

# 1 Decentralisation of the compliance of anti-tobacco law 2 in India: The case of higher educational institutions in 3 New Delhi, India.

4 Raja Singh<sup>1,2,3</sup>,

5 <sup>1</sup> Visiting Faculty, Department of Architecture, School of Planning and Architecture, New Delhi

6 <sup>2</sup> Advisor, ISAC Centre for Built Environment Policy, Delhi NCR

7 <sup>3</sup> Built Environment and Public Health Research Fellow, Tathatara Foundation, Bobbili, India.

8

9 Corresponding Author email address: rajaresearch@proton.me

10

## 11 **Abstract**

12 This paper studies the decentralised compliance responsibility of India's tobacco control  
13 legislation that the government has outsourced to higher educational institutions through an  
14 example of New Delhi. 36 higher educational institutions, including universities, are selected and  
15 studied through a unique methodology using India's transparency law, i.e., the Right to  
16 Information Act 2005. The study looks into the three most important parameters of decentralised  
17 compliance. Two of these require the installation of signboards by educational institutions, and  
18 the third involves imposing and collecting fines against persons found smoking within the  
19 educational institutions. Regarding the boards, the first board is about the warning prohibiting  
20 the sale within 100 yards of educational institutions, and the second one prohibits smoking in  
21 educational institutions. The study also asks the educational institutions whether there is a  
22 presence of cigarette and tobacco product vendors within 100 yards of the institution, where the  
23 sale of such products has been banned by law. The study also found educational activities to  
24 create awareness in the institutions for tobacco control and cessation. The results show that the  
25 intent to decentralise the compliance of the tobacco control law in New Delhi has not been  
26 universally successful and requires much effort.t for its on-ground penetration. Such studies have  
27 a policy impact as they serve as an example for the generalisability of such statutes, which only  
28 work when there is implementation from the bottom-up and when the deterrent is also strong  
29 with incentivisation to the educational institutions to implement tobacco control with vigour.

30

31 **Keywords:** *COTPA Act 2003, Tobacco Cessation, Smoking control, No Smoking signboards, the  
32 proximity of tobacco vendors, public policy, public health.*

## 33 **Introduction**

34 India has an anti-smoking and anti-tobacco law that was passed in the year 2003. It is known as  
35 the Cigarettes and Other Tobacco Products (Prohibition of Advertisement and Regulation of  
36 Trade and Commerce, Production, Supply and Distribution) Act, 2003 or the COTPA Act, 2003  
37 <sup>1</sup>. The intent of the law was to enact '*a comprehensive law on tobacco in the public interest and*

40 *to protect the public health*’ and to *‘prohibit the consumption of cigarettes and other tobacco*  
41 *products which are injurious to health with the view of achieving the public health in general as*  
42 *enjoined by Article 47*’ of the Indian Constitution <sup>2</sup>. This was made in response to the 43<sup>rd</sup> World  
43 Health Assembly, where member states were urged to consider tobacco control strategies, with a  
44 focus on protecting children from voluntary exposure to tobacco use and discouraging the use to  
45 tobacco <sup>3</sup>. It is this focus on young people that the Indian law focused on educational institutions  
46 and minors. The legal manifestation of this concern for minors and educational institution  
47 vicinity is seen in section 6 of the COTPA Act, 2003 states that:

48 *No person shall sell, offer for sale, or permit sale of, cigarette or any other tobacco*  
49 *product-*

50 *(a) to any person who is under eighteen years of age, and*

51 *(b) in an area within a radius of one hundred yards of any educational institution.*

52 This clearly shows that the intent of protecting young children from tobacco and smoking  
53 existed, even if it was in response to a national commitment in front of an international forum.  
54 But the most important and missing link in this is the way this would be implemented. The  
55 concern was raised even in the parliament when this bill was taken in the Lok Sabha on the date  
56 of its adoption as a law passed by the legislature in India after one house of the parliament had  
57 already passed it. The concern raised was whether simple enactment of the law will actually lead  
58 to its implementation? <sup>4</sup>

