



WHITE PAPER



And



IC Centre for Governance

STATE OF POLICING AND LAW & ORDER IN Delhi November 2017



Table of Contents

I. Acknowledgements	4
II. Foreword.....	5
III. Summary Section for Delhi	6
IV. Status on Police Reforms.....	14
V. Police Personnel.....	17
VI. Deliberations by Delhi MPs	22
VII. Citizen Survey Data.....	24
Annexure 1 – Sources of Data	34
Annexure 2 – Survey Methodology	35
Annexure 3 – Socio Economic Classification (SEC) Note	36
Table 1 : Crimes reported in Delhi from 2014 to 2016	6
Table 2 : District-wise crime reported from 2014 to 2016.....	7
Table 3 : Specific Crime’s highest occurrences district-wise.....	8
Table 4: Kidnapping and Abduction of women in Delhi.....	9
Table 5: Cases registered under Protection of Children from Sexual Offences (POCSO) Act in 2015 & 2016.	9
Table 6 : Cases Investigated from Crime in India Report for the Year 2014 to 2015	10
Table 7 : Trial Cases from Crime in India Report for the Year 2014 to 2015	12
Table 8 : Statement of complaints received/cases registered	15
Table 9 : Statement of police personnel involved/action taken	15
Table 10 : Departmental action/punishment	16
Table 11 : Designation wise number of Police Personnel sanctioned and working (as of Mar 2017)	17
Table 12 : Designation wise number of police personnel different between working forces in year 2016 to 2017	18
Table 13 : Police Personnel details based on Areas of Delhi (165 Police Stations) as on 31 st March 2017 ...	19
Table 14 : Police Personnel details based on Department as on 31 st March 2017	20
Table 15 : Police Personnel details based on Supervisory level officer (as on 31 st Mar 2017)	21
Table 16: Number of question asked on crime issues during the Budget session 2014 to Budget session 2017	22
Table 17: Issues-wise no. of question asked on crime	23
Table 18: Percentage of people who feel unsafe in Delhi	24
Table 19: Percentage of respondents who have witnessed or faced crime	25
Table 20: Respondents who witnessed crime and have informed police and their satisfaction	25
Table 21: Medium of Informing Police by respondents who have witnessed crime	26
Table 22: Reason for not informing Police by respondents who have witnessed crime.....	27
Table 23: Respondents who faced crime and have informed police and their satisfaction.....	28
Table 24: Medium of Informing Police by respondents who have faced crime	29
Table 25: Reason for not informing police by respondents who have faced crime	30



Table 26: Percentage of people who feel unsafe in Delhi of different socio-economic classes.....	31
Table 27: Respondents who witnessed crime or faced crime who have informed police and their satisfaction	31
Table 28: Medium of Informing Police by respondents who have witnessed or faced crime	32
Table 29: Reason for not informing the police among respondents who have witnessed crime or faced crime	33



I. Acknowledgements

Praja has obtained the data used in compiling this report card through Right to Information Act, 2005. Hence it is very important to acknowledge the RTI Act and everyone involved, especially from the officials who have provided us this information diligently.

We are also most grateful to – our Elected Representatives, the Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) and journalists who utilise and publicise our data and, by doing so, ensure that awareness regarding various issues we discuss is distributed to a wide ranging population. We would also like to extend our gratitude to all government officials for their cooperation and support.

This White Paper has been made possible by the support provided to us by our supporters and we would like to take this opportunity to express our sincere gratitude to them. First and foremost, we would like to thank the Initiatives of Change (IC) Centre for Governance, a prominent organisation working on improving governance structures and United Residents Joint Action (URJA), a well-known organisation which addresses the gap in last mile governance by connecting citizens and RWA. Our work in Delhi has been conducted in partnership with them and we have been able to conduct data driven research on vital issues affecting the governance of Delhi on aspects such as performance of Elected Representatives (ER), Health, Education, Crime and policing and Civic issues.

Praja Foundation appreciates the support given by our supporters and donors, namely European Union Fund, Friedrich Naumann Foundation, Ford Foundation, Dasra, Narotam Sekhsaria Foundation and Madhu Mehta Foundation and numerous other individual supporters. Their support has made it possible for us to conduct our study & publish this white paper.

We would also like to thank our group of Advisors & Trustees and lastly but not the least, we would like to acknowledge the contributions of all members of Praja's team, who worked to make this white paper a reality.



European Union

Friedrich Naumann
STIFTUNG **FÜR DIE FREIHEIT**

Ford Foundation



Narotam Sekhsaria Foundation

**Madhu Mehta
Foundation**



II. Foreword

Praja's whitepaper on the state of policing and law & order in Delhi, 2017 is a reflection of the requirement for a balance of scales, on which on one side should be the faith of the citizens in the authorities in terms of security and on the other should be the counter-measures taken by the authorities to balance this scale.

Regrettably the scales will tip over to the lack of faith citizens have and is reflected in the response of the citizens towards their idea of safety and security. This lack of faith can be correlated in terms of the drop in registration of cases for almost all the major crimes in Delhi. However, crime against women in Delhi has still been consistently high with 3,969 cases against molestation of women in 2016, while of the total number of cases registered under kidnapping cases 59.60% were related to women which is on a steady rise. Representing the further meek state of affairs is the total 2,181 cases of rape being registered in 2016 of which 977 are registered under Protection of Children from Sexual Offences (POCSO) Act. Underpinning the above data on crime against women and children is the percentage of people not feeling secure for women, children and senior citizens in their locality at 60% for 2016.

Praja had commissioned Hansa research to conduct a survey of 24,301 Delhi households to study the perception of citizens with regard to their safety and security. It was found through the survey that 1 of every 14 persons in Delhi over the age of 18 years have faced crime, while 1 out of every 3rd person who faced crime has not reported it to the police. Of the total respondents who had faced crime, 1 out of every 3 people did not report to the police because of lack of faith in the police and/or legal system.

Foreseeing this issue of mistrust, to bridge the gap between safety grievances of citizens and the corresponding response of the authorities to those grievances, the Supreme Court passed an order and recommended the formation of the **State Security Commission** on 22nd of September 2006. This recommended mechanism, when formed would consist of the Lt. Governor, Chief Minister of Delhi, Commissioner of Police, Leader of Opposition and other functionaries to deliberate and monitor the issues pertaining to security of citizens in Delhi. Since the formation of the AAP government, the commission has not been formed.

The pertinent question at this hour is where does this go from now? There can be numerable more examples about the attempts being made by government, but are just attempts enough? How long must the citizens of Delhi wear rose tinted glasses where the promises of better governance are only as real as a magician's trick. At this hour, there is a need for exemplary conduct by the authorities, elected representatives and government to make these attempts tangible proofs of successful execution of policy.

