CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Mainly, there are two methods of maintaining discipline in the society viz informal appeals and the use of coercive methods enforced through some formal institution. History, however, witnesses that none of the above two methods, single-handedly, ever been able to maintain discipline in any society. In fact it is a proper blend of the two that helps in ensuring peace, discipline and regulated behaviour in the society. This is because of the fact that although the society at large would submit willingly to the code of conduct [developed by the society itself], but there has always been a group of people, termed as disgruntled or anti-social elements, who would not do so. Nor the society can keep their behaviour or conduct under control through informal appeals for self-discipline. It is for such people that to keep their behaviour under control, coercive methods need to be used.

Provision of such coercive methods is made by the laws enacted by the government of the country through which the society expresses her will. The responsibility of enforcing such coercive methods remains with some specialised institution or agency, generally manned by, in modern times, 'men-in-uniform'. Amongst these, one such agency resorted to, more often than not, for the enforcement of these coercive methods, is known as 'police'
DEFINING THE TERM

The term 'police' is derived from the Greek word 'polis' or city and has been applied to the exercise of civic or collective authority. The Latin root of the word 'police' is 'politia' which literally stands for the condition of a 'polis' or 'state.'

In the past it meant a system of governance or administration (police state) but now it indicates an organised body of civil officers engaged in the preservation of law and order, detection of crime and enforcement of laws.

The Oxford Dictionary defines the term as a system of regulation for the preservation of order and enforcement of law—the internal government of a state.

According to the Encyclopedia International, police are agents charged with enforcing the law and maintaining order.

The Lexicon Universal Encyclopaedia states that "police in modern society is a department of government concerned with public order, providing protection and investigating breaches of law. Police duties include crime detection, apprehension and arrest of criminals, patrolling, riot control, and traffic regulation."

Thus in general police may be defined as that uniformed agency of the government, which is charged with the responsibility of maintaining order, preservation of peace, enforcement of laws, crime detection and control, riot control, traffic regulation, patrolling etc.
We don't know much about the origin of police. However, it dates back to the earliest history of mankind. Ever since men started living collectively, the need for protection and regulated behaviour of the members of the society was felt. This "need factor" resulted into the creation of what in modern times is known as 'police force'. In ancient societies warriors used to play the role of police and enforced the will of the ruler or the leader of the tribe.

The Pharaohs of ancient Egypt used soldiers to carry out their orders. In early times, the king, the high priests and elders used servants and soldiers to enforce their orders. About the time of the birth of Christ, Caesar Augustus formed a special police force for the city of Rome which remained in use for about 350 years. After the fall of the empire some powerful noblemen kept private troops. However, no evidence of an organised civil police force appears until many centuries later.

It is not known exactly as to who started the system of using police to 'protect the people', but is believed to have been the Franks. The English police system and later the United States police system made use of some of the ideas cherished by the police force of Charlemagne, the French emperor, who started a new police force in A.D. 800.

The Anglo-Saxons started a system of protection based on groupings of families. Ten families in a community made up a "tithing" and a head, or "tithing-man" was chosen. Ten tithings became a hundred. The hundred elected a "reeve" as headman. The
reeve then became a "constable" and as headman the "under-constable". Several hundreds in a settled community became a shire (later to be known as county) and the head of the shire was the "shire-reeve" or "sherriff". The tithing-man was responsible for keeping a watch and ward. The watch was a night guard and ward a day guard. This system continued for centuries with watches and wards increasing as per the requirements.

With the Industrial Revolution, the population of London and several other industrial cities of Europe increased massively. This rapid growth of population brought forward several problems such as those pertaining to crime, looting, rioting, poverty, famine etc. In fact, there was so much of crime and corruption in the early 19th century London that people started crying for reforms in the system of protection. Consequently, in 1829 the Metropolitan Police of London was organised under the direction of Sir Robert Peel, the then Prime Minister of England, with headquarters at Scotland Yard. Robert Peel made basic changes in the system of policing. Although based on the early system of policing, the new police force was much larger and coordinated besides being better trained and highly disciplined. The new recruits were also uniformed and wore top hats. The London Police today are called "bobbies" and "peelers" after his familiar nicknames.

In 1830s and 1840s, Sir Robert Peel's British police started attracting attention of the other countries. Among these, the Americans and Canadians were the forerunners. The sheriff-system came to the United States with the British colonists.
was in vogue in most of the American towns and cities until the 1800s. Boston set up a small force of paid daytime police in 1838. In 1845 New York became the first American city to establish a large day and night police force. During the 1850s and 1860s full uniforms were adopted by the police in various American cities. Another step towards the development of police system in the United States was the establishment of city police boards or commissions in 1850s and 1860s. This helped stopping the politicians from controlling the police for their own purposes.  

In Canada, Toronto was one of the first cities to employ professional police. Its force was first organised in 1835 with a chief constable and five policemen. In 1873 the Canadian government formed an organisation, the North-West Mounted Police, to protect its western settlers and to establish law in the newly acquired Prairie regions. This organisation, later on came to be known as Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP), is the primary law-enforcement agency of Canada. 

In the present century, with the growth and spread of industrialisation process and consequently with the growth of modern cities of complex character, the need for the establishment of organised police systems was all the more realised. In fact, during the present century more progress has been made in the organisation of modern police force than in all other centuries taken together. Police force in most of the other countries, have their beginning during this century.
POLICE IN INDIAN PERSPECTIVE

The present police system in India is a legacy of the British government and it is true that it is difficult to trace the history of a regularly organised and legally controlled police system in India before the British occupation. But at the same time, it would be unjust to remark, as J.C. Curry holds, that the "police system in India was the creation of the Britishers". The origin of police, as a law enforcing agency, can be traced to the earliest periods of Indian history. In fact, the police system, as it existed in the ancient and medieval periods, provided a base on which the Britishers created the superstructure of their police system in India.

POLICING IN ANCIENT INDIA

Indians are charged with lack of historical sense and this is true to some extent as they did not write history in the manner it is done now, nor did they write it in the way the Greeks did. We possess relatively few sources to build a regular and continuous chain of past events. No doubt there are certain authentic documents which throw valuable light on various aspects of life at the time of their writing but they are in the form of tits and bits some here and some there. Consequently, there are several mysteries in the Indian history which are yet to be unraveled. In that also our knowledge of administrative history is rather poor and limited.

