

# CHAPTER – 1

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1.0 The Prelude :

1.1.1 In the context of a vast country like India *Local Government* institutions have an important and crucial role to play. Compared to the Union and State Governments, which are remote units of governance, the daily life of the people is greatly influenced by the *Local Government* units, which are more accessible to them. Besides, these local-level institutions are better-suited to perform certain public responsibilities on a number of considerations. *First*, where a government function calls for minute and continuous supervision at the local or economies in administrative costs, diversity rather than unity in its implementation, *Local Government* institutions rather than the higher levels of government, are the ideal units for the performance of such function. *Second*, in certain public functions relating to education, public health, employment, poverty, agriculture and communications, the overshadowing importance of national interest is becoming more and more apparent. These sectors are also of great importance for the local people. In all these there exists a national as well as local interest. *Local Government* institutions have an edge in the performance of some of the activities relating to these sectors, in terms of economy and efficiency, *vis-à-vis* the higher levels of government. *Third*, certain public functions, which were once considered 'local', have gradually acquired regional and national importance in the wake of rapid developments in transport, communications and industry. As the *Rural-Urban Relationship Committee* had aptly observed, the effects of poor health, inefficient schools and ill-kept roads and communications seldom stop at the boundary of local units, and are now, more than ever, matters of great concern to the higher layer governments. However, while the existence of national interest in many locally-administered public services cannot be denied, it is not difficult to find certain governmental functions in which '*local interest*' is more predominant than the national interest. In fact, there are certain public services like street-lighting, provision of safe drinking water, intra-local roads, refuse and sewage removal, provision of

Public latrines and cremation or burial grounds, maintenance of libraries, etc., which benefit particular localities. Only **Local Government** institutions can perform these functions more efficiently than other levels of government. **Fourth**, the proximity between the **Local Government** unit and the tax payers is likely to lead to better compliance provided the nature of local expenditure is such that it is aimed at meeting the community needs of the people and that its benefits accrue only to the local people. It is not always correct to claim, as the elected functionaries of **Gram Panchayats** in India quite often point out, that such direct interface between the tax payers and tax authority at the local level prove detrimental to effective tax administration. **However, so long as the local people are convinced that their Local Government is sincere, honest and totally committed to the cause of local development there will be less reluctance to pay their taxes. Finally, Local Government** is the ‘**School of Democracy**’, which is used by the future national leaders as training ground for promoting their political career interests. These schools teach them the art not only of organizational and political administration but also of financial administration and their nuances. They inculcate in them a sense of financial responsibility and accountability.

- 1.1.2 Against the backdrop of the considerations outlined in the previous para, the crucial role, which can be played by **Local Government institutions, particularly the Panchayati Raj Institutions** in our country where about 70 % of the people still live in the rural sector should be recognized. However, apart from the political issues, these institutions have to strive for optimizing their local resource mobilization. As the quantum of local resources they can effectively mobilize would be limited in relation to their local needs, the higher level governments have, of necessity, to provide them adequate financial assistance. **The issues of Internal Resource Mobilization (IRM) and Revenue Transfers therefore call for a detailed review and recommendations to rationalize them from the Constitutional mechanism of SFC. The present report therefore makes a beginning at addressing to these two broad tasks for the Panchayats in Chhattisgarh.**

## **1.2.0 Panchayats In Chhattisgarh :**

1.2.1 As an integral part of the former composite State of Madhya Pradesh, the State of Chhattisgarh had to adopt the pattern, systems, procedures, and executive rules of the former relating to the Panchayati Raj at the time of its formation on November 1<sup>st</sup>, 2000, as a transitory arrangement. Although the State government had initiated a few minor modifications in the statutory provisions of the MP Panchayat Raj Act 1993, *the existing scenario governing the Functional and Fiscal domain of the Panchayats in the State, by and large, is a replica of the MP model as it existed at the time of formation of the new State.* However, considering the special features of Chhattisgarh it appears that the State needs slightly a different approach towards its Panchayati Raj Institutions. The Commission believe that the government of the Fast Track State would be receptive and responsive to the need for bringing about radical organizational, administrative and financial changes in the working of the **Local Government** institutions in the State with a view to ensuring good governance and service delivery to the rural people whose overall quality of life obviously demands an improvement. *The Commission therefore hopes that their well-intended recommendations relating to the empowerment of the Panchayats and their Finances would find favour with the State Government.*

1.2.2 Ever since the introduction of the three-tier pattern of rural **Local Government** in the composite MP State, Chhattisgarh had Panchayats at the village, block and district levels. At present the entire rural sector of the State consisting of 20308 revenue villages and 54816 habitations is covered by the Panchayats. *There are 9820 Gram Panchayats at the Village level, 146 Janpad Panchayats at the Block level, and 16 Zila Panchayats at the District level in the State.* In fact, there has been an increase in the total number of **Gram Panchayats** during the last two years in the State.

