CHAPTER VI
DISTRICT ADMINISTRATION AND DISTRICT POLICE ADMINISTRATION

Overview

In this chapter an attempt has been made to analyze the crimes position in Theni District and how far the District Administration stands in the way of the effective functioning of District Police Administration and the need for restructuring of District Police Administration for its effective functioning.

Crimes Position in Theni District

The details relating to crimes position from 2006 to 2008 in Theni District are discussed in the following pages.

Property Crimes

The details relating to the incidence of Property Crimes for the year 2006 to 2008 are provided in table 6.1 and diagram 6.1.

Table 6.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Crime Head</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Murder for Gain</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Dacoity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Property &amp; Assembly for Dacoity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Theft</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>308</strong></td>
<td><strong>359</strong></td>
<td><strong>359</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The details relating to the incidence of Property Crimes for the year 2006 to 2008 provided in the above table and diagram indicate that two cases during 2006 and three cases during 2007 under the category of murder for gain cases have been reported; three decoity cases have been reported during 2006; one property and assembly for decoity case has been reported during 2007; six cases during 2006, nine cases during 2007 and 21 cases during 2008 under the category of robbery cases have been reported; 68 cases during 2006, 105 cases during 2007 and 75 cases during 2008 under the category of burglary cases have been reported; 229 cases during 2006, 241 cases during 2007 and 263 cases during 2008 under the category of Theft cases have been reported; totaling 308 cases during 2006, 359 cases during 2007 and 359 cases during 2008 under the category of property crimes have been reported.
Violent Crimes

The details relating to the incidence of Violent Crimes for the year 2006 to 2008 are provided in table 6.2 and diagram 6.2.

**Table 6.2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Crime Head</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Murder</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Attempt to Commit Murder</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>C.H. Not Amounting to Murder</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Hurt/Grievous Hurt</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Riots</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>488</strong></td>
<td><strong>647</strong></td>
<td><strong>628</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The details relating to the incidence of Violent Crimes for the year 2006 to 2008 provided in the above table and diagram indicate that 22 cases during 2006, 26 cases during 2007 and 28 cases during 2008 under the category of murder cases have been reported; 30 cases during 2006, 62 cases during 2007 and 55 cases during 2008 under the category of Attempt to Commit Murder cases have been reported; one case during 2007 and one case during 2008 under the category of C.H. Not Amounting to Murder cases have been reported; 387 cases during 2006, 481 cases during 2007 and 484
cases during 2008 under the category of Hurt/Grievous Hurt cases have been reported; 49 cases during 2006, 77 cases during 2007 and 60 cases during 2008 under the category of Riots cases have been reported; 488 cases during 2006, 647 cases during 2007 and 628 cases during 2008 under the category of Violent Crimes have been reported.

**Crime Against Women**

The details relating to the incidence of Crime Against Women for the year 2006 to 2008 are provided in table 6.3 and diagram 6.3.

**Table 6.3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Crime Head</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Dowry Death</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Molestation</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Sexual Harassment</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Cruelty by Husband &amp; Relatives</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>87</strong></td>
<td><strong>127</strong></td>
<td><strong>113</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Diagram 6.3**

**Crime Against Women**
The details relating to the incidence of Crime Against Women for the year 2006 to 2008 provided in the above table and diagram reveal that 5 cases during 2006, 4 cases during 2007 and 7 cases during 2008 under the category of rape cases have been reported; 3 cases during 2006, 3 cases during 2007 and 4 cases during 2008 under the category of dowry death cases have been reported; 21 cases during 2006, 42 cases during 2007 and 30 cases during 2008 under the category of molestation cases have been reported; 16 cases during 2006, 12 cases during 2007 and 5 cases during 2008 under the category of sexual harassment cases have been reported; 17 cases during 2006, 44 cases during 2007 and 35 cases during 2008 under the category of cruelty by husband and relatives cases have been reported; 25 cases during 2006, 22 cases during 2007 and 32 cases during 2008 under the category of kidnapping and abduction of women and girls cases have been reported; totaling 87 cases during 2006, 127 cases during 2007 and 113 cases during 2008 under the category of crimes against women have been reported.

**Other Crimes**

The details relating to the incidence of other crimes for the year 2006 to 2008 are provided in table 6.4 and diagram 6.4.

**Table 6.4**

**Other Crimes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Crime Head</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Kidnapping &amp; Abduction of Others</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Criminal Breach of Trust</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Arson</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Cheating</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Counterfeiting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Other IPC Crimes</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>2473</td>
<td>3780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1990</strong></td>
<td><strong>2579</strong></td>
<td><strong>3892</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The details relating to the incidence of other crimes for the year 2006 to 2008 provided in the above table and diagram indicate that 5 cases during 2006 and 3 cases during 2008 under the category of kidnapping and abduction of others cases have been reported; 6 cases during 2006, 5 cases during 2007 and 2 cases during 2008 under the category of criminal breach of trust cases have been reported; 8 cases during 2006, 26 cases during 2007 and 17 cases during 2008 under the category of arson cases have been reported; 72 cases during 2006, 74 cases during 2007 and 88 cases during 2008 under the category of cheating cases have been reported; one case during 2007 and two cases during 2008 under the category of counterfeiting cases have been reported; and 1899 cases during 2006, 2473 cases during 2007 and 3780 cases during 2008 under the category of other IPC Crimes cases have been reported; totaling 1990 cases during 2006, 2579 cases during 2007 and 3892 cases during 2008 under the category of IPC Crimes have been reported.
**Special and Local Laws Cases under Indian Penal Code**

The Important Sections under which the Indian Penal Code (IPC) cases registered are Sections 304, 429, 294 (b), 160, 283, 411, 377, 224, 384, 318, 355, 509, 306, 332, 353, 328, 329, 143, 188, 506 (i), 506 (ii), 279, 336, 337, 338, 323 IPC R/W 190 (b), 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 471, 472, 473, 475, 476, 477 and 477 (A). The cases registered under the above Sections of Indian Penal Code are Murder, Attempt to Commit Murder, Culpable homicide Not Amounting To Murder, Rape, Kidnapping and Abduction, Dacoity, Preparation and Assembly for Dacoity, Robbery, Burglary, Theft, Riots, Criminal Breach of Trust, Cheating, Counterfeiting, Arson, Hurt, Dowry Deaths, Molestation, Sexual harassment, Cruelty by Husband and Relatives, Importation of Girls, Causing Death By Negligence and other IPC Crimes.


