

17.30 hrs

HALF-AN-HOUR DISCUSSION

VIOLATION OF FOREIGN EXCHANGE REGULATIONS ACT BY PARLE GROUP OF COMPANIES

MR CHAIRMAN: Now, we take up the half-an-hour discussion. Shri Lakkappa

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA (Tumkur): Mr. Chairman, Sir, this is a half-an-hour discussion on points arising out of the answer given on the 14th March, 1979 to Unstarred Question 3438 regarding violation of Foreign Exchange Regulation Act by Parle Group of companies. Sir, in this matter three Ministries are involved. They are—Finance Ministry, Health Ministry and the Industries Ministry. I would like to quote the relevant record. In answer to starred question No. 129 dated 28-2-1979 regarding sale of Coca Cola at the rate of Rs 2/- per bottle. I put the specific question whether the Industries Minister is aware that the Parle group of people are manipulating and bringing this essence and using it stealthily. Then the Minister of Industries replied that he will take action if any specific proof is given to him about the foreign connections of Parle Group of Industries in Bombay. That is why I am emphasising that the three Ministries have to reply otherwise the three Ministries will be in trouble.

I would like to quote answer to Q No. 3438 dated 16th March, 1979 in connection with the violation of FERA regulations indulged in by the Parle Group of companies; the Minister of Finance stated that some searches and seizures were made in the premises of Bisleri India Pvt. Ltd., Bombay, a company within the Parle Group and show-cause notices have been issued to Bisleri India Pvt Ltd, Bombay and its Directors Mr. Ramesh Chauhan and Mr. H. M. Golewala on 2-3-1978. Again a show-cause notice was issued to Mr. Ramesh Chauhan on 14-4-1978 for acknow-

ledging the debt of Rs. 2 lakhs there-by creating the contingent right in favour of Dr. C. Rossi to receive the payment—violation of Section 5(2)(f) of FERA. In the same vein the Minister stated that the charge against Mr Ramesh Chauhan was dropped in regard to the show-cause notice issued on 14-4-78. It is not known for what reason action against Mr. Ramesh Chauhan has been dropped. The penalty imposed on Mr. Ramesh Chauhan and Mr Golewala is so meagre as compared to the seriousness of the crime committed. May I know from the Minister if it is true that Dr. Rossi who is closely connected with Mr. Kanti Desai in the Italian Aircraft deal has brought pressure to drop cases against Mr. Ramesh Chauhan. It is very unfortunate that the Janata Government should indulge in corrupt activities endangering the very economy of the nation

In this connection I would like to refer to the discussion in the Parliament on S.Q. No 129 dated 20-2-79 when the hon'ble Industries Minister stated that the Parle Group of companies manufacturing soft drinks have no foreign collaboration. I would like to bring to the notice of the Minister a photostat copy of a secret agreement dated 24-9-69 entered into between the Felice Bisleri and company S. P. A. Milano and Mr. Ramesh Chauhan of the Parle Group. I am narrating some of the clauses of the Agreement to prove how the Parle Bottling company has been misusing foreign brand name Clause 12 on page 6 of the agreement says "that the Parle Bottling Company Pvt. Ltd. shall be the owner of the name Bisleri in India and shall not sell the said name to any other party

If this is not enough proof for the Minister what more proof is required by him?

Under this agreement dated 24th September, 1969 Mr. Ramesh Chauhan Managing Director of Parle Exports Pvt. Ltd., then named Parle

[Shri K. Lakkappa]

Bottling Co. Pvt. Ltd. took over 980 Equity Shares (at par value of Rs. 500/- per share. . . . at Re. 1/- per share, on behalf of Parle Bottling Company Private Limited. Reference Schedule A of the agreement.

He also took over the liability for loan of Rs. 22,37,720 due to Indian Bank and Foreigners Reference Schedule B of the agreement.

As per clause 3 of the agreement Rs. 3,15,424 were to be written off out of Rs. 6,20,000 loan by Felice Bisleri and Co. SPA Milane, a foreign company registered in Italy.

Instead of writing off the said amount Rs. 6,00,000 were remitted to the foreign company over the next 3 years. This includes illegal remittance of Rs. 3,15,424 not reflected in the foreign company's books, but diverted.

