

8

COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS

(FIFTEENTH LOK SABHA)

EIGHTH REPORT



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

November, 2010/Kartika, 1932 (Saka)

EIGHTH REPORT

COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS

(FIFTEENTH LOK SABHA)

MINISTRY OF RAILWAYS

(Presented to Lok Sabha on 16.11.2010)



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

November, 2010/Kartika, 1932 (Saka)

CPB. No. 1 Vol. VIII

Price: Rs. 25.00

© 2010 BY LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

Published under Rule 382 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha (Fourteenth Edition) and printed by the General Manager, Government of India Press, Minto Road, New Delhi -110 002.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS	(iii)
1. INTRODUCTION	(v)
2. REPORT	
Representation from Shri D.K. Khanvilkar, Ex-MLA, Alibag and Adv. V.K. Naik regarding introduction of passenger service on Konkan Railway Pen-Thal track of RCF in district Raigad, Maharashtra.	1
3. ANNEXURES	
(i) Minutes of the Seventh Sitting of the Committee held on 03.02.2010.	10
(ii) Minutes of the Fourteenth Sitting of the Committee held on 18.05.2010.	12

COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS
(2010-11)

Shri Anant Gangaram Geete — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

2. Shri Rajendra Agrawal
3. Shri Khiladi Lal Bairwa
4. Shri E.T. Mohammed Basheer
5. Shri N.S.V. Chitthan
6. Shri Gurudas Dasgupta
7. Shri Dip Gogoi
8. Shri Devendra Nagpal
9. Shri Jagdambika Pal
10. Prof. Ramshankar
11. Shri Sarvey Sathyanarayana
12. Shri Rakesh Singh
13. Dr. Sanjay Sinh
14. Shri Kabir Suman
15. Shri Joseph Toppo

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri N.K. Sapra — *Additional Secretary*
2. Shri V.R. Ramesh — *Joint Secretary*
3. Shri U.B.S. Negi — *Additional Director*
4. Shri Hulasi Ram — *Deputy Secretary*

EIGHTH REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS

(FIFTEENTH LOK SABHA)

INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman, Committee on Petitions, having been authorized by the Committee to present the Report on their behalf, present this Eighth Report of the Committee to the House on the representation from Shri D.K. Khanvilkar, Ex-MLA, Alibag and Adv. V.K. Naik regarding introduction of passenger service on Konkan Railway Pen-Thal track of RCF in district Raigad, Maharashtra.

2. The Committee considered and adopted the draft Eighth Report at their sitting held on 18th May, 2010.

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

NEW DELHI;
18 May, 2010

28 Vaisakha, 1932 (Saka)

ANANT GANGARAM GEETE,
Chairman,
Committee on Petitions.

REPORT

REPRESENTATION FROM SHRID.K. KHANVILKAR, EX-MLA, ALIBAG AND ADV.V.K.NAIK REGARDING INTRODUCTION OF PASSENGER SERVICE ON KONKAN RAILWAY PEN-THAL TRACK OF RCF IN DISTRICT RAIGAD, MAHARASHTRA.

The Committee on Petitions received a representation dated 23 November, 2009 from Shri D.K. Khanvilkar, Ex-MLA, Alibag and Adv. V.K. Naik regarding introduction of passenger service on Konkan Railway Pen-Thal track of M/s. Rastriya Chemicals and Fertilizers (RCF) in District Raigad, Maharashtra.

2. As per the petitioners, the Konkan Railway runs through Raigad district *via* Ratnagiri and Sindhudurg upto Goa. The plant of M/s. RCF is located at Thal in Alibag, District Raigad and the fertilizer produced in that plant goes to all over the country by railway. There is one siding from Pen Station of Konkan Railway to Thal Plant laid down by M/s. RCF. An agreement was executed between M/s. RCF and the Ministry of Railways on 6 February 1984. As per the agreement, the Ministry of Railways had reserved the right to start passenger service on the RCF siding, whenever necessary. One of the petitioners, on 14 July 2004, requested through Shri A.R. Antulay, the then MP to start a passenger service from Thal to Mumbai on the RCF siding. The petitioner also stated that the acquisition of land will not be necessary for Railway Station because some land near Chondhi at Thal is available. The petitioners have, therefore, requested that a passenger service on the RCF siding may be introduced and also demanded that a small Railway Station may be constructed near Thal in the name 'Alibag Road' and there should be a regular service from Mumbai to Panvel.

