ORIGINAL RESEARCH PAPER

Economics

# TRENDS IN FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE OF VARIOUS ZILLA PANCHAYATS IN KARNATAKA STATE

KEY WORDS: Constitutional 73rd Amendment, Panchayat Raj Institutions, Financial Performance of Panchayath Raj Institutions, Finanacial Performance of Zilla Panchayats, Central and State Finance Commissions, Grants from the State and Centre.

**Sowbhagya, K*** *Corresponding Author

**D.V.Gopalappa**

The 73rd and 74th Amendments to the Indian constitution have cast heavy responsibilities on political leaders, economic planners and administrative bureaucracy of the country in a measure much greater than what is seen apparently being realized. The vision of decentralized governance from the 73 constitutional Amendments authority to the panchayat raj Institutions in Karnataka's journey has been admirable up till now not complete in terms of curbing the intra-state disparities. In this direction the present paper makes an attempt to study the financial performance in Karnataka state across various divisions. This will help us to understand the extent of the funds available in terms of annual percentage change, Differences in terms of various divisions and also to study what are the districts receiving funds lower than the state average figures. Towards this we have collected time series data for about 15 years and worked out the Compound Growth Rate (CGR) to look at annual performance of all the districts across four divisions of the Karnataka state. The analysis of the data clearly reveals that Panchayat Raj Institutions have been given step-motherly treatment by both the State and Central Governments. The development of village India is possible by strengthening ZPs, TPs and GPs. However, political will is missing in this direction. Though there is a criticism that PRIs is nothing but the decentralization of corruption but the point is at least to that extent the money is diverted or shared by a larger group. So many academicians and researchers feel that decentralization of corruption itself is some positive change. Therefore, in the best possible way the finances have to be given to the Panchyats so that the Gandhiji's vision of development can be seen in the village India. Therefore, it is suggested that there need to be consistency in the allocation of resources to the PRIs so that better planning can be taken care as it will lead to rural development in general and PRIs in general.

Down from the time of Rig Vedas to Charles Metcalf's characterization of villages as 'republics' to the new famous dictum of 'power to the people' by Lord Rippon (Hundred and twenty five years ago), followed by the Bengal initiative in 1885, or indeed the more recent Gram Swaraj concept of Mahatma Gandhi. Since from that time Panchayat Raj has been the recurrent theme in our political discourse. Following Article 40 of the constitution, 1953 saw the first central initiative to establish local governments, this was followed by the 1963 recommendations on fiscal devolution. In its most potent form the credit of ushering in the Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs) must go to the dynamism of the youthful Prime Minister the late Shri Rajiv Gandhi the then Prime Minister of India. In the modern rendition too the efforts have witnessed a long travail and finally by 1986 the necessity to amend the constitution was recognized. Despite the faltering attempt of the 64th Constitutional Amendment, Mr. Rajiv Gandhi pressed on with the 73rd and 74th Constitutional Amendments, convinced that it encapsulated the vision and injunction by our founding fathers. He was acutely conscious that the fruition of the ambitious project of Panchayati Raj would take at least a generation to get deep rooted in the village India.

Through much debate and discussion there seems to have emerged a consensual clarifying response in terms of organizational frame and processes that need to be followed in case of the PRIs. The peculiar federal set up that India is of course comes in the way of full and immediate implementation in the country with Centre, State and PRIs. After all, it is said and done, it boils down to effective implementation, which necessarily has the prerequisite of empowerment of PRIs through effective devolution of finances.

The Polity, Economy and Administration are entwined in a triangular set-up that resembles not a light romantic comedy but rather a rough menage a trios and it is essential that they find a way through to EMPOWER, with adequate financial strength, for ensuring smooth attainment of the Development goals of the Indian society. This is how, in the simple story of poor PRIs and what to do about it has thickens and for all the grand designs in other related spheres and aspects, unless we are ready to put money, where our mouth is, the goal of transforming India into a 'developed' super power will suffer the fate of the Tantalus (Pethe Abhay and Mala Lalvani, 2008).

