Paving the Way Forward in the Fight Against Police Torture in Pakistan
THE UNITED NATIONS CONVENTION AGAINST TORTURE AND POLICE TORTURE IN PAKISTAN

“Torture is illegal in customary international law, illegal on 193 countries of the United Nations. Torture is immoral and it just doesn’t work, and the existence of torture demeans all of us, not just the perpetrators but it demeans societies that permit it to happen. The paradox is it’s all too prevalent.” – Ambassador Jones Perry

“Endemic, widespread and systematic practice of torture in Pakistan” – UN Special Rapporteur on Torture

“The evil practice of torture in custody is endemic.”
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ABSTRACT

The sample consists of 117 police officers and 117 members of the public. The questionnaire used was developed from ‘Police Community Violence in Nigeria’ (2000). We set out to determine whether there was any correlation between the level of education and awareness about the Convention Against Torture and reporting mechanisms of torture amongst the public and the police. We ran a data analysis for frequency distribution, pie charts and bar charts through SPSS. Results show that there is no correlation and that the root causes of torture will have to be addressed including changes in the criminal justice system, in particular the police force. This study has implications for the legal community, law-makers, civil society and the police force itself.

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this report is to raise awareness about police torture in Pakistan. In this research, we seek to evaluate the existing level of awareness about the Convention Against Torture, reporting mechanisms of torture and explore in some detail the police-public relationship and make recommendations towards eliminating the practice of torture.

Torture is defined in the United Nations Convention Against Torture in the following language:

Any act by which severe pain or suffering, whether physical or mental, is intentionally inflicted on a person for such purposes as obtaining from him or a third person information or a confession, punishing him for an act he or a third person committed or is suspected of having committed, or intimidating or
coercing him or a third person, or for any reason based on discrimination of any kind, when such pain or suffering is inflicted by or at the instigation of or with the consent or acquiescence of a public official or other person acting in an official capacity. It does not include pain or suffering arising only from, inherent in or incidental to lawful sanctions.

In the words of the United Nations Special Rapporteur on Torture, “there’s a sort of resignation that torture is inevitable. Torture is absolutely prohibited and it doesn’t recognize any excuse because of states of emergency or any excuse… And here torture among all other human rights violations is unique in international law because a single event gives rise to the obligation to investigate, prosecute and punish…” Mendez

The first step is to recognize police torture as a crime, to understand the severity of this crime and to fully comprehend the extent to which it is prevalent. The problem with police torture currently is that in many instances it is not viewed as a criminal activity. It is considered by both members of the police and public to fall within the ambit of duties to be carried out by police officers. At several forums, the renowned human rights activist and lawyer, Hina Jilani, has suggested that our law should make provisions for crimes committed by the State against its people, not just crimes against the state. This section of the proposed law should include torture along with forced disappearances and other illegal activities of that nature. She also suggested that the police are not the only perpetrators of torture. Intelligence and other agencies that have custodial powers are also implicit in this crime. While the definition of torture includes public official or other person acting in an official capacity, our research study focuses on police torture specifically. We developed two separate questionnaires – one for the public and another for police officials – with the goal of assessing the level of awareness existing about the Convention Against Torture, the prevalence of torture in Pakistan and existing mechanisms to report torture.
The first step in recognizing torture is to define it clearly. A simple way to define torture would be to adopt the language of UNCAT that Pakistan ratified in 2010. One of the problems with that approach might be that Pakistan made several reservations about the ratification of CAT. However, reservations with regard to Articles 3, 4, 6, 12, 13 and 16 were withdrawn in 2011. The remaining reservation regarding Article 8 need not affect the language that defines torture in domestic law since extradition, which is the subject of Article 8 can be easily left out. The purpose behind coming up with a clear and concise definition of torture in domestic law is to facilitate the process of its criminalization and its public recognition as a heinous crime.

As far as domestic legislation is concerned, Article 14 (2) of the Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan states: “No person shall be subjected to torture for the purpose of extracting evidence.” The definition of torture is not elaborated upon in the Constitution. The Pakistan Penal Code comes closest to criminalizing torture in Section 337 –K: Causing hurt to extort confession, or to compel restoration of property.

Whoever causes hurt for the purpose of extorting from the sufferer or any person interested in the sufferer any confession or any information which may lead to the detection of any offence or misconduct, or for the purpose of constraining the sufferer, or any person interested in the sufferer, to restore or to cause the restoration of, any property or valuable security or to satisfy any claim or demand, or to give information which may lead to the restoration of any property, or valuable security shall, in addition to the punishment of qisas, arsh or daman, as the case may be, provided for the kind of hurt caused, with imprisonment of either description for a term which may extend to ten years as ta’zir.

In the questionnaires we handed out to the public and police, we asked for suggestions that might help improve the system in favor of the public. Our contention is that the problem of police torture neither starts nor ends with the police. The Supreme Court Bar Association of Pakistan, under the leadership of Asma Jahangir, organized an international conference titled “Justice for
All, Impunity for None” where several experts voiced their concerns about the inherent flaws in the criminal justice system as it stands. Many a time, police officers are acting under strict orders from higher ups including politicians and military officers and risk losing their jobs or worse if they do anything but comply.

**Pakistan’s obligations under the United Nations Convention against Torture**

There are certain legal obligations Pakistan has to fulfill with regard to criminalization of torture. There is an obligation to set up national monitoring bodies that can go to police stations and speak with detainees. That would have a strong deterrent effect. The National Human Resource Commission should be created under the Paris Principles and be given a separate mandate to carry out investigations.

Pakistan has an obligation to report to the Commission Against Torture, but our reporting procedure is the weakest. The report is to be submitted by the Ministry of Human Rights. The Independent Media of Pakistan could participate in the meeting in Geneva that is open to the public and submit a report on dialogue that’s going on in the country. The Parliament, NGO’s, National Human Rights organizations can all get involved in writing a shadow report and making strategic recommendations to the Government.

As of now, torture has not been criminalized as defined in CAT. Section 154 allows for the filing of an FIR and Article 12 lays out judges’ obligation to order an investigation. Currently, there is
no crime of torture recognized by domestic law, no proper complaint mechanism or investigation. The idea is to keep police custody as short as possible, no longer than 48 hours. There should be video/audio recordings of interrogations, and certain legal safeguards in place at the initial stages including quick access to the individual’s doctor and family and ensure that their lawyer is present during the interrogation. Perhaps we could borrow from India’s Antitorture statute.

Eradication of torture as a systematic practice is a huge task and we are going to have to take a step-by-step approach to fight against impunity. We must explore possibilities other than torture to investigate crime. At the prosecution level, police and prosecutors should cooperate. We need to set up an Independent Prosecutor Office that specifically prosecutes crimes against police only. Preventive measures include the introduction of modern mechanisms in investigation including forensics.

**Police Order 2002 – Forward and Back**

In Pakistan, the Police Order of 2002 replaced the Police Act of 1861. This was later amended in 2004. The Pakistan Police Order of 2002 proposed the establishment of Public Safety Commissions at the federal, provincial and district levels. One of the important functions of the commissions at the provincial and district levels is to “take steps to prevent the Police from engaging in any unlawful activity arising out of compliance with unlawful or mala fide orders” **Police Order (Second Amendment) Ordinance, 2005**. According to the Human Rights Commission of Pakistan, the “reluctance of the political executive to accept the reforms propounded in the
Order of 2002 led first to the dilution of its original provisions and later to its tardy and halfhearted implementation. The commissions at different levels are yet to be established fully.”

