


INDIA JUSTICE REPORT



Ranking States on Police, Judiciary,
Prisons & Legal Aid

National Factsheet



**India
Justice**
Report | 2019

Supported by **TATA TRUSTS**

India Justice Report: Ranking States on Police, Judiciary, Prisons and Legal Aid

Published in October 2019 by Tata Trusts

Since inception in 1892, the Tata Trusts, India's oldest philanthropic organisation, have played a pioneering role in bringing about an enduring difference in the lives of the communities it serves. Guided by the principles and the vision of proactive philanthropy of the Founder, Jamsetji Tata, the Trusts' purpose is to catalyse development in the areas of healthcare and nutrition, water and sanitation, education, energy, rural upliftment, urban poverty alleviation, and arts, craft and culture. The Trusts' programmes, achieved through direct implementation, partnerships and grant making, are marked by innovations, relevant to the country.

For over a century we have been working to improve the quality of life of all Indians, particularly the vulnerable and marginalised. Tata Trusts have been spearheading social change in the criminal justice and juvenile justice systems in India by focusing on addressing the needs of the most marginalised sections of society. Changes within the justice system are complicated, systemic and interlinked and require critical attention and interventions. These interventions have been implemented across 10 states, either directly or in partnership with state governments. The Trusts have also provided grants to civil society organisations to promote research and advocate policy changes.

For more information, please visit

<https://www.tatatrusts.org/>

Cover design by Niyati Singh, Tata Trusts

Designed by How India Lives

Printed by PrintWorld

Address: 1743 Udaychand Marg, 1st & UGF, Kotla Mubarakpur Near South Ex. Part I, New Delhi-110003

© Sir Dorabji Tata Trust, 2019.

This report is based on publicly available data of different government entities and the judiciary. All efforts were made to verify that the information presented herein is correct to the best of our knowledge. The Tata Trusts and the authors disclaim any responsibility for the correctness or accuracy of the references, information, data or their sources used in this report generally and/or in support of the rankings. All rights reserved. Any part of this report, including design, may be reproduced in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photo copy, recording or any other information storage and retrieval system, using the citation provided below.

Suggested citation: 'India Justice Report: Ranking States on Police, Judiciary, Prisons and Legal Aid', Tata Trusts, New Delhi, India (2019).

Foreword

The India Justice Report is a path-breaking endeavour consolidating the efforts of numerous individuals and organizations working towards the improvement of the Indian justice system. The commendable purpose of the Report is to attract the attention of the stakeholders in the system to two important areas of national concern—access to justice, and the health of our institutions responsible for justice delivery.

The fulfilment of our civilizational aspirations is contingent on laws that give effect to constitutional provisions, and the law-abiding spirit of citizens of the country. Strong laws are by themselves inadequate in ensuring the welfare of the people. Collective human experience shows that every power has the intrinsic tendency towards excess and a mere majoritarian democracy, without the architecture of an inclusive society, tends towards electoral despotism.

If a sizeable section of people lose faith in their governance structures and in the justice dispensation in society, a socially negative critical-mass occurs, which can result in sweeping cynicism that unleashes a power of destruction. The Report, in highlighting how various actors in the justice system function, conveys a message of caution.

The issues considered in the Report cover a range of issues that are of contemporary relevance and urgency. They provide us a holistic understanding of the key actors in the Indian justice system—the police, prisons, legal aid, and judiciary. It specifically analyses the various pillars of the justice system along the lines of their budgets, infrastructure, human resources, workload and diversity. The Report has made a significant contribution

to the study of the justice system in India. It is comprehensive and brings to light several systemic faults and shortcomings, such as the abysmally low priority afforded to the justice machinery in state budgets, the persistence of an average 20 per cent vacancy across the various pillars in the justice system, and the lack of diversity within them.


While emphasizing how the inefficiencies in the working of any institution in the justice system adversely affect the working of other institutions and eventually hinder access to, and the delivery of, justice itself, the Report provides us a comparison of how extensive such problems are in various states across the length and breadth of the country. It maps the change in the functioning of state machinery across time, and highlights a critical roadblock in effectively understanding it's working.

