

Organisational structure of cbi essay



CHAPTER-1 INTRODUCTION TO C. B. I INTRODUCTION Corruption in public life is an age old problem. It is not peculiar to India but has existed in some form or the other even in economically advanced and progressive countries. The extent varies to the degree of public awareness and the national character of the people. Any well intentioned government and society which aim at purity and integrity must need waging an incessant war against “ CORRUPTION. ” Thus it caused the evolution of Central Bureau of Investigation (C. B. I) {Kendriye Anveshan Bureau in Hindi}.

The Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI) is a government agency of India that serves as a criminal investigation body, national security agency and intelligence agency. It was established on 1 April 1963 and evolved from the Special Police Establishment founded in 1941. Its motto is “ Industry, Impartiality, and Integrity”. MISSION To uphold the constitution of India and Law of the Land through in-depth investigation and successful prosecution of offenses; to provide Leadership and Direction to Police Forces and to act as the Nodal Agency for enhancing inter-state and international co-operation in law enforcement.

VISION Based on our motto, mission and the need to develop the professionalism, transparency, adaptability to change and use of science and technology in our working, C. B. I. will focus on: 1. Combating corruption in public life, curb economic and violent crimes through meticulous investigation and prosecution. 2. Evolve effective systems and procedures for successful investigation and prosecution of cases in various law courts. 3. Help fight cyber and high technology crime. 4. Create a healthy work

environment that encourages team building, free communication and mutual trust. 5.

Support State Police Organisations and Law Enforcement Agencies in national and international Co-Operation, particularly relating to inquiries and investigation of cases. 6. Play a lead role against the national and transnational organised crime. 7. Uphold Human Rights; protect the environment, arts, antiques and heritage of our civilization. 8. Develop a scientific temper, humanism and the spirit of inquiry and reform. 9. Strive for excellence and professionalism in all spheres of functioning, so that the organisation rises to high levels of endeavor and achievement. FOUNDER DIRECTOR

The founder director of the CBI was Shri D. P. Kohli who held office from 1st April, 1963 to 31st May, 1968. Before this, he was Inspector-General of Police of the Special Police Establishment from 1955 to 1963. Before that he held responsible positions in police in Madhya Bharat, Uttar Pradesh and Govt. of India. He was Police Chief in Madhya Bharat before joining the SPE. Shri Kohli was awarded ' Padma Bhushan' in 1967 for his distinguished services. Shri Kohli was a visionary who saw in the Special Police Establishment the potential of growing into the national investigative agency.

He nurtured the organisation during his long stint as Inspector General and as Director and laid the solid foundation on which the organisation grew over the decades to become what it is today. While inaugurating the 4th Biennial Joint Conference of the CBI and State Anti-Corruption Officers, Shri Kohli told the delegates: " The public expects the highest standard from you both in

efficiency and integrity. That faith has to be sustained. The motto of the CBI – Industry, Impartiality and Integrity: these must always guide your work. Loyalty to duty must come first, everywhere, at all times and in all circumstances. The CBI is controlled by the Department of Personnel and Training in the Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pension of the Union Government usually headed by a Union Minister who reports directly to the Prime Minister. While analogous in structure to the FBI, the CBI's powers and function are severely limited to specific crimes based on Acts (mainly the Delhi Special Police Establishment Act, 1946). The CBI is the official Interpol unit for India. The current director of CBI is Amar Pratap Singh. (See Annexure-A for list of Former Directors.)

CENTRAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

COMMON NAMECENTRAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION ABBREVIATIONCBI
 SEAL OF THE CENTRAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION MOTTOINDUSTRY,
 IMPARTIALITY, INTEGRITY FORMED1 APRIL 1963 PRECEDING AGENCYSP
 POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (SPE) (1941) LEGAL PERSONALITYGOVERNMENTAL:
 GOVERNMENT AGENCY FEDERAL AGENCY INDIA GOVERNING
 BODYGOVERNMENT OF INDIA GENERAL NATURE1. FEDERAL LAW
 ENFORCEMENT 2. CIVILIAN AGENCY HEADQUARTERS NEW DELHI, INDIA
 AGENCY EXECUTIVEA. P. SINGH. IPS. , DIRECTOR PARENT
 AGENCYDEPARTMENT OF PERSONNEL AND TRAINING CHILD
 AGENCYINTERPOL NATIONAL CENTRAL BUREAU INDIA BRANCH BRANCHES52
 WEBSITE [http://www. cbi. gov. n/index. php](http://www.cbi.gov.n/index.php) OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY The
 present project has the following objectives: 1. To study the evolution of
 Central Bureau of Investigation. 2. To look at the Organizational Structure of

Central Bureau of Investigation. 3. To analyse the working of Central Bureau of Investigation. 4. To give suggestions for strengthening the functioning of Central Bureau of Investigation. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY The study has relied on Secondary Data. For analyzing the functioning of Central Bureau of Investigation, the Annual Reports of the CBI along with various news items commenting on its functioning were used.

Books and Internet were also accessed for analyzing the organization and working of the CBI. CHAPTER SCHEME SERIAL No. CHAPTERSPage No.

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION TO C. B. I. CHAPTER 2. EVOLUTION AND ORGANISATIONAL STRUCTURE OF C. B. I CHAPTER 3. RECRUITMENT AND TRAINING PROCESS IN C. B. I CHAPTER 4. ANALYSIS OF THE ORGANIZATION AND WORKING OF C. B. I CHAPTER 5SELECT CASES INVESTIGATED BY C. B. I CHAPTER 6ARTICLES AND REVIEWS ON C. B. I BY VARIOUS ADMINISTRATIVE EXPERTS CHAPTER 7. CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS REFERENCES ANNEXURE-A ANNEXURE-B ANNEXURE-C CHAPTER-2 EVOLUTION AND ORGANISATIONAL STRUCTURE OF C. B. I

EVOLUTION OF C. B. I In the early stages of the World War-II, the Government of India realised that the vast increase in expenditure for war efforts had provided opportunities to unscrupulous and anti-social persons, both official and non-official, for indulging in bribery and corruption. In order to tackle the problem, the Government set up Special Police Establishment (SPE) under a DIG in the then Department of War, through an executive order in 1941, with mandate to investigate cases of bribery and corruption in transactions with which the War and Supply Department was concerned.

At the end of 1942, the activities of the SPE were extended to include cases of corruption in Railways also, which was vitally concerned with the movement and supply of war materials. In 1943, an Ordinance was issued by the Government, constituting a Special Police Force vested with powers for investigation of certain offences committed by servants of Central Government. As a need for a Central Government Agency to investigate cases of bribery and corruption was felt even after the end of the war, the Ordinance which lapsed on September 30, 1946, was replaced by Delhi Special Police Establishment Ordinance of 1946.

Subsequently, the same year, Delhi Special Police Establishment Act, 1946 (DSPE Act) was brought into existence. After promulgation of the Act, superintendence of SPE was transferred to The Home Department and its functions were enlarged to cover all departments of the Government of India. The jurisdiction of SPE was extended to all the Union Territories and the Act provided for its extension to the States with the consent of the State Government. The Headquarters of SPE was shifted to Delhi and the organisation was put under the charge of Director, Intelligence Bureau.

However, in 1948, a post of Inspector-General of Police, SPE was created and the organisation was placed under his charge. In 1953, an Enforcement Wing was added to the SPE to deal with offences under the Import and Export Control Act. With the passage of time, more and more cases under various laws other than Prevention of Corruption Act and violations of Import and Export Control Act also came to be entrusted to the SPE. In fact, by 1963, SPE was authorised to investigate offences under 91 different sections of

Indian Penal Code and 16 other Central Acts, besides offences under the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1947.

