



WHITE PAPER



And



IC Centre for Governance

STATE OF POLICING AND LAW & ORDER IN Delhi November 2016



Table of Contents

Sr. No.	Title	Page No.
I	I. Acknowledgements	4
II	II. Foreword	5
III	Part A – Summary Section for Delhi	6
IV	Section I. Crime Statistics	6
V	Section II. Status on Police Reforms	15
VI	Section III. Police Personnel	17
VII	Section IV. Deliberations by Delhi MPs	21
VIII	Part B – Citizen Survey Data	23
IX	Section I. Survey Statistics as per Areas of Delhi as per Member of Parliament Constituencies	23
X	Section II. A) Survey Statistics for Respondents who have witnessed crime (Table 21, 22 & 23)	24
XI	Section II. B) Survey Statistics for Respondents who have faced crime (Table 24, 25 & 26)	27
XII	Section III. Survey Statistics as per SEC (Socio-Economic Classification)	30
XIII	Annexure 1 – Sources of Data	33
XIV	Annexure 2 – Survey Methodology	34
XV	Annexure 3 – Socio Economic Classification (SEC) Note	35
Tables		
1	Table 1 : Crimes reported in Delhi	6
2	Table 2: District-wise crime reported in 2014 & 2015	7
3	Table 3 : Specific Crime’s highest occurrences district wise	8
4	Table 4 : Cases registered under POCSO Act during 2014 & 2015	9
5	Table 5: Offender relation, nearness to victims of Rape	9
6	Table 6 : Cases Investigated from Crime in India Report for the Year 2014 to 2015	10
7	Table 7 : Trial Cases from Crime in India Report for the Year 2014 to 2015	12
8	Table 8 : Custodial Deaths for the year 2014 to 2015	14
9	Table 9 : Statement of complaints received/cases registered	15
10	Table 10 : Statement of police personnel involved/action taken	16
11	Table 11 : Departmental action/punishment	16
12	Table 12 : Designation wise number of Police Personnel sanctioned and working (as of Mar 2016)	17
13	Table 13 : Designation wise number of police personnel different between working forces in year 2015 to 2016	18
14	Table 14 : Police Personnel details based on Areas of Delhi (163 Police Stations)	19
15	Table 15 : Police Personnel details based on Department	20
16	Table 16 : Police Personnel details based on Supervisory level officer (as on 31st Mar 2016)	20
17	Table 17: Number of questions asked on crime issues during the Budget session 2014 to Budget session 2016	21



18	Table 18: Issues-wise no. of question asked on crime	22
19	Table 19: Percentage of people who feel unsafe in Delhi?	23
20	Table 20: Percentage of respondents who have witnessed or faced crime	23
21	Table 21: Respondents who <i>witnessed</i> crime and have informed police and their satisfaction	24
22	Table 22: Medium of Informing Police by respondents who have <i>witnessed</i> crime	25
23	Table 23: Reason for not informing Police by respondents who have <i>witnessed</i> crime	26
24	Table 24: Respondents who <i>faced</i> crime and have informed police and their satisfaction	27
25	Table 25: Medium of Informing Police by respondents who have <i>faced</i> crime	28
26	Table 26: Reason for not informing police by respondents who have faced crime	29
27	Table 27: Percentage of people who feel unsafe in Delhi of different socio-economic classes	30
28	Table 28: Respondents who <i>witnessed</i> crime or faced crime who have informed police and their satisfaction	30
29	Table 29: Medium of Informing Police by respondents	31
30	Table 30: Reason for not informing police of different socio-economic classes	32



I. Acknowledgements

Praja has obtained all the data reported in this white paper through right to information requests made under the Right to Information Act, 2005. We gratefully acknowledge all the officials of the Delhi Police who diligently provided this voluminous information. We are also most grateful to - our Elected Representatives, the Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) and journalists who utilise and publicise our data and, by doing so, ensure that awareness regarding issues we discuss is spread to a diverse and wide ranging population. We would also like to extend our gratitude to all government officials for their cooperation and support.

This White Paper has been made possible by the support provided to us by our supporters and we would like to take this opportunity to express our sincere gratitude to them. We would like to thank the Initiative of Change (IC) Centre for Governance, a prominent organisation working on improving governance structures. Their insights into the policing and law & order situation in Delhi helped us to conduct this study.

Praja Foundation appreciates the support given by our supporters and donors, namely European Union Fund, Dasra, TATA Trusts, Friedrich Naumann Foundation, Narotam Sekhsaria Foundation and Madhu Mehta Foundation.

We would also like to thank our group of Advisors. Lastly, and most significantly, we gratefully acknowledge the invaluable contribution of all the Praja team members who worked tirelessly to make this report a reality.



European Union

Friedrich Naumann
STIFTUNG

FÜR DIE FREIHEIT



Narotam Sekhsaria Foundation Madhu Mehta Foundation

TATA TRUSTS

SIR DORABJI TATA TRUST • SIR RATAN TATA TRUST
JAMSETJI TATA TRUST • N.R. TATA TRUST • J.R.D. TATA TRUST

Tata Trusts have supported Praja Foundation in this project. The Trusts believe in a society of well-informed citizens and it is to this effect that Tata Trusts supports Praja's efforts to communicate with and enable citizens to interact with their administration through innovative and effective methods.



II. Foreword

There is a crisis brewing in Delhi, a crisis that this city is becoming unliveable for the common women and men. The foul air, the dismal state of civic services, the dread of disease and along with that the constant fear of Crime. Delhi exists only for the rich and the powerful who live behind high walls and air-conditioned homes. While the common women and men are constantly left to fend for themselves.

This white paper for crime is a reflection of all that has gone wrong in Delhi.

Six rapes, nearly two murders and 215 burglary/theft and robbery, every day is the abysmal state of law and order in Delhi. There has been a dangerous increase of 16% in Murder and 13% in Rapes since last year. The people are losing faith in the state to give them protection, our household survey of over 29,950 households' shows that 60% of the population does not feel safe in Delhi 67% feel that Delhi is not safe for women, children and senior citizens, and 64% do not feel safe traveling within Delhi. Also shocking is the fact that 25% of people who have faced a crime have not informed the police because they do not have faith in the police and the legal system.

The central government which is in charge of policing in Delhi has promised along with state government to take steps to protect the citizens of Delhi but most of the promises are not fulfilled:

- Adequate street lights were promised, so that women feel safer in their streets;
- Last Mile connectivity by making public transport feasible;
- Closed circuit cameras in public spaces to keep an eye on miscreant behaviour for ensuring better safety of women;
- Better judiciary response and speedy trial, delivering justice to women.

