

COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS

(TENTH LOK SABHA)

SECOND REPORT



[Presented to Lok Sabha on 9-4-92]

**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI**

February, 1992 Magha, 1913 (Saka)

Price : Rs. 23.00

CONTENTS

PAGE

COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS (iii)

INTRODUCTION (v)

REPORT

- I. Action taken by Government on the recommendations of the Committee on Petitions contained in paragraphs 3.17 to 3.21 of their Sixth Report (Eighth Lok Sabha) on the representation regarding application of rules made under Chapters IV to IX and other provisions of MRTP Act, 1969, to Government Companies, Cooperative Societies and Financial Institutions etc. 1—5
- II. Action taken by Government on the recommendations of the Committee on Petitions contained in paragraphs 3.13 to 3.20 of their Eleventh Report (Eighth Lok Sabha) on the representation of Secondary and Higher Secondary School Teachers Association, Dadra and Nagar Haveli regarding seniority, confirmation etc 6-7
- III. Action taken by Government on the recommendations of the Committee on Petitions contained in paragraphs 5.15 to 5.17 of their Eighth Report (Eighth Lok Sabha) on the representation regarding regularisation of services of employees of Sukinda Nickel Project. 8—10

APPENDICES

- I. Para-wise comments furnished by the Ministry of Industry (Department of Company Affairs) on the recommendations made by the Committee in paragraphs 3.17 to 3.21 of their Sixth Report (Eighth Lok Sabha). 11
- II. Para-wise comments furnished by the Ministry of Human Resource Development (Department of Education) on the recommendations made by the Committee in paragraphs 3.13 to 3.21 of their Eleventh Report (Eighth Lok Sabha). 13
- III. Para-wise comments furnished by the Ministry of Steel and Mines on the recommendations made by the Committee in paragraphs 5.15 to 5.17 of their Eighth Report (Eighth Lok Sabha). 23
- IV. Representation dated 1 January, 1990 from Shri M. Rout and five other class IV employees of the erstwhile Sukinda Nickel Project. 27

COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS
(1991-92)

Shri P.G. Narayanan—*Chairman*

Members

2. Shri L. Adaikalaraj
3. Shri Naresh Kumar Baliyan
4. Shri Prataprao B. Bhosale
5. Shri Lokanath Choudhury
6. Prof. Sudhir Giri
7. Dr. B.G. Jawali
8. Shri Lalit Oraon
9. Shri Sarat Chandra Pattanayak
10. Shri Prabhulal Rawat
11. Shri Muhi Ram Saikia
12. Shri Gabbaji Mangaji Thakore
13. Shri Ramesh Chand Tomar
14. Shri Arjun Singh Yadav
15. Shri Satya Pal Singh Yadav

SECRETARIAT

Shri G.L. Batra—*Additional Secretary*

Shri S.C. Gupta—*Joint Secretary*

Shri R.K. Chatterjee—*Deputy Secretary*

Shri A.N. Gupta—*Under Secretary*

**SECOND REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS
(TENTH LOK SABHA)**

INTRODUCTION

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

- (i) Action taken by Government on the recommendations of the Committee on Petitions contained in paragraphs 3.17 to 3.21 of their Sixth Report (Eighth Lok Sabha) on the representation regarding application of rules made under Chapters IV to IX and other provisions of MRTP Act, 1969, to Government Companies, Cooperative Societies and Financial Institutions etc. [Matter was considered by the Committee at their Sittings held on 21 June and 17 July, 1990].
- (ii) Action taken by Government on the recommendations of the Committee on Petitions contained in paragraphs 3.13 to 3.20 of their Eleventh Report (Eighth Lok Sabha) on the representation of Secondary and Higher Secondary School Teachers Association, Dadra and Nagar Haveli regarding seniority, confirmation etc.
- (iii) Action taken by Government on the recommendations of the Committee on Petitions contained in paragraphs 5.15 to 5.17 of their Eighth Report (Eighth Lok Sabha) on the representation regarding regularisation of services of employees of Sukinda Nickel Project.

2. The Committee considered the draft Report at their sitting held on 13 February, 1992 and adopted it.

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

NEW DELHI;
Dated 13 February, 1992

P.G. NARAYANAN
Chairman,
Committee on Petitions.

CHAPTER I

ACTION TAKEN BY GOVERNMENT ON THE RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN PARAGRAPHS 3.17 to 3.21 OF THEIR SIXTH REPORT (EIGHTH LOK SABHA) OF THE COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS ON THE REPRESENTATION REGARDING APPLICATION OF RULES MADE UNDER CHAPTERS IV TO IX AND OTHER PROVISIONS OF MRTP ACT, 1969, TO GOVERNMENT COMPANIES, COOPERATIVE SOCIETIES AND FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS ETC.

1.1 The Committee on Petitions in their Sixth Report (Eighth Lok Sabha) presented to Lok Sabha on 12 May, 1988, dealt with the representation regarding application of rules made under Chapters IV to IX and other provisions of MRTP Act, 1969 to Government Companies, Co-operative Societies and Financial Institutions etc.

1.2 Action Taken Notes have been received from Government in respect of the recommendations contained in the Report. The recommendations made by the Committee and the reply furnished by the Government are given in *Appendix-I*.

1.3 In para 3.20 of their Sixth Report (Eighth Lok Sabha) the Committee were of the considered opinion that the time had come when the Government should give serious thought to the question of withdrawing the exemption given to Government Companies and Cooperative Societies and bring them within the jurisdiction of Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Commission. In para 3.21 of the Report of the Committee desired that necessary notification in this regard be issued without further delay. "In their reply dated 21 August, 1989, Ministry of Industry (Department of Company Affairs) stated that "after careful consideration by the Government, it has been decided to retain and to continue with the exemption presently available to Government Companies and Cooperative Societies etc. under Section 3 of the MRTP Act, 1969."

1.4 The Committee on Petitions considered the action taken reply of the Government at their sitting held on 21 June, 1990 and decided to take oral evidence of the representatives of the Ministry of Industry (Department of Company Affairs) as the Committee were not satisfied with the reply of Government since the Government did not mention the reasons for non-acceptance of the Committee's recommendations.

1.5 At their sitting held on 17 July, 1990, the Committee examined the representatives of Ministry of Industry (Department of Company Affairs).

not bringing the Government Companies, Cooperative Societies and Financial Institutions etc. within the ambit of MRTP Act, 1969. The representatives of the Ministry of Industry replied that with the approval of Hon'ble Minister of Industry, the suggestion was put before the Cabinet for a decision. Two things were noticed by the Cabinet firstly the public undertakings had been set up for the benefit of the people and not for the benefit of an individual and secondly, public undertakings were controlled indirectly by the Department of Company Affairs.