A growing need was felt for a Central Police Agency at the disposal of the Central Government, which could investigate not only cases of bribery and corruption, but also violation of Central fiscal laws, major frauds relating to Government of India Departments, Public Joint Stock Companies, Passport frauds, crimes on the High Seas, crimes on the Airlines and serious crimes committed by organised gangs and professional criminals. Therefore, the Government of India set up Central Bureau of Investigation by a Resolution dated 1st April, 1963, with the following Divisions: ?

Investigation & Anti-Corruption Division (Delhi Special Police Establishment). ? Technical Division ? Crime Records and Statistics Division. ? Research Division. ? Legal and General Division. ? Administration Division. The Investigation & Anti-Corruption Division (Delhi Special Police Establishment) was entrusted with the following mandate in the Resolution although it continued to derive its jurisdiction and powers from DSPE Act, 1946: ? Cases in which public servants under the control of the Central Government were involved either by themselves or along with State Government servants and/or other persons. Cases in which the interests of the Central Government or of any public sector project or undertaking, or any statutory corporation or body set up and financed by the Government of India were involved. ? Cases relating to breaches of Central Laws with the enforcement of which the Government of India was particularly concerned, e. g. : • Breaches of Import and Export Control Orders. • Serious breaches of Foreign Exchange Regulation Act. • Passport frauds. • Cases under the

Official Secrets Act pertaining to the affairs of the Central Government.

Cases of certain specified categories under the Defence of India Act or Rules with which the Central Government was particularly concerned. ? Serious cases of cheating or fraud relating to the Railways, or Posts & Telegraphs Department, particularly those involving professional criminals operating in several States. ? Crime on the High Seas. ? Crime on the Airlines. ? Important and serious cases in Union Territories, particularly those by professional criminal. ? Serious cases of fraud, cheating and embezzlement relating to Public Joint Stock Companies. Other cases of a serious nature, when committed by organised gangs or professional criminals, or cases having ramifications in several States, including Union Territories, serious cases of spurious drugs, important cases of kidnapping of children by professional interstate gangs, etc. These cases were to be taken up only at the request of or with the concurrence of the State. ? Governments /Union Territories Administrations concerned. ? Prosecution of cases investigated by this Division. CBI was further strengthened by addition of an Economic Offences Wing by a Government of India Resolution dated February 2, 1964.

At this time, CBI had two Investigation Wings: one called the General Offences Wing, which dealt with cases of bribery and corruption involving employees of Central Government / PSUs and the other Economic Offences Wing, which dealt with cases of violation of fiscal laws. In September 1964, a Food Offences Wing was formed to collect intelligence regarding hoarding, black marketing, smuggling and profiteering in foodgrains and take up such cases interstate ramifications in view of the situation prevailing at that time. It was merged in the Economic Offences Wing in 1968.

Over a period of time, some of the work originally allotted to the CBI was transferred to other organisations. Part of the work relating to Crime Records and Statistics Division was transferred to National Crime Records Bureau (NCRB) and that relating to Research Division was transferred to Bureau of Police Research & Development (BPR). With the passage of time, requests were made by various quarters for CBI to take up investigation even in conventional crimes like assassinations, kidnappings, hijackings, crimes committed by extremists, violation of Official Secrets Act, large scale Banks and Insurance Frauds, etc. and others complicated cases like Bhagalpur Blinding, Bhopal Gas Tragedy, etc. Since early 1980's, Constitutional Courts also started referring cases to CBI for enquiry / investigation on the basis of petitions filed by the aggrieved in cases of murders, dowry deaths, rape, etc. In view of these developments, it was decided in 1987 to have two Investigation Divisions in CBI, namely, Anti-Corruption Division and Special Crimes Division, the latter dealing with cases of conventional crimes as well as economic offences.

Bank Frauds and Securities Cell was created in 1992 to investigate cases related to Bank Frauds & Securities Scams. Due to increased workload relating to Securities Scam cases and rise in economic offences with the liberalisation of Indian economy, a separate Economic Offences Wing was established in 1994. Accordingly, three Investigation Divisions were created in CBI: (a) Anti-Corruption Division – To deal with cases of corruption and fraud committed by public servants of all Central Government Departments, Central Public Sector Undertakings and Central Financial Institutions. b) Economic Crimes Division – To deal with bank frauds, financial frauds, Import

Export & Foreign Exchange Violations, large-scale smuggling of narcotics, antiques, cultural property and smuggling of other contraband items, etc. (c) Special Crimes Division – To deal with cases of terrorism, bomb blasts, sensational homicides, kidnapping for ransom and crimes committed by the mafia/ underworld. As on date, CBI has the following Divisions: 1. Anti-Corruption Division. 2. Economic Offences Division. 3. Special Crimes Division. 4. Policy and International Police Co-operation Division. 5. Administration Division. . Directorate of Prosecution. 7. Central Forensic Science Laboratory. JURISDICTION POWERS, PRIVILEGES AND LIABILITIES The legal powers of investigation of CBI are derived from the DSPE Act 1946. This Act confers concurrent and coextensive powers, duties, privileges and liabilities on the members of Delhi Special Police Establishment (CBI) with Police Officers of the Union Territories. The Central Government may extend to any area, besides Union Territories, the powers and jurisdiction of members of the CBI for investigation subject to the consent of the Government of the concerned State.

While exercising such powers, members of the CBI of or above the rank of Sub Inspector shall be deemed to be officer's incharge of Police Stations of respective jurisdictions. The CBI can investigate only such of the offences as are notified by the Central Government under the DSPE Act. JURISDICTION OF CBI VIS-A-VIS STATE POLICE Law and Order is a State subject and the basic jurisdiction to investigate crime lies with State Police. Besides, due to limited resources, CBI would not be able to investigate crimes of all kind. CBI may investigate: •Cases which are essentially against Central Govt. employees or concerning affairs of the Central Govt. and the employees of the

Central Public Sector Undertakings and Public Sector Banks. •Cases in which the financial interests of the Central Government are involved. •Cases relating to the breaches of Central Laws with the enforcement of which the Government of India is mainly concerned. •Big cases of fraud, cheating, embezzlement and the like relating to companies in which large funds are involved and similar other cases when committed by organised gangs or professional criminals having ramifications in several States. Cases having interstate and international ramifications and involving several official agencies where, from all angles, it is considered necessary that a single investigating agency should be incharge of the investigation.

ORGANISATIONAL STRUCTURE OF CBI The CBI is headed by a Director, an IPS Officer of the rank of Director General of Police or Commissioner of Police (State). Director is selected based on the procedure laid down by CVC Act 2003 and has a tenure of 2 years.

The other important ranks in the CBI are Special Director, Additional Director, Joint Director, Deputy Inspector General of Police, Senior Superintendent of Police, Superintendent of Police, Additional Superintendent of Police, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Inspector, Sub-Inspector, Assistant Sub-Inspector, Head Constable, Senior Constable and Constable. (See annexure-B for the list of Senior Officers.) According to annual reports Staff of CBI is usually divided between Ministerial staff, Ex-cadre posts which are usually of technical nature, Executive Staff and EDP Staff.

Hindi Bhasha staff belongs to the Department of official languages.

Ministerial Staff includes LDC, UDC, and Crime Assistants etc. Executive Staff includes Constables, ASI, Sub-Inspectors, and Inspectors etc. EDP Staff

includes Data Entry Operators, Data Processing Assistants, Assistant Programmers, Programmers and SSA. CHAPTER-3 RECRUITMENT AND TRAINING PROCESS IN C. B. I In C. B. I, there is both direct and indirect recruitment procedure. The officers can either appointed or promoted by the selection agency. APPOINTMENTS Recruitment rules for posts in C. B. I have been framed in almost 11 cases.

