CHAPTER – IV
AGGREGATE DATA ANALYSIS-I

The Right to Information Act 2005 has been acknowledged as the path breaking law. It has heralded the new era of transparency and accountability in the functioning of the Public Authorities; and thereby in the entire process of governance. In the present chapter aggregate data regarding the Act has been analyzed in three phases: India level, State level and District level. In Section-1 aggregate data at India level has been analyzed; in Section-2 aggregate data for the state of Haryana has been analyzed and in Section-3 data of Bhiwani District in Haryana has analyzed.

4.1 Right to Information in India: An Analysis

As per objectives of the study in the present section data from the whole of India has been analyzed in terms of number of Public Authorities registered, number of Public Authorities submitted annual report, number of opening balance, number of request received, number of request rejected, disciplinary action, number of penalty levied & collected, number of appeals & complaints received and disposed of.

4.1.1 Submission of Annual Report

It is the duty of every Public Authority to prepare the report and submit it to Central Information Commission or State Information Commission. To avoid inordinate delays by public authorities in submitting annual returns the CIC introduced quarterly submission of returns. The Public Authorities who failed to submit returns for even a single quarter have been treated as defaulter. As per provision (section 25(1)) of the act, after the end of each year the CIC/SIC are equal to prepare reports on the implementation of the provisions of the Act during that year. That report should based on information collected through the public authorities.
### Table 4.1.1
Submission of Annual Report
Aggregate Data Analysis, India Level (2005-11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Registered Public Authority</th>
<th>Report submitted by P.A.</th>
<th>Report not Submitted by P.A. (Defaulters)</th>
<th>% of Report Submission by P.A.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>89.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>1412</td>
<td>1168</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>82.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>1597</td>
<td>1382</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>86.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>1770</td>
<td>1528</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>86.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>1847</td>
<td>1427</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>77.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>2149</td>
<td>1452</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>67.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9713</td>
<td>7794</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>80.24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Central Information Commission, Annual Reports, 2005-06 to 2010-11)

As the Table-4.1.1 shows that during the study period, after implementation of RTI Act in India the highest number of Public Authorities have been registered under year 2010-11 but in spite of highest member of registered PAs, the percentage of submission of Annual Reports under section-25(2), 25(3) was highest 89.23% in the year 2005-06.

As the table mentions, both the number of public authorities as well as their percentage who have submitted their returns have shown a fluctuating trend over the years 2005-06 to 2010-11. The percentage of submission of Annual Reports by PAs has shown a clearly declining trend from the year 2007-08 to 2010-11. The lowest percentage of submission of Annual Reports by PAs is 67.5% in 2010-11 and highest percentage of submission is 89.23% in the first year of enactment of the Act i.e. 2005-06.

As is obvious from the table that, public authorities are not taking Right to Information Act seriously, the decreasing percentage indicates that section-25(2) (3)

---

* As per Section-25 (1) Chapter-VI, RTI Act , 2005 & Section-25(2) Chapter-VI, RTI Act, 2005 related to monitoring and reporting of RTI Act CIC/SIC as the case may be ‘after the end of each year, prepare a report on the implementation of the provisions of this Act during that year and forward a copy thereof to the appropriate Government. To prepare this report under this section “Each Ministry or Department shall, in relation to the public authorities within their jurisdiction, collect and provide such
of RTI Act has not effectively been implemented and the PAs track a sense of irresponsiveness regarding submission of Annual Reports. Though the number of registered PAs has increased in every year but that doesn’t mean that the work load has increased over PAs. Indeed, it is a matter of serious concern that a significant member of PAs have failed to realize their statutory responsibility under the Act.

**Table 4.1.2**

**Aggregate Application Analysis, India Level (2005-11)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Opening Balance</th>
<th>Request Received</th>
<th>Request Rejected</th>
<th>Disciplinary Action Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>24436</td>
<td>3389 (13.87%)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>12026</td>
<td>171404</td>
<td>15388 (8.98%)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>23926</td>
<td>263261</td>
<td>18966 (7.20%)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>32792</td>
<td>329728</td>
<td>23954 (7.26%)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>97474</td>
<td>529274</td>
<td>34057 (6.43%)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>137771</td>
<td>417955</td>
<td>21621 (5.17%)</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1736058</td>
<td>117375 (6.76%)</td>
<td>503</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: CIC, Annual Reports 2005-06 to 2010-11)

Table -4.1.2 depicts that, out of total (1736058) request received by PAs under RTI Act, about 7 per cent (6.76 %) were rejected during the whole study period. The table also reveals that the percentage of rejection of requests has gone down

---

information to the Central Information Commission or State Information Commission, as the case may be, as is required to prepare the report under this section and comply with the requirements concerning the furnishing of that information and keeping of records for the purposes of this section.”
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considerably. The decreasing trend in the rejection of application is indicative of PAs motivation to perform better and in more positive manner. The highest percentage of rejection of request was during the year 2005-06. It is quite possible that this percentage is due to the lack of training and incomplete knowledge about the Act may be the reason. The increasing number of requests is a sign of people’s awareness about RTI and their eagerness about transparency and accountability in the administration.

It has been provided in the Act that the PAs have to provide information to information seekers who demand it. Highest number of information demanded in 2009-10 (529,274) out of which only 6.43% request have been rejected. The lowest number of information seekers demanded information during 2005-06 because the Act was enacted in Oct 2005 and the duration of the submission of Annual Report was five months. So, people had only five months to ask for a request.

The Act has a provision of disciplinary action under section- 20(2), whether the information is not provided by PAs as it asked or the other reasons mentioned under section-20(2) of the Act. Table-4.1.2 exhibits that; total in 503 cases (0.03%) disciplinary action has taken against concerned officials. The number of cases has drastically increased thirteen times in 2010-11 (432) as compared to 2009-10 (33). These cases appear to be the instances of delinquency on the part of individual officers. The number of cases of disciplinary action taken is showing a fluctuating trend over the years. It exhibited a steady growth in 2009-10 and 2010-11. The percentage of rejection of application and disciplinary action taken indicates the increased effort on the part of public authorities to ensure compliance with provisions of the Act.
Table 4.1.3
RTI Related Appeals & Complaints in Nutshell

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Appeals/Complaint received</th>
<th>Appeals/Complaints disposed</th>
<th>Appeal/Complaints disposal rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>97.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>6839</td>
<td>4074</td>
<td>59.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>11621</td>
<td>7722</td>
<td>66.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>15426</td>
<td>13322</td>
<td>86.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>22800</td>
<td>19482</td>
<td>85.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>28875</td>
<td>24071</td>
<td>83.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>86264</td>
<td>69353</td>
<td>80.39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: CIC, Annual Report 2005-06 to 2010-11)

It has been provided in section-19(1) of the Act that, information seeker can file an appeal or complaint against the causes regarding not receiving application or has not furnished information within specified time prefer an appeal to senior rank officer in concerned public authority. It is evident from the table that, the numbers of appeals and complaints have steadily increased in 2005-06. In 2010-11 there is highest number of complaints and appeals received and the number of disposed appeals and complaints is also high in 2010-11. While the percentage of disposed of appeals and complaints is highest during 2005-06(97.01%) The percentage of disposal of appeal and complaints indicates fluctuation in the table. The increasing member of appeals/complaints indicates increased awareness of public and irresponsiveness and unaccountability of the officials.

Graph 4.1
Status of RTI Act at Union Level (2005-11)
The data presented in Graph 4.1 indicates an analysis of RTI Act at India level as presented in Table 4.1, 4.2, 4.3 of the chapter. It indicates vast number of applications and appeals were received in concerned PAs/AAs as mentioned by CIC reports while the disposal rate and recommendation of disciplinary actions were low as compare to applications and appeals.