Furthermore, the stereotyped, top-down approach in public institutions has really suffered banality, and has foreclosed any fresh outlook at the problems plaguing the justice system. Any light from outside the system is not only unwelcome, but is also generally seen as an intrusion to the functioning of state machinery. What is critical is an open-minded exposure to scientific approaches. All this has been said often: but with few paying heed to the augmented problems, persons who hold sway over critical issues inhibiting access to, and delivery of, justice must have the good sense to pay attention before it is too late.

M.N. Venkatachaliah

Former Chief Justice of India (1993 - 1994),
Bengaluru,
11 September 2019


India in the World



Justice in India


Police force training

Over the last five years, on an average, only **6.4% of the police force have been provided in-service training**. That means that over 90% deal with the public without any up-to-date training.



Diversity in police staff

Representation of **SCs, STs, OBCs and women in the police is poor**, with huge vacancies in the reserved categories.



Women

Women drop off through the ranks.

Women account for just 7% of the 2.4 million police persons in the country, but 6% are at the officer level. Similarly, they account for 28% in the lower judiciary, but this falls to 12% at the High Court level.

Pending court cases



There are **28 million cases pending in Indian subordinate courts** and 24% have been pending for more than 5 years.

Undertrial prisoners



In 2016, **67.7% of India's prison population were undertrial prisoners**. This percentage is higher than what it was a decade ago, 66%.

In Bihar, Uttar Pradesh, West Bengal, Odisha, Gujarat along with Meghalaya and Andaman and Nicobar Islands, at least **one in every four cases has been pending for more than 5 years**.



Correctional staff

There are just **621 correctional staff across India's 1,412 prisons**.



2.3 million cases pending for more than 10 years.

Conclusion

On the one hand the data on police, prisons, legal aid and the judiciary that the India Justice Report has brought together provides strong evidence that the whole system requires urgent repair. On the other hand, the segmentation of the data into budgets, human resources, infrastructure, workload and diversity helps to pinpoint areas of infirmity where quick improvements can be made with relative ease and have the real potential to cause knock on effects that will spur improvements down the line. We provide below seven 'nudges' that will stimulate change. These will assist each state in creating momentum for reform, improve its future ranking and more importantly improve access to justice for all.

Seven Nudges for a Great Leap Forward

Undertake a cost-benefit analysis that quantifies the cost of increasing human resources against the economic price of failing to address registered crime, disorder, incarceration and judicial delay caused by high workloads and inadequate manpower. Based on this analysis, fill vacancies on an urgent footing.

When filling vacancies (and otherwise), ensure that the representation of underrepresented groups such as women, SCs, OBCs, STs, and religious minorities is increased to assure that the make-up of the justice system reflects the diversity of the society it serves.

Increase the availability of justice services—access to and infrastructure in courts, police stations, legal aid clinics—in rural areas so as to reduce the present disparity in accessing justice that exists between rural and urban populations. This includes prioritizing the availability of trained lawyers and paralegals across poorly served areas.

Ensure budgetary allocations to every segment of the justice system (particularly judiciary and prisons) keep pace with increases in costs, are proportionate to increases elsewhere and do not fall disproportionately behind other allocations, as is evidenced in this report.

Each pillar must have open systems to periodically review performance; identify issues that must be tackled; arrive at short-term and long-term plans of action through a consultative process with experts and key stakeholders; closely monitor the implementation of the plan; and regularly report on the activities it undertakes.

Improve transparency all the way through the justice system by ensuring the publication of verified, disaggregated, accurate and timely data that is seamlessly serviceable for informing policy and practice across governance. At the outset, each cog of the criminal justice system can begin by visible and complete compliance to the obligation to pro-active disclosure under Section 4 of the Right to Information Act, 2005.

Ensure that periodic empirical research is sanctioned by the government to be undertaken in an independent manner, to study different facets of the justice system in India, to ensure a better informed, and evidence-based approach to policymaking.

India Justice Report

India's performance on delivering fair and speedy justice needs urgent reform. This report aims to do just that. The administration of justice is a sovereign function. The formal justice system is a universal public good on which the entire population—without exception—must be able to rely.

Being so, it becomes the duty of every government to provide an accessible, affordable, impartial, efficient and responsive justice system to all. At the moment it is a luxury within the reach of the privileged and powerful. This does not fulfil the constitutional promises, either of 'equality before the law' (Article 14) or the universal duty of all governments to ensure 'the protection of life and personal liberty' (Article 21).