3. The Committee took up the representation for examination under Direction 95 of the Directions by the Speaker, Lok Sabha and accordingly, it was referred to the Ministry of Railways for their comments. The Ministry of Railways *vide* O.M. No. 2009/Parl/4/LS/1 dated 11 December, 2009 furnished its comments in the matter as under:—

“Pen-Thal (26 kms.) is a Private Siding of M/s. RCF taking off from Pen Station on Central Railway and is meant for movement of goods traffic and is not open for running passenger services. This siding carries 4 goods trains each way per day (inward naphtha and outward fertilizer). In addition, there are proposals to provide connectivity to 2 new sidings. First, M/s. PNP Maritime will serve Dharamtar Port and carry 3 trains each way per day of imported coal and foodgrains and second, M/s. Ispat will carry 3 trains each way per day of iron ore and steel. As the Pen-Thal section is a private siding, it is not open for running passenger services. Therefore, the question of having a passenger train at Thal and running passenger services do not arise.”

4. On being enquired about agreement executed on 6 February, 1984 between M/s. RCF and the Ministry of Railways including its salient features, the Committee

were informed by the Ministry, that a siding agreement was signed between M/s. RCF and Central Railway on 6 February, 1984. The salient features of the said agreement are as under:—

1. The siding shall mean and include lines of rails, platforms, embankments, sleepers, crossings, signal posts, signals points, etc.
 2. Electrification will be done at the cost of siding owner.
 3. Renewal and repairs will be done by the Railway at the cost of the siding owner.
 4. No alterations will be permitted without permission of the Railway.
 5. All constructions are to be carried by the Railway and the cost of construction will be borne by the siding owner.
 6. Maintenance charges to be paid by the owner to the Railway.
 7. The siding may be closed by the owner or by the Railway for want of sufficient traffic by giving 30 days notice.
 8. The Railway Administration can also close the siding in public interest or if the Railway is desirous of acquiring the siding outside the working premises of the party, for the purpose of working it for public traffic as part of the railway system (clause 8 of the agreement).
 9. The Railway Administration reserves the right at any time to construct or permit the construction of any branch or extension of the siding outside the working premises of the party, and to work traffic over the siding to and such branch or extension. The Railway Administration shall also have the right to sanction the use of the siding for the traffic of persons other than the party on payment to the party of a remuneration for such use.
 10. Freight for all classes of goods upto and from the station by which the siding is served of from which wagons are worked to and from the siding will be charged in accordance with rates published from time to time.
 11. Siding charges as notified by the Railway shall be paid by the siding owner.
 12. Subletting of the siding is not permitted. However, co-use permission can be obtained from the Railway.
 13. In case of any dispute, the same shall be referred, for decision, to a sole arbitrator who shall be the GM or a person appointed by him in that behalf.
5. In response to a specific query as to whether as per the agreement a passenger service on the RCF siding was to be started, the Ministry stated that there is no such provision in the agreement which provides for a passenger service on the RCF siding.
6. On being enquired about the letters written by Shri A.R. Antulay, the then MP regarding starting of passenger service from Thal to Mumbai on the above siding, the Ministry informed that 3 letters were received from him and examined by them. The

then Minister of State for Railways, Dr. R. Velu stated that Pen-Thal is a private siding and fit only for handling freight traffic and is not owned by railways. Infrastructural facilities are not available on this section for running of passenger trains. Hence, introduction of passenger trains on Pen-Thal section is not feasible.

7. Responding to a question as to whether the Ministry has conducted any survey in terms of freight and passenger traffic to construct a Railway Station near Thal Plant, the Ministry stated as under:—

“A techno economic study was conducted to examine the possibility of running EMU/DMU services between Panvel-Nhava Sheva (25kms.), Panvel-Thal (61 kms.) and Panvel-Uran (26 kms.). It concluded that 2 services each way per day on each day on each route if run would yield a joint ROR of negative– 1.59% and hence the proposal was found financially unviable. Further, the area is served by a good network of road services including State Transport and private services run by the industries.”

