Chapter VII

Conclusion
In the Criminal Justice System, the relationship among its three primary stake-holders such as Judiciary, Administration and Police is complex with divergent scopes of interest under the democratic government sailing towards Welfare Principles.

Judiciary interested to moves on Law towards Ideal Status of Life, while Administration governed by democratically elected representative moves with interest on Political gain sailing in the name of Welfare principles, sentiments, timely interests driven by people groups towards Real Status of Life. But Police a catalyst to act between Administration and Judiciary resulting in the clash of interest between Ideal & Real Status of Life in the existence of Criminal Justice System making the society to feel the Public Order and Peace in the society.

While Police acting as catalyst, Police Administration encounters various clashes of interests within itself between Administrative, Supervisory and Field Level in an attempt to bridge the Real & Ideal status of Law & Life to prove the existence of Criminal Justice System ensuring Public Order and Peace. This results in the bad image of Policing.

In an attempt to balance or to neutralize it, the philosophy of Community Policing is opted to engage general public in policing to create awareness about the police and its attempt in bridging the Real & Ideal status of Law & Life utilizing the tactful unwritten Police Practical Works.

It is essentially true that no Criminal Justice System will succeed, if it totally disregards the significance of any of these three factors Judiciary, Administration and Police. The effectiveness of the Criminal Justice System therefore depends on the relationship prevailing among these three factors.

How can we maintain the interests of these factors in equilibrium synchronization with global administration revolutions such as decentralization, e-governance, modernization, RTI, Welfare State Principle, Legal Structure, etc parted with geographical sentiments etc?
The researchers & scientists have not been able to affect a breakthrough by providing suitable Practicing Standard Principles that can be applied with universal success. They have only focused upon every factor individually in the absence of the other ambient and Human Cultural & geographical sentimental Values with differences that exist in reality, which denotes the characteristics perception of the individual divided system of the Social System.

Just as the presence of air is felt in human survival, the presence of Criminal Justice System has to be felt as evidence for the survival of the Social System. Hence, to maintain a good balance synchronizing among these three factors of the Criminal Justice System, the Social System has to create a favourable climate within itself incorporating Human values and sentiments.

The present study is a modest attempt to identify the critical issues of policing with the community and its dimension for the prevention of crime. Earlier literatures on CP were reviewed mainly to examine the policing system in general and the participation of public at various point of time, which eventually emerges into the so called modern concept of Community Policing (COP). In this regard, various ‘Community Meeting’ with different sectors on “Security Review” was conducted followed by number of “Workshops” and assessed their views. The various questions / issues developed were subjected to analysis and they were consolidated under Ten Prime Factors which governs the socio-cultural Moral factors of the Society and the world. The present study not only intends to examine the multi-dimensional aspects of Community Policing, but also to infuse a fresh lease of life into the hitherto neglected vistas of abiding interest. The unique feature of this research lies in the fact that in this study all the three stakeholders, namely, Police Officials, Administrative Staff and Members from Society are taken as sample. Individuals occupying high position in the Police, Revenue and Judiciary were interviewed in order to obtain their expertise opinion on the subject Community Policing and its Adoption. Considerable attention has also been focused in the present study on positively illustrating the Socio-Cultural Variables and Factors determine Community Policing and its Adoption. All the hypotheses proposed in this study have been tested with appropriate statistical methods of analysis. This part highlights the major findings of this study, and an attempt is made to explain the variation in
perception of various factors of Community Policing among the three categories of respondents with a view to suggest appropriate measures to improve the awareness and adoption of Community Policing.

MAJOR FINDINGS

DISTRIBUTION OF SAMPLE RESPONDENTS

Out of 582 total respondents, 30.79 % represents Police Personnel while 22.34 % represents Administration comprising of Judiciary / Revenue personnel and 46.91 % represents General Public comprising of NGOs and other members of the society.

Out of 179 belonging to Police Personnel, 60.89 % represents Field Staff (ASI, HC & PC) while 33.52 % represents Supervisory Cadre (SI, Inspector and SP) and 5.59 % represents Managerial Officers (IGP, DIG, and SSP). Out of 130 belonging to Administration, 15.38 % represents Judiciary while 84.62 % represents from Revenue. Out of 273 belonging to Society, 19.78% represents NGOs while 80.2% represents the General Public comprising of Social representatives, Educationalists, Students, Politicians, Sociologists, and others.