The details relating to the Special and Local Laws Cases under Indian Penal Code and other Special and Local Laws Cases are provided in table 6.5 and diagram 6.5.
### Table 6.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl.No.</th>
<th>Category of Cases</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Special and Local Laws under Indian Penal Code Cases</td>
<td>2873</td>
<td>3712</td>
<td>4992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Special and Local Laws Cases</td>
<td>7858</td>
<td>10405</td>
<td>9858</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Diagram 6.5

**Special and Local Laws Cases under Indian Penal Code and Other Special and Local Laws Cases**

![Graph showing number of cases from 2006 to 2008]

The crime statistics furnished in the above table makes it clear that crimes under the IPC have been 2873 during 2006, 3712 during 2007 and 4992 during 2008. The crimes under Special and Local Laws have been 7858 during 2006, 10405 during 2007 and 9858 during 2008. Though the Crimes under Indian Penal Code have been around 5000, the Crimes under Special and Local Laws have been around 11,000.1

---

The crime statistics under Indian Penal Code and Special and Local Laws Cases under Indian Penal Code and other Special and Local Laws Cases analyzed in the above pages make it clear that there has been an increase of crime under Indian Penal Code and phenomenal growth in the Special and Local Laws Cases under Indian Penal Code and other Special and Local Laws Cases. In order to deal with crimes effectively, the District Police Administration should be strengthened. It is said that the District Police are unable to tackle the crimes effectively because of the existing arrangements between District Administration and District Police Administration in dealing with Law and Order problems and Crimes at the District level. In the following pages an attempt has been made to analyze how far the District Administration stand in the way of the effective functioning of District Police Administration and the need for restructuring of District Police Administration for its effective functioning.

**District as an Important Unit of Administration**

India is organized administratively into Union, States, Districts, Sub-Divisions, Taluks, Blocks, Circles and Villages. Of these, the basic territorial unit of public administration is the District. It is the unit of administration for various Departments like revenue, Police, judiciary, agriculture, animal husbandry, health and medical care, education, industry, public relations, etc. which have their jurisdiction extending over the District. The District is, therefore, a multifunctional unit of administration.

**The Changing Scenario**

Before independence, the Indian administrative system was governed by a “ruling bureaucracy” in the sense that the officials combined in themselves a significant measure of political authority with adequate administrative clout. They had unfettered powers and a relatively limited responsibility. The District Collector was the principal functionary, the fulcrum and the pivot of the District
Administration. He represented the Provincial Government in its totality. He verily acted as the eyes, ears and arms of the Government. Such an overriding role of the Collector was envisaged as early as 1872, exactly a hundred years after the inception of this institution, when Sir George Campbell, the then Lieutenant Governor of Bengal wrote: “It is the Lieutenant Governor’s wish to render the heads of the Districts no longer the drudgery of many Department and masters of none but in fact the general controlling authority over all Departments in each District...the real Executive Chief and Administrator of that tract of country committed to him and Supreme over everyone and everything except the proceedings of the Courts of Justice”.2

**Role of the Administrative System after Independence**

With independence came a sea change. The old priorities were suddenly gone. The role of the administrative system changed in the context of three major factors, namely democracy, development and decentralization. The Community Development Programme was introduced in the early fifties and the three-tier Panchayati Raj in the late fifties and the early sixties. Administration was to carry out the policies and programmes for economic development and social change. This implied transformation not only in the aims of administration but also in it’s rising expectations changed the entire nature of District Administration. The District administrators were no longer the rulers but the servants of the people.

**Collector: His Multiple Roles**

The District Collector is the Chief representative of the Government in the District. Rajni Kothari observes: “The Office of the Collector in India is in many ways unique and its supposed stature and authority have engendered a sort of institutionalized charisma that is in some ways unparalleled in modern administrative

---

development”. His functions can be broadly organized under two heads: regulatory and development. Regulatory functions include: maintenance of law and order, collection of revenue, magisterial responsibilities (criminal) and general functions.

**Maintenance of Law and Order**

The District Collector is in charge of law and order, which is the basis of civilized life. One effect of complete separation of executive and judiciary, after independence, was to free the Police from the controls of the Executive Magistrates. In the new set-up, District Magistrates hardly have any control over the Police and the Superintendents of Police successfully agitated to abolish the old system of District Magistrates initiating their confidential reports. Several Collectors are of the view that the Superintendent of Police no longer considers the Collector as his official superior, although the latter as the District Magistrate is the head of the criminal administration in the District. Whether the primacy of the Magistracy over the Police should continue or the Police be conferred complete organizational, professional and functional autonomy with the Superintendent of Police formally made responsible for law and order vests with the Police Commissioner, the District Magistrate having no say whatever, in this field. The critics of the present relationship argue for an extension of the Commissioner of Police system arrangement to other parts of the country. The present practice is that the organizational and professional control of the Police up to the District level is exercised by the Superintendent of Police above the District level by the Deputy Inspector General of Police and Inspector General of Police. Nevertheless, subject to certain restrictions, the general

---

4 Eswar Anand, V., was Told so by Several Collectors During this Work on a Research Project on District Administration in Orissa. See V. Eswar Anand, "Importance of Being the Collector," The Statesman (Calcutta), 8 November 1984, p.6.
functional control over the Superintendent of Police is that of the District Magistrate and in the exercise of this control, the District Magistrate is guided by the Revenue Divisional Commissioner and by the Government and not by the Police hierarchy.