4.2 Right to Information in Haryana & Evaluation of Performance of State Information Commission in Haryana

The key objective of the Right to Information Act 2005 is to promote transparency and accountability in the working of every public authority in the country. In pursuance of central Right to Information Act, 2005 and to ensure its effective implementation Haryana state government by its notification in the official Gazette, constituted a body known as the state information commission Haryana to exercise and to perform the functions assigned to it under this Act.\(^2\)

Section-27 of the Act empowers the state government to make rules to carry out the provisions of the Act by issuing notification in the official Gazette. In exercise of this power, the state government notified the Haryana Right to Information Rules 2005 (on 28\(^{th}\) October, 2005).\(^3\) Again issued a notification (21st December 2009)\(^4\) which comes into force from 1\(^{st}\) January, 2010. In that notification fee has been reduced for A4 or A3 size paper information from Rs. 10 to Rs. 2 for each. Along with this facility, the Commission has launched its own website in November 2006. Information pertaining to the activities of the Commission including its orders, case status and final order issued citizen can also access information about the dates of hearing, the bench before which it is fixed and name of the parties as well. Information on meeting holds at district level with officers and other sections of the public by the members of the Commission is provided on the website.

Along with website facility Haryana SIC decides to implement an SMS service which will provide answers to RTI queries like status of appeals/complaints, decisions and the dates of hearing of cases.\(^5\) The Commission has tied up with a

\(^2\) http://www.cicharyana.gov.in/writereaddata/CIC_Haryana/CICnotifications/227.doc
\(^5\) http://indiagovernance.gov.in/news.php?id=438

"Haryana to respond to RTI queries on SMS", Nov. 29, 2010.
Hyderabad based think tank ‘Centre for Good Governance’ which provides solutions on good governance. To ensure good governance in the state Haryana Chief Secretary directed all heads of departments of the state government to examine and take suitable necessary action on the amended and rewarded recommendation of the Second Administrative Reform Commission in its first report titled as “Right to Information – Master Key to Good Governance.”

Along with this Haryana State Governor introduced the policy for providing security to whistle blowers and RTI activist and for ensuring protection to witness in serious cases. The state government through a notification (19/9/12) provides procedure of providing security keeping in view of civil writ petition. (CWP NO. 832, 2011 H.C. Arora Advocate VS. State of Punjab)

Though, various facilities are introduced by SIC but on the ground of reality whether it exists or not. So it is essential to evaluate or analysis the performance of SIC along with trends of applications. As per trends exhibit in first report of SIC Haryana near about half of total complaints and appeals (46.93% of complaints & 44.44% of appeals) were related to service and personal matters while public interest related complaints/appellates constituted a very low percentage i.e., 15.30% and 14.28% respectively. While rest of complaints/appellates (27.55% and 20.63%) related to property matters.

In the present section data for the state of Haryana has been analyzed in terms of appeals received disposed of and indisposed of cases at the end of year from 2005 to 2011. One of the ways of evaluating the performance of SIC is, analyzing the disposal rates of complaints and appeals. In his section data has been analyzed in terms of complaints registered, disposal rate during the year and indisposed of cases dependency at the end of year as well.

Along with this, present section also analyze the SIC in terms of number of cases of disciplinary action and number of cases in which penalty had imposed to officials by SIC during 2006 to 2011 (year wise and total). State Information

---

7 http://haryana.gov.in/misc/home.pdf (visited on 4/2/13)
9 Ibid
Commission is the apex appellate authority at the state level for hearing the appeals or complaints from the citizens. Effective functioning of the SIC in a way determines effective implementation of RTI Act in state and effective implementation ensures transparency and accountability. So it is quite pertinent to evaluate the functioning of SIC.

**Table 4.2.1**

**Analysis of Status of Complaints in SIC (up to 2011)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Previous case</th>
<th>Registered during year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Disposal during year</th>
<th>Indisposded cases at the end of year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(89.24%)</td>
<td>(10.75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(88.59%)</td>
<td>(11.40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(81.76%)</td>
<td>(18.23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(82.88%)</td>
<td>(17.11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(84.44%)</td>
<td>(15.55%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(68.15%)</td>
<td>(31.84%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1753</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Data from State Information Commission, Haryana has been collected by investigator/researcher through RTI Application dated 7/5/12 diarized vide no.10601, letter No.3186/SCIC/Supdt./2012 (49), dated 31 May 2012)

Table 4.2.1 indicates the number of cases of complaints received by SIC from 2005 to 2011 and their disposal rate year wise. As per the provision of RTI Act, a person can make a complaint to the information commission if he is unable to submit a request to PIO or that such officer has not been appointed by the concerned PA, the
APIO has refused to accept his application or appeal for forwarding to the PIO or the appellate authority or he has not been given a response to a request in limited time or given incomplete, misleading or false information or required to pay an unreasonable fee/amount.\textsuperscript{10} As the table indicates that due to above mentioned reasons the number of complaints has increased over the year. In 2006 and 2007 it had increased with a number of 154 and 246 respectively. In 2008 it had gone downward after that the number of complaints had increased tremendously in last three years of the study period. While highest number of complaints have been registered during 2011 with a number of 524 and highest no of disposal of complaints is 445 in 2010.

As is evident from the table, the disposal rate of complaints during the year is not satisfactory. In 2006, the highest disposal rate of complaints was 89.24\% with a number of 141 complaints. In 2011 it has become lowest 68.15\% with a number of 4B. It is the lowest percentage of disposal of complaints. From 2006 to 2010 it is satisfactory with above 80\% rate.

During the year, the number of indisposed off cases (at the end of year) is increased. It started with 4 and reached at 193 in 2011. With the number of indisposed of cases their percentage had also increased. In 2006 only 10.75 per cent of total cases had remained indisposed off at the end of the year while in 2011, 31.84 per cent cases remained indisposed off at the end of the year. As the table shows, total 1946 complaints had registered from 2005 to 2011 in SIC Haryana. Out of that 1753 complaints had disposed off at the end of 2011 with 90.08 per cent which can be considered good rate of disposal of complaints. At the end of the year 2011 only 9.9 per cent complaints remained indisposed.

\textsuperscript{10} Sec. 18 of RTI Act, 2005
### Table 4.2.2

**Received & Disposal of Appeals SIC, Haryana (2005-2011)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Previous Year</th>
<th>Registered during Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Disposal during the year</th>
<th>Indispose of cases at the end of year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>98 (60.12%)</td>
<td>65 (39.87%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1014</td>
<td>1079</td>
<td>854 (79.14%)</td>
<td>225 (20.85%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>1454</td>
<td>1679</td>
<td>1301 (77.48%)</td>
<td>378 (22.51%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>2214</td>
<td>2592</td>
<td>2214 (25.41%)</td>
<td>378 (14.58%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>2560</td>
<td>2938</td>
<td>2116 (72.02%)</td>
<td>722 (27.97%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>3916</td>
<td>4738</td>
<td>2859 (60.34%)</td>
<td>1879 (39.65%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>11321</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>9442 (83.40%)</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: SIC Haryana, as collected by the researcher through RTI Application dated 7/5/12 diarized vide 10601, letter no.3186/SCIC/Supdt./2012 (49), dated 31 May 2012)

As per the provision of RTI Act if a person does not receive decision within the time specified in the act or aggrieved by a decision of the CPIO/SPIO prefer an appeal to senior officer.\(^{11}\) The second appeal against the decision of the appellate authority of first appeal lies to the central or state information commission.\(^{12}\) One way of evaluating the performance of SIC is analyzing the disposal rates of appeal and complaints. Table gives the number of appeals received and disposed off from 2005 to 2011 year wise. As the table depicts that in SIC Haryana the number of appeals has increased every year. The number of disposal of appeals has also increased, 98 appeals (60.12%) disposed off in 2006 while in 2011 the highest number of appeals (2859) had disposed off but the percentage of disposal was highest in 2009 with 85.41 per cent (2592). Though the number of disposal cases has increased but the percentage of these cases is fluctuating. It had started with 60.12 per cent and at the end of study period remains same 60.34 percentage in 2011. As the table indicates

---

\(^{11}\) Sec. 19(1) of RTI Act, 2005 the time for appeal is 30 days from the expiry of such period or from the date of the receipt of the decision.

\(^{12}\) Sec. 19(3) of RTI Act, 2005 the time for 2\(^{nd}\) appeal is 90 days from the date of decision have been made or actually received.
that SIC Haryana has disposed off overall 83.40 per cent of total appeals during the study period which can be considered good but year wise disposal rate of appeals is not so good. On the other hand, the number of indisposed off cases has increased over the years. In the end of 2011, the number of indisposed off cases was 1879 which is 39.65 per cent of total cases (4738) in that year which can be considered a high percentage as compared to 2009 and 2010 with 14.58 per cent and 27.97 per cent respectively.

