

# COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS

(EIGHTH LOK SABHA)

## FIRST REPORT



*Presented to Lok Sabha on 12 December, 1985*

**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT  
NEW DELHI**

*December, 1985 | Agrahayana, 1907 (Saka)*

*Price : Re. 1.00*

LC.  
3.371R  
M5.1

## CONTENTS

	AGE
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS . . . . .	(iii)
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	2
II. Petition No. 2 regarding review of the budget, imposition of effective control and limits on the prices of essential consumer goods and guarantee remunerative prices to the peasants for their produce . . . . .	3
III. Action taken by Government on the recommendation contained in the Ninth Report of the Committee on Petitions (Seventh Lok Sabha) on the representation regarding transfer of ownership rights of shops and flats to allottees in NDMC markets . . . . .	4
IV. Action taken by Government on the recommendation contained in the Ninth Report of the Committee on Petitions (Seventh Lok Sabha) on the representation from Dr. C.S. Rao, ex-Technical Adviser, Andhra Scientific Company Limited, Hyderabad regarding non-payment of arrears of salaries etc. . . . .	10
V. Action taken by Government on the recommendation contained in the Fifteenth Report of the Committee on Petitions (Seventh Lok Sabha) regarding amendment of the Cancellation of Tickets and Refund of Fares Rules, 1976 to make provision for refund of unused tickets at any Railway Station . . . . .	12
VI. Action taken by Government on the recommendation contained in the Sixteenth Report of the Committee on Petitions (Seventh Lok Sabha) on the representation regarding vacation of premises of Samaj Sadan, Ring Road, Kidwai Nagar, New Delhi . . . . .	16

## APPENDICES

I. Petition No. 2 regarding review of the budget, imposition of effective control and limits on the prices of essential consumer goods and guarantee remunerative prices to the peasants for their produce . . . . .	18
II. Letter No. 4/(16)/78-D(NF) Vol. II, dated the 28th June, 1983 from the Ministry of Defence, Department of Defence Production addressed to the Managing Director, Bharat Electronics Limited, Bangalore . . . . .	20

# COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS (1985-86)

## CHAIRMAN

- \*1. Begum Abida Ahmed

## MEMBERS

2. Shri P. A. Antony
3. Shri Bharat Singh
4. Shri Ishwarbhai K. Chavada
- \*\*5. Shri G. B. Gohil
6. Shri A. S. Gounder
- \*\*\*7. Shrimati Sheila Kaul
8. Shri Gangadhar S. Kuchan
9. Shri Lakshman Mallick
10. Dr. A. K. Patel
11. Shri K. Ramachandra Reddy
12. Shri Ajit Kumar Saha
13. Shri Surendra Pal Singh
14. Shri Dharam Vir Singh Tyagi
15. Shri Ram Singh Yadav

## SECRETARIAT

Shri M. K. Mathur—*Joint Secretary*

Shri O. P. Chopra—*Senior Legislative Committee Officer*

---

\*Appointed w.e.f. 30th July, 1985.

\*\*Nominated w.e.f. 7th August, 1985 vice Shri Jaideep Singh resigned.

\*\*\*Nominated w.e.f. 18th November, 1985 vice Shri B. R. Bhagat ceased to be a member of the Committee on his appointment as a Minister.

# FIRST REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS (EIGHTH LOK SABHA)

## I

### INTRODUCTION

1.1 I, the Chairman of the Committee on Petitions, having been authorised by the Committee to present the Report on their behalf, present this First Report of the Committee to the House on the following matters :—

