

Fact and Fiction: Governments' Efforts to Combat Corruption

CHRI's Preliminary findings from a study of NCRB's Statistics (2001-2015)

Research and Report: Venkatesh Nayak, CHRI¹

Data Compilation: Access to Information Programme, CHRI²

Introduction

According to the Corruption Perception Index (CPI) figures for 2015 released by Transparency International, with a score of 38, India ranks **76th** among 168 countries surveyed for people's perceptions about corruption³. However, the CPI is only an indicator of what people think about the levels of corruption in their respective government. CPI does not reflect facts and figures indicative of governmental action to tackle complaints of corruption. **The findings from CHRI's study, given below, show, during the last 15 years, corruption cases do not constitute even 1% of the total number of crimes registered across the country.**

India enacted its national law to combat corruption in 1947 around the time it gained independence in order to tackle war-related corruption offences. The *Indian Penal Code, 1860* (IPC) also list offences of bribery involving public servants (Section 161-171) and the offence of bribing voters during elections. These offences entail prison terms between 3 months to 3 years.

The Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 (PCA) was enacted by Parliament as a special law to combat corruption. It covers all levels of government across the country except the State of Jammu and Kashmir. J&K enacted its own anti-corruption laws, first, as part of the *Ranbir Penal Code* (RPC) in 1932 and later a special law in 1949, all of which have been amended repeatedly over time to make them more stringent.

Despite the existence of laws for preventing and penalizing corruption, since the time of independence, there is very little information in the public domain in a consolidated manner about the impact of these laws. The National Crime Record Bureau (NCRB) publishes statistics relating to the institution of cases under PCA and their outcomes in courts for all States and Union Territories (UTs) in its annual Crime in India Reports. This data not only includes information about cases instituted after investigation but also those where the charges are dropped.

¹ The author is Programme Coordinator, Access to Information Programme, Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative, New Delhi. This note is being circulated for public debate, discussion and further dissemination.

² Mr. John Mascrinaus, CHRI helped with the data compilation and tabulation in the final stages of this research. CHRI is also grateful to Ms. Shivani Mane, National Law University, Odisha and Mr. Lakshya Thukral, West Bengal National University of Juridical Sciences who helped with this research during their internship at CHRI.

³ See 2015 report of Transparency International on its website at: <http://www.transparency.org/cpi2015>, accessed on 15 December 2016.

Information about the number of persons involved in corruption cases, number arrested, number convicted or acquitted and whether they belong to the Group A, B or other services⁴ and how many of those involved are private individuals is included in these reports.

Use of Open Datasets

Thanks to the Government of India's 2012 initiative in formulating the National Data Sharing and Accessibility Policy, several departments have now started publishing the machine-readable and machine-analysable datasets. The Open Government Data Team of the National Informatics Centre (NIC) has created a digital platform for making these datasets widely accessible to the members of the public free of charge. Readers may access these datasets along with thousands of other numerical, statistical and even non-machine analyzable data such as census village lists across the country at <https://data.gov.in/>.

CHRI has taken the initiative of analysing datasets relating to the offence of corruption posted on the Open Data Portal along with updates from the latest Crime in India reports published by NCRB. The purpose of this preliminary analysis is manifold:

- a) To provide a snapshot view of the action taken by the States and Union Territories to penalize individuals who commit corruption-related offences; this information is not available in one place anywhere else;
- b) To compare the incidence of corruption with other major offences such as murder, kidnapping/abduction and robbery to ask whether corruption is really as widespread a phenomenon as it is perceived to be or if cases of corruption are under reported;
- c) to demonstrate the value of using the open datasets uploaded on the Open Data Portal to examine the actions of the governments to curb corruption and to ask questions about the quality of data displayed and make suggestions for improving the quality and quantity of the information collected and proactively disclosed.

Key findings from CHRI's preliminary study of the datasets, covering the period, 2001-2015 are given below.