The dismal interest of Delhi's MPs (Members of Parliament) is very evident – they have only raised 9 questions in Budget 2014 to Budget 2015 and 10 questions in Monsoon 2015 to Budget 2016 on the issue of crime and policing in Delhi.

The recommended State Security Commission (SSC) mechanism, which would consist of the Lt. Governor, Chief Minister of Delhi, Commissioner of Police, Leader of Opposition and other functionaries, for the smooth functioning of the Delhi Police, is yet to be formed.

How long will this go on? What will it take for the Government to act? We need to pressurise this Government to implement the long standing recommendations of the Supreme Court on Police Reform. We need to see our Elected Representatives taking active and constant interest in on issues of Law and Order. Till this is not done we will continue to see a slide towards lawlessness in Delhi.

NITAI MEHTA

Managing Trustee, Praja Foundation



Part A – Summary Section for Delhi

Section I. Crime Statistics

Table 1 : Crimes reported in Delhi

Specific Crimes Reported	2014	2015	% Increase 2014 to 2015
Murder (Sec.302)	554	640	16%
Attempt to Murder (Sec.307)	757	835	10%
Rape (Sec.376)	2075	2338	13%
Molestation (Sec.354,354A,B,C,D)	4717	4347	-8%
Riots (Sec.147-151,153A)	153	179	17%
Kidnapping / Abduction (Sec.363-369,364A)	7187	7940	10%
Burglary (Day and Night) (Sec.454,457)	10282	13577	32%
Chain Snatching (Sec.356)	7170	4729	-34%
Robbery / Dacoity (Sec.392-395,397,398)	6470	8607	33%
Accident / Fatal Accident (Sec. 279 with 337,338 or 304A)	8277	8637	4%
Theft (Sec.379 to 381)	51860	56192	8%
Extortion (Sec.384-389)	236	285	21%

Inference:

Rape has increased by 13% while molestation of women has decreased by 8% from 2014 to 2015. 16% and 17% increment in Murder and Riot in last one year. Robbery / Dacoity has increased by 33%.



Table 2: District-wise crime reported in 2014 & 2015

Nature of Crime		Murder (Sec. 302)	Attempt to Murder (Sec. 307)	Rape (Sec. 376)	Molestation (Sec.35 4,354A ,B,C,D)	Riots (Sec.14 7-151, 153A)	Kidnapping /Abduction (Sec.363-369,364A)	Burglary (Day and Night) (Sec.454 ,457)	Chain Snatching (Sec.35 6)	Robbery / Dacoity (Sec.392-395,397,3 98)	Accident / Fatal Accident (Sec. 279 with 337,338 or 304A)	Theft (Sec. 379 to 381)	Extortion (Sec.384-389)
Central	2014	29	43	84	213	5	316	606	550	301	396	3097	18
	2015	43	67	115	106	21	503	1358	647	437	475	3666	8
West	2014	58	76	250	484	3	860	970	1279	584	922	6067	17
	2015	70	94	269	462	7	854	1576	722	723	875	6792	39
East	2014	60	93	229	502	23	687	992	1005	789	802	6279	38
	2015	39	85	235	490	8	714	1013	425	817	771	4138	47
Outer	2014	87	88	269	460	13	1206	1818	1087	1014	1083	7396	27
	2015	126	108	312	464	19	1294	2535	1719	1537	1044	9362	64
New Delhi	2014	5	7	18	54	21	49	54	93	60	270	936	7
	2015	8	5	20	43	7	56	50	36	106	307	1021	6
North	2014	30	28	62	180	14	277	675	447	366	559	3465	15
	2015	26	24	50	153	7	312	791	60	514	580	3898	6
North East	2014	77	111	251	569	30	1035	1039	786	1287	658	4462	32
	2015	126	152	370	743	62	1338	1773	296	2006	1170	5459	19
North West	2014	41	84	146	405	6	684	926	513	745	659	5344	11
	2015	47	80	183	351	9	745	1097	172	860	724	5745	22
South	2014	40	57	268	862	15	639	1246	409	505	918	6413	24
	2015	33	57	321	627	12	522	1060	209	658	845	6695	22
South East	2014	65	83	253	461	19	701	1050	402	402	1022	5124	19
	2015	52	87	237	403	9	843	1296	199	380	933	5714	19
South West	2014	61	87	245	515	4	730	905	599	413	960	3124	27
	2015	70	76	225	495	18	756	1028	244	569	880	3579	33
Airport	2014	1	0	0	12	0	3	1	0	4	28	153	1
	2015	0	0	1	10	0	3	0	0	0	33	123	0
Total	2014	554	757	2075	4717	153	7187	10282	7170	6470	8277	51860	236
	2015	640	835	2338	4347	179	7940	13577	4729	8607	8637	56192	285

Inference:

Above mention data shows that maximum number of heinous crimes is happening in North East District.

Highest number of rape (370), murder (126), attempt to murder (152) and kidnapping / abduction (1338) happened in North East District in 2015. Maximum number of cases of molestation of women, 743 also happened in North East District in 2015 which is less than maximum cases, 862 in South District in 2014. Highest number of cases happened in Delhi, registered in 2015 were of theft (56,192).



Table 3 : Specific Crime's highest occurrences district-wise

Sr.no	Crime	2014		2015	
		Zone of Delhi	Occurrence	Zone of Delhi	Occurrence
1	Murder	Outer	87	Outer & North East	126
2	Attempt to murder	North East	111	North East	152
3	Rape	Outer	269	North East	370
6	Molestation	South	862	North East	743
7	Riots	North East	30	North East	62
8	Kidnapping / Abduction	Outer	1206	North East	1338
10	Burglary (Day and Night)	Outer	1818	Outer	2535
11	Chain Snatching	West	1279	Outer	1719
12	Robbery / Dacoity	North East	1287	North East	2006
13	Accident / Fatal Accident	Outer	1083	North East	1170
14	Theft	Outer	7396	Outer	9362
15	Extortion	East	38	Outer	64

Inference:

The above table represents the highest reported crimes in a particular district of Delhi in 2014 and 2015. Heinous crimes like Attempt to Murder (152), Rape (370), Molestation (743), Riot (62), Kidnapping/Abduction (1338), Robbery/Dacoity (2006) and Accident (1170) have highest reporting in the North East District in 2015.

It should also be noted that North East District also has a shortfall of 9% police personnel (refer table 14).

Remaining crimes like Murder (126), Burglary (Day and Night) (2535), Chain Snatching (1719), Theft (9362) and Extortion (64) were highest in Outer District.



