

**SIXTEENTH REPORT**  
**PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE**  
**(1985-86)**

(EIGHTH LOK SABHA)

**CONSTRUCTION OF STAFF QUARTERS AT  
PANKHA ROAD, NEW DELHI AND CONSTRUCTION  
OF STAFF QUARTERS AT SALT LAKE,  
CALCUTTA**

**MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS**

(DEPARTMENT OF TELE/COMMUNICATIONS)

[Action Taken on 205th Report (Seventh Lok Sabha)]



*Presented to Lok Sabha on* .....

*Laid in Rajya Sabha on* .....

**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT**  
**NEW DELHI**

*November, 1985/Kartika, 1907 (Saka)*

*Price : Rs. 3.00*

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMPOSITION OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE	(iii)
INTRODUCTION	(v)
PART I	
CHAPTER I	I
Report. . . . .	
CHAPTER II	19
Recommendations or Observations which have been accepted by Government. . . . .	
CHAPTER III	37
Recommendations or Observations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in the light of the replies received from Government . . . . .	
CHAPTER IV	38
Recommendations or Observations the replies to which have not been accepted by the Committee and which require reiteration.	
CHAPTER V	48
Recommendations or Observations in respect of which Government have furnished interim replies. . . . .	
PART II	
Minutes of the Sitzings of the Public Accounts Committee held on 7-8-1985, 13-8-1985 and 28-10-1985. . . . .	49
APPENDIX	61
Statement of Recommendations and Observations. . . . .	

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE  
(1985—86)

CHAIRMAN

Shri E. Ayyapu Reddy

MEMBERS

*Lok Sabha*

2. Shri J. Chokka Rao
3. Shri Amal Datta
4. Shri Ranjit Singa Gaekwad
5. Shrimati Prabhawati Gupta
6. Shri Harpal Singa
7. Shri Vilas Muttemwar
8. Shri G. Devaraya Naik
9. Shri Rameshwar Nikhra
10. Shri Raj Mangal Pandey
11. Shri H. M. Patel
12. Shrimati Jayanti Patnaik
13. Shri S. Singaravadival
14. Shri Simon Tigga
15. Shri Girdhari Lal Vyas

*Rajya Sabha*

16. Shrimati Amarjit Kaur
17. Shri Nirmal Chatterjee
18. Miss Jayalalitha
19. Shri Ghulam Rasool Kar
20. Shri Chaturanan Mishra
21. Shri K. L. N. Prasad
22. Shri Ramanand Yadav

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri K. H. Chhaya—*Chief Financial Committee Officer*
2. Shri R. C. Anand—*Senior Financial Committee Officer*

## INTRODUCTION

1. I, the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, as authorised by the Committee, do present on their behalf this Sixteenth Report on Action Taken by Government on the recommendations of the Public Accounts Committee contained in their 205th Report (7th Lok Sabha) relating to construction of staff quarters at Pankha Road, New Delhi and construction of staff quarters at Salt Lake, Calcutta.

2. In their earlier Report presented to the House on 29 April, 1984, the Committee had expressed unhappiness over non-allotment of land agreed to be allotted by DDA to P&T for construction of staff quarters at Janak Puri and Malviya Nagar, New Delhi for which advance payment of Rs. 87.08 lakhs had been made by the P&T Department towards full cost of land in 1969-70 itself. The Committee had desired that the DDA should allot promised land to the Telephone Department without further delay.

3. The Committee are disappointed that no action has been taken by the DDA on this recommendation in spite of a number of letters to DDA by the P&T Department including one from the then Minister of Communications to the then Minister of Works and Housing requesting him to look into the matter and advise the DDA to complete the transaction without further delay. All efforts made by the P&T Department proved abortive.

4. What has disturbed the Committee further is the inordinate delay in the Ministry of Works and Housing/DDA for furnishing Action Taken Notes on the recommendations contained in their Original Report. The Action Taken Notes on the recommendations which were required to be furnished by the Ministry of Works and Housing on 30 October, 1984 were furnished to the Secretariat of the Committee only on 4 September 1985. The Committee then took the evidence of the Secretary of Ministry of Works and Housing (in August 1985) on the delay in furnishing the Action Taken Notes and on allotment of land to P&T Department. In this connection, the Committee are unhappy to state that during the evidence the Secretary, Housing Ministry has displayed a casual attitude in this matter.

5. From the information now furnished by the Ministry of Works and Housing/DDA, the Committee find that a plot of land measuring 9 acres in G-17 (Revenue Estate of Nangli Syed) area in West Delhi has been allotted to the Delhi Telephones on 13th August 1985. The Committee have expressed regret that the matter which should have been settled ordinarily within an hour or so by the Secretaries of two Departments and the Head of DDA sitting together to sort out the difficulties as they are different parts of the same Government, has taken 15 long years and that too after the Public Accounts Committee called for the three Departments to ascertain as to why there were no replies for the Action Taken Report from DDA and the Housing Ministry. The Committee have expressed the view that the officers responsible for showing utter indifference to PAC's recommendations followed up by a letter from the Minister of Communications and a letter from the General Manager, Delhi Telephones, seeking personal discussions with the Vice-Chairman, DDA should be brought to book. The Committee have, therefore, recommended that disciplinary action in the matter should be initiated immediately. The Committee have also desired to be kept informed by the P&T Department of the steps taken by that Department to start the construction of long delayed quarters for its staff.

6. The Committee considered revised draft Report and finalised the same at their sitting held on 28th October 1985. The Minutes of the sittings of the Committee held on 7th August 1985, 13th August 1985 and 28th October 1985 from Part II of the Report.

7. For facility of reference and convenience, the recommendations/observations of the Committee have been printed in thick type in the body of the Report and have also been reproduced in a consolidated form in Appendix to the Report.

8. The Committee place on record their appreciation of the assistance rendered to them in the matter by the Office of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India.

9. The Committee would also like to express their thanks to the officers of the Ministry of Communications (Department of Telecommunications) and the Ministry of Works and Housing and the DDA for the cooperation extended by them in giving information to the Committee.

NEW DELHI;  
19 November, 1985  
28 Kartika, 1907 (Saka)

E. AYYAPU REDDY  
Chairman,  
Public Accounts Committee.

**PART I**  
**CHAPTER I**  
**REPORT**

1.1 This Report of the Committee deals with the action taken by Government on the Committee's recommendations/observations contained in their 205th Report (7th Lok Sabha) on paragraphs 39 and 42 of the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the year 1981-82, Union Government (Posts and Telegraphs) relating to construction of staff quarters at Pankha Road, New Delhi and construction of staff quarters at Salt Lake, Calcutta.

1.2 The Committee's 205th Report (7th Lok Sabha) was presented to Lok Sabha on 30 April, 1984. It contains 16 recommendations/observations. Action Taken Notes on all these recommendations/observations have been received from the Ministry of Communications. Corresponding replies to two recommendations at Sl. Nos. 12 and 13 (Para Nos. 1.69 and 1.70) which relate to the Delhi Development Authority (DDA) have been received from the Ministry of Works and Housing on 4 September, 1985. These action taken notes have been broadly categorised as follows:

- (i) Recommendations/observations that have been accepted by Government:  
Sl. Nos. 1-10, 11-A, 14-16
- (ii) Recommendations/observations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in the light of the replies received from Government:  
Nil
- (iii) Recommendations/observations replies to which have not been accepted by the Committee and which require reiteration:  
Sl. Nos. 11, 12 and 13
- (iv) Recommendations/observations in respect of which Government have furnished interim replies:  
Nil

1.3 The Committee will now deal with Action Taken on some of their recommendations/observations.

**Irregularities committed in the construction of staff quarters (Si. No. 11, Para 1.67)**

1.4 Commenting on the claim of Rs. 148.46 lakhs preferred by the P&T Department against the contractor for various irregularities committed by him in the construction of staff quarters, the Committee in para 1.67 of their 205th Report, had observed as under :

“As to the claims of the Department against the contractor, the Committee have been informed that under clause 2 of the agreement, in the event of the contractor failing to complete the work as per the time schedule, the contractor is liable to pay as compensation an amount equal to one per cent of the estimated cost of the whole work for every day that the due quantity of work remained incomplete, subject to a maximum of 10 per cent of estimated cost of the work put to tender. Likewise, the cost of the material issued to the contractor in excess of his requirement is recoverable at double the issue rates. Taking these into account as also an escalation of Rs. 104 lakhs, the Department had submitted an aggregate claim of Rs. 148.56 lakhs against the contractor to the Arbitrator. As against this, the contractor has submitted a counter-claim of Rs.2851 lakhs against the Department. The Committee trust that every effort will be made by the Department to see that the arbitration proceedings are expedited. They would like to be informed of the outcome of the arbitration proceeding.”

1.5 In their reply dated 30 November, 1984, the Ministry of Communications have stated :

“The arbitration proceedings have not been finalised so far. The Arbitrator appointed earlier has since resigned consequent to his transfer and a new arbitrator in the case has been appointed. The concerned Executive Engineer has been advised to pursue the matter for early finalisation of the arbitration proceedings. The PAC would be informed of the outcome in due course.”

**1.6 In their earlier Report the Committee had hoped that every effort would be made by the Department to see that the arbitration proceedings were expedited. The Committee consider the reply of the Ministry of Communications is disappointing. Transfer of the officer appointed as arbitrator does not seem to be a valid/reason for the officer resigning as arbitrator. The Committee have come across**

a number of cases where the arbitrators have continued to deal with the cases and given awards despite their transfers. The Committee express its displeasure over the action of the Ministry relating to the arbitration proceedings. Now that another arbitrator has been appointed the Committee would like the Ministry to ensure that all out efforts are made to get the arbitration proceedings completed within the shortest possible time.

*Delay in allotment of land to P&T Department by the Delhi Development Authority (Sl. Nos. 12-13—Para Nos. 1.69-1.70)*

1.7 Commenting on the delay in allotment of land in Delhi by the DDA to the Telephone Department for public utility services, for which advance payment had been made by the Department towards cost of land in 1969-70 itself, the Committee had, in paras 1.69 and 1.70 of their 205th Report observed as under :

“The Committee are not happy over the manner in which the Delhi Development Authority (DDA) had acted in this case. The General Manager, Telephones Delhi had paid Rs. 37.39 lakhs to the DDA for the purchase of 29.6 acres of land at Pankha Road and 15 acres of land at Malviya Nagar. 21.72 acres of land was allotted to the Department at Pankha Road (remaining land could not be allotted due to the land being under unauthorised occupation) but no land was allotted in Malviya Nagar. When asked in evidence why alternative land in Malviya Nagar or in its vicinity was not allotted to the P&T Department the reply of the representative of the DDA was that “in every residential centre, the land is provided for different uses. So, adjustment has to be made within the area earmarked for that use.” The Committee are not convinced by this reply, as they observe the DDA had already committed to allot the land to the Telephone Department in Malviya Nagar and the Department had already paid money on this account. Therefore, the DDA should have made an alternative allotment to the Department in Malviya Nagar itself or in its vicinity *inter-alia* bearing in mind that the Telephone Department was a public utility department rendering an essential service. However, the DDA did not do this; and, instead in 1973 offered alternative lands to the Department miles away—20 acres at Paschim Puri and 10+7.8 acres at Shalimar Garden. But here too, the



DDA failed to keep its commitments and now, after a lapse of 10 years, the Committee have been informed that the lands proposed to be allotted at Paschim Puri and Shalimar Garden have since been "utilised" by the DDA for some other purpose and fresh proposals for allotment of land to the P&T Department are under consideration of the DDA. The Committee feel that the DDA should have honoured its commitments, particularly to a public utility department like the Telephone Department. The Committee desire that the DDA should now without any further delay allot land to the Telephone Department for which a balance of Rs. 23.88 lakhs remains unadjusted with them since March 1970.

Another aspect to which the Committee would like to draw attention is that a large balance of Telephone Department nearly Rs. 24 lakhs has been lying with DDA since 1963. This amount was deposited with the DDA when the price of land was very low. As the DDA is now allotting institutional land at much higher rates, the Committee feel that the DDA should in all fairness, pay interest to the Department on this unadjusted balance. They also feel that the DDA should pay interest in all such cases. The Committee would like to be informed of the decision taken by the DDA in this matter.

1.8. In their Action Taken Note dated 9-1-1985, the Ministry of Communications have stated as follows:

"The case has been taken up demiofficially with the Vice Chairman of the DDA for allotment of land immediately. The concern of the PAC over the undue delay in this case has also been intimated. Further action shall be taken on receipt of a reply from the DDA.

As per recommendations of the PAC the case has been taken up with the Vice Chairman of the DDA for allowing interest on Rs. 23.87.638/- lying with them since long as they have not made over any land to the Delhi Telephones against the advance payment so far."

1.9. The Ministry of Works and Housing have been asking for extension of time for submission of Action Taken Notes on Committee's recommendation on the ground that the material to prepare Action Taken Notes was still awaited from DDA. The first extension was asked upto 29-12-1984; second extension upto 28-2-1985; third ex-

tension upto 30-4-1985 and fourth extension upto 30-6-1985. In their letter dated 11-7-1985 asking for fifth extension, the Ministry of Works and Housing stated as follows:

"The undersigned is directed to refer to this Ministry's letter of even number dated 22nd May, 1985 requesting extension of time upto 30th June and to say that on the draft Action Taken Notes sent to Director of Audit for vetting, he has desired to have the relevant DDA files|documents pertaining to Para 1.69 (S. No. 12) of the PAC's 205th Report. The relevant records have been called for from DDA.

Lok Sabha Secretariat are, therefore, requested to grant further extension of time of 2 months upto 31st August, 1985 to enable this Ministry to submit Action Taken Notes in respect of the Report mentioned in the above subject."

