

the violation of the FERA act. Specially the senior officers of the Punjab National Bank at London and Indian Overseas Banks at Hong Kong are involved in this. How many senior officers were forced to resign, how many were suspended and how many have left these banks to avoid action?

Due to the rampant corruption at the higher level, the banking industry is losing the confidence of the people. I wish to know how many people have been sanctioned loans without any proposal but only by telex messages in the banking industry. (*Interruptions*)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, though my memory is not very bad, even to remember all the cases of fraud, corruption and action taken from London to Hong Kong, it is too big a thing. (*Interruptions*). He should give a separate notice for this. (*Interruptions*).

[*Translation*]

Panel of Advocates Formed by Banks

*271. SHRI HUKUMDEO NARAYAN YADAV: Will the Minister of FINANCE be pleased to state.

(a) whether the three nationalised banks, viz., the Punjab National Bank, the new Bank of India and the Canara Bank have ap-

pointed a panel of advocates to attend to their cases;

(b) if so, the names of the advocates empanelled for Delhi region and Delhi zone, number of cases assigned to them and the amount paid to them as fee during the last three years; and

(c) the norms followed in appointing these advocates and assigning the cases to them?

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE): (a) to (c). A Statement is laid on the Table of the House.

STATEMENT

(a) Punjab National Bank, New Bank of India and Canara Bank have reported that they maintain a panel of advocates to attend to their cases.

(b) The information as furnished by the above three banks is at Annexure.

(c) Empanelment of advocates and allocation of work to them by the public sector banks including the above mentioned 3 banks is determined by several considerations such as, the number of years of experience at the Bar, educational qualification, the type of the case, value of suit, specific expertise of the advocate and the experience of the bank of the handling of the cases by the advocate, the time and efforts demanded by the bank from the advocate etc.

ANNEXURE

PUNJAB NATIONAL BANK

S.No.	Name of the Advocate	1987-1989	
		No. of Cases entrusted	Amount of fee paid (in Rs.)
1	2	3	4
1.	Sri ASP Ahluwalia	9	35048.95
2.	Sri Jag Mohan Sharma	—	—
3.	Sri SS Mittal	42	26737.28
4.	Sri SK Singla	1	5452.05
5.	Sri DL Bhargva	—	—
6.	Sri SS Saluja	—	—
7.	Sri BN Singh	5	32962.00

S.No.	Name of the Advocate	1987-1989	
		No. of Cases entrusted	Amount of fee paid (in Rs.)
1	2	3	4
8.	Sri Ashok Kr. Singh	—	—
9.	Sri SA Sayed	—	—
10.	Km. Archana Purohit	27	11161.00
11.	Sri YR Laroya	62	31718.00
12.	Sri SK Gupta	8	6942.31.
13.	S., BR Kholi	59	35933.00
14.	Sri Anand Kumar	8	8005.00
15.	Smt. Suman Sharma	48	33645.00
16.	Sri Mohinder Kr.	17	13242.70

S.No.	Name of the Advocate	1997-1989	
		No. of Cases entrusted	Amount of fee paid (in Rs.)
1	2	3	4
17.	Sri YP Chandna	7	51545.00
18.	Sri P Chawla	—	—
19.	Sri KL Nandwani	2	32496.00
20.	Sri AS Chandok	—	—
21.	Sri SP Kalra & Co.	1	539.00
22.	Sri Harpal Singh Nirbhaya	6	16813.00
23.	Sri Rajbir Tyagi	10	7263.00
24.	Smt. Manjeet Kaur Chawla	7	14657.00
25.	Sri RP Vats	111	64517.00

S.No.	Name of the Advocate	1987-1989	
		No. of Cases entrusted	Amount of fee paid (in Rs.)
1	2	3	4
26.	Sri SC Paul	122	134357.00
27.	Sri AP Mahajan	89	93154.00
28.	Sri VP Khetrapal	63	47354.00
29.	Sri CS Bhandari	21	50046.00
30.	Sri SP Chaudhary	39	15795.00
31.	Sri ML Ghera	44	36093.00
32.	Sri Ravinder Mohan	29	20719.00
33.	Sri SK Paruthi	73	69452.00
34.	Sri BS Ahuja	113	57459.00

