

CHRI 2015

Crime Victimisation and Safety Perception

A Public Survey of Delhi and Mumbai



CHRI

Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative

Working for the practical realisation of human
rights in the countries of the Commonwealth

Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative

The Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative (CHRI) is an independent, non-partisan, international non-governmental organisation, mandated to ensure the practical realisation of human rights in the countries of the Commonwealth. In 1987, several Commonwealth professional associations founded CHRI. They believed that while the Commonwealth provided member countries a shared set of values and legal principles from which to work and provided a forum within which to promote human rights, there was little focus on the issues of human rights within the Commonwealth.

CHRI's objectives are to promote awareness of and adherence to the Commonwealth Harare Principles, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other internationally recognised human rights instruments, as well as domestic instruments supporting human rights in Commonwealth Member States.

Through its reports and periodic investigations, CHRI continually draws attention to progress and setbacks to human rights in Commonwealth countries. In advocating for approaches and measures to prevent human rights abuses, CHRI addresses the Commonwealth Secretariat, Member Governments and civil society associations. Through its public education programmes, policy dialogues, comparative research, advocacy and networking, CHRI's approach throughout is to act as a catalyst around its priority issues.

CHRI is based in New Delhi, India, and has offices in London, UK and Accra, Ghana.

International Advisory Commission: Yashpal Ghai - Chairperson. Members: Clare Doube, Alison Duxbury, Wajahat Habibullah, Vivek Maru, Edward Mortimer, Sam Okudzeto and Maja Daruwala.

Executive Committee (India): Wajahat Habibullah – Chairperson. Members: B.K. Chandrashekar, Nitin Desai, Sanjoy Hazarika, Kamal Kumar, Poonam Muttreja, Ruma Pal, Jacob Punnoose, A P Shah and Maja Daruwala - Director.

Executive Committee (Ghana): Sam Okudzeto – Chairperson. Members: Akoto Ampaw, Yashpal Ghai, Wajahat Habibullah, Neville Linton, Kofi Quashigah, Juliette Tuakli and Maja Daruwala - Director.

Executive Committee (UK): Clare Doube – Chairperson. Members: Richard Bourne, Katherine O'Byrne, Meenakshi Dhar, Joanna Ewart-James, Frances Harrison, Sadakat Kadri, Neville Linton, Sashy Nathan, Rita Payne, Michael Stone.

ISBN: 978-93-81241-31-8

© Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative, 2015. Material from this report may be used, duly acknowledging the source.



Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative

CHRI Headquarters, New Delhi

55A, Third Floor, Siddharth Chambers-1,
Kalu Sarai, New Delhi 110 016
India
Tel: +91 11 4318 0200
Fax: +91 11 2686 4688
E-mail: info@humanrightsinitiative.org

CHRI London

Room No. 219
School of Advanced Study
South Block, Senate House
Malet Street, London WC1E 7HU
United Kingdom
Tel: +44(0) 207 664 4860
Fax: +44(0) 207 862 8820
E-mail: chri.admin@sas.ac.uk

CHRI Africa, Accra

House No.9, Samora Machel Street
Asylum Down, Opposite Beverly
Hills Hotel Near Trust Towers,
Accra,
Ghana
Tel/Fax: +233 302 971170
Email: chriafrika@humanrightsinitiative.org

www.humanrightsinitiative.org

Crime Victimisation and Safety Perception

A Public Survey of Delhi and Mumbai

Consulting Researchers and Authors

Dr. Abhijit Sarkar and Dripto Mukhopadhyay, Nielsen India Pvt Ltd

CHRI Team

Cheryl Blake and Devika Prasad

This report has been produced with the financial assistance of the European Union and the Friedrich Naumann Stiftung für die Freiheit.

The European Union is made up of 28 Member States who have decided to gradually link together their know-how, resources and destinies. Together, during a period of enlargement of 50 years, they have built a zone of stability, democracy and sustainable development whilst maintaining cultural diversity, tolerance and individual freedoms. The European Union is committed to sharing its achievements and its values with countries and peoples beyond its borders.

Founded in 1958, the Friedrich Naumann Stiftung für die Freiheit (FNF) is the “foundation for freedom” in the Federal Republic of Germany. It believes in the pursuit of liberty as an essential goal of humanity. The Foundation’s activities in the field of civic education both in Germany and abroad consist of seminars, conferences and publications aimed at promoting liberal values and principles. It aims at creating a world where an individual has the greatest liberty possible, without interfering with or undermining the freedom of any other individual.

Contents

Acknowledgements	i
Executive Summary	1
Methodology	3
Findings	7
Section I: Overview of crime incidence, reporting, and police response	7
What crimes were experienced most frequently?	8
How often do victims of crime report cases to the police?	12
Why did many victims not report crimes?.....	14
How did the victims who reported crime approach the police?	16
How have the police responded to reports of crime?	19
Were households that reported crime satisfied with the police response?.....	21
Section II: Details of crime occurrence	25
Does the incidence of crime, reporting behaviour, or police response to reports of crime vary according to income level?	26
How do other social factors relate to crime experience?	28
Where and when do the majority of theft, assault, and sexual harassment cases take place?	30
How frequently did victims of assault, sexual harassment, and criminal intimidation know the offender?	32
Section III: Perception of safety	33
Overall, how does the public perceive the police?.....	34
What crime do people most fear falling victim to?	35
How safe do households feel in their neighbourhoods?	36
How safe are different forms of transportation?.....	38
Does safety perception differ between crime-affected and non-crime affected households?	40
Does safety perception change based on income level?	41
How safe do migrants feel? Do speakers of non-majority languages feel less safe?	42
Conclusion	44
Annexure	45

Acknowledgements

The successful completion of this report is the outcome of the collaborative efforts and support of many individuals and partners. We sincerely thank all those who assisted in the research and shared their expertise in the course of developing the report.

We are thankful for the hard work of the field team and analysts at Nielsen India Pvt Ltd for designing the study, administering the survey, as well as preparing the statistical analysis and producing a first draft of the report. We also gratefully acknowledge the contributions of Maja Daruwala, Director of CHRI, to the content and design of the survey questionnaire.

Our thanks go to Renuka Sane, Indian Statistical Institute, and Ajay Shah, National Institute for Public Finance and Policy, for their advice on analysing and presenting the findings.

We also express our gratitude to Nandkumar Saravade, former IPS officer of 1987 batch, now working in the private sector and Dr. Pradnya Saravade, an IPS officer of 1989 batch and currently serving as Additional Director General of Police in Maharashtra, who drew on their significant experience to share insights on how these findings, and future crime victimisation surveys, can be of benefit to both the police and public.

Our special thanks and appreciation go to Cheryl Blake for her careful editing and dedicated efforts to produce this report.

This report and associated research and advocacy are generously supported by the European Union and the Friedrich Naumann Stiftung für die Freiheit, India. CHRI deeply appreciates this support and assumes full responsibility for the report's content.

Executive Summary

For over two decades, the Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative (CHRI) has worked to advance police reform in the Commonwealth. To achieve the aim of policing that fully respects human rights, we must recognise the barriers that limit effective law enforcement. Across South Asia, such barriers include inadequate budgets, personnel shortages, outdated training, and run-down police stations.

In India, the police are endemically under-resourced. Thus, it is imperative to allocate funds and personnel wisely. Using a variety of information, techniques, and processes to know where crime is occurring, where the public feels unsafe, and what the gap is between crime incidence and reported crime can help the police to make informed judgements about crime prevention and response strategies, public education initiatives, and much more.

Crime statistics can be one source of important information to shape these efforts. However, the data collected annually by the National Crime Records Bureau (NCRB) does not provide the full picture. Indeed, the very process of collecting and reporting these crime statistics is lacking in a number of ways. NCRB data is compiled on the basis of crime reported at police stations, but not all incidents of crime are reported. Further, if not all police stations send data—whether because they lack the personnel, digital records systems or other resources to do so—then even some reported crime will be missing from the official statistics. Such gaps grow wider when we consider the urban-rural divide, as well as the continuing problem of police refusal to register crime complaints.¹

Each of these limitations, though they may not all be equally widespread, means that NCRB data provides an incomplete picture of the actual level of crime. Certainly, it is not able to capture unreported crime, public satisfaction with the police, or the public's perception of safety. This means that both the policy and police responses to crime, particularly its prevention, are also lacking. A reliable way to collect this important information is through periodic public surveys. These can assess most accurately where, when, and to whom crime is occurring. In the United Kingdom and numerous other countries, crime victimisation surveys² are undertaken (often annually) to estimate the difference between reported and unreported crime, and thereby identify the true level of crime. Through such surveys, it is also possible to ask why individuals did not report crimes to the police, and more.

Undertaking crime victimisation surveys will provide a systematic assessment that can help inform the police operational response to crime, better direct the use of police resources, and even prompt better methods of evaluating police performance.³ Findings would be able to show what resources are needed, and where, to meet the public's needs. With such information, the government would be able to provide an evidence-based budgetary allocation to ensure the police can effectively tackle crime.

CHRI believes in making such investments towards better policing. Through the Nielson Company, we undertook a crime victimisation survey as described above in the two cities of Delhi and Mumbai to demonstrate the sorts of rich information that can be found through such studies. Throughout the discussion that follows, we make suggestions on how the police can use data of this kind to map and visualise crime trends, create new law enforcement initiatives, design crime prevention strategies, and more.

1 It is virtually impossible to know the true extent of how much crime is not reported due to police refusal to register complaints, but, anecdotally, the problem appears widespread. See, e.g., Thomas, S (2013), "HC has often slammed burking", *Times of India*: <http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/city/mumbai/HC-has-often-slammed-burking/articleshow/18490591.cms> as on 20 December 2015; Karlikar, N (2015), "Top cop warns his staff not to indulge in crime burking", *Time of India*, <http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/city/thane/Top-cop-warns-his-staff-not-to-indulge-in-crime-burking/articleshow/46885598.cms> as on 20 December 2015. In 2013, refusal to register complaints of certain crimes against women was made a punishable offence in the Indian Penal Code (IPC) (Section 166A), a first step to holding police officers accountable for refusing to register crime complaints.

2 For details on the England and Wales crime victimisation survey, see Office of National Statistics, Victims of Crime: <http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/taxonomy/index.html?nscl=Victims+of+Crime> as on 20 December 2015.

3 The Takshashila Foundation has advocated for the adoption of a periodic, national victimisation survey in India. Takshashila Foundation (2013), "The Need for an Indian Crime Survey: Memorandum to the Justice JS Verma Committee": <http://takshashila.org.in/wp-content/uploads/2013/01/TPA-InternalSecurity-CrimeSurvey-2013.pdf> as on 20 December 2015.

Despite the limitations of time and cost that constrained the survey's size and scope, the current study is the first known systematic attempt to record the actual crime experience of residents in both Delhi and Mumbai.⁴ In this survey, we focused on a diverse range of crime categories—theft, assault, house break-in, sexual harassment,⁵ criminal intimidation, unnatural death⁶ and missing persons.⁷ We chose these because they cover a broad cross section of crime that occur frequently.⁸ We also sought to survey how the experience of households facing these crimes might differ by affluence, and therefore selected samples of high-, mid-, and low-income households.

Here, the sole purpose is not to show what crime is occurring and where. The findings presented here should be seen as a window into the data that could be revealed by a larger study, undertaken periodically, to gauge the true level of crime, trends in crime occurrence, and public safety perception to inform personnel deployment, community engagement efforts, and other resource allocation on the part of police.

Snapshots of the findings:

- 13% of households surveyed in Delhi and 15% in Mumbai experienced at least one of the seven crime categories under study
- Theft was the most commonly experienced crime, followed by assault and sexual harassment
- High-income households tended to face crime less frequently
- Most who did not report crimes said they did not want to be caught up in bureaucracy
- Just over a third of Delhi households and half of Mumbai households said they were satisfied with how the police responded when they reported crime

4 As discussed by Chockalingham in the introduction to his study on crime victims in South India, few surveys on crime victimisation have been undertaken in India, save Mumbai's participation in one round of the International Crime Victims Survey (ICVS): K. Chockalingham (December 2003), Forum on Crime and Society, vol. 3, Nos. 1 and 2, *Criminal Victimisation in Four Major Cities in Southern India*, http://www.unodc.org/pdf/crime/forum/forum3_note3.pdf as on 20 December 2015.

5 Regarding crimes against women, we asked only about sexual harassment. We did not ask about rape, domestic violence, or any other gender-based or sexual crimes. Individual or targeted surveys designed specifically to address these crimes should be undertaken.

6 We surveyed unnatural death only in terms of whether a household member was murdered, or died in a road/train accident. We did not include suicides.

7 "Missing persons" itself is not a criminal offence. When a person is reported missing, the police enter the details in designated registers in the police station and immediately initiate investigation to determine whether a crime has occurred, for instance, murder or kidnapping. A First Information Report (FIR) is registered only when evidence or reasonable suspicion of any criminal activity related to the missing person is found. For the purposes of the current study, all such possible incidents were grouped under the label of missing persons. Please note the police must follow special procedures when a child is reported missing.

8 Theft, assault, house break-in, sexual harassment, and unnatural death (as described above) are cognizable offences under the Indian Penal Code (IPC). A cognizable offence is one in which the police may arrest a person without warrant. Police are authorised to investigate a cognizable case without orders from the court. Criminal intimidation under the IPC is a non-cognizable offence. In cases of non-cognizable offences, the police register an FIR and investigate only after getting permission from a judicial magistrate.

Methodology

The current crime victimisation survey represents the first attempt to systematically collect data on crime, reporting to the police, police response, and public perception of safety in Delhi and Mumbai.

The survey had four parts addressing three subjects:

(I) Crime Incidence (Part A)

The objective here was to estimate the incidence of seven crime categories: theft, assault, house break-in, sexual harassment, criminal intimidation, unnatural death, and missing persons. These were chosen as they represent a broad cross section of crimes that occur frequently.

(II) Crime Characteristics, Crime Reporting, and Police Response (Parts B & C)

This component focused on understanding (a) the characteristics of the crime committed (such as sub-categories of crime, where and when it was committed, who was the perpetrator and if s/he was known to the victim, etc), (b) the reporting behaviour of the victim household, and (c) the first response of police when the crime was reported.

(III) Perception of Safety (Part D)

This component addressed how safe respondents felt in their neighbourhoods, as well as in city travel.

The complete survey is presented in Annexure 1. The survey exercise was conducted in July–August 2015 and asked households to answer the questions based on their experiences in the preceding 12 month period (July 2014 to June 2015).

Multi-Stage Sampling Design

The study follows a multi-stage sampling design, similar to that used in India's National Sample Survey,⁹ the US Census Bureau Surveys,¹⁰ and numerous others.

We sought to reliably estimate the rate of crime incidence at the police zone level. Delhi is divided into eleven administrative police zones and Mumbai into thirteen. At a 95% confidence level and 5% margin of error, the required sample size is 384 for each zone.

Given the lack of reliable data on the true crime rate in either city, we decided to keep a buffer of 15% at the zone level, and the sample size was set at 450 households per zone. This gave an overall sample size of 4,950 households in Delhi and 5,850 households in Mumbai.

In the first stage of selecting geographical areas from which we would draw a sample of households, we used stratified random sampling to choose three census wards¹¹ within each police zone. We assigned wards in each zone to an income strata,¹² based on whether a majority of households in the ward were high-, mid-, or low-income.¹³ From each strata, one ward in each zone was randomly selected.

9 E.g., Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation (2015), National Sample Survey 71st Round, *Key Indicators of Social Consumption: Health*.

10 E.g., Murphy, P. (2008), "An overview of primary sampling units (PSUs) in multi stage samples of demographic surveys", *Proceedings of the Survey Research Methods Section, American Statistical Association*.

11 Wards that fell into two or more police zones were excluded for the purposes of this study.

12 Income level served as the basis for the stratification; though it would be ideal to adjust strata for other parameters as well, budgetary constraints prohibited this. Income nevertheless does have strong correlations with other socio-economic parameters. Because crime incidence is likely to vary based on income and other socio-economic factors, we hoped this stratification would give insight into how households of different income levels are affected by crime.

13 The Nielsen Neighbourhood Skyline (NSL) database was used to identify the income level of each ward. NSL provides a profile of household socio-economic demographics at the neighbourhood level for the top 57 cities in India. It includes information on income, savings, and expenditure of the households living in the neighbourhood, in addition to providing

In the absence of information on the exact number of households in each zone according to income level, an equal number of households were sampled from each strata in each police zone. With 450 sample households from each zone, this translated into 150 households¹⁴ per sample ward.

In the second stage, each selected ward was sub-divided into one-square kilometre grids.¹⁵ We excluded from selection any grids that had a different income level than that which was dominant in the ward. For example, in a high-income ward, mid- and low-income grids were omitted and random selection was performed only on high-income grids.¹⁶ We chose 3 of these in each ward.

In the third stage, within each grid we selected a random starting point from which surveyors went continuously household to household until reaching our quota of 50, in order to meet the target of 150 households per ward. While the random walk and quota methods can be subject to limitations,¹⁷ these sampling procedures have been successfully used in numerous studies. Given the expense of completing a full household listing in each grid, it was determined that this procedure would best meet the objectives of the study within time and resource constraints.

Survey Administration

Part A of the survey, which addressed demographic characteristics and whether households were affected by crime, was administered to each of the households identified in the process outlined above.

Parts B and C addressed characteristics of crime, such as where and when crime occurred, and victims' experiences when reporting to the police.¹⁸ These Parts were administered to all of the crime-affected households identified in Part A; this resulted in a total of 647 households in Delhi (13% of sample households) and 927 (15% of sample households) in Mumbai.