I. The geography of corruption (see Data Table 1)

The highs:

- ❖ As per NCRB data, between 2001-2015 a total of **54,139** cases were registered across the **29 States** and **seven Union Territories (UTs)**;

⁴ Central and State civilian services are often listed as Group A and B across the country. The complete list of Group A and Group B services under the Central Government are available on the website of the Department of Personnel and Training at:
[http://www.persmin.gov.in/DOPT/EmployeesCorner/Acts_Rules/ccs\(cca\)/SCHEDULE-1.PDF](http://www.persmin.gov.in/DOPT/EmployeesCorner/Acts_Rules/ccs(cca)/SCHEDULE-1.PDF) and
[http://www.persmin.gov.in/DOPT/EmployeesCorner/Acts_Rules/ccs\(cca\)/SCHEDULE-2.PDF](http://www.persmin.gov.in/DOPT/EmployeesCorner/Acts_Rules/ccs(cca)/SCHEDULE-2.PDF) respectively,
accessed on 15 December, 2016

- ❖ **53,164** of these cases were registered in the **States** and **975** registered in the **UTs**;
- ❖ **Almost 51% (27,171) of the 54,139** cases were registered in the **central and southern parts of India** (including the States of MP, Chhattisgarh and the 4 south Indian States along with Puducherry and Goa);
- ❖ The **four southern Indian States along with Goa and Puducherry** accounted for more than a **quarter (26.5%)** of the registered cases. **Karnataka (4,732)** topped the list followed by **Andhra Pradesh (3,804)**, **Tamil Nadu (3,261)**, **Kerala (2,464)** and **Telangana (332)** with **Puducherry** registering only **46** cases during this period;
- ❖ Amongst the larger States, **Bihar** and **Uttar Pradesh** registered **1,179** and **968** cases respectively during this period. In comparison, smaller States like **Punjab (3,171)** **Kerala (2,464)**, **Haryana (2,446)** and **Himachal Pradesh (1,080)** registered more cases than the larger ones;
- ❖ Amongst the larger States **Madhya Pradesh** registered the highest at **3,344** cases;
- ❖ With **8,875** cases registered, **Maharashtra** accounts for **16.39%** of the total, **topping** the list;
- ❖ **Rajasthan** with **6,393** cases, **Odisha** with **5,085**, **Karnataka** with **4,732** and **Andhra Pradesh** with **3,804** cases, figure amongst the top 5 States with the highest number of cases of corruption registered during the 15-year period;
- ❖ **Gujarat** registered **3,148** cases during this period while **Jammu and Kashmir** registered only **948**;
- ❖ **Chhattisgarh (560)** and **Jharkhand (509)** with a higher proportion of tribal population registered far fewer cases than other States with fewer tribals **averaging 33 cases per year**;
- ❖ With **739** registered cases, **Delhi** tops the list of **UTs**;
- ❖ **Telangana** registered **332** cases of corruption during the first two years (2014-15) after its formation.

and the lows:

- ❖ **Meghalaya** registered the **lowest** number of cases (**15**) among the States during this period. **Tripura** with **28** cases, **Manipur** with **32**, **West Bengal** with **39** and **Arunachal Pradesh** with **66** cases figure at the bottom of this list. More than **56%** of the corruption cases in **West Bengal**, were registered in 2015 while **no cases** were said to have been **registered** there in **2002, 2004-06, 2008-2010 and 2012**;
- ❖ Amongst the smaller States in in the **eastern** and **northeastern** part of India, **Sikkim** topped the list with **186** registered cases, followed by **Assam (134)**, **Nagaland (105)**, **Mizoram (75)**, **Arunachal Pradesh (66)**, **Manipur (33)**, **Tripura (28)** and **Meghalaya (15)**; and

- ❖ While **no cases** were registered in **Manipur** in **2009 and 2013**, no cases were registered in **Meghalaya** between **2002-04** and **2009-2013**, no cases were registered in **Mizoram** between 2003-04, no cases registered in **Nagaland** between **2002-03** and in **2006** and no case registered in **Tripura** during **2002** and **2010-2012**.

***Caveat:** NCRB admits that these statistics are sourced from the respective anti-corruption departments, only. So, these figures may not include cases of corruption inquired or investigated by the Lokayuktas or the Vigilance/Accountability Commissions or where a case of corruption is directly registered in the local police station, in the 29 States and UTs across the country. The figures for Delhi do not include the cases registered and investigated by the Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI) or those inquired into by the Central Vigilance Commission (CVC). According to NCRB, CBI stopped reporting action taken on corruption 2008 onwards. CBI and CVC publish statistics of corruption cases that they have dealt with in their annual reports. As this data has been reported widely in the media, we have not included it in this study.*

II. Corruption cases as compared with registered cases of murder, robbery and kidnapping (see Data Table 2)

Public perception about corruption in government apart (as measured by TI's CPI Index), how serious or widespread is this phenomenon? One rudimentary way of making an assessment is to compare the number of registered cases of corruption with the numbers of other offences registered with the police. In this analysis we have randomly chosen three kinds of offences for comparison with corruption: murder, kidnapping or abduction and robbery. The comparative data below indicates, corruption cases do not get registered as often as these other selected offences.