Table 4 : Cases registered under POCSO Act during 2014 & 2015

Sr. No.	Type of Assault	Number of Cases reported		Number of Victims									
				Below 6 years		6 years & above - Below 12 years		12 years & above - Below 16 years		16 years & above - Below 18 years		Total Victims	
		2014	2015	2014	2015	2014	2015	2014	2015	2014	2015	2014	2015
1	Incest Rape cases	84	52	6	0	18	8	38	28	22	16	84	52
2	Other Rape cases	924	876	65	81	110	138	348	366	401	291	924	876
Total (under POCSO)		1008	928	71	81	128	146	386	394	423	307	1008	928
Total Rapes		2075	2338										

Inference:

7.9% decrease in the number of reported rape case for victims below 18 years from 2014 to 2015. Maximum number of incest (54%) and other (42%) rape cases happened with victims 12 years & above - below 16 years in 2015. 40% of total reported rape case victims were below 18 years in 2015 while in 2014 it was 49%.

Table 5: Offender relation, nearness to victims of Rape

Year	No. of cases in which offenders were known to the	No. of cases in which offenders were								No. of cases which offenders could not be identified or unknown to the victim
		Grand Father/Father/Brother/son (Incest Rapes)	Close Family members (Other than)	Relatives (Other than)	Neighbours	Employer /Co-workers	Live in Partner or Husband (Separated) or Ex - Husband	Known Persons on pretext or promise to marry the victim	Other Known Persons	
2014	2013	140	123	180	409	78	*	*	1083	*
2015	2124	77	94	125	698	65	101	224	740	75

Inference:

5% increase in the number of cases where offenders were known to the victim, from 2014 to 2015. In 2015, number of cases where rape has been committed by live in partner has been recorded as 224.

Note: * means 2014 data is not available for these.



Table 6 : Cases Investigated from Crime in India Report for the Year 2014 to 2015

Year	Pending investigation from early year	Cases Reported in the current year	Not investigated/ Refused	Classified final as (Statement B/C ¹)	Final reports sent (Statement A)	Cases sent-up from current year (Charge sheet)	Pending investigation as of December of the current year
	<i>CLASS - II SERIOUS OFFENCES (Cases including murder, rape, grievous hurt, kidnapping, abduction etc.)</i>						
2014	9181	18876	32	2663	2665	8141	14556
2015	14556	20324	66	3431	3748	8838	18755
	<i>Other IPC crimes</i>						
2014	41306	136778	22	1400	52572	29393	94697
2015	94692	171053	62	1160	95070	35241	134178
	<i>Total</i>						
2014	50487	155654	54	4063	55237	37534	109253
2015	109248	191377	128	4591	98818	44079	152933

¹After an FIR is registered and investigation completed either in the case a charge sheet is filed and the case is sent to the courts for trials (Cases Sent-up) or the case is classified as Statement A (mentioned above as 'Final Reports Sent' meaning cases in which charge sheet was not filed but investigation completed. In colloquial police vocabulary Statement A is also known as 'Case True but not Detected') or the case is classified as B/C (meaning cases declared false or mistake of fact or law).



Inferences:

A total of 2,06,141² cases were investigated in the year 2014 and 3,00,625³ cases in the year 2015. Of which investigation was completed in 96,888⁴ cases in the year 2014 and 1,47,616⁵ cases in 2015. Compared to 2014, investigation of 50,728 cases was more in the year 2015.

Of this 1,47,616 cases, 67% of the (a total of 98,818) cases were found to be true but were not detected; and 30% (a total 44,079) cases were sent up for trials. While, investigation in 51% of the (a total of 1,52,933) cases registered in 2015 or that may have been registered prior to 2015 is yet pending for completion of investigation.

Of the total (2,06,141) cases, 14% (a total of 28,057⁶) in 2014 and the total (3,00,625) cases, 12% (a total of 34,880⁷) in 2015 are related to Class II (Serious Offences). Of the above classification of crime, Class II (Serious Offences) is the most crucial.

A total of 34,880 cases (Class II serious offences) were investigated in the calendar year 2015. Of which investigation was completed of 16,083⁸ cases in 2015. Of these 16,083 cases, 23% (a total of 3,748) cases were found to be true but were not detected; and 55% (a total of 8,838) of the cases were sent up for trials. While, investigation in 54% of the (a total of 34,880) cases registered in 2015 or that may have been registered prior to 2015 is yet pending completion of investigation i.e. in 18,755 cases.

² Sum of pending investigation from early year (50,487) and cases reported in the current year (1,55,654).

³ Sum of pending investigation from early year (1,09,248) and cases reported in the current year (1,91,377).

⁴ Sum of not investigated/refused (54), classified final (4,063), final reports sent (55,237) and cases sent-up from current year (37,534).

⁵ Sum of not investigated/refused (128), classified final (4,591), final reports sent (98,818) and cases sent-up from current year (44,079).

⁶ Sum of pending investigation from early year (9,181) and case reported in the current year (18,876) of Class – II Serious offences.

⁷ Sum of pending investigation from early year (14,556) and case reported in the current year (20,324) of Class – II Serious offences.

⁸ Sum of not investigated/refused (66), classified final (3,431), final reports sent (3,748) and cases sent-up from current year (8,838) of Class – II Serious offences.



Table 7 : Trial Cases from Crime in India Report for the Year 2014 to 2015

Trial Cases for the year – 2014 to 2015								
Year	Pending Trial from early year	Cases sent-up in the current year	Compounded	Withdrawn	Acquitted	Convicted		Pending Trial as of December of the current year
						In no.	In %	
<i>CLASS - II SERIOUS OFFENCES (Cases including murder, rape, grievous hurt, kidnapping, abduction etc.)</i>								
2014	23584	8141	221	27	2504	1672	38	27301
2015	27301	8838	150	2	2373	1455	37	32159
<i>Other IPC crimes</i>								
2014	112729	29393	738	251	12167	9694	42	119272
2015	119286	35241	682	282	7773	8373	49	137417
<i>Total</i>								
2014	136313	37534	959	278	14671	11366	42	146573
2015	146587	44079	832	284	10146	9828	47	169576



Inference:

A total of 1,73,847⁹ cases were tried in the courts in year 2014 and a total of 1,90,666¹⁰ cases in 2015. Of which trial was completed in 16% (a total of 27,274¹¹) cases in year 2014 and in the year 2015 trial was completed in 11% (a total of 21,090¹²) cases and judgement was given.

In the year 2014, of the 27,274 cases in which judgments was given, 42% of the (a total of 11,366) cases were convicted. Similarly, in the year 2015, of the 21,090 cases in which judgments was given, 47% of the (a total of 9,828) cases were convicted.