The appointing authorities are supposed to be careful in following the conditions prescribed in these rules as changed from time to time. No relation to the provisions of the rules is possible, except with the prior approval of the rule making authority i. e. , Department of personnel and administrative reforms. Appointments to all class I posts are made by the President of India, in consultation with the U. P. S. C Appointments to all class II posts except those belonging to C. S. S in C. B. I are made by the Director, C. B. I. and I. G. P. S. P. E; in consultation with the U. P. S. C. QUOTA OF EXECUTIVE POLICE OFFICERS IN DEPUTATION . Deputy director/ D. I. G Not exceeding 15% by promotion, rest by deputation 2. Assistant Director/A. I. G. /S. P. Promotion 24% Deputation 75% 3. Dy. Supdt. of Police Promotion 30% Deputation 50% Direct recruitment 20% 4. Inspector Promotion 40% Deputation 60% 5. Sub-Inspector Promotion 20% Direct recruitment 80% failing by which deputation 6. A. S. I. Promotion 25% Deputation 75% 7. Head Constable Promotion 90% Deputation 10% 8. Constable Direct recruitment 30% Deputation 70% Minimum Service for Promotion 1. A. I. G. /S. P. 8 years 2. Dy S. P. 8 years 3. Inspector 3 years 4. Sub-inspector 5 years 5. Asstt.

Sub-inspector 3 years 6. Head Constable Departmental Exam (Source: Anjali Nirmal, 1992.) CBI ACADEMY The Present Director of CBI is Shri Amar Pratap Singh. CBI Academy at Ghaziabad, Uttar Pradesh, India, started functioning in 1996. The Academy is situated towards east of Delhi, in Ghaziabad district of Uttar Pradesh[12] at a distance of around 40 km from New Delhi Railway Station and about 65 km from Indira Gandhi International Airport, Delhi. It is spread over of 26. 5 acres (107, 000 m²) of lush green fields and plantations with a covered area consisting of the Administrative, Academic, Hostel and Residential Blocks.

Prior to that a small Training Centre was functional at Lok Nayak Bhawan, New Delhi only for conducting short term in-service courses. CBI then, was dependent on State Police Training Institutions and NPA, Hyderabad for training basic courses of Dy. SsP, SIs and constables. The Academy now caters to the training needs of all ranks of CBI. Training facilities for certain specialised courses are also made available to the officials of State Police, Central Police Organisations (CPO), Vigilance organisations of public sector undertakings, banks and government departments and Indian Armed Forces.

HIERARCHICAL STRUCTURE OF CBI ACADEMY

TRAINING OBJECTIVES OF C. B. I ACADEMY CBI Academy aim to achieve excellence in training the CBI officers, State police officers and the officers of various vigilance agencies in the investigation, prosecution and vigilance functioning. •To ensure that everyone in the CBI is trained. •To guide the human resource to realize its full potential and to ensure full commitment towards achievement of the goals and objectives of the organization. •To sensitize the human resource of CBI to respond to the dynamic socio-legal

environment of the country. •To strive after quality, standardization and constant improvement in the techniques & skills of eport writing, investigation, prosecution and supervision of cases. •To re-motivate the CBI personnel to discharge their duties professionally. •To develop a sound research base in training for new vistas of investigation. •To broad-base the training efforts of CBI with inter-institutional and international cooperation. •To ensure optimal utilization of training resources through a cost conscious culture. CHAPTER-4 ANALYSIS OF THE ORGANIZATION AND WORKING OF CBI Analysis of the organisation and working of C. B. I has been undertaken on the basis of registration of cases, their investigation and disposal are taken from Annual Report of C.

B. I 2010 and Monthly Crimes Report of C. B. I 2011 for the month of June and July. CASES REGISTERED, INVESTIGATED & DISPOSED FROM INVESTIGATION UNDER C. B. I IN 2010 ? CASES REGISTERED 1009 Regular Cases / Preliminary Enquiries were registered during 2010. 33 of these were taken up on the requests of States Governments / Union Territories and 97 on the directions of the Constitutional Courts. Investigations / enquiries were finalised in 1173 cases/PEs. At the end of year, 815 cases / enquiries were pending investigation / enquiry. During the year, charge-sheets were filed in 842 cases and judgments were received in 745 cases.

The conviction rate for 2010 was 70. 8%. There were as many as 9928 trials pending in various courts at the end of year. 1009 cases registered include 867 Regular Cases (RCs) and 142 Preliminary Enquiries (PEs). 212 cases were registered for demand of bribe by public servants for showing official favors and 66 cases were registered for possession of assets

disproportionate to known sources of income. The comparative figures of registration of cases /enquiries during the last three years and break-up of registration in 2010 in the three Investigation Divisions of CBI is depicted in the Bar Chart above. ? CASES INVESTIGATED

In 2010, investigation was finalised in 1018 RCs and 155 PEs. Out of the Regular Cases, as many as 842 cases charge-sheets were filed in the Competent Courts. The following Bar Charts indicate the disposal of cases / enquiries from investigation during the last three years and also the divisionwise disposal from investigation enquiry in 2010. There were 815 cases under investigation at the end of the year as against 988 cases under investigation at the end of 2009. The following Bar Charts show the comparative figures for the last three years and also the break-up for various divisions at the end of 2010: ? ACD- ANTI CORRUPTION DIVISION SCD- SPECIAL CRIME DIVISION ? EOD- ECONOMIC OFFENSE DIVISION Monthly Crimes Report of C. B. I for Month of June 2011 ? REGISTRATION OF CASES During June 2011, CBI registered 100 cases involving 133 public servants. The cases registered so far for in the year 2011 is 502. During the month, 9 cases were registered on the direction of the High court. 2 cases were registered on the direction of the Supreme Court and 8 cases were registered on the references of State Government. The comparative figure of previous year is shown in the graph below: The breakup of accused person category wise is given below:-

N U M B E R O F C A S E S R E G I S T E R E D 502 100 84 84 June. 2011 Monthly avg
Monthly avg. 2011(Till June-2011) 2010 2011 ? DISPOSAL FROM
INVESTIGATION: During the month, 156 cases were disposed of from

investigation. The cases disposed from investigation so far, for the year, 2011 is 434. The comparative figure of the previous year is shown in the graph below: DISPOSAL FROM INVESTIGATION 434 156 9872 June. 2011 Monthly vg. 2010 Monthly avg. 2011 2011 (Till June 2011) ? INVESTIGATION DISPOSAL BREAK-UP Prosecution was recommended in 42 percent of the cases while 10 percent cases were recommended for departmental action and 29 percent cases were disposed as RDA/Trial. Action on Disposed cases June 2011 PE to RC Others 6% 1% Such action 2% Closed 10% Prosecution 42% RDA 10% RDA/Trial 29% ? CASES CHARGE-SHEETED During the month of June 2011, 138 charge sheets were filed in 117 cases. The cases charge-sheeted so far are 386.

The comparative figure of the previous year is shown in the graph below: CASES CHARGESHEETED 386 117 72 64 June. 2011 Monthly avg. 2010 Monthly avg. 2011 2011 (Till June- 2011) ? CASES PENDING INVESTIGATION As on 30th June 2011, 882 cases were under investigation as against 939 cases at the end of May 2011. The comparative figures as on the end of the previous month and the reporting month are shown below: C A S E S P E N D I N G I N V E S T I G A T I O N 9 3 9 8 8 2 May. 2011 June. 2011 ? CASES PENDING FOR PROSECUTION SANCTION

Out of 119 cases pending for Prosecution Sanction, 99 cases are pending with Central Government departments/authorities, similarly, 27 cases pending with State Government departments/authorities and in 7 cases sanction were asked from both Central Government and State Government departments/authorities. Requests for Prosecution Sanction PENDING WITH CENTRAL GOVT. /MINISTRY/DEPTT. /STATE GOVT. More than 3 Months Less

than 3 Months 54 45 18 Central Govt. State Govt. ? DISPOSAL FROM TRIAL

During the month 91 court cases were disposed. The court cases disposed so far for the year 2011 is 394 DISPOSAL FROM TRIAL 39 4 91 6 2 66

June 2011 Monthly avg. 2010 Monthly avg. 2011 2011 (Till June- 2011) ?

