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Foreword

CHRI has worked to advance access to information and access to justice in India and other Commonwealth countries for over twenty years. These realms are mutually dependent—strengthening one fortifies the other, while weakening one undermines the other.

Nowhere is this more apparent than in the context of policing. Given the great power the police exercise over the life and liberty of individuals, stringent guidelines for the legitimate use of this power must be articulated in law and enforced in practice. In addition to procedural protections governing the conduct of arrest and treatment of detainees, proactive disclosure of information by the police departments stands as an essential, though often overlooked, safeguard against arbitrariness in the deprivation of individual liberties.

In a series of amendments to the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (CrPC) in 2009, Parliament in India added provisions requiring the Police Headquarters of every State (except Jammu and Kashmir) and Union Territory to publicise information about all arrests made such as the name of the person arrested, the name and designation of the officer making every such arrest, the time and date of arrest, and the crimes of which every arrested person stands accused. All this information must be collected from every police station every day and displayed at the police control room that is required by law to be established in every district. Every State Police Headquarters is required to create a database of this information about arrests made by the police and make it accessible to the people. This obligation of proactive information disclosure is in addition to the statutory duty imposed on the police to inform the relatives or friends of the person arrested, about the facts of such arrest while effecting it.

If implemented, this mechanism for transparency carries the potential to hold police accountable for unlawful arrest practices. After the 2009 amendments to the CrPC compulsory arrest of any person accused of any crime is no longer the norm. The Police must record specific reasons for arresting a person without warrant if he/she is accused of a crime inviting a jail term of seven years or less. Giving the public access to information on arrestees enables anyone to check whether those arrested have been deprived of their liberty legitimately and have had access to justice—in other words, whether these individuals have benefited from the protective measures written into the CrPC to comply with the directions laid down by the Supreme Court of India from time to time to curb the abuse of powers of arrest by the police.
Starting in 2012, CHRI set out to test the efficacy of these new provisions for proactive disclosure of information regarding arrests made by the police. Immediately, we learned that only one state, Kerala, had made the database of arrestee information available on its website as required by the new law. Filing RTI applications in a total of twenty three States across India and in the Union Territory of Delhi, we found that although more than five years had passed since the CrPC’s mandate came into effect, less than a handful of States have taken meaningful steps toward compliance with the transparency requirements.

The reasons for these failures are many. Most State Police Headquarters have not issued guidelines with sufficient detail to enable police stations to effectively comply with Section 41C. Further, police stations lack the personnel and financial resources to maintain the information, or make it available to the public online.

Each of these barriers must be dismantled in order for both access to information and access to justice to be guaranteed. Without procedures in place to translate the law’s mandates into reality, the CrPC’s provisions – not only on proactive disclosure, but on protections for arrestees – will be nothing more than unfulfilled promises on paper.

I am grateful to our local partners who helped file the RTI applications and persisted in filing appeals and complaints against lack of response from the police departments: B. Ramakrishnam Raju, Debajit Goswami, Jowett d’Souza, Aslam Dewan, Sudhir Pal, Vikram Simha, P. Sherfudeen, Bhaskar Prabhu, Joykumar Wahengbam, Kuovi Angami, Niranjan Barpanda, Rajiv Rufus, Commodore (retd.) Lokesh Batra, Premila Nazareth and Amitava Choudhury.

Satbir Singh helped with the data collection and collation of responses during his association with CHRI. Shikha Chhibbar and Devika Prasad of the Access to Justice Programme provided useful inputs for the recommendations included in this report. Thanks to Cheryl Blake for helping with the edits and Saine Paul for proof reading.

Maja Daruwala
Director
CHRI
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AIR ................................................................. All India Reporter
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Introduction

Covering multiple jurisdictions, i.e., 23 States across India and the Union Territory of Delhi, this report examines police compliance with Section 41C of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (CrPC). Section 41C is part of a series of amendments to the CrPC that Parliament made in 2009. Broadly, the amendments codify the Supreme Court of India's guidelines on proper arrest procedures as laid down in the cases of Joginder Kumar and D.K. Basu. Both the Court's guidelines and the recent amendments are designed to rein in longstanding police abuses of arrest power, including unlawful detention, arbitrary arrest, custodial torture, and extrajudicial killing.

The new sub-sections added to Section 41 provide for a number of safeguards, including: the procedure for notifying a suspect to appear upon receipt of a summons by the police, without having to be arrested to ensure his/her interaction with the police; a requirement that all officers bear identification of their name during arrest; requirements for preparing a detailed memorandum of arrest, with the contents to be confirmed by the arrestee with his other signature at the time of being arrested; informing the arrestee's family or another person he or she chooses about the fact of arrest; and the right of an arrested person to meet with an advocate of his or her choice at some point during interrogation.

---

1 Section 6, Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Act 2008, No. 5 of 2009 (w.e.f. 1-11-2010).
2 The Supreme Court laid down detailed guidelines for arrest in the cases of Joginder Kumar v. State of U.P (1994 AIR 1349) and D.K. Basu v. State of West Bengal (AIR 1997 SC 610). In D K Basu, the Court directed as follows: “36… (11) A police control room should be provided at all district and state headquarters, where information regarding the arrest and the place of custody of the arrestee shall be communicated by the officer causing the arrest, within 12 hours of effecting the arrest and at the police control room it should be displayed on a conspicuous notice board.”
4 Section 41A, CrPC: “Notice of appearance before police officer. – (1) The police officer *[shall], in all cases where the arrest of a person is not required under the provisions of sub-section (1) of section 41, issue a notice directing the person against whom a reasonable complaint has been made, or credible information has been received, or a reasonable suspicion exists that he has committed a cognizable offence, to appear before him or at such other place as may be specified in the notice. (2) Where such a notice is issued to any person, it shall be the duty of that person to comply with the terms of the notice. (3) Where such person complies and continues to comply with the notice, he shall not be arrested in respect of the offence referred to in the notice unless, for reasons to be recorded, the police officer is of the opinion that he ought to be arrested. (4) Where such person, at any time, fails to comply with the terms of the notice or is unwilling to identify himself, the police officer may, subject to such orders as may have been passed by a competent Court in this behalf, arrest him for the offence mentioned in the notice.”
5 Section 41B, CrPC: “Procedure of arrest and duties of officer making arrest. – Every police officer while making an arrest shall- (a) bear an accurate, visible and clear identification of his name which will facilitate easy identification; (b) prepare a memorandum of arrest which shall be- (i) attested by at least one witness, who is a member of the family of the person arrested or a respectable member of the locality where the arrest is made; (ii) countersigned by the person arrested; and (c) inform the person arrested, unless the memorandum is attested by a member of his family, that he has a right to have a relative or a friend named by him to be informed of his arrest.”
6 Section 41D, CrPC: “Right of arrested person to meet an advocate of his choice during interrogation - When any person is arrested and interrogated by the police, he shall be entitled to meet an advocate of his choice during interrogation, though not throughout interrogation.”
Each of these protections is designed to ensure that individuals’ right to liberty cannot be arbitrarily curtailed. But, the amendments to the CrPC go further by establishing mechanisms for transparency and accountability. Section 41C encourages public oversight of arrest practices by requiring that certain information be made available to the people in general.

What does Section 41C of the Criminal Code say?

Specifically, Section 41C of the CrPC sets out the following three mandatory requirements:

1) State governments must establish Police Control Rooms (PCRs) at the state level and in each district;

2) State governments must ensure that notice boards outside each district PCR display: a) names and addresses of arrested persons and b) the name(s) and designation(s) of the officers who made the arrests; and

3) the Police Control Room at the State Police Headquarters must regularly collect the details of arrested persons and the nature of the offence with which they are charged, and maintain a database for the information of the general public.

The amendments to Section 41 of the CrPC relating to the procedure to be observed by the police for arresting any person accused or suspected of committing an offence were enacted on 7 January, 2009 and came into force 22 months later, on 1 November, 2010—a period meant to give States and Union Territories enough time to put in place procedures for compliance with the new mandatory requirements of transparency.

---

7 PCRs act as the nerve centre of the police administration to receive all communications about calls for help received from the people and direct the local police to respond to situations affecting law and order.
Our Study

Purpose
Making basic information about the arrestee, officers involved, and nature of the crime(s) of which the arrestee is charged available, to the public enables people's monitoring of the use of the power of arrest by the police. Without such transparency, it would be nearly impossible to expose patterns of abuse of this power by the police. However, the mechanism for transparency must be functional in order for the public to monitor arrest practices and demand accountability for unlawful and illegitimate arrests.

Therefore, we set out to determine the extent to which police authorities were implementing Section 41C. As sub-Section 3\(^8\) of Section 41C does not set out a procedure for the public to request the arrestee database maintained by State PCRs, the plain language of that Section indicates that the police are expected to proactively disclose it. Logically, the most effective way to do so would be through a regularly updated online database in addition to making such a database immediately accessible on demand for the purpose of inspection to people who have not been able to cross the digital divide.

Method
To measure compliance with Section 41C, we conducted a two-phase study surveying numerous states across India. Phase I began in late 2012—nearly two years after the amendments came into force. This phase covered the following 23 States and the Union Territory of Delhi\(^9\).

- Andhra Pradesh
- Assam
- Bihar
- Chhattisgarh
- Delhi
- Goa
- Gujarat
- Haryana
- Himachal Pradesh
- Jharkhand
- Karnataka
- Kerala
- Madhya Pradesh
- Maharashtra
- Manipur
- Meghalaya
- Nagaland
- Odisha
- Punjab
- Rajasthan
- Tamil Nadu
- Uttar Pradesh
- Uttarakhand
- West Bengal

We then researched which of these State Police Headquarters made the required database of arrestee information available on their official websites.

\(^8\) Sub-Section 2, which requires that each district PCR display the information about arrested individuals and arresting officers on a notice board, also enables public monitoring of arrests. However, it would not be possible to conduct a study – at least not one that is broad in scope – to check compliance with this provision. Moreover, an online database is more widely accessible to the public. Therefore, we focused on sub-Section 3.

\(^9\) Although it would have been ideal to conduct a baseline of all states and territories, we were limited by resource constraints and the availability of partners in local areas.
**Arrest Data Available Online**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdictions</th>
<th>Online Database</th>
<th>Jurisdictions</th>
<th>Online Database</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andhra Pradesh</td>
<td>No database available</td>
<td>Madhya Pradesh</td>
<td>Yes, with data for January to May 2013 only (the site allows users to search using keywords such as name of arrestee, date, and district of arrest. One cannot automatically download all available information from any police station or for any specific date defeating the very purpose of creating the “public” database. However no data is available for any police station for the year 2015.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assam</td>
<td>No database available</td>
<td>Maharashtra</td>
<td>Yes, with data after 2012 (the site allows users to search using keywords such as name of arrestee, date, and district of arrest. One cannot automatically download all available information.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bihar</td>
<td>No database available</td>
<td>Manipur</td>
<td>No database available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chhattisgarh</td>
<td>No database available</td>
<td>Meghalaya</td>
<td>No database available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delhi (UT)</td>
<td>No database available</td>
<td>Nagaland</td>
<td>No database available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goa</td>
<td>No database available</td>
<td>Odisha</td>
<td>No database available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gujarat</td>
<td>No database available</td>
<td>Punjab</td>
<td>No database available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdictions</td>
<td>Online Database</td>
<td>Jurisdictions</td>
<td>Online Database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haryana</td>
<td>No database available</td>
<td>Rajasthan</td>
<td>No database available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Himachal Pradesh</td>
<td>No database available</td>
<td>Tamil Nadu</td>
<td>No database available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jharkhand</td>
<td>No database available</td>
<td>Uttar Pradesh</td>
<td>No database available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karnataka</td>
<td>No database available</td>
<td>Uttarakhand</td>
<td>No database available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerala</td>
<td>Yes (from 2012 onward; accessible for the immediately preceding week only)</td>
<td>West Bengal</td>
<td>Names of persons arrested for Left Wing Extremist activities only displayed (data from April 2012 available up to March 2014 only)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the time of compiling this report, the vast majority of the State Police Headquarters, i.e., 87.5% (21 of 24) of the police jurisdictions included in this study did not publish the information mandated by Section 41C, CrPC on their websites or in the form of any other publicly available database. At the time of our initial survey in 2012, Kerala was the only state to provide this database online. Thus, it was not clear how the other states were making the database available to the public, or if they were maintaining one at all. At the time of compiling this report, the police-station-wise database of arrestees is available only for the week immediately preceding the date of search.