It should be noted that here the judgments for the case is considered and not for individual persons who are accused e.g. if there are three accused in the particular case and only one gets convicted then the entire case is treated as convicted, only when all three are acquitted then only the case is considered as acquitted for the above statistics.

While in the year 2014, 84% of the (a total of 1,46,573) cases and in the year 2015; 89% of the (a total of 169,576) cases were sent for trials are yet pending judgments.

Of the total (1,73,847) cases, 18% (a total of 31,725¹³) in year 2014 and the total (1,90,666) cases, 19% (a total of 36,139¹⁴) in year 2015 are related to Class II (Serious Offences). Of the above classification of crime, Class II (Serious Offences) is the most crucial.

A total of 36,139 cases (Class II serious offences) were tried in the courts in the calendar year 2015. Of which trial was completed in 11% (a total of 3,980¹⁵) cases and judgement was given. Of this 3,980 cases in which judgement was given, only 37% of the (a total of 1,455) cases were convicted; while the 60% cases were acquitted, 4% cases were compounded and withdrawn.

Sum of Pending Trial from early year (23,584) and Cases sent-up in the current year (8,141) of Class – II Serious offences.

⁹Sum of Pending trial from early year (1,36,313) and Cases sent-up in the current year (37,534).

¹⁰Sum of Pending trial from early year (1,46,587) and Cases sent-up in the current year (44,079).

¹¹Sum of Compounded (959), Withdrawn (278), Acquitted (14,671) and Convicted (11,366).

¹²Sum of Compounded (832), Withdrawn (284), Acquitted (10,146) and Convicted (9,828).

¹³Sum of Pending Trial from early year (23,584) and Cases sent-up in the current year (8,141) of Class – II Serious offences

¹⁴Sum of Pending Trial from early year (27,301) and Cases sent-up in the current year (8,838) of Class – II Serious offences.

¹⁵Sum of Compounded (150), Withdrawn (2), Acquitted (2,373) and Convicted (1,455) of Class – II Serious offences.



Table 8 : Custodial Deaths for the year 2014 to 2015

		2014	2015
1	Deaths in Police Custody (of persons REMANDED to police custody by court)		
1.1	No. of Deaths or Disappearance reported	0	0
1.2	No. of Autopsy conducted	0	0
1.3	No. of Judicial enquiry ordered	0	0
1.4	No. of Judicial enquiry conducted	0	0
1.5	No. of Cases registered in connection with deaths against police personnel	0	0
1.6	No. of Policemen Charge-sheeted	0	0
1.7	No. of Policemen Convicted	0	0
2	Deaths in Police Custody (of persons NOT REMANDED to police custody by court)		
2.1	No. of Deaths or Disappearance reported	0	1
2.2	No. of Autopsy conducted	0	0
2.3	No. of Magisterial Enquiry ordered/Conducted	0	0
2.4	No. of Judicial Enquiry ordered/Conducted	0	0
2.5	No. of Cases registered in connection with deaths against police personnel	0	1
2.6	No. of Policemen Charge-sheeted	0	0
2.7	No. of Policemen Convicted	0	0
3	No. of Deaths in Police Custody due to		
3.1	Injuries sustained during the police custody due to physical assault by police	0	0
3.2	Injuries sustained prior to police custody	0	0
3.3	Mob Attack or Riots	0	0
3.4	Assault by other Criminals	0	0
3.5	Suicide	0	0
3.6	While Escaping from Custody	0	0
3.7	Illness	0	0
3.8	Natural Death	0	0
3.9	Road Accidents/Journey connected with Investigation	0	0
3.1	Hospitalization	0	1
3.11	Others	0	0
	Total	0	1

Inference:

The above data shows there was no custodial death occurred in 2014 while in 2015 one person died and case for it has been registered.



Section II. Status on Police Reforms

Since the formation of the AAP government, **State Security Commission** has not been formed as per the Supreme Court given ten years back on the 22nd of September 2006.

On dated 27th February 2012, Govt. of N.C.T of Delhi has set up **Police Complaint Authority** vide **Resolution No.F.12/04/2011/AR/1630-1789/C** It will deal with the complaints of public regarding acts of serious misconduct by the policemen/officers of Delhi Police such as death in Police custody, grievous hurt caused by Police, rape or attempt to rape, illegal detention, extortion, land/house grabbing or any serious abuse of authority. People can lodge a complaint in Police Complaints Authority (PCA) in the prescribed format either personally or through post or by E-mail.

Table 9 : Statement of complaints received/cases registered

Year	No. of Complaints received during the year	No. of Inquiry Instituted			No. of criminal cases registered during the year	Complaints/ Cases declared false/ unsubstantiated after enquiry/ investigation during the year	No. of cases Charge sheeted during the year	No. of Cases Police Personnel Charge - Sheeted	No. of Police Personnel arrested during the year
		Departmental	Magisterial	Judicial					
2014	11902	540	0	0	173	237	0	0	0
2015	12913	837	0	0	145	346	7	7	0

Number of complaints received in 2015 against Police was 12,913 from which 346 were declared false. Only 145 criminal cases were registered but no police personnel got arrested.



Table 10 : Statement of police personnel involved/action taken

Year	No. of Police personnel sent up for Trial during the year	No. of Police Personnel whose cases were withdrawn or otherwise disposed of	No. of Police Personnel in whose cases the Trials were completed during the year	Number of Police Personnel	
				Convicted	Acquitted
2014	0	0	0	0	0
2015	7	0	0	0	0

Not a single police personnel was send for trial in 2014 while 7 were send in 2015.

Table 11 : Departmental action/punishment

Year	No. of Police Personnel against whom disciplinary action initiated during the year	No. of Police Personnel awarded minor punishments summarily (before enquiry)	No. of Police Personnel whose cases were withdrawn or otherwise disposed of	Number of Police personnel in whose cases enquiries were conducted during the year	Number of Police Personnel			No. of departmental enquiries in which charges were not proved and filed	No. of departmental enquiries pending at the end of the year
					Dismissal/Removal from Service	Major Punishment	Minor Punishment		
2014	899	0	749	0	68	346	137	0	0
2015	1057	0	652	0	69	292	124	0	0

In 2015, out of 1057 cases registered against police 62% were either withdrawn or disposed, 69 were dismissed and 292 got major punishment.