**Table 4.2.3**

**Status of Penalties imposed and Disciplinary Action**

**SIC Haryana (2005-2011)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Appeals Received</th>
<th>Disciplinary Action taken</th>
<th>Penalty Imposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>07 (4.37%)</td>
<td>02 (1.25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1014</td>
<td>56 (5.52%)</td>
<td>16 (1.57%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1454</td>
<td>74 (5.08%)</td>
<td>63 (4.33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2214</td>
<td>86 (3.88%)</td>
<td>76 (3.43%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2560</td>
<td>38 (1.48%)</td>
<td>108 (4.21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>3916</td>
<td>09 (0.22%)</td>
<td>49 (1.25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11321</td>
<td>270 (2.38%)</td>
<td>314 (2.77%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: SIC Haryana, as collected by researcher through RTI Application dated 7/5/12 diarized wide 10601, letter No.3186/SCIC/Suptd./2012 (49), dated 31 May 2012)

Table-4.2.3 shows that Haryana SIC has received a large number of appeals during 2005-2011. The numbers of appeals has increases tremendously as mentioned in the table (from 3 to 3916) through passing away of years. As the table indicates that, SIC even after receiving huge number of appeals (11321) only in 2.77 per cent
cases penalty has imposed and in 2.38 per cent cases disciplinary action has recommended which is very low percentage. Over the years, the number of appeals has increased but the no. of cases in which penalty has imposed and disciplinary action taken has not increased over the year. The number of cases has increased from 2006 to 2010 in penalty; in 2011 it has gone downward drastically from 108 to 49 in spite of increasing number of appeals from 2005 to 2011.

From 2006 to 2009, the recommendation of disciplinary action in concerned cases has been increased. In 2009 there is highest number of cases (86) in which disciplinary action had recommended while highest percentage of cases of disciplinary action was 5.52 per cent of total case in 2007. The lowest percentage of cases of disciplinary action was 0.22 per cent in 2011 in spite of highest number of appeals (3916) received during this year. Overall analysis of the table indicates that SIC Haryana in very few cases imposed penalty and recommended disciplinary action.

Graph 4.2

Receipt and Disposal of Appeals & Complaints at State level (Haryana)

Present graph presents the data of SIC Haryana as mentioned in earlier tables (4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.3). Vast number of appeals were received at SIC level and their
disposal rate was also satisfactory while imposition of penalty and disciplinary action indicates a very low percentage.

4.3 Right to Information in Bhiwani District: An Analysis (Study Area Profile)

Bhiwani District was created on 22 December 1972. It is one of the largest district in Haryana consisted on area of 4778.00 sq.km having a population of 16,29,109. This large number of population includes 13,06,531 of rural and 3,22,578 of urban population. Out of total population the strength of male population is 8,64,616 and female population occupies the number of 7,64,493 of total population of the district. As per Haryana Statistical Abstract 2011-12, Bhiwani district has divided into five sub divisions including seven tehsil, two sub tehsil and ten blocks.

In present section of the chapter 4, the researcher made an endeavor to analyze aggregate data of district offices of Bhiwani district. As per list provided by D.C. Office Bhiwani, there are 112 P.A./Departments in Bhiwani. Out of those 24 offices does not exist or they have not any district officer in their concerned Public Authority. Out of PAs, the researcher makes an effort to club them with each other as per guidance of RTI dealing head (Mrs. Lalita) at D.C Office Bhiwani and reached a number of 32 Public Authorities having a District Head-Office. The researcher collected the data through RTI applications from all PAs as mentioned in the list provided by D.C. office Bhiwani. In present section, data has been analyzed in the form of application received, rejected disposed off, 1st appeal, 2nd appeal, disciplinary action and penalty.

---


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Application Received</th>
<th>Application Rejected</th>
<th>Application Disposed off</th>
<th>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Appeal</th>
<th>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Appeal</th>
<th>Disciplinary Action</th>
<th>Penalty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 2005-06</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 (33.33%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1 (1.75%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2 (1.65)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>2 (1.65)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Data Collected through an RTI Application response vide Sr. No. 1518 Dated 3D5/12 District welfare office Bhiwani 661-747 RTI, Dated 15/5/12)

It indicates from Table-4.3.1 that a total of 121 applications have been received under RTI Act in the District Welfare Office of Bhiwani during the study period 2005-06 to 2011-12. No Applications under RTI Act was received during the first two years viz. 2005-06 and 2006-07 whereas in the succeeding years the number of applications received increased gradually and registered an almost increasing trend. Minimum numbers of applications (3) were received under RTI Act during 2007-08 (third year of implementation). On the other hand maximum numbers of applications (57) were received during 2010-11. None of 121 applications received under RTI Act in the District welfare office were rejected and significantly all applications were disposed off during the study period. There being no pendency neither for the study period as a whole nor on year to year basis.

A total of 1.65 percent applicants went for first appeal during the study period; 33.33 percent of the applicants during 2007-08 and 1.75 per cent of the applicants during the year 2010-11. However none of them went for second appeal. Further
neither any disciplinary action was recommended nor was any penalty imposed in any of these cases against the concerned SPIO.

Table -4.3.2
District Development & Panchayat Office

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Application Received</th>
<th>Application Rejected</th>
<th>Application Disposed off</th>
<th>1st Appeal</th>
<th>2nd Appeal</th>
<th>Disciplinary Action</th>
<th>Penalty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4 (12.5 %)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>8 (14.81%)</td>
<td>3 (37.50%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>21 (48.84%)</td>
<td>3 (14.29%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>36 (30%)</td>
<td>5 (13.89%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>64 (42.38%)</td>
<td>8 (12.5%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1 (12.50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>39 (40.63%)</td>
<td>10 (25.64%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>172 (33.79%)</td>
<td>29 (16.86%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>2 (6.89%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Data collected from DDPO Office by researcher through RTI application response Memo No. 4089, dated 25/6/12.)

As it is clear from the Table-4.3.2, that a total of 509 applications have been received from applications in the District Development & Panchayat Office of Bhiwani during the study period from 2005-06 to 2011-12. The applications received under RTI Act present almost an increasing trend except 2008-09 and 2011-12. Minimum numbers (13) of applications were received under RTI Act during the first year of the study. This was also the first year of the implementation of the Act. On the other side highest numbers of applications were received (151) during 2010-11.

It is noteworthy that all applications (509) received under RTI Act were disposed off during the study period and there was no pendency neither for the study period as whole nor on year to year basis. Number of appeals filled under RTI Act also indicated almost an increasing trend. In the first year of the study period (implementation of the Act) there was no appeal against the responses received by applicants. During 2006-07 to 2011-12, the trend of appeals has increased. During 2006-07; only 12.5 per cent applicants went for 1st appeal and none of them went for
second appeal. During 2007-08 to 2011-12; the applicants filed 2nd appeal in some cases as well. The maximum number (64) of first appeals were registered during 2010-11 while the highest 48.81 per cent of 1st appeals were during 2008-09 on the other hand the applicants went for second appeal indicates an increasing trend. The applicants went for second appeal during 2007-08 and 2011-12 exhibits the highest percentage 37.50 per cent with the maximum number (10) respectively. Overall in 33.79 per cent cases applicants went for 1st appeal of total applications (509) and 16.86 per cent of applicants went for 2nd appeal. In these cases during study period no disciplinary action was recommended. Only in two cases penalty was imposed during the study period. During 2009-10; in one case penalty was imposed (Rs. 20,000) during this year when 30 per cent applicants went for 1st appeal and 13.89 per cent went for second appeal. During 2010-11; 42.38 per cent (64 cases) applicants filed 1st appeal and 12.5 per cent filed 2nd appeal and penalty was imposed only in one case (Rs. 5000) against the concerned PIO/APIO.

Table 4.3.3
Haryana Industrial & Infrastructural Development Cooperation (HSIIDC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Application Received</th>
<th>Application Rejected</th>
<th>Application Disposed off</th>
<th>1st Appeal</th>
<th>2nd Appeal</th>
<th>Disciplinary Action</th>
<th>Penalty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1(5.88%)</td>
<td>1(100%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1(1.75%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1(2%)</td>
<td>1(100%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>3(2.41%)</td>
<td>2(66.66%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Data collected from HSIIDC office Bhiwani by researcher through RTI Application response Memo no. D.R./Bhi./858, dated 12/6/12).