NITAI MEHTA

Managing Trustee, Praja Foundation



III. Summary Section for Delhi

Section A. Crime Statistics

Table 1 : Crimes reported in Delhi from 2014 to 2016

Specific Crimes reported	2014	2015	% Increase 2014 to 2015	2016	% Increase 2015 to 2016
Murder (Sec.302)	554	640	16%	537	-16%
Att. to Murder (Sec.307)	757	835	10%	629	-25%
Rape (Sec.376)	2075	2338	13%	2181	-7%
Molestation of Women (Sec.354,354A,B,C,D)	4717	3913	17%	3969	1%
Riots (Sec.147-151,153A)	153	179	17%	92	-49%
Kidnapping / Abduction (Sec.363-369,364A)	7187	7940	10%	6707	-16%
Burglary (Day and Night) (Sec.454,457)	10282	13577	32%	8994	-34%
Chain Snatching (Sec.356)	7170	4729	-34%	4884	3%
Robbery / Dacoity (Sec.392-395,397,398)	6470	8607	33%	4758	-45%
Accident / Fatal Accident (Sec. 279 with 337,338 or 304A)	8277	8637	4%	7597	-12%
Theft (Sec.379)	51860	56192	8%	37179	-34%
Extortion (Sec.384-389)	236	285	21%	217	-24%

Inference:

- Chain Snatching, which had reported a decline in registered cases from 2014 to 2015, increased by 3% in 2016.
- Theft accounts for the highest number of criminal cases registered, with 37,179 cases in 2016.
- Incidences of Rape and Molestation of Women continue to be high in Delhi, with 2,181 cases of Rape and 3,969 cases of Molestation being reported in 2016.

Note: Data in this white paper relates to 12 districts only (East, North East, North West, North, New Delhi, Outer, South, South East, South West, West, Central and IGI Airport). The new districts (Shahdara and Rohini) were added in January 2017 and because the duration of data included in this report is from January 2016 to December 2016, only 12 districts were taken into consideration.



Table 2 : District-wise crime reported from 2014 to 2016

Nature of Crime		Murder (Sec.302)	Att. to Murder (Sec.307)	Rape (Sec.376)	Molestation of Women (Sec.354,354A,B,C,D)	Riots (Sec.147-151,153A)	Kidnapping / Abduction (Sec.363-369,364A)	Burglary (Day and Night) (Sec.454,457)	Chain Snatching (Sec.356)	Robbery / Dacoity (Sec.392-395,397,398)	Accident / Fatal Accident (Sec.279 with 337,338 or 304A)	Theft (Sec.379)	Extortion (Sec.384-389)
Central	2014	29	43	84	213	5	316	606	550	301	396	3097	18
	2015	43	67	115	106	21	503	1358	647	437	475	3666	8
	2016	29	26	108	224	7	239	493	445	194	298	2209	8
West	2014	58	76	250	484	3	860	970	1279	584	922	6067	17
	2015	70	94	269	383	7	854	1576	722	723	875	6792	39
	2016	62	77	244	354	5	751	1381	1018	444	853	5172	26
East	2014	60	93	229	502	23	687	992	1005	789	802	6279	38
	2015	39	85	235	466	8	714	1013	425	817	771	4138	47
	2016	34	62	239	318	11	610	684	487	691	678	2099	35
Outer	2014	87	88	269	460	13	1206	1818	1087	1014	1083	7396	27
	2015	126	108	312	392	19	1294	2535	1719	1537	1044	9362	64
	2016	110	92	367	550	10	1109	1758	865	889	989	6533	33
New Delhi	2014	5	7	18	54	21	49	54	93	60	270	936	7
	2015	8	5	20	38	7	56	50	36	106	307	1021	6
	2016	6	6	21	54	12	51	69	94	62	288	765	4
North	2014	30	28	62	180	14	277	675	447	366	559	3465	15
	2015	26	24	50	142	7	312	791	60	514	580	3898	6
	2016	27	23	67	189	3	267	367	283	237	523	1877	8
North East	2014	77	111	251	569	30	1035	1039	786	1287	658	4462	32
	2015	126	152	370	679	62	1338	1773	296	2006	1170	5459	19
	2016	58	116	263	535	12	969	975	693	856	741	3674	13
North West	2014	41	84	146	405	6	684	926	513	745	659	5344	11
	2015	47	80	183	329	9	745	1097	172	860	724	5745	22
	2016	43	73	177	304	15	583	882	346	581	685	4557	19
South	2014	40	57	268	862	15	639	1246	409	505	918	6413	24
	2015	33	57	321	485	12	522	1060	209	658	845	6695	22
	2016	46	41	262	590	5	619	1052	194	325	812	5211	22
South East	2014	65	83	253	461	19	701	1050	402	402	1022	5124	19
	2015	52	87	237	398	9	843	1296	199	380	933	5714	19
	2016	58	70	259	427	8	758	880	137	273	892	3264	16
South West	2014	61	87	245	515	4	730	905	599	413	960	3124	27
	2015	70	76	225	485	18	756	1028	244	569	880	3579	33
	2016	64	43	174	413	4	750	453	322	204	818	1665	33
Airport	2014	1	0	0	12	0	3	1	0	4	28	153	1
	2015	0	0	1	10	0	3	0	0	0	33	123	0
	2016	0	0	0	11	0	1	0	0	2	20	153	0
Total	2014	554	757	2075	4717	153	7187	10282	7170	6470	8277	51860	236
	2015	640	835	2338	3913	179	7940	13577	4729	8607	8637	56192	285
	2016	537	629	2181	3969	92	6707	8994	4884	4758	7597	37179	217

Inference:

- Registration of cases of Molestation with women increased in seven districts (Central, Outer, New Delhi, North, South, South East and Airport) of Delhi as compared to 2015.
- Number of registered Rape cases increased in five districts (East, Outer, New Delhi, North and South East) of Delhi from 2015 to 2016.



Table 3 : Specific Crime's highest occurrences district-wise

Sr.no	Crime	2014		2015		2016	
		Zone of Delhi	Occurrence	Zone of Delhi	Occurrence	Zone of Delhi	Occurrence
1	Murder	Outer	87	Outer & North East	126	Outer	110
2	Attempt to murder	North East	111	North East	152	North East	116
3	Rape	Outer	269	North East	370	Outer	367
6	Molestation	South	862	North East	679	South	590
7	Riots	North East	30	North East	62	North West	15
8	Kidnapping / Abduction	Outer	1206	North East	1338	Outer	1109
10	Burglary (Day and Night)	Outer	1818	Outer	2535	Outer	1758
11	Chain Snatching	West	1279	Outer	1719	West	1018
12	Robbery / Dacoity	North East	1287	North East	2006	Outer	889
13	Accident / Fatal Accident	Outer	1083	North East	1170	Outer	989
14	Theft	Outer	7396	Outer	9362	Outer	6533
15	Extortion	East	38	Outer	64	East	35

Inference:

- The data above represents the highest reported crimes in a particular district of Delhi in 2014, 2015 and 2016. Crimes like Murder (110), Rape (367), Kidnapping/ Abduction (1,109), Burglary (1,758), Robbery/Dacoity (889), Accident/ Fatal Accident (989) and Theft (6,533) had the highest numbers of registered cases in Outer District in 2016.
- Incidences of Murder, Burglary and Theft have been the highest in Outer District since 2014.
- North East district continues to have the highest number of cases of Attempt to Murder since 2014.
- South District reported the highest registration of incidence of Molestation of Women (590), while West district had the highest number of cases registered for Chain Snatching cases (1,018) in Delhi for the year 2016.


