

COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES

(FIFTH LOK SABHA)

FOURTEENTH REPORT

[Presented on the 10th March, 1975]



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

March, 1975/Phalguna, 1896 (Saka)

Price : Rs. 1.75

CONTENTS

	PAGE
1. Personnel of the Committee of Privileges	(iii)
2. Report	1
3. Minutes of sittings of Committee	9
4. Minutes of evidence	28
5. Appendices	97

PERSONNEL OF THE COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES
(1974-75)

Dr. Henry Austin—*Chairman*

MEMBERS

2. Shri Somnath Chatterjee
3. Shri M. C. Daga
4. Shri K. G. Deshmukh
- *5. Shri Devinder Singh Garcha
6. Shri H. R. Gokhale
- *7. Shri Papatlal M. Joshi
8. Shri Shyamnandan Mishra
9. Shri H. N. Mukerjee
10. Shri Chintamani Panigrahi
11. Shri K. Raghu Ramaiah
12. Shri B. R. Shukla
13. Shri Maddi Sudarsanam
14. Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee
15. Shri G. Viswanathan

SECRETARIAT

Shri Y. Sahai—*Chief Legislative Committee Officer*
Shri J. R. Kapur—*Chief Financial Committee Officer*
Shri H. L. Malhotra—*Senior Legislative Committee
officer.*

*Appointed with effect from 27th November, 1974, *vice* Sardar Buta Singh and Dr. Shankar Dayal Sharma resigned from the Committee.

FOURTEENTH REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES (FIFTH LOK SABHA)

I. Introduction and procedure,

I, the Chairman of the Committee of Privileges, having been authorised by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf, present this their Fourteenth Report to the House on the question of privilege raised by Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, M.P., and referred¹ to the Committee by the House on the 9th May, 1974, against Shri Jagjit Singh, (the then) President, the New Friends Cooperative House Building Society Ltd., Delhi, regarding a letter² purported to have been written by him to the Lt. Governor of Delhi on the 7th May, 1974, allegedly casting aspersions on Parliament.

The Committee was instructed by the House to report by the first day of the Eleventh Session of Lok Sabha.

2. The Committee held thirteen sittings. The relevant minutes of these sittings form part of the Report and are appended thereto.

3. At the first sitting held on the 16th May, 1974, the Committee decided that an enquiry might be made from the Lt. Governor of Delhi whether he had received the impugned letter dated the 7th May, 1974 from Shri Jagjit Singh and, if so, he might be requested to forward the same in original to the Committee for their perusal.

4. At the second sitting held on the 31st May, 1974, the Committee decided to examine Shri Jagjit Singh in person.

5. At the third and fourth sittings held on the 5th and 6th July, 1974, the Committee examined Shri Jagjit Singh.

At their sitting held on the 6th July, 1974, the Committee also decided that a motion be moved³ in the House by the Chairman seeking extension of time for presentation of their Report upto the end of the second week of the Twelfth Session of Lok Sabha.

¹ L.S. Deb. dt. 9.5.1974, cc 194-206.

² See Appedix I.

³ The motion was adopted by the House on the 22nd July, 1974.

6. At the fifth, sixth and seventh sittings held on the 1st and 19th October, and 6th November, 1974, the Committee deliberated on the matter.

At their sitting held on the 6th November, 1974, the Committee decided to examine, in person, Shri Baleshwar Prasad, the erstwhile Lt. Governor of Delhi. The Committee also decided that the present Lt. Governor of Delhi might be asked to cause to be produced before the Committee, through a responsible Officer, the file containing correspondence between Shri Jagjit Singh and Shri Baleshwar Prasad, the erstwhile Lt. Governor of Delhi, regarding the affairs of the New Friends Cooperative House Building Society Ltd., Delhi.

The Committee also decided that a motion be moved⁴ in the House by the Chairman seeking further extension of time for the presentation of their Report upto the last day of the first week of the Budget Session, 1975.

7. At the eighth sitting held on 11th December, 1974, the Committee examined Shri Baleshwar Prasad, the erstwhile Lt. Governor of Delhi.

8. At the ninth sitting held on the 31st December, 1974, the Committee examined Shri Rajni Kant, Secretary (Law and Judicial), Delhi Administration, Delhi, who produced before the Committee a file containing correspondence between Shri Jagjit Singh and Shri Baleshwar Prasad, the erstwhile Lt. Governor of Delhi, regarding the affairs of the New Friends Cooperative House Building Society Ltd., Delhi.

The Committee directed that the present Lt. Governor of Delhi might be requested to confirm that the file produced before the Committee contained all the correspondence between Shri Jagjit Singh and Shri Baleshwar Prasad, the erstwhile Lt. Governor of Delhi, regarding the affairs of the New Friends Cooperative House Building Society Ltd., Delhi, and that there was no other file or correspondence between them on the subject.

9. At the tenth sitting held on the 31st January, 1975, the Committee deliberated on the matter.

⁴ The motion was adopted by the House on the 20th November, 1974.

10. At the eleventh sitting held on the 13th February, 1975, Committee further deliberated on the matter and arrived at their conclusions.

The Committee also decided that a motion be moved⁵ in the House by the Chairman seeking further extension of time for the presentation of their Report upto the 10th March, 1975.

11. At the twelfth and thirteenth sittings held on the 5th and 7th March, 1975, the Committee considered their draft Report and adopted it.

II. Facts of the case

12. On the 9th May, 1974, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, M.P., raised⁶ in Lok Sabha a question of privilege against Shri Jagjit Singh, President, the New Friends Cooperative House Building Society Ltd., Delhi, regarding a letter⁷ purported to have been written by him to Shri Baleshwar Prasad, the then Lt. Governor of Delhi, on the 7th May, 1974, which read *inter alia* as follows:—

“As desired, I have succeeded in passing a resolution in the Committee meeting on 29th April, 1974. Luckily only one, out of three from other side attended. He raised certain objections which were overruled by me. His main objection was that the Lt. Governor and Managing Committee have no moral authority to have any further hold on the Society.

I have assessed the situation and feel it will not be possible for me and Committee to stand the opposition in view of the Court's attitude and its further exploitation in Parliament and Papers unless full support from Police and Registrar Societies is afforded much more than ever. The new 60 members can remain in if I am there.

“Since you are busy due to riots in the City, I will give the notice in Newspapers only when I get green signal. It is good that Parliament closes on or before 13-5-1974.”

13. While raising the question of privilege, Shri Vajpayee said that he had a photostat copy of the impugned letter⁸ dated the

⁵ The motion was adopted by the House on the 21st February, 1975.

⁶ L.S., Dec. dt. 9.5.1974, cc 194-206.

⁷ See Appendix I.

⁸ Ibid.

7th May, 1974, written by Shri Jagjit Singh to the then Lt. Governor of Delhi. He invited specific attention of the House to the statements "exploitation in Parliament" and "It is good that Parliament closes on or before 13th May, 1974", occurring in that letter and contended that by using the above phraseology, Shri Jagjit Singh had cast reflections on Parliament and its members.

14. The Speaker, thereupon, observed as follows:—

"So far as this reference to the Parliament and the question of exploitation is concerned, that makes it a little different case from the one where copies are produced and which relate to individuals and where normally we try to know how far it is authentic or not.

* * * * *

In my view, so far as the reference to Parliament in this letter is concerned...I have no objection if he seeks the leave of the House."

15. After leave was granted by the House, the House adopted the following motion moved by Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee:—

"That the question of privilege against Shri Jagjit Singh, Chairman of the New Friends Cooperative House Building Society, be referred to the Committee of Privileges for investigation, with instructions to report by the first day of the next session."

16. On the 10th May, 1974, the Speaker received a letter¹ dated the 9th May, 1974, from Shri Jagjit Singh in which he *inter alia* stated as follows:—

"May I be allowed to state that I have written no such letter at all, and, therefore, if any photostat copies of the alleged letter have been produced in the House, they are copies of what is clearly a forged document."

III. Findings of the Committee

17. The Committee note that soon after the matter was raised in the House by Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, M.P., on the 9th May, 1974, Shri Jagjit Singh addressed a letter to the Speaker, Lok Sabha, denying that he had written the impugned letter dated the 7th May, 1974, to Shri Baleshwar Prasad, the then Lt. Governor of Delhi. During his oral evidence before the Committee, when a

¹ See Appendix-II.

photostat copy of the impugned letter dated the 7th May, 1974, was shown to Shri Jagjit Singh and he was asked by the Committee whether he had written that letter, Shri Jagjit Singh stated *inter alia* as follows:

"I have read it. No such letter was at all written by me. The signature is forged....It is a clever forgery. It is not my signature....If one sees it, at first sight without proper scrutiny, it may look as if it is my signature. But if you see it more closely, it is not so.

...apart from the signature, I would say this is not my style. The man may be clever in imitating my signature; but he has not been able to imitate my style.

...This is not the kind of stationery which we use. The stationery which we use is the type on which I have written the letter to the hon. Speaker. This is the old type of stationery which they were using. As you will see the addresses also, these are the old addresses where the offices of Mr. Jaggi and his associates were there. This is the old type of stationery which was being used perhaps at that time. It may have been used during my time a few years ago. But as far as I can remember now, we are using the new type of stationery on which I wrote the letter to the hon. Speaker.....

...The present letter-head that we are using is different. This letter head, as you will see, has the address '124, Bansi House, Asaf Ali Road'. Ever since I took over, my office is not in this premises. This is the premises of the old Managing Committee. Ever since I took over, the address of the Society has the '96, Mathura Road, New Delhi."

18. The Committee made a specific enquiry from Shri Baleshwar Prasad, the then Lt. Governor of Delhi, whether he had received the impugned letter from Shri Jagjit Singh. Shri Baleshwar Prasad, in his letter¹⁰ dated the 18th May, 1974, denied that any such letter had been received either by him or by his Secretariat.

19. The Committee also examined in person Shri Baleshwar Prasad, the erstwhile Lt. Governor of Delhi. During his oral evidence, Shri Baleshwar Prasad stated that he was the Lt. Gover-

¹⁰ See Appendix-III.

governor of Delhi since the 24th March, 1972. During his tenure as the Lt. Governor of Delhi he had "not received many communications" from the New Friends Cooperative House Building Society Ltd., Delhi. He said that he remembered to have received one communication from the said Society in early 1974 "with regard to the members that the Society wanted to enrol, which needed my reply."

When a photostat copy of the impugned letter dated the 7th May, 1974, purported to have been written by Shri Jagjit Singh to Shri Baleshwar Prasad, was shown to Shri Baleshwar Prasad and he was asked by the Committee to state whether he used to receive the communications from the said Society on that type of letter-head, Shri Baleshwar Prasad said:

"I do not think I have received any letters of this kind. Unless I compare with the letter I received, I cannot tell you about the pad. I got only one letter. That was a communication with regard to the members that the Society wanted to enrol which needed my reply."

20. As there was no direct evidence before the Committee about the original of the impugned letter, the Committee called for from Shri Jagjit Singh, and perused, copies of the following documents." to satisfy themselves with regard to circumstantial evidence, if any, in respect thereto:—

- (i) Proceedings of the meeting of the Managing Committee of the Society held on the 6th January, 1974.
- (ii) Proceedings of the meeting of the Managing Committee of the Society held on the 25th January, 1974.
- (iii) Resolution No. 3 dated the 25th January, 1974, adopted by the Managing Committee for enrolment of sixty new members.
- (iv) List of new members enrolled by the Society along with the names of members who introduced them.
- (v) Letter dated the 26th January, 1974, from the President of the Society to the Chairman, Delhi Development Authority for approval of new members.
- (vi) Letter dated the 26th January, 1974, from the Chairman, Delhi Development Authority, to the President of the Society.

¹¹ See Appendix-IV.

- (vii) Proceedings of the meeting of the Managing Committee of the Society held on the 29th April, 1974.
- (viii) A short note on the roles of the Registrar Co-operative Societies, and the D.D.A. *vis-a-vis* the Society.
- (ix) Communication addressed by the Society to M/s. Swain Advertising and Swain Advertising's letter dated the 4th May, 1974, to the Advertisement Manager, *Hindustan Times*, for insertion of the advertisement on the 8th May, 1974.

21. The Committee also perused the file produced before them by the Delhi Administration containing correspondence between Shri Jagjit Singh and Shri Baleshwar Prasad, the then Lt. Governor of Delhi, regarding the affairs of the New Friends Cooperative House Building Society Limited, Delhi. The Committee did not, however, find the impugned letter in that file.

22. In reply to an enquiry from the Committee whether the file produced before the Committee by the Delhi Administration was the only and complete file containing correspondence between Shri Jagjit Singh and Shri Baleshwar Prasad, the then Lt. Governor of Delhi, the Delhi Administration stated *inter alia* as follows:—

“Enquiries have since also been made in this regard from the concerned Departments of Administration and they have intimated that no such letter has been received by them. . . . There are a number of files in different Departments of the Delhi Administration concerning the New Friends Cooperative House Building Society Limited, but these have not been found to contain any correspondence casting aspersions on Parliament or the Hon'ble members.”

23. The Committee observe that Shri Jagjit Singh, the alleged author of the impugned letter dated the 7th May, 1974, had denied in his letter dated the 9th May, 1974, addressed to the Speaker, Lok Sabha, that he had written any such letter at all. Shri Jagjit Singh had reiterated his denial when he appeared before the committee for oral examination on the 5th and 6th July, 1974. The Committee also observe that Shri Baleshwar Prasad, the then Lt. Governor of Delhi had also denied both in writing as well as during his oral evidence before the Committee on the 11th December, 1974, that he had received the impugned letter dated the 7th May, 1974, from Shri Jagjit Singh.

After careful consideration of the evidence given before the Committee, both oral as well as written, the Committee have come to the conclusion that in spite of certain serious misgivings about the transaction under reference arising out of circumstantial details emerging before the Committee, particularly the material referred to in paragraph 20 above, the existence of the impugned original letter dated the 7th May, 1974, allegedly written by Shri Jagjit Singh to Shri Bal-eshwar Prasad, the then Lt. Governor of Delhi, has not been proved to the entire satisfaction of the Committee. The Committee are, therefore, of the opinion that the matter should be dropped and no further action be taken by the House in the matter.

24. However, from the material placed before the Committee and the circumstances of the case, the Committee feel that the affairs of the New Friends Cooperative House Building Society Limited, Delhi, require to be looked into thoroughly. During the proceedings before the Committee, the Committee were informed that the Supreme Court had appointed a retired Judge of the Calcutta High Court to go into the whole question of land allotments by this Society. The Committee are not aware of the stage or nature of proceedings before the Supreme Court. The Committee nevertheless hope that the affairs this Society will be looked into thoroughly by the Central Government.

IV. Recommendation of the Committee

25. The Committee recommend that no further action be taken by the House in the matter as a question of privilege and it may be dropped.

NEW DELHI;
The 7th March, 1975.

HENRY AUSTIN,
Chairman,
Committee of Privileges.

MINUTES

I

First sitting

New Delhi, Thursday, the 16th May, 1974.

The Committee sat from 15.00 to 17.20 hours.

PRESENT

Dr. Henry Austin—*Chairman*

MEMBERS

2. Shri H. K. L. Bhagat
3. Shri Darbara Singh
4. Shri Nihar Laskar
5. Shri H. N. Mukherjee
6. Shri Vasant Sathe
7. Dr. Shankar Dayal Sharma
8. Shri R. P. Ulaganambi
9. Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee.

SECRETARIAT

Shri J. R. Kapur—*Under Secretary*

* * * *

3. The Committee then considered the question of privilege raised by Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, M.P., against Shri Jagjit Singh, President, the New Friends Cooperative House Building Society Ltd., New Delhi, regarding a letter purported to have been written by him to the Lt. Governor of Delhi, on the 7th May, 1974, allegedly casting aspersions on Parliament. The Committee noted that Shri Jagjit

Singh, in a letter dated the 9th May, 1974, addressed to the Speaker, Lok Sabha, had denied that he had written any such letter to the Lt. Governor.

The Committee decided that, in the first instance, an enquiry might be made from the Lt. Governor of Delhi, whether he had received the impugned letter dated the 7th May, 1974, from Shri Jagjit Singh and, if so, he might be requested to forward the aforesaid original letter to the Committee for their perusal.

* * * *

The Committee then adjourned.

II

Second sitting

New Delhi Friday, the 31st May, 1974.

The Committee sat from 11.00 to 13.05 hours.

PRESENT

Dr. Henry Austin—*Chairman*

MEMBERS

2. Shri H. K. L. Bhagat
3. Shri Somnath Chatterjee
4. Shri Darbara Singh
5. Shri Nihar Laskar
6. Shri H. N. Mukherjee
7. Shri Vasant Sathe
8. Dr. Shankar Dayal Sharma
9. Shri Maddi Sudarsanam
10. Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee.

***Paras 2 and 4 relate to other cases and have accordingly been omitted.

SECRETARIAT

J. R. Kapur—*Under Secretary.*

* * * * *

5. The Committee considered the question of privilege raised by Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, MP, against Shri Jagjit Singh, President, the New Friends Cooperative House Building Society Limited, New Delhi, regarding a letter purported to have been written by him to the Lt. Governor of Delhi on the 7th May, 1974, allegedly casting aspersions on Parliament. The Committee perused the letter dated the 18th May, 1974, received from Shri Baleshwar Prasad, Lt. Governor of Delhi, in which he had stated that no such letter had been received either by him or by his Secretariat and no such letter was available with him or in the records of his Secretariat.

6. Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee submitted to the Committee a photostat copy of the letter dated the 7th May, 1974, purported to have been written by Shri Jagjit Singh to the Lt. Governor of Delhi. The Committee decided to hear Shri Jagjit Singh in person at their next sitting.

* * * * *

The Committee then adjourned.

III

Third sitting

New Delhi Friday, the 5th July, 1974.

The Committee sat from 15.00 to 16.30 hours.

PRESENT

Dr. Henry Austin—*Chairman.*

MEMBERS

2. Sardar Buta Singh
3. Shri M. C. Daga
4. Shri K. G. Deshmukh

***Paras 2-4 and 7-9 relate to other cases and have accordingly been omitted.

5. Shri Shyamnandan Mishra
6. Shri H. N. Mukherjee
7. Shri Chintamani Panigrahi
8. Dr. Shankar Dayal Sharma
9. Shri B. R. Shukla
10. Shri Maddi Sudarsanam
11. Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee

SECRETARIAT

Shri J. R. Kapur—*Under Secretary.*

WITNESS

Shri Jagjit Singh—*President, New Friends Cooperative House Building Society Limited, New Delhi.*

2. The Chairman, at the out set, welcomed the members of the new Committee.

3. The Committee deliberated on the issues arising out of the question of privilege raised by Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, M.P., against Shri Jagjit Singh, President, New Friends Cooperative House Building Society Limited, New Delhi, regarding a letter purported to have been written by him to the Lt. Governor of Delhi on the 7th May, 1974, allegedly casting aspersions on Parliament.

The Committee also discussed the procedure to be followed in examining the witness.

4. Shri Jagjit Singh was then called in and examined by the Committee on oath. The examination of the witness was not concluded.

(Verbatim record was kept.)

The Committee directed Shri Jagjit Singh to appear before them again on the 6th July, 1974, at 11.00 hours for further examination.

(The witness then withdrew.)

The Committee then adjourned.

..

Fourth sitting*New Delhi Saturday, the 6th July, 1974*

The Committee sat from 11.00 to 13.45 hours.

PRESENT

Dr. Henry Austin—*Chairman.*

MEMBERS

2. Sardar Buta Singh
3. Shri Somnath Chatterjee
4. Shri M. C. Daga
5. Shri K. G. Deshmukh
6. Shri Shyamnandan Mishra
7. Shri H. N. Mukherjee
8. Shri Chintamani Panigrahi
9. Dr. Shankar Dayal Sharma
10. Shri B. R. Shukla
11. Shri Maddi Sudarsanam
12. Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee

SECRETARIAT

Shri J. R. Kapur—*Under Secretary.*

WITNESS

Shri Jagjit Singh—*President, New Friends Cooperative House Building Society Limited, New Delhi.*

2. Shri Jagjit Singh was called in and examined further by the Committee on oath regarding the question of privilege raised against him by Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, M.P., about a letter purported to have been written by Shri Jagjit Singh to the Lt. Governor of Delhi on the 7th May, 1974, allegedly casting aspersions on Parliament.

3. The Committee directed Shri Jagjit Singh to furnish to the Committee copies of certain documents and correspondence referred to during his oral examination before the Committee.

(*Verbatim record was kept.*)

(*The witness then withdrew.*)

4. The Committee felt that they would need much longer time to complete their consideration of this matter and, therefore, it would not be possible for the Committee to report to the House on the first day of the next Session i.e. 22nd July, 1974, fixed by the House for the presentation of the report. The Committee, therefore, decided that a motion be moved in the House on the 22nd July, 1974, by the Chairman, asking for extension of time for presentation of their report upto the end of the second week of the November-December 1974 Session of Lok Sabha.

The Committee then adjourned.

V

Fifth sitting

New Delhi, Tuesday, the 1st October, 1974

The Committee sat from 11.00 to 11.50 hours.

PRESENT

Dr. Henry Austin—Chairman

MEMBERS

2. Shri Buta Singh
3. Shri M. C. Daga
4. Shri K. G. Deshmukh
5. Shri Chintamani Panigrahi
6. Shri K. Raghu Ramaiah
7. Shri B. R. Shukla
8. Shri Maddi Sudarsanam

SECRETARIAT

Shri J. R. Kapur—Under Secretary

2. The Committee took up further consideration of the question of privilege raised by Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, M.P., against Shri Jagjit Singh, President, the New Friends Cooperative House Building Society Ltd., Delhi, regarding a letter purported to have been written by him to the Lt. Governor of Delhi on the 7th May, 1974,

allegedly casting aspersions on Parliament. The Committee perused copies of the documents furnished by Shri Jagjit Singh, which were called for by the Committee at their earlier sitting held on the 6th July, 1974.

The Committee decided to defer further consideration of the matter to a sitting when Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, a member of the Committee, who had raised the matter in the House and who had produced a photostat copy of the impugned letter, would also be present.

* * * *

The Committee then adjourned.

VI

Sixth sitting

New Delhi, on Saturday, the 19th October, 1974

The Committee sat from 11.00 hours to 13.00 hours.

PRESENT

Dr. Henry Austin—Chairman

MEMBERS

2. Shri M. C. Daga
3. Shri K. G. Deshmukh
4. Shri Shyamnandan Mishra
5. Shri Chintamani Panigrahi
6. Shri B. R. Shukla
7. Shri Maddi Sudarsanam.

SECRETARIAT

Shri Y. Sahai—*Deputy Secretary*

Shri J. R. Kapur—*Under Secretary*

2. The Committee took up further consideration of the question of privilege raised by Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, M.P., against

****Paras 3 & 4 relate to another case and have accordingly been omitted.

Shri Jagjit Singh, President, the New Friends Cooperative House Building Society Ltd., New Delhi, regarding a letter purported to be written by him to the Lt. Governor of Delhi on the 7th May, 1974, allegedly casting aspersions on Parliament.

The Committee deferred further consideration of the matter to a sitting when Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, a member of the Committee might also be present.

The Committee then adjourned.

VII

Seventh sitting

New Delhi Wednesday, the 6th November, 1974

The Committee sat from 11.00 to 13.30 hours.

PRESENT

Dr. Henry Austin—*Chairman*

MEMBERS

2. Shri M. C. Daga
3. Shri K. G. Deshmukh
4. Shri Chintamani Panigrahi
5. Shri Maddi Sudarsanam
6. Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee
7. Shri G. Viswanathan.