1.10. While considering the draft Action Taken Report on 205th Report at their sitting held on 7-8-1985, the Committee took strong exception to the repeated requests from the Ministry of Works and Housing asking for extension of time to furnish the Action Taken Notes on specific recommendation made by the Committee. They also noted that the Ministry have failed to exercise disciplinary control over the DDA in as much as that DDA did not pay any heed to the Ministry's letters to them to expedite the information on the Committee's recommendation enabling them to submit the Action Taken Notes to the Committee. The Committee, therefore, decided to take the evidence of the representatives of the Ministry of Works and Housing and DDA to explain the delay in furnishing information on the following points:—

- (i) Allotment of balance land by DDA to the P&T Department for construction of staff quarters at Pankha Road, New Delhi.
- (ii) Payment of interest on the balance amount of P&T lying with Delhi Development Authority; and
- (iii) Payment of interest in all such cases.

1.11 The factual position regarding allotment of land in Malviya Nagar to the P&T Department for construction of staff quarters for their employees working in South Delhi is as follows:

1. Date on which P&T requested DDA for allotment of land in Malviya Nagar: 1969-70

2. Date on which DDA identified 29.6 acres of land at Pankha Road and 15 acres of land in Malviya Nagar for allotment to the Telephone Department: 1970
3. Dates on which Rs. 87.08 lakhs towards entire cost of land at the then prevailing rates were deposited by the P&T Department with the DDA: March 1969, March 1970 and March 1971.
4. Date on which possession was given to P&T of 21.72 acres of land out of 29.6 acres at Pankha Road: July 1970
5. Date on which DDA offered land in Shalimar Bagh and Paschim Puri (West Delhi) in lieu of land in Malviya Nagar: July, 1971
6. Date on which DDA cancelled the above offer because of no interest shown by P&T in these areas: October 1975
7. Date on which Ministry of Works & Housing DDA informed PAC about the ownership dispute of land identified for the Delhi Telephones in Malviya Nagar and expressed their inability to allot land to P&T Department in that locality: 7 September, 1983
8. Date on which 205th Report of PAC suggesting early allotment of land to P&T in Malviya Nagar or its vicinity for which a balance of Rs. 23.15 lakhs remained un-adjusted with DDA since March 1970, was sent to the Ministry of Works & Housing/DDA: 29 April, 1984
9. Date on which action taken notes in the above recommendations of the Committee were required to be furnished by the Ministry of Works and Housing/DDA: 29 October, 1984

1.12. The evidence of the Ministry of Works and Housing/DDA was taken on 13 August, 1985. The Committee desired to know the reasons for the continued silence in the matter in the part of the Housing Ministry and the DDA. The Secretary, Ministry of Works and Housing stated in evidence:

"I may add that the Ministry had prepared a reply and it was sent to the Director of Audit. According to the procedure followed, all such replies have to be vetted by him before they are sent to the Secretariat of the Committee. At present it is before the Director of Audit. According to our last letter, we have asked time upto the end of August 1985 to furnish the replies and to comply with the requirements and I am sure that in case that much of time is given, the Ministry will not fail."

In reply to another question, the witness stated:

"As I have explained in our last letter the Ministry has asked for time till 31st August, 1985. As I have stated, the reply of the Ministry is pending with the Director of Audit who has to vet it. So, this is the reasonable time required to furnish the replies to the Committee."

1.13 The Committee were informed that the DDA was reminded by the Ministry of Communications many times from December 1983 onwards for allotment of land in Malviya Nagar or in any other locality in South Delhi. The Minister of State for Communications himself wrote to the Minister of Works and Housing on the subject on 4-9-1984. On being enquired why reply to any of these letters was not given and how it was that land could not be allotted in Malviya Nagar or in any other locality in South Delhi all these years though the money was lying with the DDA, the Secretary, Ministry of Works and Housing stated:

"I will check up as to what reply was sent to the Ministry of Communications. I am afraid, I will have to check up from the file."

1.14 Referring to another D.O. letter from the General Manager, Delhi Telephones, addressed to the Vice-Chairman, DDA, requesting him to fix date and time convenient to him for a meeting to discuss this issue, the Committee enquired what was the response from the Ministry of Works and Housing to that letter. The Vice-Chairman, DDA stated:

"The discussions were already going on. I had informed them on telephone. And as a result of discussions the issue of another 9 acres of land had been finalised in Pashimpuri. He has not mentioned in the subsequent conversation about his desire to meet me. Had he done so, I would have certainly met him."

1.15 Asked specifically whether any date and time was fixed and a reply sent to that letter, the witness stated:

“We had not met for this purpose, Sir. Although we discussed **this issue when he talked to me on telephone, but we have not recorded anything.**”

1.16 The Committee enquired whether he had ever brought this fact to the notice of the Secretary, Ministry of Works and Housing, the witness stated:

“No Sir, I never brought it to the notice of the Secretary because we were not in a position to meet their request.”

1.17 In reply to another question whether the Secretary, Ministry of Works and Housing ever enquired as to what the DDA was going to do with the P&T's request for allotment of land in Malviya Nagar, the Vice-Chairman DDA deposed:

“I will have to check whether there was any conversation about this. The Secretary might have enquired of me in writing but I am not sure about that.”

1.18 The Committee enquired whether from whatever the witness has stated it could be inferred that there is no record to show what development took place in this regard, the witness stated:

“That is right, Sir.”

1.19 Asked after how many letters the above said discussion between the DDA and the Ministry of Communications started and whether the Vice-Chairman DDA tried to contact or see Secretary, Communications in the interest of solving the problem, the Vice-Chairman, DDA stated:

“I do not have the letters at present, as I submitted to the Committee, as to the level of which letters have been received. After the discussions took place, they have been taking action.....The discussions were held on the basis of these letters.”

1.20 On being enquired by the Committee, whether he would offer to solve this problem and report to the Committee within 2-3 days and if he was not prepared than the Committee would take it that this problem required greater consideration and longer time was needed, the Secretary, Ministry of Works and Housing stated:

**"There are two things. First is, furnishing a reply giving a detailed position in regard to the Committee's recommendation. As I stated earlier, we have sought for time up to 31st of August, I will stick to that and send the reply within that period. Of course, there are files and all that to be shown to the Director of Audit. This is to vet the reply to the draft submitted to him. All this we will comply and submit the Report by 31st August."**

1.21 On being enquired by the C&AG of India as to when the draft replies prepared by the Ministry of Works & Housing were sent to the Director of Audit for vetting, it was stated that these were sent to Audit on 5 June, 1985 and the Director of Audit (CR) wrote back to the Housing Ministry on 28 June, 1985 asking for certain documents in support of the replies furnished to Audit for vetting. The C&AG further observed:

**"Certain things are the responsibility of the Member Finance and certain other things the Commissioner (Lands). But, is the Vice-Chairman of DDA not the executive head of the DDA? Is he not supposed to coordinate both the functions?"**

The Vice Chairman, DDA stated:

**"I did submit at that time that when it comes to implementation, it is the responsibility of the Vice-Chairman."**

1.22 From the correspondence exchanged between the Ministry of Communications and the Ministry of Works & Housing|DDA on the issue under consideration, it is noticed that various authorities in the DGP&T and Delhi Telephones had been taking up the matter with DDA and reminding them from time to time to expedite allotment of 15 acres of land in Malviya Nagar and adjustment of a sum of Rs. 23.15 lakhs lying as an excess credit with DDA since 1970 out of Rs. 37.08 lakhs deposited by the P&T Department with the DDA in 1969 and 1970 against allotment of land in Janakpuri and Malviya Nagar. Some of these letters are reproduced below:

- (1) D.O. letter No. Bldg. Plg. BD-3344/II/41 dated 27-12-1983 from Shri S. R. Venkatachari, Additional General Manager (E) Delhi Telephones addressed to Shri Harish C. Khanna, Vice-Chairman, DDA.

**"This Department had taken up the case with DDA for allotment of land required for construction of staff quarters"**

in early, 1969. Accordingly DDA had agreed to allot 15 acres of land at Rs. 60|- sq. yd. in Malviya Nagar vide Memo No. F.2(212) 60|LSB(R) dated 5-8-69. Subsequently, however, on representation from the Department, DDA agreed to charge @ Rs. 50|- sq. yard. Accordingly on amount of Rs. 36,30,000 was remitted to the DDA towards the cost of 15 acres as per details below:

(i) Rs. 12 lakhs paid vide cheque No. 0044122 dated 25-3-70 enclosed with letter No. BD-3194 dated 25-3-70.

(ii) Rs. 24.30 lakhs paid vide cheque No. 326017 dated 26-3-71 enclosed with letter No. BD-3194 dated 26-3-71.

DDA has not been able to allot any land in Malviya Nagar till date. Meanwhile, however, a part of the amount paid above had been adjusted against the land acquired by this Department for Shadi Pur Telephone Exchange and Janakpuri Telephone Exchange. A balance of Rs. 23,87,638 is still pending with the DDA as outstanding balance. This issue had come to the notice of the PAC and in the meeting held by the PAC on 6-9-83, the PAC Chairman had directed the DDA's representatives who attended the meeting, to allot 15 acres of land in Malviya Nagar to this Department on the rates prevalent at the time of making payment.

As would be seen, this case has been hanging fire for as many as 15 years and we have been questioned both by the P&T Audit and PAC for non-settlement of the case so long and for allowing an amount of Rs. 23.87 lakhs to remain with DDA for about 12 years. I would be obliged if you could kindly intervene and arrange to release allotment of 15 acres of land in Malviya Nagar in favour of this Department as per directions of the PAC."

(2) D. O. letter No. Bldg. Plg. BD-3344/II/46 dated 18-7-1984 from the General Manager, Delhi Telephones to Shri Prem Kumar, Vice-Chairman, DDA.

"I wish to bring to your kind notice a long pending case of allotment of 15 acres of land by the DDA in Malviya Nagar for construction of staff quarters for Delhi Telephones. Delhi-Telephones had asked for the allotment of 29.6 acres of land at Pankha Road and 15 acres of land at Malviya Nagar in 1969-70 and had paid an amount of Rs. 87.89 lakhs to the DDA for this purpose. Though land measuring 21.72 acres was allotted to this Department at Pankha Road,

land in Malviya Nagar has not been allotted. After adjusting the cost of land already allotted to the Department, a sum of Rs. 23.88 lakhs is lying as an excess credit with DDA since 1970.

Meanwhile this case come to the notice of the P.A.C. of Parliament. A copy of the P.A.C. report (1983-84) on the above subject has since been received by us. The relevant extracts from the P.A.C. report are enclosed herewith for your ready reference. The P.A.C. has directed that "DDA should now, without any further delay, allot land to the Telephone Department for which balance of Rs. 23.88 lakhs remains unadjusted with them since March, 1970.

Based on the deliberations of P.A.C. meeting held on 6-9-83, I had taken up the case with Shri Harish Khanna, your predecessor vide this office letter of even number dated 27-12-83, for the allotment of 15 acres of land in Malviya Nagar. We have not received any reply so far. As this case is pending for the last thirteen years, I shall be grateful if you could kindly allot 15 acres of land in Malviya Nagar at an early date."

(3) Letter No. 472|5|82-TPS (BE) dated 4-9-1984 from Shri V. N. Gadgil, Minister of State for Communications to Shri Buta Singh, Minister for Works & Housing and Parliamentary Affairs:

"I wish to bring to your notice a long standing case of allotment of 15 acres of land at Malaviya Nagar by DDA to Delhi Telephones for payment of Rs. 23.88 lakhs was made as early as 1970 for the purpose, no action has yet been taken by the DDA for assignment of the land. The Public Accounts Committee of Parliament has also commented adversely on the undue delay and has directed DDA to complete the transaction quickly.

Recently, the General Manager Telephones Delhi, has again reminded Vice-Chairman, DDA vide his D.O|No. BLDG|PLG|BD-3344|II|46 dated 18th July, 1984 for early assignment of the land. I would request you to please look into the case and advise DDA to complete the transaction without further delay."

(4) D.O. letter No. Bldg. Plg.|DA-3344|II|59 dated 26-11-1984 from the General Manager, Delhi Telephones to Shri Prem Kumar, Vice-Chairman, DDA.



'Kindly refer to your D.O. letter No. PA|VC|84|309 addressed to my predecessor Shri A.S. Wakhle in reply to this office D.O. of even number dated 18th July, 84 regarding allotment of 15 acres of land to Delhi Telephones at Malviya Nagar. In this connection kindly refer to D.O. from Shri V. N. Gadgil, Minister of State (Communications) to Shri Buta Singh, Minister for Works & Housing and Parliamentary Affairs (Copy attached). Reference is also invited to D.O. 5(1)82-A&C dated 11-9-84 to you from Chief Architect, P&T.

We have not so far received any further communication from your office. In this connection let me add that this case has been adversely commented upon by the P.A.C. of the Parliament. P.A.C. has already directed as under:

"D.D.A. should now without any further delay allot land to the Telephone Department for which balance of Rs. 23.88 lakhs remains un-adjusted with them since March 1970.

I would therefore request you to kindly intervene in the matter personally and cause early finalisation of the case."

(5) D. O. Letter No. Bldg. Plg/DA-3344/II/67 dated 30-5-1985 from the General Manager, Delhi Telephones addressed to the Vice-Chairman, DDA.

"Kindly refer to my D.O. letter No. Bldg. Plg|DA-3344|59 dated 26th November, 1984 regarding allotment of 15 acres of land to Delhi Telephones at Malviya Nagar.

I regret to intimate you that in spite of the comments of the P.A.C. of the Parliament in this case and in spite of D.O. letter from the then Minister of State (Communications), Shri V. N. Gadgil, to the then Minister for Works & Housing, Shri Buta Singh and in spite of a number of reminders from this office we have not received any communication in response to all the above from DDA. The case was also discussed by my Dy. General Manager with Commissioner of Land on 9-8-84 without any progress in the matter. Incidentally, I may also inform you again that our balance of Rs. 23.88 lakhs deposited by us for this land remains unadjusted with DDA since March '70.