Revisiting Police Laws - Human Rights Commission of Pakistan

The Police Order of 2002, no longer in force, put safeguards in place to prevent torture by police officials. The relevant section reads as follows:

**156. Penalty for vexatious entry, search, arrest, seizure of property, torture, etc.** Whoever, being a police officer –

(a) without lawful authority, or reasonable cause, enters or searches or causes to be searched any building, vessel, tent or place;

(b) vexatiously and unnecessarily seizes the property of any person;

(c) vexatiously and unnecessarily detains, searches or arrests any person; or

(d) inflicts torture or violence to any person in his custody; shall, for every such offence, on conviction, be punished with imprisonment for a term, which may extend to five years and with fine.

The commissions are also authorized to receive public complaints, inquire or get the inquiry done and recommend appropriate action. According to the Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative Newsletter published in spring of 2005:

The Police Order 2002 envisaged the establishment of Police Complaints Authorities to inquire into citizens’ complaints against misconduct or negligence of duty. Unfortunately, the Amendment Ordinance of 2004 merged them with the Public Safety Commissions at provincial and district levels. The reason behind the amalgamation is unclear, unless it has been guided solely by economic considerations. The reason becomes denser when one finds that the Police Complaints Authority has been retained in its original form as a separate independent body at the federal level, while it is mainly at the provincial and district levels that people interact with their police closely and it is at that level
that most complaints against police personnel arise. Police Reforms in Pakistan: 
A Step Forward

Amongst some other important institutions that the Police Order 2002 establishes are the 
Criminal Justice Commission at the district level to review the functioning of the system and the 
National Police Management Board at the federal level to develop standards and advise the 
governments in that country on police matters.

There seems to be no real consensus on the issue of whether the Police Order of 2002 was all 
good or all bad. Some dissenting voices like Mukhtar Ahmed Ali’s raise concerns about bringing 
District Judge and Police officials on the same forum of Criminal Justice Coordination 
Committee as envisaged under the Order. To him the District Judge holding meetings with 
District Jail Superintendent, District Coordination Officer and District Police Officer and 
discussing issues which may also come up in the court for resolution, could be problematic. 
According to him there might arise situations involving conflict of interest.

Mr. Khosa thought otherwise; in his mind since the District and Sessions Judge is envisaged as 
the top man of the criminal justice system, he is in the best position to monitor the criminal 
justice system, all others, including the DPO, DCO etc. in the coordination committee are 
subservient to him. So he thought there should be no problem. DPSCs had some power in 2002 
where police officers could be suspended for carrying out offences such as torture. The 
amendments in 2004 made the DPSC ineffective as the power of suspension was withdrawn.

107 (d) inflicts torture or violence to any person in his custody; shall, for every such offence, 
on conviction, be punished with imprisonment for a term, which may extend to five years 
and with fine.
According to Asad Jamal, a human rights lawyer, the amendments in 2004 made the DPSC ineffective as the power of suspension was withdrawn. In his opinion, the merger of PSCs and Complaints Authority, which according to the original scheme were to be independent institutions, came as a great blow. Control of the SHO over investigations, for example, was a step backwards. The commissions were not much use in a case where the role of PSC is merely recommendatory as they cannot compel the police to act on their findings and recommendations.

A related issue was highlighted by Mr. I. A. Rehman who was of the opinion that a rather inexpensive and accessible accountability mechanism was provided under the Police Act, 1861 as the district magistrate acted as a barrier to the police excesses, which was removed by the Police Order, 2002 without providing an effective and efficient alternative. He expressed his disagreement with the way the commissions and committees are required to be composed and work. He thought civil society organizations such as trade unions need to be more involved in the functioning of PSC. Speaking from his experience and observation of the Bonded Labor System (Abolition) Act under which Vigilance Committees have been formed in which each member could initiate a proceeding, he was of the opinion that every member should be so empowered that he/she in her own capacity can take effective steps to redress public complaints. Only in this way can the reform process be taken further.

A complaint authority, that is to function separately from the NSPC at the federal level as prescribed by the Order, has not yet been established and this is a significant failing. Courts are hesitant to take any action against police officials and as a result the public suffer badly. In
addition, people with resources are above the law and use the police to their advantage. Therefore, the creation of an independent complaints body is crucial towards accountability of the police. Under the amendments there are several substantive issues that have been changed for the negative (such as composition of the PSCs, SHOs role in investigations, non-binding element of PSC recommendations, merger of complaints and PSCs).

In a paper, the President of the Pakistan Society of Criminology, Fasihuddin, states the following about the Police Order 2002:

There is a totally erroneous impression deliberately being disseminated by certain vested quarters that The Police Order 2002 is no more in the field and each Province is free to enact its own Police Act. The correct position is that the only thing that has changed is that the Parliament can now amend The Police Order 2002 without prior sanction of the President, and even a Provincial Assembly can make minor amendments to meet any local and special requirements with the approval of the Prime Minister. No Provincial Assembly can change the substantive provisions of The Police Order 2002, the power for which rests exclusively with the Parliament. In any case if a Provincial Assembly enacts a law or an amendment that is repugnant to Police Order 2002, the provisions of The Police Order shall prevail, being the Federal law (Article 143 of the Constitution).

While there is no doubt that police torture is prevalent and is absolutely inexcusable and should be properly criminalized, this report goes a little bit beyond to try and understand why the practice of police torture is prevalent. We hope also to delve into some approaches that if adopted might help society in addressing this menace. We must not underestimate the importance of raising awareness about police torture and exploring opportunities to improve ties between the public and police. A complete overhaul of the system is necessary. We need to change the way the public views the police and how the police deal with the public.
Manfred Nowak, Former UN Special Rapporteur on Torture, on his last visit to Pakistan, made the following recommendations on how to eradicate torture:-

- Absolute prohibition on torture.
- No incommunicado detention.
- Central register of detainees.
- Right to see lawyers, judge and family.
- Keep police custody to a minimum, no longer than 48 hours. Separation from investigators.
- Recording of interrogations (audio/video) in presence of a lawyer.
- Systematic review of interrogation rules.
- Inadmissibility of evidence obtained under torture.
- Pre-trial detention to be kept to a minimum.
- Full medical examination.
- Ensure adequate facilities and good conditions of prisons.
- Regular, independent, preventive monitoring.
- Prompt and impartial investigations.

At the same conference, Hina Jilani stated that ratification of the Convention Against Torture is neither the beginning, nor the end; that torture is one of the most serious areas of concern for the International Human Rights Community. It is the obligation and duty of the state to protect the citizens under its jurisdiction. Torture is a policy of governance in Pakistan. It is public enemy number one. Victims of torture should receive support and the issue should receive the political and social attention that it deserves. There should be an announcement of a policy of not tolerance from all state institutions. Ms. Jilani asked for a road map of measures that officials plan to take that should include a mechanism for complaints and accountability should be stepped up. Deterrence and prevention measures should include the criminalization of torture and labeling this practice as the greatest form of misconduct.
I.A. Rehman, the Secretary General of HRCP, during a conference on Torture stated that the dignity of person is the only right that is absolute and this is the right that is abused most of all. There must be a zero tolerance policy for torture. Absolutely, under no circumstances would it ever be okay to torture a person no matter who commands or orders that the crime of torture be perpetrated on any given person for any reason whatsoever.