Distribution of respondents by Socio-Economic Characteristics:

- **Age:** 57.0 % of Police and 46.2 % of Administrative groups were in the age group between 36 – 45 years, while 79.9 % of Society was in the age group up to 35 years and the overall represents 49.7% in the age group up to 35 years. This shows that the respondents in all three groups are energetic on Socio Cultural values.

- **Education:** It is observed that a maximum of 43.0 % of Police found educated up to secondary level, while 50.0 % of Administrative groups found educated up to UG / Diploma and 43.6 % of Society found educated up to PG / Professional and the overall represents a maximum of 36.8 % found educated up to UG / Diploma. An overall average of 38.1 % found educated up to PG / Professional likewise an overall minimum of 25.1 % were found educated up to UG / Diploma. This shows that the respondents in all three groups have stated that they have sufficient Education.
• **Religion:** 63.1% of the population in Police, while 77.7% in Administration and 77.3% in Society represents to Hindu Religion. An overall of 73.0% represents Hindu religion in the entire sample.

• **Financial Status:** 81% of the population in Police, while 71.5% in Administration and 70% in Society were represented that they are moderate (Middle) in their financial Status. An overall of 73.7% represents moderate in their financial Statues out of the entire sample.

• **Social Accountability:** 70.4% of the overall respondents have perceived that they have Social Accountability. Out of it 74.3% in police, 70.8% in Administration and 67.8% in Society have marked ‘yes’ representing that they have Social Accountability. This shows that the respondents in all three groups have stated that they have sufficient Social Accountability.

• **Public Life:** 93.1% of the overall respondents have perceived that they involve in Public Life. Out of it 94.4% in police, 86.9% in Administration and 95.2% in Society have represented that they involve in Public Life. This shows that the respondents in all three groups have stated that they have sufficient involvement in Public Life.

**OPINION OF RESPONDENTS ON COMMUNITY POLICING**

**Total Respondents**

Among the ten factors, 4 Factors namely “Constitutional framework & Social Responsibility”, “Policing work in police station”, “Policing adoption to community policing” & “Community Policing – A modern concept in Policing” found scored high level of perception under comparison across all categories. Thus it proves that the basic backbone of crime prevention is highly important for establishing a crime free society. Likewise the remaining 6 Factors namely “General social expectation”, “Intentional egoism and violation - A Social Evil”, “Juveniles and youths in crime”, “The Historic Social Control, Law and its Implementation”, “Police and administration” & “Constabulary status in policing” found scored low level of perception. Thus established a common frame that society is self-centered
and creating deviation that developed the gap between Police & Public in a real community status.

**Police Personnel**

The perception status of all 10 Factors perceived by the respondents, Police Officials are summarized as follows: The four factors namely “Constitutional framework & Social Responsibility”, “Policing work in police station”, “Policing adoption to community policing” & “Community Policing – A modern concept in Policing” found scored high level of perception. Likewise the remaining six factors namely “General social expectation”, “Intentional egoism and violation - A Social Evil”, “Juveniles and youths in crime”, “The Historic Social Control, Law and its Implementation”, “Police and administration” & “Constabulary status in policing” found scored low level of perception. The status of perception of the 10 factors and its variants among the Police groups categorized as Managerial, Supervisory and Field Staff. The overall level of perception between the 3 cadres has no difference on cross table analysis. The “Police and its Administration” is moderately based on the opinion of the Managerial group but it is low as postulate by supervisory and field level police groups.

**Administrative Officials**

The perception status of all 10 Factors perceived by the respondents, Administrative groups are summarized as follows. In general, 3 Factors namely “Constitutional framework & Social Responsibility”, “Policing work in police station” & “Policing adoption to community policing” were found scored high level of perception and the factor “Community Policing – A modern concept in Policing” found scored moderate level of perception. Likewise the remaining 6 Factors namely “General social expectation”, “Intentional egoism and violation - A Social Evil”, “Juveniles and youths in crime”, “The Historic Social Control, Law and its Implementation”, “Police and administration” & “Constabulary status in policing” were found scored low level of perception. The results of cross tabulation analysis between 10 Factors and level of perception among Judiciary and Revenue Officials show that the judiciary group viewed the “Constitutional framework & Social Responsibility” as high while revenue officials perceived it as moderate.
Majority of the judiciary personnel and revenue officials have observed “General social expectation”, “Intentional egoism and violation - A social evil”, “Juveniles and youths in crime”, “The Historic social control, law and its implementation”, “Police and administration” and “Constabulary status in policing” as low. About “Policing work in police station” and “Community policing – A modern concept in policing”, the judiciary have viewed as moderate whereas revenue officials observed these two community policing factors as high. At the same time, “Policing adoption to community policing” is perceived as high by majority of both Judiciary and Revenue officials.