Table 4: Kidnapping and Abduction of women in Delhi

Crime Head	2015		2016	
	Kidnapping	Abduction	Kidnapping	Abduction
Overall Cases	7145	792	6008	699
Crime Against Women (CAW)	3935	418	3581	524
Percentage of CAW against total (%)	55.07 %	52.78 %	59.60 %	74.96 %

Inference:

- Of the total number of kidnapping and abduction cases registered in Delhi, more than 50 percent of the kidnapping and abduction cases were of women.
- In 2016 alone, of the total 699 abduction cases registered in Delhi, 74.96% were cases of women abduction.
- Similarly, in 2016 itself 59.60% of the kidnapping cases were cases of kidnapping of women.

Table 5: Cases registered under Protection of Children from Sexual Offences (POCSO) Act in 2015 & 2016

District	2015		2016	
	Total (under POCSO)	Total Rapes	Total (under POCSO)	Total Rapes
Central	87	115	47	108
West	136	269	89	244
East	108	235	96	239
Outer	133	312	178	367
New Delhi	8	20	11	21
North	22	50	24	67
North East	171	370	124	263
North West	95	183	120	177
South	135	321	84	262
South East	147	237	125	259
South West	107	225	79	174
Airport	0	1	0	0
Total	1149	2338	977	2181

Inference:

- Outer district (178 cases) registered the maximum number of cases under Protection of Children from Sexual Offences (POCSO) Act in 2016, followed by South East (125 cases) and North East (124 cases)
- Outer district had the maximum registration of Rape cases (367 cases) in 2016. This number increased from 2015 (312 cases).

Note: In Praja's Crime White Paper of 2016 the data on Protection of Children from Sexual Offences (POCSO) Act was derived from Crime in India Report 2015. Since Crime in India report 2016 has not been published yet, therefore we have obtained POCSO data for 2015 and 2016 from all police stations in Delhi through RTI.


Table 6 : Cases Investigated from Crime in India Report for the Year 2014 to 2015

Year	Pending investigation from early year	Cases Reported in the current year	Not investigated /Refused	Classified final as (Statement B/C ¹)	Final reports sent (Statement A)	Cases sent-up from current year (Charge sheet)	Pending investigation as of December of the current year
<i>CLASS - II SERIOUS OFFENCES (Cases including murder, rape, grievous hurt, kidnapping, abduction etc.)</i>							
2014	9181	18876	32	2663	2665	8141	14556
2015	14556	20324	66	3431	3748	8838	18755
<i>Other IPC crimes</i>							
2014	41306	136778	22	1400	52572	29393	94697
2015	94692	171053	62	1160	95070	35241	134178
<i>Total</i>							
2014	50487	155654	54	4063	55237	37534	109253
2015	109248	191377	128	4591	98818	44079	152933

Inferences:

A total of 2,06,141² cases were investigated in the year 2014 and 3,00,625³ cases in the year 2015. Of these, investigation was completed in 96,888⁴ cases in the year 2014 and 1,47,616⁵ cases in 2015.

Of this 1,47,616 cases, 67% of the (a total of 98,818) cases were found to be true but were not detected; and 30% (a total 44,079) cases were sent up for trials.

Of the total (2,06,141) cases, 14% (a total of 28,057⁶) in 2014 and the total (3,00,625) cases, 12% (a total of 34,880⁷) in 2015 are related to Class II (Serious Offences). Of the above classification of crime, Class II (Serious Offences) is the most crucial.

¹After an FIR is registered and investigation completed either in the case a charge sheet is filed and the case is sent to the courts for trials (Cases Sent-up) or the case is classified as Statement A (mentioned above as 'Final Reports Sent' meaning cases in which charge sheet was not filed but investigation completed. In colloquial police vocabulary Statement, A is also known as 'Case True but not Detected') or the case is classified as B/C (meaning cases declared false or mistake of fact or law).

² Sum of pending investigation from early year (50,487) and cases reported in the current year (1,55,654).

³Sum of pending investigation from early year (1,09,248) and cases reported in the current year (1,91,377).

⁴Sum of not investigated/refused (54), classified final (4,063), final reports sent (55,237) and cases sent-up from current year (37,534).

⁵Sum of not investigated/refused (128), classified final (4,591), final reports sent (98,818) and cases sent-up from current year (44,079).

⁶ Sum of pending investigation from early year (9,181) and case reported in the current year (18,876) of Class – II Serious offences.

⁷ Sum of pending investigation from early year (14,556) and case reported in the current year (20,324) of Class – II Serious offences.



A total of 34,880 cases (Class II serious offences) were investigated in the calendar year 2015. Of which investigation was completed of 16,083⁸ cases in 2015. Of these 16,083 cases, 23% (a total of 3,748) cases were found to be true but were not detected; and 55% (a total of 8,838) of the cases were sent up for trials. While, investigation in 54% of the (a total of 34,880) cases registered in 2015 or that may have been registered prior to 2015 is yet pending completion of investigation i.e. in 18,755 cases.

⁸ Sum of not investigated/refused (66), classified final (3,431), final reports sent (3,748) and cases sent-up from current year (8,838) of Class – II Serious offences.


Table 7 : Trial Cases from Crime in India Report for the Year 2014 to 2015

Trial Cases for the year – 2014 to 2015								
Year	Pending Trial from early year	Cases sent-up in the current year	Compounded	Withdrawn	Acquitted	Convicted		Pending Trial as of December of the current year
						In no.	In %	
CLASS - II SERIOUS OFFENCES (Cases including murder, rape, grievous hurt, kidnapping, abduction etc.)								
2014	23584	8141	221	27	2504	1672	38	27301
2015	27301	8838	150	2	2373	1455	37	32159
Other IPC crimes								
2014	112729	29393	738	251	12167	9694	42	119272
2015	119286	35241	682	282	7773	8373	49	137417
Total								
2014	136313	37534	959	278	14671	11366	42	146573
2015	146587	44079	832	284	10146	9828	47	169576

Inference:

A total of 1,73,847⁹ cases were tried in the courts in year 2014 and a total of 1,90,666¹⁰ cases in 2015. Of which trial was completed in 16% (a total of 27,274¹¹) cases in year 2014 and in the year 2015 trial was completed in 11% (a total of 21,090¹²) cases and judgement was given.

In the year 2014, of the 27,274 cases in which judgments was given, 42% of the (a total of 11,366) cases were convicted. Similarly, in the year 2015, of the 21,090 cases in which judgments was given, 47% of the (a total of 9,828) cases were convicted.

It should be noted that here the judgments for the case is considered and not for individual persons who are accused e.g. if there are three accused in the particular case and only one gets convicted then the entire case is treated as convicted, only when all three are acquitted then only the case is considered as acquitted for the above statistics.