As a responsible member of the international community, India has repeatedly committed to upholding human rights and the rule of law through mechanisms that ensure equality of treatment and equity in outcomes. Most recently it has promised measurable progress in justice delivery via the universally agreed upon UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Goal 16 specifically recognizes the need to 'provide access to justice for all and to build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels'. Its targets include promoting the rule of law (16.3), reducing corruption (16.5), developing accountable institutions (16.6) and ensuring public access to information (16.10).

Yet, the absence of structural and substantive reform—in the police, prisons, judiciary and legal aid—is inexorably leading towards a breakdown of rule of law and a loss of public faith in governance

and the justice system. Outdated legal frameworks, inadequate resources, poor oversight and management also hamper long-term economic growth. According to the Institute of Economics and Peace, an uptick in violence has cost India an equivalent of 9% of the GDP.¹

This report, the first of its kind, ranks states according to the level to which they have capacitated themselves to deliver justice to all. Using only government data and the standards and benchmarks each state has set itself, the report measures the capacity of the four pillars of the justice system—the police, prison system, judiciary and legal aid in each state to indicate the level to which a particular state has equipped itself to deliver justice to the population. While the report concerns itself only with the structural anatomy of the justice system and eschews direct correlations to perceptions of safety, performance or accountability, its rankings clearly indicate the obstacles these sub-systems face in delivering their mandates.

In order to compare like with like, the report clusters and ranks states on the basis of population (10 million and above) into 18 large and mid-sized states where 90% of India's population lives and 7 small states.² 7 Union Territories and 4 states² have not been ranked, though data for all is provided (see Methodology).

Wherever possible, the report uses standards laid down in hard law (e.g. Madhya Pradesh's 16% reservation for Scheduled Castes in the police force) or via policy pronouncements (e.g. 30% to 35% reservation for women for the lower judiciary). Where there are no obvious benchmarks it relies

¹ 'The Economic Value of Peace 2018: Measuring the Global Economic Impact of Violence and Conflict', Institute for Economics and Peace: Sydney, October 2018. Available at <http://visionofhumanity.org/reports> (last accessed on 25 June 2019).

² Defined here as states where AFSPA is in place

on recommendations made in government policy documents (e.g. the Model Prison Manual (2016) that set an ideal figure of 6 inmates per 1 jail cadre staff) and official commissions (e.g. the National Police Commission recommending 150 sq. km area to be covered by a rural police station). Elsewhere, it uses a simple 'more/less is better' rule to measure state activity (e.g. the lower the cases pending in subordinate courts for more than 10 years, the better a state's performance is relative to others).

The report uses six filters or themes through which it views the four pillars of the justice system: available budgets, infrastructure, human resources, workload, diversity and trends. It assesses the burden on its functionaries by way of 'workload' and also looks at the extent to which institutions involved in the administration of justice have fulfilled their 'diversity' promises, including and in particular gender diversity.

Most importantly, the report assesses the intention of governments to make year-on-year improvements in the administration of justice by comparing data over a 5-year period. This 'trend' analysis helps discern each state's intention to improve the delivery of justice and match it with the needs on the ground.

The disaggregation of official data helps pinpoint the inflexion points along the ribbon of justice delivery that if tackled can set up a chain reaction towards reform. Correlations across pillars lend themselves to the identification of cause and effect, where multiple repairs must take place simultaneously before they become reformatory of the whole.

Many who read this report will be concerned by the absence of any attempt to measure quality. After all, statistics can only tell a fragment of the

story. However, much about the ability to deliver quality justice can be discerned from shortfalls in manpower, infrastructure, the workload burden and trend indicators: quantitative preconditions necessary for qualitative outcomes.

Collectively, the data paints a grim picture. It highlights that each individual sub-system is starved for budgets, manpower and infrastructure; no state is fully compliant with the standards it has set for itself. Governments are content to create ad hoc and patchwork remedies to cure deeply embedded systemic failures. Inevitably, the burden of all this falls on the public.

This report has deliberately not indulged in the temptation to put out yet another slew of detailed recommendations specific to the repair of deficits in each branch of the system. Over time so many have been made and await implementation. Instead it suggests some 'nudges' which if quickly and earnestly undertaken will assist in stirring momentum for reform, improve a state's future ranking and, more importantly, improve the delivery of justice to all.


