

Criticism of police force

†1805. SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Will the Minister of HOME AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

- (a) whether it is a fact that the police service in the country has been subject to criticism for being incompetent, inefficient and deplorable;
- (b) if so, Government's reaction thereto;
- (c) whether it is also a fact that there is a need for comprehensive reform in the management of country's police service and its functioning; and
- (d) if so, Government's reaction thereto and the future plan of Government in this regard?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI R.P.N. SINGH): (a) and (b) Services rendered by the police forces in the country are often subjected to public criticism in various circumstances in spite of their good work. The general perception of public towards police service varies from person to person. However, the police forces, whether Central Armed Force Forces or State Police Forces, as they exist today contribute immensely in protecting our democracy, human rights, giving a sense of security to people.

(c) and (d) Yes, Sir. Various Commission/ Committees were constituted during the last three decades for carrying out reforms in the police forces in the country. Notable amongst them are the National Police Commission (1977), Ribeiro Committee (1998), the Padmanabhaiah Committee (2000), Group of Ministers on National Security (2000), Malimath Committee on Criminal Justice System (2001). A Review Committee was constituted by the Ministry of Home Affairs in December 2004 to review the status of implementation of recommendations made by the various past Commission/Committees. The Review Committee short-listed 49 recommendations from out of the recommendations of the previous Commission/Committees on Police Reforms as being crucial to the process of transforming the police into a professionally competent and service oriented organization. The Review Committee submitted its report to the Ministry of Home Affairs in 2005.

The recommendations of the various Commission/Committees, including Review Committee, were sent to all State Governments/UTs Administrations for implementation.

†Original notice of the question was received in Hindi.

In addition, the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India passed a judgement on September 22, 2006 in Writ Petition (Civil) No. 310 of 1996 - Prakash Singh and others Vs UOI and others on several issues concerning Police Reforms. The directions were as follows:

- (i) Constitute a State Security Commission.
- (ii) Selection of the Director General of Police of the State from amongst the three senior-most officers of the Department empanelled for promotion to that rank by the Union Public Service Commission and once selected, provide him a minimum tenure of at least two years irrespective of his date of superannuation.
- (iii) Prescribe a minimum tenure of two years to the police officers on operational duties.
- (iv) Separate investigating police from law and order police, starting with towns/ urban areas having population of ten lakhs or more, and gradually extend to smaller towns/urban areas also.
- (v) Setting up a Police Establishment Board at the state level for, *inter alia*, deciding all transfers, postings, promotions and other service related matters of officers of and below the rank of Deputy Superintendent of Police, and
- (vi) Constituting Police Complaints Authorities at the State and District level for looking into complaints against police officers.
- (vii) Set up a National Security Commission at the Union level to prepare a panel for being placed before the appropriate Appointing Authority, for selection and placement of Chiefs of the Central Police Organisations (CPO) who should have also be given a minimum tenure of two years.

So far as Central Government and Union Territories are concerned, there has been a significant and substantial compliance of the directions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court by the Government of India.

The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the order dated 16th October, 2012 in the aforesaid case directed the State Governments/UTs and Union of India to submit a status report on the implementation of the directions given in its judgement dated 22nd September, 2006. The Ministry of Home Affairs has filed

status report in the form of an Affidavit dated 2.1.2013 on behalf of Ministry of Home Affairs Union of India in the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

'Police' being a State subject in the Seventh Schedule to the Constitution of India, it is the State Governments/UTs Administration, who have to implement various police reforms measures. The Centre has been persuading the State Governments from time to time to bring in the requisite reforms in the police administration to meet the expectations of the people. Police reform measures are also supported through the grants-in-aid released to the State Governments under the Scheme for Modernisation of State Police Forces (MPF) by the Ministry of Home Affairs. The major items of police infrastructure for State police supported under the Scheme are mobility, modern weaponry, training infrastructure facilities, forensic science equipment, security equipment, traffic equipment, construction of residential buildings for lower level police personnel, etc.

Increase in unemployment and joblessness

1806. SHRI ALOK TIWARI:

SHRI PRABHAT JHA:

SHRI ARVIND KUMAR SINGH:

SHRIMATI KUSUM RAI:

Will the Minister of LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT be pleased to state:

(a) whether as per the recent report of Institute of Applied Manpower Research, due to policies of Government, joblessness and unemployment have increased in India during 2005-10;

(b) if so, the details thereof;

(c) the sector-wise details of unemployment and joblessness during the said period;

(d) whether as per the report by 2010, 60 per cent of the organized manufacturing employment was in the nature of informal contracts and 80 per cent of the organized non-manufacturing employment was in the nature of informal contract; and

(e) if so, the details thereof?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT (SHRI KODIKUNNIL SURESH): (a) to (c) India Human