- (i) Petition No. 2 regarding review of the budget, imposition of effective control and limits on the prices of essential consumer goods and guarantee remunerative prices to the peasants for their produce.
- (ii) Action taken by Government on the recommendation contained in the Ninth Report of the Committee on Petitions (Seventh Lok Sabha) on the representation regarding transfer of ownership rights of shops and flats to allottees in NDMC markets.
- (iii) Action taken by Government on the recommendation contained in the Ninth Report of the Committee on Petitions (Seventh Lok Sabha) on the representation from Dr. C. S. Rao, ex-Technical Adviser, Andhra Scientific Company Limited, Hyderabad regarding non-payment of arrears of salaries etc.
- (iv) Action taken by Government on the recommendation contained in the Fifteenth Report of the Committee on Petitions (Seventh Lok Sabha) regarding amendment of the Cancellation of Tickets and Refund of Fares Rules, 1976 to make provision for refund of unused tickets at any Railway Station.
- (v) Action taken by Government on the recommendation contained in the Sixteenth Report of the Committee on Petitions (Seventh Lok Sabha) on the representation regarding vacation of premises of Samaj Sadan, Ring Road, Kidwai Nagar, New Delhi.

1.2 The Committee considered the above matters at their sittings held on 7th August and 3rd and 4th October, 1985.

1.3 The Committee considered their draft Report at their sitting held on 9th December, 1985 and adopted it.

1.4 The observations/recommendations of the Committee on the above matters have been included in this Report.

NEW DELHI;  
Dated the 9th December, 1985.

ABIDA AHMED.  
Chairman,  
Committee on Petitions.

## II

### PETITION NO. 2 REGARDING REVIEW OF THE BUDGET, IMPOSITION OF EFFECTIVE CONTROL AND LIMITS ON THE PRICES OF ESSENTIAL CONSUMER GOODS AND GUARANTEE REMUNERATIVE PRICES TO THE PEASANTS FOR THEIR PRODUCE

2.1 Shrimati Geeta Mukherjee, M.P., presented to Lok Sabha on the 24th July, 1985, a petition (See Appendix I) signed by Shrimati Vimla Farooqui, General Secretary, National Federation of Indian Women, New Delhi and others regarding review of the budget, imposition of effective control and limits on the prices of essential consumer goods and guarantee remunerative prices to the peasants for their produce.

2.2 The Committee considered the petition at their sitting held on 7th August, 1985.

2.3 The Committee directed that the petition be circulated\* in extenso to the member of Lok Sabha under rule 307(1) of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha.

---

\*The petition was circulated in extenso to all members of Lok Sabha on the 9th August, 1985.

### III

#### ACTION TAKEN BY GOVERNMENT ON THE RECOMMENDATION CONTAINED IN THE NINTH REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS (SEVENTH LOK SABHA) ON THE REPRESENTATION REGARDING TRANSFER OF OWNERSHIP RIGHTS OF SHOPS AND FLATS TO ALLOTTEES IN N.D.M.C. MARKETS

3.1 In their Ninth Report (Seventh Lok Sabha), presented to Lok Sabha on 3rd August, 1982, the Committee on Petitions considered a representation regarding transfer of ownership rights of shops and flats to allottees in NDMC markets and made the following recommendation:—

“The Committee note from the factual comments furnished by the Ministry of Works and Housing stating that out of nine NDMC markets in question, seven markets were transferred to NDMC by the Government on payment of cost of construction, land etc. including ground rent. The remaining two markets were constructed by the NDMC themselves. One of the reasons for non-transfer of ownership rights of shops and flats to allottees advanced by the Ministry of Works and Housing as that the Punjab Municipal Act, 1911 under which the NDMC has been set up, does not empower the NDMC to transfer the ownership rights of its properties. The petitioners in their evidence before the Committee have, however, pointed out that in Khichripur area of Delhi, the NDMC had constructed about five hundred flats for their employees. After rejection by the NDMC employees, these flats were transferred by the NDMC to the Delhi Administration.

Therefore, in view of this, the Committee are of the opinion that the Punjab Municipal Act is in no way an obstacle in the transfer of ownership rights. However, if necessary, these markets can be returned back to the Ministry of works and Housing. Thereafter the ownership rights can be transferred to the original allottees.