SECRETARIAT

Shri J. R. Kapur—*Under Secretary.*

* * *

6. The Committee then deliberated on the question of privilege raised by Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, M.P., against Shri Jagjit Singh, President, the New Friends Cooperative House Building Society Ltd., New Delhi, regarding a letter purported to have been written by him to the then Lt. Governor of Delhi on the 7th May, 1974, allegedly casting aspersions on Parliament.

****Paras 2—4 and 7 to 8 relate to other cases and have accordingly omitted.

The Committee decided that Shri Baleshwar Prasad, erstwhile Lt. Governor of Delhi, might be asked to appear before the Committee for oral examination. The Committee also decided that the present Lt. Governor of Delhi might be asked to cause to be produced before the Committee, through a responsible officer, the file containing correspondence between Shri Jagjit Singh and Shri Baleshwar Prasad, the erstwhile Lt. Governor of Delhi, regarding the affairs of the New Friends Cooperative House Building Society Limited, New Delhi.

The Committee also decided that as it would not be possible for the Committee to present their report to the House on this matter by the last date of the second week of the next Session, a motion might be moved in the House by the Chairman seeking further extension of time for the presentation of the Report till the last day of the first week of the Budget Session, 1975.

* * * *

The Committee then adjourned.

VIII

Eighth sitting

New Delhi, Wednesday, the 11th December, 1974

The Committee sat from 15.00 to 16.40 hours.

PRESENT

Dr. Henry Austin—*Chairman*

MEMBERS

2. Shri K. G. Deshmukh
3. Shri Popatlal M. Joshi
4. Shri Shyamnandan Mishra
5. Shri Chintamani Panigrahi

SECRETARIAT

Shri Y. Sahai—*Chief Legislative Committee Officer*

Shri J. R. Kapur—*Senior Legislative Committee Officer*

****Paras 2—4 and 7 to 8 relate to other cases and have accordingly been omitted.

WITNESS

Shri Baleshwar Prasad, *Ex. Lt. Governor of Delhi.*

* * * *

3. The Committee took up further consideration of the question of privilege raised by Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee M.P., against Shri Jagjit Singh, President, The New Friends Co-operative House Building Society Ltd., Delhi regarding a letter purported to have been written by him to the Lt. Governor of Delhi on the 7th May 1974, allegedly casting aspersions on Parliament.

4. Shri Baleshwar Prasad, *ex-Lt. Governor of Delhi*, was then called in and examined by the Committee on oath.

(Verbatim record was kept.)

(The witness then withdrew)

5. The Chairman apprised the Committee of the letter dated the 6th December, 1974 received from the Delhi Administration regarding the production of the file containing correspondence between Shri Jagjit Singh and Shri Baleshwar Prasad, the erstwhile Lt. Governor of Delhi, regarding the affairs of the New Friends Co-operative House Building Society Ltd., Delhi, stating *inter alia* as follows:—

“...the Supreme Court has appointed Shri Debabrata Mookerjee, a retired Judge of Calcutta High Court, now practising in the Supreme Court to go into the whole question of land allotment by the Society. The subject is, therefore, still sub-judice. In view of above position it may kindly be seen whether the production of the file will still be required. In case the Committee so desired, the Administration will have no objection to sending through a responsible officer the file required by you.”

The Committee decided that the relevant file may be called for to be produced before the Committee.

6. The Committee decided to hold sittings on the 30th and 31st December, 1974, and 29th and 30th January, 1975, to consider the cases pending before them.

The Committee then adjourned.

****Para 2 relates to another case and has accordingly been omitted.

IX**Ninth sitting**

New Delhi, Tuesday, the 31st December, 1974

The Committee sat from 11.00 to 13.30 hours.

PRESENT

Dr. Henry Austin—*Chairman*

MEMBERS

2. Shri M. C. Daga
3. Shri Popatlal M. Joshi
4. Shri Syamnandan Mishra
5. Shri H. N. Mukherjee
6. Shri B. R. Shukla
7. Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee

SECRETARIAT

Shri Y. Sahai—*Legislative Committee Officer*

Shri J. R. Kapur—*Senior Legislative Committee Officer*

WITNESS

Shri Rajni Kant, *Secretary (Law and Judicial), Delhi Administration, Delhi.*

2. The Committee took up further consideration of the question of privilege raised by Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, M.P., against Shri Jagjit Singh, President, the New Friends Co-operative House Building Society Ltd., Delhi, regarding letter purported to have been written by him to the Lt. Governor of Delhi on the 7th May, 1974, allegedly casting aspersions on Parliament.

3. Shri Rajni Kant, Secretary (Law and Judicial), Delhi Administration, Delhi, was called in the examined by the Committee on oath. (*Verbatim record was Kept*).

4. The witness produced before the Committee the file containing the correspondence between Shri Jagjit Singh and Shri Baleswar Prasad, the erstwhile Lt. Governor of Delhi, regarding the affairs of the New Friends Cooperative House Building Society Ltd., New Delhi. The Committee perused the file and decided to retain the file for further reference by the Committee till after the next

sitting of the Committee to be held towards the end of January, 1975. The Committee also decided that if the Delhi Administration needed that file earlier in connection with the matter pending before the Supreme Court, the Delhi Administration might take it from the Secretariat.

(The witness then withdrew.)

5. The Committee deliberated on the matter and directed that the present Lt. Governor of Delhi might be requested to confirm whether the file produced before the Committee contained all the correspondence between Shri Jagjit Singh and Shri Baleshwar Prasad, the erstwhile Lt. Governor of Delhi, regarding the affairs of the New Friends Cooperative House Building Society Ltd., New Delhi and that there was no other file or correspondence between them on the subject.

* * * *

The Committee then adjourned.

X

Tenth sitting

New Delhi, Friday, the 31st January, 1975

The Committee sat from 11.00 to 12.45 hours.

PRESENT

Dr. Henry Austin—Chairman

MEMBERS

2. Shri K. G. Deshmukh
3. Shri Shyamnandan Mishra
4. Shri H. N. Mukherjee
5. Shri Chintamani Panigrahi.

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri Y. Sahai—*Chief Legislative Committee Officer*
2. Shri J. R. Kapur—*Senior Legislative Committee Officer*

****Paras 6—8 relate to another case and have accordingly been omitted.

2. The Committee took up further consideration of the question of privilege raised by Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, M.P., against Shri Jagjit Singh, President, the New Friends Co-operative House Building Society Limited, Delhi, regarding a letter purported to have been written by him to the Lt. Governor of Delhi on the 7th May, 1974, allegedly casting aspersions on Parliament.

The Committee noted that a reply was still awaited from the Delhi Administration on the enquiry whether the file produced before the Committee on the 31st December, 1974 by Shri Rajni Kant, Secretary (Law and Judicial), Delhi Administration, was the only and complete file containing the correspondence between Shri Jagjit Singh and Shri Baleshwar Prasad, the then Lt. Governor of Delhi or whether there was any other file or some other correspondence between them on the subject.

The Committee decided to defer further consideration of the asked to expedite their reply to the above enquiry.

The Committee decided to defer further consideration of the matter to their next sitting.

* * * * *

The Committee then adjourned.

XI

Eleventh sitting

New Delhi, Thursday, the 13th February, 1975

The Committee sat from 14.00 to 15.50 hours.

PRESENT

Dr. Henry Austin—*Chairman*

MEMBERS

2. Shri Somnath Chatterjee
3. Shri M. C. Daga
4. Shri K. G. Deshmukh
5. Shri Shyamnandan Mishra
6. Shri H. N. Mukerjee

****Paras 3 and 4 relate to other case and have accordingly been omitted.

SECRETARIAT

Shri J. R. Qapur—*Senior Legislative Committee Officer..*

2. The Committee took up further consideration of the question of privilege raised by Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, M.P., against Shri Jagjit Singh, ex-President, the New Friends Cooperative House Building Society Limited, Delhi, regarding a letter purported to have been written by him to the Lt. Governor of Delhi on the 7th May, 1974, allegedly casting aspersions on Parliament.

3. At the outset, the Chairman informed the Committee that in reply to an enquiry from the Committee whether the file produced before the Committee on the 31st December, 1974, by Shri Rajni Kant, Secretary (Law and Judicial), Delhi Administration, was the only and complete file containing the correspondence between Shri Jagjit Singh and Shri Baleshwar Prasad, the then Lt. Governor of Delhi a letter dated the 8th February, 1975, had been received from the Delhi Administration which stated *inter alia* as follows:—

“Enquiries have since also been made in this regard from the concerned Departments of Administration and they have intimated that no such letter has been received by them... There are a number of files in different Departments of the Delhi Administration concerning the New Friends Cooperative House Building Society Limited, but these have not been found to contain any correspondence casting aspersions on Parliament or the Hon’ble members.”

4. The Chairman also informed the Committee that Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, a Member of the Committee, had sent a letter dated the 12th February, 1975, which read *inter alia* as follows:—

“I am sorry I will not be able to attend the meeting of the Privileges Committee fixed for the 13th February....

....So far as the question of privilege against Dr. Jagjit Singh is concerned, the Committee is free to decide the matter in my absence. In fact, as the question was raised by me, it will be in the fitness of things if the Committee came to some conclusion when I am not present.”

5. The Committee then deliberated on the matter. The Committee observed that Shri Jagjit Singh, the alleged author of the impugned letter dated the 7th May, 1974, had denied in his letter

dated the 9th May, 1974 addressed to the Speaker, Lok Sabha, that he had written any such letter at all. Shri Jagjit Singh had reiterated his denial when he appeared before the Committee for oral examination on the 5th and 6th July, 1974. The Committee also observed that Shri Baleshwar Prasad, the then Lt. Governor of Delhi had also denied both in writing as well as during his oral evidence before the Committee on the 11th December, 1974, that he had received the impugned letter dated the 7th May, 1974, from Shri Jagjit Singh.

After careful consideration of the evidence given before the Committee, both oral as well as written, the Committee came to the conclusion that the existence of the impugned original letter dated the 7th May, 1974, allegedly written by Shri Jagjit Singh to Shri Baleshwar Prasad, the then Lt. Governor of Delhi, had not been proved to the satisfaction of the Committee. The Committee were of the view that in the absence of the original impugned letter, the authenticity or genuineness of its photostat copy could not be proved.

6. After careful consideration of all aspects of the matter, the Committee were of the opinion that as existence of the original impugned letter could not be proved to the entire satisfaction of the Committee and thus the authenticity and genuineness of its photostat copy produced by Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee had not been established in the absence of the original impugned letter the matter should not be pursued any further. The Committee, therefore, decided to recommend to the House that the matter should be dropped and no further action be taken by the House in the matter.

7. The Committee, however, observed that the affairs of the New Friends Cooperative House Building Society Limited, Delhi, required to be looked into by appropriate authority.

8. The Committee felt that it would not be possible to finalise their report on this matter by the 21st February, 1975, the date fixed by the House for the presentation of this report. The Committee, therefore, decided that a motion be moved in the House on the 21st February, 1975, by the Chairman, asking for a brief extension of time for presentation of their report on this matter to the House upto the 10th March, 1975.

* * * * *

The Committee then adjourned.

****Para 9 relates to another case and has accordingly been omitted.

Twelfth sitting

New Delhi, Wednesday, the 5th March, 1975

The Committee sat from 15.00 to 15.40 hours.

PRESENT

Dr. Henry Austin—*Chairman*

MEMBERS

2. Shri Popatlal M. Joshi
3. Shri Shyamnandan Mishra
4. Shri H. N. Mukerjee
5. Shri B. R. Shukla.

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri Y. Sahai—*Chief Legislative Committee Officer*
2. Shri J. R. Kapur—*Chief Financial Committee Officer*
3. Shri H. L. Malhotra—*Senior Legislative Committee Officer*

2. The Committee took up consideration of their draft Fourteenth Report on the question of privilege raised by Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, M.P. against Shri Jagjit Singh, ex-President, the New Friends Co-operative House Building Society Limited, Delhi, regarding a letter purported to have been written by him to the Lt. Governor of Delhi on the 7th May, 1974, allegedly casting aspersions on Parliament.

3. At the outset, the Chairman informed the Committee that he had received a letter dated the 5th March, 1975, from Shri Atal Bihari Vapayee, a member of the Committee, which read as follows:

“I have seen the draft Fourteenth Report. I wonder why the Committee did not accept the suggestion made by the Lt. Governor of Delhi to get the signature of Dr. Jagjit Singh examined by the handwriting expert. The report should also refer to the fact that the file produced by the Delhi Administration was not the entire file but just a bunch of few papers.

During the evidence it was clearly established that there was a collusion between Dr. Jagjit Singh and the then Lt. Governor, that Dr. Jagjit Singh had been addressing letters to the Lt. Governor from his residence bearing no numbers, that it was improper on the part of the Lt. Governor that he should have given his permission to enroll new members on the Republic Day. The Report makes no mention of these facts.

On page 8 of the Draft Report the Committee recommends that the affairs of the Society be looked into thoroughly by the appropriate authority. But the Committee has avoided giving facts warranting such an inquiry.

I suggest that the Report be suitably amended. All irregularities brought to the notice of the Committee during cross-examination of the witnesses be referred to and instead of demanding inquiry by "appropriate authorities" the Committee should recommend a high level inquiry set up by the Home Ministry to investigate what has come to be known as the land grab scandal.

I wish I could be present when the Committee meets this afternoon to adopt the report. But I am engaged otherwise and I would like the Committee either to amend the report suitably or to postpone the adoption for Friday when I shall attend the meeting."

4. In deference to the wishes of Shri Vajpayee, the Committee decided to defer further consideration of the draft Report to their next sitting to be held on Friday, the 7th March, 1975, at which Shri Vajpayee might be present.

The Committee then adjourned.

XIII

Thirteenth sitting

New Delhi, Friday, the 7th March, 1975

The Committee sat from 10.00 to 11.00 hours.

PRESENT

Dr. Henry Austin—*Chairman*

MEMBERS

2. Shri M. C. Daga
3. Shri Popatlal M. Joshi
4. Shri H. N. Mukerjee
5. Shri Chintamani Panigrahi
6. Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee.

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri Y. Sahai—*Chief Legislative Committee Officer*
2. Shri J. R. Kapur—*Chief Financial Committee Officer*
3. Shri H. L. alhotra—*Senior Legislative Committee Officer*

2. The Committee took up further consideration of their draft Fourteenth Report on the question of privilege raised by Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, M.P. against Shri Jagjit Singh, ex-President, the New Friends Co-operative House Building Society Limited, Delhi, regarding a letter purported to have been written by him to the Lt. Governor of Delhi on the 7th May, 1974, allegedly casting aspersions on Parliament.

The Committee adopted the draft Report with the following modifications:—

- (i) For Sub-paragraph of para 23 and para 24 of the draft Report, the following shall be substituted:—

“After careful consideration of the evidence given before the Committee, both oral as well as written, the Committee have come to the conclusion that in spite of certain serious misgivings about the transaction under reference arising out of circumstantial details emerging before the Committee, particularly the material referred to in paragraph 20 above, the existence of the impugned original letter dated the 7th May, 1974, allegedly written by Shri Jagjit Singh to Shri Baleshwar Prasad, the then Lt. Governor of Delhi, has not been proved to the entire satisfaction of the Committee. The Committee are, therefore, of the opinion that the matter should be dropped and no further action be taken by the House in the matter.”

(ii) In paragraph 25 of the draft Report for the words "appropriate authorities", the words "Central Government" shall be substituted."

3. The Committee authorised the Chairman, and, in his absence, Shri H. N. Mukerjee, to present their Report to the House on the 10th March, 1975.

4. The Committee decided that the file produced before the Committee by the Secretary (Law and Judicial), Delhi Administration, on the 31st December, 1974, might be returned to the Delhi Administration.

The Committee then adjourned.

**MINUTES OF EVIDENCE TAKEN BEFORE THE COMMITTEE
OF PRIVILEGES**

Friday, the 5th July, 1974

PRESENT

Dr. Henry Austin—*Chairman*

MEMBERS

2. Sardar Buta Singh
3. Shri M. C. Daga
4. Shri K. G. Deshmukh
5. Shri Shyamnandan Mishra
6. Shri H. N. Mukerjee
7. Shri Chintamani Panigrahi
8. Dr. Shankar Dayal Sharma
9. Shri B. R. Shukla
10. Shri Maddi Sudarsanam
11. Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee

SECRETARIAT

Shri J. R. Kapur—*Under Secretary*

WITNESS

**Shri Jagjit Singh—*President, New Friends Cooperative
House Building Society Limited, New Delhi.***

(The Committee met at 15.00 hours)

Evidence of Shri Jagjit Singh, President, New Friends Co-operative House Building Society Limited, New Delhi.

(The witness took his seat and then took the oath)

Mr. Chairman: You are the President of the New Friends Co-operative House Building Society, New Delhi?

Shri Jagjit Singh: Yes, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: Were you holding that office on 7th May 1974?

Shri Jagjit Singh: Yes, Sir. I am still the President.

Mr. Chairman: We have before us a photostat copy of a letter alleged to have been written by you to the Lt. Governor of Delhi, dated 7th May, 1974. I will pass it on to you. Please have a look at it and verify the signature.

Shri Jagjit Singh: I have read it. No such letter was at all written by me. The signature is forged. This is not the first time that signatures have been forged in the matter of the society. When my opponents in the society filed a writ petition in the Supreme Court some time ago in the name of 287 petitioners, we found that several members have never signed the writ petition and their signatures have been forged. In fact, the signatures of 3 members were forged even though they had died five years before the writ petition was filed.

If I may be allowed to digress, I have been subjected to a torture by the abuse of democratic and legal process. I have recently published an article in the *Illustrated Weekly of India* showing the depths to which these people can go. If any of the hon. members have not read it, I can leave a copy here. I am a science writer and I was appointed by the Lt. Governor to clean up the Augean stable. I enabled the members to get possession of the land and start building activity and in return I got nothing but torture and appearance before the courts. I have just come back from the High Court. In fact, my term was due to expire on the 8th July and on 30th June we were supposed to hold elections for which a general body meeting was fixed. But at 16 hours on the 29th I was served with a stay order from the Court of the Additional District Judge that no elec-

tion could be held. There was no time to appeal. Nevertheless we filed an appeal with the High Court that that order should be quashed. I have just come back from the hearing of the appeal. I am honest and I seek your protection.

Mr. Chairman: Did you find any similarity between this signature and your signature?

Shri Jagjit Singh: It is a clever forgery. It is not my signature.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: You may rest assured that this Committee has no intention of persecuting a citizen of this country, but all the same we have to perform this unwilling duty of investigating the truth or otherwise of this report which on the face of it is rather serious. So, I am sure you will cooperate with us in finding out the truth of the matter. You are the President of the New Friends Cooperative House Building Society. Has this precisely anything to do with the Lt. Governor of Delhi in his personal or official or any other capacity?

Shri Jagjit Singh: The old committee was removed by the Lt. Governor, Mr Jha. I was appointed by the Lt. Governor and since then we have tried to improve the affairs of the society.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Do you, from time to time, have occasion to write to the Lt. Governor of Delhi on behalf of the Society?

Shri Jagjit Singh: No, only official letter I have to write to him, if there are certain disputes between the Government and the Society. For example, Government demanded from the Society Rs. 22 lakhs as premium money for the land that they have given to the society. In that connection I had to write to him. Eventually, it was settled. We found that Rs. 22 lakhs could not be collected from all the members and we could not get the land from the Government unless we give Rs. 22 lakhs to the Government. Then I had to write to the Lt. Governor that since a section of the people could not contribute their share of the money, would he agree to give the plots to each member on paying a *pro rata* share of Rs. 22 lakhs? That it is to say, if there are 100 members, each person pays his share and gets the land. On these matters I used to correspond with the Lt. Governor, the Registrar of Cooperative Societies, the Vice-Chairman of the DDA and other officers.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Is it not a fact that in your Society there are certain groups functioning and that you were, on occasions, put to trouble by one group or the other and that you perhaps required

the intercession of the Lt. Governor, either officially or non-officially, to resolve the dispute caused by the appearance of the groups, pressing their respective claims?

Shri Jagjit Singh: No, nothing of the kind. The only disputes between the Society and the administration were resolved during the time of the Lt. Governor, Dr. A. N. Jha, himself. There were a number of disputes between the Society and the Government and the General Body resolved unanimously that the then Lt. Governor, Dr. A. N. Jha, should give his verdict on all matters of dispute and that his verdict should be accepted. After the verdict was given by the Lt. Governor, the followers of the removed Committee challenged the award. That challenge was dismissed by the High Court two months back. They have filed an appeal against that dismissal. That is a different matter.

We have had general body meeting from time to time; during my tenure, three general body meeting of the Society were held. One was on the 7th January, 1973 in obedience of the orders of the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court wanted to know that in the dispute what is the view of the general body members. Therefore, we had to hold a general body meeting. A vast majority of the members wanted to get possession of their land and build the houses because the cost of construction is soaring sky high. They did not want any delay in getting possession of the land and construction of the house by mere litigation. Even if the Government demands were a little excessive, a vast majority of the members are willing to pay the amount demanded and get possession of the land. Therefore, at that general body meeting passed resolutions in support of the stand of my Committee. I may add that as we feared they would try to create disturbance and that they might rush in outsiders, because the meeting is open only to the genuine members of the society to whom we had issued admission cards. Since there was a likelihood of gate crashing of the meeting, I did write to the Lt. Govevnrnor at that time, in 1973, that we are holding a meeting in response to the order of the Supreme Court and, in case there is any disturbance, then it is a breach of the order of the Supreme Court and, therefore, necessary protection should be provided. That protection was given. The meeting was held and there was no trouble. We had ballot on three issues and a vast majority endorsed the stand of the Society. We filed the proceedings in the Supreme Court.

Mr. Chairman: I suggest that your answers may be brief and to the point instead of giving all the details.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: We do not want too much of details. I want to find out from you whether it is not a fact that, in view of the trouble and in view of what has appeared in the press, namely, the statement of the father of the Information and Broadcasting Minister, about certain alleged goings-on in your Society, about some hocus pocus in your society right or wrong we do not know, it is in the nature of things that you occasionally got in touch with the Lt. Governor and some other people, before whom you placed your difficulty and tried to get a way out? Would that be a correct impression?

Shri Jagjit Singh: Yes, that would be.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: So, it would not be an unusual thing for you to write to the Lt. Governor and you perhaps had occasions to write to him.

Shri Jagjit Singh: Yes.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: In your letter to the Speaker you had repudiated your association with this particular allegation. On the 6th you had stated "I have written no such letter at all". At that point of time you had not seen the letter you had merely seen a press report. I presume; you had seen the report that you had been accused of having committed a contempt of the House, which you repudiated. So, your repudiation refers only to the repudiation of the violation of the privilege of the House. But, in so far as the factual text of the letter is concerned, are you denying the content of the letter entirely? Is it, according to your view, a complete textual fabrication, in content as well as in language?

Shri Jagjit Singh: When I read in the press report that a letter had been written by me to the Lt. Governor, since I had not written any letter round about that period, I could repudiate it without reading the text. In fact, I saw the text published in *Motherland* on the 10th May.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: You have very carefully looked into the signature and you say it is a very clever likeness, a fabrication, a forgery, very cleverly executed. We would not like to be driven to have technical experts pronouncing on the rightness or wrongness of a certain signature, if we can be satisfied otherwise about its veracity. Are you quite sure that the signature you have seen in the photostat is not yours and the content of the letter is also entirely fabricated? Is that a very positive averment that you make?

