

**GOVERNMENT OF INDIA  
RURAL DEVELOPMENT  
LOK SABHA**

UNSTARRED QUESTION NO:2919  
ANSWERED ON:24.07.2009  
RELEASE OF CENTRAL SHARE TO STATES  
Panda Shri Baijayant;Singh Shri Dushyant

**Will the Minister of RURAL DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:**

- (a) whether central share is not released to some of the districts in various States including Orissa and Rajasthan in respect of the Indira Awaas Yojana (IAY) and the National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (NREGS);
- (b) if so, the details thereof and the reasons therefor;
- (c) whether requests from the State Governments have been received for release of Central share; and
- (d) the details thereof and the steps taken by the Government in this regard ?

**Answer**

MINISTER OF THE STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT (SHRI PRADEEP JAIN 'ADITYA')

(a) to (d): Indira Awaas Yojana (IAY) is an ongoing allocation based scheme and the funds provided for Rural Houses are allocated to the States/UTs in accordance with the pre-determined criteria in the beginning of the year. Under Indira Awaas Yojana, financial assistance is released in two instalments. The first instalment amounting to 50% of the total allocation for a particular district is released in the beginning of the financial year to all those districts which had lifted the second instalment during the previous year without any condition. Where 2nd instalment is not availed or is released with certain conditions, 1st instalment of funds in the following year is subject to submitting the proposal or fulfilling the conditions, as the case may be. Five districts of Rajasthan and two districts of Orissa are yet to avail first instalment of funds during the current year 2009-10. A Statement showing the State-wise names of districts whom first instalment has not been released so far during the current year, including Rajasthan and Orissa, together with reasons therefor, is at Annexure-I.

NREGA is demand based and the Central Government releases funds to the districts based on labour demand. The States are required to submit district-wise Labour Budget proposed by District Programme Coordinator based on actual assessment at the field level in accordance with Chapter IV, Para-14, Sub para of the NREGA Act and Para 8.4 of the Operational Guidelines of NREGA. The requirement of the first six months of the Financial Year on acceptance of Labour Budget is released in the month of April of the Financial year. The release of second tranche is based on actual performance in the field based on certain prescribed parameters, including submission of Utilisation Certificate and audit report for the funds released during the previous year. State-wise list of districts, including the districts of Rajasthan and Orissa, which have not been released funds under NREGA during 2009-10, together with reasons therefor, is at Annexure-II.

The Central Government is in constant touch with the concerned State Government authorities to expedite the documents /clarifications pending at their end.

Annexure-I referred to in reply to Parts (a) to (d) of Lok Sabha Unstarred Question No. 2919 due for answer on 24.7.2009

Districts whom funds have not been released during the current year 2009-10 and the reasons therefor

S.No	Name of Districts	Reasons
------	-------------------	---------

S.No	Name of Districts	Reasons
1.	Arunachal	

(i)	Dibang Valley	2nd instalment was also not availed last year. Revised proposal for IAY Normal and 5% IAY separately was called for which is still awaited.
-----	---------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

(i)	Upper Siang	Block-wise Expenditure Statement (BES) not furnished and funds released during 2007-08 from out of Savings were not included in the Utilization Certificate (UC) and Audit Report (AR). Documents since received and the release of funds is now under consideration.
-----	-------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

2.	Assam Karimganj	Conditions imposed while releasing 2nd installment for removing the discrepancies in figures in the UC and AR. For 2007-08 not fulfilled.
----	-----------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

