

Chapter 5

Improving Police mobility

Chapter 5

Improving Police mobility

5.1 Introduction

Mobility is measured in terms of the ability of police force of a unit to move to the incident site. Quick police response helps to save precious lives, maintain law and order and protect public and private property besides being a reliable



indicator of police performance. BPR&D has prescribed scales for various types of operational vehicles such as heavy/medium/ light vehicles and motor cycle required for police stations, district armed reserve and armed police battalions.

5.2 Availability of vehicles

Civil Police: As per the BPR&D recommendations, the Civil Police required 11426 nos. of four types of vehicles (Heavy vehicle, Medium vehicle, Light vehicle & Motor Cycle) for 75 districts of the state. Number of vehicles required in district depends on the number of police stations in the district. Scrutiny of records revealed that only 8288 (73 per cent) vehicles were available with Civil Police as compared to BPR&D recommendations (*Appendix 5.1*).

Hence, there was a shortage of 27 per cent in vehicles for Civil police, and the shortage of Medium Vehicles which are used for patrolling was as high as 68 per cent. Shortage of vehicles could adversely affect the mobility of Civil



Police especially their patrolling functions, which could impact law and order maintenance in the State.

Provincial Armed Constabulary (PAC): As per BPR&D norms, PAC required 2,112 vehicles of four types (Heavy vehicle, Medium vehicle, Light vehicle & Motor Cycle) in the State for discharging their role and functioning effectively. Scrutiny of records revealed that only 1,502 (71 per cent) vehicles were available with PAC (*Appendix 5.2*) during 2015-16. Hence, there was an overall shortage of 29 per cent in vehicles and shortage of Medium Vehicles

was as high as 75 per cent in PAC. Such huge shortage of vehicles with PAC would certainly affect their mobility in an adverse manner in any emergency.

GoUP accepted (February 2017) the audit observation and stated that purchase of vehicle for districts police/PAC is made in accordance with BPR&D norms and budget provision of MPF scheme from GoI and after administrative/financial sanctions of GoUP.

5.3 Irrational deployment of vehicles in districts

Vehicles should be allotted to district police as per the number of vehicles sanctioned by PHQ. Audit observed that deployment of vehicles was not based on rational analysis of shortage in the districts, as there was a shortage of 11 to 46 per cent vehicles in 43 districts whereas 32 districts had either excess or the shortage was very marginal as detailed in *Appendix 5.3*.

5.4 Short deployment of vehicles at Police Stations

Authorisation of vehicles in field units was standardised by BPR&D as three light vehicles in Urban Police Stations and two light vehicles in Rural Police Stations. Scrutiny of records in test-checked districts revealed that deployment of vehicles was not as per the BPR&D recommendations. Out of 15 test



Light Vehicle at Police Station

checked districts, 10 districts had short deployment of light vehicle in Rural Police Station in which four districts had acute shortage i.e. Jhansi and Sitapur (50 per cent), Mathura (55 per cent) and Kushinagar (63 per cent) in rural police stations, Urban Police Stations of 12 districts had short deployment of light vehicles. Out of these

districts, in 8 districts short deployment of light vehicle was above 50 per cent (Kushinagar, Deoria, Pratapgarh 50 per cent, Shahjahanpur 55 per cent, Meerut 57 per cent, Mathura 64 per cent, Sitapur 66 per cent and Jhansi 67 per cent) as detailed in *Appendix 5.4*. Despite the budget being available for procurement of vehicles, the department surrendered ₹ 4.24 crore of MPF scheme and ₹ 16.81 crore of State budget as discussed in succeeding para 5.5.

The overall shortage of vehicles in the state was 27 per cent and such huge shortages in districts indicate deployment of vehicles without any rational analysis and diversion of vehicles from some districts to others in state. This could adversely affect the mobility and hence law and order situation in these districts.

5.5 Vehicle not procured and budget surrendered

During 2011-16, an amount of ₹ 72.34 crore was sanctioned under MPF Scheme by GOI for procurement of different types of vehicles. State

Government also approved and released ₹ 216.79 crore for procurement of vehicles during this period. However, department could not utilize the budget fully and an amount of ₹ 21.05 crore (₹ 4.24 crore of MPF Scheme and ₹ 16.81 crore of State Budget) remained unspent (*Appendix 5.5*). Due to the failure to utilise the budget, department could only procure 6,367 vehicles against the sanctioned 6,539 vehicles (*Appendix 5.6*).

