

ASIA REPORT 2016



Photo Credit to : Rajat Gupta/European Pressphoto Agency

INDIA The Police



The year 2016 was the year many Indians felt the effects of voicing dissent and the consequences of being labelled ‘anti-national’. It was a year that saw cases of sedition¹, a very [serious charge](#), being slapped against young student protesters in the country, signaling the rising intolerance by large sections of society to opinions and positions that are different.

In January 2016, a Dalit scholar, Rohit Vemula, committed suicide in Hyderabad, reportedly due to caste discrimination and related issues. His suicide resulted in widespread [protests](#) and anger across the country. In February 2016, a [video](#) surfaced allegedly showing the Delhi Police beating up students who were protesting Vemula’s suicide outside the RSS headquarters in New Delhi. While the students were [reported](#) to be protesting peacefully, the police used excessive force to try and disband them. The police also attacked media persons and damaged their equipment, including the cameras of press photographers. According to the Delhi Police however, the Police only reacted with force as the protesters attacked first.

In February 2016, in an incident that has become synonymous with ‘rising intolerance’ in India, the President of the Jawaharlal Nehru University Students Union (JNUSU), [Kanhaiya Kumar](#), was charged with sedition for apparently raising anti-India slogans at an event protesting the hanging of Mohammad Afzal Guru, for his role in the 2001 Parliament attack. While Kumar repeatedly denied the charges, he was arrested and granted bail in March 2016. Kumar’s arrest led to widespread protests in defense of democracy and the freedom of speech and expression. In June 2016, while protesting police brutalities on student protesters in Patna, Kumar was [detained](#) in New Delhi outside Bihar Bhawan.

While the debates raged on in newsrooms and on the web about whether India is indeed becoming an ‘intolerant’ nation, those who spoke their mind were subject to increasingly vile online abuse and hate. [Cyber ‘trolls’](#) and abusers frequently targeted liberal voices online, especially women, so much so that Union Minister for Women and Child Development, Maneka Gandhi, urged women who were subject to online harassment to inform her via email. The rising number of these incidents have pushed the frontiers of policing and the anonymity offered by cyberspace and the inherent complexities of the internet make it difficult for the police to track cyber criminals. Further, some experts state that the laws relating to cybercrimes are inadequate and insufficient to deal with such instances, and that police are [reluctant and ill-equipped](#) to handle the investigation of cases of online harassment. With the nature of crime changing and our online and offline worlds merging, the need to modernize investigation methods is even more urgent. Given the easy access to data and insufficient laws on data

¹ S.124A of the Indian Penal Code reads,

“124A. Sedition

Whoever, by words, either spoken or written, or by signs, or by visible representation, or otherwise, brings or attempts to bring into hatred or contempt, or excites or attempts to excite disaffection towards, the Government established by law in India, shall be punished with imprisonment for life, to which fine may be added, or with imprisonment which may extend to three years, to which fine may be added, or with fine.

Explanation 1- The expression "disaffection" includes disloyalty and all feelings of enmity.

Explanation 2- Comments expressing disapprobation of the measures of the Government with a view to obtain their alteration by lawful means, without exciting or attempting to excite hatred, contempt or disaffection, do not constitute an offence under this section.

Explanation 3- Comments expressing disapprobation of the administrative or other action of the Government without exciting or attempting to excite hatred, contempt or disaffection, do not constitute an offence under this section.”

privacy, it is imperative that police are trained to track and identify online abusers when they receive complaints.

The Asia Report 2016: Police for India will trace the developments related to the police in India by linking them to the major events of the year. As it was a tumultuous year with many different events changing the nature and scope of policing, it will be interesting to understand the complexities and challenges they pose for human rights. The rise in online media and the nature of news has been changing the nature of crime, as well as the nature of oversight by civil society and human rights organisations, posing new challenges and new opportunities for intervention.

Rising vigilantism and incidents of lynching

The year 2015 saw the infamous [Dadri incident](#) in which a murderous mob lynched and killed 50-year old Mohammad Akhlaq and severely injured his son, Danish, on suspicions that the family was storing beef in their refrigerator. In March 2016, in Latehar, Kharkhand, [two Muslim cattle traders](#) were found hanging from a tree, with injury marks from apparent beatings before they were killed.