- ❖ Between 2001-2015, NCRB reported the **registration of 9.11 crore offences across the country**, punishable under the **IPC and various special laws** (coded as SLL in the NCRBD datasets). As a proportion of these offences, corruption cases account for **not even 1%** of this figure. At a mere **0.06% of the total**, corruption seems like a less than minor problem. This figure does not vary much when compared between States and UTs;
- ❖ In fact while NCRB data indicates **54,139** cases of corruption **registered** during this period, people filed more than double that number (**1,16,010**) of reports about being required to pay bribes, on the popular website – [I Paid a Bribe](http://www.ipaidabribe.com/#gsc.tab=0)⁵;
- ❖ Between **2001-2015**, the NCRB reported the registration of a little more than 5 lakh **cases of murder (5,01,852 cases)** across the **29 States** and **seven UTs**. In comparison, only **54,139** cases of corruption were registered during the same period. In other

⁵ See: <http://www.ipaidabribe.com/#gsc.tab=0>, accessed on 15 December, 2016. Between circulating the background note to all participants at the Informal Media Interaction organised in Delhi on 14th December – barely 24 hours- the website received 392 new reports from people who said they were compelled to pay bribes to public servants.

words, for **ten murders** registered, **only one case of corruption** was registered across the country;

- ❖ During this 15-year period, the NCRB reported the registration of **5.87 lakh cases (5,87,347 cases)** of kidnapping or abduction across the country. In other words, for **11 kidnappings or abductions** registered across the country, **only one case of corruption** was registered by the law enforcement authorities; and
- ❖ Between 2001-2015, the NCRB reported the registration of 3.54 lakh cases of robbery across the country (**3,54,453 cases**). In other words, for a little more than **6 robberies** registered, **only one case of corruption** was registered by the law enforcement agencies.

This comparison seems to indicate severe lack of public confidence in the ability of the anti-corruption agencies to investigate a complaint of corruption, collect evidence and put the case up for trial. Of course, bribery is only one form of corruption. The PCA recognizes various offences as “corruption”. 2015 onwards NCRB has begun publishing disaggregated data for all these PCA offences in terms of institution and the final outcome.

III. Proportion of registered cases completing trial (see Data Table 1)

- ❖ While **54,139 cases registered** across the **29 States and seven UTs** (irrespective of the outcome) trial was completed in **55.26% (29,920 cases)**. In other cases the accused were discharged or the FIR was quashed or the case was simply not put up for trial or the trial was still going on;
- ❖ **Maharashtra** which registered the largest number of cases completed the trial in **72.10%** of the cases (**6,399 against 8,875 registered cases**);
- ❖ However in terms of cases where **trial was completed** as a **proportion of the registered cases**, **Haryana** tops the list with **86.10% (2,106 against 2,446 registered cases)** followed by **Gujarat** at **81.26% (2,558 against 3,148 registered cases)**. **Maharashtra** with its **72.10%** record ranks third followed by **Himachal Pradesh** at **67.78% (732 against 1,080 registered cases)** and **Karnataka** at **62.51% (2,958 against 4,732 registered cases)** and **Jammu and Kashmir** at **54.64% (518 against 948 registered cases)** occupying the 4th and 5th places respectively;
- ❖ Amongst the **UTs**, trial was completed in **83%** of the cases in **Chandigarh (95 against 114 registered cases)**;
- ❖ According to the NCRB’s datasets, trial was not completed in any of the **15 cases** registered in **Meghalaya** or in the **66 cases** registered in **Arunachal Pradesh** during this entire period. The rate of completion in **Sikkim** was almost **35% (65 against 186 registered cases)**;

- ❖ Amongst the larger **States**, trial was completed in a mere **5.3%** of the cases in **Jharkhand (27 against 509 registered cases)**, **8.82%** cases in **Bihar (104 against 1,179 registered cases)**, **23.86%** cases in **Tamil Nadu (778 against 3,261 registered cases)**, **30.37%** cases in **Uttar Pradesh (294 against 968 registered cases)**, and **31.56%** in **Rajasthan (2,018 against 6,393 cases)**. Despite having the lowest number of registered cases (**39**), trial was completed in **33%** of them in **West Bengal**; and
- ❖ There are some **outlier States** and **UTs** such as **Punjab** with **105% (3,329 against 3,171 registered cases)**, **Delhi** at **108% (803 against 739 registered cases)**, **Dadra and Nagar Haveli** at **250% (5 against 2 registered cases)** with much higher completion rates. This indicates, several cases registered prior to 2001 reached completion during the 15 year period.

