

(d) and (e) As per the Directorate General of Commercial Intelligence and Statistics (DGCIS), Kolkata about 1.886 tons of sugar has been imported during 2011-12 sugar season. Major share of about 1.873 lac tons was imported from Brazil.

(f) The Central Government has made adequate releases of non-levy sugar to keep the domestic prices at reasonable level.

Repair, restoration and renovation of water bodies in Rajasthan

†*194. SHRI ASHK ALI TAK: Will the Minister of WATER RESOURCES be pleased to state:

(a) the number of Detailed Project Reports (DPRs) sent to the Ministry by the Rajasthan Government for repair, restoration and renovation of water bodies and the dates on which those DPRs were sent; and

(b) the number of DPRs sanctioned and under consideration out of the above?

THE MINISTER OF WATER RESOURCES (SHRI HARISH RAWAT): (a) and (b) Government of Rajasthan initially proposed in December, 2008 to take up 288 water bodies at an estimated cost of Rs. 174 Crores. After approval of the scheme on Repair, Restoration and Renovation (RRR) of water bodies with domestic support in 2009, the State Government was requested in August, 2009 to submit the Detailed Project Report (DPR) with due approval of State Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). Thereafter, State Government had submitted DPR's of 61 water bodies in March, 2011 and informed that out of these, 16 water bodies can be completed during 2011-12. Accordingly, funds for these 16 water bodies were released during Eleventh Plan.

The State Government requested in July, 2012 to release funds for remaining 45 water bodies, amounting to Rs. 57.19 Crores. This proposal was examined and additional information has been sought from State Government in November, 2012. Information from the State Government is awaited.

Appointment of judges

*195. SHRI G.N. RATANPURI: Will the Minister of LAW AND JUSTICE be pleased to state:

†Original notice of the question was received in Hindi.

(a) the number of vacancies of judges at different levels in the country and the number of pending cases, State-wise;

(b) the date on which recommendations from Jammu and Kashmir Government were received by Government for appointment of six High Court judges; and

(c) the reasons for the delay in taking a decision on these recommendations?

THE MINISTER OF LAW AND JUSTICE (SHRI ASHWANI KUMAR): (a) The Statement showing the vacancies of judges in High Courts and the Supreme Court of India as on 01.03.2013 and Court-wise number of pending cases, are given in the Statement-I (*See below*).

The Statement showing the vacancies of judges in the Subordinate Courts and the number of pending cases therein, are given in the Statement-II (*See below*).

(b) and (c) Filling up of the vacancies in the High Courts is a continuous consultative process among Constitutional authorities to select suitable candidates for higher judiciary. It is time consuming process, as it requires consultations with and approval from various Constitutional authorities. The proposal for appointment of Judges in the Jammu and Kashmir High Court has since been approved by the Government and the notification issued on 07.03.2013 after following the due process.

Statement-I

Vacancies of Judges in High Courts and the Supreme Court of India as on 1-3-2013 and Court-wise number of Pending Cases.

Sl. No.	Name of the Court	Vacancies of Judges as on 01.03.2013	Number of pending cases As on 28.02.2013
1	2	3	4
A.	Supreme Court of India	5	66809
B.	High Court		As on 31.03.2012
1	Allahabad	72	10,08,533
2	Andhra Pradesh	20	1,99,229
3	Bombay	23	3,62,948
4	Calcutta	18	3,50,260

1	2	3	4
5	Chhattisgarh	06	52,264
6	Delhi	13	63,012
7	Gauhati	02	51,899
8	Gujarat	13	79,529
9	Himachal Pradesh	-	48,743
10	Jammu and Kashmir	07	85,298
11	Jharkhand	09	58,511
12	Karnataka	14	1,71,463
13	Kerala	05	1,23,437
14	Madhya Pradesh	11	2,35,150
15	Madras	12	4,83,848
16	Orissa	09	3,07,528
17	Patna	08	1,15,329
18	Punjab and Haryana	25	2,43,733
19	Rajasthan	9	2,79,577
20	Sikkim	02	69
21	Uttarakhand	-	20,507
TOTAL :		278	43,40,867

Statement-II

Vacancies of judges in subordinate courts and the number of pending cases therein

Sl. No.	State/Union Territory concerned	Vacancies in Subordinate Courts as on 31.03.2012	Number of pending cases as on 31.03.2012
1	2	3	4
1	Uttar Pradesh	268	57,98,272
2	Andhra Pradesh	117	9,17,620

1	2	3	4
3.a	Maharashtra	185	31,44,426
3.b	Goa	7	30,052
3.c	Daman, Diu and Silvassa	0	4,997
4	West Bengal	156	26,38,937
5	Chhattisgarh	38	2,66,220
6	Delhi	158	6,89,766
7	Gujarat	852	21,97,565
8.a	Assam	108	2,64,204
8.b	Meghalaya	22	3,357
8.c	Tripura	27	43,954
8.d	Manipur	5	14,238
8.e	Nagaland	6	4,130
8.f	Mizoram	32	4,426
8.g	Arunachal Pradesh	0	6,148
9	Himachal Pradesh	17	1,95,018
10	Jammu and Kashmir	17	2,07,588
11	Jharkhand	89	2,98,240
12	Karnataka	174	11,15,280
13.a	Kerala	36	10,71,305
13.b	Lakshadweep	1	240
14.a	Tamil Nadu	123	11,93,541
14.b	Puducherry	7	27,141
15	Madhya Pradesh	151	11,29,432
16	Orissa	79	11,59,482
17	Bihar	507	16,28,291

70		[RAJYA SABHA]	<i>Starred Questions</i>	
<i>Written Answers to</i>				
1	2		3	4
18.a	Punjab		116	5,44,972
18.b	Haryana		124	5,94,733
18.c	Chandigarh		0	57,890
19	Rajasthan		180	14,32,967
20	Sikkim		4	1,310
21	Uttarakhand		126	1,52,640
	Andaman and Nicobar Island		–	13,384
TOTAL :			3732	2,68,51,766

Ban on a documentary or a movie certified by CBFC

†*196. SHRIMATI MAYA SINGH: Will the Minister of INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING be pleased to state:

(a) whether, after issuance of certificate to a film documentary or a movie by the Central Board of Film Certification (CBFC), if any local organization slaps a ban on the screening of the film, the certification of CBFC is rendered meaningless and it directly strikes on the federal system.

(b) the number of States where screening of a film has been banned after its certification during the last five years; and

(c) whether banning a movie after certification violates the Right to Expression?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING (SHRI MANISH TEWARI): (a) Under the federal structure enumerated in our Constitution, the State Governments do have the power to regulate cinemas (entry 33, List II) subject to the exclusive power of the Central Government, of certification (entry 60, List I). However, a local organization that has a problem with the content of a film has no power to ban the film and such organization needs to approach CBFC under Central Government or the State Government, for redressal.

†Original notice of the question was received in Hindi.