

Production of Medium Quality Cloth

991. PROF. NARAIN CHAND PARASHAR: Will the Minister of INDUSTRY be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have any plan to augment the production of medium quality cloth for the consumption of the masses;

(b) if so, the details thereof; and

(c) the total production of the cloth of this category in the country during the years 1977-80, year-wise separately?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY (SHRI CHARANJIT CHANANA): (a) to (c). The Hon'ble Member is probably referring to cloth produced in the lower medium and higher medium categories. Though no specific steps have been taken to augment the production of these categories of cloth, their production account for about 78 per cent of the total production of cotton cloth by the organised textile industry. There is no proposal under consideration for augmenting the production of medium cloth.

The production of lower medium and higher medium cloth during the last three years were as below:

Year	(in million metres)		
	Lower Medium	Higher Medium	Total
1977 . . .	921	1600	2521
1978 . . .	910	1684	2594
1979 (Jan-Oct) .	789	1344	2133

Appointment of DANICS Officers

992. SHRI MANORANJAN BHAKTA: Will the Minister of HOME AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the fate of DANICS officers recommended twice for substantive appointment has been linked and made dependent on

the outcome of writ petitions of S. S. Gautam and others Vs. Delhi Administration etc. and Jacob & others Vs. Delhi Administration etc.;

(b) if so, reasons therefor especially when the selection of none of the officers referred to above has been challenged by the petitioners;

(c) whether Government foresee the possibility of the losing party going in appeal and obtaining stay of the operation and implementation of the court's decision resulting in a fresh stalemate; and

(d) if so, how Government intend to break the deadlock?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA): (a) to (d). A statement is attached.

Statement

A meeting of the Selection Committee for promotion of officers to DANICS Civil Service was held in 1973. The Selection Committee prepared two panels, one for substantive appointment and another for officiating appointment. It included 19 officers in the Panel for substantive appointment. No sooner the panel could be implemented, writ petitions were filed by some officers belonging to Grade-I (Executive) of Delhi Administration Subordinate Service. The High Court passed interim orders restraining Government from making substantive appointment on the basis of impugned seniority list. Consequently, no officer could be appointed to DANICS Civil Service in a substantive capacity. The High Court passed its final order on the writs in 1976 and directed that Delhi Administration should revise the seniority list, on the basis of the principle of seniority decided by the Supreme Court in the case of Ravi Verma, and 1973 selection should be reviewed and the petitioners given whatever benefits they were entitled to on the basis of such a review.

2. The Delhi Administration, thereafter, revised the seniority list of Grade-I (Executive) on the basis of the direction of the High Court and a review of 1973 selection was made in February 1978. Unfortunately, in the mean-while, 2 writ petitions were filed, by S. S. Gautam and others challenging the seniority of Grade-I (Executive), and other by Jacob and others challenging the seniority of Grade-I (Ministerial). The Ministry also received a number of representations that the panel prepared by the Review Selection Committee in February, 1978, should not be implemented as the seniority lists prepared by Delhi Administration were erroneous. Interim stay orders have also been passed on these writs petitions by the Delhi High Court restraining Government from making substantive appointment on the basis of impugned seniority lists.

3. The legal position is that so long as the stay orders are in operation, the officers who have been included in the panel for substantive appointment, cannot be appointed to DANI Civil Service in a substantive capacity even though their seniority has not been specifically challenged in these writs because relative seniority of officers may undergo change consequent on the modification of impugned seniority lists.

4. It is not possible for the Government to foresee the final results of these writs. Whether the petitioners would go in for appeal if they lose at this stage is a hypothetical question.

5. The writ petitions are expected to be disposed of soon. The Government, hope that this long standing issue will be finally settled in the near future.

Assent to Kerala Bills

993. SHRI E. K. IMBICHIBAWA:

SHRI G. M. BANATWALLA:

Will the Minister of HOME AFFAIRS be pleased to lay a statement showing:

(a) how many Bills passed by the Kerala Legislative Assembly and

forwarded to Government for the assent of the President are still awaiting the said assent; and

(b) When each of these Bills was received and Government's reaction thereon?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS AND DEPARTMENT OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH): (a) and (b). The following Kerala Bills, as passed by the State Legislature, and reserved by the Governor for the assent of the President are still pending a final decision:

- (i) The Kerala Casual, Temporary and Badli Workers (Wages) Bill, 1977 (received in Oct. 1977).
- (ii) The Kerala Headload Workers Bill, 1978 (received in December 1978).
- (iii) The Public Property (Prevention of Destruction and Loss) Bill, 1978 (received in October 1978).
- (iv) The Kerala District Administration Bill, 1979 (received in September, 1979).
- (v) The Kerala Cashew Workers Relief and Welfare Fund Bill, 1979 (received in January 1980).

The position of the above Bills is as follows:

- (i) *The Kerala Casual, Temporary and Badli Workers (Wages) Bill, 1977:*

Some provisions in it remained in correspondence between the Government of India and the State Government. A reply from the State Government has been received and the case is under the consideration of Government.

- (ii) *The Kerala Headload Workers Bill, 1978:*

The comments of the Government of India were brought to the notice of the State Government for their reactions which are awaited.