S.No.	Name of the Advocate	1987-1989	
		No. of Cases entrusted	Amount of fee paid (in Rs.)
1	2	3	4
35.	Sri DS Rastogi	42	24863.00
36.	Ms. Leena	13	8000.00
37.	Ms. Sudha Varma	41	21083.00
38.	Sri KR Marwahi	—	78.00
39	Sri SS Katyal	100	64265.00
40.	Sri KC Gandhi	—	—
41	Sri SR Yadav	1	11417.00
42.	Sri Subhash Bansal	22	83618.00
43.	Sri SK Khanna	3	11573.00

S.No.	Name of the Advocate	1987-1989	
		No. of Cases entrusted	Amount of fee paid (in Rs.)
1	2	3	4
44.	Sri Jagdeep Kishore	17	89253.00
45.	Sri Jwala Prashad	8	76978.00
46.	Smt. Archana Jain	—	—
47.	Sri VP Mendiratta	—	—
48.	Sri Alok Kumar	—	—
49.	Sri SS Soni	—	—
50.	Sri Devinder Sain	11	8371.00
51.	Sri Yaspal	—	—
52.	Sri Ashok Kr. Singh	18	26223.10

S.No.	Name of the Advocate	1987-1989	
		No. of Cases entrusted	Amount of fee paid (in Rs.)
1	2	3	4
53.	Sri BS Singh	—	—
54.	Sri Chiramal Josh	9	10549.00
55.	Sri MH Hanafi	23	16395.80
56.	Sri RB Mahender	—	—
57.	Sri Mohinder Kumar	—	—
58.	Sri MP Singh	—	—
59.	Mrs. Sudesh Yadav	15	16122.65
60.	Miss Kumkum	—	—
61.	Mrs. RB Mehndiratta	14	6604.45

S.No.	Name of the Advocate	1987-1989		Amount of fee paid (in Rs.)
		No. of Cases entrusted		
1	2	3	4	
62.	Sri SS Dabas	—	—	2738.00
63.	Sri PL Adalakra	—	—	—
64.	Sri Harish Chetan	31	—	31706 00
65.	Sri LP Mangla	—	—	—
66.	Sri PN Tewari	3	—	18251 00
67.	Sri PN Gulati	2	—	6626.00
68.	Sri Harpawan	77	—	121545.00
69.	Sri PM Nayar	1	—	16323.00
70.	Sri MS Gupta	2	—	7000 00

S.No.	Name of the Advocate	1987-1989	
		No. of Cases entrusted	Amount of fee paid (in Rs.)
1	2	3	4
71.	Sri AN Behani	1	11000.00
72.	Ms. Neena Mittal	1	552.00
73.	Sri Shyam Lal Sharma	108	78378.00
74.	Sri RIM Aggarwal	45	25244.85
75.	M/s. Sukhdev & Co.	67	40420.00
76.	Sri SP Agarwal	1	3558.50
77.	Sri Vinay Bhasin	1	3547.50
78.	Sri SC Jain	1	1813.35
79.	Sri Dinesh Kapoor	14	9283.40

S.No.	Name of the Advocate	1987-1989		Amount of fee paid (in Rs.)
		No. of Cases entrusted		
1	2	3	4	
80.	Sri SK Agarwal	2		17913.00
81.	Sri ML Gupta	17		5024.00
82.	Sri SP Sethi	1		3765.00
83.	Sri Deewan Chanilal	2		12735.00
84.	Sri BK Goyal	2		991.00
85.	Sri BK Kochar	2		875.00
86.	Sri GC Malik	15		18171.25
87.	Ms. Ina Malhotra	18		12077.00
88.	Ms. Meena Saxena	5		3818.00

S.No.	Name of the Advocate	1987-1989	
		No. of Cases entrusted	Amount of fee paid (in Rs.)
1	2	3	4
89.	Ms. Reeta	8	5000.00
90.	Sri SS Mathur	1	462.00
91.	Sri SP Dua	1	2264.00
92.	Sri YS Longwal	2	2780.00
93.	Sri RS Sidharth	5	4000.00
94.	Sri YP Chanderchud	1	4000.00
95.	Sri SK Garg	4	12000.00
96.	Sri Atual Jain	8	5000.00
97.	Sri Brij Mohan	1	—