I would, therefore, request you to kindly intervene in the matter personally and cause early finalisation of the case since this land is

badly required by us for construction of staff quarters in Malviya Nagar, in fact, I would like to call on you to discuss this case if you could fix a convenient date for the same."

1.23 In their action taken note dated 18 November, 1985, the Ministry of Works and Housing have stated:

"1.69 The P&T Department (Delhi Telephones) was allotted 29.6 acres of land in Janakpuri (Pankha Road Residential Scheme) and 15 acres of land in Malviya Nagar by DDA for construction of staff quarters. As per reconciliation conducted with the P&T Department total amount deposited by the P&T Deptt. for these sites was Rs. 87.08 lakhs, A copy of P&T Department's letter dated 6th September, 1985 is anclosed as Appendix I (Not enclosed) .

2. The land allotted at Malviya Nagar could not be made available by DDA to the P&T Department because of the dispute of ownership of the land which was reported to have been allotted by the Department of Rehabilitation to a Cooperative House Building Society. As regards allotment of land at Janakpuri, possession of 3 plots of land totalling 21.72 acres was handed over in July 1970 and their remaining 7.88 acres of land could not be allotted due to heavy encroachment and difficulties in acquisition.

3. It was decided by the DDA in a meeting held in June 1973 that the payment made by P&T Department for the cost of land at Malviya Nagar can be refunded adjusted against purchase of other land/flats. It was also further decided that an area of 7.88 acres in Shalimar Bagh area may be allotted to the P&T Department in lieu of the shortfall of allotment in Janakpuri.

4. P&T was allotted 20 acres of land in Paschim Puri and 10 acres of land at Shalimar Bagh on 13-7-1971. They were asked to pay the cost of this land (Rs. 85,22,000) in July 1971 for which reminders were also issued for a period of one year. Since no payment was made by P&T Department the allotment of land at Paschim Puri and Shalimar Bagh was cancelled by DDA on 16-7-1972. The Divisional Engineer (Delhi Telephones) was also informed that the allotment would be restored if the payment is made by 30th November, 1972. In response to the Divisional Engineer's letter dated 23-5-73 informing that necessary approval for the payment has been obtained, the land was restored to the P&T Department in June 1973. An area of 7.88 acres of land was also allotted to the P&T Department at Shalimar Bagh on 7-12-73 (in lieu of the land that could not be made available in Pankha Road against payment made for Pankha Road). P&T Department was asked to clear the outstanding dues for the

land allotted in Paschim Puri and two pieces of land at Shalimar Bagh on 13th June, 1975. Since no reply was received, the allotment was cancelled on 29-11-76. A copy of the DDA's letter dated 29-11-76 is enclosed as Appendix II. (Not enclosed)

5. P&T Department was also allotted 2 acres of land in District Centre Pankha Road for a telephone Exchange and 9312 sq.yds. of land in Shadipur. They requested the DDA to adjust the cost of these sites against the payment already made by them. Accordingly, against the total payment of 87.08 lakhs initially made by them the following dues were adjusted by DDA:

1. Cost of 21.72 acres of land @RS. 43/- per sq. metre allotted at Pankha Road for staff quarters.	Rs. 37,79,736.15
2. Cost of 2 acres of land at Pankha Road at the provisional rate of Rs. 70/- per sq. yd.	Rs. 6,77,600.00
3. Cost of 9312 sq. yds. at Shadipur for Telephone Exchange	Rs. 19,36,000.00
<b>Total:</b>	<b>Rs. 63,93,336.15</b>

6. This left a balance of Rs 23.15 lakhs with the DDA for adjustment. A sum of Rs. 18.81 lakhs has since been adjusted against this balance as per the following details.

1. Allotment of land for expansion of Telephone Exchange at Shahdara	Rs. 3,84,461.00
2. Allotment of land for DTO at Krishna Nagar	Rs. 2,96,528.93
3. Allotment of land for Telephone Exchange at Laxmi Nagar Distt. Centre	Rs. 12,00,000.00
<b>Total:</b>	<b>Rs. 18,80,989.93</b>

7. A surplus amount of Rs. 4.34 lakhs belonging to the P&T Department is now available with DDA which is to be adjusted against the allotments to be made to P&T Department.

8. A plot of 9 acres in G-17 (Revenue Estate of Nangli Syed) area has since been allotted to the Delhi Telephones in lieu of the land which was allotted in Shalimar Bagh (*Vide Para 3*) but which has since been utilised by DDA after cancellation. The land under reference is acquired and vests in DDA. It is vacant at site and

forms part of Group Housing Pockets and therefore is suitable for construction of staff quarters. This is likely to cost P&T a sum of Rs. 54 lakhs. A copy of the allotment letter is also enclosed as Appendix III (Not enclosed)"

"1.70. In the case of Government/semi-Government organisations, Delhi Development Authority does neither charge nor pay any interest on the amounts payable to/by Delhi Development Authority towards the cost of land as such arrangement is not administratively feasible."

1.24 The General Manager, Delhi Telephones had paid Rs. 87.08 lakhs (as reconciled by P&T Department with DDA) in 1969 and 1970 for the purchase of 29.6 acres of land at Pankha Road and 15 acres of land at Malviya Nagar. 21.72 acres of land was allotted to the Department at Pankha Road (remaining land could not be allotted due to the land being under unauthorised occupation) but no land was allotted in Malviya Nagar.

Expressing unhappiness over the manner in which the DDA had acted, the Committee had pointed out in their earlier Report that the DDA had failed twice to keep its commitment of making available land at Pankha Road (Janakpuri) and Malviya Nagar, New Delhi (only a part of the promised land was allotted in Janakpuri in July 1970 and no land was allotted in Malviya Nagar) to the P&T Department which had paid Rs. 87.08 lakhs towards full cost of the land in advance in 1969, 1970 and 1971. The Committee had then desired that the DDA should, without further delay, allot land to the Telephone Department adjusting a balance of Rs. 23.15 lakhs which had remained unadjusted with them (DDA) since March 1970. They had also felt that DDA should, in all fairness, not only pay interest to the Department on this unadjusted balance but should pay interest in all such cases.

1.25 Various authorities in the Ministry of Communications (DG P&T, Delhi Telephones. etc.) had addressed at least nine communications to the Ministry of Works and Housing and the Vice-Chairman, DDA during the period December 1983 to July 1985 including letter dated 4-9-1984 sent by Shri N. V. Gadgil, Minister of State for Communications to Shri Buta Singh, Minister of Works and Housing and Parliamentary Affairs drawing attention to the long standing case of allotment of 15 acres of land at Malviya Nagar, New Delhi by DDA to Delhi Telephones for construction of staff quarters there and requesting him to look into the matter and advise DDA to complete the transaction without further delay. The efforts on the part of the Ministry of Communications to get the matter settled early did not end there. In another communication dated 30 May, 1985, the then

General Manager, Delhi Telephones had requested the Vice-Chairman, DDA, to intervene personally for early finalisation of the case since the land under reference was badly needed by the P&T Department for construction of staff quarters in Malviya Nagar. The General Manager, Delhi Telephones had even offered to call on the Vice-Chairman, DDA to discuss this case with him if he could fix a date for the purpose. It is shocking that all efforts on the part of P&T failed to persuade DDA to come out with a positive response in the matter. How obdurately irresponsibile is the DDA can best be illustrated by choronologically setting out the dates:

- (1) Date on which P&T requested DDA for allotment of land in Malviya Nagar: 1969-70
- (2) Date on which DDA identified 29.6 acres of land at Pankha Road and 15 acres of land in Malviya Nagar for allotment to the Telephone Department: 1970
- (3) Date on which Rs. 87.08 lakhs towards entire cost of land at the then prevailing rates were deposited by the P&T Department with the DDA: March 1959, March 1970 and
- (4) Date on which possession was given to P&T of 21.72 acres of land out of 29.6 acres at Pankha Road: March 1971  
July 1970
- (5) Date on which DDA offered land in Shalimar Bagh and Pashchim Puri (West Delhi) in lieu of land in Malviya Nagar: July, 1971
- (6) Date on which DDA cancelled the above offer because of no interest shown by P&T in these areas: October 1975
- (7) Date on which DDA informed P&T about the ownership dispute of land identified for them in Malviya Nagar and expressed inability to allot land in that locality: 7 September, 1983
- (8) Date on which 205th Report of PAC suggesting early allotment of land to P&T in Malviya Nagar or its vicinity for which a balance of Rs. 23.15 lakhs remained unadjusted with DDA since March 1976 was presented to the House: 20 April, 1984

- (9) **Date on which action taken notes on the above recommendations of the Committee were required to be furnished by the Ministry of Works and Housing/ DDA:**

**30 October, 1984**

**1.26 The Committee have now been informed that a plot of land measuring 9 acres in G-17 (Revenue Estate of Nangli Syed) area in West Delhi costing about Rs. 54 lakhs has since been allotted to the Delhi Telephones on 13-8-1985. The Committee are unhappy to observe that the matter which should have been settled ordinarily within an hour or so by the Secretaries of two Departments and head of DDA sitting together to sort out the differences as they are different parts of the same Government, has taken 15 long years and that too after the Public Accounts Committee called for the three Departments to ascertain as to why there were no replies for the Action Taken Report from DDA and the Housing Ministry. An allotment of the land to the P&T Department by DDA even now would not have taken place had not the Public Accounts Committee made quite clear about their deep distress and their readiness to take up the question of contempt of the Committee on account of delay in sending replies.**

**1.27 It is not enough to condemn the bureaucratic non-functioning, irresponsible attitude of the DDA in general and also of the Housing Ministry. The Committee are of the view that this is a case for immediate punishment of those responsible for showing utter indifference to PAC's recommendations followed up by letter from the concerned Minister of Communications and the letter of the General Manager, Delhi Telephones seeking personal discussion with the Vice-Chairman, DDA. The Committee, therefore, recommend that disciplinary action in the matter should be initiated immediately. The starting point may be taken as the date on which pursuant to the recommendation of PAC, the Hon. Minister of Communications wrote a D.O. letter to the Minister for Works and Housing.**

**1.28 In this connection, the Committee have come across another disturbing feature in the working of DDA in regard to the case of allotment of land to P&T in Janakpuri. As against 29.6 acres of land allotted in this area to the P&T Department, delivery of possession of only 21.72 acres of land was handed over to the Department in July, 1970 and the remaining 7.88 acres could not be made available as this chunk of land was heavily encroached upon and acquisition thereof was found to be difficult. The Committee are astonished how the land was allotted and cost thereof charged from the allottee in**

advance without first checking and ensuring that the plot of land in question was available. Another case relates to the allotment of land at Malviya Nagar. The allotted land could not be made available by DDA to the Department because of dispute of ownership of the land which is now reported to have already been allotted by the Department of Rehabilitation to a Cooperative House Building Society. This gives a glimpse of the working of the DDA. The Committee are in doubt whether the DDA is in possession of clear and full records of land in Delhi belonging to the Authority. Otherwise a plot of land belonging to the Department of Rehabilitation could have not been allotted by the DDA and full cost thereof charged in advance from the allottee. It could well be presumed that the Department of Rehabilitation may have also charged cost of the land from the Housing Society to which it was allotted. Thus, the same plot of land appears to have been sold to two different organisations at the same time. This only indicates lack of control by DDA on vacant plots of land acquired by the DDA in various parts and locations of Delhi State and poor maintenance of land records by the DDA resulting in inconvenience and hardships to the allottees, be it a Government Service Department or a private organisation/individual. This situation needs to be attended to and necessary remedial measures including proper maintenance of records taken promptly. They would like DDA to devise fool-proof procedure of periodically checking and inspecting plots of land to ensure that these are not encroached upon. The Committee would also like the Ministry/DDA to take measures to ensure that in future no plot of land should be allotted or auctioned without first fully ensuring that the land is without any encumbrances and is in vacant possession of the DDA.

1.29 What has disturbed the Committee even further is the inordinate delay in the Ministry of Works and Housing/DDA for furnishing Action Taken Notes on the recommendations contained in their original Report. In this connection, the Committee are unhappy to state that the Secretary, Housing Ministry has displayed a very casual attitude in this matter in spite of the fact that Public Accounts Committee had called for an explanation for the delay in responding to Action Taken on the Report of the Committee. The Public Accounts Committee require that they must be informed about the action taken on their recommendations within six months from the date of presentation of their Report.

1.30 The Committee would also like to be kept informed by the P&T Department of the steps taken by that Department to start the construction of long delayed quarters for its staff.

## CHAPTER II

### RECOMMENDATIONS OR OBSERVATIONS WHICH HAVE BEEN ACCEPTED BY GOVERNMENT

#### Recommendation

The Committee are concerned over the inordinate delay in the construction of P&T Staff Quarters at Pankha Road, New Delhi. To meet the acute shortage of staff quarters in Delhi, 606 quarters were to be constructed in two phases at Pankha Road, New Delhi—263 quarters in Phase I at a cost of 59.41 lakhs and 343 quarters in Phase II at a cost of Rs. 87.19 lakhs. The 263 quarters in Phase I (144 Type I and 119 Type II) were to be completed by February 1978 and 343 quarters in Phase II (133 Type I and 210 Type II) by August 1980. However so slow was the progress in the construction of these quarters that by March 1982, when the construction contracts were rescinded, not a single quarter complete in all respects had been constructed. The committee note that while 119 Type II quarters in Phase I have since been completed, *i.e.* after over four years from the scheduled date of completion, the remaining quarters of Phase I—144 Type I quarters, which, according to the original schedule, should have been completed by February 1978 are now expected to be completed by March 1984. The picture regarding the construction of 343 quarters of Phase II is equally depressing. These quarters were scheduled to be completed by August 1980. But, by March 1982 *i.e.* more than 18 months after the scheduled date of completion, only 21 per cent of work in respect of these quarters had been done. These quarters are now expected to be completed by March 1985. The escalation in cost due to delay in completion is tentatively estimated at Rs. 112 lakhs and Government have also lost a considerable amount of potential revenue in the shape of licence fee from the prospective occupants, and still more importantly, the low paid departmental employees, for whom these quarters were to be constructed have not yet been able to avail themselves of the benefit of these quarters. It is evident to the Committee from the facts of the case that after awarding the contracts, the P&T Department had not made serious efforts to see that the quarters were constructed in time. A more distressing aspect is the inability of the department to get even small construction works done in reasonable periods. In March 1982 only 8 per cent of work in respect of 144 Type I quarters on Phase I remained to be done and it took two years to get this



completed. The Committee desire that all out efforts should now be made by the P&T Department to complete the remaining quarters at the earliest so that the acute problem of shortage of staff quarters which was felt even as far back as 1972 and 1973, is somewhat relieved. The Committee would also like the department to fix responsibility for the inordinate delay in the completion of quarters, particularly 144 Type I quarters after the rescission of the contract when only 8 per cent of the work remained to be done.

