

[Mr. Speaker]

who did not get a chance to speak will have an opportunity of submitting a memorandum and they should be satisfied with that. If I were to give a chance to every hon. Member who wishes to speak, I think this discussion must go on at least for a month more. Obviously, we cannot have that much time and it will undoubtedly be repetitions of the same thing. From the sources from which I have information including the various notes which hon. Members write to me, I am making a selection. It is possible that my selection may err in some respects and I can understand the urge of each hon. Member to speak something so that his constituency may feel assured that the hon. Member is discharging his duty in Parliament. But that object can be achieved even by putting in the memorandum. If it is admitted, I may say that hon. Members can publish that memorandum if admitted outside also as amended.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT  
SITUATION IN RATACHERA IN  
AGARTALA

**The Deputy Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Datar):** May I bring one point to your notice. A supplementary statement has to be made by me with regard to an adjournment motion. I am prepared to make it today or tomorrow as you wish.

**Mr. Speaker:** I am afraid it is better to make it today because tomorrow is the last day. Is it long?

**Shri Datar:** It is a fairly long statement—about six pages. I am prepared to place it on the Table of the House if you so direct.

**An Hon. Member:** He may place it on the Table.

**Shri Kamath (Hoshangabad):** No; it is about an adjournment motion.

**Mr. Speaker:** I think it should not be laid on the Table. Let the House know the facts: how far the hon. Member who gave notice of the motion is factually correct. Let me also hear what the hon. Minister has to say.

**Shri Lakshmayya (Anantapur):** Sir, I will take only one minute to make my humble submission.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order. No more submissions. I am not going to allow the hon. Member to say anything now. Now it will be taken as disobedience to the specific instructions of the Chair if he persists in that kind of thing.

Now, I call upon Shri Datar to make his statement.

**Shri Datar:** Sir, on December 2, 1955, when the adjournment motion moved by my friends, Shri Dasaratha Deb and Shri Biren Dutt, was taken up for consideration by the House, I had occasion to make a brief statement of the facts as we were able to ascertain them. When the movers of the adjournment motion had made further statements. You, Sir, were pleased to direct that further enquiries be conducted into the specific allegations made and that I should make a full statement in respect of them. A very full and thorough enquiry has now been made by the authorities of the Tripura State and I am in a position to place before the House further details of the facts as we have been able to verify them.

I will refer again to the main facts of the incidents of October 22, 1955. An Assistant Sub-Inspector of Police of the Fatikroy Police Station with four Constables was detailed to arrest an accused person in connection with a burglary case. On the way, they accidentally met one Dhan Singh Tripura with a loaded unlicensed double barrel muzzle loading gun. The Assistant Sub-Inspector arrested Dhan Singh and seized the gun after observing all the necessary formalities. While being escorted to the Police Station, Dhan Singh raised a hue and cry at which a huge mob of Tripuras, both men and women, armed with deadly weapons, surrounded the police party and snatched away Dhan Singh from police custody. After forcibly taking away Dhan Singh from police custody, the mob led by Rakhai Singh and Taki Roy Deb Barma, chased the police party with a view to recover the un-

licensed gun and also to assault the police party. The mob which had by this time swelled to about 300 persons hotly chased the police along a distance of two miles from the place of occurrence. The police found it difficult to fight against such heavy odds and they felt embarrassed as the womenfolk were in the forefront of the mob and therefore took shelter in three houses belonging to lawabiding persons. These houses were surrounded by the mob who demanded the surrender of the police personnel from the owners of the houses concerned. The officer-in-charge of the Fatikroy Police Station who was camping in an adjacent village, received information of this soon afterwards and rushed to the spot on elephant back. On the arrival of the Station Officer, the members of the police party came out of hiding. The mob apparently thought that the Station Officer had brought reinforcements with him and gradually dispersed. The police party then hurriedly retreated to the police station where two cases, one for rioting and assault and the other under the Indian Arms Act were registered.

The First Class Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Kailasahar, and the Sub-Divisional Police Officer visited the spot on October 27. They sent urgent radiograms to the Superintendent of Police urging the necessity of opening police camps in the areas to afford protection to the law-abiding persons who had assisted the police and also to help in arresting the accused persons who had gone underground. The two officers particularly stressed that the local public had become very panicky and pointed out that two of the persons who had given assistance to the police, namely Balaram Tripura and Sukul Chandra Tripura, had already been kidnapped by the anti-social elements. A police camp was accordingly set up in village Emrapassa on November 1, 1955. When the Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Kailasahar and the Sub-Divisional Police Officer visited the place of occurrence on October 27, no complaint whatever was lodged before them either of arson or of ill treatment of women.

