

Ensuring information under RTI Act

†2261. SHRIMATI MAYA SINGH : Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether informations are not being provided by Government departments within the time period as prescribed under Section 4 of the Right to Information Act, 2005;

(b) if so, the reasons therefor and the action being taken by Government to ensure that the information is provided by departments;

(c) whether any action has been taken against any department/official for not providing information under this section;

(d) if so, the details of the reformative action taken in this regard; and

(e) the number of cases registered for not providing the information sought under the Right to Information Act, 2005?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PERSONNEL, PUBLIC GRIEVANCES AND PENSIONS (SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY) : (a) Compliance of the provisions of the Right to Information Act, 2005 including Section 4 is a statutory obligation of all public authorities.

(b) Does not arise.

(c) The Central Information Commission does not compile such information.

(d) The Central Government through various means, including training of stakeholders, publishing and distribution of guides, have been impressing upon the public authorities to disclose maximum information proactively so that citizens need not resort to filing of RTI applications to access information available with the public authorities.

(e) The Central Information Commission does not compile such information.

Supreme Court's criteria for choosing CIC

2262. SHRI SANJAY RAUT : Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Apex Court has directed that Chief Information Commissioner (CIC) be chosen from only among retired or serving Supreme Court Judges or Chief Justices of High Courts and half the Information Commissioners be from judicial background; and

†Original notice of the question was received in Hindi.

(b) if so, the reaction of Government?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PERSONNEL, PUBLIC GRIEVANCES AND PENSIONS (SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY) : (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The Government has filed a review petition against the judgement dated 13.09.2012 of Supreme Court in WP(C) No. 210/2012.

Increase in annual plan for Rajasthan

†2263. SHRI ASHK ALI TAK : Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) the increase made in the annual plan of the Rajasthan State for the year 2012-13, the details thereof;

(b) whether Government proposes to make a special provision in the next plan for the desert and tribal dominated areas; and

(c) if so, the amount thereof?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PLANNING (SHRI RAJEEV SHUKLA) : (a) The Annual Plan of Rajasthan for the year 2012-13 has increased by Rs. 6000.00 crore over the Annual Plan 2011-12. The approved outlay of Rajasthan for the Annual Plan 2012-13 is Rs. 33500.00 crore while for the Annual Plan 2011-12, it was Rs. 27500.00 crore.

(b) and (c) Government of Rajasthan has intimated that preparation of draft Annual Plan 2013-14 is under process. The details will be known only after the finalisation of Annual Plan 2013-14.

Tribal districts in Andhra Pradesh

2264. SHRIMATI GUNDU SUDHARANI : Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) the details of each of the project undertaken under the Integrated Action Plan (IAP) for 60 selected tribal and backward districts in the country;

(b) the details of physical targets set and achieved in the identified tribal districts in Andhra Pradesh;

(c) whether it is a fact that the Ministry has identified some more districts under IAP; and

†Original notice of the question was received in Hindi.