In the representation, the petitioners have submitted that refugees from West Pakistan who were allotted shops in all other 56 markets built by the Central Government have

been granted ownership rights. But the allottees of shops in nine markets—Begum Zaidi, Basrurkar Markets, Moti Bagh—I, Netaji Nagar, Naoroji Nagar, Laxmibai Nagar, Pandara Road, Kidwai Nagar, South and Central Market, Prithvi Raj have, however, been denied the ownership rights. According to the petitioners, a clear discrimination has been done to the same class of refugees from West Pakistan some of whom were allotted shops in markets constructed by the Ministry of Rehabilitation and remaining were allotted shops in markets constructed by the Ministry of Works & Housing for their rehabilitation. The petitioners have requested that discrimination may be removed and they may be granted ownership rights of shops. During evidence before the Committee, the petitioners requested the Committee that the criterion of occupancy might be considered for grant of ownership rights to allottees.

The Ministry of Works and Housing in their factual note to the Committee, as well as during evidence before the Committee and in their further written information, have pointed out that more than 50 per cent of the original licensees are not in occupation of shops which have changed hands. Out of the remaining also, quite a good number of them are not refugees. However, the offer to transfer the ownership has been made by the Government only in respect of the markets constructed by the erstwhile Ministry of Rehabilitation for the displaced persons from West Pakistan whereas the markets transferred to the New Delhi Municipal Committee were not constructed by the erstwhile Ministry of Rehabilitation and, as such, the ownership rights of the shops in these markets would not have been transferred to the allottees even if the markets had remained with the Government. The Ministry of Works and Housing also have not so far taken any decision with regard to the transfer of ownership rights in respect of the markets constructed by that Ministry from the general funds.

The Committee are not convinced of the argument advanced by the Government. The Committee are of the view that the remaining refugees who were allotted shops in markets constructed by the Government of India along with other refugees, should not be denied the ownership rights for so-called fault of other original refugees allottees who had



transferred the shops and they should not be discriminated when the refugees in other markets have been granted the ownership rights.

The Ministry of Works and Housing have further pointed out that the transfer of ownership rights would seriously affect the revenue of NDMC. During the course of oral evidence before the Committee, the Administrator, NDMC, informed the Committee that they were charging a nominal licence fee of 20 paise per square foot of the total area of the shop and the total revenue was Rs. 50,000 per month only. However, they were charging higher licence fee on shops which had changed hands. The Committee feel that the amount of revenue involved in the transfer of ownership rights is not substantial. As such, it would not affect the revenues of NDMC.

The Committee, therefore, urge the Government to transfer the ownership rights of shops to original allottees in NDMC markets.”

[Paras 3.31 to 3.34, pp 20-22, Ninth Report (7LS)]

3.2 The Ministry of Works and Housing, with whom the recommendation were taken up for implementation, have in their action taken reply dated the 3rd May, 1983, stated as follows:—

The observations/recommendations of the Committee on Petitions (7th Lok Sabha) as contained in paras 3.31 to 3.34 of their 9th Report regarding transfer of ownership rights of shops to allottees in NDMC markets were communicated to the New Delhi Municipal Committee for examination and necessary action by the Committee and for making available to the Ministry an action taken report/comments through Delhi Administration.

The New Delhi Municipal Committee has again expressed its inability to agree with the demand for transfer of ownership rights of 9 NDMC markets to the allottees. The Committee has drawn the attention of this Ministry to its detailed report on the subject which was made available to the Lok Sabha Secretariat vide this Ministry's O.M. No. N-11015/15/80-DDVT dated 19-3-82 and has sent its further comments with reference to the observations of the Committee on Petitions as contained in paras 3.31 to 3.34 of their 9th Report.

With reference to the observation of Committee on Petitions that the Punjab Municipal Act is in no way an obstacle in the transfer of ownership rights, the NDMC has stated that the only transfer which is permitted by Law, as envisaged under the Punjab Municipal Act, 1911, is the transfer of certain properties by the NDMC under Section 56(2) of the Act to the State Government (Delhi Administration in the present case). The NDMC has reiterated that under the provision of the Punjab Municipal Act under which the NDMC has been set up, it cannot pass the title of its property to any person or organisation.

