

COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES

TWELFTH REPORT
(THIRD LOK SABHA)

(Presented on the 1st December, 1966)



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

December 1966/Agrahayana, 1888 (Saka)

Price : 75 Paise

328.347R

CONTENTS

	PAGE
1. Personnel of the Committee of Privileges	(iii)
2. Report	1
3. Minutes	8
4. Evidence	19
5. Appendix	54

**PERSONNEL OF THE COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES
(1966-67)**

CHAIRMAN

Shri S. V. Krishnamoorthy Rao.

MEMBERS

2. Shri Frank Anthony
3. Shri N. C. Chatterjee
4. Sardar Kapur Singh
5. Shri L. D. Kotoki
6. Shri H. N. Mukerjee
7. Shri V. C. Parashar
8. Shri Purushottamdas R. Patel
9. Shri C. R. Pattabhi Raman
10. Shri Jaganath Rao
11. Shri Yuveraj Dutta Singh
- *12. Shrimati Ramdulari Sinha
13. Shri Satya Narayan Sinha
14. Shri Sinhasan Singh
15. Shri Sumat Prasad.

SECRETARIAT

Shri M. C. Chawla—Deputy Secretary.

*Nominated on the 3rd August, 1966.

TWELFTH REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES (Third Lok Sabha)

I. INTRODUCTION AND PROCEDURE

I, the Chairman of the Committee of Privileges, having been authorised to submit the report on their behalf, present this report to the House on the question of privilege raised by Shri Madhu Limaye, M.P. on the 2nd August, 1966 against Shri Jit Paul (partner of the firm "Amin Chand Payarelal") allegedly for having printed and circulated a pamphlet purporting to be a petition to Lok Sabha before its presentation to the House.

The matter was referred¹ to the Committee by the House on the 23rd August, 1966.

2. The Committee held nine sittings. The relevant Minutes of these sittings form part of the report.

3. At the first sitting held on the 31st August, 1966, the Committee decided that Shri Jit Paul's purported petition be circulated to the Members of the Committee in the first instance.

4. At the second sitting held on the 5th September, 1966, the Committee decided that Shri Jit Paul be asked to appear before the Committee in person on the 4th October, 1966.

5. At the third sitting held on the 4th October, 1966, the Committee examined Shri Jit Paul and directed him to furnish certain information and documents (as mentioned in the Minutes of the Committee dated the 4th October, 1966, at page 11).

6. At the fourth sitting held on the 27th October, 1966, the Committee considered the information and documents furnished² by Shri Jit Paul. The Committee decided that Shri J. M. Sehgal, an employee of M/s. Amin Chand Payarelal, who had accompanied Shri Jit Paul to Shri Madhu Limaye, M.P., be asked to appear before the Committee on the 2nd November, 1966.

7. At the fifth sitting held on the 2nd November, 1966, the Committee examined Shri J. M. Sehgal. The Committee decided that

¹ L.S. Deb., dt. 2-8-1966, cc. 1959-65.

² L.S. Deb., dt. 23-8-1966, cc. 6423-27.

³ See Appendix.

Shri Ram Mohan Dube, who had accompanied Sarvashri Jit Paul and J. M. Sehgal to Shri Madhu Limaye, M.P., be asked to appear before the Committee.

8. At the seventh sitting held on the 18th November, 1966, the Committee examined Shri Ram Mohan Dube. The Committee decided that Shri Madhu Limaye, M.P., who had raised the question of privilege in the House against Shri Jit Paul in this case be asked to appear before the Committee.

9. At the eight sitting held on the 24th November, 1966, the Committee examined Shri Madhu Limaye, M.P. and arrived at their conclusions.

10. At the ninth sitting held on the 30th November, 1966, the Committee considered their draft Report and adopted it.

II. FACTS OF THE CASE

11. On the 2nd August, 1966, Shri Madhu Limaye, M.P., raised a question of privilege in the House against one Shri Jit Paul (a partner of the firm "Amin Chand Payarelal"), *inter alia* on the ground that he had got printed and circulated a pamphlet purporting to be a petition⁴ to Lok Sabha before its presentation to the House. While raising the question of privilege, Shri Madhu Limaye stated:

"Now, I believe it is a grave breach of privilege and contempt of the House to print a petition and circulate it before it has been formally presented to the Lok Sabha.

This petition, I find, has not been presented to the House.

The contempt of the House becomes all the more serious because the petition is no ordinary petition ventilating a certain grievance; it traverses the finding of the Fiftieth Report of the Public Accounts Committee and seeks to prejudice Members adversely against the Public Accounts Committee by bringing undue influence on Members, Members who do not have any of the materials that led the Public Accounts Committee to make the report.

Assuming that the said petition had been presented to Parliament with the Speaker's consent, even so, it would be a

⁴ In the purported petition, Shri Jit Paul had stated his version of facts about the firm "Amin Chand Payarelal", commented upon by the Public Accounts Committee of Lok Sabha in their 50th Report and prayed for an opportunity being given to the firm to place their version of facts before the Public Accounts Committee.

breach of privilege because I think the petition cannot be circulated without the sanction of the Committee on Petitions.

Further, this printed matter bears no printer's line and so whoever printed it has also committed breach of privilege and should be hauled up."

12. The Speaker observed that every citizen had a right to submit a petition to Parliament through a Member of Parliament and for that purpose he could approach several Members, one after another, to try to get his petition countersigned and have it presented to the House by a Member. He could not also be prevented from having his petition printed before its presentation to the House. But so far as the allegation made against Shri Jit Paul of circulating his petition before presentation to the House was concerned, that could be enquired into and action taken by the House. As regards the complaint that Shri Jit Paul's pamphlet did not bear the printer's line, the Speaker observed that the matter would be brought to the notice of the Minister of Home Affairs whose function it was to take necessary action in the matter.

13. On the 23rd August, 1966, the Speaker made the following announcement^a in the House:—

"On the 2nd August, 1966, Shri Madhu Limaye had sought to raise a question of privilege against one Shri Jit Paul of M/s. Amin Chand Payarelal for having printed and circulated a pamphlet which purported to be a petition to Lok Sabha before its presentation to the House. I had said that I would enquire whether copies thereof had been circulated. I called for an explanation of the person concerned. I have now received the following reply dated the 18th August, 1966 from Shri Jit Paul:—

'I or my Representative have never circulated any copy of our Petition to any Member of Parliament or to anybody else. I, however, met the following Members of Parliament to seek their advice as to how to proceed about this matter. I also handed over to them a copy each of this Petition explaining my position.

Shri Rajeshwar Patel

Shri Madhu Limaye

Shri Gaure Murahari

^a L.S. Deb., dt. 23-8-1966, cc. 6423-25.

This copy was merely of the 1st part of the Petition and not of the 2nd part which contains the various schedules. I have not circulated any copy to anyone by post. I might state that at none of these meetings I had the feeling that I was taking a wrong step nor had I any indication from any one of the honourable Members mentioned above whom I met that I was doing a wrong thing. I did not have any intention to influence the opinion of these Members of Parliament nor did I have a possible expectation of exercising any such influence. I have the highest respect for the Parliament and the Public Accounts Committee. I hold the Honourable Speaker, the Members of Parliament and of the Public Accounts Committee in the highest esteem and respect. It is far from my thought or intention to do anything which would even remotely savour of disrespect to Parliament or to the Public Accounts Committee and their Rules and Regulations. If, however, by any chance, there is any semblance of disrespect having been shown by me, I humbly request the Honourable Speaker to accept my humble and unconditional apology to him and to all the Members of Parliament and of the Public Accounts Committee.

This Petition was printed by the Statesman Ltd., Statesman House, 4, Chowringhee Sq., Calcutta, in their commercial printing Department.'

On the 2nd August, 1966, Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad had also mentioned that this had been published in the *Current* weekly of Bombay. Although I had not asked for any explanation of the Editor of the *Current*, he has, of his own accord, sent to me the following letter dated the 5th August, 1966:—

'I understand from our correspondent in Delhi that our weekly was mentioned in the House in connection with a privilege issue that was discussed concerning a partner in the firm of Messrs. Amin Chand Payarelal and the Public Accounts Committee.

Although we have not yet heard anything officially in this connection, I feel I should mention to you, Sir, before hand that should we inadvertently have committed any breach of privilege of your Honourable House, we would be unhesitating in our expression of regret for any error on our

part and if there is any way in which we can put this matter right, we would consider it our duty to do so'".

14. The Speaker thereafter asked Shri Madhu Limaye if he wanted to say anything further on the matter. Shri Madhu Limaye replied that he wanted time to study the matter.

The Speaker, thereupon, observed that he was referring the matter to the Committee of Privileges for consideration and report.

III. FINDINGS OF THE COMMITTEE

15. The question of privilege referred to the Committee in the present case is based on the allegation made by Shri Madhu Limaye M.P., in the House on the 2nd August, 1966, that Shri Jit Paul had circulated the pamphlet which he intended to be presented to the Lok Sabha as a petition. This was quite clearly stated by the Speaker in the House on the 2nd August, 1966.

16. The Committee, therefore, decided to find out whether there was any evidence in support of the allegation that Shri Jit Paul had circulated the said pamphlet which he had intended to be presented to the Lok Sabha as a petition. With this end in view, the Committee first examined Shri Jit Paul in person on oath.

Shri Jit Paul, in his evidence before the Committee on the 4th October, 1966, denied that he had circulated any copy of the said pamphlet to any Member of Parliament or to any body else either by post or personally by himself. He, however, said that he had approached three Members of Parliament, namely, Sarvashri Madhu Limaye, Gaure Murahari and Rajeshwar Patel, "in order to seek their advice and, if possible, get their agreement for signing it because I was told by my solicitor that some Member of Parliament has to sign these petitions". He said that even to those Members of Parliament he had given copies of the purported petition without the schedules. He also stated that what had appeared in the *Current*, dated the 25th June, 1966, was different from the said pamphlet which had been drafted by his solicitors much later in the middle or the third week of July, and was printed about the end of July. He added that 10,000 copies of the said pamphlet had been printed and except one or two copies, the balance was lying.

17. The Committee then examined on oath Shri J. M. Sehgal, Manager, Amin Chand Payarelal, New Delhi, and Shri Ram Mohan Dube a journalist, who had accompanied Shri Jit Paul to Shri Madhu Limaye, M.P. Shri Sehgal deposed that when they went to

see Shri Madhu Limaye, M.P., they had only one copy of the pamphlet with them which was given to Shri Madhu Limaye, M.P., only when he said that it might be left with him so that he could study it before discussing the matter with them. Shri Sehgal further said that they had not circulated copies of the Pamphlet either personally or by post.