Section III. Police Personnel

Table 12 : Designation wise number of Police Personnel sanctioned and working (as of Mar 2016)

Sr. No.	Designation	Sanctioned	Working in Mar'16	Difference between Sanctioned and Working (Mar'16)	% Difference between Sanctioned and Working
1	Commissioner of Police (C.P.)	1	1	0	0%
2	Special Commissioner of Police	10	13	3	30%
3	Joint Commissioner of Police (Jt. C.P.)	20	21	1	5%
4	Additional Commissioner of Police (Addl. C.P.)	19	8	-11	-58%
5	Deputy Commissioner of Police (D.C.P.)	53	49	-4	-8%
6	Additional Deputy Commissioner of Police (Addl. C.P.)	54	29	-25	-46%
7	Assistant Commissioner of Police (A.C.P.)	348	270	-78	-22%
8	Police Inspector (P.I.)	1350	1323	-27	-2%
9	Police Sub - Inspector (P.S.I.)	6111	5587	-524	-9%
10	Assistant Police Sub-Inspector (A.S.I.)	6752	6707	-45	-1%
11	Head Constable (H.C.)	20841	18971	-1870	-9%
12	Police Constable (P.C.)	46819	43258	-3561	-8%
Total Police Force		82378	76237	-6141	-7%

Inference:

Apart from Special Commissioner of Police which has 30% and Joint C.P has increased 5% more working personnel than sanction every other designation is under staff like Additional Commissioner of Police (Addl. C.P.) has shortfall of 58% even Police Sub - Inspector (P.S.I.) is working with 9% less staff. Overall, the current police force has a 7% shortfall of personnel in Delhi.



Table 13 : Designation wise number of police personnel different between working forces in year 2015 to 2016

Sr. No.	Designation	Sanctioned	Working in 2016	Working in 2015	Difference between working forces in 2016 & 2015
1	Commissioner of Police (C.P.)	1	1	1	0
2	Special Commissioner of Police	10	13	14	-1
3	Joint Commissioner of Police (Jt. C.P.)	20	21	22	-1
4	Additional Commissioner of Police (Addl. C.P.)	19	8	12	-4
5	Deputy Commissioner of Police (D.C.P.)	53	49	46	3
6	Additional Deputy Commissioner of Police (Addl. D.C.P.)	54	29	32	-3
7	Assistant Commissioner of Police (A.C.P.)	348	270	224	46
8	Police Inspector (P.I.)	1350	1323	1326	-3
9	Police Sub - Inspector (P.S.I.)	6111	5587	5630	-43
10	Assistant Police Sub-Inspector (A.S.I)	6752	6707	6558	149
11	Head Constable (H.C.)	20841	18971	18994	-23
12	Police Constable (P.C.)	46819	43258	44258	-1000
Total Police Force		82378	76237	77117	-880

Inference:

The data shows that currently Delhi has sanctioned 82,378 police personnel however only 76,237 police personnel are working (difference of 6141), a gap of only 7%. But from 2015 to 2016, the number of working police personnel rather than increasing has decreased by 880. Assistant Police Sub-Inspector have an increase of 149 personnel while Police Sub-Inspector has shortfall of 43 personnel.



Table 14 : Police Personnel details based on Areas of Delhi (163 Police Stations)

Sr. No.	Area of Delhi	No. of Police Station	Police Personnel Sanctioned (Mar'16)	Police Personnel Working (Jan'15)	Difference between Sanctioned and Working (Jan'15)	% difference between Sanctioned and Working (Jan'15)	Police Personnel Working (Mar'16)	Difference between Sanctioned and Working (Mar'16)	% Difference between Sanctioned and Working (Mar'16)
1	Central	15	3350	3030	-409	-12%	2978	-372	-11%
2	West	17	3484	3274	-305	-9%	3235	-249	-7%
3	East	16	3408	3242	-262	-7%	3200	-208	-6%
4	Outer	15	4080	3811	-364	-9%	3741	-339	-8%
5	New Delhi	7	2484	2203	-345	-14%	2263	-221	-9%
6	North	13	3178	2958	-319	-10%	2824	-354	-11%
7	North East	16	3618	3375	-336	-9%	3292	-326	-9%
8	North West	14	3241	3040	-299	-9%	3010	-231	-7%
9	South	16	4055	3641	-512	-12%	3510	-545	-13%
10	South East	17	4005	3497	-608	-15%	3600	-405	-10%
11	South West	15	2912	2964	-45	-1%	2867	-45	-2%
12	Airport	2	525	457	-81	-15%	463	-62	-12%
	Total	163	38340	35492	-3885	-10%	34983	-3357	-9%

Inference:

Overall, there has been 9% decline in the shortfall. South District has the highest percentage of difference between sanctioned and working personnel in 2016 (13%). Whereas South West has only 2% shortfall which is better than other districts.



Table 15 : Police Personnel details based on Department

Sr. No.	Department	Police Personnel Sanctioned	Police Personnel Working (Mar'16)	Police Personnel Working (Jan'15)	Difference between Sanctioned and Working (Jan'15)	% difference between Sanctioned and Working (Jan'15)	Difference between Sanctioned and Working (Mar'16)	% Difference between Sanctioned and Working (Mar'16)
1	Crime Branch	1349	1412	1363	19	1%	63	5%
2	Delhi Arm Force	9614	7943	8005	-1446	-15%	-1671	-17%
4	Security	7163	7266	6441	-677	-10%	103	1%
5	SPUW & C ¹⁶	292	348	331	44	15%	56	19%
6	Traffic	5984	5679	5744	-159	-3%	-305	-5%
7	Other	19131	18215	19390	96	0%	-916	-5%
	Total	43533	40863	41274	-2123	-5%	-2670	-6%

Inference:

Overall there is 6% shortage of number of police personnel working in various department. 17% shortage of police personnel in Delhi Arm Force. 56 police personnel are working more in SPUW & C than sanctioned number.

Table 16 : Police Personnel details based on Supervisory level officer (as on 31st Mar 2016)

Supervisory level officer	Police Personnel Sanctioned	Police Personnel Working (Jan'15)	Difference between Sanctioned and Working (Jan'15)	% Difference between Sanctioned and Working (Jan'15)	Police Personnel Working (Mar'16)	Difference between Sanctioned and Working (Mar'16)	% Difference between Sanctioned and Working
C.P., Special C.P., Jt. C.P., Addl. C.P., D.C.P. Addl.DCP and A.C.P.	505	351	-154	-30%	391	-114	-23%

Inference:

The above mention data shows the gap between police personnel sanctioned for supervisory level officer and actually working for the year 2016 which is 23% i.e. 391 officers are working while 505 posts are there.