8. It was informed by the Ministry that the cost of the survey was Rs. 4.2 lakh.

9. On being enquired about the criteria/ guidelines of the Government in this regard, the Ministry replied as under:—

“Decision for running of passenger services is taken based on the technical feasibility, financial viability, operational feasibility and other recommendations of the survey report.”

10. The Committee desired to know the effective measures taken by the Ministry for Promotion of Tourism and Historical Places in the region, the number of passenger trains running daily from Mumbai to Panvel and whether they are able to cater to the needs of the area including the possibility to extend these trains upto Thal on RCF siding. In a written reply, the Ministry stated that they run luxury tourist train “Deccan Odyssey” in association with Maharashtra Tourism Development Corporation which passes along the Konkan coast. As a part of its itinerary it stops at Sindhudurg where there is a full day sightseeing programme covering the historical sites and beaches. At present, 160 trains (82 DN Mumbai-Panvel + 78 UP Panvel-Mumbai) are running between Mumbai CST and Panvel on suburban section on Harbour line. Details of other Mail/Express/ Passenger trains serving Panvel is placed at *Annexure-I*. The existing services are by and large catering to the traffic requirements of the area. Moreover, introduction of trains is an ongoing process subject to operational feasibility, availability of resources and traffic justification.

11. Responding to the petitioner’s demand that in the beginning one train in the morning and one in the evening from Panvel upto Thal on RCF siding may be executed and the schedule may be increased as and when necessary, the Ministry in a written reply stated as under:—

“The feasibility of running one DMU service each way per day in Panvel-Thal section was surveyed in 2003. Whereas Panvel-Thal is a single line non-electrified section on the route of Konkan-Railway, doubling work of which is targeted for completion by 2012, line between Pen-Thal is a private siding used for goods

traffic by M/s RCF. The survey for running trains on this route found that one DMU service each way per day would give a negative rate of return (ROR) of-1.56% and hence would be financially unviable. Further the area is served by a good network of road services including State Transport and passenger services run by the industries. Pen- Thal siding is carrying 4 goods train each way per day. In addition, there are proposals to provide connectivity to 2 new sidings. The first M/s. PNP Maritime Services Dharammatar Port and will carry 3 trains each way per day of imported coal and food grains. The second M/s Ispat will carry 3 trains each way per day of iron ore and steel. In view of the above, it is not considered feasible to run passenger services in this section.”

12. When the Committee desired to know about the estimated expenditure to be required if the train services are extended upto Thal on RCF siding, the Ministry informed as under:—

“Combined estimated expenditure for running of services on all the three sections as per Techno Economic Feasibility Survey (TEFS) of 2003 was as under:—

Capital cost		Rs.80.13 crore
Working expenses	(2008-09)	Rs.1.42 crore
	(2013-14)	Rs.1.52 crore
	(2018-19)	Rs.1.61 crore

Current expenditure will have to be assessed by a fresh survey”

13. Responding to the suggestion of the petitioners that the acquisition of land will not be necessary for Railway Station as some land near Chondhi at Thal is available and they have undertaken to make the said land available by private negotiation, the Ministry commented as under:—

“In the absence of any commercial justification as has been revealed by the survey conducted last, it is not justified to spend large sum of resources for running of passenger services. Presently, the entire cost of operations and maintenance of the private siding is borne by the siding owner.”

14. The Committee, thereafter, took oral evidence of the representatives of the Ministry of Railways on 3 February, 2010. Explaining the position in brief, the witness, Member (Traffic) during evidence stated as under:—

“The problem is that it is a private siding and it is not on railway land. The (26 kms.) line which goes to Pen-Thal directly enters in the RCF Plant. You also informed that Konkan Railway was connected with this area and a power plant of Tata is also coming. A Dharammatar Port is also coming over there. We are expecting that 10 trains will run on this route but only after obtaining permission from RCF. As per the agreement, railway may compel RCF only for goods train because construction of siding for freight movement is different. When we lay railway tracks for passenger movement, it has special requirement and thereafter sanction of RCF is taken. Siding has not been constructed as per this requirement. There two issues are involved. Whether we can take over the private siding on private land? It can invite legal problems and thereafter we have to improve it so

as to make it fit for passenger traffic and it will require funds. Another problem is that if we have to connect it from Panvel, it will require electrification of this route and expenditure is involved. This route is presently not electrified. If we bring DMU, you know that only EMU runs in this area not DMU or MEMU. Shuttle like train could run there. If we want to run DMU, it could be done, but the point is that we have to take whole siding under control of railway and it will require expenditure. Thereafter expenditure for upgradation will also be required and further if we run EMU on this line further additional expenditure will be required for electrification. Considering all these aspects we have prepared additional return and it will be -1.49% and the actual return will be even more negative. The area of concern is that the Railway have not so much funds that we can consider to operate in unremunerative areas. We are not able to run sufficient number of trains even on harbour line as per demand. We both know that area and this is a call to be taken as to how to do it.”