As there was no *a priori* information on incidence of any of the seven crimes, it was not possible to set a quota for the individual crimes. Theft turned out to be the most common crime (506 households in Delhi and 746 in Mumbai), while in both cities fewer than 100 households were victims of each of the other six crimes. Consequently, the analysis of reporting behaviour or police response in this section can be considered to be representative only at the city level and for all seven crimes taken together.

details on road networks, markets, connectivity parameters, etc. High-income was defined as a majority of households earning Rs 1 million or more per year, mid-income as Rs 0.3–1 million per year, and low-income as less than Rs 0.3 million per year. The geographical units discussed here generally track those defined by municipal boundaries.

- 14 With sampling spread across 11 police zones in Delhi and 13 in Mumbai, the sample size for each income strata is representative at (a) the city level with 3% margin of error at 95% confidence level and (b) at the zone level with 8% margin of error at 95% confidence level.
- 15 This division was based on Nielsen's Cell Grid Geo-spatial Database. This database is based on semi-automated algorithms employing Small Area Statistics and Geo-spatial Analytics techniques to disaggregate socio-economic data for a given geographic area into a grid consisting of cells, each having an area approximately 1 sq. km. The database includes economic, demographic, infrastructure, and land cover data for every cell.
- 16 Given the desire to determine statistical validity at the zone level, as well as cost and time constraints, we employed stratified sampling at the ward level. To ensure that grids appropriately represented the income level stratification of the ward as a whole, it was necessary to guarantee homogeneity of income level in the selection of grids. Admittedly, this imposes the limitation that the study would not capture whether the crime profile of heterogeneous localities differed from homogeneous ones.
- 17 Anthony G. Turner, United Nations Secretariat Statistics Division (2003), *Sampling Strategies*, pg. 7, http://unstats.un.org/unsd/demographic/meetings/egm/Sampling_1203/docs/no_2.pdf, as on 20 December 2015. For more details on various procedures for conducting random walks, see generally Juergen H.P. Hoffmeyer-Zlotnik (2003), *New Sampling Designs and the Quality of Data*, <http://mrvar.fdv.uni-lj.si/pub/mz/mz19/hoff.pdf> as on 20 December 2015. Out of the zone level sample of 450, 150 were to be drawn from each of three income strata, with 50 from each grid. A floor of 30 crime-affected households per zone was set. Had 30 households not been reached in this initial sweep, we would have increased the number of households surveyed by 50 until meeting that quota.
- 18 With regard to police response, the questionnaire contained several questions with multiple or nuanced answers, like what happened in missing persons cases or knowing whether the police properly registered a complaint. While CHRI provided some background on law and criminal procedure, it was a challenge for the surveyors (who are not experts in the criminal justice system) to ask the interviewees clarifying questions. This may therefore result in some flaws in the findings presented here, even though they faithfully represent the answers given by respondents. One additional benefit, then, of the government undertaking routine crime victimisation surveys would be to better train surveyors and build capacity to get more accurate answers, and preserve such institutional knowledge and practice over time. With this kind of robust data, the findings would best be able to help the police and government make decisions about deployment, training, and much more.

Part D assessed the safety perception of residents in Delhi and Mumbai. To attain reliability at the city level, the sample size was set at 3,025 respondent household in Delhi and 3,575 households in Mumbai. Statistically, the sample size is representative at the city level at 95% confidence level and 2% margin of error. With eleven police zones in Delhi and thirteen in Mumbai, this results in 275 samples per police zone.¹⁹

City level representativeness of the safety perception of crime-affected households at a 95% confidence level and 5% margin of error would require 384 sample households. As such, analysis of the safety perception of crime-affected households will be representative at the city level as long as the crime incidence rate in Delhi and Mumbai is greater than 12.59% and 10.74%, respectively.²⁰

With no *a priori* information on the actual rate of incidence of crime, it was decided to administer Part D to all crime-affected households. Thus, assuming X^z to be the number of crime-affected households in a police zone (and X^w to be the number of crime-affected households in a ward), $275 - X^z$ would be the number of non-victim households sampled per zone ($90 - X^w$ per ward). With this design, the city level sample would be representative of the perception of non-victim households at a 95% confidence level and 3% margin of error even if the incidence of crime exceeds 25%.

A brief demographic profile of our sample is shown below:

Delhi		Part A: Crime incidence		Parts B and C: Crime characteristics, reporting and police response		Part D: Perception of safety	
		Delhi	Mumbai	Delhi	Mumbai	Delhi	Mumbai
Total in sample		4,990	6,036	647	927	3,035	3,658
Income level of households	Low	1,657	2,029	239	371	1,013	1,214
	Mid	1,667	1,999	248	317	1,003	1,243
	High	1,666	2,008	160	239	1,019	1,201
Gender of respondent	Male	2,290	4,030	275	620	1,335	2,410
	Female	2,700	2,006	372	307	1,700	1,248
Length of residency	Greater than 5 years in city	4,631	5,893	605	900	2,810	3,561
	Greater than 5 years at current address	3,820	5,322	521	804	2,316	3,204

Weights

The absence of a household sampling frame and lack of information on crime incidence or reporting behaviour across geographic or socio-economic factors, even at the city level, did not allow computation of household level weights. We attempted a limited city level weight computation based only on the number of households according to income, for which city level information was available.

¹⁹ The analysis at the zone level will be representative at 95% confidence level with 6% margin of error.

²⁰ This was computed by dividing 384 (the minimum required sample size for city level representation) by the respective city sample sizes: 3,025 in Delhi and 3,575 in Mumbai. Ex post, the ratios were computed to be 13% (15%) in Delhi (Mumbai).

City	Annual Household Earning	Population		Sample		Weight
		No. of households (2014-15; in '000)	% of households in each strata	No. of households in sample	% of households in each strata	
Mumbai	<Rs 3 lakh (Low)	1,285	44%	1,657	33%	1.34
	Rs 3-10 lakh (Mid)	807	28%	1,667	33%	0.83
	>Rs 10 lakh (High)	802	28%	1,666	33%	0.83
	Total	2,894	100%	4,990	100%	
Delhi	<Rs 3 lakh (Low)	2,037	54%	2,029	34%	1.62
	Rs 3-10 lakh (Mid)	833	22%	1,999	33%	0.67
	>Rs 10 lakh (High)	874	23%	2,008	33%	0.70
	Total	3,744	100%	6,036	100%	

The same was used for estimating the city level projection of the number of households affected by crime. However, the same was not used at subsequent levels when estimating reporting incidence, as the number of households in each income strata who had reported crime to the police fell below 384 per strata (the minimum required sample size for a city level representation at 95% confidence level and 5% margin of error). This statistically constrained the computation of a city level weighted ratio for crime reporting behaviour.

Findings

This report opens with an assessment of the main issues addressed in the survey: the details of crimes given by victimised households, whether and when crimes were reported to the police, and the first response of the police to complaints.

Later sections focus on the details of crimes experienced by households, such as where and when the crimes took place as well as the relationship between socio-economic factors and crime experience. Lastly, the general perception of safety in both cities is explored in the final section.

Our purpose here is not to generalise the survey results, due to both the lack of a *priori* information and the fact that we oversampled crime-affected households in order to learn more about their experiences. Throughout, we report the survey findings with the purpose of demonstrating what can be found in a study of this kind. Recommendations for how findings from an even more robust study could be used are discussed in the sections below. Note also that in some tables and in the text, figures are rounded for convenience.

Section I: Overview of crime incidence, reporting, and police response

This section explores the crime experience over a period of one year (July 2014–June 2015) of the households interviewed in both Delhi and Mumbai, including how many reported crimes to the police and how the police responded. In particular, this section addresses the following queries:

- What crimes were experienced most frequently?
- How often do crime victims report cases to the police?
- Why did many victims not report crimes?
- How did the victims who reported crime approach the police?
- How have the police responded to reports of crimes?
- Were households that reported crime satisfied with the police response?

Snapshot:

- 13% of households surveyed in Delhi and 15% in Mumbai experienced at least one of the seven crimes under study
- Theft was the most commonly experienced crime; mobile phones were most commonly stolen
- Only 1 in 13 cases of sexual harassment were reported in Delhi
- Only half of all crimes were reported, and only half of these were registered as FIRs

What crimes were experienced most frequently?

13% of households surveyed in Delhi and just over 15% in Mumbai experienced at least one instance of the seven crime categories considered in the study. Theft was the most commonly experienced crime in both Delhi and Mumbai, followed by sexual harassment and physical assault.

Overall, 647 of the households surveyed in Delhi (12.96%) and 927 (15.36%) in Mumbai faced any of the seven crime categories addressed in the questionnaire.²¹ Some of them fell victim to crime more than once, though the proportion was relatively small.

Table 1: Households affected by crime

Crime	City	No. of households surveyed	No. of households affected by crime	% of households affected
Assault	Delhi	4,990	51	1.02%
	Mumbai	6,036	98	1.62%
Criminal Intimidation	Delhi	4,990	17	0.34%
	Mumbai	6,036	31	0.51%
House Break-in	Delhi	4,990	51	1.02%
	Mumbai	6,036	65	1.08%
Missing Persons	Delhi	4,990	1	0.02%
	Mumbai	6,036	3	0.05%
Sexual Harassment	Delhi	2,700	75	2.78%
	Mumbai	2,006	39	1.94%
Theft	Delhi	4,990	506	10.14%
	Mumbai	6,036	746	12.36%
Unnatural Death	Delhi	4,990	4	0.08%
	Mumbai	6,036	12	0.20%

Of the seven crimes surveyed, theft was by far most frequently experienced. 506 (10.14%) of households in Delhi and 746 (12.36%) of households in Mumbai had been victimised by theft. A notable proportion of households had been victims of theft multiple times—100 households in Delhi and 106 in Mumbai. As such, the total number of instances of theft reported by the respondents was 650 and 874, respectively, in each city.

Table 2: Cases of crime experienced – numbers and as a percentage of total cases of crime by city

Crime type	Delhi			Mumbai		
	Households affected by crime	Cases of crime experienced	Cases of crime by category as a % of total crime cases	Households affected by crime	Cases of crime experienced	Cases of crime by category as a % of total crime cases
Assault	51	51	5.97%	98	101	8.92%
Criminal Intimidation	17	17	1.99%	31	31	2.74%
House Break-in	51	51	5.97%	65	66	5.83%
Missing Persons	1	1	0.12%	3	3	0.27%

²¹ Please note this indicates the level of actual crime experienced as shared by our respondents, not crimes reported to police.

Sexual Harassment	75	80	9.37%	39	45	3.98%
Theft	506	650	76.11%	746	874	77.21%
Unnatural Death	4	4	0.47%	12	12	1.06%
Overall		854			1,132	

We analysed the data to examine whether there was a relationship between income class and the number of times a household experienced theft. Based on this survey alone, while mid-income households in Delhi were the most victimised, there was no clear trend of households being victimised multiple times based on their affluence. (Table 3).

Table 3: Households affected by theft according to income level

City	No. of thefts experienced	No. of households			
		Total	Low-Income	Mid-Income	High-Income
Delhi	One	406	157	147	102
			39%	36%	25%
	Two or more	100	28	49	23
			28%	49%	23%
Mumbai	One	640	245	216	179
			38%	34%	28%
	Two or more	106	44	33	29
			42%	31%	27%

Of the sub-categories of crime we examined, theft of a cell phone was the most common form of theft. Further, it was equally common in both cities, accounting for nearly 4 in every 10 cases of theft. (Table 4). This was followed by theft of luggage and theft of wallet, purse, or cash.

One notable finding is that households in Delhi were victims of car theft much more so than those surveyed in Mumbai. Car thefts accounted for 10% of theft cases in Delhi, compared to only 1% in Mumbai. These findings reflect those of *Crime in India 2014* (the annual national level crime statistics released by the National Crime Records Bureau) which reported over 21,000 cases of automobile theft registered in Delhi and less than 4,000 registered in Mumbai.²² This does not come as a surprise considering the number of registered private cars in Delhi was 22 lakh compared to just 6 lakh in Greater Mumbai.²³

Table 4: Composition of each crime category

Crime	Crime sub-category	% share in crime category	
		Delhi	Mumbai
Theft	Luggage	15.90%	28.86%
	Wallet/Purse/Cash*	23.27%	25.16%
	Credit/Debit card	0.87%	2.43%
	Jewellery	7.95%	4.97%
	Cell phone	39.31%	36.47%
	TV	0.00%	0.11%
	Computer/Laptop	2.75%	1.16%
	Car	9.97%	0.85%

22 National Crime Records Bureau, Ministry of Home Affairs (2014), *Crime in India 2014*, pg. 68.

23 Ministry of Road Transport and Highways (2012), *Road Transport Year Book (2011-12)*, pg. 53.

Assault	Grabbed/shoved/slapped/beat	63.93%	88.52%
	Attack by throwing rocks/bottles	3.28%	4.92%
	Attack with a gun or a knife	3.28%	3.28%
	Attack with any other dangerous object	4.92%	1.64%
	Attack in any other way	24.59%	1.64%
House Break-in	Forcing a door or window	59.26%	52.24%
	Manipulating a lock	29.63%	40.30%
	Entering through an open door or window	11.11%	5.97%
	Using force, or threatening to use force	0.00%	1.49%
Sexual Harassment ²⁴	Passed lewd or unwelcome sexual comments	75.94%	56.72%
	Continuously stared at in a lewd or threatening manner	18.72%	20.90%
	Followed by men till you were scared or uncomfortable	3.74%	10.45%
	Touched indecently/groped/pinched	1.60%	11.94%

**Cash and wallet/purse were separate answer categories in the survey, and are shown tallied together here because they frequently occurred together.*

In terms of the seven overall crime categories, the second most commonly experienced crime was different in the two cities. Physical assault cases (just under 9%) were the second most common in Mumbai. However, sexual harassment came out as the second most commonly experienced crime in Delhi (just over 9%). (Table 2).

Only when a female adult member of the household was responding to the survey did we ask questions relating to sexual harassment.²⁵ There were 2,700 female respondents in Delhi and 2,006 in Mumbai. Of these households, 75 (almost 3%) in Delhi and 39 (just under 2%) in Mumbai shared that a female member of the household was a victim of sexual harassment over the previous year.

Indeed, in Delhi 1 in 11 cases of all crime incidents were sexual harassment, compared to 1 in 25 in Mumbai. Of sexual harassment cases, 94% in Delhi fell into the categories of staring or passing lewd comments. However, almost a quarter of cases in Mumbai involved either indecent touching or groping, or being followed by men. (Table 4).

Physical assault was the second most common crime in Mumbai, and the third in Delhi.²⁶ Two-thirds of assault cases in Delhi and four-fifths of those in Mumbai involved grabbing, shoving, slapping or beating. The categories of attacks with dangerous objects, including guns and knives, accounted for just over 11% of cases in Delhi and just under 10% in Mumbai. However, whereas 6 in 10 cases of assault in Mumbai involved a sole assailant, 7 in 10 cases in Delhi had multiple perpetrators.

24 Another category of sexual harassment was “receiving unwanted calls, SMS, or social media messages”; however, none of the respondents answered that they experienced any of these.

25 Due to the nature of the crime, we took this approach in order to show sensitivity, because male respondents may not be comfortable discussing sexual harassment of female members of the household.

26 Physical assault and house break-in were tied for third most common crime in Delhi.

Table 5: Number of assailants involved in physical assaults

City	Number of attackers involved	As a percentage of total assault cases
Delhi	One person	31%
	Two people	28%
	More than two people	41%
Mumbai	One person	57%
	Two people	20%
	More than two people	23%

Instances of the other three categories of crime we examined (criminal intimidation, unnatural death, and missing persons) were fewer in number. Less than 0.5% of surveyed households in both cities faced these crimes.

How often do victims of crime report cases to the police?

Among the survey respondents, 46.8% of crime victim households in Delhi (and 41.8% in Mumbai) had reported crime to the police. In all crime categories, except those of unnatural death or missing persons, the rate of reporting to the police was 60% or less. The percentage of cases reported was particularly low for sexual harassment cases—11.1% in Mumbai and 7.5% in Delhi.

Our survey findings show a wide disparity between the number of crimes experienced and the rate of reporting these crimes to the police. In grave cases like unnatural death or missing persons, almost all cases were reported. In the other five crime categories, however, a third or more of crime incidents went unreported. The overall rate of crime reporting, for all categories taken together, is just under half of all incidents of crime.

Alarming, there is a particularly sharp drop-off in the reporting of sexual harassment,²⁷ compared to other crimes. Only 1 in 13 cases in Delhi and 1 in 9 in Mumbai were reported to the police.

Alarming levels of unresolved crime

The survey points to a significant proportion of unaddressed and unresolved crime in each city, signalling worrying levels of insecurity among the public, particularly women. Government and police must dedicate resources and consult widely to devise strategies to tackle this. A major benefit of crime surveys is that they reliably identify areas and localities where crime is not being reported. Proactive police departments can use this information to initiate crime prevention and community policing programmes in these target areas.

Table 6: Households reporting crimes to police

City	Crime	Cases of crime experienced	Households reporting crimes to police	
		No.	No.	% of cases of crime
Delhi	Theft	650	336	51.70 %
	Assault	51	28	54.90 %
	House Break-in	51	18	35.30 %
	Sexual Harassment	80	6	7.50 %
	Criminal Intimidation	17	8	47.10 %
	Unnatural Death	4	3	75.00 %
	Missing Persons	1	1	100.00 %
	Overall	854	400	46.80 %
Mumbai	Theft	874	383	43.80 %
	Assault	101	26	25.70 %
	House Break-in	66	40	60.60 %
	Sexual Harassment	45	5	11.10 %
	Criminal Intimidation	31	7	22.60 %
	Unnatural Death	12	9	75.00 %
	Missing Persons	3	3	100.00 %
	Overall	1,132	473	41.80 %

²⁷ Please note that the offence of sexual harassment (Section 354A) was added to the Indian Penal Code only in 2013 by the Criminal Law (Amendment) Act 2013. Before this, Section 354 punished “outraging the modesty of a woman,” which applied only to routine incidents of molestation.