This can be traced as follows:—

(1) Firstly, the original secret agreement dated the 24th September 1969—Para 3—indicates the amount to be written off.

(2) The balance-sheets of the Indian Company from the year 1969 to 1974 will indicate that the amount was not written off but remitted.

(3) Remittances through Indian Bank to Italian Bank will indicate that the remittances of the value of Rs. 3,15,424/- have not been made to the Italian Company but diverted elsewhere.

(4) Italian Revenue Authorities will confirm that this amount has been written off by the Italian company.

(5) Incidentally, it can be proved that by not writing off the loan li-

bility of Rs. 3,15,424 the Indian Company has cheated the Government by claiming the said amount as carried-forward loss. At the time of take-over the Indian Company had an accumulated loss of Rs. 14,51,450. If the said amount of Rs. 3,15,424 had been written off, the Indian Company would not have been able to claim carried-forward loss of the similar amount.

In 1969-70 Parle Exports were manufacturing and selling 'Gold Spot' in Kuwait in some local party's benami name. You can make a reference. You can verify whether they have got any subsidiary company directly or indirectly, whether they have such links in Kuwait, in Italy and in South East Asia and elsewhere. I think you can also verify these things. The party in Kuwait had received a credit of 20 lakhs guaranteed by one Dr. C. Rossi, an Italian National, a non-resident.

SHRI VINODBHAI B. SETH (Jamnagar): It is not 20 lakhs but 2 lakhs. . .

SHRI K LAKKAPPA: Are you appearing for Parle company?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lakkappa, don't waste your time. Please go on.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA: But he is taking my time. You may kindly pull him up. There is the letter from J. M. Chauhan, the father of Mr Ramesh Chauhan. Mr. J. M. Chauhan was then the Chairman of Parle Exports Private Limited. For the above mentioned facts, I am placing* before you photostat copy of the 1969 agreement. You please bear with me, Sir. You can go through the record. It should be taken on record.

MR. CHAIRMAN: How can you take them on record? No, no. without previous notice I cannot allow

*The Speaker not having subsequently accorded the necessary permission, the document was not treated as laid on the Table.

you. Now you please conclude. Your time is up

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA: I only wish to raise some series of questions on this issue. Today, the Government of India is manufacturing 77. But today your Government is not encouraging 77. Why? Why are you not encouraging it? Why are you helping these private people both directly and also indirectly? Why should have this sort of soft corner for these people? Is it not a fact that Mr. Kanti Desai, who is in league with this Rossi and company, is bringing pressure not only in your ministry, not only in the Industries Ministry, but also in the Health Ministry, because they have violated many things. In proof of misuse of foreign brand name which they have done, I would like to state this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have to be brief. 10 minutes are almost over

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA: Health Ministry advised the Information and Broadcasting Ministry after coming to the conclusion that this advertisement is in violation of the rules. On the same basis the Health Ministry should have asked them to desist from advertising their products in news paper as 'Refreshing Cola'. To do so would be against our Health Regulation Act. The Ministry of information and Broadcasting have issued instructions to TV and Radio that there should not be any commercial advertisement of this drink. That is why this Ministry is also involved. Thus, four Ministries are answerable in this. This company have has violated all the rules and regulations in an organised and big way. The Finance Ministry as also the Industry Ministry have got links with this multi-national company, directly and indirectly. Consequently, the economy of this country is getting affected. On the other hand, you are not encouraging the drink 77. It is nowhere in the picture today. There are no advertisement of 77. This country is being governed today by the Janata Government who are in

connivance with the multi-nationals. Your Finance Ministry and Kanti Desai are destroying the edifice of this country I know, Mr. Minister, you are a dynamic Minister; do not deal with this question in this fashion. I have no grouse against any individual. Will you kindly assure that suitable action under the rules will be taken against the defaulters so that this kind of thing does not continue. The Industry Minister has also made a false statement on the floor of this House that they have no connection with this foreign company. I have mentioned about this 1960 agreement and the subsequent transactions and developments which indicate that what they stated was not correct. I would like to know what action you are going to take. Will you also kindly take action to request the Health Ministry to take suitable action as the company has violated the rules and are indulging in food adulteration. I want a comprehensive probe and enquiry conducted into the whole affair and after the process of enquiry is over, come to the Parliament and tell us what you have done in this matter. All these points need to be fully answered.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI SATISH AGARWAL): Mr. Chairman, Sir, the hon. Shri Lakkappa gave a notice to the Secretary, Lok Sabha which reads:

"Under Rule 55(2) of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business, I give notice of my intention to raise discussion on the following points arising out of the answer given to Unstarred Question No. 3438 on 16th March, 1978.