3.	Bihar	
----	-------	--

- (i) Gaya UC for the funds released under 5% IAY to be submitted
- (ii) Gopalganj The difference of Opening Balance (OB) in the UC to be reconciled.
- (iii) East Champaran Conditions imposed while releasing 2nd installment for removing the discrepancies in figures in the UC and AR.  
For 2007-08 not fulfilled.
- 4. Gujarat Bhavnagar Utilization is less than 60% of the total available funds.
- 5. Himachal
  - (i) Kinnaur - Funds are released in one lump sum instalment. There are certain discrepancies in the proposal submitted
  - (ii) Lahaul Spiti -do-
- 6. Jammu &
  - (i) Kisthwar 2nd instalment was also not availed last year. UC and AR for 2007-08 was called for which is still awaited.
  - (ii) Ramban -do-
  - (iii) Kupwara Discrepancies indicated while releasing 2nd instalment have since been removed. Release of funds is now under consideration.
  - (iv) Leh Funds are released in one lump sum instalment. There are certain discrepancies in the proposal submitted
  - (v) Kargil Funds are released in one lump sum instalment. There are certain discrepancies in the proposal submitted
- 7 Madhya
  - (i) Khargaon Conditions imposed while releasing 2nd installment for removing the discrepancies in figures in the UC and AR.  
For 2007-08 not fulfilled.
- 8. Manipur
  - (i) Bishnupur 2nd instalment was also not availed. Discrepancies pointed out in the proposal are yet to be removed.
  - (ii) Thoubal -do-
  - (iii) Ukhrul -do-
  - (iv) Imphal West -do-
- 9 Meghalaya
  - (i) Re bhoi Conditions imposed while releasing 2nd installment for removing the discrepancies in figures in the UC and AR.  
For 2007-08 not fulfilled.
  - (ii) South Garo Hills 2nd instalment was also not availed. Discrepancies pointed out in the proposal are yet to be removed.
  - (iii) West Khasi Hills -do-
- 10. Orissa Jagatsinghpur 2nd instalment was also not received last year. Proposal has not yet been received.  
Balasore Funds not availed last year also. Audit Report for the year 2007-08 is required.
- 11 Punjab Jalandhar 2nd instalment was also not received last year. Proposal has not yet been received.
- 12 Rajasthan
  - (i) Pali Conditions imposed while releasing 2nd installment for removing the discrepancies in figures in the UC and AR.  
For 2007-08 not fulfilled.
  - (ii) Jhalawar Discrepancies indicated while releasing 2nd instalment have since been removed. Release of funds is now under consideration
  - (iii) Dungerpur removing the discrepancies in figures in the UC and AR.  
For 2007-08 not fulfilled. Conditions imposed while releasing 2nd installment for
  - (iv) Sirohi Discrepancies indicated while releasing 2nd instalment have since been removed. Release of funds is now under consideration
  - (v) Jhunjhunu IAY Waitlist exhausted. Funds not required
- 13. Uttar Pradesh Balrampur Discrepancies indicated while releasing 2nd instalment have since been removed. Release of funds is now under consideration
- 14. West Bengal
  - (i) Medinipur East 2nd instalment also not availed last year. UC & AR for 2007-08 has been called for.
  - (ii) South 24 Pargana 2nd instalment also not availed last year. Discrepancies in

UC & AR for 2007-08 are to be rectified.

(iii) Darjeeling Not availing funds for the last couple of years. Proposal not received this year also.

15. Uttranchal Nainital 2nd instalment also not availed last year. Expenditure less than 60% of total available funds.

16 Andaman &

(i) Andaman Funds are released in one lump sum instalment.  
Nicobar

(ii) Nicobar Proposals not yet received

(iii) North & Middle

Andaman

17. Dadra & Nagar 2nd instalment also not availed last year. Expenditure less Nagar Haveli Haveli (Funds during than 60% of total available funds. 2008-09 not released )

18. Daman & Diu Daman & Diu Not availing funds since 2002-03. Expenditure less than 60% of the total available funds.

19. Lakshdweep Lakshdweep Funds are released in one lump sum instalment. Proposals not yet received

20. Pondicherry Pondicherry Funds were not availed last year also. The proposal has now been received and the release is under consideration.

Annexure-II referred to in reply to Parts (a) to (d) of Lok Sabha Unstarred Question No. 2919 due for answer on 24.7.2009

State-wise List of Districts which have not been released funds during the year 2009-10

Gujarat

S1.No. Name of District Reasons for not releasing funds in 2009-10

1 Dang Excess OB

2 Valsad Excess OB

UC and AR for 2007-08 required

3 Anand Accounts not settled.

4 Gandhinagar Excess OB

Accounts not settled.

5 Jamnagar Excess OB

Accounts not settled.

6 Surendernagar Excess OB

Excess OB

The district has excess funds due to excess Opening Balance (OB) as on 1.4.2009

Accounts not settled

The accounts upto the year 2007 not settled.