Shri Jagjit Singh: Yes.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: The files in your office do not include this?

Shri Jagjit Singh: No, I am very positive about this.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: This being a confidential communication—because I find it marked “confidential” or something like that—is it entirely unlikely that faced with some trouble, symbolised by the elder Mr. Gujral’s case, for example, that you have written some sort of thing to the Lt. Governor?

Shri Jagjit Singh: No, Sir; I wrote nothing of that kind. Coming to this letter, apart from the signature, I would say this is not my style. The man may be clever in imitating my signature; but he has not been able to imitate my style. In my official letters I write “Dear Sir” and “Yours faithfully”. This is not the way I wrote any letter.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I made a mistake. It was not marked “Confidential”. From the photostat copy, can you say that this is the kind of stationery which you use?

Shri Jagjit Singh: This is not the kind of stationery which we use. The stationery which we use is the type on which I have written the letter to the hon. Speaker. This is the old type of stationery which they were using.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: You never use this type of stationery.

Shri Jagjit Singh: As you will see the Addresses also, these are the old Addresses where the offices of Mr. Jaggi and his associates were there. This is the old type of stationery which was being used perhaps at that time. It may have been used during my time a few years ago. But as far as I can remember now, we are using the new type of stationery on which I wrote the letter to the hon. Speaker.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Would you help us in solving this mystery about one or the other side? Are there some controversies going on in regard to allocation particularly because of Mr. Gujral's statement. We are all mystified. Could you give us some idea as to what the position was so that we can come to some kind of conclusion?

Shri Jagjit Singh: About the allocation, the position was that we were in need of money for development and electrification. We passed a Resolution asking the members to pay Rs. 6 per sq. yard, about Rs. 3,000 each, depending upon the area of his plot. By the end of December, 1973, the vast majority of members had paid it. But there were about 39 persons who were refusing to pay their dues. They went to court. They had a stay order from the Supreme Court. When the stay order was also removed, even then they refused to pay. When they did not pay after the order of the Supreme Court was issued removing the stay order, then we removed them.

We were in a fix because we had no money and we had to pay Rs. 10 lakhs to DESU. Therefore, we had to dispose of these plots to outsiders who would be willing to pay the money to take the plots. A Managing Committee meeting was held. Although we had 80 to 90 plots, for immediate purpose, we thought, it would be enough if we merely disposed of 60 plots. The Managing Committee held a meeting and we selected the allottees. To improve the neighbourhood quality of our members, we selected the allottees. We passed a resolution that these persons may be enrolled as the new members of the Society. Under the rules, we have to have the approval of the Chairman of the D.D.A. who is the Lt. Governor. I obtained his approval.

It so happened that Mr. Gujral's son was one of the new members whom we enrolled. That was the position. There is no mystery about it. We enrolled him just as we enrolled several other members.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: So far as this communication is concerned, you refute it entirely.

Shri Jagjit Singh: Yes, Sir.

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I would like to seek your permission to go because I have another meeting of the Hindi Salahkar Samiti connected with the Ministry of Law. I had thought that we would start at 3 O'Clock and by 4 O'Clock, the examination of the witness would be over. But because of the electricity failure, the meeting started late.

Mr. Jagjit Singh, as you know, I was the Member who raised this question in Parliament. But let me assure you that this was not raised in a spirit to join those about whom you said that they want to indulge in harassment. A particular document came in my possession. I thought it my duty to place the matter before Parliament in public interest.

May I request you, Sir, to ask Mr. Jagjit Singh to come tomorrow?

Mr. Chairman: Yes. As the hon. Members know, Shri Vajpayee raised this question of privilege in Parliament. He has to attend another meeting. He can go. I think, in fairness to him, we request the witness to come tomorrow.

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee: Thank you. You can take up other items.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Jagjit Singh, I would request you to come tomorrow at 11 O'Clock.

Shri Jagjit Singh: Yes Sir.

Mr. Chairman: Before we adjourn, I would like to put a few questions. I understand, you are a retired Civil servant.

Shri Jagjit Singh: I retired from the Railways as the General Manager of the South-Eastern Railways. After then, I was the Chairman of the I.D.P.L. till July, 1973.

Mr. Chairman: Do you have any experience about cooperative societies?

Shri Jagjit Singh: No. Of course, my subordinates used to deal with the railway cooperative societies, banking, etc. I have no experiences directly.

Mr. Chairman: Have you ever involved yourself with any activity connected with the house-building?

Shri Jagjit Singh: No.

Mr. Chairman: How is it that you were invited to help the Society?

Shri Jagjit Singh: It was Mr. Ram Lal Jaggi who came to me and said, "You know the Lt. Governor, Mr. A. N. Jha, very well. You come and plead our case. You are a member of our Society and

you are complaining that the building of our houses has been delayed very much. You come with us and get this problem solved." I took him to the Lt. Governor and the Lt. Governor said to me, "I will talk to you privately." He said, "These people are great litigants. Why have you brought them? You will get me into difficulty. You will also be in difficulty." I told him, "I have brought them because I am a member of the Society. I am waiting for the building of my house since 1959. We are now in 1969. About 10 years have elapsed. If you can do something, I will be very grateful to you". He said, "Very good. You ask the General Body to pass a Resolution that every matter of dispute will be decided by me and at my discretion."

I told Mr. Jaggi that that is what he wanted. He held the General Body meeting. It passed the Resolution unanimously. So, everything was entrusted to the Lt. Governor, Mr. A. N. Jha.

Then, he gave his verdict. His verdict was that on certain matters of decisions, a notification be issued removing him and appointing the Managing Committee of the Society consisting of 7 members, including me as the President of the Managing Committee. I never knew those people. He picked up the people. The officers advised him, "These are the people you appoint."

That is how we got into business. We thought it would be over. But it dragged on for three years.

Mr. Chairman: What about Mr. Ram Lal Jaggi? What was his tenure? For how long did he serve there?

Shri Jagjit Singh: Unfortunately, he died. Actually, he handed over to me on the 6th September, 1971.

Mr. Chairman: What was the tenure for which he was elected?

Shri Jagjit Singh: One year.

Mr. Chairman: How is it that he was removed? Was there any allegation against him?

Shri Jagjit Singh: Yes. A show-cause notice was also issued.

Mr. Chairman: How do you know the Lt. Governor? You know him only after his coming here or even earlier?

Shri Jagjit Singh: I knew him before. I was in the Railways in Lucknow. He was then the Chief Secretary of U.P.

Mr. Chairman: How long do you know him?

Shri Jagjit Singh: Since 1952. Actually, he has read my books also.

Mr. Chairman: What about the present incumbent?

Shri Jagjit Singh: I do not know him at all.

Mr. Chairman: When did you first come to know of him?

Shri Jagjit Singh: Only when he was appointed here as Lt. Governor. That was the first time I came to know him. Since then I had only official dealings with him. I was not as familiar with him as I was with Lt. Governor Jha.

Mr. Chairman: During your long service with the Railways and other Departments of the Government did you have any occasion to come across Mr. Baleswar Prasad? Or only after assuming charge of the Co-operative Society did you have an opportunity to meet him?

Shri Jagjit Singh: No. I met him only after I assumed charge of the Society.

Mr. Chairman: Since assuming charge of the President of the Society, did you write to him?

Shri Jagjit Singh: I had to write official letters to him on behalf of the society.

Mr. Chairman: Now, You may withdraw. We will meet tomorrow at 11 a.m.

The witness then withdrew.

The Committee there adjourned.

Saturday, the 6th July, 1974.

PRESENT

Dr. Henry Austin—*Chairman.*

MEMBERS

2. Sardar Buta Singh
3. Shri Somnath Chatterjee
4. Shri M. C. Daga

5. Shri K. G. Deshmukh
6. Shri Shyamnandan Mishra
7. Shri H. N. Mukerjee
8. Shri Chintamani Panigrahi
9. Dr. Shankar Dayal Sharma
10. Shri B. R. Shukla
11. Shri Maddi Sudarsanam
12. Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee

SECRETARIAT

Shri J. R. Kapur—*Under Secretary.*

WITNESS

Shri Jagjit Singh—*President, New Friends Cooperative
House Building Society Limited, New
Delhi.*

(The Committee met at 11.00 hours)

EVIDENCE OF SHRI JAGJIT SINGH, PRESIDENT, NEW FRIENDS
COOPERATIVE HOUSE BUILDING SOCIETY LIMITED, NEW
DELHI.

Mr. Chairman: Please take the oath.

Shri Jagjit Singh: I, Jagjit Singh, do swear in the name of God that the evidence which I shall give in this case shall be true, that I will conceal nothing, and that no part of my evidence shall be false.

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee: Mr. Jagjit Singh, the question of breach of privilege against you was raised on the 9th May. The letter which you wrote to the hon. Speaker itself was written on the 9th May and in that letter you have stated "I was surprised to read today's Times of India", that is, the Times of India dated 9th May, Is that correct or there was some oversight? The question was raised on the 9th May and it was published in the paper on the 10th. How did you come to know about it on the 9th May? How could you refer to the Times of India which would be published only the next day?

Shri Jagjit Singh: As far as I remember, it is on the 9th May. But if the paper's report was 10th, then it must be 10th. The moment I read the news in the Times of India that this thing had happened, I immediately wrote a letter and came to Parliament and personally handed it over to Mr. S. Seshadri, Private Secretary to the Speaker. I have an endorsement in my office copy.

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee: What was the exact time when you handed it over to him?

Shri Jagjit Singh: That would be around 11-12 in the morning. I gave it to Mr. Seshadri personally and I came away.

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee: You gave it on the 10th?

Shri Jagjit Singh: If the paper report was on 10th, then, it must be 10th.

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee: Mr. Seshadri must have endorsed the letter?

Shri Jagjit Singh: He did not. I did not ask him. I merely wrote in my own hand, handed over to Mr. Seshadri. This is my endorsement here. Handed over to Mr. Seshadri, Private Secretary to the Speaker, and I initialled my signature. If the news was carried in the Times of India on the 10th, then, I must have made an error. Instead of 10th, I probably wrote 9th.

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee: You did not anticipate things

Shri Jagjit Singh: How can I anticipate?

Shri Atal Bihari Jajpayee: Was there a meeting of the Managing Committee held on the 29th April?

Shri Jagjit Singh: Yes. It was held.

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee: Do you keep minutes of your meetings?

Shri Jagjit Singh: Yes. We do.

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee: Can you produce them if asked for?

Shri Jagjit Singh: Yes. I can produce.

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee: Were there any objections raised by one of the members that the meeting should not be held because the Governor and the Managing Committee have lost moral authority?

Shri Jagjit Singh: No. There were no objections. Actually, the meeting of the Managing Committee was held to fix the date for the elections, for the formation of a new Committee. We were a nominated Committee and our term was to expire on the 8th July, that is, in two months' time and under the Cooperative Societies Act, a nominated Committee's term cannot be extended beyond 3 years and therefore elections had to be held and we have to notify the Registrar 60 days before hand, when the elections would be held. This meeting was held merely to fix the date in advance for the elections, for the formation of a new Committee.

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee: I now put a specific question and I would like to have a specific reply. Were any objection raised by any member at that meeting?

Shri Jagjit Singh: Out of 9 members, 3 members belonged to Mr. Madan Lal Jaggi's group and 6 were with me. Out of these 3 members, one member, as far as I remember, Mr. B. M. Rallan, attended the meeting. He said that this Managing Committee should not hold any meeting and it should not conduct any elections. But I said that elections have to be held. After the expiry of our term, we have to have elections and so we fixed the date and he agreed to all those procedures.

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee: Do you keep a despatch register for the letters that are despatched from your office either to the Government of India or to the Delhi Development Authority or to the office of the Lt. Governor?

Shri Jagjit Singh: Most of the letters are sent by registered post from the office. Those letters which I write personally to the Lt. Governor, are kept with me in a file. So, either they are sent by courier or by post.

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee: So, there is no despatch register?

Shri Jagjit Singh: There is no despatch register for my personal correspondence.

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee: Not about your personal correspondence. When you correspond as the Chairman of the Housing Society, do you regard that correspondence as personal correspondence?

Shri Jagjit Singh: No. I am only an honorary President. I do not go to office every day. Certain letters I write from my office and certain others I write from my own house and I keep the letters in my custody in a file. I have brought the file which you wanted to see. The letters that I write to the.....

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee: Mr. Jagjit Singh, did you write any letter to the Chairman of the Delhi Development Authority, who also happens to be the Lt. Governor on the 26th January 1974?

Shri Jagjit Singh: Yes.

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee: Why was it marked confidential?

Shri Jagjit Singh: It was marked confidential. Several letters which I had written were marked confidential because I did not want that the information should go to some other people except to a limited number of people to whom it should be known. I will tell you now the reason. We have some litigant opponents and I feared that a fresh court case would be started immediately if they come to know of what I was doing. What I was doing was this. I had to have money in order to pay Rs. 10 lakhs to DESU for the electrification of the colony; I had no money and some people were not paying. In regard to those who were not paying. I could not do anything because of the Supreme Court stay. As soon as the Supreme Court stay was removed, according to the Court order, I gave them prescribed time to pay the dues. They did not pay the dues. They were removed by the Committee and then we had to have fresh mem-

bers to raise the money in order to pay to DESU. There was no money with the Society to pay DESU's dues. I did not want a court stay to be brought against money being collected in order to pay to DESU. As for stays, I may odd on the 30th June, we were to hold elections. On the 29th June, a court stay was brought and we could not even hold the elections. There is no successor Committee elected.

Shri Atal Bihari Jajpayee: A letter was written by you as the President of the New Friends Cooperative Housing Society. It was addressed to the Chairman, Delhi Development Authority, was it a private communication?

Shri Jagjit Singh: No. It was a confidential communication from the President of the Society to the Chairman, DDA. It was official.

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee: Why was it confidential?

Shri Jagjit Singh: I told you. We feared court's stay. Even elections are not allowed to be held in this democratic country. On the 30th June, we were to hold elections. On the 29th June, a stay was brought.

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee: Do you want to say that you wanted to keep the contents of the letter confidential and you did not want anybody except the Lt. Governor.....

Shri Jagjit Singh: And his officers. When a letter is marked confidential to another officer, it does not mean that it is meant only for him. It is also meant for his subordinate officers. It is for him to give the information contained in that letter to such officers as he likes.

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee: Apart from the letter which you wrote on the 26th January 1974, are there any other letters which have been marked confidential?

Shri Jagjit Singh: Yes.

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee: How many?

Shri Jagjit Singh: There is one letter written on 18th April, 1973 marked 'Secret' to the Lt. Governor, Delhi State. This was written when I was assaulted in Bombay I reported to him that a false and fake case was framed against me in order to bring me to Bombay at a place where hired goondas could assault me—which

they did. When I came back, I reported this incident to the Lt. Governor for his information. Here is the office copy of my letter. I am passing it on for your perusal.

(The file was passed on to the Chairman for perusal)

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee: The alleged letter, the photo-stat copy of which was produced in Parliament, begins:

“As desired, I have succeeded in passing a resolution in the Committee meeting on the 29th April 1974.....”

You have denied this letter; but may I draw your attention to an advertisement in the Hindustan Times dated the 9th May, published in your name? It says:

“It is notified for the information of the members of the above Society, that it is decided to hold a General Body Meeting of the Society on Sunday, the 30th June 1974 at 10 a.m. at the Indian Medical Institute. Indraprastha Estate, New Delhi, to elect the members of the Managing Committee of the Society to succeed the present Committee on the expiry of its term, on 7th July, 1974.”

Would you enlighten the Committee as to when was this advertisement placed on the Hindustan Times?

Shri Jagjit Singh: The Committee decided on the 29th April, that the General Body Meeting was to be held on that day; and then the Secretary and the Joint Secretary were told to notify in the Press also, so that as much advance information may be given to the members as possible, because in any case, each member has to be written individually by registered post. I cannot tell you off-hand as to when this notice was sent to the Press. It must have been 3 or 4 days before the publication, say around the 2nd, 3rd or the 4th.

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee: The same alleged letter also says:

“Since you are busy due to riots in the City, I will give the notice in newspapers only when I get green signal.”

This letter is reported to have been sent on 7th May and on the 9th May, this advertisement had appeared. Is it just a coincidence or something else?

Shri Jagjit Singh: How can I say? I never wrote the letter. It was only my office which had sent the advertisement.

Sardar Buta Singh: Can I seek a clarification on the question? Under the Cooperative Societies' Act, is it provided that whenever any Society is to hold a general meeting specially for election purposes, it is incumbent on the Society to go to the Press, giving a certain number of days' notice before the meeting? If it is so, it must have been done according to the rules of the cooperative society.

Mr. Chairman: I will answer your point, Mr. Buta Singh. Mr. Vajpayee was just asking the witness whether the matter of publication in the papers was just a coincidence, considering the background of this letter. The same matter was mentioned in the letter of 7th. The witness may deny or give some reply. The witness has denied the existence of this letter. The matter ends there.

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee: Dr. Singh, if you are asked to furnish the details of the advertisement, will you be in a position to do it, i.e. as to when the advertisement was placed on the Hindustan Times and for which date?

Dr. Jagjit Singh: Yes, Sir; this would be available in the office. I cannot give it off-hand.

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee: You can give it later on, if the Committee thinks that it is necessary. Anyway, when was the green signal given by you for publishing the advertisement? Sometimes it happens that an advertisement is placed with an agency and it is published when the green signal telling them, "please publish it on this particular date" is given, though the advertisement might have been registered earlier.

Dr. Jagjit Singh: There is no question of any green signal. The meeting was fixed for a particular date. We decided on the 29th April that the election meeting will be held on that date. But about the date on which the office had sent the letter to the agency for publishing the advertisement, I will check up and give you the information.

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee: The advertisement must have been placed with certain instructions.

Dr. Jagjit Singh: No other instructions were given, except to publish it immediately. Normally, when we send the advertisement, we say: "publish it as soon as you can." We do not say, "you have to fix it for a particular date." And whenever we send an advertisement to an agency, we never say, "Wait for some green signal from us." The signal is to the effect that they should publish it whenever they can.

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee: Can you find out what instructions were given?

Dr. Jagjit Singh: We told the agency to publish it whenever they can. The advertisement was given through an agency.

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee: Which is that agency?

Dr. Jagjit Singh: I do not remember, Sir.

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee: But you do remember that it was not given to the newspaper direct. Has it been the practice?

Shri Jagjit Singh: I was the Chairman of IDPL and we had an agency through which we used to publish our official pharmaceutical advertisements and recruitment advertisements and other things. Since the time I was the Chairman of the Society, we used the same agency for which the Society paid.

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee: In that case you must be aware of the name of the agency?

Shri Jagjit Singh: This was done by the Public Relations Officer. Only I remember that the same agency was being used.

Mr. Chairman: Have you seen the advertisements in the papers also?

Shri Jagjit Singh: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: Have you gone through the files concerning the advertisement?

Shri Jagjit Singh: The files come when the advertisements appear and for making out the payment.

Mr. Chairman: Still you cannot remember the agency although you have in various capacities utilised this agency for publicity work. Still you cannot remember the name of the agency.

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee: The alleged letter refers to a letter of Mrs. Masani. The letter indicates that the original letter is missing. Could you throw some light whether a letter was actually written by Mrs. Masani?

Shri Jagjit Singh: What light can I throw when the letter is not mine? The sentences were produced God knows from where.

I think the light should be thrown by the ghostwriter who has written it.

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee: To whom is the letter addressed?

Shri Jagjit Singh: That also the ghost-writer should say.

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee: Is it a fact that Mrs. Masani has been allotted land in your society?

Shri Jagjit Singh: She is one of the memberes who have been enrolled. She is one of the 60 members who wanted to enrol themselves. Out of the 60, 10 refused for their own reasons and she is one of the 50 whom we enrolled.

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee: She was enrolled—by whom?

Shri Jagjit Singh: By the society, with the permission of the Chairman, DDA, as per rules.

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee: Did she approach the society or was she approached by the Society?

Mr. Chairman: How can you ask that question?

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee: That question can be asked because he says that Mrs. Masani was enrolled a member. Did the society receive a communication from Mrs. Masani for enrolment?

Shri Jagjit Singh: She sent an application for being enrolled as a member. No member can be enrolled unless a written application is received as also an affidavit to the effect that he/she does not own a house or plot in Delhi.

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee: Were there vacancies in the society? Was a public announcement made?

Shri Jagjit Singh: We do not make a public announcement. It is entirely in the discretion of the Managing Committee to fill up the vacancies and decide whom they will take as neighbours. No co-operative society is required to advertise. Only the DDA is required to advertise because they have to sell the plots by public auction. We are not allowed to auction the plots publicly.

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee: I am not talking of auction. If there was no public announcement, how did Mrs. Masani come to know that there was a vacancy in the society?

Shri Jagjit Singh: She might have friends in the Managing Committee who might have told her that a number of members have been declared defaulters and vacancies have occurred.

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee: You referred to the fact that all new members have to file an affidavit informing the society that they have no house or plot in Delhi. Was this condition applied to those high Government officials also?

Shri Jagjit Singh: It was applied to every one.

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee: Did they file an affidavit.

Shri Jagjit Singh: Yes.

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee: Were they verified?

Shri Jagjit Singh: When received, they were sent to the DDA. We take it for granted that no member will commit a perjury and sign a false affidavit.

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee: Is it not the responsibility of the co-operative society to scrutinise the affidavit?

Shri Jagjit Singh: We cannot. How can we scrutinise whether a man has a plot or house in Delhi or not? We have no records. We accept the statement made by the member.

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee: You says that it is for the DDA to verify.

Shri Jagjit Singh: Yes, if they want to. We have no means to check its veracity.

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee: In this particular context, you wrote a letter on the 26th January and on the same day. the Lt. Governor gives his approval. Do you think that the Lt. Governor had ample time to scrutinise whether the affidavits submitted were correct?

Shri Jagjit Singh: He had not to scrutinise the affidavit. He had only to say whether he approves the selections made by us or he does not. Ordinarily it does not take 5 or 10 minutes. If he approves, he will say 'Yes'. If he does not, he will say, 'No'. It is not his responsibility to scrutinise anything.

Shri Atal Bihar Vajpayee: Then, whose responsibility is it?

Shri Jagjit Singh: The Co-operative societies practically take the affidavits submitted by the members as true, unless some informa-

tion is received from some source that it is false in which case the inquiry starts.

Mr. Chairman: You said that the approval of the Lt. Governor takes only 5 minutes. Is it just a formality or is it incumbent upon the Lt. Governor, he being the last step in the process of allotment, to go into the merits and see whether everything is in order? How can you say that it takes only 5 minutes? You take it for granted that he should approve whatever you say?

Shri Jagjit Singh: What I was saying is that it is for him to either accept or reject. The selection of the members of the society is entirely the responsibility of the Managing Committee. Either he could say, 'Look here. I doubt your *bona fides*. I revoke the selection made by you'. Or, if he does not doubt the Committee's *bona fides*, he would say, 'OK. If you want to recruit them, go ahead.'

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee: The approval is given by the Lt. Governor in his capacity as Chairman of DDA or as Lt. Governor?

Shri Jagjit Singh: As Chairman of DDA.

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee: A little while ago you said that it is for the DDA to scrutinise.

Shri Jagjit Singh: If I gave that impression, I think I might clarify the point. The applications are not scrutinised by the DDA. Applications are received by the Society and it is in the society's discretion to take a member or not. It is not the responsibility of the DDA to say whether this man should be taken or should not be taken. It is entirely the Managing Committee's responsibility. DDA has merely to say whether they accept our recommendations or reject our recommendations.