As is exhibits in Table-4.3.3 total 124 applications were received during the study period in HSIIDC Dept. in Bhiwani. The Applications received under RTI Act indicates presents a shocking trend, starting four years under study period there was
no application registered and all application were received during last three years of
the study period i.e. 2009-10 to 2011-12. The table indicates that all (124)
applications were disposed off during the study period as a whole and year to year
basis.

Appeals registered against the responses to the applications presents a static
trend during above mentioned period. During starting five years of the study period
there was no application and appeal was received during this period. In the year 2009-
10, highest applicants (5.88%) went for first appeal and during the same year all
applicants went second appeal. During last two years of the study period (2010-11 &
2011-12) respectively 1.75 per cent and 2 per cent applicants went for first appeal and
overall under the study period only 2.41 per cent applicants field first appeal while
66.66 per cent of them filed second appeal. In these cases neither any disciplinary
action was taken nor was any penalty imposed.

**Table 4.3.4**

**District Statistical Office (Dept. of Economic & Statistical Analysis)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Application Received</th>
<th>Application Rejected</th>
<th>Application Disposed off</th>
<th>1st Appeal</th>
<th>2nd Appeal</th>
<th>Disciplinary Action</th>
<th>Penalty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Data collected by researcher from DSO Office Bhiwani through RTI
application response vide letter D.S.O (Bhi)-2012/979, dated 11/6/12).

As is visible from Table-4.3.4, total 13 applications have been received in District
Statistical Office. Bhiwani during 2005-06 to 2011-12. During first two years under
the study period no application was received. The highest numbers of applications (9) were received during last year under study period while lowest number of applications (1) was received during 2007-08 and 2009-10.

It is noticeable that all application 48(13) received under RTI Act were disposed off in stipulated time period and there was no pendency in any case neither as a whole nor in year to year basis. It is also significant that no appeal (I/II) was registered against the responses received to applicants and no disciplinary action was taken and no penalty was imposed in any case during the study period.

Table 4.3.5
Town & Country Planning Office Bhiwani

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Application Received</th>
<th>Application Rejected</th>
<th>Application Disposed off</th>
<th>1st Appeal</th>
<th>2nd Appeal</th>
<th>Disciplinary Action</th>
<th>Penalty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>13 (100%)</td>
<td>1 (7.69%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>17 (100%)</td>
<td>1 (5.88%)</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>17 (100%)</td>
<td>1 (5.88%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>8 (88.88%)</td>
<td>1 (11.11%)</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>22 (100%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>37 (100%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>114 (99.10%)</td>
<td>4 (3.50%)</td>
<td>2 (50%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Data collected by researcher from District Town & Country Planning Office through RTI application response Sr. no. JINYO (Bhi.) R-4, dated 11/6/12.)

It is clearly exhibits from Table-4.3.5 that total 115 applications were received under RTI Act in Town & Country Planning office Bhiwani from 2005-06 to 2011-12. The applications received during this period show almost an increasing trend. No application was received during 2005-06 in the office, which was first year of its (RTI Act) implementation as well maximum numbers of applications (37) were received during 2011-12, along with 88.88 per cent of disposal rate during 2009-10. As a whole 99.10 per cent applications were disposed off during study period. It is interesting that number of appeals against the responses to the applicants indicates a
constant trend with the same number (1) during 2006-07 to 2009-10 though their percentage was different. The highest percentage of applicant 11.11 per cent went for 1st appeal during 2009-10 and in the same year all applicants went for 2nd appeal.

Overall 3.50 per cent of those applicants who filed applications under RTI Act went for first appeal and 50 per cent of those applicants who filed 1st appeal against PIO/APIO went for 2nd appeal. It is noticeable that in any case neither any disciplinary action was recommended nor any penalty was imposed against the concerned officials.

Table 4.3.6

District Attorney Office

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Application Received</th>
<th>Application Rejected</th>
<th>Application Disposed off</th>
<th>1st Appeal</th>
<th>2nd Appeal</th>
<th>Disciplinary Action</th>
<th>Penalty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Data collected by researcher from District Attorney Office through RTI application response vide Memo no.1180/DAB/2012, dated 22/5/12)

Table 4.3.6 indicates the quantum of applications received during study period in District Attorney Office Bhiwani was very low. Only 25 applications were received during the study period. Maximum numbers (14) of application were received during the last year (2011-12) of the study period while minimum applications (2) were received during 2009-10. It is noticeable and somehow strange that all applications were disposed off during the study period (in stipulated time period). None of the
applicant went for appeal as a result neither any disciplinary action was taken nor any penalty was imposed against concerned official.

Table 4.3.7

Excise & Taxation Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Application Received</th>
<th>Application Rejected</th>
<th>Application Disposed off</th>
<th>1st Appeal</th>
<th>2nd Appeal</th>
<th>Disciplinary Action</th>
<th>Penalty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1 (4.76%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1 (1.38%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>3 (2.36%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Data collected by researcher from District Excise & Taxation Office through RTI application response no. 4019/RTI, dated 31/5/12)

As the Table-4.3.7 indicates that total 127 applications were received in District Excise & Taxation Department during the study period. During 2005-06 no application was received in the concerned office which was the first year of the implementation of the Act as well as of the study period. Gradually, the quantum of applications had increased, maximum number of application (72) were received during 2011-12 which was almost common in all departments while minimum applications (1) were received during 2006-07.

Appeals filed against the responses to the applicants registered a static trend. During starting four years (2003 to 2009) none of the applicants went for appeals against the received responses. During 2010-11, only 5 per cent of those applicants who filed applications under RTI Act went for first appeal. On the other side overall 2.36 per cent applicants went for its appeal. None of them went for second appeal. In Excise & Taxation Department, Bhiwani no disciplinary action was taken and no penalty was imposed in any case.
Table-4.3.8

District Agriculture Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Application Received</th>
<th>Application Rejected</th>
<th>Application Disposed off</th>
<th>1st Appeal</th>
<th>2nd Appeal</th>
<th>Disciplinary Action</th>
<th>Penalty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2(5)</td>
<td>36(90%)</td>
<td>4(10%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2(3.7)</td>
<td>50(92.59%)</td>
<td>4(7.40%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Data collected by researcher from District Agriculture Office through RTI application response Sr. No.5789, dated 27/6/12)

As is visible from the Table-4.3.8, total 54 applications were received during the study period in agriculture department Bhiwani. During two years (2005 to 07) there was no application received under RTI Act. The quantum of applications received indicates an increasing trend in all cases except 2010-11. In Agriculture Department under study period 3.7 per cent applications were rejected under provisions of the Act. In 92.59 per cent of cases information was provided in stipulated time period. During 2011-12 disposal rate was relatively low (90 per cent) during the study period.

It is noticeable that during the same year maximum 10 per cent appeals (4) were filed by applicants against the responses. Overall in 7.40 per cent cases applicants filed first appeal and none of them went for second appeal. During the study period no disciplinary action was taken and no penalty was imposed as a whole and year wise as well.
Table -4.3.9

District Information & Public Relation Office

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Application Received</th>
<th>Application Rejected</th>
<th>Application Disposed off</th>
<th>1st Appeal</th>
<th>2nd Appeal</th>
<th>Disciplinary Action</th>
<th>Penalty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 (66.66%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1 (7.14%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1 (3.57%)</td>
<td>27 (96.42%)</td>
<td>1 (3.70%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Data collected by researcher from District Information & Public Relation Office through RTI application response No.IPRB-2012/254, dated 23/5/12)

As Table-4.3.9 indicates that in District Public Information & Relation Office Bhiwani total 28 applications were received during study period. Maximum no. of applications were received during 2011-12. No applications under RTI Act were received during starting three years of the study period (viz. 2005-06, 2006-07 and 2007-08) whereas in the succeeding years no. of applications were increased. During study period about 4 percent (3.57%) applications were rejected and rest of the applications (96.42%) were disposed off and there being no pendency neither for the study period as a whole nor year to year basis under this period 3.70 per cent applicants went for 1st appeal while none of them went for 2nd appeal against the responses received to them. Further no disciplinary action was taken and no penalty was imposed in any case.
Table 4.3.10
District Cooperative Societies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Application Received</th>
<th>Application Rejected</th>
<th>Application Disposed off</th>
<th>1st Appeal</th>
<th>2nd Appeal</th>
<th>Disciplinary Action</th>
<th>Penalty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>5(6.57%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>5(4.54%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Data collected by researcher from Office by hand on 10/6/12 vide Memo no. CC/RTI/189 in response to RTI application dated 5/6/12)