On the morning of November 20, the officer-in-charge of the camp police station was informed by some local inhabitants that a few mischievous people among the anti-social elements had set fire to some dilapidated and abandoned huts with some special motive. The Police Officer in charge hastened to the spot accompanied by some villagers and found the information correct. He immediately sent a radiogram to the Superintendent of Police informing him of this and adding that the anti-social elements had set fire to abandoned huts with a view to make out a case for the removal of the police camp from the area. This was followed by a telegram sent from Kailasahar by one Gokul Singh, to the Chief Commissioner stating that the houses of the villagers had been burnt in Ratachern area by the police and that money, rice, jute, hens, etc., were looted by the police and women tortured. The same telegram was repeated by Shri Gokul Singh to the Home Minister and to Shri Dasaratha Deb Barman.

Following the discussion on this adjournment motion on December 2, and in pursuance of the desire expressed by the Speaker that further enquiries be made in the matter, the Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Kailasahar who is a magistrate of the 1st class and the Circle Inspector of Police, Kailasahar, on December 8, visited the villages reported to have been affected by the alleged police excesses and made further enquiries into the allegations. The Superintendent of Police, an officer of the Bengal Police on deputation and who is the Chief Police Officer of the State, also visited the place of occurrence on December 11, 1955. Throughout his enquiries, the Superintendent of Police was accompanied by Shri Gokul Singh, who was the originator of the telegram referred to above.

Shri Gokul Singh admitted that the telegram sent by him was based on pure hearsay and that at the time of the alleged occurrence, he was at Kailasahar. He also admitted that he

[Shri Datar]

does not know English and that the telegram was drafted on his behalf by Shri Baidyanath Mazumdar of Kailasahar. Shri Gokul Singh stated before the Superintendent of Police that he had no information whatsoever of rape or molestation of women nor was he aware that any such allegation was contained in the telegram sent from Kailasahar in his name. He said that the information received by him was that while searching for accused persons the police had taken away money, rice, jute, hens, etc., from the houses of the accused persons. He again made it clear that he had no personal knowledge even in respect of these allegations as he visited the village of Emrapassa for the first time only on December 8, 1955, with the Sub-Divisional Magistrate and the Sub-Divisional Police Officer.

During the enquiry, Shri Gokul Singh was given a full opportunity to produce as many witnesses as he could to support the various allegations made. He produced four women from Raikrishnapara, three women from Bilatmonipara and one from Harimohanpara. All these women were examined separately in the presence of Shri Gokul Singh completely segregated from the local police with a view to remove any suggestion of fear, intimidation or improper influence. They all categorically denied the allegations of rape and molestation. Some of them, however, alleged that some articles in cash or in kind were taken away by the police from their houses. On further questioning, they contradicted their previous statements and failed to substantiate their allegations. The teacher of the local school, Jnanendra Bhattacharjee and two students were also examined. The school is situated in the centre of the places of the alleged occurrences. The teacher and the students are residents of the houses visited by the police during search. They said they saw that after the search the police party passed by the side of the school but

they were not carrying anything away from the houses of the accused persons nor did they in the village hear any complaint from any quarter about pilfering or molestation of women.

Two women, Basanti and Suryakanya, alleged that they had received hurt on their wrists. An enquiry established that these bruises were received by them during their scuffle with the police in rescuing Dhan Singh. These women made no complaint of rape or molestation. They were examined by a medical officer and the examination proved that they had not undergone any ill treatment.

The enquiry has also established that when the Police were conducting their searches, they were always accompanied by local persons of good reputation. The women produced by Shri Gokul Singh also confirmed that the police party was always accompanied by members of the public when they came to search the houses. Other villagers also confirmed that the police party after the search did not take away any articles from any of the houses. As to the reports of arson, three small huts were found to have been gutted. These were dilapidated and abandoned huts. Several witnesses attested to the fact that the fire in the huts was seen long after the departure of the police from the place of occurrence. Well-constructed huts quite adjacent to these burnt down huts were completely intact.

The State Government, after careful enquiry, have come to the following conclusions:—

(a) Neither Shri Gokul Singh nor anybody else made any allegation of rape. The women alleged to have been raped categorically denied having made any such complaint to anybody. The medical report disapproves these allegations.

(b) It is established that the police party did not take away the belongings of the accused persons during the search of their houses.

(c) The allegation of arson by the police is baseless.

(d) The statement made by Shri Dasaratha Deb on December 2 in the House that on the representation made by two ladies who were raped, the Superintendent of Police suspended two police officers is incorrect. No such representation was received by the Superintendent of Police nor did he suspend any police officer in this connection. On the other hand, the Superintendent of Police has announced the grant of a reward to the Station Officer of the Fatikroy Police Station.

(e) The statement made by Shri Dasaratha Deb on December 2 that four women from Demdumcherra village made complaints to local authorities and that as a consequence two policemen were punished is unfounded.

(f) Some people in the area have set up this agitation and made these false allegations mainly with a view to get the police camp at Emrapassa withdrawn by the State Government. It is not possible to close down the police camp without danger to the security of the law-abiding local people. As already stated, two of these persons who helped the police, have been kidnapped by anti-social elements and the other people have a reasonable apprehension that they will be subjected to ill-treatment if the police camp were to be withdrawn.