**Dual Control of Law and Order Administration at the District Level**

The dual control exercised over the District Police which is the machinery for law and order administration at the District level is to be examined with reference to the principle of “Unity of Command”. Administrative efficiency is supposed to be enhanced by arranging the members of an organization in a determinate hierarchy of authority in order to preserve the unity of command. An analysis of this principle requires a clear understanding of what is meant by the term “authority”. A subordinate may be said to accept authority whenever he permits his behaviour to be guided by a decision reached by another.

The principle of unity of command cannot be ignored for it is physically impossible for a person to obey to contradictory commands from two higher officials and authorities. The principle involves something more than the physical impossibility. If a person is called upon to obey two contradictory commands in an organization, the result is confusion, inefficiency and even paralysis of organizational activity. The same is the case with multiple commands, which are not contradictory. There must be only one master. “A man cannot serve two masters” is a principle of human relations in everyday life. A workman subject to orders from several superiors will be confused, inefficient and irresponsible; a workman subject to orders from one superior maybe methodical, efficient and

---

5 The Principle of ‘Unity of Command’ Briefly and Simply Stated Means “An Employee Should Receive Orders from one Superior Only”. The Concept Requires that Every Member of an Organization Should Reports One and Only One Leader.

To protect the employee against the evils of multiple and contradictory commands it is suggested that a subordinate should accept the authority of only one superior in implementing decisions and carrying out his functions. This principle of unity of command believes that it is undesirable if a member of an organization is placed in a position where he receives command from more than one superior.  

The unity of command means that subordinates formally report to only one boss. Ultimately all authority and responsibility rest at the top. This is the supreme co-coordinating entity with official authority to impose its fiat upon all subordinate echelons. This principle is incompatible with the principle of specialization. On the other side of specialization is Taylor’s theory of functional supervision. The term functional has many shades of meaning but that one of them comes close to being synonymous with staff. Reference to functional contacts, functional authority and functional relations really suggests those specialized activities attached to the line, but now necessarily exercising command authority. Taylor advocated this specialization in supervisory function for industry. But it made its appearance in Public Administration too. In accordance with the principle of specialization an individual may be subjected to ‘dual command’ or ‘control’ - one administrative and the other technical or professional. As far as commands are not contradictory, duality is not harmful.

Although in administration the word ‘Control’ has become a technical s term, it has retained much its common literal meaning. In its common usage, control includes directing, compelling, guiding and instructing as well as basis for evaluating, judging or deciding or

---

7Ibid, p.56.
8Ibid, p.60.
acting; whereas in its technical use, it covers the latter only, the
former falling within others parts of the administrative process -
mainly that of directing. Control may be used not only to weed out
wrong aims or actions, but also to guide future actions.

Control without power of authority is hardly inconceivable; hence the importance of our knowing the nature and
source of this power. Control, as one of the elements in total
administrative process is inseparable from other elements. The
connection of control with organization, direction, co-ordination and
planning is implicit in the common meaning as well as in the technical
usage of these terms. Planning sets up purposes and outlines
procedures and means of attaining the purposes; organization divides
the labour and holds people to their jobs; direction authorizes and
orders actions, plans and policies and can penalize inaction or abuse;
co-ordination holds together, to the end that each supports or
supplements the others. All these contribute to control in a broad and
general sense.\footnote{12}

The unity of command is a sine qua non for achieving co-
ordination in an organization. Co-ordination means the removal of
conflicts and overlapping in administration. Its aim is to secure co-
operation and teamwork among the numerous employees engaged in
the work of organization. Co-ordination has to do with the
administrative effort to help, formulate, adopt, transmit, give effect to,
interpret and oversee the policies of the organization.\footnote{13} Co-ordination
is placing the many aspects of an enterprise in proper position relative
to each other and to the programme of which they are a part; it is

\footnote{12} Ibid., p.205.
\footnote{13} Ordway Tead, The Art of Administration, New York, 1951.
harmoniously combined agents and functions towards and achievements of a desired goal.\textsuperscript{14}

Co-ordination and control go hand in glove with each other. Once the goals of programme has been set, its policies and plans determined, money provided, organization tailored to the need, personnel assigned, direction given, delegation determined and supervision provided for, then co-ordination is the means of bringing all these factors together in an inter-locking relationship, and control is the technique whereby all are checked and kept on the track towards the goals that were set. Co-ordination is the active means by which a blend is secured; control is the analytical method by which the blend is regularly tested and evaluated. Thus co-ordination and control close the circle in the administrative process.\textsuperscript{15} Thus the focus is upon provisions for the smooth working of the organization as a whole, beyond that of each of its functional parts and upon the fostering of personal outlooks which facilities a unified result.

Organization as a way of co-ordination requires the establishment of a system of authority whereby the central purpose or objective of an enterprise is translated into reality through the combined efforts of many specialists each working in his own field at a particular time and place.\textsuperscript{16} It is clear from long experience in human affairs that such a structure of authority requires not only many men at work in many places at selected times but also a simple directing executive authority.

The dual control exercised over the District Police by the Superior Officers of the Police Departments and the Collector or the District Magistrate is a hangover of the colonial Administration. The Collector as the District Magistrate is the Chief Executive authority in

\textsuperscript{14}Marshalls Edward Dimock, V. Gladys Ogden Dimock: Public Administration, New Delhi, 1970, pp.257.258.
\textsuperscript{15}Ibid., p.258.
the District and as such is primarily responsible for the maintenance of law and order and the criminal administration in the District. The District Police functions as the Executive arm of the District Magistrate. It is an organized civil force representing the concept and practice of maintenance of public peace safety and other and devoting the operative agency for ensuring these essentials of a civilized living. To this end, the Police are invested under the law with protective detective and restrictive powers of wide ramifications touching the liberties of citizens at innumerable points in their lives.

The head of the Police force in the District is the Superintendent of Police, a member of the Indian Police Service who works under the general control and direction of the District Magistrate. The District Magistrate as the head of the Criminal administration and responsible for its efficiency, controls and directs the Police, and can make such disposition of the force in consultation with the Superintendent of Police, as are needed for the maintenance of law and order and control of crime. The Superintendent of Police is responsible for the efficiency and good behaviour of the District Police in all matters concerning its internal economy and managements and for the proper performance of all its preventive and executive functions.