59 This leads us to the second decision that the government made to solve the problem of the  
60 implementation of the COTPA Act for its implementation, especially with respect to banning the  
61 sale of tobacco products within 100 yards of educational institutions. The government simply  
62 outsourced and decentralised the compliance to educational institutions by enacting a rule under  
63 section 31 of the COTPA Act called the Cigarettes and Other Tobacco Products (Display of  
64 Board by Educational Institutions) Rules, 2009<sup>5</sup>, which states as follows:

65 *3. Display of Board by Educational Institutions.(1) The owner or manager or any person*  
66 *in-charge of affairs of the educational institution shall display and exhibit a board at a*  
67 *conspicuous place outside the premises, prominently stating that sale of cigarettes and*  
68 *other tobacco products in an area within a radius of one hundred yards of educational*  
69 *institutions is strictly prohibited and that it is an offense under Section 24 of the Act with*  
70 *fine which may extend to two hundred rupees.’*

71 By this act the government outsourced and decentralised the compliance to educational institutions  
72 and that too with the only requirement of putting up a signboard which prohibits anyone from  
73 selling cigarettes and tobacco products within 100 yards of educational institutions. There may  
74 also be scope for an assumption that putting such a board may be deterrent enough, as even if  
75 someone has been caught, the meagre punishment of a fine of rupees two hundred will not only be  
76 too little but will also be over as a summary trial. The lawmakers, while discussing it, also had  
77 similar concerns as this may not be a deterrent enough, and people may pay the money as there is  
78 no severe punishment for the re-occurrence of the offence by the same person<sup>4</sup>.

79 Another way by which compliance has been decentralised is by giving two more responsibilities  
80 to educational institutions. One is the installation of a board which states '*No-Smoking Area-*  
81 *Smoking here is an Offense*' under the Prohibition of Smoking in Public Places Rules, 2008<sup>6</sup>, at  
82 multiple places, including the entrance, other conspicuous places and one on each floor near the  
83 staircase. The second is even the on-ground implementation of the prohibition of smoking in  
84 public places by making the College/School/Headmaster/Principal or even the teacher as the  
85 authorised officer to impose and collect the fine against the violation of Section 4 of the COTPA  
86 Act, 2003. This means the teachers have been expected to be the law enforcers and collect fines  
87 from students who are found smoking in educational institutions. These have been reiterated in  
88 intent by the guideline of the Delhi State Tobacco Control Cell<sup>7</sup> to educational institutions and are  
89 also in line with the earlier Delhi Assembly statute<sup>8</sup>, which preceded the national anti-  
90 tobacco/anti-smoking Act<sup>1</sup>.

91 With this, we find out that there are three responsibilities of the educational institutions by which  
92 the anti-tobacco law has to be implemented and enforced by them. These are summed up as  
93 follows:

- 94 1. Putting a poster prohibiting the sale of cigarettes and tobacco products within 100-yard  
95 vicinity of educational institutions.
- 96 2. Putting a board prohibiting smoking within educational institutions.
- 97 3. Imposing and collecting the fine from anyone found smoking in educational institutions.

98  
99 To check compliance for the above three points, this study has been designed at the level of the  
100 higher educational institutions in New Delhi. The aim of this study is to find the decentralised  
101 implementation of the COTPA Act 2003 and its rules by educational institutions in New Delhi.  
102 This compliance has been checked for national-level institutes by the same author<sup>9</sup>, but the  
103 compliance on the level of Delhi, with respect to fine collection and placement of indoor posters,  
104 has not been covered fully by any other study from India or from the world for that matter. The  
105 author, in an earlier study, has looked for the checking of the signboard compliance prohibiting the  
106 sale of tobacco products within 100 yards of the vicinity but has found non-universal compliance  
107 with the signboard requirement<sup>10</sup>.

108 The need for this study is justified as this may be the first study looking comprehensively at the  
109 compliance by the educational institutions in the heart of India, in its capital city of New Delhi.