Throughout all of Indian history, even into the present time, one can discern two distinct police systems - a rural village
based and a system emanating from the dominant laws of imperial power at the moment. In fact, Indian police history can be written largely in terms of attempts to create an imperial system linking the indigenous fragmented system to the imperium and making it both efficient and responsive to orders form the imperial capital. Based on the system of land tenure, the rural police system is as old as the recorded Indian history, survived all odds and has continued unaffected by the tides of conquest, consolidation and anarchy that have swept over India in the past millennia.

All the great empires—the Hindus as well as Muslims—were content to establish contacts with the autonomous villages rather than to reorder their internal policing system. The details of structure as well as the names of agents within the imperial organisation changed from time to time, but the traditional police system persisted mutely. The village headman or local landowner might be contacted by the subordinate officials of the imperium but his relations to his fellow villagers and his duties within the village were not touched.

In so far as the internal duties of the village headman are concerned, he was responsible for the security and prevention and detection of crime in the village. He was also held responsible for the detection and capture of local villagers who committed crimes outside the territory of the village. He was to apprehend the disturbers of peace and restore stolen goods or sometimes, in default, to make good the losses sustained within the area of their influence. He (the village headman) was elected for a term of years, or for life, by the landholders of
the village, from the members of the family which possessed hereditary right to the appointment. However, it is noteworthy that, at places, the functions of the headman are described as more of a judicial than of an executive nature. He was usually one of the wealthier peasants and was remunerated with tax-free land, dues in kind, or both. In the larger villages he was a very important functionary with a small staff of village officials, such as an accountant, a toll-collector and a village watchman.

The village watchman, who was known by different names in different provinces, was to assist the headman in the performance of the police duties. This office [village watch] was quasi-hereditary in nature and incumbents were paid by emoluments drawn from villagers. The village watchmen were the real executive police. In case of need, they received cooperation from the whole village community. The duties of a village watchman were to keep watch at night and to report to the headman the arrival and departure of all strangers and suspicious persons within the bounds of the village. He was required to note the character of each man in the village and to detect criminals.

Whether the headman was autonomous or was responsible to higher local authority depended upon the structure of landholding. If there was a dominant landowner, as was often the case, responsibility for policing rested with the landowner and the headman acted as his agent, both for police and for revenue purposes. But where landholding was more evenly distributed or where a dominant landowner was indolent or remote, the headman represented the pinnacle of the only police authority most Indians knew.
Having dealt with the village based rural police system it would be pertinent to know what kind of system of urban policing prevailed in ancient times in India. The growth and development of ancient city states like Mithila, Ayodhya, Hastinapur, Vaisali, Rajgir, Patliputra, Taxila etc. posed serious problems of administration. The king's responsibility of ensuring internal order was reiterated in the context of growing complexities of life in the Epic age [Sabhaparba Mahabharata]. Even in Ramayan, there is mention of police called 'Dandayudharanapi' or policemen on beat. The beat constable was always on prowl against the lurking criminals. 29

Manu, the law-giver, discussed at length, the policing and judicial functions of the king and also gives an exhaustive list of various kinds of crimes and their respective ways of punishment. The chief duty of a King, as detailed by Manu, is to restrain violence and punish evildoers. He has to keep up patrols and what we now call 'police station' or fixed posts, besides a band of spies. 30 In the midst of two, three or five villages, he was to place a central post of Guards [Gulma] and another [Sangraha] in the midst of a hundred villages. Provision is made for appointment in each city of a high officer with ample powers of restraint and coercion to superintend all matters affecting the city. 31

A highly complex system of administration came to be established in the time of the Mauryas (300-200 B.C.). The main aim of the State was the allround welfare of the people. The police measures to be adopted by the King have been mentioned at
length in Kautilya's Arthashastra which is believed to be written around 300 B.C. The frontiers of the kingdom were fortified and protected by officials appointed for the purpose. The boundary guards (antapal) watched new comers, whose antecedents were enquired into and who were allowed to enter with passports after being disarmed. Roads had to be kept free from the molestations of the robbers. In the cities and towns there were Nagarks, who were in charge of the affairs of the cities, including the city police. In his book, Kautilya lays special emphasis on the system of spying and information collection. He classifies various kinds of spies into nine distinct categories. It is possible that no modern C.I.D. in any country has ever been so ubiquitous or so highly organised as the system of espionage described by Kautilya, which must have corresponded lonely with the actual arrangements.

During the Gupta period, the law and order administration was very effective. Fahien, the Chinese Buddhist pilgrim, who stayed in India for about six years during the reign of Chandragupta Vikramaditya (376-415 AD) mentions the peacefulness of India & the rarity of crimes. But unfortunately we don't have proper knowledge as to what kind of administrative arrangement existed during the Gupta period to perform the law and order functions.

A tendency towards feudalism had already started in the Gupta period and this practice of assigning lands, villages and cities to the higher officers rather than paying them in cash became well established by the time Harsh acquired the throne. Gradually, these feudatory chiefs acquired the police and
administrative functions. They also started exercising some minor powers of deciding petty cases, though the king generally retained the right to punish the thieves. The administration of criminal law, being under the two masters, became more severe. However, this severity helped to control and Huang Tsang, another Chinese traveller who travelled India during the reign of Hanshavardhan, has said that the criminal class was small.\textsuperscript{35}

During the 'dark age' of Indian history [post-Gupta period till the advent of medieval periods] we do not find any authentic source or evidence of an organised police system. In fact, after the decline of the Gupta empire, the country was divided into a number of small feudatories each working against the other. Besides, there were a series of outside invasions. Consequently, there was utter lawlessness and complete break-down of law and order machinery. The internal rivalries and the frequent outside invasions hardly left any time for the native rulers to concentrate on the internal law and order administration, nor did any energetic invader come and establish rule in India during this period.

POLICE IN MEDIEVAL INDIA

Since the very beginning of the Sultanate, the Sultans had been anxious to maintain peace and security in their dominions\textsuperscript{36} though it is a separate matter that a well organised police system could not be established due to internecine warfare and disorder.\textsuperscript{37} The routine duties of police department were preformed by the Kotwal. The Kotwal's force patrolled the city at
night and guarded the thoroughfares. The Kotwal acted in cooperation with the inhabitants. He appointed a leading man as warden in every quarter who was responsible for seeing that no criminal was harboured by the people. The Kotwal maintained a register of the inhabitants of every quarter, kept himself informed of their activities and means of livelihood and took cognizance of every new arrival and departure. He (Kotwal) was a purely civilian official and was only a committing magistrate. There is no reference to the subordinates of Kotwal.