Even within each category of crime, the likelihood of reporting differs among the sub-categories. Among theft cases, for example, in both cities less than half of the incidents of cell phone and luggage theft were reported to the police. Theft of high value items like jewellery, computers or laptops, and cars resulted in a higher rate of reporting to the police. This may be due to the utilitarian concern that claiming insurance for these items often requires showing a copy of the FIR registered by police, as in the case of insurance claims for vehicle theft.

Innovation and partnerships to tackle mobile phone theft

Mobile phone companies also need proof of loss before issuing another SIM card. One possible initiative to tackle cell phone thefts would be a national blacklist that would prevent re-activation based on the serial numbers of mobile phones reported stolen. This would have to be coordinated by telecommunications regulators and mobile phone companies, with police in a secondary role. The take away is that data on the rate of mobile phone thefts provides the impetus for law enforcement and other stakeholders to devise strategies to reduce such thefts.

Table 7: Cases of crime reported to police – theft

Crime sub-category	Delhi			Mumbai		
	Total Cases in Sample	Reported to police		Total Cases in Sample	Reported to police	
	No.	No.	% of sample cases	No.	No.	% of sample cases
Luggage	103	47	45.63%	234	80	34.19%
Wallet/Purse	59	27	45.76%	161	52	32.30%
Credit/Debit card	6	4	66.67%	23	12	52.17%
Jewellery	54	38	70.37%	47	34	72.34%
Cell phone	246	119	48.37%	328	156	47.56%
TV	0	0	0%	1	0	0.00%
Computer/Laptop	17	16	94.12%	11	7	63.64%
Cash	98	44	44.90%	61	35	57.38%
Car	67	41	61.19%	8	7	87.50%

In stark contrast, even serious cases of sexual harassment involving being touched or groped or being followed were not reported in most of the cases in both cities.

Table 8: Cases of crime reported to police – sexual harassment

Crime sub-category*	Delhi			Mumbai		
	Total Cases in Sample	Reported		Total Cases in Sample	Reported	
	No.	No.	%	No.	No.	%
Passed lewd or unwelcome sexual comments	68	3	4.41%	22	5	22.73%
Continuously stared at in a lewd or threatening manner	4	1	25.00%	10	0	0.00%
Followed by men till you were scared or uncomfortable	5	1	20.00%	5	0	0.00%
Touched indecently/groped/pinched	3	1	33.33%	8	0	0.00%

* The survey also included a sub-category on receiving inappropriate or unwanted phone calls or text messages, but in this survey no respondents selected that option as an answer.

Why did many victims not report crimes?

Of those who did not report crime, nearly half in Delhi and almost two-fifths in Mumbai said one reason they avoided reporting was that they did not want to be caught up in police or court matters. The second most common reason for not reporting is that the victim felt there was not enough evidence to go forward. The other main reasons cited by respondents were that they felt the police wouldn't entertain the complaint or would not be able to do anything about it.

As seems to be the case in many countries, our survey results provide support for the claim that most crime goes unreported. Overall, 53.2% of crime cases identified by the survey in Delhi and 58.2% in Mumbai were not reported. The primary reason for not reporting centred on fear of being caught in complex or bureaucratic police and court systems.

People also often reported that they felt that there was little evidence of the crime or that the police would not be able to do anything about the incident. A significant number said they did not report the crime for fear of retaliation.

Table 9: Reasons cited for not reporting crime (as a percentage of total unreported cases)*

City	Delhi		Mumbai	
	Number of cases	As % of crime not reported	Number of cases	As % of crime not reported
No. of crimes not reported	454		659	
Fear of retaliation	38	8%	100	15%
Lack of evidence	150	33%	138	21%
Didn't know where to report	24	5%	23	3%
Didn't know any of the helpline numbers	8	2%	9	1%
Did not think the police would entertain your complaint	88	19%	69	10%
Did not think the police would be able to do anything about the case	67	15%	112	17%
Family matters do not need to be reported	16	4%	85	13%
Did not want to get stuck in police/court matters	216	48%	242	37%
Scared to go to the police station	22	5%	81	12%

* Sum exceeds 100% as respondents could select multiple options

It does appear that many victims envision reporting to the police and possibly proceeding with a criminal case as daunting, burdensome endeavours. They also perceive little gain in going to the police, as they believe there is little evidence and the police will not be able to take steps to hold perpetrators accountable.

While these trends stay consistent among kinds of crime, some reasons for not reporting are more emphasised in some kinds of crime. For example, of the 80 households in Delhi that experienced sexual harassment, 74 of them did not go to the police. Of these, 52 said they did not want to get stuck in police or court matters. In Mumbai, there were 45 cases of sexual harassment, 40 of which went unreported. 26 said they did not report out of fear of retaliation.

Particularly in cases of sexual harassment, the data clearly indicates exceedingly low levels of reporting while incidence is relatively high in both cities. The reasons for low reporting cited above immediately signal the need for further targeted study. To be sure, visible and active efforts must be made by the police, strengthened by partnering with NGOs, to hold mass awareness programmes to educate women that sexual harassment is now a crime they can complain of, the process to make a complaint, and assure them of their safety in this process. To increase women's confidence to report these cases, it may also be beneficial to formalise the role of NGOs in providing public education as well as training police in gender

sensitisation so that they can respond to reported cases of sexual harassment appropriately. Government can make it mandatory for all modes of public transport—autos, taxis, buses, trains/metro—to prominently display the numbers of the police control room and women’s helpline number(s). Acting on women’s safety requires a response to low reporting. The detailed reasons for the gap between the experience of sexual harassment and reporting must be identified first.

Table 10: Reasons cited for not reporting crime, according to crime category (as a percentage)

Crime category	Did not want to get stuck in police/ court matters		Lack of evidence		Did not think the police would entertain your complaint		Did not think the police would be able to do anything about the case	
	Delhi	Mumbai	Delhi	Mumbai	Delhi	Mumbai	Delhi	Mumbai
Theft	65%	69%	85%	75%	85%	71%	54%	71%
Assault	6%	12%	1%	13%	2%	10%	18%	12%
House Break-in	3%	7%	11%	4%	8%	4%	10%	5%
Sexual Harassment	24%	6%	2%	5%	3%	7%	13%	6%
Criminal Intimidation	1%	4%	1%	1%	0%	6%	4%	5%
Unnatural Death	0%	1%	0%	1%	1%	1%	0%	1%
Missing Persons	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

How did the victims who reported crime approach the police?

Of households that reported crimes, two-thirds of those in Delhi and three-fourths of those in Mumbai went to the police station to make a report. Helpline numbers, including 100, were used by a quarter of victimised households in Mumbai and half of those in Delhi. Comparatively, approaching a police vehicle or registering a complaint online were used less commonly to report a crime.

Overall, in both Delhi and Mumbai, 7 in 10 households visited a police station to report crime.²⁸ In both cities, for two of the most frequently experienced crimes—*theft* and *assault*—as well as *house break-ins*, over two-thirds of households that reported these crimes went to the police station to do so. However, for the other crimes surveyed, there are not consistent trends in how crimes were reported.

Using data to ask the right questions

Though the numbers are too small to draw clear conclusions, this is yet another case where a broader survey could uncover important details. For example, victims may have called 100 to report suffering sexual harassment or assault, but then not followed up at the police station. Uncovering the reasons why—such as fear of retaliation, or concern about being caught up in a complex criminal justice system—are important to addressing the gap between incidence of crime and reporting.

Ultimately, visiting a police station remains essential to reporting crime. An individual reports an offence by registering an FIR, and as stated above, the police can investigate only after registering the FIR. Given current legal requirements, an FIR can only be registered at a police station.²⁹ An FIR can be given in writing or orally to the police officer, and the informant or complainant must sign the FIR and be given a copy. There are some exceptions for emergency situations—if the complainant cannot make it to the police station and the case needs to be registered, the police can register an FIR based on a phone call or email; or the victim can approach the nearest police station, even if the offence was not committed within its jurisdiction (this is known as a “zero-FIR”). Subsequently the investigation will be handed over to the police station with appropriate jurisdiction.

Table 11: Crimes reported at police stations

City	Crime category	Crime cases	Crimes reported	Visited police station
				% of crime reported
Delhi	Overall	854	400	70.75%
Mumbai	Overall	1,132	473	75.48%
Delhi	Theft	650	336	72.32%
	Assault	51	28	64.29%
	House Break-in	51	18	61.11%
	Sexual Harassment	80	6	50.00%
	Criminal Intimidation	17	8	50.00%
	Unnatural Death	4	3	100.00%
	Missing Persons	1	1	100.00%

28 Note that households could choose more than one answer in response to the question on how they reported the crime(s) they experienced.

29 Section 154, Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973. Proviso (a) to Section 154, inserted in 2013, states if a woman victim of a sexual offence (including sexual harassment) is a temporarily or permanently mentally or physically differently-abled person, then the FIR shall be recorded at the residence of the person reporting the offence, or at a convenient place of such person's choice, in the presence of an interpreter or a special educator.

Mumbai	Theft	874	383	78.07%
	Assault	101	26	76.92%
	House Break-in	66	40	60.00%
	Sexual Harassment	45	5	80.00%
	Criminal Intimidation	31	7	85.71%
	Unnatural Death	12	9	22.22%
	Missing Persons	3	3	66.67%

Many households used police helplines—including 100—to report a crime.³⁰ Overall, nearly half of those who reported crime in Delhi used a helpline. By comparison, just under a quarter of those in Mumbai did so.

Breaking down the use of helplines by type of crime, in Delhi the rate of use was higher for crimes like assault, sexual harassment, and criminal intimidation. One reason for this could be due to the immediacy of the crime.

However, even for these crimes, respondents in Mumbai used helplines less than Delhiites, and reported going to police stations more.³¹ One reason for the difference between the cities could be the number of initiatives undertaken in recent years to increase the number of police helplines and inform the public in Delhi about them.

Table 12: Crimes reported via helpline numbers

City	Crime category	Crime cases	Crimes reported	Called helpline
				% of crime reported
Delhi	Overall	854	400	48.75%
Mumbai	Overall	1,132	473	23.04%
Delhi	Theft	650	336	46.73%
	Assault	51	28	71.43%
	House Break-in	51	18	33.33%
	Sexual Harassment	80	6	66.67%
	Criminal Intimidation	17	8	75.00%
	Unnatural Death	4	3	33.33%
	Missing Persons	1	1	100.00%

30 The survey was designed to gauge the different ways in which people *first* approached the police for help after suffering a crime. It must be remembered here that the facilities of calling the police control room or a helpline have been set up to provide immediate access to police for protection, medical help or rescue. To register an FIR and thereby report the crime, one would have to go to the police station as described above.

31 Further, as discussed in Section III, respondents in Mumbai generally feel safer using public transport and being out at night later than respondents in Delhi. It could be that individuals in Mumbai felt more comfortable going to the police station right away in the first instance, whereas those in Delhi first opt to call the PCR or a helpline if the crime occurred in evening hours.

Mumbai	Theft	874	383	21.41%
	Assault	101	26	30.77%
	House Break-in	66	40	30.00%
	Sexual Harassment	45	5	20.00%
	Criminal Intimidation	31	7	28.57%
	Unnatural Death	12	9	44.44%
	Missing Persons	3	3	0.00%

The other two methods for reporting crime that were addressed in the survey were a) filing a complaint online and b) approaching a Police Control Room (PCR) van.³² Online complaint registration is a relatively new facility, introduced in both Delhi and Mumbai, covering only some kinds of minor crime; it was little used in comparison to other reporting mechanisms.³³ Moreover, online registration would only be a meaningful option for those who have access to the internet.

Out of those households who reported crime, only 6% of those in Delhi and 1.48% of those in Mumbai answered that they approached a PCR van. The fact that these figures are low comes as no surprise, to the extent that respondents only shared incidents where they walked to a nearby police vehicle or stopped a passing van. Certainly, periodic surveys could indicate the extent to which the public approaches PCR vans (one step further would be to record and collate the vans' response times); such factors would help determine the true cost-benefit of this police service, and particularly to help identify the number of PCR vans needed in each city.

Table 13: Crime affected households choosing to approach PCR van or use online services to report crime

City	Approached a PCR van	Online
Delhi	6.0%	3.5%
Mumbai	1.48%	0%

³² In future surveys, this question could be better phrased to get a clearer picture of respondents' experiences. Again, the intent here was to survey how many people first approached a PCR van after being victimised.

³³ Indeed, neither of the online registration portals in Delhi and Mumbai accept registration of cognizable crimes. In Delhi, the portal (<http://www.delhipolice.nic.in/register.html>) is limited only to lodging reports of missing documents and items and explicitly states that if the loss is due to "theft or any other crime", one must contact the nearest police station. The limited parameters of the online reporting facility need to be clarified to the public. Those who used the portal in Delhi reported thefts or break-ins, which to a lay person could fall under the umbrella of "report of loss". In Mumbai, the portal (<https://mumbaipolice.maharashtra.gov.in/complaint.asp>) explicitly states that it can only be used to register minor or non-cognizable crimes.

How have the police responded to reports of crime?

Under the Code of Criminal Procedure, the police must register a First Information Report (FIR) when anyone reports a cognizable offence—these are serious crimes for which police do not need a warrant to make an arrest. Almost all the crimes surveyed here are cognizable. However, in both Delhi and Mumbai, an FIR was only filed in just under half of the cases that victims reported to the police.

Taking all crimes together, in both cities less than half of the cases reported to the police by the respondents had an FIR registered. Given that only half of all crimes experienced were reported in the first place, this means only a quarter of crimes experienced were registered.

In terms of sexual harassment, none of the six cases reported in Delhi³⁴ and only two of the five cases in Mumbai led to an FIR being filed.³⁵ This is particularly concerning in light of the fact that only 7.5% of households in Delhi and 11.1% of those in Mumbai who had faced sexual harassment reported the incident to the police.

As Table 14 below shows, half or less of households who reported thefts, assaults, or break-ins answered that FIRs were filed in their cases. Only in cases of unnatural death was FIR registration consistently high; however, none of the missing persons cases in Mumbai were registered.³⁶

Table 14: FIR registered – number and as a percentage of crimes reported to police

City	Crime category	Crime cases	Crimes reported to police	FIR Registered	
				No.	% of crime reported
Delhi	Overall	854	400	195	48.75%
Mumbai	Overall	1,132	473	229	48.41%
Delhi	Theft	650	336	169	50.30%
	Assault	51	28	12	42.86%
	House Break-in	51	18	9	50.00%
	Sexual Harassment	80	6	0	0.00%
	Criminal Intimidation	17	8	1	12.50%
	Unnatural Death	4	3	3	100.00%
	Missing Persons	1	1	1	100.00%
Mumbai	Theft	874	383	187	48.83%
	Assault	101	26	12	46.15%
	House Break-in	66	40	19	47.50%
	Sexual Harassment	45	5	2	40.00%
	Criminal Intimidation	31	7	2	28.57%
	Unnatural Death	12	9	7	77.78%
	Missing Persons	3	3	0	0.00%

Within sub-categories of crime, there are also differences in the proportion of reported cases that had FIRs registered. For instance, FIRs were filed for 37% of reported cell phone thefts in Delhi and 45% of those in Mumbai.

34 In Delhi, this low rate of FIR registration in sexual harassment cases also casts doubt on the purported success of initiatives like *Operation Shistachar* [(Express News Service (2015), “Operation Shistachar: In 20 days, 370 arrested, 2400 detained for harassing women”, The Indian Express: <http://indianexpress.com/article/cities/delhi/operation-shistachar-in-20-days-370-arrested-2400-detained-for-harassing-women> as on 20 December 2015] by the Delhi Police. The high number of individuals detained under this operation is also worrying.

35 While Section 166A of the Indian Penal Code penalises a police officer who refuses to register an FIR for certain crimes against women (minimum imprisonment of six months extendable to two years plus a fine), the offence of sexual harassment is not included.

36 This may be because no cognizable offence was made out.

Cases of car theft had a relatively better rate of FIR registration, probably due to insurance requirements.³⁷ Reports of theft of other high value items like computer or laptop and jewellery also were more likely to be registered. Notably, the types of theft showing a high rate of FIR registration in general were also more commonly reported in the first place.

Table 15: FIR registered in cases of theft – number and as a percentage of theft cases reported to police

Item stolen	Delhi			Mumbai		
	No. of cases reported to police	FIR registered		No. of cases reported to police	FIR registered	
		No.	% of cases reported		No.	% of cases reported
Luggage	47	26	55.32%	80	43	53.75%
Wallet/Purse	27	15	55.56%	52	24	46.15%
Credit/Debit card	4	1	25.00%	12	5	41.67%
Jewellery	38	26	68.42%	34	13	38.24%
Cell phone	119	44	36.97%	156	70	44.87%
Computer/Laptop	16	10	62.50%	7	6	85.71%
Cash	44	21	47.73%	35	21	60.00%
Car	41	26	63.41%	7	5	71.43%

³⁷ Because of the high number of car thefts in Delhi, the Delhi Police encourages and facilitates electronic filing of FIRs in these cases.

Were households that reported crime satisfied with the police response?

For those households who reported crime, roughly 36% in Delhi and 51% in Mumbai said they were satisfied with the police response.³⁸ The discussion below explores the reasons why households felt satisfied or dissatisfied with the police response.

Of households who reported crime, just over a third of those in Delhi and half of those in Mumbai shared that they were satisfied with the police response. The data shows that even some households that had FIRs registered in response to their complaints still felt dissatisfied with the police response.

To find out why respondents felt satisfied or not, we asked a series of questions probing for the reasons.