1.7 He further stated that the prices were fixed mostly by Government after taking into consideration the subsidy etc. being given to the companies. Thus keeping in view all these aspects, it was decided by Cabinet that for the time being, such companies might not be brought under section 3 of MRTP Act.

1.8 Asked to clarify what kind of relaxation was being given to public undertakings and Cooperative Societies etc. under Section 3 of MRTP Act, the witness stated that the relaxation meant that they were exempted from any action under MRTP Act. He, however, stated that Consumer Protection Act was passed recently in order to protect the interests of the consumers.

1.9 On being enquired as to whether there was any contradiction in Section 3 of MRTP Act and Consumers' Protection Act, the witness stated that the Consumers Protection Act was applicable to those bodies which were not covered by MRTP Act; whereas the aim to formulate the MRTP Act was to prevent concentration of economic power. Action could be taken under consumer protection Act against the Public Sector undertakings and Cooperative Societies which remained outside the purview of MRTP Act.

1.10 He further stated that there was no provision either in Consumer Protection Act or in MRTP Act under which effective steps could be taken to stop mismanagement or implementation of the Act. It could be done by Government by exercising their powers. He added that Parliamentary Committee on Public Undertakings was already overseeing the functioning of public undertakings.

1.11 When asked what remedy was available to the consumers in case they felt that the public undertakings and cooperative societies etc. which had been created to keep the prices under control and check the monopolies of other companies, did not fulfil their purpose, the witness stated that quasi judicial bodies would be set up at District, State and Centre level. In case the consumer is treated unfairly, he would be heard and action could also be taken against Government Companies and Cooperative Societies etc. who would be made to pay cash compensation to the consumers.

1.12 In the same context he added that a body for looking into the implementation of Consumer Protection Act was being constituted by

Central Government so that the Act could become effective and the consumers could get a relief. On the other hand if the exemption under section 3 was withdrawn, those companies would come under the MRTP Act thereby under a limit of investment of Rs. 100 crores. Such companies would no longer remain under jurisdiction of Consumer Protection Act and thus there would be no way to protect the interest of consumers.

1.13 When asked what steps could be taken against Government Companies, Cooperative Societies etc. in case they indulged in monopolistic and unfair trade practices, the witness stated that for that purpose management had to be geared up. Administrative machinery had to be alert.

1.14 The Committee desired to know whether there was any incident when a Government firm had resorted to some unfair practices and if so, what steps were taken against those firms. The witness replied that whenever such type of complaints were received in the Ministry, those were sent to the concerned Administrative Ministry as the MRTP Board was not vested with powers over such subjects. He further stated that as the Ministry of Industry could not order inquiry on such complaints, it was not possible for him to state the number of complaints received in that regard. He, however, informed the Committee that the concerned Department or Ministry was empowered to get informations and take concrete steps whatever deemed necessary on the complaints against the institutions falling within their jurisdiction.

1.15 In their post evidence reply dated 1 May, 1991 furnished by the Ministry of Industry (Department of Company Affairs), the Ministry have given the following reasons for continuing with the exemption presently available to Government Companies and Cooperative Societies etc. under section 3 of the MRTP Act, 1969:—

- (a) The nature and structure of the Government undertakings in respect of which exemption in terms of Section 3 of the Act is presently available are such that they are required to function to achieve certain objectives which ensure public interest. The concept of concentration of economic power and adoption of monopolistic, restrictive or unfair trade practices by such undertakings are subservient to the larger goals served by them without any element of private profiteering. They are also subjected to scrutiny by Parliament and its Committees. Also, many of these undertakings are in strategic sectors like steel, oil coal, civil aviation and power generation having a regime of administered prices. Decisions, *inter alia*, to raised prices in these sectors could result in cases being granted by the Commission and/or Courts, the moment the provisions of the Act, specially those relating to trade practices are made applicable to these undertakings. It is, therefore, apprehended that the

implementation of the Government's policy of administered prices may run into litigation and delays.

- (b) In so far as the allegations relating to restrictive and unfair practices by Government/public sector undertakings are concerned, they can be dealt with suitably by the administrative Ministry. Furthermore, with the passing of the Consumer Protection Act, 1986, the undertakings referred to in Section 3 of the Act are liable for action under that Act in respect of unfair trade practices.
- (c) Clause (f) of Section 3 of the MRTP Act was inserted by the MRTP (Amendment) Act of 1984 w.e.f. 1.8.84 for exempting co-operative Societies from the purview of the Act at the instance of the Department of Agriculture and Cooperation. The co-operative societies are mostly engaged in consumer goods like sugar, fertilizers, milk food products, dairy products etc. and are doing useful services to the consumers. Over the last few years, the cooperative movement in India has gained momentum and some of the companies in the cooperative sector are also operating as a countervailing force to the concentration of economic power to the common detriment.

1.16 In a subsequent communication dated 8 October, 1991, the Ministry of Industry (Department of Company Affairs) informed that keeping in view the recommendation of the Committee contained in their Sixth Report (Eighth Lok Sabha) that the Government should give serious thought to the question of withdrawing the exemption given to Government Companies and Cooperative Societies etc. and bring them within the jurisdiction of Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Commission, the Government have decided to bring the Government Companies and Cooperative Societies etc. within the jurisdiction of MRTP Commission and a Gazette Notification to this effect has been issued on 27 September, 1991 which reads as under:—

“In exercise of the powers conferred by section 3 of the Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Act, 1969 (54 of 1969), the Central Government hereby directs that the said Act shall apply to the undertakings specified in clauses (a), (b), (c), (e) and (f) and financial institutions under clause (g) thereof, except the undertakings owned or controlled by a Government company, or the Government, as the case may be, engaged in the production of arms and ammunition and allied items of the defence equipment, defence aircraft and warships, atomic energy, minerals specified in the Schedule to the Atomic Energy (Control of Production and Use) Order, 1953 and industrial units under the Currency and Coinage Division, Ministry of Finance, Department of Economic Affairs.”

1.17 The Committee had observed that Government should give serious thought to the question of withdrawing the exemption given to Government Companies and cooperative societies and bring them within the jurisdiction of MRTP Commission and had desired that necessary notification be issued without any further delay.

The Ministry of Industry (Department of Company Affairs) *vide* their communication dated the 8th October, 1991 informed that Government have decided to bring the Government Companies, Cooperative Societies etc. within the jurisdiction of MRTP Commission. Ministry also furnished a copy of Notification dated the 27th September, 1991 in this regard.

On perusal of the Notification, it is noted that MRTP Act shall now be applicable to the undertakings specified in Clauses (a), (b), (c) (e) and (f) and financial institutions under clause (g) of Section 3 of the MRTP Act, 1969.