## **1.2.3 From Table No. 1.1 It May Be Observed That :**

- (1) The Average Population of **Gram Panchayats** among the districts varies between 1511 (Rajnandgaon) and 1822 (Korba), while the said **Average Population of a Gram Panchayat** for the entire State is a mere 1695;

- (2) *The share of Rural Population is the Total Population of the district* is more than 90% in 6 districts with Jashpur district claiming the first place with 9.42%. Another 4 districts registered this figure between 87% and 89%. On the other hand, only 7 districts in the State had a Rural Population 82% or less than of the Total Population of the district among which three had this figure at less than 70%. The district, which has the least Percentage of Rural Population, is Durg (61.85%).
- (3) In 50% of the total number of districts, the *Average Population of a Gram Panchayats* is below the All-District / State Average of 1695;
- (4) The *share of the combined Rural Population of SCs and STs in the Total Rural Population of a district* range from a low of 29.29% (Durg) to a high of 85.16% (Dantewada) among the districts in the State. Moreover, the Percentage of SC/ST Rural Population is more than 50 in 8 districts, 60% in 7 districts, and 70% in 2 districts in the State. In 11 districts, the Percentage is not less than 40. *For the entire State, the combined Rural Population of SCs and STs claim a share of 49.04% in the Total Rural Population;*
- (5) *The respective shares of Rural SCs and STs in the Total Rural Population in the State are 11.41% and 37.63%.* Scheduled Tribe Population claim a share ranging from 12.46% (Janjgir-Champa) to 82.46% (Dantewada) in the Total Rural Population of the District. On the other hand, Scheduled Caste Population account for about 2.55%, 2.70% in Bastar and Dantewada districts and for 23.38% in Janjgir-Champa district.
- (6) Of the total number of 146 Blocks as many as 85 Blocks are in Schedule -V areas in the State. Again, all Blocks in 7 districts are entirely '*Tribal*';
- (7) And access to train/rail connectivity is available only to 30 Blocks in the State.

1.2.4 As for the distribution of *Gram Panchayats* in the State according their population size-groups, *Table-1.2* reveals that 80% of the *Gram Panchayats* in the State cover a population of not more than 2000, and 95% cover a maximum population of 3000. In

other words, only about 5% of the total numbers of 9820 Gram Panchayats have a population of more than 3000 in the rural sector of the State. The primary reason attributable to the predominance of small-sized **Gram Panchayats** is constitution of habitation-wise **Gram Panchayats**, particularly in the tribal Blocks. This is evident from the fact that about 56% of the total numbers of Gram Panchayats are located in tribal areas of the State.

### **1.3.0 Our Approach :**

Keeping in mind the provisions of the 73<sup>rd</sup> Constitutional Amendment Act and of the Chhattisgarh Panchayat Raj Act, 1993 as well as the present scenario in the working of the Panchayats at the local level in the State, *our Commission, after careful examination, decided to adopt the following approaches in their analysis of the various facets of Financial Administration of the Panchayats in the State :-*

- 1.3.1 The Commission considers that in Chhattisgarh, greater emphasis seems to have been placed on the lowest units of rural **Local Government**, namely, the **Gram Panchayats**, in terms of powers, functions and flow of financial resources. The intermediate and district-level Panchayats are not accorded the importance that they rightfully deserve and the important role that they are expected to play in the overall dispensation of rural development. In fact, a careful reading of the various provisions of Art.243 of the Indian Constitution makes it clear that the letter and spirit of the provisions relating to Panchayats, particularly Art.243(G) to 243(J), do not, by and large, give any special importance to any specified level of Panchayats. Rather, all 'Panchayats' at different levels are treated alike. *In view of this, the Commission considers it necessary to empower all levels of Panchayats in the State in terms of financial resources, without overemphasizing the grass-root level Gram Panchayats.*
- 1.3.2 The Commission is also of the view that the Panchayats should be assured of a minimum core of **Untied/Genera-Purpose** resources in view of their general inability to generate internal resources to meet their normal expenditure needs. Therefore, the Commission recommended that all payments to Panchayats at different levels under '**Assigned Revenues**', and the '**General-Purpose Grants**', be totally untied in nature

so as to enable the Panchayats to utilize these funds according to their own needs. All other Panchayats to them through grants-in-aid could be *‘tied to ‘broad sectors / activities’, or Itemized in nature.*

