

17.19 hrs.

PUBLIC PREMISES (EVICTION OF  
UNAUTHORISED OCCUPANTS)  
AMENDMENT BILL

[English]

**As passed by Rajya Sabha**

THE MINISTER OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT (SHRIMATI SHEILA KAUL): Sir, as you are aware, the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) Amendment Bill, 1992 which was introduced by me in the Rajya Sabha during march, 1992, was passed by the house of elders without any amendment on 16.7.1992. During the pendency of the Bill in this House, certain further developments have taken place which necessitate a few more amendments to the Act.

The Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) Act, 1971 was enacted to provide for the eviction of unauthorised occupants from public premises including the premises of government companies and those of corporations established by Central Acts and organisations specified in the Act.

Over the years, certain lacunae in the Act have come to the notice of Government. A number of hon. Members of Parliament have written to me about the arbitrary use of the provisions of the Public Premises Act by various Central Public Sector Undertakings, including nationalised banks, for evicting even genuine tenants. In order to limit the use of the summary powers by these undertakings under the Public Premises Act intended, primarily to evict unauthorised occupants or retired/transferred employees, my

Ministry had issued to the administrative Ministers in January, 1992 guidelines to be followed by the Public Undertakings under their Ministries, while initiating eviction cases under the Public Premises Act. We are pursuing the matter with various Ministers for implementation of these guidelines so that the interests of genuine tenants are not jeopardised.

The Bill, as passed by the Rajya Sabha include two major amendments. These are:-

(a) To include premises of the state governments situated in Delhi and other Union Territories within the definition of "public premises".

(b) To provide for summary procedure for eviction of unauthorised occupants in respect of temporary allotment made by the Central Government, State Government, Government of Union Territories and statutory authorities in guest hostel, holiday houses, tourist accommodation, etc, with a shorter notice than presently provided.

As I have already mentioned, after passing of the Bill by the Rajya Sabha, further developments have taken place necessitating certain more amendments to the Act. These amendments are based on the suggestions made in the estimates committee report and the judgements of Civil Courts. These are:

(i) To include the properties managed by the Cantonment Boards within the meaning of "public premises".

(ii) To make the summary eviction in respect of temporary allotment of guest house, etc. more stringent without insisting on any statutory time limit.

(iii) To remove certain ambiguities in the language of section 4 dealing with manner of serving of show cause notice to all occupants of a public premises.

Temporary allotment of guest houses is normally allotted for short periods to guests of Members of Parliament, Ministers, etc. The existing procedure of evicting unauthorised occupants takes a longer time from the period for which the accommodation was allotted. It was, therefore, decided that the time limit for show cause and eviction be restricted to 48 hours only. Subsequently, the estimates committee of Parliament suggested that this notice period should be done away with to avoid litigations. The present amendment, therefore, prescribes no time limit for evicting such unauthorised occupants in guest houses and such other premises which are allotted for short time. The Estate Officer shall make such enquiries as necessary and if he is satisfied about the unauthorised occupancy he shall forthwith take action to evict the occupant.

The other official amendment relates to Section 4 of the Act which deals with the issue of show cause notice to the unauthorised occupants. Subsection (4) of Section 4 provides that the show cause notice should be served on each and every unauthorised occupant. Subsection (3) on the other hand provides that in case a notice is pasted on a conspicuous part of the premises, it would be deemed to be served on all occupants of that premises. On examination of these con-

tradictory provisions it has been decided to remove this ambiguity by omitting subsection (4) from the Act.

I have already given separate notice for moving the above amendments as official amendments to the Bill as passed by the Rajya Sabha.

I would like to mention that the proposed amendments are either at the behest of the State Governments on the basis of recommendations of Estimates Committee of judicial pronouncements and are non-controversial in nature and would provide for better enforcement of the Act.

With these words, I request that the Bill as passed by Rajya Sabha may be considered by this august House with further amendments for which I have given separate notice.

MR. SPEAKER: Motion moved:

"That the Bill further to amend the Public Premises (Eviction of unauthorised occupants) Act, 1971 as passed by Rajya Sabha, "

Now, Shri Manoranjan Bhakta.