The Committee are happy that Government have accepted the recommendations made by the Committee and all the undertakings and cooperative societies will hence onward be accountable for quality of their products and services rendered by them.

CHAPTER II

ACTION TAKEN BY GOVERNMENT TO THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS CONTAINED IN PARAGRAPHS 3.13 TO 3.21 OF THEIR ELEVENTH REPORT (EIGHTH LOK SABHA) ON THE REPRESENTATION OF SECONDARY AND HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS ASSOCIATION, DADRA AND NAGAR HAVELI REGARDING SENIORITY, CONFIRMATION ETC.

2.1 In their Eleventh Report (Eighth Lok Sabha) presented to Lok Sabha on 31 July, 1989, the Committee on Petitions, considered a representation of Secondary and Higher Secondary School Teachers' Association, Dadra and Nagar Haveli regarding their seniority, confirmation etc. and made certain observations/recommendations. These recommendations were taken up for implementation with the Ministry of Human Resource Development (Department of Education).

2.2 Action taken Notes have been received from Government in respect of the recommendations contained in the Report. The recommendations made by the Committee and the replies furnished by the Government are given in Appendix-II.

2.3 The Committee will now deal with the action taken by Government on some of their recommendations:—

Problems faced by teachers of different categories in the Union Territory of Dadra and Nagar Haveli

Recommendation (S. Nos. 3.13 to 3.20)

2.4 The Committee noted that under the present administrative set up, the Union Territories were supposed to function in an autonomous manner like other States. However, Union Territory Administrations had no powers to create any new post and for starting any new scheme, it had to seek the approval of the concerned Central Ministry in all such cases. The Committee recommended that the administrative apparatus not only of the Union Territory of Dadra and Nagar Haveli but also of other Union Territories which were similarly placed, needed to be streamlined. It was imperative that the posts of Chief Secretary and Administrator were combined and that post be vested with adequate financial powers so that it was able to take decisions on its own.

2.5 In their reply Government have stated that at present Governor of Goa is the Administrator of the U.T. of Dadra and Nagar Haveli and Daman and Diu. A separate post of Administrator common to these two

Union Territories has been created. The Ministry have conceded that at present some difficulties are being faced by the Chief Secretary and other officers assisting the administrator as distance between the seat of the Administrator and the Union Territory Headquarters is about 800 kms. However, according to the Ministry, this problem will be taken care of when a new incumbent joins the office.

The Committee are not happy with the reply of the Ministry. They view with concern the inordinate delay in improving the administrative set up of the Union Territory of Dadra and Nagar Haveli and reiterate that urgent measures be taken to streamline the administrative set up so that the delay in the process of decision making is avoided.

2.6 The Committee note that the Union Territory Administration had made some efforts to alleviate the grievances of the teachers. From the information furnished it is noticed that out of 456 PST, and 136 TGT, 298 and 57 teachers respectively had been confirmed by the Union Territory Administration.

There are however still 35 TGT who are employed on *ad-hoc* basis. Government have not explained as to why these teachers are working on *ad-hoc* basis and for how long they have been working as such. The Committee would like to reiterate that keeping persons on *ad-hoc* basis for long should be avoided. They would urge that the action for their regularisation and confirmation of all the teachers should be expedited.

CHAPTER III

ACTION TAKEN BY GOVERNMENT ON THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS CONTAINED IN PARAGRAPHS 5.15 TO 5.17 IN THEIR EIGHTH REPORT (EIGHTH LOK SABHA) ON THE REPRESENTATION REGARDING REGULARISATION OF SERVICES OF EMPLOYEES OF SUKINDA NICKEL PROJECT

3.1 The Committee on Petitions in their Eighth Report (Eighth Lok Sabha) presented to Lok Sabha on 2 May, 1989 dealt with representations dated 10 July, 1987 and 19 June, 1988 from Shri N.K. Jena and six others of Sukinda Nickel Project regarding regularisation of their services and made their recommendations/observations.

3.2 After considering the representations, the factual comments of the Ministry of Steel and Mines on the points raised in the representations and the oral evidence of the representatives of the Ministry of Steel and Mines, Hindustan Copper Limited and the Department of Public Enterprises, the Committee made certain observations/recommendations. Action taken notes have been received from Government in respect of the recommendations contained in the Report. The recommendations made by the Committee and the replies of the Government are given in Appendix—III

3.3 Shri M. Rout and five other class IV employees of the erstwhile Sukinda Nickel Project further submitted a representation dated 1 January, 1990 (Appendix—IV) in which the following demands were made:—

- (1) Continuity in service;
- (2) Revised scales of pay as per the Fourth pay Commission Report with effect from 1 January, 1986; and
- (3) Those who were on consolidated pay roll became entitled to regular pay scales after completion of 240 days of continuous service.

3.4 The representation was referred to the Ministry of Steel & Mines for their comments on the above three points. The Ministry in their reply dated 19 April, 1990 stated as follows:—

“As regards continuity of services, it may be stated that all the representationists were employed in the Sukinda Nickel Project, which was being managed by HCL. However, with the decision taken to shelve the Project due to adverse economics of producing nickel, HCL had no alternative but to close down the establishment

and to retrench the employees of the Project after paying them due compensation under the relevant laws."

The Committee on Petitions had made the following specific recommendations for the absorption of all the retrenched employees. The relevant extract from the 8th Report of the Committee on Petitions presented to Lok Sabha on 2 May, 1989, is reproduced below:—

"The Committee are of the view that both on humanitarian and moral grounds, the cases of these employees for absorption in service need to be reviewed afresh by the Department of Mines, the Committee would like to be informed of the precise action taken in this regard."

3.5 The Ministry of Steel & Mines further stated that:—

"In deference to the recommendations of the Committee and contrary to the Management's agreement with the workers, HCL have given employment to all the retrenched employees in a regular pay scale against available vacancies, in their unit of Lapse Kyanite Mines in Bihar. In this background, when the company has taken a humane stand, the demand of the employees for continuity in services after they were legally retrenched and due compensation paid, will not be just, particularly in view of the fact that the Sukinda Nickel Project was never considered in integral part of HCL.

