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Abstract

Madhya Pradesh is a pioneer state in the national movement for conservation of flora and fauna. For conservation of different varieties of wildlife, state forest area is divided into many protected areas like National Parks, Wildlife Sanctuaries, Tiger Reserves and many territorial managed forests. Wildlife crime or abuse for amusement and earning money has increased year by year due to lack of knowledge and neglecting seriousness on such major issues. The main objective of this paper is to highlight such issues in past 4 years (2011-2014) in Madhya Pradesh. Data from Preliminary Offence Report (POR) of M.P. from 2011 to 2014 lists some of the species of wild life which have been greatly impacted due to illegal hunting. This paper below is a study about the rising forest offence on different wild animals including reptiles and birds. It endeavors to assess the status of wild animals of the state, their rate of hunting per year and major reasons behind their killing. The study highlights that the majorly affected animals are snakes, cobra and Indian python or ajgar and discusses abuse on snakes in the name of religion. Paper also throws light on the fact that such crimes are not yet taken seriously by any regulatory body and people should know that killing a snake or a bird is as big offence as killing a tiger.

This paper provides in-depth analysis about the cases of ill-treatment, exploitation and killing of wild animals from the Madhya Pradesh. Decrease in the number of mammalian animals like wild pig, nilgai and chital has been emphasized by the collection of data from 2011 onwards. Other than this reason for the reduction in number of snakes has been put forward which is generally overlooked. Such offences occur regularly in many remote areas of state.

For protection and conservation of forests & wild Life, state forest department has 16 different spheres which are divided into 63 Divisions and in 10 wild animal conserved areas in which 25,737 officers/workers are posted. Conservation, protection of forest and wildlife assumes greater significance in the present scenario because of increased pressure on forest and the monetary value involved in the wildlife trade.
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Introduction

Wildlife resources constitute a vital link in the survival of the human species and have been a matter of research and attraction for the tourists all over the world. India is a land of biological diversity for wildlife owing to its exceptional bio-geographic positioning, varied climatic conditions and a widespread eco-diversity and geo-diversity. Among all the states, comparatively Madhya Pradesh is enriched with different species of both wild flora and fauna. A great wealth of biological diversity exists in this region. This diversity is, however under stress from poaching and organized illegal wildlife trade. But despite of such wealth, figure of few wild animals are drastically dropping down due to hunting and other causes [1-3].

Wildlife crime can be defined as taking, possession, trade or movement, processing, consumption of wild animals and plants or their derivatives in contravention of any international, regional, or national legislation(s). Infliction of cruelty to and the persecution of wild animals, both free-living and captive are also at times added to this definition. Though wild animals and plants are the victims of any wildlife crime at first place, it has got a cascading effect on the ecosystem of particular country or region. It is clear from the constitutional mandate that wildlife is our national wealth. Therefore, the country is also a victim of wildlife crimes. As illegal wildlife trade involves huge amounts of money, it is, also to be treated as a serious economic offence [4-6].

Madhya Pradesh is a pioneer state in the national movement for conservation of flora and fauna. Conservation oriented legal provisions were made in the previous Acts regulating hunting of birds and wild animals. Efforts are under way to increase
the Protected Area network to 15% of the forest or 5% of the geographical area as suggested by State Wildlife Board. Protection wildlife is not possible by the government policies alone. Active cooperation of the public, committed active and educated non-governmental organizations and individual are essential ingredients for successful wildlife protection. There should be a more participatory approach to wildlife conservation. We must remember that all species are created equal and man has no right to arrogate to himself the power to cause their extinction [7-11].

Total geographical area of Madhya Pradesh is 3,08,245 square kilometer, out of which National Park, Sanctuaries, Tiger Reserve and general forest land covers 94, 689 square kilometer of forest area which is 37.72% of states and 2.81% of total India’s geographical area. In M.P. there are 52,731 villages in which 21,797 villages are located in 5km circumference on the outer of forest border along with other 893 villages.

Most of the villagers depend on forests for their daily Needs due to which there is biotic pressure on the forest area. Forest crimes in M.P. are majorly due to illegal cutting of timbers, illegal transportation, hunting, digging or excavation, encroachment on forest land, illegal grazing etc. Key forest crimes are mainly illegal cutting of tree, transportation of forest products, illegal excavation, illegal mining encroachment on forest land, hunting, saw machine and fire incidence. Recently tendency of forest criminal units for unlawful forest cutting, excavation and encroachment has increased a lot to terrorize forest workers and to exploit forest products illegally. In previous one year only, 41 incidents took place in state in which there was violence and fighting with forest safety troop. This indicates that forest Mafiya/Criminal groups are busy in doing forest crime another major problem is Grazing Number of cattle grazing in forests is approximately 3.63 crores. Beside this about 30 lakhs cattle from neighbor states also enter the forest area for grazing.

Conservation, protection of forest and wildlife assumes greater significance in the present scenario because of increased pressure on forest and the monetary value involved in the wildlife trade. The research article summarizes in detail wildlife crime, its detection, prevention agencies and steps to be taken during the wildlife crime area.