Punjab

S1.No. Name of District Reasons for not releasing funds in 2009-10

1 Jalandhar Excess OB.

UC and AR for 2007-08 required

2 Patiala UC and AR for 2007-08 required

3 Sangrur Excess OB

UC and AR for 2007-08 required

4 SAS Nagar Excess OB

UC and AR for 2007-08 required

5 Ludhiana Excess OB

UC and audit report for 2007-08 required

6 Barnala UC and AR for 2007-08

7 Kapurthala Excess OB

UC for 2007-08 for SGRY and NREGA

8 Ferozepur Excess OB

UC and AR for 2007-08 required

9 Muktsar UC and AR for 2007-08 required

10 Roopnagar Excess OB

UC and AR for 2007-08 required

11 Taran Taran Excess OB

Excess OB

The district has excess funds due to excess Opening Balance as on 1.4.2009

Andhra Pradesh

S. No. Name of District Reasons for not releasing funds in 2009-10

1 Rangareddy Excess OB

2 Krishna UC and AR for 2007-08 required

3 Visakhapatnam

4 W.Godavari

Excess OB

The district has excess funds due to excess Opening Balance as on 1.4.2009

Karnataka

Sl.No. Name of district Reasons for not releasing funds in 2009-10

- 1 Davanagere Excess OB
- 2 Raichur Excess OB
- 3 Hasan Excess OB
- 4 Mandya Excess OB
- 5 Chamrajnagar Excess OB
- 6 Tumkur Excess OB
- 7 Haveri Excess OB
- 8 Bangalore (Urban) Excess OB
- 9 Dakshin Kannada Excess OB
- 10 Kolar Accounts not settled.
- 11 Uttar Kannada Excess OB
- 12 Dharwad Excess OB
- 13 Udupi Excess OB
- 14 Bangalore (Rural) Excess OB
- 15 Chikabalapura Accounts not settled.
- 16 Ramanagara Excess OB

Excess OB

The district has excess funds due to excess Opening Balance as on 1.4.2009

Accounts not settled

The accounts upto the year 2007 not settled

Maharashtra

Sl.No. Name of District Reasons for not releasing funds in 2009-10

- 1 Ahmednagar Excess OB  
UC and AR for 2007-08 required.
- 2 Amravati UC and Audit Report for SGRY 2006-07 required.
- 3 Bhandara Excess OB
- 4 Chandarpur Excess OB  
UC and AR for 2007-08 required
- 5 Yavatmal Accounts not settled.
- 6 Akola Excess OB  
UC and AR for 2007-08 required
- 7 Buldhana Accounts not settled.
- 8 Osmanabad UC and AR for 2007-08 required
- 9 Wardha Excess OB  
UC and AR for 2007-08 required
- 10 Washim Excess OB  
UC and AR for 2007-08 required
- 11 Beed Accounts not settled.
- 12 Jalgaon Excess OB  
UC and AR for 2007-08 required
- 13 Jalna Accounts not settled.
- 14 Kolhapur Excess OB  
UC and AR for 2007-08 required
- 15 Nagpur Excess OB  
UC and AR for 2007-08 required
- 16 Nasik Excess OB  
UC and AR for 2007-08 required
- 17 Parbhani Excess OB  
Accounts not settled.
- 18 Pune Excess OB  
UC and AR for 2007-08 required
- 19 Raigad Excess OB  
UC and AR for 2007-08 required
- 20 Ratnagiri Excess OB  
UC and AR for 2007-08 required
- 21 Sangli Excess OB  
UC and AR for 2007-08 required
- 22 Satara Excess OB  
UC and AR for 2007-08 required
- 23 Sindhudurg Excess OB  
UC and AR for 2007-08 required
- 24 Sholapur Excess OB  
UC and AR for 2007-08 required

Excess OB

The district has excess funds due to excess Opening Balance as on 1.4.2009

Accounts not settled

The accounts upto the year 2007 not settled.

Uttar Pradesh

Sl.No. Name of District Reasons for not releasing funds in 2009-10

- 1 2 3
1. Farrukhabad Comments on Auditor observations on para 5-10 of AR of 2007-08.
2. Shrawasti Audit Report of 2007-08 of SGRY.