3.6 As regards the second demand of the employees, it is stated that in deference to the Committee's recommendations, HCL has made payments of arrears to the employees after re-fixing their pay on the basis of the recommendations of the 4th Pay Commission in the cases of those employees who were on 3rd Pay Commissions scale and the remaining employees who were drawing fixed wages, the compensations have been re-worked out on the basis of minimum wages applicable under the Minimum Wages Act for the copper industry, inspite of the fact that no minimum wages have been prescribed under the Minimum Wages Act for nickle mining. The additional payments made by the company on account of revision of wages and retrenchment compensation, are as follows:—

1. Shri N.K. Jena, Ex-Driver	Rs. 40,949.12
2. Shri M. Rout, Ex-Peon	Rs. 29,247.40
3. Shri R.C. Manhar, Ex-Watchman	Rs. 26,735.47
4. Shri S. Dash, Ex-Peon	Rs. 11,226.48
5. Shri G. Jena, Ex-Watchman	Rs. 13,964.70
6. Shri A. Mohanti, Ex-Watchman	Rs. 13,924.92
7. Shri K. Nayak, Ex-Sweeper	Rs. 16,818.48

3.7 As regards the last demand of giving regular scales of pay after completion of 240 days of continuous service it is clarified that there is no such legal provision in existence. Under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, which is the guiding statute for such employment it has been provided that after the completion of 240 days regular work, a workman is entitled for compensation. In the instant case, due compensation has been paid to the retrenched employees more than their entitlement under the law and, therefore, this demand of the employees also does not appear to be a valid one.

3.8 The Ministry of Steel and Mines have informed the Committee that the Department of Mines and HCL have not taken a legalistic stand in this case and in deference to the wishes of the Committee on Petitions (Lok Sabha), they have fully compensated all the retrenched employees and have also rehabilitated them permanently.

3.9 The Committee had recommended that the case of the seven employees who were retrenched after the decision to close down the establishment of Sukinda Nickel Project at Bhubaneswar was taken, should be reviewed afresh by the Department of mines both on humanitarian and moral grounds. They note that the 7 retrenched workers have been allowed to join Hindustan Copper Limited in their Lapsa Kyanite mines in Bihar in a regular scale of pay and additional payments on account of revision of wages and retrenched compensation has been made to them. The Committee feel that no further intervention is called for on their part in the matter.

NEW DELHI;

13 February, 1992

Magha 24, 1913 (Saka)

P.G. NARAYANAN

Chairman,
Committee on Petitions

APPENDIX I

[Reference Para 1.2 of the Report]

Recommendations (Para Nos. 3.17 to 3.21) of the Report

3.17 Section 3 of the MRTP Act, 1969 provides that unless the Central Government by notification otherwise directs the Act shall not apply to certain categories of undertakings like Government companies corporations and Cooperative Societies etc. No notification has so far been issued by Government to bring these organisations within the purview of the Act and hence Government companies, public undertakings and cooperative societies continue to be exempt from the provisions of the Act. As a result the consumers in the country are denied the availability of a quick and inexpensive remedy for the redressal of their grievances against the monopolistic, restrictive or unfair trade practices indulged in by these organisations, MRTP Act provides a remedy and the the MRTP Commission is the forum to which the consumers look for protection. Wherever the consumer's interests are hurt or harmed by monopolistic, restrictive or unfair trade practices indulged in by private sector enterprises, relief can be sought through the MRTP Commission but when the Government companies and Cooperative societies indulge in any objectionable trade practices the forum of the MRTP Commission cannot be made use of at present by the aggrieved consumers.

3.18 Since the subject of consumer protection has been given the recognition it deserved by the enactment of the Consumer Protection Act, 1986, it is necessary that the impediment in the proper enforcement of the Act are also removed at the earliest. Undoubtedly one of the major bottlenecks in the implementation of the consumer Protection Act is that at present it covers only unfair trade practices indulged in by the Government companies and cooperative societies. The monopolistic and restrictive trade practices of Government companies and cooperative societies are beyond the pale of the present Act and unless a proper notification under Section 3 of the MRTP Act is issued, these activities of Government companies etc. cannot be brought within the fold of Consumer Protection Act. The Committee have been informed that the matter is under the consideration of the Government.

3.19 It is a matter of common knowledge that most of the Government undertakings and cooperative societies are now carrying on a vast variety of industrial, commercial and trading activities affecting the consumers at large and many of them enjoy monopolistic position leaving no scope for competition. Under the circumstances the need for protection of consumers' interests and strengthening the consumer movement cannot be over

emphasised. Furthermore, if the provisions of restrictive and unfair trade practices are not made applicable to Government undertakings and cooperative societies analibi is available to the private sector to indulge in restrictive and unfair trade practices on the ground that they are doing so with a view to counter-acting similar practices being followed by Government companies and Cooperative Societies. The Committee consider that in view of the steadily increasing number of complaints against the cooperative societies and Government undertakings being received by the consumers organisations, appropriate action needs to be taken to ensure that such undertakings / cooperative societies are made accountable for the quality of their products and services they render.

3.20 The Committee are therefore of the considered opinion that the time has come when the Government should give serious thought to the question of withdrawing the exemption given to Government companies and cooperative societies and bring them within the jurisdiction of MRTP Commission.

3.21 The Committee desire that necessary notification in this regard be issued without further delay.

Reply of Government

“...after careful consideration by the Government, it has been decided to retain and to continue with the exemption presently available to Government companies and cooperative societies etc. under Section 3 of the MRTP Act, 1969.”

[Ministry of Industry (Department of Company Affairs) O.M. No. 7 / 26 / 86-CL-V dated 21 August, 1989.]

APPENDIX II

Recommendation (S.No. 3.13)

The representation from the Secondary and Higher Secondary School teachers of the Union Territory of Dadra and Nagar Haveli relating to their service conditions puts into focus the problems faced by the teachers of different categories in various Union Territories. Under the present administrative set up, the Union Territories are supposed to function in an autonomous manner like other States. However, in the matter of creation / filling up of plan posts, the Union Territory Administration does not have powers to create any new posts and it has to seek the approval of the concerned Central Ministry in all such cases. Similarly for starting any new scheme, the Union Territory Administration has to obtain the prior permission of the administrative Ministry concerned.

Reply of Government

[Reference Para 3.2 of the Report]

The Union Territories are governed by the President through Administrator, as per provision of Article 239 of the Constitution. To ensure that for day-to-day functioning, the Union Territories are not subject to Administrative control and supervision of Government of India, some financial powers of the Central Government have been delegated to the Administrators, as per provisions of DFPR 1978. Administrators are to work within the parameters of these rules. If any proposal is beyond the ambit of these delegated powers, they have to approach the respective subject matter controlling Ministry, as defined in the Allocation of Business Rules 1961 for taking necessary action. No comparison can be made between a State and UT in respect of financial powers. While State Governments have their own financial resources and only a small part of the deficit under plan programme are met by Central Government, budgets for the Union Territories are entirely funded by the Centre, as such the Union Territories enjoy limited financial powers. However, the proposals received from UTs are dealt on priority basis as and when received.

[Ministry of Human Resource Development, Department of Education
O.M. No. 4-11 / 87 U.T.I dt. 26.6.90.]

