

### GRANT NO. 3 – ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

	Total Grant Or Appropriation	Actual expenditure	Saving (-) Excess (+)
(In thousand of rupees)			

#### REVENUE

##### **Charged –**

<u>Original</u>	<u>328,49,00)</u>			
<u>Supplementary</u>	<u>1,50,00)</u>	<u>329,99,00</u>	<u>222,24,52</u>	<u>-107,74,48</u>

Amount surrendered during the year -50,45,00

##### **Voted -**

Original	1203,14,00)			
Supplementary	4,00)	1203,18,00	883,24,28	-319,93,72

Amount surrendered during the year -187,59,00

#### CAPITAL

**Voted -** 23,00,00 60,05 -22,39,95

Amount surrendered during the year 12,00,00

#### **Notes and Comments**

In the **Charged portion of Revenue Section** of the grant, the overall saving of ₹10774.48 lakhs (against the sanctioned provision of ₹32999.00 lakhs inclusive of supplementary provision of ₹150.00 lakhs) constituted 32.65% of the sanctioned appropriation.

An amount of ₹150.00 lakhs remained wholly un-utilised under one sub-head. This includes the following sub-head.

- Under Major Head “2015” – Election – Electoral Officers – ₹150.00 lakhs -- due to payment to Maha Laxmi Tent House continued to be subjudice.**

Savings / Excess occurred mainly under the following Major Head: –

(In lakh of rupees)

#### **High Court**

##### **Major Head “2014”**

Administration of Justice

<u>O.</u>	<u>32599.00)</u>			
<u>R.</u>	<u>-5175.00)</u>	<u>27424.00</u>	<u>21844.77</u>	<u>-5579.23</u>

**Civil & Session Court****Major Head “2014”**

Administration of Justice

O. 250.00)

R. 130.00)

380.00

379.75

-25

Savings occurred more than ₹1.00 crore mainly under the following sub heads: –

1. **Under Major Head “2014”** – Administration of Justice – High Court – (i) Direction and Administration – Savings of ₹10454.18 lakhs (against the sanctioned provision of ₹32049.00 lakhs) was mainly due to non filling up of vacant posts, less number of personal claims, less official in land & overseas tours and less funds spent on Mediation & Conciliation centre.

(ii) Computerisation of High Court – Savings of ₹171.89 lakhs (against the sanctioned provision of ₹200.00 lakhs) was mainly due to funds received late resulted in non modernization of process.

(iii) Delhi High Court Arbitration Centre – Savings of ₹128.16 lakhs (against the sanctioned provision of ₹350.00 lakhs) was mainly due to receipt of less bills.

The above savings were partly off-set by excesses under the following sub-head:-

1. **Under Major Head “2014”** – Administration of Justice – Civil & Session Courts – Session Court – excess of ₹129.75 lakhs (against the sanctioned provision of ₹250.00 lakhs) was mainly due to more procurement.

In the **Voted portion of Revenue Section** of the grant, the overall saving of ₹31993.72 lakhs (against the sanctioned provision of ₹120318.00 lakhs inclusive of supplementary provision of ₹4.00 lakhs) constituted 26.59% of the total sanctioned provision.

An amount of ₹1.00 lakh remained wholly unutilized under one sub-head.

Savings / Excess occurred mainly under the following Major Heads: –

(In lakh of rupees)

**High Court****Major Head “2014”**

Administration of Justice

O. 1131.00)

R. -41.00)

1090.00

724.61

-365.39

**Civil and Session Court**

O. 106092.00)

R. -19110.00)

86982.00

77445.78

-9536.22

**Directorate Of Prosecution**

O. 3491.00)

S. 1.00)

R. -82.00)

3410.00

3148.13

-261.87

**Law Department**

O.	6236.90)			
S.	2.00)			
R.	-389.90)	5849.00	4916.63	-932.37

**Election Office****Major Head “2015”****Election**

O.	2725.00)			
S.	1.00)			
R.	855.00)	3581.00	1485.04	-2095.96

Savings occurred more than ₹1.00 crore mainly under the following sub heads: –

1. **Under Major Head “2014”** – Administration of Justice – (a) High Court – Delhi Judicial Academy – Saving of ₹406.39 lakhs (against the sanctioned provision of ₹1131.00 lakhs) was mainly due to approval of terms and condition of salary of Ld. Chair person awaited from the competent Authority, less claims and training expenses of other countries Judges were reimbursed by the respective agencies.