15. When the Committee desired that Railway should conduct a fresh survey for this route, the witness stated as under:—

“Right Sir, we will see in the survey as to whether Railway could lay its own separate line. The present line had been laid as per the requirement of RCF. It may be possible that we will reach Alibag from different alignment. The road is from another location. The route of road is different and faster. We have been informed that there is fast movement on this road.”

16. When the Committee observed that trains are running on existing railway track then what prevents them to run additional trains, the witness responded as under:—

“Sir, this siding is cleared only for running of goods trains. Whatever agreement we have with the RCF is for running freight trains, goods trains only. The passenger train running has not been planned or cleared.”

17. When the Committee asked what prevents them to reopen agreement with M/s. RCF which is a Public Sector Undertaking, the witness the Chairman, Railway Board stated as under:—

“.....This was a private line as my colleague said and made basically for the carriage of goods and materials required for that factory. We do not know, tomorrow they may need more number of trains to be run. As we have mentioned, already there is a demand for six more pairs of trains to be run by taking another siding out of this and this is basically a freight siding. That is one point. The agreement does not provide for it. As you have mentioned there may be scope of opening the agreement. We can approach them for changing the agreement. If they agree, we can do it. But that will not be advisable because once we start running passenger trains, there will be demand for more and more passenger trains and then the freight trains will be compromised. Basically this was made for that purpose.

Therefore, if there is a demand for running passenger train the Ministry have already agreed for carrying out another survey which will be a railway line and not a private line and the Ministry will have the freedom to operate any number of

passenger trains on that.”

18. When the Committee referred to clause 9 of the agreement which stipulate – the Railway Administration shall also have the right to sanction the use of the side for the traffic of passengers, the witness clarified as under:—

“Sir, traffic of persons means some other party, like ISPAT is now demanding. We can process that because it is a freight siding. We are telling them that they should be permitted to handle their traffic on the line.”

The witness further emphasized as under:—

“Sir, the traffic of persons means traffic of certain entrepreneurs who have a plant there.”

19. When the Committee enquired what prevents the Ministry of Railways for approaching the Ministry of Chemicals and Fertilizers for changing the agreement and incorporating the passenger service, the witness, Member (Engineering) stated as under:—

“Sir, the first thing is the technical part as the Hon’ble Member had asked for. There is a distinct difference between the tax structure, the maintenance standards, and like for instance the balanced cushion, the type of sleepers, the density of sleepers, the type of wheels, the types of fittings etc. and also the maintenance standards for passenger trains and goods trains. This line has been made only for goods trains and it is maintained for the standards of the goods trains. That is the technical part as the line exists today. Second is in regard to the policy.”

20. On being enquired by the Committee as to whether it would not be technically feasible to convert the existing line into passenger line, the witness responded as under:—

“Sir, the Hon’ble Member’s question was —what is the technical issue, the standard today. I am saying today it is; in future by making investments we can even make it into a fast train track. Nobody doubts and denies that fact. Even there may be goods trains like in Konkan where they are running at 100 km. per hour. Today the siding that we have there is for about 40 km per hour. If a Konkan train comes we will have to raise the standards. Therefore, the standards of our tracks are commensurate with the speed of the freight, the type of wagons that we are running type of coaches, the speed we are running. So, that is how it is. There is a prevailing policy. In the policy, the term ‘persons’ has to be understood very clearly because we do not have sidings only with RCF. We have got sidings all over the country. The interpretation is constant and common. It is so-so with all the people we have and there it very clearly means that if a private siding is there, the Railways reserve their right in case somebody else comes there to allow. That somebody else is some other factory or some other user from the freight point of view. We reserve our right to permit them with the permission of the owner.”