¹⁶ SPUW & C - Special Police Unit for Women and Child



Section IV. Deliberations by Delhi MPs

Table 17: Number of question asked on crime issues during the Budget session 2014 to Budget session 2016

Name of MPs	No. of questions asked on crime issues		Total questions	
	Budget 2014 to Budget 2015	Monsoon 2015 to Budget 2016	Budget 2014 to Budget 2015	Monsoon 2015 to Budget 2016
Meenakshi Lekhi	1	2	105	101
Maheish Girri	4	4	127	109
Manoj Tiwari	0	0	5	20
Parvesh Sahib Singh	1	0	29	18
Ramesh Bidhuri	0	1	22	47
Udit Raj	3	3	42	78
Total	9	10	330	373

Inferences:

The above data represents question asked by MPs on crime and police personnel/infrastructure from Budget 2014 to Budget 2015 and Monsoon 2015 to Budget 2016. Maheish Girri has asked maximum questions, 4 in above mention sessions while Manoj Tiwari has not asked even a single question on crime.

Total questions asked during Budget 2014 to Budget 2015 were 330 from which only 9 were on crime and 10 questions from 373 asked during Monsoon 2015 to Budget 2016 were on crime.



Table 18: Issues-wise no. of question asked on crime

Issues	No. of question asked on crime	
	Budget 2014 to Budget 2015	Monsoon 2015 to Budget 2016
Cyber Crime	2	1
First Information Report (FIR)	1	3
Human Resources Related	3	0
Police Station Infrastructure	1	1
Women Issues Related	1	1
Prison Custody	0	1
Illegal Immigrants	1	0
Schemes Policies in Crime	0	2
Terrorism/Naxals/Extremists Related	0	1
Total	9	10

Inference:

Maximum questions (3) in Budget 2014 to Budget 2015 were Human Resources Related while maximum 3 in Monsoon 2015 to Budget 2016 were asked on First Information Report (FIR).



Part B – Citizen Survey Data

Section I. Survey Statistics as per Areas of Delhi as per Member of Parliament Constituencies

Table 19: Percentage of people who feel unsafe in Delhi?

Percentage of Respondents ¹⁷ who feel unsafe in Delhi	Area of Delhi ¹⁸							Delhi	Mumbai
	North West Delhi	North East Delhi	Chandni Chowk	New Delhi	West Delhi	South Delhi	East Delhi		
Percentage of people not feeling secure in Delhi	48%	58%	61%	65%	55%	69%	67%	60%	29%
Percentage of people not feeling secure for women, children and senior citizens are in one's locality	58%	60%	75%	67%	67%	70%	74%	67%	33%
Percentage of people not feeling secure while travelling from one place to another within the city	54%	58%	67%	68%	68%	69%	68%	64%	31%

Inference:

- 60 % of people feel unsafe in Delhi in which highest number 69% are from South Delhi
- 64% do not feel safe while travelling within the city and maximum feel are from South Delhi (69%)
- 67% feels women, children and senior citizens are unsafe in which maximum are from Chandni Chowk i.e. 75%

While two third of Delhi are concerned about security of women, children and senior citizens, in Mumbai one third feel the same (According to Praja’s annual survey of households).

Table 20: Percentage of respondents who have witnessed or faced crime

9% respondents have witnessed crime of the nature of accident, theft, murder, etc.

Amongst those who witnessed, 52% of the Respondents have faced crime of the nature of accident, theft, murder, etc.

¹⁷Data based on a household survey of 29,950 respondents across the city of Delhi. Kindly refer to Annexure 2 for more details on the survey methodology.

¹⁸North West Delhi includes: Civil Line, Narela, Rohini; North East Delhi includes: Civil Line, Shahadra North; Chandni Chowk includes: City, Civil Line, Karol Bagh, Paharganj, Rohini; New Delhi includes: Central Zone, Karol Bagh, Paharganj, South; West Delhi includes: Najafgarh and West; South Delhi includes: Central Zone, Najafgarh and South and East Delhi includes: Central Zone, Shahadra North and Shahadra South Zone.



Section II. A) Survey Statistics for Respondents who have *witnessed* crime (Table 21, 22 & 23)

Table 21: Respondents who *witnessed* crime and have informed police and their satisfaction

	North West Delhi	North East Delhi	Chandni Chowk	New Delhi	West Delhi	South Delhi	East Delhi	Delhi	Mumbai
Percentage of respondents who <i>witnessed</i> crime	10%	12%	7%	11%	10%	4%	12%	9%	5%
Percentage of respondents who have witnessed crime and have informed police	47%	39%	49%	35%	49%	48%	50%	45%	50%
Percentage of respondents who had witnessed crime and informed police and were satisfied with their response	30%	23%	52%	46%	18%	17%	28%	29%	64%

Inference:

- Cases of crime are higher in North East Delhi and East Delhi where 12% of the respondents have witnessed crime.
- Amongst those who have witnessed, 45% of them have informed the police and only 29% were satisfied with the response.
 - A higher percentage of East Delhi residents (50%) informed the police about crime but only 28% of them got satisfactory response.
 - Response of Police from Chandni Chowk was most satisfactory at 52% even though maximum number of people (75%) feel women, children and senior citizens are unsafe here (refer table 19).

Satisfaction level of respondents who witnessed crime and informed police is 64% in Mumbai while for Delhi it is only 29%.



Table 22: Medium of Informing Police by respondents who have *witnessed* crime

	North West Delhi	North East Delhi	Chandni Chowk	New Delhi	West Delhi	South Delhi	East Delhi	Delhi	Mumbai
Called the helpline numbers like 100/103 etc.	64%	69%	49%	47%	76%	80%	44%	61%	57%
Called on the local telephone number of the police station	13%	18%	24%	19%	12%	9%	26%	18%	12%
Personally visited the nearest police station and complained	11%	9%	20%	21%	5%	5%	19%	12%	20%
Personally visited the nearest police station and registered an FIR	6%	2%	7%	4%	1%	4%	7%	4%	9%
Others	5%	2%	1%	9%	6%	2%	4%	4%	3%

Inference:

- Common helpline numbers (61%) and Personal visits (12%) are the prominent modes of informing the police officials about the Crime.
- Residents in South Delhi prefer to call the common helpline (80%) while residents in New Delhi prefer to visit the police station personally (21%).
- Only 4% of entire city residents have personally visited the nearest police station and registered an FIR

Number of people who visited police station personally is 20% in Mumbai but only 12% in Delhi. Even though a person who went and logged FIR is more or less similar i.e. 9% Mumbai while 4% Delhi.