3. Bulandsahar The UC and AR for the amount Rs 68.50 lakhs released under NREGA during 2007-08. CB in UC and AR is Rs. 149.02 lakhs while in UC 2008-09, the OB shown Rs. 88.69 lakhs
  4. Goutam B.Nagar Proposal with UC and AR for 2007-08 and UC 2008-09. UC and AR for the year 2007-08 for NREGA.
  5. Meerut UC and AR for 2007-08 of SGRY.
  6. Kanshiram Nagar Amount received from Etah district during 2008-09 and expenditure during the year has not been reported.
- C.B implies Closing Balance

#### Tamil Nadu

Sl.No. Name of District Reasons for not releasing funds in 2009-10

- 1 Nilgiri The district has sufficient funds due to excess opening balance as on 1.4.2009.
- 2 Kanya Kumari UC and AR for the year 2007-08 of NREGA do not tally. Details of Block-wise expenditure for the year 2007-08 of SGRY.UC of NREGA for the year 2008-09.
- 3 Dindigul The district has sufficient funds due to excess opening balance as on 1.4.2009.
- 4 Sivagangai The district has sufficient funds due to excess opening balance as on 1.4.2009.
- 5 Thanjavur The district has sufficient funds due to excess opening balance as on 1.4.2009.
- 6 Karur The district has sufficient funds due to excess opening balance as on 1.4.2009.
- 7 Vellore The district has sufficient funds due to excess opening balance as on 1.4.2009.
- 8 Salem The district has sufficient funds due to excess opening balance as on 1.4.2009.
- 9 Nammakkal The district has sufficient funds due to excess opening balance as on 1.4.2009.
- 10 Dharmapuri The district has sufficient funds due to excess opening balance as on 1.4.2009.
- 11 Erode The district has sufficient funds due to excess opening balance as on 1.4.2009.
- 12 Coimbatore The district has sufficient funds due to excess opening balance as on 1.4.2009.

#### West Bengal

Sl.No. Name of District Reasons for not releasing funds in 2009-10

1. Malda Details of Block-wise expenditure for the year 2006-07 authenticated by the auditor and UC and AR for the year 2007-08 and UC 2008-09 with proposal.
2. North Dinajpur OB and CB of UC and AR for the year 2006-07 do not tally. UC and AR for the year 2007-08 and UC 2008-09 with proposal..
3. South Dinajpur Proposal with UC and AR for 2007-08 and UC 2008-09.
4. 24 South Parganas Revised UC for the year 2006-07 as per audit report and Proposal with UC and AR for 2007-08 and UC 2008-09.
5. Nadia An amount Rs. 337.60 lakhs released to Nadia district in the month of March 2007 has not been reflected in UC/AR.  
The CB of UC and AR for the year 2006-07 do not tally. There is a difference of Rs. 0.68 lakhs in CB of UC and AR.  
In the AR for the year 2006-07, an amount of Rs. 297.98 lakhs has been reflected as CB as on 31.3.2007, while in the UC of NREGA for the year 2007-08, an amount of Rs. 516.13 lakhs has been reflected as OB of the previous year.
6. Silliguri Details of Block-wise expenditure for the year 2006-07 authenticated by the auditor and AR of SGRY for the year 2007-08.
- 7 Howrah The AR for the amount Rs 68.50 lakhs released under NREGA during 2007-08. Fresh AR for 2007-08 after segregated Rs. 10 crore from SGRY account.

#### Haryana

Sl.No. Name of District Reasons for not releasing funds in 2009-10

- 1 Gurgaon Proposal with UC and AR for 2007-08 and UC 2008-09.UC and AR for the year 2007-08 for NREGA.
- 2 Faridabad The district has sufficient funds due to excess opening balance as on 1.4.2009.
- 3 Mohinder Garh The district has sufficient funds due to excess opening balance as on 1.4.2009.
- 4 Rewari The district has sufficient funds due to excess opening balance as on 1.4.2009.
- 5 Sonapat The district has sufficient funds due to excess opening balance as on 1.4.2009.