Our hope is that the states that feel themselves judged harshly through the dry truth of numbers and digits will focus sweat and sinew on implementation. The delivery of justice is an essential service. Today, the system is unable to deliver. It is only when we stop denying the undeniable and defending the indefensible that we can move towards the reform and repair of this broken system.

After all, justice is the business of us all.

Maja Daruwala,
Chief Editor, India Justice Report




Overall ranking*



* Composite ranking across police, prisons, judiciary and legal aid

Map 1: Large and mid-sized states

Rank (out of 18)	State	Score (out of 10)
1	Maharashtra	5.92
2	Kerala	5.85
3	Tamil Nadu	5.76
4	Punjab	5.53
5	Haryana	5.53
6	Karnataka	5.11
7	Odisha	5.10
8	Gujarat	5.09
9	Madhya Pradesh	5.01
10	Chhattisgarh	4.97
11	Telangana	4.88
12	West Bengal	4.87
13	Andhra Pradesh	4.77
14	Rajasthan	4.52
15	Uttarakhand	4.49
16	Jharkhand	4.30
17	Bihar	4.02
18	Uttar Pradesh	3.32



Map 2: Small states

Rank (out of 7)	State	Score (out of 10)
1	Goa	4.85
2	Sikkim	4.31
3	Himachal Pradesh	4.05
4	Mizoram	3.89
5	Meghalaya	3.81
6	Arunachal Pradesh	3.43
7	Tripura	3.42

Note: 1. Calculated basis population size (18 large and mid-sized states have a population above 10 million, and seven small states below 10 million). 2. Map of Jammu & Kashmir is pre-August 2019. 3. For reasons of readability, the score is shown up to 2 decimals. While they both show the same score, Punjab is ranked above Haryana on the third decimal (5.534 versus 5.528).

How each state scored across the 4 pillars of justice

Table 1: Rank and score for large and mid-sized states

	Rank (out of 18)					Score (out of 10)				
	Overall	Police	Prisons	Judiciary	Legal aid	Overall	Police	Prisons	Judiciary	Legal aid
Maharashtra	1	4	2	4	5	5.92	5.52	6.89	5.96	5.43
Kerala	2	13	1	5	1	5.85	4.43	7.18	5.61	6.58
Tamil Nadu	3	1	10	1	12	5.76	6.49	5.23	6.99	4.65
Punjab	4	3	16	2	3	5.53	5.61	4.35	6.57	5.84
Haryana	5	8	11	3	2	5.53	5.14	4.79	6.23	6.09
Karnataka	6	6	3	16	7	5.11	5.32	6.50	3.76	5.22
Odisha	7	7	5	9	15	5.10	5.17	5.94	4.78	4.61
Gujarat	8	12	9	7	6	5.09	4.55	5.23	5.32	5.30
Madhya Pradesh	9	15	7	6	9	5.01	4.24	5.30	5.61	4.98
Chhattisgarh	10	10	8	12	8	4.97	4.91	5.24	4.64	5.13
Telangana	11	11	13	11	4	4.88	4.86	4.48	4.68	5.58
West Bengal	12	16	4	10	13	4.87	4.20	6.12	4.70	4.64
Andhra Pradesh	13	5	15	13	10	4.77	5.36	4.35	4.49	4.93
Rajasthan	14	17	12	8	11	4.52	3.77	4.72	5.04	4.67
Uttarakhand	15	2	17	15	17	4.49	5.88	3.72	4.17	4.46
Jharkhand	16	9	18	14	14	4.30	4.94	3.46	4.30	4.63
Bihar	17	14	6	18	16	4.02	4.28	5.61	2.41	4.52
Uttar Pradesh	18	18	14	17	18	3.32	2.98	4.42	3.70	2.50