5.6 Irregular procurement of vehicles against replacement of condemned vehicles

As per Government Accounting Rules and Uttar Pradesh Budget Manual, “Replacement Expenditure is debit to Revenue Expenditure head of the Government Account”. Audit scrutiny revealed that ₹ 153.89 crore were spent for replacement of condemned vehicles during 2011-16 under capital head and amounted to misreporting of expenditure to the legislature (*Appendix 5.7*).

GoUP accepted (February 2017) the audit observation and stated that in exceptional circumstances to maintain the law and order situation in the state provision in budget is being made through re-appropriation and vehicles were purchased to overcome the shortage of vehicles.

5.7 Vehicles not procured against condemned vehicles

Government order (2009) stated that when a new vehicle is purchased against the condemned vehicle of the District/Unit/PAC Corps, it should be allocated to the same unit.

During 2015-16 PHQ submitted a proposal (January 2016) to the State Government for procurement of 1,792 vehicles against condemned vehicles at district/units. Government however released sanction for procurement of only 190 vehicles.

Hence only 10 *per cent* of total condemned vehicles were replaced during 2015-16 and as of March 2016, 1,847 condemned vehicles (including 245 condemned vehicles in march 2016) were awaiting replacement at the end of 2015-16.

5.7.1 Procurement of vehicles for VVIP

On proposal of Police Headquarters (September 2013), Government accorded administrative and financial sanction (13 September 2013) of ₹ 5.84 crore for purchase of 10 bullet proof and 08 general Tata Safari vehicles for the security of the Hon'ble Chief Minister against the 18 condemned vehicles of 11 districts. Government accorded administrative and financial sanction of ₹ 3.24 crore on 31 January, 2014 for purchase of two Land Cruiser bulletproof vehicles at a cost of ₹ 1.62 crore per vehicle for the Hon'ble Chief Minister's security. Again, Government on 5th March 2014 accorded administrative and financial sanction of ₹ 6.90 crore for purchase of two Mercedes Model M-Guard Bulletproof vehicles at the cost of ₹ 3.45 crore per vehicle, accordingly payment made (upto March 2015) after adjusting the earlier sanction of ₹ 3.24 crore for two Land Cruiser.

Thus, Government incurred avoidable extra expenditure of ₹ 3.66 crore by deciding to purchase more expensive and luxurious vehicles for VVIP instead of Land Cruiser sanctioned earlier.

Audit noticed that Bullet Proof Tata Safari and Bullet Proof Mahindra Scorpio are being used by the Hon'ble Chief Minister, Maharashtra and Ambassador Car is being used by Hon'ble Chief Minister, Madhya Pradesh and Hon'ble Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh is provided with Bullet Proof Scorpio and Bullet Proof Ambassador/Tata Sumo vehicles.

GoUP in reply (February 2017) stated that vehicle were purchased as per the requirement of vehicles to maintain law and order situation and instructions were issued to all concerned for maintenance of vehicles. Vehicles were allotted to the concerned police units/district/PAC for which they were purchased. Vehicles were attached to other units on temporary basis as per the requirement/necessity to maintain law and order situation.

Reply of the GoUP was not tenable because government purchased 10 bulletproof Tata Safari and 08 General Tata Safari vehicle for security of Chief Minister against the 18 condemned vehicle of 11 districts.

5.8 Vehicles used by the department after completing their age

Government had fixed the norms for uses of vehicle in Police department in October 1986 as under:

Table 5.1: Service Life of vehicles as per Norms

Sl. No.	Description of vehicle	Life of vehicle
1.	Heavy vehicle	4.5 lakh Kilometer or 15 years
2.	Medium vehicle	2.25 lakh Kilometer or 12 years
3.	Light vehicle	1.75 lakh Kilometer or 10 years
4.	Motor cycle 3.5 H.P and above	1.00 lakh kilometer or 5 years
5.	Motor cycle up to 3.5 H.P	60,000 kilometer or 5 years

(Source: Police Headquarter, Allahabad)

Scrutiny of records of 15 test-checked districts revealed that 13 per cent to 70 per cent of vehicles used by the district authorities had completed their service life as fixed by the government (Deoria: 41 per cent, Kushinagar: 47 per cent, Jhansi: 49 per cent and Sitapur: 70 per cent). Out of 3,113 vehicles, 955 vehicles had completed their prescribed life but were still being used by the department as these vehicles were not replaced. This could impact the mobility and delivery of police services. District-wise position of available vehicles and vehicles that have completed their prescribed life is shown in (Appendix 5.8).

