

Andaman & Nicobar Islands*

* Not part of India Justice Report ranking 2019



POLICE

HOW TO READ THE DATA: Since each indicator has a different unit, to enable comparison, we rebased values to score the union territory's performance in a band of 1 to 10. The line graphs show how the UT compares, on each indicator, against the other 6 UTs. The longer the lines, the better the UT is doing. 'Worst value' and 'best value' point to the highest and lowest results in that indicator.

Budgets

	State value	State score (out of 10)	Worst value	Best value
Modernisation fund used (% , 2016-17)	NA		NA	80
Spend on police per person (Rs, 2015-16)	824		166	3,283

The state exceeded its sanctioned strength of constables. But more than half of its officer posts remained vacant.

Human Resources

Constables, vacancy (% , Jan 2017)	-6.3		23.3	-6.3
Officers, vacancy (% , Jan 2017)	56.4		65.6	8.6
Officers in civil police (% , Jan 2017)	7.5		6.5	17.8

Diversity

Share of women in police (% , Jan 2017)	12.2		7.2	18.0
Share of women in officers (% , Jan 2017)	13.8		3.1	22.7
SC officers, actual to reserved ratio (% , Jan 2017)	NA		22	588
ST officers, actual to reserved ratio (% , Jan 2017)	33		26	222
OBC officers, actual to reserved ratio (% , Jan 2017)	16		0	91

This UT is unable to meet its diversity quotas.

Infrastructure

Population per police station (rural) (Jan 2017)	12,479		183,114	884
Population per police station (urban) (Jan 2017)	28,698		160,595	25,841
Area per police station (rural) (sq km, Jan 2017)	432		445	1
Area per police station (urban) (sq km, Jan 2017)	8		46	5

Workload

Population per civil police (persons, Jan 2017)	106		1,017	106
---	-----	--	-------	-----

Trends

Women in total police (pp, CY '12-'16)	0.31		0.16	1.62
Women officers in total officers (pp, CY '12-'16)	1.91		-0.38	2.91
Constable vacancy (pp, CY '12-'16)	-3.38		2.91	-4.51
Officer vacancy (pp, CY '12-'16)	6.18		6.18	-3.38
Difference in spend: police vs state (pp, FY '12-'16)	NA		-3.63	11.92

Over 5 years, while constable vacancies decreased, officer vacancies increased

Data sources: Data on Police Organizations, Bureau of Police Research and Development (BPR&D); Combined Finance and Revenue Accounts of the Union and State Governments in India, Comptroller and Auditor General of India; Primary Census Abstract, Census 2011; Open Budgets India.
Notes: 1. Data for 'Jan 2017' is as of January 1, 2017. 2. SC: Scheduled castes; ST: Scheduled tribes; OBC: Other backward classes. 3. pp: percentage points (the difference between two percentages). 4. NA: Not available. 5. CY: Calendar year; FY: Financial year. 6. Civil police includes district armed reserve police. 7. Modernisation fund used: Neither contribution nor utilisation data was available. 8. SC officers, actual to reserved ratio: BPR&D shows 0% reservation. 9. Difference in spend: Revenue and capital expenditure for police was not available for 2010-11, and revenue expenditure for police was not available for 2015-16. 10. Modernisation grant data is available for only one union territory (Puducherry). That available value is taken as the 'best value' and no 'worst value' or score has been assigned for the indicator.



PRISONS

HOW TO READ THE DATA: Since each indicator has a different unit, to enable comparison, we rebased values to score the union territory's performance in a band of 1 to 10. The line graphs show how the UT compares, on each indicator, against the other 6 UTs. The longer the lines, the better the UT is doing. 'Worst value' and 'best value' point to the highest and lowest results in that indicator.

Budgets

	State value	State score (out of 10)	Worst value	Best value
Spend per inmate (Rs, 2016-17)	32,787		0	67,797
Prison budget utilised (% , 2016-17)	100		0	100

Famous for the iconic Cellular jail, this UT is able to exhaust its allocated prisons budget.

Human Resources

Officers, vacancy (% , Dec 2016)	0.0		55.5	0.0
Cadre staff, vacancy (% , Dec 2016)	23.0		48.2	0.0
Correctional staff, vacancy (% , Dec 2016)	NA		NA	75.9
Medical staff, vacancy (% , Dec 2016)	0.0		39.2	0.0
Medical officers, vacancy (% , Dec 2016)	0.0		51.5	0.0

While nearly 1 in 4 cadre staff posts remained vacant, there were no vacancies across all other categories.