Shri Ram Mohan Dube, however, deposed that they had two copies of the said pamphlet when they went to see Shri Madhu Limaye, M.P. He added that a copy was left with Shri Madhu Limaye M.P., when he asked for it for studying it and thereafter fixing up some other time for discussion. According to him, another copy was left with Shri Gaure Murahari, M.P., also for the same purpose. He said that they had not gone to any other Member of Parliament thereafter on that day.

18. The Committee, thereafter, examined Shri Madhu Limaye, M.P. to find out whether he had any evidence in support of his allegation that Shri Jit Paul had circulated copies of the said pamphlet which he had intended to be presented to Lok Sabha. Shri Madhu Limaye said that Shri Jit Paul had left a copy of the printed pamphlet with him on his own and that there was no question of entering into any discussions with him or asking him to give him any paper or Shri Jit Paul's asking him to sponsor his petition. He, however, said that he had no knowledge whether the pamphlet had been circulated to others, except that Shri Rajeshwar Patel, M.P., had told him that he had been given a copy of the petition. He added that it was a presumption and an inference that the pamphlet had been circulated as he was given to understand by some dignitary of the Public Accounts Committee that 3,000 copies of the *Current* dated the 25th June, 1966 had been purchased by Shri Jit Paul.

19. After careful consideration of the evidence placed before the Committee, the Committee have come to the conclusion that there is no evidence in support of the allegation made by Shri Madhu Limaye, M.P., in the House that the purported petition had been published and circulated by Shri Jit Paul, except to the three Members of Parliament whom, as he stated, he had approached in connection with the presentation of the purported petition to Parliament.

20. The Committee, however, consider that the circumstances of the case are very suspicious, particularly in view of the fact that

the name of the printing press is not published on the pamphlet in question; but in the absence of any proof of actual distribution and also in view of the apology tendered by Shri Jit Paul, no further action need be taken in the matter.

IV. RECOMMENDATION OF THE COMMITTEE

21. The Committee recommend that no further action be taken by the House in the matter.

NEW DELHI;
The 30th November, 1966.

S. V. KRISHNAMOORTHY RAO,
Chairman,
Committee of Privileges.

MINUTES

I

First Sitting

New Delhi, Wednesday, the 31st August, 1966.

The Committee met from 16.00 to 16.45 hours.

PRESENT

Shri S. V. Krishnamoorthy Rao—*Chairman*

MEMBERS

2. Shri N. C. Chatterjee
3. Sardar Kapur Singh
4. Shri L. D. Kotoki
5. Shri H. N. Mukerjee
6. Shri V. C. Parashar
7. Shri Purushottamdas R. Patel
8. Shri C. R. Pattabhi Raman
9. Shri Jaganath Rao
10. Shri Yuveraj Dutta Singh
11. Shrimati Ramdulari Sinha
12. Shri Sinhasan Singh
13. Shri Sumat Prasad.

SECRETARIAT

Shri M. C. Chawla—*Deputy Secretary.*

* * * * *

5. The Committee then considered the question of privilege raised by Shri Madhu Limaye, M.P., against Shri Jit Paul (partner of the firm "Amin Chand Pyarelal") allegedly for having printed and circulated a pamphlet purporting to be a petition to Lok Sabha before its presentation to the House. The Committee decided that Shri Jit Paul's purported petition be circulated to the Members of the Committee in the first instance.

6. The Chairman read out to the Committee the letter dated the 25th August, 1966 from Shri Madhu Limaye, M.P., in which he had requested for giving him an opportunity to appear before the Committee in the cases against the Bihar Government, Col. Amrik Singh and Shri Jit Paul. The Committee decided to consider Shri Limaye's request later on at appropriate stages.

* * * * *

9. The Committee decided to meet on Saturday, the 1st October, 1966 to consider the various cases pending before the Committee.

The Committee then adjourned.

II

Second Sitting

New Delhi, Monday, the 5th September, 1966. . .

The Committee met from 16.00 to 17.25 hours.

PRESENT

Shri S. V. Krishnamoorthy Rao—*Chairman*

MEMBERS

2. Shri L. D. Kotoki
3. Shri H. N. Mukerjee
4. Shri Purushottamdas R. Patel
5. Shri Jaganath Rao
6. Shrimati Ramdulari Sinha
7. Shri Sinhasan Singh
8. Shri Sumat Prasad.

SECRETARIAT

Shri M. C. Chawla—*Deputy Secretary.*

* * * * *

4. The Committee then considered the question of privilege against Shri Jit Paul allegedly for having printed and circulated a

****Paragraphs 2 to 4 and 7 and 8 relate to other cases and will be included in the Minutes of the relevant Reports.

pamphlet purporting to be a petition to Lok Sabha before its presentation to the House.

The Committee directed that Shri Jit Paul be asked to appear before the Committee in person on the 4th October, 1966.

The Chairman read out to the Committee a communication from the Ministry of Home Affairs enquiring whether, in view of Shri Jit Paul's letter of regret read out to the House by the Speaker, Government should still initiate action against the printers of the petition under the Press and Registration of Books Act, 1867. The Committee decided that that matter should be considered by the Government independently on merits in the normal course.

* * * * *

6. The Committee decided to meet at 11.00 hours on Tuesday, the 4th October, 1966, instead of the 1st October, 1966 as decided by them earlier on the 31st August, 1966 to consider the various cases pending before the Committee.

The Committee then adjourned.

III

Third Sitting

New Delhi; Tuesday, the 4th October, 1966.

The Committee met from 11.00 to 13.15 hours and from 15.30 to 16.05 hours.

PRESENT

Shri S. V. Krishnamoorthy Rao—*Chairman*

MEMBERS

2. Shri Frank Anthony
3. Sardar Kapur Singh
4. Shri L. D. Kotoki
5. Shri H. N. Mukerjee

****Paragraphs 2, 3 and 5 relate to other cases and will be included in the Minutes of the relevant Reports.

6. Shri Purushottamdas R. Patel
7. Shri Jaganath Rao
8. Shrimati Ramdulari Sinha
9. Shri Sinhasan Singh
10. Shri Sumat Prasad.

SECRETARIAT

Shri M. C. Chawla—*Deputy Secretary.*

WITNESS

Shri Jit Paul.

* * * * *

5. Shri Jit Paul was then called in and examined by the Committee on oath.

6. The Committee directed Shri Jit Paul to furnish the following information and documents by the 20th October, 1966:—

- (i) Copy of the typed note left by Shri Jit Paul with the Editor of the *Current* magazine when he met him in June, 1966 in Bombay which was subsequently published in the *Current*.
- (ii) Copy of the letter from M/s. *Statesman*, Calcutta, in reply to Shri Jit Paul's letter, dated the 13th August, 1966 asking the reason for not printing the name of the printers and the printing press on the printed copies of the petition which was proposed to be presented to Lok Sabha by Shri Jit Paul.
- (iii) The date of receipt of the printed copies of the purported petition by Shri Jit Paul from M/s. *Statesman*, Calcutta.
- (iv) The complete particulars, of one, Shri Sehgal, stated to be an employee of Shri Jit Paul's firm and one, Shri Dube who took Sarvashri Sehgal and Jit Paul to Shri Madhu Limaye, M.P.

(The witness then withdrew)

* * * * *

The Committee then adjourned.

***Paragraphs 2 to 4 and 7—9 relate to other cases and will be included in the Minutes of the relevant Reports.

IV

Fourth Sitting

New Delhi, Thursday, the 27th October, 1966.

The Committee met from 11.00 to 11.30 hours.

PRESENT

Shri S. V. Krishnamoorthy Rao—*Chairman*

MEMBERS

2. Sardar Kapur Singh
3. Shri L. D. Kotoki
4. Shri Purushottamdas R. Patel
5. Shri Jaganath Rao
6. Shri Sumat Prasad.

SECRETARIAT

Shri M. C. Chawla—*Deputy Secretary.*

* * * * *

3. The Committee then considered the letter dated the 14th October, 1966 from Shri Jit Paul in response to the directive of the Committee to furnish certain information and documents.

The Committee decided that Shri Sehgal, an employee of M/s. Amin Chand Pyare Lal, who had accompanied Shri Jit Paul to Shri Madhu Limaye, M.P., be asked to appear before the Committee on the 2nd November, 1966, at 15.30 hours.

* * * * *

The Committee then adjourned.

****Paragraph 2 and 4 relate to other cases and will be included in the Minutes of the relevant Reports.

Fifth Sitting*New Delhi; Wednesday, the 2nd November, 1966.*

The Committee met from 15.00 to 16.50 hours.

PRESENT**Shri S. V. Krishnamoorthy Rao—Chairman****MEMBERS**

2. Shri Frank Anthony
3. Sardar Kapur Singh
4. Shri L. D. Kotoki
5. Shri H. N. Mukerjee
6. Shri V. C. Parashar
7. Shri C. R. Pattabhi Raman
8. Shri Jaganath Rao
9. Shri Yuveraj Dutta Singh
10. Shrimati Ramdulari Sinha
11. Shri Sinhasan Singh
12. Shri Sumat Prasad.

SECRETARIAT**Shri M. C. Chawla—Deputy Secretary****WITNESS**

Shri J. M. Sehgal (Manager, M/s. Amin Chand Pyarelal, New Delhi).

* * * * *

5. Shri J. M. Sehgal, Branch Manager, M/s. Amin Chand Pyarelal Group of Firms, New Delhi, was then called in and examined by the Committee on oath on the object of his visit to Shri Madhu Limaye along with Sarvashri Jit Paul and Dube.

The witness then withdrew

6. The Committee decided that Shri Dube, who had accompanied Sarvashri Jit Paul and J. M. Sehgal to Shri Madhu Limaye, M.P.,

****Paragraphs 2 to 4 relate to other cases and will be included in the Minutes of the relevant Reports.

be asked to appear before the Committee on the 8th November, 1966 at 16.00 hours.

The Committee then adjourned.

VI

Sixth Sitting

New Delhi, Tuesday, the 8th November, 1966.

The Committee met from 15.00 to 15.50 hours.

PRESENT

Shri S. V. Krishnamoorthy Rao—*Chairman*

MEMBERS

2. Shri N. C. Chatterjee
3. Shri L. D. Kotoki
4. Shri Jaganath Rao
5. Shri Sinhasan Singh
6. Shri Sumat Prasad.

SECRETARIAT

Shri M. C. Chawla—*Deputy Secretary.*

* * * * *

5. The Chairman then informed the Committee that he had received a letter dated the 5th November, 1966 from Shri Ram Mohan Dube (who had accompanied Shri Jit Paul and Shri J. M. Sehgal to Shri Madhu Limaye, M.P.) expressing his inability to appear before the Committee on the 8th November, 1966 and requesting for giving him another date after the 10th December, 1966.

