

"The country which faces police vacancy to the tune of over 5 lakh personnel deploys three cops to protect its one VIP as against availability of merely one cop for 761 lesser mortals."
[\[Economic Times\]](#)

CHRI has filed an appeal with the appellate authority with respect to refusal of information sought by a Right to Information (RTI) application on frivolous grounds by the Police Department, Alwar District. The RTI was filed to obtain information on the respective number of deployments of police personnel for VIP Duty and police escorts for prisoners in Alwar District of Rajasthan .

Police Escorts are to escort the prisoners from the prison complex to the courts for production, to hospitals for treatment, and even for transfer of prisoners from one prison to the other. The RTI filed to get the numbers to assess the above ratio was refused on grounds that they cannot disclose the information to public. But ironically, the Bureau of Police Research and Development (BPRD) data itself exposes that the State governments' have 'personalized' VIP lists, which run into thousands, alongside a central list which covers '300-odd protectees'. Also, the sanctioned deployment for the security of 16,788 VIPs in 2010 was 28,298 guards, whereas, actually, 50,059 police personnel were deployed for the same. [\[BPRD Data\]](#)

These statistics are alarming and depict the sordid state of affairs. In Rajasthan, information sought through RTI from Alwar Prisons Department on the production of undertrials has startlingly revealed that on a daily average, the number of police escorts requisitioned by the Prison Department was about 63 guards a day, whereas, in reality, only 11 guards reported in response to the requisition. The common man, who is to be the centre of a democracy, is instead, standing at the periphery, looking on at the blatant abuse of power. Justice, in its essence, is being denied and defeated day after day, as the so-called 'accused' is refused production in court and a stamp on his production warrant reads 'unable to be produced in court due to lack of police escorts'. Is this a 'reason' reasonable enough to deny a person his right to a fair and speedy trial, a right guaranteed by our constitution and upheld by the apex court as well?