The District Superintendent of Police and other subordinate Police Officers shall make it a point of meeting as frequently as possible the Magistrate of the District in which they are employed and have a free and full consultation with them on all subjects connected with the Police work of their Districts.

The Magistrate of the District may also require the Superintendent of Police to submit report on any matter connected with crimes, maintenance, of law and order, prevention of disorder.

etc. Thus the District Magistrate exercises general functional control over the Superintendent of Police and the latter exercises organizational and professional control over the Police force.

In this context the legal position of the Superintendent of Police and the District Magistrate should be examined. The term District Magistrate has been defined by Section 1 of the Police Act (5) of 1861 in the following words:

“The words ‘Magistrate of the District’ shall mean the Chief Officer charged with the executive administration of a District and exercising the powers of a Magistrate by whatever designation of Chief Officer charged with such executive administration is styled”.

The conceptual backdrop of duality of control over the Superintendent of Police stems from Section 4 of the Police Act (5) 1861, which reads as follows:

“The administration of the Police throughout a general Police District shall be vested in an Officer to be styled the Inspector General of Police and in such Deputy Inspectors General and Assistant Inspectors General as to the State Government shall deem fit. The administration of Police throughout local jurisdiction of the Magistrate of the District shall, under the general control and direction of such Magistrate, be vested in a District Superintendent and such Assistant District Superintendents as the state Government shall consider necessary.”

Accordingly the administration of Police in a District is vested in the District Superintendent of Police and such Assistant Superintendents of Police subject to the general control and direction of the District magistrate. By virtue of the second s part of Section (4) of the Police Act of 1861, the District Magistrate has been made to play a significant role in the Police administration of a District. Section (4) also enjoins upon the Deputy Superintendent of Police to discharge
his responsibilities pertaining to law and order in consultation with or under the supervision of the District Magistrate.

By virtue of the same Section, the administration of the Police in the whole State vests in the Inspector General of Police, the Deputy Inspectors General and the Assistant Inspectors General. Undeniably the administration of Police in a District is subordinate to the administration of Police in the State. Thus Section (4) prescribes a diarchy of administration which, legally speaking, means that only the Superintendent of Police is subject to a dual control—general functional control of the District Magistrate and all administrative, technical, professional and organizational control of the Inspector General of Police, Deputy Inspector General of Police and Assistant Inspector General of Police.

The role played by the District Magistrate in the administration of the District Police is governed and circumscribed by the provisions of Indian Police Act 1861. These provisions are supplemented by the rules framed by the State Governments under Section 46 of the Indian Police Act of 1861. The relationship between the District Magistrate and the Superintendent of Police is best illustrated as follows: “The administration of Police throughout the District shall, under the general control and direction of the District Magistrate, be vested in the District Superintendent of Police. Such general control and direction shall not extend to the internal management and discipline of the force, which are primarily vested in the District Superintendent of Police.”

---

18 Now the Administration of the Police in the whole State vests in the Director General of Police.
19 Prabhu Datta Sharma, Indian Police- a developmental approach, New Delhi, 1977, pp.31-32. In the report of the National Police Commission (1977) it is stated that the S.P. is subjected to two controls—hierarchical control by the Officers of the Police and operational control by the Chief Executive of the District (Fifth Report para 39.3).
It is in the light of the above mentioned duality of control over the Superintendent of Police that the entire gamut of relationship between District Magistrate and Superintendent of Police and ‘Inter Alia’ the role of the District Magistrate in the administration of the District Police has to be viewed and analyzed.

According to certain Police Officers dual control is only on paper. Police have to deal completely with laws and order situation. The Collector acts only on the information supplied by the Police. There is a chance of disagreement on how to act in a particular situation. But really no such problem arises. Actually this dual control system was introduced at a time when Collector belonged to the Indian Civil Service and the Police Officers were of inferior calibre.

**District Collector and the Superintendent of Police**

The relationship between the District Collector and the Superintendent of Police may be viewed in relation to the Generalist-Specialist dichotomy in Public Administration. The Collector as the Generalist Administrator is trained to handle a vast and varied field ranging from the maintenance of law and order to development projects. He has to learn the art of managing individuals and social forces to achieve results. In the discharge of his duties, he is assisted by the Specialists in various fields of administration. In the maintenance of law and order in the District, the Collector is assisted by the Police, which is a specialized service. In the field of development, he co-ordinates the work of various Specialists, ranging from Agriculture Specialists to Public Works and Cooperation Specialists. General Administration is concerned with all types of administrative process indicated by the word “POSDCORB”\(^1\). It is understood to mean those duties, which are concerned with the formulation of policies with co-ordination and improvements of Government machinery and with the general management and control

---

\(^1\)Planning, Organization, Staffing, Directing Co-Ordination, Reporting & Budgeting.
of the Department. The generalist is professional administrator, who possesses the skill and techniques of Manager and a kind of politician. As a manager he is entrusted with the responsibility of getting things done and as a politician he is responsible for interpreting the public mind to complex social, economic and even political problems of the State within the constraints of administration. The administrative all rounder - The Generalist - played a crucial part by linking the broad objectives of the politician to the more specific or vocational orientation of specialist interest. He plays the role of facilitator, mediator, arbiter and coordinator. As a facilitator the role of the generalist calls for the knowledge of the system. The politician provides ideas and motive force. The generalist has to ensure that decisions are properly recorded, processed and implemented. When the generalist links the specialist to the rest of the system he plays the role of a mediator. The role of arbiter demands the ability to compare and reconcile the conflicting priorities. In a large degree, a generalist performs the work of a coordinator.

