

with the respective High Court establish one or more special courts to try any particular case or particular class of cases. The information on number of Mahila Courts established in the country is not maintained centrally.

Disposal of cases

4884. SHRI BHUPENDER YADAV: Will the Minister of LAW AND JUSTICE be pleased to state:

(a) the current sanctioned/filled/vacant posts of judges in the Supreme Court and High Courts in the country, till date;

(b) the steps taken or proposed to be taken to fill the existing vacancies and create more posts;

(c) the per head load in terms of average number of cases per judge in the Supreme Court and High Courts and whether it is justified;

(d) whether there is any study undertaken to find out State-wise need of judges for High Courts and lower courts; and

(e) if so, what is the scene in Rajasthan and Haryana?

THE MINISTER OF LAW AND JUSTICE (SHRI SALMAN KHURSHEED): (a) and (b) Sanctioned strength, working strength and the vacant posts of Judges in the Supreme Court and the High Courts as on 15.05.2012, is given in Statement (*See below*).

Pursuant to the Supreme Court Judgment of October 6, 1993 read with their Advisory Opinion of October 28, 1998, the process of initiation of proposal for appointment of a Judge of a High Court rests with the Chief Justice of the concerned High Court, and for appointment of a Judge in the Supreme Court, rests with the Chief Justice of India. In this arrangement, posts have remained vacant for want of adequate number of proposals to fill them. The Government has been periodically reminding the Chief Justices of the High Courts to initiate proposals in time for filling the existing vacancies as well as the vacancies anticipated in next six months in the High Courts.

(c) to (e) The Judge strength of High Courts is reviewed periodically through a system of Triennial Review, which takes into account both the institution of cases and past pendency. The required strength of Permanent Judges is determined by taking into account the average institution of main cases in the last five years as well as the average rate of disposal of main cases per Judge per year in each High Court. The required strength of Additional Judges is decided by taking into account

the number of main cases pending over two years and the average rate of disposal of main cases per Judge per year in each High Court. The last Triennial review was made in 2006. The national average for disposal of main cases per Judge per year in the High Court was determined at 2324.

As per the Triennial Review of 2006, average rate of disposal per Judge per year in respect of main cases for Rajasthan and Punjab and Haryana High Courts, was 1565 and 2944 respectively.

The administrative control over the members of the subordinate judiciary vests with the concerned High Court and State Government under Article 235 of the Constitution of India. They review the strength of Judges required from time to time. The Central Government doesn't maintain the data.

Statement

Details of posts of Judges in the Supreme Court and High Courts as on 15.5.2012

Sl.No.	Name of the Court	Sanctioned Strength as on 15.05.2012	Actual in position as on 15.05.2012	Vacancy of Judges as on 15.05.2012
1	2	3	4	5
A.	Supreme Court of India	31	26	5
B.	High Court			
1.	Allahabad	160	86	74
2.	Andhra Pradesh	49	31	18
3.	Bombay	75	57	18
4.	Calcutta	58	45	13
5.	Chhattisgarh	18	13	05
6.	Delhi	48	36	12
7.	Gauhati	24	23	01
8.	Gujarat	42	29	13
9.	Himachal Pradesh	11	11	-
10.	Jammu and Kashmir	14	06	08

1	2	3	4	5
11.	Jharkhand	20	11	09
12.	Karnataka	50	40	10
13.	Kerala	38	31	07
14.	Madhya Pradesh	43	34	09
15.	Madras	60	54	06
16.	Odisha	22	14	08
17.	Patna	43	37	06
18.	Punjab and Haryana	68	40	28
19.	Rajasthan	40	24	16
20.	Sikkim	03	02	01
21.	Uttarakhand	09	08	01
TOTAL		895	632	263

Complaints against judges

4885. DR. JANARDHAN WAGHMARE: Will the Minister of LAW AND JUSTICE be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Central Government has received complaints of corruption and misconduct against serving judges of the Supreme Court and High Courts during the last five years;

(b) if so, the details and nature of complaints of corruption against serving judges received during the said period;

(c) whether Government has forwarded such complaints to the Chief Justice of Supreme Court and concerned High Courts for necessary action; and

(d) if so, the action taken by Government and Chief Justice of Supreme Court/concerned High Courts in this regard?

THE MINISTER OF LAW AND JUSTICE (SHRI SALMAN KHURSHEED): (a) to (d) As per the 'in-house mechanism' of the higher judiciary, the Chief justice of India (CJI) is competent to receive complaints against the conduct of the Judges of the Supreme Court and the Chief Justices of the High Courts. Similarly, the Chief Justices of the High Courts (CJHs) are competent to receive complaints against the conduct of the Judges of their courts.