

आय-कर विभाग, पटना द्वारा उन व्यक्तियों को जिन्होंने आय-कर दे दिया है प्रमाण-पत्र जारी किया जाना

4855. श्री भोगेन्द्र झा :  
 श्री योगेन्द्र शर्मा :  
 श्री चन्द्रशेखर सिंह :  
 श्री क० मि० मधुकर :  
 श्री रामावतार शास्त्री :

क्या वित्त मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या यह सच है कि आय-कर विभाग के पटना कार्यालय ने उन व्यक्तियों के विरुद्ध भी प्रमाणपत्र जारी कर दिए हैं, जिन्होंने एक या दो वर्ष पहले आय-कर दे दिया था ;

(ख) यदि हाँ, तो इसके क्या कारण हैं ;

(ग) क्या यह भी सच है कि आय-कर सम्बन्धी बही-खाता ठीक प्रकार से नहीं रखा जाता है ; और

(घ) आय-करदाताओं की ऐसी शिकायतों को दूर करने के लिए सरकार का क्या कार्यवाही करने का विचार है ?

वित्त मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्री प्र० चं० सेठी) : (क) और (ख) . जी, हाँ । कुछ ही ऐसे मामले थे जिनमें खजाने से चालानों के अर्धपत्र नहीं मिले थे, और उनमें मियाद-बाहर होने से बचने के लिए प्रमाण-पत्र जारी किये गये थे ।

(ग) जी, नहीं ।

(घ) आय-कर अधिकारियों को हि-दायते जारी कर दी गयी हैं कि वसूली प्रमाण-पत्र जारी करने से पहले निर्धारितियों से पूछताछ करके कर की अदायगी की सत्यता की जांच कर लिया करें । इसके अलावा यदि किसी भी मामले में आय-कर अधिकारी के ध्यान में यह बात लायी जाती है कि कोई

प्रमाण पत्र गलती से जारी हो गया है तो उसे तुरन्त वापस ले लिया जाता है ।

**Central Funds for Rural Electrification in Haryana**

4856. SHRI MUHAMMAD SHERIFF: Will the Minister of IRRIGATION AND POWER be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have allocated Rs. 7 crores to Haryana for rural electrification, during the Fourth Plan;

(b) whether for the rural electrification, allocation of funds for other States has also been made; and

(c) if so, the amount of the funds, State-wise?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF IRRIGATION AND POWER (SHRI SIDDHESHWAR PRASAD): (a) The Fourth Five Year Plan is yet to be finalised. But in the Draft Fourth Five Year Plan, an outlay of Rs. 7 crores has been included for Haryana for rural electrification schemes.

(b) and (c). The following outlays have been included for the other States for Rural Electrification in the Draft Fourth Five Year Plan:—

	(Rs. in Crores)
Andhra Pradesh	15.00
Assam	6.00
Bihar	40.00
Gujarat	11.00
Jammu & Kashmir	1.00
Kerala	4.50
Madhya Pradesh	20.00
Maharashtra	30.00
Mysore	24.00
Nagaland	0.17

	(Rs. in Crores)
Orissa . . . . .	5.00
Punjab . . . . .	20.00
Rajasthan . . . . .	9.00
Tamil Nadu . . . . .	40.00
Uttar Pradesh . . . . .	70.00
West Bengal . . . . .	10.00

### Mineral Production in Orissa

4857. SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI: Will the Minister of PETROLEUM AND CHEMICALS AND MINES AND METALS be pleased to state:

(a) the total mineral production during the year 1967-68 and 1968-69 in Orissa;

(b) whether any financial assistance has been given to that State for increasing the production of minerals during the current year; and

(c) if so, the details thereof?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PETROLEUM & CHEMICALS AND MINES & METALS (SHRI JAGANATH RAO): (a): The total mineral production, excluding that of salt, minor minerals and atomic minerals, in Orissa during 1967 and 1968 was 9.99 million tonnes valued at Rs. 155 million and 11.01 million tonnes valued at Rs. 182 millions respectively.

(b) No, Sir.

(c) Does not arise.

**Stay of an Assistant Accounts Officer under the control of Controller of Defence Accounts, Dehradun at one Place**

4858. SHRI HARI KRISHNA: Will

the Minister of FINANCE be pleased to state:

(a) whether any period for stay at one place has been prescribed for an Assistant Accounts Officer under the control of the Controller of Defence Accounts, Dehra Dun;

(b) if so, what and if not, the reasons therefor;

(c) the number of such Officers who have stayed in Delhi for more than 3-5 years and the reasons for their continued stay; and

(d) the number of cases in which transfer orders were issued and the number out of them in which these orders were cancelled and the reasons for their cancellation?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI JAGANNATH PAHADIA): (a): No, Sir.

(b) The answer to the first part of the question is contained in the answer to (a) above. As regards the second part of the question the answer is that this has been considered to be administratively unnecessary. It is always open to the competent authority to order a transfer whenever this is considered necessary.

(c) Three officers have completed three years at Delhi but no officer has completed five years under C.D.A. (A.F.). Two officers under C.D.A. (A.F.) Dehra Dun have, however, completed more than five years continuous stay at Delhi but they were serving under other organisations before being posted under C.D.A. (A.F.) and have served for only two years in Delhi in C.D.A. (A.F.)'s organisation.

(d) Only in one case a transfer order was cancelled. An officer working under C.D.A. (A.F.) in Delhi was posted to Shillong but the transfer was cancelled on account of an accident necessitating treatment at the hospital.