OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER OF POLICE: DELHI.

No. 350 /PRO/PHQ dated Delhi, the 16.05.2020 .

To

The Editor,
The Hindu,

Sub: Rejoinder regarding "Rescripting North-East Delhi riots - and question of justice".

Sir,

This is with reference to the above-mentioned byline news item, which appeared in your esteemed newspaper, today. It is found to be factually incorrect based on wholly unverified sources and purely conjectural imagination. Their ideological predispositions apart, what has been published leads to an incontrovertible conclusion of either pure indolence or crass communalism. A look at the following is warranted to set the facts straight:

i). It has been admitted in the report itself that PUDR is privy to only 'few' FIRs, in fact, less than 6% of the total FIRs registered during the riots. What have been the criteria of selecting these FIRs is not clear. It is deliberately done. We may leave it for the readers to conclude. However, a perusal of the published story makes one believe that PUDR has taken it upon themselves to treat the riots as unidimensional. Fortunately though, the Delhi Police doesn't suffer from this cognitive disability. The police actions in all such situations are guided by the twin principles of providing relief to the victims and ensuring legal action against the perpetrators.

ii). It is no surprise then that PUDR has dismally failed in projecting the quantum and nature of arrests. As per the records, about 1,300 accused have been arrested in over 750 cases concerning the riots. To the sheer discomfort of PUDR and its likes, it may be added that in terms of proportion of the arrested accused, the numbers from two communities are almost identical to each other. Further, it may also be added that all arrests are based on scientific and technical evidence, since the responsibility cast upon the police goes much beyond, in prosecuting the arrested accused before a court of law where every bit of evidence is scrutinized thread bare. Each arrested accused was produced before the Judicial Magistrate as mandated in law where legal aid was available to him / her in the form of Private counsel or a Legal aid counsel from the Delhi Legal Services Authority. PUDR may revisit the issue and will themselves realize how unwittingly they have exposed themselves by erroneously attributing motives to Delhi Police.

iii). The allegations of malafide arrests falls flat on its face as several Writ petitions have been filed in the Honble High Court by the "activists " with similar allegations where Delhi Police has given suitable response and in none of these matters the Honble Courts have passed any adverse remarks.

iv). May we remind PUDR that true conscientiousness lies not only in raising the voice of a particular community but in being objective and fair to all victims of a crime. What may help PUDR in reorienting their conscience is to refer to the list of people who have applied for

compensation from the Delhi Administration; the sufferance has been almost equal for all victims.

v). In line with the mandate that PUDR has been trying to live up to, they have been surreptitiously 'selective' in choosing FIRs and concluding that grievances of a particular community have not been recorded properly and non bailable sections have been diluted to give relief to the other community. Nothing could be more illustrative of their lopsided intellectual capabilities, single community bias, fragmentation, and sectarian approach. Needless to say, the story does not even deserve rebuttal. PUDR may be well informed that for every single murder case, Delhi Police has registered a separate FIR and 'clubbing' is only a mindset of the authors, not a 'fact' as claimed.

vi). Delhi Police on its own also moved a proposal for appointing a Claims Commissioner to fix the liability of offenders for the destruction of Public and Private properties, a mechanism by which the offenders would be monetarily penalized and the victims compensated out of this. It is only to remind that the Claims Commissioner would independently examine the issue which shall be further adjudicated upon by the High court. The Hon'ble High Court of Delhi has already appointed a Claims Commissioner.

vii). The report also talks about the action taken against Shri Zafarul-Islam Khan, Chairman of Delhi Minority Commission (DMC), under Unlawful Prevention Act. PUDR in order to give validation to the conspiracy theory has accused Delhi Police of harassing the Chairman-DMC. First of all, it must be clearly understood that the conduct of DMC Chief and the subsequent criminal action against him is distinct and separate from the North-East riots. By twisting facts, the report tries to make out a case of communal bias against Delhi Police. It has also tried to make out a case of non-registration of complaints of victims belonging to a particular community. Whether PUDR is aware of any other instance, where more than 750 cases were registered on the incident of communal riots. It is difficult to find a similar precedent. To that extent, PUDR has been over- zealous in order to reach out to a premeditation conclusion of "Rescripting" of North-East riots.

viii). We remain committed to ensuring justice for the victims. We also expect greater realization of responsibilities incumbent upon the enlightened civil society organizations.

In view of the above-stated facts, it is requested that this rebuttal may be published with the same prominence, so as to put the facts in proper perspective before your esteemed readers.

Yours faithfully,

(M.S. Randhawa)IPS
Additional Commissioner of Police,
PRO Delhi Police, Delhi