Diversity

Women in prison staff (% , Dec 2016)	9.0		5.7	15.2
--------------------------------------	-----	--	-----	------

Infrastructure

Prison occupancy (% , Dec 2016)	41		200	11
---------------------------------	----	--	-----	----

Workload

Inmates per officer (persons, Dec 2016)	46		192	30
Inmates per cadre staff (persons, Dec 2016)	2		13	2
Inmates per correctional staff (persons, Dec 2016)	NA		NA	2,008

Trends

Officer vacancy (pp, CY '12-'16)	0.00		7.54	-5.51
Cadre staff vacancy (pp, CY '12-'16)	1.84		4.50	-3.08
Share of women in prison staff (pp, CY '12-'16)	-0.17		-0.17	0.65
Inmates per prison officer (% , CY '12-'16)	-25.8		27.6	-25.8
Inmates per cadre staff (% , CY '12-'16)	-25.4		19.4	-25.4
Share of undertrial prisoners (pp, CY '12-'16)	-4.17		5.29	-4.17
Spend per inmate (% , FY '13-'17)	17.1		-86.1	30.4
Prison budget used (pp, FY '13-'17)	0.37		-7.80	0.37
Difference in spend: prisons vs state (pp, FY '12-'16)	-3.0		-7.1	35.8

Over 5 years, this UT showed the largest reduction in inmates per officer and cadre staff.

Data sources: Prison Statistics India (PSI), National Crime Records Bureau (NCRB); Combined Finance and Revenue Accounts of the Union and State Governments in India, Comptroller and Auditor General of India; Primary Census Abstract, Census 2011; Open Budgets India.

Notes: 1. Data for 'Dec 2016' is as of December 31, 2016. 2. pp: percentage points (the difference between two percentages). 3. NA: Not available. 4. CY: Calendar year; FY: Financial year. 5. Correctional staff, vacancy; inmates per correctional staff: PSI data shows 0 correctional staff. 6. Correctional staff data is available for only one union territory (Delhi). That available value is taken as the 'best value' and no 'worst value' or score has been assigned for the two correctional staff indicators.



JUDICIARY

HOW TO READ THE DATA: Since each indicator has a different unit, to enable comparison, we rebased values to score the union territory's performance in a band of 1 to 10. The line graphs show how the UT compares, on each indicator, against the other 6 UTs. The longer the lines, the better the UT is doing. 'Worst value' and 'best value' point to the highest and lowest results in that indicator.

Budgets

	State value	State score (out of 10)	Worst value	Best value
Per capita spend on judiciary (Rs, 2015-16)	NA	—	125	453

Human Resources

Population per High Court judge (2016-17)	2,380,693	●	2,380,693	472,900
Population per sub. court judge (2016-17)	101,643	●	106,719	23,445
High Court judge vacancy (% , 2016-17)	46.5	●	46.5	26.1
Sub. court judge vacancy (% , 2016-17)	11.0	●	49.0	0.0
High Court staff vacancy (% , 2016-17)	31.1	●	31.1	5.5

No women judges at the subordinate court level.

Diversity

Women judges (High Court) (% , Jun 2018)	17.9	●	12.2	20.5
Women judges (sub. court) (% , Jul 2017)	0.0	●	0.0	41.7

Infrastructure

Courthall shortfall (% , 2016-17, Mar 2018)	NA	—	39.0	0.0
---	----	---	------	-----

Cases pend for 6 years, on average, at the subordinate court level.

Workload

Cases pending (5-10 years) (sub. court) (% , Aug 2018)	19.10	●	19.10	1.80
Cases pending (10+ years) (sub. court) (% , Aug 2018)	8.18	●	8.18	0.15
Average High Court pendency (years, Sep 2017)	3.7	●	3.7	2.5
Average sub. court pendency (years, Aug 2017)	6.2	●	8.4	3.9
Case clearance rate (High Court) (% , 2016-17)	101	●	81	101
Case clearance rate (sub. court) (% , 2016-17)	91	●	87	110

Trends

Cases pending (per High Court judge) (% , FY '13-'17)	-6.8	●	4.3	-6.8
Cases pending (per sub. court judge) (% , FY '13-'17)	-2.8	●	25.0	-14.1
Total cases pending (High Court) (% , FY '13-'17)	-8.4	●	5.5	-8.4
Total cases pending (sub. court) (% , FY '13-'17)	0.0	●	12.3	-8.0
Judge vacancy (High Court) (pp, FY '13-'17)	3.53	●	3.53	1.00
Judge vacancy (sub. court) (pp, FY '13-'17)	-1.00	●	2.81	-5.00
Case clearance rate (High Court) (pp, FY '13-'17)	3.50	●	-3.53	3.50
Case clearance rate (sub. court) (pp, FY '13-'17)	-3.32	●	-7.35	7.81
Difference in spend: judiciary vs state (pp, FY '12-'16)	NA	—	-0.02	3.10

Over 5 years, at the subordinate court level, the cases pending per judge and vacancies reduced.