S.No.	Name of the Advocate	1987-1989	
		No. of Cases entrusted	Amount of fee paid (in Rs.)
1	2	3	4
98.	Sri GL Malik	1	11000.00
99.	Sri JL Gupta	8	8000.00
100.	Sri Balraj Kishan	1	200.00
101.	Sri Dinesh Kapoor	1	424.00

NEW BANK OF INDIA

(Advocates on the panel of New Bank of India for attending the cases in respect of the branches coming under Union Territory of Delhi)

		1987-1989	
S No	Name of the Advocate	No of cases entrusted	Amount of fee paid
1	2	3	4
1	Sri Ashok Kumar Bhakri (only criminal cases)	2	—
2	Sri A D Mahindroo (Legal Advisor, H O)	9	11451
3	Sri A P Mahajan	5	973
4	Sri Arun Jetely	—	—
5	Sri Ashwani Kumar	1	465
6	Sri A K Tewari	1	—

S.No.	Name of the Advocate	1987-1989	
		No. of cases entrusted	Amount of fee paid
1	2	3	4
7.	Sri Anil Chawla	1	128
8.	Sri A.K. Vali (since resigned)	1	633
9.	Miss Anita Singh (Gone to USA for higher studies)	—	—
10.	Sri Ashok Bhasin	3	2421
11.	Sri Arun Kumar Shukla (Yet not sent his certificate & acceptance)	—	—
12.	Dr. Abhishek Manu Singhvi (Empanelled in 1969)	1	—

S.No.	Name of the Advocate	1987-1989	No of cases entrusted	Amount of fee paid
1	2		3	4
	Sri Arvind Sinha (empanelled in 1989)		1	—
13	Sri Anil Sapra (Since resigned)		1	598
14	Sri Alak Kumar		1	100
15	Sri B D Kaushik (was given one case in 86 and since he is secretary of Bar Association and have no time for handling cases)		—	—
16.	Sri B.M. Sabharwal		1	300
17.	Sri C.M Baweja		3	250

S.No.	Name of the Advocate	1987-1989	
		No. of cases entrusted	Amount of fee paid
1	2	3	4
18.	M/s. Chandra & Partners	Depanelled.	
	Sri Harish Chandra	Depanelled.	
	Sri Satish C. Aggarwala	Depanelled.	
	Sri Adish C. Aggarwala (De. empanelled)	Depanelled.	
19.	Sri D.R. Thaker (Already given number of cases)	—	—
20.	Sri D.D. Mahajan (has given a case but refused to file as want to file only foreign exchange cases)	—	—

S.No.	Name of the Advocate	1987-1989	
		No. of cases entrusted	Amount of fee paid
1	2	3	4
21.	Sri Dinesh Goyal	3	3782
22	Sri Dev Nath Suri	4	740
23.	Sri Ghan Shyam Vashisht (Empanelled in 1989)	2	460
24.	Sri H C. Malhotra	2	287
25.	Sri H.C. Kundra	1	239
26.	Sri Harish Lal Narula	1	—
27.	Sri H.S. Parihar	1	1520
28.	Sri Harminder Singh Kwatra	2	580

S.No.	Name of the Advocate	1987-1989	
		No. of cases entrusted	Amount of fee paid
1	2	3	4
29.	Sri H.C. Dhall (Legal Retainer)	7	16287
30.	Mrs. Inderjeet	7	860
31.	Mrs. Ina Malhotra	6	7954
32.	Sri Jawahar Chawla	1	555
33.	Sri J.S. Gulati	2	575
34.	Sri Jagdish Chandra Trikha (has been given small cases of DRI in 1988)	—	—
35.	Sri J.M. Sabharwal	—	—

S.No.	Name of the Advocate	1987-1989		
		No. of cases entrusted	Amount of fee paid	
1	2	3	4	
36.	Sri J.K. Sibal	1	—	
37	Sri J.R. Midha	1	277	
38.	Sri J.K Gupta	2	471	
39.	Sri J.R. Goil (CLA at H O.)	—	—	
40.	Sri K.K. Arora	3	400	
41.	Sri K. V. Rathi (out of India)	—	—	
42.	Miss. Kum Kum (empanelled in 1989)	1	—	