We next filed applications under *The Right to Information Act, 2005* (RTI Act)\(^\text{10}\) with the State Police Headquarters in each of the 24 jurisdictions listed above to determine:

1) whether they were maintaining arrestee databases as required; and

2) if so, through what means they were making the information available to the public.

The questions we included in each RTI application, and their rationale, were as follows:

1. A certified copy of all standing orders/office memoranda/instructions/guidelines/ circulars etc. issued for the purpose of implementing Section 41C of the CrPC;

   Because State Police Headquarters is responsible for collecting information from district PCRs and police stations for the arrestee database, they must issue guidelines for these entities to follow in collecting and forwarding the required information.

2. The complete postal address of all district police control rooms established as on the date of this application;

\(^{10}\) A copy of the RTI application is attached as Annexe 1. The list of our partners who filed RTI applications in various jurisdictions is at Annexe 2.
To assess compliance with Section 41C (1)—establishment of Police Control Rooms.

3. The designation of the officer(s) responsible for sending information about arrested persons from every police station to the district level police control room;

4. The designation of the officer(s) responsible for sending information about arrested persons from every police station and every district to the State Police Headquarters (PHQ);

   To assess the chain of responsibility put in place for implementing Section 41C(3) for channelizing the information from the police station level to the Control Room established at the State Police Headquarters through the district level PCRs.

5. The website address, if any where the database of arrested persons is being made available to the general public;

6. If the website does not exist please provide details of the alternative means by which the general public can have access to the database of arrested persons at the State PHQ;

   Although we reviewed the websites of each State Police Department, it is possible that the database had been made available online at another location. If States were not publishing the database online, we wanted to know what methods they were using to make it available to the public offline.

7. The amount of funds sanctioned and actually spent for the purpose of giving effect to Section 41C of the CrPC during the financial years 2011-2012 and 2012-2013;

   To establish whether funds have been allocated to enable the police to fulfil their duties under Section 41C.

8. A description of the constraints faced by the Police Department in implementing the provisions of Section 41C of the CrPC;

   To document genuine challenges that may hinder implementation of Section 41C.

9. A list of persons arrested throughout the State between 01 April – 31 April, 2012 along with the nature of offence and the name and designation of the officer who made the arrest, in each case.

   To assess the quality and accuracy of local data held by Police Headquarters.

In 2014, we conducted Phase II of the study. This time, we narrowed our focus to the states of Rajasthan and West Bengal to see if either State had made any progress in terms of compliance with Section 41C.\textsuperscript{11}

\textsuperscript{11} Another criterion for selecting these States was that CHRI works there closely with the administration and its civil society partners for the promotion of access to justice, in particular prison reforms and also access to information.
We devoted our resources to examining compliance in these states because both of them showed high rates of arrest, particularly preventive detention, in their responses to our RTIs in Phase I. In Phase II, we modified Question 9 to request arrestee data for the period of 01, to 31 January, 2013.

In both phases of the study, we did receive from some police authorities the data we requested on arrestees for the months of April 2012 and January 2013 under Question #9. While we refer to this data briefly throughout the discussion below, we focus on the responses we received to all our queries and leave the in-depth analysis of the arrestee data (gender, age, religion, crimes of which accused etc.) to a later report to come.
Findings from Phase I

From the first phase of our study, we received a variety of responses to our RTI applications. While we got many direct responses, for the most part we faced numerous transfers of our applications and failures to answer our queries in whole or in part. All RTI applications were addressed to the Public Information Officers (PIO) designated in the offices of the Director General of Police in the States and the Office of the Police Commissioner in Delhi (UT) because the primary responsibility for implementing Section 41C is placed with them. However we believe the RTI applications were forwarded from these offices further and further down below the police bureaucracy, on account of Question #9 which sought detailed information about the arrestees – a clear indication that in most of these States the database of arrestees required to be maintained by the State level PCRs was not being compiled. The RTIs ultimately landed up with each Police Station which was required to compile the data about arrestees and send them to us in addition to responding to other queries in these RTI applications. In many cases, appeals were necessary. We received some responses as late as 2014 – two years after filing our initial requests.

Guidelines for implementing Section 41C

In response to our first question on what orders, guidelines, or circulars had been issued to implement Section 41C, responses fall into four categories:

1) the State Police Headquarters (PHQ) issued guidelines for compliance with Section 41C(3);
2) the PHQ circulated a copy of the amendments to Section 41C;
3) the PHQ circulated a copy of the Supreme Court’s guidelines from Joginder Kumar and/or D.K. Basu from the 1990s; or
4) the PHQ did not issue anything or did not respond to our query.

Under each of these headings, the findings for each State are discussed in turn.
A) Where guidelines for compliance were issued

Kerala\(^{12}\) and Bihar\(^{13}\) are the only states where PHQs have issued detailed guidelines on how police stations and district PCRs should implement Section 41C(3). Bihar’s circular is modelled on that issued in Kerala, and contains similar guidelines.

Both states required the following:

1) Notice boards outside each district PCR to display the details of persons arrested on that day and the previous day, as well as the designation of the arresting officer in each case.

2) After every arrest, the station house officer (SHO) to be responsible for immediately forwarding the required details to the district PCR and Deputy Superintendent of Police, District Crime Record Bureau (DCRB).

3) The arrestee details to be communicated are the: name; name of the father of the arrestee; age; sex; address of the arrestee; place at which arrested; time of arrest; date of arrest; FIR no.; Sections of the law under which arrested; name of the police station; name, rank, and designation of arresting officer (in fact this list has been expanded beyond the requirement of Section 41C with additional data fields being required to be despatched by the police stations to the PCRs.

4) All Deputy Superintendents of Police to consolidate the list of arrested persons from Sunday to Saturday of every week and electronically forward the list to the State Crime Record Bureau (SCRB) by the succeeding Wednesday.

5) The Inspector General of Police, SCRB to maintain this list as a computerised digital data bank for the information of the general public and for the Police Department. The Assistant Inspector of Police (Public Grievances) Police Headquarters will co-ordinate this activity and review the position every week; any deficiencies will be reported to the Zonal Additional Director Generals of Police (ADGP) and the State Police Chief.

Though Assam did not have the detailed guidelines issued in Kerala and Bihar for implementing Section 41C, it merely assigned responsibility for compliance with Sections 41A through 41D to the Superintendents of Police of each district in general.

The Additional Director General of Police circulated\(^{14}\) an order of the Guwahati High Court laying down guidelines for maintaining case diaries and general diaries. The circular also stated that, “The officials of district administration shall in their periodical inspection, ensure that the duties of the police personnel by Section 41A to 41D of the CrPC have been followed and to make necessary notes in case of any dereliction in this regard. Any dereliction shall be, immediately brought to the notice of the Chief Judicial Magistrate of the concerned district.” However no instructions or guidelines detailing the process for collecting data required to be proactively made available to the people about arrestees were issued. In addition to specific data about arrestees, we received these stock responses from the offices of the Superintendents of Police from the districts of Bongaigaon,

---


\(^{13}\) Circular no. 4998/XL 203-2011 by the DGP Office dated 26/12/2011 is at Annexe 4.

\(^{14}\) vide Memo No. V CB/1/12/5585 635.
Cachar, Darrang, Dharam, Dhubri, Dibrugarh, Goalpara, Golaghat, Guwahati, Hailakandi, Jorhat, Kamrup, Lakhimpur, Morigaon, Nagaon, Sivasagar and Sonitpur. Other 10 districts did not bother to respond to the RTI application forwarded to them by the DGP’s office.

**B) Where a copy of the amendments Section 41A-D was circulated.**

Most of the State PHQs issued circulars that were simply photocopies of the amendments that Parliament made to Section 41 of the CrPC in 2009. The circulars directed police stations to comply with the amendments, but did not lay down a framework of who would be responsible, and in what timeframe, to consolidate and publish the database described in Section 41C.

**Assam** — A different circular than the one listed above was issued by the state Criminal Investigation Department (CID). The only direction in regard to Section 41C was that “the information about arrests has to be sent through morning and evening sitreps from DSB Unit.”

**Himachal Pradesh** — Here, the State PHQ transferred our RTI application to the police headquarters of every district. A few of them replied to us directly, while others transferred the application to the police stations under their charge. Ultimately, the responses we received showed that the PHQ had issued a memo that was only a copy of the text of Sections 41A through 41D of the CrPC.

We received circulars from other authorities like the Crime Branch that referred just to Section 41A. Interestingly, the Superintendent of Police of Mandi district issued a circular echoing the requirements issued in Kerala and Bihar. The office of the DSP of Baddi district sent us a copy of an order issued by the DSP in June 2012 (18 months after Section 41C had become operational) ordering the officer-in-charge of the Police Control Room of Baddi to “display the name and address of the persons arrested and the name and designation of the police officers who made the arrests on the notice board outside the control room”. All SHOs of the police stations in the district were required to provide the relevant information to the officer-in-charge of the PCR immediately after making every arrest. However there was no indication whether this information was to be supplied verbally through wireless or telephone communication or in writing. No proforma for supply of the information about arrests made was attached to this order. Also, there was no direction or guideline about the manner and frequency of supply of this information to the State Police Headquarters.

---

16 Memo No. 1921-34 dt. 9/3/12, see Annexe 6.
17 Crime Branch Instruction 27335-65 dated 8/9/11 and another circular, which did not contain information identifying the issuing authority, dated 25/2/2012, see Annexe 7.
18 Circular no. 1/2012, see Annexe 8.
19 Para 5 of the circular issued by the office of the DGP, Kerala refers to Section 41C and states that, “It is also directed that the present District Police Control Room will function as the District Control Room required as per Section 41C. A notice board shall be kept outside the Control Room to display the details of the persons arrested on the day and the previous day and the designation of the police officer who made the arrests. All Police Station Officers of the district shall inform necessary details to their District Police Control Room with the copy to the DySP Headquarters after the arrest of any person. The particulars to be communicated are the name of the Accused/name of the father of the accused/Age/Sex/Address of the accused/place at which arrested/time of arrest/date of arrest/crime no./section of law/police station/name of arresting officer/rank/designation.” see Annexe 3.
20 Annexe 9.
Maharashtra — The PHQ circular\textsuperscript{21} contained the \textit{D.K. Basu} guidelines and directed officers to refer to the latest amendments of the CrPC. There was no reference to any guidelines for implementing Section 41C of the CrPC.

Odisha — The Crime Branch issued a circular\textsuperscript{22} listing each of the 2009 amendments to the CrPC and nothing more.

Rajasthan — We received several replies from multiple police authorities in Rajasthan, all of whom sent us copies of two circulars issued by the Director General of Police (DGP) and the Crime Investigation Department (CID). Both of these circulars included the text of S. 41C without any guidelines for their implementation.\textsuperscript{23}

Uttarakhand — Unlike in other States, the State PHQ did not respond directly to our RTI application. Instead, it transferred the RTI application to all police districts, which in turn forwarded it to the police stations under their charge. All DSP’s offices responded to the RTI application with data sent by the police stations under their jurisdiction about the people whom they had arrested during the month of April 2012. Only the offices of the DSP of district Rudrapur and Uttarkashi sent us a copy of the amendments to the CrPC along with details of persons arrested by the police stations under their charge. It is not clear whether the PHQ had circulated any guidelines along with the notice of amendments to the CrPC to the district police administration and the respective police stations.