With reference to the observation that the refugees should not be denied the ownership rights for so-called fault of other original refugees who had transferred the shops and they should not be discriminated with the refugees in other markets who have been granted the ownership rights, it may be stated that the markets in respect of which the ownership rights have been decided to be transferred to the allottees by this Ministry were constructed out of funds allotted to the erstwhile Rehabilitation Ministry for rehabilitation purposes. The 9 NDMC markets in question were constructed by the Ministry/NDMC out of the general funds. The question of discrimination can perhaps arise only if the shopkeepers of the markets were allotted shops constructed out of general funds by this Ministry. As neither this Ministry nor the NDMC has so far transferred the ownership rights in respect of any markets constructed out of general funds it may not be correct to say that the denial of ownership rights to the allottees of 9 NDMC markets is a case of discrimination.

As regards the observation of the Committee on Petitions that the amount of revenue involved in the transfer of ownership rights of these markets by the NDMC is not substantial and as such it would not affect the revenue of the NDMC, the NDMC has stated that the major source of revenue to it is the licence fee collected from the licensees. The other source of revenue, i.e., House tax is not yielding much revenue and if the licensees are granted ownership rights, the NDMC would lose its

revenue and the NDMC's programme of provision/augmentation of civic amenities would badly suffer and would adversely affect lakhs of people as compared to the handful of the licensees who are pressing for the transfer of ownership rights.

The NDMC have also furnished the following additional facts which are relevant in this context:

- (i) Out of the 9 markets one market, viz. Prithvi Raj Market comes under the NDMC re-development plan of Khan Market Complex and has eventually to be demolished. The transfer of ownership rights in the case of this market would act as a serious impediment in the execution of this development project of the NDMC.
- (ii) All the 9 markets are double storeyed—the upper story comprising of residential flats occupied by the NDMC officers. These markets are so constructed that in each residential unit there are 3 to 4 shops on the ground floor. The law does not empower the transfer of the part of the premises especially when land under all the markets is lease-hold from the Government.

These views of the NDMC have been endorsed by the Delhi Administration and the Government are also in agreement with the views expressed by the NDMC.

This issues with the approval of the Minister of Works & Housing.”

#### *Observations of the Committee*

**3.3 The Committee note that Government in their action taken reply have expressed inability of NDMC to agree to the Petitioners demand for the transfer of ownership rights of nine NDMC markets to the allottees. The Committee are not convinced of Government's stand that under the provisions of the Punjab Municipal Act, 1911, under which NDMC has been set up, it cannot pass the title of its properties to any person or organisation, except to the State Government i.e. Delhi Administration in this case.**

**After having considered this matter in all its aspects, the Committee feel that if under the existing law, Government can transfer flats in khichripur area constructed for NDMC employees to Delhi**

**Administration, on the same analogy, why the NDMC markets in question cannot be transferred to Delhi Administration, who can in turn transfer title to the original allottees. In spite of the fact that the Committee made a specific mention of this case in their recommendation, Government have not explained their position in this matter. The other difficulties pointed out by Government earlier and now at action taken stage, in the opinion of the Committee, are not unsurmountable. The Committee, therefore, reiterate their earlier recommendation and would like Government to transfer the ownership rights of shops to original allottees in NDMC markets, without loss of time.**

**ACTION TAKEN BY GOVERNMENT ON THE RECOMMENDATION CONTAINED IN THE NINTH REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS (SEVENTH LOK SABHA), ON THE REPRESENTATION FROM DR. C. S. RAO, EX-TECHNICAL ADVISER, ANDHRA SCIENTIFIC COMPANY LIMITED, HYDERABAD, REGARDING NON-PAYMENT OF ARREARS OF SALARIES ETC.**

4.1 In their Ninth Report (Seventh Lok Sabha), presented to Lok Sabha on 3rd August, 1982, the Committee on Petitions after considering a representation from Dr. C. S. Rao, ex-Technical Adviser, Andhra Scientific Company Limited, Hyderabad, regarding non-payment of arrears of salaries etc. and factual comments of the Ministry of Defence had recommended as follows:—

“The Committee note from the factual comments furnished by the Ministry of Defence (Department of Defence Production) on the points raised in the representation from Dr. C. S. Rao that an amount of about Rs. 64,000/- is due from the Company to Dr. C. S. Rao towards arrears of salary etc. But in view of the moratorium on the discharge of pre-take-over liabilities of the Company under section 18 FB of the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act, 1951, no payment of his dues could be made to Dr. C. S. Rao. The moratorium is stated to be in force till 26 June, 1982.