States arranged in decreasing order of overall rank in cluster

Table 2: Rank and score for small states


	Rank (out of 7)					Score (out of 10)				
	Overall	Police	Prisons	Judiciary	Legal aid	Overall	Police	Prisons	Judiciary	Legal aid
Goa	1	3	1	2	1	4.85	3.69	5.30	5.19	5.47
Sikkim	2	1	7	1	4	4.31	5.66	3.43	5.36	3.30
Himachal Pradesh	3	6	6	3	3	4.05	3.41	3.46	4.95	4.60
Mizoram	4	7	4	5	2	3.89	3.35	3.99	3.66	4.66
Meghalaya	5	5	2	4	6	3.81	3.53	5.24	3.74	3.03
Arunachal Pradesh	6	2	3	7	7	3.43	4.51	4.10	2.81	2.67
Tripura	7	4	5	6	5	3.42	3.58	3.49	3.59	3.05

States arranged in decreasing order of overall rank in cluster

Note: For reasons of readability, the score is shown up to 2 decimals. While 2 or more states may show the same score in the table, one is ranked above the other on the third decimal. This happens in the following instances:


1. Overall: Punjab above Haryana (5.534 versus 5.528)
2. Judiciary: Kerala above Madhya Pradesh (5.611 versus 5.606)
3. Prisons: Gujarat above Tamil Nadu (5.233 versus 5.231), and Andhra Pradesh above Punjab (4.352 versus 4.351)

Police ranking



Map 9: Large and mid-sized states

Rank (out of 18)	State	Score (out of 10)
1	Tamil Nadu	6.49
2	Uttarakhand	5.88
3	Punjab	5.61
4	Maharashtra	5.52
5	Andhra Pradesh	5.36
6	Karnataka	5.32
7	Odisha	5.17
8	Haryana	5.14
9	Jharkhand	4.94
10	Chhattisgarh	4.91
11	Telangana	4.86
12	Gujarat	4.55
13	Kerala	4.43
14	Bihar	4.28
15	Madhya Pradesh	4.24
16	West Bengal	4.20
17	Rajasthan	3.77
18	Uttar Pradesh	2.98




Map 10: Small states

Rank (out of 7)	State	Score (out of 10)
1	Sikkim	5.66
2	Arunachal Pradesh	4.51
3	Goa	3.69
4	Tripura	3.58
5	Meghalaya	3.53
6	Himachal Pradesh	3.41
7	Mizoram	3.35


Note: Map of Jammu & Kashmir is pre-August 2019.

Prisons ranking



Map 11: Large and mid-sized states

Rank (out of 18)	State	Score (out of 10)
1	Kerala	7.18
2	Maharashtra	6.89
3	Karnataka	6.50
4	West Bengal	6.12
5	Odisha	5.94
6	Bihar	5.61
7	Madhya Pradesh	5.30
8	Chhattisgarh	5.24
9	Gujarat	5.23
10	Tamil Nadu	5.23
11	Haryana	4.79
12	Rajasthan	4.72
13	Telangana	4.48
14	Uttar Pradesh	4.42
15	Andhra Pradesh	4.35
16	Punjab	4.35
17	Uttarakhand	3.72
18	Jharkhand	3.46




Map 12: Small states

Rank (out of 7)	State	Score (out of 10)
1	Goa	5.30
2	Meghalaya	5.24
3	Arunachal Pradesh	4.10
4	Mizoram	3.99
5	Tripura	3.49
6	Himachal Pradesh	3.46
7	Sikkim	3.43


Note: 1. Map of Jammu & Kashmir is pre-August 2019. 2. For reasons of readability, scores are shown up to 2 decimals. While they both show the same score, Gujarat is ranked above Tamil Nadu on the third decimal (5.233 versus 5.231). Likewise, Andhra Pradesh is above Punjab (4.352 versus 4.351).

Judiciary ranking



Map 13: Large and mid-sized states

Rank (out of 18)	State	Score (out of 10)
1	Tamil Nadu	6.99
2	Punjab	6.57
3	Haryana	6.23
4	Maharashtra	5.96
5	Kerala	5.61
6	Madhya Pradesh	5.61
7	Gujarat	5.32
8	Rajasthan	5.04
9	Odisha	4.78
10	West Bengal	4.70
11	Telangana	4.68
12	Chhattisgarh	4.64
13	Andhra Pradesh	4.49
14	Jharkhand	4.30
15	Uttarakhand	4.17
16	Karnataka	3.76
17	Uttar Pradesh	3.70
18	Bihar	2.41




Map 14: Small states

Rank (out of 7)	State	Score (out of 10)
1	Sikkim	5.36
2	Goa	5.19
3	Himachal Pradesh	4.95
4	Meghalaya	3.74
5	Mizoram	3.66
6	Tripura	3.59
7	Arunachal Pradesh	2.81


Note: 1. Map of Jammu & Kashmir is pre-August 2019. 2. For reasons of readability, the score is shown up to 2 decimals. While they both show the same score, Kerala is ranked above Madhya Pradesh on the third decimal (5.611 versus 5.606).