#### Madhya Pradesh

Sl.No. Name of District Reasons for not releasing funds in 2009-10

- 1 Rewa (1) An amount Rs. 414.99 lakhs received from Centre and State during 2007-08 as intimated vide letter dated 20.03.2009 while in UC and AR this amount shown Rs.302.09 lakhs.  
(2) Difference in funds transferred to NREGA as shown in AR of SGRY(Rs.350.06 lakhs) for the year 2007-08 and fund received in NREGA(Rs. 424.37 lakhs) as shown in UC and AR of 2007-08. In addition to Rs. 350.06 lakhs transferred to NREGA, Rs. 43.66 lakhs shown balance as on 31.03.2008 in AR of SGRY, as the total balance of SGRY as on 31.03.2008 was Rs. 393.73 lakhs as per UC of 2007-08.
- 2 Bhind UC for the year 2007-08 & 2008-09 of NREGA. Block-wise details of expenditure for the year 2007-08 of SGRY.
- 3 Ujjain Fair copy of Audit Report of SGRY for the year 2007-08 and UC of 2008-09 of NREGA.
- 4 Datia Fair copy of AR of SGRY for the year 2006-07 & UC of NREGA of 2008-09.  
The Block-wise details of expenditure for the year 2007-08 of SGRY & NREGA.
- 5 Hoshangabad 1.CB of UC and AR do not tally.

Clarification in respect of high cost of person day is not satisfactory.

6 Betul The amount received by the implementing agencies do not tally with the amount disbursed by the DRDA to the Implementing agencies.

7 Shadol The district has sufficient funds due to excess opening balance as on 1.4.2009.

8 Burahanpur The district has sufficient funds due to excess opening balance as on 1.4.2009.

#### Arunachal Pradesh

No. of Distt Name of District Reasons for not releasing funds in 2009-10

- 1 2 3
- 1 Upper Subansiri State has submitted the Labour Budget of the districts recently which is
- 2 Changlang under Consideration
- 3 Lohit
- 4 Tawang
- 5 W.Kameng
- 6 E.Kameng
- 7 Papum-Pare
- 8 L.Subansiri
- 9 W.Siang
- 10 E.Siang
- 11 U.Siang
- 12 Tirap
- 13 U.D.Valley
- 14 L.D.Valley
- 15 Kurung-Kumey
- 16 Anjaw

#### Assam

No. of Distt Name of District Reasons for not releasing funds in 2009-10

- 1 North Cachar Hills The required clarification has not received till date.
- 2 Marigaon District has sufficient funds in Opening Balance to meet the requirement of initial 6 months during 2009-10.
- 3 Darrang  
(i) District not furnished UC/AR of 06-07 of SGRY  
(ii) UC & AR does not tally for the year 07-08 under NREGA.
- 4 Barpeta Under consideration
- 5 Golaghat District has sufficient funds in Opening Balance to meet the requirement of initial 6 months during 2009-10.
- 6 Nagaon District has sufficient funds in Opening Balance to meet the requirement of initial 6 months during 2009-10.
- 7 Sonitpur District has sufficient funds in Opening Balance to meet the requirement of initial 6 months during 2009-10.

#### Bihar

No. of Distt Name of District Reasons for not releasing funds in 2009-10

- 1 Madhubani Under Consideration
- 2 Nawadah District has sufficient funds in Opening Balance to meet the requirement of initial 6 months during 2009-10.
- 3 Samastipur Under Consideration
- 4 Sheohar Under Consideration
- 5 Munger District has sufficient funds in Opening Balance to meet the requirement of initial 6 months during 2009-10.
- 6 Purnea District has not furnished the due UC for the year 07-08 under NREGA and District has also not furnished the complete AR for the year 2007-08 under SGRY.
- 7 Darbhanga District has sufficient funds in Opening Balance to meet the requirement of initial 6 months during 2009-10.
- 8 Rohtas Under Consideration
- 9 Kishanganj District has sufficient funds in Opening Balance to meet the requirement of initial 6 months during 2009-10.
- 10 Sheikhpura District has not furnished the complete AR for the year 2007-08 under SGRY
- 11 Sitamarhi District has sufficient funds in Opening Balance to meet the requirement of initial 6 months during 2009-10.
- 12 West Champaran  
(i) District has not furnished the UC/AR of SGRY of 06-07  
(ii) and action taken report on audit observation for the year 07-08 under NREGA .
- 13 Begusarai Under Consideration
- 14 Saran (Chhapra) District has not carried forward full unspent balance of 2006-07 in the next year ie 2007-08. Audit report not settled for the year 2007-08.
- 15 Arwal UC/AR not settled for the year 2007-08.