Society

As far as the respondents from ‘Society’ are concerned, the factor “Policing adoption to community policing” was found to have scored high level of perception. 5 Factors namely “Constitutional framework & Social Responsibility”, “Police and administration”, “Policing work in police station”, “Constabulary status in policing” & “Community Policing – A modern concept in Policing” were found to have scored an average moderate level of perception. Likewise the remaining 4 Factors namely “General social expectation”, “Intentional egoism and violation - A Social Evil”, “Juveniles and youths in crime” & “The Historic Social Control, Law and its Implementation” were found to have scored low level of perception. The Factors “Constitutional framework & Social Responsibility” & “Community Policing – A modern concept in Policing” are found high by NGOs while Moderate by General Public while the Factor “Policing work in police station” was perceived moderate by both NGOs and General Public.

DIFFERENCES IN THE OPINION ON COMMUNITY POLICING AMONG THE RESPONDENTS OF VARIOUS GROUPS

Among Police Personnel, Administrative Officials and Society

It is found that there is a significant difference in the perceived status of all the ten factors of CP among Police Personnel, Administrative Officials and Society. Further based
on the mean scores, it is observed that the difference in the perception is more between the respondents of Police Personnel and Society. The Police Personnel have high perception on the following 4 factors, namely, “Constitutional framework & Social Responsibility”, “Policing work in Police Station”, “Community policing – A modern concept in policing” and “Policing adoption to community policing”, whereas the respondents of society have high perception on the remaining 6 Factors, viz., “General social expectation”, “Intentional egoism and violation - A social evil”, “Juveniles and youths in crime”, “The Historic social control, law and its implementation”, “Police and Administration” and “Constabulary Status in Policing”.

**Differences within Police Personnel**

It is observed that there is a significant difference in the perceived status of all the ten factors of CP among Managerial, Supervisory and Field Level. Further based on the mean scores, it is observed that the difference in the perception is more between the respondents of Managerial, Supervisory and Field Level. The Managerial Personnel have high perception on the following 3 factors, namely, “Constitutional framework & Social Responsibility”, “Police and Administration” and “Policing adoption to community policing”, while the Supervisory Personnel have high perception on the following 5 factors, namely, “General social expectation”, “Intentional egoism and violation - A social evil”, “Juveniles and youths in crime”, “The Historic social control, law and its implementation” and “Policing work in Police Station” and the Field Level Personnel have high perception on the following 2 factors, namely, “Constabulary Status in Policing” and “Community policing – A modern concept in policing”.

**Differences within Administrative Officials**

As far as the respondents of Administrative Officials are concerned it is found that there is no significant difference in perception of Community Policing between Judiciary and Revenue Officials.
Differences within Society

There are significant differences in the perception between NGOs and General public regarding all the ten factors of Community Policing. Further, it is observed that ‘General Public’ have better opinion compared to ‘NGOs’, except the factor ‘Community policing – A modern concept in policing’.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SOCIO-ECONOMIC VARIABLES AND COMMUNITY POLICING

Total Respondents

In general, it is found there is a significant relationship between respondents’ age and their perceived status of community policing. It is observed that perception of community policing is independent of the educational status of the respondents. It is found that there is significant relationship in the perceived status between religion and about their perception on Community Policing. Financial Status of respondents plays an important role in determining their perception about community policing. Respondents’ participation in social activities has significant influence on their perception about community policing. It is found that there is no relationship between Public Life Experience and the opinion about Community Policing among respondents of the entire sample.

Police Personnel

Perceived status of community policing among police personnel is independent of their age. It is found that there is a moderate relationship between educational status and perceived status of community policing among police personnel. No significant relationship between religion and perceiving community policing among police personnel group. No notable relationship between financial status and perceived status of community policing among police personnel. No significant relationship between participation in social activities and giving opinion about community policing among police personnel. Experience in public life of police personnel does not have any influence on their perception about community policing.
Administrative Officials

There is no significant relationship between administrative officials’ age and their perceived status of community policing. Administrative officials’ perceived status of community policing is unrelated to their educational status. Perceived status of community policing among Administrative Officials is independent to the religion they professed. No significant relationship between financial status and perceived status of community policing among administrative officials. There is no influence of participation in social activities on perceived status of community policing among administrative officials. Community policing factors except “Policing work in police station” between two administrative official groups with and without public life experience does not differ significantly.