Above the Kotwal there was an executive official called the Muhtasib who performed diverse kinds of functions such as religious, moral, municipal, police etc. In short he was responsible for smooth running of civic life in a city. Amir-i-dad was another important functionary who looked after the executive side of the justice. In this capacity it was his duty to see that the qadi's (judge's) decisions were carried out. He controlled the Kotwal, the police and the Muhtasib. Thus while the 'qazi' was a judge and amir-i-dad a sort of an ombudsman in modern administrative terminology, the muhtasib was an executive officer expected to suppress illegal practices and punish the wrongdoers.

There was a considerable shift in so far as the jurisdiction of the Kotwal during the later years of the Sultanate when it was confined to the metropolitan towns. Smaller cities and rural areas had separate police posts manned by the 'Thanadars' who maintained peace and order and also helped in the realisation of revenue. The structure of village police, however, survived unchanged.
During the Mughal period, some efforts were made towards organising the system of police but even then no change was made in principle and the ideas, which formed the basis of Indian indigenous police system survived unchanged. The villages were still left responsible for their own safety and that of the travellers within their limits. A Mughal province was a replica of the empire, and provincial government centered in the provincial capital. Outside that the people were left alone as long as they paid their revenue and did not disturb the peace. In a province, police administration was the responsibility of the Governor, known as Subedar, who was, however, responsible to the Mughal Emperor for the overall administration of the province.

The Emperor appointed a Fauzdar for a Sarkar (district) who was, however, placed under the control of the Subedar. He was the chief police officer as well as the administrative and military head of the district. He was vested with executive powers which enabled him to function as a Police Magistrate. Under a Fauzdar were appointed Shikdars, one each for a pargana. The Shikdar had control over the Thanadars appointed one each for a thana (police station). A Thanedar was assisted by a small number of armed guards called Burkandazes.

Policing the metropolitan cities and the provincial headquarter was the responsibility of the Kotwal who was appointed by the Central Government. He was in charge of the watch and ward of the town. To help in the performance of this function, he appointed one or two watchmen in every mohalla to
report the daily occurrences thereat. He also seems to have served as the censor of public morals of the people within his jurisdiction. He was also in charge of jails and checked the number of prisoners. He could release them on payment of adequate fines. Besides, he also functioned as a judicial officer in certain criminal cases. In addition to this, he had to perform certain special duties because of the Din-i-Ilahi of Akbar. He was essentially an urban officer, who acted as chief of city police. He was a magistrate, a prefect of police and a municipal officer, all rolled into one.

POLICE DURING EAST INDIA COMPANY

When the English East India Company assumed political power in India in 1765, there was utter chaos and total anarchy in the matters of law and order in the country. It was a time when armed bands of freebooters roamed the countryside - Pindaris, Marathas, Afghans and bandits and adventurers of all kinds - and villages settled disputes over stolen property and cattle by means of surprise raids on one another at night. Some of the zamindars were also responsible for the spread of disorder. Instead of preserving the peace of the country according to the terms of their tenure, they harboured decoits and robbers and conspired with them in the loot and plunder of property. As a matter of fact extortion and repression flourished unchecked through all gradations of officials responsible for the maintenance of peace and order. Although in the towns where there was a King's officer - a Fauzdar or a Kotwal - a semblance of order did continue, in the countryside,
there was nothing of the nature of the "king's peace". However, in spite of the extremely unsatisfactory state of police machinery at the time, the remedies adopted by the British were haphazard and not sufficiently far reaching to make any appreciable impact on the law and order situation. Consideration of finance always stood in the way of real and substantial reforms. Moreover, the East India company had to start afresh in this field and it followed only familiar patterns influenced by the western ideas of the rule of law. Consequently, the steps taken by the British to restructure and organise the police for about a century prior to 1860 were, as a part of the general administration, that of a long series of experiments—often unsuccessful.

Even after the company had acquired complete grip over the administration and finances of three provinces viz. Bengal, Bihar and Orissa through the dewani rights conferred on it in 1765, it did not assume direct responsibility of the administration as it might have affected the private trade of the Governor and Company most directly by inviting interference of the Ministers of the Crown in the affairs of the Company. Clive, therefore, established in Bengal the "absurd" system which came to be known as the "Dual Government"—a Government in which power vested in the company without responsibility and responsibility vested in the Nawab without power. As a consequence, the law and order situation further deteriorated.

The company might have been a silent spectator of all this mess if it did not have threatened its interests. It was a
fall in the revenues of the company in 1767-68 as compared to 1766-67, which ultimately forced it to act. Although the remedies differed in different provinces, the general line of reform was to retain the village system and improve the machinery for supervision.

Consequently, considering their alignment and collusion with and harbouring of criminals, the Zamindars were relieved of their liability for police service. As a result of Richard Becher's report, Governor Verelst instituted the office of European Supervisors in districts in August 1769. Simultaneously, the Nawab's police officers and all the Fauzdar, except those at Dacca and Hoghly and their staffs, were discharged in December 1770 with the result that not even a semblance was left of any organised police arrangement for ensuring the safety of the lives and property of the people. These first steps of the company towards exercising some direct control over the administration of law and order were of no avail because of the inadequacy of the powers of Supervisors and the insufficiency of the police functionaries and more particularly because the former concentrated their attention on their own private trade.

Considering this fact, the Directors, in August 1771, issued orders for the President and the Council to assume direct control of the Administration of the Revenues and Civil Justice and Warren Hastings was selected to carry these orders into effect who assumed office as the Governor of Bengal on the 13th April, 1772. Resa Khan was divested of the office of Naib Diwan, as a first measure, by a proclamation issued on 11th May, 1772.
and all the responsibility with respect to the revenue was placed in the hands of the English Supervisor who were named 'Collectors' by Resolutions passed on the 14th May, 1772. He also reorganised the judicial administration by a set of 37 Regulations passed and obtained on the 21st August 1772. The administration of criminal justice was entrusted to a Sadar Nizamat Adalut at the Presidency under the supervision of the Governor and Council and a separate Fauzdar Adalut was set up in each district under the supervision of the Collector. Some regularity was also attempted to be introduced in the functioning of the criminal courts and provision was made for their proceedings to be supervised by the company's servants and for the uncertainties and leniency of the Mohamedan Law to be substituted by almost inhuman punishment in the case of persons convicted for decoy.63

Hastings also felt that remedy lay in reforming the indigenous police system rather than destroying it. He accordingly reintroduced in 1774 the institution of Fauzdar in three districts, as a trial, to curb the activities of the recalcitrant zamindars.64

In October, 1775 Hasting made another change in the police administration. Instead of personally supervising it he vested this authority in the Naib Nazim Mohammed Reza Khan, who was reappointed to this office on 18th October, 1775 on the recommendations of Warren Hastings, for executing his plan of the Fauzdar establishment. A total of twenty six Fauzdar thanas was provided for the chief towns of all large districts. The Fauzdar thanas were assisted by a number of small police stations as well
as by some additional troops to check the atrocious activities of the robbers and other criminals. A central police office was also established at Murshidabad under the superintendence of Raza Khan. Where there were no fauzdars, the ancient system of village police responsible to the zamindars was retained.

