- (b) if so, the details thereof;
- what were the reasons for the detention of the team of Mumbai ATS; and (c)
- what action Government has taken in the matter? (d)

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI MULLAPPALLY RAMACHANDRAN): (a) to (d) No team of Mumbai ATS was detained by Delhi Police in the National capital.

Encounter and custodial deaths

2873. SHRI T.K. RANGARAJAN: Will the Minister of HOME AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

- the State-wise total number of encounter deaths reported during the years (a) 2009, 2010 and 2011; and
- the State-wise total number of custodial deaths during the years 2009, (b) 2010 and 2011?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI JITENDRA SINGH): (a) State-wise details of the total number of 493 cases of encounter deaths by police, defence and para-military forces, registered by the National Human Rights Commission (NHRC) during the years 2009-10, 2010-11 and 2011-2012 are given in Statement I (See below).

State-wise details of the total number of 4611 cases of custodial deaths under police, judicial, defence and para-military forces, registered by the NHRC during the years 2009-10, 2010-11 and 2011-2012 are given in Statement II.

Statement I Statewise Details of the Cases of encounter Deaths by Police, Defence and Paramilitary Forces

| <u>S1.</u> | Name of the State/UT | 2009-10 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 |
|------------|----------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| No. | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | Andhra Pradesh | 2 | 11 | 8 |
| 2 | Arunachal Pradesh | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 3 | Assam | 31 | 54 | 87 |
| 4 | Bihar | 2 | 7 | 2 |
| 5 | Chhattisgarh | 0 | 8 | 3 |
| 6 | Goa | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Written Answers to | | [2 MAY, 2012] | Unstarred Questions | 121 |
|--------------------|------------------------|---------------|---------------------|-----|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7 | Gujarat | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 8 | Haryana | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 9 | Himachal Pradesh | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10 | Jammu and Kashmir | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| 11 | Jharkhand | 5 | 7 | 9 |
| 12 | Karnataka | 2 | 8 | .1. |
| 13 | Kerala | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 14 | Madhya Pradesh | .2 | 4 | 5 |
| 15 | Maharashtra | 8 | 8 | 1 |
| 16 | Manipur | 0 | 4 | 17 |
| 17 | Meghalaya | 0 | 6 | 5 |
| 18 | Mizoram | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 19 | Nagaland | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 20 | Odisha | 1 | 10 | 5 |
| 21 | Punjab | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 22 | Rajasthan | б | 5 | 5 |
| 23 | Sikkim | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 24 | Tamil Nadu | 4 | 4 | 2 |
| 25 | Tripura | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 26 | Uttar Pradesh | 47 | 42 | 20 |
| 27 | Uttarakhand | 4 | 1 | 0 |
| 28 | West Bengal | 1 | 12 | 5 |
| 29 | Andaman and Nicobar | 0 | 0 | .1. |
| 30 | Chandigarh | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 31 | Dadar and Nagar Haveli | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 32 | Daman and Diu | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 33 | Delhi | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 34 | Lakshadweep | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 35 | Puducherry | б | 0 | 0 |
| | Total | 111 | 199 | 183 |

Statement II Details of Total No. of Cases of Custodial Deaths registered by NHRC from 2009-2012

| S1. | Name of the State/UT | 2009-10 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 |
|-----|----------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| No. | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | Andhra Pradesh | 114 | 106 | 90 |
| 2 | Arunachal Pradesh | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| 3 | Assam | 21 | 33 | 25 |
| 4 | Bihar | 141 | 136 | 103 |
| 5 | Chhattisgarh | 42 | 37 | 46 |
| 6 | Goa | 1 | 5 | 1 |
| 7 | Gujarat | 67 | 75 | 58 |
| 8 | Haryana | 4.5. | 45 | 53 |
| 9 | Himachal Pradesh | 6 | 7 | 10 |
| 10 | Jammu and Kashmir | 4 | 6 | 6 |
| 11 | Jharkhand | 75 | 60 | 50 |
| 12 | Karnataka | 35. | 20 | 15 |
| 13 | Kerala | 50 | 47 | 38 |
| 14 | Madhya Pradesh | 93 | 84 | 94 |
| 15 | Maharashtra | 128 | 130 | 115 |
| 16 | Manipur | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| 17 | Meghalaya | 3 | 3 | 1 |
| 18 | Mizoram | Ó | 4 | 1 |
| 19 | Nagaland | 2 | 6 | 0 |
| 20 | Odisha | 48 | 55 | 37 |
| 21 | Punjab | 110 | 96 | 122 |

| Written Answers to | | [2 MAY, 2012] | Unstarred Questions 123 | |
|--------------------|------------------------|---------------|-------------------------|------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 22 | Rajasthan | 83 | 85 | 73 |
| 23 | Sikkim | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 24 | Tamil Nadu | 7 6 | 77 | 65 |
| 25 | Tripura | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 26 | Uttar Pradesh | 348 | 331 | 277 |
| 27 | Uttrakhand | 16 | 19 | 13 |
| 28 | West Bengal | 72 | 73 | 97 |
| 29 | Andaman and Nicobar | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| 30 | Chandigarh | 2 | 5 | 4 |
| 31 | Dadar and Nagar Haveli | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 32 | Daman and Diu | 0 | 0 | 1. |
| 33 | Delhi | 10 | 22 | 29 |
| 34 | Lakshadweep | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 35 | Puducherry | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| | Total | 1599 | 1574 | 1438 |

Terror threat from L-E-T to oil refineries

 $2874.\,$ DR. JANARDHAN WAGHMARE : Will the Minister of HOME AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

- (a) whether the inputs provided by the Intelligence Bureau recently has pointed out terror threat from Pak based Lashkar-e-Taiba (L-e-T) to biggest oil refineries in the country;
 - (b) if so, the details thereof;
- (c) whether in view of threat posed by terrorist organisations, Government proposes to provide fool proof security to all the major oil refineries in the country;
- (d) if so, whether the Ministry of Home Affairs has taken up the matter with the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas; and
 - (e) if so, the concrete steps Union Government proposes to take in this regard?