STATE WISE PENDING TRIAL CASES. The details of state wise pending trial cases are given below:- STATE/UT (Respective fig. should match with MPR fig.) ; 2 Yrs(a) 2-5 Yrs. (b) 5-10 Yrs. (c) 10-15 Yrs (d) 15-20 Yrs (e) ; 20 Yrs.

(f) Total (a+b+c+d+e+f) 1. Andaman and Nicobar Islands 388610 26 2.

Andhra Pradesh 1051781862141 495 3. Arunachal Pradesh 210010013 4.

Assam 467282381313264 5. Bihar 75117142265831449 6.

Chandigarh 38361262094 7. Chhattisgarh 1714131102 57 8. Dadra and Nagar

Haveli 000000 0 9. Daman and Diu 100000 1 10. Goa 20133030066 11.

Gujarat 481311391014029488 12. Haryana 16323160085 13. Himachal

Pradesh 1811200031 14. Jammu and Kashmir 35536115912185 15.

Jharkhand 84120168545838522 16. Karnataka 57771094763 299 17.

Kerala 998684461 280 18. Lakshadweep 000000 0 19. Madhya

Pradesh 777755631219 20. Maharashtra 25429428914076341087 21.

Manipur 461232128 22. Meghalaya 165311329 23. Mizoram 023120 8 24.

Nagaland 221031 9 25. NCT of Delhi 30556044728310366 1764 26.

Orissa 731219430430 361 27. Pondicherry 21100000 31 28.

Punjab 4158632702191 29. Rajasthan 8513313536193411 30. Sikkim 002200

4 31. Tamil Nadu 23215115957236 628 32. Tripura 5100000 51 33. Uttar

Pradesh 1861662211846641 864 4. Uttarakhand 411810772 85 35. West

Bengal 14616623113111476864 TOTAL: 2198 2727 2792 1247 659 366 9989

Monthly Crimes Report of C. B. I for Month of July 2011 ? REGISTRATION OF

<https://assignbuster.com/organisational-structure-of-cbi-essay/>

CASES During July 2011, CBI registered 64 cases involving 82 public servants. The cases registered so far for the year 2011 is 565. During the month, 7 cases were registered on the direction of the High court. No case has been registered on the direction of the Supreme Court and 6 cases were registered on the reference of State Government. The comparative figure of previous year is shown in the graph below: NUMBER OF CASES REGISTERED

Month	2010	2011 (Till July 2011)
July	484	565
Monthly avg.	41	47

DISPOSAL FROM INVESTIGATION During the month, 51 cases were disposed of from investigation. The cases disposed from investigation so far, for the year, 2011 is 485 The comparative figure of the previous year is shown in the graph below: DISPOSAL FROM INVESTIGATION

Month	2010	2011 (till July 2011)
July	498	485
Monthly avg.	41	40

CASES CHARGE-SHEETED During the month of July 2011, 57 charge sheets were filed in 43 cases. The cases charge-sheeted so far are 429. The comparative figure of the previous year is shown in the graph below CASES CHARGESHEETED

Month	2010	2011 (Till July- 2011)
July	429	437
Monthly avg.	35	36

CASES PENDING INVESTIGATION As on 31st July 2011, 896 cases were under investigation as against 882 cases at the end of June 2011. The comparative figures as on the end of the previous month and the reporting month are shown below: INVESTIGATION PENDING CASES

Month	2010	2011
June	882	896
July	882	896
Monthly avg.	73	75

DISPOSAL FROM TRIAL

During the month 62 court cases were disposed of from trial. The court cases disposed of so far for the year 2011 are 456. DISPOSAL FROM TRIAL

Month	2010	2011
July	62	65
Monthly avg.	4	5

STATE WISE PENDING TRIAL CASES The details of state wise pending trial

cases are given below: STATE/UT (Respective fig. should match with MPR fig.); 2 Yrs. (a)2-5 Yrs. (b)5-10 Yrs. (c)10-15 Yrs. (d)15-20 Yrs. (e); 20 Yrs. (f)Total (a+b+c+d+e+f) 1.

Andaman and Nicobar Islands48761026 2. Andhra Pradesh941811902241492 3. Arunachal Pradesh210000012 4. Assam447483371413265 5. Bihar79117143275331450 6. Chandigarh3839952093 7. Chhattisgarh151215110255 8. Dadra and Nagar Haveli0000000 9. Daman and Diu1000001 10. Goa20132930065 11. Gujarat481071641003930488 12. Haryana413441600122 13. Himachal Pradesh1811400033 14. Jammu and Kashmir36515918912185 15. Jharkhand88119167555638523 16. Karnataka58731104763297 17. Kerala998583371278 18. Lakshadweep0000000 19. Madhya Pradesh917857531235 20. Maharashtra25629429014176341091 21. Manipur461232128 22. Meghalaya165311329 23. Mizoram0231208 4. Nagaland2210319 25. NCT of Delhi259550462290112631736 26. Orissa621309530430360 27. Pondicherry2010000030 28. Punjab2236812502166 29. Rajasthan8013413636175408 30. Sikkim0022004 31. Tamil Nadu23314615956236623 32. Tripura510000051 33. Uttar Pradesh1831652291816439861 34. Uttarakhand43181077287 35. West Bengal14416823213111278865 TOTAL:

21512678287612496563669976 INITIATIVES TAKEN BY CBI FOR FIGHTING CORRUPTION “ Join us (CBI) in Fighting Corruption” An initiative taken by the C. B. I for fighting against corruption: •The CBI welcomes your suggestions and look forward to interacting with you through this site. The CBI welcomes information relating to corruption in Central Government departments and

Central Public Sector Undertakings. The Website can be used to pass on the information. •The identity of the informants can be kept secret, if they so desired. •Every State in India has at least one CBI office headed by a Superintendent of Police, where a signed complaint can be lodged. The complaint can be sent by post, fax or in person. (Source: C. B. I website)

CHAPTER-5 SELECT CASES INVESTIGATED BY C. B. I SOME OF THE SELECT CASES INVESTIGATED BY C. B. I

Normally, cases assigned to the CBI are sensitive and of national importance. It is a usual practice for the respective state police departments, to initially register any case coming under its jurisdiction, and if necessary, through mediation by the central government, the cases may be transferred to the CBI. The CBI handles many high profile cases, and is never far from controversy. Bofors scandal In January 2006, it was found that CBI had quietly unfrozen bank accounts of Italian businessman Ottavio Quattrocchi, one of the prime accused in the Bofors scandal of 1986 which had tainted the Rajiv Gandhi government. 4] The Central Bureau of Investigation has been responsible for the inquiry into the Bofors Case. Associates of the late Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi were linked to alleged pay-offs made in the mid-1980s by the Swedish arms firm AB Bofors, with \$40 million in kickbacks moved from Britain and Panama to secret Swiss banks. The \$1, 300 million arms purchase of 410 howitzer field guns involved in the sale were reported to be inferior to those offered by a French competitor. The Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI), which defreeze

Rs 21 crore stashed in a London bank in two accounts held by Bofors scam accused Ottavio Quattrocchi and his wife Maria in 2006, has facilitated his

travel across the globe by asking Interpol to take him off the “ wanted” list on 29 Apr 2009. Following a communication from the CBI, the Interpol has withdrawn the Red Corner Notice against the Italian. The development that comes barely three weeks before the end of the Manmohan Singh government’s tenure has brought back the issue of the Bofors scandal to the centre stage.