(g) It was stated on December 2 by Shri Dasaratha Deb in the House that the news about the alleged incidents in Ratacherra were published in the Calcutta Daily *Swadhinata*. This is a party paper, and is the only paper which published news of the alleged incidents.

**Shri Dasaratha Deb (Tripura East):**  
I rise to a point of order.

**Mr. Speaker:** No point of order now. I have heard the statement carefully. The enquiry appears to me to have been not merely an enquiry by the police but by a magis-

trate. That means in some sense a judicial enquiry. I was myself very particular to have as fair and truthful an enquiry as possible especially because of the allegations of molestation of women, as stated in the House. The way in which the women have been examined is also set out in detail in that statement. The statements were taken not in the presence of the police but the police was kept out and the statements were taken separately from each other, so that no women would fight shy of stating anything if she really had to say anything. Now, in view of this statement and enquiry, I do not think there is any ground at all for me to give consent to the adjournment motion. There is nothing to discuss. The facts are already before the House now and, therefore, I do not give my consent to it, and we proceed to the next business.

**Shri Dasaratha Deb:** My submission is.....

**Mr. Speaker:** There is nothing more to be done. The hon. Member will resume his seat. It is not the function of the Chair now to decide upon the facts.

**Shri Dasaratha Deb:** Not the facts; the statement which I made is....

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order. He made his statement. I gave him an opportunity of making it. I requested him to go and help the Ministry with statements and facts as he liked. Whether that was done or not, I do not know.

**Shri Datar:** It was done.

**Shri Dasaratha Deb:** That was not the point.

**Mr. Speaker:** That is not the way of going on with the business in the House.

**Shri Dasaratha Deb:** rose—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order. The very person who was the informant of the hon. Member was present all through the enquiry.

**Shri Dasaratha Deb:** In another place.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order. In another place or not, we are not concerned with it now. I am concerned only with the statement made by the hon. Member as a ground for the adjournment motion.

**Shri Dasaratha Deb:** The statement was.....

**Mr. Speaker:** No talks like that. To my mind, the position is very clear and whatever it be, I am not going to sit further in judgment upon the facts. Whether the hon. Member accepts the position or not, I accept the statement which is made after a judicial or semi-judicial enquiry in the matter, on the spot, keeping the informant of the hon. Member present all through the enquiry. I do not think any further proof is necessary to accept *prima facie* the truthfulness of the account stated. On the facts stated, I am quite clear that I cannot give my consent to the adjournment motion.

**Shri Kamath:** Magisterial enquiry.

**Mr. Speaker:** The magistrate is different from police. The hon. Member himself was a magistrate for some time. The magistrate is connected with the police no doubt. That way, even a judge is connected, even a Minister is connected and hon. Members also are connected with the police. Whatever it may be, I am not quite sure whether the hon. Member has heard the whole statement.

**Shri Kamath:** I have heard it as carefully as you have.

**Mr. Speaker:** If he has carefully heard it, probably it is not necessary for me to say anything more. I do not say anything more. We proceed to the next business.

#### MOTION RE. REPORT OF THE STATES REORGANISATION COMMISSION

**Shri Lakshmayya (Anantapur):** I would be failing in my duty if I do not answer the points raised by my hon. friends from Karnataka in regard to specific issues over the Tungabha-

dra project, the high-level canal and Bellary. I request you to give me chance.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. Member is taking the opportunity of making out his points in the form of a point of order. That is very wrong; that is very irregular. The debate cannot proceed if merely because one hon. Member has said anything, the other hon. Member immediately wants to reply. It will be an endless business and if the debate is to be carried on in that manner, logically, I do not see any reason why hon. Members who have already spoken should not be given a chance again of speaking on some points raised after they have spoken. There is no end to that. Members must remember that the subject of the debate is not one remark of an hon. Member. That is not the subject of the debate. It is only the principles of reorganisation, a general picture of reorganisation, the advantages and disadvantages of a particular proposal of the S.R.C. These are the broad points on which the discussion is sought,—more with a view to discuss....

**Shri Lakshmayya:** With a view to..

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order. I shall have to ask him to leave the House if he gets up in the middle. He has been doing that persistently. If he does so, I should ask him to leave the House; I should be sorry, but then I shall have to do it. Even in interruption in debates, we must observe some parliamentary decorum, some kind of procedure. The point that he raises is not the way of discussion. The discussion should be confined to the main points of the subject under consideration. Even if a Member makes some remarks, casually, here or there, there is no reason why another Member should be called upon by the Chair to reply to it. I have again and again explained it. It is impossible to call upon all Members, but if the hon. Member has a grievance about it, and thinks that he must reply, he has got the remedy of making a statement and filing it. As I said, he can publish it