Public personnel in India fall into two broad categories. Those who are recruited to a service on the basis of their pre-entry professional qualification are specialists where as those recruited on the basis of general educational background irrespective of subjects studied in the universities are ‘generalists’. The Generalists service again falls into two groups - functional and general administrative services. Police is a functional service, which has a well-defined functional area in which it has to specialize and operate through a specified Department or organization. On the other hand, the administrative service, which has been primarily organized for District Administration, does not have a well-defined functional area beyond

---

23 Jain, R.B., Contemporary Issues in Indian Administration, Delhi, 1976, p.188.
the District level. The members of the Indian Administrative Service fall into this category.

Personnel belonging to general administrative service require a diverse nature of experience, a breadth of vision and outlook, a capacity to co-ordinate and synthesize mutually conflicting approaches and an understanding of socio-economic and political environment. On the other hand the Specialists who have a deeper knowledge of their narrow specialized field become rigid and inflexible in their approach and over enthusiastic in respect of their own specialism. Their differing characteristics are often directed by calling ‘Generalists’ as ‘multi-functional’ and specialists as ‘unifunctional’. Accordingly the members of the Indian Administrative Service are ‘Multifunctionaries’ and those of the Indian Police Service are ‘Unifunctionaries’.

The Generalists can exercise his function only with the wholehearted co-operation of the specialist class. In the case of Collector-Police relationship the Collector is responsible for the maintenance of law and order at the District level while he can exercise this function only with the assistance of the Police organization under the Superintendent of Police. In this relationship, the Superintendent of Police cannot be a sub-ordinate to the Collector as a Deputy Collector is to the Collector. The traditional hierarchical relations that the Generalist is on the ‘top’ and the specialist on the ‘tap’ cannot be applied to this situation.

In certain cases the dichotomy of ‘Generalists’ and ‘Specialists’ is blurred in regard to the use of services by the employer. Specialists belong to the functional services. They spend their entire career in the parent Department, unless their services are required in other Departments. But the concept of parent Department is alien to

---

the Generalists. They move from one Department to another. Hence they are birds of passage.26

The District Collector is the ultimate authority in the case of law and order at the District level. He is the Executive Magistrate. The Police under the Superintendent of Police, which is the functional agency, have to work under the general control of the District Magistrate. In this vein, the Police can be considered a specialist as the Police is the only agency capable of assessing law and order situation developing in the District and to report to the Collector about it and to suggest the course of action to be taken to deal with the situation. In this set up neither the Collector nor the Superintendent of Police can exercise the power relating to law and order alone. They must work together as a team, harmonizing different approaches and synthesizing different experiences. No particular class of functionaries can claim a monopoly of managerial skills and administrative capacities.27 The Police get appropriate training for maintenance of law and order and prevention and detection of crime. Collector is actually a generalist who decides certain courses of action based on the information received from the Police.

No specialism today stands complete in itself in terms of problems confronting the society. Several specialisms require be integrating and putting into a defined relationship in order to fulfill any large-scale task.28 The specialist’s judgment has to be evaluated in the larger framework of social, economic, political and administrative considerations. They call for consultation, synthesis, co-ordination and control, which are the true functions of a generalist

administrator. Viewed in this way, both the generalists and specialists have complementary roles to play in public administration.

The powers relating to the maintenance of law and order are shared both by the Collector and the Superintendent of Police. In the development administration the pressure for increased specialization on the one hand and the pressure for greater co-ordination on the other are to be accommodated with a view to replacing the superior-subordinate relationship with a new concept of partnership.\(^\text{29}\)

It may be mentioned that the collector is heavily armed with a plethora of powers connected with development administration. At the same time the powers of maintaining law and order, which are the legacies of the British are, also retained. Consequently his importance is gradually being shifted from the maintenance of law and order to the developmental work.

**Conflicts and Co-operation in the Collector - Police Relationship**

In the study of dual control of law and order administration and its feasibility, the areas of conflicts and co-operation in the Collector-Police relationship may be examined.

The necessary and irksome control over the Superintendent of Police and his abject subordination to the District Collector has been the cause of much friction between the two personnel. The duality of control over the sub-ordinate Police has been the cause of divided loyalties, shirking of responsibility at all levels and delay in carrying out orders.\(^\text{30}\)

In certain instances the Collector and the Superintendent of Police are brought into intimate contact. They are aware of the necessity of working together and of the importance of harmonious

\(^{29}\text{Muttalib, M.A., op.cit., p.750.}\)

\(^{30}\text{Misra, S.C., Police Administration in India, Mount Abu, 1970, p.65.}\)
relations. They are always not in agreement. The Superintendent may resent the Collector suggesting that a certain Station House Officer has misbehaved and ought to be investigated, the Collector on the other hand may feel that his Superintendent is too protective of the personnel under his Command and is not ready to weed and prune as complaints to the Collector warrant.\textsuperscript{31}

A Collector suddenly perceives the need for a movement of Armed Police in order to contain potentially dangerous events. The Superintendent, feeling the move unnecessary, interprets the suggestions as a command and away believes he has been treated as a subordinate and not as a colleague.

The Collector and the Superintendent belonging to the All India Services first think in terms of their services. The level of Government they serve comes only next. A Superintendent thinks of himself as an Indian Police Service Officer first, second as the member of a District Command Team. The Collector also nurtures a profound sense of pride in his service (Indian Administrative Service). This factor mars the working relationship between the Collector and the Superintendent of Police in most of the States. In some States the conflicts culminated in the transfer of one Officer or both. Sometimes bitterness runs down to the staff, to the public and to the politicians.

Every system of Government is dependent in the last report on the men who run the administration. In general, the dual system indeed had certain advantages, although it was inevitable that personalities played an important role. Where the District Officer was weak and allowed himself to become the rubber stamp of his Superintendent of Police the system was at its worst.\textsuperscript{32} N.B. Banerjee during his service worked with many British Superintendents of Police and Deputy Inspectors General of Police than Indian Officers.

\begin{footnotesize}\textsuperscript{31}David H. Bayley, Police and Political Development in India, New Jersy, 1969, p.359. \\
\textsuperscript{32}Banerjee, N.B., Under two Masters, Oxford University Press, 1970, p.136.\end{footnotesize}
Although there were disagreements, the difficult problems were settled by informal discussions.