Data sources: Court News, Supreme Court of India; National Judicial Data Grid; eCourts Services; Websites of High Courts; Approaches to Justice in India: A Report by DAKSH; Combined Finance and Revenue Accounts of the Union and State Governments in India, Comptroller and Auditor General of India; Primary Census Abstract, Census 2011; Application under Right to Information (RTI) Act filed by Vidhi Centre for Legal Policy; Open Budgets India; Department of Justice.

Notes: 1. Data for 'Aug 2018' is as of August 23, 2018; for 'Sep 2017' is as of September 19, 2017; for 'Aug 2017' is as of August 29, 2017. 2. Sub. court: subordinate court. 3. pp: percentage points (the difference between two percentages). 4. NA: Not available. 5. CY: Calendar year; FY: Financial year. 6. Since West Bengal and Andaman & Nicobar Islands share a High Court, they have been assigned the same values for High Court indicators. 7. Per capita spend on judiciary; difference in spend: Data on judiciary expenditure was neither available in the CAG reports used or in Ministry of Home Affairs, Demand Number 90. 8. Courthall shortfall: Indicator not used as Court News aggregated data on sanctioned number of subordinate court judges for West Bengal and Andaman & Nicobar Islands. 9. The raw data given for West Bengal and Andaman & Nicobar Islands was clubbed for 7 subordinate court indicators: population per judge; judge vacancy (2016-17 and 5-year trend); case clearance rate (2016-17 and 5-year trend); cases pending; total cases pending; judge vacancy. Hence, their values for these 7 indicators are the same.



LEGAL AID

HOW TO READ THE DATA: Since each indicator has a different unit, to enable comparison, we rebased values to score the union territory's performance in a band of 1 to 10. The line graphs show how the UT compares, on each indicator, against the other 6 UTs. The longer the lines, the better the UT is doing. 'Worst value' and 'best value' point to the highest and lowest results in that indicator.

Budgets

	State value	State score (out of 10)	Worst value	Best value
NALSA fund utilized (% , 2017-18)	8		4	68
State's share in legal aid spend (% , 2017-18)	0		0	49

Human Resources

DLSA secretary vacancy (% , 2019)	100.0		100.0	0.0
PLVs per lakh population (number, Jan 2019)	25.2		0.9	69.8
Sanctioned secretaries as % of DLSAs (% , 2019)	0		0	100

Despite DLSAs in all districts, there were no full-time secretary posts sanctioned.

Diversity

Women panel lawyers (% , Jan 2019)	28.1		24.1	50.0
Women PLVs (% , Jan 2019)	44.8		41.4	67.8

Infrastructure

DLSAs as % of state judicial districts (% , 2019)	100		0	100
Villages per legal services clinic (number, 2017-18)	NA		5.4	0.0
Legal services clinic per jail (number, 2017-18)	0.00		0.00	1.42

Representation of women among legal aid providers could be improved.

Workload

PLA cases: settled as % of received (% , 2017-18)	50		0	121
Total LAs: Pre-litigation cases disposed (% , 2017-18) *	25.8		3.4	100.0
SLSA LAs: Pre-litigation in cases taken up (% , 2017-18) **	6.5		0.0	86.5

Data sources: National Legal Services Authority (NALSA); Primary Census Abstract, Census 2011; Prison Statistics India (PSI), National Crime Records Bureau (NCRB).

Notes: 1. DLSA: District Legal Services Authority; LA: Lok Adalat; PLA: Permanent Lok Adalat; PLV: Para-Legal Volunteer; SLSA: State Legal Services Authority. 2. Villages per legal services clinic: Did not have any legal service clinic.

Full indicators: * NLAs + SLSA LAs: Share of pre-litigation cases in disposed cases (% , 2017-18); ** SLSA LAs: Pre-litigation cases disposed as % of total cases taken up (% , 2017-18).



About India Justice Report

The India Justice Report 2019 provides the first comprehensive quantitative index that ranks the capacity of the formal justice system operating in various states on their police, prisons, judiciary and legal aid. This ranking was supported and facilitated by Tata Trusts in partnership with DAKSH, Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative, Common Cause, Centre for Social Justice, Vidhi Centre for Legal Policy and TISS-Prayas.

Visit www.tatatrusts.org for the main report, ranking and methodology, data visualisations, related research and more.

Data and design: How India Lives