110

## 111 **Materials & Methods**

112 This study focuses on higher education institutions. 47 higher education institutions, most of them  
113 run by the Government of National Capital Territory of Delhi, have been included. This number is  
114 of randomly selected higher educational institutions, including 4 universities run by the  
115 Government of NCT of Delhi located in New Delhi and all 12 colleges of the Delhi University  
116 that are fully sponsored by the Delhi government, i.e., colleges funded 100% by the Delhi  
117 Government, but under the Delhi University<sup>11</sup>. The main campus of the Delhi University has also  
118 been included. Many colleges of the universities and other autonomous stand-alone colleges run

119 directly by the Delhi Government have been included. This is a fairly representative sample, and  
120 the knowledge of the exact number of all the colleges run by various governments and the lack of  
121 calculation of sample size may be a limitation of the study. But covering 4 universities, all Delhi  
122 government-run colleges of the Delhi University provide a fairly good representation of higher  
123 educational institutions in New Delhi. The author has performed a separate study for the colleges  
124 run by the Central Government in India, which also includes the centrally run colleges in New  
125 Delhi like the Indian Institute of Technology, New Delhi.

126 This study uses a unique methodology, where the transparency law of India has been used for data  
127 collection from the various institutions that have been included in the study. The Right to  
128 Information Act of 2005, usually otherwise used for holding the government to account, has also  
129 found its use in this study where it has been used for research<sup>12,13</sup>. This is just like the FOIA or the  
130 Freedom of Information Act of the United States. Out of the 47, 11 institutions did not respond to  
131 the request for the information in defiance of the Right to Information Act 2005. This can lead to  
132 penalty and disciplinary action, and the author has invoked Section 19 and will be following up  
133 with the institutions as they have not responded to the request, which is not only prohibitive for  
134 research but is also illegal as per law. In this study, therefore, 36 institutions have finally been  
135 included out of the 7 that were reached out.

136 The information asked for was in the sense of checking the decentralised application of the  
137 COTPA Act 2003 by the educational institutes.

138 The information was asked in the form of applications filed under Section 6 of the Right to  
139 Information Act 2005. This mandates the public authority, which in our case is the educational  
140 institutions run by the Government of NCT of Delhi as mentioned before, to provide the  
141 information under the seal and signature of a senior officer of the public authority, which is  
142 usually a senior faculty in the case of educational institutions. This information has to be supplied  
143 within a mandatory time period of 30 days as per Section 7(1) of the Right to Information Act  
144 2005. This approach enables only authentic, duly certified information and makes the information  
145 accurate. This information, since released under the public transparency law, also becomes  
146 information in the public domain and is available for wide public usage. A limitation of using the  
147 Right to Information Act 2005 is twofold. Firstly, the information has not been ground-truthed by  
148 the author, and it relies on the information provided by the officer. But since the information is of  
149 legal nature, this apprehension may be diluted as the government officer will not provide false  
150 information under their sign and seal. Secondly, another limitation is that this approach is only  
151 valid for educational institutions which come under the category of public authority as per Section  
152 2(h) of the RTI Act 2005. This automatically excluded the private educational institutions that are  
153 present in New Delhi but are not included in this study. Due to the exclusion of these under the  
154 transparency law, these private institutions become somewhat of opaque and cannot be mandated  
155 by law to provide information of public interest, and researchers may need to depend on the choice  
156 and will of these institutions to provide such information, and this may lead to the provision of no  
157 information at all. This is because, due to the absence of a legal requirement, information which

158 may put the institution in a bad light may never be available for researchers, journalists and others  
159 interested.