The Committee decided that he be telegraphically asked to appear before the Committee on the 18th November, 1966 at 16.00 hours.

* * * * *

The Committee then adjourned.

****Paragraphs 2 to 4 and 6 relate to other cases and will be included in the Minutes of the relevant Reports.

Seventh Sitting

New Delhi; Friday, the 18th November, 1966.

The Committee met from 15.00 to 15.50 hours.

PRESENT

Shri S. V. Krishnamoorthy Rao—*Chairman*

MEMBERS

2. Shri N. C. Chatterjee
3. Shri L. D. Kotoki
4. Shri H. N. Mukerjee
5. Shri V. C. Parashar
6. Shri Yuveraj Dutta Singh
7. Shri Sumat Prasad.

SECRETARIAT

Shri M. C. Chawla—*Deputy Secretary.*

WITNESS

Shri Ram Mohan Dube.

2. Shri Ram Mohan Dube, who had accompanied Shri Jit Paul to Shri Madhu Limaye, M.P., in connection with the presentation to the House of a Petition by Shri Jit Paul (Partner of the firm named M/s. Aminchand Pyarelal) on the observations made by the Public Accounts Committee in their Fiftieth Report, was called in and examined by the Committee on oath.

The witness then withdrew.

3. The Committee decided that Shri Madhu Limaye, M.P., who had raised the question of privilege in the House against Shri Jit Paul in this case might be asked to appear before the Committee on the 24th November, 1966, as requested by him.

* * * * *

The Committee then adjourned.

***Paragraphs 4 and 5 relate to other cases and will be included in the Minutes of the relevant Reports.

VIII

Eighth Sitting

New Delhi; Thursday, the 24th November, 1966.

The Committee met from 15.00 to 17.15 hours.

PRESENT

Shri S. V. Krishnamoorthy Rao—*Chairman*

MEMBERS

2. Shri N. C. Chatterjee
3. Sardar Kapur Singh
4. Shri L. D. Kotoki
5. Shri V. C. Parashar
6. Shri Jaganath Rao
7. Shri Yuveraj Dutta Singh
8. Shri Sinhasan Singh
9. Shri Sumat Prasad.

SECRETARIAT

Shri M. C. Chawla—*Deputy Secretary.*

WITNESS

Shri Madhu Limaye, M.P.

* * * *

4. Shri Madhu Limaye, M.P., was then called in and examined by the Committee in regard to the question of privilege raised by him in Lok Sabha against Shri Jit Paul (partner of the firm "Amin Chand Pyarelal") allegedly for having printed and circulated a pamphlet purporting to be a petition to Lok Sabha before its presentation to the House.

(The witness then withdrew)

5. The Committee came to the conclusion that there was no evidence in support of the allegation that the purported petition had been published and circulated by Shri Jit Paul except to the three

Members of Parliament whom he was stated to have approached in connection with the presentation of the purported petition to Parliament. The Committee decided to recommend that no breach of privilege or contempt of the House was involved in the matter.

The Committee decided to meet again on the 29th †November, 1966 to consider their draft Report.

* * * * *

The Committee then adjourned.

IX

Ninth Sitting

New Delhi; Wednesday, the 30th November, 1966.

The Committee met from 16.15 to 16.50 hours.

PRESENT

Shri S. V. Krishnamoorthy Rao—*Chairman.*

MEMBERS

2. Sardar Kapur Singh
3. Shri L. D. Kotoki
4. Shri H. N. Mukerjee
5. Shri Jaganath Rao
6. Shri Yuveraj Dutta Singh
7. Shrimati Ramdulari Sinha
8. Shri Sumat Prasad.

SECRETARIAT

Shri M. C. Chawla—*Deputy Secretary.*

2. The Chairman apprised the Committee of the contents of a letter, dated the 28th November, 1966 from the Editor of the "CURRENT" stating that he was unable to find out the copy of the note which had been handed over to him by Shri Jit Paul and extracts from which had been published in the "CURRENT", dated the 25th June, 1966.

† The Committee considered their draft report at the Sitting held on the 30th November, 1966.

****Paragraphs 2, 3, 6 and 7 relate to other cases and will be included in the Minutes of the relevant Reports.

3. The Committee then considered their draft Twelfth Report and adopted it with the substitution of the following for the existing para 20:—

“20. The Committee, however, consider that the circumstances of the case are very suspicious, particularly in view of the fact that the name of the printing press is not published on the pamphlet in question; but in the absence of any proof of actual distribution and also in view of the apology tendered by Shri Jit Paul, no further action need be taken in the matter.”

* * * * *

5. The Committee authorised the Chairman and in his absence, Shri Sumat Prasad, to present their Twelfth and Thirteenth Reports to the House on the 1st December, 1966.

The Committee then adjourned.

****Paragraph 4 relates to another case and has been included in the Minutes of the relevant Report.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE TAKEN BEFORE THE COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES

Tuesday, the 4th October, 1966

PRESENT

CHAIRMAN

Shri S. V. Krishnamoorthy Rao

MEMBERS

2. Shri Frank Anthony
3. Sardar Kapur Singh
4. Shri L. D. Kotoki
5. Shri H. N. Mukerjee
6. Shri Purushottamdas R. Patel
7. Shri Jaganath Rao
8. Shrimati Ramdulari Sinha
9. Shri Sinhasan Singh
10. Shri Sumat Prasad

SECRETARIAT

Shri M. C. Chawla—*Deputy Secretary.*

WITNESS

Shri Jit Paul

(The Committee met at 11.00 hours)

EVIDENCE OF SHRI JIT PAUL

Shri Jit Paul: I, Jit Paul, 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.

Mr. Chairman: An allegation has been made by some one that you circulated a printed memorandum to the Members of Parliament before it was presented to Parliament. What have you got to say on that?

Shri Jit Paul: In this connection I have to say that I did not circulate any copy to any Member of Parliament. All that I did was, when I approached the three members, whose names I have already given to you, namely, Shri Madhu Limaye, Shri Gauri Murahari and Shri Rajeshwar Patel, I showed them a part of my petition, which I wanted to submit, in order to seek their advice and if possible, get their agreement for signing it because I was told by my solicitor that some Member of Parliament has to sign these petitions. The schedules were to be given even later. Because I was leaving the next day for Calcutta, I was told—Shri Madhu Limaye told me—“After you send the schedule, we will go through it”. I have not circulated either by post or by myself to anybody other than these people.

Mr. Chairman: It has appeared in the paper, *Current*. How has it appeared?

Shri Jit Paul: Whatever has appeared in the *Current* is not exactly a petition. The petition was drafted by the solicitors much later. I met Shri Morarka around 10th or 11th June and from here I went to Bombay. By then *Current* had already published two issues on us giving all sorts of allegations against us. I went to their office and told them that this is not the fact, that certain facts have not been presented to the PAC by the department concerned, that I have requested also the Chairman accordingly and the Chairman told me, “The best way is to go to your solicitor, draft a petition and give it to Parliament”. Then he—Shri Karaka—saw that note of mine and possibly I left an unsigned copy with him. Because Shri Morarka told me clearly, “You consult your solicitors and then give it”, there was no signed copy given to him.

Sardar Kapur Singh: Is he the Karaka who edits the *Current*?

Shri Jit Paul: Yes. ..

Mr. Chairman: Who gave it to the *Current*?

Shri Jit Paul: I gave him the note. I told him the facts of the case which I had told Shri Morarka when I was in Delhi. This petition was a different petition than that.

Sardar Kapur Singh: Is Shri Karaka a solicitor?

Shri Jit Paul: Shri Karaka is *Current's* editor. He published two articles and I went to him and told him, “You are publishing these articles which are very damaging to us; actually, the facts are slightly different but they have not been given to the PAC”.

Mr. Chairman: Before the publication who briefed him?

Shri Jit Paul: I told him.

Sardar Kapur Singh: If I have understood him correctly, he says that Shri Karaka had been publishing things against their firm; so, he went to Shri Karaka and said, "You are not well informed; the real facts are something like this". He says that in that connection an unsigned copy might have been left with him to let him know what the real facts, according to him, are. It was not meant for publication. Is that the position?

Shri Jit Paul: Yes, Sir. I told him that Shri Morarka has told me, "Whenever any petition has to be given to Parliament or anybody, you must consult your solicitor". He told me categorically, "I will see that nothing is published or said which is against the High Court", because some cases of this are also pending with the High Court. He said, "He will examine it himself and then say something which should be said".

Mr. Chairman: Did your solicitors in any way give notice to the editor of *Current*?

Shri Jit Paul: From Bombay I went to Calcutta and then we drafted this petition to be filed in the House.

Mr. Chairman: Was your talk with the editor of *Current* after publication or before publication?

Shri Jit Paul: Before publication of this petition.

Mr. Chairman: Do you mean to say that what is published in the *Current* is a garbled version of the information you gave him?

Shri Jit Paul: I would say "Yes". But I never told him to publish all this because the High Court was involved. I told him that all these cases were pending before the High Court and "You should either stop the publication of articles which you are publishing every week against us or say something which is not contrary to the rules of the High Court or even the House".

Mr. Chairman: Did you issue any lawyer's notice?

Shri Jit Paul: No, Sir; we did not.

Sardar Kapur Singh: This publication, as a matter of fact, was in his favour.

Shri Jaganath Rao: Is it a true version of the memorandum given to Parliament?

Shri Jit Paul: This is different.

Sardar Kapur Singh: The one which is published is substantially the same as the printed memorandum.

Shri Jit Paul: The facts are near about the same.

Sardar Kapur Singh: But the language is different.

Shri Jit Paul: The language is very much different because that has been worded in accordance with the Rules of the Lok Sabha.

Mr. Chairman: Do you swear that apart from these three Members of Parliament you have never distributed any copy to anybody else?

Shri Jit Paul: I do swear that I have not given any copy to anybody and to these Members also only without the schedules.

Sardar Kapur Singh: You did not authorise Shri Karaka to publish it.

Shri Jit Paul: No, Sir; absolutely not. Rather, I told him, "Do not publish anything because Shri Morarka told me, when I wanted to give a petition to Shri Morarka, "Do not give it like this; consult your solicitors".

Sardar Kapur Singh: Shri Morarka gave you the best advice.

Shri Jit Paul: I acted like that.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: You had this proposed petition printed in the *Statesman* printing press.