***Caveat:** NCRB's annual datasets do not indicate the period of time taken to complete the trial in a given case. Therefore in several States and UTs the number of cases in which trial was completed is higher than the number of registered cases in a given year (see attached MS Excel Sheet). Similarly, in some States and UTs the trial was completed in more cases than were registered there during the 15-year period. So the dataset indicates very high performance rates for them, which may be illusory.*

IV. Proportion of cases which resulted in conviction (see Data Table 1)

According to a reply furnished by the Union Minister of State for Home Affairs to an unstarred question in the Lok Sabha in August 2015, the conviction rate for IPC offences across the country in 2014 was **45.1%**.⁶ In 2015 NCRB reported that the rate of conviction had gone up to **46.9%**. However the rate of conviction in corruption cases sent up for trial is much below the national average. It is much worse, when seen as a proportion of number of cases registered by the anti-corruption agencies.

- ❖ The **national average** (2001-2015) for corruption cases **sent up for trial** ending in **conviction** is **35.33%** i.e., **roughly one in every 3 cases going up for trial ending in the conviction of the accused.** This figure is much better in the **UTs** at **53.67%** when compared to **34.73%** across the **States**;
- ❖ However as a proportion of the number of **registered cases**, the **national average** for **convictions** is a mere **18.94%** i.e., **for every 100 corruption cases registered roughly 19 ended in conviction on an average during 2001-2015;**
- ❖ In terms of absolute numbers, **Maharashtra**, topped the list of cases ending in **conviction** at **1,592** against **6,399** cases that **went up for trial (24.87%)**. As a proportion of **registered cases** barely **18%** ended in **conviction**;

⁶ Unstarred Question No. 2418 raised by Lok Sabha MPs Shri Sanjay Dhotre, Shri Bhartruhari Mahtab and Shri B. Senguttuvan, and replied in writing by MoS (Home) Shri Haribhai Parathibhai Chaudhary.

- ❖ Amongst the larger States **Madhya Pradesh** topped the list of States with the highest proportion (**56.15%**) of cases **sent up for trial** ending in conviction (**1,005 out of 1,790**) where a large number of cases were **sent up for trial**. As a proportion of **registered cases**, **30%** ended in conviction;
- ❖ In **Karnataka** only **20.75%** of the cases **sent up for trial** ended in conviction making it the lowest success rate amongst the States. As a proportion of **registered cases**, the rate of conviction was only **12.98%**;
- ❖ In **Bihar** the conviction rate was high at **67.31%** but only **104** of the **1,179** cases were **sent up for trial** during the 15-year period. However, as a proportion of the **registered cases** convictions were attained only in about **6%** of the cases.
- ❖ In **Uttar Pradesh**, the conviction rate in cases **sent up for trial** was **40.48%**. However the proportion of convictions to **registered cases** was only **12.29%**;
- ❖ In **Jharkhand**, despite only **27** of the **509** registered cases **sent up for trial**, **55.55%** ended in conviction (**15** cases). However as a proportion of **registered cases**, the conviction rate was an abysmal **2.95%** - the **lowest across the country**. In **Chhattisgarh** despite only **102** of the **332** cases being **sent up for trial**, convictions were achieved in **48.03%** of the case. As a proportion of the registered cases this was **25%** - much better than Jharkhand;
- ❖ In **Jammu and Kashmir** the proportion of **convictions** in cases **sent up for trial** was **31.85%** but as a proportion of **registered cases** it was only **17.41%**;
- ❖ In the smaller States which registered a large number of cases and also sent them up for trial, **Punjab** with convictions in **1,160** of **3,329** cases **sent up for trial** clocked a success rate of **34.85%** - the highest in this group. As a proportion of **registered cases**, **36.58%** ended in conviction in Punjab. At **28.2%**, **Haryana** clocked the second highest conviction rate in cases sent up for trial. The proportion of convictions to registered cases was **24.28%**. In **Himachal Pradesh** the proportion of **convictions** in case sent up for **trial** was **22.26%** but as a proportion of **registered cases** it was only **15%**, bucking the trend in this category;
- ❖ In the southern States, **Kerala** clocked the highest conviction rate as a proportion of cases sent up for trial at **62.95%** (**highest amongst all States**) whereas it was only **24.35%** of the registered cases. In **Andhra Pradesh** almost **55%** of the cases sent up for trial ended in conviction but as a proportion of the registered cases they were only **27.81%**. In **Tamil Nadu**, **convictions** were achieved in **42.93%** of the cases **sent up for trial** but these constituted only **10.24%** of the **registered cases**. In **Telangana** the **conviction** rate was **48.03%** in the cases **sent up for trial** but they constituted only **14.76%** of the registered cases;
- ❖ In the eastern and northeastern parts of India, **Odisha** clocked almost **40% conviction rate in cases sent up for trial** whereas they were only **14.61%** of the registered cases. **Sikkim** performed better with more than **66%** of the cases sent up

for trial resulting in **convictions**. This was however only **23.12%** of the **cases registered** in that State;

