

[Shri Om Mehta]

of the Indian Explosives Act was registered in regard to this crime at Police Station Tilak Marg, New Delhi. The investigation of this case was taken over by the C.B.I. on 30th June, 1975 at the instance of Delhi Administration.

The investigation into this case is almost complete. While it will not be in the public interest to give the details at this stage, we would like to take the House into confidence about certain salient facts relating to this case.

The conspiracy resulting in this outrage was hatched some time in early March, 1975 by a gang of fanatic Anand Margis of which Santoshanand, Sudevanand and Vikram were the principal members.

According to evidence which has now come on record Santoshanand and Sudevanand actually threw the grenades—one each—and Vikram was with them on the spot. After throwing the grenades Santoshanand and Sudevanand stayed for a short period in a room which had been reserved for them in a fictitious name. While staying there Santoshanand got certain letters written in Hindi and English which were posted to various addresses including one threatening letter to the Chief Justice of India. Santoshanand, Sudevanand and Vikram have been arrested.

The C.B.I. has been able to get not only oral but also documentary evidence to establish the complicity of Santoshanand, Sudevanand and Vikram and a few others, and a charge sheet against them will be filed soon.

11.13 hrs.

**ELECTION LAWS (AMENDMENT)
BILL***

**THE MINISTER OF LAW, JUSTICE
AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI H.
R. GOKHALE):** Sir, I beg to move for

leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Representation of the People Act, 1951 and the Indian Penal Code.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Mohan Dharia, the other day, I had given the ruling that at this preliminary stage only technical and constitutional points should be raised.

SHRI MOHAN DHARIA (Poona): I am here to oppose the leave sought by the hon. Minister to introduce the Bill. I am referring to your Direction 19(B) as referred to by Mr. Gokhale. It is very clear. Two clear days for circulation of a Bill are necessary and it could be waived for valid reasons. I am reading out from page 2, para 3 of the memorandum. It says:

"In view of the short duration of the current session of Parliament and the need to get the Bill passed in the current session itself, it is not possible to comply with the requirement in direction 19B of the directions of the Speaker...."

It is not stating the reasons. What are the exact reasons? What is the need? Is it because the Supreme Court is going to consider the appeal of the Prime Minister on the 11th August that this Bill is being introduced?

Sir, it was an assurance given by the hon. Prime Minister and also by Mr. Raghu Ramaiah that so far as election reforms are concerned, the Opposition parties and all sections of the House will be taken into confidence. Is it not the duty of the Government, after giving an assurance, to take all sections of the House into confidence? Therefore, I feel that granting of this sort of leave will not be proper; it may not be fair. There was adequate time. The Bill could have been brought for introduction

9 Election Laws (Amdt.) SEAVANA 13, 1957 Elections Laws (Amdt.) 10
Bill Bill

tomorrow thus giving two clear days for circulation. Why this indecent haste? Therefore, I fail to understand why this indecent haste is being shown, particularly when the Opposition parties, a major section of the Opposition is not participating in the deliberations?

(Interruptions)

My submission is that Mr. Raghu Ramaiah had said that this was a very urgent session. They would like to carry out several measures regarding the economic programme and therefore even the Rules of Procedure should be set aside by the House. Is it part of the economic programme? I would like to know from the hon. Minister what is the urgency? What is the need for it? Why has he not explained the reasons? Therefore, I am opposing this.

Under Article 14 of the Constitution, every citizen should enjoy equal rights. Let us be clear that by giving retrospective effect to this Bill, we are snatching away the rights given to the citizens of the country, particularly to the respondents, to the petitioners for going to the Allahabad High Court.

THE MINISTER OF WORKS AND HOUSING AND PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI K. RAGHU RAMAIAH): Since my name has been mentioned it is my duty to clarify the position. We did start talk with the Opposition leaders in regard to electoral reforms. To the last of my recollection the talks were postponed because the date fixed by us did not suit the opposition and the House adjourned *sine die* after that. Secondly, what I said on that day was very clear. I said that the session was for disposing of Government business and that the session was going to be a short one because the Ministers were busy with the implementation of the economic programme. That is what I said, I did not say that the session was

to carry out measures of economic programme.

SHRI MOHAN DHARIA: Then what is the need for this Bill?

SHRI H. R. GHOKALE: You have already waived it.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:

"That the leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Representation of the People Act, 1951 and the Indian Penal Code."

The motion was adopted.

SHRI H. R. GOKHALE: Sir, I introduce the Bill.

THE MINISTER OF LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI H. R. GOKHALE): Sir, with your kind permission, I propose to move the Bill for consideration and passing tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: That is very good of you. You have agreed for tomorrow.

SHRI H. R. GOKHALE: Yes

MR. SPEAKER: So, it will come tomorrow.

SHRI H. R. GOKHALE: I suggest that it may be taken up tomorrow as first item.

MR. SPEAKER: I think Mr. Mohan Dharia will be very happy on this.

SHRI MOHAN DHARIA: Why this indecent haste?

MR. SPEAKER: You must have some people with you to share your happiness.