Shri Jit Paul: That is right.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: The *Statesman* is a very reputable business organisation.

Shri Jit Paul: That is right.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I think, you will agree that the *Statesman* usually observes the rules regarding printing jobs.

Shri Jit Paul: That is right.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: What is the number of copies you ordered to be printed?

Shri Jit Paul: About 10,000.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: A very large number.

Shri Jit Paul: That is right.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Your idea was to distribute it very largely all over the place.

Shri Jit Paul: After it was presented, yes.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Did you notice that there was no printer's line in the document as it was printed, as you say, by the *Statesman*?

Shri Jit Paul: We did not know about that. *The Statesman* and the advertising agents, J. Walter Thompson, we thought, were very reputable and they will certainly take care of any rules and regulations. We never knew that it is very essential.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: You will agree with me that the *Statesman*, doing a normal job of work, would be expected to observe some rules, which may not be known to you but are very well known to the *Statesman*.

Shri Jit Paul: I think so. They should.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Could it be that your idea was to see to a large circulation of this petition surreptitiously so that the *Statesman* or any other press may not get into the picture?

Shri Jit Paul: No, it was not our idea because we appointed these two people specifically and there was no question of hiding any fact from anybody. We thought and our solicitors advised us that this was well within our rights that after we had filed the application, we could circulate it. That is how both these people advised us plus our solicitors.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: You knew that in this petition of yours you were making a detailed criticism of a report made by a Committee of Parliament.

Shri Jit Paul: According to my counsels, they have not criticized. .

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: You knew it.

Shri Jit Paul: No, we have not done it. We have only said that certain facts have not been given by Hindustan Steel to the PAC.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: In any case, when you were asking for 10,000 copies of this petition, a very detailed and argumentative petition, to be printed by a very efficient printing establishment, your idea was to propagate this as widely as possible and as speedily as possible in view of Parliament taking notice of this Report.

Shri Jit Paul: Certainly we had the desire to give the information that certain facts which could have gone in our favour have not been given to the PAC. Even the whole Report says that certain things have not been brought to their notice. If they would have been brought to their notice, their conclusion might have been different.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I put it to you, therefore, that your idea was to put your point of view before Parliament and the whole country through the press or otherwise as quickly as possible and as widely as possible.

Shri Jit Paul: That is right. Our idea was to bring certain facts to the notice of Parliament and other Houses which were not given by the departments concerned.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: If a presumption is made by many people, as it has been made, that printing of such a large number of copies of this petition and the way it got circulated surreptitiously suggests something which really should not have been done, what is your answer?

Shri Jit Paul: It has not been circulated at all. That can be verified at any time if you like. Even the delivery was taken of 9000 and odd pieces much later from the *Statesman* themselves.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Do you mean to say that, when you met Mr. Karaka who is the Editor of the *Current* and possibly you expected him to have some sympathy from your point of view and you showed him the document, you had no expectations at all about his utilising it for the purpose of publication?

Shri Jit Paul: Certainly not to the extent he utilised. He told me categorically that he will look into both the aspects. I had seen the Chairman before that and at that time the petition was not ready. The petition was drafted sometime in the middle or the third week of July.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: But, substantially, you say, what Mr. Karaka did actually print in the *Current* is in your petition.

Shri Jit Paul: That is for him to answer. I only told him, "You have put two publications against us, 2 full pages, without going into the details which should not be your job." That is what I told him.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: You gave specific instructions to Mr. Karak, whom I suppose you know very well. . . .

Shri Jit Paul: That was my first meeting with him. I had not known his face prior to this and I have not seen his face after that.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Did you tell him very definitely that the matter was pending before Parliament and that no publicity should be given to it?

Shri Jit Paul: I had told him that the matter was pending before the Parliament and the High Court and that he should say only what he can say.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Did you tell him that till the petition was presented to Parliament, the substance of the petition, however, differently worded, should not be given publicity in the *Current* or elsewhere?

Shri Jit Paul: At that time the petition did not exist. That came in sometime in July. At that time, the matter was pending before the House and I told him that and I never expected him to print it like this.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I have not seen the *Current* report. But your evidence is that the *Current* report is based on some notes in regard to the petition which you were going to present.

Shri Jit Paul: The petition was drafted much later. The *Current* only says that certain facts, which we think, were not brought to the notice of the P.A.C.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: The *Current* was shown a fairly comprehensive and quite an accurate draft of the petition as it was to be presented.

Shri Jit Paul: There was no draft petition. At that time, it was certain notes which I had prepared to discuss with Shri Morarka.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Therefore, according to your evidence, what appeared in the *Current* should be very different in composition from the petition as was later formulated.

Shri Jit Paul: The facts are the same but the language is different.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I have not seen it. I am asking you, its phrasing, its wording, its formulation, is different from the actual petition.

Shri Jit Paul: The wording is different. But the facts are, of course, same.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: You got 10,000 copies printed. You must have paid for it.

Shri Jit Paul: Not yet. I will pay in course of time.

Sardar Kapur Singh: How much will the bill come to?

Shri Jit Paul: Roughly, Rs. 12,000.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: When you got the printed pamphlet, you did not see whether it bore the name of the printer and the publisher.

Shri Jit Paul: I did not see and I do not know.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: When you get a copy, would not your eye fall on the printer's or the publisher's name?

Shri Jit Paul: I did not notice it.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: 10,000 is a big number. You say that you wanted to send round the copies after it was presented to the Parliament. You say that you approached only three Members of Parliament. All the three Members refused to present it to Parliament?

Shri Jit Paul: All the three persons said, "We will study it and let you know." Mr. Madhu Limaye said, "You send the schedules also." I left for Calcutta the next day and then I found that the privilege motion was filed against me. Then, my men never approached him nor we approached anybody thereafter.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: You approached Mr. Madhu Limaye, Mr. Rajeshwar Patel and another Member also. It was Mr. Madhu Limaye who moved the privilege motion in Parliament. May I know what was the talk that passed between you and Mr. Madhu Limaye about the presentation of the petition to Parliament and how many days earlier you had met him and how many days after you presented it. What happened in between?

Shri Jit Paul: One Mr. Dube who is known to our Manager, Mr. Sehgal came and said, "We can go to these people". I myself, Mr. Sehgal and Mr. Dube went to Shri Gauri Murahari and we talked for about 10 to 15 minutes. He said, "Let me read it." After that, we went to Mr. Madhu Limaye. I asked him, "Should I start the

subject?". He said, "Well, have you got the P.A.C. Report?". I said, "I have not got it". Then, he brought the Report and I told him that certain facts were not given to the P.A.C. Then, he said, "There are certain other papers/schedules which are mentioned here. You send them to me and I will read them." Later on I learnt on Monday or on Tuesday and I found that the motion of privilege was filed against me.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: You say that certain schedules were to be produced. Did you ask him the time by which you could produce those schedules?

Shri Jit Paul: I was to send those schedules through my man. But before I could do so, the motion was filed against me.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: What was the time fixed? There was a talk between two gentlemen and he must have fixed some time for you to produce those schedules. What was the time fixed?

Shri Jit Paul: There was no time fixed. He only told us to send the schedules to him and that he will read them. The next day, the motion was filed against us and we never approached anybody thereafter.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: You mean to say that Mr. Madhu Limaye did not observe the contract that was between you and him.

Shri Jit Paul: There was no contract.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: There was an understanding or a contract or an agreement between you and him. You went to him and he wanted more details and you said that you would supply him those details. But before you could supply him, he ran to Parliament and filed a motion of breach of privilege against us. Afterwards, did you tell Mr. Madhu Limaye, "Why did you run to Parliament when you had asked me to send you those details, the schedules, and file the motion of breach of privilege against us?"

Shri Jit Paul: I have not met him. Later on, I learnt that Mr. Dube was not a reliable man.

Mr. Chairman: Who is Mr. Dube?

Shri Jit Paul: There is one Mr. Dube who is known to my Manager, Mr. Sehgal.

Mr. Chairman: Is he a Member of Parliament?

Shri Jit Paul: No, Sir. He took us to Mr. Madhu Limaye. Otherwise, I did not know Mr. Madhu Limaye.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: Who is Mr. Dube?

Shri Jit Paul: My Manager will know it.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: Your Manager can inform us more on this point than yourself?

Shri Jit Paul: My Manager knows him.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: You talked with Mr. Madhu Limaye directly?

Shri Jit Paul: Yes.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: After that, did you think it proper to meet Mr. Madhu Limaye and ask him, "Why did you run to Parliament when you had asked me to produce certain documents which you wanted to go through?" Did you see him and make a complaint to him?

Shri Jit Paul: I did not do that since I had not known Mr. Madhu Limaye and that was my first contact with him. Later on, I learnt that Mr. Dube was not the right man.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: It seems Mr. Dube took you to the wrong person. If Mr. Dube was a wrong man, he took you to a wrong person to serve your interest.

Shri Jit Paul: I would say, probably, Mr. Madhu Limaye did not trust Mr. Dube or some such thing.

Sardar Kapur Singh: Is Mr. Dube known as a contact man?

Shri Jit Paul: I have no knowledge of that.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: Did you find out through Mr. Sehgal who Mr. Dube was?

Shri Jit Paul: I did not find out. As soon as Mr. Madhu Limaye filed the motion, I learnt that he was not the right man.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: He moved a different motion against you. You had approached him and it seems your purpose was frustrated by him.

Shri Jit Paul: Yes.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: So, as a natural consequence you must have approached Mr. Madhu Limaye or his party leader that he had betrayed you.

Shri Jit Paul: I did not know him. Otherwise, I would have certainly approached him or anybody else.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: What did Mr. Rajeshwar Patel and the other Member tell you?

Shri Jit Paul: Mr. Rajeshwar Patel and the other Member also said, "We will read it and let you know." I did not follow it up after the motion had been filed.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: After the motion had been filed, there was no question of following it up. It is a question of prior to that. When the document was printed, after how many days you approached Mr. Madhu Limaye and Mr. Rajeshwar Patel?

Shri Jit Paul: I think I approached these three people within the 10th August.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: When was the document printed?

Shri Jit Paul: The document was printed about the end of July.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: When did you meet Mr. Madhu Limaye?

Shri Jit Paul: I met Mr. Limaye on 6th or 7th August.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: So a fortnight passed between your meeting Mr. Limaye and the printing of the document.

Shri Jit Paul: Yes.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: When did you meet Mr. Karaka?

Shri Jit Paul: I met Mr. Karaka in June.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: Then the copy was left unsigned. This printed document.....

Shri Jit Paul: This printed document was not ready then. There was a note which I brought to discuss with him.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: Was it written?

