

# *Chapter 4*

## *Internal Control Mechanism*



## Chapter-4

### Internal Control Mechanism

#### 4.1 Internal control mechanism

To ensure successful implementation of the various acts/schemes for prevention of crime against women, it is imperative that the State Government should have a proper monitoring and internal control system in place. Several procedures and feedback mechanisms have already been incorporated in the acts/rules to enable the GoR to keep continuous watch over the performance of the key field functionaries. This was supposed to provide timely, adequate and accurate information to the relevant authorities to enforce mid-course corrections for enhancement of the performance of the field offices.

Curbing crime against women and girl child in a big state like Rajasthan is an ongoing task involving multiple departments carrying out different activities at different levels. To ensure that objectives under various Acts and Schemes are met satisfactorily, administration is supposed to make plans, sets targets and deploy resources in the form of funds, infrastructure and human resources.

Five Departments/authorities (WED, SJED, DCR, Police & Legal Services Authority) were primarily entrusted with the task of preparation of plans for prevention of crime against women, enforcement of various act/rules/schemes in place, generating awareness about the issues, providing relief and work towards rehabilitation of the victims and monitoring the implementation of these measures. The internal controls and monitoring mechanisms included setting up of designated committees, holding their regular meetings, preparation of annual/periodic progress reports by the field functionaries and their evaluation by the higher authorities, conduct of prescribed inspections, instituting proper security measures at shelter homes, taking measures for rehabilitation of victims/destitute etc.

Audit evaluated whether the monitoring structures and evaluation mechanisms were effective in improving the State machinery involved in curbing crime against women and girl child and the findings are described below:

Name of the Act	Section/provision	Internal Control prescribed	Responsible functionary	Monitoring Authority
<b>4.1.1 The Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013</b>	<b>Section 21 of the Act</b>	An annual report to the employer and the District Officer	IC/LC	District officers
		The District Officer to forward brief reports on these annual reports to State Government	District officers	GoR

None of the IC/LC submitted annual reports to employers/District Officers since enactment of the Act till 2017. Further, not a single brief was sent to the State Government by any of district officers since enactment of the Act till 2017. Further scrutiny of test checked districts (Jaipur and Tonk in August-September 2020 and remaining six districts in August-October 2021) revealed that there was no improvement during 2017-20 also.

WCD Department, GoR in its reply (February 2021) to the draft report (December 2020) stated that annual report of IC/LC was being sent to Directorate by the District Officers.

The reply is not tenable as the Directorate did not have complete information about the organisations where 10 or more employees were working. It had information of only 1540 such organisations (instead of 69,879 units in Rajasthan as informed by ESIC). The test checked districts also did not have complete information of ICs. Hence, annual report submitted by District Officers to Directorate could not have given complete information.

Annual Reports of ICs/LCs provide crucial information about their existence; functioning and their role in ensuring women feel safe and protected in work environment. Department's failure to enforce this mechanism is reflected in the fact that it does not even have complete and reliable information about the total number of ICs and LCs existing in Rajasthan.

WCD Department, GoR in its reply (February 2022) to the draft report (November 2021) stated that letters were issued (February 2021 and January 2022) to District Collectors for effective implementation of the Act.

Name of the Act	Section/ provision	Internal Control prescribed	Responsible functionary	Monitoring Authority
<b>4.1.2 The Prohibition of Child Marriage Act, 2006 &amp; Rajasthan Prohibition of Child Marriage Rules, 2007</b>	<b>Rule 5 (3) of Rajasthan Prohibition of Child Marriage Rules, 2007</b>	CMPO to send quarterly report to the District Magistrate on cases of attempted child marriages and the action taken.	CMPO	District Magistrate
	<b>Rule 4 of Rajasthan Prohibition of Child Marriage Rules, 2007</b>	CMPO shall inspect from time to time records of the Marriage Registration Officer	CMPO	WED

Quarterly returns were not sent by any of the test checked CMPOs during 2012-17. GoR stated (February 2019) that all concerned officers have again been instructed for submission of Quarterly Progress Report. Further scrutiny of test checked 14 CMPOs (three CMPOs of Jaipur and Tonk in August-September 2020 and 11 CMPOs of remaining six districts in August-October 2021) revealed that there was no improvement during 2017-20 except CMPO, Pali. It was stated that the quarterly

returns were being submitted to District Magistrate but no corroborative evidence was produced to audit. CMPO Rohat (Pali) did not furnish reply as of October 2021.