According to Kamran Arif, a human rights activist and lawyer, the police either don’t have the resources, the training or the inclination to conduct proper, scientific investigation. There has to be a commitment, he said at a conference on torture, to wean lower level police officers off the practice of torture. He said that the law, practice and attitudes of lawyers and judges must also change if we are to take the metaphoric bull of torture by the horns. Many lawyers, he said, cannot distinguish between torture and violence. Individually, in their Training Manual on Reporting on Torture for the print media clearly distinguish between the definitions of violence and torture. Perhaps this manual should be made available more widely as an information resource especially for those in the legal profession.

**Code of Conduct for Law Enforcement Officials**

SEHER’s Project Completion Report on “Ending Torture Against Women in Police Custody” in Sibi and Quetta Districts January to May 2007 lays out the ideal functions of Police according to International Rules:

- To prevent and control conduct widely recognized as threatening to life and property
- To aid individuals who are in danger of physical harm, such as the victims of violent attack
- To facilitate the movement of people and vehicles
- To assist those who cannot care for themselves, the intoxicated, the addicted, the mentally ill, the physically disabled, the old, and the young
• To resolve conflict, whether it be between individuals, groups or individuals, or individuals and their government
• To identify problems that have the potential for becoming more serious problems
• To create and maintain a feeling of security in communities

The crux of this list can be condensed to the following three main points:

1) To safeguard and protect human dignity
2) The Police is the Guardian and Custodian of Law
3) To Provide safety and protection to the lives and assets of the citizens

These guidelines need to become a part of police officers’ training if we are to change the way they think about their profession and the manner in which they deal with the public.
METHODOLOGY

Research Design
Cross-sectional exploratory research design.

Sampling strategy
Purposive sampling strategy was used.

Sample
The sample consisted of N = 117 police officers
(n = 100 males, n=17 females).

The sample consisted of N = 117 members of the public
(n = 62 male, n = 55 female).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>f (Frequency)</th>
<th>%age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>57.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-49</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gender of Police Officers \( (n=117) \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>f (Frequency)</th>
<th>%age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>85.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Education of Police Officers (n=117)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>f (Frequency)</th>
<th>% in Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informal Education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matriculation</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate or Technical Training</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>50.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.L.B.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>117</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Designation of Police Officers (n=117)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>f (Frequency)</th>
<th>%age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constable</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>71.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASI/SI</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>f (Frequency)</td>
<td>%age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than two years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 years</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 years</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 20 years</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Demographic characteristics of public sample (n = 117)

The table below shows the distribution of the participants across different age groups:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>f (Frequency)</th>
<th>%age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-24</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>57.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-49</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gender of Participants ($n=117$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>f (Frequency)</th>
<th>%age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>53.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Education of Participants *(n=117)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>f (Frequency)</th>
<th>%age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non formal (Religious Literacy Class/Adult Education)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary School</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary/Technical/Teacher's College</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Secondary (Polytechnic, College of Education, University)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>72.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>117</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Occasion of Participants (n=117)

- Unemployed: 55 (47.0%)
- Farming/Petty Trading/Self Employed/Artisan: 4 (3.4%)
- Driver/Moto Park Assistants/Driver's Union Officials: 4 (3.4%)
- Junior Staff (of Government Agencies and Companies): 1 (0.9%)
- Intermediate Staff (of Government Agencies and Companies): 5 (4.3%)
- Senior Staff (of Government Agencies and Companies): 5 (4.3%)
- Businessman/Self Employed Professional: 11 (9.4%)
- Others: 32 (27.4%)
- Total: 117 (100.0%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>f (Frequency)</th>
<th>%age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming/Petty Trading/Self Employed/Artisan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver/Moto Park Assistants/Driver's Union Officials</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Staff (of Government Agencies and Companies)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate Staff (of Government Agencies and Companies)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Staff (of Government Agencies and Companies)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businessman/Self Employed Professional</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>f (Frequency)</td>
<td>%age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than two years</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 years</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 20 years</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROCEDURE

Permission was sought from CLEEN Foundation, formerly known as the Center for Law Enforcement Education to use their questionnaires for the police and public. The questionnaire was edited, some questions added, others changed or deleted to make it more pertinent to the study at hand. The questionnaire was then translated into Urdu. Five police stations around Lahore were identified (Garden Town, Model Town and Gulberg for their central location and the population size they serve, Race Course because it is the only women’s police station in the city and Harbanspura because it is a particularly high crime area) and 117 (100 male, 17 female) questionnaires were distributed to police officers of varying ranks and age groups. 117 (62 male, 55 female) questionnaires were distributed amongst mostly the youth and university students of Lahore. The participants were all informed that their responses would remain anonymous and that they need not identify themselves on the questionnaires. After collecting the data, statistical analysis was conducted using SPSS to analyze the data and generate tables and figures.
RESULTS

Are you familiar with the United Nations Convention Against Torture?
Are you aware of existing mechanisms of reporting police torture?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAT?</th>
<th>f  (Frequency)</th>
<th>%age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>74.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>97.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Awareness about UNCAT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Torture reporting mechanisms</th>
<th>f (Frequency)</th>
<th>%age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>80.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>96.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Are you aware of existing laws on torture and mechanisms for reporting torture?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Been Harsh</th>
<th>f (Frequency)</th>
<th>%age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>70.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Awareness about torture reporting mechanisms

- Yes: 83%
- No: 17%
9.5% of the research participants from the police force admit to often being harsh towards the public. 3.4% say they are sometimes harsh in their dealings with the public. 71.6% say they are rarely harsh and 14.7% claim to have never been harsh in their dealings with the public. An overwhelming majority of police officers, therefore, say that they are either never or rarely harsh with the public in the course of their duty. These numbers do not match up when the same question is put to the public. There could be several possible explanations for the discrepancy. Whether or not the police officers are being truthful, the question of perception is an important one.

### Used Force

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Used Force</th>
<th>f (Frequency)</th>
<th>%age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>49.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.6% of police officers admit to using physical force often and 4.3% say they sometimes use physical force. However, 49.6% say they rarely use physical force and 42.7% claim to never have used physical force. Though in some ways there is cultural acceptance for the use of force by the police, it appears to be the case that police officers are either of the legal sanctions against the abuse of force or consider it morally reprehensible. These are some of the reasons why the vast majority’s answers do not match the reality as we are told by the public.