S.No.	Name of the Advocate	1987-1989	
		No. of cases entrusted	Amount of fee paid
1	2	3	4
43.	Khan Law Firm	2	—
	Mrs. Sona Khan		
	Ms. Ramni Taneja		
44.	Sri K.N. Kapur Legal Adviser R.O Delhi	5	4286
45.	Sri Kishan Chandra Bajaj (Acceptance & Certificates yet to be received)	—	—
46.	Sri K. Gambhir	3	1302
47.	Sri M.S. Sethi	4	5327

S.No.	Name of the Advocate	1987-1989		
		No. of cases entrusted	Amount of fee paid	
1	2	3	4	
48.	Miss Meera Bhatia	6	2266	
49	M Dharam Vir Marwah	5	1245	
50.	Sri M.L. Gera	4	1861	
51	Sri Manjeet Chawla	2	585	
52	Sri M D Taneja	1	—	
53.	Smt Maniner Kaur	1	230	
54.	Maj. N N. Gupta (already has 5 cases prior to 1987)	—	—	
55.	Sri N.L. Chaudry	—	—	

S.No.	Name of the Advocate	1987-1989	
		No. of cases entrusted	Amount of fee paid
1	2	3	4
56.	Sri Nanak Chand Gupta (already given cases in 1986)	—	—
57.	Sri N.S. Jain (has small cases)	—	—
58.	Sri N.S. Das Bahl	1	—
59.	Sri O.P. Girotra	—	—
60.	Sri O.P. Soni (Since died)	1	125
61.	Sri P. L. Bhandari	5	1679
62.	Sri P.K. Jetely	1	—

1987-1989			
S.No.	Name of the Advocate	No. of cases entrusted	Amount of fee paid
1	2	3	4
63.	Sri Parkash Chawla	10	2608
64.	Sri P.S. Uppal (have small cases)	—	—
65.	Sri Parveen Kalra	6	2115
66.	Sri P.S. Sahni	1	3300
67.	Miss Poonam	1	152
68.	Sri P.N. Gera	2	245
69.	Sri P.S. Khera	2	—
70.	Sri R.P. Batra	1	215

S.No.	Name of the Advocate	1987-1989		Amount of fee paid
		No. of cases entrusted		
1	2	3	4	
71.	Sri Ramesh Madan	2	—	—
72.	Sri Ravi Pratap	2	—	—
73.	Sri R.K. Gupta	5	2775	2775
74.	Sri Ramesh Duggal	1	2555	2555
75.	Sri Rajinder Singh	3	548	548
76.	Sri Ramesh N. Keswani (empanelled in 1989)	—	—	—
77.	Sri R.K. Sharma	2	—	—
78.	Sri R.K. Chadha (Legal Retainer)	26	31878	31878

S.No.	Name of the Advocate	1987-1989	
		No. of cases entrusted	Amount of fee paid
1	2	3	4
79.	Sri R K. Dhawan	—	—
80.	Sri Rajesh Mitra	1	—
81.	Sri R.C. Chauhan	1	205
82.	Sri R C. Pandey	—	—
83.	Sri Ravi Kher (De-empennelled)	—	—
84.	Sri R.M. Aggarwal	1	270
85.	Miss Rajani Tomar	3	371
86.	Sri Rajeshwar Tyagi	1	—

S.No.	Name of the Advocate	1987-1989	
		No. of cases entrusted	Amount of fee paid
1	2	3	4
87.	Sri R. N. Govind	—	—
88.	Sri Rakesh Sawhney (De-empanelled)	—	—
89.	Sri R. K. Sharma (De-empanelled)	—	—
90.	Sri Rajinder Rana (Certificate & acceptance not received)	—	—
91.	Sri R. P. Sharma	1	264
92.	Sri S. R. Yadav	1	—
93.	Sri S. P. Chopra	6	260

S.No.	Name of the Advocate	1987-1989	
		No. of cases entrusted	Amount of fee paid
1	2	3	4
94.	Sri S.P. Manga	—	—
95.	Sri S.C. Arora	—	—
96.	Sri Subodh Markendya	—	—
97.	Smt. Sudesh Yadav	11	4644
98.	Sri Sandeep K. Beri	—	—
99.	Sri Satinder M. Bedi	—	—
100.	Sri S.K. Arora	1	—
101.	Sri Suresh Minocha	—	—
102.	Sri S.C. Ahuja	—	—