The Ministry have further stated that the future set up of the Company is under the consideration of the Government. In case the Company is nationalised, the liabilities are usually discharged as per the approved schedule of priorities from the asset amount made available as compensation. The liabilities of arrears of salary etc. of pre-take-over period are covered under the schedule of priorities. However, Government will have to take a considered view in the nationalisation scheme on such liabilities if they are not dischargeable in terms of the priority.

The Committee further note that Dr. Rao is 72 years old and he is suffering from heart ailments. The Committee

recommend that in view of his advanced age and ill health Government should make some *ad hoc* payment to the ex-employee in lieu of his dues pertaining to pre-take-over management period."

[Para 6.4, Pages 44-45, Ninth Report (7 LS)]

4.2 The Ministry of Defence (Department of Defence Production) with whom the recommendation was taken up for implementation, have in their action taken reply dated 7th July, 1983, stated as follows:—

"Dr. C. S. Rao unfortunately expired on 20th November, 1982. The Government has, however, authorised the Managing Director, BEL, a Defence Ministry's PSU, with which Andhra Scientific Company has been vested after nationalisation, for making *ad hoc* payment of Rs. 20,000/- to the legal heir of late Dr. Rao, *vide* this Ministry's letter No. 4(16)|78|D(NF) dated the 28th June, 1983." (See Appendix II).

4.3 In their note dated 5th May, 1984, the Ministry of Defence (Department of Defence Production) have informed that an *ad hoc* payment of Rs. 20,000/- has been made to the legal heir of late Dr. C. S. Rao, on 6th April, 1984.

#### *Observations of the Committee*

4.4 The Committee regret to note from the action taken replies furnished by the Ministry of Defence that the petitioner, Dr. C. S. Rao, expired on 20 November, 1982 without getting any relief from Government. The Committee are further distressed to note that in spite of Committee's recommendation made two years back, Government has released Rs 20,000 only after Dr. Rao's death to his legal heir.

The Committee hope that Government by now might have settled and paid the remaining dues to the legal heir of the petitioner. In case full payment has not been made so far, the Committee would like that the remaining dues should be paid to the legal heir of the petitioner expeditiously.

ACTION TAKEN BY GOVERNMENT ON THE RECOMMENDATION CONTAINED IN THE FIFTEENTH REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS (SEVENTH LOK SABHA) REGARDING AMENDMENT OF THE CANCELLATION OF TICKETS AND REFUND OF FARES RULES, 1976 TO MAKE PROVISION FOR REFUND OF UNUSED TICKETS AT ANY RAILWAY STATION.

5.1 In their Fifteenth Report (Seventh Lok Sabha), presented to Lok Sabha on the 21st December, 1983, the Committee on Petitions after considering a representation regarding refund of unused Railway ticket and factual comments/reply of the Ministry of Railways (Railway Board) made the following recommendation:—

“The Committee note with satisfaction that the refund of the unused ticket has since been made to the petitioner.

The Committee are, however, of the view that in order to obviate such instances in future which could cause undue hardship and avoidable loss to the *bona fide* passengers, the relevant rules, i.e. Cancellation of Tickets and Refund of Fares Rules, 1976, should be amended by the Ministry of Railways to provide that where a *bona fide* passenger is held up and is unable to complete his journey on account of cancellation of train service due to natural calamities, accidents etc., the passenger is given full refund of unused ticket by surrendering his ticket within three months at any Railway station convenient to him.”