As Table 4.3.10 exhibited that no application was received during starting five years of the study period viz. 2005-06 to 2009-10 and gradually increased the number of applications and reached at the total of 110. Maximum numbers of applications (76) were received during the last year of the study period and minimum numbers (34) of applications were received during 2010-11. None of the applications received (110) under RTI Act were rejected and significantly all were disposed of during the study period as a whole and year to year basis as well. A total of 4.54 per cent applicants went for first appeal under that period while 5.57 per cent were went for first appeal during 2011-12 whereas. However none of them went for second appeal. Further neither any disciplinary action was taken nor was any penalty imposed in any case.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Application Received</th>
<th>Application Rejected</th>
<th>Application Disposed off</th>
<th>1st Appeal</th>
<th>2nd Appeal</th>
<th>Disciplinary Action</th>
<th>Penalty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3(27.27%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3(7.14%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Data collected by researcher from District Office of Labour Department through RTI application response Sr. No.763, dated 23/5/12)

As Table-4.3.11 exhibits that a total of 42 applications were received during 2005-06 to 2011-12 in Labour department, Bhiwani. No applications were received during starting three years of the study period (viz. 2005-06, 2006-07, 2007-08) gradually this trend had changed and presents almost an increasing trend. Maximum numbers of applications (24) were received during 2010-11. None of the received applications (42) under RTI Act were rejected and significantly all were disposed off during the above mentioned period. A total of 7.14 per cent of the applicants went for first appeal during 2009-10. However none of the applicants went for second appeal and further no disciplinary action was taken and no penalty was imposed during the study period.
### Table -4.3.12
District Treasury Office

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Application Received</th>
<th>Application Rejected</th>
<th>Application Disposed off</th>
<th>1st Appeal</th>
<th>2nd Appeal</th>
<th>Disciplinary Action</th>
<th>Penalty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2(11.76)</td>
<td>15(88.23%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2(4.54)</td>
<td>42(95.4%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Data collected by researcher from District Treasury Office through RTI application response Sr. no. EA/1918, dated 13/6/12)

It is clear from the Table-4.3.12 that total 44 applications were received during the study period in Treasury Office, Bhiwani under RTI Act. During this period a total of 4.54 per cent of the applications were rejected and 95.4 per cent of the applications were disposed off. Maximum numbers of applications (17) were received during 2011-12 while minimum numbers of applications (3) were received during 2008-09 of the study period. There being no pendency of applications as a whole and year to year basis as well. It is noteworthy that none of the applications went for appeal (neither 1st nor 2nd) and as a result no disciplinary action was taken place and no penalty was imposed during this period.
Table -4.3.13

Department of Mines & Geology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Application Received</th>
<th>Application Rejected</th>
<th>Application Disposed off</th>
<th>1st Appeal</th>
<th>2nd Appeal</th>
<th>Disciplinary Action</th>
<th>Penalty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5(6.57%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>5(4.54%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Data collected by researcher from Department of Mines & Geology through RTI application response vide Memo no. RTI/Mining/1091, dated 10/7/2012)

As is evident from Table-4.3.13, total 64 applications were received during the study period in Mines & Geology Department in Bhiwani. The applications under RTI have registered fluctuating trend. Minimum numbers (2) of applications were received during 2006-07 second year of its implementation. On the other hand maximum (21) numbers of applications were received during last year of study period viz. 2011-12. No applications under RTI Act were rejected during study period and significantly all (64) applications were disposed off; there being no pendency neither for the study period as a whole nor on year to year basis. Further no appeal was filed (either 1st or 2nd) by applicants against the response received by them from concerned public officer also neither any disciplinary action was taken nor any penalty was imposed in any case against the concerned SPIO.
Table -4.3.14

Women & Child Development
(Program Office ICDS Cell)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Application Received</th>
<th>Application Rejected</th>
<th>Application Disposed off</th>
<th>1st Appeal</th>
<th>2nd Appeal</th>
<th>Disciplinary Action</th>
<th>Penalty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1(100%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>6(100%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1(100%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>2(100%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1(100%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1(4%)</td>
<td>24(96%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>1(0.85%)</td>
<td>117(99.15%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>2(1.30%)</td>
<td>152(98.70%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Data collected by researcher from Program Office ICDS Cell through RTI application response vide Memo no.857, dated 05/6/12)

As it is clear from the Table-4.3.14, a total of 254 applications have been received from applicants in Women & Child Development Office, Bhiwani during the study period. The applications registered indicate a fluctuation except last two years of the study period viz. 2010-11 and 2011-12. It is interesting that minimum number (1) of applications were received during three years of the study period having the same data during first, third and fifth year of its implementation while maximum (118) number of applications were received during 2011-12. It is noteworthy that 1.30 per cent applications were rejected during the study period with highest percentage (4%) during 2010-11. Overall 98.7 per cent applications were disposed off in stipulated time period. None of the applicant went for 1st or 2nd appeal against the responses. It indicates the same consistency in disciplinary action and penalty as well. There is no case of disciplinary action and penalty during the study period in Women and Child Development Department Bhiwani.
Table -4.3.15

Forest Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Application Received</th>
<th>Application Rejected</th>
<th>Application Disposed off</th>
<th>1st Appeal</th>
<th>2nd Appeal</th>
<th>Disciplinary Action</th>
<th>Penalty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1(11.11%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2(3.22%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>3(1.05%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Data collected by researcher from Divisional Forest Officer through RTI application response vide Memo no.401, dated 28/5/12)

As is exhibits in Table-4.3.15, total 286 applications were received during the study period in Forest Department Bhiwani. The applications under RTI have registered an almost increasing trend; maximum numbers of applications (80) under RTI Act received during 2010-11 while minimum numbers of applications (9) were received during 2005-06, which were the first year of the study period as well as first year of implementation of the Act. It is significant that all applications (286) received under RTI Act were disposed off during the study period and there being no pendency neither for the study period as a whole nor on year to year basis.

Overall about one per cent (1.05%) applicants went for first appeal during the study period. During 2005-06 maximum percentage of applicants (11.11%) went for 1st appeal. However, none of them went for second appeal. Further neither any disciplinary action was taken nor was any penalty imposed in any case against the concerned official.
Table -4.3.16

District Election Office

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Application Received</th>
<th>Application Rejected</th>
<th>Application Disposed off</th>
<th>1st Appeal</th>
<th>2nd Appeal</th>
<th>Disciplinary Action</th>
<th>Penalty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Data collected by researcher from District Election Office through RTI application response Memo no. Election/2012/359, dated 6/7/12)

As is visible from Table-4.3.16, total 66 applications have been received in District Election Office during 2005-06 to 2011-12. The applications received during the study period increased gradually and registered an almost increasing trend. Maximum numbers of applications (16) were received during 2011-12 and minimum numbers of application (5) were received during 2005-06 which was the first year of implementation of the Act. It is remarkable that, none of 66 applications received under RTI Act in the District Election Office were rejected all were disposed off during the study period. None of the applicants filed first or second appeal against the responses received by them. As a result no disciplinary action was taken and no penalty was imposed in any of these cases.
Table-4.3.17

District Khadi & Village Industries Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Application Received</th>
<th>Application Rejected</th>
<th>Application Disposed off</th>
<th>1st Appeal</th>
<th>2nd Appeal</th>
<th>Disciplinary Action</th>
<th>Penalty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1(100%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1(50%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1(50%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3(60%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Data collected by researcher from District Khadi & Village Industries Office through RTI application response Memo no. D.O/Bhiwani/RTI/2012-13, dated 12/6/12)

As Table-4.3.17 shows that total only 5 applications were received during study period under RTI Act in District Khadi & Village Industries office. Applications received during this period indicate that no application under RTI Act was received during four year whereas in the succeeding years the number of applications received increased gradually. Maximum numbers (2) of applications were received during last two years of the study period viz. 2010-11 and 2011-12. All applications were disposed off during the study period despite that overall 60 per cent of applicants went for 1st appeal. During 2009-10 maximum percentage (100%) of applicants went for 1st appeal while none of them went for second appeal and no penalty was imposed and no disciplinary action was taken in any case against concerned officials.
Table 4.3.18

District Child Welfare Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Application Received</th>
<th>Application Rejected</th>
<th>Application Disposed off</th>
<th>1st Appeal</th>
<th>2nd Appeal</th>
<th>Disciplinary Action</th>
<th>Penalty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Data collected by researcher from District Council for Child Welfare through RTI application response Endst no.DCC00/2012-13/74, dated 5/6/12)

As above Table-4.3.18, exhibits that there is every low quantum of applications received during the study period in District Child Welfare Office. A total of 26 applications were received during the above mentioned period. No application under RTI Act was received during first two years whereas in the succeeding years the number of applications received increased gradually maximum number of applications (10) was received during 2010-11 and on the other hand minimum number (1) of applications were received during 2008-09.