[Sl. No. 1 (Para 1.57) of Appendix II of 205th Report of PAC  
(Seventh Lok Sabha)]

### Action Taken

"Construction works are executed by the Department through the contract system. The contracts are entered into by the Deptt. in the form which has the approval of Ministry of Law. The contracts provide for liquidated damages for delay on the part of the contractor in completion of building works. As a party to the contract, the Deptt. too has certain obligations to perform like issuing architectural and structural drawings, cement and steel etc. Considering these and other hindrances in the execution of the work, it is not always possible to fix responsibility on the contractor for the delay in performance of the contract. However, when the delays are clearly and entirely attributable to the contractor, the remedy available to the department is rescission of the contract. This step is taken only when constant persuasion with the contractor fails, because the whole process of rescission of work, calling of tenders for the balance of work to another agency is highly time consuming. In view of the foregoing, the conscious decision taken by the department in getting the works completed through the original contractors to the extent possible and rescinding the contract when it was a must, was the right decision in the circumstances.

Regarding the inordinate delay in completion of the balance of 8 per cent of work in respect of 147\* type I quarters and fixing responsibility for the same, it may be mentioned that before a contract is rescinded, the work completed by the original contractor has to be measured. In this particular case, the contractor adopted dilatory tactics and did not appear for joint measurements on 19-4-82 and again on 30-4-82. When joint measurements were ordered by High Court of Delhi w.e.f. 25-11-82, the contractor's representative participated in the joint measurements on 26th, 27th and 29th November 1982 and thereafter did not participate in the joint measurements. The *ex-parte* measurements carried out by the Deptt. were communicated to the contractor on 6-1-83. The contract for the balance of work was awarded to another agency on 29-1-83 and work started

on 18-2-83, as stipulated. But the original contractor again created hindrance in the progress of the work by getting an injunction from the Delhi High Court on 9-3-1983 restraining the department from awarding the work to another agency till the work executed by the petitioner (original contractor) was measured in the presence of local commissioner. The date of next hearing was 29-5-83. The contractor, however, evaded the issue of joint measurements on one pretext or the other. In the circumstances the Court vacated the injunction orders of 9-3-83 and allowed the department to carry out the balance of work. The deptt. appointed a Technical Examination Committee on 13-6-83 to examine the construction of Pankha Road quarters. This Committee submitted its report on 15-10-83. This report had to be evaluated and decisions taken about rectification/removal of faults pointed out. Rectification of defective work already carried out took a lot of time. Many items had been left incomplete by the previous contractor. All this took time and even then the quarters were practically completed by, 15-2-84 but due to rectification of defective work like overhead water storage tank, leakage plugging etc. the work could be finally completed on 2-4-84. The probable date of completion of Phase-II quarters is 31-12-84.

In view of the above, it may be seen that the delay in completion of the balance 8 per cent work of 147-Type-I\* quarters occasioned by factors beyond the control of the Department and no officer is responsible for the same.

\* (Actually 147-Type-I quarters in Phase-I were constructed and not 144 quarters. There are 21 blocks, each with 7 quarters. As per design each block is 4 storeyed with two quarters on either side of a central stair case, with one wing set apart for cycle shed at ground floor. Thus each block has 7 quarters)."

[Ministry of Communications (P&T Board) O.M. No. 5(1)82  
dt. 24-11-84]

### Recommendation

1.58 Apart from the unconscionable delay in the construction of quarters, serious omissions and irregularities on the part of the dealing officials of the Department have come to light. These are set forth in the succeeding paragraphs.

[Sl. No. 2 (Para 1.58) of Appendix II of 205th Report of PAC  
(7th Lok Sabha)]

### Action Taken

The para is of a general nature and there is no specific recommendation. Hence no comment.

[Ministry of Communications (P&T Board) O.M. No. 5(1)-82-  
A & C dated 24-11-84]

### Recommendation

"Re-measurements of the work done by a Committee of two engineers showed that the department has paid Rs. 3.20 lakhs for work not executed by the contractor. According to the Ministry, the overpayments had occurred mainly due to the following reasons:—

- (a) Irregular authorisation of part rates higher than those justified on the basis of the part quantum of the items executed.
- (b) Incorrect over-measurements of the work actually executed.

According to a note furnished by the Ministry, "the assessment of higher part rates has been done by the Executive Engineer" which is a "lapse on his part." As to over-measurements, the Ministry have stated that "this is a lapse on the part of the officials according the measurements (Junior Engineers) and the officers entrusted with test check of these measurements (Assistant Engineer)." An idea of the dereliction of duty on the part of the higher officials can be had from the fact that while the Asstt. Engineer had test-checked about half the running bills as against all the running bills which he was required to test-check under the prescribed procedure, the Executive Engineer had not test-checked a single running bill in respect of Phase II and had test-checked only a few bills in respect of Phase I, though under the prescribed procedure has was required to test-check every alternative running bill."

[Sl. No. 3 (Para 1.59) of Appendix II of 205th Report of PAC (7th Lok Sabha)].

### Action Taken

"The para states the factual position. In this connection it is stated that the entire matter stands referred to the CBI whose recommendations are awaited.

Based on the CBI's investigations|recommendations appropriate action against the AE|Executive Engineer as deemed necessary, will be taken.

This has been vetted by audit *vide* their U.O. No. RR.I/2(d)/2166|1683 dated 9.12.84. Audit desired that they may be furnished with the final ATN. This will be done."

[Ministry of Communications (P&T Board) O.M. No. 5(1)82-A&C dated 24.11.84]

### Recommendation

According to Departmental rules, secured advances may be paid to contractors on the recommendations of the officer-in-charge of the work on the security of the material brought to the site. However, secured advances to the tune of Rs. 75,000 were granted to the contractor in respect of material not available at site. One of the items against which secured advances were given was, G.I. Pipes. As per the Department's agreement with the contractor, G.I. Pipes were to be supplied by the Department but they were shown as brought by the contractor and secured advance was allowed to him against these pipes. According to the report of the Director Vigilance, PMG Delhi Circle, "it is noteworthy that nothing on record was shown during enquiry about the non-availability of these pipes in the Central Store of the Civil Wing. The Government supply rate of these pipes is Rs. 6.25 whereas this was shown as purchased from the contractor at the rate of Rs. 9 per metre. It is still surprising that the stock of these pipes at the site of found to be Nil. It is not humanly possible to bring such huge quantity on site and to take it away without the knowledge of the supervising officers at the site."

[Sl. No. 4 (Para 1.60) of Appendix II of 205th report of PAC (7th Lok Sabha]

### Action Taken

"Para states the factual position. In this connection it may be mentioned that the entire matter stands referred to the CBI whose recommendations are awaited. Necessary action as deemed fit will be taken against the delinquent officials after receipt of the CBI's report.

"This has been vetted by audit *vide* their U.O. No. RR.1 2(d) 2166| 1983 dated 9.11.84". Audit desired that they may be furnished with the final ATN. This will be done."

[Ministry of Communications (P&T Board) O.M. No. 5(1)82-A&C dated 24.11.84].

### **Recommendation**

An examination of the steel and cement accounts revealed that 28.164 Metric Tonnes (MT) of mild steel, 268.803 MT of tor steel and 448.58 MT of cement were issued to the contractor in excess of the actual requirement. The cost of the material issued in excess and recoverable at double the issue rates as per provisions of the agreement works out to Rs. 10.40 lakhs.

[Sl. No. 4 (Para 1.60) of Appendix II of 205th report of PAC (7th Lok Sabha)]

### **Action Taken**

"This para states the factual position. In this connection it may be mentioned that the entire matter stands referred to CBI whose recommendations are awaited. Action as called for under the rules will be taken against the delinquent officials.

This has been vetted by audit *vide* their U.O. No. RR-1|2(d) 2166|1983 dt 9.11.84. Audit desired that they may be furnished with the final ATN. This will be done.

[Ministry of Communications (P&T Board) O.M. No. 5(1) 82-A&C dated 24.11.84]

### **Recommendation**

"The Committee observe that as per Govt's rules, the materials are to be issued to the contractor depending upon the progress of the work and actual requirement and extra care has to be taken by the issuing officer to see that the quantities issued do not exceed the theoretical requirement which is arrived at by allowing an extra of 3 per cent on cement and 10 per cent of steel over and above the quantity worked out on the basis of standard co-efficients. In a note furnished to the Committee the Ministry have admitted that "in this case proper watch was not kept in issuing the materials to the contractor by the Assistant Engineer and Executive Engineer." In evidence, the Chief Engineer, Delhi Circle.

conceded that "it was a serious lapse" on the part of the officials responsible for the issue of the materials and that this case was "indefensible". The Committee note that according to the report of the Director, Vigilance, PMG Delhi Circle, the possibility of over issued quantities of cement and steel having been sold by the contractor in the black market, in collusion with the Departmental officials cannot be ruled out. According to the Chief Engineer, Delhi Circle, "the cement and steel cannot be removed from the site without the connivance of Junior Engineer and Assistant Engineer..... The lock and the key are kept by the Junior Engineer. The interesting part was that in the cement register, the total quantity received, the total quantity issued and the remaining balance all tallied. When a quantity of material is issued from the store, it should go to the site of works. If it does not go there, it means that it is going somewhere else. This cannot happen without the connivance of the junior staff."

ISI. No. 4 (Para 1.60) of Appendix II of 205th report of PAC (7th Lok Sabha)

#### **Action Taken**

"The para states the factual position. In this connection it may be mentioned that the entire matter stands referred to the CBI whose recommendations are awaited. Necessary action against the officials at fault will be taken after receipt of the CBI's report.

"This has been vetted by audit *vide* their U.O. No. RR.1/2(d)/2166/1383 dated 9.11.84. Audit desired that they may be furnished with the final ATN. This will be done."

(Ministry of Communications (P&T Board) O.M. No. 5(1)82-A&C dated 24-11-84).

#### **Recommendation**

Apart from the above irregularities and malpractices, the report of the Director, Vigilance, P.M.G., Delhi Circle, highlights some other serious deficiencies, two of which are mentioned below:

- (i) 338.85 quintals of steel for about 2075 chowkhats was paid for, while on inspection only 212 chowkhats (door window frames) were found to have been fixed to the different quarters and 575 chowkhats were found laying at the site. Thus, 787 steel chowkhats had been actually provided for as against 2075 chowkhats paid for.

- (ii) The number of windows paid for as per last bill was 850 but on inspection only 89 windows were found fixed and 103 were found lying at the site of which 53 were incomplete.

Evidently, there has been large scale misappropriation of materials by the contractor with the active collusion of the Departmental officials."

[Sl. No. 7(Para 1.63) of Appendix II of 205th Report of PAC (7th Lok Sabha)].

### **Action Taken**

"The para states the factual position. In this connection it may be mentioned that the entire matter stands referred to CBI whose recommendations are still awaited. Action against the delinquent officers will be taken after receipt of CBI's report.

This has been vetted by Audit vide their U.O. No. RR-1/2(d) 2168/1383 dated 9.11.84. Audit desired that they may be furnished with the final ATN. This will be done."

[Ministry of Communication (P&T Board) O.M. No. 5(1)32 A&C dated 24.11.84]

### **Recommendation**

As to the action taken against the officials responsible for the irregularities and malpractices, the Committee observe that a vigilance case is under process and in the meanwhile, the concerned Asstt. Engineer and two Junior Engineers stand suspended since November, 1981. On 30-12-1982, the Deputy Director General (Vigilance) had forwarded his report to the Central Vigilance Commission for their advice. The Committee enquired during evidence why the Executive Engineer had also not been placed under suspension along with the Asstt. Engineer and the Junior Engineers. They were informed that according to the findings of the Superintending Engineer, the Executive Engineer was responsible only for "ommission but in the case of the other two Junior Engineers and Asstt. Engineer, it appeared that they were in direct collusion with the contractor". The Committee see no force in this explanation. In their opinion, a supervisor, officer who fails to exercise the prescribed checks and allows, by his negligence or otherwise, his subordinates to indulge in malpractices has to be dealt with severely. The Committee find from the report of the Director (Vigilance),

PMG Delhi Circle, that "according to the correspondence in the file on the subject, it appeared that the Executive Engineer was aware of the over-payment and other irregularities in this case but had taken no action to recover the over-payments. According to this report, the case depicted "gross negligence and serious lapses" on the part of the officials of the Civil Wing including the Executive Engineer. As the Committee observe, it was he who had irregularly authorised part rates higher than those justified on the basis of the quantum of the items executed. He was also responsible for passing the bills of the contractor without any proper check. As overall incharge of the works he was supposed to visit the site from time to time and check the quality and quantity of works paid for but he totally failed in his duties.