21. When the Committee asked pointedly as to whether Railways would like to reconsider to change the agreement and talk with the Ministry of Chemicals and Fertilizers in this regard, the witness stated as under:—

“Sir, on behalf of the Chairman, I would like to again inform you that we have said that we would like to go for a survey. Kindly let me complete. The survey encompasses all possibilities. When we do have a survey, it encompasses all possibilities there. As my colleague, Member (Traffic) has said, it is possible that we may not think it is desirable to have a passenger train coming from this connection. Therefore, in the earnestness of getting it examined from the various options and possibilities that exist, we feel very strongly that a survey is first essential. In that survey, one of the possibilities is this also.”

22. When the Committee observed that Railways had done a survey six years ago, then why there was a need for another survey for technical evaluations, the witness replied as under:—

“On technical grounds, there is a necessity. The Hon’ble Member is also agreeing with us. Let the survey be done. It would be a survey encompassing all the things. There may be improved economic options also as the Hon’ble Chairman has said that there is an airport which is going to come up there. These were some factors which were not known to us earlier. If this survey goes through now, we might find a different picture altogether.”

23. On being enquired as to whether feasibility of a passenger train was examined at the time of previous survey which was done six years ago, the witness stated as under:—

“Sir, it was examined and they thought that in the goods train, one coach may be attached. I also agree that now the traffic is so much and that is not a solution. I accept that that is not a solution but that is how six years ago, they had ended it.”

In this regard, the witness further clarified:

“Sir, Member (Engineering) has already told you that any track can be taken up and improved. There is just no difficulty. Somewhere it will cost less and somewhere it will cost more. Our engineers are capable of improving any track. I have worked there and the Hon’ble Chairman is also from that area. What I was suggesting is that the area is developing so fast that probably a connection from Pen may not be right, but if you all want it, it will have to be seen now how much investment is required in that because the survey conducted was for three lines. It was for Uran as well as Navasheva lines. We will now take it up for this and in all sincerity. I also concede that if we have to run a train, it has to be a full train. It cannot be one coach because one coach is not the solution. But then we will have to see how RCF will function and how we take care of Ispat and Dharammatar. I concede that the need is there.”

24. When the Committee enquired about the time required for this survey, the witness Member (Engineering) stated as under:—

“Sir, with the budget preparations already having undergone its process, I cannot assure you that we will be able to include it in this budget or not. But certainly when the papers have to be prepared for the supplementary budget we will include it as an out of turn work. Since the budget preparations have started and there are some things which have been taken away, we cannot discuss them. Since this is

a length of about 26 kilometres, it will take about six months as it is a ghat section.”

25. When the Committee observed that it was not a ghat section, the witness, Member (Traffic) clarified as under:—

“Sir, there is a ghat section on Navasheva line, not on Pen-Thal section. We would like a connection from Panvel itself. Probably, it should be possible to go from Panvel itself. Otherwise, if we have to run 10 to 12 trains later on, then Pen to Panvel will become a bottleneck.”

Observations/ Recommendations

26. The Committee note from the submission of the petitioners that there is one siding from Pen station of Konkan Railway to Thal Plant of M/s. RCF. As per the agreement between M/s. RCF and the Ministry of Railways executed on 6 February, 1984, the right to start a passenger service is reserved with the Ministry. The petitioners have, therefore, requested that a passenger service on the RCF siding may be started and a small Railway Station may be constructed near Thal for which the land is available.

27. In its reply, the Ministry of Railways has informed the Committee that Pen-Thal Track (26 kms.) is a private siding of M/s. RCF, which is meant for movement of goods traffic and the same is not open for running of passenger services. The Ministry contended that there is no provision in the agreement which provides for a passenger service on the RCF siding as claimed by the petitioners. As per the agreement, Ministry of Railways may compel M/s. RCF only for goods train. Siding has not been constructed as per the requirement for running passenger services. Infrastructural facilities are also not available on Pen-Thal section for running of passenger trains. Hence, introduction of passenger trains on this section is not feasible. A techno-economic study was conducted in 2003 to examine the feasibility of running EMU/DMU services but the proposal was not found financially viable. The area is fully connected with rail and also served by a good network of road services including State Transport and private services run by the industries. Further, Pen-Thal siding is carrying 4 goods trains each way per day. In addition, there are proposals to provide connectivity to 2 new sidings. In view of this and in the absence of commercial justification it was not considered feasible to run passenger services in this section. According to the Ministry, re-opening of agreement executed with M/s. RCF might invite legal problems as well as similar demands for running passenger trains on tracks which are primarily meant for freight trains.