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee: In case of any person filing a false affidavit, what is the check and what is the remedy? Who has to go into that case? Is it the Housing Society or the DDA or any third agency?

Shri Jagjit Singh: If an affidavit is found to be false, then we cancel his plot. That is what the society can do. There is nothing else the society can do. In fact we cancelled the plots of 42 people when it was brought to our notice that these people have either not submitted their affidavits or their affidavits are wrong or are not correct. We cancelled their membership.

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee: Apart from cancelling the membership, do you file a case?

Shri Jagjit Singh: We have no machinery to do that, to file criminal cases against people who file false affidavits. There was a case of one Mr. Gupta that he has filed a false affidavit. I do not know. It is not my responsibility to file any criminal proceedings against him. But I have been told that it is a false affidavit. I am not a Policeman of the Delhi State. All I can do is that when it is officially reported to me by DDA that it is a false affidavit, I will cancel his plot.

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee: You said you had received the affidavits from high government officials who applied for the land from your society.

Shri Jagjit Singh: Yes, Sir. Otherwise, we would not have allotted the plots to them.

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee: Originally you asked for the approval for 60 members. But, subsequently only fifty members were enrolled.

Shri Jagjit Singh: I asked for approval for 60 members. He gave the approval for 60 members. After the receipt of the approval, we wrote to all the sixty members who were offering for the membership of the society. We asked them to pay so much dues. Of these sixty, these ten either refused or replied in the negative. We asked all of them to send their cheques if they wished to be members of the society. We enrolled these fifty only.

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee: Did you offer the membership to them?

Shri Jagjit Singh: They applied for the membership. The Managing Committee passed a Resolution approving their membership. Then a letter was written to the D.D.A. The Managing Committee decided to enrol these members. We asked for the approval of the Chairman, D.D.A. who gave his approval. And when the approval was received, the Secretary of the Society wrote to each of the members that the Managing Committee had approved his admission application to the society and he was given one month's notice to send Rs. 25,000 for a plot of 500 Sq. Yd. and Rs. 15,000 for a plot of 300 sq. yd. If the money was sent within this period, the allotment would be made and if the money was not sent within this prescribed period, this offer could lapse. A letter to this effect was written to all the members. Out of sixty, fifty replied and they were enrolled while the ten either refused or did not reply.

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee: They have applied for the membership themselves. Why did the rest decide to back out?

Shri Jagjit Singh: For their own reasons. I did not ask them why they had refused our offer.

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee: You know that high government officials have to secure permission of the Government before buying a property. Is there any such rule?

Shri Jagjit Singh: No. What they have to do is to advise the Government after they have bought it—not before. I might give you an example. I bought a flat in Bombay about 8 or 9 years ago. As soon as I bought I advised the Government. Similarly, when I bought the car, I advised the Government afterwards. I bought refrigerator. Thereafter I advised the Government. If I were to secure the permission from Government in advance that I may be allowed to buy such and such a thing, then I will never buy anything.

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee: Prior permission is necessary.

Shri Jagjit Singh: Provided you advise the authority after you do the transaction, prior permission is not necessary.

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee: Thank you.

Shri Buta Singh: My first question to the witness is this. Why are you called Dr. Jagjit Singh?

Shri Jagjit Singh: Well, Sir, I am not a medical doctor. It so happened that the Roorkee University conferred on me an honorary degree. It so happened that when Indo-Pak war broke out in 1965 I was transferred as General Manager in North-Eastern Frontier Railway. At that time, as you know, we had Indo-Pak route and consignments from Calcutta area used to be booked by that route.

Mr. Chairman: You answer briefly that you were conferred an honorary degree by the Roorkee University. Further details are not necessary.

Sardar Buta Singh: May I, with your permission ask the witness to spare a copy of the judgment of the Supreme Court in which it has been reflected that some of the affidavit filed in the court bore the signatures of the people who were not alive at all?

Yesterday, in his opening remarks, he said that, what to talk of a letter which has been forged, even the document in the Supreme Court was forged by the parties who were very much against him. I just wanted to have a copy of the judgment of the Supreme Court in which it has been reflected or it has observed that some of the affidavits filed by some parties were not only forged but they bore the signatures of some of the persons who have died much before the affidavit was filed in the court. Some strictures were also passed by the Supreme Court. That is why I want you to get the relevant portion of the judgment.

Shri Jagjit Singh: There was no judgment. The members whose signatures were forged had filed affidavits to that effect in the Supreme Court. Vakalatnama was forged. Affidavit was filed by fifteen members in the Supreme Court and we found, after checking our records that three members had died although their signatures had been forged on the Vakalatnama filed in the Supreme Court. These people had died many years before the affidavit was filed.

Mr. Chairman: Was there any reflection?

Shri Jagjit Singh: The judgment is still to come. The case is still pending.

Mr. Chairman: No judgment has been given.

Shri Jagjit Singh: No, Sir. No judgment has yet been given.

Sardar Buta Singh: If I remember aright, there was a requisition for convening the general body meeting of the Society. For that also quite a large number of members sent requisition letters to the Chairman or President of the Society. It was found that some of the letters were forged ones as if they were written by the members. Is it a fact?

Shri Jagjit Singh: Yes, Sir. Actually in October, 1972 a number of letters was received. Of 200 and odd members who asked for a meeting to be convened. I asked three or four people whose signatures were on that letter about that. They gave me in writing that they never asked for the meeting. Their signatures had been forged.

Sardar Buta Singh: Yesterday, while introducing himself, he said that he wrote some books. With your permission I would like to know from him what types of books he has written. He also mentioned that he was a winner of Kalinga Prize. I would like

to know what is the composition of the Committee for the award of Kalinga Prize and who was his predecessor?

Shri Jagjit Singh: Well, Sir, Kalinga Prize is given by UNESCO for popularisation of Science and it is given annually. I was the twelfth winner in 1963. The other recipients were people like Sir. Juliun Huxley, Sir Bertrand Russell and various other eminent people.

As for my books, I have written a books on Mathematics, on Cosmology, on Computers, on Cybernatics, on Railway operation, on Eminent Indian Scientists and on various other subjects.

Shri K. G. Deshmukh: Are you getting any remuneration from the Office of the Society?

Shri Jagjit Singh: No, Sir.

Shri K. G. Deshmukh: No. D.A. or T.A. or anything of that sort.

Shri Jagjit Singh: No.

Shri K. G. Deshmukh: You say that while working as the President, you were facing so many difficulties. One of them was that you encountered some clash in Bombay and you got injured and all that. In your article which you have supplied, you have stated this and so, I wanted to know from you as to why you want to continue on this post when you are not getting any facility in the nature of T.A., D.A. or anything of that kind.

What is the cause of your being in this post?

Shri Jagjit Singh: The cause of my being in this post is this. Our colony will not be build up if I did not defend my actions which are under challenge in Courts. The actions were these. First of all, as I explained yesterday I persuaded the Delhi Administration to allow each individual a lease. We all got our lease. Let me put it frankly that if I quit, there is nobody else to take over the society.

Shri K. G. Deshmukh: The Chairman is already there.

Shri Jagjit Singh: I am the Chairman. When the case is pending in the Supreme Court, if I quit, then without any adequate defence everything that we have done will be undone. That is why I am there.

Shri K. G. Deshmukh: You said you are working not as a full-time man in the office and that generally you do not go to the office.

Shri Jagjit Singh: Yes.

Shri K. G. Deshmukh: Then how do you manage the work from the house itself?

Shri Jagjit Singh: There is a paid staff.

Shri K. G. Deshmukh: You said that you write almost all the letters from the house itself.

Shri Jagjit Singh: A few letters. The rest of the work is done by the office.

Shri K. G. Deshmukh: You have kept copies of the letters which you have written to the Lt. Governor?

Shri Jagjit Singh: Three or four letters.

Shri K. G. Deshmukh: Did you send those letters by ordinary post or by registered post?

Shri Jagjit Singh: I sent some of these letters by special messenger. All the other letters from the office go by post.

Shri B. R. Shukla: Mr. Jagjit Singh, you have partly answered some of the questions which I wanted to put to you. But, for the sake of clarification and elucidation, I would like to put them again.

On 29th April, 1974, a resolution at the committee meeting was passed under your presidentship. There were persons at the meeting who were opposed to your group?

Shri Jagjit Singh: Only one person.

Shri B. R. Shukla: Who was that?

Shri Jagjit Singh: He was Mr Rallan.

Shri B. R. Shukla: He opposed it?

Shri Jagjit Singh: He did not. He began by saying that the election meeting should not be held. But then eventually agreed to it.

Shri B. R. Shukla: He raised some objection.

Shri Jagjit Singh: Even he did not record any objection to the fixing of the date.

Shri B. R. Shukla: Did any occasion arise for your ruling out the objection raised at that meeting from that member concerned?

Shri Jagjit Singh: There were five of us, and he was the sixth member. He first began by saying that we should hold any election meeting, and we told him that if we did not hold the election meeting, "who is to take over charge from us?" We said that the election meeting should be held, and that it is a statutory requirement. Then he kept quiet, and we fixed the date to which he agreed.

Shri B. R. Shukla: After the passage of the resolution at the meeting dated 29th April, 1974, did you still feel that the situation was not as you desired? Even after passing the resolution at the said meeting, your assessment of the situation was that everything was not O. K.

Shri Jagjit Singh: My assessment was that everything was fine; that the election would be held and that everybody would support, barring a small group, the action of the managing committee; which was proved by the fact that on the election date was fixed the opposite party brought stay of the election order from Court.

Shri B. R. Shukla: Before the passing of the resolution on the 29th April, did you contact the Lt. Governor personally, or through some letters?

Shri Jagjit Singh: There was no need to contact him. It is our responsibility to fix the date.

Shri B. R. Shukla: Regarding the contents in this allegedly forged letter which says, "as desired I have succeeded in passing the resolution at the committee meeting on the 29th April, 1974." you say that you never wrote such a letter. You deny the contents and deny the signatures. But do you challenge the authenticity of the contents, whether the contents are true or not? You never caused this letter to be prepared but it is written here that "as desired." You never desired that any meeting should be held and the resolution should be passed?

Shri Jagjit Singh: I really do not understand the question.

Shri B. R. Shukla: Did the Lt. Governor ever desire that a meeting should be held and a resolution, which was subsequently passed on the 29th April, should be passed?

Shri Jagjit Singh: Lt. Governor never desired anything because this is a matter for the managing committee, to hold the election.

Shri B. R. Shukla: The other letters which you sent to the Lt.-Governor or to the other parties, if any, were typed on the typewriting machine possessed by you or is it the property of the managing committee of which you happen to be the President?

Shri Jagjit Singh: They are typed also on the typewriters of the society in the office. I have a typewriter of my own but that is a very peculiar typewriter. I do not normally use it for writing these letters. I get them typed from the office or from some of my friends.

Shri B. R. Shukla: You maintain a file in which a copy of the correspondence is kept by you?

Shri Jagjit Singh: Yes.

Shri B. R. Shukla: Have you cared to compare the typewritten text of this letter in question with the letters typewritten on your machine?

Shri Jagjit Singh: Typewritten thing of what?

Shri B. R. Shukla: Of this so-called letter.

Shri Jagjit Singh: I have not had any occasion to compare the letters.

Shri B. R. Shukla: You saw it yesterday.

Shri Jagjit Singh: I saw the photostat copy.

Shri B. R. Shukla: I do not know whether you are an expert in comparing the letters typed on various typewriters, but still, would you be able to suggest whether they have any similarity or not?

Shri Jagjit Singh: I have not seen the typed letter. I have seen only the photostat copy; and I am not an expert.

Mr. Chairman: You wrote a letter to the Speaker—in which there is some correction—that you have never written any such impugned letter. Did you make any effort to find out the contents of the letter about which a discussion was raised in Parliament?

Shri Jagjit Singh: That day, I heard the Times of India report but I was sure that no such letter had ever been written by me. So, I sent my denial straightaway.

Mr. Chairman: Before writing such a letter or at any time after writing it, did you make any enquiry in your office or in your house— if you have a staff there or something—whether your typewriter on which you normally write letters to the Lt. Governor or others had been utilised by anyone for writing any letter?

Shri Jagjit Singh: I did not make any enquiry.

Mr. Chairman: Have you made any effort to find out whether your office machinery or whether your office stationery has been utilised for creating the forged letter?

Shri Jagjit Singh: Actually, when I saw for the first time the photostat copy published in the *Motherland* on the 10th, when I saw the text of the letter, I knew I had not written any such letter at all, and so I did not think it necessary that I should start an enquiry whether the typewriter is the same or not. What purpose would it have served?

Mr. Chairman: The *Motherland* published the photostat copy and you saw the contents of that. Did you think that it would be better in the context of controversy raised both inside and outside the Parliament that it should be verified and be ready with defence if the question comes up?

Shri Jagjit Singh: I thought that since I had never written such a letter and was very prompt in sending my denial to the hon. Speaker, I had done my duty.

Mr. Chairman: Have you made any effort to be ready with any defence which may substantiate your argument?

Shri Jagjit Singh: I do not know what defence I can possibly offer. When I saw the letter and since I was sure that I had never written that letter, I thought that nothing more was required of me.

Mr. Chairman: You were the Chairman of other organisations also. You were in the Railway service. Naturally, as a part of your official work, you may have perhaps dealt with court cases and have consulted the lawyers. Did you have any occasion to consult the lawyers on this issue.

Shri Jagjit Singh: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: Here also, as a reasonably knowledgeable person, you could expect some kind of development taking place about the controversy raised in the Parliament particularly when it was referred to the Privileges Committee. In view of the fact that the

matter was referred to the Privileges Committee, did you consult any lawyer in this matter?

Shri Jagjit Singh: No, Sir. I could have done so.

Mr. Chairman: You did not think it worthwhile to consult any lawyer in this matter.

Shri Jagjit Singh: I did not consult any lawyer.

Shri B. R. Shukla: Before 7th May, 1974 did you have any occasion to know that Mrs. Masani had written some letter whose effect was psychologically adverse to you and the Lt. Governor? In this so-called forged letter, there is a mention of the fact, "I am trying to get the original letter of Mrs. Masani and I hope to succeed. I am on the job." It is not mentioned to which letter the reference is made. Have you any recollection that some letter was in your knowledge which written by Mrs. Masani?

Shri Jagjit Singh: This assumes as if I had written this letter and had any connection with it.

Shri B. R. Shukla: I do not say that you have written this letter. Let us assume that it is a forged letter. Apart from that it is a forged letter, do you have any recollection that Mrs. Masani had written any letter about which you had some knowledge?

Shri Jagjit Singh: She never wrote any letter to me. I have no knowledge of any letter written by her to anybody else. I am quite clear in my mind about it.

Shri B. R. Shukla: You say that the alleged signature on this allegedly forged letter is a clever forgery in the sense that it apparently resembles your genuine signature.

Shri Jagjit Singh: I think, you are trying to put something in my mouth which I have not said. It is not fair.

Mr. Chairman: You should not feel that way. What he is saying is with reference to what you said earlier. You said that it is a clever forgery. This question has much relevance. You should not say that he is putting something in your mouth.

Shri Jagjit Singh: What I meant to say was this. If one sees it, at first sight without proper scrutiny, it may look as if it is my signature. But if you see it more closely, it is not so. For example, I can say one thing here. The signature is before me. Normally, I always

dot the "i" in my name. There is no dot on the "i" here. There are other ways also where the signature differs in detail. If you see it casually, you will say it is signed by "Jagjit Singh." That is what I meant.

Shri B. R. Shukla: It purports to bear the signature of "Jagjit Singh." But I want to know whether a person who is not very much acquainted with your hand-writing would be likely to be deceived by the apparent similarity in the forged signature and your genuine signature.

Shri Jagjit Singh: By casual examination, it might mislead anybody.

Shri B. R. Shukla: Would you be in a position to suggest or speculate as to which possible enemy of yours is responsible for this forged letter?

Shri Jagjit Singh: Shri Madan Lal Negi or his brothers.

Shri B. R. Shukla: Can you suggest as to who has forged your signature?

Shri Jagjit Singh: That I cannot say.

Shri Shyamnandan Mishra: May I put it to the witness that so far as the first paragraph and its factual portion is concerned, if such a report were made by any member of the Managing Committee, would the witness say that it would be an incorrect report?

Shri Jagjit Singh: As I said, one member of their group did attend this meeting, Mr. Rallan. To this extent, it is true that one out of three members from the other side, from Mr. Jagjis side, only attended the meeting. Out of 9 members, 3 members were from other group and 6 members were with me. Out of those 3 members, only 1 member from the other side attended the meeting. The other 2 members did not attend the meeting.

Shri Shyamnandan Mishra: I am speaking about factual portion of it. I ask: Would the first paragraph stand in tact if a report of this nature were made by any member of the Managing Committee?

Shri Jagjit Singh: Factually, one out of the three members attended the meeting. That is correct.

Shri Shyamnandan Mishra: Another question which I would like to put to the witness is: Is it a fact that for every meeting of the Managing Committee you requisition the police force to be present?

Shri Jagjit Singh: Never.

Shri Shyamnandan Mishra: For the General Body meeting?

Shri Jagjit Singh: Yes. That happens once in a year.

Shri Shyamnandan Mishra: When any application is made by any person for a plot, is there any column in the application for introduction by a member of the Society?

Shri Jagjit Singh: Yes.

Shri Shyamnandan Mishra: Would you kindly say who was the Member who introduced Mrs. Masani (in the application)? I have made a mention of a specific case. Would you be good enough to provide relevant information in respect of 60 members? Name of the Member and the person who introduced may be given.

Is a candidate supported by a Member at the meeting or any members at the meeting when the application is taken up for consideration? Is it a practice that some members should support the application of a particular person?

Shri Jagjit Singh: The application form itself contains the name of the Member and the person who is introducing the member and when the Managing Committee considers the entire bunch of applications then they take a view as to who are to be enrolled and given the vacancy and it is a collective committee decision.

Shri Shyamnandan Mishra: If a particular case is put up for consideration after introduction and support by the members, then the Committee takes up the case. The members might be supporting or objecting the application and all these things must form part of the proceedings.

Shri Jagjit Singh: When the meeting is held, the consensus is arrived at, that these are the applications and out of these, these are the vacancies and these are the members who are going to be enrolled and those people who are present at the meeting take a collective view.

Shri Shyamnandan Mishra: Does your proceedings indicate as to who are the members who supported and who are the members who objected?

Shri Jagjit Singh: Whenever we discuss, we do not take down detail notes of what happened. We only record the decisions. Our procedure is that the minutes of the meeting must be finished at the meeting itself. They are not be sent subsequently. In long hand

the Secretary writes the decisions on every item and every member signs at the end having accepted or dissented. We never leave it for further typing.

Shri Shyamnandan Mishra: If a member wants to challenge the proceedings of a particular meeting, what is the basis on which he can challenge?

Shri Jagjit Singh: He cannot challenge the proceedings. When the decision on an item is taken, he can only say that he does not agree with the decision. In some cases they dissent.

Shri Shyamnandan Mishra: If I go to the Court and I say that in a particular meeting it was decided and these were the persons who voted in favour and these were the persons who voted against and there is incorrect representation of the proceedings and there was my objection which had not been recorded, how is the Chairman of the Committee going to prove to the Court whether the objection of the Member is right or wrong?

Shri Jagjit Singh: If a member objects to the decision, he writes that in the Minute Book there and then.

Shri Shyamnandan Mishra: Would you kindly let us know the objections, if any, recorded with regard to all these 60 applications?

Shri Jagjit Singh: There were no objections recorded.

Shri Shyamnandan Mishra: Would you be good enough to supply us the proceedings of the 25th January and 29th April meetings.

Shri Jagjit Singh: I shall submit.

Shri Shyamnandan Mishra: Any candidate can get information in regard to a plot from the source available to him privately. It all depends upon the private sources of a candidate. Do you think that it is a satisfactory method and that is a system that prevails in the case of other societies?

Shri Jagjit Singh: Yes. Managing Committee's mandate is derived from its existing members. Suppose there are 1000 members of our society and they elect the Managing Committee. We were nominated and not elected. As nominated members we have to bear in mind the wishes of 1000 members and their interests we are supposed to watch. I can say very fairly and squarely that in getting the people of eminence enrolled as our member, we fulfilled at the wishes of a vast majority of existing members who feel that we should have people of status and eminence.

Shri Shyamnandan Mishra: That is a matter of opinion.

Shri Jagjit Singh: Being a private society I beg to submit that it is not obligatory for us to advertise or give wider publicity when a vacancy arises or follow the procedure put or laid down for public institutions.

Vasant Vihar managing committee gets applications and they do not worry about the date of application.

Mr. Chairman: Whether your procedure includes wider publicity to be given or not.

Shri Jagjit Singh: No.

Shri Shyamnandan Mishra: Since you have been stressing that it is a private society, may I know what kind of control is being exercised by the public authorities including the Lt. Governor.

Shri Jagjit Singh: Accounts are audited by the Registrar of Co-operative Societies.

There are certain rules laid down *i.e.* no Society should not enrol a member whose affidavit is not submitted. That is enforced by the D.D.A. There are certain rules, for example, if a man wants to transfer his plot in the name of his son, then the Society can do so provided the administration approves it. The applications are sent to the D.D.A. and after approval is received from them, the transfer is effected. This is the type of control we exercise.

Shri Shyamnandan Mishra: Now, would you kindly supply us with the information regarding the nature of the functions and the control that is being exercised by the public authority including the Co-operative Society other than the Lt. Governor? That will give us a full idea about the functions and control that are being exercised by the public authority including the Registrar of Society.

Shri Jagjit Singh: The public authority is mostly the Registrar of the Society. Lt. Governor comes into the picture as a Chairman of D.D.A.

Mr. Chairman: Can your Constitution throw some light in regard to the functions of other officers like Registrar, etc.?

Shri Jagjit Singh: No, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: I think there is no constitutional provision.

Shri Jagjit Singh: It is only governed by the Co-operative Act.

Shri Shyamnandan Mishra: The second paragraph mentions about the Registrar of Co-operative Society and I have to put it in this way.

Shri Jagjit Singh: That is under the Co-operative Society.

Shri Shyamnandan Mishra: Now that the Co-operative Society might have laid down certain rules, I want to know about the working and functions of the society on various subjects.

Shri Jagjit Singh: No, Sir. There is nothing like that. But I just now said about its functions and control in one sentence. That is all.

Shri Shyamnandan Mishra: You can give it in a note form.

Shri Jagjit Singh: I have already described it, Sir.

Shri Shyamnandan Mishra: Now, in respect of these 60 cases, whether any objection has been raised by the Registrar of the Co-operative Society or the Lt. Governor?

Shri Jagjit Singh: No, Sir. On the other hand, I have got the approval.

Shri Shyamnandan Mishra: So, he could have raised objection or given approval.

Shri Jagjit Singh: I have the approval and there is no question of objection.

Shri Shyamnandan Mishra: Whatever their opinions on these 60 cases, could they be made available to us?

Shri Jagjit Singh: I have got the approval of the Lt. Governor.

Mr. Chairman: Whose approval do you mean?

Shri Jagjit Singh: Registrar of Co-operative Society and the Lt. Governor.

Shri Shyamnandan Mishra: What did they have to say about these 60 cases?

Shri Jagjit Singh: I have got the file with me. If you want I can show it to you, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: He probably means the Registrar.

Shri Jagjit Singh: Registrar has nothing to do with it.

