

## LOK SABHA DEBATES

---

### LOK SABHA

---

Wednesday, March 8, 1989/Phalgun 17,  
1910 (Saka)

---

*The Lok Sabha met at Eleven of the Clock*

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

#### ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

[*Translation*]

#### DDA dues against Private Builders

\*183 SHRI KALI PRASAD PANDEY:  
Will the Minister of URBAN  
DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

(a) whether a heavy amount payable to the Delhi Development Authority by a number of private builders in respect of land purchased by them is outstanding;

(b) if so, the details of such private builders, the amount outstanding against each and the bank guarantee furnished by them;

(c) the steps taken by the DDA so far to recover the outstanding amount;

(d) whether DDA proposes to cancel the allotment of land to those private builders for their default in payment; if not, the reasons for not ordering the cancellation of the allotment;

(e) whether Government have conducted any inquiry in this regard and if so, the outcome thereof and the action taken thereon; and

(f) the time by which the outstanding dues are likely to be recovered?

[*English*]

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE  
MINISTRY OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT  
(SHRI DALBIR SINGH): (a) to (f). A State-  
ment is given below.

#### STATEMENT

In all there were 12 such cases. In one case, the bid was cancelled, the earnest money forfeited and the plot re-allotted. In two cases, it was decided to cancel the bid on account of failure of the parties to pay the balance 75% of the premium. Both the parties went to court and the cases are subjudice. Two more cases are subjudice on different grounds. In the sixth case, the builder is open to payment of the balance amount due with interest provided he is allowed to construct the building according to the conditions notified by the Delhi Development Authority at the time of auction in 1980. But the revised guidelines on the subject induced by the Government in February, 1988 do not permit the construction of the building on these lines. This aspect of the matter is being sorted out by the Delhi Development Authority with the builder. The remaining six cases are under consideration on the basic question of relaxation in the last date of payment of balance premium and the terms and conditions on which such a relaxation should be granted.

2. Out of the total 11 pending cases, the

possession of land had been granted only in three cases. In all these three cases, more than 50% of the premium has been received and the balance along with interest is backed by bank guarantees.

3. Under the circumstances stated above, it has not been considered necessary to hold any enquiry.

[*Translation*]

SHRI KALI PRASAD PANDEY: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the hon. Minister in his reply to my question has stated that there are outstanding dues against 12 private builders and in this connection, I need your protection. You will be surprised to know that there are Rs. 8 crores outstanding amount against Messers. Ansals since 18.2.1982. Similarly, there are Rs. 9 crores outstanding against Anand Constructions since 6.6.1982 and Rs. 2 crores are to be paid by Delhi Towers since 6.6.1982. In the same way, there are 12 private builders who have defaulted in their payment for the last 15 years and this outstanding amount is not less than Rs. 15 or 16 crores in each case. I want to know whether the hon. Minister is aware that a raid was carried on the offices of these private builders and colonisers on 21st January and Rs. 80 lakhs worth of benami deeds were seized. The total amount involved is Rs. 25 crores. The hon. Minister has stated in his reply that 50 per cent of the amount has been recovered during the last 15 years. A meeting of the senior officers of the DDA was convened in connection with the recovery of outstanding dues on 13.3.1983 and in which a decision to constitute a committee was taken and this committee has given its recommendations which have been sent to the concerned Ministry for approval. Will the hon. Minister please state as to what recommendations have been made and what decisions have been taken on them? In case no decisions has been taken what are the reasons therefor?

MR. SPEAKER: Why should he not be appointed as the auditor?

SHRI GIRDHARI LAL VYAS: Had it been done, the dues would have been recovered.

MR. SPEAKER: This is what I am saying.

SHRI DALBIR SINGH: As stated by the hon. Member, 12 such cases are there. In one case, the earnest money was 25 per cent which has been forfeited and in two cases it was decided to cancel the bid on account of failure of the parties to pay the balance 75 per cent of the premium. But both the parties approached the court. Similarly, 2 more cases are sub-judice on different grounds. As the hon. Member wanted to know about the D.D.A. meeting I want to inform him that a meeting was held and in this meeting, a decision was taken to sort out these matters. We have always made efforts to ensure that dues are recovered. There are 6 more such private builders who have not paid the premium and in this connection, it is being considered that what concessions can be given to enable them to repay their outstanding dues. I want to assure the hon. Member that we shall sort out this matter as early as possible.

SHRI KALI PRASAD PANDEY: MR. SPEAKER, SIR, I AM AMAZED TO HEAR THE reply of the hon. Minister. I had raised my supplementary with great hope but the clear manner in which the hon. Minister has misled the House has astonished me. I wanted a categorical reply from the hon. Minister regarding the details of the outstanding amount and the amount recovered so far but these points have not been clarified in the reply.