28. The Committee are not convinced with the explanation given by the Ministry of Railways in the matter. The Committee are of the view that every time commercial viability of a project may not necessarily be the sole criteria for introduction of new train service in some parts of the country. One of the important aspects may be the socio-economic consideration of the area for opening up of new train service between two destinations. Further, the argument of the Ministry that re-opening of agreement executed with M/s. RCF in 1984 may involve legal problems does not seem to be sustainable in view of the fact that M/s. RCF is a Public Sector Undertaking which comes under the Ministry of Chemicals and Fertilizers. Therefore, the Ministry of

Railways should not have any problem in approaching the Ministry of Chemicals and Fertilizers to review the said agreement with M/s. RCF. During the course of evidence, the Ministry of Railways have conceded that it would be feasible to convert any line into fast passenger track. The Committee, therefore, recommend that the Ministry of Railways should initiate action to review the agreement signed with M/s. RCF to enable them to upgrade RCF siding/ track for introduction of passenger service in the area as demanded by the petitioners.

29. Another plea taken by the Ministry of Railways is that techno-economic study for running one DMU service each way per day in Panvel-Thal section was conducted almost way back in 2003 and the same was not found financially viable. The Committee are, however, of the opinion that a lot of development has taken place since then in and around the area. Further, a number of plants/ industries are being established in the area and it has the potential to develop as a big commercial and industrial hub as well as a tourist destination not only for the people in the country but also for tourists from abroad. Besides, there may be several other factors having a bearing on improvement of economy of the area. Therefore, the demand of the petitioners for introduction of passenger service in the area including on RCF siding and construction of Railway Station at Thal does not seem to be unjustified.

30. The Committee note with satisfaction that the Chairman, Railway Board has assured the Committee during the evidence that they would go in for a fresh survey regarding the feasibilities of introducing a passenger service between Panvel and Thal on RCF siding and the budget for the survey will be included in supplementary budget. According to the Ministry, the survey is likely to be completed within a period of about six months. The Committee, therefore, recommend that the matter in this regard, may be processed expeditiously and in right earnest. The Committee may also be apprised of the concrete action taken by the Ministry in this regard.

NEW DELHI;
18 May, 2010
28 Vaisakha, 1932 (Saka)

ANANT GANGARAM GEETE,
Chairman,
Committee on Petitions.

MINUTES OF THE SEVENTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS
(FIFTEENTH LOK SABHA)

The Committee on Petitions sat on Wednesday, the 3rd February, 2010 from 1500 hrs. to 1600 hrs. in Committee Room 'C' Ground Floor, Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi to take oral evidence of the representatives of the Ministry of Railways (Railway Board):—

PRESENT

Shri Anant Gangaram Geete — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

2. Shri Rajendra Agrawal
3. Shri Khiladi Lal Bairwa
4. Shri E.T. Mohammed Basheer
5. Shri N.S.V. Chitthan
6. Shri Gurudas Das Gupta
7. Shri Jagdambika Pal
8. Prof. Ram Shankar
9. Shri Sarvey Sathyanarayana
10. Dr. Sanjay Sinh

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri N.K.Sapra — *Additional Secretary*
2. Shri Ashok Sarin — *Joint Secretary*
3. Shri V.R. Ramesh — *Director*
4. Shri U.B.S. Negi — *Additional Director*

WITNESSES

Ministry of Railways

(Railway Board)

1. Shri S.S. Khurana — *Chairman*
2. Shri Rakesh Chopra — *Member Engg.*
3. Shri Vivek Sahai — *Member Traffic*
4. Shri A.K. Goyal — *Member Staff*

5. Shri P.K.Sharma	—	Additional Member (Staff)
6. Shri V.K.Gupta	—	Adviser (Land & Amenities)
7. Shri R.D. Choudhary	—	Executive Director (Esstt. N)
8. Shri N. Madhusudan Rao	—	Executive Director (Planning)
9. Shri P.K. Sanghi	—	Executive Director (Works)
10. Shri Mukesh Nigam	—	Executive Director (Coaching)
11. Shri G.D. Brahma	—	Executive Director (Freight Mkt.)
12. Shri Felix Kerketta	—	Director (Parliament.)