\textbf{C) Where guidelines issued by Supreme Court on arrest were circulated}

Other states responded with copies of circulars that listed the Supreme Court’s guidelines in \textit{D.K. Basu} case. Some of these were issued in connection with the text of the 2009 CrPC amendments or other guidelines, though it is unclear from these responses whether any clear directions have been communicated to district PCRs and police stations to enable them to comply with Section 41C.

Assam — Some of the police stations and districts that responded included copies of the \textit{D.K. Basu} guidelines in addition to the memos issued by the CID and DGP, referred to above.

Maharashtra — The State PHQ sent us a copy of its circular\textsuperscript{24} containing the guidelines for arrest contained in the Supreme Court’s judgement in \textit{D.K. Basu}, but followed up with a second response supplying a copy of a circular reproducing the full text of the 2009 CrPC amendments including Section 41C.

\begin{itemize}
    \item \textsuperscript{21} Circular dated 19/3/2011, see Annexe 10.
    \item \textsuperscript{22} CB Circular No. 12/2011, see Annexe 11.
    \item \textsuperscript{23} Circular No. 2011/278 – 328 dated14/2/2012 and circular issued by CID vide CID/CB/PRC/874-926 dated 27/1/12, see Annexe 12.
    \item \textsuperscript{24} Circular No. DGP/23/court cases/97 dated 11/4/1997, see Annexe 13.
\end{itemize}
D) Where there were no guidelines

Ultimately, the majority of states either said they had not issued guidelines for compliance with S. 41C, or failed to respond to this question.

**Delhi** — The PHQ at the Police Commissionerate transferred our RTI application to each of the office of the head of each police district which in turn forwarded it to each police station under his charge. Most of those who replied stated that this query was “beyond the scope of their jurisdiction”. Two mentioned a Standing Order—issued before the amendments were made—by the Commissioner of Police that contained the guidelines handed down in *Joginder Kumar* and *D.K. Basu*. Another response mentioned a circular (no. 8/2011) issued by the head of the Delhi Police North District, but did not enclose a copy of the circular with its response.

**Jharkhand** — Here again, the state PHQ transferred our application to districts and police stations. Some of these units replied saying they have not received any circular about the implementation of Section 41C from the PHQs. One of the police stations responded with a copy of the CrPC amendments only without any supporting document containing guidelines as to how that provision would be implemented.

**Meghalaya**—The PHQ did not bother to respond to the RTI application until the matter escalated to the State Information Commission (SIC) through a second appeal submitted under the RTI Act. The SIC directed the PHQ to conduct an inquiry into the lack of response to the RTI application as well as the first appeal filed by us. The PHQ replied only after receiving the SIC’s order that no directions, guidelines or office memorandum had been issued to implement the provisions of Section 41C of the CrPC. An examination of the website of the Meghalaya Police at the time of compiling this report indicates that the situation had not changed despite the intervention of the SIC. The final order of the SIC in the second appeal case is yet to be received.

**Uttar Pradesh** — The DGP’s office washed its hands off the RTI as application as well as the requirement of implementing Section 41C of the CrPC stating that none of the information sought in the RTI application was held in its records. Instead the RTI applicant was advised to approach the PIOs in the districts directly. Clearly, the PHQ could not be bothered to explain the lack of action from its end for issuing directions to implement the information disclosure requirements under Section 41C.

**Gujarat** — The DGP’s office did not respond to the RTI application initially. After waiting for the statutory period of 30 days our partner filed a first appeal with the designated first appellate authority of that office. Soon after the DGP’s office transferred the RTI application to the offices of all District Superintendents of Police and Police Commissionerates. Several Public Information Officers from these offices called up our partner on the phone seeking clarification about the exact nature of the information sought. Later we received list of arrestees from several districts and police stations but there was no clarity on the nature of guidelines issued for implementing Section 41C, CrPC.

This experience indicates a significant lack of clarity arising out of inadequate guidance from the PHQs about the responsibilities of various police authorities in regard to Section 41C as well as providing responses to a requestor under the RTI Act. Generally, PHQs are responsible for issuing guidelines for subordinate offices to comply with laws, and amendments to existing laws or directions issued by the concerned High Court or the Supreme Court. Under Section 41C specifically, the Police Control Rooms in PHQs are the specified level of the police administration mandated to collect arrest data, compile a database of such data and make the database available to the public for their information. Had the PHQs in most States covered by this study issued detailed guidelines, they could have responded to every query in the RTI application and provided copies of the circulars issued to implement Section 41C of the CrPC without having to transfer it to the police station level. In the course of this study we unwittingly ended up burdening the police stations and the district police headquarters for responding to the RTI application with information that ought to have been available with the State PHQs, had they paid serious attention to their mandated duties under the 2009 CrPC amendments.

Channels for communicating arrestee-related information

In our RTI applications, we asked a series of questions to find out which individuals and institutions had been made responsible for implementing Section 41C. These were:

- the complete postal address of all district PCRs established as on the date of this application;

- the designation of the officer(s) responsible for sending information about arrested persons from every police station to the district level police control room; and

- the designation of the officer(s) responsible for sending information about arrested persons from every police station and every district to the State Police Headquarters (PHQ).

Establishment of PCRs

In response to our first question on the establishment of district PCRs, most States and the UT of Delhi responded with the relevant addresses. In Delhi, however, most of the police stations that responded to the RTI application stated that the question about the establishment of PCRs did not apply to them. Some of them provided the address of the PCR of their district. The RTI responses also show that PCRs had been established in all the districts from which detailed responses to the RTI application were received.

Only the Maharashtra State PHQ responded to these questions directly. All other states transferred our applications to the districts, which in turn often transferred them to the police stations.

26 In the following states, most of the police stations that responded provided addresses for PCRs: Assam, Bihar, Himachal Pradesh, Jharkhand, Maharashtra, Nagaland, Rajasthan, and West Bengal. Meghalaya provided one PCR address after and appeal was filed. One police station in Uttarakhand answered that they do not have the addresses of the PCRs.
Communicating data on arrests to the PCRs and PHQs

We next sought information on the framework of responsibility for communicating arrest data:

1) from individual police stations to district PCRs; and
2) from police stations and district PCRs to the Police Control Room State PHQ.

The responses received to these queries are recorded in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Who sends information from the police station to the district PCRs</th>
<th>Who sends information from the police stations and the districts to PHQs</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assam</td>
<td>SHO</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>None of the districts which responded to our RTI application clarified the designation of the officer to whom the list of arrestees is sent at the State PHQ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bihar</td>
<td>SHO</td>
<td>Responses said information must be sought from the District Headquarters or District Police Control Room</td>
<td>Though Bihar has guidelines for the implementation of Section 41C, most of the police stations that responded stated that only the district could provide the designation of the officer responsible for transferring information to the PHQ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction</td>
<td>Who sends information from the police station to the district PCRs</td>
<td>Who sends information from the police stations and the districts to PHQs</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Delhi        | - SHO  
- Muharrar Head Constable (Records In charge)  
- IO | Different Police stations replied differently:  
- IO  
- SHO  
- District PCR | Different Police stations responded differently about the designation of the office responsible for communicating details of arrestees to the PCRs and the PHQs. It appears that there is no uniformity of practice in this regard. The guidelines issued by the PHQ discussed above also show that no clear procedure has been laid down for transmitting this information. |
| Gujarat      | - SI | - SI | Most of the responses did not contain specific replies to these queries. |
| Himachal Pradesh | SHO | Different Police stations replied differently:  
- District PCR must send the data from stations and districts to the State Police HQ  
- SHO of District Headquarters | No individual officer has been tasked with forwarding arrestee information to the State PHQ even in the PCRs at the district level. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Who sends information from the police station to the district PCRs</th>
<th>Who sends information from the police stations and the districts to PHQs</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jharkhand</td>
<td>SHO</td>
<td>Different Police stations replied differently:</td>
<td>The varied responses showed that most of the replies to this query were being drawn up in order to provide a substantial reply to the RTI application. They do not give any indication that a proper system has been laid down to communicate arrestee information to the Police Control Room of the PHQ. The PIO of Simdega district Police headquarters sent a copy of the posts sanctioned by the PHQ in each police district along with their pay scales in response to the RTI query.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- SSP, District Headquarters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- SP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Police Control Rooms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madhya Pradesh</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>- NA</td>
<td>The PHQ replied that the information sought was available with the PIOs appointed in the offices of the heads of the district police administration. We were advised to contact the PIOs individually for all information. A first appeal filed with the designated appellate authority of the PHQ did not result in any response. A second appeal has been filed with the State Information Commission. This appeal matter has not been decided yet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction</td>
<td>Who sends information from the police station to the district PCRs</td>
<td>Who sends information from the police stations and the districts to PHQs</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maharashtra</td>
<td>The PHQ answered that it does not have the information sought about the PCRs in the districts. Instead we were advised to contact the offices of the district Superintendents of Police (SP) and the Commissioners of Police (CP) directly.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>The PIO attached a copy of the list of SPs and CPs with the reply without providing any contact address advising the RTI applicant to contact these offices directly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manipur</td>
<td>The PIO of the PHQ did not bother to respond to the RTI application at all. The first appeal filed with the designated first appellate authority of PHQ met the same fate. A complaint was submitted to the State Information Commission about the lack of response.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>The State Information Commission of Manipur remained without a member for a very long time. The complaint case has not been decided by the Information Commission as on the date of compiling this report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction</td>
<td>Who sends information from the police station to the district PCRs</td>
<td>Who sends information from the police stations and the districts to PHQs</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meghalaya</td>
<td>Officer of SI rank and above</td>
<td>List of arrestees from police stations goes to the District SPs and the Courts which have jurisdiction over the case along with the case diary.</td>
<td>The PHQ cryptically replied that information about attested persons “would not be given to the PCR”. The PHQ initially, did not respond to the RTI application or the first appeal. The PHQ sent this response only after the State Information Commission directed the PHQ to appoint an inquiry officer to examine the lack of response to the RTI application and the first appeal. It appears that no action had been taken for implementing Section 41C in Meghalaya.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagaland</td>
<td>Officer in-charge of the Police Station</td>
<td>The Superintendent of Police, Kohima, Nagaland</td>
<td>The DGP’s office replied only to the extent of the two police stations in Kohima (North and South). The RTI application was not transferred to other police stations across the State.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rajasthan</td>
<td>- SHO</td>
<td>Different Police stations replied differently:</td>
<td>Some police stations responded that they did not have information about who in their office is designated to transmit arrestee information to district PCRs. Clearly, no guidelines had been issued by the PHQ for communicating this information to them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- A few police stations failed to answer on the ground that the information was not available with them.</td>
<td>- PCR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- SP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Information is displayed on a board outside the station</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27 We received a reply pursuant to an order of the State Information Commission on Second Appeal.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Who sends information from the police station to the district PCRs</th>
<th>Who sends information from the police stations and the districts to PHQs</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uttarakhand</td>
<td>- No separate post created; anyone can transfer arrest data from police station and district level to State PHQ - PHQ is not informed of arrests and the information is sent to “city control rooms” - Arresting Officer - SHO (most common response)</td>
<td>Different Police stations replied differently: - Senior Superintendent of Police - SP - District PCR</td>
<td>The varied responses showed that most of the replies to this query were being drawn up in order to provide a substantial reply to the RTI application. They do not given any indication that a proper system has been laid down to communicate arrestee information to the Police Control Room of the PHQ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Bengal</td>
<td>SHO</td>
<td>Different Police stations replied differently: - District PCR - SI - SP - District Crime Record Bureau</td>
<td>Although the collection point for the arrestee information is the SHO, the police stations responded variesingly to regarding the recipient for the purpose of the creation of the database. While some indicated the PCR or the officer investigating the crime, one police station stated that the data was being sent to the DCRB. This clearly indicates the non-existence of clear channels of communication of arrestee data from the level of the police station to the State PHQ.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The response of Maharashtra was puzzling. Although the website of the DGP’s office does contain a link to the arrestee database, neither the PIO of the PHQ nor the PIOs in the districts nor the police stations were able to explain how the arrestee information was communicated from the level of the district PCRs to the State PHQ. Given the requirement for filling up search words in order to get information about arrestees in this facility, the very purpose of Section 41C stands defeated. Further, when we tried to access the database by merely indicating a time frame for data about arrestees on this website, we could only find the names of the arrestees along with the date and time of arrest apart from the name of the police station whose officer arrested each person for some of the police districts. No details regarding the name and designation of the arresting officer or the offences for which the person has been arrested or the place of arrest is accessible on this database.\(^{28}\) In the case of a large number of other districts and police stations the search showed “No records found” as the result and in a several others the website simply did not allow us to select a start date for any month or year other than December 2015.\(^{29}\)