As per instructions contained in the CPWD Manual Vol. II (para 14, Sec. 27), he was required to test-check the stock of cement go-down every fortnight. However, he had checked the cement stock at site only twice during two years. The Committee feel that stern action is called for in this case against all the delinquent officials (including the Executive Engineer) so that it acts as a deterrent to others. With this end in view, the Committee desires that:— •

- (i) the P&T Department should approach the Central Vigilance Commission with a request for a very early advice so that disciplinary proceedings against the delinquent officials which have already been too much delayed, are started without any further loss of time;
- (ii) the case should be referred to the CBI for detailed investigation, particularly in the matter of irregularities partaking of a criminal character;
- (iii) after the report of the CBI becomes available, the Department should proceed with instituting criminal proceedings against the delinquent officials; and
- (iv) it should also be examined as to how far the superintending Engineer was responsible for the "lapses revealed in this case. The Committee observe from the report of the Director (Vigilance), PMG, Delhi Circle, that he was quite aware of the over-payments made to the contractor and other irregularities alleged to have been committed in this case, but he did not seem to have taken any action to direct the Executive Engineer to recover the over-payments. Further, when after the transfer of the Executive Engineer in question, the new E.E. wrote to him that he had taken up the matter for making enquiries into



the over-payments made to the contractor, he is reported to have "turned a deaf ear to the repeated requests of the new Executive Engineer for allowing him to complete the enquiries". On the other hand the new Executive Engineer was transferred after a short spell of 45 days. Significantly, the confidential file on the subject which was reported as misplaced by the Executive Engineer in question was traced out after the transfer of the new Executive Engineer. It may be examined whether this was done with the knowledge of the Superintending Engineer".

[Sl. No. 6 (Para 1.62) of Appendix II of 205th Report of PAC (7th Lok Sabha)]

### Action Taken

"1. Further action is being taken in consultation with Central Bureau of Investigation.

2. C.B.I. have already filed a F.I.R. vide PE No. 15/84/DLI dated 20-6-1984 and further action will be taken on receipt of C.B.I. report.

3. The involvement of the Superintending Engineer in this case will be examined after the receipt of C.B.I. report. This has been vetted by Audit vide their U.O. No. RR.1/2(d) 2166/1338 dated 17-10-84. However, they desired the final action to be intimated. This will be done."

[Ministry of Communication (P&T Board) O.M. No. 17/1/84-Vig. I dated 11-12-1984]

### Recommendation

"A disturbing feature of the case is that although the CPWD Code provides for built-in checks and safeguards, the case might not have come to light but for a complaint received by the Central Vigilance Commission. This indicates that all the procedural checks and counter-checks come to naught when the officials act in collusion with unscrupulous outside parties. The Committee would like the Ministry of Communications, in consultation with the Ministries of Works and Housing and Home Affairs, to examine the procedures to provide for effective safeguards against such malpractices".

[Sl. No. 9, Para (1.65) of Appendix II of 205th Report of PAC (Seventh Lok Sabha)]

### Action Taken

“As per recommendations of the PAC the matter has been taken up with the Ministry of Works and Housing, Home Affairs to examine the procedures and to provide for more effective and inbuilt safeguards against such malpractices. It may also be mentioned that the entire matter stands referred to CBI whose recommendations are still awaited.

This has been vetted by audit vide their U.O. No. RR-1|2(d)2166|1383 dated 9-11-84. Audit desired that they may be furnished with the final ATN. This will be done.”

[Ministry of Communication (P & T Board) O.M. No. 5(1)|82 A&C dated 24.11.84]

### Recommendation

“As to the action taken against the contractor, the Committee have been informed that the name of the contractor has been removed from the registered list of contractors of the P&T Civil Wing under a letter dated 20-9-82. Copies of this letter have been endorsed to all the Departments/Ministries for information and necessary action. The Committee suggest that on the basis of the findings of the CBI, the question of launching criminal prosecution against the contractor should be considered. The Committee would also like the Ministries/Departments to ensure that no contract is awarded to the contractor in question.”

[Sl. No. 10 (Para 1.66) of Appendix II of 205th Report of PAC (Seventh Lok Sabha)]

### Action Taken

“The contractor was first debarred from tendering for P&T works for a period of six months vide letter No. 4(2)74-A&C dated 29-11-82 and for a further period of six months from 29-5-83. Subsequently, the contractor's name was removed from the P&T list of approved Class I (B&R) contractors vide letter No. 1 even dated 20-9-83 (Note: The date of this letter has been indicated in Para 1.66 as 20-9-82 which may be on account of misprinting). A copy of letter dated 20-9-83 was also endorsed to other departments like CPWD, MES, Railways, DDA etc. for information. The contractor has filed a petition in the Delhi High Court for quashing the department's orders of removing his name from the list of approved class I (B&R) contractors. The matter being sub-judice action on Committee's obser-

vations (that all Ministries|Departments should ensure that no contract is awarded to the contractor) by endorsing copy of orders dated 20-9-83 alongwith their observations to all Ministries|Departmenis shall be taken after obtaining clarification from the Ministry of Law that it would not amount to contempt of Court.

As regards the Committee's recommendation for launching criminal proceedings against the contractor, it may be mentioned that the case has already been referred to the CBI and on receipt of their report, action as per their recommendations shall be taken.

This has been vetted by audit vide their U.O. Note No. RR.1|2(d)|2166|1383 dated 9-11-84. Audit desired that they may be furnished with the final ATN. This will be done."

[Ministry of Communications (P&T Board) O.M. No. 5(1)82-A-C dated 24-11-84].

### **Recommendations**

"There are also allegations of sub-standard materials having been used in the construction work. According to the report of the Director Vigilence, PMG Delhi Circle, "based on layman's inspection of the cement mortar and the wood used showed that these materials may be sub-standard." The Committee would like a technical examination to be made as to how far the materials used were su-standard and, based on its results not only take appropriate measures to strengthen the structure to the requisite standard but also prefer a claim on the contractor on this account. The Committee would also like the Ministry to fix responsibility as to how the contractor was allowed to use sub-standard materials ."

[Sl. No. 11-A (Para 1.68) of Appendix II of 205th Report of PAC (Seventh Lok Sabha)].

### **Action Taken**

"A Technical Examination Committee was appointed on 13-6-83 and this Committee submitted its report on 15-10-83. The structure is being strengthened on the directions of the Chief Engineer(C) North Zone New Delhi in the light of the Technical Examination Committee's report. For the sub-standard work, the Department has preferred a claim of Rs. 2,72 980|- and referred it to the arbitrator.

As regards Committee's advise to fix responsibility as to how the contractor was allowed to use sub-standard materials, it may, be stat-

ed that the matter stands referred to the CBI and on receipt of their report appropriate action shall be taken against the persons responsible for allowing the use of sub-standard materials by the contractor.

This has been vetted by audit vide their U.O. No. RR/I/2(d)/2166/1383 dated 9-11-84. Audit desired that they may be furnished with the final ATN. This will be done."

[Ministry of Communications (P&T Board) O.M. No. 5(1)82-A&C dated 24-11-84].

### Recommendation

The Committee observe that although there was urgent need to provide quarters to low paid employees of the P&T Department, 540 type I and type II quarters which were ready in the Salt Lake Area in Calcutta by December, 1979 had remained unoccupied for periods ranging from 1 to 22 months; the allotment of Type I quarters was completed in June, 1980 and type II quarters in October, 1981. The delay in allotment of quarters had not only caused loss of revenue to the Department to the extent of Rs. 1.40 lakhs on account of non-recovery of licence fee but also necessitated avoidable expenditure on payment of house rent allowance to the extent of Rs. 2.03 lakhs."

[Sl. No. 14 (Para 2.28) of Appendix II of 205th Report of PAC (7th Lok Sabha)].

### Action Taken

"The observation of the Committee has been noted".

[Ministry of Communications (P&T Board) O.M. No. 760—20/82-TPS (Genl.) BG Vol. II dated 1-10-1984].

### Recommendation

One of the main reasons for delay in the allotment of quarters was stated to be delay in supply of electricity by the West Bengal State Electricity Board (WBSEB). The Committee note in this connection that the detailed plans were supplied by the Department to the West Bengal State Electricity Board in June, 1978 and the land for construction of sub-station was offered in Oct, 1978. The power supply was given by West Bengal State Electricity in December 1979 including service connections to the water supply pumps, while the committee appreciate that the matter was not wholly within the

control of the P&T Department, they do feel that with a little more advanced planning on the part of the project authorities, coupled with sustained, vigorous pursuance of the matter with the West Bengal State Electricity Board, the delay in supply of electricity could have been, considerably cut short.

[Sl. No. 15 (Para 2.29) of Appendix II of 205th Report of PAC (Seventh Lok Sabha)].

### **Action Taken**

“Instructions to all Heads of Circles|Districts and officers of P&T Electrical|Civil Wing have been issued *vide* D.D.G, P&T Circular D.O. letter No. 760-20|82-TPS(G)|BG dated 1-6-84 (copy enclosed) for taking advance action to ensure timely allotment of quarters after their completion. The earlier instructions issued on 21-4-76 regarding avoidance delay in handing over the buildings including staff quarters and the advance action required to be taken by local P&T officials for ensuring provision of water|power supply connections to quarters after physical completion of civil works have been reiterated in this D.O. letter.”

[Ministry of Communications (P&T Board) O.M. No. 760-20|82-TPS (Genl.) B.G. Vol. II dated 1-10-1984].

### **Recommendations**

“The Committee also accept non-availability of power meters as a valid ground for delay in allotment of quarters. However, as they find, the Department had already started allotting quarters in March, 1980 in anticipation of individual connections. If so, the Committee are unable to understand why the process of allotment of quarters particularly type II quarters should have stretched over 19 months. In evidence, the Committee enquired whether allotment procedure could not be started simultaneously with the start of construction work so that there was no delay in allotment of flats. The explanation of the Secretary Ministry of Communications was if the individual allotment procedure starts too early... the allottees may be transferred. There may be complications. The Committee are not convinced by explanation. In the opinion of the Committee, the Department should have completed the allotment lists by the expected date of completion of quarters so that the allotment could be

made as soon as the quarters were ready for allotment. The Committee trust that the Ministry will draw upon their experience in this case and avoid such delays in future."

[Sl. No. 16 (Para 2.30) of Appendix II of 205th Report of PAC (Seventh Lok Sabha)].

### Action Taken

"Instructions to all Heads of Circles/Districts and officers of P&T Electrical/Civil Wing have been issued *vide* DDG(S) circular D.O. letter No. 760-20/82-TPS(BG) dated 1-6-84 (copy enclosed) for taking advance action to ensure timely allotment of quarters after their completion. The earlier instructions regarding avoidance of delay in handing over the buildings including staff quarters and advance action required to be taken by local P&T office for ensuring provision of water/power supply connection to quarters after physical completion of civil works have also been reiterated (copy enclosed)."

[Ministry of Communications (P&T Board) O.M. No. 760-20 82-TPS (Genl.) B.G. Vol. II dated 1-10-1984].

### INDIAN POSTS & TELEGRAPHS DEPARTMENT Office of the Director General Posts & Telegraphs

Parliament Street  
Dak Tar Bhawan,

61-2/85-TPS(BG)

New Delhi-110001

No. 1

Dated the 21st April, 1976

To

All Superintending Engineer (Civil & Electrical) P&T Civil Wing

**SUBJECT:** *Handing over of the building including staff quarters-  
Avoidance of delay in*

It has been noted in a few cases that there has been considerable delay in handing over of the buildings to the users after the physical

construction of the building is completed. One of the main reasons for this has been observed to be the non-availability of services like water supply, power supply, sanitary fittings etc., at the time of completion of the main building work. Though the application for water connection|power connection to the local municipal authority is to be made by the user of the building, the construction schedule for completion of the building will not be known correctly to the local P&T officers unless the same is intimated to them by the Executive Engineer (Civil Wing) incharge of the building construction. In some cases the delay has also been noticed on account of the delay in finalisation of the distribution of quarters between the various P&T units at the station.

Under this office letter No. 61-2|35-TPS (BG) dated August, 1975 it has been stipulated that the civil Wing will inform the PMG&G1 Telecom at least four months before completion of the quarters the probably date of handing over the same. It is also necessary for the Civil Wing officers to give adequate advance notice to the local P&T Administrative Unit responsible for obtaining water supply|electric connection indicating the action required to be taken by the local P&T Administrative authority and the likely date by which the building is expected to be ready, so that water supply|electric supply can be arranged well in time.

3. It is once again stressed that the overall coordination and the general responsibility for ensuring that all the services in the building are completed on schedule to match with the completion of the main building work rests with the Civil Wing Officer-in-charge of the building construction and it is his responsibility to inform the local P&T Administrative Officers of the action required to be taken by them to ensure the provision of the services by completion of the requisite formalities.

4. In case the Civil Wing Officer anticipated that the handing over of the building will be delayed on account of the delay in provision of water|power supply connection, the matter should be reported by him to the Circle Office (Postal or Telecom) well in time and if necessary brought to the personal notice of the Head of the Circle so that timely and adequate action is taken by all concerned to ensure that handing over of the building to user is not delayed on any

5. The above instructions should be carefully noted and observed as failure to hand over the building in time after the building work is completed and delay in its occupation will result in non-utilisation of the asset and possible objection from the Audit besides putting the local P&T staff to inconvenience due to denial of the building facility.

Sd/-

(S. K. SANYAL)  
Asstt. Director General (BT)

Copy to:—

1. All Postmaster General/GM Telecom/G.M. Projects.
2. General Managers, Telephones.
3. All District Managers, Telephones.
4. Chief Engineer, Civil, P&T New Delhi.
5. NB Section, 'PRP' Section.

D. O. No. 760-20/82-TPS(Genl)|BG

M. B. Ramamurthy  
Dy. Director General(S)

Office of the Director General  
Posts & Telegraphs  
New Delhi-110001

Dated the 1st June '84

Dear Shri

In a recent case the Public Accounts Committee has adversely commented on the delay in the allotment of staff quarters which has resulted in a loss due to non recovery of licence fee and expenditure on payment of House Rent Allowance. The loss could have been avoided by taking advance action in time for the allotment of quarters and the provision of electric and water connections.

