बावजूद भी सरकार बार-बार न्यायपालिका को यह लिखती है कि जब आप नियुक्तियां करते हैं तो आपको विशेष ध्यान देना पड़ेगा कि कुछ विशेष वर्गों का उच्च न्यायालयों और उच्चतम न्यायालय की नियुक्तियों के अंदर उनका स्थान बने।

**SHRI R. MARGABANDU :** So, the entire prerogative is with the judiciary itself. I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether the Government is taking steps to see that the authority of appointment.....

**MR. CHAIRMAN :** Question Hour is over.

**SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI :** Sir, this is an important matter. I think there should be a full-fledged discussion on the appointment of judges. A number of issues are involved in this.

## WRITTEN ANSWERS TO STARRED QUESTIONS

### Urban Slums in Andhra Pradesh

**\*63 DR. DASARI NARAYANA RAO :** Will the **MINISTER OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT AND POVERTY ALLEVIATION** be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government are aware that the number of slums in urban areas of Andhra Pradesh have increased manifold during the last one decade;

(b) if so, whether Government have conducted any survey in this regard;

(c) if so, the findings thereof;

(d) the remedial measures Government propose to take to contain the rising trend in slums in the State; and

(e) the amenities Government propose to provide in existing slums of the State with the help of the State Government?

**THE MINISTER OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT AND POVERTY ALLEVIATION (SHRI JAGMOHAN):** (a) to (e) Slum development being a State subject, State Governments survey and take stock of slums in their respective States. No such survey in respect of Andhra Pradesh has been conducted by the Government of India. State specific programmes for slum development are devised and implemented by all the State Governments including Andhra Pradesh.