Across states, the SHO (Station House Officer) is typically responsible for sending data about arrests from police stations to district PCRs or other office such as the District Superintendent of Police or the District Crime Record Bureau in some cases (DCRB). A majority of these replies indicate that there is no uniformity of procedure with even a single State about the communication of information from the police station to the Police Control Room at the State PHQ. This is ample evidence of the fact that in a large number of the States channels for communicating the arrestee data above the PCRs in the districts to the PCR at the State PHQ have not been created at all. The communication of arrestee data by police stations either directly to us or through the District Superintendents of Police in all States which provided this information clearly indicate that with the exception of Kerala, Madhya Pradesh and Maharashtra is indicative of this major finding. So the question of making the database available for the information of the general public does not even arise.

The numerous problems we faced in getting information evidence the casual ease with which the police feel free to violate obligations under Section 41C of the CrPC as well as the provisions of the RTI Act. First, instead of forwarding our requests wholesale, State Police Headquarters ought to have collected information they did not have from police stations, collated it, and sent it to us as one response as an initiative to commence the task of implementing their obligation of collating a database of information about arrestees. The fact that so many top level police authorities passed the requests on to their subordinate offices shows that either they did not have or take the time to understand the questions and address them appropriately. Several questions that ought to have been responded to by the PIO of the PHQ were needlessly transferred all the way down to the police station placing an unnecessary burden on them.

Not only does this violate the letter and spirit of the RTI Act, but such transfer of RTI applications ultimately wastes the time and effort of the public body tasked with answering the queries. Further, over time such responses lower public trust in these bodies, and government as a whole.

\(^{28}\) Annexes 15a-d.

\(^{29}\) Annexes 16a-b.
Availability of budgetary support

We received few clear answers to our questions on what budgetary allocation has been provided, and actually spent, for the implementation of Section 41C. All but three of our RTI applications were sent from State PHQs to districts and police stations, but these entities replied that only the State PHQ could answer queries on budgeting and spending. The most frequent responses were,

- the question is not applicable to the district or police station in question and/or
- there are no documents available in this regard.

A few police stations in Assam, Bihar, Goa and Rajasthan answered that no budget allocation had been made for 2011-12 or 2012-13.

In Kerala, the circular regarding the implementation of Section 41C requires the State Crime Records Bureau to function as the repository of all arrestee data. Presumably the SCRB causes the weekly list of persons arrested across every police station in Kerala to be uploaded on the Kerala Police website. However the PIO of the State PHQ replied that no information was available regarding budgetary sanction made for the purpose of implementing Section 41C. Perhaps the expenditure involved is absorbed in the existing funds allocated to all agencies involved from the police stations concerned to the SCRB. This is a clear indication that when there is a clear signal issued by the PHQ that it intends to comply with a statutory requirement, all police stations fall in line even though there is no budgetary support. This could be a model for other State PHQs to follow. Unfortunately, some of the States discussed above have only copied and adapted the circular for implementation issued by the Kerala Police regarding implementing the 2009 amendments to the CrPC without ensuring that there is compliance from all levels of the police administration.

In Jharkhand, one police station said that its expenditure to implement Section 41C was all of Rs. 168. There is no indication in this reply as to how this meagre figure has been calculated. The Superintendent of Police, Nadia in West Bengal replied stating: “The expenditure has to be met out of the Government’s head of Account: 2055-Police-00-108-District Police-NP-NonPlan-001-West Bengal Police, which is already burdened with its meagre allocation.” Several Police Stations and offices of the District Superintendents of Police did not bother to mention even a “Nil” or “not applicable” reply against this question. Instead they sent comprehensive lists of arrestees for the month of April 2012 as was sought in the RTI application. This pattern of responses makes it clear that most of the police jurisdictions included in the study have simply not paid adequate attention to ensuring budgetary support for implementing Section 41C of the CrPC. Even maintaining a manual or computerised list of arrestees at the level of the Police Stations, the PCRs and the PCR at

30 A different police station in Jharkhand replied with budgetary details unrelated to Section 41C, including the salaries of officers and a training schedule. This demonstrates either significant confusion about our questions, the amendments, or lack of will to properly address RTI requests. Resolution issued by Home Department, Government of Jharkhand dated July 2006, which provides details of officers appointed in districts and their salary; and Circular no. 631/General Crime S.S. 63/12 Crime Research Department, Ranchi dated 29/10/12, which was the schedule of the SIRD training of officers.

31 Response was received from the office of Superintendent of Police, Jamtada district, Jharkhand.
the State PHQs will require sanction of funds. Creating a database for public reference will involve considerable expenditure on the development of the computerised database even if it is not made public proactively.

**Constraints faced in implementing Section 41C**

The last question that, our RTI applications asked the State PHQs was to describe any constraints they have faced in implementing Section 41C. Though this question aimed to identify barriers to implementation and, from this feedback identify possible solutions to help police comply effectively with their obligation of transparency of arrestee data under Section 41C of the CrPC, , the responses we received were insufficient to lay the groundwork for any meaningful recommendations in this regard.

A large number of PIOs replied that the query was not in the nature of “information” as defined under Section 2(f) of the RTI Act. Several PIOs at various levels of the police administration treated this query as a hypothetical question that did not require any reply from them within the terms of the RTI Act. Maharashtra, Meghalaya and Nagaland replied that descriptions of constraints of this kind cannot be given under RTI. Interestingly, several PIOs from police stations in West Bengal and Bihar stated that they face no constraints in complying with Section 41C. Clearly, they were replying to their duty of supplying arrestee information to the district PCRs as a matter of routine. None of the PIOs of the PHQs thought it fit to indicate whether they had faced any constraints in implementing Section 41C, particularly, with regard to the creating of the arrestee database for the reference and use of the general public. The PIO of Kerala State PHQ also replied that this query was not required to be replied under the provisions of the RTI Act.

Two responses from Assam and one from West Bengal mentioned constraints in the implementation of Section 41C of the CrPC. In Assam, one response identified shortage of staff as a constraint in the implementation of Section 41C. Both responses from Assam primarily described constraints in apprehending suspects in a criminal case rather than the difficulties faced in giving effect to Section 41C’s requirements. The office of the Nadia District Superintendent of Police mentioned meagre budget allocation as a constraint, as mentioned above. Strangely, the PIOs from the Offices of the Superintendent of Police in Hamren and Morigaon in Assam replied that they did not have official websites and were not linked to the Internet, they did not find it appropriate to mention this as a constraint in response to our question.

**Supply of list of persons arrested by the police**

In order to test whether the police authorities were maintaining information about arrestees in the manner required by Section 41C at the PHQ level even though they were not proactively disclosed (as our web research showed), we sought information about people arrested in each State and the UT of Delhi covered by the study for a period of one month, namely, April 2012 in Phase I of this study.

The PHQ of Andhra Pradesh did not bother to reply to the RTI application at all. An appeal has been field before the State Information Commission. The result of this case is awaited at the time of
compiling this report. We received arrest data either directly from the police stations or through the offices of the District Superintendents of Police/Commissioners of Police upon payment of additional fee in the States of Assam, Bihar, Goa, Himachal Pradesh, Jharkhand, Nagaland, Rajasthan, Uttarakhand and West Bengal and the UT of Delhi. In Gujarat the data was supplied from several police stations only after a first appeal was filed with the PHQ and the PIO of the DGP’s Offices transferred the RTI application to all heads of the district police and the Police Commissionerates. The Meghalaya PHQ sent the arrestee data only after the State Information Commission ordered an inquiry to be conducted into the lack of response from the PHQ to the RTI application and the 1st appeal. The West Bengal Police sent the data only after our partner RTI applicant in that State used his personal contacts with the DGP and urged him to take action on the RTI application. Even in the States from which we received arrestee data not all police stations responded to the RTI application that was transferred to them. Lists of persons arrested by the police were received in large numbers from the States of Rajasthan, Gujarat, Himachal Pradesh, Uttarakhand and the UT of Delhi. Some of the police stations sent lists of arrestees from the States of Assam, Bihar, Jharkhand and Goa.

The PHQs in the States of Haryana, Karnataka and Uttar Pradesh advised us to approach the local police stations directly for the information about arrestees. The police stations in Punjab did not respond to the RTI application despite the PHQ transferring the RTI application to the heads of the district police administration.

**Follow-up with the Union Ministry of Home Affairs**

After wading through the flood of replies that we received from the police jurisdictions covered by this study, we filed an RTI application of the Ministry of Home Affairs in 2013 asking for a copy of the Cabinet note attached to the text of the 2009 amendments to the CrPC that was put up for the approval of the Union Cabinet before the Bill was tabled in Parliament. Neither the Cabinet Note which we succeeded in obtaining without much difficulty, nor the Statement of Objects and Reasons attached to the CrPC Amendment Bill tabled in Parliament contained any justification for the inclusion of Section 41C(3), namely, the creating of a database of arrestees for the information of the general public. In the absence of a clearly laid down justification in official documents that are now public about the rationale behind Section 41C(3), it may be presumed that this provision was incorporated in the CrPC in compliance with the directions of the Supreme Court in *D. K. Basu* to disclose publicly on notice boards, information about the arrestees including their place of detention within 12 hours of the arrest being effected.

Parliament’s will to make the people of India knowledgeable about the manner in which the police make use of their power of arrest is reflected in Section 41C of the CrPC. However, the cumulative effect of the lack of guidelines, non-provision of dedicated budget, the absence of protocols for communication of information from the level at which arrests are made to the level at which the arrestee database has to be compiled and maintained for the use and reference of the people, with the exception of States like Kerala and Maharashtra is that Parliament’s will has been ignored.

32 See Annexe 17.
year after year. Madhya Pradesh appears to have created a space for uploading this data but it has not been used for uploading any information for the year 2015. This neglect of their mandated statutory obligations by State agencies is a slap on the face of the rule of law which forms the foundation of India’s democratic governance structures. That States like Rajasthan and West Bengal (covered by us in two phases of this study) have not woken up to the idea of drawing up plans for implementing Section 41C effectively, even after being alerted to their inaction in 2012 explains the lackadaisical approach of the police at the highest levels of the administration to the need for greater transparency in the functioning of their departments, particularly in the context of the deprivation of the freedoms of citizens. It is extremely unfortunate that this is the state of affairs after almost 20 years of the Supreme Court’s directions in *D. K. Basu* and five years of Section 41C being incorporated in the CrPC.