5.9 Vehicles provided to VIPs and expenditure incurred on POL

PHQ informed (26 August 2014) the Principal Secretary, Home, GoUP that there were shortages of vehicles in police force and purchase of vehicles for use in police department' and allotting them to Hon'ble ministers would make for permanent shortage of vehicles in the department and would affect the law

and order situation in the respective districts. In spite of these reservations expressed by PHQ, orders for purchase (December 2016) of 56 vehicles (*Maruti Gypsy*) at a cost of ₹ 3.08 crore for use as staff cars was issued and were allotted to hon'ble Ministers of various departments through concerned district police offices. It was further noticed that an order of meeting out the POL expenditure of these vehicles which were running for Hon'ble Ministers other than Police Department was issued (June 2015).

Audit observed that out of 15 test checked district in 12 districts⁶, 1 to 316 vehicles were attached with VIPs and ₹ 0.25 crore to ₹ 3.21 crore were spent on POL on these vehicles engaged for VIP duties (*Appendix 5.9*).

It was the responsibility of the district police to provide escort vehicle to Hon'ble Ministers during their visit to the districts. However, it was irregular on the part of the Government to permanently attach district police vehicles with Hon'ble Ministers especially when most of the districts had huge shortage of vehicles which would adversely impact their law and order related operations/functions.

5.10 Unfruitful expenditure on Automotive workshops

UP Police Automotive Workshop (PMT) was set up in 1947 at Sitapur district for providing training to reserve drivers, testing their ability to drive, renewal of their driving license as well as preventive maintenance and first level repairing of Police Vehicles. Along with the main workshop of Sitapur, regional workshops were established at Lucknow, Moradabad, Agra and Varanasi. The number of vehicles serviced/repared at PMT workshop and expenses of the workshop during the period 2011-16 are as under:

Table 5.2: Repair cost of vehicles at PMT

Year	Total repaired vehicles	Total expenditure incurred on workshops (in ₹)	Expenditure per vehicle (in ₹)
2009-10	990	509,84,291	51,499.20
2010-11	772	562,60,739	74,392.04
2011-12	703	674,27,843	95,914.32
2012-13	361	715,27,393	198,136.73
2013-14	355	731,47,737	206,052.67
2014-15	116	662,58,013	571,189.77
2015-16	244	999,95,963	409,819.52

(Source: UP Police Motor Workshop, Sitapur)

It was noticed that ADG (TS) requested PHQ (November 2014) that cost per unit of repair has increased during last seven years due to cost of salary of the staff and decrease in the number of vehicles repaired at the workshop (old models being replaced with the new vehicles etc.) The cost of the maintenance increased because workshop was not upgraded and there was lack of expertise in staff in repair of vehicles of new models/generations.

⁶ Allahabad, Deoria, Jhansi, Kanpur Nagar, Kushinagar, Moradabad, Mathura, Meerut, Pratapgarh, Shahjahanpur, Sitapur, Sonbhadra.

GoUP in reply (February 2017) stated that decision to assess the requirement of present workshop and their qualitative improvement were taken after approval of HoD on the recommendations of a high level committee.

Reply of GoUP was not tenable as cost per unit of repair has increased eight times during last seven years due to decrease in the number of vehicles repaired at the workshop. The decline is mainly on account of failure to upgrade the workshop and lack of expertise of staff in repair of new models/generations vehicles.

Recommendations

- *Vehicles should be purchased and provided to Civil Police/PAC as per BPR&D norms and the shortages should be minimised on priority to improve mobility and operational efficiency of State Police.*
- *Police vehicles should not be diverted for any other use.*
- *Need for continuance of PMT may be reviewed.*