Shri Shyamnandan Mishra: This is extremely important.

Mr. Chairman: In a normal process for allotment of plot, Registrar has nothing to do.

Shri Shyamnandan Mishra: He says he has got the approval. Could we see that?

Shri Jagjit Singh: Yes, Sir.

Shri Shyamnandan Mishra: Now these applications must have been sent for approval of the Chairman.

Shri Jagjit Singh: Yes, Sir.

Shri Shyamnandan Mishra: Now could we see those applications?

Shri Jagjit Singh: Yes, Sir. The file is with you now. The applications are in the same file.

Mr. Chairman: Whatever documents you have got, kindly provide copies of those documents for our records.

Shri Jagjit Singh: Yes, Sir.

Shri Shyamnandan Mishra: Now, in certain cases membership was cancelled. The membership of some persons was cancelled because there were some lapses. Could we get details of the cancellation of the membership?

Shri Jagjit Singh: Yes, Sir. We would give a list of persons whose membership has been concealed. There are only two reasons for cancellation. One is inability to file the proper affidavit. There are 42 Members. The other is delay in payment. There are 39 cases. Out of those 39 cases, 14 were given additional time by the Supreme Court and were restored.

Shri Shyamnandan Mishra: I want to see the cancellation proceedings.

Shri Jagjit Singh: The proceedings are with the Managing Committee. When they are received back, copies will be made and supplied.

Shri Chintamani Panigrahi: Was there any query from you to the Lt. Governor with regard to all these things happening in the Society for which his name was brought before Parliament including your name? -

Shri Jagjit Singh: I got a telephone call from his Private Secretary asking me whether I had written any letter to him (Lt. Governor). I told him, of course, I had not written any letter to him.

Shri Chintamani Panigrahi: When did you receive it?

Shri Jagjit Singh: When this question came up in Parliament, that is, on the 9th May, if I remember correctly.

Shri Chintamani Panigrahi: He telephoned you on the 9th?

Shri Jagjit Singh: His Private Secretary rang me up to say that there was a question in Parliament and whether I had written any letter to the Lt. Governor.

Shri Chintamani Panigrahi: Even before that, the name of the Lt. Governor was also brought in the proceedings of the Parliament with regard to the activities of your co-operative society. Was there any query from the Lt. Governor to you?

Shri Jagjit Singh: Before that, there was no query.

Shri Chintamani Panigrahi: As you have said that you are suffering from mental torture, did you discuss this thing with the Lt. Governor?

Shri Jagjit Singh: No.

Shri Chintamani Panigrahi: There are three facts: (1) the meeting was held on 29th and the resolution was passed and you succeeded in making the resolution passed, because one member out of three was present.

Shri Jagjit Singh: He also did not disagree with this resolution that was passed. In the beginning he was saying that we should not hold this meeting, but when I said that this was to be held to form a committee, he did not say anything and agreed.

Shri Chintamani Panigrahi: Did you ever contact the Lt. Governor?

Shri Jagjit Singh: There was no need.

Shri M. C. Daga: Can you put your signatures 4-5 times on a blank paper?

Shri Jagjit Singh: Yes, I will put.

(A blank paper was given to the witness and he put his signatures 4-5 times).

Shri M. C. Daga: Have you seen this photostat copy?

Shri Jagjit Singh: Yesterday, I saw it.

Shri M. C. Daga: Kindly see it.

(A photostat copy was given to him).

What are the peculiarities in the spelling? Do you find any changes?

Shri Jagjit Singh: Spelling is all right.

Shri M. C. Daga: What about this punctuation?

Shri Jagjit Singh: I normally put a 'dot' on the top of "i" here, there is no dot.

Shri M. C. Daga: Do you write 'J' as capital?

Shri Jagjit Singh: Yes, Sir.

Shri M. C. Daga: Sometimes or always?

Shri Jagjit Singh: Always.

Shri M. C. Daga: Are you a subscriber to this paper (A paper was shown to him)?

Shri Jagjit Singh: No, Sir.

Shri M. C. Daga: How did you get it?

Shri Jagjit Singh: Someone said that this thing had appeared in it and then I asked him to get me a copy.

Shri M. C. Daga: Who was that body?

Shri Jagjit Singh: I think he is Mr. B. N. Seth.

Shri M. C. Daga: As soon as you saw this news in the paper, since then, did you ever try to go to Mr. Vajpayee and tell him that this point was raised in the Parliament?

Shri Jagjit Singh: Well, it did not occur to me when I read the newspaper report in the *Times of India*. At that time, I thought, the best thing I could do was to write a letter to the Speaker, and as I mentioned earlier, I did it immediately.

Shri M. C. Daga: Did you ever talk to Mr. Vajpayee?

Shri Jagjit Singh: No, Sir. I think it might have been better if I had a talk with him. But, it did not occur to me to do so.

Shri M. C. Daga: Did you also enquire from any Member of Parliament how this thing had happened and how the question came up in Parliament?

Shri Jagjit Singh: I happen to know Mr. Shashi Bhushan and Mr. Mahavir Tyagi also is a member of our society. I did ask him as well as few other friends and they told me that this matter was referred to the Privileges Committee and that I would be summoned, before it. I was also told that the Committee consist of very eminent persons and great intellectuals. They said 'You tell them the truth and everything will be cleared up'. They also said 'They will enquire into it, they will go into it no doubt; you have to do nothing at this stage; you wait for the summons of the Privileges Committee and if you tell them the truth, they will protect you and see that nothing happens.'

Shri M. C. Daga: You called upon Mr. Shashi Bhusan or he came to you.

Shri Jagjit Singh: I called on him and a few other Members of Parliament and they all said that.

Shri M. C. Daga: On what date?

Shri Jagjit Singh: I do not remember.

Shri M. C. Daga: Within a week?

Shri Jagjit Singh: A few days after that.

Shri M. C. Daga: Why did you not address any letter to the Editor of *Hindustan Times* or *Motherland*?

Shri Jagjit Singh: I did address a letter to *Motherland*.

Shri M. C. Daga: Was it published?

Shri Jagjit Singh: It was published.

Shri M. C. Daga: On what date?

Shri Jagjit Singh: They published it on the 13th.

Shri M. C. Daga: Did you get any reply?

Shri Jagjit Singh: I sent the letter and it was acknowledged on my file.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: Mr. Jagjit Singh, you have got a very easy access, rather a ready access to the Lt. Governor of Delhi. Have you not?

Shri Jagjit Singh: I am a retired senior Government officer. Normally, I have access to all the Officers. I was the Chairman of the IDPL. If I ring up any officer, for an interview or a meeting, they normally agree. It is not that I have access only to the Lt. Governor. This is because of my past service.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: Because of your acquaintance with the present incumbent of the office of the Lt. Governor, you can write confidential letters to him although matters do not relate to you personally?

Shri Jagjit Singh: No. I do not do that.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: But, you did that in respect of a letter that you wrote on the 26th January, 1974?

Shri Jagjit Singh: That related to an official matter of the society. I am the President of the Society. As President of the Society, I wrote to him.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: Therefore, although, it did not relate to you personally, in respect of matters connected with the Society, official matters of the Society, you thought that you could write to him confidentially?

Shri Jagjit Singh: Yes.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: Although you had nothing to do with it in your personal capacity, as such. It is not your personal matter. But, you chose to write to him in a confidential manner, with the inscription 'confidential'.

Shri Jagjit Singh: I explained earlier why I made this. . . .

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: I am not going into that question. We have heard you. The letter was written on the 26th January, 1974, a national holiday and it was addressed to the Chairman, Delhi Development Authority, Indra Prastha Estate, New Delhi. So, it was meant to reach the Indra Prastha Estate.

Shri Jagjit Singh: No. It was sent to him, to his Secretariat, by a special messenger.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: What was the urgency?

Shri Jagjit Singh: The urgency was lack of money. I wanted money because no new member would pay his dues unless he is given one month's notice. DESU was threatening to stop work and if they stop work, the cost of electrification would go up.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: The matter was so urgent that you had to send it on a national holiday. You could have waited till the morning of 27th?

Shri Jagjit Singh: On national holidays also, people attend to their work. Everybody does it. I, as a Government Officer, have been doing it. National holiday does not mean that we should not do any work. If the exigencies of work require, there is no reason why on national holidays we should not do any work.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: It was addressed to his office as Chairman, DDA and it was sent to his office?

Shri Jagjit Singh: It was sent to his Secretariat by a special messenger.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: Where?

Shri Jagjit Singh: Old Secretariat Road, where his office is.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: Not to Indra Prastha Estate?

Shri Jagjit Singh: No.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: Not to the DDA Office?

Shri Jagjit Singh: No. He has his office in the Old Secretariat. It was sent to his Private Secretary through a messenger.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: Who was this Messenger?

Shri Jagjit Singh: One of the Society's staff.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: Did you obtain a receipt? Was any receipt obtained for this letter?

Shri Jagjit Singh: Receipt might have been obtained. I do not have it on the file.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: From the letter of the Lt. Governor, which you produced today it appears on the very same day, 26th, a reply came.

Shri Jagjit Singh: Reply came to me on the next day, 27th.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: But, it was dated 26th.

Shri Jagjit Singh: Yes.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: With ref. nos?

Shri Jagjit Singh: Yes.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: Can you explain how could that be dated 26th?

Shri Jagjit Singh: I did not do it. I can only surmise this. Normally an Officer works in the evening, he has his steno and gives the dictation. The steno types the date on which he gets the dictation.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: Is it not a fact you made it known to the Lt. Governor that you wanted the approval on that day?

Shri Jagjit Singh: I told him that I was in great distress and I needed money. I have to give one month's notice to the members because they would not pay me Rs. 25,000 per plot straightway unless they were given notice.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: You told him that you wanted his approval on that day? That was not in the letter. You must have been in communication with him otherwise.

Shri Jagjit Singh: I told him earlier that the matter was urgent and I wanted his clearance.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: And to oblige the Society and you, it appears that the Governor's Secretariat was opened, approval was given for 60 names and a letter was drafted with reference no.....

Shri Jagjit Singh: And delivered to me the next day.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: By hand?

Shri Jagjit Singh: Yes.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: To oblige you that was done?

Shri Jagjit Singh: Yes.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: Have you seen this letter which you have denied? Is this the Society's letter-head?

Shri Jagjit Singh: It is the old letter-head. The present letter-head of the Society is different.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: But, this is one of the letter-heads. Is this the letter-head?

Shri Jagjit Singh: Could be.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: Either say 'Yes' or 'No'.

Shri Jagjit Singh: The present letter-head that we are using is different.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: But, this is a old form.

Shri Jagjit Singh: May I have a look at it? This letter-head, as you will see, has the address '1/24, Bansi House, Asaf Ali Road'. Ever since I took over, my office is not in this premises. This is the premises of the old Managing Committee. Ever since I took over, the address of the Society has been '96 Mathura Road, New Delhi.'

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: Is this one of the letter-heads of the Society?

Shri Jagjit Singh: It is an old form of the Society.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: Did you see this photo-stat copy much before this matter was referred to the Privileges Committee or around that time?

Shri Jagjit Singh: I had seen it in the "Motherland".

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: You had never raised any objection or made any point, that this was not the letter-head of the Society.

Shri Jagjit Singh: That is not a very relevant thing. The main relevant thing is that I had not written the letter. At the time I wrote my letter to the Speaker and to the Editor of the "Motherland", I simply said that this letter was not my letter at all.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: So far as correspondence with the Government is concerned, you did not put any reference number. You treat them as your personal letters. Is it so?

Shri Jagjit Singh: I keep the important files in my personal custody.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: You do not put any reference number, although they are official letters.

Shri Jagjit Singh: On that letter, there is no reference number.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: I am not asking about this letter or any particular letter.

Mr. Chairman: This is a general question.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: In your letter to the Lt. Governor as Chairman of the D.D.A., did you put any reference number?

Shri Jagjit Singh: No.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: But this letter of the 26th January was a very important one for your purposes. Did you not think that it should be treated as an official letter? If so, why did you not put a reference number?

Shri Jagjit Singh: It is not a personal letter; but when it is kept in my personal file, I thought there was no need for a reference number.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: Have you got any authority from the managing committee of the Society to keep the Society's papers in your personal custody?

Shri Jagjit Singh: Yes; all records are kept in the office. But certain records are with us because we are responsible to members of the managing committee for their safe custody.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: I wanted to know whether there is any resolution passed by the managing committee authorizing the Society's papers and documents to be kept in the personal custody of the President.

Shri Jagjit Singh: This question never arose. Therefore, no resolution was passed. It is obvious that as responsible persons, we felt that instead of keeping them with the office, some important papers have to be kept in our personal custody for greater security.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: Did you ever constitute an enquiry as to how a Society's letter-head could be used by some unauthorized person, as it is supposed to have happened in this case?

Shri Jagjit Singh: I did not think there was need for any enquiry.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: Is this the control that you are enforcing over your Society? This old letter-head is used by somebody; till to-day you have not thought it fit, as a responsible person in charge of the Society, to find out how the Society's letter-head could be misused by anybody.

Shri Jagjit Singh: I wanted to say that the people who have posted these letters, were originally the controllers of the Society

and they had these forms with them already. What enquiry can I undertake in order to prevent them, before they handed over charge?

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: You never tried to find out from the previous people.

Shri Jagjit Singh: I know who has done it. Those people had the forms.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: Is it your definite view?

Shri Jagjit Singh: Yes.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: Don't be so anxious. Is it your definite case that this is a forged letter?

Shri Jagjit Singh: Yes, Sir.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: Is it your definite case that you know as to who has done it?

Shri Jagjit Singh: I can reasonably surmise as to who is the author.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: Who is the author?

Shri Jagjit Singh: Mr. Madan Lal Jaggi and/or his brothers.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: Have you taken any steps to lodge any complaint with anybody, that somebody is forging your signature and using your name for the purpose?

Shri Jagjit Singh: I have not lodged any complaint.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: Why not? Your prestige and reputation are being questioned.

Shri Jagjit Singh: I do not know what I can achieve by lodging complaints. My experience is that it only adds to my troubles. One paper was forged in Bombay and a criminal case was lodged against me. I lodged a complaint both in Bombay and Delhi. To this day, nothing has been heard.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: This is your explanation. Now, so far as the first para of this letter is concerned, you have already admitted that factually, the statements are substantially correct.

Shri Jagjit Singh: I said that factually, the meeting was held. I did not say that the statements were ever made by me. No such thing. I have no connection with this.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: Why are you so keen all the time to show your disconnection? I have put a simple question.

Shri Jagjit Singh: It is because all the time you have asked me as to whether I have anything to do with it.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: We are trying to find out the necessary information.

Mr. Chairman: Naturally, Dr. Singh, one who cross-examines you, will put such questions.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: I am not either for or against anybody. I am only trying to find out. There was a meeting on the 29th April. You said that there was another set of people. The other set consists of three members of the managing committee.

Shri Jagjit Singh: I had also said that although we had no authority to hold the meeting in the beginning, when the resolution fixing the date was passed, he said nothing and agreed to it.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: May be so; but he raised the objection.

Shri Jagjit Singh: In the beginning, yes. In fact, he also withdrew the objection later when he agreed to the resolution without dissent.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: At about that time, namely the first week of May, there was a great deal of comments in the newspapers about the Society. Was it not so?

Shri Jagjit Singh: Yes; even earlier I think.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: At about this time, there were considerable comments and publications of reports.

Shri Jagjit Singh: A little earlier also.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: And the matter had gone to the court.

Shri Jagjit Singh: It was much earlier.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: At that time, it was pending.

Shri Jagjit Singh: Even now, it is pending.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: It was also before the question was raised in Parliament; but please forget the privilege issue.

Shri Jagjit Singh: Yes.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: Therefore, if it is said that the matter was before Parliament and the papers, it is factually correct.

Shri Jagjit Singh: Yes.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: You said you were keen to take the 60 members and you wanted them to continue as members.

Shri Jagjit Singh: That was in January and they had been taken by February.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: At that time also, in the first week of May, you wanted them to continue as members.

Shri Jagjit Singh: They were actually continuing before May.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: You have said that you are keen even here-after, to continue as the Chairman of the Society.

Shri Jagjit Singh: Yes; I stood for the election because the case is coming up before the Supreme Court; and if I do not defend it, all the steps that we have been taking, would be undone.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: We can understand it if somebody feels that because of the discussions in the Parliament, publications of reports in the newspapers and these court cases, it is all the more necessary that the authority should not desert the Society also. It was very necessary.

Shri Jagjit Singh: Yes.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: I was usual for people to think; and you would also naturally be interested in getting the support of the Lt. Governor. Please forget about the letter.

Shri Jagjit Singh: Yes.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: You were in very close terms with the Lt. Governor. You can get things done through telephone from him.

Shri Jagjit Singh: I did not say that I can get things done through telephone. I had said that if while speaking through the telephone to his PAs they would accommodate me to give me time to see him.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: You can get a very important decision taken by the Chairman of the DDA who happens to be the Lt. Governor of Delhi in a matter of a few hours and even on a national holiday you can get it done. That shows your ready access to the Lt. Governor and you can speak to him on the telephone although you have written to him a letter. There is nothing wrong in ex-

pecting the Ld. Governor, that is, the official machinery to stand by you and support you as well as the Registrar of Co-operative Societies. There is nothing wrong in believing that, in your position. You were also very keen that the meeting should go through with the new elections. Otherwise your term would expire and because the matter is before the Parliament and everyday things are coming in the newspapers, what was wrong in thinking, 'Let the Parliament session come to an end. At least these things will not come out in the newspapers.' A person in your position tells that in the second week of May. What was wrong there?

Shri Jagjit Singh: What was right about that? After all, if the Parliament was closing in the middle of May, it would reopen after a while.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: 'Almost every day this was featuring in Parliament.' Obviously it was not to your liking and not very complementary things were being said. Therefore, obviously you were not enjoying that.

Shri Jagjit Singh: The point was that even if I did not enjoy these things, how can I save myself or anybody by writing such a letter?

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: Again, you are thinking of this letter. I am not asking that.

A person placed in your position would think, 'Every day I find the Parliament is discussing this; making comments and strictures which are given very wide publicity in the newspapers. Now that Parliament will not be in session for 2-3 months, these will not be discussed.'

Shri Jagjit Singh: I do not think there is anything right about this thinking. This will not save the situation. If I think that way, would the Parliament stop thinking? I think it would be very silly of me to think so.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: That was not for public consumption. Supposing you have written this letter, you are writing to your intimate friend. . .

Shri Jagjit Singh: He is not my intimate friend. I only know him.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: A person in a position in the Government with whom you had some close contacts.

Shri Jagjit Singh: Yes, I had contacts with him.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: So far as the application from Mrs. Masani is concerned, what was the application from her?

Shri Jagjit Singh: That was in January.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee: Therefore, in this letter, the portion to which you object is some reference to probable exploitation by the Parliament. Apart from that, what is the other thing you could not have written.

Shri Jagjit Singh: I think the whole matter is being put in a very different way. It is being made as if the bulk of the statement made in this alleged letter could have arisen in my mind and from the fact that they could have arisen, I therefore, I would have written it also is a very short step. I totally deny the letter which is completely a fabrication and if some of the facts stated are really true, it does not mean that I would think of putting them together and sending a letter. It will be very silly for me to say that this will stop the things in the Parliament.

Secondly, may I tell you that even if I am foolish enough to write a letter like this, I would not be more foolish to compound my folly by denying it. If I had written a letter, I would say that I have written it. It is a foolish letter.

Mr. Chairman: You said some cases are pending in the Delhi High Court and also in the Supreme Court concerning the affairs of your co-operative society. What is the nature of the case, for instance, in the Delhi High Court?

Shri Jagjit Singh: In the Supreme Court there are two writ petitions filed by these people. Both are the same and it is about the old elected committee which was removed by Dr. A. N. Jha that the removal was illegal and unconstitutional and that his act of removal should be revoked and the committee which was nominated should be suspended, and that whatever action in the meantime the committee has taken should be treated as *null and void*. This writ petition they have filed both in the High Court and the Supreme Court though parallel litigation is not allowed. There is another suit filed in the Delhi High Court where they had challenged the award given by the Lt. Governor in the dispute between the Society and the Managing Committee though the society had accepted it earlier. The suit was dismissed by the Delhi High Court but they have filed another appeal against the dismissal and that is pending.

Mr. Chairman: When sensitive matters concerning your society are being raised in both the High Court and the Supreme Court, do

you think that writing an article concerning your Society is in a well-publicised weekly is called for? I know, it is a rejoinder?

Shri Jagjit Singh: It is a rejoinder. Actually, to be frank, I had written an article with the same title in September last year. Then it was accepted by the editor for publication but before he could put it, I asked him to send it back because on the very point you have raised that as the whole thing is before the court, I thought let me not ventilate my private frustration in the press and in a well-circulated paper. He sent it back. When this article appeared—'Landed Gentry in Delhi', I felt that I should not let my case go by default. I sent a very guarded reply. As you might have read, I have not said what I might have said just for that very reason and I have just given a very bare outline of the abuses of our democratic system by people with resources and access.

Mr. Chairman: Don't you think that there is a possibility of some one raising the point that you have written on matters now being agitated before judicial bodies?

Shri Jagjit Singh: I have not raised any question either about the Parliament or the Judiciary.

Mr. Chairman: Leave alone the question of privilege before this committee. I am just putting this question with reference to the issues that are being raised before the High Court and the Supreme Court.

Shri Jagjit Singh: I have not raised anything about a matter which is *sub judice* either in the Supreme Court or the High Court.

Mr. Chairman: What made you to present the copy of the Illustrated Weekly of India yesterday to this Committee? What was the object behind this?

Shri Jagjit Singh: The object was to make this hon. Committee aware of the sort of assaults and harassments I am being put to.

Mr. Chairman: You have already given your specimen signatures. But, I would suggest that you write out in your own handwriting the letter that you have written to the Speaker. That letter has no relevance but, that would help us. There was a suggestion that you write out in your own handwriting the letter that you wrote to the Lt. Governor. Perhaps, there may be some sentimental objection for you to write that. But I would only suggest that you write in long hand a copy of the letter you have written to the Speaker in your own handwriting.

Shri Jagjit Singh: That is a typed letter to the Speaker.

Mr. Chairman: We want to have something in your own hand. We thought that it would do if you write down in your own hand the letter that you have sent to the Hon. Speaker.

Shri Jagjit Singh: You suggest to me that I should write it in long hand. I shall give you just now.

Shri Shyamnandan Mishra: Please assure him that there is no animus. We are Members of Parliament and we may belong to one or the other party. Whichever party we may belong, we are Members of this Committee and we are not after his blood. Tell him that we were not after his blood.

Shri Jagjit Singh: I may tell you the reason. I did not do many of the things which you thought I should have done because I had full confidence in this august Committee that it would be fair to me. There are many many eminent and intellectual people like Prof. Mukherjee, Dr. Sharma and many others and I have not the slightest doubt that they would be fair to me.

Mr. Chairman: My colleagues want to make clear one thing. We may belong to different political parties; but, when we sit here, as members of Privilege Committee, we bring to bear on the work of the Privilege Committee utmost of objectivity and impartiality transcending party loyalties. Questions are raised in the interest only of bringing out truth. All of us are interested in finding out the truth and nothing else.

Shri Jagjit Singh: Thank you, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: Will you kindly withdraw to the adjoining room and write in your own hand the letter that you have sent to the Speaker?

Shri Jagjit Singh: Yes, Sir.

The witness withdrew.

The Committee then adjourned.