Muhammed Reza Khan organised the police on the Mughal pattern. While the Fauzards represented the executive authority of Government, the Zamindars and revenue farmers acted as an ancillary instrument of peace as part of the terms of their land tenure. However, with the shifting of political balance in favour of the company, loyalty had already shifted to its servants and agents and the Zamindars did not assist the Fauzdars thus making them ineffective in checking the prevalence of crime and maintaining order.

Consequently, the office of the Fauzdar was abolished on 6th April 1781. Their duties were ultimately transferred to the Company's covenanted servants acting primarily as Judges of the courts of diwani adalut. In their additional capacity they became designated as Magistrates and thus functioned both as Judges and Magistrates. This arrangement of appointing the English Magistrate in place of the Fauzdars made a fundamental difference. The basic military character of the fauzdari system was replaced by an essentially civil administration which had now nothing to do with any military contingent. Moreover, these reforms strengthened the position of the Zamindars. They were now made directly responsible to the European Magistrates for the efficient performance of police functions.
However, even this provision of Hastings did not bear fruits. In fact, there were some basic flaws which hindered this process of reforms. It was that the Muslim laws continued to be applied against the Hindus and other Non-Muslim criminals and since it was beyond the legislative competence of the Governor-General-in-Council to modify the existing laws, Hastings' reform restricted to the executive imposition of the government and were consistent with the practice of Mughals.

The plan of 1781-82 operated until June 1787, when in conformity with the orders of the Directors Cornwallis, who came to India in September, 1786, united in the office of Collector the duties annexed to the Magistrate and civil Judge. In addition, he conferred on the magistracy part of the authority exercised by the criminal courts themselves. Apart from his police duties, the Magistrate was, for instance, empowered to hear and determine, without any reference to the faujdari courts, all complaints and prosecutions brought before him for petty offences, such as abusive language or calumny, inconsiderable assaults or affrays, and to punish the same. But cases meriting a greater punishment than that specified above were to be referred to the hearing of the nearest criminal courts.

Though contrary to Islamic jurisprudence, police and judicial functions were, thus, for the first time united in the office of the Magistrate on a general plan. It brought such cases
under his cognizance as previously fell within the primary jurisdiction of criminal courts.

The Magistrate was also empowered to put zamindars under arrest and commit them for trial to criminal courts. But a previous information of such commitment had to be given to Government, so that an alternative arrangement might be made for the collection of the revenue. The authority of the Magistrate thus became more effectual and complete. But the administration of criminal justice remained practically unaltered.

That's why Cornwallis made some fundamental changes in criminal law by bringing certain changes in the procedure, equality in application of law, regulating the mode of punishment and the law of evidence. But these measures fell short of Cornwallis's expectations as there was extensive opportunity of the judges to misuse their authority. That's why he decided to strike off the Muslim judges and replace them by Europeans. The fact is that Cornwallis did not believe in the expediency of allowing Indians to hold key positions in the administration of the country.

Muhammad Reza Khan was accordingly discharged, and in December, 1790, the nizamat adalat removed to Calcutta again. It was now to consist of the Governor-General and members of the Supreme Council, who were to exercise all the powers lately vested in the naib nazim. They were to be assisted by a chief qazi and two muftis whose duty it was to declare the law applicable to the circumstances of each case. A covenanted servant of the Company was appointed to the office of Register
(Registrar) to conduct the executive business of the nizamat adalat.

The Darogas of criminal courts were struck off, and four courts of circuit were constituted, one for each of the four divisions of Calcutta, Murshidabad, Dacca and Patna. Each of these courts of circuit was superintended by two covenanted civil servants under the denomination of Judges of the Court of Circuit for the division to which they were respectively appointed. They were assisted by a qazi and a mufti as law officers who were not to be removed except with the orders of the Government. A Registrar was appointed to perform the executive business of the court.

Within the limits of their respective divisions the Judges were required annually to make two circuits and hold two jail deliveries. They were to proceed to the place of residence of each Magistrate within their jurisdiction, and to remain there until persons committed or held to bail for trial by the Magistrate should have been duly tried and sentenced.

The cognizance of the criminal courts thus amended in December, 1790, however, did not extend to British-born subjects. They continued to be amenable to the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court at Calcutta. Unlike the inhabitants of the country, they were not to be apprehended by the Magistrate.\footnote{71}

Then, in 1792 Cornwallis turned to the executive side of the police administration. It was generally admitted that the police establishments of the Magistrate were poor and slender. In spite of the union of revenue and judicial function in 1787, 'there was still experienced a want of power to enforce the
Magistrate's orders on the landholders.

The subsidiary organ of the zamindar police, on the other hand, generally operated in a manner contrary to the original object of that institution. Suspicious of the intentions of the Government, the zamindars withheld their support from a system designed ultimately to reduce their own power and influence. And as the village watchmen and land servants acted immediately under them, the official knowledge of crime suffered from want of accuracy except in the rare cases when it was founded on the willing co-operation of zamindar. Consequently, Cornwallis undertook another set of reform measures in 1792 in which it was provided that the landholders and farmers of land who kept up establishments of thanadars and chaukidars, were divested of their entire police authority, and were accordingly required to discharge them with instructions not to entertain any such establishment in future. They were in fact no longer to be considered responsible for robberies committed in their respective estates.

Secondly, the districts were divided into thanas or police jurisdictions of about twenty to thirty miles square in extent. To each of these was appointed an officer of Government under the denomination of Daroga of police with an establishment consisting generally of a muharrir a Zamindar and ten barkandazes.

