

Permission Sought by Deputy Secretary and above for filling jobs for the Children and Relations in Private Industrial Houses

5138. SHRI SANAT KUMAR MANDAL: Will the Minister of HOME AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government's attention has been drawn to the news item captioned 'At home' appearing under the feature 'Monday Diary' in the *Indian Express*, New Delhi dated the 16 November, 1981;

(b) if so, the reaction of Government thereto;

(c) whether Government propose to consider the desirability of making it mandatory on Senior Government Officers by amending the Classification (Control) and Appeal Rules/Government Servants Conduct Rules to seek Government permission while getting their children or near relations employed in private industrial houses;

(d) the particulars of officers of the rank of Deputy Secretary and above whose children have been employed in the industrial houses during the last three years; and

(e) the steps taken by Government in this regard?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS AND IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SH. P. VENKATASUBBIAH): (a) and (b). An item captioned 'At home' under the feature 'Monday Diary' in the *Indian Express* dated 16-11-81 has come to the notice of the Government.

(c) The Conduct Rules already provide that no Class I Officer shall permit his son, daughter or other dependent to accept employment in any company or firm with which he has official dealings or in any other

company or firm having official dealings with the Government. Even where the acceptance of the employment is urgent, it can be accepted only provisionally subject to the permission of the Government.

(d) Department of Personnel & Administrative Reforms has no information as such information is not centrally monitored by it. Granting or refusing permission under the Conduct Rules is the concern of the particular Ministry or Department under which an officer is serving.

(e) This does not arise in view of the reply at (c) above.

Writ Petition Filed by Petitioners against Appointment of Officers of DANICS

5139. SHRI MANORANJAN BHAKTA: Will the Minister of HOME AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) the name(s) of petitioner (s) belonging to Grade I officers (Executive), who had filed the writ petition(s) against order dated 12 September, 1973 appointing 19 officers of DANICS on regular basis, as further notified in the official gazette dated 29 September, 1973;

(b) the CW/OM No. on which, and the date on which, the Delhi High Court had passed the interim order restraining the Government from making any substantive appointment;

(c) whether the High Court, in its interim order, had ever passed any order quashing the appointments already made and notified in the official gazette dated 29 September, 1973; and

(d) if so, the CW/OM No., the name(s) of petitioner(s), and the date on which the order was passed and whether any gazette notification was ever made subsequent to the publication of the order dated 12 Sep-

tember, 1973 in Gazette of India, dated 29 September, 1973?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA): (a) S/Shri Chandergupt and Sultan Singh II, Grade I (Executive) officers of Delhi Administration had filed writ petitions in the Delhi High Court challenging the selection made by the Selection Committee in its meetings held on 24th and 25th August, 1973 for promotion of officers to DANICI vil Service on the ground that their seniority in Grade I(E) was erroneously fixed by the Delhi Administration.

(b) The High Court of Delhi had passed an order on 13-9-73, in case CM No. 1877-W/73 in CW No. 1215/73 filed by Shri Chandragupt Vs. Union of India for issue of notice for 11-10-1973 and granting stay in the meanwhile. The Division Bench of High Court had passed a further order in CM No. 1877-W/73 in CW No. 1215/73 on 5-12-1973, directing that there shall be no substantive appointments in the sense that every such appointment would be subject to review and subject to the final orders of the Court.

(c) No, Sir. But in view of the stay order passed on 13-9-73, the Delhi and Andaman Administrations were asked not to implement the panel.

(d) Does not arise in view of answer to part (c) above.

दिल्ली वक्फ बोर्ड द्वारा मस्जिदों के जोर्जोंद्वार के लिए नई दिल्ली नगर पालिका से अनुमति प्राप्त करना

5140. श्री अशफाक हुसेन : क्या गृह मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) उन मस्जिदों के नाम क्या हैं जिनकी मरम्मत या जोर्जोंद्वार के लिए दिल्ली वक्फ बोर्ड ने नई दिल्ली नगर पालिका से

अनुमति मांगी थी और अब तक उनको अनुमति न देने के क्या कारण हैं ;

(ख) क्या जनपथ की मस्जिद की मरम्मत के लिए भी अनुमति मांगी गई थी; और

(ग) यदि हां, तो यह अनुरोध नई दिल्ली नगर पालिका कार्यालय में कब से लम्बित है ?

गृह मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्री योगेश चक्रवर्ती) । (क) से (ग) . नई दिल्ली नगर पालिका ने सूचित किया है कि दिल्ली वक्फ बोर्ड ने केवल एक मस्जिद अर्थात् जो जनपथ होटल के सामने जनपथ पर स्थित है, को मरम्मत करने के लिए उसकी अनुमति मांगी थी। दिल्ली वक्फ बोर्ड से आवेदन पत्र जून, 1979 में प्राप्त हुआ था। नई दिल्ली नगर पालिका ने मामला अवास और निर्माण मंत्रालय को भेज दिया था, जिस ने अब मस्जिद में आवश्यक मरम्मत करने की अनुमति देने का निर्णय कर लिया है। तदनुसार नई दिल्ली नगरपालिका ने दिल्ली वक्फ बोर्ड से पहले वर्तमान मस्जिद को भवन योजना को प्रस्तुत करने का अनुरोध किया है जिसमें प्रस्तावित मरम्मत कार्य का वास्तविक विवरण दिखाया गया हो।

Posts of Commandants and DIG in Central Police Organisation of Assam Rifles

5141. SHRI VISHWANATH SHARMA: Will the Minister of HOME AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) the total number of posts of Commandants and DIG in the Central Police Organisation of Assam Rifles;

(b) how many of these are at present held by officers of the Assam