While in the year 2014, 84% of the (a total of 1,46,573) cases and in the year 2015; 89% of the (a total of 169,576) cases were sent for trials are yet pending judgments.

⁹Sum of Pending trial from early year (1,36,313) and Cases sent-up in the current year (37,534).

¹⁰Sum of Pending trial from early year (1,46,587) and Cases sent-up in the current year (44,079).

¹¹Sum of Compounded (959), Withdrawn (278), Acquitted (14,671) and Convicted (11,366).

¹²Sum of Compounded (832), Withdrawn (284), Acquitted (10,146) and Convicted (9,828).



Of the total (1,73,847) cases, 18% (a total of 31,725¹³) in year 2014 and the total (1,90,666) cases, 19% (a total of 36,139¹⁴) in year 2015 are related to Class II (Serious Offences). Of the above classification of crime, Class II (Serious Offences) is the most crucial.

A total of 36,139 cases (Class II serious offences) were tried in the courts in the calendar year 2015. Of which trial was completed in 11% (a total of 3,980¹⁵) cases and judgement was given. Of this 3,980 cases in which judgement was given, only 37% of the (a total of 1,455) cases were convicted; while the 60% cases were acquitted, 4% cases were compounded and withdrawn.

Sum of Pending Trial from early year (23,584) and Cases sent-up in the current year (8,141) of Class – II Serious offences.

¹³Sum of Pending Trial from early year (23,584) and Cases sent-up in the current year (8,141) of Class – II Serious offences

¹⁴Sum of Pending Trial from early year (27,301) and Cases sent-up in the current year (8,838) of Class – II Serious offences.

¹⁵Sum of Compounded (150), Withdrawn (2), Acquitted (2,373) and Convicted (1,455) of Class – II Serious offences.



IV. Status on Police Reforms

Since the formation of the AAP government, **State Security Commission** has not been formed as per the Supreme Court given ten years back on the 22nd of September 2006.

On dated 27th February 2012, Govt. of N.C.T of Delhi has set up **Police Complaint Authority** vide **Resolution No.F.12/04/2011/AR/1630-1789/C** It will deal with the complaints of public regarding acts of serious misconduct by the policemen/officers of Delhi Police such as death in Police custody, grievous hurt caused by Police, rape or attempt to rape, illegal detention, extortion, land/house grabbing or any serious abuse of authority. People can lodge a complaint in Police Complaints Authority (PCA) in the prescribed format either personally or through post or by E-mail.

DEPOL/R/2017/09642.
TIMED/UNDER RTI ACT-2005.

OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICER, POLICE HDQRS.,
M.S.O BUILDING, 8TH FLOOR, I.P ESTATE, NEW DELHI.

No. XXIV/29/Spl/ID-1911/2017/ 15450 /RTI Cell/PHQ dated 21/5/17
To

Ms. Anjali Srivastava,
Praja Foundation, Room No. 901,
9th Floor, Nirmal Tower, 26, Sarakhamba Road,
New Delhi-110001.

Subject:- **Seeking information under Right to Information Act-2005.**

With reference to your RTI application dated 11.04.2017 [received in this Hdqrs. on 13.04.2017], on the subject cited above. I am to provide the requisite reply, pertaining to PIO/PHQ, on the basis of report received from concerned quarter [principle supplier of the information], as under:-

Point No.	Reply.
(i)	After the new elected Govt. of NCT of Delhi, a proposal for re-constitution for State Security Commission has been sent to Principal Secy. to Hon'ble LG, Delhi vide letter No. 8799/C&T/AC-I/PHQ, dated 20.3.2015, which is still under consideration.
(ii)	No meeting has been held by the Security Commission of Delhi since 1 st Jan 2016 to till date.
(iii)	Nil, in view of point No. 2 above.
(iv)	The function of the Security Commission are mentioned in GOI/MHA's order Nos. 14040/45/2009-UTP, dated 3.3.2010 and 14040/127/2010-UTP, dated 10.1.2011, their copies are available in this Hdqrs. You may obtain the above mentioned copies after depositing/sending of its cost of stationery charges of Rs. 04/- [Rs. 2/- per page] by way of cash against proper receipt or Bank Draft/Banker's Cheque or IPO addressed to Accounts Officer, Delhi Police, under RTI Act-2005.
(v)	As per record, no such report has been received in this Hdqrs.

[VIKRAMJIT SINGH] IPS
PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICER-CUM
DEPUTY COMMISSIONER OF POLICE
DELHI POLICE HDQRS., NEW DELHI
Ph # 23762616 Extn. 30079.

The first appellate authority under section 19 of RTI Act-2005 is Spl. CP/PHQ [GA], Office location: 7th Floor, MSO Building, IP Estate, New Delhi. The appeal could be filed within thirty days of receipt of the reply, if not satisfied with the above reply.



Table 8 : Statement of complaints received/cases registered

Year	No. of Complaints received during the year	No. of Inquiry Instituted			No. of criminal cases registered during the year	Complaints/ Cases declared false/ unsubstantiated after enquiry/ investigation during the year	No. of cases Charge sheeted during the year	No. of Cases Police Personnel Charge - Sheeted	No. of Police Personnel arrested during the year
		Departmental	Magisterial	Judicial					
2014	11902	540	0	0	173	237	0	0	0
2015	12913	837	0	0	145	346	7	7	0

Inference:

Number of complaints received in 2015 against Police was 12,913 from which 346 were declared false. Only 145 criminal cases were registered but no police personnel got arrested.

Table 9 : Statement of police personnel involved/action taken

Year	No. of Police personnel sent up for Trial during the year	No. of Police Personnel whose cases were withdrawn or otherwise disposed of	No. of Police Personnel in whose cases the Trials were completed during the year	Number of Police Personnel	
				Convicted	Acquitted
2014	0	0	0	0	0
2015	7	0	0	0	0

Inference:

Not a single police personnel was sent for trial in 2014 while 7 were sent in 2015.

**Table 10 : Departmental action/punishment**

Year	No. of Police Personnel against whom disciplinary action initiated during the year	No. of Police Personnel awarded minor punishments summarily (before enquiry)	No. of Police Personnel whose cases were withdrawn or otherwise disposed of	Number of Police personnel in whose cases enquiries were conducted during the year	Number of Police Personnel			No. of departmental enquiries in which charges were not proved and filed	No. of departmental enquiries pending at the end of the year
					Dismissal/Removal from Service	Major Punishment	Minor Punishment		
2014	899	0	749	0	68	346	137	0	0
2015	1057	0	652	0	69	292	124	0	0

Inference:

In 2015, out of 10,57 cases registered against police 62% were either withdrawn or disposed, 69 were dismissed and 292 got major punishment.