Wednesday, the 11th December, 1974

PRESENT

Dr. Henry Austin—*Chairman*

MEMBERS

2. Shri K. G. Deshmukh
3. Shri Papatlal M. Joshi
4. Shri Shyamnandan Mishra
5. Shri Chintamani Panigrahi

SECRETARIAT

Shri Y. Sahai—*Chief Legislative Committee officer*

Shri J. R. Kapur—*Senior Legislative Committee Officer*

WITNESS

Shri Baleshwar Prasad, *Ex. Lt. Governor of Delhi.*

(The Committee met at 15.00 hours)

Evidence of Shri Baleshwar Prasad, Ex. Lt. Governor of Delhi

(oath taken by the witness)

Mr. Chairman: You were the Lt. Governor of Delhi.

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: From which date?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: 24th March, 1972. I am on leave from 5th October, 1974.

Mr. Chairman: Is it preparatory to retirement?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: This is not preparatory to retirement. I am on leave on expiry of which I have resigned.

Mr. Chairman: Are you in Delhi?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: I am in Patna.

Shri Chintamani Panigrahi: Did you come in contact with the New Friends Cooperative House Bldg. Society since 1972, as you assumed office?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: Yes.

Shri Chintamani Panigrahi: Did you receive letters from them off and on?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: I do not think, I have received many communications from the Society; may be one or two.

Shri Chintamani Panigrahi: What was the subject?

Shri Baleswar Prasad: One was about the selection of members of the society, that had come to me. And I do not recollect, there is any other communication which I had received as such. I had issued a communication about extending the term of the Committee.

Shri Chintamani Panigrahi: When did you receive their first letter

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: I would not be able to say the date. I think, it was some time in 1974.

Shri Chintamani Panigrahi: Do you recollect the date?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: No.

Shri Chintamani Panigrahi: You received only one communication.

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: That is what I recollect.

Shri Chintamani Panigrahi: Can there be more letters?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: I cannot say if the Delhi Administration has got any.

Shri Chintamani Panigrahi: Here is a copy of the letter of the Friends Cooperative Society. Did you receive their letters in this form? You look to the pad only, you are not concerned with the letter. (A Photostat copy of a letter was shown).

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: I cannot tell you anything. I do not think I have received many letters of this kind. Unless I compare with the letter I received, I cannot tell you about the pool. I got only one letter. That was a communication with regard to the members that the society wanted to enrol which needed my reply.

Shri Chintamani Panigrahi: You do not remember the form of that letter.

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: No, I can not tell you.

Shri Chintamani Panigrahi: We may have to get that letter.

Was there any difficulty with regard to the society that came to your notice in February, March or April, 1974?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: The society had difficulties all along. It is not a question of 1974 alone. I think, all the time I was in office, there was some trouble or the other.

Mr. Chairman: That means, almost from the date of assumption of your office, you knew this. What was the first source of your information of these difficulties?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: That was when the old defunct society Managing Committee people had come to see me.

Mr. Chairman: What was the date?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: Sometimes towards the middle or end of 1972. There was some arbitration which was done by my predecessor. They wanted that matter to be settled. There was lot of litigation going in between the Society and the old committee. That was the first time.

Mr. Chairman: Are there any proceedings about the steps you took?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: That was a matter to be decided by the court.

Mr. Chairman: You said that they met you and sought your good offices to follow the steps taken by your predecessor in office towards settlement.

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: These were people who were old managing Committee members of the society. They had come to see me that this matter should be settled because it had been going on for long.

Mr. Chairman: Is there any record available in your office about your initiative when you met these people?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: Actually, there would be no proceedings for this. They came to see me and they mentioned this to me. I told them that this was a matter for the court.

Mr. Chairman: Was there any correspondence since then?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: No.

Shri Chintamani Panigrahi: The communication received from the Society was with regard to the formation of the Committee?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: No, the communication was about taking in of new Members and not the formation of the Committee, because the formation was done long time ago.

Shri Chintamani Panigrahi: Only for taking new Members?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: Yes, and not for the formation of the Committee because the Committee was already there when I came; I had only to extend its life because it was expiring.

Shri Chintamani Panigrahi: What was the contention of the old Members who had registered this complaint?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: Cases were going on for some time. My predecessor had done some adjudication with the old Members and

he had given some award; they were saying that this award should be set aside.

Shri Chintamani Panigrahi: When did you come into contact with Shri Jagjit Singh?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: That must be at the time when the question of extension of the life of the Committee came up.

Shri Chintamani Panigrahi: When did it come to your notice?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: I cannot tell you; that I will have to look into the records.

Shri Chintamani Panigrahi: That reference would be helpful to us.

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: This can be found out from the records where the life of the Committee has been extended because there was a notification about it.

Shri Chintamani Panigrahi: In regard to the inclusion of additional Members, how many Members were to be taken in?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: They had sent some names; it is a matter of documents.

Shri Chintamani Panigrahi: When this controversy was accentuated, it came to your notice in March 1974?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: What type of controversy?

Shri Chintamani Panigrahi: It went to court; then it was discussed in the Parliament and a meeting was called for etc. You must be aware of all these things.

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: I had nothing to do with meetings.

Shri Chintamani Panigrahi: The Cooperative Society must have called a meeting for taking in new Members?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: That is for the Society.

Shri Chintamani Panigrahi: Did they inform you?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: They sent a letter to me saying they want to take so many new Members.

Shri Chintamani Panigrahi: Can you show us the letter?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: The letter is in the office Record.

Shri Chintamani Panigrahi: That letter will be helpful to us if you have got it.

Now, Shri Jagjit Singh met you personally to know your opinion as to how the meeting should be convened etc?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: Actually, I have nothing to do with the functioning of the Society. The Society holds its own meetings and I have nothing to do with them.

Shri Chintamani Panigrahi: Don't you give any advice?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: No.

Shri Chintamani Panigrahi: But here is a letter which says "As desired by you....." etc.

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: There is no occasion for the Society to ask my advice to hold meetings.

Shri Chintamani Panigrahi: Then, it was in the month of April that there was this riot and all those things?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: There was a riot.

Shri Chintamani Panigrahi: There was a notice in the newspapers that a meeting was going to be convened?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: I don't recollect what was the date: it must be there in the records.

Shri Chintamani Panigrahi: How many were the Members who were agitating against Shri Jagjit Singh's actions in the meeting.

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: I won't be able to tell you.

Shri Chintamani Panigrahi: Do you know when this meeting was held—in the month of April or May?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: There was a meeting but I do not know when it was held.

Shri Popatlal M. Joshi: When did you first come into contact with Shri Jagjit Singh in respect of the Society's affairs?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: I came in contact with him only in respect of the Society's affairs and that was here in Delhi. I did not know Shri Jagjit Singh before that; it was only when the term of the Managing Committee of the Society expired.

Shri Popatlal M. Joshi: When?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: I cannot tell you the exact date, but perhaps it was during 1972.

Shri Popatlal M. Joshi: About a month back?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: May be some time in 1972, because extension was to be given to the new Management Committee appointed by my predecessor.

Shri Popatlal M. Joshi: How many times did you see Shri Jagjit Singh during your tenure?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: May be three or four times.

Shri Popatlal M. Joshi: Do you remember what talks he had with you?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: I won't be able to remember everything.

Shri Popatlal M. Joshi: Any minutes?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: No.

Shri Popatlal M. Joshi: Any communication?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: Not, excepting the one I told you about.

Shri Popatlal M. Joshi: Have you written any letter to him?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: No; except the reply to the communication that came to me, I have not written any letter.

Shri Popatlal M. Joshi: What do you do for keeping a record as to whether you have written or not written or whether you have received or not received a letter?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: All receipts and dispatches are there in my office record.

Shri Popatlal M. Joshi: Did you see the register today or within this week before coming here?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: No, I have not seen any.

Shri Popatlal M. Joshi: Have you seen any lawyers about the evidence?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: Nothing. This letter from the Lok Sabha Secretariat came to me and I came from Patna.

Shri Popatlal M. Joshi: Regarding your talks with Shri Jagjit Singh, there were three or four meetings with you?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: May be three or so.

Shri Popatlal M. Joshi: When was your last meeting with him?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: He came to see me.

Shri Popatlal M. Joshi: Was it in April '74 or March '74 or February '74?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: I think it was sometime in January, 74.

Shri Popatlal M. Joshi: What was the talk about? Do you remember?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: About the Membership.

Shri Popatlal M. Joshi: About the membership issue only?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: Yes.

Shri Popatlal M. Joshi: When was the issue settled?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: The issue of Membership was only this, that he had prepared a list of members and he said that this was the list of members they wanted to take and these were the plots available; it is only a formality.

Shri Popatlal M. Joshi: He showed it to you when he came to see you?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: Yes.

Shri Popatlal M. Joshi: For how much time was he there with you?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: Not long.

Shri Popatlal M. Joshi: What was the issue discussed? You must have asked whether this Member or that Member is being taken etc.?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: That is not for the Lt. Governor to ask. I did not ask because Membership is entirely a question for the Society.

Mr. Chairman: Were you at that time aware of any public criticism of the functioning of the Society—either through the Press or otherwise—when Mr. Jagjit Singh came to see you?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: There was something going on, but it was not much at that time; it was only thereafter that it became very much controversial.

Mr. Chairman: You are the Chairman of the DDA?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: Therefore, you are technically or legally responsible for the way the plots are distributed?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: Actually, the DDA has nothing to do with the distribution of plots by the society.

Mr. Chairman: Not society, but when land is distributed from the DDA, it may be given to a Co-operative Society or an individual. So, when public criticism is levelled against the way land has been distributed by Co-operatives or otherwise, it is not within the purview of your responsibility to be concerned about it?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: Land is given as such to the Society and it is for the Society to distribute it; and for that purpose, the Society comes within the purview of the Registrar of Co-operative Societies and not directly under the DDA.

Shri Popatlal M. Joshi: You have said that he must have come to you some time in January 1974. Now, can you tell us for how long he was with you?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: About 15 to 20 minutes.

Shri Popatlal M. Joshi: When you say that you have nothing to do with the Society's function, what was he talking with you for 15 to 20 minutes?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: He had written a letter. The letter had come to me. I had to go through the letter and then I had to send a reply to them.

Shri Popatlal M. Joshi: He had written to you a letter and he wanted a particular reply for which he came to you and talked about.

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: He had come to say that the Lt. Governor had formally to send a reply and that reply was given.

Shri Popatlal M. Joshi: He reminded you that the formal letter was not received.

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: He brought the letter personally.

Shri Popatlal M. Joshi: And he wanted the reply within 20 minutes and you gave him the reply.

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: Yes, I gave him the reply as it was mere formality.

Shri Popatlal M. Joshi: Is it available with you?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: It is there in the records.

Shri Popatlal M. Joshi: Certain land is given to the Society for distribution to the members of the society. Now does it not fall within your purview to see whether the plots are properly distributed according to natural justice or according to moral justice, whatever it may be?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: Actually it is not my function at all. It is the function of the society and if any member of the society has got any grievance, then he has to go to the Registrar of Co-operative Societies for adjudication.

Shri Popatlal M. Joshi: Apart from that, does it not come within your purview or authority to see whether the Society distributes the land according to natural justice?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: I am not the judicial authority to sit on judgement of natural justice or anything else.

Shri Popatlal M. Joshi: For how many years you have served the Government?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: For 20 years.

Shri Popatlal M. Joshi: What is your qualification?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: I was the member of the Indian Administrative Service and I retired in January, 1972.

Shri Popatlal M. Joshi: During your service have you not performed judicial function?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: Yes, I have performed.

Shri Popatlal M. Joshi: Now, does it not come under judicial function? And can't you give your judgement?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: So far as that judicial function is concerned, I would say that I sat as a court to perform my function. But here it is not a court.

Shri Popatlal M. Joshi: Even though it is not, don't you see that natural justice is given in this case?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: The question is about the functioning of the society.

Shri Popatlal M. Joshi: Even then, is it not necessary for you to see that natural justice is done in this case?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: It is not the question whether the land is distributed properly or whether natural justice is done. Here we have only to see the number of members and the plots that are there and the society distributes them among its members. And if anybody has any grievance, he can go to the Registrar of Co-operative Societies for justice or they can go to the Court.

Shri Popatlal M. Joshi: If they come to you, will you not do natural justice?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: I cannot do anything.

Shri Popatlal M. Joshi: What are your functions in regard to the Co-operative Societies?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: Under the Co-operative Societies Act I have got certain appellate authority.

Shri Popatlal M. Joshi: What are the powers?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: I do not remember.

Shri Popatlal M. Joshi: Cannot you tell at least some of the powers?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: I do not recollect. I cannot tell off hand. If you give me the Act, I can tell you.

Shri Popatlal M. Joshi: The functions regarding proper distribution of land come within your purview. Am I right?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: I do not think so. I think the Registrar will have to be approached and he will have to give judgement, he has got the power.

Shri Popatlal M. Joshi: The Registrar of Co-operative Societies intervenes only if they are doing anything improper or illegal, when an appeal is preferred to him. But in a distribution of land which is given to the society by the authority, if the distribution is not properly done, then your function is to interfere and see that it is properly done.

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: The co-operative societies function under the Co-operative Act enacted under the legislative power of the Government and in that there are powers defined for the Registrar as well as for the Lt. Governor. And only those functions I can perform and I recollect those functions are mostly appellate.

Shri Popatlal M. Joshi: Always an appellate authority can intervene, *suo moto* or on an appeal.

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: Well, that may not be true. That clause is there. But *suo moto*, things might arise in such a manner that somebody comes to me seeking interference and I might suggest to him to go in for an appeal.

Shri Popatlal M. Joshi: When news about this case appeared in the newspaper during the period of January 1974, did you not enquire into this matter? Did you not interfere in this matter?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: I know what the newspapers had given. I cannot comment on that. There were many things that came in the newspaper. If they are facts, well, I do not know what facts are. The matter came up after January, 1974 and after that I had nothing to do as by then the matter became *subjudice* and went to the court.

Shri Popatlal M. Joshi: Did this statement come to light after a couple of days or a couple of weeks?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: I think the whole thing started mainly after March, 1974. The matter became *sub judice* and I had nothing to do. Before it became *sub judice* I don't think there was any. I don't think there are anything worth to interfere in the matter.

Shri Popatlal M. Joshi: When did you come to know that there is something fishy in the management of society?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: The question implies so many things. You are saying that something fishy is going on. I do not think there was anything fishy.

Mr. Chairman: Before the matter came up to the Court and when the controversy was going on, did you give any judgement or did you try to rectify it?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: No. Actually it started only after the matter had gone to the court.

Shri Popatlal M. Joshi: The records and important papers connected with this case will be necessary to corroborate and contradict whatever statements were made here. The letters will also be necessary. There was a meeting with Mr. Jagjit Singh and the minutes were recorded. I want to see those papers. So I keep things pending.

Shri K. G. Deshmukh: I am concerned about your reference with this Society. First, you said that you had nothing to do with it as a Lt. Governor. Then how is it that Mr. Jagjit Singh was writing letters to you?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: There is a clause in terms of the lease for the land to the Society and that is how they (the Societies) used to

write to the Lt. Governor for formal approval for nomination of the members. That is all that we have got to communicate.

Shri K. G. Deshmukh: What is the term of the executive function of that Society?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: Under the Act of the Co-operative Societies, when there is no proper body constituted for the purposes of conducting the working of the society, then the question of appointment of a body is within the purview of the Lt. Governor. As I said, under the Act, the life of that body can be extended upto a certain maximum period.

Shri K. G. Deshmukh: Is it necessary to take your consent for calling a meeting?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: No.

Shri K. G. Deshmukh: It may or may not be true. How is it that Mr. Jagjit Singh says that on your advice, he had to call a meeting.

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: How can I say anything about this thing?

Shri K. G. Deshmukh: Did he not call any meeting?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: I had nothing to do with the meeting.

Shri K. G. Deshmukh: Is it not necessary for adding new members to the Society?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: It is.

Shri K.G. Deshmukh: Did he see you at any time in this connection?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: I do not recollect.

Shri Shyamnandan Mishra: My impression may be wrong. But the Lt. Governor has much more executive functions than any Governor in any State.

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: That is correct.

Shri Shyamnandan Mishra: That being so, what executive functions does he exercise (Lt. Governor) in matters like this? Just now, you had said that your functions in this respect can be made available from the Act. Did you have, at any time, any opportunity of exercising any executive functions in respect of the co-operative societies like this?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: As I told you, the lease deed terms of this Co-operative Society and most of the co-operative societies have provided that the list of members and all these things will have to come

to the Lt. Governor for his saying yes to them. Membership enrolment and distribution of land does not form part of the executive function of the Lt. Governor.

Shri Shyamnandan Mishra: Can we get from the record how many times did you exercise this function?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: I do not remember exactly whether such executive functions had been performed. Just now, I do not recollect them.

Shri Shyamnandan Mishra: Even in the case of the President, the President may not have executive functions in many cases, but he has got unlimited powers of receiving information. The President can command information with regard to anything, and to my mind, that is one of the most important checks that can be exercised by him. If he says that he requires such and such information, even his requiring information may act as a restraint, as a check. Does the Lt. Governor exercise any power like that, that is, of receiving information.

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: Certainly, we can ask for that information.

Shri Shyamnandan Mishra: When the matter is especially in Parliament.

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: We can take information.

Shri Shyamnandan Mishra: What did the Office of the Lt. Governor think about this matter?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: As I told you that when it went to Parliament, as an affidavit by that time, the whole thing had been before the court.

Shri Shyamnandan Mishra: That is something else. You know that there are matters in the court and yet there are matters which the Government on its own, can try to think about. The question is when this scandal was going on or raised especially in Parliament, did not the Office of the Lt. Governor think it fit to go into the matter for its own satisfaction and act in the matter in such a way that as it did not prejudice the trial before the court?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: All these matters were matters of record. There was no such thing as had to be enquired into.

Shri Shyamnandan Mishra: This matter came before the court after a certain time. But this agitation was there. As the Lt. Governor charged with the responsibility of having a clean administration in the State, did you exercise any power as Lt. Governor to probe

into it or to find out the reasons for your own satisfaction and see that the image of your State should not be tarnished?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: When this question came up before Parliament, the whole matter was gone into and the record was examined and everything was prepared and sent to the Ministry.

Shri Shyamnandan Mishra: We can get some recort from the Office of the Lt. Governor. Did you have any kind of consultation wih the Central Government, that is, the Ministry of Home Affairs with regard to this affair?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: Actually, I did not have any consultation; but the officers of the co-operative society department had some consultation with the Home Ministry.

Shri Shyamnandan Mishra: So, the minutes of the consultation would be available with the Home Ministry as well as Office of the Lt. Governor.

Shri Popatlal M. Joshi: Is the Office of the Co-operative Society under the Lt. Governor?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: Yes. You can also get the record about the affidavit that was given on behalf of the Lt. Governor in the court on this matter.

Shri Shyamnandan Mishra: Did you receive at any time any information from the co-operative society that there used to be disorders in its meetings?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: I think I had received one or two telegrams stating that there would be threats and other things in the meetings. That is all.

Shri Shyamnandan Mishra: But the President of the Society did not inform you that they were confronted with peculiar circumstances?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: No. There was a telegram from some people saying that there was some likelihood of violence in this meeting.

Shri Shyamnandan Mishra: Did the Home Ministry ask for any specific information from you on the question of admission of new members?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: No; I do not think so. But they wanted to know the whole thing; and the whole thing was sent to them.

Shri Shyamnandan Mishra: In case the President of the Society had to secure the assistance of the police, did he have to come to the Lt. Governor?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: Not necessarily; they can inform the police on their own; or they can inform the district magistrate.

Shri Shyamnandan Mishra: Did not the President of the Society tell you that there has been some complaints about the admission of new members, unnecessarily?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: No; I do not recollect.

Shri Shyamnandan Mishra: Are there no set rules of the Administration which govern the functional relationship between the Lt. Governor and the cooperative society? I am not speaking in terms of the Act.

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: Not relating to the cooperative society as such. Only the Act is there and the rules thereunder. The bye-laws of a particular Society might give them.

Shri Shyamnandan Mishra: Since the office of the Lt. Governor has been in existence for quite some time now, some administrative rules must have been developed. What kind of arrangement exists in regard to the sending of the proceedings of the meetings of the Society to the Lt. Governor?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: They are sent to the Registrar of Co-operative Societies if requested or if any Society sends itself.

Shri Shyamnandan Mishra: Are there no rules?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: There are no rules affecting the Lt. Governor, but the Registrar has got all the powers under the rules and regulations for the purpose, governing the working of the Society.

Shri Shyamnandan Mishra: Is it not strange that even in so far as the sending of information to the Lt. Governor, there is no firm basis?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: There is nothing which stipulates that they will send information automatically to the Lt. Governor. These things do not come to the Lt. Governor.

Shri Shyamnandan Mishra: It is very strange. The Lt. Governor has executive functions; but still it is not done. The President of India may not function; but still he is informed.

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: I do not think that every paper goes to him. Anyway, only policy matters come to the Lt. Governor.

Mr. Chairman: This scandal was there; and it was reported in the national Press. I do not get the impression that you had shown the necessary concern for finding out the facts. You could have taken some action to do it.

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: The entire thing was examined; and all the details of the matter were collected out and necessary report sent to the Home Ministry.

Mr. Chairman: When you had enquired in depth, you could have called in Dr. Jagjit Singh and tried to find things out.

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: Dr. Jagjit Singh has nothing to do with it. It is a matter of record.

Mr. Chairman: The easier thing would have been to call him in and find out.

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: It is a matter of Records and the Registrar of Cooperative Societies had looked into it. I don't think I normally go into their records. It was put up to him and it was sent to the Ministry.

Mr. Chairman: You did not think that it was necessary to call for Dr. Jagjit Singh. You did not find it important enough to call him.

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: No, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: We have examined Dr. Jagjit Singh. We have his testimony here.

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: There is no question of having personal discussions.

Mr. Chairman: Not personal ones, but at the personal level, i.e. Lt. Governor versus the Chairman of the Cooperative Society.

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: We had one or two meetings, but not on this matter.

Mr. Chairman: How long did you know Dr. Jagjit Singh?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: The first time I had met him was when the term of Managing Committee of this Society had expired; and not before then.

Mr. Chairman: Do you know anything about his background?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: I have heard about it.

Mr. Chairman: Did you not have an opportunity of meeting him on those occasions? Was there no personal contact—other than the meetings you had with him?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: No, Sir. I had told you about the two or three occasions.

Shri Shyamnandan Mishra: Did some members withdraw from the Society after the allegations which were made that they were unduly admitted?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: I don't think I will be able to say anything on it.

Shri Shyamnandan Mishra: Did any member inform you that he was withdrawing from the Society?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: Not to me.

Shri Shyamnandan Mishra: Did any member also send you this information?

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: As far as I remember nobody had sent any intimation to me that he was withdrawing.

Shri Shyamnandan Mishra: That means that you did not get the information that somebody was withdrawing.

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: It appeared in the papers that 2 or 3 people had withdrawn.

Mr. Chairman: We have one difficulty, Mr. Baleshwar Prasad. Mr. Vajpayee had wanted to examine you, because he is the hon. Member who had raised this matter in the Lok Sabha. Unfortunately he is not available to-day; and I was wondering what to do.

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: I am here upto the 13th; and if there is any need, you can call me.

Mr. Chairman: But the difficulty is that Mr. Vajpayee is coming only on the 17th. Anyway, thank you very much, Mr. Baleshwar Prasad.

Shri Baleshwar Prasad: Thank you, Sir.