Legal aid ranking



Map 15: Large and mid-sized states

Rank (out of 18)	State	Score (out of 10)
1	Kerala	6.58
2	Haryana	6.09
3	Punjab	5.84
4	Telangana	5.58
5	Maharashtra	5.43
6	Gujarat	5.30
7	Karnataka	5.22
8	Chhattisgarh	5.13
9	Madhya Pradesh	4.98
10	Andhra Pradesh	4.93
11	Rajasthan	4.67
12	Tamil Nadu	4.65
13	West Bengal	4.64
14	Jharkhand	4.63
15	Odisha	4.61
16	Bihar	4.52
17	Uttarakhand	4.46
18	Uttar Pradesh	2.50




Map 16: Small states

Rank (out of 7)	State	Score (out of 10)
1	Goa	5.47
2	Mizoram	4.66
3	Himachal Pradesh	4.60
4	Sikkim	3.30
5	Tripura	3.05
6	Meghalaya	3.03
7	Arunachal Pradesh	2.67

Note: 1. Map of Jammu & Kashmir is pre-August 2019.


Ranking intention*



* What the trends show based on 5-year data for 23 indicators across police, prisons, judiciary and legal aid. Indicators listed on Page 16 of the main report.

Map 7: Large and mid-sized states

Rank (out of 18)	State	Score (out of 10)
1	West Bengal	5.70
2	Maharashtra	5.68
3	Gujarat	5.65
4	Haryana	5.47
5	Punjab	5.38
6	Chhattisgarh	5.29
7	Tamil Nadu	5.16
8	Odisha	4.95
9	Uttar Pradesh	4.68
10	Rajasthan	4.45
11	Madhya Pradesh	4.22
12	Kerala	4.14
13	Bihar	4.05
14	Karnataka	3.98
15	Jharkhand	3.96
16	Uttarakhand	3.87




Map 8: Small states

Rank (out of 7)	State	Score (out of 10)
1	Goa	6.41
2	Meghalaya	5.57
3	Himachal Pradesh	4.86
4	Sikkim	4.49
5	Tripura	4.34
6	Mizoram	3.79
7	Arunachal Pradesh	3.61

Note: 1. Map of Jammu & Kashmir is pre-August 2019. 2. Andhra Pradesh and Telangana are not included as 5-year data for these states was not available separately.


Ranking diversity*



* How do the police, prisons, judiciary and legal aid score on 10 diversity indicators? Indicators listed on Page 16 of the main report.

Map 5: Large and mid-sized states

Rank (out of 18)	State	Score (out of 10)
1	Tamil Nadu	7.01
2	Karnataka	6.31
3	Kerala	6.12
4	Maharashtra	5.64
5	Odisha	4.83
6	Andhra Pradesh	4.80
7	Uttarakhand	4.73
8	Gujarat	4.24
9	West Bengal	4.04
10	Punjab	3.92
11	Telangana	3.85
12	Madhya Pradesh	3.78
13	Chhattisgarh	3.76
14	Haryana	3.74
15	Jharkhand	3.62
16	Rajasthan	3.54
17	Bihar	3.14
18	Uttar Pradesh	2.16




Map 6: Small states

Rank (out of 7)	State	Score (out of 10)
1	Sikkim	5.78
2	Mizoram	4.20
3	Goa	4.10
4	Meghalaya	4.01
5	Arunachal Pradesh	2.76
6	Himachal Pradesh	2.60
7	Tripura	2.39

Note: 1. Map of Jammu & Kashmir is pre-August 2019.


Ranking human resources*



* How do the police, prisons, judiciary and legal aid score on our 16 indicators? Indicators listed on Page 16 of the main report.