V. Police Personnel

Table 11 : Designation wise number of Police Personnel sanctioned and working (as of Mar 2017)

Sr. No.	Designation	Sanctioned	Working in Mar'17	Difference between Sanctioned and Working (Mar'17)	% Difference between Sanctioned and Working
1	Commissioner of Police (C.P.)	1	1	0	0%
2	Special Commissioner of Police	12	13	1	8%
3	Joint Commissioner of Police (Jt. C.P.)	20	21	1	5%
4	Additional Commissioner of Police (Addl. C.P.)	19	8	-11	-58%
5	Deputy Commissioner of Police (D.C.P.)	53	57	4	8%
6	Additional Deputy Commissioner of Police (Addl. D.C.P.)	54	36	-18	-33%
7	Assistant Commissioner of Police (A.C.P.)	348	264	-84	-24%
8	Police Inspector (P.I.)	1350	1329	-21	-2%
9	Police Sub - Inspector (P.S.I.)	6819	5055	-1764	-26%
10	Assistant Police Sub-Inspector (A.S.I.)	6759	7123	364	5%
11	Head Constable (H.C.)	21579	19892	-1687	-8%
12	Police Constable (P.C.)	47671	42795	-4876	-10%
Total Police Force		84685	76594	-8091	-10%

Inference:

- There appears to be an acute shortage of police personnel in Delhi Police. Additional Commissioner of Police (Addl. C.P.) (58% shortage), Additional Deputy Commissioner of Police (Addl. D. C.P.) (33% shortage), Assistant Commissioner of Police (A.C.P.) (24% shortage) and Police Sub - Inspector (P.S.I.) (26% shortage) record the highest shortfall as of March 2017.
- Police Inspectors (2 % shortage) and Police constable (10% shortage) designations also need to be filled as shortage of these directly affects the investigation and law and order of the city.

Note: Data related to police personnel in Delhi is for 14 districts as the information is 'as of March 2017'. Two new districts were added in January 2017 only.



Table 12 : Designation wise number of police personnel different between working forces in year 2016 to 2017

Sr. No.	Designation	Sanctioned	Working in 2017	Working in 2016	<i>Difference between working forces in 2017 & 2016</i>
1	Commissioner of Police (C.P.)	1	1	1	0
2	Special Commissioner of Police	12	13	13	0
3	Joint Commissioner of Police (Jt. C.P.)	20	21	21	0
4	Additional Commissioner of Police (Addl. C.P.)	19	8	8	0
5	Deputy Commissioner of Police (D.C.P.)	53	57	49	8
6	Additional Deputy Commissioner of Police (Addl. D.C.P.)	54	36	29	7
7	Assistant Commissioner of Police (A.C.P.)	348	264	270	-6
8	Police Inspector (P.I.)	1350	1329	1323	6
9	Police Sub - Inspector (P.S.I.)	6819	5055	5587	-532
10	Assistant Police Sub-Inspector (A.S.I.)	6759	7123	6707	416
11	Head Constable (H.C.)	21579	19892	18971	921
12	Police Constable (P.C.)	47671	42795	43258	-463
Total Police Force		84685	76594	76237	357

Inference:

- The data is reflective of the understaffed police department. At present Delhi has sanctioned total 84,685 police personnel, of which 8,091 positions are still vacant in 2017.
- 10% gap in the sanctioned and working numbers of police is severely affecting the quality of city policing.
- The personnel at the Police Sub-inspector (P.S.I) level is short of 532 people from the previous year.


Table 13 : Police Personnel details based on Areas of Delhi (165 Police Stations) as on 31st March 2017

Sr. No.	Area of Mumbai	No. of Police Station	Police Personnel Sanctioned	Police Personnel Working	Difference between Sanctioned and Working	% difference between Sanctioned and Working
1	Central District	15	3352	2897	-455	-14%
2	West District	12	2545	2569	24	1%
3	East District	10	2140	2060	-80	-4%
4	Outer District	12	2316	1892	-424	-18%
5	Shahdara	10	2175	1792	-383	-18%
6	Rohini	11	3181	2978	-203	-6%
7	New Delhi District	9	2486	2170	-316	-13%
8	North District	13	3180	2743	-437	-14%
9	North East District	12	2941	2766	-175	-6%
10	North West District	14	3243	2935	-308	-9%
11	South District	16	3976	3352	-624	-16%
12	South East District	17	3929	3487	-442	-11%
13	South West District	12	2527	2560	33	1%
14	Airport	2	526	491	-35	-7%
	Total	165	38517	34692	-3825	-10%

Inference:

- Overall there is 10% of difference between sanctioned and working Police personnel in Delhi. Except for South West district and West district all the rest districts face shortfall of working police personnel.
- The incidences of Murder, Burglary and Theft have been the highest in Outer District since 2014. (refer to Table-3) and yet outer district has highest gap between the sanctioned Police personnel and working Police personnel which is 18%.

Note: Data related to police personnel in Delhi is for 14 districts as the information is 'as of March 2017'. Two new districts were added in January 2017 only.


Table 14 : Police Personnel details based on Department as on 31st March 2017

Sr. No.	Department	Police Personnel Sanctioned	Police Personnel Working (Mar'17)	Police Personnel Working (Mar'16)	Difference between Sanctioned and Working (Mar'16)	% difference between Sanctioned and Working (Mar'16)	Difference between Sanctioned and Working (Mar'17)	% Difference between Sanctioned and Working (Mar'17)
1	Crime Branch	1350	1407	1412	63	5%	57	4%
2	Delhi Arm Force	9190	7629	7943	-1671	-17%	-1561	-17%
4	Security	7179	7088	7266	103	1%	-91	-1%
5	SPUW & C ¹⁶	291	361	348	56	19%	70	24%
6	Traffic	5978	5771	5679	-305	-5%	-207	-3%
7	Other ¹⁷	21673	19246	18215	-916	-5%	-2427	-11%
	Total	45661	41502	40863	-2670	-6%	-4159	-9%

Inference:

- There is a consistent difference of 9% in the overall police personnel across several departments of Delhi Police.
- There is a constant shortage of 17% in the Delhi Arm forces.

¹⁶ SPUW & C - Special Police Unit for Women and Child

¹⁷ 'Other positions' include Railway and Metro, E.O.W., Spl Cell/SB, Licensing, Spl Branch, Vigilance, D.E. cell, FRRO, P.C.R., Ops/COMM., P&L, Central armoury P&L, Vig, PHQ and comn, R. P. Bhawan, PHQ, PTC, Recruit PTC, Under Posting, GNCT SEC/OTH, Directorate of Vigilance, PCR/Driver duty (executive), Deputation to other department and A C Branch.

Along with this, 1,410 sanctioned positions which have been provided by police stations are also added in 'Other' category.



Table 15 : Police Personnel details based on Supervisory level officer (as on 31st Mar 2017)

Supervisor y level officer	Police Personnel Sanctione d	<i>Police Personne l Working (Mar'16)</i>	<i>Difference between Sanctione d and Working (Mar'16)</i>	<i>% Difference between Sanctione d and Working (Mar'16)</i>	Police Personne l Working (Mar'17)	Difference between Sanctione d and Working (Mar'17)	<i>% Difference between Sanctione d and Working (Mar'17)</i>
C.P., Special C.P.,Jt. C.P., Addl. C.P., D.C.P. Addl.DCP and A.C.P.	507	391	-114	23%	400	-107	-21%

Inference:

- Delhi Supervisory level officers suffers from a shortfall of Police personnel with 21% of difference between sanctioned and working Police personnel.