Table 23: Reason for not informing Police by respondents who have *witnessed* crime

	North West Delhi	North East Delhi	Chandni Chowk	New Delhi	West Delhi	South Delhi	East Delhi	Delhi	Mumbai
I don't have the time for all this	25%	21%	11%	17%	12%	33%	11%	18%	27%
I don't have any faith in the police / legal system	24%	21%	31%	28%	14%	27%	42%	26%	13%
Speaking to the police officials is a painful task	14%	13%	14%	24%	16%	11%	21%	16%	9%
I don't think it's my duty to inform them	5%	9%	9%	11%	6%	7%	9%	8%	7%
I don't want to get involved in any trouble	15%	10%	9%	12%	8%	7%	9%	10%	11%
Others	17%	27%	26%	8%	45%	17%	7%	21%	33%

Inference:

- **Overall 26% respondents who witnessed crime did not report because they do not have faith in the police, while only 13% have this view in Mumbai.**
- 18% of citizens across all wards stated lack of time as a major reason for non-reportage of crimes witnessed by them whereas Mumbai has larger number of people 27% in this category.
- 24% of people from New Delhi hesitate to report because they feel speaking to the police officials is a painful task.
- 15% of people from North West Delhi feel that by informing about crime incidences to police, they will invite trouble for themselves.



Section II. B) Survey Statistics for Respondents who have *faced* crime (Table 24, 25 & 26)

Table 24: Respondents who *faced* crime and have informed police and their satisfaction

	North West Delhi	North East Delhi	Chandni Chowk	New Delhi	West Delhi	South Delhi	East Delhi	Delhi	Mumbai
Percentage of respondents who faced crime	58%	52%	53%	46%	48%	46%	57%	52%	46%
Percentage of respondents who have faced crime and have informed police	66%	55%	76%	59%	76%	77%	69%	66%	75%
Percentage of respondents who had faced crime and informed police and were satisfied with their response	28%	15%	55%	48%	16%	20%	31%	28%	63%

- A higher percentage of residents (58%) in North West Delhi have personally faced crime and 66% of them have informed police but only 28% of them were satisfied from police's response. Even the percentage of people satisfied with police response on Entire City level is only 28% while 66% people inform police.
- The number of people who have faced crime is less in Mumbai (46%) than Delhi (52%) but Mumbai (75%) has more people informing police than Delhi (66%) and also they (63%) are more satisfied than Delhi (28%) in police's response.



Table 25: Medium of Informing Police by respondents who have *faced* crime

	North West Delhi	North East Delhi	Chandni Chowk	New Delhi	West Delhi	South Delhi	East Delhi	Delhi	Mumbai
Called the helpline numbers like 100/103 etc.	64%	74%	46%	48%	80%	81%	48%	63%	61%
Called on the local telephone number of the police station	13%	17%	23%	18%	8%	5%	24%	16%	12%
Personally visited the nearest police station and complained	12%	5%	23%	21%	5%	6%	18%	12%	18%
Personally visited the nearest police station and registered an FIR	6%	3%	7%	3%	0%	5%	6%	4%	8%
Others	5%	1%	0%	10%	7%	2%	4%	4%	1%

Inference:

- Even amongst those who faced the crime personally, South Delhi residents preferred to call the common helpline numbers (81%) while Chandni Chowk preferred to visit the police station personally (23%).
- Only 4% people from entire city who have faced crime personally visited the nearest police station and registered an FIR while 63% just call from common helpline numbers.

More people in Mumbai (18%) went to police and Complained than Delhi (12%).



Table 26: Reason for not informing police by respondents who have *faced* crime

	North West Delhi	North East Delhi	Chandni Chowk	New Delhi	West Delhi	South Delhi	East Delhi	Delhi	Mumbai
I don't have the time for all this	32%	16%	10%	22%	20%	17%	13%	20%	26%
I don't have any faith in the police / legal system	20%	19%	34%	27%	9%	26%	44%	25%	13%
Speaking to the police officials is a painful task	11%	15%	19%	33%	4%	9%	14%	15%	12%
I don't think it's my duty to inform them	2%	9%	5%	2%	0%	21%	7%	6%	5%
I don't want to get involved in any trouble	17%	8%	0%	8%	16%	8%	11%	11%	8%
Others	17%	33%	33%	8%	51%	19%	12%	24%	36%

Inference:

- On an average 20% of citizens who faced crime stated lack of time as a major reason for not reporting it and this response was highest in North West Delhi (32%).
- Overall 25% citizens who faced crime did not report because they do not have faith in the police, while 11% did not report as they don't want to get involved in any trouble.
- 17% of North West Delhi did not report crimes to avoid any further trouble due to police involvement.
- 44% of people from East Delhi cited lack of faith as a cause for non-engagement with police.

More percentage of respondents in Delhi don't have any faith in police or legal system i.e. 25% in comparison to Mumbai which have more number of people believing in them.



Section III. Survey Statistics as per SEC (Socio-Economic Classification)¹⁹

Table 27: Percentage of people who feel unsafe in Delhi of different socio-economic classes

	Delhi			Mumbai		
	SEC A	SEC B&C	SEC D&E	SEC A	SEC B&C	SEC D&E
Percentage of people not feeling secure in Delhi	58%	61%	60%	27%	26%	34%
Percentage of people not feeling secure about women, children and senior citizens are in one's locality	64%	67%	67%	29%	30%	38%
Percentage of people not feeling secure while travelling from one place to another within the city	61%	64%	66%	27%	27%	36%

Inference:

People belonging to lower SEC D & E (skilled and unskilled labour class) feel least secure than middle to higher SEC individuals (petty traders, businessman, supervisor, officer etc.) as their women and children feel more vulnerable and it is even hard for them to move around in the city.

Percentage of people of all SEC A, B&C, D&E in all categories feel more secure in Mumbai than Delhi.

Table 28: Respondents who *witnessed* crime or faced crime who have informed police and their satisfaction

	Delhi			Mumbai		
	SEC A	SEC B&C	SEC D&E	SEC A	SEC B&C	SEC D&E
Respondents who <i>witnessed</i> crime & have informed	47%	46%	43%	54%	48%	49%
Respondents who <i>faced</i> crime & have informed	68%	67%	65%	71%	74%	77%
Respondents who had informed police and were satisfied with their response	41%	32%	18%	61%	64%	64%

Inference:

Respondents who witnessed the crime and have informed were highest in SEC A (47%) also they were the ones who are most satisfied with police response received (41%). While, SEC D & E respondents are less keen to inform police when they witness (43%) or face crime (65%), and even their satisfaction level with the response on informing is very low 18%.

The satisfaction level of all SEC about police response is higher in Mumbai but the difference in SEC D&E is very noticeable as it is 64% in Mumbai while only 18% in Delhi.

¹⁹Data based on a household survey of 29,950 respondents across the city of Delhi. Kindly refer to Annexure 3 note on the Socio Economic Classification (SEC).