Recommendation (S.No. 3.14)

The Committee have been further informed that unlike other Union Territories, the Union Territory of Dadra and Nagar Haveli does not have an independent Administrator. There is one common Administrator both for the Union Territories of Daman and Diu and Dadra and Nagar Haveli,

and the Governor of Goa looks after these two Union Territories. Although a separate Chief Secretary has been appointed recently for the Union Territory of Dadra and Nagar Haveli, no independent Administrator has been appointed so far. Under the delegation of powers rules, the Chief Secretary of a Union Territory enjoys limited financial powers whereas it is the Administrator who is vested with the requisite financial powers relating to the Union Territories in his charge.

Reply of Government

According to the information sent by the Ministry of Home Affairs, the appointment of a new Administrator for the Union Territory of Dadra and Nagar Haveli is likely to take some more time. However, the present incumbent is of the status of Secretary to the Government of India. The powers enjoyed by Administrator of Dadra and Nagar Haveli in financial and administrative matters are as below:—

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| (i) Sanctioning of schemes (other than works) | — | Rs. 25 lakhs |
| (ii) Sanctioning of schemes (works) | — | Rs. 15 lakhs |
| (iii) Negotiated / single tender contract | — | Rs. 1 lakh |
| (iv) normal contract purchase | — | Rs. 10 lakhs |
| (v) Indent for stores of proprietary nature | — | Rs. 1 lakh |
| (vi) Direct emergent purchase | — | Rs. 1 lakh |
| (vii) Powers of appropriation and reappropriation | — | Full powers |
| (viii) Powers to incur contingent expenditure | — | Full powers |
| (ix) Powers to incur miscellaneous expenditure | — | Full powers |
| (x) Powers to write off loss | — | (a) Rs. 1 lakh for loss of stores not due to theft, fraud or negligence.
(b) Rs. 25,000/- for other cases. |
| (xi) Loss of revenue or irrecoverable loans / advances | — | Rs. 50,000/- |
| (xii) Deficiency and depreciation in value of stores | — | Rs. 50,000/- |

In view of the above, it may be seen that the Administrator of Dadra and Nagar Haveli enjoys lot of powers even in the financial matters.

[Ministry of Human Resource Development, Deptt. of Education Q.M. No. 4-11 / 87-U.T.I. dt. 26.6.90]

Recommendation (S.No. 3.15)

The Committee get an impression that the administrative set up in the Union Territory of Dadra and Nagar Haveli in which there are three separate sources of power namely, a Chief Secretary with limited powers an Administrator who has then necessary financial powers and looks after another Union Territory as well and the Central Ministry concerned, is not conducive to proper functioning of the administrative machinery. It only leads to delay in decision making as is evident from the complaints of the petitioners, now under consideration of the Committee. The Committee are concerned to note that teachers who have put in 15 to 20 years of service continue to be treated as temporary employees; their seniority lists have not been finalised for years and although the higher secondary level education was introduced in the Union Territory of Dadra and Nagar haveli sometime in 1976, pay scales admissible to higher secondary teachers have not been allowed to them till date. There are other grievances of the teachers which are crying for redressal but the administrative machinery has failed to cope up with with the situation. The Committee are strongly of the view that the administrative apparatus not only of the Union Territory of Dadra and Nagar Haveli but also of other Union Territories which are similarly placed needs to be streamlined. So far as the small Union Territory of Dadra and Nagar Haveli is concerned, it is imperative that the posts of Chief Secretary and Administrator are combined and the authority by whatever name it is called, is vested with adequate financial powers so that it is able to take decisions on its own and thus cut out unnecessary delay in decision making.

Reply of Government

Governor of Goa is at present the Administrator of the UT of Dadra and Nagar Haveli and Daman and Diu. A separate post of Administrator, common to these 2 Union Territories, has been created. At present, some difficulties are being faced by the Chief Secretary and other officers, assisting the Administrator, as distance between the seat of the Administrator and the Union Territory Headquarters is about 800 kms. However, this problem will be taken care of when a new incumbent joins the office.

In regard to the service problems of the teachers, it is stated that in February, 1989 the UT Administration issued orders for confirmation of 50 teachers. Seven teachers were already confirmed earlier. As regards the seniority list, the UT Administration issued the seniority list of Assistant teachers and Headmasters and High Schools on 25.6.87. The seniority list was also published earlier in 1967, 1971, 1979, 1982 and 1986. Thirty-six posts of post-Graduate Teachers have been sanctioned by the

Government of India vide sanction No. 4-3 / 89-UT.I dt. 10.4.89 for Senior Secondary Classes. The UT Administration is being continuously reminded to expedite the confirmation of remaining teachers, issue revised seniority lists, and grant PGT pay-scales to the eligible teachers.

[Ministry of Human Resource Development, Department of Education
O.M. No. 4-11 / 87-UT.I dated 26.6.90.]

Recommendation (S.No. 3.16)

As to the specific complaints / grievances of the teachers of the Union Territory of Dadra and Nagar Haveli, the Committee find that as a result of their intervention, some action has been initiated by the Union Territory Administration to tackle the problems. The Departmental Promotion Committee has reportedly cleared the cases of 50 out of 120 teachers for confirmation. It has been stated that regularisation of another 40 *ad hoc* teachers was under consideration and as soon as these are regularised, action for their confirmation will be taken. The Committee urge that necessary action in the matter should be taken early within a fixed time frame.

Reply of Government

UT Administration has taken necessary action for confirmation and regularisation of teachers. Ut Administration of Dadra and Nagar Haveli has intimated the position as below:—

Confir- mation	Category of teachers	Total No. of teachers	No. of teachers confirmed
	PST	456	298
	TGT	136	57
	Vice Principal	2	—
	Principal	7	2*

Regularisation

Category of teachers	Total No. of teachers	No. of teachers on ad-hoc basis
PST	456	—
TGT	136	35
PGT	36	Vacant
Vice Principal	2	2
Principal	7	2

* The incumbent are not confirmed as V.P. / P as they are already confirmed in other cadres and according to Govt. instructions. confirmation now is required against one post only.

From the above, it may be seen that majority of the teachers have been confirmed by the UT Administration. As regards regularisation of ad hoc appointments, only 35 Trained Graduates Teachers are on ad hoc basis.

[M/o Human Resource Development, Deptt. of Education O.M. No. 4-11/87-UTI dt. 17.1.91]

Recommendation No. 3.17

The Committee unhappy to note that the Union Territory has not drawn up seniority lists of teachers on a regular basis and as a result there have been ad-hoc recruitments and promotions. Now that the seniority lists of secondary/Higher Secondary teachers has been finalised, the Committee would expect that cases of ad-hoc appointments and promotions are reviewed once again to ensure that the seniority of none of the regular teachers is adversely affected. If any such case comes to the notice, rectification action should be taken to the satisfaction of the aggrieved teachers.