Non-compliance with Section 41C of the CrPC does not invite any penal consequences for any police officer or even the PHQ or the State Government as a whole. It is most unfortunate that despite there being a statutory provision to enable people to monitor the use of the powers of arrest by the police, the police authorities in a majority of the States have not acted upon their mandate and the State Governments have also not lifted a finger to secure compliance.
Findings from Phase II

Overall, the results from the first phase of the study demonstrated a lack of knowledge about the requirements of Section 41C, lack of systems to implement them, and inconsistent processes at all levels – whether at the micro level of police stations to the macro level of states. Compounding this, the responses we received indicate confusion about the obligations the police have under the RTI Act.

In the second phase of our study, launched in January 2014, we filed RTI applications in only Rajasthan and West Bengal. The purpose was to determine whether any advances had been made in implementing Section 41C since the first round of RTI applications filed in 2012.

We focused on these two states because of their responses to our initial request for data on arrests for the month of April 2012 – each state recorded over 7,000 arrests in that one month time frame. With such a high volume of arrests, we sought to take a closer look at what information was being recorded in these states. Further, Section 41 requires that, for any offense where the maximum punishment is less than seven years, there must be a record of the reasons for the arrest in order to facilitate bail hearings. Both States also feature a high proportion of preventive arrests made under various provisions of the CrPC such as Section 107, 151 etc. We also selected these States as CHRI has been working for the promotion of access to justice and access to information with the local administration and civil society actors. Further, we did not want to spend another year or two waiting for responses from all 23 States and the UT of Delhi as had happened in 2012.

We filed RTI applications with the following authorities:

- Rajasthan
  - PIO, Office of the Police Commissioner, Jodhpur Metropolitan, Jodhpur
  - PIO, Office of the Superintendent of Police Jodhpur (Rural)
  - SPIO, Home Department, Government of Rajasthan, Rajasthan Secretariat, Jaipur
  - SPIO, DGP, Rajasthan Police Headquarters, Jaipur

- West Bengal
  - PIO, Deputy Commissioner of Police (HQ), Howrah
  - SPIO, Joint Commissioner of Police, Kolkata
  - SPIO, Director General of Police, West Bengal
  - SPIO, Home Department, Government of West Bengal, Kolkata
This time we elected to seek information from the Home Departments in the two States, as well in order to ascertain whether they, being the administrative department for the police, had taken any action to implement Section 41C earnestly. As we experienced during the first phase of our study, our RTI applications were transferred from the PHQs to the district police administration and sometimes within the PHQs between different branches. The Home Department of West Bengal transferred the RTI application to the offices of the Police Commissioners of the Commissionerates of Barrackpore, Bidhan Nagar, Asansol-Durgapur, Howrah, Kolkata, Siliguri. While the PIOs of the Bidhan Nagar and Asansol-Durgapur Commissionerates alone responded with some information which is discussed below, none of the other police authorities bothered to send any reply.

The Home Department of Rajasthan transferred the RTI application to the DGP’s Office which in turn transferred it to the Crime Branch. The PIO of the office of the Inspector General of Police, Headquarters and Reorganisation replied that the information sought was available with multiple public authorities and that we must approach them individually with our information request. Upon not receiving any substantial information from any of these offices in Rajasthan, we filed a complaint with the Rajasthan State Information Commission. This case is yet to be decided at the time of compiling this report.

Availability of arrest data on Police Headquarters’ websites

As of the time of this writing in 2015, Rajasthan State PHQ has still not published the database of arrested persons online. West Bengal continues to display data only for those persons arrested in association with Left Wing Extremism (LWE)/Maoism. Even this data is not updated beyond the month of March 2014.

However some police districts in Rajasthan upload some information about arrests made. A detailed web search reveals that the Jodhpur Rural Police regularly uploads on its website information on arrests for crimes made every day on its dedicated website. The arrestee lists ordinarily in tabular form include details such as: name of the arrestee, date, time and place of arrest, reasons for arrest, and the name of the person to whom information about the arrest was furnished. There is no information about the officer making the arrest in this list as is required to be made public under Section 41C. Similar lists of arrestees are published on the District Police websites of Bhilwara, Bundi (up to 03 Nov, 2015 only), Pali and Sriganganagar. The district police which provide descriptive data about arrestees without tabulation are: Alwar, Bharatpur, Bikaner (up to April 2015 only), Dholpur, Jaisalmer, Rajasmand, Jhunjhunu, Kota City (up to September 2015 only), Sikar (up to October 2015 only), Tonk and Udaipur (not regularly updated). Jalore district police uploads information about persons arrested for possessing illicit liquor only. Nagaur, Pratapgarh and Sirohi district police upload information about arrests made in sensational cases occasionally (not regular).

The name and/or designation of the officer making the arrest is included in the lists of arrestees uploaded on their respective websites by the district police of Churu and Jhalawar (descriptive

33 See Annexe 18.
34 See: http://jodhpurruralpolice.rajasthan.gov.in/PressRelease.aspx# Lists of arrests are available for a 500-day period only in the form of Press Notes. See Annexe 19.
form). The Press Notes of Kota Rural, Jaipur City and Sawai Madhopur police districts are illegible due to uploading of the pdf files without checking for font compatibility. None of the remaining 11 police districts of Rajasthan upload any information about persons arrested on suspicion of the commission of crimes or for preventive purposes.

The evidence presented above is indicative of the absence of standard protocol or proforma for uploading information about arrests made by the district police. While some of the districts are uploading arrestee information on a daily basis, this has not become standard practice across the State. The lack of adequate guidance and monitoring of this process from the State PHQ is clearly the reason for this state of affairs. However we are happy to note some progress made since 2012 when none of this information was made publicly available by the police at any level in Rajasthan.

**Guidelines for implementing Section 41C**

In response to our request for copies of the guidelines issued to enable compliance with Section 41C, we received two circulars from the PHQ of Rajasthan. The first reply included copies of a communication received during the first phase of our study; it was issued by the Crime Investigation Department in 2012, and contained only a copy of the 2009 amendments to the CrPC with a note to the heads of all police districts to be aware of and implement them. The second circular was issued by the Home Department of Rajasthan, and had been published prior to the enactment of the statutory amendments. It contained the *D.K. Basu* guidelines, guidelines on extrajudicial killings, copies of amendments made to the CrPC in 2006, and definitions of “abhiraksha” (custody) and search of “abhirakshit” (in-custody) persons.

Two police authorities from West Bengal, the Office of the Commissioner of Police and the Bidhannagar Asansol-Durgapur Police Commissionerate, answered that because they came into existence only after 2011, they did not have access to guidelines issued prior that time. However, they stated that they complied with Section 41C although no list of arrestees was available on either their dedicated websites or on the website of the PHQ of West Bengal.

Only two other authorities in West Bengal responded. The office of the West Bengal Police Directorate Bhabani Bhawan, Alipore responded with a copy of a communication, which again was only a copy of the 2009 amendments with a direction from the State PHQ to adhere to it. Finally, the Office of the Deputy Commissioner of Police, Howrah replied that it had no record of any circular relating to the implementation of Section 41C.

**Channels of communication**

In response to our questions on which officers are designated to transfer information on arrest data to the relevant authorities, in Rajasthan the Additional Superintendent of Police, Jodhpur Rural

---

35 CID/CB/PRC/2012/874-926 dated 27/01/2013, see Annexe 20.
37 This entity has been operational since 20 January, 2012
38 This authority was not on our original list of RTI application recipients. Even here, our applications were forwarded to other entities. This authority had been established only on 1 September, 2011
39 Issued vide Org. No. 286/Law cell dated 21/12/2011, see Annexe 22.
district stated that information about all arrests made by the police is not sent to the State Police Control Room. Rather, only information about people accused/suspected of heinous crimes who are arrested is transferred to the state level.\textsuperscript{40} Clearly despite being alerted to the requirements of Section 41C of the CrPC through our RTI application in 2012, the State PHQ had not taken any action towards ensuring compliance.

In West Bengal, several replies provided the address of the Police Control Rooms. For the query asking for the designation of officers who supply arrest data from the police stations to district PCRs, the uniform reply was the officer in-charge of the police station. But for the question on the designation of the officer responsible to send the information from districts to the State Police Headquarters, we received varied replies. Two responses stated that the officer in-charge of the District Crime Record Bureau (DCRB) is the designated official although the designation/rank of the officer concerned was not indicated). Another reply asked us to obtain this information from the Home Department. The PIO did not bother to transfer the RTI application to the Home department as is the mandatory requirement under Section 6(3) of the RTI Act when the receiving public authority does not hold the requested information. One other respondent shared that the officer in charge of the Commissioner’s Crime Record Bureau was the officer responsible for this task.\textsuperscript{41}

### Availability of budgetary support

From the responses received to this question, both states appear to lack budgetary allocations for implementing Section 41C. In Rajasthan, one authority stated that no allocation had been made during the financial year 2013-2014.\textsuperscript{42} Surprisingly, the office of the State Police Headquarters responded that they do not have information pertaining to this query. It is unclear who else would be in a position to provide the requested information.

All of the responses from West Bengal either communicated that the authority did not have information or records relating to the budgetary allocation, or that there had been no specific budgetary allocation for implementing Section 41C.\textsuperscript{43}

### Constraints faced in implementing Section 41C

None of the respondents from either state provided information about what constraints might be limiting their implementation of Section 41C. For those that addressed the question, responses included that no records were available, the query was not relevant to their office, or that “no such constraint” was known to them.

\textsuperscript{40} The reply reads: “Pratyek din girafarti ki suchana zila control room se rajya control room mein nahin di jati hai tatha, sangeen abaradhon mein lipta aparadhiyon ki suchana rajya control room mein di jati hai.” See Annexe 23.

\textsuperscript{41} In Phase I, we also received a variety of responses to this question from West Bengal.

\textsuperscript{42} We received the same answer during Phase I of our study.

\textsuperscript{43} This is consistent with the reply we received in Phase I, which stated that no additional funds had been allocated for implementing Section 41C and that the existing police budget was already overburdened.
Supply of list of persons arrested by the police
We received a list of arrestees only from the Jodhpur Rural Police, Rajasthan. None of the other offices sent us the list of arrestees in Rajasthan and West Bengal.

Obstacles faced in collecting information for the two phases of the study
The obstacles we faced in collecting information through our RTI requests can be summarized as the following:

1. Lack of procedures for collecting data
The vast majority of states lack clear and well thought out procedures to comply with Section 41C of the CrPC. Not all entities had designated officials to compile arrestee information and send it to district PCRs and from there to the State PHQs. Others had appointed a variety of officials; inconsistency of this kind necessarily increases the opportunity for confusion, inefficiency, and ultimately failure to comply with the statutory mandate.

   Indeed, in the vast majority of cases we only received arrestee data from the police stations that responded, not PCRs, DCRBs, SRCBs or the State PHQs. Clearly, most states are not maintaining the required database of information, much less making it available to the public.

2. Lack of a uniform format for arrest data
The arrest data we received in response to our RTIs showed that there was no consistent format within, much less among, states. Some databases we received omitted basic information required by Section 41C, such as the name and age of the arrestee. It is not unreasonable to assume that the basic pre-legislative requirements of the Supreme Court’s directive in D. K. Basu required to be followed by the Supreme Court as long ago as 1996 has also not been strictly followed in most States and UTs across the country.

3. Lack of infrastructure and resources
Though most replies we received were in the form of standard computer printouts, many were handwritten lists of details of arrestees that appeared to have been prepared solely for the purpose of replying to our request. Thus, to make the arrest data available to the public, officers would have to conduct this manual exercise repeatedly unless all police stations are computerised and networked to the district level PCRs and State PHQs.

   Such a state of affairs is obviously burdensome and inefficient. Not only would it take officers away from other duties, but means in effect that neither the public nor the department itself can analyse or benefit from the data in any meaningful way.