(The witness then withdrew)

(The Committee then adjourned)

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

(See para 1 of the Report)

**THE NEW FRIENDS CO-OPERATIVE
HOUSE BUILDING
SOCIETY LTD.**

**Head Office
Mathura Road, New Delhi-14.**

**H.O.
1/24, Bansi House,
A.A. Road, New Delhi,
Tele: 630409.**

In reply Please quote:

Ref. No. _____|d-

Dated 7th May, 1974.

Respected Sir,

As desired, I have succeeded in passing a resolution in the Committee meeting on 29th April, 1974. Luckily only one, out of three from other side attended. He raised certain objections which were overruled by me. His main objection was that the Lt. Governor and Managing Committee have no moral authority to have any further hold on the Society.

I have assessed the situation and feel it will not be possible for me and committee to stand the opposition in view of the Court's attitude and its further exploitation in Parliament and Papers unless full support from Police and Registrar Societies is afforded much more than ever. The new 60 members can remain in if I am there.

Since you are busy due to riots in the City, I will give the notice in Newspapers only when I get green signal. It is good that Parliament closes on or before 13-5-1974.

I am trying to get the original letter of Mrs. Massani and hope to succeed. I am on the job.

With kind regards.

Yours respectfully,

Sd|- JAGJIT SINGH

Shri Baleshwar Prasad,
Raj Niwas,
Delhi-6.

APPENDIX II

(See para 16 of the Report)

**THE NEW FRIENDS
CO-OPERATIVE HOUSE
BUILDING SOCIETY LTD.**

JAGJIT SINGH,
President.

**91, New Friends Colony
Mathura Road,
NEW DELHI-14.
Phone: 630409.
May 9, 1974**

To

**The Hon'ble Speaker,
Lok Sabha,
Parliament House,
New Delhi-1.**

Sir.

I was surprised to read in today's Times of India that I was charged by Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee of 'contempt of the House for casting aspersions on Parliament in a letter written to the Lt. Governor, Shri Baleshwar Prasad about the affairs of the Society". May I be allowed to state that I have written no such letter at all, and therefore, if any photostat copies of the alleged letter have been produced in the House, they are copies of what is clearly a forged document.

Yours faithfully,

Sd|- JAGJIT SINGH,
President.

APPENDIX III

(See para 18 of the Report)

CONFIDENTIAL
MOST IMMEDIATE

SEAL
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

No. TE|517|LGS|74,
Raj Niwas
Delhi-6.
Dated, 18-5-74.

From: Shri Baleshwar Prasad,
Lt. Governor of Delhi.

To: Shri J. R. Kapur,
Under Secretary,
Lok Sabha Secretariat,
Parliament House,
New Delhi-1.

SUBJECT: Question of privilege raised by Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, M.P., against Shri Jagjit Singh, President, the New Friends Co-op. House Building Society Ltd., New Delhi, regarding a letter purported to have been written by him to the Lt. Governor of Delhi on the 7th May, 1974, allegedly casting aspersions on Parliament.

Sir,

Reference your letter No. 18|2|CI|74, dated 17th May, 1974, on the above subject.

2. It is seen that the alleged letter has been addressed to the Lt.-Governor by name. All letters addressed to the Lt. Governor by name are received in the Secretariat of the Lt. Governor. It has been checked up in the Lt. Governor's Secretariat and it has been found that no such letter has been received either by the Lt. Governor of his Secretariat. No such letter is available with the Lt. Governor or in the records of the Lt. Governor's Secretariat.

.. Yours faithfully,

Sd|- BALESHWAR PRASAD.

APPENDIX IV

(See para 20 of the Report)

(i)

Proceedings of the meeting of the Managing Committee of the Society held on the 6th January, 1974.

An ordinary meeting of the Managing Committee of the New Friends Co-operative House Building Society Limited at 4.00 P.M. at Delhi Gymkhana Club Ltd. on 6th January, 1974.

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|------|
| 1. Dr. Jagjit Singh, President | Sd - |
| 2, Mr. B. N. Seth, Secretary | Sd - |
| 3. Mr. N. K. Kothari, Member | Sd - |
| 4. Lt. General C. C. Kapila, Member | Sd - |
| 5. Mr. S. C. Chhabra, Member | Sd - |
| 6, Mr. Balmokand vig, Member | Sd - |
| 7. Mr. J. P. Bajaj, Member | Sd - |
| 8. Mr. B. M. Rallan, Member | |
| 9. Mr. G. R. Bahmani, Member | |

Proposals :

1. To consider action to be taken on Hon'ble Supreme Court's order, dated 11-12-1973 :

The President and the Secretary explained that the Hon'ble Supreme Court had adjourned *sine die* the hearing of both the writ petitions on 6-11-1973 as there was another writ petition with similar prayers pending in the Delhi High Court. By its order dated 11-12-1973, the Hon'ble Supreme Court also vacated the stay order dated 21-9-1973, restraining the Society from declaring any member a defaulter except that "a fortnight's time from 11-12-1973 was allowed to members for payment of their requisite dues". The Committee therefore, resolved to declare them defaulting members. Their names are shown in List No. 1 at page 334.

In addition five members who are writ petitioners have only sent part of their requisite dues by cheques or draft on dates much after the expiry of the fortnight's period prescribed by the Hon'ble Sup-

reme Court's order dated 11-12-1973, i.e., 26th December, 1973, the last date upto which the Society was accepting payments due. The names of these five members shown in List No. 2 at page 335. Mr. Chhabra and Mr. Vig, however, dissented.

Since the aforementioned members have failed to pay the dues in full even now it was resolved to declare them also as defaulting members.

2. Action taken on DDA's letter No. F.15(107)|57-CS|DDA, dated 22-12-1973, regarding the removal of members who have not been able to file their mandatory, affidavits in compliance with Mg. Committee's Resolution No. 2, dated 17-8-1973.

The Committee noted the action taken in pursuance of its Resolution No. 2 passed at its meeting held on 17-8-1973. After the vacation of stay by the Hon'ble Supreme Court on 11-12-1973; the DDA in their letter No. F. 18(107)|57-CS|DDA, dated 22-12-1973 decided the removal of 42 members for non-submission of prescribed affidavit by this target date. The members so declared defaulters are shown in List No. 3 at page 337A to 337B. The Committee confirmed the declaration of these 42 members as defaulters for which notices have already been issued to them in accordance with Resolution No. 2 dated 17-8-1973.

3. Action taken in compliance with Managing Committee's Resolution No. 1, dated 17-8-1973.

As decided by the Committee in its Resolution No. 1, dated 17-8-1973 defaulter notice were issued to 160 members who were not writ petitioners for non-payment of their dues to the Society. Since 140 members paid their dues on receipt of these notices, the defaulting notices to these 139 members were withdrawn and cancelled. This left only 20 members whose dues were not received before 11-12-1973. Of these twenty, fifteen members have still not paid their dues at all. It was, therefore, resolved to confirm its earlier decision to declare them defaulting members. The names are shown in List No. 4 at page 339.

The five remaining members sent their dues only in part and that too after the expiry of the period prescribed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court dated 11-12-1973. It was, therefore, resolved to confirm its

earlier decision to declare them as defaulting members. The names are shown in List No. 5 at page 340.

The Committee also noted that although President's circular dated 30-4-1973 intimating the arrears due from the members was issued to almost all members who had not paid their dues to the Society, there are a few members to whom these notices for payment of Society's dues were not sent for valid reasons. In fact, payments were not being accepted from them even some of them came to pay their dues. These cases are as under:

(a) Nineteen members whose admission was not regularised in accordance with clause (vii) of Lt. Governor's award dated 6-7-1971. Since 42 members have been declared defaulters for non-submission of their prescribed affidavits, it would now be possible to accommodate these members while at the same time comply with the Lt. Governor's award. Accordingly they have now been sent a notice asking them to pay their dues within a fortnight failing which there would be no alternative but to declare them defaulting members.

(b) Similarly 28 members whose affidavits had not been accepted by DDA had also not been sent notices for payment of the arrears due from them. Since their affidavits have now been accepted by DDA, they have been sent a notice asking them to pay their dues within a fortnight failing which they would have to be declared defaulting members.

4. *To consider the action to be taken on the notice sent by Mr. P.P. Grover Advocate on behalf of Mrs. Wiran Wali Jaggi, widow of Shri Ram Lal Jaggi.*

* * * * *

5. *Review of action taken to have the services of the colony tested by Delhi Municipal Corporation by putting water in the existing line.*

* * * * *

6. *Accounts of the Society from September 1973 to December, 1973.*

* * * * *

7. *Any other item with the permission of the Chair.*

LIST No. 1

List of Members who are writ petitioners and have not paid their dues of Society

S.No.	M.No.	Name	Plot No.	Area in Sq. Yards
1	134	Shri Suresh Kumar Juneja	635	486.1
2	359	Shri Siri Ram Khurana	779	481.3
3	39	Shri Rajinder Kumar	275	505.7
4	187	Shri Lekh Raj	878	300.4
5	210	Shri Kewal Khosla Dewan	809	492.0
6	1038	Shri S. P. Singh	60	492.0
7	87	Shri P. N. Malhotra	284	485.2
8	194	Shri Jit Singh	765	516.0
9	469	Shri Kanwar Nain Jaggi	358	501.0
10	565	Shri Ram Narain Singh	706	495.8
11	1342	Shri P. S. Khera	776	480.0
12	943	Shri Mohan Lal Nayyar	738	478.3
13	247	Shrimati Ram Lubhai	893	291.4
14	139	Shri K. K. Kapur	608	291.4

List No. 2

List of Members who are writ petitioners and have sent their draft/cheque @ Rs. 6/- per Sq. Yds. after the target date 26th December, 1973

S.No	M. No.	Name	Plot No.	Area in Sq. Yds.	Amount due	Amount sent by Drafts	Amount sent by Cheques
1	559	Miss Punam Sawhney	500	504.00	3,809.00	..	3,024.00
2	1421	Shri Jang Bahadur	280	508.4	5,511.29	3,000.00	..
3	005	Smt. Nilu Sawhney	554	540.00	6,925.96	..	3,240.00
4	13	Shri G. P. Sethi	1085	540.00	5,299.96	3,000.00	..
5	8	Shri K. N. Malhotra	944	500.00	3,637.00	3,000.00	..

LIST No. 3

Particulars of the Members whose Membership have been revoked due to non-Submission of Affidavits

S. No.	Name	Plot No.	Area Sq.	Yd.
1	2	3	4	5
1	55 Shri Sewa Ram Kapur		549	471
2	82 Shri T. G. Sethi		328	524
3	111 Shri G. R. Juneja		393	296.2
4	118 Shrimati Jamna Devi		616	501.7
5	119 Shri J. G. Mehra		433	491.9
6	282 Shri Dharam Vira		783	481.3
7	308 Shrimati Krishna Wanti		1099	299.3
8	389 Shri Ashok Pahwa		436	475.5
9	390 Shrimati Sheila Sethi		512	510
10	447 Shri A. D. Bhasin		472	298.6
11	488 Shri K. L. Gujral		145	492.9
12	520 Dr. H. G. Khosla		462	298.4
13	524 Shrimati I. D. Kohli		688	478.3
14	539 Shrimati Bachan Kaur		988	450.1
15	554 Shri D. R. Pahwa		346	516
16	603 Shrimati Kanti Devi		575	299.8
17	624 Dr. Ladha S. Uberoi		204	487.4
18	659 Shri D. C. Pahwa		155	492
19	671 Shrimati S. D. Puri		254	286.7
20	684 Shri M. Narain Dass		675	537.5
21	704 Dr. D. D. Singhi		58	492
22	721 Shrimati P. W. Kochhar		507	504
23	754 Mrs. Mohini Sahi		817	492
24	778 Shri B. N. Khosla		309	495
25	785 Sh. H. S. Puri		506	504
26	799 Shri Yog Raj Shah		989	486.7
27	821 Dr. Rajinder Singh		294	517
28	851 Capt. S. K. Malhotra		727	478.3
29	861 Shrimati I. Bir Kaur		913	480

1	2	3	4	5
30	1077	Mrs. Mohini Chaudhury	184	478.4
31	1089	Shri Suresh Mullick	970	486
32	1196	Mrs. Lalit Kaur	386	492
33	1361	Shri S. N. Luthra	658	482.9
34	1406	Shri Amarjit Singh	1056	513.3
35	1407	Shri Tilak Raj	1057	513.3
36	96	Shri B. M. Tuteja	348	501
37	546	Shrimati B. M. Malhotra	159	492
38	567	Shrimati Surinder Bhalla	666	492
39	646	Shri Pyare Lal	976	492
<i>Members who have been Surrendered their Plot</i>				
1	54	Shri Ved Kapur	67	491
2	692	Shri K. P. Kapoor	216	492
3	776	Shri H. R. Khanna	84	486

LIST No. 4

Members who are not Writ Petitioners & have not Paid their Dues of Society @Rs. 6/- Sq. Yd. Declared Defaulter as per Res. No. dated 17.8.1973 upto 26.12.1973

S.No	M. No.	Name	Plot No.	Area in Sq. Yds.
1	16	Shri Ram Saran Das Marwaha	1061	284.4
2	197	Shri R. C. Kapur	788	481.3
3	478	Shrimati Ram Chameli	717	478.3
4	584	R. B. Ch. Keshri Singh	792	485.3
5	598	Shri Hari Singh	222	487.4
6	599	Shrimati Ram Kaur	1042	552.4
7	822	Shri D. L. Kohli	395	296.2
8	862	Dr. Dewan Singh	99	504.00
9	879	Maj. Lov Chopra	960	489.7
10	1193	Shri G. M. Marwah	899	504.00
11	1258	Shri Ramesh Gupta	1072	493.3
12	1466	Shri K. K. Chona	929	199.9
13	1463	Shri G. D. Anand	662	492.0
14	525	Shrimati Vidya Sahni	1082	492.0
15	820	Shri (Dr.) Balraj Sehgal	505	504.0

LIST No. 5

List of Members who are not writ petitioners and have sent their drafts/cheques @ Rs. 6/- per Sq. Yds. after the target date 26th December, 1973

S. No.	M. No.	Name	Plot No.	Area in Sq. Yds.	Amount due	Amount sent by Drafts	Amount sent by cheques
1	499	Shri Virendra	316	495.00	3,435.95	..	3,000.00
2	597	Shri D. S. Tuteja	791	500.9	4,679.81	..	3,000.00
3	954	Shri Hargopal Bhatia	869	300.4	2,168.83	..	1,800.00
4	1101	Smt. Shakuntla Dewan	787	481.3	4,303.46	..	3,000.00
5	1149	Shri I. C. Khanna	974	492.00	5,764.41	..	3,000.00

(ii)

Proceedings of the meeting of the Managing Committee of the Society held on the 25th January 1974.

An Ordinary meeting of the Managing Committee of New Friends Cooperative House Building Society Ltd. was held at 4. P. M. at Delhi Gyamkhana Club Ltd. New Delhi on 25.1.75.

- | | |
|-------------------------|------|
| 1. Dr. Jsgjit Singh | Sd - |
| 2 Mr. B. N. Seth | Sd - |
| 3 Mr. J. P. Bajaj | Sd - |
| 4 Mr. N. K. Kothari | Sd - |
| 5 Mr. S. C. Chadha | |
| 6 Mr. Balmokandvig | |
| 7 Mr. B. M. Rallan | |
| 8 Mr. G. R. Bahmani | |
| 9 Lt. Gen. C. C. Kapila | Sd - |

1. Consideration of Internal Auditors Report for the year ending June 1972 to June, 1973. It was resolved that consideration of the report be postponed to the next meeting in view of the fact that the comments of the society's accountant, Sh. Patni were not yet available on the various points raised in the report.

2. Report on the steps taken to have building permission from the Corporation. The President explained that efforts had been made to hand over the services of the colony to the Municipal Corporation of Delhi with a view to obtaining permission for building activities which is urgently required to enable the members to start construction of their houses. The Municipal Engineers had checked up the services, worked out the deficiencies and maintenance charges, which would have to be paid to the Municipal Corporation before the services can be taken over by them and before permission to start building activities can be granted.

The Dy. Commissioner (S) of Municipal Corporation in his letter No. 205 AVAS dated 25-1-74 just received has intimated that cost of deficiencies in respect of water and sewerage system amount to Rs. 851894 -(Rupees Eight lakhs fifty one thousands eight hundred ninety four only) excluding the cost of storm water drainage outfall. He has advised the society to deposit the aforesaid amount with CE (W) and obtain no objection certificate to the taking over the services and grant of building permission.

It was resolved to pay the aforesaid amount of Rs. 891894 to CW (E) as suggested in the above mentioned letter of l y. Commissioner (S). It was also resolved to pay the

Cost of other deficiencies in respect of road system and horticulture work etc. when the same are worked out and intimated to the society as mentioned in the Dy. Commissioner (S) letter referred to above.

3. Follow up action on the declaration of defaulters on account of non-payment of their dues to the Society and non sub-mission of their mandatory affidavits.

It was noted that a total of 42 members have been declared defaulters for non-submission of their mandatory affidavits and another thirty nine for non payment of their dues to the society in addition there are ten vacancies existing due to the voluntary surrender of the plots by members of their deaths etc. Since the society has to refund the deposit of these default members, it would be necessary to entrol fresh members in order to have to necessary funds for making the requisite refunds to the defaulting members. As the society has no funds to meet this obligation, it was resolved to admit the sixty members who have applied for admission to the society and are shown in annexure I at page 352 a & b the Committee also resolved to initiate immediate action to obtain the approval of the Delhi Administration to their admission as members of the society for the allotment of residential plots for which they have applied. It was also resolved to charge by way of premium a sum of Rs. 3000/- (Rupees Three thousands) per member for 500 Sq. Yds. Plot and Rs. 1800/- (Rupees one thousand eight hundred) per member for 300 Sq. yard in addition to the normal dues paid by existing members.

4. Consider the work allotted to M/s. Gobind Ram for flushing & cleaning sewerage Scheme to enable the Corporation to take over the services.

The Managing Committee approved the action taken by Shri N. K. Kothari and Sh. B. N. Seth to have the likely deficiencies in the sewerage system reduced by having the sewerage system expeditiously flushed prior to it's examination by the Municipal Corporation Engineers. It was noted that the work was entrusted to the same contractor viz. M/s. Govind Ram & Co. as had earlier done the water supply cleaning. It was also noted that the work was done at a cost of Rs. Twenty four thoudands lumpsum which was the lowest quotation of the five quotations received. The Committee also wish to place on record its appreciation of the promptness with which Sh. Kot hari and Sh. Seth managed to have this work carried out.

5. Maintenance of duplicate record of the Minute Book of the Mg. Committee meeting.

At the instance Sh. B. N. Seth it was resolved to have Photostat copies (in duplicate) of the complete records of the minutes of the Mg. Committee meeting held during the term of the Present Managing Committee. Two Photostat copies along with the negative of the records is estimated to cost Rs. 1200/- (Rupees one thousand two hundred). The Committee authorised the Secretary to implement the aforementioned resolution and keep one Photostat copy with him and the other with the President.

6. Safe custody of important documents of the Society.

At the suggestion of the Jt. Secretary it was resolved to purchase a Godrej Safe for safe custody of important society documents. This safe be also used for keeping of the files of members declared defaulters and on no account should these files be handled by any-body other than the Jt. Secretary himself.

(iii)

Resolution No. 3 dated 25-1-1974 adopted by the Managing Committee for enrolment of sixty new members.

MANAGING COMMITTEE'S RESOLUTION NO. 3 DATED 25-1-1974

Follow-up action on the declaration of defaulters on account of non-payment of dues to the Society and non-submission of their mandatory affidavits.

It was noted that a total of 42 members have been declared defaulters for non-submission of their mandatory affidavits and another thirty-nine for non-payment of their dues to the Society. In addition, there are ten vacancies caused by the voluntary surrender of the plots by members for their deaths, etc. Since the Society has to refund the deposit of these defaulting members, it would be necessary to enrol fresh members in order to have the necessary funds for making the requisite payments to the defaulting members. As the Society has no funds to meet this obligation, it was resolved to admit the sixty members who have applied for admission to the Society and are shown in *Annexure I* at page 352 A&B. The Committee also resolved to initiate immediate action to obtain the approval of the Delhi Administration to their admission as members of the Society for the allotment of residential plots for which they have applied.

It was also resolved to charge by way of premium a sum of Rs. 3,000 (three thousand) per member for 500 sq. yds. plot and Rs. 1,800 (one thousand eight hundred) per member for 300 sq. yds. in addition to normal dues paid by existing members.

ANNEXURE I

S.No.	Name	Address
1	Shri Govind Narain . . .	11, Thyagaraja Marg, New Delhi.
2	Shri I. D. N. Sahi . . .	5/A-9, Pandara Road, New Delhi.
3	Mrs. Presti Sehgal . . .	C-II/79, Bapa Nagar, Dr. Zakir Hussain Road, New Delhi.
4	Shri M. S. Pathak . . .	16, Tuglak Road, New Delhi.