Out of 14 test-checked CMPOs, inspection of Marriage Registration Officers was not carried out by nine CMPOs during the period 2012-17 and one CMPO (Rohat) conducted only one inspection in 2016-17 while other four CMPOs (Pratapgarh, Pali, Ramganj Mandi and Jaipur-I) did not provide information/ records in this regard. GoR stated (February 2019) that all concerned officers have again been instructed for regular inspection of records of Marriage Registration Officers.

On being enquired, test checked 14 CMPOs (Three CMPOs of Jaipur and Tonk in August-September 2020 and 11 CMPOs of remaining six districts in August-October 2021) revealed that there was no improvement except in Jaipur-I which carried out three inspections (*Gram Panchayat* - Sirsi, Dhankaya and Begas) during 2017-20. CMPO Rohat (Pali) did not furnish reply as of October 2021.

WCD Department, GoR in its reply (February 2021) to the draft report (December 2020) stated (February 2021) that District Collector obtained quarterly information from SPs office relating to stopping of child marriages. Further, notified Child Marriage Prohibition officers were instructed from time to time by the Directorate to inspect offices of Marriage Registration Officers.

The reply is not tenable as CMPOs were required to send quarterly returns to district collector. Further, replies regarding non-submission of quarterly returns by three test-checked CMPOs and inspections not conducted by the two test checked CMPOs were not provided.

Rajasthan records one of the highest number of cases of child marriage and the practice has been prevailing for a long time. Sustained efforts and constant monitoring of implementation of these efforts are essential to rid the State of this social evil. However, failure to enforce basic controls such as regular submission of reports and regular inspections by higher authorities has the potential to undermine the work done by the State and prevent them from taking steps to improve the current mechanisms.

WCD Department, GoR in its reply (February 2022) to the draft report (November 2021) stated that WED consolidated the information related to stopping of child marriages after obtaining it from District Collector and SP offices.

The reply is not tenable as information related to submission of quarterly reports by CMPOs to District Magistrate and inspection of records of the Marriage Registration Offices were still not provided to Audit.

Name of the Scheme	Section/ provision	Internal Control prescribed	Responsible functionary	Monitoring Authority
<b>4.1.3 Mahila Suraksha evam Salaha Kendra (Regulation and Grant) Scheme</b>	<b>MSSKs to be visited/inspected by Programme Officers (POs) at least once in a month</b>  <b>(Instructions (January 2014) of WED)</b>	MSSKs were to be visited/inspected by Programme Officers (POs) at least once in a month	Programme Officer	WED
<p>Only 13.91 per cent (42 against 302) of the prescribed visits in MSSKs were conducted by POs during 2014-17. Further scrutiny of records of 11 MSSKs (four MSSKs in four Police Districts Jaipur East, Jaipur West, Jaipur Rural and Tonk during August-September 2020 and remaining seven MSSKs in seven Police Districts during August-October 2021) revealed that against 373 mandated inspections, only 45 inspections (12.06 per cent) were carried out in MSSKs Tonk (10), Jaipur – East (3), Jaipur – Rural (10), Pali (10), Baran (5), Kota-City (4), Kota-Rural (3). Not a single inspection was carried out by PO Jaipur – West, Udaipur, Pratapgarh, Bharatpur during 2017-20.</p> <p>WCD Department, GoR in its replies (February 2021 and February 2022) to the draft reports (December 2020 and November 2021 respectively) stated that all the Deputy/Assistant Directors had been instructed (January 2021) to carry out monthly inspections of MSSKs for effective implementation and monitoring of various schemes of department and for sending the progress reports to Directorate after inspection.</p> <p>The deficiencies like basic facilities, deployment of staff etc. at MSSKs have remained unnoticed/unresolved by the authorities of WED for long period of time, due to persistent lack of monitoring and supervision.</p>				
Name of the Regulation	Section/ provision	Internal Control prescribed	Responsible functionary	Monitoring Authority
<b>4.1.4 Rajasthan State Commission for Women Regulation, 2007</b>	<b>Regulation 3(1) and 4(a)</b>	Ordinary meeting of the Commission was to be held at least once in two months to enquire into any unfair practices, remedial action taken	Rajasthan State Commission for Women	GoR
		Report annually thereof to the State Government	Rajasthan State Commission for Women	GoR

Against the required 30 meetings, only 13 meetings were held during 2012-17. As part of further scrutiny, audit observed that situation had not improved since 2017 and only 4 meetings (against 18) were held during 2017-20. Moreover, no meeting was held during 2019-20.