1.3.3 The Commission further feel that if the Panchayati Raj Institutions (***PRI*s**) in our State are to evolve as institutions of self-government, the State government would do well to entrust appropriate specific powers, responsibilities, staff support and financial resources to all the three levels of Panchayats in planning and implementation of schemes for economic development and social justice, keeping the ***‘Subsidiarity’ Principle*** in mind. We do not need intermediate and district-level Panchayats merely for implementing the line department schemes and for transfer of funds downwards to the ***Gram Panchayats***. Instead, they must have ‘identity’ of their own as institutions of self-government in the rural sector. Similarly, there is no need to create these institutions with responsibilities and powers which may be in the nature of only advisory/review/promotion/assisting other authorities/encouraging/coordination / information - dissemination/collection, monitoring and evaluation of information, etc. *All Panchayats should have specific and clearly-delineated role in planning and implementation of schemes, including those in relation to the matters listed in the Eleventh Schedule, for economic development and social justice.*

1.3.4 Viewed in this light, we hope that the ***‘Activity-Mapping’*** reported to have been prepared by the State Government for transfer of powers and responsibilities to the Panchayats in the State, aims at empowering all the three levels of Panchayats appropriately. Moreover, let us not forget that with a very small average population of not more than 1695, lack of knowledgeable staff, and a significant majority of the Sarpanches being new to their elected offices and several of them are either illiterate / semi-literate, infusions of scarce financial resources on a large scale in the form of Assigned Revenues and Grants-in-Aid into the coffers of ***Gram Panchayats*** in the State is likely to result in misapplication or wastage of these resources. Moreover, ‘Block’ is considered to be the ***‘cutting-edge’*** of Rural Local Government Administration, while the ‘District’ the apex level of Rural Local Government in a district to ensure that the lower level units of Panchayati Raj work effectively, and to expedite the process of rapid rural development, in the district by actively

participating in the process. Spatial jurisdiction of each level of Panchayats being clearly delineated, in entrusting additional responsibilities to these different levels the appropriate level at which each identified responsibility can be effectively performed needs to be identified. In other words, *'Efficiency-in-Performance'* of each specific activity dictates the level to which the said activity could be safely entrusted. Therefore, 'activity-mapping' demands greater attention to the sound canons of *'Economy and Efficiency'* in performance of a given activity by a level of Panchayats. The Commission is aware that the State Legislature is the Constitutionally-empowered entity to decide on this issue. Hence *we consider that the Commission can not encroach upon this legislative privilege relating to devolution on Panchayats under Art.243(G) of our Constitution. Instead, the Commission, to a large extent, devoted its attention to Art.243(H) to (J) and 280(3)(bb) of the Indian Constitution and the ToR specified by the State government*

- 1.3.5 The Commissions are of the view that, though the absolute quantum of local resources which can be mobilized by a large number of **Gram Panchayats** in the State is greatly limited, there is need for rationalizing the existing powers of all the three levels of Panchayats in the mobilization of local resources. Moreover, there is an imperative need to exercise greater vigilance and control over the utilization of public funds by the **Gram Panchayats**. Towards this end, the mechanisms of audit, inspections and recourse to drastic penal measures against erring or defaulting **Gram Panchayats**, have to be promptly employed without any exception or reservation by the government. *Considerations of efficiency, economy, transparency and accountability alone should, in our view, receive top priority.* Simultaneously, appropriate motivational measures like offer of incentive matching grants related to IRM, guidance in the area of proper and prompt maintenance of accounts and other related documents, training in financial management, etc., have also to be taken by the government. To the extent of our ability and timeframe of the Commission, we have endeavoured to suggest several measures in this Report in conforming to this approach.