#### Chhattisgarh

No. of Distt Name of District Reasons for not releasing funds in 2009-10

- 1 Dantewada District has sufficient funds in Opening Balance to meet the requirement of initial 6 months during 2009-10.

- 2 Kanker District has sufficient funds in Opening Balance to meet the requirement of initial 6 months during 2009-10.
- 3 Raigarh District has sufficient funds in Opening Balance to meet the requirement of initial 6 months during 2009-10.
- 4 Janjgir - Champa District has sufficient funds in Opening Balance to meet the requirement of initial 6 months during 2009-10.

#### Himachal Pradesh

No. of Distt Name of District Reasons for not releasing funds in 2009-10

- 1 Mandi District has sufficient funds in Opening Balance to meet the requirement of initial 6 months during 2009-10.
- 2 Kullu District has sufficient funds in Opening Balance to meet the requirement of initial 6 months during 2009-10.
- 3 Lahaul & Spiti District has sufficient funds in Opening Balance to meet the requirement of initial 6 months during 2009-10.

#### Jammu & Kashmir

No. of Distt Name of District Reasons for not releasing funds in 2009-10

- 1 Anantnag District has sufficient funds in Opening Balance to meet the requirement of initial 6 months during 2009-10.
- 2 Jammu District has not furnished the UC & AR of 06-07 of SGRY
- 3 Srinagar State/District has not furnished Labour Budget for the year 2009-10
- 4 Budgam State/District has not furnished Labour Budget for the year 2009-10
- 5 Pulwama State/District has not furnished Labour Budget for the year 2009-10
- 6 Baramulla State/District has not furnished Labour Budget for the year 2009-10
- 7 Ladakh State/District has not furnished Labour Budget for the year 2009-10
- 8 Kargil The district s not furnished UC and AR of 2007-08 under SGRY
- 9 Kathua State/District has not furnished Labour Budget for the year 2009-10
- 10 Udhampur State/District has not furnished Labour Budget for the year 2009-10
- 11 Ganderbal State/District has not furnished Labour Budget for the year 2009-10
- 12 Kulgam State/District has not furnished Labour Budget for the year 2009-10
- 13 Shopian State/District has not furnished Labour Budget for the year 2009-10
- 14 Bandipora State/District has not furnished Labour Budget for the year 2009-10

#### Jharkhand

No. of Distt Name of District Reasons for not releasing funds in 2009-10

- 1 Godda District has sufficient funds in Opening Balance to meet the requirement of initial 6 months during 2009-10.
- 2 Gumla District has sufficient funds in Opening Balance to meet the requirement of initial 6 months during 2009-10.
- 3 Lohardagga District has sufficient funds in Opening Balance to meet the requirement of initial 6 months during 2009-10.
- 4 Singhbhum West District has sufficient funds in Opening Balance to meet the requirement of initial 6 months during 2009-10.
- 5 Bokaro District has sufficient funds in Opening Balance to meet the requirement of initial 6 months during 2009-10.
- 6 Dhanbad District has sufficient funds in Opening Balance to meet the requirement of initial 6 months during 2009-10.
- 7 Hazaribagh District has sufficient funds in Opening Balance to meet the requirement of initial 6 months during 2009-10.
- 8 Ranchi clarification letter issued (district has continued the work under SGRY despite Ministry's clear cut instructions on the subject )
- 9 Giridih District has sufficient funds in Opening Balance to meet the requirement of initial 6 months during 2009-10.
- 10 Deoghar District has sufficient funds in Opening Balance to meet the requirement of initial 6 months during 2009-10.
- 11 Khunti District has sufficient funds in Opening Balance to meet the requirement of initial 6 months during 2009-10.