Reply of Government

Union Territory Administration has been issuing seniority lists of teachers from time to time. UT Administration has informed that the seniority lists of teachers were published regularly in the years 1967, 1971, 1979, 1982, 1986, 1987. The latest seniority list has been issued by the UT Administration on 4-6-90. The Government has noted the observation of the Committee that seniority of none of the teachers should be adversely affected.

[Ministry of Human Resource Development, Deptt. of Education O.M. No. 4-11/87-UTI dated 17.1.91]

Recommendation (S.No. 3.18)

The Committee find that the Union Territory has now formulated proposals for creation of 36 posts of PGTs. Such of the Trained Graduate Teachers who have been teaching Higher Secondary Classes should be considered for appointment against these newly created posts. The Committee desire that necessary sanction for creation of the requisite number of posts should be obtained from the Ministry of Finance by the Department of Education and all the posts should be filled up at the earliest.

Reply of Government

The Department of Education has issued sanction on 10.4.1989 for creation of 36 posts of Post-Graduate Teachers. The UT Administration is taking necessary action to fill up these posts.

[Ministry of Human Resource Development (Department of Education) O.M No. 4-11/87-UT. I dated 4.4.1990]

Recommendation (S. No. 3.19)

The Committee note that Union Territory have assured the Department of Education that all cases for grant of senior scales and selection grades scales would be attended to by March, 1989. The Committee trust that necessary action in the matter will have been completed by now. The Committee would like to be apprised of the precise action taken in this regard within 3 months.

Reply of Government

Senior and Selection Scale to teachers in the Union Territory have been granted as below:—

Senior Scale

Category of Teachers	Total No. of teachers	No. of teachers eligible for Senior Scale	No. of teachers granted Senior Scale
PST	456	291	76 + 215 = 291
TGT	136	43	43
PGT	—	—	—

Selection Scale

Category of Teachers	Total No. of teachers	No. of teachers eligible for Selection Scale	No. of teachers granted Selection Scale
PST	456	None is eligible for selection scale as the selection scale is to be given after 12 years service rendered in the Senior scale.	
TGT	136		
PGT	36 (These posts have been created only in April, 1989).		

[Ministry of Human Resource Development (Deptt. of Education) O.M. No. 4-11/87-UT.I dt. 17.1.91]

Recommendation (S.No. 3.20)

Another point of grievance brought out in the petition related to anomalies in the pay scales of certain miscellaneous categories of teachers like craft teachers, music teachers and language teachers etc. According to the Department of Education there are certain anomalies in the scale of

pay admissible to different categories of miscellaneous teachers and it was proposed to take up the matter with the Ministry of Finance. The Committee would like that necessary clarifications may be sought from the Ministry of Finance and the scales of these teachers may be refixed or revised keeping in view the position obtaining in other Union Territories. The Committee hope that a reasonable solution to the problems will be found within the shortest possible time.

Reply of Government

The Government have examined the matter regarding pay scales of miscellaneous categories of teachers in Dadra and Nagar Haveli. The Government have found pay anomaly in the case of carpentry teacher. Accordingly the pay scale of the carpentry teacher has now been upgraded vide order dated 5.11.90. In other cases, no pay anomaly has been found and the UT Administration has been informed of the position vide letter dated 6.11.90, a copy of which is annexed. (Annexure to Appendix).

[Ministry of Human Resource Development (Department of Education)
O.M. No. 4-11/87-U.T. I Vol. II dated 17.1.91]

Recommendation (S.No. 3.21)

After considering the points raised in the petition, the Committee feel that there should be an in-built system either in the Union Territory itself for in the concerned administrative Central Ministry/Department for monitoring the working of each Department in the Union Territory, particularly in the implementation of plan schemes. This is essential because in each and every case of complaint or grievance, the affected persons could not be expected to approach the Parliamentary Committee or any other authority for redress. Some departmental mechanism for attending to the complaints from the aggrieved staff should be evolved. The Committee would watch with interest the action taken in this regard.

Reply of Government

UT of Dadra and Nagar Haveli is uni-District Administration. Collector, Dadra and Nagar Haveli, looks into the grievances of the Administration employees and general public and monitors the progress of plan schemes with due care, with the help of his subordinates. In large UTs like Delhi and Pondicherry, there are separate Cells/Departments for these purpose. However, in smaller UTs, Collectors look after these aspects properly.

[Ministry of Human Resource Development (Department of Education)
O.M. No. 4-11/87-UT. I dated 4.4.1990]

(Annexure to Appendix-II)

No. F. 3-3/90-UT-I
Government of India
Ministry of Human Resource Development
(Department of Education)

New Delhi, the 6th November, 1990

To

1. The Collector,
UT of Dadra and Nagar Haveli,
Silvassa.
2. Asstt. Director of Education,
UT of Dadra and Nagar Haveli,
Silvassa.

Sub: Cases of pay-anomalies of miscellaneous categories of teachers.

Sir,

Kindly refer to your letter No. A. 1019/11/Edn. Vol. II dated 24.9.90 on the subject cited above and also the directions dated 14.2.90 of the Hon'ble Central Administrative Tribunal, Bombay as contained in TA No. 114 of 1986 and similar other applications.

2. The cases of miscellaneous categories of teachers of UT of Dadra and Nagar Haveli had been under the consideration of Govt. Keeping in view the qualifications possessed by these teachers, the qualifications and pay-scales prescribed in other Union Territories particularly in Delhi Administration and other relevant factors, the Government has taken the following decisions:

- i) *Drawing Teachers, Type and Shorthand Instructor and Carpentry Demonstrator.*

These teachers were in the pre-revised pay-scale of Rs. 425-640 and in the revised pay-scale of Rs. 1400-2300. Their demand is that the pre-revised pay scale of Rs. 425-640 may be up-graded to Rs. 440-750 in accordance with the Govt. of India, order No. 5-44/82-Sch. 6 dated 27th March, 82, as done in the case of Junior Craft teachers, Junior Language Teachers and Junior Dance Teachers etc. & Rs. 1400-2600 instead of Rs. 1400-2300 w.e.f. 1.1.86.

The Govt. have examined this demand of these teachers. The pay scale

of Rs. 425-640 was upgraded in respect of six categories of Junior Teachers to the pay scale of Rs. 440-750 as the recruitment to the Junior cadre had been stopped and that Junior Teachers were eligible for promotion to the senior grades. In the case of present petitioners these conditions are not fulfilled. There is 100% direct recruitment to the post of Drawing Teachers, Type and Shorthand Instructor and Carpentry Demonstrator in the Union Territory, Dadra and Nagar Haveli and these teachers are not having any promotional avenue to the higher level posts.