(i) The answers given are not satisfactory.

(ii) Answers to parts (b) and (c) are vague and incomplete.

I request that permission may be given to raise the discussion. . . . An

[Shri Satish Agarwal]

explanatory note stating reasons for raising the discussion is attached herewith."

Now, what was the original question. For the information of the hon. Members, I would like to read the question raised and my answer there-to before saying something on the points that the hon. Member has raised. The question was:—

"(a) whether it has come to the notice of Government that Parle Group of Companies (Bombay) have violated the Foreign Exchange Regulation Act, and if so, details thereof;

(b) if answer to (a) is in the affirmative, the consideration which weighed with the Government for granting foreign exchange to Parle Group for opening an office in U.S.A.; and

(c) action taken/proposed to be taken by Government in regard to violation of FERA by Parle Group?"

My answer to this question was:—

"(a) and (c). Consequent upon searches conducted at the premises of M/s. Bisleri (India) Private Ltd., a company within the Parle Group and some other connected premises on 15-11-1977, the Enforcement Directorate initiated investigations against the said company and its directors under the provisions of Foreign Exchange Regulation Act, 1973 and as a result of which the following Show Cause Notices were issued:—

(i) To M/s. Bisleri (India) Private Ltd., Bombay and its Directors, S/Shri Ramesh J. Chauhan and H. M. Golwalla on 2-3-1978 for having utilised foreign exchange amounting to 14,336/- for a purpose other than the one for which it was acquired—violation of Section 4(3) of the Foreign Exchange Regulation Act, 1973.

(ii) To Shri Ramesh J. Chauhan on 14-4-1978 for acknowledging a debt of Rs. 2 lakhs thereby creating a contingent right in favour of Dr. C. Rossi to receive a payment—violation of Section 5(1) (f) of Foreign Exchange Regulation Act, 1947.

(iii) To Shrimati Meenaxi Jasdandwala on 15-12-77 for acquiring foreign exchange amounting to U.A.E. Dirhams 500 without the permission of Reserve Bank of India in violation of Section 8(1) of Foreign Exchange Regulation Act, 1973.

These cases have been adjudicated on 25-9-78 and 20-10-78 by the Directorate of Enforcement as a result of which penalty of Rs. 1,50,000 has been imposed on the company and Rs. 15,000 each on its Directors S/Shri Ramesh J. Chauhan and H. M. Golwalla, in case of show cause notice at (i) above. The charge against Shri Ramesh J. Chauhan was dropped, in case of show cause notice (ii) above. Smt. Meenaxi Jasdandwala is understood to have died in an air crash on 1-1-1978. The proceedings against her, therefore, abate.

(b) Information is being collected from the RBI and will be laid on the Table of the House."

This information has been laid later on the table of the House. Now, what is the ambiguity and what is the incompleteness, so far as the answer is concerned? My hon. friend has raised various issues with regard to this particular company. Here, I am required to reply to the incompleteness or to the vagueness of the answers that I gave to this Unstarred Question, to which the hon. Member had no opportunity to ask supplementaries, because it was an Unstarred Question. So, whatever information the hon. Member required with regard to the foreign exchange violations, the issue of show-cause

notices and the adjudication proceedings, I clearly started them in my reply to the Unstarred Question.

So, so far as the new points are concerned, I would say this: e.g. about the point that the Government is not encouraging '77' how does it arise from this question? How can I answer that question? (*Interruptions*) Even in a Starred Question, the hon. Member would not get that much time which he is going to have here, when the answer is complete. If it had been a Starred Question, the hon. Member could have got hardly 10 minutes, and what more information could he have asked for from me? After all, the searches were conducted. . . (*Interruptions*)

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA: It is not for information. Information you could have collected from an officer I am asking the Minister to take action against all such violations.

I can assure that in this particular case .