Table 16: Satisfied with police response

City	Crime category	Cases of crime	Crimes reported	Satisfied with police response	
				Count	%
Delhi	Overall	854	400	145	36.25%
Mumbai	Overall	1,132	473	242	51.16%
Delhi	Theft	650	336	125	37.20%
	Assault	51	28	12	42.86%
	House Break-in	51	18	4	22.22%
	Sexual Harassment	80	6	1	16.67%
	Criminal Intimidation	17	8	2	25.00%
	Unnatural Death	4	3	1	33.33%
	Missing Persons	1	1		0.00%
Mumbai	Theft	874	383	200	52.22%
	Assault	101	26	15	57.69%
	House Break-in	66	40	14	35.00%
	Sexual Harassment	45	5	2	40.00%
	Criminal Intimidation	31	7	5	71.43%
	Unnatural Death	12	9	4	44.44%
	Missing Persons	3	3	2	66.67%

Even out of those who said they were satisfied, overall, with how the police responded, comparatively few³⁹ answered that the reasons for their satisfaction included that the police: “explained the action they will take”; “arrived without delay”; and “acted fast”.

³⁸ Please note that this only includes the first response of the police, and that too quite broadly.

³⁹ Respondents were able to choose more than one reason for why they were satisfied by the police response. Therefore, these numbers are not lower simply because respondents chose other reasons.

Table 17: Reasons cited for satisfaction – as a percentage of those satisfied with police response

City	Crime category	Number satisfied with police	Listened carefully	Registered my complaint correctly	Registered my complaint without delay	Explained the action they will take	Arrived without delay	Acted fast
		No.	As a percentage of those satisfied with the police response					
Delhi	Overall	145	51.03%	53.79%	33.79%	8.97%	4.14%	8.28%
	Theft	125	49.6%	54.40%	32.80%	6.40%	0.80%	6.40%
	Assault	12	66.67%	66.67%	50%	33.33%	33.33%	16.67%
	House Break-in	4	25%	50%	25%	0%	0%	0%
	Sexual Harassment	1	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
	Criminal Intimidation	2	50%	0%	50%	0%	0%	50%
	Unnatural Death	1	100%	0%	0%	100%	100%	0%
	Missing Persons	0	–	–	–	–	–	–
Mumbai	Overall	242	53.72%	48.76%	32.23%	27.69%	19.01%	19.42%
	Theft	200	54%	48.50%	31.50%	26.50%	18.50%	20.00%
	Assault	15	40%	46.67%	13.33%	33.33%	13.33%	20.00%
	House Break-in	14	92.86%	57.14%	64.29%	57.14%	35.71%	14.29%
	Sexual Harassment	2%	100%	50%	50%	0%	0%	0.00%
	Criminal Intimidation	5	20%	60%	0%	20%	0%	0.00%
	Unnatural Death	4	0%	25%	25%	0%	50%	25.00%
	Missing Persons	2	0%	50%	100%	0%	0%	50.00%

Identifying training opportunities

Few people had the police explain the next steps in the process to them. This indicates that more soft skills training is needed on how the police can help victims understand what to expect after they have made a complaint. Indeed, doing so helps avoid frustration, and therefore promotes cooperation on the part of complainants.

Not preparing victims for what they should expect means that the criminal justice system will continue to be perceived as confusing and burdensome. As discussed earlier, many victims avoided reporting crimes in the first place because they felt intimidated by the criminal justice system (see Table 9 and related discussion).

There were also few respondents who answered that the police arrived without delay or acted fast. Such reasons may not have been applicable to all cases; for example, those who reported crime at a police station after the crime occurred wouldn't be expected to answer that the police arrived without delay.

However, these responses could also reflect issues on the ground, such as lack of police personnel and PCR vans. This is yet another instance where data helps identify the questions that need to be answered, rather than providing an answer to all questions.

Among those who said they were dissatisfied with the police response, most answered that this was on account of delay and/or refusal to register an FIR, rude behaviour while registering an FIR, and attempting to dissuade the complainant from filing an FIR.

Burking bars access to justice

There is an urgent need for police departments to address the long-standing obstructions and violations by police in registering FIRs. Preventing, refusing, and delaying FIR registration impedes access to justice at the very beginning. There are certainly initiatives to address this, through technology inputs for instance, but the root of the problem is lack of accountability. It is incumbent on supervisory officers to monitor and take swift action against violations in every instance. For instance, police supervisors, from the Station House Officer and above, should ensure FIRs are filed against police officers for refusal to register FIRs of crimes against women, as under Section 166A, IPC. Police departments should initiate the collection and analysis of data on the volume of complaints against police for refusal to register, individuals being complained against, district wise concentration of these complaints, and the action being taken in response to such complaints. This analysis can provide powerful evidence of gaps and deficiencies in the department's response to this problem, which in turn can be used to correct and strengthen internal disciplinary processes.

Table 18: Reasons cited for dissatisfaction – as a percentage of those dissatisfied with police response

City	Crime category	Crimes reported	Rude/ impolite	Refused to register FIR	Put me at fault and tried to persuade me not to register	Asked for a bribe	Took a long time to register FIR	PCR van took an hour or more	Did not help injured persons
		Nos.	% of crime reported						
Delhi	Overall	255	41.18%	27.84%	18.82%	5.1%	31.37%	5.49%	3.53%
	Theft	211	41.23%	24.64%	20.38%	5.21%	32.7%	5.21%	4.27%
	Assault	16	31.25%	25%	0%	6.25%	43.75%	6.25%	0%
	House Break-in	14	50%	57.14%	7.14%	7.14%	7.14%	14.29%	0%
	Sexual Harassment	5	20%	60%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Criminal Intimidation	6	33.33%	33.33%	50%	0%	33.33%	0%	0%
	Unnatural Death	2	100%	50%	50%	0%	50%	0%	0%
	Missing Persons	1	100%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Mumbai	Overall	231	43.29%	43.29%	29.87%	19.05%	41.13%	17.75%	16.02%
	Theft	183	46.99%	45.9%	33.88%	22.95%	42.08%	21.31%	20.22%
	Assault	11	54.55%	27.27%	54.55%	0%	36.36%	9.09%	0%
	House Break-in	26	19.23%	38.46%	0%	7.69%	34.62%	3.85%	0%
	Sexual Harassment	3	0%	66.67%	0%	0%	66.67%	0%	0%
	Criminal Intimidation	2	50%	0%	50%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Unnatural Death	5	20%	20%	0%	0%	60%	0%	0%
	Missing Persons	1	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

For the last two reasons that respondents could choose—that the PCR van took over an hour to arrive or the police did not help injured persons—it is expected to see comparatively lower numbers because those circumstances wouldn't be relevant to all of the reported cases.

Section II: Details of crime occurrence

This section explores the relationships among various factors at play in how victims experienced crime, such as households' income level, where and when crimes took place, etc. Specific questions include:

- Does the incidence of crime, reporting behaviour, or police response to reports of crime vary according to income level?
- How do other social factors relate to crime experience?
- Where and when do the majority of theft, assault, and sexual harassment cases take place?
- How frequently did victims of assault, sexual harassment, and criminal intimidation know the offender?

Snapshot:

- Not all reported crimes get registered as FIRs
- Thefts occurred most often in residential areas in Delhi
- Sexual harassment in Mumbai seems to be perpetrated anonymously in open spaces or commercial areas, whereas victims in Delhi more often recognised the perpetrator
- Non-dominant groups, such as non-Hindi speakers in Delhi and non-Marathi speakers in Mumbai, seem somewhat more vulnerable to crime

Does the incidence of crime, reporting behaviour, or police response to reports of crime vary according to income level?

Overall, the results of our survey show that high-income households are less affected by crime compared to low-income households. When looking at individual crimes, however, trends are less clear, due largely to the fact that theft and assault cases dominate the responses. Together, these crimes accounted for 86% of crime in Delhi and 91% of that in Mumbai.

In Mumbai, the percentage of households affected by crime gradually decreased while moving up the income ladder. Though high-income households in Delhi were somewhat less affected by crime than the other two income categories, the percentage of crime-affected households was comparable between mid- and low-income brackets.

Table 19: Percentage of sample households affected by crime across income classes

City	Income Class	Sample households in each income class	Households affected by crime	% of sample households affected by crime
Delhi	Low	1,013	239	23.59%
	Mid	1,003	248	24.73%
	High	1,019	160	15.7%
Mumbai	Low	1,214	371	30.56%
	Mid	1,243	317	25.5%
	High	1,201	239	19.9%

In terms of the kinds of crime affecting different income brackets, trends are neither clear nor consistent. As in the city-wide data, theft is the most commonly experienced crime across all income brackets in both cities.

While trends in crime reporting similarly lack a clear pattern according to income level, in Delhi there does appear to be a difference in reports of theft versus other kinds of crime. Yet, it is important even here to acknowledge that the statistics don't provide all the answers, especially in light of the small sample size.

Rather, having an indication that many more affluent than poor households report theft would point to the need for additional exploration to identify the cause. Reasons for low reporting on the part of poorer households could include ignorance of the process, fear of the police, or difficulty accessing police stations. Each of these can be addressed, but we can only begin to know what issues are present if good data on crime and safety trends are collected first.

Table 20: Crime reported to police across income classes

Crime category	Income class	Delhi			Mumbai		
		Cases of crime	Reported to police	% reported	Cases of crime	Reported to police	% reported
Overall	Low	290	115	39.66%	412	194	47.09%
	Mid	280	133	47.50%	389	135	34.70%
	High	284	152	53.52%	331	144	43.50%
Theft	Low	217	91	41.94%	314	157	50.00%
	Mid	208	113	54.33%	291	107	36.77%
	High	225	132	58.67%	269	119	44.24%

Others	Low	73	24	32.88%	98	37	37.76%
	Mid	72	20	27.78%	98	28	28.57%
	High	59	20	33.90%	62	25	40.32%

Further, despite reporting crime at a higher rate than other income groups, the high-income households in Delhi had a lower rate of reported crime being registered by the police compared to mid-income households, and slightly below that of low-income households.

In Mumbai however, crime reported by high- and mid-income households more often led to FIR registration than crimes reported by low-income households, even though in Mumbai it was low-income households that reported crime most.

Table 21: Crime reported to police leading to registration of FIR (across income classes)

	Income class	Delhi			Mumbai		
		Reported to police	FIR Registered	Registration as % of reported	Reported to police	FIR Registered	Registration as % of reported
Overall crime	Low	115	47	40.87%	194	64	32.99%
	Mid	133	92	69.17%	135	83	61.48%
	High	152	56	36.84%	144	82	56.94%

How do other social factors relate to crime experience?

These results show that non-Marathi speakers in Mumbai and non-Hindi speakers in Delhi are comparatively more vulnerable to crime. However, there does not seem to be a difference between households living in the city for less than 5 years versus those who had lived there longer. The data also didn't show clear differences in crime victimisation according to the religion or caste of the household.

Of the households surveyed in both cities, over 85% were Hindu and 7–8.5% were Muslim. The rates of crime victimisation among these groups were comparable.⁴⁰ Similarly, the rate of crime victimisation for the SC/ST community (constituting 14% of sample in Delhi and 12% in Mumbai) was also comparable to non-SC/ST households in both cities.

We asked respondents whether they had been living in the city for less than five years, to see whether recent migrants were affected by crime differently than long-term residents. However, recent migrants constituted a very small portion of the sample: 7% in Delhi and 2% in Mumbai. Based on this data, there was no notable difference between the two groups.

Yet, those who don't speak the primary language of the city they live in do seem to be more slightly more vulnerable to crime, particularly when it comes to non-Hindi speakers in Delhi. One must be cautious in drawing conclusions from a small sample size, yet it stands to reason that migrants who struggle to communicate in the local language would be at a relatively greater risk of crime as a result of their lack of knowledge of the city, and difficulty integrating due to language barriers.

Supporting vulnerable communities

This is yet another area where a more robust and targeted study on crime victimisation would shed light on the extent to which these populations are more vulnerable, and whether the police should focus efforts to reach out to and protect these communities. Indeed, many questions could be addressed through smaller-scale surveys directed at recent migrants only. That information would enable customised crime prevention strategies aimed at helping recent migrants.

Table 22: Impact of demographic characteristics on victimisation and reporting behaviour

City	City sample household size	Religion/ Caste/ Period of stay/ Mother tongue	Households in each income class		Sample crime victim households	Sample crime affected households reporting crime
	No.		No.	% of city sample household	% of sample household	% of crime victim households
Religion						
Delhi	4,990	Hindu	4,381	87.80%	13.10%	44.43%
		Muslim	348	6.97%	13.22%	36.96%
		Christian	43	0.86%	4.65%	50.00%
		Sikh	212	4.25%	10.85%	47.83%
		Other	6	0.12%	33.33%	50.00%

⁴⁰ As stated in the methodology, sample sizes below that used to determine a representative size at the city or police zone levels must be treated with caution, and not used to make generalisations. This analysis is shown for comparative purposes within our survey, and to demonstrate potential findings of a large-scale survey.

Mumbai	6,036	Hindu	5,341	88.49%	15.22%	42.44%
		Muslim	520	8.61%	15.96%	43.37%
		Christian	64	1.06%	25.00%	25.00%
		Sikh	32	0.53%	18.75%	66.67%
		Other	79	1.31%	11.39%	33.33%
Caste						
Delhi	4,990	Non SC/ST	4,275	85.67%	13.01%	45.14%
		SC/ST	715	14.33%	12.73%	37.36%
Mumbai	6,036	Non SC/ST	5,308	87.94%	15.49%	42.70%
		SC/ST	728	12.06%	14.42%	39.05%
Period of stay in city						
Delhi	4,990	≤ 3 years	204	4.09%	9.80%	50.00%
		4 to 5 Years	155	3.11%	14.19%	22.73%
		> 5 Years	4,631	92.81%	13.06%	44.63%
Mumbai	6,036	≤ 3 years	59	0.98%	18.64%	27.27%
		4 to 5 Years	84	1.39%	19.05%	37.50%
		> 5 Years	5,893	97.63%	15.27%	42.56%
Mother tongue						
Delhi	4,990	Hindi	4,732	94.83%	12.49%	44.16%
		Non-Hindi	258	5.17%	21.71%	42.86%
Mumbai	6,036	Marathi	2,869	47.53%	14.15%	43.10%
		Non-Marathi	3,167	52.47%	16.45%	41.65%
		Hindi	2,290	37.94%	16.77%	41.15%
		Gujarati	416	6.89%	15.38%	48.44%
		Others	461	7.64%	15.84%	38.36%

Where and when do the majority of theft, assault, and sexual harassment cases take place?⁴¹

Of these three most common crimes, the vast majority take place in open areas and public transport, with theft cases in Delhi being an exception to this trend. In both cities, the majority of all crimes take place from 12PM to 6PM.

The majority of thefts in Delhi took place during the late night to early morning hours (29% occurred from 12AM to 6AM) and afternoon to early evening hours (45% occurred from 12PM to 6PM). Further, most thefts in the city were committed in residential areas (56%).

In contrast, though the majority of the thefts in Mumbai happened in the afternoon and evening rather than late night or early morning (the 12PM to 12AM time periods accounted for 68% of thefts), location-wise the thefts were more dispersed than in Delhi.

Table 23: Place and time of occurrence of thefts, assaults, and sexual harassment in Delhi and Mumbai

	Delhi					Mumbai				
	Overall	12AM to 6AM	6AM to 12PM	12PM to 6PM	6PM to 12AM	Overall	12AM to 6AM	6AM to 12PM	12PM to 6PM	6PM to 12AM
Theft										
Residential area	56%	20%	5%	23%	7%	33%	8%	6%	14%	5%
Work place	5%	1%	1%	3%	0%	4%	0%	1%	2%	0%
Commercial place	9%	2%	1%	5%	1%	13%	1%	1%	5%	5%
Open area/ on the streets	19%	5%	2%	10%	3%	13%	2%	2%	6%	3%
Public transport	12%	1%	3%	4%	3%	38%	1%	9%	17%	10%
Time bracket share in total theft		29%	12%	45%	14%		13%	19%	44%	24%
Assault										
Residential area	33%	3%	2%	22%	5%	15%	1%	4%	6%	3%
Work place	14%	2%	2%	10%	0%	6%	0%	6%	0%	0%
Commercial place	3%	0%	2%	2%	0%	11%	2%	4%	4%	0%
Open area/ on the streets	45%	2%	5%	24%	14%	61%	3%	6%	35%	16%
Public transport	5%	2%	2%	2%	0%	7%	3%	3%	1%	0%
Time bracket share in total assault		9%	12%	60%	19%		10%	24%	47%	19%
Sexual Harassment										
Residential area	3%	0%	0%	1%	1%	3%	0%	0%	3%	0%
Work place	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	3%	0%	3%	0%	0%
Commercial place	3%	0%	1%	0%	1%	32%	0%	0%	16%	16%
Open area/ on the streets	91%	0%	1%	33%	58%	45%	3%	5%	21%	16%
Public transport	4%	0%	0%	4%	0%	18%	0%	8%	11%	0%

⁴¹ Ultimately, this report is not intended to show a complete picture of reality on the ground, much less tell the police how to counter crime. Even a full crime victimisation survey will be but a piece, although an essential one, of how to help make policing more effective. The description of the data in this section serves to illustrate the cross-tabulations of data that can help give an overview of where and when crime occurs.

Time bracket share in total sexual harassment		0%	3%	38%	60%		3%	16%	50%	32%
Overall										
Residential area	49%	17%	5%	21%	6%	30%	7%	5%	12%	5%
Work place	4%	1%	1%	2%	0%	4%	0%	1%	3%	1%
Commercial place	8%	1%	1%	4%	1%	13%	1%	1%	5%	5%
Open area/ on the streets	28%	4%	2%	13%	9%	18%	2%	3%	9%	5%
Public transport	10%	1%	2%	4%	3%	34%	1%	8%	16%	9%
Time bracket share overall		25%	11%	45%	20%		12%	18%	45%	25%

The two cities somewhat differed in terms of time and place of occurrence of assault cases. 60% of the assault cases in Delhi happened in the 12PM–6PM period, and location-wise were primarily divided between residential (33%) and open areas/streets (45%). Incidences of assault in Mumbai, on the other hand, mostly took place in the open areas (61%) during the day time (6AM–6PM accounted for 71%).