[Paras 11.8 and 11.9, pages 40-41, Fifteenth Report (7 LS)]

5.2 The above recommendation was taken up with the Ministry of Railways (Railway Board) for implementation. In their communication dated the 29th May, 1984, the Ministry of Railways (Railway Board) have stated as follows:—

“The existing rules for refund on tickets where passengers have to discontinue their journey due to dislocation of train services have been provided under Rule 213.11 of

IRCA Coaching tariff No. 23, Part. I (Vol. I) (incorporating the provision of the Cancellation of Tickets and Refund of Fare Rules, 1976) which read as under:—

213.11—Discontinuance of journey due to dislocation of train service:—When a train journey is dislocated due to unforeseen circumstances, such as accidents, breaches, floods, etc., fare shall be refunded as follows:—

- (i) If the Railway Administration is unable to carry the passenger to his destination station within a reasonable time by arranging transshipment or diversion or otherwise, and the journey has to be terminated on route on that account; or if passenger involved in a Railway accident and injured, he is not in a position to continue his journey; or in case of deceased passengers, the next of kith and kin; fare for the entire booked journey without any deduction for the travelled portion and without charging any cancellation fee shall be refunded at the station at which the journey is terminated; or
- (ii) If the Railway Administration offers to carry the passenger to his destination station by any diverted route or by arranging transshipment or otherwise and the passenger is not willing to avail of such an alternative arrangement, fare for the untravelled portion of the journey shall be refunded, without charging any cancellation fee, at the station at which the journey has been terminated.
- (iii) When a train service is cancelled due to unforeseen circumstances such as accident, breaches, floods, etc. full refund of fare including reservation charges, if any, in respect of tickets booked by the concerned train shall be refunded at the starting station provided, however, the ticket is surrendered within three days after the scheduled date of departure of the train.

*Note:* When trains are brought back from the site of accident, etc. to a convenient station in the rear, the ticket shall be treated as used up to that station in the rear only, provided they are surrendered at that station.'



When a passenger has to discontinue his journey due to an accident/breaches etc. on-route, it will be seen from the above that refund of the ticket can be granted on the spot at the station where the journey is being discontinued. Hence, there should not be any hardship to the passengers in such a case in respect of refund of tickets.

However, when the journey cannot be started at all due to cancellation of the train at the starting station itself, the rules provide that refund can be granted at the starting station only. This is because the genuineness of the ticket can be examined only at the station from which it has been issued. Details of the tickets sold at a station every day are entered in a register maintained at the station which is known as 'Daily trains cash-cum-Summary Book'. Before granting any refund, it is incumbent on the station staff to consult this document. In case permission is accorded to claim refund at a station other than the ticket issuing station, this safeguard will not be available to the Railways. Similarly, the present system guards against refund of duplicate, forged or pickpocketed tickets. By allowing refund at stations other than ticket booking station, chances of payment against such tickets are likely to increase.

As far as the recommendation of the Committee on Petitions regarding enhancement of time-limit for surrendering tickets from 3 days to three months is concerned, it may lead to misuse of journey tickets inasmuch as refund can be claimed on the ticket on which journeys have been performed in unreserved compartments. Cent per cent checking and collection of tickets is not practicable and this may lead to misuse of this provision on the part of some unscrupulous passengers.

Moreover, provision exists for grant of refund on tickets not governed by the normal rules vide Rule 213.4(A) of the IRCA Coaching Tariff No. 23, Part I (Vol. I) which reads as under:—

'213.4(A):—After the lapse of the time-limit prescribed refunds may be granted by the Railways Administration under special circumstances only and any refund then made will be subject to a deduction of 10 per cent of the amount refundable in the case of unreserved and wait-listed tickets not provided with reserved accommodation and 30 per cent of the amount refundable in the case of

reserved tickets and wait-listed tickets provided with reserved accommodation but not purchased reservation tickets.'

In genuine and deserving cases, those passengers who have failed to surrender their tickets within 3 days, can be granted refund under these rules."