160 The educational institutions, once selected, were sent an application as mentioned before with the  
161 following point of information asked:

- 162 1. Information regarding the presence of the signboard on the outside of the educational  
163 institution in compliance with the Cigarettes and Other Tobacco Products (Display of  
164 Boards by Educational Institutions) Rules, 2009<sup>5</sup>, which instruct the educational  
165 institutions to put up a board which states to prohibit the sale of cigarettes and tobacco  
166 products in an area within a radius of one hundred yards.
- 167 2. Information regarding the presence of boards and their location state that the educational  
168 institution is 'No Smoking Area-Smoking Here is an offence' as per Section 3(b) and  
169 Schedule II of the Prohibition of Smoking in Public Places Rules, 2008<sup>6</sup>.
- 170 3. Information of the total instances of fines collected/offences compounded/offences  
171 recorded/warning issued in respect to Section 5 of the Prohibition of Smoking in Public  
172 Places Rules, 2008, which stated the authorised officers who are competent to act under  
173 Schedule III of the Prohibition of Smoking Rules, 2008 from the year 2012 till the year  
174 2022. In this, the Principal/teacher/director/head of the institution is a person authorised  
175 to take action under the law.
- 176 4. Information on the presence and number of vendors of cigarettes and other tobacco  
177 products within a distance of 100 yards from the outer boundary of the educational  
178 institute.
- 179 5. Information regarding the list of events/initiatives/activities/circulars/anything on record  
180 where the educational institution has taken steps to prevent use of cigarettes and tobacco  
181 products.

182 An annexure with the detailed quoted laws was also annexed with the application.

183 The institutions provided the reply through the RTI portal<sup>14</sup> as well as written replies with  
184 signatures on the letterhead of the institution. The period of collection of the information has been  
185 between April to May 2023. The information from the educational institutions was received in  
186 three ways. Some sent a detailed hard copy; others uploaded it to the Right to Information portal  
187 and some sent it via email. This information was collected till the end of the one-month  
188 information period and even extended by another month of grace period to cater for the postal  
189 delays or any other delays.

190 These results were compiled in the form of a table, and then the results were reported, and  
191 interpretation was drawn and made in line with the aims and objectives of the study.

192 Another limitation that is reported is that the first reply by the educational institutions has been  
193 reported, and the first appeal or the second appeal has not been filed to obtain clarification on the  
194 information provided in the first reply by the educational institutions.

195

196 ***Non-requirement of ethics review for this study:*** This study uses data available in the public  
197 domain that has been supplied by a public authority under the Right to Information Act 2005.



198 There is no involvement of any human participant, human subject, human or animal tissue. There  
199 is also no linked identifier to any human participant or subject. The mere fact that the data has  
200 been supplied under the open public domain through the Right to Information Act 2005 deems it  
201 non-personal as, according to the transparency law, the public authority cannot provide any third-  
202 party information by law.

203

## 204 **Results**

205 In general, out of 36 institutions that provided the information, on the issue of the provision of the  
206 signboard prohibiting the sale of cigarettes and tobacco products within a vicinity of 100 yards, 16  
207 have provided the board in the format required, which means the board stated explicitly that the  
208 ‘Sale of cigarettes and other tobacco products within 100 yards of the educational institutions is an  
209 offense...’. 7 stated clearly that the board has not been provided, though, from the reply, many of  
210 the 7 were in the belief that the placement of the board was not their own responsibility but was of  
211 some other agency. This will be discussed in the paper later. 7 out of the 36 stated there was a  
212 presence of the board, but it was not clear whether the format was as required, as many of these 7  
213 stated that they had placed ‘No Smoking’ boards instead of the boards which prohibit the sale  
214 within 100 yards vicinity. It is also pertinent to note that 6 out of the 36 that provided information  
215 in general did not provide the information related to the signboard prohibiting sale within 100  
216 yards. They either stated that the information is either not on record or used some other way of  
217 denying the information.

218 But, with respect to the placement, the simple signboards prohibiting smoking in educational  
219 institutes as public places, the signboard compliance was more promising. Out of 36 institutions,  
220 32 have the boards placed. 2 institutions did not place the boards, and 2 did not provide the  
221 information.

222 On the matter of the recording instances of smoking of instances of collecting the fines, these two  
223 were together clubbed, and it was found that only 1 institution has a record of smoking  
224 instances/fine collection. 17 educational institutions had no instances of smoking recorded/no  
225 fines collected. For this, a staggering 18 institutions did not provide the information or did not  
226 have such information on record.