WCD Department, GoR in its reply (February 2021) to the draft report (December 2020) stated that meetings of the Commission were not organised during 2019 and 2020 due to lack of required quorum and non-constitution of commission.

Thus, by not ensuring conduct of regular meetings of the Commission, the State Government failed to make use of an important feedback mechanism, based on which focused action could have been initiated.

Name of the Regulation	Section/provision	Internal Control prescribed	Responsible functionary	Monitoring Authority
<b>4.1.5 Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961</b>	<b>Section 8(b)(4)</b>	State Government shall constitute/appoint an Advisory Board for the purpose of advising and assisting the Dowry Prohibition Officers	SJED	GoR

Advisory Boards were not constituted in test checked districts during 2012-17. GoR stated (December 2018) that District Advisory Boards have been constituted in four districts and the District Collectors of other districts have been instructed for nomination of social workers in the Advisory Board. Further scrutiny revealed (August 2020) that, even after lapse of two years since GoR's instructions, District Advisory Boards had still not been constituted in the remaining 29 districts of the state.

SJED, GoR in its replies (January 2021 and February 2022) to the draft reports (December 2020 and November 2021 respectively) accepted the facts and stated that District Advisory Boards had been constituted in four districts and in remaining districts nomination would be done at the earliest.

Failure to install basic yet crucial monitoring mechanism such as District Advisory Boards has undermined State Government's efforts towards eliminating this scourge, as highlighted by the increasing number of dowry related crimes in Rajasthan.

Name of the Regulation	Section/provision	Internal Control prescribed	Responsible functionary	Monitoring Authority
<b>4.1.6 Rules for Homes and Shelters 1970</b>	<b>Rule 52 and 53 (iii)</b>	Inspection of homes and shelters by Director SJED and Chief Inspector at least once and twice in a year respectively	Director and Chief Inspector	GoR
<p>Director SJED (against 17 inspections) and Chief Inspector (against 34 inspections) did not carry out the inspections of the <i>Nari Niketans/Mahila Sadan</i> during 2012-17, except once in Jaipur by Director SJED. GoR stated (December 2018) that inspections were carried out by Director and Chief Inspector.</p> <p>Contrary to GoR's reply, further scrutiny of records of <i>Mahila Sadan</i> Jaipur in September 2020 and <i>Nari Niketans</i> Kota, Udaipur and Bharatpur in August-October 2021 revealed that the Director, SJED, against the required 12 inspections, inspected only three times (Udaipur: August 2017; Jaipur: May 2019; and Kota: May 2019) and the Chief Inspector, against the required 24 inspections, inspected only three times (Udaipur: July 2018 and September 2019 and Jaipur: April 2018) during 2017-20.</p> <p>SJED, GoR in its replies (January 2021 and February 2022) to the draft reports (December 2020 and November 2021 respectively) stated that district level monitoring committees had been constituted and quarterly meetings were organised.</p> <p>However, GoR did not furnish reply regarding lesser number of inspections conducted in <i>Mahila Sadan</i>, Jaipur during 2017-20.</p> <p>In the absence of adherence to simple monitoring mechanisms such as regular inspections, the deficiencies like deployment of staff, not following up of rehabilitated women etc. have remained unnoticed for long period of time.</p>				

Name of the Guidelines	Section/provision	Internal Control prescribed	Responsible functionary	Monitoring Authority
<b>4.1.7 Swadhar Greh scheme guidelines</b>	<b>Clause K (i)</b>	Constitution of District Women Welfare Committee (DWWC) for their smooth functioning	Assistant Director SJED	SJED
	<b>Appendix III</b>	Maintenance of separate file for each inmate having complete case record	Concerned NGOs	SJED



DWWC was not constituted in any of the three test checked districts of Baran, Tonk and Udaipur. GoR stated (December 2018) that district level monitoring committees have been constituted (December 2017) and monitoring is being done regularly. Contrary to GoR's reply, further audit scrutiny of records of Assistant Director, SJED Tonk revealed (September 2020) that District Women Welfare Committee has still not been constituted in the district as of August 2020. District Office Baran and Udaipur informed (September-October 2021) that *Zila Mahila Kalyan Samitti* have been constituted in the districts.