None of applications received under RTI Act in the District Child Welfare Office were rejected and significantly all were disposed off during the study period. It is noteworthy that none of the applicant went for appeal (rather 1st of 2nd appeal) further neither any disciplinary action was taken nor any penalty was imposed against any SPIO.
Table-4.3.19
Red Cross Society

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Application Received</th>
<th>Application Rejected</th>
<th>Application Disposed off</th>
<th>1st Appeal</th>
<th>2nd Appeal</th>
<th>Disciplinary Action</th>
<th>Penalty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1(50%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4(50%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3(37.5%)</td>
<td>1(33.33%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4(50%)</td>
<td>1(25%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12(46.15%)</td>
<td>2(16.66%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Data collected by researcher from Indian Red Cross Society Ref. No. RCB/77/12, dated 13/6/12)

As is visible from Table-4.3.19, total 26 applications were received under RTI Act in Red Cross Office, Bhiwani during the study period. Though no applications were received under RTI Act in starting two years of the study period whereas in succeeding years gradually. Although it registered a static trend is last three years of the study period. None of received applications were rejected and all were disposed off in stipulated time period.

A total of 46.15 per cent of the applicants who filed applications under RTI went for 1st appeal under the study period while 50 per cent of the applicants went for 1st appeal during three years viz. 2007-08, 2009-10, 2011-12. On the other hand overall 16.66 per cent of the applicants went for 2nd appeal with maximum percentage 33.33 per cent during 2010-11. In any of these cases no disciplinary action was taken and no penalty was imposed during the study period.
Table-4.3.20

Employment Exchange Office

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Application Received</th>
<th>Application Rejected</th>
<th>Application Disposed off</th>
<th>1st Appeal</th>
<th>2nd Appeal</th>
<th>Disciplinary Action</th>
<th>Penalty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1(100%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1(100%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1(100%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1(33.33%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1(11.11%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1(33.33%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6(33.33%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Data collected by researcher from District Employment Office through RTI application response vide Memo no. RTI/12/1505-06, dated 13/6/12)

It is clearly indicates from Table-4.3.20 that a total of 18 applications were received during the study period which is very low quantum in Employment Exchange Office. Maximum number (9) of applications was received during 2010-11. None of the application was rejected and significantly all were disposed off during the study period. Even if 33.33 per cent of the applicants went for 1st appeal and all applications went for 1st appeal during three years of the study viz. 2006-07, 2007-08 and 2008-09 while minimum percentage 11.11 per cent of the applicants went for 1st appeal during 2010-11 against the responses to the applications under RTI Act. It is remarkable that none of the applicant (6) went for second appeal further neither any disciplinary action was taken nor any penalty was imposed in above mentioned cases against the concerned official.
Table -4.3.21

Roadways Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Application Received</th>
<th>Application Rejected</th>
<th>Application Disposed off</th>
<th>1st Appeal</th>
<th>2nd Appeal</th>
<th>Disciplinary Action</th>
<th>Penalty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1(1.28%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1(1.04%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>3(1.07%)</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>2(0.72%)</td>
<td>1(50%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Data collected by researcher from GM Office Bhiwani through RTI application for inspection of record dated 5/5/12)

Present Table-4.3.21 shows that a total of 281 applications were received under RTI Act in Haryana Roadways Department, Bhiwani during the study period. The applications under RTI have registered an increasing trend during this period; maximum numbers of applications (96) were received during last year of the study period while minimum (1) applications were received during the first year of its implementation. It is noteworthy that 1.07 per cent applications were rejected and left applications were disposed of in stipulated time period.

Overall only 0.72 per cent applicants went for 1st appeal and maximum (1.28%) applicants were moved for 1st appeal during 2010-11. On the other hand overall 50 per cent of the applicants went for 2nd appeal. In none of the case neither any penalty imposed nor any disciplinary action recommended under RTI Act in the Roadways Department. While during 2010-11 there is a case of 2nd appeal.
Table -4.3.22  
Animal Husbandry & Dairy Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Application Received</th>
<th>Application Rejected</th>
<th>Application Disposed off</th>
<th>1st Appeal</th>
<th>2nd Appeal</th>
<th>Disciplinary Action</th>
<th>Penalty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Data collected by researcher from Animal Husbandry & Dairy Department Bhiwani through RTI application for inspection of record dated 5/5/12)

As is exhibited in Table-4.3.22, total 50 applicants were received in Animal Husbandry & Dairy Dept. Bhiwani. No applications under RTI Act were received during the first year of the study period whereas in the succeeding years numbers of applications were increased gradually. Minimum numbers of application (15) were received during 2009-10 while minimum numbers of applications (2) were received during 2011-12 under RTI Act.

None of the applications received under RTI Act were rejected and significantly all were disposed off during the study period as well as year to year basis. It is important to discuss that none of the applicants filed any appeal (rather 1st or 2nd) against the responses received. As a result neither any disciplinary action was taken nor was any penalty imposed in Animal Husbandry and Dairy Dept. during the study period.
### Table -4.3.23

**H.S.A.M & Agriculture Office (A.S.C.O Bhiwani)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Application Received</th>
<th>Application Rejected</th>
<th>Application Disposed off</th>
<th>1st Appeal</th>
<th>2nd Appeal</th>
<th>Disciplinary Action</th>
<th>Penalty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5(31.25%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>103</strong></td>
<td><strong>Nil</strong></td>
<td><strong>103</strong></td>
<td><strong>5(4.85%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Nil</strong></td>
<td><strong>Nil</strong></td>
<td><strong>Nil</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Data collected by researcher from Assistant Soil Conservation Office Bhiwani through RTI Memo no. 756, dated 19/6/12 and Executive Engineer HSAM Board Bhiwani through Memo no.1304, dated 11/6/12)

Table -4.3.23 shows that during the study period 2005-06 to 2011-12 a total of 103 applications were received in HSAM and Agriculture (A.S.C.O) Bhiwani. During first year of the study period no applications were received under RTI Act in concerned office viz. 2005-06 which was first year of implementation of the Act. Minimum number of applications (1) were received during 2007-08 (last year of the study period) while maximum number of applications were received (32) during 2010-11. None of the applications were rejected and all were disposed off during the study period; there being no pendency neither for the study period as a whole nor on year to year basis. A total of 4.85 per cent applicants went for 1st appeal whereas 31.25 per cent applicants went for 1st appeal during 2008-09. On the other hand, none of the applicant went for 2nd appeal further no disciplinary action was taken and no penalty was imposed against any concerned official.
### Table -4.3.24
**Public Health Department**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Application Received</th>
<th>Application Rejected</th>
<th>Application Disposed off</th>
<th>1st Appeal</th>
<th>2nd Appeal</th>
<th>Disciplinary Action</th>
<th>Penalty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>6 (50%)</td>
<td>3 (33.33%)</td>
<td>1 (33.33%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>25 (32%)</td>
<td>8 (50%)</td>
<td>4 (50%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>41 (95.34%)</td>
<td>13 (30.23%)</td>
<td>1 (7.69%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>60 (92.31%)</td>
<td>18 (27.69%)</td>
<td>9 (50%)</td>
<td>1 (11.11%)</td>
<td>3 (33.33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>63 (96.92%)</td>
<td>10 (15.38%)</td>
<td>2 (20%)</td>
<td>1 (50%)</td>
<td>1 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>195 (95.59%)</td>
<td>52 (25.49%)</td>
<td>17 (32.69%)</td>
<td>2 (11.76%)</td>
<td>4 (23.52%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Data received from SE Public Health Engineering circle Bhiwani vide Memo No. 10928, dated 31/5/12. Memo No. 11035 Dated 22/6/12 Executive Engineer Public Health Division No. 1 Bhiwani and Memo No. 9837 Dated 3/7/12 Executive engineer public health Division No. 2 Bhiwani)

Table-4.3.24 shows that total of 204 applications received in Public Health Department including Superintending Engineer Office and Division Office 1 and 2 of Bhiwani circle. Minimum numbers of applications (6) were received during third year of the study period (2007-08) while maximum of applications (65) were received during last 2 year of the study period i.e. 2010-12 and 2011-12 No applications were received during the first two years whereas in succeeding years the number of applications receives increased gradually and registered almost an increasing trend. None of the applications received under RTI Act were rejected and near about 95 per cent (95.59%) of the applications were disposed off in the stipulated time period.