227 With respect to the issue of whether there was a presence of tobacco vendors within 100 yards of  
228 the educational institution vicinity, it was found that 2 institutions reported the presence of  
229 vendors. 17 on the other hand, stated that there was no presence of the vendors. 7 institutions  
230 responded that this information was either not under the purview of the educational institution or  
231 was not a responsibility of the educational institution. Some even went ahead and transferred this  
232 part of the information either to the Delhi Police or to the health department. 10 educational  
233 institutions denied the information or did not provide or stated that the information was not on  
234 record.

235 As education is the major role played by educational institutions in society, we checked the role  
236 played by educational institutions in educating about tobacco cessation. We found that out of 36  
237 educational institutions, 27 stated that they conducted activities related to educating students on

238 tobacco cessation. These activities may range from counselling to plays, dramas, talks, and other  
239 seminars. One institution reported no activities on tobacco cessation, and 8 did not provide any  
240 information and stated that no such information was on record.

241

## 242 **Discussion**

243 This study is not the first one to check the compliance of the COTPA Act 2003 in India, yet it is  
244 unique and brings forth new knowledge in new ways. The basis of the study has been the  
245 decentralisation of the compliance of the COTPA Act 2003 in educational institutions of New  
246 Delhi, India which forms the heart of the second most populated country in the world. The first  
247 contribution of this study is that it is the first one which checks the decentralised compliance of  
248 educational institutions in Delhi with respect to the detail of the smoking instances checked or  
249 fines collected. This is something that is part of the law, where the decentralised duty is given to  
250 the principal, headmaster and faculty of the educational institution, but this check is not part of the  
251 standard check that forms part of the 'Self-Evaluation Scorecard for Tobacco Free Educational  
252 Institution' released by the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Government of India<sup>15</sup>. There  
253 are also other studies that are related to compliance with the COTPA Act 2003 in India. The first  
254 study is which only simply measured advertisements at vendor's points and only selected 30  
255 schools randomly<sup>16</sup>. This study did not include signboard compliance or fines compliance.  
256 Another group performed two studies performed cross-sectional and proximity analysis<sup>17</sup>, and  
257 earlier did a multi-stage cluster sampling survey for checking the advertisement by tobacco  
258 vendors<sup>18</sup>. In these, the signboard component has been missed. Another study used questionnaires  
259 for compliance. But, even this study was restricted to the 'No Smoking boards' compliance and  
260 did not include the signboard prohibiting sale in 100 yards vicinity<sup>19</sup>. Another study performed  
261 concentrated on tobacco vendors on various parameters, including advertisement and selling the  
262 products to minors<sup>20</sup>. This current study is useful as it deals with three important points related to  
263 two formats of signboard compliance and the third being the compliance of smoking instance/fine  
264 collection recording. The author has himself performed a similar study on national-level  
265 educational institutions and also performed ground truthing of the signboard compliance (the  
266 board banning sale within 100 yards) and the actual presence of the vendors within 100 yards of  
267 the educational institutions<sup>10</sup>. Another unique component of this study is the sourcing of the data  
268 right from the source itself. Using the Transparency law of India, i.e., the Right to Information Act  
269 2005, ensures that the information provided is most authentic as it has been provided under the  
270 sign and seal of the educational institution under a legal requirement, with penal punishments  
271 available for the provision of wrong information.

272 There is also the important issue of the seeming confusion regarding the format of the boards.  
273 There were 7 institutions that did not provide the appropriate reply to the issue of the board  
274 prohibiting the sale of cigarettes and tobacco products within 100 yards of the educational  
275 institutions. Some institutions seemed to be using the two boards interchangeably, where the 'No  
276 smoking' boards were only represented as the board which prohibited the sale of cigarettes within

277 100-yard proximity. This has also been confirmed by a ground-truthing study by the author in  
278 Delhi.