The Daroga was to act under the immediate authority of the Magistrate. His duty was to apprehend persons charged with crimes and offences, and to send them under custody to the
Magistrate. In the exercise of his powers he was not to pass any sentence or inflict any punishment on any of the parties or their witnesses.\textsuperscript{72}

The charge of a Daroga was on an average about 20 square miles. He had immediately under him 20 to 50 armed burkandazes and all watchmen of the village establishments were subject to his order. The cities retained the office of the Kotwal under whom a Daroga was appointed for each ward of the city to assist him. Some reforms were also effected in the administration of criminal justice and a more mild and rational system of trial and punishment was substituted for the cruel and partial methods of the earlier governments.\textsuperscript{73}

But the results of the Daroga system also proved to be far from satisfactory. There was a marked increase in crime everywhere, robberies and murders, accompanied by the most atrocious and deliberate cruelties, were of frequent occurrences; gangs of dacoits roamed unchecked about the country. This was in large measure due to the inadequacy of police establishments and the absence of assistance which was formerly available from the local population. Moreover, a much higher degree of proof was now required by the courts. The criminal soon learnt how difficult it was to secure his conviction. The punishments were also much milder. The treatment in jails was also now comparatively mild and the criminal could no longer be tortured to the previous extent to compel the restoration of stolen property.\textsuperscript{74} All these factors led to the deterioration of law & order situation and the increase of crime go uncontained
Whereas in Bengal after the failure of the daroga system, further changes were introduced, in Bombay and Madras Presidencies initial efforts were made in this sphere during this period. The failure of the daroga system had complicated the problem of an efficient functioning of the police administration. In order to arrest the fast worsening state of affairs, the British authorities now desired to find out some solution which could ensure a stable peace and security of life and property throughout the country.

Following Cornwallis, both, Wellesley and Bentinck tried to cope with the flood of crime which was engulfing Bengal, and, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, Madras also. This was a period of chaos and internecine war throughout a large part of India. The island of Bombay did not escape the consequences.

Wellesley held an inquiry into police affairs in 1801 in Bengal, and in 1806 Bentinck appointed a committee to consider the possibility of improving the police system in Madras. Nevertheless, the state of crime in the three presidencies continued to grow more and more serious. In 1809 the Bombay Government appointed a committee which recommended the adaptation to Bombay of Colquhoun's system for improving the Police of London. By 1813 things had reached such a pitch that the intervention of the Court of Directors was rendered necessary, and they appointed a special committee of their own. On receipt of the committee's report, they issued orders in 1814. These orders, while condemning the darogah system, insisted on the
maintenance of the old village police as the best means of ensuring internal peace. The Court, quite rightly, emphasized the view that the village police were organized according to the ancient customs and circumstances of the land, and held that for that reason they must be better than a totally insufficient agency such as the darogah system provided. Their most far-reaching direction was one by which the duties of District Magistrate and control of the police were transferred from District Judge, with whom they then rested, to the Collector. This resulted, at any rate outside Bengal, in the control of the existing executive establishment of Government being in the hands of a man with a knowledge of the local conditions in his district.

Through these Regulations the old police system of the country was resorted to. It was executed by village watchmen, mostly hereditary, under the direction of the heads of the villages, tehsildars (minor revenue officials) of districts and the collector and magistrate of the province. The establishments of the tehsildars are employed, without distinction, either in police or revenue duties as the occasion requires.

In Madras a Regulation (No. XI of 1816) was issued to give effect to the orders of the Court. Through these Regulations the old police system of the country was resorted to. Under this system, the police functions were performed by village watchmen, mostly hereditary, under the direction of the heads of the villages, tehsildars (minor revenue officials) of the districts and the collector and magistrates of the province. The establishments of the tehsildars were employed without
distinction either in police or revenue duties, as the occasion
requires.

Bombay gave effect to the views of the Court through
Regulation XII of 1827, by which the Collector and Magistrate
aided by his assistants, became the head of the police; next
came the Mamlatdar or Tahsildar with his retinue of peons who
were used alternately for police and revenue duties. Below the
'Mamlatdar was the Patel or village officer. He was assisted in
time of need by all the revenue servants of the village. "The
general superintendence of both criminal justice and police was
vested in the court of Saddar Faujdari Adawlat." In Bengal,
because of the permanent settlement, there was no subordinate
revenue establishment and the arrangements made in Madras and
Bombay were not possible. It was, therefore, impossible to abolish
the Daroga and his men. However, some attempt was made in 1811,
to curtail his powers for evil by removing from his cognizance
all complaints of petty and bailable offences like forgery,
adultery, etc.

Meanwhile in Bengal further changes took place in
police administration. Lord Minto, who took over as the Governor-
General in 1807, gave first priority to the amelioration of the
police administration in the Lower Provinces. He was convinced by
the successive inquiries that the police administration could not
function effectively so long as there was absence of a proper
division of labour in police organization. There was, for
instance, the need for a central police force. He, therefore,
took certain important measures in this direction. Accordingly, a
Superintendent of Police (later known as Inspector General of Police) was appointed in Bengal to supervise the police of three Divisions of Bengal, namely, Calcutta, Dacca and Murshidabad. This marked the first attempt of the British to introduce a coordinating agency of control in the administration of police. This officer was also the Magistrate of the 24-Parganas. He was given a superior concurrent criminal jurisdiction with the several District and City Magistrates. He was directly subject to the authority of the Nizamat Adalat. This system was extended in 1810 to the Divisions of Patna, Banaras and Bareilly.

As a result of the institution of this office the system of personal superintendence produced activity, vigilance and constant attention which brought considerable improvement in police matters. The crime situation of the Bengal Presidency had steadily improved. Dacoity had been nearly suppressed. Other offences like robbery, house breaking and theft had become less prevalent. The greater advantage of this office was that the management of the police was placed in the hands of an officer who could devote the whole of his attention to the police affairs, without being distracted by the duties of the civil court, or of the revenue department. Moreover, the actual position and functioning of the police department came under constant review, which greatly helped in improving the police.

The above arrangement did not last long, as in 1829, on the appointment of Divisional Commissioners or Commissioners of Revenue and Circuit, as they were called, the office of the Superintendent of Police was abolished. The functions of the Superintendent were transferred to the Commissioners. The
professed reason for the abolition of the post of Superintendent was that the retention of the post would involve duality of control over the magistrates but the real ground was the saving in expenditure. It was about this time that the office of the [judicial] magistrate was transferred from the judge to the Collector and the Collector-Magistrate became the head of the police.