It is often suspected that ruling governments interfere with the work of the CBI, and nevertheless the handling of the bofors investigation by CBI under congress governments has created a new synonym for CBI. After letting of the bofors accused – Oppositions have never tired to call it as the Congress Bureau of Investigation. ISRO spy ring case In 1994 two scientists with the Indian Space Research Organisation (ISRO) and two Indian businessmen were arrested for allegedly conspiring to sell space secrets to two Maldivian women, who were originally described by newspapers as agents of Pakistani intelligence, for money and sex.

The CBI investigation did not reveal the existence of a spy ring, and by early 1995 it was clear that the case was more a product of inexperience and over exuberation on the part of the police and Intelligence Bureau. It was a well planned scheme to remove the then DGP Ramon S by concocted links to Maldivian lady. The scheme was plotted by some officers of Kerala police, the media and Muslim League as DGP was made of sterner stuff. Hawala Scandal In 1991 an arrest linked to militants in Kashmir led to a raid on hawala brokers, revealing evidence of large-scale payments to national politicians.

The prosecution that followed was partly prompted by a public interest petition (see Vineet Narain), and yet the court cases of the Hawala scandal eventually all collapsed without convictions. The CBI's role was again criticised. In concluding the Vineet Narain case, the Supreme Court of India directed that the Central Vigilance Commission should be given a supervisory role over the CBI. Priyadarshini Mattoo murder case The CBI has been under a cloud owing to its handling of the Priyadarshini Mattoo case, in which the alleged murderer of a 22-year old law student was acquitted for what the case judge called “deliberate inaction” by the investigating team. The accused was the son of a high ranking officer in the Indian Police Service, due to which the case had been shifted from the regular police force to the CBI. However, the 1999 judgment commented on how “the influence of the father of the accused has been there”. Embarrassed by the judgment, the-then CBI Director, R K Raghavan, requested two Special Directors, P C Sharma and G H Achari, to study the judgment. Subsequently the CBI appealed the verdict in Delhi High court in 2000, after which the High Court issued a bailable warrant against the accused.

The case again shot into limelight in 2006 after much media coverage and public bashing (this was mainly due to a similar acquittal in another high profile case though not handled by the CBI). The CBI filed an application for early hearing in July 2006. The High Court subsequently found Santosh Kumar Singh guilty of rape and murder and awarded death sentence for the same in October 2006. Nithari Killings The CBI was given the responsibility of investigating the murders of dozens of children in the Nithari village near Noida, UP.

This was after the local police was found to be incompetent and lethargic in their investigations. The serial killings were in the Indian and international media for weeks since decomposing bodies were found outside the house of the accused Moninder Singh Pandher. Due to political influence he is a free man at present. Dawood Ibrahim case In August 2007, the CBI asked its Pakistani counterpart, the Federal Investigation Agency, for its comments on recent media reports about the detention of Dawood Ibrahim by authorities in Karachi.

Sister Abhaya murder case Sister Abhaya murder case concerns a nun, who was found dead in a water well in Saint Pius X convent hostel in Kottayam, Kerala on 27 March 1992. Altogether there were five CBI inquiries into the murder case so far without any tangible results. The powerful Catholic Lobby had exerted their undue influence to subdue the case as a Priest and a nun were involved. Abhaya had caught them in a compromising position.

Malankara Varghese murder case The Malankara Varghese murder case concerns the death of T. M.

Varghese also known as Malankara Varghese, a member of Malankara Orthodox Church's managing committee and a timber merchant in 5 December 2002. On 9 May 2010 charged Father Varghese Thekkekara, a priest and manager of the Angamali diocese in the rival Jacobite Syrian Christian Church (a part of the Syriac Orthodox Church) with conspiracy in the murder of Malankara Varghese and named him as the prime accused. Till date, the prime accused has not been arrested, CBI is highly being criticized for this by Kerala High Court and Media.

Bhopal gas tragedy The public perceived that CBI was very ineffective in trying the Bhopal gas tragedy case, the former CBI director has now confessed that he asked to remain soft on extraditing the Union Carbide CEO Warren Andreson, and dropped charges including culpable homicide against accused in this case, who received two year sentences. The events resulted in the deaths of more than 15000 people. CHAPTER-6 Articles and Reviews on C. B. I by Various Administrative Experts There is a huge debate that how C. B. I can be made more effective.

Many experts gave their opinion on this issue but due to various political reasons it is unable to draw a conclusion. There is big question of delegation of power to the C. B. I; whether C. B. I should be made autonomous? Or should C. B. I have enough assurance to investigate at any level? Therefore let's have a glance over the various articles written by the ADMINISTRATIVE EXPERTS: SHOULD CBI MADE AN AUTONOMOUS AGENCY? Article written by former CBI director Mr. R. K. Raghavan: Case for an autonomous CBI (THE HINDU, DEC 16, 2010)

Give the agency enough assurance that it can function without fear and it need not be worried about the consequences of speaking the truth.

Thursday's Supreme Court order asking the Central Bureau of Investigation to go ahead with the probe into the 2G scam and to extend it to finding out how the whole matter was handled as far back as in 2001 comes as no surprise. There are a few significant features, either explicit or implied, to the court's directive. First, the plea for forming a Special Investigation Team (SIT) to continue with the CBI-initiated investigation has been rejected.

This is most logical because of the enormity of the probe, which only an organisation like the CBI can undertake. The second feature is the obvious acknowledgement of the highest court's faith in the much-maligned investigating agency. This should come as a shot in the arm for the CBI, which has a brand new Director with a Himalayan reputation for sobriety and honesty. If he cannot deliver the goods, no one can at this juncture. This is an extremely sensitive investigation in which several persons in high places have something or the other to tell the CBI, either on their own or in response to questions from the agency.

Papers available at the Prime Minister's Office may have to be made available to the investigating officer at some stage of the investigation. This is in the context of the allegation that the former Telecom Minister spurned the Prime Minister's wise counsel for fairness and caution in doling out licenses. This could involve senior officials in that office deposing to the chain of correspondence and the responses from the Telecom Ministry. All this will require deft handling, and any heavy-footed work will only invite criticism of an agency that has always been the whipping boy to many.

In passing its order, the Supreme Court did not mince words about how the CBI should be absolutely professional. "Don't be influenced by anybody," is its clear warning to the agency. This is tantamount to a direction that the investigators will have to be wholly apolitical and objective, and should not be overawed by any personality, however high in the hierarchy. This is the acid test that the court has prescribed for the CBI. This is something similar to what Chief Justice J. S. Verma told the CBI in the Hawala case in an almost intimidator tone.

The organisation rose to the occasion and came out with certain findings which resulted in some heads rolling. This is the crux of the matter. Give the CBI enough assurance that it can function without fear and it need not be worried about the consequences of speaking the truth. It is only in such an ambience that the CBI can get to the bottom of the scandal. It has a number of officers who have the right investigating skills and can ferret out facts much needed to bring the offenders to book. They require not only a free hand, but also protection. Or else, they will go only half way.

This brings me to the most vital point, namely, the autonomy of the CBI. What is the point in deriding it as a handmaiden of the ruling party, if you tie its destinies totally to the executive? We, no doubt, need an accountable CBI that will not deviate from the law of the land and will not commit any human rights violation in going about its chores. At the same time, it needs total autonomy from the caprice and malice of a politically-oriented executive. Vested interests want us to believe that autonomy and accountability cannot go together. This is obfuscation of the most condemnable variety.

The judiciary, despite all the setbacks it has suffered recently, is the best bet against a CBI that could act recklessly under political control. The commendable manner in which the Supreme Court has been guiding the spectrum scandal is proof enough that a judiciary-monitored CBI is the kind of mechanism that a nation battered by a tsunami-like wave of corruption needs now. Those who have an entirely different agenda and pay lip service to democratic norms will view such an arrangement, where the CBI is answerable only to the courts, as a dilution of executive authority that the framers of our Constitution did not visualise.

