

Questions & Debates Section  
Parliamentary Library Building  
Room No. PB-025  
Block 'G'  
Acc. No. 25122  
Dated 24.11.2014

THE  
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(Part II—Proceedings other than Questions and Answers)  
OFFICIAL REPORT

1685

1686

HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE

Tuesday, 10th March, 1953

The House met at Two of the Clock

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(See Part I)

3 P.M.

STATEMENT RE: INCIDENT AT  
BARA TOOTI, SADAR BAZAR.

The Minister of Home Affairs and States (Dr. Katju): Sir, yesterday I promised to make a statement about the happenings in Delhi on the 8th March 1953, and the following is the statement which I shall now make with your permission.

A meeting organised by the Jan Sangh and the Hindu Mahasabha and presided over by Shri Shama Charan, M.L.A. was held at Bara Tooti at about 5-40 P.M. The strength of the audience was approximately 4,000 to 5,000. The meeting went on without any trouble for an hour and a quarter and was in its concluding stage when at about 7 P.M. the Magistrate on duty, Shri J. D. Sharma sitting in a police van at some distance noticed sudden confusion and found the crowd running helter and skelter. There was at the same time some brickbattling from part of the crowd towards the police. This took the Magistrate by surprise and as he started towards the meeting, some pressmen asked him why the police had started the lathi charge. He said that he had no knowledge and would find out what had happened. On reaching near the stage the Magistrate was informed that some policemen had used lathis, but only one person with an injury on the head was shown to him. He told the

organisers that he would make enquiries and assured them that they could continue their meeting unmolested if they so desired. But before he could start his inquiry, brick-battling started from all sides in spite of his repeated warnings and at least 12 policemen were injured and two police vans damaged.

Thereupon the Magistrate declared the assembly unlawful and asked them to disperse. The announcement to this effect was made through the amplifier of the wireless van, but a number of people in the crowd did not pay any heed and continued pelting stones. After about four or five minutes, the Magistrate ordered tear-gassing which continued for some time. The crowd receded temporarily but soon re-formed after the tear gas cleared. Brick bats came again more intensively and the Magistrate had to order lathi charge which cleared the area.

Subsequent enquiries show that confusion was caused by some bulls charging into the crowd and some people shouting that firing had started. A head constable was also manhandled by the crowd when he tried to restore order. Brickbats also started coming and some people with bricks and shoes rushed towards the police who were not far from the stage. When a few constables saw the head constable being manhandled and found a part of the crowd rushing towards them, they used their lathis to ward off the onrush and the attack of the crowd.

When Professor Ram Singh saw that tear gas was about to be used, he left the stage and walked some distance away along with some of his colleagues. After the unlawful assembly at Bara Tooti had been completely dispersed, Professor Ram Singh, M.L.A., Shri Deshpande, a Member of this House, and some others formed another procession and started marching towards Paharganj shouting provocative slogans challenging revenge against the police and expressing their

535 PSD

[Dr. Katju]

determination to march to the Parliament House, to break the ban imposed under section 6 of the Punjab Security of the State Act, as extended to Delhi. The processionists numbered several hundreds by the time they were intercepted near Paharganj police station at about 7-45 P.M. They were very excited and threw a few brick-bats at the accompanying police van. Their conduct gave rise to apprehension of breach of the peace in case they were allowed to swell and march through crowded places, to Parliament House. The procession was therefore declared unlawful again and asked to disperse. Professor Ram Singh and eight others refused to obey, saying that they would ask the procession to disperse, provided they were arrested. Otherwise the procession would not disperse, and would march to the Parliament House. Shri Deshpande also said the same thing, but eventually withdrew himself. But the other nine persons, including Professor Ram Singh, M.L.A., persisted in the defiance and were arrested under Section 151 I.P.C.

Enquiries made show that at least 12 police men were injured and one is still an indoor-patient in the hospital with swelling and contusions. Eight people were sent to the Irwin Hospital by the police,—and these are non-officials—but six were discharged after first-aid treatment. One injured person has a head injury while the other has swelling round the chest. One more person is reported to have joined Dr. Joshi's hospital, with a broken knee-cap.

In this connection, I may add that evidently with a view to cause excitement, the Jan Sangh and Hindu Mahasabha papers and workers have been indulging in absolutely false propaganda that Muslim police has been summoned from Uttar Pradesh to suppress the Hindus. It is also reported that a large number of R.S.S.S. volunteers were present in the meeting, under various disguises, presumably for the purpose of making some mischief.

It is a matter of deep regret that grossly exaggerated and misleading accounts have been published in some local newspapers, more specially in some Urdu newspapers.

**Shri V. G. Deshpande (Guna):** May I say a word of personal explanation, because my name has been mentioned, and certain serious allegations have been made? According to the procedure, I am entitled to give an explanation.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** True. Personal explanations are allowed only with respect to statements made on the floor of the House. This is not a case where personal explanation can be allowed, merely because one of the persons referred to is an hon. Member of this House.

**Shri S. S. More (Sholapur):** May I make a submission to you, Sir, that the right of offering a personal explanation is not confined to statements made on the floor of the House only. Supposing about a certain conduct of mine, a statement is made in my presence here, I have every right to contradict it, if it is not a fact. That is the law-point, which I want to submit to you.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I shall consider the matter. I shall find out how far a personal explanation can be allowed, whenever here a reference is made to the conduct of an hon. Member outside, either in answer to a motion made here, or in answer to a question put here, and if I am satisfied, I shall give the hon. Member an opportunity to do so.

**Shri V. P. Nayar (Chirayinkil):** Sir, on a point of submission. Yesterday I made a speech here, and after the House adjourned, when I got a cyclostyled copy of my speech, I found that a very important statement of fact has been expunged by order of the Chair. I have always found that you have been keeping an unflinching vigil over the debate so that when every time a member went astray, you were ready to call upon that Member to withdraw such remarks. But yesterday, nothing of that kind happened. I find that in Rule 294 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business, this is what is stated.....

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** What I would say is this. I am prepared to hear the hon. Member. This is a matter which took place yesterday. If he could only have told me a little earlier, I would have come prepared knowing what exactly it is, instead of my spending away the time in the House, regarding this matter. I shall allow the hon. Member an opportunity to come and tell me what he has to say, after I retire to my chamber.

**Shri V. P. Nayar:** I was submitting this now, because I came here only just now and I got the copy only today.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I am not accusing the hon. Member. Even now it is