In view of the position as above, these categories of teachers are not covered under the provisions of Govt. of India order dated 27th March 1982.

These teachers are already in the revised pay scale of Rs. 1400-2600 with effect from 1.1.86. The cases of these categories were earlier examined by the Government and the pay-scale of Rs. 1400-2600 was sanctioned to them vide orders dated 6.6.88. A copy of the orders dated 6.6.88 is enclosed. In view of this, there is no pay anomaly in these cases.

ii) *Carpentry Teacher and Carpentry Demonstrator*

The post of Carpentry Teacher has been upgraded from the pay scale of Rs. 1200-2040 to Rs. 1400-2600 as per orders dated 5.11.90. (copy enclosed).

iii) *Assistant Teachers (Language, Physical Education and Tailoring)*

These categories of teachers are in the pay scale of Rs. 1200-2040, i.e. Primary School Teachers' pay scale. The demand is that their pay scale should be revised to Rs. 1400-2600, i.e. TGT'S pay scale for the reasons that they have been teaching in the High schools. The Government have examined this matter. These teachers do not fulfil the conditions for appointment in TGT Grade. Similar categories of teachers in other Union Territories are also in the pay scale of Rs. 1200-2040 only.

Further these categories of teachers were in the pre-revised pay scale of Rs. 330-560 and they have been getting this pay scale from 1.1.73. Even prior to 1973 these teachers were having parity with the Primary School Teachers only. The revised pay scale of the pre-revised pay scale of Rs. 330-560 is Rs. 1200-2040 from 1.1.86, which these teachers are getting like other teachers of similar categories.

In view of above, the Govt. is of the view that there is no pay anomaly in these cases.

iv) *Moulding Instructor and Fitting Instructor*

These categories of teachers are in the pay scale of Rs. 1200-2040 and the demand is for the pay scale of Rs. 1400-2600, i.e. TGT pay-scale. There pre-revised pay scale was Rs. 330-560. These teachers had been recruited after 1.1.1973 when the pay-scale was Rs. 330-560. Their qualifications are SSC with certificate in the concerned trade. For a similar teacher to be entitled to the pay scale of Rs. 1400-2600 in Delhi, the qualifications should be Matric with Maths and Science, with National Training Certificate or National Apprenticeship Certificates with three years experience in the relevant trade or Diploma holder in corresponding discipline with one year experience. In the Union Territory of Daman and Diu also the pay scale of similar posts of Instructor (Fitting) and Instructor (Welding) is only Rs. 950-1500.

In view of the position stated above the Govt. is of the view that there is no pay anomaly in these cases.

It is requested that the position as above may please be brought to the notice of all concerned immediately.

Yours faithfully,

sd/-

(SAT PAL)

UNDER SECRETARY TO THE GOVT. OF INDIA

APPENDIX III

(Reference para 3.2 of the Report)

Recommendation of the Committee

Recommendation (5.15)

The Committee find that the Sukinda Nickel Project was set up in 1973 by the Department of Mines for the purpose of exploring the possibility of producing nickel at Sukinda. To start with project was to be handled by the Hindustan Copper Limited as agents and ultimately a new company was to be brought into existence to carry out the work of the project. An officer on special duty was nominated who alongwith seven other employees specially recruited for the purpose, worked for the project. After 15 years i.e. in 1988, the Department of Mines decided to shelve the project because the ores were found to be of a very low grade and no viable technology was available or could be developed for the setting up of the project. In the process an amount of Rs. 76 lakhs was stated to have been spent. The Committee are shocked to learn that it took the Department of Mines/Sukinda Nickel Project authorities, 15 long years to come to the conclusion that on account of the unfavourable economics of producing nickel at Sukinda, there did not appear to be sufficient justification for setting up a pilot plant at Sukinda. The Committee feel that the Department of Mines owe an explanation for the infructuous expenditure of Rs. 76 lakhs on the project, which only after 15 years was found to be unviable and uneconomical.

Reply of the Government

Nickel is an important metal used in core industries. There is no indigenous production. The entire requirement is met through imports. At present, the annual requirement in the country is about 20,000 tonne, which will go up in due course of time. Thus, irrespective of the price of the metal in foreign countries we have to import nickel thereby depleting our foreign exchange reserves to that extent. Apart from the foreign exchange angle, it would not be in national interest to fully depend on import of such a strategic metal. It is, therefore, necessary that at least a part, if not the whole, of the requirement is met indigenously. Hence, the sanction of the project in April, 1974 and incurring expenditure thereafter was in the national interest. It is relevant to mention here that the technology development on laboratory scale should be tested in a pilot plant to be set up before going ahead with the establishment of the project. Any mineral based industry requires considerable preliminary expenditures especially when the grade of the ore is poor and quantity of extractable deposits are uncertain and there is no proven/commercialised

indigenous technology. It takes many years to identify a viable and mineable deposit through geological surveys and exploration, followed by laboratory scale testing, which is further confirmed in a pilot plant before production on commercial scale. Because of the inherent uncertainty in such cases, the initial enabling expenditure may be high and period of gestation long. All such preliminary activities roughly cover the first 5 years upto 1978 when pilot plant testing of the indigenous technology was completed and bulk of the expenditure amounting to Rs. 62.30 lakhs was incurred during this period. The indigenous technology developed on laboratory scale could not be established during pilot plant tests. Since pilot plant testing was an essential step for proving the technology and confirming the design parameters before going in for a commercial plant for which the estimated investment in 1974 was of the order of about 40 crores. An expenditure of Rs. 62.30 lakhs was incurred on preparation of preliminary feasibility, pilot plant; installation test work etc. upto 1978-79. This cannot be deemed to be infructuous.

Since indigenous technology could not be established through pilot plant tests, efforts were subsequently launched to explore the possibilities of setting up a plant based on foreign technology. But due to various factors such as unfavourable economics on account of price fluctuations of nickel, serious resources constraints, etc. the project could not take off. It is worth mentioning here that for setting up a project to produce 10,000 tonnes of nickel per annum, which is only 50% of the country's requirement, an expenditure of more than Rs. 500 crores would be required. In the interest of national economy and national self reliance exploratory efforts were being continued and, therefore the small establishment at Sukinda had to be maintained for about another 11 year period, involving an expenditure of about Rs. 14 lakhs. In view of the importance of the work in the context of national economy, this expenditure was essential and, therefore, cannot be treated infructuous.

The Department of Mines has not given up the effort to find out the possibility of producing nickel in the country preferably based on indigenous technology. In fact, the Department has been continuously deliberating on the subject and interacting with research laboratories and experts in the field. The idea of eventually setting up a plant to produce nickel indigenously has not been given up, rather the inadequacy of the data available so far have promoted the Department to go in for further investigation. But the Sukinda Nickel Project was shelved so that further expenditure on running an establishment and maintaining staff could be avoided.