279 Another issue of important concern is the belief that some educational institutions had regarding  
280 the two issues, where the educational institutions assumed that the duty did not lie with the  
281 educational institution but with some external agency like the police or the health department of  
282 the government. The first is the placement of the board prohibiting the sale of tobacco within 100  
283 yards of the educational institutions, where the educational institutions in question, stated that this  
284 was the responsibility of the police or the government agencies to place the boards. This belief is  
285 not only false but is also illegal and in direct contravention to the COTPA Act 2003 and its related  
286 rules. Another important factor that the educational institutions believed are not ‘under the  
287 purview’ of the educational institution is the presence of cigarettes and tobacco products vendors  
288 within 100 yards of the educational institution's vicinity. This may appear true in the first instance,  
289 but from the point of view of decentralisation, it may then be an educational institute that may  
290 either be the direct fine imposing authority or may be the first responder by informing the law  
291 enforcement agencies. But, from the point of view of the guidelines issued by the Ministry, as  
292 stated before, one of the important criteria for self-evaluation for check compliance of the COTPA  
293 Act 2003 is the check for the presence of tobacco vendors within proximity of 100 yards. By the  
294 presence of this factor in a ministry-issued guideline, the educational institutions cannot absolve  
295 themselves of the responsibility of checking for the vendors selling cigarettes and tobacco  
296 products and reporting the same to the law enforcement agencies. This has not been followed by  
297 the educational institutions that have in the information provided seemingly outsourced this  
298 responsibility to either the police or the health department.

299 As another peripheral issue, the awareness activities organised by the institutions are also an  
300 important step by the educational institutions with 75% of the institutions undertaking such  
301 activities.

302 Another important issue mentioned earlier, deals with the collection of fines. The empowerment of  
303 the headmaster, principal/head of the institute, or even the faculty member to impose and collect  
304 the fines is a decentralised approach to the compliance of the COTPA Act 2003 by the  
305 government, made in response to the legislature's wish of implementing the act. At the first  
306 glance, it may appear as a very positive step as the power has been transferred to the actual person  
307 on the ground till the last mile, but at the same time, it appears that there may also be concerns  
308 regarding the outsourcing of responsibility to the educational institutions.

309 From the generalisability point of view, it is important to understand that making a statute and  
310 effecting its implementation are important points to consider. There may be other such statutes  
311 which prohibit speed limits, fast food sale, or any other prohibition which may be top-down in  
312 nature. For the statute to actually be implemented, capacity buildings, training, and regular  
313 outreach must be part of the process in order to make the implementation more bottoms up in  
314 nature.



## 315 **Conclusions**

316 The aim of this study is to find the decentralised implementation of the COTPA Act 2003 and its  
317 rules by educational institutions in New Delhi. As far as the installation of boards prohibiting the  
318 sale of cigarettes and other tobacco products is concerned, the implementation is not universal,  
319 with only 44.4% of the institutions having a board. In the case of the no-smoking board, the  
320 compliance was better, with 88.9 per cent of the institutions having such boards. On instances of  
321 smoking and fine collection, only one institution reported an instance and collected a fine, while  
322 47.2 per cent of institutions did not have any instance of smoking/collected fine. It is negative that  
323 about 505 institutions did not even have a record of this collection of fines and recording of the  
324 smoking instances, which can safely be assumed as defiance of the law. In New Delhi, with the  
325 sample size studied, it can be stated that compliance with the COTPA Act 2003 is not universal in  
326 the complete sense, and there are many areas that need attention. The COTPA Act 2003 must be  
327 made stricter with more severe and deterring punishments for the offenders. The police should  
328 coordinate with educational institutions by taking the lead and initiative so that the vendors selling  
329 cigarettes and tobacco products within 100 yards can be punished severely.  
330 The intent of decentralising the role to the educational institutions has not been universally  
331 implemented, with some educational institutions not even owning up to the fact that the  
332 compliance of installing a signboard prohibiting the sale of cigarettes in the vicinity of 100 yards  
333 falls in their responsibility. A push needs to be made to incentivise educational institutions in the  
334 form of academic accreditations and enhanced academic rankings if they are able to fully  
335 implement the COTPA Act 2003 in and around their premises.  
336 There is also scope for further study in multiple areas, including the implementation check in all  
337 geographies. Another issue is research on whether 100 yards limit is effective and whether this  
338 needs to be increased, and whether the simple position of a signboard by an educational institution  
339 is deterrent enough for the vendors to not sell cigarettes and tobacco within the vicinity of  
340 educational institutions. Also, to check whether the process of imposing fines is an effective  
341 measure as a person affording a cigarette may pay the fine and carry on with smoking due to lack  
342 of stricter punishments or on recurrence of the offence.