Over 28 years since the 73rd and 74th Amendments introduced Articles 280 (3) (bb) and (c) into the constitution, which mandated the Union Finance Commission to determine the measures needed to augment the Consolidated Fund of a State to supplement the resources of the Panchayats and the Municipalities in the State. We are at an interesting juncture where we can trace the evolution of the grand system that provides a slice from the divisible pool of the Union government to Local Bodies (LBs) via the State Governments. The Tenth, Eleventh and Twelfth Finance Commissions broadly recommended grants for the LBs, amounting to around 1 to 1.5 per cent of the divisible pool. The Thirteenth Finance Commission (TFC) broke fresh ground in increasing the allocation to around 2.5 per cent of the divisible pool and earmarking a part of the grant for performance, based on the meeting of conditionality that it laid down.

The above trend was continued by the Fourteenth Finance Commission (FFC), which recommended nearly 4.5 per cent of the divisible pool as the grant and prescribed simpler constitutionalities that were to be met. For the first time, the FFC restricted the grant only to the Rural Local Bodies (RLBs) at the first mile, the Village Panchayats, and mandated that these funds be used only for the delivery of core services that have been devolved to them across nearly all States (Devaluation of Union Commission Grants to Panchayat, A study for the Fifteenth Finance Commission By Accountability Initiative, 2019). Further, the states are not bothered to take action on the SFC reports. This is against the spirit of Constitutional provision. They have to follow the convention set by the Centre in implementing the Central Finance Commissions (CFC) recommendations with the states. Further, the role of CFC in supplementing the resources of local governments is very important. However, the three FCs at the Central level followed adhoc measures without any impact on the Local Government Finances (LGFs). The present 13th FC of India has to link its recommendations not only to the recommendations of SFC but also on the states' implementation (Babu, 2009).

Karnataka is often cited as an important example of a pro decentralization state. This is mainly due to the earlier legislation passed by the state during 1983 which was regarded as a landmark step. After the 73rd Amendment to the Constitution, Karnataka was the first State to pass the Karnataka Panchayat Raj Act, 1993, as per the 73rd Amendment and conducted elections to Gram Panchayats (GPs) in December that year. This was the beginning of a full-fledged three-tier system of panchayat raj in Karnataka, making use of the 11th Schedule in the Constitution to decentralize power and functions to panchayat raj bodies at all the three levels of PRIs.

The Karnataka Panchayat Raj Act, 1993 provides for three tier structure of PRIs – Zilla Panchayats at district level, Taluk Panchayat at intermediate level and Gram Panchayat at village level. The other salient features are providing reservation for women, Other Backward Classes and Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. This reservation applies not only to election of members but also to the election of office-bearers or chairpersons of these institutions. The Gram Sabras (GSs) and the Ward Sabras in Karnataka are the soul of panchayat raj and the idea is to progressively strengthen their functioning to ensure full participation of the people with some responsibility (Study of Panchayat Finances in Karnataka Report Prepared by, Institute for Development and Empowerment, Mysore, Submitted to Decentralisation Analysis Cell - Government of Karnataka 2014).

The democratic local governments to be called 'self-governments' should have some degree of financial autonomy. This means that these institutions should have some own tax powers, share in certain taxes and duties of the state, grants-in- aid from the state and the Centre, loan raising powers etc. From this the point that emerges is that the local governments should not heavily depend upon the state and Central governments for their financial needs. They should be in a position to generate resources as much as possible from their own sources. The resources they have at their command, as far as possible, should match their responsibilities. In the absence of own resource raising powers, the local governments would in all probability become only spending agencies and always dependent upon the discretion of the state governments in the transfer of grants. Non-tax is another important source of revenue for the PRIs. In Karnataka all the three-tiers have been vested with powers to collect non-tax revenue from their own properties and assets and utilize the same for their own needs and at their will (Government of Karnataka, 1996).