2. It is emphasised that there should be no delay whatsoever in the taking over of staff quarters from the civil wing after the same have been physically completed. The allocation of the quarters between various units of the Deptt. should be decided well in advance by the G.M.T. so that there is no delay in the allotment of quarters to the staff once the quarters are completed. Moreover, it is



the overall responsibility of the G.M.T. to ensure that advance action is taken for the provision of electric and water supply connections to the quarters and that the cases are pursued vigorously with the local water and electricity supply authorities. In this regard instructions issued (copy enclosed) under this office letter No. 61-2/65-TFS (BG) dated 21-4-76 on the subject of the handing over of quarters may please be referred to.

With regards,

Yours sincerely

Sd/-

(M. B. RAMAMURTHY)

Encl: As above

Shri

General Manager Telecom Telephones|D.M. Telephones  
C.E. (Civil)|S.Es (Civil & Electrical) P&T Civil Wing.

**CHAPTER III**

**RECOMMENDATIONS|OBSERVATIONS WHICH THE COMMIT-  
TEE DO NOT DESIRE TO PURSUE IN VIEW OF THE REPLIES  
RECEIVED FROM GOVERNMENT.**

**—NIL—**

## CHAPTER IV

### RECOMMENDATIONS OR OBSERVATIONS THE REPLIES TO WHICH HAVE NOT BEEN ACCEPTED BY THE COMMITTEE AND WHICH REQUIRE REITERATION

#### Recommendation

“As to the claims of the Department against the contractor, the Committee have been informed that under clause 2 of the agreement, in the event of the contractor failing to complete the work as per the time schedule, the contractor is liable to pay as compensation an amount equal to one per cent of the estimated cost of the whole work for every day that the due quantity of work remained incomplete, subject to a maximum of 10 per cent of estimated cost of the work put to tender. Likewise, the cost of the material issued to the contractor in excess of his requirement is recoverable at double the issue rates. Taking these into account as also an escalation of Rs. 104 lakhs, the Department had submitted an aggregate claim of Rs. 148.56 lakhs against the contractor to the Arbitrator. As amongst this the contractor has submitted a counter-claim of Rs. 28.52 lakhs against the Department. The Committee trust that every effort will be made by the Department to see that the arbitration proceedings are expedited. They would like to be informed of the outcome of the arbitration proceedings.”

[Sl. No. 11 (Para 1.67) of Appendix II of 205th PAC Report (7th Lok Sabha)].

#### Action Taken

“The arbitration Proceedings have not been finalised so far. The Arbitrator appointed earlier has since resigned consequent to his transfer and a new arbitrator in the case has been appointed. The concerned Executive Engineer has been advised to pursue the matter for early finalisation, of the arbitration proceedings. The PAC would be informed of the outcome in due course.

This has been vetted by audit vide their U.O. No. RR-1|2(d) 2166| 1383 dated 9-11-84. Audit desired that they may be furnished with the final ATN. This will be done.”

[Ministry of Communications (P&T Board) O.M. No. 5(1)82 A&C dated 24-11-84].

### Recommendation

"The Committee are not happy over the manner in which the Delhi Development Authority (DDA) had acted in this case. The General Manager, Telephones Delhi had paid Rs. 87.89 lakhs to the DDA for the purchase of 29.6 acres of land at Pankha Road and 15 acres of land at Malviya Nagar. 21.72 acres of land was allotted to the Department at Pankha Road (remaining land could not be allotted due to the land being under unauthorised occupation) but no land was allotted in Malviya Nagar. When asked in evidence why alternative land in Malviya Nagar or in its vicinity was not allotted to the P&T Department the reply of the representative of the DDA was that "in every residential centres, the land is provided for different uses. So, adjustment has to be made within the area earmarked for that use". The committee are not convinced by this reply, as they observe, the DDA had already committed to allot the land to the Telephone Department in Malviya Nagar and the department had already paid money on this account. Therefore, the DDA should have made an alternative allotment to the Department in Malviya Nagar itself or in its vicinity *inter alia* bearing in mind that the Telephone Department was a public utility department rendering an essential service. However, the DDA did not do this; and, instead in 1973 offered alternative lands to the Department miles away—20 acres at Paschim Puri and 10+7.8 acres at Shalimar Garden. But here too, the DDA failed to keep its commitments and now, after a lapse of 10 years, the Committee have been informed that the lands proposed to be allotted at Paschim Puri and Shalimar Garden have since been "utilised" by the DDA for some other purpose and fresh proposals for allotment of land to the P&T Department are under consideration of the DDA. The Committee feel that the DDA should have honoured its commitments, particularly to a public utility department like the Telephone Department. The Committee desire that the DDA should now, without any further delay, allot land to the Telephone Department for which a balance of Rs. 23.88 lakhs remains unadjusted with them since March 1970.

[Sl. No. 12 (Para 169) of Appendix II of 205th Report of PAC (7th Lok Sabha)].

### Action Taken

"The case has been taken up demiofficially with the Vice-Chairman of the DDA for allotment of land immediately. The concern of the P.A.C. over the undue delay in this case has also been intimated. Further action shall be taken on receipt of a reply from the D.D.A.

"This has been vetted by Audit vide their U.O. No. RRI/2(d)2166/1576 dated 26-12-84. However, they desire that the final outcome may be intimated to PAC in due course. This will be done".

[Ministry of Communciations (D.G.P&T) U.O. No. 5(1)82-A&C  
dated 28-12-84]

### **Action Taken**

"The P&T Department (Delhi Telephones) was allotted 29.6 acres of land in Janakpuri (Pankha Road Residential Scheme) and 15 acres of land in Malviya Nagar by DDA for construction of staff quarters. As per reconciliation conducted with the P&T Department total amount deposited by the P&T Deptt. for these sites was Rs. 87.08 lakhs. A copy of P&T Department's letter dated 6th September, 1985 is enclosed as Appendix I.

2. The land allotted at Malviya Nagar could not be made available by DDA to the P&T Department because of the dispute of ownership of the land which was reported to have been allotted by the Department of Rehabilitation to a Cooperative House Building Society. As regards allotment of land at Janakpuri, possession of 3 plots of land totalling 21.72 acres was handed over in July 1970 and their remaining 7.88 acres of land could not be allotted due to heavy encroachment and difficulties in acquisition.

3. It was decided by the DDA in a meeting held in June 1973 that the payment made by P&T Department for the cost of land at Malviya Nagar can be refunded adjusted against purchase of other land flats. It was also further decided that an area of 7.88 acres in Shalimar Bagh area may be allotted to the P&T Department in lieu of the shortfall of allotment in Janakpuri.

4. P&T was allotted 20 acres of land in Paschim Puri and 10 acres of land at Shalimar Bagh on 13-7-1971. They were asked to pay the cost of this land (Rs. 85.22,000) in July 1971 for which reminders were also issued for a period of one year. Since no payment was made by P&T Department the allotment of land at Paschim Puri and Shalimar Bagh was cancelled by DDA on 16-7-1972. The Divisional Engineer (Delhi Telephones) was also informed that the allotment would be restored if the payment is made by 30th November, 1972. In response to the Divisional Engineer's letter dated 23-5-73 informing that necessary approval for the payment has been obtained, the land was restored to the P&T Department in June 1973. An area of 7.88 acres of land was also allotted

to the P&T Department at Shalimar Bagh on 7-12-73 (in lieu of the land that could not be made available in Pankha Road against payment made for Pankha Road). P&T Department was asked to clear the outstanding dues for the land allotted in Paschim Puri and two pieces of land at Shalimar Bagh on 12th June, 1975. Since no reply was received, the allotment was cancelled on 29-11-76. A copy of the DDA's letter dated 29-11-76 is enclosed as Appendix II.

5. P&T Department was also allotted 2 acres of land in District Centre Pankha Road for a Telephone Exchange and 9312 sq. yds. of land in Shadipur. They requested the DDA to adjust the cost of these sites against the payment already made by them. Accordingly, against the total payment of 87.08 lakhs initially made by them the following dues were adjusted by DDA:

1. Cost of 21.72 acres of land @ Rs. 43/- per Sq. meter allotted at Pankha Road, for staff quarters.	Rs.	37,79,736.15
2. Cost of 2 acres of land at Pankha Road at the provision rate of Rs. 70/- per sq. yds.	Rs.	6,77,600.00
3. Cost of 9321 sq. yds. at Shadipur for Telephone Exchange	Rs.	19,36,000.00
		-----
TOTAL :	Rs.	63,93,336.15
		-----

6. This left a balance of 23.15 lakhs with the DDA for adjustment. A sum of Rs. 18.81 lakhs has since been adjusted against this balance as per the following details.

1. Allotment of land for expansion of Telephone Exchange at Shahdra	Rs.	3,84,461.00
2. Allotment of land for DTC at Krishna Nagar	Rs.	2,96,528.93
3. Allotment of land for Telephone Exchange at Laxmi Nagar Distt. Centre.	Rs.	12,00,000.00
		-----
TOTAL :	Rs.	18,80,989.93
		-----

7. A surplus amount of Rs. 4.34 lakhs belonging to the P&T Department is now available with DDA which is to be adjusted against the allotments to be made to P&T Department.

8. A plot of 9 acres in G-17 (Revenue Estate of Nangli Syed) area has since been allotted to the Delhi Telephones in lieu of the land which was allotted in Shalimar Bagh (Vide para 3) but which has since been utilised by DDA after cancellation. The land under

reference is acquired and vests in DDA. It is Vacant at Site and forms part of Group Housing Pockets and therefore is suitable for construction of staff quarters. This is likely to cost P&T a sum of Rs. 54 lakhs. A copy of the allotment letter is also enclosed as Appendix III.

[Ministry of Urban Development (Delhi Division) Letter No. K-20011/3/84/DDVA dated 18th November, 1985].

## APPENDIX I

D.O. No. Bldg. Plg. BD-334/II/73

M. L. Handa  
A.C.M. (Bldg. Plg.)

Dated: 6th Sept., 1985.

Dear Shri Shome,

Please refer to your D.O. letter No. F. 1(42) 83-Instl. dated 29-8-1985 regarding confirmation of statement of accounts of various lands acquired by us from DDA.

The statement of accounts now received in detail has been checked up and found in order and can be accepted by us subject to the following conditions:—

1. DDA allots us a piece of land measuring 9 acres in G-17 area as mentioned in your statement of accounts (Last para). The detailed layout plan of this area may please be sent to us for our concurrence.
2. 15 acres of land is allotted to us at Malviya Nagar as per instructions of the PAC. However if DDA still finds it difficult to allot land in Malviya Nagar then 15 acres of land should be allotted in Vasant Kunj area in lieu thereof. Layout plan of this area may also be sent for our concurrence.
3. The cost of land at G-17 & Malviya Nagar Vasant Kunj should be charged from us at the rates prevalent at the time when we made initial payments during 1969—71.

Yours sincerely,

Sd/-

(M. L. HANDA)

Shri S. R. Shome,  
Dy. Director (Instl.)  
DDA Vikas Minar,  
New Delhi.



**ANNEXURE II**

Dated 29-11-76

F. (29188)/71-LSB(I)

Land Sales Officer (I)  
Delhi Development Authority

The Divisional Engineer Phones (Bldgs.)  
Delhi Telephones, Planning Branch,  
Eastern Court, New Delhi-110050.

SUBJECT: *Allotment of land for staff quarters at Paschimpuri and Shalimar Bagh.*

Sir,

With reference to your letter No. Plg./Bd-3344/94 dated 25-8-76 on the subject noted above, I am directed to inform you that allotment of land in Paschimpuri and Shalimar Bagh stands cancelled in default of payment vide letter dated 7-7-72.

Yours faithfully,

Sd/-

(R. B. Kulsreshtha)  
for Land Sales Officer (I)

### APPENDIX III

F.No. 26(1)/71-Instal.

Delhi Development Authority  
Vikas Minar

Indraprastha Estate  
New Delhi-2

Dated : 13-8-1985.

From : S. R. Shome,  
Dy. Director (Instl.)

To

The Asstt. General Manager (Bldgs.)  
O/O The General Manager Telephones,  
Delhi Telephones, Eastern Court,  
NEW DELHI-110050.

SUB: *Allotment of land for construction of Staff quarters in G-17 Area.*

Sir,

I am directed to inform you that it has been decided to allot a plot of land measuring 9 acres in G-17 area to the Delhi Telephones Department for the construction of staff quarters on usual terms and conditions which shall also include the following:—

1. The Telephones Department shall be required to pay the cost of land measuring 9 acres at the provisional rate of Rs. six lakhs per acres.
2. The Telephones Department shall give an undertaking to the effect that the difference of cost of land at the rate as may be decided by the Govt. of India/DDA will be paid by them on demand.
3. The land shall be used by the Telephones Department for the construction of staff quarters and for no other purpose what-so-ever.
4. The construction plans should be got approved from the local body/DDA before undertaking any construction on the land.

5. The Telephones Department shall be required to complete the construction within a period of two years from the date of handing over possession of the plot.
6. The land shall not be transferred/sub-leased to any other department without prior permission of DDA obtained in writing.
7. The Telephones Department shall fence the plot immediately after taking over possession of the plot to avoid encroachment.
8. The DDA/Leaser reserve its right to alter any terms and conditions in its discretion.

If the above terms and conditions are acceptable to the Telephones Department the acceptance thereof, may be communicated to the undersigned. The total amount of premium comes to Rs. 54,00,000 after adjusting a sum of Rs. 3.55 lakhs being the balance amount outstanding against payment for allotment of land at Malaviya Nagar and Pankha Road, the balance amount of premium in this case comes to Rs. 50,45,000 which may kindly be deposited in the DDA. within thirty days from the date of issue of this letter so that possession of the land could be handed over.