1.3.6 In examining the financial administration of the *Gram Panchayats*, the Commission had to deal with a few other crucial issues of organizational and administrative nature which significantly influence the efficiency of these lowest levels of Rural Local Governance. These include reorganization of *Gram Panchayats* and pruning their number; appointment of a regular government employee as '*Group Gram Panchayat Secretary*'; general reassessment/revaluation of taxable buildings by a separate cadre of Panchayat Tax Officers; redefining the role of Panchayat Auditors in an appropriate manner after they ceased to be the statutory auditors of *Gram Panchayats*; establishment of a separate M&E Cell in the Directorate of Panchayats; strengthening the accounts machinery at the Block level, the LF Audit machinery and training institutions of SIRD and PTCs/ETCs; and provision of secretarial support to *Gram Panchayats*, etc. We have accordingly addressed to these issues in this report in view of their importance and relevance.

#### **1.4.0 Methodology Adopted :**

1.4.1 As the Commission did not have the benefit of either Macro-level or Micro-level statistical and other information pertaining to the finances of different levels of Panchayats in the State, they had to undertake the tedious and time-consuming task of collecting this information on its own directly from the Panchayats. A variety of methods were adopted by the Commission to elicit not only the statistical data from the individual Panchayats on their Receipts and Expenditure at least for two cut-off years of *1999-2000 and 2003-04*, but also their views on different facets of their financial administration.

1.4.2 Accordingly, the Commission prepared an appropriate questionnaire for each level of Panchayats and sent it to each of them. The relevant Panchayat Department officials were also requested to scrutinize the filled-in questionnaires of *Gram Panchayats* before forwarding them to the Commission. Noting that the Panchayats are taking more time to fill and send to us the questionnaires, we had to issue reminder letters to them to expedite their responses. It was a Herculean task for us to deal with 9820 units of *Gram Panchayats*, 146 *Janpad Panchayats* and 16 *Zila Panchayats* in this regard. After repeated requests to the Panchayats as well as to the district and block-level officials, we could finally succeed in receiving the filled-in questionnaires from



around 6000 *Gram Panchayats* spread over all the 16 districts by July 2006. Similarly, we were receiving the filled-in questionnaires from the *Zila Panchayats* and *Janpad Panchayats* till the said month end. In the meantime, the Commission was busy in tabulating the data received from the Panchayats as and when they were received.

1.4.3 In addition to the questionnaires to the Panchayats, the Commission had collected the Macro-level information relating to the outflow of different Assigned Revenues and Grants-in-Aid from various line departments at the State headquarters, though our attempt proved to be partially successful. *Also the Commission had interacted with the Heads of Departments of Finance, and Panchayats, LF Directorate, etc., besides select CEOs of Zila Panchayats and Janpad Panchayats, and elicited their views informally.*

1.4.4 A one-day Seminar was organized by the Commission in mid-2005 at the State Institute of Rural Development in which opportunities were thrown open to the CEOs of *Janpad Panchayats*, Secretaries and Sarpanches of *Gram Panchayats*, academics and NGOs to provide their valuable insights and experiences on several issues pertinent to the finances of Panchayati Raj Institutions in the State.

#### **1.5.0 Problems And Constraints Encountered By The Commission :**

1.5.1 While compiling the information provided to the Commission by the *Gram Panchayats*, a variety of unforeseen problems confronted us. Briefly put, the deficiencies or irrelevancies noticed in the process of scrutinizing and tabulating the data received by us from the individual *Gram Panchayats* include: (i) absence of response to some items in the questionnaire; (ii) responses which are totally irrelevant to the issue(s) in the questionnaire; (iii) misclassifications of statistical data; (iv) obvious non-reliability of the information furnished; (v) lack of understating of the nature of information sought by the Commission while filling the questionnaires; (vi) inadequate disaggregate data on Receipts and Expenditure; (vii) absence of response to the item relating to their 'suggestions'; (viii) inadequate or haphazard scrutiny of the filled-in questionnaires by the officials of the Panchayat Department before forwarding them to the Commission, etc. The Commission had therefore to discard or

reject a majority of the filled-in questionnaire of the *Gram Panchayats* and *finally be content with only 2728 filled-in questionnaires. Thus our sample size of Gram Panchayats is about 28 % which, we consider, is reasonably representative. As stated in Para 1.2, these Sample Gram Panchayats (SGPs) are spread over 61 Blocks in all the 16 districts of the State. Table No. 1.3 shows distribution of these Sample Gram Panchayats.*