Fiscal decentralization in Karnataka is far from complete in terms of increasing own source revenue (OSR) mobilization and making use of increased spending for desired goals. Low resource base, weak accountability mechanisms, lack of monitoring and evaluation of schemes and low utilization rates in centrally sponsored schemes have created a wedge between Karnataka's well-developed and backward regions. In the last twenty years, what Karnataka has so far achieved can be somewhat attributed to 'partial decentralization'. There is a need to create adequate fiscal space for decentralization to thrive in the state whereby rural masses benefit from inclusion in the growth processes and reform efforts are made for more durable, richer and fuller decentralization. ( Babu, et al, 2018).

**Funds Flow to Zilla Panchayats:**
Zilla Panchayats receive the funds from the Consolidated Fund of the State & Central Governments in the following categories.

- Planned Funds.
- Non- Planned funds.
- Additional grants

Plan & Non-plan funds are released by the State Government to the Z.P. in a Quarterly basis & ZP in turn releases these funds to the District level Officers of different Departments, Taluk Panchayats (TPs) & Grama Panchayats (GPs) in monthly/Quarterly basis. Funds are also released from the Central Government to the various Programmes/Schemes implemented through the Zilla Panchayat & its subsidiary units such as TPs and GPs. Clarification regarding the planned funds, non-planned funds and additional grants are given below.

**Planned \Fund:**
It is received both from State as well as Central Government for the Execution of developmental activities/works including the creation of the new infrastructure & their maintenance. In addition, various centrally sponsored schemes such as Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act/Programme (MGNREGA), 12th & 13th FINANCE, ARWS, IAY, SGSY, TSC etc., are implemented in the country. For the Welfare of the Scheduled Castes (SCs) & Scheduled Tribes (STs) grants are also released through a separate programme called Special Component Programme (SCP). For the planned programmes the financial allocation is made by the Government on the basis of;

- Population
- Actual Needs
- Backwardness (Determined by specific parameters)

**Non-Plan Funds:**
It is mainly meant to meet the committed expenditure of the different departments (mainly the salary) & also the maintenance of the infrastructures which are already created. These funds are exclusively released to the Zilla panchayat from the State Government.

**Additional Grants:**
These funds are not provided in the budget of the ZP & hence it is called the Extra budgetary or non-budgetary Grants. Usually it is released by the State/Central Governments to be met out the emergency needs such as to provide drinking water, formation of roads, to create rural employment at the drought prone areas, for the control of epidemic diseases & to meet the deficiency of the budget (Ramya and Manjunath, 2019).

With this background of information an effort is made to study the financial performance of ZPs in Karnataka state across various divisions. This will help us to understand the extent of the funds available in terms of annual percentage change, Differences in terms of various divisions and also to study what are the districts receiving funds lower than the state average figures. Towards this we have collected time series data for about 15 years and worked out the Compound Growth Rate (CGR) to look at annual performance of all the districts across four divisions of the Karnataka state.

The Table-1 contains the growth rates of the financial performance across various districts in Bangalore Division. In Bangaluru division we have nine districts and the performance of each district is presented in the same table. Compound Growth Rates are given for two periods starting from 2003-04 to 2012-13 and 2013-14 to 2017-18 (Since the data is available with out gap for these years we have considered the time period, otherwise there is no special reason for the selection of the time period). The table clearly reveals that Bangalore urban district has been the district, which is mobilizing/receiving more funds, year by year, as it shown the GR of about 16.48 per cent for the first period to 41.92 per cent in the second period starting from 2013-14 to 2017-18. Even the overall GR has been very high in case of the Bangalore Urban district showing 21.91 per cent per annum compared to any other district in the division.

Chikkaballapur and Ramnagara are the other two districts, which have shown the GR at higher level compared to the other six districts. For the Chikkaballapur district the GR has shown around 19 per cent and for the Ramanagar district it is more than 17 per cent. Interestingly we need to keep an issue in mind that both the Chikkaballapur and Ramnagara districts have been formed very recently. May be that is the reason why the GR in terms of finances to these districts has been more. Even Shimoga district has shown the GR little higher side compared to the other districts. In Bangalore division Kolar district has shown the lowest GR in terms of receiving the funds. Kolar district seems to be the dry district, funds need to flow very steadily to this district but the GR has shown very low in the first period and in the subsequent periods it is better. It can be concluded based on the CGR for the funds mobilization in Bangalore division that there is stability in terms of funds flow.