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL: What can I answer with regard to non-encouragement to '77'? What can I answer with regard to adulteration? What can I answer with regard to the letter from the Ministry of Health or the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting? (*Interruptions*) How can I answer these questions? The question here is with regard to the foreign exchange violations, to the issue of show-cause notices and to the adjudication proceedings.

Under the law, it is quasi-judicial proceedings. The Director has adjudicated the case. He has imposed a penalty of Rs. 1.5 lakhs and Rs. 15,000 on each Director, apart from the company; and in a particular case, the lady has died. Therefore, naturally the proceedings have abated. Mr. Banatwalla knows it very well. So, in one particular case, the proceedings have been dropped. In another case, penalties have been imposed. Now the case is still under investigation. The proceedings are still there. Some show-cause notices which are found

to be there, shall be issued to the respective parties.

As far as this Government is concerned, I can assure you that not even in a single case I directed any one single officer in this country in my department, saying "You issue a notice, or you don't issue a notice. You adjudicate it this way, or you adjudicate it that way." The officers have complete freedom as far as that is concerned, but if there is some injustice, if there is some *mala fide* action, some collusion somewhere, then, if it comes to my notice, I am there to take action, which will be evidenced from the fact that during the last 2 years, we have suspended 38 officials including CBI officials and including my own Customs officials who were involved in smuggling. We are prosecuting them and 8 persons have been put under COFE-POSA. This one particular factor is in evidence of the fact that we are not there to safeguard or to protect any particular officer. But so far as the main question is concerned, all these issues do not arise out of it.

I can assure the hon. Member that in this particular case—I have got all the details with me—the searches were conducted somewhere in November 1977; and large number of files were recovered. Thousands of documents are there. Incriminating letters have been recovered. Statements have been recorded. On the basis of that, some show-cause notices were issued. Cases were adjudicated. Penalties were imposed. Parties have gone in appeal before the Foreign Exchange Appellate Board. They are pending there. I cannot say anything with regard to them; and hereafter also, whenever more violations come to the notice of the Department, I can assure the hon. Member that necessary show-cause notices will be issued to the parties concerned, and cases adjudicated, penalties imposed—whatever they are, according to law, by the officers concerned. It is not for me to dictate whether this penalty is less, or that

[Shri Satish Agarwal]

that penalty is more. Suppose for a violation involving Rs. 2 lakhs, a penalty of Rs. 1.5 lakhs has been imposed and a penalty of Rs. 15,000 on each director has been imposed. This Government takes it that these are quasi-judicial functions; and we take them to be just like judicial functions. We do not want to interfere in that particular process. You will kindly appreciate that so far as the main question is concerned, I replied to it to the best of my ability, and to the best of the information available with me. Whatever additional information the hon. Member wants, I am the last person to hide anything from this hon. House. Whatever information is here with me, I am prepared to part with it.

I am not going to take political advantage out of it. Now you have brought politics into it; he says Dr. Rosi is under the pressure of Mr. Kanti Desai; Kanti Desai pressurised the department. I can assure you that I would prefer to quit rather than conduct the affairs of this department under pressure.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA: Not that you have done; I have said: you probe the matter whether there are such links.

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL: I do not want to have any political angle in this case. Prof. Mavalankar would be interested to know that some incriminating material came to the notice of the government and in this particular case a letter was recovered; it was written in Italian; it was got translated and then Dr. Rosi's statement was recorded. Perhaps you may not be interested to know, but if you are interested to know, I can tell you that there were allegations of certain alleged pay offs for the import of certain articles against very highly placed VIPs; I have not made political capital out of it... (Interruptions). You want me to disclose?

PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR (Gandhinagar): The House is entitled to have full information.

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL: I say that had a political angle; the department thought it fit to bring it to the notice of the CBI; that political angle is not covered under the Foreign Exchange Regulation Act, whether there was a deal, what was the intention behind it, whether the deal materialised or not, payment was made or not, alleged pay offs by way of commission for allowing certain importations in the month of March 1977 prior to the elections. We have referred it to the CBI for a thorough investigation and they are investigating into that matter.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND (Chikodi): It is not including the period 77 to 79. You have left it out when referring the matter to CBI?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I am not allowing this questions; there is a procedure if you want to put questions.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: I am not making a speech; please be guided by the rules.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA: Interruptions are allowed.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: You want to shut it out?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Those who have given notice, whose names are there, they can ask a question.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: I am not making a speech. You do not want to hear me? In his reply the Minister says he has referred the allegations covering some period, whether he is covering the period from 1977 to 1979 also for a probe by CBI—that is what I am asking.