### Observations of the Committee

5.3 The Committee are not satisfied with the action taken reply furnished by the Ministry of Railways (Railway Board) expressing their inability to give full refund of unused tickets to a bona fide passenger surrendering his ticket within 3 months at any Railway Station convenient to him when he is held up and is unable to complete his journey on account of cancellation or disruption of train service in the event of natural calamity, accidents, etc. They are not convinced of Ministry's apprehensions about misuse of tickets by unscrupulous persons or refund against duplicate, forged or pick-pocketed tickets, especially in view of the fact that tickets are issued for a particular date and train and refund will be made only once after cancelling the ticket. The Committee, reiterate their earlier recommendation and would like Government to amend the relevant rules viz. The Cancellation of Tickets and Refund of Fares Rules, 1976 so as to provide that where a bona fide passenger is held up and is unable to complete his journey on account of cancellation or disruption of train service due to natural calamities, accidents, etc. the passenger is given full refund of unused ticket by surrendering his ticket within three months at any railway station convenient to him.

## VI

### ACTION TAKEN BY GOVERNMENT ON THE RECOMMENDATION CONTAINED IN THE SIXTEENTH REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS (SEVENTH LOK SABHA) ON THE REPRESENTATION REGARDING VACATION OF PREMISES OF SAMAJ SADAN, RING ROAD, KIDWAI NAGAR, NEW DELHI.

6.1 In their Sixteenth Report (Seventh Lok Sabha), presented to Lok Sabha on 11th April, 1984, the Committee on Petitions after considering a representation regarding vacation of premises of Samaj Sadan, Ring Road, Kidwai Nagar, New Delhi and the factual comments furnished by the Ministry of Home Affairs made the following recommendation:—

“The Committee note from the factual comments furnished by the Ministry of Home Affairs that a school is being run unauthorisedly in the Samaj Sadan, a Government property and while the Association running the school was asked to vacate the premises, extensions are being granted to them from year to year and that the current extension to them is valid upto 30th April, 1984. The Committee feel that in view of the unauthorised activity, no more extension should be given to the Association and the premises be got vacated after the expiry of the present extension.”

[Para 7.4, page 50, Sixteenth Report (7LS)]

6.2 The above recommendation was taken up with the Ministry of Home Affairs (Department of Personnel and Administrative Reforms) for implementation. In their communication dated the 30th April, 1984, the Ministry of Home Affairs (Department of Personnel and Administrative Reforms) have stated as follows:—

“... prior to the receipt of the Committee's report the Home Minister had already agreed to grant one year's extension to run the Bal School in the Samaj Sadan, Ring Road, Kidwai Nagar, New Delhi and it would be embarrassing to reverse this decision now. However, after the expiry of this year's extended term on 30th April, 1985, the school will be asked to close down its activities in the Samaj Sadan.”

6.3 The Committee considered the above reply of the Ministry of Home Affairs at their sitting held on 10th September, 1984 and directed that the Ministry of Home Affairs (Department of Personnel and Administrative Reforms) might be asked to state the date when extension was granted and whether their decision could not be reviewed after the report of the Committee on Petitions in the matter was received by that Ministry.

6.4 In their note dated the 27th September, 1984, the Department of Personnel and Administrative Reforms have informed that "the Home Minister had decided to grant one year's extension for continuation of Bal School in Samaj Sadan Kidwai Nagar (Ring Road) on 4th April, 1984. The above decision of the Home Minister was conveyed to the Organisers of the Bal School on 9th April, 1984. A copy of the Sixteenth Report of the Committee on Petitions (Seventh Lok Sabha) was received in this Department on 19th April, 1984, through Lok Sabha Secretariat O.M. No. 57|3|CI|84, dated 16th April, 1984. The Report of the Committee on Petitions was placed before the Home Minister who decided that the decision already taken and conveyed to the Organisers of the School may stand as it would be embarrassing to reverse it at this stage. It was, however, decided by the Home Minister that no further extension would be granted beyond 30th April, 1985."

6.5 The Department of Personnel and Training have further informed *vide* their note dated the 29th August, 1985 that "the vacant possession of the building of Samaj Sadan, Kidwai Nagar (Ring Road), New Delhi, was taken over by this Department on 12th July, 1985."