In case, the premium of land is not received within the stipulated period, the rate prevailing after the expiry of the stipulated period will be made applicable and the Telephones Department shall have to make payment accordingly.

Yours faithfully,

Sd/-

(S. R. SHOME)

*Dy. Director (Institutional)*

D.D.A.

#### **Recommendation**

“Another aspect to which the Committee would like to draw attention is that a large balance of Telephone Department nearly Rs. 24 lakhs has been lying with DDA since 1969. This amount was deposited with the DDA when the price of land was very low. As the DDA is now allotting institutional land at much higher rates, the Committee feel that the DDA should in all fairness, pay interest to the Department on this unadjusted balance. They also feel that the DDA

should pay interest in all such cases. The Committee would like to be informed of the decision taken by the DDA in this matter.”

[Sl. No. 13 (Para 1.70) of Appendix II, 205th report of PAC 1983-84 (7th Lok Sabha)].

#### **Action Taken**

“As per recommendations of the P.A.C. the case has been taken up with the Vice Chairman of the DDA for allowing interest on Rs. 23,87,638/- lying with them since long as they have not made over any land to the Delhi Telephones against the advance payment so far.

This has been vetted by Audit vide their U.O. No. RRI 2(d)2166/1576 dated 26-12-84. However, they desire that the final outcome may be intimated to PAC in due course. This will be done”.

[Ministry of Communications (D.G.P&T) U.O. No. 5(1)82-A&C dated 28-12-84].

#### **Action Taken**

“In the case of Government/semi-Government organizations, Delhi Development Authority does neither charge nor pay any interest on the amounts payable to/by Delhi Development Authority towards the cost of land as such arrangement is not administratively feasible.”

[Ministry of Works and Housing Letter No. K-2001/3 84-IDDVA dated 2-9-1985].

**CHAPTER V**  
**RECOMMENDATIONS/OBSERVATIONS IN RESPECT OF**  
**WHICH GOVERNMENT HAVE FURNISHED INTERIM**  
**REPLIES.**

—NIL—

NEW DELHI:  
19 *November*, 1985  

---

28 *Kartika*, 1907 (*Saka*)

E. AYYAPU REDDY,  
*Chairman,*  
*Public Accounts Committee.*

## PART II

### MINUTES OF THE SECOND SITTING OF THE ACTION TAKEN SUB-COMMITTEE OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE HELD ON 7TH AUGUST, 1985

The Action Taken Sub-Committee sat from 15.30 hours to 17.30 hours.

#### PRESENT

Shri E. Ayyapu Reddy—*Chairman.*

#### MEMBERS

2. Shri Rajmangal Pande
3. Shri Amal Datta
4. Shri Nirmal Chatterjee
5. Shri H. M. Patel
6. Shri J. Chokka Rao

#### SECRETARIAT

1. Shri K. H. Chhaya—*Chief Financial Committee Officer.*
2. Shri R. C. Anand—*Senior Financial Committee Officer.*

#### REPRESENTATIVES OF THE OFFICE OF C&AG

1. Shri T. M. George—*Add. Deputy C&AG of India (RC).*
2. Shri O. P. Goel—*Director of Audit (P&T).*
3. Shri A. K. Jain—*Director of Audit, Central Revenues—II.*
4. Shri C. L. Gupta—*Joint Director of Audit, CW&M.*

2. The Action Taken Sub-Committee considered the following draft Action Taken Reports:

(i)       \*\*\*                       \*\*\*                       \*\*\*                       \*\*\*

- \* (ii) Draft Report on Action Taken on 205th Report (7th Lok Sabha) relating to construction of Staff Quarters at Pankha Road, New Delhi and construction of Staff Quarters at Salt Lake, Calcutta.

(iii)       \*\*\*                       \*\*\*                       \*\*\*                       \*\*\*

3. The Sub-Committee adopted the draft Reports at (i) and (iii) above with certain modifications/amendments.

4. Regarding Draft Report at (ii)\* above the Sub-Committee decided to take evidence of the Ministry of Works and Housing and the Delhi Development Authority at their sitting to be held on Tuesday, the 13th August, 1985 on the following points:

- (i) Allotment of balance land by DDA to the P&T Department.
- (ii) Payment of interest on the balance amount of P&T lying with DDA.
- (iii) Payment of interest in all such cases.

\*\*\*

\*\*\*

\*\*\*

\*\*\*

*The Sub Committee then adjourned.*

---

MINUTES OF THE 8TH SITTING OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS  
COMMITTEE HELD ON 13 AUGUST, 1985

The Committee sat from 15-30 hrs, to 17-30 hrs.

PRESENT

Shri E. Ayyapu Reddy—*Chairman*.

MEMBERS

2. Shri Ranjit Singh Gackwad
3. Shrimati Prabhawati Gupta
4. Shri Vilas Muttemwar
5. Shri Raj Mangal Pandey
6. Shri H. M. Patel
7. Shrimati Jayanti Patnaik
8. Shri Simon Tigga
9. Shri Nirmal Chatterjee
10. Miss Jayalalitha

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri N. N. Mehra—*Joint Secretary*.
2. Shri K. H. Chhaya—*Chief Financial Committee Officer*.
3. Shri R. C. Anand—*Senior Financial Committee Officer*.

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE OFFICE OF THE C&AG

1. Shri T. N. Chaturvedi—*C&AG of India*.
2. Shri T. M. George—*Addl. Deputy C&AG of India (RC)*.
3. Shri O. P. Goel—*Director of Audit, P&T*.
4. Shri A. K. Jain—*Director of Audit, Central Revenues—II*.
5. Shri P. S. Wagle—*Joint Director (RC)*.
6. Shri Gopal Singh—*Joint Director of Audit, P&T*.

WITNESSES

**Ministry of Communications**

Shri K. Thomas Kora, *Secretary (T)*.

**Ministry of Works & Housing**

1. Shri Ramesh Chandra—*Secretary*.
2. Shri R. L. Pradeep—*Joint Secretary (UD)*.



## Delhi Development Authority

Shri Prem Kumar—*Vice Chairman*

While considering the draft Action Taken Report on 205th Report at their sitting held on 7-8-1985, the Committee took strong exception to the repeated requests from the Ministry of Works and Housing asking for extension of time to furnish the Action Taken Notes on specific recommendation made by the Committee. They also noted that the Ministry have failed to exercise disciplinary control over the DDA in as much as that DDA did not pay any heed to the Ministry's letters to them to expedite the information on the Committee's recommendation enabling them to submit the Action Taken Notes on the Committee. The Committee took the evidence of the representatives of the Ministry of Works and Housing and DDA to explain the delay in furnishing information on the following points:

- (i) Allotment of balance land by DDA to the P&T Department for construction of staff quarters at Pankha Road, New Delhi.
- (ii) Payment of interest on the balance amount of P&T lying with Delhi Development Authority; and
- (iii) Payment of interest on all such cases.

The Committee desired to know the reasons for the continued silence in the matter on the part of the Housing Ministry and the DDA. The Secretary, Ministry of Works and Housing stated:

“I may add that the Ministry had prepared a reply and it was sent to the Director of Audit. According to the procedure followed, all such replies have to be vetted by him before they are sent to the Secretariat of the Committee. At present it is before the Director of Audit. According to our last letter, we have asked time upto the end of August 1985 to furnish the replies and to comply with the requirements and I am sure that in case that much of time is given, the Ministry will not fail.”

In reply to another question, the witness stated:

“As I have explained in our last letter the Ministry has asked for time till 31st August, 1985. As I have stated, the reply of the Ministry is pending with the Director of Audit who has to vet it. So, this is the reasonable time required to furnish the replies to the Committee.”

The Committee were informed that the DDA was reminded by the Ministry of Communications many times from December 1983 onwards for allotment of land in Malviya Nagar or in any other locality in South Delhi. The Minister of State for Communication himself wrote to the Minister of Works and Housing on the subject on 4-9-1984. On being enquired why reply to any of these letters was not given and how it was that land could not be allotted in Malviya Nagar or in any other locality in South Delhi all these years though the money was lying with the DDA, the Secretary, Ministry of Works and Housing stated:

“I will check up as to what reply was sent to the Minister of Communications. I am afraid, I will have to check up from the file.”

Referring to another D.O. letter from the General Manager, Delhi Telephones, addressed to the Vice-Chairman, DDA, requesting him to fix date and time convenient to him for a meeting to discuss this issue the committee enquired what the response from the Ministry of Works and Housing to that letter. The Vice-Chairman, DDA stated:

“The discussions were already going on. I had informed them on telephone. And as a result of discussions the issue of another 9 acres of land had been finalised in Paschimpuri. He has not mentioned in the subsequent conversation about his desire to meet me. Had he done so, I would have certainly met him.”

Asked specifically whether any date and time was fixed and a reply sent to that letter, the witness stated:

“We had not met for this purpose, Sir. Although we discussed this issue when he talked to me on telephone, but we have not recorded anything.”

The Committee enquired whether he had ever brought this fact to the notice of the Secretary, Ministry of Works and Housing, the witness stated:

“No Sir, I never brought it to the notice of the Secretary because we were not in a position to meet their request.”

In reply to another question whether the Secretary, Ministry of Works and Housing ever enquired as to what the DDA was going to

do with the P&T's request for allotment of land in Malviya Nagar, the Vice-Chairman, DDA deposed:

"I will have to check whether there was any conversation about this. The Secretary might have enquired of me in writing but I am not sure about that."

The Committee enquired whether from whatever the witness has stated it could be inferred that there is no record to show that development took place in this regard, the witness state:

"Tha is right, Sir."

Asked after how many letters the above said discussion between the DDA and the Ministry of Communications started and whether the Vice-Chairman DDA tried to contact or see Secretary, Communications in the interest of solving the problem, the Vice-Chairman, DDA stated:

"I do not have the letters at present, as I submitted to the Committee, as to the level at which letters have been received. After the discussions took place, they have been taking action.....The discussions were held on the basis of these letters."

On being enquired by the Committee, whether he would offer to solve this problem and report to the Committee within 2-3 days and if he was not prepared then the Committee would take it that this problem required greater consideration and longer time was needed, the witness stated:

"There are two things. First is, furnishing a reply giving a detailed position in regard to the Committee's recommendation. As I stated earlier, we have sought for time up to 31st of August. I will stick to that and send the reply within that period. Of course, there are files and all that to be shown to the Director of Audit. This is to vet the reply to the draft submitted to him. All this we will comply and submit the Report by 31st August."

On being enquired by the C&AG of India as to when the draft replies prepared by the Ministry of Works & Housing were sent to the Director of Audit for vetting, it was stated that these were sent to Audit on 5 June, 1985 and the Director of Audit (CR) wrote back

to the Housing Ministry on 28 June, 1985 asking for certain documents in support of the replies furnished to Audit for vetting. The C&AG further observed:

“Certain things are the responsibility of the Member Finance and certain other things the Commissioner (Lands). But, is the Vice-Chairman of DDA not the executive head of the DDA? Is he not supposed to coordinate both the functions?”

The Vice-Chairman, DDA stated:

“I did submit at that time that when it comes to implementation, it is the responsibility of the Vice-Chairman.”

*The Committee then adjourned.*

## PART II

### MINUTES OF THE TWENTY-SECOND SITTING OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE HELD ON 28 OCTOBER, 1985.

The Public Accounts Committee sat from 1500 hrs. to 1620 hrs. on 28 October, 1985 in Committee Room 'A', Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi. The following were present:

#### MEMBERS

Shri Girdhari Lal Vyas—*In the Chair*

2. Shri J. Chokha Rao
3. Shri Amal Datta
4. Shri Ranjit Singh Gaekwad
5. Shrimati Prabhawati Gupta
6. Shri Vilas Mutterwar
7. Shri Rajmangal Pande
8. Shrimati Jayanti Patnaik
9. Shri Simon Tigga
10. Shri Nirmal Chatterjee
11. Shri K. L. N. Prasad
12. Shri Ramanand Yadav

#### REPRESENTATIVES OF THE OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER AND AUDITOR GENERAL OF INDIA

- |                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| 1. Shri C. Shankar Menon | Addl. Deputy Comptroller & Auditor General of India (R)        |
| 2. Shri P.C. Asthana     | Addl. Deputy Comptroller & Auditor General of India (Railways) |
| 3. Shri D.K. Chakravarty | Director of Audit, Central Revenue-I                           |
| 4. Shri O.P. Goel        | Director of Audit, P&T   |
| 5. Shri A.K. Jain        | Director of Audit, Central Revenue II                          |
| 6. Shri M. Parthasarthy  | Director of Audit, Defence Services                            |
| 7. Shri C.V. Srinivasan  | Director of Audit, Defence Services (N&AI)                     |
| 8. Shri P.C. Wagle       | Joint Director (R.S.)  |
| 9. Shri B.S. Gill        | Joint Director (Defence)                                       |
| 10. Shri P.N. Misra      | Joint Director (Railways)                                      |

## SECRETARIAT

1. Shri K. H. Chhaya—*Chief Financial Committee Officer*
2. Shri R. C. Anand—*Senior Financial Committee Officer.*

2. In the absence of Chairman, the Committee chose Shri Gir-dhari Lal Vyas, M.P. to act as Chairman for the sitting under Rule 258(3) of the Rules of Procedure and conduct of Business in Lok Sabha.

3. The Committee considered the following Draft Reports.

(i) \* \* \* \* \*

(ii) Action Taken on the recommendations of the Public Accounts Committee contained in their 205th Report (Seventh Lok Sabha) regarding construction of sta- quarters at Pankha Road, New Delhi by P&T.

4. Regarding draft Action Taken Report at (ii) above, the Com- mittee were informed that a copy of the revised action taken note on the recommendations of the Committee at Para Nos. 1.69—1.70 (S.L. Nos. 12-13) sent to Audit by the Ministry of Works & Housing for vetting was received at 2.30 P.M. on 28-10-1985 after reconcilia- tion of the amounts paid by P&T Department to DDA in 1969-71 for purchase of land. Necessary corrections in the recommenda- tions have been made accordingly. The existing Action Taken Note will be substituted by the revised Action Taken Note on receipt from the Ministry of Works & Housing.