A beginning in this direction was made as early as 1821 but as a regular policy measure this principle was adopted only under William Bentick in 1831. This measure raised a lot of hue and cry and was strongly condemned by all and sundry. It was argued that the union of thief-catcher and thief trier, as was done by the union of the office of Collector and Magistrate, was basically against the principle of criminal justice.

These two changes were followed by a deterioration in the state of the police and an increase of crime, especially dacoity. Crime statistics reveal that criminal incidents and occurrences increased many times. Whereas the folly of uniting the two offices was corrected by Lord Auckland some six years later (in 1837), it took a long time for the Britishers to again organise the police force as a separate administrative agency under one superior officer exclusively charged with policing functions.
The changes proved so disastrous that the Select Committee of Parliament, which considered the affairs of the East India Company, drew attention in the famous 'Fifth Report' (in 1813) to the deterioration in the police, particularly in Bengal. Considering this report and impressed by Peel's reform of 1827 in London Metropolitan Police, the Court of Directors issued a dispatch urging the consideration of similar measures in India. They gave orders that expense was not to stand in the way of improvement. But no concrete action was taken to materialise what was desired by the Court. Only in Bengal a committee under W.W. Bird was appointed in 1838 to consider the replies. This committee found that the chief cause of inefficiency was inadequate supervision.

Although no definite recommendation was made on this subject, but Mr. Frederick Halliday in a minute of dissent, proposed among other sweeping reforms, that the whole force should be under the control of a Superintendent General, with four covenanted officers as Deputies and a Superintendent and an Assistant Superintendent for each district a scheme of organisation which was introduced almost in its entirety some 25 years later.

There is something dramatic about the next development in the long search for a solution of the problem of upholding the law and maintaining order, by lawful measures, in India. It was as though the moment brought the man and his measure.

The solution was found, not in the places where Englishmen and Scotchmen had settled-and grumbled since the
sixteenth century about the inadequate policing of the neighbourhood on their Grand Juries and otherwise—not in the districts of Bengal or Madras where so many attempts had been made, but in the newly won province of Sind.\textsuperscript{76}

The principle of Halliday's proposed reforms was introduced by Sir Charles Napier in Sind soon after its annexation in 1843. Napier had realised that under-paid and ill-controlled police officers became oppressors. He maintained that only under a proper organization they could become efficient protectors of the people. Since Peel's system of Metropolitan Police in England was based on purely civilian force, Napier preferred the Royal Irish Constabulary, as his model. The new system constituted a separate and self contained police organization under which officers had no other functions but police duties to perform.

Sir George Clerk, the Governor of Bombay, who visited Sind in 1847 was so greatly impressed by the efficiency of the Sind Police that he immediately decided to reorganize the Bombay Police on these lines. In 1853, the Bombay Police was accordingly remodelled. Under the new system, a Superintendent of Police was appointed to every district who, while generally subordinate to the Magistrate had exclusive control over the police. It also provided for the appointment to every tehsil of an Indian police officer whose relations to the Mamlatdar (tehsildar) were the same as those between the Superintendent and the Magistrate. Other important feature was the transfer of the general control of the police from the Sadar Faujdari Adalat to the Judicial Secretary to the Government—a arrangement which proved
unsatisfactory - and was revised in 1855 by transferring the administration of the police from the Judicial Secretary to a Commissioner of Police, who was also Inspector of Prisons for the whole Presidency.

Madras was next Presidency which adopted the new system. The Torture Commission of 1855 had brought to light innumerable instances of torture inflicted on the well-disposed and peaceable people by the police which also exercised revenue powers. The Commission recommended the separation of revenue and police functions and placing the exclusive control of the police establishments in a district under a separate European Officer. In December 1858, W. Robinson, Inspector-General of Police, submitted a Memorandum on the re-organisation of the police system of Madras Presidency. It was drafted on the lines indicated by the late Court of Directors. Its main features were to make the police a distinct department under the direct supervision, control and management of its own officers and to divest it of judicial functions. A Chief Commissioner of Police was to be appointed for the whole Presidency. He was to be given the powers of the direction, discipline and internal economy of the police force in the Madras Presidency. The police establishments were to be adequately remunerated and properly controlled. A European Deputy Commissioner of Police and a sufficient number of subordinate officers and peons were to be appointed in each district. The judicial duties of the Magistrate were to be separated from those relating to the prevention and detection of crimes. The village police was to be
thoroughly and strictly localized as hithertofore. Its strength was to be increased and placed under the control of the District Superintendent. The village Moonsiff or Patel was to be substituted by a Police Inspector. The functions of the Police Inspector were to be executive in character. He was now to superintend the village watch. He was also to form a vital link between the village police and the general Constabulary.

Thus we have seen that the alien rulers conducted a number of experiments towards the development of a uniform system of police in India most of which, however, remained unsuccessful. However, these reforms provided the first Police Commission, which was appointed in 1860, a sound footing to understand the whole problem and to suggest measures to reorganise the police administration in India.

POST MUTINY DEVELOPMENT

The mutiny of 1857 shook very roots of the administration of law and order in India. Besides other things, it showed the sheer inefficiency and utter inadequacy of police administration in India. It directed the attention of the Crown towards the urgent need of reforming the police set-up in India. Consequently, the Imperial Government appointed a Police Commission in August 1860 with M.H. Court as its President. The Commission was required to make a comprehensive enquiry into the existing constitution of the police establishments throughout British India, with the view of ascertaining in what way they may be most effectually improved, and also whether in any part of
The police Commission in its historic report recommended
police
1) Abolition of the military as a separate organisation as it was considered incapable of performing every kind of police duty and was a financial waste, and the creation of a single homogeneous force of civil constabulary for the performance of all duties.

2) A province-based police system with an Inspector General at the head of police in each province as it would be helpful in bringing uniformity of general management and unity of action.

3) At the district level, Police was to be headed by a Superintendent of police who was to function under the general supervision and control of the District Magistrate.

4) These senior police functionaries viz. the Inspector General of Police, Superintendent of Police and the Assistant Superintendent of Police have to be European citizens.

5) A subordinate police force consisting of Inspectors, Head Constable, Sergeants and Constable; the Head Constable being charge of a Police Station and the Inspector of a group of Stations.

6) Retention of the village police, which was although
inefficient and corrupt, considering its necessity and usefulness in Indian context.