### Gun

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gun</th>
<th>f (Frequency)</th>
<th>%age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>60.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
60.7% of police officers admit that they sometimes threaten suspects with a gun and 29.1% claim they never have. 6.8% rarely threaten a suspect with a gun, but a significant percentage (2.6%) say they always threaten suspects with a gun. Is there perhaps an understanding in the police force that threatening with a weapon is a legitimate use of power?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>f (Frequency)</th>
<th>%age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>81.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18.8% of police officers feel that being sworn at is enough provocation to justify the beating of an accused. The Code of Conduct for the Police lists patience as one of the necessary requirements of the profession. However, in interviews some officers cite harsh working conditions, low wages and long hours as some of the reasons why police officers behave the way they do.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>f (Frequency)</th>
<th>%age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>54.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>99.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
44.8% of police officers who filled out the questionnaires believe that it is okay to beat the accused if they first beat you (the policeman/woman) while 55.2% do not believe that is a good enough excuse.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arrest Warrant</th>
<th>f (Frequency)</th>
<th>%age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>96.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The vast majority of police officers (91.2%) do not think that a demand to see an arrest warrant is sufficient cause to perpetrate violence against the inquisitor but 8.8% think that it is.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Misbehaves</th>
<th>f (Frequency)</th>
<th>%age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>99.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approximately 1/3 of the police officers believe that if an accused misbehaves with a police officer, s/he should be beaten up by the police. The term ‘misbehave’ was not defined so it is not clear what exactly it meant to the police officers filling out the questionnaires. Results show that ‘misbehavior’ is considered less provoking than verbal abuse (18.8%) and physical beating (48.8%). Exploring this question further might make for an interesting psychological study that evaluates emotional and physical reactions to ‘misbehavior’ and all that it constitutes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
<td>99.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This question is arguably about the lawful use of force while arresting a suspect. The respondents seem to be divided down the middle (48% and 52%) on this question. This question like many others in the questionnaire hint towards a lack of differentiation between violence and torture, legal and illegal use of force.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Govt. Protest</th>
<th>f (Frequency)</th>
<th>%age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>71.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>98.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In detailed responses to the questionnaire where police officers were asked for recommendations, many asked for better equipment/facilities etc. including protection during protests.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Run Away</th>
<th>f (Frequency)</th>
<th>%age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>65.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>99.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
66.4% of police officers believe that if an accused resists arrest s/he should be beaten up. The responses to most of these questions seem to be based on ethical considerations and/or socially/culturally acceptable practices. There does not seem to be a clear understanding of the code of conduct for the police force. Essential training on acceptable and unacceptable police practices do not seem to be a part of the core education of police officers. It seems to be the case that senior officers are granted more opportunities to learn from other systems and interact with more of a variety of personnel. Lower rank officers, the ones who deal most frequently and most closely with the public, are almost never given the same exposure as their seniors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Argues</th>
<th>f (Frequency)</th>
<th>%age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>87.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>97.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.5% of police officers believe it is okay to beat up an accused who constantly argues with the police. Argument is enough to provoke violence in the form of physical beating. This is problematic and reflects on the lack of patience and tolerance on the part of police officers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abusive Language</th>
<th>f (Frequency)</th>
<th>%age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>99.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>99.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It seems to be the case that police officers are a little bit more cautious when it comes to the use of guns. Even in torture cases, the torture is usually stopped when it becomes apparent that the victim might die or the techniques/type of torture employed is designed in a way to minimize the chance of death. However, the research shows that there exist officers, if in small numbers, who
do not hesitate to use a gun on the slightest excuse. This is highly problematic and indeed an alarming situation. Police officers’ training, oversight and the system of checks and balances, punishment and reprimand should ensure that a police officer never uses or threatens to use a gun unless absolutely mandated by the law. De-weaponization of the police force is one of the suggestions that came forth but it has to go hand in hand with the de-weaponization of the public.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Govt. Protest</th>
<th>f (Frequency)</th>
<th>%age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>94.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>98.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The vast majority of the respondents do not believe that protests against the government should be a cause for firing at the public. Interviews with police officers and members of the legal community reveal that torture is usually employed in cases of robbery. There is a pressure to recover the stolen goods and no technology or resources available to make that discovery without resorting to torture to elicit a confession. This is the excuse that police officers and some among the legal fraternity cite. The excuse, any excuse is unacceptable, but it forces us to address some of the root causes of the problem of police torture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beaten</th>
<th>f (Frequency)</th>
<th>%age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>90.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>99.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.6% of the police officers said that they had been beaten by the accused. The question does not elicit an explanation of the facts surrounding the incident. A detailed study of this question might be helpful in further exploring the police-public relationship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNCAT?</th>
<th>f (Frequency)</th>
<th>%age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>54.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>96.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

43% of the police officers answered in the affirmative when asked if they were familiar with the United Nations Convention Against Torture as opposed to 57% who said that they were not. A further question that should have been added to the questionnaire would have asked the police officers to define torture to determine whether or not they understood what CAT stood for. It appears to be the case that trainings that would include information on UNCAT for example are made available to senior level officers compared to junior staff whereas the reality is that it is the lower-level officers who have more direct contact with the public and are the more likely perpetrators of torture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tortured</th>
<th>f (Frequency)</th>
<th>%age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>90.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>97.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7% of the police officers confess that they are guilty of torturing people. 93% say they have never tortured anyone. Given that the sample size was small (117) and based on 5 police stations of Lahore there is a fair chance that this percentage is lower than the expected average for the country or even the province of Punjab.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inform Senior</th>
<th>f (Frequency)</th>
<th>%age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>86.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>95.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.8% of the police officers who were a part of this research study said yes when asked whether they had ever reported a case of police torture to a senior police officer. Given the conceivable dangers of reporting a fellow officer to a senior officer, this number is not as small as one would expect. The reporting was done via sms (text messaging), which makes it unclear whether or not it was anonymous.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Torture Reported</th>
<th>f (Frequency)</th>
<th>%age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>74.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>97.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23.7% of the police officers said that complaints against police torture were registered in their police stations. Registering an F.I.R. – First Instance Report – at a police station remains the only
recourse most people have to report police torture. This system is fraught with problems for obvious reasons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Should torture continue?</th>
<th>f (Frequency)</th>
<th>%age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>92.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>95.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

96.4% of police officers believe that the practice of torture should not be continued. This is heartening because where there is acceptance of something as unacceptable, there is hope that things can change. This research shows that the majority of police officers believe that torture should stop. We should look to ways to make this dream a reality.
Effect of Education on the Awareness of Police about Convention Against Torture (CAT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Informal M(SD)</th>
<th>Primary M(SD)</th>
<th>Matric M(SD)</th>
<th>Inter M(SD)</th>
<th>Grad. M(SD)</th>
<th>L.L.B M(SD)</th>
<th>M.A M(SD)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAT</td>
<td>1(0.00)</td>
<td>2(-)</td>
<td>1.50(.51)</td>
<td>1.65(.48)</td>
<td>1.5(.58)</td>
<td>1.00(-)</td>
<td>1.5(.71)</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CAT=Convention Against Torture, Informal=Informal Education, Primary=Primary School, Inter=Intermediate or Technical Training, Grad=Graduation

One-way ANOVA was carried out to find out the difference in awareness about CAT in different educational groups. The results in the above table show that there is no significant difference in the awareness about CAT in people with different educational levels. It can be inferred from the results that there is no effect of education on awareness about CAT.

Graphical Representation of Effect of Education on Awareness of Police about CAT

Where, 1 = awareness and 2 = no awareness
One-Way ANOVA was performed to find out the difference in awareness about CAT in people with different designations. The results in the above table show that there is no significant difference in the awareness about CAT in with respect to different designations. It can be inferred from the results that there is no effect of designation on awareness about CAT.

Graphical Representation of Effect of Designation on Awareness of Police about CAT

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
\text{Constable} & \text{ASI/Sl} & \text{Inspector} \\
\hline
M(SD) & M(SD) & M(SD) & F & p \\
\hline
1.62(.49) & 1.42(.50) & 1.50(.55) & 1.57 & .21 \\
\end{array}
\]

Where, 1 = awareness and 2 = no awareness
Effect of Education on the Awareness of Police about Existing Laws of Reporting Police Torture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Police Torture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Informal</strong></td>
<td>1.50 (0.70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary</strong></td>
<td>1.00 (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Matric</strong></td>
<td>1.26 (.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grad.</strong></td>
<td>1.26 (.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L.L.B</strong></td>
<td>1.25 (.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M.A</strong></td>
<td>1.5 (.71)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Police Torture = Awareness of Existing Laws of Reporting Police Torture

One-way ANOVA was carried out to find out the difference in awareness of the existing laws of reporting police torture in groups with different educational levels. The results in the above table show that there is no significant difference in the awareness of the existing laws of reporting police torture in people having different education. It can be inferred from the results that there is no effect of education on awareness about the laws of reporting police torture.