Separate personal files of inmates as prescribed in guidelines were not maintained in *Swadhar Greh* Tonk and Baran during 2012-17. GoR stated (December 2018) that personal files were maintained during 2012-17 by *Swadhar Greh* Tonk and Baran. Further scrutiny of records of AD, SJED Tonk revealed (September 2020) that the *Swadhar Greh Gurukul Sewa Samiti* Tonk was closed in June 2017. Further scrutiny of records of DD/AD, SJED Tonk, Udaipur and Baran (Tonk in September 2020 and Udaipur and Baran in September-October 2021) revealed that personal files of inmates were not stored in records in district SJED offices.

SJED, GoR did not furnish reply.

Absence of personal files of inmates indicated that the actual assistance provided to inmates was not being properly recorded which would have hampered the assessment of efforts made towards their rehabilitation.

Name of the Acts	Section/provision	Internal Control prescribed	Responsible functionary	Monitoring Authority
4.1.8 POCSO Act	Section 44 (1)	Rajasthan State Commission for Protection of Child Rights (RSCPCR) was required to monitor the implementation of the provisions of the Act.	RSCPCR	GoR

Out of total 605 complaints received by RSCPCR during January 2010 to December 2017, 503 complaints (83.14 per cent) were disposed and 102 (16.86 per cent) complaints remained pending as of March 2018. Further, scrutiny of RSCPCR revealed (September 2020) that out of total 421 complaints received during January 2018 – March 2020, 397 complaints (94.30 per cent) were disposed and 24 (5.70 per cent) complaints remained pending as of August 2020. The age of pendency in case of 28 (including previously pending 4) complaints ranged from twelve to forty-eight months. On being pointed out RSCPCR replied that complaints are pending due to non-receipt of report regarding submission of challans in the court.

DCR, GoR in its reply (January 2022) to the draft report (November 2021) stated that in few cases the investigation took more time or due to some other reasons the submission of challan may get delayed by the police, and hence such cases may not be considered as pendency of RSCPCR.

Audit is of the opinion that GoR may ensure effective monitoring to reduce the delay in disposal of cases of complaints.

Name of the Acts	Section/ provision	Internal Control prescribed	Responsible functionary	Monitoring Authority
<b>4.1.9 Rajasthan Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Rules 2011</b>	<b>Rule 63</b>	Inspection committees at State and district levels were required to be constituted for monitoring and overseeing the conditions and appropriateness in the institutions (girls' homes)	DCR DCPUs	GoR DCR
	<b>Rule 62</b>	Permission to a juvenile or child for going on leave by JJB or CWC and to refer the case to police for bringing the child back to the institution if the juvenile or child does not return on expiry of leave	Juvenile Justice Board or Child Welfare Committee	DCPU
<b>4.1.10 Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act 2015</b>	<b>Section 30 (viii)</b>	CWC to conduct two inspections per month of residential facilities and recommend action for improvement in quality of services to the DCPU and State Government.	CWC	DCPU and State Government
<b>4.1.11 Commission for Protection of Child Right Act 2005</b>	<b>Section 13 (i)</b>	Rajasthan State Commission for Protection of Child Rights has the mandate for inspections of institutions and take up irregularities with the concerned authorities for remedial action.	Rajasthan State Commission for Protection of Child Rights	GoR
<b>4.1.12 Rules for Homes and Shelters 1970</b>	<b>Rule 22 (1)</b>	Follow up of rehabilitated girls	Concerned Home	DCR

(a) Members of voluntary organisations/ social workers were not included and these committees were not found functional as of June 2017 though orders for constitution of inspection committees at State/districts were issued (February 2012). GoR stated (February 2019) that inspection committees at state and district level were constituted in February 2012. Further scrutiny revealed (August 2020) that inspection committee at State level still did not have all the members required to be appointed (Medical expert was absent) and still it has not carried out prescribed inspections.

Further scrutiny of eight test checked DCPUs (Two DCPUs Jaipur and Tonk in August-September 2020 and remaining six DCPUs in August-October 2021) revealed that District Level Committee was constituted in all the DCPUs. However, DCPUs Jaipur and Baran did not have members from voluntary organisations/social workers in the constituted committees. Hence, inputs from non-governmental organisations engaged in these activities could not be obtained.