- 1.5.2 As the data from these SGPs relate only to 1999-2000 and 2003-04, the Commission sought, in the first quarter of 2006-07, time-series data from about 150 select *Gram Panchayats* for the period 2001-02 to 2005-06 to take stock of the ‘trends’ in their finances. However, we had received the said data from only 77 *Gram Panchayats*. We have accordingly incorporated their data also in the relevant Chapters.
- 1.5.3 As for the data relating to the finances of *Janpad Panchayats* and the *Zila Panchayats*, we could finally succeed in achieving cent per cent response rate. Nevertheless, two major hurdles in the data provided to us were noticed. *First*, the data are not disaggregated sector-wise. Rather they were supplied to us under a few broad heads on the basis of source of their receipt. *Second*, the data supplied by them initially were deficient in many respects. For instance, even the data initially provided to the Commission by some of the *Zila Panchayats* had shown ‘nil’ receipts from State government grants. Moreover, the data supplied to us by both the *Janpad and Zila Panchayats* exhibited under their ‘Receipts and Expenditure’ the grants meant for downward transfer to lower-level Panchayats. Grants meant for their own use and grants meant for lower-level Panchayats which are channeled through them are all mixed up together, and combined figures alone were provided to us. The Commission had again to contact the *Janpad Panchayats* and *Zila Panchayats* for rectification of the data originally supplied to us. However, by August 2006, the Commission could receive information on the quantum of funds meant to be transferred to the *Janpad and Gram Panchayats* from the *Zila Panchayats* only. Therefore, the receipts of the *Janpad Panchayats* in many cases represent also the funds meant to be transferred to the *Gram Panchayats*. Similarly, their reported expenditure includes the funds actually transferred through them to the *Gram Panchayats*. In view of lack of timely response from the *Janpad Panchayats*, the Commission was forced to make use of the data as supplied by the *Janpad Panchayats* initially. Even here, we would like to

sound a note caution. The reported data again suffer from several misclassifications and therefore should be considered with a pinch of salt. They are to be treated as ‘provisional’ or tentative or approximations.

1.5.4 The callous manner in which the Panchayat functionaries had provided the information to the Constitutional entity like the SFC should be viewed seriously. *In future, the State government may evolve its own mechanism to provide to the SFC all the information required by the latter promptly and carefully. It is impossible for a SFC to deal with several thousands of Panchayats for the supply of information to them, within their strictly limited timeframe of two years. It should be the responsibility of the Directorate of Panchayats to develop the database and supply the same to the SFCs and CFCs, as when requested for. This is one of the reasons for our setting aside a small percentage of the XII<sup>th</sup> FC grant for the Establishment of an M&E Cell in the Directorate of Panchayats.* Too much dependence of the SFC on too many Panchayats for the supply of relevant data on the Finances of Panchayats is however placing severe limitations on the available time of the SFC for analysis of the data and to concretize their recommendations. The Commission however hopes that the future SFCs will not encounter the problems as the First SFC of Chhattisgarh had to grapple with. The Commission therefore urges the State government to take corrective measures in this regard.

#### 1.6.0 Organization Of The Report :

*The present report is divided into the following 6 Chapters:*

Chapter - 1	<b>Introduction</b>
Chapter - 2	<b>Internal Revenue Mobilization By Panchayats</b>
Chapter - 3	<b>Revenue Transfers To Panchayats</b>
Chapter - 4	<b>A Balance Sheet Of Panchayat Finances</b>
Chapter - 5	<b>Other Financial, Organizational And Administrative Issues</b>
Chapter - 6	<b>Summary Of Recommendations.</b>