S.No.	Name of the Advocate	1987-1989	
		No. of cases entrusted	Amount of fee paid
1	2	3	4
103.	Sri Sahib Singh (empanelled in 1989 given DRI cases)	—	—
104.	Sri Sunil Ahuja (empanelled in 1989 for criminal cases)	3	—
105.	Sri Shiv Kumar (empanelled in 1989)	2	—
106.	Sri Satya Prakash Gupta (empanelled in 1989)	—	—
107.	Sri Subhas Chand Jain	2	497
108.	Sri S.L. Bhayana (since resigned)	2	505

S.No.	Name of the Advocate	1987-1989			
		No. of cases entrusted	Amount of fee paid		
1	2	3	4		
109.	Ms. Sunita	2	280		
110.	Sri S.C. Sharda	1	—		
111.	Sri Sanjay Sarin	4	394		
112.	Mrs. Sunada Ray	7	6430		
113.	Sri S.C. Gulati	2	2472		
114	Sri S. Rizvi	3	924		
115.	Sri Surinder Kumar Gupta (acceptance & certificates received in 1990)	—	—		

S.No.	Name of the Advocate	1987-1989	
		No. of cases entrusted	Amount of fee paid
1	2	3	4
116.	Ms. Shobha Dekshit (has not submitted her certificates)	—	—
117.	Sri T.R. Bhalla	—	—
118.	Sri Vikram Kumar Nanda	7	3373
119.	Sri V.K. Makhija	—	—
120.	Sri V.K. Verma	1	453
121.	Sri Vinod Asri (not interested)	—	—
122.	Sri V.K. Bhalla	2	1191

S.No.	Name of the Advocate	1987-1989	
		No. of cases entrusted	Amount of fee paid
1	2	3	4
123.	Sri V.K. Gupta	1	1298
124.	Mrs. Vidya Singh Malik	1	375
125.	Sri Vinod Kumar Goel	1	401
126.	Sri V.K. Khurana	1	—
127.	Sri YOgesh Kalra	2	480

CANARA BANK

(Advocates on the panel of Canara Bank for attending the cases in respect of the branches coming under Union Territory of Delhi)

S.No.	Name of the Advocate	No. of cases entrusted (1987-1989)	Amount of fee paid (in Rupees)
1	2	3	4
1.	Sri K.N. Bhat	1	5,712.65
2.	Sri Arun Kumar	22	1,24,532.35
3.	Sri A.K. Single	74	12,584.75
4.	Sri Adish Chandra Aggarwal	11	37,613.95
5.	Sri Anil Chawla	135	1,08,526.78
6.	Sri Ajay Kaul	—	—
7.	Sri Anand Singh	—	—
8.	Sri Alakh Kumar	51	63,197.82

S.No.	Name of the Advocate	No. of cases entrusted (1987-1989)	Amount of fee paid (in Rupees)
1	2	3	4
9.	Sri Atul Chandra Jain	4	6,450.83
10.	Sri Bhasin & Bhasin	9	9,400.00
11.	Sri Bakshi Bikram Singh Sawhney	19	41,773.00
12.	Sri B. N. Singh	—	—
13.	Gagret & Co.	4	1,05,735.00
14.	Sri J.L. Singla	121	87,294.11
15.	Sri Joginder Nath Aggarwal	7	27,384.00
16.	Sri Kailash Gambhir	5	1,217.00
17.	Sri O.P. Girotra	7	29,606.00

S.No.	Name of the Advocate	No. of cases entrusted (1987-1989)	Amount of fee paid (in Rupees)
1	2	3	4
18.	Sri P.N. Sethi	43	1,09,600.30
19.	Sri Pradeep Dewan	40	63,420.30
20.	Sri P.R. Aggarwal	2	8,020.00
21.	Sri Ravinder Dayal	—	—
22.	Sri Ramesh Chandra	2	1,005.85
23.	Sri S R Yadav	97	1,27,328.01
24.	Sri Satya Prakash Aggarwal	10	76,265.85
25.	Sri Shanti Swaroop Sharma	79	2,26,920.21
26.	Sri Salman Khurshid	—	—
27.	Smt. Sudesh Yadav	—	—