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL: When matters are referred to CBI they are on specific material that comes to the notice of the department. In this

particular case, some letters were written, they were in Italian, they were translated and statements were recorded. That particular material is a specific case and it has been referred to the CBI for investigation. If the hon Member puts a question to me on the scope of it, I will be too happy to reply to that. I do not want to make political capital out of it. But the period so far as this case is concerned relates to imports prior to March 1977 when his party came to power. This deal could not materialise though everything was settled. That is the whole question. That particular aspect of alleged pay-offs by these companies to certain VIPs, very high dignitaries in the Government of India are being looked into by CBI. No more details at this particular moment need be disclosed so far as this question is concerned. I am not one who is going to take political advantage or hit back on political considerations. So far as the main question is concerned, there was no incompleteness and no vagueness. There was full answer. Regarding the additional information the hon member will give me, I can assure him that so far as my department is concerned and action at my level is concerned I am not going to spare anybody. We shall have a thorough enquiry and a thorough probe into any malpractices or irregularities committed by this group so far as my department is concerned.

SHRI P RAJAGOPAL NAIDU (Chittoor) May I know whether the Government has asked the CBI to investigate into the foreign exchange violations of this company and what is the connection between Dr Rosi and Mr Chauhan? Secondly, may I know whether Mr Kanli Desai is involved in it or not?

SHRI VINODHBHAI B SURETH The matter has already been adjudicated upon by the Government and a heavy penalty has been imposed. Whenever search and seizure and raid take place in connection with

income-tax or central excise or custom, it is relentless and nothing is spared. Mr Lakkappa is not interested in facts and figures as to how many documents have been seized, etc. I want to know from the Minister, have you found out any further material beyond what you had found out, after the matter has been adjudicated?

SHRI MALLIKARJUN (Madak) It is very painful that this vindictive Janata Government and Finance Ministry revealed to this august House on 16th March, 1979 that there was violation of section 1(3) of the Foreign Exchange Regulation Act 1947. The Minister himself committed in this august House that section 4(3) has been violated. May I know from the Minister as to what he means by foreign exchange and how it is earned? Through what India is foreign exchange earned? It means that the Parle group of companies have got some business or other in a fraudulent way through which foreign exchange is being earned. Then violation of the Foreign Exchange Regulation Act comes into the picture. As this has been committed by the Minister, on what basis the foreign exchange has been earned because it is a fraudulent company in collaboration with foreign companies? Whether Dr Rosi and others are involved, etc. Mr Lakkappa has given a lot of material. I need not go into it.
18 hrs

There is one product by name Thun's Up. They are making a false advertisement saying that the extract of Cola has been used though it has not been used. They say it is a Cola. That is how they have evaded tax of the Finance Ministry. I do not know to what extent.

MR CHAIRMAN I am sorry you are not putting a question.

SHRI MALLIKARJUN I am telling you how the foreign exchange is earned. (Interruptions) So far as the foreign exchange is concerned, the question before you

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is already 6 o'clock. Is it the pleasure of the House to extend the time by another 4 to 5 minutes to finish this?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

SHRI MALLIKARJUN: The relevant question is how the violation of section 4(3) of the Foreign Exchange Regulation Act came into the picture. It has been held ...

MR. CHAIRMAN. No reason need be given.

SHRI MALLIKARJUN. The next question is ...

MR. CHAIRMAN. You can put only one question.

SHRI MALLIKARJUN: He has stated in the House that in 1977 raids were conducted and incriminating documents were seized. So, on that basis, he has proceeded with the investigation. He is still saying the case is not dropped against Shri Ramesh Chavan and Shri Gorwala. Why? Is there any underhand dealing between Shri Ramesh Chavan and the Janata Government? It is the false propaganda of Thums Up...

MR. CHAIRMAN: It will not go on record.

SHRI MALLIKARJUN: * * *

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am not allowing it. I am not allowing him to ask any further question. It is not going on record.