**Table-1: Financial Performance of PRI in the Districts of Bangaluru Division (CGR in %).**

| Sl. No. | Years | Bangaluru - Urban | Bangaluru - Rural | Chikkaballapur | Chitradurga | Davanagere | Kolar | Ramnagar | Shivamoga | Tumkur |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 01 | 2003-04 | 3499 | 5573 | NA | 4979 | 4915 | 6338 | NA | 4582 | 6821 |
| 02 | 2004-05 | 3895 | 5969 | NA | 5419 | 5360 | 6731 | NA | 5109 | 7624 |
| 03 | 2005-06 | 8007 | 11499 | NA | 10691 | 10547 | 13904 | NA | 10502 | 15172 |
| 04 | 2006-07 | 8787 | 12615 | NA | 14986 | 14981 | 16426 | NA | 11504 | 16987 |
| 05 | 2007-08 | 8635 | 12443 | NA | 14673 | 15015 | 16245 | NA | 10939 | 17958 |
| 06 | 2008-09 | 8560 | 15647 | 7786 | 12418 | 12444 | 8286 | 7230 | 11065 | 18942 |
| 07 | 2009-10 | 11692 | 17023 | 9320 | 13566 | 14491 | 9802 | 8196 | 13607 | 22100 |
| 08 | 2010-11 | 11194 | 17050 | 10291 | 13202 | 14667 | 9872 | 8417 | 13580 | 23497 |
| 09 | 2011-12 | 12643 | 17070 | 10895 | 13114 | 14692 | 9589 | 8289 | 14414 | 23911 |
| 10 | 2012-13 | 17330 | 19197 | 13655 | 17352 | 18007 | 13020 | 10323 | 19280 | 26781 |
| CGR in % | | **16.477** | **13.972** | **13.653** | **11.534** | **12.958** | **3.091** | **7.504** | **14.258** | **15.195** |
| 01 | 2013-14 | 24663 | 10470 | 13664 | 19950 | 19680 | 15013 | 11668 | 23849 | 29890 |
| 02 | 2014-15 | 29878 | 12894 | 15640 | 24013 | 14382 | 18723 | 13431 | 25186 | 35201 |
| 03 | 2015-16 | 32333 | 13546 | 17615 | 26205 | 26227 | 18583 | 15193 | 27331 | 37095 |
| 04 | 2016-17 | 41513 | 14095 | 19152 | 27788 | 29480 | 19152 | 16107 | 29143 | 40223 |
| 05 | 2017-18 | 120441 | 43085 | 74547 | 85779 | 47445 | 65067 | 52065 | 86301 | 128323 |
| CGR **in %** | | **41.916** | **33.888** | **43.274** | **35.840** | **28.117** | **34.390** | **37.341** | **31.234** | **35.628** |
| **Over all GR in %** | | **21.914** | **7.509** | **19.321** | **14.396** | **12.129** | **9.416** | **17.792** | **16.358** | **15.441** |

Note: 1). Figures are in Lakhs.

2).The data, for all the tables, has been taken from various issues of Budget Documents of the Government of Karnataka.

The performance of the finances in the Belgam Division has been presented in the Table-2. The table reveals that in the first period i.e., from 2003-04 to 2012-13 the GR has been very much stable for all the districts with minor differences. For instance the highest GR seems to be 18.704 per cent for the Bijapur district and the lowest seems to be in the Belagam district showing the GR of 15.26 per cent. This clearly indicates that the performance of the PRIs finances across the districts has been steady compared to the Bangalore Division during the first part of the period of analysis. However, during the second period i.e., from 2013-14 to 2017-18 there is a lot of change in the CGR where there is a wide gap between the lowest and the highest GR between various districts in this division. For instance the highest GR seems to be in Belagaum district i.e., 42.82 per cent and even Bijapur also near to that (41.86 per cent) and the least seems to be in the Haveri district showing the CGR at 22.52 per cent per annum. It is highly difficult to say why this kind of trends and variation in terms of ZP finances. If this is the trend it is highly difficult to take up the developmental works in a stable manner. Again the overall GR stability/consistency maintained in terms of the funds flow as there is no major difference between the lowest and the highest GR in terms of ZP finances.