Table No. 1.1

## Distribution Of Janpad Panchayats And Gram Panchayats District-Wise

S.No	District	Total Area Covered (Sq.Km)	Total Population (2001) (Lacs)	Rural Population (Lacs)	Share Of Rural Population In Total (%)	% Share Of SC/ST In Total		Blocks/JPs		No. Of Blocks/JPs With Rail Link	No. Of Gram Panchayats	Average Population Per GP (2001)
						SC	ST	Total No.	No. Of Tribal Blocks			
1	Bastar	1702	13.07	11.77	90.05	2.55	71.62	14	14	2	655	1797
2	Bilaspur	857	19.98	15.12	75.68	20.37	24.21	10	3	4	864	1750
3	Dantewada	1561	7.19	6.67	92.77	2.70	82.46	11	11	2	409	1631
4	Dhamtari	408	7.06	6.13	86.70	6.69	28.87	4	1	2	339	1808
5	Durg	870	28.01	17.38	61.85	12.89	16.40	12	1	3	998	1741
6	Janjgir-Champa	447	13.17	11.72	88.99	23.38	12.46	9	0	3	582	2014
7	Jashpur	656	7.43	7.09	95.42	4.65	64.46	8	8	0	417	1700
8	Kanker	643	6.51	6.20	95.24	4.19	57.74	7	7	0	389	1594
9	Kawardha	435	5.85	5.40	92.31	12.41	22.04	4	0	0	371	1456
10	Korba	715	10.12	6.45	63.74	8.20	57.21	5	5	1	354	1822
11	Koriya	598	5.86	4.12	70.23	6.80	57.10	5	5	2	250	1646
12	Mahasamund	496	8.60	7.63	88.72	11.93	29.49	5	0	2	492	1551
13	Raigarh	653	12.66	10.96	86.57	14.14	39.05	9	5	2	710	1544
14	Raipur	1345	30.17	20.99	69.57	17.58	15.58	15	3	4	1204	1743
15	Rajnandgaon	802	12.83	10.52	82.00	9.03	30.99	9	3	2	696	1511
16	Sarguja	1603	19.72	18.35	93.05	4.80	57.44	19	19	1	1090	1683
<b>Total</b>		<b>13791</b>	<b>208.34</b>	<b>166.48</b>	<b>79.91</b>	<b>11.41</b>	<b>37.63</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>9820</b>	<b>1695</b>

Table No. 1.2

**Distribution Of Gram Panchayats  
According To Population (2001) District-Wise**

S.No	District	No. Of Gram Panchayats With A Population						Total No. of GPs
		Upto 1000	Between 1000 and 2000	Between 2001 and 3000	Between 3001 and 4000	Between 4001 and 5000	Above 5000	
1	Bastar	39	448	119	38	6	5	655
2	Bilaspur	38	619	152	29	11	15	864
3	Dantewada	18	334	40	11	4	2	409
4	Dhamtari	2	249	65	15	4	4	339
5	Durg	13	768	178	31	5	3	998
6	Janjgir-Champa	20	372	111	42	23	14	582
7	Jashpur	26	308	58	12	11	2	417
8	Kanker	13	332	38	3	1	2	389
9	Kawardha	13	333	19	4	2	0	371
10	Korba	3	245	84	12	8	2	354
11	Koriya	9	197	35	3	4	2	250
12	Mahasamund	22	413	48	5	3	1	492
13	Raigarh	34	583	75	9	5	4	710
14	Raipur	111	863	162	41	16	11	1204
15	Rajnandgaon	2	620	63	10	0	1	696
16	Sarguja	101	769	175	36	5	4	1090
<b>Total</b>		<b>464</b>	<b>7453</b>	<b>1422</b>	<b>301</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>9820</b>
<b>% in Total</b>		<b>4.73</b>	<b>75.90</b>	<b>14.48</b>	<b>3.07</b>	<b>1.10</b>	<b>0.73</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Table No. 1.3

**Distribution Of Sample Gram Panchayats**

S.No	District	Total No. Of Panchayats			Sample Gram Panchayats			As % Of Total No. Of GPs	Average Population
		ZP	JP	GP	No. Covered	Spread Over Blocks (No.)	Population Covered By GPs (2001)		
1	Bastar	1	14	655	167	5	283616	25.50	1698
2	Bilaspur	1	10	864	254	4	517087	29.40	2036
3	Dantewada	1	11	409	49	3	81924	11.98	1672
4	Dhamtari	1	4	339	141	2	267593	41.59	1898
5	Durg	1	12	998	422	10	745951	42.28	1768
6	Janjgir- Champa	1	9	582	98	3	213012	16.84	2174
7	Jashpur	1	8	417	34	3	65635	8.15	1930
8	Kanker	1	7	389	100	2	154732	25.71	1547
9	Kawardha	1	4	371	97	3	159971	26.15	1649
10	Korba	1	5	354	122	2	223417	34.46	1831
11	Koriya	1	5	250	63	1	121288	25.20	1925
12	Mahasamund	1	5	492	343	5	546823	69.72	1594
13	Raigarh	1	9	710	115	3	166135	16.20	1445
14	Raipur	1	15	1204	277	5	549481	23.01	1984
15	Rajnandgaon	1	9	696	300	6	470370	43.10	1568
16	Sarguja	1	19	1090	146	4	246676	13.39	1690
<b>Total</b>		<b>16</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>9820</b>	<b>2728</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>4813711</b>	<b>27.78</b>	<b>1765</b>