In July 2016, in what would set off one of the largest and most unified Dalit protests in India, seven members of a Dalit family were beaten, stripped, tied up and their agony caught on camera, for skinning a dead cow. This attack in [Una, Gujarat](#), was carried out by ‘Gau Rakshaks’ or ‘cow vigilantes’, self-appointed custodians of Hindu pride and honour in the ‘Holy Cow’.



Mass protests by Dalits in Ahmedabad, Gujarat. Credit: PTI

Source: [The Wire](#)

The incident renewed the conversation on caste-based discrimination, vigilantism and police apathy, with allegations that the police stood and watched while the vigilantes attacked the men. More ominously, the incident was one of the biggest reminders of the wave of ‘Gau Rakshak’ [vigilantism](#) that had already begun. Gau Rakshaks are extreme right-wing fundamentalists who have taken it upon themselves to ensure cow protection. This includes targeting those who slaughter the cow as well as those who consume beef or cow meat.

Earlier in March 2016, [four Kashmiri students](#) were arrested in Chittorgarh, Rajasthan after they got into a fight with locals who alleged they were cooking and consuming beef in their hostel room at Mewar University. While there is no information regarding whether those who spread the allegations and indulged in the scuffle were arrested, the four students were promptly detained. They were only released after the meat was found not to be beef.

After the Dadri mob incident of 2015 that shook the nation, resulting in the death of [50 year old Mohammad Akhlaq](#), 19 people were arrested on charges of murder and assault. [Two years later](#) however, charges have still not been framed against them. Meanwhile, in June 2016, the local Surajpur District Court directed that an FIR be registered against Akhlaq and his family, under laws prohibiting cow slaughter.

These incidents of vigilantism show how the police become agents of a majoritarian religious belief in a secular country meant to be governed by the Constitution. In popular conception, beef is commonly eaten by non-Hindus, Dalits and mainly Muslims, and the professions of skinning dead cattle and getting rid of the carcasses are relegated to the Dalits. Any sustained policy to prohibit cow slaughter and the consumption of beef impinges on people's freedom to practice their profession and eat what they wish.

In a secular country with no State religion, it is unbecoming that a movement to protect the cow and prevent its slaughter and consumption has taken such strong roots. It has supported the mushrooming of vigilante groups, to which the police usually turn a blind eye, especially in Hindu majority states and states where cow slaughter is prohibited. When policing is undertaken by non-state agents and where vigilantism and lynching become commonplace, it is clear that there is a breakdown in rule of law. Furthermore, when the police effectively stand by and allow vigilantism to flourish instead of protecting the people, there is a breakdown of trust. This is a dangerous situation for India to be in, and it is hoped that the Central Government and the State Governments will take adequate measures to reign in these vigilante groups, book them for their crimes and bring them to justice. It is equally important that the police officers who allowed the vigilante groups to flourish and failed to protect those being attacked, are also punished.

Burhan Wani and the continuing violence in Kashmir



Youths shout pro-independence slogans in Srinagar, Indian-controlled Kashmir, as clashes between Indian troops and protesters continued for a fourth consecutive day despite a curfew. (Dar Yasin/AP) Source: [Washington Post](#), July 12, 2016

In July 2016, young militant leader Burhan Wani was killed in a gun battle by Indian security forces. His death resulted in protests in Kashmir, with [clashes](#) between security forces and the protesters. Although there was a curfew, thousands of people attended Wani's funeral in Tral, south of Srinagar, and the ensuing violence between the civilians and the security forces saw many civilians being killed due to police firing. The violent protests began on July 8 and the clashes [have resulted](#) in the death of more than 42 people, while more than 3,400 people have been injured, including 1,600 security force personnel.²

The handling of the protests by the security forces put the focus back on the conflict in Kashmir, and the alleged use of excessive force by the Army and the Police in conflict zones in India. It also brought the debate squarely back on the constitutionality of the [Armed Forces \(Special Powers\) Act](#) and its purported need in 'disturbed areas'. According to experts, the violence was the worst seen in Kashmir in many years and there were allegations and counter-allegations bandied about, wherein the forces blamed the stone-pelters and the protesters for instigating the violence, while the civilians claimed that the security forces used excessive force, giving them no option.