Shri Jit Paul: It was typed.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: Have you got a copy of that?

Shri Jit Paul: No.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: Can you produce it? I mean, the copy with which you went to Mr. Karaka.

Shri Jit Paul: It might be available in the office in Calcutta. I do not know. I will send it if you like.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: When you knew that this report had appeared in Current, naturally the question was how the matter went to Current. It was said that a copy was left there without any instruction for publication.....

Mr. Chairman: That is not the issue.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: The issue is whether this very thing was in typed form when he went to Mr. Karaka. Can he produce that document?

Shri Jit Paul: If I can get a copy from Calcutta, I will send it. At that time there was no petition like that.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: Who were your lawyers?

Shri Jit Paul: Mr. Siddhanta Ray and Mr. R. C. Deb.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: This document must have passed through several hands before it got printed.

Shri Jit Paul: Yes.

Shri Jaganath Rao: Did you know these three MPs. earlier?

Shri Jit Paul: No; I met all the three for the first time.

Shri Jaganath Rao: Did you meet all of them on the same day?

Shri Jit Paul: I met Mr. Gaure Murahari and Mr. Madhu Limaye on the same day within a gap of fifteen minutes. We finished that within one or one and a half hours. I met Mr. Rajeshwar Patel two days earlier.

Shri Jaganath Rao: Did Mr. Rajeshwar Patel tell you that he would present the petition?

Shri Jit Paul: He said, "let me go through this".

Shri Jaganath Rao: Mr. Limaye also said the same thing?

Shri Jit Paul: He said, "let me get the schedule and read it".

Shri Jaganath Rao: Mr. Limaye presented the memorandum to Parliament on the 2nd August complaining against you. How many days earlier did you meet him?

Shri Jit Paul: I met him one Sunday afternoon. If 2nd is Tuesday, I must have met him on the 31st.

Shri Jaganath Rao: Do you suggest that you never distributed any of these copies of the Memorandum to any other MP?

Shri Jit Paul: It is not a suggestion; it is a fact. All copies are lying with me. The date of delivery by *Statesman* can be checked up.

Sardar Kapur Singh: I suggest that your omission of the printer's line on this printed petition is deliberate and that you have something to do with it.

Shri Jit Paul: Certainly not.

Sardar Kapur Singh: Do you repudiate that?

Shri Jit Paul: I repudiate that. It is not deliberate at all.

Shri Kotoki: You have said in your letter to the Speaker that it was printed in the Commercial Department of *Statesman*.

Shri Jit Paul: That is right.

Shri Kotoki: But the name of the Press is not mentioned here. Can you give any proof that it was actually printed in the *Statesman*?

Shri Jit Paul: Surely.

Shri Kotoki: You said that you received about 9,000 and odd copies. When did you receive?

Shri Jit Paul: It was after the motion was filed because they were not ready by then.

Shri Kotoki: When did you meet the editor of the Current?

Shri Jit Paul: It was sometime in June, may be 11th or 12th.

Shri Kotoki: You said a little earlier, when Mr. Mukerjee asked you, that you might have left inadvertently a copy of the unsigned petition.

Shri Jit Paul: No.

Shri Kotoki: Anyway, what was the date when you received the copies from the *Statesman*?

Shri Jit Paul: I have noted down these. I shall send you all the information—the proof that it was printed in *Statesman*, the delivery of the petition, the date when we received the copies.

Shri P. R. Patel: You wanted to approach the Parliament through this petition. Is it so?

Shri Jit Paul: Yes.

Shri P. R. Patel: For that purpose, you wanted to seek the help of some M.P., so that it may be presented to Parliament.

Shri Jit Paul: That is right.

Shri P. R. Patel: That was the only intention?

Shri Jit Paul: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: Have you written to the Statesman office asking why they have not printed this line?

Shri Jit Paul: I do not know whether we wrote. My man talked to them on telephone. They say that it is not necessary to print. That is what they have again repeated.

Mr. Chairman: This is a firm of printers. You know what their function is as printers.

Shri Jit Paul: As soon as I learnt about it, I checked up myself.

Mr. Chairman: Have you got anything in writing to show that you asked them and they replied like that?

Shri Jit Paul: I think we wrote to them one letter on 13th August. May I read this letter?

“With reference to the conversation that our representative had with you the other day, we would request you to let us know the names of the printers and printing press as well of our petition entitled above. The Deputy Secretary, Lok Sabha, in his letter has called upon us to assign the reason why the name of the printers and the printing press on the petition was not disclosed. We shall be thankful if you can furnish us with the above information, as requested, at an early date, in order to enable us to satisfy the query of the Deputy Secretary, Lok Sabha.”

Mr. Chairman: Is it addressed to the Editor, Statesman?

Shri Jit Paul: Not to the Editor, but to the Statesman.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: What is the reply?

Shri Jit Paul: The reply is not unfortunately filed here. We must have got a written reply, but it is not filed in this file.

Mr. Chairman: Can you produce it before the Committee?

Shri Jit Paul: Yes. I distinctly remember that they told my man that it is not necessary under some clause.

Mr. Chairman: Whatever it is, you can produce it.

Shri Jit Paul: Yes. Even the advertising agents were a reputed one.

Mr. Chairman: Who were the advertising agents?

Shri Jit Paul: J. Walter Thompson.

Mr. Chairman: Their name also does not find a place here?

Shri Jit Paul: They are advertising agents. Normally that does not appear.

Mr. Chairman: When you approached the MPs, this was not printed?

Shri Jit Paul: This was printed in July.

Shri Kotoki: Why did you have an advertising agent?

Shri Jit Paul: This is the normal practice of any commercial organisation. We hardly go to the Press direct.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Have you destroyed all the copies which were printed by the Statesman, after you got into this?

Shri Jit Paul: The copies are lying as they are.

Mr. Chairman: What is the number of copies? Are they lying with you?

Shri Jit Paul: Yes, about 10,000 of them. One or two copies were sent to the Lok Sabha. The balance are lying.

Mr. Chairman: That is all. Thank you.

Shri Jit Paul: I again apologize if there is anything which I have.....

Mr. Chairman: That is all right.

Shri Jit Paul: I shall send those documents. I am grateful for this. Thank you.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: I would like to know when he will be filing the documents which we wanted from him. Mr. Chairman, you have asked him to file certain documents and I have also asked him to submit certain documents, the typed copy of the other document with which he went to Mr. Karaka.

Mr. Chairman: You please send us these documents and also the reply of THE STATESMAN. When will you be able to submit them?

Shri Jit Paul: I will try to locate that reply. I will also send the documents which the honourable Member wanted. I think within a fortnight I will be able to send them.

Mr. Chairman: Can you do so by 20th of this month which is Thursday? You can send them to the Office.

Shri Jit Paul: I will do that.

Mr. Chairman: Your statement before the Committee will be ready by 4.30 or 5.00. You can come at that time, correct the thing if it is necessary and then sign it.

Shri Jit Paul: Thank you, Sir.

(The witness then withdrew)

Wednesday, the 2nd November, 1966.

PRESENT

CHAIRMAN

Shri S. V. Krishnamoorthy Rao

MEMBERS

2. Shri Frank Anthony
3. Sardar Kapur Singh
4. Shri L. D. Kotoki
5. Shri H. N. Mukerjee
6. Shri V. C. Parashar
7. Shri C. R. Pattabhi Raman
8. Shri Jaganath Rao
9. Shri Yuveraj Dutta Singh
10. Shrimati Ramdulari Sinha

11. Shri Sinhasan Singh
12. Shri Sumat Prasad.

SECRETARIAT

Shri M. C. Chawla—*Deputy Secretary.*

WITNESS

Shri J. M. Sehgal (*Manager, M/s Amin Chand Pyare Lal, New Delhi.*)

(The Committee met at 15.00 hours)

EVIDENCE OF SHRI J. M. SEHGAL (MANAGER, M/S AMIN CHAND
PYARE LAL, NEW DELHI).

Shri J. M. Sehgal: I, J. M. Sehgal, do swear in the name of God and solemnly affirm 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 Sinhasan Singh: You are the Manager of Aminchand Pyarelal here in Delhi.

Shri Sehgal: Yes.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: Did you go to Mr. Madhu Limaye along with one Shri Dube and Mr. Jit Paul?

Shri Sehgal: Yes.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: Who is this Mr. Dube? Can you give his full address?

Shri Sehgal: His full name is Ram Mohan Dube and his address is 12/14, Tilak Nagar. He is a journalist.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: Did Mr. Jit Paul ask you about the address of this gentleman and his whereabouts after he appeared before this Committee and if so, when?

Shri Sehgal: I have given the address of this gentleman to Mr. Jit Paul only yesterday, because he was not here; he was out of station. I was also out of the country when Mr. Jit Paul came here to appear before this Committee.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: Only yesterday you have given him the address. What about this Mr. Dube? Is he a reliable man? How long you have known him?

Shri Sehgal: I have known this gentleman for the last about two years. Of course I did not see anything wrong with this gentleman.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: You were confident that the man was reliable.

Shri Sehgal: From what little I knew of this man, I did not find anything bad in him. I did not have much dealings with him.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: Did Mr. Jit Paul know him?

Shri Sehgal: Mr. Jit Paul did not know him.

Mr. Chairman: How long before you knew him?

Shri Sehgal: For the last two years.

Mr. Chairman: In what connection you had acquaintance with him?

Shri Sehgal: He is a journalist. We had often occasion to meet in the Coffee House.

Mr. Chairman: He had no dealings with your firm.

Shri Sehgal: No Sir, he is a journalist and he used to drop in our office sometimes.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: You had given him a copy of the printed petition before you went to Mr. Madhu Limaye with him.

Shri Sehgal: I did not give any copy.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: For what purpose you took him to Mr. Madhu Limaye?

Shri Sehgal: He came to my office, as he does sometimes, and then I asked him to help us in this matter. I told him 'we are interested in putting our view point because there has been criticism in the papers and could you tell me or introduce us to some Members of Parliament whom we could approach to represent our case'. He said, 'yes, I will fix it up; I have a few friends'. He eventually talked to Mr. Madhu Limaye.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: You talked to him and requested him to help you in submitting a petition to the Parliament because you felt that something is wrong. Did he ask you what was the particular petition that you were going to submit?

Shri Sehgal: Of course everything has been coming in the papers. I just gave him the gist of it. I did not give him a copy of the petition. I told him our view point which we were thinking to place

before the Parliament. As this was the first occasion when we had to face such a situation and as we were not aware of the parliamentary procedure, I asked him whether he could suggest to me some course of action.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: Your petition had been printed before you met Mr. Dube.