**Table-2: Financial Performance of PRI in the Districts of Belgaum Division (CGR in %).**

| Sl. No. | Years | Bagalakote | Belagam | Bijapur | Dharwad | Gadag | Haveri | UK |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 01 | 2003-04 | 3646 | 8806 | 4226 | 2888 | 2337 | 3419 | 4104 |
| 02 | 2004-05 | 4113 | 9818 | 4521 | 3237 | 2668 | 3841 | 4403 |
| 03 | 2005-06 | 9393 | 20305 | 10612 | 6978 | 6178 | 8889 | 9512 |
| 04 | 2006-07 | 11926 | 22644 | 12737 | 8159 | 7074 | 10285 | 11069 |
| 05 | 2007-08 | 11516 | 22249 | 13007 | 8040 | 6716 | 10127 | 11209 |
| 06 | 2008-09 | 11550 | 21995 | 13843 | 8162 | 7027 | 10673 | 11530 |
| 07 | 2009-10 | 14357 | 27211 | 16142 | 9128 | 8669 | 11731 | 13565 |
| 08 | 2010-11 | 14299 | 26949 | 17237 | 9056 | 8769 | 12045 | 13320 |
| 09 | 2011-12 | 14221 | 30094 | 17830 | 9845 | 8809 | 12578 | 14619 |
| 10 | 2012-13 | 18761 | 40101 | 23621 | 13785 | 10684 | 15885 | 19175 |
| CGR in % | | **17.130** | **15.265** | **18.704** | **15.314** | **15.968** | **15.724** | **16.076** |
| 01 | 2013-14 | 22677 | 46964 | 25663 | 16140 | 12016 | 17698 | 21106 |
| 02 | 2014-15 | 27052 | 33213 | 20793 | 26942 | 13914 | 20440 | 38863 |
| 03 | 2015-16 | 31427 | 69787 | 34910 | 22527 | 15811 | 23182 | 25650 |
| 04 | 2016-17 | 36343 | 70280 | 40134 | 23911 | 17549 | 25880 | 27293 |
| 05 | 2017-18 | 55715 | 191841 | 106121 | 68094 | 43109 | 43422 | 78338 |
| CGR **in %** | | **23.282** | **42.820** | **41.859** | **31.783** | **32.142** | **22.520** | **25.477** |
| **Over all GR in %** | | **17.212** | **17.278** | **18.186** | **18.689** | **16.062** | **15.076** | **17.252** |

Note: Figures are in Lakhs.

The CGR performance of the Panchayat finances at the district level in Mysuru Division seems to be very much normal and there is no major change across various districts. Mysuru district showed the highest GR of 14.784 and lowest seems to be in Udupi and Kodugu districts in the first period of our data analysis i.e., from 2003-04 to 2012-13 (Table-3). Even other districts also in the Mysuru division the performance is better and steady. There is a lot of variation during the second period starting from 2013-14 to 2017-18 where in, certain years, there is abnormal increase in the absolute change in the figures. It is highly difficult to give the reason for this. For instance for Chamarajnagar district there is abnormal jump in the absolute figures from 120.66 lakhs to 918.41 lakhs from 2013-14 to 2017-18. Except in Udupi district all the other districts have got the same kind of trend. The CGRs are highest in case of the Chamrajnagar district followed by Hasan. The lowest seems to be in Udupi but it is steady starting from 2003-04 to 2017-18. And also the over all CGR also it is maintained. There can be discrepancy in case of the PRIs finances so that the planning will be better and the development can be maintained. The abrupt change in the allocations lead to so many inconsistency problems.