Overall one-fourths (25.49%) of the applicants went for 1st appeal during the study period; maximum 50 per cent of the applicants during 2007-08. In last five
years from 2007-08 to 2011-12 there was continuous process of appeals. While near about 33 per cent (32.69%) of the applicants went for 2nd appeal as a whole during the study period; maximum 50 per cent of the applicants during 2008-09 filed 2nd appeal. Further in 11.76 per cent cases disciplinary action was recommended while in 23.52 per cent cases penalty was imposed. The cases in which disciplinary action was recommended related to Division 1, Bhiwani while cases of penalty related to Division 1, and Division 2 Bhiwani of Public Health Department.

**Table -4.3.25**

Irrigation Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Application Received</th>
<th>Application Rejected</th>
<th>Application Disposed off</th>
<th>1st Appeal</th>
<th>2nd Appeal</th>
<th>Disciplinary Action</th>
<th>Penalty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1(6.6%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1(5%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2(2.06%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>2(1.76%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>2(0.72)</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>6(2.20%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


As Table-4.2.25 exhibited that total 274 applications were received in Irrigation Department during study period from 2005-06 to 2011-12. During this period 0.72 per cent applications were rejected and rest all applications was disposed off in irrigation department. The application received under RTI Act presents an increasing trend; maximum number of applications (115) were received during
2011-12 (Last year of the study period) while minimum number of applications were received during 1st year of the study period which was first year of the implementation of the Act as well. Overall about 2 per cent (2.02%) applicant went for 1st appeal during the whole study period. On the other hand maximum percentage (6.6%) of appeals was registered during 2007-08 and minimum applicants (2) went for 1st appeal during 2010-11 and 2011-12. It is noticeable that none of the appellant went for 2nd appeal as a result any disciplinary action or penalty was not imposed.

Table -4.3.26

Fisheries Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Application Received</th>
<th>Application Rejected</th>
<th>Application Disposed off</th>
<th>1st Appeal</th>
<th>2nd Appeal</th>
<th>Disciplinary Action</th>
<th>Penalty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>6 (100%)</td>
<td>1 (6.6%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>6 (100%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>4 (100%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>10 (83.33%)</td>
<td>2 (16.66%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>27 (93.10%)</td>
<td>2 (6.89%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Data collected by researcher through RTI application response vide Memo no.788, dated 1-8-12 Fisheries Office Bhiwani)

As Table-4.2.26 exhibited that total 29 applications were received in District Fisheries Department which indicates a very low proportion during the whole study period. In spite of very few number of applications received all applications were not disposed off during study period. Near about 93 per cent (93.10%) of application were responded in stipulated time frame. During the year 2011-12; approximate 83 per cent (83.33%) of applications were responded in stipulated time frame. On other hand near
about 7 per cent (6.89%) per cent of the applicant went for first appeal but none of them went for 2nd appeal and there is no case of recommendation of disciplinary action and imposition of penalty in any case.

### Table -4.3.27

**Market Committee Bhiwani**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Application Received</th>
<th>Application Rejected</th>
<th>Application Disposed off</th>
<th>1st Appeal</th>
<th>2nd Appeal</th>
<th>Disciplinary Action</th>
<th>Penalty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>9 (10%)</td>
<td>1 (11.11%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>12 (100%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>18 (94.76%)</td>
<td>1 (5.26%)</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>41 (100%)</td>
<td>3 (7.31%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>42 (100%)</td>
<td>4 (9.52%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>123 (99.13%)</td>
<td>9 (7.26%)</td>
<td>1 (11.11%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Data received from Secretary & Executive Officer Market Committee Bhiwani vide Memo no. 783, dated 13/6/12.)

As Table-4.3.27 exhibits in Market Committee, total of 124 applications were received and significantly none of the applicant was rejected while 99.13 per cent of the applications were disposed off in stipulated time period. Maximum no. of applications (42) were received during 2011-12 while minimum no (1) of applications were received during 2066-07 (second year of the study period). A total of 7.26 per cent of the applicants went for 1st appeal and maximum percentage (9.52%) of applicants went for 1st appeal during 2011-12 on the other hand minimum percentage (11.11%) of the applicant went for 1st appeal during 2007-08. In 11.11 per cent cases applicant filed second appeal however no disciplinary action was taken in any case while penalty was imposed in single case against the concerned official during 2005-11.
Table -4.3.28

Education Department Bhiwani

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Application Received</th>
<th>Application Rejected</th>
<th>Application Disposed off</th>
<th>1st Appeal</th>
<th>2nd Appeal</th>
<th>Disciplinary Action</th>
<th>Penalty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>2 (100%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>33 (100%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>83 (100%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>133 (98.51%)</td>
<td>2 (1.48%)</td>
<td>2 (100%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>143 (84.11%)</td>
<td>27 (15.88%)</td>
<td>27 (100%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>247 (84.58%)</td>
<td>35 (12.41%)</td>
<td>26 (74.28%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1 (3.84%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>340 (90.90%)</td>
<td>43 (11.52%)</td>
<td>24 (55.81%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1 (4.16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>1079</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>981 (90.00%)</td>
<td>107 (9.92%)</td>
<td>79 (73.83%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>2 (2.53%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


It is clear from Table-4.3.28 that total of 1079 applications were received from applicants in Education Department during the study period. The applications received under RTI Act presents an increasing trend. Minimum number of applications (2) was received during the first year of its implementation.

On the other side, maximum number of applications was received (374) during the last year of the study period i.e. 2011-12. Over the period one application was rejected and reason of rejection was mentioned as mutual compromise. During the study period 90 per cent of the applications were responded in stipulated time period. Appeals field by applicants also indicated an increasing trend.

Near about 10 per cent (9.92%) of the applicants filed first appeal. During 2009-10 it indicates highest percentage (15.88%) while maximum numbers (43) of first appeal were registered during 2011-12. On the other hand out of 107 applicants, 8 second appeal cases were in process in SIC when data collected.

* Eight 2nd appeal cases were in process in SIC when data collected.
79 applicants (73.83%) went for 2nd appeal it represents a high proportion. In these cases during study period no disciplinary action was recommended while only in two cases (2.53%) penalty was imposed against the concerned SPIO.

Table -4.3.29

Food & Supplies Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Application Received</th>
<th>Application Rejected</th>
<th>Application Disposed off</th>
<th>1st Appeal</th>
<th>2nd Appeal</th>
<th>Disciplinary Action</th>
<th>Penalty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4 (16.66%)</td>
<td>3 (75%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1 (1.53%)</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1 (1.47%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>6 (4.08%)</td>
<td>2 (33.33%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>10 (4.52%)</td>
<td>2 (20%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>22 (3.89%)</td>
<td>8 (36.36%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Data collected by researcher from District Food & Supplies Office Bhiwani through RTI application for inspection of record dated 5/5/12)

Present Table-4.3.29 shows that total 565 applications were received during study period under RTI Act in Food & Supplies Department. Applications received during this period depicts an increasing trend maximum number of application (221) were received during last year of the study period i.e. 2011-12. On the other hand minimum member of applications (24) were received during 2006-07. It is remarkable that none of the application was rejected and all were disposed off during the study period as whole and year to year basis as well.