5. The Committee adopted the above Report subject to certain modifications as shown in Annexure II.

6. The Committee authorised the Chairman to incorporate in the Reports, certain other minor modifications/amendments arising out of factual verification of the same by Audit. The Committee also authorised the Chairman to present these Reports in the House.

*The Committee then adjourned.*

---

## ANNEXURE II

Modifications/amendments made in Revised Draft Report on Action taken on 205th Report relating to construction of staff quarters at Pankha Road, New Delhi and Salt Lake, Calcutta by the Public Accounts Committee at their sitting held on 28-10-1985 (AN).

Page	Para	Line	Modifications/Amendments
3	1-6	4-6	<i>For</i> "The Committee find that the reply of the Ministry of Communications in this regard is disappointing." <i>Read</i> "The Committee consider the reply of the Ministry of Communications disappointing."
3	1.6	6-8	<i>For</i> "Transfer of the Officer appointed as arbitrator does not seem to be a valid reason for a resignation as arbitrator." <i>Read</i> "Transfer of the Officer appointed as arbitrator does not seem to be a valid reason for the Officer resigning as arbitrator."
7	1.11(3)	1	<i>For</i> "Rs. 87.89" <i>Read</i> "Rs. 87.63"
7	1.11 (5)	1	<i>For</i> 'Paschini Vihar' <i>Read</i> 'P. Chini Puri'
8	1.11 (8)	5	<i>For</i> 'Rs. 23.88' <i>Read</i> 'Rs. 23.15'
8	1.11 (9)	1	<i>For</i> '30 October 1984' <i>Read</i> '29 October 1984'
12	1.22	8	<i>For</i> 'Rs. 23.88' <i>Read</i> 'Rs. 23.15'
12	1.22	10	<i>For</i> 'Rs. 89.86' <i>Read</i> 'Rs. 87.68'
19	1.24	2	<i>For</i> "Rs. 87.89 lakhs in 1969" <i>Read</i> "Rs. 87.68 lakhs (as reconciled by P&T Department with DDA)"
19	1.24	15-16	<i>For</i> "Rs. 87.89 lakhs towards full cost of the land in advance in 1969 and 1970." <i>Read</i> "Rs. 87.68 lakhs towards full cost of the land in advance in 1969, 1970 and 1971"
19	1.24	19	<i>For</i> 'Rs. 23.88 lakhs' <i>Read</i> 'Rs. 23.15 lakhs'
20	1.25	6	<i>For</i> "In another communication dated 20 May, 1985 addressed by the then General Manager, Delhi Telephones to the Vice-Chairman, DDA, while requesting the latter to intervene personally and cause early finalisation of the case since the land under reference was badly needed by the P&T Department for construction of staff quarters in Malviya Nagar. The General Manager, Delhi Telephones

Page	Para	Line	Modifications/Amendments
			had even offered to call on the Vice-Chairman, DDA to discuss this case with him if he could fix a date for the purpose. True to the reputation of DDA, all efforts on the part of P&T failed to persuade DDA to come out with a positive response in the matter.'
			<i>Read</i> 'In another communication dated 30 May, 1985, the then General Manager, Delhi Telephones had requested the Vice-Chairman, DDA, to intervene personally for early finalisation of the case since the land under reference was badly needed by the P&T Department for construction of staff quarters in Malviya Nagar. The General Manager, Delhi Telephones had even offered to call on the Vice-Chairman, DDA to discuss this case with him if he could fix a date for the purpose. It is shocking that all efforts on the part of P&T failed to persuade to come out with a positive response in the matter.'
21	1.25(3)	1	<i>For</i> 'Rs. 87.89 lakhs'
			<i>Read</i> 'Rs. 87.68 lakhs'
21	1.25 (8)	5	<i>For</i> 'Rs. 23.88 lakhs'
			<i>Read</i> '23.15 lakhs'
21	1.26	4	<i>For</i> 'Rs. 64 lakhs' <i>Read</i> Rs. 54 lakhs'
22	1.27	1-3	<i>For</i> 'It is not at all enough to condemn wholesale the bureaucratic non-functioning, irresponsible attitude of the DDA and also of the Housing Ministry.'
			<i>Read</i> 'It is not enough to condemn the bureaucratic Non-functioning, irresponsible attitude of the DDA in general and also of the Housing Ministry.'
22	1.27	5	<i>For</i> 'of immediate'
			<i>Read</i> 'for immediate'
22	1.27	8	<i>For</i> 'the Posts and Telegraphs Department'
			<i>Read</i> 'Communications'
22	1.27	9	<i>For</i> 'Secretary, Communications'
			<i>Read</i> 'General Manager, Delhi Telephones'
22	1.27	13	<i>For</i> 'may be taken'
			<i>Read</i> 'should be taken'
22	1.27	15	<i>For</i> 'Minister for P&T'
			<i>Read</i> 'Minister of Communications'
23	1.28	5-6	<i>For</i> ] 'Actual possession of 21.72 acres of land only was handed over'
			<i>Read</i> 'delivery of possession of only 21.72 acres of land was handed over'



Page	Para	Line	Modifications/ Amendments
23	1.28	22	<i>Delete</i> 'now'
23	1.28	24	<i>For</i> 'could have been'
			<i>Read</i> 'could not have been'
23	1.28	77	<i>Add</i> 'may' after 'Rehabilitation'
24	1.28	8	<i>For</i> 'taken promptly'
			<i>Read</i> 'including proper maintenance of records taken promptly'
24	1.28	11.12	<i>For</i> 'Nevertheless, the Committee would like'
			<i>Read</i> 'The Committee would also like'

## APPENDIX

### Statement of Recommendations and Observations

Sl No	Para No	Ministry/ Deptt. Concerned	Recommendations/Observation
1	2	3	4

1    1.24    Ministry of Communications  
(Deptt. of Tele-Communications)  
Ministry of Urban Development  
(Delhi Division)/(DDA)

The General Manager, Delhi Telephones had paid Rs. 87.08 lakhs (as reconciled by P&T Department with DDA) in 1969 and 1970 for the purchase of 29.6 acres of land at Pankha Road and 15 acres of land at Malviya Nagar. 21.72 acres of land was allotted to the Department at Pankha Road (remaining land could not be allotted due to the land being under unauthorised occupation) but no land was allotted in Malviya Nagar.

Expressing unhappiness over the manner in which the DDA had acted, the Committee had pointed out in their earlier Report that the DDA had failed twice to keep its commitment of making available land at Pankha Road (Janakpuri) and Malviya Nagar, New Delhi (only a part of the promised land was allotted in Janakpuri in July 1970 and no land was allotted in Malviya Nagar) to the P & T Department which had paid Rs. 87.08 lakhs towards full cost of the land in advance in 1969, 1970 and 1971. The Committee had then desired that the DDA should, without further delay, allot land to the Telephone Department adjusting a balance of Rs. 23.15 lakhs which had remained

unadjusted with them (DDA) since March 1970. They had also felt that DDA should, in all fairness, not only pay interest to the Department on this unadjusted balance but should pay interest in all such cases.

2

1.25

—do—

Various authorities in the Ministry of Communications (DG P&T, Delhi Telephones, etc.) had addressed at least nine communications to the Ministry of Works and Housing and the Vice-Chairman, DDA during the period December 1983 to July 1985 including letter dated 4-9-1984 sent by Shri N. V. Gadgil, Minister of State for Communications to Shri Buta Singh, Minister for Works and Housing and Parliamentary Affairs drawing attention to the long standing case of allotment of 15 acres of land at Malviya Nagar, New Delhi by DDA to Delhi Telephones for construction of staff quarters there and requesting him to look into the matter and advise DDA to complete the transaction without further delay. The efforts on the part of the Ministry of Communications to get the matter settled early did not end there. In another communication dated 30 May, 1985, the then General Manager, Delhi Telephones had requested the Vice-Chairman, DDA, to intervene personally for early finalisation of the case since the land under reference was badly needed by the P&T Department for construction of staff quarters in Malviya Nagar. The General Manager, Delhi Telephones had even offered to call on the Vice-Chairman, DDA to discuss this case with him if he could fix a date for the purpose. It is shocking that all efforts on the part of P&T failed to persuade DDA to come out with a positive response in the matter. How obdurately

62

2

irresponsible is the DDA can best be illustrated by chronologically setting out the dates:

- (1) Date on which P & T requested DDA for allotment of land in Malviya Nagar . . . . . 1969-70
- (2) Date on which DDA identified 29.6 acres of land at Pankha Road and 15 acres of land in Malviya Nagar for allotment to the Telephone Department . . . . . 1970
- (3) Date on which Rs. 87.08 lakhs towards entire cost of land at the then prevailing rates were deposited by the P & T Department with the DDA . . . . . March 1969  
March 1970  
and  
March 1971
- (4) Date on which possession was given to P & T of 21.72 acres of land out of 29.6 acres at Pankha Road . . . . . July 1970
- (5) Date on which DDA offered land in Shalimar Bagh and Paschim Puri (West Delhi) in lieu of land in Malviya Nagar . . . . . July 1971
- (6) Date on which DDA cancelled the above offer because of no interest shown by P & T in these areas : . . . . . October, 1975
- (7) Date on which DDA informed P & T about the ownership dispute of land identified for them in Malviya Nagar and expressed inability to allot land in that locality . . . . . 7 September, 1983

Date of which 205th Report of PAC suggesting early allotment of land to P & T in Malviya Nagar or its vicinity for which a balance of Rs. 23.15 lakhs remained unadjusted with DDA since March 1970 was presented to the House . . . . . 29 April, 1984

(9) Date on which action taken notes on the above recommendations of the Committee were required to be furnished by the Ministry of Works and Housing/DDA . . . . . 30 October, 1984

3      1.26      Do.

The Committee have now been informed that a plot of land measuring 9 acres in G-17 (Revenue Estate of Nangli Syed) area in West Delhi costing about Rs. 54 lakhs has since been allotted to the Delhi Telephones on 13-8-1985. The Committee are unhappy to observe that the matter which should have been settled ordinarily within an hour or so by the Secretaries of two Departments and head of DDA sitting together to sort out the differences as they are different parts of the same Government, has taken 15 long years and that too after the Public Accounts Committee called for the three Departments to ascertain as to why there were no replies for the Action Taken Report from DDA and the Housing Ministry. An allotment of the land to the P&T Department by DDA even now would not have taken place had not the Public Accounts Committee made quite clear about their deep distress and their readiness to take up the question of contempt of the Committee on account of delay in sending replies.

64

4      1.20      Do.

It is not enough to condemn the bureaucratic non-functioning, irresponsible attitude of the DDA in general and also of the Housing Ministry. The Committee are of the view that this is a case for

---

immediate punishment of those responsible for showing utter indifference to PAC's recommendations followed up by letter from the concerned Minister of Communications and the letter of the General Manager, Delhi Telephones seeking personal discussion with the Vice-Chairman, DDA. The Committee, therefore, recommend that disciplinary action in the matter should be initiated immediately. The starting point may be taken as the date on which pursuant to the recommendation of PAC, the Hon. Minister of Communications wrote a D.O. letter to the Minister for Works and Housing.

In this connection, the Committee have come across another disturbing feature in the working of DDA in regard to the case of allotment of land to P&T in Janakpuri. As against 29.6 acres of land allotted in this area to the P&T Department, delivery of possession of only 21.72 acres of land was handed over to the Department in July, 1970 and the remaining 7.88 acres could not be made available as this chunk of land was heavily encroached upon and acquisition thereof was found to be difficult. The Committee are astonished how the land was allotted and cost thereof charged from the allottee in advance without first checking and ensuring that the plot of land in question was available. Another case relates to the allotment of land at Malviya Nagar. The allotted land could not be made available by DDA to the Department because of dispute of ownership of the land which is now reported to have already been allotted by the Department of Rehabilitation to a Cooperative House Building Society. This gives a glimpse of the

working of the DDA. The Committee are in doubt whether the DDA is in possession of clear and full records of land in Delhi belonging to the Authority. Otherwise a plot of land belonging to the Department of Rehabilitation could not have been allotted by the DDA and full cost thereof charged in advance from the allottee. It could well be presumed that the Department of Rehabilitation may have also charged cost of the land from the Housing Society to which it was allotted. Thus, the same plot of land appears to have been sold to two different organisations at the same time. This only indicates lack of control by DDA on vacant plots of land acquired by the DDA in various parts and locations of Delhi State and poor maintenance of land records by the DDA resulting in inconvenience and hardships to the allottees, be it a Government service Department or a private organisation/individual. This situation needs to be attended to and necessary remedial measures including proper maintenance of records taken promptly. They would like DDA to devise fool-proof procedure of periodically checking and inspecting plots of land to ensure that these are not encroached upon. The Committee would also like the Ministry/DDA to take measures to ensure that in future no plot of land should be allotted or auctioned without first fully ensuring that the land is without any encumbrances and is in vacant possession of the DDA.

83

What has disturbed the Committee even further is the inordinate delay in the Ministry of Works and Housing/DDA for furnishing Action Taken Notes on the recommendations contained in their original Report. In this connection, the Committee are unhappy to state that the Secretary, Housing Ministry has displayed a very casual attitude in this matter in spite of the fact that Public Accounts Committee had called

---

1	2	3	4
7	1.3.1	Ministry of Communications (Deptt. of Tele-Communications)	<p>for an explanation for the delay in responding to Action Taken on the Report of the Committee. The Public Accounts Committee require that they must be informed about the action taken on their recommendations within six months from the date of presentation of their Report.</p> <p>The Committee would also like to be kept informed by the P&amp;T Department of the steps taken by that Department to start the construction of long delayed quarters for its staff.</p>