343

## 344 **Acknowledgements**

345 Special thanks to Rajshekhar Pullabhatla and Group Captain P Aanand Naidu (retd.) of the  
346 Information Sharing and Analysis Center and Tathatara Foundation, respectively. Many thanks to  
347 the staff and faculty of the Department of Architecture. Thanks to Shreya G and Praveen K for  
348 their support. Many thanks to the Public Information officers of all the institutes for their kind  
349 support.

350

## 351 **Declarations**

352 The author declares no competing interests.

353 This study does not require ethics approval as stated in the 'Materials and Methods' above in  
354 detail.

355

356

## 357 **References**

358

- 359 1. Government of India. The Cigarettes and Other Tobacco Products (Prohibition of  
360 Advertisement and Regulation of Trade and Commerce, Production, Supply and Distribution)  
361 Act, 2003.; 2003. Accessed February 14, 2023.  
362 <https://legislative.gov.in/sites/default/files/A2003-34.pdf>
- 363 2. Bakshi PM. The Constitution of India; Selective Comments. Universal Law Publishing
- 364 3. Forty-Third World Health Assembly: Resolutions and Decisions Annexes. World Health  
365 Organisation; 1990:15. Accessed June 19, 2023.  
366 [https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/173422/WHA43\\_1990-REC-](https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/173422/WHA43_1990-REC-1_eng.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y)  
367 [1\\_eng.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y](https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/173422/WHA43_1990-REC-1_eng.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y)
- 368 4. Lok Sabha Debates (English Version) Twelfth Session (Thirteenth Lok Sabha). Lok  
369 Sabha Secretariat, New Delhi; 2003:358. Accessed June 19, 2023.  
370 [https://eparlib.nic.in/bitstream/123456789/759727/1/lst\\_13\\_12\\_30-04-2003.pdf](https://eparlib.nic.in/bitstream/123456789/759727/1/lst_13_12_30-04-2003.pdf)
- 371 5. Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Government of India. Cigarettes and Other  
372 Tobacco Products (Display of Boards by Educational Institutions) Rules, 2009. Accessed  
373 February 14, 2023. <https://nhm.gov.in/cota/Notifications%20on%20Section-6%28b%29>
- 374 6. Government of India. The Prohibition of Smoking in Public Place Rules, 2008.; 2008.  
375 Accessed February 14, 2023.  
376 [https://nhm.gov.in/cota/Notifications%20on%20Section%204%20of%20the%20Act%20Related](https://nhm.gov.in/cota/Notifications%20on%20Section%204%20of%20the%20Act%20Related%20to%20Prohibition%20of%20Smoking%20in%20Public%20Places/GSR-417-D%28E%29.pdf)  
377 [%20to%20Prohibition%20of%20Smoking%20in%20Public%20Places/GSR-417-](https://nhm.gov.in/cota/Notifications%20on%20Section%204%20of%20the%20Act%20Related%20to%20Prohibition%20of%20Smoking%20in%20Public%20Places/GSR-417-D%28E%29.pdf)  
378 [D%28E%29.pdf](https://nhm.gov.in/cota/Notifications%20on%20Section%204%20of%20the%20Act%20Related%20to%20Prohibition%20of%20Smoking%20in%20Public%20Places/GSR-417-D%28E%29.pdf)
- 379 7. Guideline for Tobacco Free schools/Educational Intitutions. Published online December  
380 8, 2009. Accessed June 19, 2023.  
381 [https://www.edudel.nic.in/upload\\_2013\\_14/11008\\_dt\\_24072013/3971\\_76\\_dt\\_07012010.pdf](https://www.edudel.nic.in/upload_2013_14/11008_dt_24072013/3971_76_dt_07012010.pdf)
- 382 8. The Delhi Prohibition of Smoking and Non-Smokers Health Protection Act 1996.  
383 Accessed January 2, 2023. <http://www.bareactslive.com/Del/dl155.htm>
- 384 9. Singh R. Compliance with the Provisions Related to Higher Educational Institutes of  
385 Anti-Tobacco/Smoking Law by Institutes of National Importance in India. Health Policy; 2023.  
386 doi:10.1101/2023.02.13.23285898
- 387 10. Singh R. Signboards prohibiting tobacco sale within 100 yards of educational institutes:  
388 the appraisal of prohibition compliance and on-ground status of the anti-smoking law in New  
389 Delhi's major administrative precinct. Cities Health. Published online May 31, 2023:1-10.  
390 doi:10.1080/23748834.2023.2215417
- 391 11. DU Colleges Sponsored by Govt. of NCT of Delhi | Directorate of Higher Education.  
392 Accessed June 19, 2023. [https://higherredn.delhi.gov.in/higher-education/du-colleges-sponsored-](https://higherredn.delhi.gov.in/higher-education/du-colleges-sponsored-govt-nct-delhi)  
393 [govt-nct-delhi](https://higherredn.delhi.gov.in/higher-education/du-colleges-sponsored-govt-nct-delhi)