SHRI MANORANJAN BHAKTA (Andaman and Nicobar Islands): Mr. speaker, Sir, as we all know, nowadays since the encroachments and unauthorised occupation of Government accommodations are the social evils, we have to fight it out. I rise to support this piece of legislation and I also like to thank the hon. Minister because she has brought this piece of legislation as per the wishes of the Estimates Committee which has gone through the long process of examining this subject and thereafter made the recommendations.

[Shri Manoranjan Bhakta]

Sir, I would also like to request the hon. Minister that we are passing a lot of number of legislation, but ultimately while implementation we are not getting much of satisfaction. So, that is why, whatever the legislation is passed today it should be implemented in letter and spirit and proper precaution should also be taken so that there is no misuse of authority. The concerned authorities who have been given powers should not misuse the powers and they should see that it is properly used.

I support this Bill for consideration.

[*Translation*]

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES (Muzaffarpur): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to say a few things regarding this Bill. I am not against it, but the way it has been passed by the Rajya Sabha, gives me a pinch. My objection is that the Government is going to give wide powers to the Estate Officer. There is a provision in it that if the Estate Officer thinks that a person is living in a temporary allotted premises beyond the permissible period then he would issue a 24 hours' notice to that person. If he does not vacate it even after the notice is served then he would personally go there for enquiry. How long will this inquiry continue is not clear in it. It has been explained in 3(a) (2):

[*English*]

"after the expiry of the said period of twenty-four hours the Estate Officer may visit the said premises and make such enquiries as is expedient, including an opportunity of giv-

ing oral hearing to the persons concerned, if they are available at the premises."

[*Translation*]

Now there are two things in it. May be he calls on the concerned person at a time when there is none at the premises, it will create a problem. If he is there, the process of enquiry will start but it has not been mentioned in it as to how long it will last. If he is absent due to some valid reason, if he has gone to hospital, school or market, then he would have no escape, but the one who is present—he may be occupying the premises illegally has been given a chance to present his case. Then we have some objection to the clause 3(a) (2):

[*English*]

"If, after the aforesaid enquiry, the Estate Officer is satisfied that the persons concerned should be evicted, the Estate Officer may make a written order of eviction forthwith, directing that the said premises shall be vacated within twenty-four hours with effect from the date and time specified in the order."

[*Translation*]

Basically, we support this Bill. We would like to say that the Government should not create a situation in which a person is thrown on the road. Therefore, the hon. Minister should incorporate some provision in it to solve this problem. Most of the people who continue to occupy the public premises unauthorisedly are VIPs. Some MPs continue to live there even after they cease to be Members of Parliament. I would not mention the names of

the Ministers since they live there for years even after they cease to be the Ministers. There is no law for them. This amendment is for the States and Union Territories.

[*English*]

It is mentioned here: "Any State Government or the Government of a Union Territory situated in the Union Territory of Delhi or in any other Union Territory."

[*Translation*]

Even after the eviction is ordered, Members of Parliament and high officials continue to occupy Government accommodation till their death. We have seen it and it is going on even today. You want the right to evict the poor person who happen to stay there for some urgent work and over stays for four more days in the process. We have objection to it that the Government is not ready to enforce the right of eviction against an hon. Minister or a former Minister. We want that the same norms of justice should be followed for all and whatever amendment is required to achieve this end should be made. If wrong order is passed for the people occupying high positions, then we can not expect observance of rules at the lower level.

[*English*]

SHRI RAMESH CHENNITHALA (Kottayam): Sir, I rise to support this Bill. It is a welcome step because this new amendment which has been brought here, includes the State Government's properties also and, therefore it will be helpful to the State Government to recover their properties. For example, in re-

spect of the Travancore House, which was the property of the Kerala Government, hectic efforts were done by the Government of Kerala for more than fifteen years, but the MRTTP Commission, which had been occupying the Travancore House for more than 15-20 years, was not at all vacating it. Finally they were vacated. This new amendment will be helpful to all the State Governments and, therefore, I welcome this Bill.