S.No.	Name of the Advocate	No. of cases entrusted (1987-1989)	Amount of fee paid (in Rupees)
1	2	3	4
28.	Sri S.P. Kalra	13	47,774.07
29.	Sri V.N. Mathur	1	206.60
30.	Sri Vinod Kumar Verma	43	60,504.34
31.	Sri V.K. Sharma	20	31,079.14
32.	Sri Vijay Kumar Verma	7	37,732.81
33.	Sri V.P. Narula	10	1,77,162.50
34.	Miss Kumkum	1	1,437.40
35.	Sri C.R. Iyer	—	—
36.	Sri A.P. Mahajan	—	—

S.No.	Name of the Advocate	No. of cases entrusted (1987-1989)	Amount of fee paid (in Rupees)
1	2	3	4
37.	Sri M.S. Dutta	—	—
38.	Sri J.K. Sinha	—	—
39.	Sri M.D. Taneja	2	550.00
40.	Mrs. Inderjeet Saroop	15	5,950.45
41.	Sri C.L. Narsimhan	—	—
42.	Sri L.R. Goel	1	3,093.75
43.	Sri D.P. Singh	1	1,462.50
44.	Sri J.C. Bhagat	1	6,600.00
45.	Sri Harpawan Kumar	2	5,965.00
46.	Sri Chinoy Chakravorthy	1	500.00

S.No.	Name of the Advocate	No. of cases entrusted (1987-1989)	Amount of fee paid (in Rupees)
1	2	3	4
47.	S Bhasin & Co.	10	14,463.02
48.	Sri N.K. Singla	1	9,622.20
49.	Sri Rajender Sharma	1	19,059.60
50.	Sri S.K. Mukherjee	1	200.00

SHRI HUKUMDEO NARAYAN YADAV: Mr. Speaker, Sir, a number of things have been stated in the statement furnished by the Government in their reply to the question. It is impossible to get the detailed information on all the points mentioned thereon in the House because it requires a comprehensive investigation. Still, however I would like to submit that it has been stated in the Government reply that empanelment of advocates and allocation of work to them by the banks to attend to their cases, is determined by their seniority, experience and competence. I would like to know as to who is going to examine it and ensure that the Bank officials do not do any discriminator in the allocation of cases? According to the lists of advocates on the panel of the three banks, presented here, the Canara Banks has a total of 50 advocates on its panel. Out of them 8 advocates were paid an amount ranging from Rs. one lakh to two lakh another 8 were given an amount ranging from Rs. one thousand to two thousand and 10 others were not assigned a single case and were not given a single paisa. As regards the position in respect of the New Bank of India, there are 127 advocates on their panel out of which 44 were paid an amount less than Rs. one thousand seven advocates were given a sum of more than five thousand rupees each and there were 7 such advocates who were not paid a single paisa. As per the information furnished in respect of the Punjab National Bank there are 101 advocates on their panel and out of them, 18 advocates were not allocated a single case while two advocates were paid an amount of more than two lakh rupees. Thus, a lot of irregularities are taking place in the allocation of cases. Instances are there where a payment of one lakh rupees was made for a single case whereas in other cases just a total amount of ten thousand rupees was paid for 75 cases. So, I would like to know whether the Government proposes to lay down some a set of norms in this regard? Every thing has been left to the discretion of Bank management and does the Government think that whatever they have done is correct and it has been done

honestly? Will you get an enquiry conducted in this regard?

PROF. MADHU DANAVATE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is a fact that the criteria adopted for the empanelment of advocates in various banks widely differ from bank to bank. So far as the question of experience is concerned, the names of only those advocates, who have a seniority of 5 to 10 years are listed in the panel of the banks. I have got a long list with me, which shows the number of advocates whose names have been listed in the panel of advocates for various banks. It is a genuine complaint, that due to the different norms for the empanelment of advocates in different banks, there are many banks where the names of a large number of advocates have been kept on the panel. So these advocates do not get enough cases. All these complaints have not been received only from the hon. Member but many other members have even written letters to us in this regard. After taking all that into consideration, we would convene a joint meeting of the directors of various banks and try to develop a uniform basis, as far as possible, for the empanelment of advocates in the various banks. I am sure that we would be able to solve the problem of irregularities, if and when such a uniform basis is agreed upon.

SHRI HUKUMDEO NARAYAN YADAV: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the hon. Minister has talked of convening a meeting of the the Managing directors or Board of Directors of the banks to find out a solution to the problem of irregularities. However what I would like to say in this regard is that all these things will be done in future but in the past, the advocates fulfilling all the eligibility conditions whether it was LL.B., M.A or B.L. or any other qualification laid down for the purpose and the advocates who are experienced and competent were not allocated cases because they were not in the good books of the director, the Law Officer or the Chairman, of the Bank or just because they did not associate themselves in any way with them. Instead the Advocates with political approach were allocated cases.