Society

There is a significant relationship between respondents’ age and their perceived status of community policing in the society. It is evident that there is a significant association between educational status and perceived status of community policing among the respondents in the society. The perceived status of community policing among the respondent in the society is not influenced by their religion. The perceived status of community policing among NGOs and General public in the society is significantly related to their Financial Status. There is a significant relationship between participation in social activities and perceived status of community policing among the respondents in the society. There is no impact of experience in public life on perceived status of community policing among the respondents in the society.

SOCIO-ECONOMIC VARIABLES DETERMINING THE PERCEPTION OF COMMUNITY POLICING

Age and participation in social activities discriminate the respondent group with high status of Community Policing from the respondent group with low status. That is, the respondents in the higher age group who frequently participate in social activities have perceived the status of community policing as high. On the other hand the respondents with more experience in public life have perceived the status of community policing as low.
Police Personnel with high financial status and with higher level of education have high perception about community policing whereas the police personnel with less experience in public life have low perception about community policing.

Socio-economic variables have no discriminating power on perceived status of community policing adoption among administrative officials.

Socio-economic variables altogether have low discriminating power on perceived status of community policing among society. Elder respondents with high level of education in the society who frequently participate in social activities perceive the status of community policing as high. On the other hand, the respondents in the society with moderate level of experience in public life perceive the status of community policing as low.

FACTORS DETERMINING THE PERCEPTION OF COMMUNITY POLICING

It is observed that higher the perception on “Policing Work in Police Station” more is the status of Community Policing whereas the lower the “Constabulary Status in Policing”, low is the status of Community Policing among the respondents of the entire sample.

Police personnel with low perception about “Constabulary status in policing” perceive the status of community policing as low when their perception about “The Historic social control, law and its implementation” and “Juveniles and youths in crime” is also low. It is also found that the police personnel who have moderate opinion about “Intentional egoism and violation - a Social Evil” tend to have high perception about community policing.

It is found that the Administrative Officials with strong agreement with “Policing work in Police Station” and moderate agreement with “Constitutional framework & Social Responsibility” tend to perceive the Community Policing with high status.

Respondents in the society with high perception about “Constabulary Status in Policing” perceive the status of community policing as low while those in the society with high perception about “Policing work in police station” and “Constitutional framework & Social Responsibility” are likely to perceive the status of Community Policing as high.
SOCIO-ECONOMIC VARIABLES DETERMINING THE PERCEPTION OF COMMUNITY POLICING ADOPTION

Age and educational status discriminates the respondent group with high perceived status from low perceived status group in respect of Community Policing Adoption.

Socio Economic Variables of the police personnel have no discriminating power on perceived status of community policing adoption.

Socio economic variables do not have any discriminating power on perceived status of community policing adoption among Administrative Officials.

Respondents in the society with high educational status tend to perceive the status of community policing adoption as high. The respondents in the higher age groups also perceive status of Community Policing Adoption as high to certain extent.

FACTORS DETERMINING THE PERCEPTION OF COMMUNITY POLICING ADOPTION

This reveals that the respondents with low perception about “The Historic social control, law and its implementation” tend to perceive the community policing adoption as low whereas the respondents with high perception about “Policing work in Police Station” tend to have high perception about Community Policing Adoption.

Police personnel with high perception about “Policing work in police station” and “Intentional egoism and violation - A social evil” perceive the status of community policing adoption as high whereas those with low perception about “The Historic social control, law and its implementation” and “General social expectation” perceive the community policing adoption as low.

Administrative Officials with strong agreement with “Policing work in Police Station” and moderate agreement with “Constitutional framework & Social Responsibility” tend to perceive the Community Policing Adoption with high status. Administrative Officials with low perception about “Intentional egoism and violation - A Social Evil” tend to perceive
the Community Policing Adoption as low. It is further found that the Administrative Officials with moderately agreed opinion about “Constitutional framework & Social Responsibility” and “Policing work in police station” perceive the status of community policing adoption as high.

Respondents in the society with high perception about “Constabulary status in policing” as well as with “The Historic social control, law and its implementation” are likely to perceive the status of community policing adoption as low. Other CP factors do not have any power in discriminating respondents with low and high perceived status of Community Policing Adoption.

MAJOR OBSERVATIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

1. “General social expectation”, “Intentional egoism and violation - A Social Evil”, “Juveniles and youths in crime”, “The Historic Social Control, Law and its Implementation”, “Police and administration” & “Constabulary status in policing” found scored low level of perception. Thus established a common frame that society is self-centered creating deviation that developed the gap between Police & Public in a real community status.