² 'INDIA: Cycles of violence and revenge must end' Statement by the Asian Human Rights Commission published on July 20, 2016 available at <http://www.humanrights.asia/news/ahrc-news/AHRC-STM-106-2016>

Chattisgarh and the counter-insurgency operations

In June 2016, reports emerged that a young woman, 23-year old [Madkam Hidme](#) had been allegedly raped and murdered by security forces in Gompad, Chattisgarh. The state is a hotbed of violent Naxalism and counter-insurgency operations, with ordinary villagers and tribals caught in the crossfire. It was alleged by the police that Hidme was a Maoist who was killed in an ‘encounter’, in a ‘fierce gun battle’ with Naxalites in the area. Hidme’s family, on the other hand, claim that she was not a Maoist and was raped and tortured before being killed. A [petition](#) was filed before the Chattisgarh High Court asking for a judicial probe after a photo of the encounter revealed Hidme’s dead body in a Maoist uniform that was “clean and ironed”, showing “no signs of an encounter”. The court directed that the body be exhumed and a postmortem conducted.

Earlier in the year, in March, the AHRC had issued an [urgent appeal](#) regarding the breakdown of rule of law in the state of Chattisgarh:

“The AHRC has taken note of new reports from Chhattisgarh, which expose how the rule of law and democratic space are being asphyxiated, as a result of continuing malevolent governance. Threats, harassment, and attacks on the Jagdalpur Legal Aid Group, journalist Malini Subramaniam, and Soni Sori showcase how anyone providing a voice to the poorest and most vulnerable in the state is being hounded. The reports speak of the even worse reality faced by the majority population at the hands of Chhattisgarh state authorities, who have taken to openly abusing the criminal justice apparatus.”

News reports stated that those who were helping the tribals in the region either through legal assistance as in the case of the Jagdalpur Legal Aid Group (JagLAG), or by writing about it like journalist Malini Subramaniam, were targeted by the police through threats and monitoring, and even public lynching by vigilante groups accusing them of being Naxalites or Naxalite sympathisers. In February 2016, the JagLAG and Subramaniam were both forced to leave Bastar due to the threatening situation. Two days later, activist [Soni Sori](#) was attacked in Bastar while on her way to work. Soni Sori, one of the most prominent voices against police brutalities in the region, is herself a victim of police torture.

These incidents show how there has been a complete breakdown of trust in the police within the region. The police are accused of engaging in criminal activities, trying to shut down dissent and labeling anyone concerned about the treatment of tribals as a Maoist or a sympathizer. The AHRC hopes that the security forces in the region begin to treat the tribals and others with respect and dignity, and those who are committing human rights violations be brought to book. It is also imperative that the State finds new ways to manage the insurgency in the region, with honest efforts at negotiation.

Jonathan Powell, author of the book “Talking to Terrorists, How to End Armed Conflicts” and chief British negotiator on the Northern Ireland peace talks, wrote in an essay for [the Guardian](#):

“If you can’t kill them all, then sooner or later you come back to the same point, and it is a question of when, not whether, you talk. If there is a political cause then there has to be a political solution...”

....If people sit around waiting for a conflict to be “ripe” for talks to start, or for the forces of history to solve it for them, then it will never be resolved. If the negotiations are handled badly, they will fail, which is why it is worth trying to learn from the experience of others.”

Powell was the chief negotiator on behalf of the British Government in its peace talks with the Irish Republican Army. His work and his advice to governments handling armed conflict is especially potent for the Indian State today, dealing with the continuing violence in different conflict zones across the country, whether in Kashmir or Chhattisgarh.

Important judicial and legal developments in 2016

A. Police Reforms

In the 2015 Asia Report, the Asian Human Rights Commission wrote that,

“Continuing failed efforts at police reform have only deepened the mistrust and fear that the public harbor against the police. The police in India are not a symbol of safety and security – instead, they operate as tools of the patriarchal political elite, powerful, violent and something to be feared.”

The year 2016 brought with it another effort at reforming the police, once again from the judiciary. In September 2016, the Supreme Court of India issued directions in the writ petition *Youth Bar Association of India vs. Union of India & Others*.³ The writ petition was filed for issuing a writ of mandamus, directing the Union of India (UOI) and the States to:

“upload each and every First Information Report (FIR) registered in all the police stations within the territory in India in the official website of the police of all States, as early as possible, preferably within 24 hours from the time of registration”.⁴

The directions issued were lauded as far-thinking, a serious attempt at modernizing aspects of the criminal justice framework. It is necessary to reproduce the guidelines herein:

³ Writ Petition (CRL.) No. 68 of 2016 available here http://supremecourtindia.nic.in/FileServer/2016-09-07_1473255677.pdf

⁴ Ibid

(a) An accused is entitled to get a copy of the First Information Report at an earlier stage than as prescribed under Section 207 of the Cr.P.C⁵.