At the outset, the Chairman welcomed the representatives of the Ministry of Railways (Railway Board). The Chairman, then drew their attention to Direction 55(1) of the Directions by the Speaker regarding confidentiality of the proceedings.

2. The Chairman, thereafter, referred to the representations received from Shri D.K. Khanvilkar, Ex. MLA, Alibag and Adv. V.K.Naik regarding introduction of passenger service on Konkan Railway Pen-Thal track of RCF siding in District Raigad, Maharashtra and also from Shri Shrinivas Jatav, District Dhaultpur, Rajasthan forwarded by Shri K.L. Bairwa MP, Lok Sabha requesting for laying of new railway line for development of Dang area. The officers of the Ministry of Railways explained that Pen-Thal Track of RCF is a private siding for running goods train only and if the siding is converted into track for running passenger service, it would involve investment, besides the same might invite legal problems. While soliciting the clarifications on certain issues/points the Committee desired that the Ministry of Railways (Railway Board) should take up the issue with the Ministry of Chemicals and Fertilizers for change of agreement which was signed between RCF and Ministry of Railways. However, the Ministry assured the Committee that they would go for a fresh survey which encompasses all possibilities.

** ** * * * * *

4. A copy of the verbatim proceedings of the sitting of the Committee was kept on record.

The witnesses then withdrew.

The Committee then adjourned.

ANNEXURE-II

MINUTES OF THE FOURTEENTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS
(FIFTEENTH LOK SABHA)

The Committee on Petitions sat on Tuesday, the 18th May, 2010 from 1400 hrs. to 1520 hrs. in Committee Room 'C', Ground Floor, Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri Gurudas Das Gupta — *In the Chair*

MEMBERS

2. Shri Rajendra Agrawal
3. Shri Khiladi Lal Bairwa
4. Shri E.T. Mohammed Basheer
5. Shri N.S.V. Chitthan
6. Shri Jagdambika Pal
7. Prof. Ram Shankar
8. Shri Joseph Toppo

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri N.K. Sapra — *Additional Secretary*
2. Shri V.R. Ramesh — *Director*
3. Shri U.B.S. Negi — *Additional Director*
4. Shri Hulasi Ram — *Deputy Secretary*
5. Smt. Jagriti Tewatia — *Under Secretary*

2. In the absence of the Chairman, the Committee chose, Shri Gurudas Das Gupta to act as Chairman for the sitting under Rule 258 (3) of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha.

3. At the outset, the Chairman welcomed the Members of the Committee and then the Committee took up the following draft reports for consideration and adoption:—

(i) Seventh report

Chapter-I: Representation signed by Smt. Shakauntala Devi requesting to consider her case under the category of 'War Widow' and grant her all the applicable financial benefits.

Chapter-II: Representation from Ms. Rita Kunur forwarded by Shri Gurudas Das Gupta, M.P, Lok Sabha regarding non-implementation of the decision of Appointment Committee of Cabinet (ACC).

(ii) Eighth report

Chapter-I: Representation from Shri D.K. Khanvilkar, Ex- M.L.A, Alibag and Adv. V.K. Naik, regarding introduction of passenger service on Konkan Railway, Pen-Thal Track of RCF in district Raigad, Maharashtra.

Chapter-II: Representation from Shri H. Mahadevan, Deputy General Secretary, All India Union Congress and forwarded by Shri Gurudas Das Gupta, M.P, Lok Sabha regarding default in contribution to the Provident Fund by the Employees.

4. After due deliberations by the Committee, Chapter-I of Seventh and Eighth reports were adopted without any modifications. As regards Chapter II of Seventh and Eighth reports, the Committee suggested to incorporate therein certain changes/modifications. However before their finalization and adoption, the Committee decided that the Cabinet Secretary might be called to hear his views with reference to the representation from Ms. Rita Kunur. The Committee also decided that officials of the Ministry of Labour and Employment might again be called for further discussion before Chapter-II of eighth report is finalized.

**

**

**

**

The Committee then adjourned.