

आवेदन पत्र को इस आशय से उनके मंत्रालय को अग्रसारित कर दिया था कि मंजूरी न दी जाय;

(ग) क्या निदेशक ने बाद में निर्माण करने की अनुमति दे दी थी; और

(घ) यदि हां, तो क्या सरकार ने इस बारे में कोई जांच करवाई है और दोषी अधिकारियों के खिलाफ कार्यवाही की है ?

रक्षा मंत्रालय में राज्य मन्त्री (श्री के० पी० सिंह देव) : (क) से (घ) पट्टे पर लिए गये स्थलों, जहां पट्टे की शर्तों के अनुसार अतिरिक्त निर्माण की अनुमति है और इस प्रकार की अनुमति कमान के जी० ओ० सी०-इन-सी की स्वीकृति से दी जा सकती है, को छोड़कर अधिसूचित सिविल क्षेत्र से बाहर स्थित बंगलों में अतिरिक्त निर्माण करने की अनुमति नहीं है ।

2. कानपुर छावनी के बंगला नं० 56 के पट्टा-धारक ने 1981 में पट्टे की शर्तों के अनुसार अतिरिक्त निर्माण करने के लिए एक प्रार्थना-पत्र प्रस्तुत किया था । पट्टे की शर्तों के अन्तर्गत अतिरिक्त निर्माण की स्वीकृति प्रदान करने के लिए सक्षम प्राधिकारी, मध्य कमान का जी० ओ० सी०-इन-सी है, जिन्होंने अक्टूबर, 1981 में निर्माण के लिए स्वीकृति प्रदान की । चूंकि अतिरिक्त निर्माण की स्वीकृति प्रदान करने का मामला, मध्य कमान के जी० ओ० सी०-इन-सी के क्षेत्राधिकार में आता था इसलिए निदेशक, रक्षा भूमि तथा छावनी मध्यकमान द्वारा जब यह मामला भेजा गया तो सरकार ने इस मामले में हस्तक्षेप करना उचित नहीं समझा ।

3. इन परिस्थितियों में किसी भी अधिकारी के विरुद्ध जांच करने का प्रश्न ही नहीं उठता ।

Advances in excess of figures made by Punjab and Sind Bank

10585. SHRI AJIT BAG : Will the Minister of FINANCE be pleased to state :

(a) is it true that Punjab and Sind Bank has made Advances very much in excess of the figures and hence paid penal rate of interest to Reserve Bank of India for not conforming to Statutory Liquidity Ratio (SLR) and Cash Reserve Ratio (CRR) ; and

(b) what is the total such amount paid by the Bank to Reserve Bank [of India for the last three years ?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY) : (a) and (b) While banks do endeavour to maintain Statutory Liquidity Ratio and Cash Reserve Ratio stipulated by the Reserve Bank primarily as a matter of Liquidity management on a continuing basis, liquidity fluctuations do occur in banks from time to time, particularly in the context of sudden enhancements of ratios or lower than expected deposit growth or higher than anticipated credit flows.

As a means of bringing about greater financial management discipline among the banks, the Reserve Bank of India is empowered to impose penal interests/penalties on shortfalls in the maintenance of stipulated ratios, which it does on a regular basis. The quantum of penalty, however, does not indicate any continuing failure on the part of any bank in maintaining these ratios.

Punjab & Sind Bank has also had fluctuating liquidity ratios, severe liquidity constraints being experienced particularly in the wake of credit restraint measures taken by the Reserve Bank in 1981.

While the quantum of penalty for the shortfalls has not yet been finally decided by the Reserve Bank, keeping in view the sensitive nature of these institutions, it would be desirable in public interest, not to discuss in public, matters relating to liquidity management of banks.

CBI case against officers of AEPC

10586. SHRI ASHFAQ HUSSAIN : Will the Minister of COMMERCE be pleased to state :

(a) whether there are any complaints registered by C.B.I. against Officers of

Apparels Export Promotion Council and garments exporters for the alleged frauds in the matter of tempering export documents, export quota extensions etc. and details thereof ;

(b) reasons for allowing said Council and the then Director General not to take any action against officers and exporters who are members of executive Committee although C.B.I. reports were sent to A.E.P.C. for over one year ago ;

(c) reasons for dropping C.B.I. case against Ex-Chairman of A.E.P.C. under orders of an earlier Secretary (Textiles) ; and

(d) whether 4 Senior Government Officers nominated to executive Committee of A.E.P.C. be instructed to see that departmental action against officers of A.E.P.C. is taken and exporters who are in the C.B.I. reports are punished under relevant provisions of Import and Export Control Act, 1947, and Export (Control) Order 1947 under Clause 7 ?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF COMMERCE (SHRIMATI RAM DULARI SINHA) : (a) Sometime back, three cases had been investigated by the CBI for alleged irregularities against some exporting firms and officials of the Apparels Export Promotion Council.

(b) As action was to be taken by the Council, the AEPC had been directed to initiate proceedings under the rules on the basis of the CBI reports. It is understood that the matter is still under consideration of the Council. The Council has been asked to expedite action in the matter.

(c) According to the CBI report in the case relating to the firm belonging to the then Chairman of the AEPC, the charges against the firm and not been proved.

(d) Does not arise in view of (b) above.

List of garment exports found to tamper with export documents etc

10587. SHRI ASHFAQ HUSSAIN : Will the Minister of COMMERCE be pleased to state :

(a) a list of Garment Exporters who

have been found to tamper with export documents export contracts L.C. conditions or validity, etc. ;

(b) whether 3 parties put under abeyance by Chief Controller of Imports Exports have won in Delhi High Court because of some flaws in issue of show cause Notices by Government and whether such lapses will not occur in future ;

(c) results of the enquiries against 16 Garment Exporters who were alleged to have sent non-handloom garments to U.K. and Benelux as handloom garments and this fact was mentioned by Prime Minister while opening the second meeting of the All India Handloom and Handicrafts Board ;

(d) position of 9 Garments Exporters who exported dresses to France which was pointed out by French Government ; and

(e) whether Government will give deterrent punishment to concerned officers of CCI & E, A.E.P.C. and Exporters ?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF COMMERCE (SHRIMATI RAM DULARI SINHA) : (a) A list is enclosed at statement indicating the names of Indian Exporters, in whose cases, export documents are suspected to have been tempered with.

(b) Out of the three Indian Exporters who were placed under abeyance, by the Office of the Chief Controller of Imports and Exports, two went to Court against the abeyance orders. In one case, the Court had directed the Government to pass a final order on the show cause notice, within a specified period. Accordingly, an Order debaring the firm for specified licensing periods was passed. The firm moved the Court for quashing the debarment order. The Court granted their prayer, but there was no mention of any flaw in the show cause notice. In the other case, the High Court has passed an interim-order directing the Apparel Export Promotion Council to make an endorsement on the shipping bill relating to a specific Entitlement Certificate.

When a prime-facie case is established against an exporter, the Government can place a firm under abeyance without issuing a show cause notice. Hence no show cause