- ❖ Amongst the UTs, NCRB reported a **conviction** rate of **54.79%** of the cases sent up for trial. The proportion to registered cases was higher at **59.54%**. In **Dadra & Nagar Haveli** the proportion of **conviction** was **40%** in cases sent up for trial as **more cases ended in conviction than those registered** during this period, the second figure was **100%**. However, as pointed out earlier, these are outlier States where the number of cases where trial was completed was higher than the number of cases registered for investigation during the 15-year period; and
- ❖ Despite several cases going up for trial no convictions have been reported from States such as **West Bengal, Goa, Mizoram, Arunachal Pradesh, Tripura** and **Meghalaya** by the NCRB. In **Manipur** **only one case** is said to have reached **conviction** during this 15-year period.

***Caveat:** The statistics about the end result of the trial cases in some of the States is very disturbing, to say the least. Whether the outcomes of cases have been accurately reported to NCRB from those States with no conviction at all needs to be examined urgently.*

Further, the NCRB datasets do not indicate how many of these convictions were appealed against and upheld in the higher courts.

V. The Outcome of Trials - Convictions or Acquittals of the Accused (see Data Table 3)

The NCRB datasets published in the annual Crime in India reports contain several categories of information about the accused, such as, the number of persons arrested, number of persons discharged, number of persons brought up for trial, number of individuals convicted or accused. These datasets also indicate whether the individuals involved in the corruption cases belong to Group A or Group B services or whether they are non-gazetted officers or are private individuals (accused of abetting corruption). However it is difficult to correlate these categories to get a clear picture of the numbers of individuals against whom cases were registered and their fate at the conclusion of the trial. Similarly, the figures for the accused in whose cases trial was completed, often do not match with the number of officers and private individuals involved in those cases. Perhaps, the figures giving the background of persons involved pertain to the registration stage of the corruption cases. In several cases, the total number of persons involved in the corruption cases is higher than the number of accused whose trial was completed during the 15-year period. So we have not analysed this data until there is further clarity on the correlation between these categories of information. Instead we have looked at cases where trial was completed and analysed the proportion of convictions and acquittals of the accused during this 15-year period. The findings are astonishing, to say the least.

- ❖ Between 2001-2015, **trials involving 43,394 individuals were completed** across the **28 States** (excluding Himachal Pradesh⁷) and **seven UTs**;
- ❖ 68.19% (29,591) of the accused were acquitted by courts during this 15-year period (excluding Himachal Pradesh). In other words, only 31.81% (13,803) of the accused were found guilty by courts;
- ❖ **In States like Goa, Manipur and Tripura the acquittals were 100%. All 30 accused were acquitted by courts in these States. In Andaman and Nicobar Islands the trial was completed in relation to one accused during this 15-year period resulting in acquittal;**
- ❖ Nagaland is the only State that bucked this trend with convictions of more than 90% of the accused. In all, 438 accused were convicted. Of these, 404 were convicted in 2014. In Assam also, convictions were much higher (70%), despite fewer cases going up to and completing trial;
- ❖ Among the larger States, **78.60%** of the accused were **acquitted in Maharashtra**, **78.37%** acquitted in **Karnataka**, **78.31%** were acquitted in **Uttar Pradesh**, and **70.39%** were acquitted in Gujarat. In **Bihar** acquittals were much lower at **54.15%**. So, even though some of these States registered a large number of corruption cases and sent several to trial, convictions were poor on par with others that sent fewer cases to trial;
- ❖ Almost **90%** of the accused were acquitted in **Jammu and Kashmir**;
- ❖ Despite fewer cases reaching the trial stage in the tribal dominated States of **Chhattisgarh** and **Jharkhand** the conviction figures were relatively better at **42.53%** and **41.46%** respectively;
- ❖ The smaller States of **Haryana** and **Punjab** which performed better in terms of the number of cases being registered and going to trial, the **acquittal** figures were high- **76.22%** and **69.10%** respectively;
- ❖ While the acquittals in **Tamil Nadu** was at **65.85%**, neighbouring **Andhra Pradesh** and **Kerala** reported only about **48%** acquittals each. **52.68%** of the accused were acquitted in two years in **Telangana**;
- ❖ The **UTs** performed much better than the **States** in terms of convicting the accused thanks to Delhi. In **Delhi 52.52%** of the accused were convicted. As a result, while almost **two-thirds** (65.16%) of the accused were **acquitted** in the **States**, in the **UTs** only a **half** of the accused were **acquitted**.
- ❖ While only **46.88%** of the accused were acquitted in **Puducherry**, the figure was as high as **68%** in **Chandigarh**;

⁷ See the last bullet point in this section.