For protection and conservation of forests, state forest department has 16 different spheres which are divided into 63 Divisions and in 10 wild animal conserved areas in which 25,737 officers/workers are posted. This group includes Chief Conservator of Forest, Divisional Forest officer, Sub-divisional officer, area wise Ranger and Sub-ranger, fourth class and other different staff members. For Protection forest area has been divided into one module beat which is patrolled timely for effective protection. Remote area of every beat is regulated by its Gazetted and Zonal officers. Flying Scotts have also been kept in duty for extra protection and invigilation of every diameter/area of forest. For cooperation and help to the villagers 15,228 forest protection committees are into action. Along with this, for more protection effective arrangements like telecommunication strategy in which not only 5,500 Mobile phones but 9,000 P. D. A. equipments and wireless sets are also made available to forest guard. Along with this for patrolling elephants and boats on water area are made available and time to time sudden patrolling is conducted. Presently forest protection troop has 2,600 (12 bore) and 136 revolvers. M.P. Forest there are various type of forest like Teak (Tectona grandis) , Bamboo, Sal (Shorea robusta,) Mixed forest and Miscellaneous forest, etc. as well as it is highly rich in minerals coal, paving stone, Murom and lime stone (Figure 1 & 2).

![Figure 1: Graph showing forest offence.](image-url)
From year 2011 to 2013, total 1,94,120 criminal cases related to wild animals have been registered. From year 2006 to 2013, comparatively every year average 64,921 Offence (2011 to 2013) have been Registered. From this data reduction in offence has been observed Table 1 & 2. Objective & Study of effect of Wildlife Conservation Act 1972

i. Study of registered cases on conservation of snakes by forest ranger.

ii. Study of cases related to snakes from registered cases on forest crime (Figure 3).
Methodology

On analyzing the enforcement cases of wild animals from 2011 to 2013, a difference in data on yearly basis created from prevalent application of forest department FOMS (Forest Offence Management System) has been detected. This may be due to lack of entries by the management in computer by this application. This yearly report is created by taking details from each and every state’s forest department. Primary data for the year 2011 to 2013 and some of the data of 2014 has been obtained from the website of Forest department application FOMS Management System. Secondary data has been gathered from Annual administrative department report. This data is including all the cases related to killing of wild animals in Madhya Pradesh state region in India.

From study in the year 2014 it has been analyzed that total 653 cases on illegal hunting in the year 2013 has been registered in which approximately 650 cases on wild animals every year were registered. Data from 10 different places in M.P. is gathered and analyzed. In M.P. the status of decreasing illegal hunting cases in the forest area is as follows.

Results and Discussion

On analyzing the enforcement cases of wild animals from 2011 to 2013, we detected a difference in data on yearly basis based on the application from the forest department FOMS (Forest Offence Management System). This may be due to lack of system entries by the management related to this application. From the report shown in Table 2 we noticed that most of the cases are of mammalian animals and only a few cases are related to birds and other species. This is because either there is very less information available about birds and small animals or they are hardly beneficial to humans and if abused, their cases are not taken seriously. Data also indicates that POR (Primary Offence Report) of snakes is far less than animals like beer, Tiger, leopard, Chital and Sambhar.

Table 2 also indicates that killing and hunting of wild pig has been largely reported, followed by Chital and Nilgai. This is because of the damage caused to the crops by wild pig as well as Nilgai as they remain close to the area of local villagers. In the forest area, wild pig and Sambhar are found abundantly and their flesh as food is liked by local tribes, therefore they

Figure 3: Area of studies Madhya Pradesh, India.
are hunted and cooked during festivals and special occasions. Very often, cases on killing of Langur, fox, wolf, Hyena, sheep and snakes due to road accidents are also reported. Killing of large mammals like Sloth bear, tiger, cheetah, gaur, peacock, chital, Sambhar, etc. are taken more seriously and given primary importance by the government and hence these cases are always reported. Exploration of data indicates that POR's of reptiles and snakes are very few and that incomprehensive hunting is maximum in Shehdol district. Low rate of such crime has been reported in districts like Chhindwara and Seoni (Table 3).

Table 2: Preliminary offence report of Madhya Pradesh from 2011 to 2014.

