

States-wise progress is as under

States	Notified	Operationalised	Amount released (in Rs lakh)
Madhya Pradesh	89	89	1534.20
Rajasthan	45	45	711.00
Orissa	8	8	126.4
Maharashtra	9	9	142.20
Karnataka	2	0	25.20
TOTAL	153	151	2539.00

(b) The Ministry of Panchayati Raj has a proposal to establish Nyaya Panchayats at the level of each village Panchayat or a cluster of village Panchayats. However, pending consultation on this proposal, the Ministry of Panchayati Raj has advised the States/UTs to undertake dispute free Village scheme on the pattern of Mahatma Gandhi Dispute Free Village Campaign of Government of Maharashtra. This is an Alternate Dispute Resolution Mechanism at the village level which can prevent occurrence of disputes, resolve present and future disputes amicably through a 'Panch Panel' comprising village elders, police and respected citizens.

Retirement age of Judges

526. SHRI T.M. SELVAGANAPATHI: Will the Minister of LAW AND JUSTICE be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that demand has been received by Government to increase the retirement age of Judges;

(b) if so, the details thereof;

(c) whether it is also a fact that there has been a demand not to appoint Judges after their retirement to any commissions; and

(d) if so, the views of Government in this regard?

THE MINISTER OF LAW AND JUSTICE (SHRI SALMAN KHURSHEED):

(a) and (b) The Department-Related Parliamentary Standing Committee on Personnel, Public Grievances, Law and Justice had, in its 26th Report on Demands for Grants of the Ministry of Law and Justice, *inter-alia*, recommended that Government should immediately bring forward a Constitutional Amendment Bill to raise the retirement age of Judges of High Courts from 62 to 65 i.e. at par with the retirement age of Judges of the Supreme Court without any further delay. Pursuant to this recommendation, the Constitution (One Hundred and Fourteenth Amendment) Bill, 2010 was introduced in the Lok Sabha on 25th August 2010.

- (c) No, Sir.
- (d) Does not arise.

Restoring faith in judiciary

527. SHRI NANDI YELLAIAH: Will the Minister of LAW AND JUSTICE be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Supreme Court has stated during January 2012, that the people's faith in Judiciary was dwindling at an alarming rate, posing a very grave threat to Constitutional and democratic governance of the country;

(b) if so, the details of action taken in this regard;

(c) the number of judgments delivered in the Supreme Court but kept pending for delivery to the respective States and Union Territories during 2009; 2010 and 2011;

(d) the reasons for this gap between delivery and implementation of judgments; and

(e) the details of measures to be undertaken by the Ministry to put an end to this miserable situation?

THE MINISTER OF LAW AND JUSTICE (SHRI SALMAN KHURSHEED):

(a) and (c) All the judgments and orders of the Hon'ble Supreme Court are reported in various Law Reports and are also available on the Supreme Court websites *i.e.* www.supremecourtindia.nic.in and www.sci.nic.in and can be accessed therefrom.

(d) and (e) Implementation of judgments is the responsibility of concerned parties involved in the case. In the event of non-compliance of any of the judgements, the aggrieved party has the remedy and can file a contempt petition in the Court of Law for implementation of the decision.

Restoration of retirement cycle for State Legislative Council

528. SHRI RAJEEV CHANDRASEKHAR: Will the Minister of LAW AND JUSTICE be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that a proposal for the restoration of the cycle of retirement of members of the legislative council from the local authorities/constituencies for every two years from Karnataka Government has been pending with the Central Government for over a decade;

(b) if so, the details thereof and the reasons for the inordinate pendency of the proposal with the Central Government; and

(c) the action Government proposes to take on the proposal of the State Government within a time-frame?