The major recommendations of the Commission were incorporated into a Bill which was more or less on the lines of Madras Act of 1859. Later on it was passed into an Act V of 1861. The Act applied to all British India except Bombay and Madras. These two provinces already had police acts almost identical to the Central Act.

It is, however, noteworthy that the reforms of 1860 did not give any fresh police force to India. They were neither revolutionary nor particularly novel. Instead, they created a new conglomeration of the old heterogenous elements deposited over a period of time both by accident and design. Actually, they presented the old corps with the label of a new force and perhaps also in a new clothing.

The significance of the act lay in the fact that it provided authoritative answers to the two questions implicit in British experimentation during the previous hundred years, namely, what should be the relations between imperial and rural police and how should imperial police administration be coordinated with other functions of imperial authority.

These reforms of 1860-61 could not be fully implemented. Its implementation was deterred in almost all the provinces on one account or the other. Either political or financial considerations prevailed at the cost of efficiency of the police administration. Nevertheless the importance of these reforms could not be under rated keeping in view the fact that
the new police system was a distinct improvement over the past, continued for a period of forty years and survived great stress and strains till the end of the 19th century.

Major weaknesses that were left in the aftermath of reforms of 1860 were the following:

a) Extent of cooperation envisaged between village police and regular police had not been achieved;

b) importance of police work had been underestimated and responsible duties were assigned to the untrained and ill-educated officers recruited in the lowest ranks from the lower strata of Society.

c) supervision had been defective;

d) the superior officers of the department were not sufficiently trained.

e) there was apparent increase in serious crimes and the measures taken for their prevention and detection were far from satisfactory.

f) corruption continued unchecked.

In July 1902, Lord Curzon, Viceroy of India set up a new Police Commission to make a searching enquiry into the functioning of police. The Commission found a great deal to criticize. The criticism, though, was directed at failure to achieve high levels of performance and not at the system itself. The new Commission strongly endorsed the organisational principles established in 1861. Consequently, one finds no recommendations for substantial organisational changes in the report of 1902. Some of the major recommendations of the
Commission were as follows:

1. A Criminal Investigation Department was to be established in each province with a Deputy IGP as its administrative head to control and supervise the organisation and working. A similar organisation for the entire country at the national level was also recommended with a fingerprint bureau and a special branch of CID to be established as part and parcel of this agency.

2. The province as a unit of administration was to be divided into several ranges and each such range was to be controlled by a Deputy IGP to be appointed for this purpose.

3. The office of the SP of the district was to be strengthened. A Deputy SP was to be appointed for this purpose.

4. A separate and independent police organisation to be known as Railway Police Force was also to be constituted. A police official of the rank of DIG was to head this organisation.

5. The Divisional Commissioner was no more to interfere directly in the day-to-day affairs and working of the police administration. Yet general control and supervision of the Commissioner were to stay in terms of direction, supervision and advice to the District Collector, who was in overall charge of law and order in the district.

6. At the lower rungs of administrative hierarchy, there were to be several police circles within a district. Each
of these circles was to be under a Sub-Inspector. The cadre of SIs was to be raised for the first time in India and they were henceforth to be distinguished from their former counterparts viz. the Darogas, the Thanedars and the Kotwals.

7. The pay and other remunerative benefits of the police officers right from the lowest constable to the highest IGP of the province were also to be raised quite substantially.

8. The institution of the village headman was to continue. He was to perform the rural police duties through the deployment of village watchmen.

9. Recruitment policy should be strengthened and proper training should be provided to the recruits. Moreover care should be taken while assigning any duties to any official and it should be confirmed that the person concerned is capable to perform them.

The recommendations of the commission were accepted by the government in their entirety, which later on served as the basis for the reorganisation of the police machine in the provinces.

POLICE IN POST-INDEPENDENCE INDIA.

India became independent in August 1947 and with that came the change in the nature and concept of State. It now became a Welfare State and since our political leadership entrusted the task of bringing development to the administration, it come to be
Development Administration. It, thus, became the responsibility of the administration to act as an agent of bringing development. However, for this it is necessary that the administration, including the police, must have a developmental perspective. But since we inherited the administration as a legacy from the British, it was completely wanting in such an attitudinal attribute. That's why, it was but essential, to attain the twin objectives of Welfare State and Development Administration, that there should have been a complete change of the functional aspect of the bureaucracy. But unfortunately this could not be achieved on account of one reason or the other.

Right after the independence, Indian administration had to face the problem of "depleting number" as a result of British officers, who were nearly 70% in the senior ranks, leaving India and the migration of a very large proportion of Muslim personnel. Consequently, a large number of higher positions fell vacant to which the Indian, earlier holding lower positions, were promoted. However, this had serious repercussions for the administration, as even the incompetent and inefficient persons were also promoted to the key administrative positions. Moreover, they were hardly equipped in training and experience to undertake the stupendous task of such a vast country with its manifold problems. In that also police administration had to face a still more grave problem that of internal disorder and a civil war-like situation following the partition of the country into India and Pakistan. The ultimate impact of all these factors was that no
change in the police administration could become possible.

During the last 45 years, the challenges of development so engaged the attention of the government administration, by and large, went unattended. Though the problems of organised crime and disorder have become both formidable and urgent in recent years, it seems paradoxical that most of the States have preferred to cling to the status quo in police administration. Though some of the states have appointed committees and commissions to recommend reforms in their police administration, yet their reports still await acceptance, let alone the question of sincere implementation by the governments. This situation has been clarified by Dr. P.D. Sharma in more explicit terms.

"The political masters do realise that the police machinery in India is outdated as well as ruthless. But any effort to improve it will make it less amenable to their dictates. The top civil bureaucracy, which enjoys its supremacy and superiority over the senior-most police personnel, shares its vested interests with the political masters and advises them to keep the police where it is. Senior police leadership is quite restive about the stagnant state of affairs, but conventions and professional ethics make them suffer in silence."

Seen in this background, we do find that the police administration in India is essentially a pre-independence machinery both in structure as well as in functioning. Even after a lapse of more than four decades we are not able to create a machinery (police) suiting our developmental needs, nor have we been able to provide it a new orientation in the changed socio-political context. We are still treading along the old police
machinery created to suit the purpose of the imperial government. It has been widely accepted that the police administration we are having doesn’t serve our purpose as even today it continues to be an instrument of oppression and repression.