DCR, GoR in its reply (January 2022) to the draft report (November 2021) stated that Inspection committees at State and district levels were constituted.

However, details of nominated members were not provided to Audit.

(b) In *Madhu Smriti Mahila evam Bal Kalyan Uthan Sansthan*, Kota, 80 girls remained absent from the institution without obtaining permission of CWC, Kota during 2013-17. Of these, 42 girls did not return. Scrutiny further revealed that Child Welfare Committee as well as Sansthan did not refer these cases to police.

(c) Against the targeted 552 inspections, only 38 inspections (7 per cent) were carried out by five CWCs (Bharatpur, Jaipur, Tonk, Udaipur and Kota) during 2016-17. GoR stated (February 2019) that inspections of child care institutions are being carried out regularly. Further scrutiny of records of eight CWCs (two CWCs Jaipur and Tonk in August-September 2020 and remaining six CWCs in August-October 2021) revealed that, contrary to GoR's reply, frequency and number of inspections continued to be dismal. Against the targeted 1695 inspections, only 238 inspections (14.04 per cent) were carried out during 2017-20.

(d) The details of inspections of Government/NGOs run *Balika Grehs*, carried out by the Commission during 2012-17 was not available on records, though inspections were carried out by the chairperson of the Commission. Further, scrutiny of records of RSCPCR revealed (August 2020) that though 36 inspections (2018: 05 and 2019: 31) of Government/NGOs run *Balika Grehs* were carried out during calendar years 2018-19 relevant inspection reports were not provided to audit.

(e) Two thousand five hundred and eighty five girls were rehabilitated and discharged from 10 test checked Government/Non-Governmental *Balika Grehs* and open shelters but the follow up of rehabilitated girls as prescribed in rules was not carried out at any of the *Balika Grehs/shelters* during 2012-17. GoR stated (February 2019) that follow up of rehabilitated girls is being done by CWCs. Further scrutiny of four test checked *Balika Grehs* (*Balika Greh* Jaipur in August-September 2020 and remaining three *Balika Grehs* in August-October 2021) revealed that 1,912 girls (Jaipur: 672, Udaipur: 239 and Kota: 1,001) were rehabilitated but follow up of only 113 rehabilitated girls (Jaipur: 31, Udaipur: 55 and Kota: 27) was done in the three *Balika Grehs* during 2017-20. Further, in *Balika Greh*, Bharatpur, 378 girls were rehabilitated but follow up was not done during 2017-20.

DCR, GoR did not furnish reply.

Lapses by multiple agencies in adhering to control and monitoring provisions such as constitution of inspection committees, conduct of inspections, security of inmates, follow-up of rehabilitated girls etc. undermined the efforts of these agencies in providing security and protection to vulnerable and victimised girls.

Name of the Guidelines	Section/provision	Internal Control prescribed	Responsible functionary	Monitoring Authority
<b>4.1.13 Rajasthan State Legal Services Authority Regulations 1999</b>	<b>Regulation 12 and 16</b>	The District Authority/ <i>Taluk</i> Committee shall meet once in a month to discuss and monitor the pending cases and to take decision to award compensation and provide free legal aid to the victims.	DLSA TLSC	RSLSA DLSA
<p>The shortfall of meetings during 2012-17 in nine test-checked DLSAs was 65.93 per cent while in eight test-checked TLSCs it was 86.88 per cent. In two TLSCs (<i>Anta</i> in Baran district and <i>Sojat</i> in Pali district) no meeting was organized during 2012-17.</p> <p>Three DLSAs (Bharatpur, Jaipur and Tonk) stated (March–July 2018) that due to non-deployment of full-time secretary, legal services to be provided (cases of legal aid and compensation) could not be monitored effectively.</p> <p>Further scrutiny of records of nine DLSAs (three DLSAs Jaipur District, Jaipur Metro and Tonk in August-September 2020 and remaining six DLSAs in August-October 2021) revealed that despite a Secretary being appointed in September 2018, none of the test checked nine DLSAs and eight TLSCs organized the prescribed number of meetings. The shortfall of meetings during 2017-20 in DLSAs was 37.65 per cent while in TLSCs it was 92.01 per cent.</p> <p>Law &amp; Legal Department, GoR did not furnish reply.</p> <p>Pending cases were not properly monitored and decision to award compensation and provide free legal aid to the victims were delayed, due to huge shortfall in the meeting of DLSAs/TLSCs.</p>				

#### **4.1.14 Cases registered with police and courts under Special Laws**

Data related to crime against women registered under Special and Local Laws (SLLs) during 2012-19 was collected from the State Police Department. Further, a similar data for the same period was also called for from Rajasthan High Court, Jodhpur. A fair comparison of two sets of data revealed that very few cases (3,139 cases) were registered under SLLs with police in comparison to total number of cases (1,10,023 cases) registered in various courts during 2012-19 as given in the **Table 22**.