- ❖ The **data** from **Himachal Pradesh** appears to be **unreliable**. The statistics indicate that trial was completed in cases involving **4,066** individuals. However the total number of persons convicted comes to only **239** for this 15-year period. The total number of acquittals is reported as only **1,129** accused. This demonstrates the unreliability of this data.

Conclusion

What do we make of these findings?

What policy prescriptions may be required?

What recommendations may be made for reporting more robust data about corruption?

What is the fate of the anti-corruption legislation pending in Parliament?

- ❖ **Prevention of Corruption (Amendment) Bill,**
- ❖ **Criminal Laws (Amendment Bill) - Lokpal and Lokayuktas and DSPE Act,**
- ❖ **Whistleblower Protection (Amendment) Bill,**

When will the lapsed Bills be revived?

- ❖ **Prevention of Bribery of Foreign Public Servants Bill,**
- ❖ **Grievance Redress Bill,**
- ❖ **National Judicial Standards and Accountability Bill.**

Data Table 1: Corruption Cases: From registration to Conviction – An Overview

STATE/UT	Year	Total no. of registered crimes	Corruption cases registered during the period	Corruption cases as a % of total registered crimes	Total no. of cases in which trial was completed	Cases where trial was completed as a proportion of registered corruption cases	Cases resulting in conviction	% of cases resulting in conviction	% of registered cases ending in conviction
ANDHRA PRADESH	2001-2015	7984980	3804	0.048	1925	50.60	1058	54.96	27.81
ARUNACHAL PRADESH	2001-2015	37682	66	0.18	0	0	0	0	0.00
ASSAM	2001-2015	920463	134	0.01	38	28.36	24	63.2	17.91
BIHAR	2001-2015	2040046	1179	0.06	104	8.82	70	67.31	5.94
CHHATTISGARH	2001-2015	3913440	560	0.01	296	52.86	140	47.30	25.00
GOA	2001-2015	87634	85	0.10	10	11.76	0	0	0.00
GUJARAT	2001-2015	4928153	3148	0.06	2558	81.26	776	30.34	24.65
HARYANA	2001-2015	1254326	2446	0.20	2106	86.10	594	28.20	24.28
HIMACHAL PRADESH	2001-2015	255360	1080	0.42	732	67.78	163	22.26	15.09
JAMMU & KASHMIR	2001-2015	366332	948	0.26	518	54.64	165	31.85	17.41
JHARKHAND	2001-2015	615800	509	0.08	27	5.30	15	55.55	2.95
KARNATAKA	2001-2015	2179537	4732	0.22	2958	62.51	614	20.75	12.98
KERALA	2001-2015	4777286	2464	0.05	953	38.68	600	62.95	24.35
MADHYA PRADESH	2001-2015	5458103	3344	0.06	1790	53.53	1005	56.15	30.05
MAHARASHTRA	2001-2015	5215489	8875	0.17	6399	72.10	1592	24.87	17.94
MANIPUR	2001-2015	58908	32	0.05	3	9.38	1	33.33	3.13
MEGHALAYA	2001-2015	38998	15	0.04	0	0	0	0	0.00
MIZORAM	2001-2015	44567	75	0.17	11	14.67	0	0	0.00
NAGALAND	2001-2015	23121	105	0.45	37	35.24	37	100.00	35.24