As regards the guest accommodation of M.Ps, as rightly pointed out by Shri George Fernandes, it is very difficult for an M.P. to get a guest accommodation. Some people are permanently staying in the Western Court and in some other guest accommodations. Therefore, even if an M.P. writes repeatedly to the Estate Office or to the Chairman, House Committee, he will not get it because some people are occupying that for years and years. They are permanently staying in the Western Court and other guest accommodation. So, the Government should take necessary steps to vacate their permanent residents.

The second point I wanted to raise is the accommodation problem which is being faced by the Government employees who are staying in Delhi. People from different States are working in the Union Territory of Delhi. They are not getting proper accommodation. They have to go to ministers for out-of-turn priority allotments and other things. But how many out-of-turn priority orders can be given by the minister? Lack of accommodation is the main problem. So, Government should take adequate steps to solve this very serious problem. Those who are working in different departments of the

[Shri Ramesh Chennithala]

Government especially who are from Southern States and North-Eastern States are not at all getting accommodation here in Delhi. So, Government should take care of this seriously.

I was told that more than 1,000 houses are unauthorisedly occupied by certain people in Delhi. Even if Government employees retire, they are not vacating the house. What do they do? They file a petition in the court and they submit it to the litigation branch. These cases were never fought. If a case is filed, the employee can stay in the house for another 3-4 years more because nobody is going to take up this issue and nobody is going to pursue this. These litigations were not at all be settled. So, everybody is going for litigation. The litigation branch is such a branch that they welcome all the injunctions but will not pursue them. Once you put an application in the litigation branch, it will not be pursued. So, the occupants are safe. That is what is happening.

Sir, I do not want to take much time of the House. The Government should settle this issue.

I agree with Shri George Fernandes on the question of occupation of houses by ex-M.Ps. Of course, when we are Members of Parliament we are getting accommodation. But when we are not entitled to this, we should not retain them. But unfortunately this is a regular feature now. When I came as a first-time M.P. I had to wait for more than 7-8 months to get accommodation. That is the case of most of the M.Ps.

I think that merely passing a legislation will not help. This should be imple-

mented and pursued properly. Therefore, I urge the Minister to review the cases pending in the litigation branch which is under the Urban Development Ministry. Hon. Minister should review the working of the litigation Branch's.

I am sure the hon. Minister will take care of all the points mentioned by me.

SHRI UMRAO SINGH (Jalandhar): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to support this measure. But, at the same time, I would also like to say that most of the houses which the Government has been keeping as Government accommodation for their own people—may be M.Ps. or Government servants—are under unauthorised occupation of some people. Now the Government want more stringent measures to get them vacated. This, I think, will be supported by all.

I will request and seek your protection on one point. Is this law only applicable to the poor people or the poor guests of the M.Ps or other people also who are in high authority like ex-ministers and ex-M.Ps or those who are occupying high positions? Most of the Members of Parliament are without houses. I do not want to refer to my own case. But I would like to say about my colleagues from Punjab who were elected two years before, in January, 1992. Two of them still do not have a house.

A lot of work is held up and we are not able to function properly without accommodation. I am just bringing this to your notice about the difficulties which we are facing and other M.Ps are facing. I will just seek your protection and help because we can only effectively work as Members of Parliament or a Member of Legislature and we can meet our voters who come here when we have proper

working accommodation. Then we can come here fully prepared for the debates.

So, I submit that those people who are having unauthorised occupation—either guest houses or other houses—by those who are in high authority, may be even an ex-minister or ex-M.P.—should vacate the place. Law should have a similar course of action on all the people. It should be equally applicable to all. I submit that not only the Members of this House should be given preference but all those who are not getting houses should be given preference so that they can work effectively.

With these words I conclude my speech.

*[Translation]*

SHRI CHANDULAL CHANDRAKAR (Durg): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am a strong supporter of this Bill but the officers interfere in petty things and create problem. For example, there is a shortage of houses and it leads to a fight for the houses. This fight will continue until the accommodation increases. One cannot get guest accommodation in Western Court since it has become a centre of conspiracy. Therefore, the Government or the DDA should construct more houses. The Government has brought this Bill to get the premises evicted from those who have been occupying it for years unauthorisedly. How can these be got evicted when this right will be with those officers who are involved in the bungling?