Table 29: Medium of Informing Police by respondents

	Delhi			Mumbai		
	SEC A	SEC B&C	SEC D&E	SEC A	SEC B&C	SEC D&E
Called the helpline numbers like 100/103 etc.	59%	63%	61%	52%	53%	62%
Called on the local telephone number of the police station	16%	16%	21%	14%	13%	10%
Personally visited the nearest police station and complained	15%	12%	11%	12%	24%	19%
Personally visited the nearest police station and registered an FIR	6%	4%	4%	16%	9%	5%
Others	4%	6%	3%	6%	2%	4%

Inference:

- 63% respondents from SEC B&C called up help lines (100/103) numbers to inform police; whereas only 4% of them personally visited the nearest police station to register an FIR.
- 15% of the respondents from SEC A prefer to personally visit the police stations.
- 21% of SEC D&E called on the local telephone number of the police station.

In Mumbai, 16% of SEC A respondents visit police station and register FIR while in Delhi only 6% did. 24% respondents of SEC B&C personally visited the nearest police station and complained which is approx. 50% more than Delhi.



Table 30: Reason for not informing police of different socio-economic classes

	Delhi			Mumbai		
	SEC A	SEC B&C	SEC D&E	SEC A	SEC B&C	SEC D&E
I don't have the time for all this	11%	16%	24%	22%	30%	26%
I don't have any faith in the police/legal system	26%	30%	22%	17%	13%	12%
Speaking to the police officials is a painful task	18%	18%	14%	11%	7%	10%
I don't think it's my duty to inform them	11%	6%	8%	8%	7%	6%
I don't want to get involved in any trouble	8%	11%	12%	8%	12%	10%
Others	28%	20%	19%	32%	30%	35%

Inference:

- 26% respondents from SEC A don't have faith in legal system while in Mumbai it is only 17%.
- 12% of the respondents from SEC B & C didn't inform the police because they don't want to get involved in any trouble.
- Respondents from SEC B&C (30%) have the highest percentage who don't have any faith in the police/legal system, whereas 18% of respondents feel that speaking to police is a painful task.

30% of respondents of SEC B&C don't have the time to inform police while respondents with this response is less in Delhi (16%).



Annexure 1 – Sources of Data

RTI Data – Part A

Section I (Crime Statistics) – Right to information (RTI) applications were filed in all 12 districts of Delhi to get the crime statistics from all 163 police stations. For Crime In India statistics, RTI applications were filled in all 12 DCP offices from where information from every SO Branch was provided to us.

Section III (Police Personnel) – Right to information (RTI) application was filed in Delhi Police Headquarters for strength of police personnel in all the police stations of Delhi. Establishment Branch provided us the required information.

Section IV (Deliberations by Delhi MPs) – Detailed information regarding questions asked by various MPs during Budget 2014 to Budget 2015 and Monsoon 2015 to Budget 2016 was taken from the below mention link: <http://164.100.47.194/Loksabha/Questions/QResult15.aspx?qref=28999&lsno=16>

Survey Data – Part B

Household survey of 29,950 respondents across the city of Delhi was commissioned to Hansa Research by Praja to study the perception of people based on prefixed criteria and suitable methodology had been designed (whose detail is given below) to meet survey objectives.



Annexure 2 – Survey Methodology

Praja Foundation had commissioned the household survey to Hansa Research and the survey methodology followed is as below:

- In order to meet the desired objectives of the study, we represented the city by covering a sample from each of its 272 wards. Target Group for the study was :
 - ✓ Both Males & Females
 - ✓ 18 years and above
 - ✓ Belonging to that particular ward.
- Sample quotas were set for representing gender and age groups on the basis of their split available through Indian Readership Study (Large scale baseline study conducted nationally by Media Research Users Council (MRUC) & Hansa Research group).
- The required information was collected through face to face interviews with the help of structured questionnaire.
- In order to meet the respondent within a ward, following sampling process was followed:
 - ✓ 5 prominent areas in the ward were identified as the starting point
 - ✓ In each starting point about 20 individuals were selected randomly and the questionnaire was administered with them.
- Once the survey was completed, sample composition of age & gender was corrected to match the population profile using the baseline data from IRS. This helped us to make the survey findings more representatives in nature and ensured complete coverage.
- **The total study sample was 29,950.**



Annexure 3 – Socio Economic Classification (SEC) Note

SEC is used to measure the affluence level of the sample, and to differentiate people on this basis and study their behaviour / attitude on other variables.

While income (either monthly household or personal income) appears to be an obvious choice for such a purpose, it comes with some limitations:

- Respondents are not always comfortable revealing sensitive information such as income.
- The response to the income question can be either over-claimed (when posturing for an interview) or under-claimed (to avoid attention). Since there is no way to know which of these it is and the extent of over-claim or under-claim, income has a poor ability to discriminate people within a sample.
- Moreover, affluence may well be a function of the attitude a person has towards consumption rather than his (or his household's) absolute income level.

Attitude to consumption is empirically proven to be well defined by the education level of the Chief Wage Earner (CWE*) of the household as well as his occupation. The more educated the CWE, the higher is the likely affluence level of the household. Similarly, depending on the occupation that the CWE is engaged in, the affluence level of the household is likely to differ – so a skilled worker will be lower down on the affluence hierarchy as compared to a CWE who is businessman.

Socio Economic Classification or SEC is thus a way of classifying households into groups' basis the education and occupation of the CWE. The classification runs from A1 on the uppermost end thru E2 at the lower most end of the affluence hierarchy. The SEC grid used for classification in market research studies is given below:

EDUCATION OCCUPATION		Illiterate	literate but no formal schooling / School up to 4 th	School 5 th – 9 th	SSC/ HSC	Some College but not Grad	Grad/ Post-Grad Gen.	Grad/ Post-Grad Prof.
Unskilled Workers		E2	E2	E1	D	D	D	D
Skilled Workers		E2	E1	D	C	C	B2	B2
Petty Traders		E2	D	D	C	C	B2	B2
Shop Owners		D	D	C	B2	B1	A2	A2
Businessmen/ Industrialists with no. of employees	None	D	C	B2	B1	A2	A2	A1
	1 – 9	C	B2	B2	B1	A2	A1	A1
	10 +	B1	B1	A2	A2	A1	A1	A1
Self-employed Professional		D	D	D	B2	B1	A2	A1
Clerical / Salesman		D	D	D	C	B2	B1	B1
Supervisory level		D	D	C	C	B2	B1	A2
Officers/ Executives Junior		C	C	C	B2	B1	A2	A2
Officers/Executives Middle/ Senior		B1	B1	B1	B1	A2	A1	A1

*CWE is defined as the person who takes the main responsibility of the household expenses