In the relationship between the two Officers one thing must be emphasized. The Superintendent Police is the line authority that directs and coordinates the field operations. The Collector must take into consideration the loyalty that the Superintendent Commands from his force and the allegiance which he owes to his Departmental seniors. Both the functionaries are executants of policy and directives, which they receive through two different communication channels. Coordination of law and order cannot successfully be done if a single major element in the machinery functions erratically or in a way as to produce friction. “A competent Collector will, therefore, use his locus with the calculation of a strategist; the self-possession of a philosopher, the dominance of a charismatic leader and the informality of an intimate friend so that there will be created in the Police the necessary psychological preparedness for the instinctive acceptance of his authority.”33 The difficulties arising from the possible power equation between the Collector and the Superintendent of Police are easily overcome, if the former is capable of developing his informal authority to stabilize and to assert unassumingly his formal authority. Once this is achieved, Coordination in the field of law and order will be a smooth wholehearted cooperation under the overall direction and control of the collector.

Sometimes the problem of relationship may be aggravated by age differences between the Collector and the Superintendent of Police. When the Superintendent of Police is older, he may resent the supervision of the young Collector. The idea of a young Collector may be resented by the Superintendent of Police as being too bookish and

---

theoretical, not matured through practical experience in the field.\textsuperscript{34} Sometimes an imaginative Superintendent has to work with an older Collector who is not of the Indian Administrative Service but has been promoted from the State service. The Indian Police Service officer may suffer untold anguish in subordinating himself to men of this stamp.

According to Bayley, the rivalry assumes a host of petty forms. Some Indian Police Service Officers are reported to go to extreme lengths never to appear before the Collector “Covered”, that is, with their uniform caps on, so that they will not have to salute. Others in order to underscore their collegiate status with the Collector will carefully change from Khaki uniform to bush shirt and non-uniform trousers before attending a meeting with him. Collectors are often invited to preside over cultural events or at prize giving functions in schools while the Superintendent of Police is rarely considered even though he has quite as much education. Wives, as well are not immune from the sense of competition.\textsuperscript{35}

In lessening the strain of the Collector - Superintendent relationship the Collector must take up the initiative. He can remove the taint of sub-ordination and make the Superintendent a colleague.

The relationship between the Superintendent of Police and the Collector is that of two colleagues of whom the Collector is admittedly the senior colleague.\textsuperscript{36} It is the duty of the Superintendent of Police to render every assistance to the District Collector in maintaining law and order but they both must endeavour to maintain cordial relations and offer their utmost help and co-operation in the discharge of each other’s official responsibilities. Good social relations go a long way in developing good official relations also.

\textsuperscript{34}David, H. Bayley, Police & Political Development in India, New Jersy, 1969, p.361.
\textsuperscript{35}Ibid., p.361.
\textsuperscript{36}Notes on Police Procedure and Administration prepared by National Police Academy, Mount Abu, 1966, p.20.
There are instances of tussle between the Collector and Superintendent of Police which are not a question of personalities—they have their roots elsewhere. Advantage is taken by subordinates and the politician to create friction between the Collector and the Superintendent of Police. The Collector must abstain from any action likely to weaken the authority of the Superintendent. It is incumbent on the Superintendent to afford the Collector all the possible assistance in the criminal administration of the District. If the collector and the Superintendent of Police faithfully discharge their functions, the possibility of a conflict would not arise. On the other hand, the District Administration would be strengthened greatly by the two officers working in harmony and co-operation as a team.37

S.C. Misra, Retired Director of National Police Academy, Mount Abu also narrates an incident where the Superintendent and the Collector came at loggerheads.38

Administrative Reforms Commission, August 1967, in its report on the working group on “Police Administration” States that the conflict between the Superintendent of Police and the District Magistrate is one of the drawbacks of the dual control. The Commission also cites an instance of difference of opinion between the Superintendent of Police and the District Magistrate.39

---

38Misra, S.C., Beyond Rules. Ajmir, 1971, p.71. In the instance narrated by Misra the villains of the piece-prosecuting Inspector. They exchanged some hot words and consequently they reported the matter to their respective bosses. It became a Departmental quarrel. The Police were the suffers. The Magistracy decided to acquit all cases and pass strictures on the Police. The IG took notice of sudden increase in crime rate and asked for the report of the Superintendent of Police. To save his skin the Superintendent had to disclose the facts. The Divisional Commissioner asked the report of the Collector. The report of the Collector drew a very gloomy picture of the Police administration. Even after this the collector and the Sp never attempted to discuss things at a personal level. The commissioner visited the District to discover the facts the himself. As a result the Collector, the SP and the prospecting Inspector were transferred. Thus even by remote causes the two powerful officers cannot work in harmony.
39Report of the Administrative Reforms Commission (August 1967) (Convener of the working group was S. Balakrishna Shetty, Additional Director CBI. Members were (1) B.B. Misra, IGP, Delhi. (2) V.P Nair, Special IG of Police, CRP, (3) A. Gupta,
The present system of administration is actually a continuation of the British system. In the days of the British, the Collector and the Superintendent used to work with abundant mutual understanding. They could discuss major problems in the informal meetings and there were a few occasions when matters could not be settled by mutual talks. If the collector and the Superintendent of Police work in close co-operation and with understanding most of the difficulties will disappear. Still when the Collector finds it necessary to enforce his judgment against the views of the Superintendent of Police he should communicate his decision in writing and should be prepared to shoulder the responsibility for it.

Arguments are advanced for and against the retention of the dual control of law and order administration at the District level, which is a hangover of the imperial Administration.