2. There is a significant difference in the perceived status of all the ten factors of CP among Police Personnel, Administrative Officials and Society. Further, it is observed that the difference in the perception is more between the respondents of Police Personnel and Society. The Police Personnel have high perception on the following 4 factors, namely, “Constitutional framework & Social Responsibility”, “Policing work in Police Station”, “Community policing – A modern concept in policing” and “Policing adoption to community policing”, whereas the respondents of society have high perception on the remaining 6 Factors, viz., “General social expectation”, “Intentional egoism and violation - A social evil”, “Juveniles and youths in crime”, “The Historic social control, law and its implementation”, “Police and Administration” and “Constabulary Status in Policing”.
3. It is also observed that there is a significant difference in the perceived status of all the ten factors of CP among Managerial, Supervisory and Field Level of police officials as well as between NGOs and General Public, whereas there is no significant difference in perception about Community Policing between Judiciary and Revenue Officials.

4. It is found there is a significant relationship between respondents' age, religion, financial status, participation in social activities and their perceived status of community policing. On the other hand, the other two variables, educational status and public life experience do not have any influence on the perception of Community Policing among respondents of the entire sample. When the analysis was extended to each group of respondents, it was observed that among Police Personnel except 'educational status', perceived status of Community Policing is independent of their socio-economic status. Likewise, personal variables do not influence the perceived status of community policing as far as Administrative Officials are concerned. In case of respondents from 'Society', most of the personal variables influence the perception of Community Policing of the respondents.

5. Through discriminant analysis it has been observed that, the discriminating power of socio-economic variables and Community Policing Factors on the status (low and high) of community policing and community policing adoption is analyzed for entire samples (via. Police Personnel, Administrative Officials and Society) and it is concluded that socio-economic variables of the respondents in the total sample as well as those in the Society have power in discriminating between low and high status Community Policing and Community Policing Adoption. But the above is not true for Police Personnel and Administrative Officials. However, all eight community policing factors together have discriminating power in the case of respondents of all categories.

The Research findings identifies that the community in general is at downfall due to the effects of the various issues identified. Few points were reproduced as follows
• Criminal Justice System was created when people have no awareness on law and its legal loopholes. It is now misused/exploited thereby acting as the missing links in the Criminal Justice System that makes the culprits to escape from the clutches of law. The missing links/loopholes have to be identified and resolved incorporating, burden of proof to lay on accused and statement before Police officers to be made admissible before Law.

• Quota system introduced to up-left the poorest sector of the society is not successful. It is being enjoyed only by Upper & Middle class in all corners. They have extended it to official promotions ignoring their own poorest fellow people exploiting the Constitutional Goal and Welfare State Policy of the government. Here it is imminent to introduce revamp that the quota is only to the poorest of the poor and not applicable for promotion which well be on workout bases.

• Every Government or Private established have their own associations with & without political/organization/NGO’s affiliation but corruption & corrupt practices continues pointing fingers on others. This shows us that the general greediness for easy money remains with all. This proves that there is some missing link in the administration which has to be identified and revamped.

• In every industrial and business locations, some sort of extortion by local villagers, organization, etc being continued claiming various types of donations to conduct Temple construction, Temple festival, Temple rituals etc. but no one turns back to temple after the festival for regular worship. During festival celebration they are interested in conducting of orchestra with film songs in front of Temple instead of promoting religious values and discipline with younger generation. It is nothing but lowering the dignity of the deity or demoralize our religious & spiritual values. It is well known to all but in the pretext of smooth functioning of their business they remain calm. As the result, the real knowledge on our religious/cultural/ethical values is melting commendably and it will get vanished, if not attended even now.
• Controlling of exploitation / misusing under Human Rights & various constitutional welfare initiatives to be revised with limitations.

• Any type of private business shows improvements with low salary to its staffs, while every government sectors with high salary leading to closure even though there exists various types of labour unions etc. The missing link to be identified & revamped or all have to be privatized

SUGGESTIONS

1. Human Resource Concept has to be adopted in Policing.

2. Incentive system to be incorporated for non-core police duties relating to human values done during policing

3. Prestige & Pride on dressing, punctuality and strait forwardness to be induced as inborn.

4. Prestige, Courage & Pride to be induced to tactfully put forth the differences in the idealness & realness before the society and government towards the ethical common goal of the society

5. Periodical legal competences to be upgraded on par with Criminal activities via refresher courses.

6. Method of extracting discipline to be drawn to bridge the gap against groupism that exists at various levels based on Region / Ranks / Caste / Religion / Political affiliation etc within Police eliminating egoism and false prestige.