My second supplementary is in connection with HUDCO. You will be surprised to know that only 10 thousand LIG flats have been constructed for HUDCO by DDA. You will also be very surprised to know and which I want to corroborate with a document that on 7.6.1988, the Lt. Governor of Delhi in the light of the question raised by Shri Sewa Ram Arya, Metropolitan Councillor had stated that this was a case of bungling and it

should have been referred to the CBI at the initial stage. When you were aware of this bungling will you kindly let us know the date on which those private builders approached the court. And is it a fact, that it was after the Lt. Governor's reply about the bungling of Rs. 25 crores that these people went to court? Is this a fact or not?

MR. SPEAKER: A new word has been coined. I have not heard the word 'Ghatola' used for bungling so far.

SHRI DALBIR SINGH: The hon. Member in his first supplementary had wanted to know about the amount of outstanding dues. Well, it is Rs. 34.31 crores out of which a premium of Rs. 15.50 crores has been recovered and nearly Rs. 25.99 crores are still to be recovered. As regards the question regarding HUDCO, the hon. Member should give a separate notice because it is not related to this question.

SHRI KALI PRASAD PANDEY: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I need your protection because I am a new Member. I had asked categorically as to whether they had gone to the court before or after the reply given by the Lt. Governor?

MR. SPEAKER: I do not agree with you, Shri Pandey. If you are a new Member even after 4 years inside the Parliament then I wonder when you will become an old Member.

SHRI KALI PRASAD PANDEY: I want to know only this much from the hon. Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: You give a separate notice, I will ensure that a reply is given to it.

SHRI KALI PRASAD PANDEY: I want to know whether they went to the court before or after that reply?

MR. SPEAKER: I will get this point clarified as well.

SHRI RAM SINGH YADAV: Mr.

Speaker, Sir, D.D.A. had acquired land from the farmers some 15 or 20 years ago but it has not made full payment so far in this regard. The price of this land has increased to Rs. 50 thousand, 1 lakh or Rs. 2 lakh per bigha today. D.D.A. has not paid to the farmer and the property dealers have reaped all the benefits. Keeping this in view I want to know whether Government will pay the balance amount at the current rate?

[English]

SHRI DALBIR SINGH: It is entirely a separate question and it is not related to this question.

SHRI CHIRANJI LAL SHARMA: Will the hon. Minister kindly let the House know as to what is the criterion for allotment of land to private builders and as to whether it is a fact that land allotted to the cooperative society formed by Members of Parliament as members which had been registered, and sold in favour of the society, money realised, possession delivered and construction not allowed. I would like to know the details therefor.

[Translation]

SHRI DALBIR SINGH: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I will request the hon. Member to give separate notice on this matter because this supplementary is not related to the main question.

MR. SPEAKER: This is right. Only related questions can be asked.

(Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI BHADRESWAR TANTI: Sir, the DDA is hobnobbing with the private property dealers and they are minting money like anything. Even in genuine cases the DDA has not yet settled the claims. (Interruptions)

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Tanti's point is relevant.

[English]

SHRI CHIRANJI LAL SHARMA: Sir, these are questions pertaining to the Ministry of Urban Development. These questions are regarding allotment of land, purchase of land for building purposes. Should we put separate questions on each and every point? The hon. Minister, instead of giving evasive replies should give positive reply.

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER: The information may not be available with him at the moment. He will furnish it later.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: I have already stated that I agree with you. But now it is better if we pack-up.

(Interruptions)

[English]

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: It was good that Parliament House was not built by the DDA.

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER: Thank God, you are safe

(Interruptions)

#### Import of Rags

\*184. SHRI AKHTAR HASAN: Will the Minister of TEXTILES be pleased to state:

(a) the names of countries from which Government are importing rags;

(b) whether Government are aware that

these could be carriers of dreaded diseases; and

(c) if so, the reaction of Government thereto and remedial steps contemplated in this regard?

[English]

THE MINISTER OF TEXTILES AND MINISTER OF HEALTH AND FAMILY WELFARE (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA): (a) to (c). A statement is given below.

#### STATEMENT

(a) Government do not import rags. However, eligible importers are permitted to import woollen/synthetic rags under Open General Licence. Import is mainly from U.S.A., U.K., France, Switzerland, Belgium, Holland, West Germany, Japan, Italy and Australia.

(b) Yes, Sir.

(c) Under the Indian Port Health Rules 1955, no second hand clothing consignment can be cleared by the Customs without a certificate of disinfection from the Government or Municipal Health Authority for the Port of despatch or for the Port of arrival in India.

[Translation]

SHRI AKHTAR HASAN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the hon. Minister in his reply to Part (a) of my question has stated that rags are imported from 10 countries of the world and in Part (b) of the question, he has clarified that these rags carry dreadful diseases like gonorrhoea, syphilis, AIDS, scabies, ringworms and other dangerous diseases. The hon. Minister has also stated that permission is not taken from the Finance Ministry in this regard. When it is so harmful for the country and diseases from outside are carried into our country why does not the Government impose a ban on the import of rags?

SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA: Mr.