Shri Sehgal: The petition must have been printed in Calcutta.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: Was it printed before you met Mr. Dube?

Shri Sehgal: Yes.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: When you went with him to Mr. Madhu Limaye....

Shri Sehgal: The idea was not to hand over the petition.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: Leave alone the ideas. The specific question is, you went to Mr. Madhu Limaye along with Mr. Dube and Mr. Jit Paul with a copy of the petition.

Shri Sehgal: We had one copy.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: Mr. Dube must have asked you to show the petition and you must have also shown him that.

Shri Sehgal: I did not show the petition.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: Mr. Jit Paul also did not show him the petition.

Shri Sehgal: Nobody showed him the petition.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: When it was presented to Mr. Madhu Limaye. . . .

Shri Sehgal: It was like this. When we went to Mr. Madhu Limaye, Mr. Jit Paul asked him, 'I would like to place my view point before Parliament; I would like to know your opinion about presenting my case to Parliament'. Mr. Madhu Limaye asked, 'have you read the report of PAC, have you got a copy of PAC Report? Mr. Jit Paul said 'No'. Mr. Madhu Limaye got up and went back to his room and brought a copy of the PAC Report. He told Mr. Jit Paul 'carry on with what you have got to say.' When Mr. Jit Paul told him a gist of what he wanted to say, Mr. Madhu Limaye said, 'if you have some documents with you, you leave it with me, I will study it and discuss it with you further if necessary.' Mr. Jit Paul told him that we have drafted a petition which is not yet complete, because all the enclosures to be attached with the petition we were not carrying. Mr. Madhu Limaye said, 'I will study whatever you have got with you now and then discuss it with you'.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: Did he ask for the enclosures?

Shri Sehgal: He asked for the enclosures, but we said we would deliver them on a later date.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: Did you deliver the enclosures to him?

Shri Sehgal: No. When we came to know what had happened, we did not think it proper to deliver the enclosures.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: This document was in your possession or in the hands of Mr. Jit Paul when you went to Mr. Madhu Limaye.

Shri Sehgal: The file I was carrying.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: So it was in your possession. How many copies were there with you?

Shri Sehgal: That time I had only one copy.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: You were going to meet so many members.

Shri Sehgal: We did not take any copies—I mean more than one. Even when we went to Mr. Madhu Limaye we had no intention of giving a copy to him. Only when he said that we should leave a copy with him so that he could study before he discusses it with us, we left a copy with him.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: Did you meet any other Member?

Shri Sehgal: Yes, Mr. Gauri Murahri.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: And no other Member.

Shri Sehgal: No. The same thing happened there also. He asked us to leave a copy there.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: You left a copy there also. And thereafter, you did not go anywhere.

Shri Sehgal: Nowhere. Sir.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: Who got this copy printed?

Shri Sehgal: I only know Mr. Jit Paul who brought it from Calcutta.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: You are a Manager here.

Shri Sehgal: Yes, Sir. I am looking after the Delhi Office.

Shri Frank Anthony: Did you go to Shri Rajeshwar Patel?

Shri Sehgal: No, Sir. I did not go to him.

Shri Pattabhi Raman: You are a Liaison Officer here.

Shri Sehgal: I am the Manager of the Delhi Office.

Shri Pattabhi Raman: That is what I am saying. What is your function here?

Shri Sehgal: We deal in steel imports.

Shri Pattabhi Raman: You have no other work excepting the trading business or whatever it is.

Shri Sehgal: We are concerned with trading business only at Delhi.

Shri Pattabhi Raman: In Delhi Office, you are a contact man.

Shri Sehgal: Whatever trading business we do here in Delhi is in connection with sales and purchases. That I look after here.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Dube is the person who introduced you to Mr. Madhu Limaye.

Shri Sehgal: Yes, Sir.

Shri Frank Anthony: Was any signature taken when this was handed over to him?

Shri Pattabhi Raman: Frankly, will you be able to say as to how many copies were sent?

Shri Sehgal: We did not send any copy at all.

Shri Pattabhi Raman: You did not send any by post.

Shri Sehgal: No.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: When did you come to know about the remarks having been made against your concern in the P.A.C. Report?

Shri Sehgal: Only when I read that in the paper.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: Then, did you inform your head office that such and such a thing appeared in the P.A.C. Report?

Shri Sehgal: He read the paper in Calcutta; I did not inform him.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: Was there any talk between you and Mr. Jit Paul to have further knowledge about the whole report of the P.A.C. at any stage before that?

Shri Sehgal: They asked us to buy a copy of the report and send that to them.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: You bought it and send that on to them.

Shri Sehgal: Yes, Sir.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: How much was paid for the report?

Shri Sehgal: I don't know. Because, I did not go to buy that. One of my clerks must have gone to buy a copy of it. That was for the Office to buy that.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: You must have paid for that. How much amount was paid for that? Is there any account?

Shri Sehgal: Yes, Sir. When we pay for that, it is in the accounts.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: How many copies of the P.A.C. Report were bought by you?

Shri Sehgal: I cannot remember exactly whether we bought one or two copies of the report.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: At least you can say as to how many copies were bought by you.

Shri Sehgal: I can only look into my file and tell you. But, I cannot tell you off-hand as to how many copies were bought.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: How many days after having bought the copy of the P.A.C. Report, did Mr. Jit Paul come to you when you went to see Mr. Madhu Limaye?

Shri Sehgal: I cannot tell you off-hand.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: Was it after ten days or how many days after?

Shri Sehgal: I cannot tell you exactly. Of course, when we met Mr. Madhu Limaye, probably, it was over three months ago or so.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: Have you seen the copy?

Shri Sehgal: I don't remember the date when Mr. Jit Paul gave.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: Did you read the Current to know that a certain thing appeared therein?

Shri Sehgal: Yes, Sir. I did read the Current.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: Whether your petition has been printed before publication in the Current or was it printed afterwards?

Shri Sehgal: I do not remember that.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: Was it printed before or after that?

Shri Sehgal: I do not remember the exact date.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: When did you actually get the copy of the printed report?

Shri Sehgal: That also I cannot tell you off-hand.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: These are the things you should know.

Shri Sehgal: I do not remember the dates exactly as to when I bought the copies. We did not buy the copy yesterday or so. So, I could not remember.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: Whether when you read in the Current, you should have seen the copy of the petition.

Shri Sehgal: I cannot tell you off-hand. I do not remember that. I do not remember the date as to whether it was after or before.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: You got the copy of the petition printed before or after the publication in the Current?

Shri Sehgal: I do not remember now as to the date of the Current.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: Did you find any difference between these two publications or are they same?

Shri Sehgal: I read it about two or three months before. The subject-matter was nearabout the same.

Shri Parashar: What do you mean by subject-matter was the same. Do you mean to say that the Current publication was almost the same which was in the petition?

Shri Sehgal: No, Sir. I cannot tell you exactly as to what was there in the petition. The petition also contains ten pages and the Current also contained the matter in full page. I do not exactly know as to what was there in the Current and what was contained in the petition since I did not tally both the things together.

Shri Parashar: Your impression was that it was not the same which was in the petition.

Shri Sehgal: The question is relating to the subject-matter. I am not saying as to what are the contents in the petition and the contents in the Current so as to know as to what they are.

Shri Parashar: Does it mean that you did not read the Current?

Shri Sehgal: I read the Current. But, I cannot say exactly the contents of that.

(The witness then withdrew)

Friday, the 18th November, 1966

PRESENT

CHAIRMAN

Shri S. V. Krishnamoorthy Rao

MEMBERS

2. Shri N. C. Chatterjee
3. Shri L. D. Kotoki
4. Shri H. N. Mukerjee
5. Shri V. C. Parashar
6. Shri Yuveraj Dutta Singh
7. Shri Sumat Prasad

SECRETARIAT

Shri M. C. Chawla—*Deputy Secretary*

WITNESS

Shri Ram Mohan Dube

(The Committee met at 15.00 hours).

EVIDENCE OF SHRI RAM MOHAN DUBE

Mr. Chairman: You are Mr. Dube.

Shri Dube: Yes, Sir,

Mr. Chairman: You please take the oath.

Shri Dube: "I, Ram Mohan Dube, 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 will be false."

Mr. Chairman: What are you by profession?

Shri Dube: I am a journalist and I represent a daily from Kanpur.

Mr. Chairman: What paper is it?

Shri Dube: It is an Urdu paper by name *Peighame*.

Mr. Chairman: How long have you been representing this?

Shri Dube: This is the tenth year. I have been a correspondent here for nine years.

Mr. Chairman: Your headquarters is in Delhi.

Shri Dube: Yes, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: We are informed that you took Mr. Jit Paul to Mr. Madhu Limaye. Is that true?

Shri Dube: It is true.

Mr. Chairman: How long do you know Mr. Madhu Limaye?

Shri Dube: Five years.

Mr. Chairman: You have been going to him often.

Shri Dube: Yes, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: In what connection?

Shri Dube: As a journalist, it is my duty to meet some politicians and he has been a figure in the Opposition and I put to him certain questions and he replies.

Mr. Chairman: Did you take Shri Jit Paul?

Shri Dube: I know Mr. Sehgal who is one of the directors of M/s. Amin Chand Pyare Lal firm and I never knew Mr. Jit Paul before all these things came out.

Mr. Chairman: You do not know for whom you wanted to see Mr. Madhu Limaye?

Shri Dube: No. I meet everyday Mr. Sehgal who wanted to see Mr. Madhu Limaye.

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

Shri Dube: I knew Mr. Sehgal because he is the General Manager as well as the Director in many firms.

Mr. Chairman: Is he the director in Amin Chand Pyare Lal's firm?

Shri Dube: Probably, they have a dozen firms and I do not know in detail. Shri Sehgal was also connected with one of the institutions viz., International Hospitality. There I happen to be a member of the same institution I know him.

Mr. Chairman: So, you took him to Shri Madhu Limaye.

Shri Dube: What happened was that all this was published in the paper. By chance, I asked Mr. Sehgal as to what is all about that

everyday there is the name of your firm in Parliament. Then, he said that I might possibly drop at his office some time. There we could talk it over. Then, I was given brief details about that. It was in that connecton they asked me whether it was possible for me to guide them. I told him that I did not know how to guide. Then, Shri Sehgal asked me as to whether I knew about the Parliamentary procedure. Thereafter, I said that I shall ask Mr. Madhu Limaye about this since he was the member who puts questions in Parliament. So, I fixed up a meeting with Mr. Madhu Limaye. Mr. Madhu Limaye said that I might come to him at 4 O'clock. I said that there were two other gentlemen viz., Shri Jit Paul and Shri Sehgal.