- 394 12. Singh R. RTI for Research: Using the Right to Information Act, 2005 for Research in  
395 India. Vol 1. Sandeep Kaur(BooksBonanza); 2020. 10.5281/zenodo.6088938
- 396 13. Republic of India. The Right to Information Act, 2005. Vol 200522.; 2005. Accessed  
397 November 17, 2021. <https://rti.gov.in/rti-act.pdf>
- 398 14. RTI Online : Online RTI Information System. Accessed June 19, 2023.  
399 <https://rtionline.delhi.gov.in/>
- 400 15. Guidelines for Tobacco Free Educational Institution. Ministry of Health and Family  
401 Welfare, Government of India Accessed June 19, 2023.  
402 <https://ntcp.mohfw.gov.in/assets/document/TEFI-Guidelines.pdf>
- 403 16. Elf JL, Modi B, Stillman F, Dave P, Apelberg B. Tobacco sales and marketing within 100  
404 yards of schools in Ahmedabad City, India. *Public Health*. 2013;127(5):442-448.  
405 doi:10.1016/j.puhe.2013.02.003
- 406 17. Mistry R, Pednekar MS, McCarthy WJ, et al. Compliance with point-of-sale tobacco  
407 control policies and student tobacco use in Mumbai, India. *Tob Control*. 2019;28(2):220-226.  
408 doi:10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2018-054290
- 409 18. Mistry R, Pednekar M, Pimple S, et al. Banning tobacco sales and advertisements near  
410 educational institutions may reduce students' tobacco use risk: evidence from Mumbai, India.  
411 *Tob Control*. 2015;24(e1):e100-e107. doi:10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2012-050819
- 412 19. Khargekar NC, Debnath A, Khargekar NR, Shetty P, Khargekar V. Compliance of  
413 Cigarettes and Other Tobacco Products Act among Tobacco Vendors, Educational Institutions,  
414 and Public Places in Bengaluru City. *Indian J Med Paediatr Oncol*. 2018;39(04):463-466.  
415 doi:10.4103/ijmpo.ijmpo\_136\_17
- 416 20. Goel S, Kumar R, Lal P, et al. How Compliant are Tobacco Vendors to India's Tobacco  
417 Control Legislation on Ban of Advertisements at Point of Sale? A Three Jurisdictions Review.  
418 *Asian Pac J Cancer Prev*. 2015;15(24):10637-10642. doi:10.7314/APJCP.2014.15.24.10637  
419