**Arguments Against Retention**

Superior Police officers who appeared before Uttar Pradesh Police Commission of 1960-61 have strongly urged that the control of the District Magistrate over the Superintendent of Police is indication of want of confidence in the Superintendent of Police. The Superintendent of Police is responsible for law and order and the power must go with responsibility. The control of the District Magistrate lowers the position of the SP in the eyes of his subordinates and causes loss of morals in the Police force. Some Police officers were very outspoken and said that both Indian

---

National Police Academy, (Mount Abu). Commission says that instances of delay as a result of differences of opinion leading to very unhappy relations between the Sp and the DM are numerous. It cites and instance connected with the strike of State Government staff in Uttar Pradesh. A meeting was in Progress in the vicinity of the residence of the DM. The strike had been declared illegal. The Chief Organizer of the strike was delivering a provocative speech. The Police officers on the spot wanted to arrest him, but the Dm felt otherwise. The matter was referred to higher authorities who endorsed the action proposed by the Police; but the meantime the organizer had disappeared and remanded underground creating much trouble.

---

Administrative Service and Indian Police Service Officers are recruited from the same class of people. The educational qualifications prescribed for both are the same. In principle the Commission do not agree that there is anything basically wrong with control exercised by the District Magistrate over the Police. The administration of Police is vested in the Superintendent of Police. He must carry out lawful orders of the District Magistrate. No unnecessary interference with the Superintendent of Police should be allowed. District Magistrate should avoid acting so as to weaken the influence and authority of the Superintendent of Police.

Dichotomy of responsibility of law and order revealed itself to be nothing more than dual command for a disciplined force of considerable strength. \textsuperscript{41} Advocates for abolition of dual control say that Police have to face unpredictable situations themselves. District Magistrate will refuse to take decision except on a Police report. If something goes wrong District Magistrate will try to save him on the ground that he was acting on Police report. It is the Superintendent of Police who has to shoulder the responsibility. Generally it is the Superintendent of Police and not the District Magistrate who suffers when there is a failure of law and order machinery. District Magistrate can hardly do anything to improve through a conscious effort and better organization. If the Police force and the Superintendent of Police are to be ultimately held responsible it would be in the fitness of things that the SP Should be solely responsible for law and order and should have full powers to take decision independently.

F.V. Arul, a former Inspector General of Tamil Nadu advocated for the abolition of the system of dual control. He says that the Police’s work is highly technical and a Collector or any other officer of any other Department can have only a vague notion of Police operation. The separation of Police function from the Collector is a

\textsuperscript{41}Mukherji, A.K.S., Thoughts on Police Reform, Mount Abu, 1966, p.69.
natural corollary to the separation of judiciary from the Executive. With a democratic set up and with elected representatives of the people stationed throughout Districts there is an adequate check on Police operations and there is no need for the Police to be supervised by any other Department of Government.42

The Administration Reforms Commission (August 1967) in its report says that the dual control is damaging to the best interest of administration in three different ways.43 They are the District Magistrate is overloaded with responsibility in multifarious spheres; services of senior Police officers like Deputy Inspector General and Superintendent of Police are not utilized to the best advantage of administration; and it is damaging to the discipline and morale in Police service that the Superintendent of Police must look practically to two masters.

If the responsibility for maintaining law and order were placed squarely on the shoulders of the Superintendent of Police he would act with due caution and circumspection.

Dichotomy of responsibility for law and order has resulted in the duality of command, the evil affects of which are primarily felt on the side of the Police. Police have to face unprecedented situations themselves. The District Magistrate except on Police report takes no decisions. Generally it is the Superintendent of Police who suffers if there is a failure of law and order. The Commission said:

We strongly recommend that if the Police administration at the District level should be efficient, speedy and just, the Superintendent of Police must be fully responsible for law and order and for Police administration and fully answerable for all actions. Wisdom will not be in persisting with an arrangement whose origin

43Administrative Reforms Commission, Report of the working group on Police Administration, August, 1967, p. 79.
lies in compulsion of a foreign power. The Police must be made independent of local extra-Departmental and judicial control only. The Government, the public, the press, the elected representatives of the people are wide a wake.\textsuperscript{44}

The commission also recommended that section (4) of the Police Act of 1961 should be amended in order to delete the words “general control and direction of the District Magistrate”.

According to V.N. Rajan it is high time that the paternalistic concept of the District Collector or Deputy Commissioner vis-à-vis law and order is to be done away with. The Collector’s functions now are primarily those of a leader and coordinator of development programmes. His functions as an Executive Magistrate are best discharged under the specific provisions of the criminal procedure code and the Police Act for the preservation of peace.\textsuperscript{45} In regard to these no supplementary provision for “general control and direction is necessary”. With the democratic process fully developed in India, the responsibilities of the Police and the manner in which these responsibilities are discharged have undergone basic changes. The Police organization and operation have become specialized to an extent that requires adequate understanding and experience of these, if any worthwhile direction and control are to exercise over them. Moreover in the present day administration it is the Superintendent of Police and the higher supervisory officers of the Police Department who are considered accountable for the failures of the Police.

The Collector has an important function to perform in the coordination of Government activity at the District level. However, coordination is not synonymous with control. It does not contemplate interference. It requires no more than a general grasp of requirements and an ability to bring the participating elements together and to see

\textsuperscript{44}Ibid., p.97.  
that they function cheerfully, enthusiastically and efficiently in their allotted spheres for the success of the common programme. For anyone who would successfully coordinate, the first need is to refrain from throwing his weight about unnecessarily. This must be the basis of the relationship of the Collector with the Police.