(b) An accused who has reasons to suspect that he has been roped in a criminal case and his name may be finding place in a First Information Report can submit an application through his representative/agent/parokar for grant of a certified copy before the concerned police officer or to the Superintendent of Police on payment of such fee which is payable for obtaining such a copy from the Court. On such application being made, the copy shall be supplied within twenty-four hours.

(c) Once the First Information Report is forwarded by the police station to the concerned Magistrate or any Special Judge, on an application being filed for certified copy on behalf of the accused, the same shall be given by the Court concerned within two working days. The aforesaid direction has nothing to do with the statutory mandate inhered under Section 207 of the Cr.P.C

(d) The copies of the FIRs, unless the offence is sensitive in nature, like sexual offences, offences pertaining to insurgency, terrorism and of that category, offences under POCSO⁶ Act and such other offences, should be uploaded on the police website, and if there is no such website, on the official website of the State Government, within twenty-four hours of the registration of the First Information Report so that the accused or any person connected with the same can download the FIR and file appropriate application before the Court as per law for redressal of his grievances. It may be clarified here that in case there is connectivity problems due to geographical location or there is some other unavoidable difficulty, the time can be extended up to forty-eight hours. The said 48 hours can be extended maximum up to 72 hours and it is only relatable to connectivity problems due to geographical location.

(e) The decision not to upload the copy of the FIR on the website shall not be taken by an officer below the rank of Deputy Superintendent of Police or any person holding equivalent post. In case, the States where District Magistrate has a role, he may also assume the said authority. A decision taken by the concerned police officer or the District Magistrate shall be duly communicated to the concerned jurisdictional Magistrate.

(f) The word 'sensitive' apart from the other aspects which may be thought of being sensitive by the competent authority as stated hereinbefore would also include concept of privacy regard being had to the nature of the FIR. The examples given with regard to the sensitive cases are absolutely illustrative and are not exhaustive.

(g) If an FIR is not uploaded, needless to say, it shall not enure per se a ground to obtain the benefit under Section 438 of the Cr.P.C.

(h) In case a copy of the FIR is not provided on the ground of sensitive nature of the case, a person grieved by the said action, after disclosing his identity, can submit a representation to the Superintendent of Police or any person holding the equivalent post in the State. The Superintendent of Police shall constitute a committee of three officers which shall deal with the said grievance. As far as the Metropolitan cities are concerned, where Commissioner is there, if a representation is submitted to the Commissioner of Police who shall constitute a committee

⁵ Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973

⁶ Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012

of three officers. The committee so constituted shall deal with the grievance within three days from the date of receipt of the representation and communicate it to the grieved person.

(i) The competent authority referred to hereinabove shall constitute the committee, as directed herein-above, within eight weeks from today.

(j) In cases wherein decisions have been taken not to give copies of the FIR regard being had to the sensitive nature of the case, it will be open to the accused/his authorized representative/parokar to file an application for grant of certified copy before the Court to which the FIR has been sent and the same shall be provided in quite promptitude by the concerned Court not beyond three days of the submission of the application.

(k) The directions for uploading of FIR in the website of all the States shall be given effect from 15th November, 2016.

This Supreme Court decision is one of the most important developments in 2016 with respect to police reforms and human rights. If implemented as envisaged, this move will help protect the rights of the accused in a country where corruption within the police is rife. While the police authorities are exempted from uploading FIRs in sensitive cases such as those related to sexual assault, those under the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012 (POCSO) and those related to terrorism and national security, for other offences the guidelines will help the accused obtain access to FIRs, which is largely an uphill task in many cases. The police usually refuse to provide the FIR unless a bribe is paid, or refuse to share the details of the provisions under which the person has been accused.

Relying on judgments in cases such as *Som Mittal vs Government of Karnataka*[(2008) 3 SCC 753], *State of West Bengal and others vs. Committee for Protection of Democratic Rights, West Bengal and others*[(2010) 3 SCC 571] and the landmark judgment in *D.K. Basu vs. State of West Bengal*[AIR 1997 SC 610], the Supreme Court bench stated that when a person's liberty is at stake due to the criminal law, then they have a right to all the information required in order to protect their liberty, referring to the right to life guaranteed under Article 21 of the Indian Constitution.