7. Policing and its legal framework to be periodically audited & upgraded for patching loopholes as like security system of computer and its network via upgrading & updating of software, hardware, anti-virus, Firewall, anti-spyware etc

8. Criminal Justice System and its legal framework to be periodically audited & upgraded for patching loopholes as like security system of computer and its network via upgrading & updating of software, hardware, anti-virus, Firewall, anti-spyware etc
9. Social Justice System and its legal framework to be periodically audited & upgraded for patching loopholes as like security system of computer and its network via upgrading & updating of software, hardware, anti-virus, Firewall, anti-spyware etc

10. Police Department is responsible to contain certain crimes but not the only machinery or system to stop all types of crime.

11. Ethics and moral values in the Society is responsible to contain all types of crime and it is the only machinery or system to stop all type of crimes.

12. Principle of Community policing is fruitful only if there is Ethical and cultural values in the Society supported by Community. Community represents every member headed by Judiciary, Administration, Revenue, Police, head of the Village, head of the Family, members of the Family, NGO’s, Political representatives, Social Organizations, Print and Visual Medias, etc. This further includes head of the respective religion and sub religion, caste and sub caste, race and sub race etc

13. In general, managerial personnel policies and practices should be modified in relation to the expectations. In particular, the recruitment policy should eschew favouritism and personal biases. There should be sufficient scope for promotion and career advancement. Satisfactory procedures for handling grievances should be established. Due recognition should be given to efficient workers, distinguishing them from average workers. That is to say, there should be an obvious link between performance and rewards.

14. To conclude, those who occupy the top position in each of the three segments, namely, a) Police Department, b) Administrative, which includes Judiciary and Revenue and c) Society consists of NGOs and General Public have their own share to contribute. The practicability of goal achievement depends on the degree of neutralization between Real and Ideal status under Criminal Justice System. The individual, by relinquishing some of his individual flexibility and freedom, is well on his way towards a favourable Social Cultural Order, human values resulting in the excise of good Criminal Justice System in the society by way of Community Policing.
SCOPE FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

It is a fact that any study leaves ample scope for further studies. Hence this section aims at indicating aims for further and deeper study on the subject.

1. To explore the ways and means to introducing limitations in Human Rights Guidelines for the better utility of the general citizens uplifting geographical moral & cultural values containing misuse and exploitations at various sectors including terrorist, hardcore criminals, prisoners, convicts etc. in the interest of upholding Criminal Justice System for ensuring social order and peace.

2. To explore ways and means to bridge gap between Ideal and Real life of the society identified in the research to cure our human psychological to unfold the known blindness in the interest of upholding Criminal Justice System and social values.

3. To explore ways and means to bridge legal values in Community Policing Philosophy with the existing laws governing Criminal Justice System with its stakeholders at all required corners to boost up its growth with global moral & cultural values.

4. To explore way and means in amending limitations in the welfare state principles extended by the democratic government to contain its misuse / abuse / no use of constitutional limitations under unbalanced political urge paving way for their wanted blindness on Social Justice System.

CONCLUSION

Real and Ideal issue plays a vital role directly on social functioning. The acceptance on Real and Ideal issues among the 3 respondents proves the existence of deviation. This deviation relate to the principles sliding to SENTIMENTS within the Community as routine life.
Community Policing in the existence of deviation between the Real and Ideal issues within the society becomes the principle factor, proves the existence of mixed formal & Informal law with "50% on Sentimental feeling & 50% on of mixed formal & Informal law. This proves the absence of "In accordance to Law and the existence of In accordance to Sentiments resulting in the hybrid unwritten law" which acts against crime. The influence of Real conditions and Ideal Conditions acts directly. Here the population is well aware of the Constitutional Frame and Social Expectation incorporating Social evils.

Therefore the existence of "In accordance to Sentiments and hybrid law" ignoring the Constitutional Framework, its Formal and Informal Laws to a large extend. In this status the acceptances of Community Policing “In accordance to law” get defeated. This lead to the slow growth of Community Policing in the community globally. The Policing Concept and Constitutional Frame need a real time revision to influence the Community Policing in the society.

Therefore the Constitutional, formal & informal Legal frame are to be synchronized with TIME frame that acts with Social Change influenced by modernization and utility resources catering the mankind.