#### Kerala

No. of Distt Name of District Reasons for not releasing funds in 2009-10

- 1 Pathanamthitta UC/AR for the year 2007-08 & 2008-09 does not tally
- 2 Ernakulam District has sufficient funds in Opening Balance to meet the requirement of initial 6 months during 2009-10.

#### Manipur

No. of Distt Name of District Reasons for not releasing funds in 2009-10

- 1 Bishnupur District has not submitted the MPR for the month of March 09

#### Meghalaya

No. of Distt Name of District Reasons for not releasing funds in 2009-10

- 1 West Khasi Hills Under consideration

#### Orissa

No. of Distt Name of District Reasons for not releasing funds in 2009-10

- 1 Boudh District has sufficient funds in Opening Balance to meet the requirement of initial 6 months during 2009-10.
- 2 Deogarh District has sufficient funds in Opening Balance to meet the requirement of initial 6 months during 2009-10.
- 3 Dhenikanal District has sufficient funds in Opening Balance to meet the requirement of initial 6 months during 2009-10.
- 4 Jharsuguda District has sufficient funds in Opening Balance to meet the requirement of initial 6 months during 2009-10.
- 5 Kalahandi District has sufficient funds in Opening Balance to meet the requirement of initial 6 months during 2009-10.
- 6 Keonjhar District has sufficient funds in Opening Balance to meet the requirement of initial 6 months during 2009-10.
- 7 Koraput District has sufficient funds in Opening Balance to meet the requirement of initial 6 months during 2009-10.
- 8 Nabarangpur District has sufficient funds in Opening Balance to meet the requirement of initial 6 months during 2009-10.
- 9 Sambalpur District has sufficient funds in Opening Balance to meet the requirement of initial 6 months during 2009-10.
- 10 Sonepur District has not submitted the revised Utilization Certificate 2007-08 with agency-wise details.
- 11 Sundergarh UC/AR not tally for the year 2007-08 under NREGA
- 12 Bargarh District has sufficient funds in Opening Balance to meet the requirement of initial 6 months during 2009-10.
- 13 Anugul District has sufficient funds in Opening Balance to meet the requirement of initial 6 months during 2009-10.
- 14 Balasore The distt. Has not fur. The due UC & AR of 07-08.
- 15 Jajpur District has sufficient funds in Opening Balance to meet the requirement of initial 6 months during 2009-10.
- 16 Cuttack District has not furnished the due UC&AR for the year 2007-08 under SGRY.
- 17 Jagatsinghpur District has not furnished the due UC&AR for the year 2007-08 under SGRY.
- 18 Kendrapada District has not furnished the due UC&AR for the year 2007-08 under SGRY.
- 19 Khurda District has not furnished the due UC&AR for the year 2007-08 under SGRY.
- 20 Nayagarh District has not furnished the due UC&AR for the year 2007-08 under SGRY.
- 21 Puri District has not furnished the due UC&AR for the year 2007-08 under SGRY.

#### Rajasthan

No. of Distt Name of District Reasons for not releasing funds in 2009-10

- 1 Pratapgarh State/District has not submitted the Labour Budget 2009-10

#### Andaman & Nicobar Island

No. of Distt Name of District Reasons for not releasing funds in 2009-10

- 1 Andamans (South) District has sufficient funds in Opening Balance to meet the requirement of initial 6 months during 2009-10.
- 2 Nicobars District has sufficient funds in Opening Balance to meet the requirement of initial 6 months during 2009-10.
- 3 North & Middle District has sufficient funds in Opening Balance to meet the requirement of Andaman initial 6 months during 2009-10.

#### Lakshadweep

No. of Distt Name of District Reasons for not releasing funds in 2009-10

- 1 Lakshadweep State/District not submitted Labour Budget for the year 2009-10

#### Pondicherry

No. of Distt Name of District Reasons for not releasing funds in 2009-10

- 1 Pondicherry State/District not submitted Labour Budget for the year 2009-10
- 2 Karaikal State/District not submitted Labour Budget for the year 2009-10

#### Goa

No. of Distt Name of District Reasons for not releasing funds in 2009-10

- 1 North Goa State/District not submitted Labour Budget for the year 2009-10
- 2 South Goa State/District not submitted Labour Budget for the year 2009-10