**Graphical Representation of Effect of Education on the Awareness of Police about Existing Laws of Reporting Police Torture**

Where 1 = awareness and 2 = no awareness
Effect of Police Designation on the Awareness of Existing Laws of Reporting Police Torture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Constable M(SD)</th>
<th>ASI/SI M(SD)</th>
<th>Inspector M(SD)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of Existing Laws of Reporting Police Torture</td>
<td>1.30(.46)</td>
<td>1.19(.40)</td>
<td>1.14(.38)</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One-way ANOVA was carried out to find out the difference in awareness of the existing laws of reporting police torture in groups with different designations. The results in the above table show that there is no significant difference in the awareness of the existing laws of reporting police torture in people having different designations. It can be inferred from the results that there is no effect of designation on awareness about the laws of reporting police torture.

Graphical Representation of the Effect of Police Designation on the Awareness of Existing Laws of Reporting Police Torture

Where 1 = awareness and 2 = no awareness
Two-Way ANOVA was carried out in order to find out the combined effect of education and designation on the awareness about Convention Against Torture (CAT). The result in the above table shows that education and designation do not have a combined effect on the awareness about CAT.

Graphical Representation of the Combined Effect of Education and Designation of Police on CAT

Estimated Marginal Means of are you aware of CAT?

Where 1 = awareness and 2 = no awareness
Two-Way ANOVA was carried out in order to find out the combined effect of education and designation on the awareness of existing laws of reporting police torture. The result in the above table shows that education and designation do not have a combined effect on the awareness about existing laws of reporting police torture.

Graphical Representation of the Combined Effect of Education and Designation on the Awareness of Existing Laws of Reporting Police Torture

Estimated Marginal Means of are you aware of existing laws of reporting police torture?

Where 1 = awareness and 2 = no awareness
To unearth the influence of education on the awareness about CAT in general population, One-Way ANOVA was carried out. Results in the above table reveal that there is no significant difference in the awareness about CAT in people having different educational levels. Thus, it can be deduced that there is no effect of education on awareness about CAT in general public.

### Graphical Representation of the Effect of Education on the Awareness regarding CAT

![Graph showing the effect of education on the awareness of CAT](image)

*Where, 1 = awareness and 2 = no awareness*
Effect of Education on Awareness of Public about Existing Laws on Torture and Mechanisms for Reporting Torture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M$(SD)</td>
<td>$M$(SD)</td>
<td>$M$(SD)</td>
<td>$M$(SD)</td>
<td>$M$(SD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laws on torture</td>
<td>1.50(.55)</td>
<td>1.71(.49)</td>
<td>1.80(.45)</td>
<td>1.69(.48)</td>
<td>.32(.04)</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>.054</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1=informal religious literacy class or adult education, 2=primary school, 3=secondary/technical/teacher’s college, 4=post secondary (polytechnic, college of education, university), 5=none

To find out the influence of education on the awareness about existing laws on torture and mechanisms for reporting torture in public, One-Way ANOVA was carried out. Results in the above table exhibit that there is no significant difference in the awareness about existing laws on torture and mechanisms for reporting torture in people having different educational levels. Thus, it can be deduced that there is no effect of education on awareness about the existing laws on torture and mechanisms for reporting torture in general public.

Graphical Representation of Effect of Education on Awareness about Existing Laws on Torture and Mechanisms for Reporting Torture

Where, 1 = awareness and 2 = no awareness
DISCUSSION

Results show that there is no correlation between education and awareness about the Convention Against Torture. This is true for both the police and the public. In the case of the police, designation or rank is also of no significance when it comes to awareness about UNCAT. The same is true for existing laws and reporting mechanisms for torture for both categories of police and public. These results challenge the myth or misconception that recruiting police officers with a higher education level will solve the problem of torture, or that an educated public will be more aware of the law and hence in a better position to access justice. The education system in most of our schools does nothing to raise awareness about rights or issues of public importance. There is a culture of impunity that pervades the entire legal system and society at large. Police officers seem to act on whim. There do not exist any strict codes of conduct that are strictly enforced. In detailed interviews, police officers often cite exertion from over work, long duty hours, low wages, corruption and authoritarianism within the police force and lack of resources as some of the factors that lead to police torture. While the government needs to enforce an absolute ban on all torture practices, the criminal justice system also needs a complete overhaul. The law about getting a First Instance Report (F.I.R.) registered, evidence collection, and the threshold the state needs to reach before a person can be arrested, the role of the magistrate and proper exercise of his/her powers to investigate any and all reports of torture and to ensure that the victim is not returned to police custody. The overall culture of society will have to change in that the potential perpetrators and victims of violence should all recognize and realize the heinous nature of the crime of torture.

Prompt investigation and criminalization of torture in accordance with CAT obligations – building a national coalition to stop police torture
Article 4 that obligates the criminalization of torture in line with the definition of torture in Article 1 of the Convention Against Torture as one of the most serious crimes punishable by appropriate penalties. The first step in the process of criminalization is to have a clear and comprehensive working definition of torture. The Pakistan Penal Code makes no such provision, and therefore we must define torture. It is perhaps best to adopt the exact definition of torture from Article 1 of the Convention Against Torture, including the clause on participation and complicity from Article 4.

While the culture of impunity is a general problem and torture pervades the very fabric of our society, penalization of torture should be limited to public officials and not extend to include non-state actors. There are existing provisions in the law that could deal adequately with perpetrators of torture who are non-state actors. On the question of whether there should be a separate anti-torture legislation enacted by parliament, or amendments made to the existing penal code, the agreement among the community seems to be that it would be best to have a short-term and a long-term strategy. In the short term, we should define torture, agree on penalties for the crime of torture, and rehabilitation and compensation for victims of torture – this can be incorporated in the Pakistan Penal Code and later on we could develop separate anti-torture legislation.

There should be a minimum and maximum penalty for torture so as to incentivize punishment. There should be a sliding scale where the punishment would increase with the severity/degree/type of torture. Aggravating circumstances should therefore be taken into consideration, and penalty should include both monetary compensation as well as imprisonment.
It is suggested that we have sentencing guidelines for judges. What is an efficient system of reporting and investigation? Most people agree that police investigating police torture is not likely to be an effective method and unlikely to produce results. It is necessary to have special investigative bodies that are outside the police, but not necessarily outside the Ministry of Interior, although it might be more advisable to have an independent body under the ambit of the Ministry of Justice.

The imminent formation of the National Human Rights Commission is welcome news. Some argue that the police force is the only entity fully equipped with the tools of investigation. The Public Service Commission is cited as an example. The British Police Complaints system, for example, is effective. People sitting on the board are independent from those being investigated. A similar commission in Pakistan could fall under either the Ministry of Justice or the Parliament. The point is that the investigation should be independent from the on-going trial against the accused.

There are major issues with the criminal procedure code and its implementation with regard to torture. Under international law – the covenant on civil and political liberties, police custody should be no longer than 24 hours. The magistrate should decide to either release the person, or they should be put in a special remand center under the Ministry of Justice, but not be handed back to the police. Evidence shows that the risk of torture is higher in police custody than in prisons, and that remand centers under the Ministry of Justice reduce incidences of torture. There is a need for a thorough and immediate medical examination of people alleging torture and those suspected of having been subjected to torture.
There is consensus on the fact that we need major structural reforms in the country. We need to clearly establish as required by the Convention a separate crime of torture and decide on the appropriate penalties keeping in view that torture is one of the most serious human rights violations. It is destroying people’s lives, has long term impact on victims and is damaging society at large. Torture is up there with socially, culturally, morally and legally unacceptable practices such as slavery and genocide which are among some of the worst crimes. Torture should be criminalized not just as a misdemeanor, but with the severity of homicide and armed robbery for example.