While this decision by the Supreme Court is a step in the right direction, with some even terming it a 'landmark judgment', it is one that might remain on paper due to the limitations of digital infrastructure and lack of internet connectivity in many places. The directions do not include any penalties if the police stations do not upload the FIR as per the guidelines. These directions may well have the effect of a blunt knife, as with no measures to ensure implementation, they will only look good on paper with no realistic hope of execution. It is however an important aspect of modernizing investigation methods in India, and one that can go a long way in the fight against torture and impunity. It remains to be seen what the impact of this decision will be and the AHRC hopes that it does not meet the same fate as the landmark 2006 Supreme Court judgment in *Prakash Singh v. UOI & Ors*⁷[(2006) 8 SCC 1].

⁷ The Supreme Court of India in a judgment delivered on 22 September 2006 in WP (Civil) 310 of 1996

B. Extrajudicial Killings in Manipur

On 8 July 2016, the Supreme Court of India, in the case of *Extra Judicial Execution Victim Families Association (EEVFAM) &Anr. v. Union of India &Anr.*⁸, ruled that victims of extrajudicial executions have the right to know the truth. This was an extremely important development in the fight against extrajudicial executions or ‘encounter killings’ in India, particularly by the armed forces and police in conflict zones and during counter-insurgency operations. The AHRC’s partner organization in Manipur, Human Rights Alert, was the second petitioner in this important case.⁹ The judgment reiterated the view expressed by a Constitution Bench in the case *in Naga People’s Movement of Human Rights v. Union of India*(1998) 2 SCC 109.

The Supreme Court stated that the right of self-defence or private defence must be differentiated from the use of excessive force or retaliation.¹⁰ Relying on the judgments in previous cases, such as *Rohtash v. State of Haryana*[(2013) 14 SCC 290] and *Darshan Singh v. State of Punjab* [(2010) 2 SCC 333], the Supreme Court stated:¹¹

“122. From the above, it is abundantly clear that the right of self-defence or private defence falls in one basket and use of excessive force or retaliatory force falls in another basket. Therefore, while a victim of aggression has a right of private defence or self-defence (recognized by Sections 96 to 106 of the IPC) if that victim exceeds the right of private defence or self-defence by using excessive force or retaliatory measures, he then becomes an aggressor and commits a punishable offence. Unfortunately, occasionally, use of excessive force or retaliation leads to the death of the original aggressor. When the State uses such excessive or retaliatory force leading to death, it is referred to as an extra-judicial killing or an extra-judicial execution... Society and the courts obviously cannot and do not accept such a death caused by the State since it is destructive of the rule of law and plainly unconstitutional.”

In paragraph 123, the Court stated that,

“123. *The problem before the courts tends to become vexed when the victims are alleged to be militants, insurgents or terrorists. In such cases, how does anyone (including the court) assess the degree of force required in a given situation and whether it was excessive and retaliatory or not? Scrutiny by the courts in such cases leads to complaints by the State of its having to fight militants, insurgents and terrorists with one hand tied behind its back. This is not a valid criticism since and this is important, in such cases it is not the encounter or the operation that is under scrutiny but the smoking gun that is under scrutiny. There is a qualitative difference between use of force in an operation and use of such deadly force that is akin to using a sledgehammer to kill a fly; one is an act of self-defence while the other is an act of retaliation.*”

⁸(W.P. (CRL.) 129 OF 2012

⁹ ‘INDIA: Cycles of violence and revenge must end’ Statement by the Asian Human Rights Commission published on July 20, 2016 available at <http://www.humanrights.asia/news/ahrc-news/AHRC-STM-106-2016>

¹⁰ Ibid

¹¹ Ibid

Crucially, the Court noted that the use of excessive and disproportionate force on a person is wrong and illegal, irrespective of whether the person was a militant or not:

“It does not matter whether the victim was a common person or a militant or a terrorist, nor does it matter whether the aggressor was a common person or the State. The law is the same for both and is equally applicable to both.”

The Court went on to add that there must be a proper and thorough inquiry if there is an allegation that excessive force was used or that there has been an extrajudicial killing.

“Each instance of an alleged extra-judicial killing of even such a person would have to be examined or thoroughly enquired into to ascertain and determine the facts. In the enquiry, it might turn out that the victim was in fact an enemy and an unprovoked aggressor and was killed in an exchange of fire. But the question for enquiry would still remain whether excessive or retaliatory force was used to kill that enemy...”