#### Observation of the Committee

6.6 The Committee note with satisfaction from the action taken reply furnished by the Ministry of Home Affairs that the vacant possession of the building of Samaj Sadan has been taken over by Government.

NEW DELHI;

Dated the 9th December, 1985.

ABIDA AHMED.

Chairman,  
Committee on Petitions.

## APPENDIX I

(See para 2.1 of the Report)

[Petition No. 2 regarding review of the budget, imposition of effective control and limits on the prices of essential consumer goods and guarantee remunerative prices to the peasants for their produce.]

LOK SABHA

PETITION NO. 2

(presented to Lok Sabha on 24th July 1985)

[Considered by the Committee on Petitions, Lok Sabha, at their sitting held on 7th August, 1985 and circulated\* in pursuance of the Committee's direction under rule 307(1) of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha]

To

LOK SABHA

NEW DELHI.

The humble petition of Shrimati Vimla Farooqui, General Secretary, National Federation of Indian Women (NFIW), New Delhi and others.

SHEWETH

That the prices of essential commodities of food articles, clothes, medicines etc., are soaring beyond all our imagination and putting the people of poor and middle classes, particularly, the women as housewives in terrible distress.

That this is a phenomenon directly connected with the Union and Railway Budgets of the current year.

That no effective steps are being taken by the Government to check the continuous rise of prices.

---

\*The petition was circulated in extenso to the members of Lok Sabha on 9th August, 1985.

We, therefore, demand that the Government—

- (a) Review the budget and bring mid-term supplementary budget if necessary to rectify the situation;
- (b) Bring back the prices of rationed items within the public distribution system to their previous levels;
- (c) Impose effective control and limits on the prices of all essential consumer goods; and
- (d) Guarantee remunerative prices to the peasants for their produce, who are not at all the beneficiaries of the prices rise, and supply them fertilizer, electricity, seeds, irrigation, water etc. to them at cheap prices and rates.

Accordingly your petitioners pray that the Lok Sabha may direct the Government to do the above.

And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

Name of Petitioners	Address	Signature or Thumb impression
Shrimati Vimla Farooqui and others	1002, Ansal Bhawan Kasturba Gandhi Marg, New Delhi.	Sd/-

Countersigned by: Geeta Mukherjee, M.P., Div. No. 449.

## APPENDIX II

(See para 4.2 of the Report)

Letter No. 4(16)78-D(NF) Vol. II, dated the 28th June, 1983 of Ministry of Defence, Department of Defence Production, addressed to the Managing Director, Bharat Electronics Limited, Bangalore.

SUBJECT:—*Payment of arrears of salary to Dr. C. S. Rao, Ex-Technical Adviser, ASCO, Machilipatnam.*

Sir,

I am directed to refer to the letter No. Accts|4.6|82, dated the 25th September, 1982, received from the Authorised Controller, ASCO, Machilipatnam (since nationalised and vested in BEL as one of their units), with reference to this Ministry's letter No. 4(16)78-D(NF), Vol. II, dated the 24th August, 1982, on the above mentioned subject and to say that the Government has no objection to the payment of Rs. 20,000 to the legal heir of late Dr. C. S. Rao, Ex-Technical Adviser, ASCO, Machilipatnam as an advance subject to the following conditions:—

- (a) determination of legal heir by a competent authority;
- (b) obtaining of idemnity bond from the Payee, specifying clearly that the amount of advance payment will be adjusted against the payment of award by the Payments Commissioner. If no amount is awarded by the Payments Commissioner subsequently, clear provision may be made for the recovery of the amount already paid in one lump-sum.

2. BEL are further requested to consult their legal adviser before making the advance payment referred to above.

3. The above payment is being authorised in view of the exceptional circumstances of the case and should not be treated as a precedent.

4. A copy\* each of the letter referred to above as well as of the subsequent correspondence are attached for reference.

Yours faithfully,  
Sd/-  
(K. L. Ralhan)  
*Desk Officer.*