A desperate situation like the one we are now facing demands desperate remedies. And one such remedy is a CBI that stands by itself and derives all its authority from a statute passed by Parliament. I know this is a pipe dream. All political parties across the spectrum (no pun intended) want a subservient investigating agency that would not dare to go against a ruling party functionary when the latter transgresses the law. The Hawala case brought in reform in the form of a fair and objective system of choosing the right candidate for the position of CBI Director and giving him a mandatory two-year term.

Let us hope that the spectrum investigation will, similarly, lead to a more far-reaching reform of giving statutory insularity to the CBI. This cannot happen unless there is the weight of media and public opinion backing the laudable move aimed at lending credibility to the highest investigating agency in the land. For an autonomous CBI (EDITORIAL, TNN Nov 4, 2004) It's shameful that the government has denied CBI permission to proceed against former petroleum minister and Congress leader Satish Sharma and others for their alleged role in a petrol pump scam.

This is reason enough for new legislative steps to make the CBI fully autonomous. Independence of the judiciary is insufficient to ensure justice, if prosecution of criminals depends on arbitrary political choice. The way to shelter innocent functionaries from victimisation via false cases is to have an efficient system of investigation and prosecution, with penal disincentives for malafide allegations. The government should not have the power to decide whom to prosecute and whom to let go scot free. This malaise, however, is not a Congress monopoly.

Then home minister L K Advani, from the “ party with a difference,” was acquitted in September 2003 by a Rae Bareilly-based special court, hearing the Babri Masjid demolition case, just because the CBI ‘ failed’ to file a proper chargesheet. Such accurate failures, indeed, inspire awe, as do the 65-70% conviction rate it manages, probably by catching telephone linemen accused of accepting bribes. The CBI has, clearly been reduced to our average hinterland police thana where networks of patronage and political control override the national good and a fair quest for justice and truth.

What is even more alarming is that the Sharma sensation has occurred even though a 1997 Supreme Court verdict accorded a semblance of autonomy to the CBI by bringing it under the superintendence of the Central Vigilance Commission. Evidently, this bit of judicial activism has not succeeded in making prosecution of crime independent of political meddling. We need to amend the Constitution so that the CBI doesn’t need to seek the permission of the government of the day to prosecute ministerial crimes.

India needs a probe agency completely free of government control and thus politically unpliant. This institution can be made answerable to Parliament, to ensure democratic accountability and guard against abuse by those who man the agency. Is the CBI truly autonomous? (An article by Paranjay Guha Thakurta on website: [www. delhitalks. in](http://www.delhitalks.in)) Is the Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI) truly autonomous? Very few believe that the country’s premier police investigative agency is free from political interference.

Yet, somewhat paradoxically, more people seem to have greater faith in the ability of the CBI (more than state government police agencies) to prosecute

offenders, particularly influential politicians, if not, at least, unearth relevant facts relating to the commission of crimes, including acts of corruption. In the complex case relating to misallocation and undervaluation of second generation telecommunications spectrum, the CBI has not just placed behind bars Andimuthu Raja, former Union minister for communications and information technology, Siddharth Behura, former secretary of the Department of Telecommunications, and R.

K. Chandolia, an official who was close to Mr Raja, the agency has also taken into custody affluent builder Shahid Usman Balwa who controls Etisalat DB (formerly Swan Telecom). And that's not all. The CBI recently interrogated K. Kanimozhi, member of Parliament belonging to the Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam (DMK), and her step-mother Dayalu Ammal, second wife of DMK head Muthuvel Karunanidhi. They were reportedly questioned in connection with the investments made by one of Mr Balwa's companies in Kalaignar TV which is owned by members of the family of the Tamil Nadu chief minister. So, is the CBI truly independent to pursue any line of inquiry it wishes to in the 2G spectrum scam and is it genuinely not afraid to accuse any individual it holds responsible for the scandal, no matter how important she or he might be in the current ruling dispensation? " If indeed the CBI today appears relatively autonomous in conducting its investigations – it has to submit a chargesheet in the spectrum case against certain " unknown" persons that had been registered in October 2009 by the end of March – the people of this country have to be especially thankful to the Supreme Court of India.

After the public interest litigation in the 2G spectrum case (in which this columnist is one of the three petitioners) was dismissed by the Delhi high court, one could scarcely have imagined how proactively the Supreme Court would take the matter up and eventually monitor the CBI's investigations. " Does the way in which the CBI has acted in investigating the spectrum scandal, under the direct supervision of the Supreme Court, suggest that the agency is basking in its newfound freedom? In other words, the CBI may not have displayed the kind of autonomy it has so far if the highest court of the country had not prodded it to act expeditiously and independently.

Interestingly, the fact that the CBI was acting under the directions of the Supreme Court was used by a section of the Congress Party to its advantage while negotiating for seats with the DMK in the run-up to the Assembly elections that have been scheduled for April 13. The CBI is expected to submit a status report on the spectrum case to the Supreme Court today.

Recently, Prime Minister Manmohan Singh had suggested that one of the most important reasons why the government took as long as it did before ensuring that Mr Raja put in his papers – and action was taken against his allegedly criminal acts in depriving the national exchequer of huge amounts of money by manipulating the allocation of scarce and precious electro-magnetic spectrum to mobile telecommunications companies – was the " compulsions of coalition politics" Few were convinced by Dr Singh's arguments because of the arithmetic involved.

The DMK (the second-largest constituent of the ruling United Progressive Alliance coalition) has 18 members in the current Lok Sabha, whereas 34 members of the legislative Assembly of Tamil Nadu belonging to the

Congress have been propped up Mr Karunanidhi's government in Chennai. The obvious question that arises is whether the DMK needs the Congress more than the Congress needs the DMK. The DMK was initially adamant on not giving 63 seats to the Congress in the forthcoming Assembly elections. In fact, the DMK ministers in the Union government had threatened to resign over the seat-allocation dispute.

This is not the first time that Mr Karunanidhi has sought to virtually blackmail the government in New Delhi to abide by his wishes – he had earlier acted in a similar manner and successfully arm-twisted the Atal Behari Vajpayee government as well as the second UPA government. In fact, many argue that Mr Raja's appointment as the telecom minister for a second term in May 2009 was largely a consequence of the “ politics of blackmail” mastered by Mr Karunanidhi. The crucial difference on this occasion was that Mr Karunanidhi had to eat humble pie.

His pressure tactics did not work, not with Congress president Sonia Gandhi nor the Prime Minister. The Congress stuck to its guns and, for a change, the DMK had to backtrack. The Tamil Nadu chief minister's emissaries were clearly told that the Union government would not be able to ensure that the CBI would not interrogate Ms Kanimozhi and Ms Dayalu, something the DMK was clearly keen on avoiding before the elections. But that was not to be. The elderly head of the Tamil Nadu government and his party would be further embarrassed if names of members of the “ first family” of the state find their way into the CBI's chargesheet.

To return to the question that was raised earlier: One would like to believe this is true, but it may be a bit too early to rejoice. Why? Information obtained through an application using the Right to Information Act filed by a news magazine indicates that during 2008 and 2009, the CBI was denied sanction by the Central government to prosecute 23 senior government officers (most of them above the rank of joint secretary) against who charges of corruption had been investigated.

Apart from political cases, the rich people normally go scot-free for various reasons — like influencing the witnesses and better legal aid. As a result, the faith of people in the entire criminal justice system is getting eroded. If this state of affairs is allowed to continue, people will lose faith in the system and take law in their own hands. CHAPTER-7 CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS C. B. I has emerged as a premier investigating agency over the years. Since it establishes in year 1963, it has been gaining strength.

