SOME HON. MEMBERS : Yes.

MR. SPEAKER : The members will be informed accordingly.

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE

(*i*) Fifty-First Report

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH (Nandyal) : Sir, I beg to present the Fifty-first Report of the Estimates Committee on the Ministry of Petroleum and Chemicals—Oil India Limited.

(*ii*) Minutes

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH : Sir I beg to lay on the Table, Minutes of sittings relating to Fifty-first Report of Estimates Committee on the Ministry of Petroleum and Chemicals—Oil India Limited.

13.09 hrs.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION UNDER RULE 357

SHRI A. K. SEN (Calcutta-North-West) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I was surprised when I was informed that Shri Umanath, a Member of Lok Sabha, had made the following allegations against me in course of his speech in connection with the debate on the Demands for Grants relating to the Ministry of Industrial Development and Company Affairs on the 25th April, 1968:

> "They approached the Maharashtra Chief Minister. Through whom did they approach ? They approached him through Shri A. K. Sen, who is a lawyer appearing to defend the company's fraud and to defend the company's misappropriation. Shri A. K. Sen and one Commander Ghate, who is an employee of the Mafatlal group, these two people approached the Chief Minister and a deal was struck by which they were arrested and released on the same day. You will be surprised to know who this Commander Ghate is who is an employee of the Mafatlal, group, who has such powers over the Chief Minister. Commander Ghate is no other person than the brother-in-law of Shri V. P. Naik, the Chief Minister of Maharashtra."

The aforesaid allegations against me are absolutely untrue and unfounded. It is no doubt correct that I have defended one out of four accused in what is known as the Fedco case, namely, Shri Balwantrai K. Parekh in his appeal to the Supreme Court. Shri Chari, a senior Advocate of the Supreme Court, had appeared for one of the accused, Shri B.N. Khakhar. Other Advocates appeared for the other accused. As far as I remember, I concluded my arguments by the first week of February, 1967, just before the General Elections. I left for my constituency immediately after I concluded my arguments in connection with my own election. The Supreme Court delivered judgment in the appeals preferred by the several accused some time in March, 1967, whereby it was pleased to dismiss all the appeals. I have never seen accused Y. E. Rangawalla. I do not know B. M. Khakhar at all. I do not know the other accused. I have never known Commander Ghate, referred to by Shri Umanath, in his speech and I have never seen him. It is absolutely untrue and is a malicious libel against me that myself and the said Commander Ghate had approached the Chief Minister of Maharashtra and struck a deal by which the accused persons were arrested and released on the same day. In fact, I have now found out from the answers given by the Chief Minister of Maharashtra on the release of the accused persons in the Fedco case on the floor of the Maharashtra Legislative Assembly on the 29th February 1968 and the 5th of March, 1968, that only one of the accused, B. M. Khakhar, who was defended by Shri Chari ... (*Interruption*).

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH (Nandlal) : Who is Chari ? Is he a Communist ?

SHRI A. K. SEN : He is a senior advocate of the Supreme Court.

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH : Shri Umanath will take reasonable pride,