The combination of the magisterial, Police, judicial and revenue function in a single controlling authority which has the sole justification for the retention of unusual position, has become not only unnecessary but is also acknowledged as undesirable for the fair exercise of the judicial and executive power of the state. The separation of judiciary from the Executive is made on this basis. It is necessary that the Police in India too should be made independent of the tutelage of the Executive magistracy.\textsuperscript{46}

The National Police Commission (1977) also discussed the relation between the District Police and the Executive Magistracy. There are no reasons to subject the District Police Administration to any control other than that exercised by the officers in the Departmental hierarchy itself and subject to only such co-ordination by the Chief Executive of the District as may be essential for the maintenance of public order.\textsuperscript{47}

The Police is the vital adjuncts of the District Administrative set up and its performance affects all aspects of public activity and public welfare. In this aspect the District Officer and the SP have to work in close association with each other and cannot afford to assume postures, which would tend to promote individualism and destroy collective performance. While Police should have a District identity and adequate competence and operational independence to play an effective role in the administration, it cannot exist in isolation and away from other areas of administration affecting people. The

\textsuperscript{46}Ibid., p.52.
District Officer can play an important role as an effective instrument in dealing with the different administrative systems including the District Police System in his area.\textsuperscript{48} There should be frequent and intimate contact and consultation between the District Officer and the Chief of the District Police. It should be obligatory for the Superintendent of Police to give the utmost consideration and attention to a communication from the District Officer. The Superintendent of Police should take prompt steps to look into and deal with any situation brought to his notice by the District officer.\textsuperscript{49}

Subordination of one agency to another is not essential for healthy cooperation between two agencies. On the contrary subordination is an extremely unsuitable factor to facilitate satisfactory co-operation. Therefore subordination of the Police to the District Officer should be removed.\textsuperscript{50}

The commission suggests that the Superintendent of Police should be adequately armed under the law to deal with situations independently and without recourse to detailed consultation and advice from any other authority. All powers, which are required for regulation and control and the promotion of order, should vest in the Superintendent of Police and other appropriate ranks in the Police.\textsuperscript{51}

**Arguments for the Retention of Dual Control**

The Report of the Kerala Administrative Reorganization and Economy Committee (1965-67) headed by M.K.Vellodi represents the diehard civil service view of the continuance of dual control. The concept that the collector is the Head of the District Police and is responsible for maintenance of law and order is a time-honoured one and has necessarily to be respected. It is to the Collector that the

\textsuperscript{48}Ibid, para.39.44.
\textsuperscript{49}Ibid, Para, 39-47.
\textsuperscript{50}Ibid, Para, 39-48.
\textsuperscript{51}Ibid; para, 39-50.
Government looks for maintenance of law and order; it is the Collector
who is taken to task by Government if things go wrong. It is therefore
essential that nothing is done to curtail his authority or to weaken his
control. The report says:

In our opinion the assessment of local law and order
situation should be the responsibility of the Collector, assisted of
course by the Superintendent of Police; where the Inspector General
considers it necessary to issue instructions to the Superintendent of
Police he should invariably keep the Collector informed. In all local
situations the Superintendent of Police should take instructions from
the District Collector.

The Indian Police Commission 1902-03 are strongly of
opinion that it is necessary to insist on the subordination of Police
force to the District Magistrate who is responsible for the Criminal
administration of the District and for preservation of public peace. In
the interest of the people, the Police must remain under the general
control and direction of the District Magistrate. He is the officer in
every way marked out for discharge of the duties of supervising of
both the Magistracy and the Police. He must have the power to issue
to the Police any order necessary to secure the efficient discharge of
their duties in the preservation of peace or in the prevention and
detection of offence. In a Resolution of the Government of India
(Home Department) on 21.3.1905 on the report of the Indian Police
Commission 1902-1903) it is stated:

It is not intended to be constant or detailed; it is intended
to be confined to what is necessary to maintain the magisterial control
over the Criminal administration of the District and his responsibility
for the maintenance of peace; but it is not intended to extend to the
administration of the Police Department except where interference in

52Report of the Kerala Administrative Reorganization & Economy Committee, 1965-
67, p.39.
that is necessary for maintaining the above control and responsibility.\textsuperscript{54}

The Commission of 1902-03 has emphasized the necessity of maintaining the responsibility of the District Magistrate for the criminal administration of the District. They have stated the limitations under which justice and expediency demand that his general control over the Police should be exercised. But they have strongly deprecated the proposal to deprive him wholly of that control. The Superintendent of Police the less will the interference of the District Magistrate be required; and the less it will be exercised displays the more efficiency and judgment. Commission are of opinion that “it is absolutely necessary to maintain the principle of his control over the Police, and it would be a blunder of the most serious character to make the Police in India wholly dependent of magisterial control in unintelligent of what is believed to be English practice.”\textsuperscript{55}

In short, arguments are advanced for and against this dual control of law and order at the District level, which is a hangover of the Imperial administration. The National Police Commission (1977) put forward valuable suggestion for the working of Police machinery by discussing the relation between the District Magistrate and the Superintendent of Police. The Superintendent of Police should be adequately armed under the law to deal with situation independently and without recourse to detailed consultation and advice from any other authority. While the Police should have a District identify and adequate competence and operational independence to play an effective role it cannot exist in isolation. The District Officer and the Superintendent of Police have to work in close association with each other.

\textsuperscript{54}Fort st. George Gazette (Supplement), 1905 p.13.
\textsuperscript{55}Op.cit., p.129.
Conclusion

In this chapter the controversies relating to District Administration and District Police Administration have been examined elaborately. Arguments in favour of the District Collector as in charge of District Police Administration and arguments in favour of District Superintendent of Police as in charge of District Police Administration have been elaborately discussed. Critics of District Police Administration have observed that the Collector’s control over the Police is unnecessary as it leads to delays, indecision and inefficiency, for the Collector is often unable to devote adequate time to Police matters because of his various other preoccupations. Further, the Collector’s exercise of general functional control over the Superintendent of Police breeds discontent and confusion, as the former is not subject to any control by the Inspectors General of Police. The report of the study group on Police Administration set up by the Administrative Reforms Commission (1969) questions the rationale of the continuance of the District Magistrate’s position as the Officer ultimately responsible for the administration of law and order and cautions that dichotomy of responsibility for law and order results in duality of command, which prejudices the efficient performance of the Police and, ultimately, the welfare of the people. It underlines the need for accepting the basic principle of sound administrative organization that authority and responsibility should follow a direct and unbroken lien from the apex to the base and that this is nowhere more important than in the administration of law and order. Therefore, in the interest of District Police Administration the Researcher opines that the District Superintendent of Police should be made in charge of District Police Administration.

56 Ibid.,