   Police Headquarters must draw up a proper plan of action for channelizing arrestee data within 12 hours from the level of the police station to the district PCRs and the State level PCR as directed
by the Supreme Court in D. K. Basu. This is not difficult to do considering the fact that all States are participating in the Crime and Criminal Tracking Network & Systems which is intended to make real time exchange of information possible about crime and criminals across the networked police jurisdictions in the country. Adequate budgetary support must be provided for making computerised entries regarding arrests effected by the police in the template provided below.

Each of these barriers must be addressed in order to fully operationalize Section 41C. Systematic guidelines must be issued by Police Headquarters in all states and Union Territories to institute procedures and assign determinable officials the responsibility for complying with Section. 41C.

Were the required information digitally entered at each police station, records would be more readily available for use and analysis by the police and public. It would also be easier to update the information regularly, rather than facing delays caused by manually recording and later digitizing the information. Using a standard template, such as the one suggested below (page 45), would ensure consistency and completeness of information.
Recommendations

It is alarming that now—five years after the 2009 amendments to the CrPC regarding the duty to make information about arrests publicly accessible to the people, came into effect—most states are not able to implement Section 41C in any credible manner. Not only have they failed to make databases of arrest information available online, but the responses we received to our RTI applications indicate a serious deficit in police authorities’ understanding of their obligations under the amendments. We are proposing the following recommendations for ensuring effective implementation of Section 41C of the CrPC:

A combined reading of the requirements of Section 41C, CrPC and the directions of the Supreme Court of India in *D. K. Basu* make it mandatory for the police to disclose the following information in the public domain in the following manner:

1) The State Government should establish police control rooms at two levels – in every district and at the State Headquarters with notice board facility located at a conspicuous place outside the control rooms (*D. K. Basu* & Section 41C);

2) The police officer making the arrest must communicate to the police control room, information regarding the arrest and place of custody of the arrestee within 12 hours of the arrest (*D. K. Basu*);

3) The police control rooms at the district and State levels must display on a notice board, the name and address of every arrestee, the name and designation of every officer making the arrest and the place of custody of the arrestee (*D. K. Basu* & Section 41C);

4) The PCR at the State Police Headquarters must collect from time to time details about persons arrested, nature of offence with which they are charged and maintain a database for the information of the general public (Section 41C).

44 In addition the fact that the law declared by the Supreme Court is the law of the land under Article 141 of the Constitution and all authorities are required to act in aid of the Supreme Court for ensuring that its orders and directives are complied with under Article 144, the Court made all directives given in *D. K. Basu* mandatory on pain of punishment. The Court directed as follows:

“37. Failure to comply with the requirements hereinabove mentioned shall apart from rendering the concerned official liable for departmental action, also render him liable to be punished for contempt of court and the proceedings for contempt of court may be instituted in any High Court of the country, having territorial jurisdiction over the matter.

38. The requirements, referred to above flow from Articles 21 and 22(1) of the Constitution and need to be strictly followed. These would apply with equal force to the other governmental agencies also to which a reference has been made earlier.

39. These requirements are in addition to the constitutional and statutory safeguards and do not detract from various other directions given by the courts from time to time in connection with the safeguarding of the rights and dignity of the arrestee.” [emphasis supplied]
The *D. K. Basu* guidelines were issued at a time when the police departments were not connected to mobile telephony and the Internet and the only instant means of communication was through the wireless network. However large sums of public funds are being paid to police departments across the country to get linked up to the Internet through official websites as well as through Intranet communication. Mobile phones with SMS facility are commonly used across police stations and at least every district police headquarters is equipped with fax machines. Given these revolutionary developments in communications technology, we recommend the following protocol for ensuring compliance with the transparency requirements of Section 41C and the *D. K. Basu* directives:

1. The police officer making an arrest of one or more persons must communicate the following information to the district PCR and the police station where he/she is posted or the local police station (if different from the police station where he/she is posted) as soon as is practicable and in no case later than 12 hours of the arrest through wireless, mobile telephone or email:
   a) The name, gender, age and address of the arrestee;
   b) The name and designation of the officer making the arrest;
   c) The date, time and place of arrest;
   d) The offences that the arrestee is suspected to have committed or is likely to commit or the grounds for preventive detention, as the case may be;
   e) The name and contact details of the relative or friend of the arrestee or any witness attesting the arrest memo who has been informed of the arrest;
   f) Whether a medical examination has been conducted and the report has been furnished to the arrestee or not and reasons for not furnishing such report.

2. The officer in charge of the district PCR must cause all information specified at para #1 above, to be displayed on the PCR’s notice board as soon as is practicable. If the information about

45 In *D. K. Basu* the Supreme Court also directed that every arrestee if he/she so requests must be examined for any major or minor injuries by the officer making the arrest at the time of such arrest and a copy of the “inspection memo” signed by the arrestee and the arresting officer must be provided to the arrestee. The medical examination of the arrestee upon arrest has become mandatory with the incorporation of Section 54, CrPC in 2009 along with Section 41C. Section 54 now reads as follows:

"54. Examination of arrested person by medical officer.—(1) When any person is arrested, he shall be examined by a medical officer in the service of the Central or State Governments and in case the medical officer is not available by a registered medical practitioner soon after the arrest is made:
Provided that where the arrested person is a female, the examination of the body shall be made only by or under the supervision of a female medical officers, and in case the female medical officer is not available, by a female registered medical practitioner.
(2) The medical officer or a registered medical practitioner so examining the arrested person shall prepare the record of such examination, mentioning therein any injuries or marks of violence upon the person arrested, ant the approximate time when such injuries or marks may have been inflicted.
(3) Where an examination is made under sub-Section (1), a copy of the report of such examination shall be furnished by the medical officer or registered medical practitioner, as the case may be, to the arrested person or the person nominated by such arrested person."
any arrest is received at the end of the calendar day, it must be displayed on the notice board within six hours indicating the date and the exact time of receipt of the information;

3. The information about every arrest made must remain displayed on the notice board of the district PCR for a full period of 24 hours for the reference of the general public. Any person must be permitted to inspect this information and take photographs at his or her own expense with the approval of the officer in charge of the PCR;

4. As a multitude of villages, settlements and habitats are located at considerable distance from the district headquarters it is much easier for people to access this information at the police station that has jurisdiction over that locality. All information specified at para #1 above must also be displayed at every police station on a daily basis;

5. The Inspector in-charge of a circle/group of police stations must ascertain compliance with these requirements during his/her daily visits and rounds and make a note of any lapse in the Station Diary or the PCR daily log, faithfully indicating the name and designation of the police officer responsible and the reasons for such lapse;

6. The sub-divisional police officer or deputy superintendent of police (headquarters) must ascertain compliance with the requirements of information disclosure by the district PCR during his visits/rounds to such PCR;

7. The Officer-in-charge of every police station or any other police officer deputed by him/her in this regard must communicate by wireless, mobile telephone, email or fax, all information specified at para #1 above about every arrest made in his/her police station’s jurisdiction to the head of the district police administration by 12 noon every day for the preceding day;

8. The head of the district police administration or any other police officer deputed by him/her in this regard must communicate by wireless, mobile telephone, email or fax, all lists of arrestees in the proforma prescribed below (page 45) received from the police stations under his/her jurisdiction on a weekly basis on such day of the week as may be specified by the State PCR to the officer designated at such Headquarters to receive and collate such information;

9. The State PHQ must designate an officer at the State PCR as the responsible officer for collecting and maintaining a database of arrestees from all heads of the district police administration and publicise this information widely for the reference of both the police and the general public;

10. The officer designated for the purpose of collecting and maintaining the State-wide database of arrestees must cause the lists of arrestees received from the district police administration to be uploaded on the official website on a weekly basis. The alphabetically arranged, police station-wise list for the week immediately preceding the date of display must be accessible on the home page of the website while older lists may be archived on the same website in an accessible manner;
11. Pdf or html files of the weekly lists of arrestees must be displayed in an easily accessible manner without a surfer being required to enter any search word for accessing arrestee details for the current week. Search facility may be provided for the archived database of older lists;

12. The list of arrestees displayed at the police stations and the district PCRs must be drawn up in the official language(s) of the area. The lists displayed on the State Police website may be bilingual (official language(s) and English);

13. The State PHQ must make adequate budgetary provisions every year and provide infrastructure facilities such as mobile phones, computers with reliable internet connectivity in order to facilitate the channelisation of arrestee-related information from the level of the police stations to the district and State level PCRs and for their display on the official website prominently in the official language as well as English for the reference of the general public. Until such time that adequate communication facilities are provided, police personnel who communicate arrestee information to the concerned authorities using their personal mobile devices or Internet connections must be reimbursed for the expenses incurred; and

14. The governments in the States and UTs must develop standard operating procedures (SOPs) along the lines recommended above and impart training programmes for police officers designated to communicate arrestee information to the concerned authorities on a regular basis. Officers tasked with these responsibilities must be trained to use email and Internet facilities on a priority basis.

15. A record retention schedule must also be put in place to determine the lifespan of these records and the manner of their destruction under the supervision of a senior officer.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SI no.</th>
<th>FIR/Case no. (where applicable)</th>
<th>Police Station</th>
<th>Name and address of the arrestee</th>
<th>Gender &amp; Age of the arrestee</th>
<th>Date, time and place of arrest</th>
<th>Name &amp; designation of the arresting officer</th>
<th>Offences for which arrested including grounds for preventive arrest / detention</th>
<th>Name and contact details of the relative/friend or witness signing the arrest memo who has been informed of the arrest</th>
<th>Whether medical examination done and report provided to the arrestee or his nominee “Y/N” Give reasons for “N”</th>
<th>Place of custody of the arrestee</th>
<th>Time of intimation about arrest to the PCR (District) and State PHQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annexe 1

Draft RTI Application

(Where formats are prescribed under the RTI Rules, please fill in the details under the relevant portions of the formats. Please pay application fee in any one of the modes of payment notified in the Rules.)

Date: XX/09/2012

From,
(Name and complete postal address of the applicant)

To,
The Public Information Officer
Director General of Police
(complete postal address of the DGP’s office)

Dear sir,

Sub: Request for information under Section 6(1) of The Right to Information Act, 2005

I would like to obtain the following information from your public authority regarding compliance with the provisions of Section 41C of the Criminal Procedure Code, 1973 (CrPC) about making information about arrested persons available to the general public:

A certified copy of all standing orders/ office memoranda/ instructions/ guidelines/ circulars etc. issued for the purpose of implementing Section 41C of the CrPC;

The complete postal address of all district police control rooms established as on the date of this application;

The designation of the officer(s) responsible for sending information about arrested persons from every police station to the district level police control room;

The designation of the officer(s) responsible for sending information about arrested persons from every police station and every district to the State Police Headquarters (PHQ);
The website address, if any where the database of arrested persons is being made available to the general public;

If the website does not exist please provide details of the alternative means by which the general public can have access to the database of arrested persons at the State PHQ;

The amount of funds sanctioned and actually spent for the purpose of giving effect to Section 41C of the CrPC during the financial years 2011-2012 and 2012-2013;

A description of the constraints faced by the Police Department in implementing the provisions of Section 41C of the CrPC; and

A list of persons arrested throughout the State between 1st April – 31st April 2012 along with the nature of offence and the name and designation of the officer who made the arrest, in each case.

I am a citizen of India. I have enclosed application fee. I would like to receive the information requested at my postal address mentioned above. Please inform me of the additional fee payable for obtaining the said information.