Mr. Chairman: To whom else did you take Mr. Jit Paul and Shri Sehgal other than Shri Madhu Limaye?

Shri Dube: We went to one Rajya Sabha Member Shri Gaure Murahari.

Mr. Chairman: That is all and none else.

Shri Dube: None else, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: Why did you take them?

Shri Dube: They wanted my guidance and I knew Mr. Sehgal who is my friend. He asked me as to whether I will be able to guide them as to how they should submit their petition before the House. That was the only reason why I took them there.

Mr. Chairman: Have they taken any petition with them?

Shri Dube: They had a copy of the petition. It was a draft copy.

Mr. Chairman: Was it not a printed draft?

Shri Dube: It was a draft copy which they had taken. Probably they had two copies—not one. I have gone through it before I took them to Shri Madhu Limaye as to what is written in that draft petition. Mr. Madhu Limaye asked Mr. Jit Paul whether he had gone through the Public Accounts Committee's Report to which he replied 'Yes'. When he asked him whether he had a copy of that report, he said 'no'. Then Mr. Limaye went to the other room and brought a copy of the same.

Mr. Chairman: Is this the petition that you saw with him?

Shri Dube: Yes, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: This is printed and this was not a draft.

Shri Dube: No, Sir. He has put the seal of 'draft'. In the copy which he was carrying, it was written as 'draft'.

Mr. Chairman: You told us that this was the document he had with him. And this is a printed document.

Shri Dube: That is true. This was a printed document.

Mr. Chairman: How many did he have with him?

Shri Dube: He had two.

Mr. Chairman: You gave one to Mr. Madhu Limaye.

Shri Dube: No, Sir. That was shown to Mr. Madhu Limaye. Then he requested that he should leave this copy. He will study it and fix up some other time.

Mr. Chairman: Did he leave that copy with him?

Shri Dube: Yes, on the request of Mr. Madhu Limaye, he left a copy.

Mr. Chairman: Similarly he left a copy with Mr. Murahari also.

Shri Dube: He did it, because he also wanted to study it and see what best he can do for him in the Upper House.

Mr. Chairman: Did you see any other Member of Parliament?

Shri Dube: No, Sir, afterwards Mr. Madhu Limaye reported the matter. In fact there were only these two people. We had a mind to meet Mr. Ram Manohar Lohia. He was out of station during those days.

Mr. Chairman: Was it on the same day that you saw both the people?

Shri Dube: The same day.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: When you telephoned to Mr. Madhu Limaye, what did you tell him?

Shri Dube: That I am coming with Mr. Jit Paul and Mr. Sehgal.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: You had been going to Mr. Madhu Limaye before that?

Shri Dube: Yes, Sir.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: In connection with Chaman Lal. That is what he says that you have been seeing him in connection with some matter which was then being discussed.

Shri Dube: I did not discuss any matter concerning Chaman Lal.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: "दुबे साहब दो चार महीने पहले जब यहां जमन लाल का मामला चल रहा था मुझे जानकारी देने चाये थे।"

Is that correct?

Shri Dube: No, Sir. मैं श्री मधुलिमये से कई वक्ता मिला हूँ।

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: That is not correct?

Shri Dube: No, Sir.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: He gave the appointment and you turned up with your friend.

Shri Dube: Yes, Sir.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: Did you introduce this gentleman to him?

Shri Dube: Yes, Sir.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: What else happened there.

Shri Dube: When I introduced, he said: If you give me 5 minutes, I will explain my case. Then they had a talk. Jit Paul explained the whole case, whatever he wanted to tell Mr. Madhu Limaye.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: You took no part in the discussions?

Shri Dube: I was sitting there only. I attended to a few telephone calls which Mr. Madhu Limaye asked me to attend. I was sitting by his side as I knew him earlier also.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: With regard to the subject matter of conversation, you took no part.

Shri Dube: No, Sir.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: You had nothing to do with the matter.

Shri Dube: No, Sir.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: What did you say, you actually saw two copies of that?

Shri Dube: Yes, Sir. They had two copies. After the talk Mr. Madhu Limaye asked whether he had studied the Public Accounts Committee Report. Jit Paul replied: "Yes". He said: "Do you have a copy of the same". He said "No, Sir. I don't have it here". He went to the other room, and brought a copy of the Public Accounts Committee report. He read out a few things before him. Then he said: I have brought a petition which is a draft, I want you to study it and help me to submit it to Parliament.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: Did you see the name of the publisher or the printer there?

Shri Dube: I had not gone through it. I have no idea about it. It was just in good faith that I wanted to take him.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: How long did you know this gentleman—Jit Paul?

Shri Dube: I never knew Jit Paul. I knew Mr. Sehgal Mr. Sehgal introduced him.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: You had nothing to do with Jit Paul.

Shri Dube: No, Sir. Mr. Sehgal told me: "Will you please fix up time with Mr. Madhu Limaye. I am coming with Mr. Jit Paul." Only at that time when they came to me, I saw him.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: You were only a contact man for this purpose.

Shri Dube: No Sir, I was not a contact man at all.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: You only took him to Mr. Madhu Limaye at the instance of Mr. Sehgal.

Shri Dube: Yes Sir, that is all. Nothing else.

Shri Kotoki: Did you see Mr. Jit Paul after that day?

Shri Dube: No, Sir. After that I had talked on telephone to Mr. Sehgal, but not Jit Paul.

Shri Kotoki: I am asking about Jit Paul.

Shri Dube: No, Sir.

Shri V. C. Parashar: Before you took Jit Paul to Madhu Limaye, you had no occasion to testify as to whether the story that he was giving was correct or incorrect. You simply introduced him. That is all.

Shri Dube: Yes, Sir,

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: Merely introduced at the instance of your friend Mr. Sehgal.

Shri Dube: Yes, Sir.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: Not at your own initiative.

Shri Dube: No, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: Have you undertaken such a mission for others also?

Shri Dube: No, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: This is the first occasion you took it.

Shri Dube: Yes, Sir and that was because of my personal relations of friendship with Mr. Sehgal.

Mr. Chairman: For how long do you know him?

Shri Dube: Two or three years.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: Who is the Editor of your paper?

Shri Dube: Wazihuddin.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: The Lucknow man.

Shri Dube: The Kanpur man.

(The witness then withdrew)

Thursday, the 24th November, 1966

PRESENT

CHAIRMAN

Shri S V. Krishnamoorthy Rao

MEMBERS

2. Shri N. C. Chatterjee
3. Sardar Kapur Singh
4. Shri L. D. Kotoki
5. Shri V. C. Parashar
6. Shri Jaganath Rao
7. Shri Yuveraj Dutta Singh
8. Shri Sinhasan Singh
9. Shri Sumat Prasad

SECRETARIAT

Shri M. C. Chawla—*Deputy Secretary.*

WITNESS

Shri Madhu Limaye, M.P.

(The Committee met at 15.00 hours)

EVIDENCE OF SHRI MADHU LIMAYE, M.P.

Mr. Chairman: Let us now take Shri Madhu Limaye's evidence.

Shri Madhu Limaye: I do not know whether the Committee has examined Shri Jit Paul. May I have a copy of his deposition?

Mr. Chairman: We have examined him and also Mr. Dube.

Shri Madhu Limaye: May I have a look at their depositions?

Shri Sinhasan Singh: Our proceedings are confidential.

Shri Madhu Limaye: How do I know what they have said?

Shri Sinhasan Singh: You have to give your own version.

Mr. Chairman: There is no provision under the Rules to make their evidence available to you.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: How did you come to get this document, how you raised the privilege issue in the House—you explain first. You give your version of the part of the story which motivated you to raise this privilege issue.

Shri Madhu Limaye: I refer you to the printed report of the debates of 2nd August. I will read out the relevant portion.

“अब पहले जो जीत पाल साहब हैं, इनके बारे में ही अर्ज करूंगा। इतवार के सबेरे की बात है। एक दूबे नाम के आदमी हैं, उनका मुझे टेलीफोन आया और उन्होंने मुझसे कहा कि मैं आपसे मिलना चाहता हूँ और साथ में एक दोस्त को भी ले आऊंगा। मैंने साढ़े पांच बजे का समय दिया। ये दूबे साहब दो चार महीने पहले, जब यहाँ चमन लाल का मामला चल रहा था, मुझे जानकारी देने आये थे। उस वक्त उन्होंने जो जानकारी मुझे दी थी, उसका उस वक्त कोई इस्तेमाल नहीं हुआ, क्योंकि उसमें मैंने कोई विशेष बात नहीं पाई। जब इतवार की शाम को ये सज्जन मेरे पास आये, तो जिन दो आदमियों को लाये उन में से एक ने कहा कि मैं जीत पाल हूँ और श्री-चन्द प्यारे लाल फर्म का मैं पार्टनर हूँ। उन्होंने पब्लिक एकाउन्ट्स कमेटी के आरोप का सवाल फेड़ा और उन्होंने यह था दस्तावेज मुझे दिया, जिसमें कि मैंने प्राथमिकी करके आप के पास भेज दिया। वह कहने लगे कि पब्लिक एकाउन्ट्स कमेटी ने मेरे साथ बहुत अन्याय किया है और उसके खिलाफ मैं लोक सभा में एक अर्ज देना चाहता हूँ। फिर उन्होंने मेरे हाथ में यह कागज रखा और कहा कि आप मेरी बात सुनिये। मैंने उनसे कहा कि पब्लिक एकाउन्ट्स कमेटी के सामने सारी बातें थी, सारे दस्तावेज थे, और उनकी जांच करने के पश्चात् पब्लिक एकाउन्ट्स कमेटी अपने फैसले पर पहुँची है। इसलिये मैं इसके बारे में आपसे बहस नहीं करना

चाहता हूँ और न कुछ सुनना चाहता हूँ। फिर उन्होंने कहा कि यह मेरी अर्जी है, आप कम से कम इसको तो पढ़िये। तब यह अर्जी मैंने ले ली। उसके पन्चात् मैंने दूबे साहब से कहा कि आप ने सबेरे मुझे नहीं बतलाया कि जो अमीचन्द प्यारे लाल फर्म के एक पार्टनर हैं यह आपके साथ आ रहे हैं और पी० ए० सी० के मामले में बात करना चाहते हैं। इसके बाद वह चले गये।

अब यह कारण बगैरह दिये हैं अंग्रेजी में।

अब इसमें एक सवाल जो उठाया गया है और पहले भी मैंने उसे स्पष्ट किया था और यह वह कि स्पीकर साहब ने मुझसे पूछा था कि क्या यह सही नहीं है कि उन्होंने आपसे यह बिनती की.....