This judgment unequivocally establishes that the rule of law is paramount and no one is above the law and no circumstance can justify bypassing the law.

C. Developments in the LGBTQ (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer) Rights movement in India

Human rights violations by police are rife with respect to the LGBTQ community in India. Section 377 of the Indian Penal Code criminalises “unnatural” sexual acts, effectively criminalising homosexuality in India.

“377. Unnatural Offences:

Whoever voluntarily has carnal intercourse against the order of nature with any man, woman or animal, shall be punished with imprisonment for life, or with imprisonment of either description for a term which may extend to ten years, and shall also be liable to fine.

Explanation- Penetration is sufficient to constitute the carnal intercourse necessary to the offence described in this section.”

This archaic section was challenged before the Delhi High Court, which ruled it to be unconstitutional in 2009. This landmark judgment was [overturned](#) by the Supreme Court in 2013 however, thereby recriminalizing gay sex, and effectively homosexuality. On 2 February 2016, the Supreme Court referred the batch of curative petitions filed to a five-judge Constitutional Bench. In June 2016, the Supreme Court judgment was once again challenged in a joint petition filed through prominent Indian LGBTQ personalities. The court [declined](#) to examine the plea and instead directed that the petition be placed before a bench headed by the Chief Justice of India.



Supporters of LGBT rights protesting the 11 December 2013 decision of the Supreme Court that upheld section 377 of the Indian Penal Code. Credit: PTI (Source: [The Wire](#))

The existence of Section 377 is a grim reminder that the State can poke its nose into the private spaces of individuals and police their behaviour. Moral policing at its worst, Section 377 allows the police to exploit this provision to harass members of the community. LGBTQ persons may be subject to [extortion](#), threats, blackmail, torture and the like by police and others. It is hoped that the Supreme Court takes the opportunity to pass a far-thinking judgment that will ensure that the human rights of LGBTQ persons in India are not trampled upon and that they are able to live openly, without fear.

Quick look at the data

In terms of human rights violations by the police, the National Crime Records Bureau (NCRB) data for 2015¹² shows that,

- “A total of 54,916 complaints were made against police personnel during the year 2015, out of which 5,526 criminal cases were registered, 1,122 police personnel were charge-sheeted and 25 police personnel were convicted.
- A total of 94 cases of human rights violation by police (all cases against State police personnel and Nil cases against Central Armed Police Forces) were reported during 2015 out of which 34 police personnel were charge-sheeted during 2015. In 12 cases registered against State police personnel final reports were submitted declaring these cases as false.
- Out of 94 cases of human rights violations, maximum cases were reported under ‘Hurt/Injury’ (14 cases) followed by ‘Extortion’ (13 cases) and ‘Assault on women with intent to outrage her modesty’ (7 cases) during 2015. ”

¹² ‘Snapshots -2015’ National Crime Records Bureau, Ministry of Home Affairs, India available at <http://ncrb.gov.in/StatPublications/CII/CII2015/FILES/Snapshots-11.11.16.pdf>

Conclusion

The year 2016 shows the new and more complicated challenges faced by the police in India. With rising incidents of vigilantism and lynching by mobs in different parts of the country and the increase in online abuse and harassment by vigilantes and abusers in cyberspace, the police are having a hard time keeping up. Add this to the age-old issues plaguing the police in India, such as police torture, extrajudicial killings and human rights violations committed against the most vulnerable populations in India such as tribals, LGBTQ persons and women, the nature of relations with the police appears to be worsening. The rise of social media, though, has enabled the police in many Indian cities to maintain a direct link with the people, with different [online initiatives](#) through different channels allowing ordinary citizens to understand the police and their challenges better and help the police respond as quickly and efficiently as possible to complaints. The changing nature of crime along with the rapid developments in technology and media requires India's police to not only keep up to fight crime better, but also, to rebuild people's trust and gain their support. It is hoped that the coming year sees some broad strides in this area.

###

The Asian Human Rights Commission (AHRC) works towards the radical rethinking and fundamental redesigning of justice institutions in order to protect and promote human rights in Asia. Established in 1984, the Hong Kong based organisation is a Laureate of the Right Livelihood Award, 2014.

Published by

Asian Human Rights Commission
Ground Floor, No. 52, Princess Margret Road,
Kowloon, Hong Kong (SAR), China

Tel: +(852) 2698 6339

Fax: +(852) 2698 6367

Web: www.humanrights.asia