Almost all sexual harassment cases (91%) in Delhi were in the open areas/on the streets, and 60% of them happened during the evening to night time (6PM–12AM). In contrast, sexual harassment incidences in Mumbai were more concentrated in the afternoon to early evening period, and apart from open areas, commercial places and public transport jointly accounted for almost half the cases.

This section shows how a crime victimisation survey would provide a wealth of information for both the police and the public. Assessing the time and location of crimes together gives the police the basis for directing personnel and resources towards targeted crime prevention and public safety strategies. With that kind of information, the police would be able to:

- Identify crime “hotspots” in their local jurisdictions and concentrate personnel and PCR vans in those areas to promote safety
- Assess police station performance on the basis of their ability to tackle crime hotspots in their areas
- Run awareness programmes on crime prevention and local safety issues for localities and neighbourhoods. It will only instil greater public confidence in policing if the public visibly sees that their local police are actively monitoring and tracking crime incidence and taking measures to address and prevent it

How frequently did victims of assault, sexual harassment, and criminal intimidation know the offender?

Due to the nature of assault, sexual harassment, and criminal intimidation, we hypothesised that many victims may recognise the perpetrator. Indeed, the data here shows that except for sexual harassment cases in Mumbai, the perpetrators were more often than not familiar to the victim.

For assault and criminal intimidation cases in both Delhi and Mumbai, victims recognised perpetrator(s) by name or sight in just over two-thirds of cases. A significant difference can be seen between the two cities, however, when it comes to sexual harassment cases.

While most of the victims of sexual harassment in Delhi knew the perpetrator by sight, in almost 9 out of 10 cases in Mumbai, the perpetrator was not known to the victim. Most cases of sexual harassment in Mumbai took place on public transport or commercial places.⁴² These two trends together show that many perpetrators are taking advantage of the anonymity of public spaces to harass women. This also gives guidance for the police response—in Mumbai, the police can step up its presence and patrolling in the areas which are prone to cases of sexual harassment; in Delhi, where perpetrators are largely known to victims, the police can work in partnership with NGOs to reach both victims and perpetrators and devise the appropriate strategies.

Table 24: Cases where offenders were known to victim

Crime category	Cases of crime	At least one known by name	At least one known by sight	Did not know offender	Did not see the offender
	Nos.	% of cases of crime*			
Delhi					
Assault	51	35.3%	33.3%	35.3%	13.7%
Sexual Harassment	80	1.25%	60%	38.8%	1.3%
Criminal Intimidation	17	47.1 %	41.2%	11.8%	11.8%
Mumbai					
Assault	101	27.7%	31.7%	35.6%	10.9%
Sexual Harassment	45	2.2%	11.1%	86.7%	2.2%
Criminal Intimidation	31	35.5%	29.0%	32.3%	6.5%

* May exceed 100% in case of multiple perpetrators with differing identification status.

⁴² The lack of a similar trend in Delhi could be tied to the fact that many individuals reported that they avoided public transport and felt unsafe earlier in the evening more so than respondents in Mumbai (see Section III).

Section III: Perception of safety

Having presented crime-affected and non-crime-affected households with this portion of the questionnaire, this section presents a general assessment of respondents' safety perception of their city and immediate neighbourhood. It also presents answers to questions on satisfaction with policing generally.

It focuses on the following set of questions:

- Overall, how does the public perceive the police?
- What crime do people most fear falling victim to?
- How safe do households feel in their neighbourhoods?
- How safe are different forms of transportation?
- Does safety perception differ between crime-affected and non-crime affected households?
- Does safety perception change based on income level?
- How safe is the city for migrants? Do speakers of non-majority languages feel less safe?

Snapshot:

- Residents of Mumbai generally perceived the police in a more positive light, and felt safer than those in Delhi
- People most fear falling victim to theft, assault, and sexual harassment
- Households in Delhi begin feeling unsafe, even in their own neighbourhoods, earlier in the evening than those in Mumbai
- Recently experiencing crime, or being poorer, correlate with lower safety perception

Overall, how does the public perceive the police?

Mumbai residents tended to perceive the police positively, while the perception in Delhi was more evenly split between positive and negative. Views were quite consistent across income classes in Mumbai. In Delhi, many high- and mid-income households answered that their perception was very positive or positive. Though many low-income households did as well, more answered neutral or negative than the other two income groups.

First, we asked all crime-affected households as well as a sample of non-crime-affected households about their perception of the police overall.

More than two-thirds of those in Mumbai answered that they perceive the police in a positive light, though just under half of Delhi respondents did. This may well track the overall safety perception in both cities, which is notably higher in Mumbai than Delhi. (Tables 34 & 35).

It should also be noted that just over a fifth of respondents in both cities answered that they viewed the police in neither a positive nor negative light.

Table 25: Overall perception of local police (% of final sample households)

City	Total households	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative
Delhi	3,035	2%	40%	22%	32%	3%
Mumbai	3,659	19%	45%	22%	13%	1%

Table 26: Satisfaction with police – by income class

City	Income category	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative
Delhi	Low	4%	34%	21%	36%	5%
	Mid	1%	41%	21%	35%	2%
	High	2%	46%	25%	25%	1%
Mumbai	Low	17%	47%	25%	11%	1%
	Mid	20%	47%	22%	10%	1%
	High	20%	42%	20%	17%	2%

What crime do people most fear falling victim to?

In both cities, people's fear of crime closely relates to the actual incidence of crime seen through the surveys. Theft is the universal top-most fear. In Delhi, respondents were 4 times more fearful of sexual crimes than those in Mumbai. Households in Mumbai generally were more fearful of assault than Delhiites.

Fear of theft seems universal across the two cities. Fewer people are fearful of assault and unnatural death in Delhi compared to Mumbai.

Around a quarter of the Mumbai respondents listed assault as their second strongest fear. This is possibly shaped by the actual crime experience. Whereas around 6% of sample households in Delhi experienced assault in the previous year, the proportion was higher at roughly 10% in Mumbai.

Yet public perception of safety, as informed by the news media, also seems to play a significant role here. This is most evident in Delhi, where 17% of households answered that they were worried about sexual harassment.

Delhi's actual experience of sexual harassment was roughly one percentage point higher than that in Mumbai. (Table 1). However, given Delhi's longstanding reputation as unsafe for women, the aftermath of the Jyoti Singh Pandey rape case in 2012 and the resulting heightened coverage of women's safety issues, the fear of sexual crime has likely become much more acute in Delhi.

Table 27: Crimes people fear most of falling victim to (% of sample respondents)*

City	Theft	Assault	Unnatural death	Sexual crime	Criminal intimidation
Delhi	86%	16%	5%	17%	2%
Mumbai	77%	26%	13%	4%	3%

** Respondents could choose more than one option. As such, the sum of these percentages exceeds 100%.*

How safe do households feel in their neighbourhoods?

Only one-fifth of households in Delhi and one-third of those in Mumbai did not find crime to be problem in their locality. However, irrespective of gender, respondents by and large felt safe in their neighbourhood during daytime hours. Relative to Delhiites, more Mumbai respondents feel comfortable going out at night in their neighbourhood.

Respondents in Mumbai felt considerably less fearful of crime in their neighbourhoods relative to respondents in Delhi, though the safety perception among those in Mumbai was only marginally better than Delhiites'. One possible reason is that, as shown above, around half of crimes in Delhi were committed in and around residential areas, whereas the rate of crime in residential areas in Mumbai was significantly lower, at 30%. (Table 23).

In both cities, the vast majority of households reported feeling safe in their neighbourhoods during the day time. Female respondents felt as safe as their male counterparts in their neighbourhood during day time in both the cities.

However, the cross city difference sets in as the night deepens—20% of respondents in Mumbai would start worrying for their safety in their own neighbourhood only after midnight. In comparison, only 3% in Delhi would feel safe beyond 11 PM.

When it comes to travelling beyond the immediate neighbourhood, there is a clear difference in safety perception based on gender. Whereas only 7% of respondents would be worried for a lone male member staying away from home beyond 8PM in Delhi, 52% would worry for a lone female member of the household at the same hour of the night.

Table 28: Do you feel safe walking around in the neighbourhood during the day?

City	Gender	No. of respondents	Yes		No		Don't Know	
			No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Delhi	Male	1,335	1,147	85.92%	148	11.09%	40	3%
Delhi	Female	1,700	1,430	84.12%	210	12.35%	60	3.53%
Delhi	Overall	3,035	2,577	84.91%	358	11.80%	100	3.29%
Mumbai	Male	2,410	1,950	80.91%	204	8.46%	256	10.62%
Mumbai	Female	1,248	1,059	84.86%	110	8.81%	79	6.33%
Mumbai	Overall	3,658	3,009	82.26%	314	8.58%	335	9.16%

Table 29: At what time in the evening would one stop feeling safe walking around alone in neighbourhood?

City	Gender	Always feel safe	After 7 PM	After 8 PM	After 9 PM	After 10 PM	After 11 PM	After Midnight
Delhi	Male	2%	13%	20%	20%	28%	15%	3%
	Female	1%	9%	16%	29%	31%	13%	2%
	Overall	1%	10%	18%	25%	30%	14%	2%
Mumbai	Male	14%	7%	3%	5%	17%	33%	22%
	Female	8%	5%	4%	8%	19%	39%	17%
	Overall	12%	6%	3%	6%	17%	35%	20%

Table 30: What time would one start worrying about the safety of an adult male/female household member who is out alone at night?

	City	After 7 PM	After 8 PM	After 9 PM	After 10 PM	After 11 PM	After Midnight	Would not worry
Male member of household	Delhi	1%	6%	24%	33%	33%	2%	1%
	Mumbai	1%	4%	8%	18%	39%	20%	10%
Female member of household	Delhi	21%	31%	32%	13%	2%	0%	0%
	Mumbai	6%	11%	16%	25%	29%	8%	5%

How safe are different forms of transportation?

Buses, train or metro, and auto are the three most preferred modes for travel in both Delhi and Mumbai. Buses are most popular in Mumbai whereas the metro is most preferred in Delhi, though both are perceived to be comparably safe. Shared autos and all types of taxis are considered to be the least safe in Delhi.

Buses, local trains or the metro, and autos are the three preferred forms of transit from a safety perspective in both cities. Safety perception regarding travelling by bus or auto during the day is also comparable in both cities.

However, the Delhi metro was perceived as safer compared to the suburban rail system of Mumbai. A clear difference in safety perception can be observed between auto and shared auto in Delhi, which is absent in Mumbai.

Barely a third of Delhi day time commuters reported feeling safe with taxi services. In comparison, two-thirds of those in Mumbai perceive taxis to be safe for day time travel.

Table 31: Do you feel safe travelling alone in public transport during the day?

City	Gender	DTC/ BEST Buses	Grameen Sewa	Delhi/ Mumbai Metro/ Local Train	Delhi/ Mumbai metro feeder buses	Auto	Shared auto	Radio Taxi	Other taxi services
Delhi	Male	76%	65%	81%	52%	61%	35%	36%	25%
	Female	73%	63%	78%	51%	64%	40%	33%	19%
	Overall	74%	64%	79%	51%	63%	38%	34%	21%
Mumbai	Male	77%	-	66%	-	66%	67%	65%	67%
	Female	79%	-	69%	-	67%	64%	61%	69%
	Overall	78%	-	67%	-	66%	66%	64%	68%

In Delhi, the pattern of heightened safety concerns at night time extends to the perceived safety of travelling in the evening. 45% of Delhiites (compared to just under 14% in Mumbai) start to worry about their safety while travelling by public transport after 9 PM.

Similarly, whereas 22% of respondents in Mumbai would feel unsafe using their own transportation to move around the city beyond 10 PM, the ratio jumps to 68% in Delhi. However, these results don't demonstrate a significant gender difference regarding safety perception for travel at night.

Table 32: At what time in the evening would one stop feeling safe travelling in public transport?

City	Gender	After 7 PM	After 8 PM	After 9 PM	After 10 PM	After 11 PM	After Midnight	Would not worry
Delhi	Male	2%	13%	32%	32%	19%	1%	1%
	Female	2%	18%	24%	33%	22%	1%	0%
	Overall	2%	16%	27%	33%	21%	1%	1%
Mumbai	Male	5%	2%	7%	19%	33%	23%	11%
	Female	3%	4%	9%	22%	41%	17%	4%
	Overall	4%	3%	7%	20%	36%	21%	9%

Table 33: At what time in the evening would one stop feeling safe while travelling in personal transport?*

City	Gender	Always feel safe	After 7 PM	After 8 PM	After 9 PM	After 10 PM	After 11 PM	After Midnight
Delhi	Male	3%	2%	6%	16%	39%	33%	3%
	Female	2%	2%	6%	17%	48%	22%	2%
	Overall	2%	2%	6%	16%	44%	27%	3%
Mumbai	Male	15%	1%	1%	8%	12%	31%	19%
	Female	7%	1%	2%	7%	15%	35%	15%
	Overall	13%	1%	1%	7%	13%	32%	17%

* Note: 67% (52%) of responding households in Delhi (Mumbai) owned two wheelers at the time of survey. Car ownership was 31% (15%) among Delhi (Mumbai) respondent households. However, the question was asked to all respondents irrespective of whether they owned a vehicle.

Does safety perception differ between crime-affected and non-crime affected households?

The responses here show that households in Delhi feel more concerned about crime and safety when they have been recently affected by crime, even compared to Mumbai residents who recently experienced crime.

Among the sample respondents, 13% of those in Delhi and 15% of households in Mumbai had experienced at least one of the seven crime categories considered in the study.

Overall, 36% of respondent households in Delhi felt crime was a big problem in their local areas. This figure jumps to 48% among those who recently experienced crime.

In contrast, crime-affected households in Mumbai do not show any discernible shift in perception of how much of a problem crime is, compared to the general population.

However, in both cities, recently experiencing crime clearly makes households feel less safe in their neighbourhoods.

Table 34: How big a problem is crime in your local area?

	City	No. of respondent households	Perception of crime in local area (%)			
			Big problem	Somewhat of a problem but not very big	Not much of a problem	Don't know
Overall	Delhi	3,035	36%	40%	22%	2%
	Mumbai	3,658	19%	33%	35%	13%
Crime affected households	Delhi	647	48%	42%	10%	1%
	Mumbai	927	15%	29%	32%	25%

Table 35: How safe is the neighbourhood?

	City	No. of respondent households	Safety in neighbourhood (%)				
			Very safe	Safe	Moderate	Unsafe	Very unsafe
Overall	Delhi	3,035	1%	44%	37%	16%	1%
	Mumbai	3,658	4%	48%	34%	13%	1%
Crime affected households	Delhi	647	2%	23%	39%	33%	3%
	Mumbai	927	1%	30%	43%	24%	1%

Does safety perception change based on income level?

Safety perception increases with prosperity, which parallels the trend that fewer high-income households are falling victim to crime. This pattern is more evident in Delhi. However, even poor households in Mumbai feel safer than their counterparts in Delhi.

Overall, more Mumbai respondents answered that they felt safe in their local areas than did households in Delhi; this trend is visible across all three income classes. In both cities, however, the safety perception shows steady improvement as one moves from low- to high-income households.

This parallels the survey findings that crime incidence in both cities is lower by 4–6 percentage points among the higher income households relative to low-income households. Such differences in crime experience may well be the reason for a greater percentage of high-income households reporting that they feel safe/very safe at a higher rate than other income groups.

In Mumbai, poorer households report feeling safe more than those in Delhi. Even in the low-income households in Mumbai, for every 100 households feeling unsafe/very unsafe, 350 households reported feeling safe/very safe. In comparison, for every 100 low-income households feeling unsafe/very unsafe in Delhi, only 200 households are feeling safe/very safe.

Table 36: How safe is the neighbourhood – by income class

City	Safety Perception	Low-Income	Mid-Income	High-Income
Delhi	Safe/Very safe	41%	45%	49%
	Moderate	39%	35%	37%
	Unsafe/Very unsafe	21%	20%	14%
Mumbai	Safe/Very safe	49%	50%	56%
	Moderate	37%	39%	27%
	Unsafe/Very unsafe	14%	11%	17%

How safe do migrants feel? Do speakers of non-majority languages feel less safe?

Non-Hindi speaking households in Delhi experienced crime more frequently than the Hindi speaking population, but did not report feeling less safe. However, non-Marathi speakers in Mumbai reported feeling less safe in comparison to Marathi speakers—and reported feeling that crime was a big problem.

A move to a new city or a new address always brings with it some safety concerns, and the option to pre-screen and select the locality before actually moving in is not feasible for all, especially the poor.

The cost and time constraints limited the current study to stratified random sampling based on household income only. As such, this study wasn't able to meet a minimum target sample for other categories of households, including period of stay in the city or current address.

The final sample had only 1% and 4% of households that had moved to Mumbai or Delhi, respectively, less than 3 years ago. 7% and 16%, respectively, had moved to their current address within the last three years. From this data, we don't observe recent inter- or intra-city migrants feeling less safe or experiencing more crime compared to households who have resided in an area longer.