Its three dimensions namely Anti Corruption Division, Economic Offenses Division; Special Crime Division and newly added departments like: Investigation & Anti-Corruption Division (Delhi Special Police Establishment), Technical Division, Crime Records And Statistics Division, Research Division, Legal And General Division. , Administration Division has been handling many crucial cases and as a result has been trusted by many. However, on account of its control by the government, it has lended itself in many controversies.

There have rising demand for its autonomy as some charges of political vendetta and biasness has been leveled against it. Further considering its better conviction rate (66. 2%in 2008 and 67. 9% in 2007), it is still considered as a very effective investigating agency. SUGGESTIONS To improve the Organizational working of C. B. I, following points are being suggested: REGULAR CHECK BY VIGILANCE AGENCIES:- Because of its intensely political overtones, it has been exposed by its former bigwigs like Joginder Singh and BR Lall who were Director and Joint Director respectively, to be engaging in nepotism, mal-prosecution and outright corruption.

In his book, “ Who Owns CBI”, BR Lall, details the modus operandi of manipulating and derailing investigation. According to many experts this organisation has become synonymous with corruption as information obtained under the RTI Act has revealed and even the Top Bosses are known for stooping to illegal fund diversions. Therefore, C. B. I should be under vigilance by agency like Central Vigilance Bureau of India. REMOVE POLITICAL HINDERANCES:- An agency like C. B. I which has so much responsibilities and duties to perform need more authority to overcome political hindrances.

C. B. I should be kept away from political pressures, so as to work more effectively & efficiently. ANSWERABLE ONLY TO CONSTITUTION:- Recent debate on the issue that “ C. B. I should be answerable to the Lokpal” cannot be justified as complexity in the working of C. B. I is increasing rapidly. Therefore it should be only answerable to ‘ CONSTITUTION’ of INDIA. The recommendations of C. B. I should be taken seriously by the government as

C. B. I is one of the most responsible agencies working for govt. of India.

APPROPRIATE FUNDING: – C. B.

I should be funded appropriately for its smooth functioning & should be provided with updated technology to handle hi-tech crimes. AVOID

MALPRACTICES:- C. B. I should not be misused by the party in power to spy on the activities of opponent parties, but to focus on major problems of country like NAXALISM, TERRORISM, and CORRUPTION etc. INCREASE

TRANSPARENCY:- C. B. I should bring more transparency in its working, to gain faith among citizens of India. It should REFERENCES “ Case for an autonomous CBI”; Article written by former CBI director Mr. R. K. Raghavan.

THE HINDU, DEC 16, 2010) “ CBI annual report 2007”. cib. gov. in.

[http://www. cib. gov. in/annualreport/cbi_annual_report_2007. pdf](http://www.cbi.gov.in/annualreport/cbi_annual_report_2007.pdf). “ CBI annual report 2008”. cib. gov. in. [http://www. cib. gov.](http://www.cbi.gov.in/annualreport/cbi_annual_report_2008.pdf)

[in/annualreport/cbi_annual_report_2008. pdf](http://www.cbi.gov.in/annualreport/cbi_annual_report_2008.pdf). “ CBI – Organisation Chart”.

[http://www. cib. gov. in/orgnchart/orgchartnew. htm](http://www.cbi.gov.in/orgnchart/orgchartnew.htm). “ Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI) – India”. [http://www. globalsecurity.](http://www.globalsecurity.org/intell/world/india/cbi.htm)

[org/intell/world/india/cbi. htm](http://www.globalsecurity.org/intell/world/india/cbi.htm). Datta, Saikat. “ Grease On The Lens”. (21 September 2009). outlookindia. com. [http://www. outlookindia. com/article.](http://www.outlookindia.com/article.aspx?261778)
[aspx? 261778](http://www.outlookindia.com/article.aspx?261778). Retrieved 9 October 2010. For an autonomous CBI”.

(EDITORIAL, TNN Nov 4, 2004) “ Is the CBI truly autonomous? ” Article written by Paranjay Guha Thakurta (website: [www. delhitalks. in](http://www.delhitalks.in)) “

Malankara Varghese murder: HC questions CBI”. [expressbuzz. com](http://expressbuzz.com). 1 June 2010. [http://expressbuzz. com/cities/kochi/malankara-varghese-murder-hc-questions-cbi/177965. html](http://expressbuzz.com/cities/kochi/malankara-varghese-murder-hc-questions-cbi/177965.html). Retrieved 9 October 2010. Mohan, Vishwa (27 November 2006). “ Origin of Hawala funds were not traced”. India Times.

<http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/india/Origin-of-hawala-funds-were-not-traced/articleshow.> “ Sr Abhaya murder: CBI Lies in HC kerala”. mathrubhumi.com. <http://mathrubhumi.com/php/news> Venkatesan , J. “ CBI putting pressure on me: Geeta Johri”. The Hindu (29 august 2010). <http://www.hindu.com/2010/08/29/stories/2010082960770100.htm>. Retrieved 9 October 2010. “ Vineet Narain Case, Directions of the Court”. 2 November 2006. <http://cbi.nic.in/Judgements/dsc.htm>. “ Was told to go soft on Warren Anderson: Former CBI official”. NDTV. <http://www.ndtv.com/news/india/was-told-to-go-soft-on-warren-anderson-former-cbi-official-30511.php>. “ Welcome to CBI Academy School of eLearning”. [cbiacademy.gov.n](http://www.cbiacademy.gov.in/). <http://www.cbiacademy.gov.in/>. ANNEXURE-A FORMER DIRECTORS (1961 – PRESENT) Late Sh. D. P. Kohli 01/04/63 – 31/05/68 Sh. F V Arul 31/05/68 – 06/05/71 Sh D. Sen 06/05/71 – 29/03/77 Sh. S N Mathur 29/03/77 – 02/05/77 Sh. C V Narsimhan 02/05/77 – 25/11/77 Sh. John Lobo 25/11/77 – 30/06/79 Shri R D Singh 30/06/79 – 24/01/80 Shri J S Bawa 24/01/80 – 28/02/85 Late Shri M G Katre 28/02/85 – 31/10/89 Dr A P Mukherjee 31/10/89 – 11/01/90 Shri R Sekhar 11/01/90 – 14/12/90 Shri Vijay Karan 14/12/90 – 01/06/92 Shri S K Datta 01/06/92 – 31/07/93 Shri K Vijaya Rama Rao 1/07/93 – 31/07/96 Shri Joginder Singh 31/07/96 – 30/06/97 Shri R C Sharma 30/06/97 – 31/01/98 Shri D R Karthikeyan(acting) 31/01/98 – 31/03/98 Dr. T N Mishra(acting) 31/03/98 – 04/01/99 Dr. R. K. Raghavan 04/01/99 – 30/04/01 Shri PC Sharma 30/04/01 – 06/12/03 Shri U S Misra 06/12/03-06/12/05 Shri Vijay Shanker 12/12/05-31/07/08 A. P. Singh 31/07/08-present ANNEXURE –B CBI SENIOR OFFICERS Director CBI A. P. Singh Indian Police Service (Jharkhand Cadre, 1974 Batch) DIRECTOR , CBI, INDIA Special Director Balwinder Singh Indian Police Service (Andhra Pradesh Cadre, 1976 Batch)

Chennai Zone, Hyderabad Zone, Mumbai-I Zone, Mumbai-II Zone, BS Zone, Economic Offence Zone Special Director Vineet K. Gupta Indian Police Service (Gujarat Cadre, 1977 Batch) Chandigarh Zone, Delhi Zone, Bhopal Zone, Anti-Corruption Zone, Lucknow Zone Additional Director K. Saleem Ali Indian Police Service (Manipur Tripura Cadre, 1978 Batch) Special Crime Zone, Kolkata Zone, Gauhati Zone, Patna Zone, STF & MDMA Zone, Joint Director – Chennai Ashok Kumar Indian Police Service (Tamil Nadu Cadre, 1982 Batch) ACB-Chennai, ACB-Cochin, SCB-Thiruvanthapuram, SCB-Chennai, EOW-Chennai