STATE/UT	Year	Total no. of registered crimes	Corruption cases registered during the period	Corruption cases as a % of total registered crimes	Total no. of cases in which trial was completed	Cases where trial was completed as a proportion of registered corruption cases	Cases resulting in conviction	% of cases resulting in conviction	% of registered cases ending in conviction
ODISHA	2001-2015	1085298	5085	0.47	1865	36.68	743	39.84	14.61
PUNJAB	2001-2015	838861	3171	0.38	3329	104.98	1160	34.85	36.58
RAJASTHAN	2001-2015	3155723	6393	0.20	2018	31.566	741	36.72	11.59
SIKKIM	2001-2015	12272	186	1.52	65	34.95	43	66.15	23.12
TAMILNADU	2001-2015	10083141	3261	0.03	778	23.86	334	42.93	10.24
TELANGANA	2014-2015 (2 years)	250484	332	0.13	102	30.72	49	48.03	14.76
TRIPURA	2001-2015	71811	28	0.04	5	17.86	0	0	0.00
UTTAR PRADESH	2001-2015	25587410	968	0.004	294	30.37	119	40.48	12.29
UTTARAKHAND	2001-2015	1845128	100	0.005	47	47.00	24	51.06	24.00
WEST BENGAL	2001-2015	6478528	39	0.0006	13	33.33	0	0	0.00
TOTAL STATES	15 years	89608881	53164	0.06%	28981	54.51%	10067	34.73%	18.94%
A & N ISLANDS	2001-2015	78021	64	0.08	1	1.563	0	0	0.00
CHANDIGARH	2001-2015	66108	114	0.17	95	83.33	44	46.31	38.60
DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI	2001-2015	5848	2	0.03	5	250.00	2	40.00	100.00
DAMAN & DIU	2001-2015	3906	1	0.03	0	0	0	0	0.00
DELHI	2001-2015	1269968	739	0.06	803	108.66	440	54.79	59.54
LAKSHADWEEP	2001-2015	1107	9	0.81	2	22.22	1	50	11.11
PUDUCHERRY	2001-2015	81495	46	0.06	33	71.74	17	51.51	36.96
TOTAL UTs	15 years	1506453	975	0.064	939	96.3%	504	53.67%	51.69%
TOTAL INDIA	15 years	91115334	54139	0.06%	29920	55.26%	10571	35.33%	19.53%

Data Table 2: Corruption cases and other IPC Offences – A Comparison

STATE/UT	Year	Total no. of registered crimes	Total Number of Murder Cases	% of total registered crimes	Total Number of Kidnapping/ Abduction Cases	% of total registered crimes	Total Number of Robbery Cases	% of total registered crimes
ANDHRA PRADESH	2001-2015	7984980	36514	0.457	25341	0.317	9131	0.114
ARUNACHAL PRADESH	2001-2015	37682	1053	2.794	1320	3.503	1054	2.797
ASSAM	2001-2015	920463	19580	2.127	43394	4.714	10356	1.125
BIHAR	2001-2015	2040046	51267	2.513	56488	2.769	28427	1.393
CHHATTISGARH	2001-2015	3913440	14932	0.382	9677	0.247	6227	0.159
GOA	2001-2015	87634	588	0.671	608	0.694	384	0.438
GUJARAT	2001-2015	4928153	17167	0.348	22742	0.461	18013	0.366
HARYANA	2001-2015	1254326	13561	1.081	18030	1.437	8443	0.673
HIMACHAL PRADESH	2001-2015	255360	1794	0.703	2781	1.089	271	0.106
JAMMU & KASHMIR (RPC)	2001-2015	366332	6743	1.841	12661	3.456	1551	0.423
JHARKHAND	2001-2015	615800	23884	3.879	12572	2.042	10274	1.668
KARNATAKA	2001-2015	2179537	24731	1.135	16152	0.741	23859	1.095
KERALA	2001-2015	4777286	5806	0.122	3636	0.076	10749	0.225
MADHYA PRADESH	2001-2015	5458103	35124	0.644	29923	0.548	27951	0.512
MAHARASHTRA	2001-2015	5215489	40458	0.776	29789	0.571	65492	1.256
MANIPUR	2001-2015	58908	2225	3.777	2353	3.994	100	0.170
MEGHALAYA	2001-2015	38998	2204	5.652	1259	3.228	1226	3.144
MIZORAM	2001-2015	44567	508	1.140	125	0.280	128	0.287
NAGALAND	2001-2015	23121	1225	5.298	524	2.266	1169	5.056
ODISHA	2001-2015	1085298	18830	1.735	18408	1.696	19998	1.843