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Delhi is a big city. Professors, intellectuals and politicians from every corner of the country come to stay here but they have to live in hotels due to the shortage of accommodation. Those who have money can stay in 5 Star

hotels but for the people belonging to low income group, there should be a facility of hostels in a Central place in Delhi where at least one to two thousand people could stay. This accommodation should be at 'no profit no loss' basis. Earlier accommodation used to be available for the guests in V.P. House but now the officers and politicians are staying there permanently.

The Government employees have to wait for long for Government accommodation since their numbers too are increasing day by day. Therefore, through you, I urge the Government to give permission to convert the one-story houses into 4-5 storeys so that the number of Houses could be increased. Besides, if this eviction law is implemented, it will be a good thing. In this context the officers should be given permission to get the accommodation evicted and the definition of eviction should be made clear.

I express my thanks to the hon. Minister for introducing this Bill in Rajya Sabha and I hope that it would be passed by the Lok Sabha since "it is never too late."

*[English]*

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the Bill subject to the clarifications sought by the hon. Member, Mr. George Fernandes. But I rise also to make a very special plea, a very brief plea in respect of public charitable endowments that they should also be treated as public premises from the point of view of eviction of illegal or unauthorised occupation. This is the point I, have repeatedly made because a large number of such public endowments including public wakfs, of which the public at large is the beneficiary, are unlawfully

[Shri Syed Shahabuddin]

occupied and occupied for years and years. The normal processes of law which are applied to private property take for too long for their vacation and for their becoming available to the public at large for whom they are made.

That is why, it is suggested that public charitable endowments, including public wakfs of which public at large is the beneficiary should be treated as public premises and should be brought within the definition of public premises by a suitable amendment to this particular Act.

[*Translation*]

SHRI DHARAM PAL SINGH MALIK (Sonepat): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I will not take much time of the House. In regard to the present amendment Bill, I think that it will not particularly affect the implementation of the existing Public Premises Act because the eviction procedure under it is applicable to only licensed buildings or properties. It does not apply to tenancy occupation as such. I have been pleading for the past ten years on the subject and I have dealt with several cases connected with the Act. License is issued to any public premises, a hostel, a guest house or any other Government accommodation and when such licence is withdrawn, the possession becomes unauthorised. The position has not changed at present except for the inclusion of the property of the cantonment area within the scope and definition of the Public Premises Act. It is only a matter of implementation. In the States, the implementation is in the hands of the State Governments. Proceedings linger on for one to one and a-half years and such cases are dealt at the level of SDM or Deputy Commissioner and there

is no one to advocate on behalf of the Central Government. Cases are dragged on for ten years or so. Therefore, my submission is that instead of making an amendment, emphasis should be laid on implementation and strict rules should be framed for setting a time limit within which licenses would be terminated and unauthorised occupants should be evicted through summary proceedings. I would suggest that we should make a study on these lines and bring about necessary amendments.

SHRI ANADI CHARAN DAS (Jajpur): Mr. Speaker, Sir, many adivasis are in Government service today. My request is that before evicting them from Government accommodation they should be allotted alternative accommodation. They have not been allotted Government accommodation so far. The scavenger community also falls within this category. I myself have observed the miserable plight in which they are living. Five working families are living together in a single house.

ONE HON. MEMBER: Our position is also not better than the adivasis.

SHRI ANADI CHARAN DAS: There is no need to refer to your condition. You will get it. A large number of people are living there. They should not be evicted. It is imperative that they are provided new accommodation before they are evicted. Otherwise it will be very difficult to come across people like us.

SHRI BHOGENDRA JHA: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I support the Bill but I cannot understand the need for introducing such a Bill. Does such a law not exist already? There have been one or two occasions when I made my guests

stay at the Western Court. Such occupation is needed for a week. For over-stay the concerned Ministry is accountable. Necessary legislation already exists and the same is quite adequate. Therefore, I think that it is necessary to first submit a list of such Government buildings, flats etc. where there is unauthorised occupancy. Even if they are Ex. MPs or Ex- Ministers, their indentivity should be made clear. If the hon. Minister does not have the list at present, she should table it in the next week so that the country comes to know about the persons who are unauthorisedly occupying the Government premises.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Shri Shahabuddin had rightly said that the land of some temples is also being misused. Such type of land should also be included in this Bill or another Bill should be brought in this regard. This property does not belong to the management of the temples and mosques. In such situation, it is better to include such land in this Bill or separate Bill should be brought in that regard. This public property is being misused in Delhi as well as in the other parts of the country. A list of such properties should be tabled in the House and the hon. Minister should tell about the short-comings. Even the land on all sides of the Parliament House is being illegally occupied. The hon. Minister should also pay attention in this regard.