Table 37: Perception of crime vs length of stay in city

	Stay in city	No. of households	Big problem	Somewhat of a problem but not very big	Not much of a problem	Don't know
Delhi	≤3 years	129	29%	50%	17%	3%
	4 to 5 Years	96	32%	39%	29%	-
	> 5 Years	2,810	37%	39%	22%	2%
Mumbai	≤3 years	38	11%	32%	42%	16%
	4 to 5 Years	59	22%	31%	31%	17%
	> 5 Years	3,561	19%	33%	35%	13%

Table 38: Safety perception vs length of stay in city

	Stay in city	No. of households	Very safe	Safe	Moderate	Unsafe	Very unsafe
Delhi	≤3 years	129	2%	47%	41%	10%	-
	4 to 5 Years	96	1%	44%	40%	14%	2%
	> 5 Years	2,810	1%	44%	37%	17%	1%
Mumbai	≤3 years	38	3%	55%	39%	3%	-
	4 to 5 Years	59	5%	47%	39%	7%	2%
	> 5 Years	3,561	4%	48%	34%	13%	1%

Table 39: Perception of crime vs length of stay in address

	Stay in current address	No. of households	Big problem	Somewhat of a problem but not very big	Not much of a problem	Don't know
Delhi	≤3 years	478	29%	43%	25%	2%
	4 to 5 Years	241	36%	38%	25%	1%
	> 5 Years	2,316	38%	39%	21%	2%
Mumbai	≤3 years	260	16%	35%	38%	11%
	4 to 5 Years	194	19%	34%	34%	14%
	> 5 Years	3,204	19%	33%	35%	13%

Table 40: Safety perception vs length of stay in address

	Stay in current address	No. of households	Very safe	Safe	Moderate	Unsafe	Very unsafe
Delhi	≤3 years	478	2%	47%	41%	10%	-
	4 to 5 Years	241	1%	44%	40%	14%	2%
	> 5 Years	2,316	1%	44%	37%	17%	1%
Mumbai	≤3 years	260	3%	55%	39%	3%	-
	4 to 5 Years	194	5%	47%	39%	7%	2%
	> 5 Years	3,204	4%	48%	34%	13%	1%

Although Table 22 shows non-Hindi speakers in Delhi experiencing crime at a higher rate than Hindi speakers, non-Hindi speakers did not feel crime to be more of a problem than Hindi speakers. The overall safety perception was therefore also comparable among the two groups in Delhi.

In contrast, safety perception varied between two groups in Mumbai. Twice as many non-Marathi speakers thought crime was a big problem compared to Marathi speakers. This is also reflected by the finding that, while 47% of non-Marathi speakers felt safe/very safe, the ratio was higher at 58% for Marathi speakers.

Table 41: Crime perception vs language spoken

	Language spoken	No. of households	Big problem	Somewhat of a problem but not very big	Not much of a problem	Don't know
Delhi	Hindi	2,835	37%	40%	21%	2%
	Non-Hindi	200	29%	35%	35%	2%
Mumbai	Marathi	1,715	13%	36%	36%	14%
	Non-Marathi	1,943	24%	31%	34%	11%

Table 42: Safety perception vs language spoken

	Language spoken	No. of households	Very safe	Safe	Moderate	Unsafe	Very unsafe
Delhi	Hindi	2,835	1%	45%	37%	16%	1%
	Non-Hindi	200	1%	41%	32%	26%	1%
Mumbai	Marathi	1,715	4%	54%	29%	13%	1%
	Non-Marathi	1,943	4%	43%	40%	13%	1%

Conclusion

Surveys, such as this one, that gather data on crime victimisation and safety perception enable police departments and governments to understand the true level of crime. A crucial aspect of such surveys, as exemplified by this pilot initiative, is their ability to identify the proportion of crimes that go unreported. There is no other method by which the government could gather information on such crimes. While bearing in mind that this survey is only a first effort to assess the true level of crime, the results show a rate of unreported crime over 50% in both Delhi and Mumbai. Should this finding be borne out by a larger study, it would carry serious implications for the scale of response needed from both the police and government.

Further, even without attempting to generalise the results, this survey points to important information (as well as areas of future research) on experiences of crime, the location and timing of crimes, and how crime affects migrants, different income classes, and women. Moreover, the survey tells us how the police initially respond to crime, and how satisfied the public is with this response, all based on the true and direct opinions of ordinary households. General safety perceptions also show how safe, or unsafe, the public feels—a measure that will not be revealed without a survey.

As shown here, crime victimisation surveys can provide a treasure trove of information. This not only helps all of us understand the nature of crime better, but allows police and policymakers to implement crime reduction strategies and policies where they can make the most impact. As crime reduction strategies become more focused and targeted, a natural progression would be to evaluate police performance against these; such a step would help address the current lack of systems or processes for regular police performance evaluation.

Surveys such as this cannot be one-off. They must be conducted at regular intervals in the same geographies to yield data that can be acted upon in a visible and tangible way, and bit by bit, better direct and strengthen police response and behaviour. They ideally must be done through an independent agency, and the entire exercise coordinated and overseen by a committee of diverse experts working with the police. They must be fully transparent and the results easy to access for everyone. These efforts have to be collaborative between governments, police departments, and even civic agencies. Undoubtedly, the dividends of conducting such surveys will be maximised when police departments and/or governments themselves take the lead to do it, in partnership with civil society experts, academics, retired officers, independent institutions and any other relevant stakeholders. Such efforts are urgently needed.

Part A: LISTING SHEET

Listing No.			
-------------	--	--	--

Brief Introduction: Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative (CHRI) in collaboration with Indicus Analytics (A Nielson Company) is conducting a crime victimisation survey in Delhi and Mumbai. In this survey we are collecting data on personal and household experience of crime and major public safety concerns across localities, income groups and socio demographics in the these two cities. The survey also seeks to assess personal experience of reporting of crimes to law enforcement agencies and satisfaction levels. The findings will be published in the form of a report and circulated widely to the Central and State governments, police, media and civil society.

संक्षिप्त परिचय: इण्डिक्स एनालिटिक्स (नेल्सन कंपनी) के सहयोग से कॉमनवेल्थ ह्यूमन राइट्स इनिशिएटिव (सीएचआरआई) दिल्ली और मुंबई में एक अपराध उत्पीड़न सर्वे कर रही है। इस सर्वे में हम इन शहरों की विभिन्न कॉलोनीयों में, विभिन्न आय वर्ग एवं सामाजिक जनसंख्या के द्वारा अपराधिक व्यक्तिगत एवं घरेलू अनुभव और प्रमुख जन सुरक्षा से संबंधित डेटा एकत्रित कर रहे हैं। सर्वे कानून प्रवर्तन एजेंसियों और संतुष्टि के स्तर के लिए अपराधों की रिपोर्टिंग के व्यक्तिगत अनुभव का भी आकलन करना चाहता है। निष्कर्ष एक रिपोर्ट के रूप में प्रकाशित किया जाएगा और केन्द्र तथा राज्य सरकारों, पुलिस, मीडिया और नागरिक समाज के लिए व्यापक रूप से परिचालित किया जाएगा।

Thank you for giving your valuable time to answer the questionnaire. We are also grateful for your support.

प्रश्नावली का जवाब देने के लिए अपना बहुमूल्य समय देने के लिए धन्यवाद! हम आपकी सहायता के लिए भी आभारी हैं।

Household ID	City	Zone	Thana	Locality Name
Name of Interviewer:				
Region/Address:				
Date of Interview: DAY/MONTH/YEAR		Phone No		
Type of dwelling:	1=Independent house/bungalow		2=Apartment/flat in a building	
			3=Slum/jhuggi	

PART A: Listing

A1. Demographicsजनसांख्यिकी

1. Respondent details (Select an adult member for the survey)

उत्तरदाता का विवरण (सर्वे के लिए किसी वयस्क सदस्य को चुनें)

Name of the respondent उत्तरदाता का नाम	Gender लिंग		Age (in years) उम्र (वर्ष में)	Whether CWE मुख्य कमाने वाले हैं या नहीं	
	Male पुरुष	Female महिला		Yes हाँ	No नहीं
	1	2		1	2

2. CWE मुख्य कमाने वाले

Age (in years) उम्र (वर्ष में)	Genderलिंग		Education of CWE मुख्य कमाने वाले की शिक्षा (Code)	Occupation of Chief Wage Earner (CWE) मुख्य कमाने वाले का व्यवसाय	Mother tongue of CWE मुख्य कमाने वाले की मातृभाषा	Annual household Income वार्षिक घरेलू आय		
	Male पुरुष	Female महिला				Below 3Lacs 3 लाख से कम	Between 3-10Lacs 3-10 लाख के बीच	Above 10 Lacs 10 लाख से अधिक
	1	2				1	2	3

Education: शिक्षा:	1=Illiterate अशिक्षित	2=Literate but no formal schooling/ School-Upto4 years शिक्षित लेकिन कोई औपचारिक स्कूली शिक्षा नहीं/ चौथी कक्षा तक स्कूल	3=School-5 to 9 years, 5वीं से 9वीं कक्षा तक स्कूल	4=SSC/ HSC एसएससी/ एचएससी
5= Some College (including a Diploma) but not Graduateकुछ कॉलेज (डिप्लोमा सहित) लेकिन ग्रेजुएट नहीं		6=Graduate/ Post Graduate: General ग्रेजुएट/ पोस्ट ग्रेजुएट-जनरल		7= Graduate/ Post Graduate: Professional ग्रेजुएट/ पोस्ट ग्रेजुएट-प्रोफेशनल
Occupation (in the last one year): व्यवसाय (पिछले एक वर्ष की):				
1=Unskilled अकुशल	2=Shop Owners दुकान मालिक	3=Businessmen with No employees व्यवसायी बिना कर्मचारी के		4=Businessmen with 1-9 employees व्यवसायी 1-9 कर्मचारी वाले
5=Businessmen with 10+ employees		6=Self Employed professional		7=Clerical/Salesman

व्यवसायी 10 से अधिक कर्मचारी वाले	स्व-निर्वाहित पेशेवर	कॉलेजियल/सेलमैन
8=Supervisory Level सुपरवाइजर स्तर	9=Officers/Executives-Junior ऑफिसर्स/एग्जीक्यूटिव्स-जूनियर	10=Officers/Executives-Mid/Senior ऑफिसर्स/एग्जीक्यूटिव्स-मिडिल/सीनियर

3. Household details घर का विवरण

Total no. of Male members पुरुष सदस्यों की कुल संख्या	No. of Adults (above 18) वयस्क की संख्या (18 से ऊपर)	Total no. of female members महिला सदस्यों की कुल संख्या	No. of married members विवाहित सदस्यों की संख्या	No. of working members काम करने वाले सदस्यों की संख्या	Religion धर्म	Caste (if applicable) जाति (यदि लागू हो)
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Religion: 1=Hindu, 2=Muslim, 3=Christian, 4=Sikh, 5=Other
धर्म: 1=हिन्दू, 2=मुस्लिम, 3=क्रिस्चियन/ईसाई, 4=सिख, 5=अन्य

Caste जाति	1=General/सामान्य	2=SC/STअनुसूचित जाति/ अनुसूचित जनजाति	3=Others/अन्य
---------------	-------------------	---------------------------------------	---------------

4. How long have you lived in Delhi? (in years)आप दिल्ली में कितने समय से रहते हैं? (वर्ष में)

5. How long have you lived at your current address? (in years)

आप अपने वर्तमान पते पर कितने समय से रहते हैं? (वर्ष में)

6. Which of the following languages you can speak/read/write.
इनमें से कौन सी भाषाओं को आप बोल सकते हैं/पढ़ सकते हैं/लिख सकते हैं।

Only Speak=1; Can speak & read, but not write=2;

Speak, Read and write=3

केवल बोल सकते हैं=1; बोल सकते हैं और पढ़ सकते हैं लेकिन लिख नहीं सकते हैं=2; बोल, पढ़ और लिख सकते हैं=3

English अंग्रेजी			Hindi हिन्दी			Marathi मराठी		
1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3

7. Is the home you live in your own or rented?

जिस घर में आप रहते हैं वह आपका अपना है या किराए का?

Owned without mortgage
बिना ऋण के अपना

Owned, but paying off
अपना, लेकिन बकाया नहीं है

Rented
किराए का

1	2	3
---	---	---

MULTIPLE RESPONSES ALLOWED for Question 8, 9, 10

प्रश्न 8, 9, 10 के लिए एक से अधिक जवाब की अनुमति

8. Household assets: Does your house have a..... (Read out)MULTIPLE RESPONSES ALLOWED

घरेलू संपत्तियाँ : क्या आपके घर में (पढ़ें) है? एक से अधिक जवाब की अनुमति

Ceiling Fan छत का पंखा	LPG Stove एलपीजी स्टोव	Two-Wheeler टू-व्हीलर	Colour TV रंगीन टीवी	Refrigerator रेफ्रिजरेटर/फ्रिज	Washing Machine वाशिंग मशीन
1	2	3	4	5	6
Computer/ Laptop कम्प्यूटर/लैपटॉप	Car कार	Air-conditioner एयर-कंडीशनर	Water-purifier वाटर-प्युरिफायर	Cellphone सेलफोन	Agri Land at Native place पैतृक स्थान पर खेती की जमीन
7	8	9	10	11	12

9. Do you have the following in your home (read out)?MULTIPLE RESPONSES ALLOWED

क्या आपके पास निम्नलिखित में से आपके घर में (पढ़ें) है? एक से अधिक जवाब की अनुमति

Electricity connection बिजली कनेक्शन	Private/ Separate toilet निजी/अलग शौचालय	Tap-water नल का पानी	More than one room (excluding the kitchen) एक से अधिक कमरे (रसोई को छोड़कर)
1	2	3	4

10. Is your home protected by any of the following?MULTIPLE RESPONSES ALLOWED

क्या आपका घर इनमें से किसी से भी संरक्षित है? एक से अधिक जवाब की अनुमति

Special door/window locks and grills विशेष दरवाजा/विंडो लॉक और गril	A security guard एक सुरक्षा गार्ड	Neighbourhood Chowkidar पड़ोस में चौकीदार	Not protected संरक्षित नहीं
1	2	3	4

11. Do you have a bank account?

क्या आपके पास बैंक खाता है?

1=Yes/हाँ

2=No/नहीं

12. Do you have a Voter ID card/Aadhar card

क्या आपके पास मतदाता पहचान पत्र (वोटर आईडी)/आधार कार्ड है?

1=Yes/हाँ

2=No/नहीं

A2. Incidence of crime अपराध की घटना

I am going to give you some examples that will give you an idea of the kinds of crimes this study covers. As I go through them, tell me if any of these happened to you in the last one year from July 2014-June 2015.

मैं आपको कुछ उदाहरण देने जा रहा हूँ जो आपको इस सर्वे में शामिल किये गये अपराधों के प्रकार के बारे में एक आयडिया देगा। जैसे ही मैं उसे बताऊँ, आप मुझे बताएं कि इनमें से कोई भी आपके साथ पिछले एक साल जुलाई 2014 – जून 2015 में हुआ।

Did any incidence mentioned below experienced by you or any member of your household in the last <u>one year</u> from July 2014-June 2015 ? पिछले एक साल जुलाई 2014 – जून 2015 में नीचे दिये किसी भी घटना का अनुभव आपके या आपके घर के किसी भी सदस्य द्वारा किया गया था?	Yes हाँ	No नहीं	If Yes, Ask for section * यदि हाँ तो ... संस्थान के लिए पूछें	Whether the incidence took place inside the city or outside घटना शहर के भीतर हुआ था या बाहर		Did you report to the police? क्या आपने पुलिस को रिपोर्ट किया था?		If you face a similar crime in future, would you report to the police? यदि आप भविष्य में इसी तरह के अपराध का सामना करते हैं तो, क्या आप पुलिस को रिपोर्ट करेंगे?	
				In city शहर में	Outside बाहर	Yes हाँ	No नहीं	Yes हाँ	No नहीं
B1. Theft चोरी	1	2	B1	1	2	1	2	1	2
B2. Assault resulting in injury, including physical injury शारीरिक चोट सहित चोट के परिणामस्वरूप हमला करना	1	2	B2	1	2	1	2	1	2
B3. House Break-in घर का छाला तोड़ना	1	2	B3	1	2	1	2	1	2
B4 Sexual Harassment (to be asked from adult female member of the household) लैंगिक/ यौन उत्पीड़न (केवल घर के वयस्क महिला सदस्य से पूछा जाए)	1	2	B4	1	2	1	2	1	2
B5 Criminal intimidation अपराधिक धमकी	1	2	B5	1	2	1	2	1	2
B6. Un-natural Death अप्राकृतिक मृत्यु	1	2	B6	1	2	1	2	1	2
B7. Missing persons व्यक्ति गुम होना/ खो जाना	1	2	B7	1	2	1	2	1	2

*Circle the relevant section उपयुक्त संस्थान को सर्कल करें

PART B, C & D

Listing No.							
Household ID	City	Zone	Thana	Locality Name			
Name of Interviewer:							
Region/Address:							
Date of Interview:		Phone No					
DAY/MONTH/YEAR							
Type of dwelling:		1=Independent house/bungalow		2=Apartment/flat in a building		3=Slum/jhuggi	

PART B: Details of crime

B1.Theft (This includes only where respondent is sure loss of item is due to theft)(Multiple options are allowed)

चोरी (इसमें केवल वही शामिल है जिसके बारे में उत्तरदाता को यकीन है कि सामान चोरी की वजह से गुम हुआ है) (एक से अधिक विकल्पों की अनुमति है)

Code	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
	Luggage सामान/स गेज	Wallet/ Purse बटुआ/प र्स	Credit/ Debit card क्रेडिट/डेबिट कार्ड	Jewelry ज्वेलरी/ आभूषण	Cellphone सेलफोन	TV टीवी	Computer/ Laptop कम्प्यूटर/ले पटॉप	Cash नगद	Car कार

B1.1 In the past 1 Year, have you been a victim of theft in any of the above ways?

पिछले 1 साल में, क्या आप उपरोक्त में से किसी भी तरीके से चोरी का शिकार हुए हैं?