It is a master of the people instead of their friend and guide. It acts autocratically, is inhuman in its behaviour.

The general apathy of the police and their ill behaviour with the community resulted into the formation of the National Police Commission in 1977 when Janta Party was voted to power. Although the Commission made certain far reaching recommendations to improve the functioning and increase the efficiency of the police administration and in the field of police public relationship in their report submitted in 1981, but it has remained a dead letter as has been in the case of reports of most of the other commissions and committees that have been appointed to look into the functioning of the Indian Administration in the post independence era. And it is lamented that police still continues to, more or less, what it was in the pre independence era.

NEED OF RESEARCH

In the modern complex societies, police is an inevitable necessity. As a law-enforcing agency, it acts for the attainment of twin-objectives of apprehending the law-breakers or breachers and of providing security and safety to the law-abiding citizens. Although the former function has remained important ever since the concept of police came into being, but the latter
one has acquired significance with the emergence of welfare state in the present century. However, for the better performance of these functions, the police administration needs to be scientifically organised and trained with human considerations as the focal point. But if we look at the police systems in various countries, we are shocked to find that the manner in which police are performing their functions are completely contrary to the ideals of a welfare state. This is particularly so in the case of developing countries and in those which had remained colonies of industrial mights in the colonial era.

It, therefore, becomes necessary to reorganise and reorient the system of policing in such countries and for this purpose there is need to conduct more and more studies and research on this subject. However, it is a matter of deep concern that the subject has not been given due importance and attention by the scholars especially at home. Again, the Indian police administration is a particularly neglected area as very few studies have been conducted on it. Moreover, most of the studies that are conducted till now, are either by the political scientists or sociologists from their respective angels. Whereas the administrative angle of police needs to be dealt with urgently, it is the most neglected one. The present is an endeavour in that direction.
STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

An encounter with the needs highlighting the necessity of research in police administration led the researcher to concentrate on various aspects/facets of Police Administration with a zeal to explore the same. Thus the following statement of problem emerged:

"Police Administration: A Case Study of Rohtak District."

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The present study is conducted on the following objectives:

1. To study the state of police-public relationship;
2. To study and analyze the necessity of reforms in police administration;
3. To study and analyze the level of efficiency of police administration;
4. To study the senior-subordinate relationship in police organisation;
5. To study and analyze the aspect of unionism in police administration;
6. To take note of the nature of the existing police magistracy relationship;

7. To study and analyze the behaviour of police with offenders and detainees;

8. To study the impact of Spoils system/ mass transfers on police administration.

HYPOTHESIS

The present study is aimed at testing the following hypothesis:

1. Police community relations are not cordial;

2. Police administration needs dire reforms structurally as well as functionally;

3. The efficiency of the police organization is more utilised for unproductive aspects amounting to its misuse;

4. Senior-subordinate relationship in police hierarchy is more orthodoxy-monarchical than democratic and participative;

5. Unionism in police needs to be discouraged and replaced by some mediation machinery.
6. Application of spoil system/frequent mass transfers for higher positions in police organisation are not advisable;

7. Duality of police magistracy relationship exists and cannot be resolved by making any one of the two supercede the other.

DELIMITATION OF THE STUDY

In view of the paucity of time and resources, the research has delimited the study in the following manner:

1. The study has been limited to organisational and functional aspects of Police Administration.

2. The study has been limited to Rohtak district of Haryana State only.

3. The study has been restricted to a period of ten years i.e., from 1983 to 1993.

METHODODOLOGY

In requirement of the nature of research study, case study is the most obvious method supplemented by questionnaire method, both the methods running on the lines of empirical as well as normative survey. The researcher, therefore, has opted for the case study and questionnaire methods and prepared the research design accordingly.
RESEARCH DESIGN

Research design is a set of tools to prove or disprove the hypothesis. It includes the selection, organisation and application of the set of tools.

SELECTION OF RESEARCH DESIGN

The selection of Research Design is directly related to the problem under study. After the problem is selected and stated, the research design is brought in to carry out the Research.

ORGANISATION OF A RESEARCH DESIGN

Various research tools are organised in a linear manner so as to facilitate the research process.

APPLICATION OF RESEARCH DESIGN

After the selection and organisation of a research design, it is ascertained as to how and in what manner the Design is to be applied. This would amount to accomplish the research study. Broadly, the Research Design is categorized in two ways:

1. Classic Research Design
2. Experimental Research Design
In a Classic Research Design there is a control group and an understudy group upon which the research tools are to be tested. The significance of difference in pretest and post test is the outcome of the research project.

In an Experimental Research Design, the researcher is directly concerned with the group or sample under experiment and the results are computed to an observational manner.

Keeping in view the nature of study and the Research Design adopted following samples have been chosen by the researcher to collect the requisite data for the study:

1. Sample No. 1. : The General Public within the Rohtak District.

This sample of 50 inhabitants of Rohtak District has been randomly chosen and has been sub-classed into 3 categories viz. The Elite & Middle Class, the Lower strata of society and the students. Questionnaire No. 1 containing 16 questions was administered to them.

2. Sample No. 2 : Police Person

This sample of 50 policemen below the rank of Inspector posted in various Police Station of Rohtak District, has been randomly chosen and Questionnaire No. 2 containing 10
question was administered to them.

3. Sample No. 3: Police Persons as Private Self

To ascertain and include in the study the private views of police persons about the police force, a sample of 50 policemen below the rank of Inspector posted in various Police Station of District Rohtak was chosen and Questionnaire No. 3 containing 19 questions was administered to them.

4. Sample No. 4: Police Magistracy Relationship

A sample of 20 officers of police and executive side above the rank of Inspectors and Superintendent respectively was chosen randomly from amongst officers of both sides presently working in Rohtak District and Questionnaire No. 4 containing 10 questions was administered to them.

5. Sample No. 5: Police Polity Relationship

A random sample of 50 politicians from major political parties of the state viz the Congress (I), Samajwadi Janata Party, Haryana Vikas Party and the Bharatiya Janata Party was chosen and Questionnaire No. 5 containing 10 questions was administered to them.
6. Sample 6: Police Detainee Relationship

A sample of 50 detainees detained in the lock-ups of various police stations of Rohtak District was randomly chosen and Questionnaire No. 6 containing 15 questions was intended to be administered to them.

The data thus collected with the help of Questionnaire Nos 1 to 5 has been organised and tabulated, analysed and interpreted and the inferences drawn have been explained in the coming chapters.
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