VI. Deliberations by Delhi MPs

Table 16: Number of question asked on crime issues during the Budget session 2014 to Budget session 2017

Name of MPs	No. of Question asked on crime issues			Total questions		
	Budget 2014 to Budget 2015	Monsoon 2015 to Budget 2016	Monsoon 2016 to Budget 2017	Budget 2014 to Budget 2015	Monsoon 2015 to Budget 2016	Monsoon 2016 to Budget 2017
Meenakshi Lekhi	1	2	3	105	101	86
Maheish Girri	4	4	4	127	109	97
Manoj Tiwari	0	0	6	5	20	112
Parvesh Sahib Singh	1	0	1	29	18	56
Ramesh Bidhuri	0	1	6	22	47	75
Udit Raj	3	3	3	42	78	79
Total	9	10	23	330	373	505

Inferences:

- The above data represents question asked by MPs on crime and police personnel/infrastructure from Budget 2014 to Budget 2017.
- Manoj Tiwari and Ramesh Bidhuri raised the maximum number of questions six (6) on Crime while only one (1) question was raised by Parvesh Sahib Singh in sessions starting from Monsoon 2016 to Budget 2017.
- Total questions asked during Monsoon 2016 to Budget 2017 were 505 from which only 23 were on crime while if we see the total number of questions raised from Budget 2014 to Budget 2017, from the total 1,208 questions raised only 42 were on crime.

**Table 17: Issues-wise no. of question asked on crime**

Issues	No. of Question asked on crime issues		
	Budget 2014 to Budget 2015	Monsoon 2015 to Budget 2016	Monsoon 2016 to Budget 2017
Cyber Crime	2	1	4
First Information Report (FIR)	1	3	6
Human Resources Related	3	0	2
Police Station Infrastructure	1	1	1
Women Issues Related	1	1	2
Prison Custody	0	1	1
Illegal Immigrants	1	0	1
Schemes and Policies in Crime	0	2	3
Terrorism/Naxals/Extremists Related	0	1	1
Crime Related	0	0	2
Total	9	10	23

Inference:

Only 2 questions were raised by MPs on issues related to Women in sessions starting from Monsoon 2016 to Budget 2017.



VII. Citizen Survey Data

Section I. Survey Statistics as per Areas of Delhi as per Member of Parliament Constituencies

Table 18: Percentage of people who feel unsafe in Delhi

Percentage of Respondents ¹⁸ who feel unsafe in Delhi	Area of Delhi ¹⁹							Delhi	Mumbai
	North West Delhi	North East Delhi	Chandni Chowk	New Delhi	West Delhi	South Delhi	East Delhi		
Percentage of people not feeling secure in Delhi	48%	56%	54%	46%	39%	56%	53%	50%	17%
Percentage of people not feeling secure for women, children and senior citizens are in one's locality	57%	63%	67%	53%	46%	67%	65%	60%	25%
Percentage of people not feeling secure while travelling from one place to another within the city	58%	63%	61%	54%	45%	61%	58%	57%	23%

Inference:

- 50% of the respondents do not feel secure in Delhi whereas 60% do not feel that Delhi is secure for women, children and senior citizen.
- 67% respondents from Chandni Chowk and South Delhi find Delhi to be unsafe/ not secure for women, children and senior citizens are in one's locality. South district of Delhi police recorded very high occurrence of Molestation with women (590 in 2016. Refer table 3)
- 57% of respondents do not feel secure while travelling in Delhi, of which highest number of respondents were of North East Delhi i.e. 63%.
- A comparison between Delhi and Mumbai numbers (Annual Survey of Households), strictly going on people's perceptions, Delhi is not considered to be as secure by its residents.

¹⁸Data based on a household survey of 24,301 respondents across the city of Delhi. Kindly refer to Annexure 2 for more details on the survey methodology.

¹⁹North West Delhi includes: Civil Line, Narela, Rohini; North East Delhi includes: Civil Line, Shahadra North; Chandni Chowk includes: City, Civil Line, Karol Bagh, Paharganj, Rohini; New Delhi includes: Central Zone, Karol Bagh, Paharganj, South; West Delhi includes: Najafgarh and West; South Delhi includes: Central Zone, Najafgarh and South and East Delhi includes Central Zone, Shahadra North and Shahadra South Zone.



Table 19: Percentage of respondents who have witnessed or faced crime

15% respondents have **witnessed crime** of the nature of accident, theft, murder, etc.

Amongst those who witnessed, 46% of the Respondents have **faced crime** of the nature of accident, theft, murder, etc.

Section II. A) Survey Statistics for Respondents who have *witnessed* crime (Table 20, 21 & 22)

Table 20: Respondents who witnessed crime and have informed police and their satisfaction

	North West Delhi	North East Delhi	Chandni Chowk	New Delhi	West Delhi	South Delhi	East Delhi	Delhi	Mumbai
Percentage of respondents who <i>witnessed</i> crime	12%	13%	12%	18%	25%	11%	18%	15%	5%
Percentage of respondents who have witnessed crime and have informed police	48%	40%	54%	45%	35%	44%	44%	43%	40%
Percentage of respondents who had witnessed crime and informed police and were satisfied with their response	21%	25%	21%	26%	23%	22%	30%	24%	50%

Inference:

- Of the total of 24,301 respondents, 15% respondents witnessed crime in Delhi while only 5% respondents in Mumbai witnessed crime. Of these 15% respondents, 57% did not inform the police in Delhi.
- Of the 43% respondents who reported to the police, 76% were not satisfied with their response.
- Respondents from North West Delhi (21%) and Chandni Chowk (21%) were the least satisfied respondents from among those who witnessed and reported crime to the police. North West Delhi Parliament constituency has Outer district of police in it which recorded the highest occurrence of major/ heinous crimes and also reported major shortage of police personnel (18%). (Refer table 13)
- 50 % people in Mumbai who witnessed crime and informed the police were satisfied with the institution as opposed to a meagre 24% of people in Delhi who were satisfied with the police response.



Table 21: Medium of Informing Police by respondents who have witnessed crime

	North West Delhi	North East Delhi	Chandni Chowk	New Delhi	West Delhi	South Delhi	East Delhi	Delhi	Mumbai
Called the helpline numbers like 100/103 etc.	77%	75%	71%	47%	53%	76%	87%	69%	45%
Called on the local telephone number of the police station	11%	6%	11%	36%	36%	12%	4%	17%	10%
Personally visited the nearest police station and complained	9%	6%	9%	13%	6%	5%	6%	7%	30%
Personally visited the nearest police station and registered an FIR	2%	9%	5%	3%	4%	5%	1%	4%	11%
Others	0%	4%	5%	1%	1%	3%	2%	2%	3%

Inference:

- From the respondents who witnessed crime in Delhi, 69% preferred to use the police helpline numbers like 100/ 103 to inform the police.
- Mumbai sees a good 30% of people personally visiting the police station and complaining as opposed to Delhi which is a measly 7 %.
- The second most preferred medium of informing Police by respondents who have witnessed crime was calling on the local telephone number of the police station (17%).