The main bottleneck in the system is the lack of an effective complaints and investigation mechanism. All allegations must, and any suspicion should also be investigated. Police investigating against police does not work. Therefore, we need a “Police Police” – a police complaints board outside the police force. It can’t be the same police officers that are interested in bringing the alleged criminal to justice. It must be effective in that it should have the same investigation power as the police. Pre-trial detention should be the exception, not the rule. This would reduce the pretrial prison population by 70-80%, which would reduce overcrowding. Currently, there is a big gap in coordination between all the different departments involved – police, judiciary, lawyers, doctors and social workers.

The Round table on torture reaffirmed the need for allegations of torture to be moved to a separate forum to actors who are not directly involved in the criminal justice system and hence have a vested interest in preserving the status quo. Police investigating against police leads to
nowhere – special investigative bodies that are outside the police, but have full investigative powers should be set up.

The police’s view is that it is not feasible to set up a parallel body with the police; that it is up to courts to try police officers. The Punjab police website has a hotline where people can register complaints. According to the police, there are as many complaints of torture as there are cases. Public safety commissions like the British police complaints system are effective. They have full investigative powers and the people sitting on the board are independent from those who investigate. They should fall either under the Ministry of Justice or under the Parliament. In essence, they must be independent from the ongoing trial against the accused.

National Human Rights Commissions such as the ones set up in Bangladesh and Malaysia are independent in their working and not pressurized by the government. Under International Law – the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights - police custody should be no longer than 24 hours. The magistrate should decide to release the person, or place them in a special remand center under the Ministry of Justice, not police custody. Torture takes place when the magistrate sends you back to the police. Torture is usually committed in illegal detention. This is why we need pre-trial detention centers to be separate from police custody. We need to provide quick and independent medical examination. An interdepartmental committee should be formed by various ministries. The main conclusion drawn from the Roundtable on torture was that the risk of torture is much higher in police custody than in prisons, and that the incidence of torture was reduced where remand centers fell under the Ministry of Justice.
In a consultation on “Lawyers Training on Combating Torture” organized by the Parliamentarian Commission for Human Rights (PCHR), there was consensus on the fact that torture erodes public confidence in the credibility of the criminal justice system. Georgia state and Turkey where torture was abolished, public opinion of the police improved. There are loopholes in the law. Insensitivity, administrative practices and problems of attitude create an environment where police can torture with impunity. Political Interference in police work shows how torture is used as a means of governance.

The Criminal Procedure Code provides up to 15 days of police remand, which is against international standards that allow for no more than 24 hours. Complaints to the police serve little purpose. The Public Safety Commission is not functional. A police complaints commission is required. There is no demand from lawyers for implementation of Pakistan’s obligations under UNCAT and ICCPR nor is it taken up during legal proceedings. Police lack the capacity and resources, medico legal officers do not take torture seriously and torture cases are not properly reported in the press. These are some of the reasons why torture persists as a menace in our society.

Torture takes place during periods of illegal detention. There is need for legislation to properly criminalize torture and better procedural safeguards. The campaign against torture will have to work on the following issues:

- Properly criminalize torture
- Make demands for structural and procedural laws
- Better documentation and reporting of torture cases - End impunity for perpetrators of torture.
Torture is an absolute crime under all circumstances. There should be no tolerance for torture whether we are defense or prosecution. Magistrates and judicial officers have a role to play as well. Sovereignty can only be maintained when you respect the rights of citizens and safeguard their interests, says Hina Jilani. Some lawyers think that the Justice of peace is the best forum. At any rate, a lawyer is the first port of call for a victim of torture so lawyers need to be sensitized to the problem of police torture. Between section 199 and 491, 199 is broader but 491 is more useful as far as appeals are concerned. With 491, one can appeal directly to the Supreme Court from the High Court. One has to file an inter-court appeal with section 199.

Some of the recommendations that came out of this meeting included procedural reform with the help of joint forces like an NGO alliance, a medico-legal alliance etc. It was decided that it is important to litigate torture, and to do a mapping exercise of obstacles that lawyers face. Broad and inclusive strategy to prepare first report to submit to Ministry of Human Rights and all major stakeholders will be included. Participants recognized the need for an awareness raising and media strategy. Commitment of parliament should go further than saying zero tolerance. An effective policy aimed at the eradication of torture that includes legislative, even constitutional reforms.

In conclusion, there is need for a specific crime of torture under Pakistani law with a definition, penalties, compensation and rehabilitation according to the Convention Against Torture and a need to set up appropriate independent bodies to monitor the complaints and investigation mechanism including proper forensic medicine techniques.
LIMITATIONS

This was a Lahore-based research study and therefore has low external validity. The sample was limited to 5 police stations chosen because they provided a convenient opportunity, primarily in terms of their location. The public sample consists mostly of youth. Since most of the public participants fall within the same age group, the results might vary for an older sample for example.

RECOMMENDATIONS

If we are to tackle the problem of police torture, we will have to orient ourselves on clear, specific, positive obligations written down in the Convention Against Torture. Any gaps can be addressed by administrative techniques. It is also advisable to look into the Constitution and see if there is a need for reform in the interest of criminalizing torture. Legal safeguards to prevent torture include ratification of the Optional Protocol to the Convention. Ratifying OPCAT would probably have the most effective deterrent impact. In addition, an effective national preventive mechanism must be installed. The police cannot be trusted to solve this problem alone. There is an important and urgent need to further explore the police-public relationship and use the media to help facilitate a mutually beneficial working relationship between the public and the police.
There should be a duty to investigate where there is a complaint. Right to a complaint should be established at the legal level. The victim has a right to complaint against torture. There should be safeguards in place that ensure the transparent processing of complaints. Art. 14 – Right to Human Dignity – has a rider clause that states that no one will be tortured for the purpose of extracting confession. The language of that clause needs to change in order to make the prohibition of torture absolute. Punishment for torture should be appropriate to the gravity of the crime. The way torture is defined should make clear the complicity and acquiescence of the state and there should be a mechanism whereby complaints can be made against officials. The public mindset does not abhor torture. Relevant institutions like the judiciary, bureaucracy, parliament and legislature should be properly trained, sensitized and equipped. Under the UNCAT, states have an obligation to set up a national committee that regularly inspects facilities where conditions of torture exist. We need an ombudsman and institution monitoring for external assessment.

In terms of investigation, it is not enough to wait till there is a complaint. If you are in police custody, whom do you complain to? Article 13 encompasses the right to complain to an individual body and Article 12 is an official obligation to establish a “Police Police” since it is normally not effective for police to investigate against itself. The first step in dealing with impunity is to make it a state obligation to criminalize torture with adequate penalties. Torture is also an International Criminal Act – a War Crime and a Crime against Humanity. Articles 13 and 14 provide adequate reparation and rehabilitation. Perpetrators must be brought to criminal justice.
Maintenance of registers is important. The magistrate has a very important role to play in ensuring that unnecessary physical remand is not given to the police. The penalty for torture according to section 155 of the Police Order is a maximum of three years. According to section 337 k of the PPC it is ten years, but does not include mental torture. The existing complaints channels do not work. People should be encouraged to register complaints. Complaints should not be sent back to the police. Superior courts should order forensic examination to corroborate physical evidence. According to Article 13, the victim of torture should be removed from police custody and moved to a judicial remand center, which could fall either under the Ministry of Interior or Ministry of Justice.