SHRIMATI SHEILA KAUL: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am grateful to the hon. Members for taking so much interest in this Amendment Bill. It is hoped that this amendment will provide a lot of relief. You are well aware that we are as distressed as your people are. The recommendations I receive are sent by the hon. Members and I have to accept recommendation and Act accordingly. I am

happy that they are supporting me in this regard. They are able to understand our problems.

I have listened to the views expressed by Shri George Fernandes, Shri Bhagat, Shri Bhogendra Jha, Shri Ramesh, Shri Chandulal Chandrakar and others. It has been said that there are no hostels for intellectuals but it is not so. There are hostels, but they are being occupied by your friends. If you do not recommend, we can ask them to vacate after one week. It is a problem both ways while allotting or not allotting.

SHRI BHOGENDR A JHA: This problem will continue even after this amendment.

SHRIMATI SHEILA KAUL: No, it will not be there, because I will restrain and there will be strict implementation. I accept whatever is being asked by the hon. Members. But now this will be implemented according to your own will. The Government officials act according to the law and we are above them. Some Members continue to stay in Delhi. It should not be so. Delhi is only like a inn for us. We should not establish our home here. Some Members establish their homes here for education of their children or for other reasons. It should not be like that.

I am grateful to you all for giving the suggestions. I would like to get them implemented and you all should assist us in this regard. Whatever Shri Shahabuddin had said is a State subject. You give it to the States...*(Interruptions)*. Please assist us in evicting the people illegally occupying the hostels, V.P. House and guest houses of Corporations. This is a very small issue.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:

"That the Bill further to amend the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) Act, 1971, as passed by Rajya Sabha, be taken into consideration."

*The motion was adopted.*

MR. SPEAKER: The House will now take up clause-by-clause consideration of the Bill. Now, we take up Clause-2

*Clause-2—Amendment of Section 2*

Amendments made:

"Page 1, line 13,—

*for "following item" substitute "following items" (3)*

Page 2, line 2,—

*for "Union territory of" substitute "National Capital Territory of" (4)*

Page 2, line 3,—omit "and;" (5)

*Page 2, after line 3, insert —*

"(viii) any Cantonment Board constituted under the Cantonments Act, 1924; and" (6)

2 of 1924.

Page 2,—after line 4, insert—

'(a) in the opening portion, for the words "Union Territory of Delhi"

the words "National Capital Territory of Delhi" shall be substituted," (7)

Page 2, line 5,—

*for "(a)" substitute "(b)" (8)*

Page 2, line 7,—

*for "(b)" substitute "(c)" (9)*

Page 2, line 8,—

*for "(c)" substitute "(d)" (10)*

Page 2, after line 12 insert—

'(2) in clause (fa), in item (iv) for the word, brackets and figure "and (vi)", the brackets, figures and words ",(vi) and (viii)" shall be substituted;' (11)

Page 2, line 13,—

*for "(2)" substitute "(3)". (12)*

(Shrimati Sheila Kaul)

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:

"That Clause 2, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

*The motion was adopted.*

*Clause 2, as amended, was added to the Bill.*

*New Clause 2A—Motion for suspension of  
Rule 80C*

SHRIMATI SHEILA KAUL: There is a new clause 2A, I beg to move:

"That this House do suspend clause (i) of Rule 80 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha in so far as it requires that an amendment shall be within the scope of the Bill and relevant to the subject matter of the clause to which it relates, in its application to Government amendment No. 13 to the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) Amendment Bill, 1992 and that this amendment may be allowed to be move." (17)

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:

"That this House do suspend clause (i) of Rule 80 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha in so far as it requires that an amendment shall be within the scope of the Bill and relevant to the subject matter of the clause to which it relates, in its application to Government amendment No. 13 to the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) Amendment Bill, 1992 and that amendment may be allowed to be moved." (17)

*The motion was adopted.*

Amendment made"

"Page 2, after line 20, insert, -

"2A. In section 3 of the principal Act, in clause (a), after the words

"officers of Government"" the words "or of the Government of any Union Territory" shall be inserted." (13)

(Shrimati Sheila Kaul)

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:

"That new Clause 2A be added to the Bill."