Table 22: Reason for not informing Police by respondents who have witnessed crime

	North West Delhi	North East Delhi	Chandni Chowk	New Delhi	West Delhi	South Delhi	East Delhi	Delhi	Mumbai
I don't have the time for all this	10%	11%	9%	4%	5%	18%	9%	9%	32%
I don't have any faith in the police / legal system	63%	29%	24%	71%	71%	22%	10%	46%	15%
Speaking to the police officials is a painful task	6%	3%	14%	12%	12%	4%	3%	8%	6%
I don't think it's my duty to inform them	3%	3%	3%	2%	4%	9%	8%	4%	7%
I don't want to get involved in any trouble	12%	13%	9%	6%	5%	15%	21%	11%	9%
Others	4%	41%	41%	4%	4%	32%	50%	23%	32%

Inference:

- No faith in the police / legal system came out to be the biggest reason for not informing Police by respondents who have witnessed crime. 46% of the respondents who witnessed crime reported the same reason. This lack of faith in the police/ legal system clearly explains the fall in registration of cases for almost all the major crimes in Delhi. (Refer table 1)
- 11% of respondents did not inform police because they do not want to get involved in any trouble even after witnessing a crime.
- Comparing Delhi and Mumbai on the parameter of 'people's faith in the police/legal system', Mumbai does fairly well with 15% of its resident not having faith to 46% of Delhi residents who do not have faith in the institutions of police and legal system.



Section III. B) Survey Statistics for Respondents who have *faced* crime (Table 23, 24 & 25)

Table 23: Respondents who faced crime and have informed police and their satisfaction

	North West Delhi	North East Delhi	Chandni Chowk	New Delhi	West Delhi	South Delhi	East Delhi	Delhi	Mumbai
Percentage of respondents who faced crime	54%	48%	50%	37%	36%	52%	52%	46%	41%
Percentage of respondents who have faced crime and have informed police	67%	64%	70%	77%	72%	61%	57%	66%	64%
Percentage of respondents who had faced crime and informed police and were satisfied with their response	18%	26%	12%	28%	19%	19%	27%	21%	46%

Inference:

- 1 out of 14 respondents faced crime in Delhi
- 1 out of 3 respondents who faced crime in Delhi did not report to the police.
- From all the respondents who witnessed crime in Delhi, 46% respondents faced crime in Delhi. Of these, 34% respondents did not inform the police.
- The percentage of respondents who faced crime and amongst those who faced crimes and informed the police are comparable. However, respondents who were satisfied with the response are a meagre percentage, 21% in Delhi as compared to Mumbai where 46% people are satisfied.
- Respondents from East Delhi reported least satisfaction from the response they got from police (only 57%).
- The second and third highest percentage of Respondents who faced crime were from South Delhi (52%) and East Delhi (52%) consecutively. It should be noted that highest percentage of respondents (56%) felt unsafe in South Delhi (Refer Table-18) and incidentally this is also the region which has the highest registered cases of Molestation of women.



Table 24: Medium of Informing Police by respondents who have faced crime

	North West Delhi	North East Delhi	Chandni Chowk	New Delhi	West Delhi	South Delhi	East Delhi	Delhi	Mumbai
Called the helpline numbers like 100/103 etc.	78%	71%	62%	41%	48%	74%	89%	66%	41%
Called on the local telephone number of the police station	10%	5%	15%	40%	40%	13%	5%	19%	10%
Personally visited the nearest police station and complained	10%	7%	12%	14%	8%	5%	3%	8%	35%
Personally visited the nearest police station and registered an FIR	1%	12%	7%	3%	4%	4%	1%	5%	11%
Others	0%	5%	4%	1%	1%	4%	2%	2%	2%

Inference:

- From the respondents who faced crime in Delhi, 66% used the police helpline numbers like 100/ 103 to inform the police.
- 35% people in Mumbai preferred personally visiting the police station as opposed to Delhi which is a dismal 8% visiting police station to report crime. The percentage of people willing and able to access the institution is relatively low in Delhi.
- The second most preferred medium of Informing Police by respondents who have faced crime in Delhi was calling on the local telephone number of the police station (19%).



Table 25: Reason for not informing police by respondents who have faced crime

	North West Delhi	North East Delhi	Chandni Chowk	New Delhi	West Delhi	South Delhi	East Delhi	Delhi	Mumbai
I don't have the time for all this	21%	2%	6%	2%	11%	16%	10%	11%	29%
I don't have any faith in the police / legal system	61%	17%	31%	44%	58%	20%	9%	32%	13%
Speaking to the police officials is a painful task	8%	4%	9%	13%	14%	2%	5%	7%	7%
I don't think it's my duty to inform them	0%	2%	1%	2%	6%	3%	7%	4%	10%
I don't want to get involved in any trouble	6%	17%	12%	19%	3%	24%	26%	16%	5%
Others	4%	57%	40%	21%	8%	35%	42%	30%	36%

Inference:

- No faith in the police / legal system came out to be the biggest reason for not informing Police by respondents who have faced crime. 32% of the respondents who faced crime reported the same reason for not informing the police. This also has clear linkages with low reportage of crimes in 2016 for almost all the major crimes as compared to 2015.
- Respondents from North West Delhi (61%) had least faith in police/ legal system. This is despite the fact that maximum number of respondents who faced crime in Delhi were from North West (54%).
- The second highest reason for not informing the police by respondents who faced crime was that they do not want to get involved in any trouble (16% of respondents).



Section IV. Survey Statistics as per SEC (Socio-Economic Classification)²⁰

Table 26: Percentage of people who feel unsafe in Delhi of different socio-economic classes

	Delhi			Mumbai		
	SEC A	SEC B&C	SEC D&E	SEC A	SEC B&C	SEC D&E
Percentage of people not feeling secure in Delhi	47%	50%	53%	17%	16%	17%
Percentage of people not feeling secure about women, children and senior citizens are in one's locality	57%	59%	62%	23%	24%	26%
Percentage of people not feeling secure while travelling from one place to another within the city	54%	56%	60%	21%	21%	25%

Inference:

- People belonging to lower SEC D & E (skilled and unskilled labour class) feel least secure than middle to higher SEC individuals (petty traders, businessman, supervisor, officer etc.) as their women and children feel more vulnerable and it is even hard for them to move around in the city.
- Across the sections A, B&C, and D&E; Mumbai feels more secure than Delhi.

Table 27: Respondents who witnessed crime or faced crime who have informed police and their satisfaction

	Delhi			Mumbai		
	SEC A	SEC B&C	SEC D&E	SEC A	SEC B&C	SEC D&E
Respondents who <i>witnessed</i> crime & have informed	55%	41%	38%	51%	45%	31%
Respondents who <i>faced</i> crime & have informed	67%	68%	64%	75%	71%	54%
Respondents who had informed police and were satisfied with their response	28%	26%	19%	68%	46%	46%

Inference:

- Respondents who witnessed crime and have informed police were highest in SEC A (55%) also they were the ones who are most satisfied with police response received (28%). While, SEC D & E respondents are less keen to inform police when they witness (38%) or face crime (64%).
- Satisfaction level of respondents from SEC D&E with the response on informing police is least i.e. 19%.