Thanking you,
Yours sincerely,

(Signature of the applicant)
(Name of the applicant)
## Annexe 2

RTI Applicants who helped with this study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>RTI Applicant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Andhra Pradesh</td>
<td>B Ramakrishnam Raju (United Forum for RTI Campaign)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Assam</td>
<td>Debajit Goswami (Assam RTI Forum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Bihar</td>
<td>Nandita Sinha (CHRI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Delhi</td>
<td>Amikar Parwar (CHRI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Chhattisgarh</td>
<td>Venkatesh Nayak (CHRI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Goa</td>
<td>Jowett d’Souza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Gujarat</td>
<td>Aslam Dewan (Nagarik Adhikar Kendra)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Haryana</td>
<td>Venkatesh Nayak (CHRI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Himachal Pradesh</td>
<td>Amikar Parwar (CHRI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Jharkhand</td>
<td>Sudhir Pal (Manthan Yuva Sansthan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Karnataka</td>
<td>Vikram Simha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Kerala</td>
<td>P. Sherfudeen (National Constitution Club)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Madhya Pradesh</td>
<td>Dr. Rakesh Ranjan (MP Suchana Adhikar Abhiyan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Maharashtra</td>
<td>Bhaskar Prabhu (Mahiti Adhikar Manch)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Manipur</td>
<td>Joykumar Wahengbam (Human Rights Initiative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Meghalaya</td>
<td>Venkatesh Nayak (CHRI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Nagaland</td>
<td>Hekani Jakhalu, Kuovi Angami (YouthNet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Odisha</td>
<td>Niranjan Barpanda (NCPRI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Punjab</td>
<td>Venkatesh Nayak (CHRI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Rajasthan</td>
<td>Suchismita Goswami (CHRI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Tamil Nadu</td>
<td>Rajiv Rufus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Uttar Pradesh</td>
<td>Commodore (retd.) Lokesh Batra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Uttarakhand</td>
<td>Premila Nazareth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>West Bengal</td>
<td>Amitava Choudhury (AICURD)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annexe 3a
Circular Issued by the Police Headquarters, Kerala
(50) Where making such arrest the police officer shall pronounce on such as.

(51) In all cases where the arrest of a person is required the police officer shall record the reasons or neglect for not making the arrest.

(52) In all cases where the arrest of a person is not required under the provisions of any section, the police officer shall, issue a notice to the person to appear before the police station to comply with the service of notice. The service of notice can be served in such person fails to comply with such directions.

Office Address:

Notice

In exercise of the powers conferred under sub-section (2) of Section 31(3) of CrPC,

I hereby direct you that during the investigation of Case No. _______________ file registered at ______________ Police Station, it is

hereby notified that there are reasonable grounds to believe that you have committed the offence mentioned above. You are hereby directed to appear before the ______________ Police Station on ______________

Dear,

__________________________
Signature
(Inspecting Magistrate)

(50) The police officer while making any arrest shall—

(a) hold an enquiry, with all other identification of the person for easy identification, and record a memorandum of such arrest and complete same by at least one witness confirmed by the person.
6. It is also directed that any present District Police Control Room in every district will function as the District Control Room in accordance with Section 42 KCC. An official board shall be kept outside the District Office to display the details of the persons arrested on the day and the previous day and the designation of the police officers who made the arrests. All Station House Officers of the district shall inform necessary details to their respective DPCR’s with copies to the DySP/DCP immediately after they arrest any persons. The particulars to be communicated are: Name of the Accused/Name of the Victim/Arresting Station name/Nature of Case/Arresting Officer/Location/Date of Arrest.

7. The State Crime Records Bureau, which is responsible for the enumeration of Crime, will function as the State Level Crime Room under the Police Headquarters. The details of NCPR will be forwarded every week to the crime room in the form of a consolidated list to the NCPR on the preceding Wednesday. NCPR will maintain this as a computerized digital data base for the information of the general public and for the Department. All, Department of Police (Public Information) Police Headquarters will coordinate the activity and review the position every week and report to the State ACP/SP and the Superintendent of Police.

State Police Chief
Kertaka

[Signature]
Annexe 3b
Circular Issued by the Police Headquarters, Kerala
V. INVESTIGATION OF OFFENCES RELATING TO WOMEN

Section 157 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 has been amended so as to provide that the investigation of the offence under sections 376 and 376-A of the IPC should be conducted as far as possible at the place of the crime and as far as practicable by a special police officer in the presence of the victim or production of any other witness or relative of the victim.

Section 159 has been amended to provide that the investigation of the case of rape of a child may be completed within 3 months from the date on which the information was recorded by the officer-in-charge of a police station. The final report under Section 173(1)(g) will also have to mention whether the report of medical examination of the woman has been attached where the investigation relates to an offence under Sections 375, 376, and 376-A of the IPC.

Section 160 which provides in certain cases of offences under Section 376, 376-A the investigation by producing the “victims” shall be conducted as far as possible by a woman police officer.

Section 173(1)(g) which deals with production of any evidence in relation to such “victims” has been amended so as to provide that the investigation of an offence has been completed by registering the victim, and in the event of death of such victim, it may be recorded by the officer-in-charge of the police station that the investigation is completed by the investigation of the offence under Section 376, 376-A of the Cr. PC.

VI. INTIMIDATION OF WITNESS

The Criminal Law Amendment Act, 2013 has amended Section 337 of the IPC to provide a complete immunity to all persons who are likely to be prejudiced by giving evidence in any proceeding, and the said immunity shall extend to all persons who are likely to be prejudiced by giving evidence in any proceeding.
V. INVESTIGATION OF OFFENCES RELATING TO CHILDREN

Section 176 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 has been amended the provisions that the investigation of the case shall be completed within 3 months from the date on which the information was recorded by the officer in charge of a police station. The final report under Section 173(2)(p) will also have to mention whether any report of criminal conduct of the child has been obtained when the investigation referred to an offence under Sections 376, 376A, and 376B, as it is of the IPC.

Section 327(2) which provides in cases that of a charge under Section 326, 326A to 328 has been completed by providing that an officer has been completed as far as possible by the competent court in cases of children.

Section 327(3) which provides in cases that of a charge under Section 326, 326A to 328 has been completed by providing that an officer has been completed as far as possible by the competent court in cases of children.

VI. INTIMATION OF WITNESSES

The procedure for intimation of witnesses in cases relating to children is mentioned in Section 170 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973. The procedure is prescribed by the Writings of Section 170 A of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

VII. COMPLAINTS OF OFFENCES

The cases of complaining under Section 152 have been amended. Section 152, 359, 360, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 390, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, and 445 are newly incorporated in the list of offences which can be complained of the police stations in the cases relating to children. All these sections which are incorporated in the list of offences which can be complained of the police stations in the cases relating to children. All these sections which are incorporated in the list of offences which can be complained of the police stations in the cases relating to children. Section 152 has been amended in the list of offences which, with the permission of court before whom such police station is sitting, can be complained of by the person claiming to be a minor, under Section 170 of the Code of Criminal Procedure.
null
Annexe 4
Order Issued by the Police Headquarters, Bihar
Annexe 5
Circular Issued by CID Assam
Annexe 6
Circular Issued by the Police Headquarters, Himachal Pradesh
Annexe 7
Circular Issued by the Police Headquarters, Himachal Pradesh
Annexe 8
Circular Issued by the Superintendent of Police, Mandi
(a) Such person was a proper officer in the presence of another officer or the public in whose custody the person was, or such person was a proper officer in the opinion of the investigating officer, such person was not, at the time of the commission of the offense, in public view or public place, and such person was not, at the time of the commission of the offense, under continuous surveillance of the person who is under arrest or in the presence of such person.

(b) While making such arrest, the person arrested shall answer the accused.

(c) In all cases where the accused is a person to whom the accused is not required under the provisions of this section to be brought before the officer shall hear, the person arrested shall, when a proper place for the hearing of the accused is not readily available, be held in custody pending the bringing of the accused before the proper place of hearing.

(d) The person arrested shall, when a proper place for the hearing of the accused is not readily available, be held in custody pending the bringing of the accused before the proper place of hearing.

(e) The person arrested shall, when a proper place for the hearing of the accused is not readily available, be held in custody pending the bringing of the accused before the proper place of hearing.
3. The police officer while making any arrest shall— (a) have an assurance, visible and other identification of the name for any identification (b) prepare a description of arrest which shall be signed by at least one witness and accompanied by the person arrested (c) inform the person arrested that he has right to have a relative or a friend present by him to be informed of arrest.

4. Where any person, arrested the arrest is necessary and investigated by the police, he shall be entitled to one an advocate of his choice during investigation, though not throughout investigation.

5. It is also directed that the person District Police Control Room with reference to the District Control Room, required as per section 41C. A notice board shall keep silent the Control Room to display the details of the person arrested on the day and the previous day and the designation of the police officer who made the arrest. All Police Station Officers of the district shall inform necessary details to their superior officers.
February 24, 1972

To: Chief Inspector, Presidency

From: Superintendent of Police

Subject: Notice to all Police Stations

Copy to: All SHOs, SP, Pro, SP, and DC

The purpose of this notice is to inform and provide necessary information.

Kindly ensure compliance with the instructions.

[Signature]

Superintendent of Police

[Name]

Chief Inspector

[Signature]
Annexe 9
Circular Issued by the Superintendent of Police, Baddi
Annexe 10
RTI reply received from the Police Headquarter, Maharashtra
Annexe 11
Circular Issued by the CID, Crime Branch, Odisha
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41A. Notice of appearance before police officer-

1. The police officer shall, in all cases where the arrest of a person is not required under the provisions of sub-section (1) of section 41, issue a notice directing the person against whom a reasonable complaint has been made, or credible information has been received, or a reasonable suspicion exists that he has committed a cognizable offence, to appear before him or at such other place as may be specified in the notice.

2. Where such a notice is issued to any person, it shall be the duty of that person to comply with the terms of the notice.

3. Where such person complies and continues to comply with the notice, he shall not be arrested in respect of the offence referred to in the notice unless, for reasons to be recorded, the police officer is of the opinion that he ought to be arrested.

4. Where such person, at any time, fails to comply with the terms of the notice, or is unwilling to identify himself, the police officer may, subject to such orders as may have been passed by a competent court in this behalf, arrest him for the offence mentioned in the notice.

41B. Procedure at arrest and duties of officer making arrest-

Every police officer while making an arrest shall-

a. Bear an accurate, visible and clear identification of his name which will facilitate easy identification;

b. Prepare a memorandum of arrest which shall be-
   i. Attested by at least one witness, who is a member of the family of the person arrested or a respectable member of the locality where the arrest is made;
   ii. Countersigned by the person arrested; and
   iii. Informed the person arrested, unless the memorandum is attested by a member of his family, that he has a right to have a relative or a friend named by him to be informed of his arrest.

41C. Control room at districts-

1. The State Government shall establish a police control room—
   a. In every district; and
   b. At State level.

2. The State Government shall cause to be displayed on the notice board kept outside the control rooms at every district, the names and addresses of the persons arrested and the name and designation of the police officers who made the arrests.

CID, Crime Branch, Orissa, Cuttack.
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Annexe 12
Circular Issued by the Crime Branch, Jaipur
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Annexe 13
Circular Issued by the Police Headquarters, Maharashtra
1. 

2. 

3. 

4. 

5. 

6.
[Invisible text on the page]
Annexe 14
Delhi Police Standing Order on Guidelines for Arrest
whose information is not used in such a manner. The
punishment of all such police personnel shall consist of
the arrest and detention in a cell for a period of six
months.

9. The police officer arresting the accused shall make
a record of the arrest and shall be entitled to have the
name and address of the accused or his relatives
registered in the station book. The record shall also
be made of the place and time of arrest.

10. A person who has been arrested or released and is
being held in custody in a police station or interrogation
centre or other location shall be entitled to have the
name and address of the person arrested or the person
arrested or the person released in the station book. The
provision of this section shall be enforced by the
police officer in charge of the station or by any police
officer acting on behalf of the officer in charge.