Appeals (I, II) received during the study period presents a fluctuation on data. Maximum numbers (10) of first appeals were received during 2011-12 while the highest percentage 16.6 per cent was during 2006-07 for first appeal. In near about 4

---

* In Education Department, data of District Education office of (DEO), District Elementary Education officer (DEEO) and Block Education officer’s of Siwani, Bhiwani, Loharu, Bahal, Bound Kalan, Tosham and Kairu is clubbed in above table. While the data of Rest three Blocks (Dadri, Bawani Khera and Badhra) was not received till Date. In Bhiwani District there are 10 BEEO as well. Their Post takes place after March 2012. So there is no directly received application in these offices. So data of DEEO is considered of the year 2011-12.
per cent (3.89%) applicants went for first appeal against the responses received while maximum number (3) of applicants filed second appeal during 2006-07 as same in first appeal and their highest percentage (100%) was during 2008-09 when information seekers went for 2nd appeal. Overall in more than 36 per cent (36.36%) cases applicants went for second appeal. It is noticeable and significant that neither disciplinary action was taken nor penalty was imposed during the study period.

Table-4.3.30
Health Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Application Received</th>
<th>Application Rejected</th>
<th>Application Disposed off</th>
<th>1st Appeal</th>
<th>2nd Appeal</th>
<th>Disciplinary Action</th>
<th>Penalty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>1017</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1017</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Data received through RTI Application response Memo no. 05/12/1879 dated 12/7/12 from Civil Surgeon Office Bhiwani, Memo no. RTI Act 05/12/1672 Dated 13/06/12 Civil Surgeon Office Bhiwani, Memo no. GHD-13/77 Dated 23/5/13 GH Dadri)

Table-4.2.30 indicates that total 1017 applications were received under RTI Act in Health Department Bhiwani. The applications received in Health Department, indicates almost an increasing trend. Minimum numbers of applications (9) were received under RTI Act during first year of its implementation. On the other hand, maximum numbers of application (398) were received during last year of the study period i.e. 2011-12. None of applications (1017) received under RTI Act in Health Department were rejected and significantly all the applications were responded in stipulated time frame. There being no pendency neither for the study period as a whole nor on year to year basis.
Further near about 12 per cent (11.99%) applicants went for first appeal during the study period. During 2010-11 maximum percentage (15.63%) of applicants went for 1st appeal while during 2007-08 it indicates lowest percentage (4.21%) of applicants under 1st appeal. In opposite trend during 2007-08 maximum (100%) of applicants went for 2nd appeal while during 2009-10 it indicates lowest proportion.

Overall near about one-fourths (23.77%) of applicants filed 2nd appeal under RTI Act. Further any disciplinary action was not recommended against concerned SPIO. While overall in one case (3.44%) penalty was imposed of Rs. 500 against concerned SPIO.

Table -4.3.31
Police Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Application Received</th>
<th>Application Rejected</th>
<th>Application Disposed of</th>
<th>1st Appeal</th>
<th>2nd Appeal</th>
<th>Disciplinary Action</th>
<th>Penalty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>59 (100%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>148 (100%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>142 (100%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>452 (99.77%)</td>
<td>13 (2.86%)</td>
<td>8 (61.53%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>615 (100%)</td>
<td>24 (3.90%)</td>
<td>6 (25%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>798 (99.62%)</td>
<td>44 (5.49%)</td>
<td>17 (38.63%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>200 (98.52%)</td>
<td>7 (3.44%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>2421</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>2414 (99.71%)</td>
<td>88 (3.64%)</td>
<td>31 (35.22%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Data received through RTI Response Memo no. 14988/ SPIO SP Bhiwani Dated 25/5/12 and Memo no. 5903 dated 20/6/12 from Jail Superintendent Bhiwani.)

It is clear from the Table-4.3.31 that overall 2421 applications have been received from applicants in the Police Department during the study period. The applications received under RTI Act presents almost an increasing trend. Minimum numbers of applications (59) were received during 2006 and maximum numbers of applications (801) were received during 2011. The data of 2012 is up to April.

* In Health Department in Bhiwani District includes civil Hospital Bhiwani, General Hospital Dadri (Independent), Siwani, Bawani Khera and Devarala. Along with a community Health centers (CHC) 41 primary health centers, ESI Hospital. In above table Data of civil Surgeon Bhiwani Civil Hospital and General Hospital Dadri is club. While Data received From CHC’s All GH and ESI Hospital indicates that there is no application received independently.
It is noticeable that none of the application was rejected and more than 99 per cent (99.71%) of the applications were disposed off during the study period or responded in stipulated time frame. In case of appeal provision, more than 3 per cent (3.64%) of the applicants went for 1st appeal during the whole study period whereas maximum percentage (5.49%) as well as maximum number (44) of applicants went for 1st appeal during 2011. On the other side, near about 35 per cent of applicants went for 2nd appeal. It is interesting that in any case neither any disciplinary action was taken nor any penalty was imposed against the concerned officials.

Table -4.3.32
DHBVN (Electricity Department)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Application Received</th>
<th>Application Rejected</th>
<th>Application Disposed off</th>
<th>1st Appeal</th>
<th>2nd Appeal</th>
<th>Disciplinary Action</th>
<th>Penalty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1 (10%)</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2 (5%)</td>
<td>2 (100%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>2 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>22 (12.15%)</td>
<td>8 (36.36%)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>3 (37.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>51 (12.65%)</td>
<td>21 (41.17%)</td>
<td>1 (4.76%)</td>
<td>9 (42.85%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>34 (7.03%)</td>
<td>14 (41.17%)</td>
<td>Nil*</td>
<td>Nil*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>1117</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1117</td>
<td>110 (9.84%)</td>
<td>46 (41.81%)</td>
<td>1 (2.17%)</td>
<td>14 (30.43%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Data received from Executive Engineer S/U Division Bhiwani through Memo no. SU-3/RTI-321 dated 11/7/12, Data received from XEN Electricity Division Bhiwani through Memo No. 11787/RTI No. 605, dated 4/10/12 and Data received from XEN ‘OP’ Division, Dadri through Memo No. 3059, dated 12/7/12 in response of RTI Application)

As is exhibits in Table-4.3.32 total 1117 applications were received during the study period in DHBVN. During first two years of the study period no application registered. After that in succeeding years there was tremendous increase in applications. Maximum numbers of application (483) were received during last year

* In above Table-4.3.31 data of Bhiwani District police department is mentioned. In this table data received from SP office Bhiwani and Jail superintendent Bhiwani is clubbed. As per SP office data all applications were disposed off responded in stipulated time frame while as per Jail superintendent data; seven applications were not responded in stipulated time frame during the whole study period.
of the study period i.e. 2011-12. None of the applications were rejected and significantly all applications (1117) were disposed off during the study period; there being no pendency neither for the study period as a whole nor on year to year basis. Appeals filed under RTI Act shows fluctuation in number of appeals as well as percentage of appeals. Maximum percentage (12.65%) of 1st appeal filed during 2010-11 with maximum number (51). Over the study period more than 9 per cent (9.85%) per cent of the applicants went for 1st appeal whereas more than two-fifths (41.82%) applicants went for 2nd appeal during the study period. Maximum number of 2nd appeal filed during 2010-11 while highest percentage (100%) of applicants for end appeal during 2007-08 & 2008-09. Only in one case (2.17%) disciplinary action was recommended and as a whole in more than 30 per cent (30.43%) cases penalty was imposed during the study period. In this exercise maximum number of penalty cases (9) taken place during 2010-11 while maximum percentage (100%) of 2nd appeal registered during 2008-09.#

Graph 4.3

Status of RTI Act in Selected PAs at District Level

---

# Dakshin Haryana Bijali Vitran Nigam has three divisions in Bhiwani District comprising City Division Bhiwani, Sub urban Division Bhiwani and Dadri Division Data if all three divisions is clubbed in above table and District officer (Superintendent Engineer) of DHBVN Bhiwani is circle office Bhiwani.
Present graph represent the data of selected PAs of Bhiwani district regarding status of RTI Act at respective level. These PAs are selected on the basis of public interface regarding RTI Act on the basis of applications received by PAs for collection of primary data from information seekers as analyzed in next chapter.