STATE/UT	Year	Total no. of registered crimes	Total Number of Murder Cases	% of total registered crimes	Total Number of Kidnapping/ Abduction Cases	% of total registered crimes	Total Number of Robbery Cases	% of total registered crimes
PUNJAB	2001-2015	838861	11672	1.391	12137	1.447	2266	0.270
RAJASTHAN	2001-2015	3155723	20623	0.654	46810	1.483	12664	0.401
SIKKIM	2001-2015	12272	210	1.711	133	1.084	94	0.766
TAMILNADU	2001-2015	10083141	25616	0.254	20431	0.203	17190	0.170
TELANGANA	2014-2015 (2 years)	250484	2496	0.996	2196	0.877	685	0.273
TRIPURA	2001-2015	71811	2448	3.409	1868	2.601	898	1.251
UTTAR PRADESH	2001-2015	25587410	80372	0.314	94809	0.371	41915	0.164
UTTARAKHAND	2001-2015	1845128	3555	0.193	10152	0.550	2409	0.131
WEST BENGAL	2001-2015	6478528	27633	0.427	42797	0.661	9096	0.140
TOTAL STATES	15 years	89608881	492819	0.550	539116	0.602	332020	0.371
A & N ISLANDS	2001-2015	78021	193	0.247	158	0.203	79	0.101
CHANDIGARH	2001-2015	66108	309	0.467	1318	1.994	599	0.906
DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI	2001-2015	5848	125	2.137	182	3.112	35	0.598
DAMAN & DIU	2001-2015	3906	88	2.253	81	2.074	35	0.896
DELHI	2001-2015	1269968	7878	0.620	46250	3.642	21577	1.699
LAKSHADWEEP	2001-2015	1107	3	0.271	1	0.090	0	0
PUDUCHERRY	2001-2015	81495	437	0.536	241	0.296	108	0.133
TOTAL UTs	15 years	1506453	9033	0.600	48231	3.202	22433	1.489
TOTAL INDIA	15 YEARS	91115334	501852	0.550	587347	0.644	354453	0.38

Data Table 3: Convictions and Acquittals – An Overview

STATE/UT	Years	Persons In Whose Cases Trial Completed	Persons Acquitted	% of persons acquitted	Persons Convicted
ANDHRA PRADESH	15 years	2514	1210	48.13	1306
ARUNACHAL PRADESH	15 years	0	0	0.00	0
ASSAM	15 years	50	15	30.00	36
BIHAR	15 years	253	137	54.15	100
CHHATTISGARH	14 years	442	254	57.47	188
GOA	15 years	19	19	100.00	0
GUJARAT	15 years	3499	2470	70.59	1029
HARYANA	15 years	4088	3116	76.22	972
HIMACHAL PRADESH	15 years	4066	1129	27.77	239
JAMMU & KASHMIR	15 years	1042	935	89.73	105
JHARKHAND	13 years	41	24	58.54	17
KARNATAKA	15 years	3394	2660	78.37	714
KERALA	15 years	1355	650	47.97	681
MADHYA PRADESH	14 years	2617	1232	47.08	1279
MAHARASHTRA	15 years	9055	7117	78.60	1938
MANIPUR	15 years	4	4	100.00	0
MEGHALAYA	15 years	0	0	0.00	0
MIZORAM	15 years	30	22	73.33	0
NAGALAND	15 years	480	45	9.38	438
ODISHA	15 years	2467	1576	63.88	891
PUNJAB	15 years	4178	2887	69.10	1491

STATE/UT	Years	Persons In Whose Cases Trial Completed	Persons Acquitted	% of persons acquitted	Persons Convicted
RAJASTHAN	15 years	4214	3021	71.69	1193
SIKKIM	15 years	90	45	50.00	45
TAMILNADU	15 years	1678	1105	65.85	573
TELANGANA	2 years	112	59	52.68	53
TRIPURA	15 years	7	7	100.00	0
UTTAR PRADESH	15 years	249	195	78.31	52
UTTARAKHAND	15 years	47	24	51.06	23
WEST BENGAL	15 years	29	28	96.55	1
TOTAL STATES	15 years	46020	29986	65.16	13364
A & N ISLANDS	15 years	1	1	100.00	0
CHANDIGARH	15 years	225	153	68.00	72
DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI	15 years	13	8	61.54	5
DAMAN & DIU	15 years	0	0	0.00	18201
DELHI	15 years	1131	537	47.48	594
LAKSHADWEEP	15 years	6	5	83.33	1
PUDUCHERRY	15 years	64	30	46.88	34
TOTAL UTs	15 years	1440	734	50.97	5543
TOTAL INDIA	15 years	47460	30720	64.73	18907

For more information please contact:

Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative

Access to Information Programme

#55A, 3rd Floor, Siddharth Chambers-1, Kalu Sarai, New Delhi- 110 001. Tel: +91-11-43180215/201; Fax: + 91-11-26864688

Email: venkatesh@humanrightsinitiative.org; Website: www.humanrightsinitiative.org; <http://www.attacksonrtiusers.org/>