

* 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)	3,283	—	166	3,283

Exceeded the sanctioned number of constables, while officers vacancies stood at less than 10%.

Human Resources

Constables, vacancy (% , Jan 2017)	-1.9	—	23.3	-6.3
Officers, vacancy (% , Jan 2017)	8.6	—	65.6	8.6
Officers in civil police (% , Jan 2017)	17.8	—	6.5	17.8

Diversity

Share of women in police (% , Jan 2017)	8.6	—	7.2	18.0
Share of women in officers (% , Jan 2017)	9.8	—	3.1	22.7
SC officers, actual to reserved ratio (% , Jan 2017)	92	—	22	588
ST officers, actual to reserved ratio (% , Jan 2017)	98	—	26	222
OBC officers, actual to reserved ratio (% , Jan 2017)	16	—	0	91

Less than 10% women in police. Marginally missed meeting SC and ST quota, unable to meet OBC reservation.

Infrastructure

Population per police station (rural) (Jan 2017)	NA	—	183,114	884
Population per police station (urban) (Jan 2017)	95,725	—	160,595	25,841
Area per police station (rural) (sq km, Jan 2017)	NA	—	445	1
Area per police station (urban) (sq km, Jan 2017)	7	—	46	5

This UT has the third best area coverage of urban police stations.

Workload

Population per civil police (persons, Jan 2017)	223	—	1,017	106
---	-----	---	-------	-----

Trends

Women in total police (pp, CY '12-'16)	0.30	—	0.16	1.62
Women officers in total officers (pp, CY '12-'16)	0.46	—	-0.38	2.91
Constable vacancy (pp, CY '12-'16)	-1.24	—	2.91	-4.51
Officer vacancy (pp, CY '12-'16)	0.75	—	6.18	-3.38
Difference in spend: police vs state (pp, FY '12-'16)	-3.63	—	-3.63	11.92

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. Population/area per police station (rural): BPR&D shows 0 rural police stations. 9. 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)	52,141		0	67,797
Prison budget utilised (% , 2016-17)	96		0	100

Highest levels of prison staff vacancies across UTs. Over 5 years, officer and cadre staff vacancies increased.

Human Resources

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

Diversity

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

Infrastructure

Prison occupancy (% , Dec 2016)	180		200	11
---------------------------------	-----	--	-----	----

12 prisons functioned at 6,000+ inmates beyond capacity. Over 5 years, UTPs population increased.

Workload

Inmates per officer (persons, Dec 2016)	78		192	30
Inmates per cadre staff (persons, Dec 2016)	13		13	2
Inmates per correctional staff (persons, Dec 2016)	2,008		NA	2,008

Trends

Officer vacancy (pp, CY '12-'16)	7.54		7.54	-5.51
Cadre staff vacancy (pp, CY '12-'16)	4.50		4.50	-3.08
Share of women in prison staff (pp, CY '12-'16)	0.30		-0.17	0.65
Inmates per prison officer (% , CY '12-'16)	1.7		27.6	-25.8
Inmates per cadre staff (% , CY '12-'16)	-0.6		19.4	-25.4
Share of undertrial prisoners (pp, CY '12-'16)	0.87		5.29	-4.17
Spend per inmate (% , FY '13-'17)	-2.0		-86.1	30.4
Prison budget used (pp, FY '13-'17)	-0.80		-7.80	0.37
Difference in spend: prisons vs state (pp, FY '12-'16)	-7.1		-7.1	35.8

Only 7 of the 29 sanctioned correctional staff available. This means 1 correctional officer serves more than 2000 inmates.

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. 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 two indicators: correctional staff, vacancy; inmates per correctional staff.



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)	453		125	453

Human Resources

Population per High Court judge (2016-17)	472,900		2,380,693	472,900
Population per sub. court judge (2016-17)	34,366		106,719	23,445
High Court judge vacancy (% , 2016-17)	40.8		46.5	26.1
Sub. court judge vacancy (% , 2016-17)	38.2		49.0	0.0
High Court staff vacancy (% , 2016-17)	29.7		31.1	5.5

High vacancies across both courts.

Diversity

Women judges (High Court) (% , Jun 2018)	20.5		12.2	20.5
Women judges (sub. court) (% , Jul 2017)	33.8		0.0	41.7

Best representation of women HC judges among UTs. In subordinate courts, 1 out of 3 judges is a woman.

Infrastructure

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

Workload

Cases pending (5-10 years) (sub. court) (% , Aug 2018)	6.24		19.10	1.80
Cases pending (10+ years) (sub. court) (% , Aug 2018)	0.79		8.18	0.15
Average High Court pendency (years, Sep 2017)	3.4		3.7	2.5
Average sub. court pendency (years, Aug 2017)	3.9		8.4	3.9
Case clearance rate (High Court) (% , 2016-17)	91		81	101
Case clearance rate (sub. court) (% , 2016-17)	87		87	110

Trends

Cases pending (per High Court judge) (% , FY '13-'17)	2.4		4.3	-6.8
Cases pending (per sub. court judge) (% , FY '13-'17)	-3.8		25.0	-14.1
Total cases pending (High Court) (% , FY '13-'17)	1.4		5.5	-8.4
Total cases pending (sub. court) (% , FY '13-'17)	-2.9		12.3	-8.0
Judge vacancy (High Court) (pp, FY '13-'17)	3.48		3.53	1.00
Judge vacancy (sub. court) (pp, FY '13-'17)	2.64		2.81	-5.00
Case clearance rate (High Court) (pp, FY '13-'17)	-3.53		-3.53	3.50
Case clearance rate (sub. court) (pp, FY '13-'17)	-7.35		-7.35	7.81
Difference in spend: judiciary vs state (pp, FY '12-'16)	-0.02		-0.02	3.10

Despite lowest case clearance rate in subordinate courts, cases remained pending for an average of almost 4 years, the lowest among all UTs.

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.



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 utilised (% , 2017-18)	68		4	68
State's share in legal aid spend (% , 2017-18)	49		0	49

Human Resources

DLSA secretary vacancy (% , 2019)	0.0		100.0	0.0
PLVs per lakh population (number, Jan 2019)	7.6		0.9	69.8
Sanctioned secretaries as % of DLSAs (% , 2019)	100		0	100

Amongst UTs, largest state contribution towards legal aid.

Diversity

Women panel lawyers (% , Jan 2019)	27.3		24.1	50.0
Women PLVs (% , Jan 2019)	47.3		41.4	67.8

Infrastructure

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

Each jail in Delhi, on average, had a functioning legal services clinic.

Workload

PLA cases: settled as % of received (% , 2017-18)	94		0	121
Total LAs: Pre-litigation cases disposed (% , 2017-18) *	31.0		3.4	100.0
SLSA LAs: Pre-litigation in cases taken up (% , 2017-18) **	86.5		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 services 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