(b) Civil and Session Courts – (i) Session Court – Saving of ₹24532.17 lakhs (against the sanctioned provision of ₹96729.19 lakhs ) was mainly due to vacant posts, procurement of less items, receipt of less claims and major provision kept for payment of arrears of upgradation of pay scales could not be utilised for want of completion of necessary procedure and getting approval of the competent authority.

(ii) Computerisation of District and Session Court -- Savings of ₹291.74 lakhs (against the sanctioned provision of ₹300.00 lakhs ) was mainly due to enhancement of leased line from 34 to 155 Mbps and procurement of 6 NAS storage devices not materialised.

(c) Small Causes Courts – Saving of ₹343.31 lakhs (against the sanction provision of ₹463.00 lakhs) was mainly due to vacant posts, procurement of less items & receipt of less claims.

(d) Criminal Courts – Judicial Magistrate’s Courts – Saving of ₹3479.00 lakhs (against the sanction provision of ₹8599.81 lakhs) was mainly due to vacant posts, procurement of less items, receipt of less claims, bills not received from the Govt. press and bills of advocate / mediators payable on settlement cases were quantitatively on lower side than anticipated.

(e) Legal Advisors and Counsels – (i) Prosecution Wing – saving of ₹343.87 lakhs (against the sanctioned provision of ₹3492.00 lakhs inclusive of supplementary provision of ₹1.00 lakhs ) was mainly due to vacant posts, less claims, purchase proposal of books & electronic appliances not finalised.

(ii) Law Officers – saving of ₹128.30 lakhs (against the sanctioned provision of ₹1250.00 lakhs) was mainly due to less bills.

(iii) Delhi Legal Services Authority – saving of ₹590.60 lakhs (against the sanctioned provision of ₹1848.00 lakhs) was mainly due to less repairs, less bills, vacant posts not filled, tour programmes not undertaken and shifting of office also is under consideration.

(iv) GIA to Delhi Dispute Resolution Society – saving of ₹107.50 lakhs (against the sanctioned provision of ₹400.00 lakhs) was mainly due to release of less grant.

(f) Family Courts – Establishment of family Courts – saving of ₹536.16 lakhs (against the sanctioned provision of ₹1939.90 lakhs inclusive of supplementary provision of ₹1.00 lakhs) was mainly due to procurement of less items, transfer of officers and non materialising of the purchase proposal of desktop, furniture & printing of forms.

2. **Under Major Head “2015”** – Election – (a) Electoral Officers – Saving of ₹472.79 lakhs (against the sanction provision of ₹1171.30 lakhs inclusive of supplementary provision of ₹1.00 lakhs) was mainly due to non filling of vacant posts & non receipt of anticipated bills.

(b) Preparation & Printing of Electoral Rolls – Saving of ₹445.76 lakhs (against the sanction provision of ₹600.00 lakhs ) was mainly due to the printing work assigned to Govt. press not completed.

(c) Charges for the Election to the State/UT conduct Legislature – Issue of Identity Cards to Voters – Saving of ₹388.12 lakhs (against the sanction provision of ₹929.70 lakhs ) was mainly due to vacant posts, less bills and bills regarding printing of cards not received as anticipated.

The above savings were partly off-set by an excess of ₹82.63 under one sub head which exceeds ₹50.00 lakhs but less than ₹1.00 crore.

In the **Voted portion of Capital Section** of the grant, the overall saving of ₹2239.95 lakhs (against the sanctioned provision of ₹2300.00 lakhs ) constituted 97.38% of the total sanctioned provision.

Provision of ₹1.00 lakh remained wholly unutilized under one sub-head.

Savings / Excess occurred mainly under the following Major Head: –

(In lakh of rupees)

**Election Office**

**Major Head “4059”**

Capital Outlay on Public Works

O. 2300.00)

R. -1200.00) 1100.00 60.05 -1039.95

Savings occurred more than ₹1.00 crore mainly under the following sub head: –

1. **Under Major Head “4059”** – Capital Outlay on Public Works – Office Buildings – Construction -- Chief Election Office Building -- Saving of ₹2239.95 lakhs (against the sanction provision of ₹2300.00 lakhs) was mainly due to slow progress of work, codal formalities not completed and therefore approval of the Competent Authority could also be not obtained.