| S.No. | Common Name | Latin Name       | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | Total |
|-------|-------------|------------------|------|------|------|------|-------|
| 1     | Barahsingha | Cervus duvaucelii| 0    | 2    | 0    | 0    | 2     |
| 2     | Chital      | Axis axis        | 61   | 55   | 55   | 41   | 212   |
| 3     | Chinkara    | Gazella bennetti | 4    | 3    | 11   | 7    | 25    |
| 4     | Fox         | -                | 0    | 0    | 0    | 1    | 1     |
| 5     | Langur      | Simia entellus   | 11   | 17   | 12   | 12   | 52    |
| 6     | Gaur        | Bos gaurus       | 2    | 1    | 4    | 0    | 7     |
| 7     | Hares       | Lepus nigricollis| 14   | 6    | 9    | 12   | 41    |
| 8     | Hyena       | H. hyaena        | 13   | 18   | 15   | 4    | 50    |
| 9     | Mongoose    | Herpestes edwardsi| 7    | 2    | 2    | 0    | 11    |
| 10    | Nilgai      | Boselphus tragocamelus| 105  | 65   | 120  | 33   | 323   |
| 11    | Sambhar     | Rusa unicolor    | 21   | 27   | 29   | 19   | 97    |
| 12    | Sloth bear  | Melursus ursinus | 16   | 15   | 16   | 3    | 50    |
| 13    | Wild dog    | Cuon alpines    | 1    | 4    | 2    | 0    | 7     |
| 14    | Wild pig    | Sus scrofa       | 125  | 134  | 139  | 59   | 457   |
| 15    | Wolf        | Canis lupus pallipes| 0    | 1    | 4    | 1    | 6     |
| 16    | Tiger       | Panthera tigris  | 0    | 4    | 3    | 0    | 7     |
| 17    | Snake       | Many species     | 8    | 5    | 8    | 7    | 28    |
| 18    | Peacock     | Many species     | 18   | 34   | 21   | 16   | 89    |
| 19    | Owls        | Many species     | 0    | 1    | 3    | 2    | 6     |

Table 3:

| S.No. | Place        | Poaching Cases | No. of Wild Animals |
|-------|--------------|----------------|---------------------|
| 1     | Shahdol      | 79             | 72                  |
| 2     | Rewa         | 72             | 67                  |
| 3     | Jabalpur     | 66             | 71                  |
| 4     | Chhatarpur   | 64             | 53                  |
| 5     | Gwalior      | 69             | 90                  |
| 6     | Sagar        | 56             | 40                  |
| 7     | Bhopal       | 52             | 82                  |
| 8     | Balaghat     | 50             | 60                  |
| 9     | Chhindwara   | 29             | 31                  |
| 10    | Seoni        | 25             | 24                  |

According to the census in 2001, numbers of snake charmers in M.P. are approximately 60,415, out of which 90% (54,297) reside in urban areas and rest 10% (6,188) are from rural sectors. These people earn their living by doing shows of snakes and begging money for that. In M.P. during two major festivals, Nagpanchami and Mahashivratri, the snake charmers do shows of cobra (Nag) to earn a hefty amount of begged money. For this they take out poisonous teeth of the snakes which results in death of those snakes after a few days. Moreover, there are many factors which are affecting snake’s natural life. Fire, illegal digging, encroachment and many other incidents are destroying the native places of snakes. Due to misconceptions and lack of knowledge regarding snakes, people kill snakes immediately if seen in their houses, surroundings or in fields. These are the main reasons for drastic decrease in snake population. None of such cases are reported or documented anywhere.
From 2011 to 2013, out of total animal abuse cases only 28 cases on snake abuse are found to be reported. Among the reported cases, 9 are from revenue area, another 9 are from forest area and 7 are related to other areas. Information regarding 13 cases has been given by the informers, 9 cases while patrolling and 3 cases by police to forest protection group. In the year 2013, Total 1554 hectare area has been affected of Kanha and Mandla by 133 wild animal abuse cases. Whereas in Betul area, 160 hectare area is affected due to 38 cases. In most of the cases, flaw in court proceedings, absence of witness on time, lack of scientific analysis of crime and due to neglecting the seriousness of cases by forest group results in delay of cases. Until now, no punishment or no poundage or crime fine has been noticed during the study.

Conclusion

This study has attempted to highlight those hidden aspects of wildlife in the forest area wherein many innocent animals are hunted or abused to fulfill personal needs of mankind. During the study, 19 different species have been found to be affected due to hunting of which wild pig, Nilgai and Chital are the most hunted ones. They have been largely hunted for personal consumption, livelihood and for other economic reasons.

Maximum number of cases seems to be pending in the court. Villagers are not much aware of the stringent of the government laws. They should be made aware of such laws and legislations.

Wildlife including flora and fauna are equally important in maintaining balance between natural ecosystems. Any disturbance due to reduction in any species may affect this balance and food chain among animals. Efforts should be made to increase the Protected Area network to 15% of the forest or 5% of the geographical area as suggested by State Wildlife Board. Protection of wildlife is not possible by the government policies alone. Active cooperation of the public, committed, active and educated non-governmental organizations and individual support are essential ingredients for successful wildlife protection. Eco-development i.e., development ecologically, socially and economically is necessary from all prospectus. Though state government has implemented a project to save tigers but at the same time many other wild animals especially mammals and snakes are killed at an alarming rate which needs to be curbed too. Many national parks and sanctuaries can help them sustain life but local people also have to be given awareness regarding this illegal act of hunting and killing animals or keeping them under their custody and affecting their normal life.

The Wild Life (Protection) Act, 1972, is the umbrella legislation in the country for wildlife crime enforcement. State Forest and Police Departments are the primary enforcement agencies with regards to wildlife crimes. Wildlife crimes should be investigated by Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI) with the permission of State Governments concerned. Laws which are made for such acts should be strictly followed and implemented either in terms of fine or imprisonment. The local administration and the protected area management should initiate a programmed strategy to examine conservation status of vegetation, communities, habitats, and species that are threatened and need protection.
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