-
- 5 Shri K. F. Rustamji Border Security Force, Ministry of Home Affairs, Nirvachan Sadan, New Delhi-1.
- 6 Shri V. C. Trivedi Ministry of External Affairs, South Block, New Delhi-1.
- 7 Mrs. Shukuntla Masani 2, Tughlak Road, New Delhi.
- 8 Shri B. Mukerji 3, Lower Rawdon Street, Calcutta-20.
- 9 Shri B. B. Lal 3, Teen Murti Lane, New Delhi-11.
- 10 Mrs. Kanta Advani 6, Sunder Nagar Market, New Delhi-3.
- 11 Shri P. K. Idiula H-46, Green Park Extension, New Delhi.
- 12 Shri Rattan Singh P-92, South Extension Part II, New Delhi-49.
- 13 Miss Sarita Soni 436, Double Storey, New Rajinder Nagar, New Delhi.
- 14 Shri J. C. Kawatra E-135, Okhla Industrial Estate, New Delhi.
- 15 Mrs. Mohini Arora R—208, Greater Kailash I, New Delhi—48.
- 16 Shri Walayati Ram Chadha N—99, Connaught Circus, New Delhi.
- 17 Shri M. N. Phadke 10, Nizamuddin East, New Delhi—13.
- 18 Shri Vijay K. Makhija W—26, Grater Kailash I, New Delhi—48.
- 19 Mrs. Suman Satia R—9, India Market, Subzimandi, Delhi—7.
- 20 Shri F. L. Thukral A—65/A, Nizamuddin East, New Delhi—13.
- 21 Shri S. K. Soni 6/80, Punjabi Bagh West, New Delhi-26.
- 22 Shri D. S. Khanijau E—25, NDSE Part I, New Delhi—49.
- 23 Shri S. P. Arora S/c Gulabrai & Co. Brar House, Baratooti, Delhi.
- 24 Mrs. Sudershan Puri F/18, Kakanagar, New Delhi.
- 25 Mrs. Jaswant Kaur 2, Northend Road, Delhi—6.
- 26 Shri G. S. Panag N—191 (First Floor), Greater Kailash I, New Delhi—49.
- 28 Mrs. Sarla Sethi AII/37, Safdarjung Enclave, New Delhi-16.
- 28 Mrs. Mohini Jain Banaras Art House N-13, Connaught Circus New Delhi—1.
- 29 Shri B. K. Nehru 1, Western Avenue, Maharani Bagh, New Delhi—14.
- 30 Shri Ashoka Sen 88, Shahjahan Road, New Delhi.
- 31 Mrs. V. Mohini Giri Rashtrapati Bhavan, New Delhi.
- 32 Lt. Col. D. R. Thukral A 65/A,,Nizamuddin East, New Delhi—13.
-

Sl. No.	Name	Address
33	Shri G. Umesh Chadha	. N-17, Connaught Circus, New Delhi.
34	Shri Sarup Krishan Anand	. M/4, Lajpat Nagar III, New Delhi-24.
35	Maj. M. S. Anand	. C/o M/s. Raj Kumari Barkat Singh, E-4, Lajpat Nagar III, New Delhi-24.
36	Shri Mumman, M.A.	. Q-2, Green Park Extension, New Delhi-16.
37	Shri Naresh Kumer	. 16, Feroze Gandhi Road, New Delhi.
38	Shri L. N. Saklani	. CII/3, Court Lane, Delhi-6.
39	Mrs. Mala Madhukar Parekh	. 129, Sunder Nagar, New Delhi.
40	Shri N. K. Mukerji	. 8, Tughlak Lane, New Delhi-11.
41	Maj. Genl. Narender Singh	. 79, Shahjahan Road, New Delhi.
42	Shri Bahadur Ram Tamta	. 10, Rajpur Road, Delhi-6.
43	Shri P. P. Srivastava	. 21, Boulevard Road, Delhi-6.
44	Smt. Jammuna Bai	. W/o Shri Sunder Dass, B-138, Malviya Nagar, New Delhi.
45	Smt. S. V. Purushottam	. C/o Shri K. K. Srivastava, 6, Flagstaff Road, Delhi-6.
46	Shri Gopal Narayan Tandon	. 17/AB Pandara Road, New Delhi.
47	Shri Kumal Deo Narayan	. 135, Jangpura Extension, New Delhi.
48	Shri Vijay Kumar Bajaj	. II-K/98, Lajpat Nagar, New Delhi.
49	Shri Sushan Pal Soni	. N-17/Connaught Circus, New Delhi-1.
50	Shri Sushil Khanna	. B-211, Greater Kailash, New Delhi-48.
51	Shri Deepak K. Malhotra	. 8/15, East Patel Nagar, New Delhi-8.
52	Shri Hari Kishan Panchal	. 59/29, New Rohtak Road, New Delhi.
53	Shri Somnath Revri	. 5, Scindia House, New Delhi-1.
54	Shri Zafar Ahmed Dar	. 2110, Gali Nahir Khan, Kucha Chelan, Darya Ganj, Delhi-6.
55	Shri H. P. Jain	. Deputy Chief Pay & Accounts Officer, Ministry of Supply, Akbar Road, New Delhi.
56	Mrs. Leila Seth	. 122, Malcha Marg, New Delhi.
57	Shri Satish Kumar Tuli	. R-527, New Rajinder Nagar, New Delhi.
58	Shri Inder Bal Singh	. C-62, Lajpat Nagar I, New Delhi-24.
59	Shri Anil Khanna	. E-165, Ashok Vihar, Delhi.
60	Mrs. Rita Mathur	. 2140, Masjid Khajur, Delhi-6.

List of new members enrolled by the Society along with the names of members who introduced them

S. No.	Name	Introduced by
1	Sh. Govind Narain (1536)	Dr. Jagjit Singh (1021)
2	Sh. I. D. N. Sahi (1537)	Sh. B. N. Seth (773)
3	Mrs. Preeti Sehgal (1481)	Dr. Jagjit Singh (1021)
4	Sh. M. S. Pathak (1516)	Dr. Jagjit Singh (1021)
5	Sh. K. F. Rustamji (1538)	Sr. B. N. Seth (773)
6	Sh. V. C. Trivedi (1482)	Do.
7	Mrs. Shakuntla Masani (1483)	Dr. Jagjit Singh
8	Sh. B. Mukerji (1484)	Do.
9	Sh. B. B. Lala (1485)	Do.
10	Mrs. Kanta Advani (1486)	Sh. N. K. Kothari (683)
11	Sh. P. K. Idicula (1487)	Mr. C. C. Kapila (857)
12	Sh. Rattan Singh (1488)	Dr. Jagjit Singh (1021)
13	Miss Sarita Soni (1518)	Sh. S. P. Soni (729)
14	Sh. J. C. Kawatra (1513)	Sh. J. P. Bajaj (672)
15	Mrs. Mohini Arora (1515)	Sh. N. K. Kothari (683)
16	Sh. W. R. Chadha (1489)	Sh. J. P. Bajaj (672)
17	Sh. M. N. Phadke (1517)	Dr. Jagjit Singh (1021)
18	Sh. Vijay K. Makhija (1496)	Sh. S. P. Soni (729)
19	Mrs. Suman Satis (1490)	Sh. C. C. Kapila (857)
20	Sh. K. L. Thukral (1491)	Do.
21	Sh. S. K. Soni (1492)	Sh. B. N. Seth (773)
22	Sh. D. S. Khanijau (1493)	Do.
23	Sh. S. P. Arora (1494)	Sh. C. C. Kapila (858)
24	Mrs. Sudershan Puri (1495)	Sh. N. K. Kothari (683)
25	Mrs. Jswant Kaur (1497)	Sh. C. C. Kapila (857)

S. No.	Name	Introduced by
26	Sh. G. S. Panag (1498)	Dr. Jagjit Singh (1021)
27	Smt. Sarla Sethi (1529)	Do.
28	Mrs. Mohini Jain (1499)	Do.
29	Sh. B. K. Nehru (1539)	Do.
30	Sb. Ashok Sen (1535)	Do.
31	Mrs. V. Mohini Giri (1524)	Do.
32	Lt. Col. D. R. Thukral (1500)	Sh. B. N. Seth (773)
33	Sh. Gurmehsh Chadha (1522)	Sh. S. P. Soni (729)
34	Sh. S. K. Anand (1502)	Mr. B. N. Seth (773)
35	Maj. M. S. Anand (1502)	Do.
36	Sh. Mamman M. A. (1503)	Sh. C. C. Kapila (857)
37	Sh. Naresh Kumar (1504)	Dr. Jagjit Singh (1021)
38	Sh. L. N. Saklani (1527)	Sh. N. K. Kothari (783)
39	Mrs. Mala Madhukar Parekh (1505)	Do.
40	Sh. N. K. Mukerji (1526)	Dr. Jagjit Singh (1021)
41	Maj. Gen. Narinde Singh (1525)	Do.
42	Sh. B. R. Tamta (1531)	Do.
43	Sh. P. P. Srivastava (1532)	Sh. B. N. Sethi (773)
44	Smt. Jamuna Bai (1533)	Sh. S. P. Soni (729)
45	Sr. S. V. Purushottam (1507)	Dr. Jagjit Singh (1021)
46	Sh. G. N. Tandon (1508)	Sh. B. N. Seth (773)
47	Sh. Kamal Deo Narayan (1523)	Sh. N. K. Kothari (683)
48	Sh. Vijay Kumar Bajaj (1528)	Sh. C. C. Kapila (857)
49	Sh. Sushan Pal Soni (1506)	Sh. S. P. Soni (729)
50	Sh. Sushil Khanna (1509)	Sh. B. N. Seth (773)
51	Sh. Deepak K. Malhotra (1540)	Sh. B. N. Seth (773)
52	Sh. H. K. Panchal (1510)	Sh. C. C. Kapila (857)
53	Sh. Som Nath Revri (1511)	Sh. B. N. Seth (773)
54	Sh. Zafar Ahmed Dar (1519)	Sh. N. K. Kothari (783)
55	Sh. D. P. Jain (1512)	Sh. B. N. Seth (773)
56	Mrs. Leila Seth (1513)	Do.
57	Sh. Satish Kumar Tuli (1520)	Sh. J. P. Bajaj (672)
58	Sh. Inder Bal Singh (1521)	Sh. B. N. Seth (773)
59	Sh. Anil Khanna (1514)	Sh. N. K. Kothari (683)
60	Mrs. Rita Mathur (1534)	Sh. C. C. Kapila (857)

CONFIDENTIAL

THE NEW FRIENDS COOPERATIVE HOUSE BUILDING
LIMITED

Jagjit Singh,
President.

91, New Friends Colony,
Mathura Road,
NEW DELHI-14.

To

January 26, 1974

The Chairman,
Delhi Development Authority,
I.P. Estate,
NEW DELHI.

Sir,

You will be glad to know that the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India ordered on 6-11-1973 *sine die* adjournment of the hearing of the writ petitions filed by the associates of the old removed Managing Committee of the Society. By its further order dated 11.12.1973, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has also vacated the stay against the removal of the small minority of recalcitrant members who have either not submitted their mandatory affidavits to the effect that they do not own a house or a residential plot in the Union Territory of Delhi, or have not paid their dues at the rate of 6/- per square yard to the Society. According to the list furnished by the DDA *vide* their letter No. F.15 (107) |57-CS|DDA, dated 22nd December, 1973; 42 members have not submitted the prescribed affidavits and have, therefore, to be removed from the membership of the Society. Consequently, they have been declared defaulters and informed accordingly.

Further, the Managing Committee of the Society by its resolution dated 6-1-1974 has declared 50 members defaulters for non-payment of their dues to the Society within the extended period of a fortnight from 11-12-1973 granted by the Hon'ble Supreme Court. As there are in addition 10 vacancies due to some members surrendering their plots or due to deaths of the members concerned we have at present about 100 vacancies to fill. As the members, who have been declared defaulters for non-submission of their mandatory affidavits or for non-payment of their dues to the

Society, will have to be refunded the money deposited by them with the Society, it will be necessary to enrol new members in their lieu as there will be no funds available with the Society to refund the dues of those defaulting members.

Accordingly, the matter was considered by the Managing Committee of the Society at its meeting held on 25-1-1974 and the Managing Committee resolved to fill in the first instance 60 vacancies only. It was also resolved to fill these 60 vacancies by the admissions of the new members as per attached list—Annexure I. I shall, therefore, be very grateful if you will kindly accord your approval to their inclusion as new members of our Society.

Yours faithfully,

Sd/- JAGJIT SINGH,
President.

ANNEXURE I

S. No.	Name	Address
1	Shri Govind Narain	. 11, Thyagaraja Marg, New Delhi.
2	Shri I. D. N. Sæbi	. 6/A— B, Pandara Road, New Delhi.
3	Mrs. Preeti Sehgal	C— II/79, Bapa Nagar, Dr. Zakir Hussain Road, New Delhi.
4	Shri M. S. Pathak	. 16, Tughlak Road, New Delhi.
5	Shri K. F. Rustamji Director General	Border Security Force, Ministry of Home Affairs, Nirvachan Sadan, New Delhi— 1.
6	Shri V. C. Trivedi	. Ministry of External Affairs, South Block, New Delhi— 1.
7	Mrs. Shakuntla Mesæni	. 2, Tughlak Road, New Delhi.
8	Shri B. Mukerji	. 3, Lower Rawdon Street, Calcutta— 20.
9	Shri B. B. Lal	. 3, Teen Murti Lane, New Delhi— 11.
10	Mrs. Kærtæ Advani	6, Sunder Nager Market, New Delhi— 3.
11	Shri P. K. Idicula	. H— 46, Green Park Extension, New Delhi.
12	Shri Rattan Shingh	. P— 92, South Extension Part II, New Delhi— 49
13	Miss Sarita Soni	. 436, Dautle Storey, New Rajinder Nagar, New Delhi.
14	Shri J. C. Kawatrs	. E— 125, Okhla Industrial Estate, New Delhi.
15	Mrs. Mohiri Arora	. R— 208, Greater Kailash I, New Delhi— 48.
16	Shri Welayæti Ram Chada	. N— 99, Connaught Circus, New Delhi.
17	Shri M. N. Phadke	. 10, Nizamuddin East, New Delhi— 13.
18	Shri Vijay K. Makhija	. W— 26, Greater Kailash I, New Delhi— 48.
19	Mrs. Suman Satia	. R— 9, Indira Market, Subzimandi, Delhi— 7.
20	Shri K. L. Thukral	. A 65/A, Nizamuddin East, New Delhi— 13.
21	Shri S. K. Sæmi	. 6/80, Punjabi Bagh, West, New Delhi— 26.
22	Shri D. S. Kharijæu	. E/25, NDSE Part I New Delhi— 49.
23	Shri S. P. Arora	. C/O Gulabrai & Co. Brar House, Baratooti, Delhi
24	Mrs. Sudershan Puri	. F/18, Kakanagar, New Delhi.
25	Mrs. Jaswant Kaur	. 2, Northern Road, Delhi— 6.

Sl. No.	Name	Address
26	Shri G. S. Panag	N-19 (First floor), Greater Kailash I, New Delhi-49.
27	Mrs. Sarla Sethi	AII/37, Safdejung Enclave, New Delhi-16.
28	Mrs. Mobini Jain	Banaras Art House, N-13, Connaught Circus, New Delhi-1.
29	Shri B. K. Nehru	1, Western Avenue, Maharani Bagh, New Delhi-14.
30	Shri Ashhoke Sen	88, Shahjahan Road, New Delhi.
31	Mrs. V. Mohini Giri	Rashtrapati Bhavan, New Delhi.
32	Lt. Col. D. R. Thukral	A65/1, Nizamuddin East, New Delhi-13.
33	Shri Gurmehesh Chadha	N-17, Connaught Circus, New Delhi.
34	Shri Sarup Krishan Anand	M/4, Lajpat Nagar III, New Delhi-24.
35	Maj. M. S. Anand	C/o M/s. Raj Kumari Barket Singh, E/4, Lajpat Nagar III, New Delhi-24.
36	Shri Mamman, M.A.	Q-2, Green Park Extension, New Delhi-16.
37	Shri Narish Kumar	16, Feroze Gandhi Road, New Delhi.
38	Shri L. N. Saklani	CII/3, Court Lane, Delhi-6.
39	M/s. Mala Madhukar Parekh	129, Sunder Nagar, New Delhi.
40	Shri N. K. Mukerji	8, Tughlak Lane, New Delhi-11.
41	Maj. Gen. Narinder Singh	79, Shahjahan Road, New Delhi.
42	Shri Bahadur Ram Tamta	10, Rajpur Road, Delhi-6.
43	Shri P. P. Srivastava	21, Boulevard Road, Delhi-6.
44	Smts. Jemuna Brij	W/o Shri Sundar Dass, B-138, Malviya Nagar New Delhi.
45	Smt. V. Purushottam	C/o Shri K.K. Srivastava, 6, Flagstaff Road, Delhi-6.
46	Shri Gopal Narayan Tandon	17/AB, Pandara Road, New Delhi.
47	Shri Kanai Deo Narayan	135, Jangpura Extension, New Delhi.
48	Shri Vijay Kumar Bajaj	II-K/9B, Lajpat Nagar, New Delhi.
49	Shri Sushar Pal Soni	N-17, Connaught Circus, New Delhi-1.
50	Shri Sushil Khanna	B-211, Greater Kailash, New Delhi-48.
51	Shri Deepak K. Malhotra	8/15, East Patel Nagar, New Delhi-8.
52	Shri Hari Kishan Panchal	59/29, New Rohtak Road, New Delhi.

S. No.	Name	Address
53.	Shri Somnath Revri	. 5, Scindia House, New Delhi—1.
54.	Shri Zafar Ahmed Dar.	. 2110, Gali Nahir Khan, Kucha Chelan, Darya Ganj, Delhi—6.
55.	Shri D.P. Jain	Deputy Chief Pay & Accounts Officer, Ministry of Supply, Akbar Road, New Delhi.
56.	Mrs. Leile Seth	. 122, Malcha Narg, New Delhi.
57.	Shri Satish Kumar Tuli	. R—527, New Rajinder Nagar, New Delhi.
58.	Shri Inder Bal Singh	. G—62, Lajpat Nagar I, New Delhi—24.
59.	Shri Anil Khanna	. E-165, Ashok Vihar, Delhi.
60.	Mrs. Rita Mathur	. 2140, Masjid Khajur, Delhi-6.

(vi)

DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
(CHAIRMAN'S SECRETARIAT)

No.F.15(107)/57-CS/DDA

Dated the 26th January, 1974.

To

The President,
New Friends Co-operative
House Building Society,
91, New Friends Colony,
Mathura Road,
New Delhi-14.

Subject: *Admission of 60 new members.*

Sir,

Please refer to your letter No. JS/74, dated 26th January 1974.

In view of the circumstances explained in your letter, we have no objection to your taking 60 new members as per list enclosed with your letter. However, if some members on the approved waiting lists of some of the co-operative house building societies in south Delhi are offered to you for membership by us, these will have to be accommodated by your Society.

A copy of the list of 60 members duly attested is enclosed.

Yours faithfully,

CHAIRMAN

DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

DA: list

(VII)

Proceedings of the meeting of the Managing Committee of the Society held on the 29th April, 1974.

An ordinary meeting of the Managing Committee of New Friends Cooperative House Building Society Ltd. held on Monday, the 29th April, 1974 at 5.00 P.M. at Delhi Gymkhana Club Ltd., New Delhi.

1. Dr. Jagjit Singh, President	Sd/-
2. Mr. B.N. Seth, Secretary	Sd/-
3. Mr. J.P. Bajaj, Member	Sd/-
4. Mr. S.C. Chhabra, Member	Sd/-
5. Mr. B.M. Vig, Member	Sd/-
6. Mr. N.K. Kothari, Member	Sd/-
7. Mr. B.M. Rallan, Member	Sd/-
8. Mr. G.R. Bahmani, Member	
9. Lt. Gen. C.C. Kapila, Member	Sd/-

Proposals:

1. To consider the follow-up action regarding the Hon'ble Supreme Court orders dated 4-4-1974 and 18-4-1974

The President read out the Hon'ble Supreme Court's orders dated 4-4-1974 and 18-4-1974. The order dated 18-4-1974 did not make any further change with regard to earlier order passed on 4-4-1974. According to earlier order, fifteen out of thirty-nine persons declared defaulters as per Mg. Committee resolution dated 6-1-1974 were given four weeks' time from 4-4-1974 to pay the balance due. It was noted payment of the full arrears from the following members have been received:—

1. Shri Sri Ram Khurana, M. No. 359
2. Shri Lekh Raj, M. No. 197
3. Shri Mohan Lal Nayyar, M. No. 934
4. Shri Jang Bahadur, M. No. 1421
5. Shri Hari Singh, M. No. 593
6. Shri Virendra, M. No. 499

7. Shri D. S. Tuteja, M. No. 597
8. Smt. Shakuntla Dewan, M. No. 1101
9. Shri I. C. Khanna, M. No. 1149.

It was accordingly resolved to cancel the defaulter notice issued to the above-mentioned persons who have paid their full dues in accordance with the Hon'ble Supreme Court order dated 4-4-74.

2. To report about the action taken in pursuit of Mg. Committee Resolution No. 4 dated 4-3-74 regarding convening of General Body meeting for election of New Mg. Committee

The Mg. Committee, as per Resolution No. 4 dated 4th March, 1974 had already authorised the President and the Secretary to determine date, time and place of the General Body meeting and to take all the necessary action, as per Schedule II of the Delhi Cooperative Societies Rules, 1973. The Committee was informed that it has been decided to convene the General Body meeting for election of the successor committee, consisting of seven members, on Sunday, the 30th June, 1974 at I.M.A. Hall, Indraprastha Estate, New Delhi.

The Committee also noted that the Registrar, Cooperative Societies has already been advised of date, time and place of the General Body meeting and the notice on the Society's Notice Board containing following information has been put up for the information of all concerned:—

- (a) The vacancies to be filled up by election—seven including one President and one Secretary.
- (b) The nomination papers to be filed in Form E by members will be received at the Society's office between 10.30 A.M. to 1.00 P.M. on every working day between 15th May, 1974 to 27th May, 1974.
- (c) Nomination papers will be scrutinised on Tuesday, the 28th May, 1974 between 10.30 A.M. to 1.00 P.M.
- (d) Polling will take place at the General Body meeting on 30th June, 1974, at I.M.A. Hall, Indraprastha Estate, New Delhi.

It was also resolved to issue advertisement in the papers notifying date, time and place of General Body meeting on 30th June, 1974 at I.M.A. Hall, Indraprastha Estate, New Delhi.

Sufficient stock of Forms E on which nomination of candidates is to be filed should be kept in Society's office to the members on demand.

A short note on the roles of the Registrar—Cooperative Societies & the DDA *Vis-a-Vis* the Society

The Registrar, Cooperative Societies is the agency for ensuring compliance with the Provisions of the Delhi Cooperative Societies Act (1972) and the Rules framed thereunder. He is also responsible for adjudication of disputes, if any between the members and the Society. He deposes annually his auditor to check the Society's accounts.

DDA is responsible for ensuring that the Society Membership includes only those members who are able to file the prescribed affidavit to the effect that the member and his wife or dependent children do not own any house or plot in Delhi. It is also responsible for granting members the sub-leases of their plots as well as approving the enrolment of new members. It has also to sanction transfer of membership from one to his blood relation like husband to wife, father to son, etc., provided certain conditions are complied with.

Communication addressed by the Society to M/s Swain Advertising and Swain Advertising's letter dated 4-5-1974, to the Advertisement Manager, *Hindustan Times* for insertion of the advertisement on the 8th May, 1974.

THE NEW FRIENDS CO-OPERATIVE
HOUSE BUILDING SOCIETY LTD.

91, NEW FRIENDS COLONY
MATHURA ROAD
NEW DELHI—14.
PHONE 630409
May 1, 1974.

The Swain Advertising,
Madan Mohan Lane,
4, Ansari Road,
Delhi.

Dear Sir,

It is requested that the attached advertisement may kindly be inserted in the *Times of India* and *Hindustan Times* immediately.

Yours faithfully,
Sd/-
JT. SECRETARY.

THE NEW FRIENDS CO-OPERATIVE
HOUSE BUILDING SOCIETY LTD.

91, Mathura Road.
New Delhi-14.
Phone: 630409.

It is notified for the information of all the members of the above Society that it is decided to hold a General Body Meeting of the Society on Sunday, 30th June, 1974 at 10.00 A.M. at Indian Medical Association Hall, Indraprastha Estate, New Delhi to elect the mem-

bers of the Managing Committee of the Society to succeed the present Committee on expiring of its term on 7-7-1974.

Nomination of candidates wishing to seek election will be received at Society office from 15th May, 1974 to 27th May, 1974. Further details may be obtained from the Society office during office hours.

Sd/-
(B. N. SETH)
Secretary.

Sd/-
(JAGJIT SINGH)
President,

RELEASE ORDER

SWAIN ADVERTISING

4346, Madan Mohan Lane, 4, Ansari Road

DELHI-110006

Phone : 270422 Gram : SWAINPUB

No. RO/1017/74

Dated: 4-5-1974.

The Advertisement Manager

Hindustan Times

NEW DELHI

CLIENT M/S. New Friends Co-operative House Bld. Society Ltd.—
 RATE Casual 25 per cent+20 per cent.

Please insert the following in accordance with the terms of contract
 in force

Date of insertion	Size	Key No.	Caption	Material
1	2	3	4	5
8-5-1974	8x2cols 16cms.			Text enclosed.
				3rd page.

- (1) The advertisement should appear according to the actual size of the advertisement material, if the mat shrinks, the size of the advt. should be reduced accordingly. (2) Blocks (only) must be returned immediately after the publication of the advertisement.

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS

1. Please follow our layouts strictly, setting of the blocks and type matter as shown in the layout.
2. One voucher copy must be sent to our client, two to us on the date of each insertion.
3. No two advertisements of a product should be published in one issue unless specially instructed.
4. Please submit bills in duplicate.

SWAIN ADVERTISING
 Media Manager