

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
8.	Gujarat	39	13	52	27	06	33	12	07	19
9.	Himachal Pradesh	10	03	13	09	02	11	01	01	02
10.	Jammu and Kashmir	13	04	17	09	0	09	04	04	08
11.	Jharkhand	19	06	25	09	05	14	10	01	11
12.	Karnataka	47	15	62	23	04	27	24	11	35
13.	Kerala *	35	12	47	26	07	33	09	05	14
14.	Madhya Pradesh *	40	13	53	22	12	34	18	01	19
15.	Madras	56	19	75	38	0	38	18	19	37
16.	Manipur*	04	01	05	03	01	04	01	0	01
17.	Meghalaya	03	01	04	03	0	03	0	01	01
18.	Orissa	20	07	27	16	03	19	04	04	08
19.	Patna*	40	13	53	27	0	27	13	13	26
20.	Punjab and Haryana *	64	21	85	42	02	44	22	19	41
21.	Rajasthan	38	12	50	24	07	31	14	05	19
22.	Sikkim*	03	0	03	02	0	02	01	0	01
23.	Tripura*	04	0	04	04	0	04	0	0	0
24.	Uttarakhand	09	02	11	06	0	06	03	02	05
TOTAL		771	308	1079	511	91	602	260	217	477

* Acting Chief Justice

Vacancies of Judges in High Courts

1440. SHRI DILIP KUMAR TIRKEY: Will the Minister of LAW AND JUSTICE be pleased to state:

- the total number of vacancies of Judges in various High Courts;
- whether these vacancies are leading to undue pendency in judicial decisions; and
- if so, the steps being taken by Government in this regard?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE (SHRI P.P. CHAUDHARY): (a) A Statement showing the approved strength, working strength and

vacancies of Judges in the High Courts as on 25.7.2016 is given in the Statement. [Refer to the Statement appended to the Answer to USQ No. 1439 (Part a and b)]

(b) and (c) Filling of vacancies of Judges in the High Courts is a continuous and collaborative process of the Judiciary and Executive. Disposal of cases in courts falls within the domain of Judiciary. However, a large number of vacant posts of judges is one of the several reasons for pendency of cases. The Government has adopted a co-ordinated approach to assist judiciary for phased liquidation of arrears and pendency injudicial systems, which, *inter-alia*, involves better infrastructure for courts A including computerisation, increase in strength of judicial officers/judges, policy and legislative measures in the areas prone to excessive litigation/and emphasis on human resource development.

Judge-population ratio and utilization of funds

1441. SHRI HUSAIN DALWAI: Will the Minister of LAW AND JUSTICE be pleased to state:

(a) whether low Judge to population ratio is leading to pendency of cases in courts;

(b) the details of Judges population ratio, State-wise;

(c) the details of vacancies in each High Court and District Court, State-wise;

(d) how was the sum of ₹5000 crore allocated for judicial infrastructure by the Thirteenth Finance Commission utilized, the details thereof under different expenditure heads, State-wise;

(e) how much of the ₹ 9749 crore allocated by the Fourteenth Finance Commission for improvement in justice delivery system has been disbursed to States the details thereof, State-wise; and

(f) how much has been utilized so far?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE (SHRI P.P. CHAUDHARY): (a) to (f) Some of the main factors responsible for pendency of cases in courts are increased impact of state and Central legislations, accumulation of first appeals, continuation of ordinary civil jurisdiction in some of the High Courts, vacancies of Judges, appeals against orders of quasi-judicial forums going to High Courts, number of revisions / appeals, frequent adjournments, indiscriminate use of writ jurisdiction, lack of adequate arrangement to monitor, track and bunch cases for hearing.