11. The record of arrest shall be immediately
submitted to the court, and the person arrested shall be
entitled to have the record made of the arrest and the
place and time of arrest.

12. No person arrested shall be released unless
as a result of the arrest such person is charged with
a crime

13. The record of arrest shall be submitted to the
court, and the person arrested shall be entitled to
have the record made of the arrest and the
place and time of arrest.

14. No person arrested shall be released unless
as a result of the arrest such person is charged with
a crime.

15. The record of arrest shall be submitted to the
court, and the person arrested shall be entitled to
have the record made of the arrest and the
place and time of arrest.
Annexe 15a
Screenshot of the “Arrest Details” Search Facility on the Maharashtra Police Website
Annexe 15b
Screenshot of the Maharashtra Police Website with “Search Criteria” entered
Annexe 15c

Screenshot of the Maharashtra Police Website showing search results for persons arrested by Hadapsar Police.
Annexe 15d
Screenshot of the Maharashtra Police Website showing Arrest Details
Annexe 16a

Screenshot of the Maharashtra Police Website showing alternate "Search Criteria" entered.
Annexe 16b
Screenshot of the Maharashtra Police Website showing absence of Arrestee Details
Annexe 17
Cabinet Note attached to CrPC Amendment Bill, 2006
(relating to Section 41C)
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The problem which were proposed to the Commission was in support of which the Ministry of those Affairs had also put forth several suggestions which would be necessary for:

- Greater cooperation between the different state authorities.
- More effective communication policies.
- Increased budget for technical support.
- Improved access to educational materials.
- Enhanced teacher training programs.

Moreover, the primary focus of this legislation is the establishment of the

- Greater awareness and public education, so the future generations
- Emphasis on early education to reduce drop-out rates and ensure that all children have the opportunity to learn and reach their full potential, so that the next generation will be better served.
The sample text is not visible in the image.
STATEMENTS OF COURTS AND RELATIONS

The need to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 is evident and quite justified and to that end the relevant judicial system has been set for quite sometime. The Law Commission has submitted a comprehensive review of the Code of Criminal Procedure in the 18th report and thereafter several bills have been introduced in the legislature, particularly those relating to provisions making arrest, trial, and punishment, provisions for speedy trial, important evidences, apprehension of offenders, and preliminary investigation. Preliminary is especially important for the good and speedy trial of persons accused under it. Also, as per the 19th Chandrakanta 1979 report relating to courts, it has been made necessary to amend the 
so that they may be treated as such from the liberty of the individual and the dignity cannot be compromised of persons as well as that rule.

1. The Code of Criminal Procedure 1973 as amended by the said amendment.

New Delhi 2000 January 15th.
Annexe 18
RTI reply received from the IGP- Headquarters and Reorganisation,
Rajasthan Police
Annexe 19

Screenshots of the “List of Arrestees” on the website of Jodhpur Rural Police
Annexe 20
Circular Issued by CID, Rajasthan Police
प्रमुख प्रकारिति प्रतिवादियों के समर के बारे में कानूनी संदेह बनाए रखे हैं। अपनी तरह मुकदमे में उन्होंने कहा कि कानून के जिस प्रकार व्यक्तिगत निर्देशनों को खोल दिया जाता है उसी प्रकार हम भी इसका प्रयोग करेंगे।

उन्होंने दायरा में मुकदमा के लिए तत्वों को उल्लिखित करने की कोशिश की। वे दायरा में मुकदमा के लिए तत्वों को उल्लिखित करने की कोशिश की।

प्रकारिति प्रतिवादियों के समर के बारे में कानूनी संदेह बनाए रखे हैं। अपनी तरह मुकदमे में उन्होंने कहा कि कानून के जिस प्रकार व्यक्तिगत निर्देशनों को खोल दिया जाता है उसी प्रकार हम भी इसका प्रयोग करेंगे।
अदालत 41 (के) के तहत (२०) एक जन, शहीद की अवधारणा के द्वारा निरीक्षित किए गए थे।

५. इस वसरहै, ४५०, ४५०, क्षेत्र और ४५०० का जन-स्वास्थ्य — गृह अधिकारी की नाम १२ के वातावरण निरीक्षित द्वारा किए गए आंक-अनुमान की है।

"बताओ, पूर्वतन अधिकारी के छोटे वास्तवात्मक होने का मतलब—" (५) 'पूर्वतन अधिकारी' के लिए जन में वह नाम का वर्तमान (६) के पासानों के साथ वास्तव- पूर्वी अवधारणा की है। पूर्वतन अधिकारी निरीक्षण द्वारा किए गए आंक-अनुमान की है। यह पूर्वतन अधिकारी के साथ वास्तव-एवंस्तवात्मक होने की आशा है।

(६) बताओ, जब और वास्तव-एवंस्तवात्मक होने के लिए जन में वह नाम का वर्तमान (७) के पासानों के साथ वास्तव- पूर्वी अवधारणा की है। पूर्वतन अधिकारी निरीक्षण द्वारा किए गए आंक-अनुमान की है। यह पूर्वतन अधिकारी के साथ वास्तव-एवंस्तवात्मक होने की आशा है।

(७) बताओ, जब और वास्तव-एवंस्तवात्मक होने के लिए जन में वह नाम का वर्तमान (८) के पासानों के साथ वास्तव- पूर्वी अवधारणा की है। पूर्वतन अधिकारी निरीक्षण द्वारा किए गए आंक-अनुमान की है। यह पूर्वतन अधिकारी के साथ वास्तव-एवंस्तवात्मक होने की आशा है।

(८) बताओ, जब और वास्तव-एवंस्तवात्मक होने के लिए जन में वह नाम का वर्तमान (९) के पासानों के साथ वास्तव- पूर्वी अवधारणा की है। पूर्वतन अधिकारी निरीक्षण द्वारा किए गए आंक-अनुमान की है। यह पूर्वतन अधिकारी के साथ वास्तव-एवंस्तवात्मक होने की आशा है।

(९) बताओ, जब और वास्तव-एवंस्तवात्मक होने के लिए जन में वह नाम का वर्तमान (१०) के पासानों के साथ वास्तव- पूर्वी अवधारणा की है। पूर्वतन अधिकारी निरीक्षण द्वारा किए गए आंक-अनुमान की है। यह पूर्वतन अधिकारी के साथ वास्तव-एवंस्तवात्मक होने की आशा है।
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Annexe 21
Circular Issued by the Home Department, Rajasthan
GOVERNMENT OF RAJASTHAN

NOTICE OF THE ADJUDICATOR SECRETARY,
Home Affairs & Justice department, Rajasthan, Jaipur.

Date: 10 March, 2023.

All Divisional Commissioners, Registrars,
All Inspector General, Rajasthan.

Dear Sir,

You are hereby advised that the High Court Bench in its judgment dated 20-12-1992 has declared the above-mentioned offence to be non-bailable. The following directions shall be observed:

1. The accused persons shall be produced before the court within 24 hours of their arrest and shall be identified by the police within 24 hours of their arrest.

2. The police personnel shall record the statement of the accused persons before the court and shall also provide a copy of the record to the accused persons.

3. The accused persons shall be produced before the court within 24 hours of their arrest.

4. The police personnel shall ensure that the accused persons are produced before the court within 24 hours of their arrest.

5. The police personnel shall ensure that the accused persons are produced before the court within 24 hours of their arrest.

6. The police personnel shall ensure that the accused persons are produced before the court within 24 hours of their arrest.

Yours faithfully,

[Signature]

[Name]

[Position]
Annexe 22
Circular issued by the Director General of Police, West Bengal
Annexe 23
RTI reply received from Jodhpur Police (Rural)
Notes
CHRI Programmes

CHRI’s work is based on the belief that for human rights, genuine democracy and development to become a reality in people’s lives, there must be high standards and functional mechanisms for accountability and participation within the Commonwealth and its member countries. CHRI furthers this belief through strategic initiatives and advocacy on human rights, access to justice and access to information. It does this through research, publications, workshops, information dissemination and advocacy.

Access to Justice

Police Reforms: In too many countries the police are seen as an oppressive instrument of state rather than as protectors of citizens’ rights, leading to widespread rights violations and denial of justice. CHRI promotes systemic reform so that the police act as upholders of the rule of law rather than as instruments of the current regime. In India, CHRI’s programme aims at mobilising public support for police reform. In South Asia, CHRI works to strengthen civil society engagement on police reforms. In East Africa and Ghana, CHRI is examining police accountability issues and political interference.

Prison Reforms: CHRI’s work is focused on increasing transparency of a traditionally closed system and exposing malpractices. A major area is focussed on highlighting failures of the legal system that result in terrible overcrowding and unconscionably long pre-trial detention and prison overstays, and engaging in interventions to ease this. Another area of concentration is aimed at reviving the prison oversight systems that have completely failed. We believe that attention to these areas will bring improvements to the administration of prisons as well as have a knock-on effect on the administration of justice overall.

Access to Information

CHRI is acknowledged as one of the main organisations working to promote access to information across the Commonwealth. It encourages countries to pass and implement effective right to information laws. We routinely assist in the development of legislation and have been particularly successful in promoting right to information in India, Bangladesh and Ghana where we are the Secretariat for the RTI civil society coalition. We regularly critique new bills and intervene to bring best practices into governments and civil society knowledge both in the time when laws are being formulated and when they are first being implemented. Our experience of working across even in hostile environments as well as culturally varied jurisdictions allows CHRI to bring valuable insights into countries seeking to evolve and implement new laws on right to information. In Ghana, for instance we have been promoting knowledge about the value of access to information which is guaranteed by law while at the same time pushing for introduction of an effective and progressive law. In Ghana as and when the access to information law comes into being we intend to build public knowledge in parallel with monitoring the law and using it in ways which indicate impact of the law on system accountability – most particularly in the area of policing and the working of the criminal justice system.

Strategic Initiatives Programme

CHRI monitors member states’ compliance with human rights obligations and advocates around human rights exigencies where such obligations are breached. CHRI strategically engages with regional and international bodies including the Commonwealth Ministerial Action Group, the UN and the African Commission for Human and People’s Rights. Ongoing strategic initiatives include: Advocating for and monitoring the Commonwealth’s reform; Reviewing Commonwealth countries’ human rights promises at the UN Human Rights Council and engaging with its Universal Periodic Review; Advocating for the protection of human rights defenders and civil society space; and Monitoring the performance of National Human Rights Institutions in the Commonwealth while advocating for their strengthening.
In a series of amendments to the *Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973* (CrPC) in 2009, the Indian Parliament added provisions requiring the Police Headquarters in every State (except Jammu and Kashmir) and Union Territory to publicise information about all arrests made, such as the name of the person arrested, the name and designation of the officer making every such arrest, the time and date of arrest, and the crimes of which every arrested person stands accused. All this information must be collected from every police station every day and displayed at the police control room in every district. Every State Police Headquarters is required to create a database of this information about arrests made by the police and make it accessible to the people.

If implemented, this mechanism for transparency carries the potential to hold police accountable for unlawful arrest practices. Giving the public access to information on arrestees enables anyone to check whether those arrested have been deprived of their liberty legitimately and have had access to justice.

CHRI set out to test the efficacy of these new transparency provisions regarding arrests made by the police. Filing RTI applications in a total of twenty three States across India and in the Union Territory of Delhi, we found that although more than five years had passed since the CrPC’s mandate came into effect, less than a handful of States have taken meaningful steps toward compliance with these transparency requirements.

The reasons for these failures are many. Most State Police Headquarters have not issued guidelines with sufficient detail to enable police stations to effectively comply with these transparency requirements. Further, police stations lack the personnel and financial resources to maintain the information, or make it available to the public online. Each of these barriers must be dismantled in order for both access to information and access to justice to be guaranteed. This report contains our findings from the two-phase study and recommendations for implementing the transparency provisions relating to arrests made by the police.