Yes/हाँ	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
No/नहीं	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2

B1.2 In the past one year, how many times have the items been stolen? (No.s)

पिछले एक साल में, यह चीज कितनी बार चोरी हुआ है? (संख्या)

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

B1.3 If stolen, where did this happen? (Multiple options are allowed)

यदि चोरी हुआ तो यह कहाँ हुआ था? (एक से अधिक विकल्पों की अनुमति है)

Your home without break-in ताला तोड़े बगैर आपके घर	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
With House Break-in घर में ताला तोड़कर	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Family/ friends home परिवार/दोस्तों के घर	3	3	3	3	3		3	3	3
Your workplace आपके कार्यस्थल	4	4	4	4	4		4	4	4
Commercial place (mall/theatre/ restaurant/ grocery store/market) व्यवसायिक स्थान (मॉल/थिएटर/ रेस्तरां/किराना दुकान/बाजार)	5	5	5	5	5		5	5	5
In open areas/on the street खुले जगहों में/गली में	6	6	6	6	6		6	6	6
In public bus सार्वजनिक बस में	7	7	7	7	7		7	7	7
In the metro मेट्रो में	8	8	8	8	8		8	8	8
In an auto/cab ऑटो/टैब में	9	9	9	9	9		9	9	9

B1.4 Please name the locality where the theft happened? (If response in B1.3 is 1 or 2, Don't ask the locality name)

कृपया उस स्थान का नाम बताएं जहाँ चोरी हुआ था? (यदि बी1.3 में जवाब 1 या 2 है तो स्थान का नाम न पूछें)

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

B1.5 What time did it happen? (Write the time in completed hours) यह किस समय हुआ था? (पूर्ण घंटे में समय लिखें)

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Time of occurrence घटने का समय (00:01 to 23:59)									
B1.6 In case you were a victim of any of the crimes listed above, did you report to the police? अगर आप ऊपर दिये अपराधों में से किसी का शिकार हुए थे तो क्या आपने पुलिस को रिपोर्ट किया था?									
Yes/हाँ	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
No/नहीं	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2

B2. Assault resulting in injury, including physical injury

शारीरिक घोट सहित, घोट के परिणामस्वरूप हमला करना

Code	A	B	C	D	E
	Grabbed/shoved/slapped/beat पकड़ा/धकेला/धमका/मारना/आघात करना	Attack you by throwing rocks/bottles at you आप पर पत्थर/बोतल चेंककर हमला करना	Attack you with a gun or a knife बंदूक या चाकू से आप पर हमला करना	Attack you with any other dangerous object किसी अन्य खतरनाक वस्तु से आप पर हमला करना	Attack you in any other way किसी अन्य तरीके से आप पर हमला करना
B2.1 Have you over the past one year been physically attacked by someone in any of the above ways: (read out) क्या आप पर पिछले एक साल में किसी के द्वारा उपरोक्त में से किसी भी तरीके से शारीरिक रूप से हमला किया गया है: (पढ़ें)					
Yes/हाँ	1	1	1	1	1
No/नहीं	2	2	2	2	2
B2.2 If Yes, how many times has this happened past one year? यदि हाँ तो पिछले एक साल में यह कितनी बार हुआ है?					
No. of times बार					
B2.3 How many people attacked you? कितने लोगों ने आप पर हमला किया है?					
One person/एक व्यक्ति	1	1	1	1	1
Two People/दो लोग	2	2	2	2	2
More than Two People दो लोग से अधिक	3	3	3	3	3
B2.4 Where did this happen? यह कहाँ हुआ था?					
Your home without break-in ताला तोड़े बगैर आपके घर	1	1	1	1	1
With House Break-in घर में ताला तोड़कर	2	2	2	2	2
Family/ friends home परिवार/दोस्तों के घर	3	3	3	3	3
Your workplace आपके कार्यस्थल	4	4	4	4	4
Commercial place (mall/theatre/ restaurant/grocery store/ market) व्यावसायिक स्थान (मॉल/थिएटर/ रेस्तरां/किचन दुकान/बाजार)	5	5	5	5	5
In open areas/on the street खुले जगहों में/सड़क में	6	6	6	6	6
In public bus सार्वजनिक बस में	7	7	7	7	7
In the metro मेट्रो में	8	8	8	8	8
In an auto/cab ऑटो/कैब में	9	9	9	9	9
B2.5 Name of the locality where it happened? (If response in B2.4 is 1 or 2, Don't ask the locality name) उस स्थान का नाम बताएं जहाँ यह हुआ था? (यदि B2.4 में जवाब 1 या 2 है तो स्थान का नाम न पूछें)					
Locality Name/स्थान का नाम					
B2.6 What time did it happen? (Write the time in completed hours) यह किस समय हुआ था? (पूर्ण घंटे में समय लिखें)					
Time of occurrence घटने का समय (00:01 to 23:59)					
B2.7 Did you know the offender(s) by name or by sight at the time of the offence? क्या आप उस अपराधी(अपराधियों) को नाम से या देखने से जानते थे जो अपराध के समय पर था?					

Code	A	B	C	D	E
	Grabbed/shoved/slapped/beat पकड़ा/धकेला/धप्पड़ मारा/आघात करना	Attack you by throwing rocks/bottles at you आप पर पत्थर/बोतल फेंककर हमला करना	Attack you with a gun or a knife बंदूक या चाकू से आप पर हमला करना	Attack you with any other dangerous object किसी अन्य खतरनाक वस्तु से आप पर हमला करना	Attack you in any other way किसी अन्य तरीके से आप पर हमला करना
Did not know offender अपराधी को नहीं जानते थे	1	1	1	1	1
(At least one) known by sight (कम से कम एक को) देखने से जानते थे	2	2	2	2	2
(At least one) known by name (कम से कम एक को) नाम से जानते थे	3	3	3	3	3
Did not see the offender अपराधी को नहीं देखा था	4	4	4	4	4
B2.8 In case you were a victim of any of crime listed above, did you report to the police? अगर आप ऊपर दिये अपराधों में से किसी का शिकार हुए थे तो क्या आपने पुलिस को रिपोर्ट किया था?					
Yes/हाँ	1	1	1	1	1
No/नहीं	2	2	2	2	2

B3. House Break-in/घर का ताला तोड़ना

Code	A	B	C	D
	Forcing a door or window दरवाजे या खिड़की से जबरदस्ती	Manipulating a lock ताले में हेर-फेर	Entering through an open door or window किसी खुले दरवाजे या खिड़की के माध्यम से प्रवेश	Using force, or threatening to use force, against you or any other person आपके या किसी अन्य व्यक्ति के खिलाफ बल प्रयोग करना, या बल प्रयोग करने की धमकी देना
B3.1 In the last 1 year, has anyone broken in or attempted to break into your home by any of the above ways? पिछले 1 साल में, क्या कोई आपके घर में उपरोक्त में से किसी भी तरीके से ताला तोड़कर घुसा है या घुसने की कोशिश की है?				
Yes/हाँ	1	1	1	1
No/नहीं	2	2	2	2
B3.2 In past one year, how many times has the incident happened? पिछले एक साल में यह घटना कितनी बार हुआ है?				
B3.3 Was it accompanied by any theft/assault? क्या यह किसी चोरी/हमला के साथ हुआ था?				
Theft चोरी	1	1	1	1
Assault हमला	2	2	2	2

B4. Sexual Harassment (To be asked from adult female member of the household)

लैंगिक/ यौन उत्पीड़न

Code	A	B	C	D	E
	Passed lewd or unwelcome sexual comments अश्लील या अभिय यौन टिप्पणियाँ करना	Continuously stared at in a lewd or threatening manner लगातार अश्लील या डराने के तरीके से घूरना	Followed by men till you were scared or uncomfortable पुरुषों द्वारा तब तक आपका पीछा करना जब तक कि आप डर न जाएं या असहज न हो जाएं	Touched indecently/groped/pinched अशुभता से छूना/टटोलना/चिकोटी कटटना	Sending unwanted messages through SMS/e-mail/social media/internet/making telephone calls एसएमएस/ईमेल/सोशल मीडिया/इंटरनेट के माध्यम से अवांछित संदेश भेजना / टेलीफोन कॉल करना
B4.1 Over the past one year has anyone done, or tried to harass you in any of the ways mentioned above? क्या पिछले एक साल में किसी ने ऊपर बताये तरीके में से कोई भी आपको किया है या परेशान करने की कोशिश की है?					
Yes/हाँ	1	1	1	1	1
No/नहीं	2	2	2	2	2
B4.2 If Yes, how many times has this happened past one year? यदि हाँ तो, पिछले एक साल में यह कितनी बार हुआ है?					
No. of times/बार					
B4.3 Where did this happen? यह कहाँ हुआ था?					
Your home without break-in ताला तोड़े बगैर आपके घर	1	1	1	1	1
With House Break-in घर में ताला तोड़कर	2	2	2	2	2
Family/ friends home परिवार/दोस्तों के घर	3	3	3	3	3
Your workplace आपके कार्यस्थल	4	4	4	4	4
Commercial place (mall/theatre/ restaurant/ grocery store/market) व्यावसायिक स्थान (मॉल/थिएटर/ रेस्तरां/किचन दुकान/बाजार)	5	5	5	5	5
In open areas/on the street खुले जगहों में/गली में	6	6	6	6	6
In public bus सार्वजनिक बस में	7	7	7	7	7
In the metro मेट्रो में	8	8	8	8	8
In an auto/cab ऑटो/टैक्सी में	9	9	9	9	9
B4.4 Name of the locality where it happened? (If response in B4.3 is 1 or 2, Don't ask the locality name) उस स्थान का नाम बताएं जहाँ यह हुआ था? (यदि बी4.3 में जवाब 1 या 2 है तो स्थान का नाम न पूछें)					
Locality Name स्थान का नाम					
B4.5 What time did it happen?(Write the time in completed hours) यह किस समय हुआ था?(पूर्ण घंटे में समय लिखें)					
Time of occurrence घटने का समय (00:01 to 23:59)					
B4.6 Did you know the offender(s) by name or by sight at the time of the offence? क्या आप उस अपराधी(अपराधियों) को नाम से या देखने से जानते थे जो अपराध के समय पर था?					

Code	A	B	C	D	E
	Passed lewd or unwelcome sexual comments अश्लील या अभिग्रहण टिप्पणियाँ करना	Continuously stared at in a lewd or threatening manner लगातार अश्लील या डराने के तरीके से घूरना	Followed by men till you were scared or uncomfortable पुरुषों द्वारा तब तक आपका पीछा करना जब तक कि आप डर न जाएं या असहज न हो जाएं	Touched indecently/groped/pinched अशिष्टता से छूना/टटोलना/चिकोटी काटना	Sending unwanted messages through SMS/e-mail/social media/internet/making telephone calls एसएमएस/ईमेल/सोशल मीडिया/इंटरनेट के माध्यम से अवांछित संदेश भेजना / टेलीफोन कॉल करना
Did not know offender? अपराधी को नहीं जानते थे	1	1	1	1	1
(At least one) known by sight (कम से कम एक को) देखने से जानते थे	2	2	2	2	2
At least one) known by name (कम से कम एक को) नाम से जानते थे	3	3	3	3	3
Did not see the offender अपराधी को नहीं देखा था	4	4	4	4	4
B4.7 In case you were a victim of any of crime listed above, did you report to the police? अगर आप ऊपर दिये अपराधों में से किसी का शिकार हुए थे तो क्या आपने पुलिस को रिपोर्ट किया था?					
Yes/हाँ	1	1	1	1	1
No/नहीं	2	2	2	2	2

B5. Criminal intimidation

अपराधिक धमकी

B5.1 In the last one year, did anyone threaten you (or your family) with injury or damaging your property for not following their demands?
पिछले एक साल में क्या किसी ने भी अपनी मांगों का पालन नहीं करने पर आपको (या आपके परिवार को) घोट या आपकी संपत्ति को नुकसान पहुँचाने की धमकी दी है?

1=Yes/हाँ 2=No/नहीं

B5.2 If Yes, how many times has this happened in past one year? यदि हाँ तो, पिछले एक साल में यह कितनी बार हुआ है?

No. of times/बार

B5.3 Name of the locality where it happened? (If incidence happened at home, Don't ask for the locality name)
उस स्थान का नाम बताएं जहाँ यह हुआ था? (यदि घटना घर पर हुआ है तो स्थान का नाम न पूछें)

Locality Name/स्थान का नाम

B5.4 Did you know the offender(s) by name or by sight at the time of the offence?
क्या आप उस अपराधी(अपराधियों) को नाम से या देखने से जानते थे जो अपराध के समय पर था?

Did not know offender?
अपराधी को नहीं जानते थे 1

(At least one) known by sight
(कम से कम एक को) देखने से जानते थे 2

At least one) known by name
(कम से कम एक को) नाम से जानते थे 3

Did not see the offender
अपराधी को नहीं देखा था/देखी थी 4

B5.5 In case you were a victim of any of crime mentioned above, did you report to the police?
अगर आप ऊपर दिये अपराधों में से किसी का शिकार हुए थे तो क्या आपने पुलिस को रिपोर्ट किया था?

1=Yes/हाँ 2=No/नहीं

B6. Un-natural Death (This does not include suicides that may have happened in households.)

अप्राकृतिक मृत्यु

Code	A	B
	Member of your household was murdered आपके घर के सदस्य की हत्या हुई हो	Member of your household died in a road/train accident आपके घर का सदस्य सड़क/ट्रेन दुर्घटना में मरा हो
B6.1 Over the past one year, has any of the above mentioned incidents happened to someone in your household? पिछले एक साल में ऊपर बताये घटनाओं में से कोई भी आपके घर में किसी के साथ हुआ है?		
Yes/हाँ	1	1
No/नहीं	2	2
B6.2 If Yes, how many times has this happened past one year? यदि हाँ तो, पिछले एक साल में यह कितनी बार हुआ है?		
No. of times/बार		
B6.3 Name of the locality where it happened? उस स्थान का नाम बताएं जहाँ यह हुआ था?		
Locality Name/स्थान का नाम		
B6.4 What time did it happen? (Write the time in completed hours) यह किस समय हुआ था? (पूर्ण घंटे में समय लिखें)		
Time of occurrence (00:01 to 23:59) घटने का समय		
B6.5 Did you know the offender(s) by name or by sight at the time of the offence? क्या आप उस अपराधी(अपराधियों) को नाम से या देखने से जानते थे जो अपराध के समय पर था?		
Did not know offender अपराधी को नहीं जानते थे	1	1
(At least one) known by sight (कम से कम एक को) देखने से जानते थे	2	2
(At least one) known by name (कम से कम एक को) नाम से जानते थे	3	3
Did not see the offender अपराधी को नहीं देखा था	4	4
B6.6 In case you were a victim of any of crime listed above, did you report to the police? अगर आप ऊपर दिये अपराधों में से किसी का शिकार हुए थे तो क्या आपने पुलिस को रिपोर्ट किया था?		
Yes/हाँ	1	1
No/नहीं	2	2

B7. Missing Persons व्यक्तिगुम होना

B7.1 Has anyone in your household gone missing and/or disappeared? क्या आपके घर में कोई भी व्यक्ति गुम हुआ है और/या गायब हुआ है?	1=Yes/हाँ	2=No/नहीं
If the answer to Question B7.1 is Yes, continue to B7.2 onwards यदि प्रश्न बी7.1 में जवाब हाँ है तो बी7.2 से आगे जारी रखें		
B7.2. Is the missing person below 18 years old? क्या गुमशुदा व्यक्ति 18 वर्ष से कम का है?	1=Yes/हाँ	2=No/नहीं
B7.3. Please specify the gender of the missing person. कृपया गुमशुदा व्यक्ति का लिंग बताएं।	1=Male पुरुष	2=Female महिला
B7.4 What time did it happen? यह किस समय हुआ था? [Time of occurrence (00:01 to 23:59)] (Write the time in completed hours)		
B7.5 Name of the place, where it happened? उस स्थान का नाम बताएं जहाँ यह हुआ था?		
B7.6. Did you report to the police? क्या आपने पुलिस को रिपोर्ट किया था?		
	1=Yes/हाँ	2=No/नहीं

PART C: Reporting of crime to police and satisfaction/dis-satisfaction

First, note down the crimes for which the respondent household had approached the police. In case of multiple cases reported within a section, mention each one separately. Then, mark the Section, Crime heading and Codes in the tables

सबसे पहले, उस अनराई को टिक करें जिसके लिए उरपरदाता का घर पुलिस से संपर्क किया था। अगर एक सैकशन में कई केस रिपोर्ट किया गया है तो होके को अलग-अलग बताएं। उसके बाद सैकशन, अपराध के शीर्षक पर निशान लगायें और टेबल में कोड करें।

B1. Theft/चोरी

Code	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
	Luggage सामान/लगेज	Wallet/Purse बटुआ/पर्से	Credit/Debit card क्रेडिट/डेबिट कार्ड	Jewellery ज्वेलरी/अभूषण	Cellphone सेलफोन	TV टीवी	Computer/Laptop कंप्यूटर/लैपटॉप	Cash नगद	Car कार

B2. Assault resulting in injury, including physical injury शारीरिक चोट सहित चोट के परिणामस्वरूप हानि करण

Code	A	B	C	D	E
	Grabbed/shoved/slapped/beat धक्का/जकड़ना/धक्का मारना/आघात करना	Attack you by throwing rocks/bottles at you आप पर पत्थर/बोतल फेंककर हानि करना	Credit/Debit card क्रेडिट/डेबिट कार्ड	Jewellery ज्वेलरी/अभूषण	Cellphone सेलफोन

B3. House Break-in/घर का तला लूटन

Code	A	B	C	D
	Forcing a door or window धक्का देना या खिड़की से उबरारना	Manipulating a lock लाल में हेर-फेर	Entering through an open door or window खिड़की खुले दरवाजे या खिड़की के माध्यम से प्रवेश	Using force, or threatening to use force, against you or any other person आपकी या किसी अन्य व्यक्ति के खिलाफ बल प्रयोग करना, या बल प्रयोग करने की धमकी देना

