Lakshadweep*

India Justice Report | 2019
Supported by **TATA TRUSTS**

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.

	State value	State score (out of 10)	Worst value	Best value
Budgets				
Modernisation fund used (%, 2016-17)	NA		NA	80
Spend on police per person (Rs, 2015-16)	2,488		166	3,283
Human Resources				
Constables, vacancy (%, Jan 2017)	20.7		23.3	-6.3
Officers, vacancy (%, Jan 2017)	65.6		65.6	8.6
Officers in civil police (%, Jan 2017)	7.9		6.5	17.8
Diversity				
Share of women in police (%, Jan 2017)	7.9		7.2	18.0
Share of women in officers (%, Jan 2017)	3.1		3.1	22.7
SC officers, actual to reserved ratio (%, Jan 2017)	NA		22	588
ST officers, actual to reserved ratio (%, Jan 2017)	26		26	222
OBC officers, actual to reserved ratio (%, Jan 2017)	NA		0	91
Infrastructure				
Population per police station (rural) (Jan 2017)	884		183,114	884
Population per police station (urban) (Jan 2017)	NA		160,595	25,841
Area per police station (rural) (sq km, Jan 2017)	1		445	1
Area per police station (urban) (sq km, Jan 2017)	NA		46	5
Workload				
Population per civil police (persons, Jan 2017)	160		1,017	106
Trends				
Women in total police (pp, CY '12-'16)	0.50		0.16	1.62
Women officers in total officers (pp, CY '12-'16)	-0.38		-0.38	2.91
Constable vacancy (pp, CY '12-'16)	2.91		2.91	-4.51
Officer vacancy (pp, CY '12-'16)	0.39		6.18	-3.38
Difference in spend: police vs state (pp, FY '12-'16)	10.50		-3.63	11.92

Nationally, Lakshadweep had the highest officer vacancies.

Extremely poor performance in meeting diversity quotas.

Amongst UTs, lowest representation of women officers. Over 5 years, this share reduced.

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/OBC officers, actual to reserved ratio: BPR&D shows 0% reservation. 9. Population per police station (urban): BPR&D shows 0 urban police stations. 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)	0		0	67,797
Prison budget utilised (%, 2016-17)	0		0	100

Human Resources

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

Diversity

	State value		Worst value	Best value
Women in prison staff (%, Dec 2016)	NA		5.7	15.2

Infrastructure

	State value		Worst value	Best value
Prison occupancy (%, Dec 2016)	11		200	11

Had the lowest prison occupancy among UTs.

Workload

	State value		Worst value	Best value
Inmates per officer (persons, Dec 2016)	NA		192	30
Inmates per cadre staff (persons, Dec 2016)	NA		13	2
Inmates per correctional staff (persons, Dec 2016)	NA		NA	2,008

Trends

	State value		Worst value	Best value
Officer vacancy (pp, CY '12-'16)	NA		7.54	-5.51
Cadre staff vacancy (pp, CY '12-'16)	NA		4.50	-3.08
Share of women in prison staff (pp, CY '12-'16)	NA		-0.17	0.65
Inmates per prison officer (%, CY '12-'16)	NA		27.6	-25.8
Inmates per cadre staff (%, CY '12-'16)	NA		19.4	-25.4
Share of undertrial prisoners (pp, CY '12-'16)	0.00		5.29	-4.17
Spend per inmate (%, FY '13-'17)	-86.1		-86.1	30.4
Prison budget used (pp, FY '13-'17)	-7.80		-7.80	0.37
Difference in spend: prisons vs state (pp, FY '12-'16)	32.2		-7.1	35.8

Over a 5 year period, on average, the share of undertrials in its prisoner population has not increased.

Fares the worst among UTs over a 5-year period in terms of using its prison budgets.

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. Data on indicators under 'human resources' theme was not available in PSI. 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. 7. Spend per inmate; prison budget utilised: PSI data shows Rs 0.8 crore budget, but 0 actual expenditure.

JUDICIARY

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

Low vacancies for subordinate court judges.

Human Resources

	State value	State score (out of 10)	Worst value	Best value
Population per High Court judge (2016-17)	963,181		2,380,693	472,900
Population per sub. court judge (2016-17)	23,445		106,719	23,445
High Court judge vacancy (%, 2016-17)	26.1		46.5	26.1
Sub. court judge vacancy (%, 2016-17)	8.3		49.0	0.0
High Court staff vacancy (%, 2016-17)	5.5		31.1	5.5

Diversity

	State value	State score (out of 10)	Worst value	Best value
Women judges (High Court) (%, Jun 2018)	14.3		12.2	20.5
Women judges (sub. court) (%, Jul 2017)	NA		0.0	41.7

Infrastructure

	State value	State score (out of 10)	Worst value	Best value
Courthall shortfall (%, 2016-17, Mar 2018)	0.0		39.0	0.0

About 8% of cases were pending in subordinate courts for more than 10 years.

Workload

	State value	State score (out of 10)	Worst value	Best value
Cases pending (5-10 years) (sub. court) (%, Aug 2018)	7.87		19.10	1.80
Cases pending (10+ years) (sub. court) (%, Aug 2018)	7.87		8.18	0.15
Average High Court pendency (years, Sep 2017)	2.6		3.7	2.5
Average sub. court pendency (years, Aug 2017)	NA		8.4	3.9
Case clearance rate (High Court) (%, 2016-17)	88		81	101
Case clearance rate (sub. court) (%, 2016-17)	104		87	110

Trends

	State value	State score (out of 10)	Worst value	Best value
Cases pending (per High Court judge) (%, FY '13-'17)	2.5		4.3	-6.8
Cases pending (per sub. court judge) (%, FY '13-'17)	25.0		25.0	-14.1
Total cases pending (High Court) (%, FY '13-'17)	5.5		5.5	-8.4
Total cases pending (sub. court) (%, FY '13-'17)	12.3		12.3	-8.0
Judge vacancy (High Court) (pp, FY '13-'17)	1.00		3.53	1.00
Judge vacancy (sub. court) (pp, FY '13-'17)	-5.00		2.81	-5.00
Case clearance rate (High Court) (pp, FY '13-'17)	-2.76		-3.53	3.50
Case clearance rate (sub. court) (pp, FY '13-'17)	7.81		-7.35	7.81
Difference in spend: judiciary vs state (pp, FY '12-'16)	NA		-0.02	3.10

Over 5 years, largest reduction of subordinate court judge vacancies amongst UTs.

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.

	State value	State score (out of 10)	Worst value	Best value
Budgets				
NALSA fund utilised (%, 2017-18)	6		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)	69.8		0.9	69.8
Sanctioned secretaries as % of DLSAs (%, 2019)	0		0	100
Diversity				
Women panel lawyers (%, Jan 2019)	27.3		24.1	50.0
Women PLVs (%, Jan 2019)	66.7		41.4	67.8
Infrastructure				
DLSAs as % of state judicial districts (%, 2019)	0		0	100
Villages per legal services clinic (number, 2017-18)	0.0		5.4	0.0
Legal services clinic per jail (number, 2017-18)	0.0		0.00	1.42
Workload				
PLA cases: settled as % of received (%, 2017-18)	0		0	121
Total LAs: Pre-litigation cases disposed (%, 2017-18) *	100.0		3.4	100.0
SLSA LAs: Pre-litigation in cases taken up (%, 2017-18) **	34.2		0.0	86.5

High presence of women among paralegal volunteers.

All cases disposed off by Lok Adalats were pre-litigation cases.

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