A National Human Rights Commission would be in charge of conducting independent investigations, without which the cycle of impunity cannot be broken. The Commission would ensure protection for those registering complaints.

The Police Order of 2002 should be implemented in its original form where it made provisions for the establishment of a complaint authority, public safety commissions, and civil oversight. Also, since 2002, the Investigations and Operations branches have been separated. More concrete steps need to be taken to ensure that the two strands of the police force are indeed independent of each other to the extent that is necessary to ensure transparency and proper functioning of the two departments.

We need to end the culture of impunity. The military must stop interfering in civilian affairs. There must be no impunity with respect to the law and upholding it in principle and practice.
Duty hours should be enforced, facilities provided and the police force should not be used to serve as private security force for politicians.

The media has an important role to play in changing the perception and hence the reality of the relationship between the public and the police. The police must be trained to treat citizens with respect and the public must be made aware of their rights and responsibilities with regard to law enforcement agencies. We must come together and decide that we need to work collectively. Instead of pitting one against the other, we must view ourselves as part of the same criminal justice system where the law reigns supreme and we all play our part to make the machine work as best it can. As soon as you militarize the police, you automatically distance them from the public. The police should be trained to recognize their role as one of public service.

One of the measures that must absolutely be implemented in procedural law is that the period of remand needs to be reduced. Custodial law provides a safeguard against torture, which is unfortunately not implemented. Magistrates do not inquire about torture and if reported, do not change the custody. There should be a procedural requirement that magistrates offer alternatives to giving remand back to the same police that are implicated in the torture.

In addition to the above recommendations, it is equally important that the working conditions for the police force be improved, minimum wage and working hours established and enforced. Many police affairs complain about being overworked and underpaid and not having time for their families. All of these factors lead to frustration, anger and anxiety which manifest themselves in the form of violent and exploitative practices, sometimes leading to torture.
IMPLICATIONS

This report will help raise awareness about police torture in Pakistan for the general public and the non-profit sector, in particular organizations working on custodial torture practices. This report has implications for all members of the legal fraternity who seek to improve the criminal justice system, and policymakers to end the practice of torture. This report would be particularly helpful for academics, students and activists who wish to further explore the police-public relationship in the interest of enforcing some form of community policing and more accountability with regard to law enforcement personnel.
QUESTIONNAIRE #1 (For Police in Urdu)

پولس کے بیچ

1- کمک کر کے ہمارے ڈھانچے کی سہولت کے حوالے سے ہم کہاں ہیں؟

2- کمک کر کے ہمارے ڈھانچے کی سہولت کے حوالے سے ہم کہاں ہیں؟

3- کمک کر کے ہمارے ڈھانچے کی سہولت کے حوالے سے ہم کہاں ہیں؟

4- کمک کر کے ہمارے ڈھانچے کی سہولت کے حوالے سے ہم کہاں ہیں؟

5- کمک کر کے ہمارے ڈھانچے کی سہولت کے حوالے سے ہم کہاں ہیں؟
(5) پولیس میں تعلق کی فہرست
2-سال
2-5
6-20
6-10
11-20
20 سال پیشوا

(6) پولیس کے معاہدے نہیں مجبور ہے، معاہدہ نہیں۔

(7) پولیس کے معاہدے نہیں مجبور ہے، معاہدہ نہیں۔

(8) آپ کی حالت میں چھوٹے کم مال کی میں 500 امیر عناfir وہ کیا؟

(9) آپ کی حالت میں چھوٹے کم مال کی میں 500 امیر عناfir وہ کیا؟

(10) آپ کی حالت میں چھوٹے کم مال کی میں 500 امیر عناfir وہ کیا؟
11) آپ کی مقبولیت میں کہا پیچھے کی کلاغی سب سے سامان تر منہ اضافہ کیا؟

12) آپ کو کیوں کسے طرف سے چہلے ہیں؟ آپ کیا کسے سے چہلے ہیں?

13) آپ کلاڈنی کی طرف سے چہلے ہیں یا چہلے نہیں?

14) ایسا ہے یا نہیں کہ آپ کا کوئی اور شخص نے چہلے ہیں؟

15) کیوں آپ کسی بھی شخص کو چہلے ہیں؟

16) کیوں آپ کسی بھی شخص کو چہلے ہیں؟

17) کیا آپ پچھلے کسی بھی شخص کو چہلے ہیں؟
(18) اگر الگوی یک سری مجموعاتی در محدودیت کی ضابطه کریں:

__________________________

(19) کیا بھی نگری کے سملی پک چالو چالو آوازی پہلی پا کر گیا؟

پان چئیں

__________________________

(20) اگر پان نہ بالا نگری میں ہو سکتا ہے ایک ہیں کیوں؟

__________________________

(21) کیا پلن سر کونا جدیدی؟

اگر پلن سر کا لگن کے:

پان چئیں

اگر پلن سے ایک کا لگن چئیں:

پان چئیں

اگر پلن سر کے کوئی حد کا لگن چئیں:

پان چئیں

اگر پلن سر کے ہیں کوئی حد کا لگن چئیں:

پان چئیں

اگر پلن سر کے کوئی حد کا لگن چئیں:

پان چئیں

اگر پلن سر کے کوئی حد کا لگن چئیں:

پان چئیں

اگر پلن سر کے کوئی حد کا لگن چئیں:

پان چئیں

اگر پلن سر کے کوئی حد کا لگن چئیں:

پان چئیں

اگر پلن سر کے کوئی حد کا لگن چئیں:

پان چئیں

اگر پلن سر کے کوئی حد کا لگن چئیں:

پان چئیں

اگر پلن سر کے کوئی حد کا لگن چئیں:

پان چئیں
22) کیوں اگر زہر جاتی ہوئی، میں پتھر میں کھچی ہوئی ہو؟
اگر زہر لیکھنے کے لیے پتھر کو گھویں?
ہنی
اگر زہر کھیکر کے موٹر کا سطح کے لیے؟
ہنی
اگر زہر میں گھویں کو کھچی کر کے?
ہنی
اگر زہر پتھر کے لیے؟
ہنی
اگر زہر اور میں تیار کیے جاتے?
ہنی
اگر زہر اور ماہی تیار کیے جاتے?
ہنی
جب زہر پتھر کے سطح اضافے کے لیے?
ہنی

23) کیا آپ کپڑے کو پھینکتے ہیں؟
ہنی

24) آپ کے لیے میں کلود کا ساتھ ہے؟
ہیں
ہیں
ہیں
ہیں

25) آپ کے لیے میں کلود کے گولی پھانسی کیں?
ہیں
ہیں
ہیں
ہیں
ہیں
26) آپ کو چھوٹی ہسپتال اور ایک کھانے کے چھوٹے ہسپتال کے میکے کے سفارش کے حوالے سے کامیاب ہوئے؟

27) آپ اور دوسرے کو چھوٹی ہسپتال اور ایک کھانے کے چھوٹے ہسپتال کے اہم امور میں کامیاب ہوئے؟

28) کچھ اورچھوٹے ہسپتال اور دوسرے کو سفارش کیا کھانے کے چھوٹے ہسپتال کے حوالے سے کامیاب ہوئے؟

