

Year	Received (including brought forward)
2007	2073
2008	1669
2009	2781
2010	2250

The Commission has observed that sometimes such complaints are made against officers at the time when they become due for promotion/retirement etc.

(d) The Central Vigilance Commission (CVC) has, *vide* its circular No.3(v)/99/2 dated 29th June, 1999, ordered that no action should at all be taken on any anonymous or pseudonymous complaints and they must just be filed. In its subsequent circular No. 98/DSP/9 dated 11th October, 2002, while reiterating the earlier instructions, the CVC has further directed that if any department/organization proposed to look into any verifiable facts alleged in such complaints, it may refer the matter to the Commission seeking its concurrence through the Chief Vigilance Officer or head of the organization, irrespective of the level of employees involved therein.

The Central Government *vide* OM dated 29th September, 1992, had issued instructions dealing with anonymous and pseudonymous complaints. The said OM *inter-alia* lays down that generally no action is warranted on anonymous/pseudonymous complaints against Government servants and they are to be filed and that selective cognizance of anonymous/pseudonymous complaints, containing verifiable allegations can be taken with specific orders from the head of the Department/Chief Executive.

#### Undecided cases with CBI

†2547. SHRI RASHEED MASOOD: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) the action taken by Government on news-item “18 Saal Baad Aarop Patra Dayar, Court ne CBI se Maanga Jawab” published in news paper on 17th August, 2010; and

(b) the number of such cases, which could not be decided even after passing of twenty years despite an investigation made by the CBI?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PERSONNEL, PUBLIC GRIEVANCES AND PENSIONS (SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY): (a) A case RC 58A/90-DLI was registered by Central Bureau of Investigation, in which a closure report was filed on 9.10.2001 in the court of Special Judge, Tis Hazari Court, Delhi. The Hon'ble Court declined to accept the closure report on 4.5.2002.

†Original notice of the question was received in Hindi.

After conducting the further investigation, charge sheet was filed against the accused, before Spl. Judge, Tis Hazari Court, Delhi on 29.12.2008. As per directions of Hon'ble Delhi High Court on 16.8.2010 in Cr MC No. 1436/2009, CBI has conducted enquiry against the officials responsible for delay in filing the charge-sheet and suitable action has been taken. A Status report in this regard was filed in Hon'ble Delhi High Court on 4.7.2011.

(b) No, Sir. In CBI, there is no such case which is pending investigation even after passing of twenty years.

#### **Increase in corruption**

†2548. SHRI UPENDRA KUSHWAHA: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that as per a recent survey conducted by 'Transparency International', corruption has immensely increased in different States of the country; and

(b) if so, the details thereof and the action being taken to curb the corruption?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PERSONNEL, PUBLIC GRIEVANCES AND PENSIONS (SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY): (a) Transparency International India (TII) publishes the Corruption Perception Index (CPI) annually ranking countries "by their perceived levels of corruption, as determined by expert assessments and opinion surveys". The agency has placed India at 95th rank in 2011 as compared to 87th rank in 2010.

(b) The CPI ranks countries/territories based on how corrupt their public sector is perceived to be. It is a composite index, a combination of polls, drawing on corruption-related data collected by a variety of institutions. According to the Press-release of the TII, perception about corruption in India seems to have increased primarily due to the ongoing movement for the enactment of an effective Lokpal and alleged corrupt practices in a series of scandals involving the sale of telecom licenses, preparations for the Commonwealth, etc.

Corruption thrives where transparency is lacking, procedures are complicated, discretion of a high order is permitted and where there is a demand supply gap. Government is tackling these situations by encouraging greater transparency, introducing simplified procedures reducing scope for discretion. The Central Government is fully alive and committed to implement its policy of "Zero Tolerance against Corruption" and has taken several steps to combat corruption. These include:-

- (i) Issue of Whistle Blowers Resolution, 2004 and the introduction of the Public Interest Disclosure and Protection to Persons making the Disclosure Bill, 2010 in Parliament;

---

†Original notice of the question was received in Hindi.