SHRI MALLIKARJUN: * * *

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would request the Member to co-operate with the Chair. Why are you repeating the same question again and again?

SHRI MALLIKARJUN: * * *

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN (Badagara): Sir, on a point of order. Have you extended the time?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: He is supporting to whom?

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN. Mr. Shankaranand, if I am to answer, who is supporting whom, a lot will have to be said... (Interruptions).

MR. CHAIRMAN: If you are not interested in the debate, I will adjourn the House.

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL: Mr. Naidu raised a question whether this reference to CBI includes the violation of foreign exchange. I may submit that so far as the violations of Foreign Exchange Regulation Act are concerned they are adjudicated by the Directorate under the Foreign Exchange Regulation Act. So, there is no question of reference to the CBI so far as the foreign exchange violations are concerned. It is only the other angle, the involvement of other officers or the question of alleged pay-offs which has been referred to the CBI for investigations. So far as the foreign exchange violations are concerned, under the law the machinery under the Foreign Exchange Regulation Act is quite competent to deal with all those violations. So far as your question whether Mr. Kanti Desai is involved in this case is concerned, I say, my answer is categorically 'No'.

So far as the question raised by Mr. Vinodbhai Sheth is concerned, on whether further material after adjudication has come to the notice of the Government, during the raids conducted practically 35 files were recovered running into 4000 pages, hundreds of documents, letters and all that. They are all being inquired into and investigated into, in some cases show-cause notices were issued, some cases had been adjudicated and the other cases are still pending. The material is still being scrutinised and some show-cause notices are likely to be issued in the near future. No favour to any party.

So far as the points raised by the hon. Member, my esteemed friend, Mr. Mallikarjun, are concerned on how the foreign exchange is earned, I would say that so far as the earning of foreign exchange is concerned, or the violation is concerned you under-invoice certain exports, then you get some compensatory payments there—something like that. (*Interruptions*). You know it very well. In this case, there was a mention that there was some...

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH (Nandyal). Mr Chairman, Sir, he says he knows it very well. By implication the hon. Minister involves him in this. (*Interruptions*).

MR CHAIRMAN: Don't you know that? I think everybody knows that

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL: Mr. Venkatasubbaiah is, after all, an hon. Member and there is no question of my being against him, he is my friend. I am not against anybody whatsoever.

MR CHAIRMAN: Everybody knows it

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL. Everybody knows how it is done by compensatory payments, by under-invoicing, by over-invoicing etc. These are the methods. In this particular case it was brought to the notice of the Department that there was some adjustment of a loan in Italy against some payments to be made there. So, those cases are to be inquired into. Now, so far as the dropping of the case is concerned Mr. Ramesh J Chauhan has also been penalised under other offences, but when the show-cause notices were issued, they were issued under various sections. So, under a particular Section if the offence is not proved or if the violation is not proved, then that case is dropped. But under another show-cause notice, Mr. Ramesh J. Chauhan has also been penalised along with the Company.

So, it is not a case of complete acquittal that way. But notices had to be issued under various Sections, cases are adjudicated and if under that particular Section he is not found to have violated the law, then the case is dropped, but under another Section he is penalised.

So far as the case of Thums Up is concerned, I am not sure whether this Parle Group is dealing with that, but so far as the question of advertisement of Thums Up as Coca Cola having a Coca Cola content is concerned, I had already brought this matter, when the question was raised during the last Session, to the notice of the Delhi Administration saying that "they are advertising like this and so you must take some action. They are trying to cheat the customers that way" But so far as my province is concerned, I cannot take any action on that false advertisement. I can assure the hon House that so far as the violations are concerned, so far as the offences are concerned, there is no interference from any political side, and at least you can rest assured that I will be the last person to interfere in the proper adjudication of cases. The law will take its own course if they have violated the law. Whether it is X or Y or Z, they may be related to anybody, they may have association with anybody, the law will take its own course and my officers are free to take any course according to law.

18.70 1/2 hrs

**BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
THIRTY-FOURTH REPORT**

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND LABOUR (SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA): I beg to present the Thirty-fourth Report of the Business Advisory Committee.

18.11 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Monday May 7, 1979/Vaisakha 17, 1901 (Saka).