29) آپ کو کھانے کے سفارش ہسپتال اور دوسرے کو سفارش کیا کھانے کے چھوٹے ہسپتال کے حوالے سے کامیاب ہوئے؟

30) کہا جاتا ہے کہ چھوٹی ہسپتال اور دوسرے کو سفارش کیا کھانے کے چھوٹے ہسپتال کے حوالے سے کامیاب ہوئے؟

31) کیا آپ کو مائل ہے جس بات کے حوالے سے (سفارش کے حوالے سے) سفارش کیا کھانے کے چھوٹے ہسپتال کے حوالے سے کامیاب ہوئے؟
(32) کیا آپ پنگوئن کی پنگوئنیکاں ہیں؟
پن: نا

(33) اگر آپ 32 کمیون لیو ہوں، تو یہ وہاں چیزوں کی بات ہے؟ کہاں ہوں؟ اور آپ کیا کریں؟
پن: نا

(34) اگر آپ 34 کمیون لیو ہوں، تو یہ وہاں چیزوں کی بات ہے؟
پن: نا

(35) کیا آپ پنگوئن کے پنگوئن کی پنگوئنیکاں ہیں؟
پن: نا

(36) کیا آپ پنگوئن کے پنگوئن کی پنگوئنیکاں ہیں؟
پن: نا

(37) کیا آپ پنگوئن کے پنگوئن کی پنگوئنیکاں ہیں؟
پن: نا
QUESTIONNAIRE #2 (For Public)

Note: You are requested to please assist by providing honest answers to the following questions. Whatever answer you give will not be released to any individual or authority. The final report will not contain information about any individual respondents. Please tick the responses that best apply to you. Thank you for your cooperation.

SECTION A

1. Age.
   a. 15 – 24 years.
   b. 25 – 34 years.
   c. 35 – 49 years.
   d. 50 years and older.

2. Sex.
   a. Male.
   b. Female.

3. Highest level of Education.
   a. None.
   b. Non – formal religious literacy class or adult education.
   c. Primary school.
   d. 4) Secondary / technical / teacher’s college.
   e. Post-secondary (Polytechnic, college of Education, University).

4. Occupation.
   a. Unemployed.
   b. Farming, petty trading, self-employed or artisan.
   c. Driver, motor park assistants, drivers' union officials, etc.
   d. Junior staff of government agencies and companies.
   e. Intermediate staff of government agencies and companies.
   f. Senior staff of government agencies and companies.
   g. Businessmen and self-employed professionals.
   h. Other (specify)…………………………………………

5. How long have you lived in Lahore.
   a. Less than 2 years.
   b. 2 – 5 years.
   c. 6 – 10 years.
   d. 11- 19 years.
   e. 20 years and more.

SECTION B

6. Have you ever been arrested by police in Lahore?
   a. Yes.
7. If Yes, how many times?
   a. Once.
   b. Twice.
   c. Three and more.
8. For what offence were you detained?
   a. Traffic.
   b. Offences relating to loss or theft of property or money.
   c. Offences relating to fighting, injuring someone.
   d. Demonstration or protests, strike.
   e. Other (specify)…………………………………………
9. Have you ever been detained in cell by police in Lahore?
   a. Yes.
   b. No.
10. If Yes, for how long?
    a. Less than 1 day.
    b. 1 – 3 days.
    c. 4 – 7 days.
    d. 1 – 4 weeks.
    e. 1 – 3 months.
    f. 3 – 12 months.
    g. 1 year and longer.
11. Have you ever personally been subjected to the following actions in Lahore?
    a. Abused by police.
       i. Yes.
       ii. No.
    b. Slapped by Police.
       i. Yes.
       ii. No.
    c. Kicked by Police.
       i. Yes.
       ii. No.
    d. Beaten by Police.
       i. Yes.
       ii. No.
    e. Injured by Police.
       i. Yes.
       ii. No.
    f. Police pointed gun at you.
       i. Yes.
       ii. No.
    g. Police threatened to shoot you.
12. Have you ever witnessed any of the following action by the police in Lahore?
   a. Police abusing a person.
      i. Yes.
      ii. No.
   b. Police slapping a person.
      i. Yes.
      ii. No.
   c. Police kicking a person.
      i. Yes.
      ii. No.
   d. Police beating a person.
      i. Yes.
      ii. No.
   e. Police injuring a person.
      i. Yes.
      ii. No.
   f. Police pointing a gun at a person.
      i. Yes.
      ii. No.
   g. Police shooting a person.
      i. Yes.
      ii. No.
   h. Police helping a person.
      i. Yes. ii. No.
   i. Police receiving bribe from people.
      i. Yes.
      ii. No.

13. Do you agree that the police in Lahore abuse, beat and kick civilians only when provoked or challenged by members of the public?
   a. Yes.
   b. No.

14. How much do you think the police in Lahore respect members of the police?
   a. Very much.
   b. Much.
   c. Little.
   d. Very little.

15. Have you ever:
   a. Abused a police officer?
i. Yes.
ii. No.

b. Beat or slapped a police office?
   i. Yes.
   ii. No.

c. Obstruct police from arresting someone?
   i. Yes.
   ii. No.

d. Threw stones at police officer
   i. Yes.
   ii. No.

e. Refuse to assist a police officer on duty?
   i. Yes.
   ii. No.

f. Resist arrest by police?
   i. Yes.
   ii. No.

16. Which of the following is the most important reason why police in Lahore beat, injure or kill civilians.
   a. The government supports the police for engaging in the act.
   b. The government orders the police to engage in the act.
   c. There are too many criminals in the country.
   d. The people are afraid of police.
   e. The police are not respected by the police.
   f. The police are frustrated.
   g. The police are corrupt.
   h. Other (specify)…………………………………………

17. What is your suggestion for improving the relationship between the police and the public?
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………..
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………..
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………..

18. How effective are the Lahore police in controlling crimes?
   a. Very effective.
   b. Effective.
   c. Ineffective.
   d. Very ineffective.

19. Do you support the idea that State Governments should establish their own Police force? a. Yes.
   b. No.

20. Do you support the idea that Local Governments should establish their own Police force? a. Yes.
   b. No.

21. If Yes to questions 19 and 20, which of the following is the most important reason for your answer?
   a. Will reduce crime.
   b. Will make police respect members of the public.
c. Will make police men and women more comfortable.
d. Will reduce police corruption and brutality.
e. Other (specify)…………………………………………

22. If No to question 19 and 20, which of the following is the most important reason for your answer?
a. Too many police forces will lead to confusion and conflict.
b. It will not reduce crime.
c. It will be used by politicians in power at state and local levels to oppress opponents.
d. State and Local Governments do not have enough money to properly run police force.
e. It will make police more corrupt and violent.
f. They will be used to rig elections.
g. Other (specify)…………………………………………

23. Have you ever heard of OR read about the CAT (Convention Against Torture)?
a. Yes.
b. No.

24. What do you understand by “Torture”?

25. Do you know anyone who has been ever tortured by the police?
a. Yes.
b. No.

26. If Yes to question 25 please give details (when, where and by whom)?

27. Are you aware of existing Laws on Torture and Mechanisms for Reporting Torture?
a. Yes.
b. No.

28. Have you OR anyone you know ever reported Torture?
a. Yes.
b. No.

29. If Yes to question 28.
a. Describe the relation with the victim
b. When, where and how you reported?
c. To whom you reported?
d. What happened in response?

30. In your opinion what would be an effective mechanism for reporting torture (your suggestions).