B4. Sexual Harassment (To be asked from adult female member of the household if respondent is male) लैंगिक/लैंगन शोषण (हंसा पर के सवाल-जवाब सदास से पूछाजाएगा)

Code	A	B	C	D	E
	Passed lewd or unwelcome sexual comments अश्लील या अस्वीकृत लैंगन टिप्पणियां करना	Continuously stared at in a lewd or threatening manner लगातार अश्लील या डराने के तरीके से घूरना	Followed by men till you were scared or uncomfortable मुन्को द्वारा तब तक आनासा पीछा करना जब तक कि आप डर न जाएं या अवहता न हो जाएं	Touched indecently/groped/pinched अश्लीलता से छुलना/टटोलना/पिंकाटी काटना	Sending unwanted messages through SMS/e-mail/social media/Internet/making telephone calls एसएमएस/ईमेल/सोशल मीडिया/इंटरनेट के माध्यम से अवांछित संदेश भेजना / टेलीफोन कॉल करना

B5. Criminal intimidation/अशुद्धिक डमकी

	Threaten you (or your family or property) with injury for not following their demands उनके मुन्को का धमका नहीं करने पर चोट के साथ आनाको (या आपके परिवार या संपत्ति को) उनकी
--	---

B6. Un-natural Death/अशुद्धिक मृत्यु

Code	A	B
	Member of your household was murdered आपके घर के सदस्य की हत्या हुई हो	Member of your household died in a road/train accident आपके घर का सदस्य सड़क/ट्रेन दुर्घटना में मरा हो

B7. Missing Persons/बकि मुन होना/को जान

	Missing Persons/बकि मुन होना/को जान
--	-------------------------------------

C.1. Reporting and response of police/reporter कल्ला और पुलिस की प्रतिक्रिया

Sr. No.	Mention relevant section no. (B1-B6) उपयुक्त सैक्शन संख्या लिखें (बी1-बी6)										B7.
	Section heading/sैक्शन का शीर्षक										Missing Persons ग़ायब व्यक्ति
	Crime code/अपराध का कोड										
1	How did you report?/कैसे रिपोर्ट किया था?										
1.1	Called 100 100 पर कॉल किया	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
1.2	Called relevant police helpline like 1091, 1094 1091, 1094 सम्बन्धित पुलिस हेल्पलाइन पर कॉल किया	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
1.3	Went to the police station/पुलिस स्टेशन/घर गया	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
1.4	Approached a PCR van/पैसीजर वैन से संपर्क किया	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
1.5	Online/ऑनलाइन	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
1.6	Other (specify)/अन्य (स्तर)	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
1.7	Other (specify)/अन्य (स्तर)	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
2	What did the police do?/Multiple responses allowed/पुलिस ने क्या किया था?										
2.1	File a complaint/रिपोर्ट दर्ज किया	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	NA
2.2	Register an FIR/एफआईआर दर्ज किया	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	NA
2.3	Dispatched a PCR van/पैसीजर वैन के घर भेजा गया	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	NA
2.4	Did not take your complaint and asked you to go to another police station/आपकी शिकायत को नहीं सुना था और आपको दूसरे पुलिस स्टेशन पर जाने के लिए कहा था	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	NA
2.5	Reached the spot where you called from and made inquiries/उस स्पॉट पर पहुंचा जहाँ से आपने कॉल किया था और पूछताछ किया था	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	NA
2.6	Directed you to the police station you should go to/आपको निर्देश दिया गया कि आपको पुलिस स्टेशन जाना चाहिए	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	NA
2.7	Took any injured persons for medical assistance/किसी घायल व्यक्ति को चिकित्सा सहायता के लिए ले गये	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	NA
2.8	Did not do anything/कुछ नहीं किया था	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	NA
2.9	Filed a Missing Persons Report and informed you of the same/ग़ायब व्यक्ति का रिपोर्ट फाइल किया और उसके बारे में आपको सूचित किया था	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1
2.10	Registered an FIR in case of a missing child and informed you of the same/ग़ायब बच्चे के मामले में एक एफआईआर रजिस्टर किया और उसके बारे में आपको सूचित किया था	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	2
2.11	Publicized photograph of the missing person at various public places and through local newspaper and television channel	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	3

C.3. Whether you are/were satisfied with the action taken by the police? (This refers only to the first response of the police. It does not cover status and outcome of the case investigation.) क्या आप पुलिस द्वारा की गई कार्रवाई से आप संतुष्ट हैं/थे? (यह पुलिस की पहली प्रतिक्रिया को दर्शाता है। इसमें पुलिस की कार्रवाई की स्थिति और परिणाम सम्मिलित नहीं है।)

Sr. No.	Mention relevant section no. (B1-B7)		Section heading		Code					
1	Satisfied/संतुष्ट						1	1	1	1
2	Not satisfied/नहीं संतुष्ट						2	2	2	2

If satisfied, Ask for C.4, otherwise C.5

C.4. For what reasons were you satisfied? You can give more than one responseकिन कारणों से आप संतुष्ट थे? आप एक से अधिक जवाब दे सकते हैं।

Sr. No.	Mention relevant section no. (B1-B7)		Section heading		Code					
1	They listened carefully उन्होंने ध्यान से सुना था						1	1	1	1
2	They registered my complaint correctly उन्होंने सही-सही मेरी शिकायत को रजिस्टर किया था						2	2	2	2
3	They registered my complaint without delay उन्होंने देरी किए बिना मेरी शिकायत रजिस्टर किया था						3	3	3	3
4	They explained the action they will take उन्होंने उन कार्रवाई के बारे में बताया जो वे करेंगे						4	4	4	4
5	They arrived without delay/देरी किए बिना पहुँच गए						5	5	5	5
6	They acted fast/उन्होंने तेज कार्रवाई की						6	6	6	6
7	Any other (please specify) /अन्य						7	7	7	7

C.5. For what reasons were you dissatisfied? You can give more than one responseकिन कारणों से आप असंतुष्ट थे? आप एक से अधिक जवाब दे सकते हैं।

Sr. No.	Mention relevant section no. (B1-B7)		Section heading		Code					
1	They were rude and impolite while registering my FIR at the police station पुलिस स्टेशन में वे मेरा एचआरआर दर्ज करते समय अशुभ और अलम्य थे						1	1	1	1
2	They refused to register my FIR and told me to go away from the police station उन्होंने मेरा एचआरआर दर्ज करने से मना कर दिया और मुझे पुलिस स्टेशन से दूर जाने के लिए कहा था						2	2	2	2
3	They put me at fault and tried to persuade me to not register an FIR						3	3	3	3

[illegible]

C.6. If you did not report to the police, why did you not report? यदि अपने पुलिस को रिपोर्ट नहीं किया था तो, इसे नहीं किया क्यों?

[illegible]

D. Perception of Safety सुरक्षा का अनुभव

D1 What time would you start worrying about safety of an adult male member of your household who is out alone at night? अपने घर के एक वयस्क पुरुष सदस्य की सुरक्षा के बारे में रात को किस समय उनके अकेले बाहर रहने पर चिंता करना शुरू कर देंगे?							
after 7 pm 7 बजे के बाद	after 8 pm 8 बजे के बाद	after 9 pm 9 बजे के बाद	after 10 pm 10 बजे के बाद	after 11 pm 11 बजे के बाद	After midnight मध्य रात्रि के बाद	Would not worry चिंता नहीं करेंगे	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
D2 What time would you start worrying about safety of an adult female member of your household who is out alone at night? अपने घर की एक वयस्क महिला सदस्य की सुरक्षा के बारे में रात को किस समय उनके अकेले बाहर रहने पर चिंता करना शुरू कर देंगे?							
after 7 pm 7 बजे के बाद	after 8 pm 8 बजे के बाद	after 9 pm 9 बजे के बाद	after 10 pm 10 बजे के बाद	after 11 pm 11 बजे के बाद	After midnight मध्य रात्रि के बाद	Would not worry चिंता नहीं करेंगे	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
D3 Do you feel safe leaving your home locked for many days? क्या आप अपने घर को कई दिनों तक ताला लगाकर छोड़ देने पर सुरक्षित महसूस करते हैं?							
1=Yes हाँ		2=No नहीं		3=Don't know मालूम नहीं			
D4 Do you feel safe traveling using public transport alone during the day? (1=Yes, 2=No, 3= Don't Know) क्या आप दिन के दौरान अकेले सार्वजनिक परिवहन का इस्तेमाल करते हुए यात्रा करने पर सुरक्षित महसूस करते हैं? (1=हाँ, 2=नहीं, 3=मालूम नहीं)							
DTC/BEST buses डीटीसी/बीईएसटी बसें	Grameen Sewa ग्रामीण सेवा	Delhi/Mumbai Metro/Local Train दिल्ली/मुंबई मेट्रो/लोकल ट्रेन	Delhi/ Mumbai metro feeder buses दिल्ली/मुंबई मेट्रो की फीडर बसें	Auto ऑटो	Shared auto साझा ऑटो	Radio Taxi रेडियो टैक्सी	Other taxi services अन्य टैक्सी सेवाएं
1 2 3	1 2 3	1 2 3	1 2 3	1 2 3	1 2 3	1 2 3	1 2 3
D5 At what time in the evening would you stop feeling safe while traveling using public transport? सार्वजनिक परिवहन इस्तेमाल करते हुए यात्रा करते समय शाम को किस समय में आप सुरक्षित महसूस करना बंद कर देंगे?							
after 7 pm 7 बजे के बाद	after 8 pm 8 बजे के बाद	after 9 pm 9 बजे के बाद	after 10 pm 10 बजे के बाद	after 11 pm 11 बजे के बाद	After midnight मध्य रात्रि के बाद	Would not worry चिंता नहीं करेंगे	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
D6 At what time in the evening would you stop feeling safe while traveling in your personal transport (cycle, bike, car)? अपने निजी वाहन (साइकिल, बाइक, कार) में यात्रा करते समय शाम को किस समय में आप सुरक्षित महसूस करना बंद कर देंगे?							
after 7 pm 7 बजे के बाद	after 8 pm 8 बजे के बाद	after 9 pm 9 बजे के बाद	after 10 pm 10 बजे के बाद	after 11 pm 11 बजे के बाद	After midnight मध्य रात्रि के बाद	Always feel safe हमेशा सुरक्षित महसूस करेंगे	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
D7 Do you feel safe walking around in your neighbourhood during the day? क्या आप दिन के दौरान अपने पड़ोस में चलने पर सुरक्षित महसूस करते हैं?							
1=Yes हाँ		2=No नहीं		3=Don't know मालूम नहीं			
D8 At what time in the evening would you stop feeling safe walking around alone in your neighborhood? शाम को किस समय में आप अपने पड़ोस में अकेले टहलने पर सुरक्षित महसूस करना बंद कर देंगे?							
after 7 pm 7 बजे के बाद	after 8 pm 8 बजे के बाद	after 9 pm 9 बजे के बाद	after 10 pm 10 बजे के बाद	after 11 pm 11 बजे के बाद	After midnight मध्य रात्रि के बाद	Always feel safe हमेशा सुरक्षित महसूस करेंगे	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
D9 At what time in the evening would you stop feeling safe withdrawing money from your neighborhood ATM? शाम को किस समय में आप अपने पड़ोस के एटीएम से पैसा निकालने पर सुरक्षित महसूस करना बंद कर देंगे?							
after 7 pm 7 बजे के बाद	after 8 pm 8 बजे के बाद	after 9 pm 9 बजे के बाद	after 10 pm 10 बजे के बाद	after 11 pm 11 बजे के बाद	After midnight मध्य रात्रि के बाद	Always feel safe हमेशा सुरक्षित महसूस करेंगे	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
D10 How much of a problem do you think crime is in your local area आपके स्थानीय क्षेत्र में अपराध आपको कितनी बड़ी समस्या लगती है							
Big problem बड़ी समस्या	Somewhat of a problem but not very big कुछ हद तक समस्या लेकिन बड़ी समस्या नहीं			Not much of a problem बहुत समस्या नहीं		Don't know मालूम नहीं	
1	2			3		4	

D11 What in your opinion is the single most prevalent crime in your residential area? आपकी राय में आपके आवासीय क्षेत्र में एक सबसे प्रचलित अपराध कौन सा है?		(write here in detail) (यहाँ विस्तार से लिखें)		
D12 Which of the following crimes do you fear you are likely to be a victim of? MULTIPLE RESPONSES ALLOWED निम्नलिखित अपराधों में से किससे आपके शिकार होने की संभावना का डर आपको होता है? एक से अधिक जवाब की अनुमति				
Theftचोरी	Assaultहमला	Un-natural death अजकृतिक मृत्यु	Sexual crimeयौन अपराध	Criminal intimidation अपराधिक धमकी
1	2	3	4	5
D13 Do you know where your nearest police chowki or police station is? क्या आपको मालूम है कि आपका नजदीकी पुलिस चौकी या पुलिस स्टेशन कहाँ है?				1= Yesहाँ 2= Noनहीं
D14 How would you rate your local police? अपने स्थानीय पुलिस को आप कैसे आंकलन/रेट करेंगे?				
1=Very Positive बहुत सकारात्मक	2=Positive सकारात्मक	3=I don't have an opinion मेरी कोई राय नहीं है	4=Negative नकारात्मक	5=Very Negative बहुत नकारात्मक
D15 How safe do you feel your neighbourhood is? आपको अपना पड़ोस कितना सुरक्षित लगता है?				
1=Very safe बहुत सुरक्षित	2=Safe सुरक्षित	3=Moderate सामान्य	4=Unsafe असुरक्षित	5=Very unsafe बहुत असुरक्षित

CHRI Programmes

CHRI's work is based on the belief that for human rights, genuine democracy and development to become a reality in people's lives, there must be high standards and functional mechanisms for accountability and participation within the Commonwealth and its member countries. CHRI furthers this belief through strategic initiatives and advocacy on human rights, access to justice and access to information. It does this through research, publications, workshops, information dissemination and advocacy.

Access to Justice

Police Reforms: In too many countries the police are seen as an oppressive instrument of state rather than as protectors of citizens' rights, leading to widespread rights violations and denial of justice. CHRI promotes systemic reform so that the police act as upholders of the rule of law rather than as instruments of the current regime. In India, CHRI's programme aims at mobilising public support for police reform. In South Asia, CHRI works to strengthen civil society engagement on police reforms. In East Africa and Ghana, CHRI is examining police accountability issues and political interference.

Prison Reforms: CHRI's work is focused on increasing transparency of a traditionally closed system and exposing malpractices. A major area is focused on highlighting failures of the legal system that result in terrible overcrowding and unconscionably long pre-trial detention and prison overstay, and engaging in interventions to ease this. Another area of concentration is aimed at reviving the prison oversight systems that have completely failed. We believe that attention to these areas will bring improvements to the administration of prisons as well as have a knock-on effect on the administration of justice overall.

Access to Information

CHRI is acknowledged as one of the main organisations working to promote access to information across the Commonwealth. It encourages countries to pass and implement effective right to information laws. We routinely assist in the development of legislation and have been particularly successful in promoting right to information in India, Bangladesh and Ghana where we are the Secretariat for the RTI civil society coalition. We regularly critique new bills and intervene to bring best practices into governments and civil society knowledge both in the time when laws are being formulated and when they are first being implemented. Our experience of working across even in hostile environments as well as culturally varied jurisdictions allows CHRI to bring valuable insights into countries seeking to evolve and implement new laws on right to information. In Ghana, for instance we have been promoting knowledge about the value of access to information which is guaranteed by law while at the same time pushing for introduction of an effective and progressive law. In Ghana as and when the access to information law comes into being we intend to build public knowledge in parallel with monitoring the law and using it in ways which indicate impact of the law on system accountability – most particularly in the area of policing and the working of the criminal justice system.

Strategic Initiatives Programme

CHRI monitors member states' compliance with human rights obligations and advocates around human rights exigencies where such obligations are breached. CHRI strategically engages with regional and international bodies including the Commonwealth Ministerial Action Group, the UN and the African Commission for Human and People's Rights. Ongoing strategic initiatives include: Advocating for and monitoring the Commonwealth's reform; Reviewing Commonwealth countries' human rights promises at the UN Human Rights Council and engaging with its Universal Periodic Review; Advocating for the protection of human rights defenders and civil society space; and Monitoring the performance of National Human Rights Institutions in the Commonwealth while advocating for their strengthening.

This report represents one of the first efforts to conduct a public survey on crime victimisation and public safety perception in India. Surveying residents in both Delhi and Mumbai, the report captures their experiences of crime, both reported and unreported to the police, as well as satisfaction with the police, reasons for not reporting crime, and the public's overall safety perception. Further, the report demonstrates how such data can be used to help the police and government identify and answer important questions about crime and safety, and allocate resources and develop partnerships with civil society and community groups to implement new and better crime prevention strategies, public engagement initiatives, and more.

Published with support from:



Delegation of the European Union to India

5/5, Shantiniketan, New Delhi - 110 021 (India)

Phone: +91-11-66781919

Fax: +91-11-66781955

Website: http://www.eeas.europa.eu/delegations/india/index_en.htm



USO House

6, Special Institutional Area

New Delhi - 110067 (India)

Phone: +91-11-26862064 or +91-11-26863846

Fax: +91-11-26862042

Website: www.southasia.fnst.org

www.freiheit.org/content/welcome-friedrich-naumann-foundation-freedom

The contents of this report are the sole responsibility of CHRI and can under no circumstances be regarded as reflecting the position of the European Union or Friedrich-Naumann-Stiftung für die Freiheit



Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative

55A, Third Floor, Siddharth Chambers-1,
Kalu Sarai, New Delhi 110 016 (India)

Tel: +91 11 4318 0200

Fax: +91 11 2686 4688

E-mail: info@humanrightsinitiative.org

Website: www.humanrightsinitiative.org