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: Please Speak in English.

Shri Madhu Limaye: I was asked by the Speaker whether it was not a fact that Shri Jit Paul asked me to sponsor his petition, I said that that question did not arise at all because I took Mr. Dube to task for Mr. Jit Paul's coming under a subterfuge. So there was no question of his making any request to me.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: Then, what happened?

Shri Madhu Limaye: I told Mr. Dube, 'why have you come under a subterfuge.' If he had wanted to bring this controversial figure, who wanted to discuss the PAC Report with me, he should have given advance intimation. I thought he wanted to come to me in connection with Chamanlal affair and he was bringing along a friend. That is why I took him to task. There was no question of entering into any discussions with him or asking him to give me any paper or his asking me to sponsor his petition. On his own he left that printed thing.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: Your memory is quite correct when you say now that he was coming in connection with Chamanlal affair.

Shri Madhu Limaye: Approximately, I can even mention the period. It must have been in the Budget session. About the circulation of petition, I wonder whether what is published in the *Current* is correct. A dignitary in the PAC told me that no such letter was ever written to them and that Jit Paul took 3000 copies of *CURRENT* for circulation. Incidentally, *CURRENT* demanded half-an-hour discussion on that. Not only in this connection, but even during the Monsoon Session of Lok Sabha *CURRENT* completely blocked out my name. I did not raise any privilege issue on the ground that it was not a fair and objective report simply because I took up this question, they completely blocked me out. I think Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad raised this question of *CURRENT*. He has admitted that several thousand copies of *CURRENT* were printed. What did they do with these copies? Circulation of this petition or the *Current* issue is likely to create misunderstanding about the Report of PAC. I

would suggest that this is not a trifling matter. Big business groups, especially those who are thriving by manipulating bureaucratic controls, are indulging in these things. We must lay down the correct procedure. . . .

Shri Sinhasan Singh: I am asking you whether you wanted certain other papers connected with this petition. For that Shri Jit Paul replied you that he would send them later on?

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: Is it true that what Mr. Jit Paul made over to you at the interview was only one part of the petition and that the second part of it was not there?

Shri Madhu Limaye: I know nothing about that. There was no question of my asking any further information from him.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: Is it correct that he has made over only the first part of the petition and not the second part of it? He could have made over to you the schedules also.

Shri Madhu Limaye: He did not mention anything except that leaving behind the document he went away.

Mr. Chairman: Did he give you the printed document with the schedules?

Shri Madhu Limaye: This is all I have. I was not prepared to look at it. In fact, I took him to task for bringing this man and asked him why he did such things.

Mr. Chairman: Did you tell him that you would look into this?

Shri Madhu Limaye: Not at all. It is a lie if he had said that. That is why I wanted to see the records of what he had said.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: Did you enquire from him whether he brought any other Member of Parliament about this document to help him?

Shri Madhu Limaye: I did not ask him. I was discourteous to him. In fact he told me that he was presenting this Petition to Lok Sabha.

Mr. Chairman: "This is what I have said. I have already given to you viz., Shri Madhu Limaye, Shri Gaure Murahari and Shri Rajeshwar Patel. I showed them a part of my petition which I wanted to submit in order to seek their advice and if possible get their agreement for signing it because I was told by my Solicitor that some Member of Parliament has to sign this petition".

Shri Madhu Limaye: It is all wrong and it is a complete lie.

Shri Sumat Prasad: Did he want ^{you} to do anything in the matter?

Shri Madhu Limaye: He did not ask me to do anything. When he came I was angry. The moment he introduced himself as Jit Paul, I lost my temper.

Sardar Kapur Singh: Why? He is a decent fellow.

Shri Madhu Limaye: I knew many things about Amin Chand Pyarelal's firm. Mr. Dube said that he was bringing with him a friend of him. But he never mentioned that that friend was Mr. Jit Paul and that he had come to discuss the P.A.C. Report with me.

Mr. Chairman: Did not Mr. Dube tell you that he was bringing Jit Paul in connection with presentation of a Petition?

Shri Madhu Limaye: No, Sir.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: He says he had lost his temper.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: I want to know whether it is a fact that he met three Members one of whom was yourself to seek their advice as to how to proceed in the matter?

Shri Madhu Limaye: This is a complete lie. You all know that the question just did not arise because I was in a very bad mood.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: "I handed over to them a copy each of this petition". This is what he says: He gives three names—your name is one—and he gave the first part of the petition and not the second part of it which contain schedules. He further says that he has not circulated it to anybody.

Shri Madhu Limaye: It is a complete lie. He left it there and I did not take it. I did not ask for any further information. I have not read the petition except that I saw the printed line.

Shri L. D. Kotoki: Your allegation against this firm is that he has circulated a petition before it was presented to the House and therefore it was a breach of privilege. Except this copy that was left with you in your house, whether you have any further information about its circulation? You forget about the *Current* issue. Whether this particular document was circulated?

You know my question is clear. I want to know whether there was any proof that you have about the circulation of this particular document which purported to be a petition which was to be presented to the House.

Shri Madhu Limaye: I have no proof except that Shri Rajeshwar Patel told me that he was given a copy of the petition. It is a presumption and it is an inference and it is based on the information given to me by the P.A.C. dignitary that 3,000 copies of *Current* have been taken by Mr. Jit Paul. Probably Shri Rajeshwar Patel also told that in the House. Let me see that.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: I think that is all he has to say.

Mr. Chairman: How long does Shri Dube know you?

Shri Madhu Limaye: He came to me once or twice in connection with the Chamanlal affair. He never told me that he was an employee of M/s Amin Chand Pyarelal.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: He has nothing to do and he never approached you except in connection with Chamanlal's case. And are you quite sure about this?

Shri Madhu Limaye: I am positive about this.

Mr. Chairman: He has told that he knew you for three years.

Shri Madhu Limaye: He came to me once or twice here in Delhi in connection with Chamanlal's case.

Sardar Kapur Singh: Have you ever asked Mr. Dube when he came to see you in connection with Chamanlal's case as to what was his motive?

Shri Madhu Limaye: He said that he was a bad man.

Mr. Chairman: Are you having any proof that these copies were circulated?

Shri Madhu Limaye: No, Sir. I have only heard about it.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you Mr. Limaye.

(The witness then withdrew)

APPENDIX

(See para 6 of Report)

15, BRABOURNE ROAD,
CALCUTTA-1,
INDIA

October, 14 1966.

Shri M. C. Chawla,
Deputy Secretary,
Lok Sabha Secretariat,
Parliament House,
New Delhi.

Dear Sir,

I thank you for your registered letter No. 76|11|C-II|66, dated the 12th instant which I have just received. As directed by your good-self, I forward herewith the required information covering the points of query raised by you as under:

In the first instance, I respectfully submit and state, that the note which we have made out against the findings of Public Accounts Committee, had been left with the Editor, Current Magazine, inadvertently, and has not been traced out so far. It will be sent to you the moment it is located.

Secondly, I humbly submit that immediately upon receipt of your letter No. 21|C|1|66, dated 3rd August, 1966, we wrote to the Statesman Limited vide our letter No. PAC|6001 dated 13th August, 1966 and regret to state that no reply has been received by us so far. Further I sent another reminder on 8th October, 1966 for expediting the reply to our aforesaid letter dated 13th August, 1966. I enclose* herewith the true copies of the two aforesaid letters for your kind perusal.

Thirdly I beg to state that we have placed the order with Messrs. J. Walter Thompson Co. Private Ltd., 30 Bondel Street, Calcutta 19, advertising agents for printing 10,000 copies of our petition entitled "Our Submissions" who arranged with The Statesman Limited, Calcutta, for having the aforesaid copies printed. We however, received on different dates between 23rd July, 1966 and 16th August,

* See Enclosures.

1966, 10,000 copies of our aforesaid petition duly printed by the Statesman Limited from the said Messrs. J. Walter Thompson Co. Private Ltd. I attach* herewith all the relevant correspondence with the said Messrs. J. Walter Thompson Co. Private Ltd. in this regard.

Fourthly, I would like to state that Sri Sehgal is the Manager of Messrs. Amin Chand Pyare Lal, New Delhi Branch and resides at D335 Defence Colony, New Delhi. Sri Dube is known to Sri Sehgal and the former introduced Sri Sehgal and myself to Sri Madhu Limaye, M.P.

Moreover, I may reiterate that I have the highest honour and respect for Parliament and the Public Accounts Committee and I hold the Speaker and the Honourable Members of the Parliament in the highest esteem and respect. I wish to add and submit that it was farther from my part or my intention to do anything which could even remotely show any disrespect to our Parliament or to the Public Accounts Committee or amount to flouting any of the rules or regulations of our Parliament or to the Public Accounts Committee.

I remain,

Sir,

Yours faithfully,

Sd/- JIT PAUL.

Encl: As above.

* Not enclosed with the Report.

ENCLOSURES

AMIN CHAND PAYARE LAL

15, Brabourne Road,
Calcutta-1.

August 13, 1966.

PAC/6001

The Statesman Ltd
Statesman House,
4, Chowringhee Square,
Calcutta-1.

Dear Sirs,

SUB: Petition entitled "Our Submissions" submitted to the Lok Sabha.

With reference to the conversation our representative had with you the other day, we would request you to let us know the names of the Printers and the Printing Press as well of our Petition entitled as above. The Deputy Secretary, Lok Sabha, New Delhi in his letter No. 21/C/2/66 dated the 3rd instant called upon us to assign reason why the names of the Printers and/or Printing Press of our Petition were not disclosed. So, we shall be thankful if you kindly furnish us with the above information as requested, at an early date, in order to enable us to satisfy the query of the Deputy Secretary, Lok Sabha.

Please treat this as urgent.

Thanking you,

Very truly yours,

For **AMIN CHAND PYARE LAL.**

8th October, 1966.

REF: PAC/7053

The Statesman Ltd.
Statesman House,
4, Chowringhee Square,
Calcutta-1.

Dear Sirs,

SUB: Petition entitled "Our Submissions" submitted to the Lok Sabha.

This has reference to our previous letter No. PAC/6001 dated 13th August, 1966 and regret to state that we have not been favoured with your reply so far. Since we have to furnish the said information to the Lok Sabha Secretariat, please treat this as extremely urgent and let us have your reply immediately.

However, we are enclosing herewith a copy of our previous letter to you dated 13th August, 1966 for your ready reference.

We look forward for your early reply.

Thanking you,

Very truly yours,
AMIN CHAND PYARE LAL
Sd./-
Partner.

Encl: As above.