Thus, considering the importance and desirability of producing nickel indigenously, the endeavour had to continue taking into account the nature of the ore, the technology involved and the inadequacy of the data available, the expenditure incurred was not infructuous. No time limit can be prescribed for arriving at a definite decision on the future of the

production of nickel in the country. A break through in technology and factors relating to the costs of production will be determining factors.

[Ministry of Steel & Mines (Deptt. of Mines) O.M. No. 4/40/87-Met III dated 19.2.1990]

Recommendation (5.16)

The Committee further note that after it was decided to close down the establishment of Sukinda Nickel Project at Bhubaneswar, 7 employees specially recruited for the Project became surplus and were thrown out of employment. Thus these seven employees who worked for the project since its inception in 1973 found themselves literally on the road after a period of about 15 years. In terms of a peculiar condition stipulated in the letters of appointment of these employees, they were not given the option to join Hindustan Copper Limited after the Sukinda Nickel Project was wound up. It is unfortunate that these seven employees who spent best part of their career in the service of the project could not be absorbed permanently in any of the undertakings working under the administrative control of the Department of Mines. It is seen that out these seven workers three were watchmen, one was a driver, another a peon, yet another a sweeper and one worked as LDC-cum-Typist. Four, out of these belong to Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. The Committee cannot be persuaded to believe that such low paid employees could not be provided with the suitable jobs in other undertakings, under the same Ministry inspite of the fact that at one stage, the then Minister of Steel and Mines was himself reported to have stated that instead of terminating the services of the employees working in Sukinda Nickel Project, Government would consider to engage them in similar public sector undertakings. The Committee are of the view that both on humanitarian and moral grounds, the cases of these employees for absorption in service need to be reviewed afresh by the Department of Mines. The Committee would like to be informed of the precise action taken in this regard.

Reply of the Government

All these 7 retrenched workers of the Sukinda Nickel Project have been appointed by M/s. Hindustan Copper Limited in their Lapso Kyanite mines in the district of Singhbhum, Bihar. Though the offers of appointment were given on 14th August, 1989, the local people did not allow these workers to join. It is relevant to mention here that Sukinda Nickel Project was in Orissa and, therefore, there is resentment among the local people against appointment of such workers in a different mine in Bihar. However, in deference to the recommendations of the Committee on Petitions, M/s. Hindustan Copper Limited persuaded the local people not to resist the appointment of these workers. Ultimately, the company succeeded in

persuading the local agitators and these workers have not been allowed to join their new posts. Thus, the above recommendation of the Committee has been implemented.

[Ministry of Steel & Mines, Deptt. of Mines O.M. No. 4/40/87-Met, III dated 19.2.1990]

Recommendation (5.17)

Another point made by the petitioners was that the compensation paid to them after the termination of their services had not been correctly calculated. With the implementation of the recommendations of the Fourth Pay Commission w.e.f. 1.1.1986 the workers who were in the regular pay scales became entitled to revise, and better scales. Similarly, four employees who had been given consolidated salaries for several years became entitled to regular scales after completion of 240 days of continuous service. The salaries of all these employees, if refixed in the revised scales recommended by the Fourth Pay Commission would substantially enhance the amount of compensation paid to them. The Committee desire that not only the Ministry should provide jobs to these workers without further delay their pay scales should also be refixed and their dues calculated accordingly.

Reply of the Government

These 7 workers have already been paid compensation at the time of retrenchment. These retrenched workers have been appointed by M/s. Hindustan Copper Limited in their Lapso Kyanite mines in Bihar. But, because of the agitation of the local people, they could join their new posts only recently and hence no action could be taken earlier regarding recalculation of their compensation. The company has now initiated steps to implement the recommendation of the Committee regarding re-fixation of pay and recalculation of compensation payable to them. Thus, the above recommendation has also been implemented.

[Ministry of Steel & Mines (Department of Mines) O.M. No. 4/40/87 Met. III Dated 19th February, 1990.]

APPENDIX IV

(Reference para 3.3. of the Report)

Shri O.P. Chopra,
Under Secretary,
Lok Sabha Secretariat,
Parliament House,
New Delhi.

*Absorption of the Ex-employees of Sukinda Nickel Project,
Bhubaneswar, Orissa.*

Respected Sir,

We, the ex-employees of Sukinda Nickel Project, most humbly, beg to put forth the following few lines for favour of your kind consideration and necessary action.

- (1) That with reference to our representation to the Parliamentary Committee on Petitions and as per the favourable report of the Committee (the Eighth Lok Sabha), we have been offered appointment to join in Lapso Kyanite Mines, Galudin, under Indian Copper Complex, Hindustan Copper Ltd.
- (2) That the Management has taken an undertaking on the date of joining (17.10.89) in service, that we have no claim in our past service of the erstwhile Sukinda Nickel Project and that we have received the full and final settlement of dues from the Management.
- (3) That the total number of employees were seven only, out of which, three were watchmen, one was Driver, another a Sweeper, yet another a Peon and one was working as LDC-cum-Typist. But except the Driver and Sweeper all other five employees have been appointed as Mazdoor, which we feel is injustice to us.
- (4) That we have been offered fresh employment on *ad hoc* basis. We have joined on 17.10.89 in our new assignment. Copy of the appointment order is attached herewith.
- (5) That due to our poor condition, there was no other way than to accept this offer.
- (6) That as ill luck would have it, after devoting more than 14 years of continuous service to the company, our services are discontinued.

- (7) That we have not yet received our back wages as approved by the Petition Committee.
- (8) That we belong to the class IV categories and as such, are unable to fight with the Management and therefore, had no other way left than to appeal to you for the following, as recommended by the Committee.
- (i) Continuity of service.
 - (ii) Revised Scale as per the 4th Pay Commission Report w.e.f. 1.1.1986.
 - (iii) Those who on the consolidated pay roll became entitled to regular scales after completion of 240 days of continuous service.
- (9) That we have not yet received a printed copy of the report, as mentioned in Parliamentary Committee Report of the 8th Lok Sabha.
- (10) Sir, we are most unfortunate. More than 50% of our service life is already gone and we have done nothing in our life.

In view of the facts stated above, we pray your honour to kindly consider our case and pass necessary orders to do the needful.

We beg to remain Sir, soliciting an urgent action.

Yours faithfully,

Sd/-
Maheswar Raut
and
others

Place: Lapso Kyanite Mines
Galudin (Amda).

Date: 01.01.1990

Communication:

Maheswar Raut,
Lapso Kyanite Mines,
Hindustan Copper Ltd.,
P.O. Galudin (Amda),
Dist.: Singhbhum,
Pin: 833 101,
BIHAR.