**Table-3: Financial Performance of PRI in the Districts of Mysuru Division (CGR in %).**

| Sl. No. | Years | Chamrajnagar | Chikkamagaluru | Kodagu | D.Kannada | Hasan | Mandya | Mysuru | Udupi |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 01 | 2003-04 | 3316 | 4344 | 2301 | 4205 | 5285 | 4661 | 5296 | 3089 |
| 02 | 2004-05 | 3687 | 4880 | 2456 | 4730 | 5787 | 5213 | 5829 | 3414 |
| 03 | 2005-06 | 6930 | 8898 | 4396 | 8324 | 10693 | 9709 | 11935 | 5514 |
| 04 | 2006-07 | 7821 | 10211 | 4702 | 8999 | 12492 | 10598 | 14284 | 5626 |
| 05 | 2007-08 | 7779 | 9795 | 4747 | 8606 | 12032 | 10232 | 13838 | 5388 |
| 06 | 2008-09 | 8124 | 9744 | 4370 | 9228 | 12206 | 10932 | 14364 | 5346 |
| 07 | 2009-10 | 9479 | 11448 | 5153 | 11106 | 14052 | 12250 | 16697 | 6287 |
| 08 | 2010-11 | 9570 | 11089 | 4863 | 11172 | 14116 | 13317 | 17024 | 5960 |
| 09 | 2011-12 | 9436 | 11570 | 4840 | 11067 | 14073 | 13381 | 17220 | 6519 |
| 10 | 2012-13 | 10940 | 14461 | 6599 | 15062 | 17769 | 17216 | 22175 | 8985 |
| CGR in % | | **12.582** | **11.734** | **9.467** | **12.617** | **14.393** | **13.187** | **14.784** | **9.419** |
| 01 | 2013-14 | 12066 | 15593 | 7194 | 16365 | 19541 | 19456 | 25312 | 10072 |
| 02 | 2014-15 | 13747 | 19003 | 23093 | 23806 | 8347 | 60923 | 30198 | 11219 |
| 03 | 2015-16 | 15429 | 20079 | 8834 | 22524 | 26146 | 24412 | 34887 | 12365 |
| 04 | 2016-17 | 16817 | 20850 | 10014 | 25178 | 28724 | 25970 | 40497 | 13696 |
| 05 | 2017-18 | 91841 | 64780 | 26975 | 69151 | 89734 | 76611 | 109586 | 14567 |
| CGR **in %** | | **53.126** | **34.193** | **19.813** | **34.156** | **41.863** | **20.785** | **38.049** | **9.828** |
| **Over all GR in %** | | **15.571** | **13.874** | **14.342** | **15.937** | **13.114** | **16.917** | **16.977** | **10.890** |

Note: Figures are in Lakhs.

Interestingly in all the districts of the four divisions in the first period of the analysis i.e., 2003-04 to 2012-13 there is consistency in terms of the CGR of the financial performance of the PRIs finances. Even in Gulbarga division the same kind of trend is noticed. The lowest GR seems to be 12.780 per cent in case of the Gulbarga district and the highest seems to be in case of the Raichur district, which is 17.628 per cent (Table-4) Therefore, one can say that there is no major difference between the lowest and highest GRs in the Gulbarga division for the first period of the analysis. Interestingly in case of the Gulbarga division, even in the second period of analysis, there is consistency in terms of the CGR of the PRIs performance. Because there is no major difference in case of the lowest and highest values of the GRs. However, compared to the first period of analysis in the second period, the GRs are very much high, leading to the increase is some where around two to three times are more. Investigations have to be conducted about why this kind of major differences between the first period of analysis to the second period of analysis. Surprisingly, in the overall performance, consistency is maintained between various districts in the division. Only Yadgiri district has shown some difference where it is very high consisting of 24.760, which is the highest. Yadgiri district came into existence very late and this may be the explanation for the difference. The district came into existence in the year 2010-11 and the data has been computed from the same year. Since it was a new district, formed recently, may be the reason why the fund allocation is more and therefore CGR is more.