Joint Director -Lucknow, Patna Javeed Ahmad Indian Police Service (Uttar Pradesh Cadre, 1984 Batch) ACB-Lucknow, ACB-Dehradun, ACB-Ghaziabad, SCB Lucknow ACB-Patna, AHD-Patna, ACB-Ranchi, AHD-Ranchi, ACB-Dhanbad Joint Director -BS Indian Police Service (Manipur Tripura Cadre, 1984 Batch) BS Delhi. BS Kolkata, BS Mumbai, BS Bangalore Joint Director –Delhi H. C. Awasthy Indian Police Service (Uttar Pradesh Cadre, 1985 Batch) ACB-Delhi, ACB-Jaipur, ACB-Jodhpur Joint Director –EOO. P. Galhotra Indian Police Service (Rajasthan Cadre, 1985 Batch)

EO-I, EO-II, EO-III Joint Director -Mumbai-1 Rishi Raj Singh Indian Police Service (Kerala Cadre, 1985 Batch) ACB-Mumbai, ACB-Nagpur, ACB-Pune, ACB-Goa Joint Director -Policy A. K. Pateria Indian Police Service (Madhya Pradesh Cadre, 1986 Batch) Policy Division, SU-I, SU-II, Vigilance Cell, Media & Communication Joint Director -SCR. P. Agrawal Indian Police Service (Assam-Meghalaya Cadre, 1986 Batch) SC-I, SC-II, SC-III Joint Director – TFCKeshav Kumar Indian Police Service (Gujarat Cadre, 1986 Batch) CFSL, IPCU, System Division, Technical Advisory Unit

Joint Director –Administration R. K. Tandon Indian Police Service (Madhya Pradesh Cadre, 1988 Batch) Administration, Training Joint Director -Ac Prabodh Kumar Indian Police Service (Punjab Cadre, 1988 Batch) AC-I, AC-II, AC-III Joint Director -Mumbai-IIP. Kandaswamy Indian Police Service (Tamil Nadu Cadre, 1989 Batch) ACB-Gandhinagar, SCB-Mumbai, EOW-Mumbai Joint Director -MDMA, Chandigarh Anil Palta Indian Police Service (Jharkhand Cadre, 1990 Batch) MDMA-Delhi, MDMA-Chennai ACB-Chandigarh, SCB-Chandigarh, Shimla Branch, ACB-Jammu, Srinagar Branch. Joint Director – Hyderabad V.

V Laxminarayana Indian Police Service (Maharashtra Cadre, 1990 Batch) ACB-Hyderabad, ACB-Bangalore, ACB-Visakhapatnam Joint Director – STF Rajeev Sharma Indian Police Service (Rajasthan Cadre, 1990 Batch) STF-Delhi, STF-Mumbai Director of Prosecution Abdul Aziz Indian Legal Service Legal Division ANNEXURE-C CBI Network Zone / Branch Name Postal Address Contact Nos. Email Mobile No. for SMS Jurisdiction (Division / Districts) CBI HEAD OFFICE Plot No 5-B, CGO Complex, Lodhi Road, New Delhi-110003 EPABX Board Nos: 011-24360422, 011-24360334, 011-24360275, 011-24360276 DELHI ZONE

DELHI ZONE Plot No 5-B, 10th Floor, B-Wing, CGO Complex, New Delhi-110003 011-24360213, 011-24363513 (FAX) hozdel[at]cbi[dot]gov[dot]in 098717-94027, 099680-81218, 099680-81216 State of Rajasthan and Delhi ACB Delhi Plot No 5-B, 1st Floor, A -Wing, CGO Complex, New Delhi-110003 011-24367887, 011-24361536, 011-24363460 hobacdel[at]cbi[dot]gov[dot]in 9650094204 All over Delhi ACB Jaipur 1, Tilak Marg, C Scheme, Jaipur-302005 0141-2228315

hobacjpr[at]cbi[dot]gov[dot]in 094133-44004, 094133-44005 Jaipur, Sikar, Jhunjhunu, Bharatpur, Dholpur, Alwar, Dausa, Kota, Baran, SawaiModhopur, Karauli, Bundi, Jhalawar, Ajmer.

ACB Jodhpur Near Gokulji Ki Pyau, LalSagar, MagraPunjala, Jodhpur-342304 (Rajasthan) 0291-2574142, 0291-2574143, 0291-2574144 Fax : 0291-2574145 hobacjdh[at]cbi[dot]gov[dot]in 094133-14635, 094133-44003 Jodhpur, Churu, Baswara, Jaisalmer, Jalore, Dungarpur, Barmer, Bhilwara, Nagaur, Sriganganagar, Rajsamand, Udaipur, Hanumangarh, Chittorgarh. BHOPAL ZONE BHOPAL ZONE AnveshanParisar, Charimli, Bhopal-462016 0755-2430313, 0755-2430303 hozbpl[at]cbi[dot]gov[dot]in 094260-00070 State of Madhya Pradesh .

ACB Bhopal AnveshanParisar, Char Imli, Bhopal-462016 0755-2430313, 0755-2430303 hobacbpl[at]cbi[dot]gov[dot]in 094256-00070 Alirajpur, Ashoknagar, Barwani, Betul, Bhind, Bhopal, Burhanpur, Datia, Dewas, Dhar, Guna, Gwalior, Harda, Hoshangabad, Jhabua, Indore, Khandwa, Khargone, Mandsaur, Morena, Neemuch, Raisen, Rajgarh, Ratlam, Sehore, Shajapur, Sheopur, Shivpuri, Ujjain, Vidisha. 30 Districts of Madhaya Pradesh) ACB Jabalpur CARVAS Commercial Complex, Block-A, IInd Floor, 15 Civil Lines, Jabalpur 482001 (MP) 0761-2679222, 0761-2679111 hobacjbp[at]cbi[dot]gov[dot]in 094256-00091 Balaghat, Chhindwara, Chhattarpur, Jabalpur, Katni, Sagar, Satna, Shahdol, Sidhi, Seoni, Tikamgarh, Narsinghpur, Rewa, Umaria, Panna, Mandla, Dindori, Damoh. ACB Chhattisgarh Bungalow No – 4, Street No-15, Sector – 9, Bhilai, Distt.

Durg, Chhattisgarh-490009. 0788-2242900 hobaccg[at]cbi[dot]gov[dot]in
094258-05672 Bilaspur, Dantewara, Dhamtari, Durg, Bastar, Janjgir-Champa,
Jashpur, Kanker, Korba, Koriya, Kabirdham, Mahasamund, Raigarh, Raipur,
Rajnandgoan, Surguja, Narayanpur, Bijapur. LUCKNOW ZONE LUCKNOW
ZONE 7, Nawal Kishore Road, Hazratganj, Lucknow-226001 0522-2622985
hozlko[at]cbi[dot]gov[dot]in 094154-00002 All over Uttar Pradesh and
Uttarakhand.

ACB Lucknow7, Nawal Kishore Road, Hazratganj, Lucknow-226001 0522-
2622985 hobaclko[at]cbi[dot]gov[dot]in 094150-12635 The 45 districts
covered are Allahabad, Azamgarh, Ambedkar Nagar, Bhadohi, Ballia,
Barabanki, Balrampur, Behraich, Basti, Banda, Chandauli, Deoria, Etawah,
Faizabad, Fatehpur, Gonda, Gorakhpur, Ghazipur, Hamirpur, Hardoi, Jhansi,
Jalaun, Jaunpur, Kanpur, Kanpur Dehat, K