**Table 22**

S. No.	Name of SLLs	Number of cases registered with Court	Number of cases registered with police	Difference
1.	The Immoral Traffic (Prevention) Act, 1956	1,204	581	623
2.	The Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961	13,463	130	13,333
3.	The Indecent Representation of Women (Prohibition) Act, 1986	1,060	183	877
4.	The Commission of Sati (Prevention) Act, 1987	1	0	1
5.	The Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005	68,506	49	68,457
6.	The Prohibition of Child Marriage Act, 2006	224	74	150
7.	The Protection of Children from sexual offences Act, 2012	24,887	2,025	22,862
8.	The Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013	578	0	578
9.	The Rajasthan Prevention of Witch-hunting Act, 2015	100	97	3
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,10,023</b>	<b>3,139</b>	<b>1,06,884</b>

*Source: Data provided by the Rajasthan High Court, Jodhpur and State Police Department.*

It can be seen from the above table that there was a huge difference in the number of cases registered under three SLLs 'The Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961', 'The Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005' and 'The Protection of Children from sexual offences Act, 2012'. Thus, the data was not being reconciled. This was indicative of lack of proper coordination between police and legal authorities and other stakeholders.

GoR stated (January 2019) that many cases were submitted directly in the courts under various sections of IPC and CrPC and not submitted in the police stations. However, details regarding cases registered directly in the courts under specific sections of IPC and CrPC was not provided by the police to substantiate the reply.

Home Department, GoR in its reply (February 2021) to the Draft Report (December 2020) stated that many cases were submitted directly in the courts under various sections of IPC and CrPC and not submitted in the police stations. Further, many cases were registered in court on suo moto basis.

Reply needs to be viewed in the light of the huge difference in the cases registered with police department and courts while effective efforts were not made by the Department to reconcile the difference.

**Conclusion:**

*The internal control mechanism prescribed under various acts/rules established for protection of women and girl child was not functioning properly. The authorities concerned did not undertake proper monitoring of the shelters and protectives homes and did not meet as per prescribed periodicity to discuss critical issues of welfare of women and girl child. The Internal Committee/Local Committee did not submit annual reports to employers/District Officers, only 12.89 per cent of the prescribed inspections of MSSKs were carried out by the POs in test checked districts, against required 48 meetings of Rajasthan State Commission for Women. Only 35.42 per cent (17 meetings) were held during*

2012-20. District Advisory Boards under Dowry Prohibition Act had still not been constituted in the 29 districts as of December 2020. The quality of services in Balika Grehs could not be ensured due to lack of inspections, residential facilities and other requirements for children in need of care and protection. Follow up of rehabilitated girls as prescribed in rules was not carried out at any of the Balika Grehs/shelters during 2012-19. None of the test checked DLSAs and TLSCs organized prescribed number of meetings during 2012-20.

### **Recommendations**

14. The State Government should ensure that the State level monitoring mechanism through Rajasthan State Commission for women etc. functions as per prescribed guidelines. The designated authorities should conduct the prescribed number of public meetings and internal meetings so as to monitor the efficacy of the measures taken for welfare and protection of women in the State.
15. The State Government should ensure that the monitoring committees envisioned under the various statutes (e.g. Dowry Prohibition Act, Rajasthan Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Rules etc.) are duly constituted and function as per the mandate provided by their respective statutes.
16. Proper monitoring and regular supervisions of the Swadhar Grehs, Balika Grehs and Protection & Rehabilitation Homes for timely rectification of irregularities in providing the services to the inmates should be ensured.

*Anadi Misra*

**JAIPUR,  
The 06 April, 2022**

**(ANADI MISRA)  
Accountant General  
(Audit-I), Rajasthan**

**Countersigned**

*Girish Chandra Murmu*

**NEW DELHI,  
The 08 April, 2022**

**(GIRISH CHANDRA MURMU)  
Comptroller and Auditor General of India**