**Table-4: Financial Performance of PRI in the Districts of Gulbarga Division (CGR in %).**

| Sl. No. | Years | Bellary | Bidar | Gulbarga | Koppal | Raichur | Yadgiri |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 01 | 2003-04 | 4642 | 4307 | 7093 | 3378 | 4297 | NA |
| 02 | 2004-05 | 5104 | 4689 | 7858 | 3602 | 4687 | NA |
| 03 | 2005-06 | 10810 | 9772 | 16905 | 7955 | 10208 | NA |
| 04 | 2006-07 | 13726 | 12222 | 24236 | 10226 | 15562 | NA |
| 05 | 2007-08 | 13169 | 13147 | 25840 | 10343 | 15727 | NA |
| 06 | 2008-09 | 13682 | 11419 | 23075 | 11057 | 14659 | NA |
| 07 | 2009-10 | 16184 | 11747 | 26027 | 12353 | 16350 | NA |
| 08 | 2010-11 | 15765 | 13132 | 19557 | 12335 | 16946 | 8501 |
| 09 | 2011-12 | 15988 | 12997 | 20606 | 12319 | 17427 | 9273 |
| 10 | 2012-13 | 21594 | 15557 | 27716 | 14230 | 22710 | 11451 |
| CGR in % | | **15.831** | **12.827** | **12.780** | **15.922** | **17.628** | **16.062** |
| 01 | 2013-14 | 24568 | 16561 | 31296 | 16397 | 25569 | 12564 |
| 02 | 2014-15 | 22102 | 30831 | 29598 | 19762 | 23834 | 14718 |
| 03 | 2015-16 | 34475 | 25450 | 41693 | 23127 | 33352 | 16872 |
| 04 | 2016-17 | 39242 | 28103 | 48271 | 25637 | 38539 | 18661 |
| 05 | 2017-18 | 92431 | 85241 | 121073 | 90078 | 80290 | 60738 |
| CGR **in %** | | **38.045** | **37.496** | **37.644** | **44.302** | **31.905** | **40.338** |
| **Over all GR in %** | | **16.872** | **15.993** | **14.035** | **17.274** | **16.665** | **24.760** |

Note: Figures are in Lakhs.

## CONCLUSION:

Panchayat Raj Institutions have been given step-motherly treatment by both the State and Central Governments. The development of village India is possible by strengthening ZPs, TPs and GPs. However, political will is missing in this direction. Though there is a criticism that PRIs is nothing but the decentralization of corruption but the point is at least to that extent the money is diverted or shared by a larger group. So many academicians and researchers feel that decentralization of corruption itself is some positive change. Therefore, in the best possible way the finances have to be given to the Panchyats so that the Gandhiji's vision of development can be seen in the village India. Therefore, it is suggested that there need to be consistency in the allocation of resources to the PRIs so that better planning can be taken care as it will lead to rural development in general and PRIs in general.

## REFERENCES

1. Babu Devendra (2009). Fiscal Empowerment of Panchayats in India: Real or Rhetoric? working paper, No (229), *The Institute for Social and Economic Change, Bangalore.*
2. Babu Devendra, Farah Zaire and Rajesh Khanna Prakash (2018). Two Decades of Fiscal Decentralization Reforms In Karnataka: Opportunities, Issues and Challenges. *The Institute for Social and Economic Change,* Bangalore, Working Paper, No (416), pp. 1-34.
3. Government of Karnataka (1996). Report of the Sate Finance Commission Relating to Rural Local Bodies, *Government of Karnataka.*
4. *Pethe Abhay and Mala Lalvani (2008). Finances of Panchayati Raj Institutions: A Simple Story but A Messy Plot. Deportment of Economics University of Mumbai. pp. 1-56.*
5. Ramya, M. and T,R, Manjunath (2019). An Overview of Finances of Panchayats Raj Institutions in Karnataka. *Indian Journal of Research*, Vol (8), Iss (9): pp. 1-3.
6. Government of Karnataka (2014). Study of Panchayat Finances in Karnataka Report Prepared by the Institute for Development and Empowerment, Mysore Submitted to Decentralisation Analysis Cell Government of Karnataka, pp. 1-181.
7. Government of Karnataka (2003-04 to 2017-18). Budget Documents. Budget Allotment for Zilla Panchayat Plan and Non-Plan. As Presented to the Legislature in each Financials Year.