

(b) whether Government will consider putting a time limit within which the cases have to be finalized; and

(c) if not, the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF LAW AND JUSTICE (SHRI H. R. BHARDWAJ):

(a) Disposal of cases, its manner, time taken in disposing a case and related aspects are in the matters falling in the exclusive domain of judiciary. However, the Government with a view to reducing pendency has increased the Judge strength from time to time. Besides this, measures such as grouping of cases involving common questions of law, constitution of specialized benches and organizing Lok Adalats at regular intervals, etc. have been taken. Alternative modes of disposal including mediation, negotiation and arbitration have been encouraged. Special tribunals like Central Administrative Tribunal, State Administrative Tribunals, Income Tax Appellate Tribunals, Family Courts, Labour Courts, Consumer Courts etc. have been set up to expedite disposal of cases in different areas.

Information technology is being used in generation of cause lists, providing information to the litigants/Advocates etc. for speedy disposal of cases. Fast Track Courts (FTCs) for the disposal of long pending cases, particularly sessions cases and cases involving undertrials in jails have been set up. The Government has extended the term of existing 1562 Fast Track courts, which were functional as on 31.3.2005, for another five years i.e. upto 31.3.2010 for clearing huge pendency of cases at District level.

The Code of Criminal Procedure has also been amended to introduce certain provisions for speedy disposal of cases. The concept of plea bargaining was also introduced.

(b) and (c) disposal of a case in the court being in the domain of the judiciary, Government does not interfere in that jurisdiction.

#### **Application of RTI Act on Supreme Court**

4179. DR. ABHISHEK MANU SINGHVI:  
SHRI VIJAY J. DARDA:  
SHRIMATI MOHSINA KIDWAI:

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

(a) whether Government are aware of the Supreme Court's claim that Right to Information could compromise the independence of the judiciary;

(b) if so, whether the Supreme Court Bar Association is against this approach of the Supreme Court to dilute the application of RTI upon itself; and

(c) what are the considered views of Government in this regard so that such step of the Supreme Court may not become a precedent for other constitutional entities like Election Commission, CAG, etc.?

THE MINISTER OF LAW AND JUSTICE (SHRI H.R. BHARDWAJ):

(a) to (c) The position in this regard is being ascertained for examination in the Government.

### **Exploitation of women in courts**

†4180. SHRI MANOHAR JOSHI: Will the Minister of LAW AND JUSTICE be pleased to state:

(a) whether this fact has come to the notice of Government that incidents of sexual exploitation are increasing at large scale in the courts of Delhi;

(b) whether keeping this fact in view, a Committee consisting of Judges has been set up in District Courts where harassed women may get their complaint lodged; and

(c) if so, the details thereof?

THE MINISTER OF LAW AND JUSTICE (SHRI H.R. BHARDWAJ):

(a) to (c) Information and details in this regard have been called for from the High Court of Delhi which are awaited.

### **Pending cases and judges-population**

4181. SHRI B.K. HARIPRASAD: Will the Minister of LAW AND JUSTICE be pleased to state:

(a) whether in view of more than 5,31,477 cases pending in High Courts for 10 years and much more in subordinate courts, the budgetary allocation of Rs. 1000 crore for 2006-07 for judicial reforms is grossly mismatched;

(b) whether the Judges population ratio in India is 10.5 judges per million persons, according to 2001 census, whereas the Law Commission prescribes 107 judges per million; and

(c) whether as an interim measure, Government would consider raising the judge-strength five-fold from 10.5 to atleast 50 judges per million?

†Original notice of the question was received in Hindi.