I would like to know from the Hon'ble minister whether he would get all these things investigated and initiate legal proceeding to punish all such officers who have shown any favour in this manner or if they have given away the money of the Bank to some particular individual just to oblige him, to serve their personal interests. Will you consider it as just another instance of corruption or will you punish the guilty officials under criminal Act?

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have information about the Bank-Book, but it is not possible to have complete information regarding the good books. The complaints which the hon. Member has made in this regard are based on facts. He had said that only those advocates, who are in the good books of few directors and officers are allocated more work. due to which they are able to earn more money. When such a complaint comes from a hon. Member and specially a member whose authenticity is known to me for years and who will never level false allegations, it cannot be ignored. My reply to his question whether an enquiry would be conducted or not, is that we would definitely conduct an enquiry.

SHRI R.N. RAKESH: Mr. Speaker, Sir, according to the constitution, there is a provision of 18 per cent and 7 per cent reservation in respect of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes respectively. The Government has made a declaration about extending the facility of reservations to the Buddhists (neo-Buddhists) as well. Only the Government can tell us about the percentage of reservation, proposed to be made for the Neo-Buddhists. You are also aware that the number of persons belonging to scheduled castes and scheduled tribes is increasing day by day. I would like to know as to how many seats have been reserved for the candidates of Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes and the Neo-Buddhists respectively, in the existing panels of advocates?

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Mr.

Speaker, Sir, at the moment, it would be difficult for me to find out from this long list the exact number of seats reserved for them. However his demand for the adequate representation of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes in all the appointments, is justified and in principle I do agree with him. Moreover I would like to give an assurance to the hon. Member that if, after the study and evaluation of the complete list, it is found that the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled tribes have not been adequately represented, then after examining it, we would certainly see to it that they are adequately represented.

SHRI R.N. RAKESH: What percentage of reservation would be made for the Neo-Buddhists?

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, right now, I cannot specify the percentage of seats to be reserved for them, but I would specify it later on.

SHRI THAN SINGH JATAV: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to know whether such panels have been prepared even in respect of other banks like Rajasthan Bank, UCO Bank and S.B.B.J (State bank of Bikaner and Jaipur) and also whether High Court judges have been included in these panels and is there is any such provision in the law which provides for the inclusions of High Court judges in such panels?

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, this question relates to the Punjab National Bank, the New Bank of India and Canara Bank only but you must have observed that in the beginning itself, I had mentioned about all the banks in my reply. I had said that, the basis on which the names of advocates are listed on the Panel of advocates of the banks, differs from bank to bank. I have admitted that therefore, I assure the hon. Member, as I have already said in the beginning itself, that be it UCO Bank or any other bank, we would endeavour to prepare a uniform basis for the empanelment of advocates, in consultation with the top officials of the banks.

[English]

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ:-Sir, I raise a broader question to our able Finance Minister. But I would request him not to disarm me by his humour.

I see a continuous relationship between Question No. 270 and No.271. It is a question of widerange of irregularities and mal-practices which the banking sector indulges in. The thing is, they are not answerable to Parliament; they are not answerable to the Central Government. I had worked on the Financial Committee and I raised this question there. They enjoy autonomy.

I want to put a question to Prof. Madhuji. Will they enjoy this autonomy and will they remain out of the purview of these financial committees or he is going to take measures to make these national banks answerable either to PAC or PUC so that we can examine them. At present, they are not answerable.

A junior officer of the PNB would not answer my question straight because there was a circular issued by the Chairman of that bank. I explained to them at Srinagar, when I was a Member of the Estimates Committee. I told them, the Central Government is answerable to Parliament. We represent Parliament and, therefore, you are answerable.

I remember another occasion when the Central Bank official drew the attention of that letter and took shelter under that ground. I raised this matter and Mr. Eduardo Faleiro, former Finance Minister made a commitment in this House that he would ask the Chairman of Central Bank of India to come to his office and also call me and it would be decided. I have now taken up this matter with Prof. Madhu Dandavate. I want the banking sector to be answerable to the Parliamentary committee—either of the three financial committees.