*The motion was adopted.*

*New Clause 2A was added to the Bill.*

*Clause 3—Insertion of new section 3A*

Amendment made:

"Page 2, for lines 23 to 45, substitute—

"3A. Notwithstanding anything contained in section 4 or section 5, if the estate officer, after making such inquiry as he deems expedient in the circumstances of the case, is satisfied that any persons who were allowed temporary occupation of any public premises are in unauthorised occupation of the said premises, he may, for reasons to be recorded in writing, make an order for the eviction of such persons forthwith and, thereupon, if such persons refuse or fail to comply with the said order of eviction, he may evict them from the premises and take possession thereof and may, for that purpose, use such force as may be necessary." (14)

Page 3,—

*omit* lines 1 to 17 (15)

(Shrimati Sheila Kaul)

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:

"That Clause 3, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

*The motion was adopted.*

*Clause 3, as amended, was added to the  
Bill.*

18.00 hrs.

*Clause 3A—(New)*

SHRIMATI SHEILA KAUL: I beg to move:

"That this House do suspend clause (i) of Rule 80 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha in so far as it requires that an amendment shall be within the scope of the Bill and relevant to the subject matter of the clause to which it relates, in its application to Government amendment No. 16 to the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) Amendment Bill, 1992 and that this amendment may be allowed to be moved."

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:

"That this house do suspend clause (i) of Rule 80 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha in so far as it requires that an amendment shall be within the scope of the Bill and relevant to the subject matter of the clause to which it relates, in its application to Government amendment No. 16 to the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) Amendment Bill, 1992 and

that this amendment may be allowed to be moved."

*The motion was adopted.*

Amendment made:

Page 3,—

*after line 17, insert—*

"3A. In section 4 of the principal Act, sub-section (4) shall be omitted; (16)

(Shrimati Sheila Kaul)

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:

"That new clause 3A be added to the Bill."

*The motion was adopted.*

*New Clause 3A was added to the Bill.*

Clause 1—*Short title and commencement*

Amendment made:

Page 1, line 4, -

*for "1992" substitute "1993" (2)*

(Shrimati Sheila Kaul)

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:

"That Clause 1, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

*The motion was adopted.*

*Clause 1, as amended, was added to the  
Bill.*

*Enacting Formula*

18.05  $\frac{1}{2}$  hrs.

Amendment made:

PANEL OF CHAIRMEN

Page 1, line 1, -

[English]

for "Forty-third" substitute -

"Forty-fourth" (1)

(Shrimati Sheila Kaul)

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:

"That Enacting Formula, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

*The motion was adopted.*

*Enacting Formula, as amended, was added to the Bill.*

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:

*"That the long title stand part of the Bill."*

*The motion was adopted.*

*The long title was added to the Bill.*

SHRIMATI SHEILA KAUL: I beg to move:

"That the Bill, as amended, be passed."

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:

"That the Bill, is amended, be passed."

*The motion was adopted.*

MR. SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that under Rule 9 of the Rules of Procedure, I have nominated the following Members to the Panel of Chairmen.

1. Shri Sharad Dighe
2. Shri Peter G. Marbaniang
3. Shri Nitish Kumar
4. Shrimati Geeta Mukherjee
5. Shri Tara Singh
6. Shrimati Malini Bhattacharya
7. Shri Ram Naik
8. Shri P.C. Chacko
9. Shrimati Santosh Chowdhary
10. Prof. Rita Verma

MR. SPEAKER: I should really thank the Members for their excellent co-operation.

Now the House stands adjourned to re-assemble on Monday, the 13th December, 1993 at 11.00 a.m.

18.06 hrs.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Monday, the 13th December, 1993/Agrahayana 22, 1915 (Saka).*