Map 3: Large and mid-sized states

Rank (out of 18)	State	Score (out of 10)
1	Kerala	7.45
2	Maharashtra	7.33
3	Odisha	6.44
4	Tamil Nadu	5.88
5	Madhya Pradesh	5.88
6	Karnataka	5.81
7	Punjab	5.77
8	Rajasthan	5.74
9	Haryana	5.60
10	Gujarat	5.42
11	West Bengal	4.63
12	Telangana	4.63
13	Andhra Pradesh	4.47
14	Chhattisgarh	4.38
15	Uttarakhand	4.19
16	Jharkhand	4.13
17	Bihar	3.43
18	Uttar Pradesh	3.13



Map 4: Small states

Rank (out of 7)	State	Score (out of 10)
1	Himachal Pradesh	4.55
2	Goa	4.07
3	Meghalaya	3.83
4	Sikkim	3.49
5	Tripura	3.19
6	Arunachal Pradesh	2.33
7	Mizoram	2.28

Note: 1. Map of Jammu & Kashmir is pre-August 2019. 2. For reasons of readability, the score is shown up to 2 decimals. While they both show the same score, Tamil Nadu is ranked above Madhya Pradesh on the third decimal (5.883 versus 5.876) and West Bengal above Telangana (4.634 versus 4.627).

About our partners

Centre for Social Justice (IDEAL) is an organization fighting for the rights of the marginalized and the vulnerable, principally in the sphere of access to justice. Inspired by Freirean thought, CSJ has been active in more than eight states across India, creating human rights interventions, using law as a key strategy through an intimate engagement with grassroots realities. Central to CSJ's efforts are its institutional interventions in legal reform and research, which bridge and symbiotically combine grassroots activism, law and policy-making on a wide gamut of issues concerning the rights of women, Dalits, Adivasis, minorities and other socially vulnerable groups.

Common Cause is dedicated to championing public causes, campaigning for probity in public life and the integrity of institutions. It seeks to promote democracy, good governance and public policy reforms through advocacy and democratic interventions. Common Cause is especially known for the difference it has made through a large number of Public Interest Litigations (PILs), such as recent ones on the cancellation of the entire telecom spectrum; cancellation of arbitrarily allocated coal blocks; and the Apex Court's recognition of an individual's right to die with dignity.

DAKSH is a Bengaluru based civil society organization that is working on judicial reforms at the intersection of data science, public policy and operations research. DAKSH's primary focus is on the Rule of Law Project which it began in 2014 in order to evaluate judicial performance and, in particular, to study the problem of pendency of cases in the Indian legal system.

The Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative (CHRI) is an independent, non-profit, non-partisan,

international non-governmental organization working in the area of human rights. Through its reports, research and advocacy, CHRI draws attention to the progress and setbacks to human rights in Commonwealth countries. In advocating for approaches and measures to prevent human rights abuses, CHRI addresses the Commonwealth Secretariat, the United Nations Human Rights Council members, civil society and the media on criminal justice concerns.

Prayas is a social work demonstration project of the Center for Criminology and Justice, Tata Institute of Social Sciences. Prayas's focus is on service delivery, networking, training, research and documentation, and policy change with respect to the custodial/institutional rights and rehabilitation of socio-economically vulnerable individuals and groups. Their mission is to contribute knowledge and insight to the current understanding of aspects of the criminal justice system policy and process, with specific reference to socio-economically vulnerable and excluded communities, groups and individuals who are at greater risk of being criminalized or exposed to trafficking for the purpose of sexual exploitation.

The Vidhi Centre for Legal Policy is an independent think-tank doing legal research to make better laws, and improve governance for the public good. Vidhi engages with ministries and departments of the Indian government, as well as state governments, and also collaborates with other relevant stakeholders within public institutions, and civil society members, to assist and better inform the laws and policies being effectuated. The Centre also undertakes, and freely disseminates, independent research in the areas of legal reform, which it believes is critical to India's future.



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.tatatrusters.org for the main report, ranking and methodology, data visualisations, related research and more.


Data and design: How India Lives



**COMMON
CAUSE**
A ROMANCE WITH PUBLIC CAUSES SINCE 1980



CHRI
Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative
working for the practical realisation of human rights in
the countries of the Commonwealth



V | D | H | Centre for
Legal Policy

Supported by

TATA TRUSTS