I have raised a broader question and let him not disarm me through his humour.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Without disarming my friend with my humour, I want to assure him that I would like to reiterate what I have said in my Budget speech. I said, our efforts will be to ensure functional autonomy of the banking institutions and financial institutions within a broader framework of accountability. Within a few weeks, it will be our constant endeavour to spell out what are the parameters of functional autonomy and also the accountability. I am sure that all these institutions will be accountable to you—not to you personally, but to Parliament.

SHRI GUMAN MAL LODHA: Mr. Speaker, Sir, my question is in two parts. I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether he proposes to formulate a national policy for the empanelment of advocates in nationalised banks, so that those lakhs of advocates who have been practising for the last less than 10 to 15 years and are almost having no work with them, may also get jobs and no advocate is allowed to monopolize atleast for a period of five years and also than women advocates are also brought on the panel of advocates in banks, situated in the rural areas. After formulating a national policy in this regard, employment of advocates should be done in consultation with the District Judge in order to keep it away from the influence of red tapism, nepotism and politicalisation. Under 'B' part of my question, as you have said, I intend to seek the information whether the Government, in view of the present national perspective, proposes to take any effective action, in the near future, under the Criminal law, regarding the diversion of crores of rupees of the Reliance Industries by the Bank of Baroda?

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, panels of advocates would not be maintained by the banks, only to provide work to the unemployed advocates. However as I have said earlier also and as Shri Hukumdeo Narayan Yadav has said, empanelment of advocates would be done on a uniform basis for all banks and also according to the capacity of the banks and the experience of advocates. Secondly, while doing so, we would not care as to who is

exerting his influence on the preparation of such panels. The second part of the question pertains to a particular company. As I understand it and Mr. Speaker, Sir, you will also agree that the question pertains to the empanelment of advocates and it is not regarding any particular company.

[English]

SHRI AJIT PANJA: The panels which are now existing are quite old. There are lot of junior advocates practising all over India who have made their mark otherwise in their profession. But still, they do not receive a single briefing a year from the banks. The briefs always go to all those who are already on the panel and the Board. I have experience for 25 years as bank panel advocate. When the brief comes, it comes one day before the date of litigation i.e., if it is mortgage, 12 years period is there. I take the brief on the last day. We take the brief in the evening. We just cyclostyle the petition. We will fill up the gaps. Next day at 10 O'Clock in the morning, we have to file a petition to get a receiver appointed. By this method, as I have already mentioned Rs. 6,000 crores worth of properties could be realised—If the hon. Minister applies his mind to this and if he asks for particulars, I will give—and if junior advocates are given an opportunity to come in time when senior advocates do not come. The court passes out the matter because the senior is not present.

Therefore, my question is would the hon. Minister consider that the names of junior advocates of repute—not just because of giving some employment—junior advocates who have made their mark in the panel, are taken and whether plaint petition in the right time would be given to the advocates so that the bank would realise their dues in time.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: On the basis of his experience, he had made welcome and constructive suggestions. He had spelled them out. I would accept them and I can assure him that whatever panels we

have appointed in the past, I will revise them and reconstitute them.

Implementation of Court Orders by Government

+
*275. PROF. K.V. THOMAS:
SHRI RAM SAGAR (Saidpur):

Will the Minister of LAW AND JUSTICE be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Attorney General of India was written to Government that many of the Court orders and directions are not implemented by Government in time; and

(b) if so, what action is being taken in this regard?

THE MINISTER OF ENERGY AND MINISTER OF CIVIL AVIATION (SHRI ARIF MOHAMMAD KHAN): (a) The Attorney-General of India has written to the Government that the number of contempt petitions for non-compliance with Court orders and directions is on the increase and that prompt steps be taken to ensure that Court orders and directions are carried out without the pain of contempt petition.

(b) Ministries/Departments of Government of India have been requested to take prompt steps as recommended by the Attorney General for India.

PROF. K.V. THOMAS: Sir, unfortunately in this House we find that the concerned Ministers are not available. This is a serious matter. You should also look into this.

MR. SPEAKER: Why should you waste your time. You should put the question so that the Minister can reply.

PROF. K.V. THOMAS: As the custodian of this House, you should also look into this. This is a serious matter. I now put the question. There are a number of contempt petitions before the Supreme Court because