²⁰Data based on a household survey of 24,301 respondents across the city of Delhi. Kindly refer to Annexure 3 note on the Socio Economic Classification (SEC).



Table 28: Medium of Informing Police by respondents who have witnessed or faced crime

	Delhi			Mumbai		
	SEC A	SEC B&C	SEC D&E	SEC A	SEC B&C	SEC D&E
Called the helpline numbers like 100/103 etc.	75%	69%	64%	38%	44%	52%
Called on the local telephone number of the police station	14%	18%	19%	6%	14%	8%
Personally visited the nearest police station and complained	6%	6%	9%	35%	31%	27%
Personally visited the nearest police station and registered an FIR	3%	4%	5%	18%	9%	9%
Others	1%	2%	2%	3%	3%	4%

Inference:

- 69% respondents from SEC B & C called up help lines (100/103) numbers to inform police; whereas only 4% of them personally visited the nearest police station to register an FIR.
- 3% of the respondents from SEC A prefer to personally visit the police stations and register an FIR.
- 19% of SEC D & E called on the local telephone number of the police station.
- There is a noticeable difference between the Delhi and Mumbai numbers for Section D&E where in Mumbai 27% people belonging to this section personally visited the police station and complained as opposed to only 9 % in Delhi. The numbers indicate the state of accessibility of the section D&E to police stations.



Table 29: Reason for not informing the police among respondents who have witnessed crime or faced crime

	Delhi			Mumbai		
	SEC A	SEC B&C	SEC D&E	SEC A	SEC B&C	SEC D&E
I don't have the time for all this	9%	9%	8%	27%	28%	36%
I don't have any faith in the police/legal system	44%	47%	45%	10%	17%	14%
Speaking to the police officials is a painful task	8%	7%	8%	7%	5%	6%
I don't think it's my duty to inform them	3%	4%	5%	7%	7%	6%
I don't want to get involved in any trouble	11%	11%	12%	5%	12%	8%
Others	26%	21%	22%	45%	31%	30%

Inference:

- 44% respondents from SEC A don't have faith in legal system.
- 11% of the respondents from SEC B & C didn't inform the police because they don't want to get involved in any trouble.
- 47% respondents from SEC B & C don't have any faith in the police/legal system and hence did not inform the police when they witnessed or faced crime, whereas 7% of respondents reported that speaking to the police is a painful task and therefore they restrained from informing them.



Annexure 1 – Sources of Data

Section I (Crime Statistics) – Right to information (RTI) applications were filed in all 12 districts of Delhi to get the crime statistics from all 165 police stations. For Crime In India statistics, RTI applications were filled in all 12 DCP offices from where information from every SO Branch was provided to us.

Section V (Police Personnel) – Right to information (RTI) application was filed in Delhi Police Headquarters for strength of police personnel in all the police stations of Delhi. Establishment Branch provided us the required information.

Section VI (Deliberations by Delhi MPs) – Detailed information regarding questions asked by various MPs during Budget 2014 to Budget 2017 was taken from the below mention link:
<http://164.100.47.194/Loksabha/Questions/QResult15.aspx?qref=28999&lsno=16>

Section VII (Survey Data)

Household survey of 24,301 respondents across the city of Delhi was commissioned to Hansa Research by Praja to study the perception of people based on prefixed criteria and suitable methodology had been designed (whose detail is given below) to meet survey objectives.



Annexure 2 – Survey Methodology

Praja Foundation had commissioned the household survey to Hansa Research and the survey methodology followed is as below:

- In order to meet the desired objectives of the study, we represented the city by covering a sample from each of its 272 wards. Target Group for the study was:
 - Both Males & Females
 - 18 years and above
 - Belonging to that particular ward.
- A.** Sample quotas were set for representing gender and age groups on the basis of their split available through Indian Readership Study (Large scale baseline study conducted nationally by Media Research Users Council (MRUC) & Hansa Research group).
- B.** The required information was collected through face to face interviews with the help of structured questionnaire.
- C.** In order to meet the respondent within a ward, following sampling process was followed:
 - ✓ 5 prominent areas in the ward were identified as the starting point
 - ✓ In each starting point about 20 individuals were selected randomly and the questionnaire was administered with them.
- D.** Once the survey was completed, sample composition of age & gender was corrected to match the population profile using the baseline data from IRS. This helped us to make the survey findings more representatives in nature and ensured complete coverage.
- E. The total study sample was 24,301.**



Annexure 3 – Socio Economic Classification (SEC) Note

SEC is used to measure the affluence level of the sample, and to differentiate people on this basis and study their behaviour / attitude on other variables.

While income (either monthly household or personal income) appears to be an obvious choice for such a purpose, it comes with some limitations:

- Respondents are not always comfortable revealing sensitive information such as income.
- The response to the income question can be either over-claimed (when posturing for an interview) or under-claimed (to avoid attention). Since there is no way to know which of these it is and the extent of over-claim or under-claim, income has a poor ability to discriminate people within a sample.
- Moreover, affluence may well be a function of the attitude a person has towards consumption rather than his (or his household's) absolute income level.

Attitude to consumption is empirically proven to be well defined by the education level of the Chief Wage Earner (CWE*) of the household as well as his occupation. The more educated the CWE, the higher is the likely affluence level of the household. Similarly, depending on the occupation that the CWE is engaged in, the affluence level of the household is likely to differ – so a skilled worker will be lower down on the affluence hierarchy as compared to a CWE who is businessman.

Socio Economic Classification or SEC is thus a way of classifying households into groups' basis the education and occupation of the CWE. The classification runs from A1 on the uppermost end thru E2 at the lower most end of the affluence hierarchy. The SEC grid used for classification in market research studies is given below:

EDUCATION OCCUPATION		Illiterate	literate but no formal schooling / School up to 4 th	School 5 th – 9 th	SSC/ HSC	Some College but not Grad	Grad/ Post- Grad Gen.	Grad/ Post- Grad Prof.
Unskilled Workers		E2	E2	E1	D	D	D	D
Skilled Workers		E2	E1	D	C	C	B2	B2
Petty Traders		E2	D	D	C	C	B2	B2
Shop Owners		D	D	C	B2	B1	A2	A2
Businessmen/ Industrialists with no. of employees	None	D	C	B2	B1	A2	A2	A1
	1 – 9	C	B2	B2	B1	A2	A1	A1
	10 +	B1	B1	A2	A2	A1	A1	A1
Self-employed Professional		D	D	D	B2	B1	A2	A1
Clerical / Salesman		D	D	D	C	B2	B1	B1
Supervisory level		D	D	C	C	B2	B1	A2
Officers/ Executives Junior		C	C	C	B2	B1	A2	A2
Officers/ExecutivesMiddle/ Senior		B1	B1	B1	B1	A2	A1	A1

*CWE is defined as the person who takes the main responsibility of the household expenses.