

Sir, there is a huge potential in Andhra Pradesh. But why are you not fixing targets in Andhra Pradesh when there is a huge potential? I would like to know from the hon. Minister the reasons behind this. What efforts his Ministry is making to create Wind Energy Parks to have better approach to wind energy in Andhra Pradesh.

DR. FAROOQ ABDULLAH: Sir, policy not very conducive for investment as compared to the other States is one reason. Second, captive consumption and Third Party sales are not allowed by Andhra Pradesh; and tariff rates are not enough for wind regimes in the State. These have been the reasons why the private people have not invested in Andhra Pradesh.

Sir, in 2009, I wrote to the then Chief Minister, Rajasekhar Reddy, telling him that if these things are done, there will be a possibility of people coming in larger number as they have done in Tamil Nadu, in Karnataka, in Maharashtra, etc. This will make a difference to Andhra Pradesh also because it has a good potential of wind, but, unfortunately, it has not moved forward. Sir, as the hon. Member belongs to that State, I hope she would also kindly pursue the State Government to see that these things are done so that the private enterprise can come in larger number and produce this energy.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Question No. 367. ... (*Interruptions*)... Please. Please. Question No. 367.

\*[The questioner Shri O.T. Lepcha was absent]

#### **Work load and staff strength in Supreme Court**

\*367. SHRI O.T. LEPCHA: Will the Minister of LAW AND JUSTICE be pleased to state:

- (a) whether overall work load of the Supreme Court has increased in view of the increase in the number of Judges;
- (b) if so, the details thereof;
- (c) whether any work study on the increased work load on officers and staff has been conducted and if so, the details thereof and if not, the reasons therefor;
- (d) whether there has been corresponding increase in the officers and staff of the Supreme Court;

(e) if so, the number of persons recruited during the last three years and those who left;  
and

(f) if not, the reasons for not recruiting the required officers and staff?

THE MINISTER OF LAW AND JUSTICE (SHRI SALMAN KHURSHEED): (a) to (f) A Statement is laid on the Table of the House.

***Statement***

(a) to (d) In accordance with the provisions of Article 146 (1) and (2) of the Constitution, the appointment and conditions of service of the officers and servants of the Supreme Court is the concern of the Chief Justice of India. Accordingly, the subject matter of the question falls under the exclusive domain of the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court has informed that:-

Consequent upon increase in filing, disposal and pendency of matters in the Supreme Court, there has been increase in work-load at all levels. The details showing the institution, disposal and pendency of cases for the last four years are given in the Statement-I (See below).

Considering the increased workload and with a view to bring improvement in the working of the Registry of the Supreme Court, the competent authority was pleased to order review of staff strength of dealing officials on Judicial side. Also, there has been 20% increase in the Judge strength which caused 20% increase in the staff in ancillary sections and sections on administrative side.

As a result of increase in the strength of Judges, number of Courts and work load, the strength of officers and staff has been increased. The competent authority has sanctioned creation/revival of about 284 posts in different categories since 01.01.2009. Further, a Committee of three Senior Officers has been constituted to study the working of the Registry.

(e) and (f) In all, about 282 persons have been recruited in various categories during the last three years starting from 01.01.2009. 41 persons have left after joining the service for personal reasons.

**Statement**

***Institution, Disposal and Pendency of Matters***

Institution				Disposal			Pending as on 1st May of respective year	Number of matters Reduced/ Enhanced with respect to previous year
Duration	Admission	Regular	Total	admission	Regular	Total		
As on 1st May, 2007							41730	
May, 2007 to April, 2008	64161	7370	71531	60605	6282	66887	46374	4644(+)
May, 2008 to April, 2009	59107	6517	65624	55252	6598	61850	50148	3774(+)
May, 2009 to April, 2010	73412	9048	82460	71276	6314	77590	55018	4870(+)
May, 2010 to April, 2011	70836	8314	79150	72212	7409	79621	54547	471(-)

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member is not present. Any supplementary?

SHRIMATI VASANTHI STANLEY: Sir, considering the huge pendency in the Supreme Court, I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether the Government would consider shortening the vacation period for the Supreme Court.

SHRI SALMAN KHURSHEED: Sir, this is not an issue that is directly in our purview. The Supreme Court decides it. In fact, the Supreme Court, conscious of the issue of pendency, has been deciding considerable number of applications and matters during vacations also. Several Benches are beginning to sit during vacation as well. But, ultimately, Sir, let me just say this that the Supreme Court's situation today, at least, as far as the pendency is concerned is improving. The pendency has actually gone down; arrears have gone down. Even though it is marginal, but they have reversed the pattern of increasing number of arrears and pendency; and therefore I think it is best left to the wisdom of the Court itself.

SHRI T.K. RANGARAJAN: In view of the fact that the Supreme Court has got a heavy workload, I want to know whether we should still continue with the colonial legacy that court works on such and such day and court takes leave on holidays. So my question is, should we still continue with that legacy or have we changed from that legacy?

SHRI SALMAN KHURSHEED: Sir, I can assure the hon. Member that there is no question of any colonial legacy still continuing. We have, of course, a common law system that we do share with many other common law countries, including the United Kingdom. But we have developed our own system, to the acclaim and acknowledgement of all other legal systems in the world. We have put in intrinsic Indian jurisprudence, and I believe that we have give models for other people to emulate with success. As far as the sittings of the Court are concerned, it is according to the Court's own convenience. I believe, the Court is conscious of the concerns that are expressed here in the House, but I think it is best left for the Court to decide how and when it wants to sit and the number of cases it believes it can potentially dispose of during any given period.

SHRI RAASHID ALVI: Sir, granting bail is the discretionary power of the Court. यह कोर्ट पर डिपेंड करता है कि वह किसको बेल दे या न दे। And these days, important cases related to known personalities are described not only...

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is on workload.

SHRI RAASHID ALVI: Yes, Sir. I am talking about the Supreme Court. Important cases related to known personalities including celebrities are not only being tried in the Court but also in the media, and courts are being influenced by the media. My question is, has the Government given any thought to amending the procedure of granting bail?

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is a workload-related question.

**श्री राशिद अल्वी:** सर, इसी वजह से तो वर्कलोड है कि बेल नहीं हो रही है। Media is influencing our courts. One cannot get justice under fear and influence.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Raashid Alvi ... *(Interruptions)*...

SHRI RAASHID ALVI: Sir, it is a very important question.

SHRI SALMAN KHURSHEED: Sir, may I just tell my learned friend and hon. Member that the Goddess of Justice is blindfolded, she has a balance in front of her, and for her it does not matter whether a person is known or unknown. Justice is done without any पक्षपात and justice is done without actually knowing who the person before her is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Question No. 368. The hon. Member is not present. Any supplementary? No supplementaries on this question. Okay;

\*368. [The questioner Shri Kalraj Mishra was absent]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Question No. 369.

#### **Central assistance for the Food Security Scheme**

\*368. SHRI KALRAJ MISHRA: Will the Minister of CONSUMER AFFAIRS, FOOD AND PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION be pleased to state:

(a) the Central aid given to different States and Union Territories for implementation of the food security scheme during 2009-10 and 2010-11 and during the current year so far; and

(b) the steps taken by Government to ensure that the Central aid is not diverted by the State Governments concerned?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS, FOOD AND PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION (PROF. K.V. THOMAS): (a) and (b) A Statement is laid on the Table of the House.