India Justice Report

METHODOLOGY

In order to assess the capacity of states to deliver justice, we looked at data indicators from four pillars, namely:

1. Police: 20 indicators
2. Prisons: 21 indicators
3. Judiciary: 24 indicators
4. Legal aid: 13 indicators

The indicators, across the pillars, covered the following themes:

1. Infrastructure
2. Human Resources
3. Diversity (gender, SC/ST/OBC)
4. Budgets
5. Workload
6. Trends (change over 5 years)

- Though there were over 200 possible data points to take into account, the 78 used came to be chosen on the basis that all were evenly available across pillars and themes, and able to deliver a fair comparison between states against benchmarks that the state itself had committed to.

- Where there were no benchmarks in hard law, policy pronouncements or government committee recommendations, the scores were graduated taking account of how well a state had capacitated itself to deliver a public good optimally.

.

Clusters

- Cluster I (ranked): 18 large- and mid-sized states (population above 10 million). As per the Census 2011, these house 90% of India's population. We see this as the core of our study.

- Cluster II (ranked): 7 small-sized states (population up to 10 million): Arunachal Pradesh, Goa, Himachal Pradesh, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Sikkim, Tripura.

- Cluster III (not ranked): 7 UTs, including Delhi and Puducherry (we are giving values but not ranking them).

- Cluster IV (not ranked): 4 conflict states (where AFSPA is in force): J&K*, Manipur, Assam and Nagaland.

*pre-bifurcation

Scoring

Raw data was rebased on a common scale so that every indicator could be scored on a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 being the lowest or least desirable status, and 10 indicating the highest or best score. The scores in-between were calibrated to show where a state stood in relation to the best and the worst.

Where a state met or exceeded the benchmark it had set for itself, it received a score of 10. If there were no benchmarks to rely on, but a state received a 'top' score of 10, it does not mean that the state has reached an ideal capacity, merely that it is best in class in that area.

The scores of every indicator were aggregated and averaged out to arrive at a pillar score, also scored on a scale of 1 to 10. Averages were arrived at using geometric mean because this method is less prone to distortion by extreme outlying figures.

Thus, for every pillar, every state got a score out of 10, and a rank in its cluster. We averaged the pillar scores for a state (again, using the geometric mean) to arrive at an overall score, out of 10.

India Justice Report | 2019
Supported by TATA TRUSTS