

COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS

(FOURTEENTH LOK SABHA)

TWENTY FIFTH REPORT

**MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE
MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS AND
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY
MINISTRY OF PETROLEUM AND NATURAL GAS**



**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI**

March, 2007/Phalguna, 1928 (Saka)

TWENTY FIFTH REPORT

COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS
(FOURTEENTH LOK SABHA)

MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE
MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS AND
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

MINISTRY OF PETROLEUM AND
NATURAL GAS

(Presented to Lok Sabha on 07-05-2006)



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

March, 2007/Phalguna, 1928 (Saka)

CB-1 No. 335 Vol. XXV

Price: Rs. 43.00

© 2007 BY LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

Published under Rule 382 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha (Eleventh Edition) and Printed by the Manager, Government of India Press, Minto Road, New Delhi-110002.

CONTENTS

	PAGES
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS	(iii)
I. INTRODUCTION	(v)
II. REPORT	
(i) Representation requesting to enquire about the delay in opening up of Krishi Vigyan Kendra (KVK) at District Saran, Bihar	1
(ii) Representation from Shri Dharmendra Kumar Singh complaining about non-appointment of Shri Manoj Kumar Singh as Postal Assistant despite his getting selected for the post.	16
(iii) Representation regarding irregularities in awarding dealership/distributorship by oil companies	22
III. Annexures	
a. Minutes of the Fifth sitting of the Committee held on 18.10.2004	27
b. Minutes of the Eighteenth sitting of the Committee held on 15.06.2005	29
c. Minutes of the Thirty Fifth sitting of the Committee held on 10.04.2006	31
d. Minutes of the Fifty Second sitting of the Committee held on 15.02.2007	34
e. Minutes of the Fifty Fourth sitting of the Committee held on 20.03.2007	37

COMPOSITION OF THE
COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS
(2006-2007)

Shri Prabhunath Singh — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

2. Shri Shingada Damodar Barku
3. Shri Nandkumar Singh Chauhan
4. Shri N.S.V. Chitthan
5. Shri Anant Gangaram Geete
6. Shri Mohan Jena
7. Shri Wangyuh W. Konyak
8. Shri C. Kuppusami
9. Adv. Suresh Kurup
10. Shri Dharmendra Pradhan
11. Kunwar Jitin Prasada
12. Shri Kishan Singh Sangwan
13. Shri Jyotiraditya M. Scindia
14. Shri Mansukhbai Dhanjibhai Vasava
15. Shri Paras Nath Yadav

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri M. Rajagopalan Nair — *Additional Secretary*
2. Shri J.P. Sharma — *Joint Secretary*
3. Shri A.K. Singh — *Director*
4. Shri U.B.S. Negi — *Deputy Secretary*
5. Shri V.P. Gupta — *Under Secretary*
6. Smt. Jagriti Tewatia — *Committee Officer*

TWENTY FIFTH REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS
(FOURTEENTH LOK SABHA)

INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman, Committee on Petitions, having been authorised by the Committee to present the Report on their behalf, present this Twenty Fifth Report (Fourteenth Lok Sabha) of the Committee to the House on the following representations:

- (i) Representation requesting to enquire about the delay in opening up of Krishi Vigyan Kendra (KVK) at District Saran, Bihar.
- (ii) Representation from Shri Dharmendra Kumar Singh complaining about non-appointment of Shri Major Kumar Singh as Postal Assistant despite his getting selected for the post.
- (iii) Representation regarding irregularities in awarding dealership/ Distributorship by oil companies.

2. The Committee considered and adopted the draft Twenty Fifth Report at their sitting held on 20th March, 2007.

3. The observations/recommendations of the Committee on the above matters have been included in the Report.

NEW DELHI;
20 March, 2007
29 Phalguna, 1928 (Saka)

PRABHUNATH SINGH,
Chairman,
Committee on Petitions.

CHAPTER I

REPRESENTATION REQUESTING TO ENQUIRE ABOUT THE DELAY IN OPENING UP OF KRISHI VIGYAN KENDRA (KVK) AT DISTRICT SARAN, BIHAR

1.1 Shri Nitish Kumar the then M.P. forwarded a representation signed by Shri Sudama Singh and others from Bihar regarding enquiring about the delay in opening up of Krishi Vigyan Kendra (KVK) at District Saran, Bihar.

1.2 In the representation the petitioners have *inter-alia* submitted that:—

“The Government of India had sanctioned Krishi Vigyan Kendras (KVKs) in each district of the State of Bihar. In the country, Bihar is such a State, where the farmers have to face the burden of devastating flood and drought every year. Farmers of Bihar are highly affected with the flood and drought situations, which are happening every year. With the setting up of Krishi Vigyan Kendra (KVK) it will be convenient to encourage and train the farmers to adopt commercial and scientific farming and in this way the farmers will be able to register success in producing important and commercial crops on their lands through scientific method. Many years ago an approval was made by the Government of India to set up a Krishi Vigyan Kendra in Jalalpur area of District Saran in Bihar, which is a highly backward area, affected with devastating flood and drought, but the construction work has not been started so far.

It has come to the notice that, a Committee was constituted by Rajendra Agriculture University. This Committee have already submitted their positive report after investigating the matter in this regard, still the construction work has not been started so far.”

1.3 The petitioners, have therefore, requested to investigate the reasons for delay in setting up of Jalalpur Krishi Vigyan Kendra, so that the construction work of the said Kendra could be started at the earliest.

1.4 The Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Agricultural Research & Education) were requested to furnish their factual comments on the points raised in the representation. In response, the Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Agricultural Research & Education) vide their O.M. No. 9 (7)/2004-Parl. Dated 22 September, 2004 has furnished their comments. The Ministry informed that the issue of setting up a KVK at the Saran District has been under active consideration of this Department (ICAR). Initially a site was examined at the Jalalpur village by the Rajendra Agricultural University, Pusa which was not found

suitable. However, an alternative site at the Manjhi Farm has been selected for the setting up of a KVK. The formalities like MoU and transfer of land etc. was in progress.

1.5 After perusing the comments furnished by the Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Agricultural Research and Education), the Committee took the oral evidence of the representatives of the Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Agricultural Research and Education) on 18th October, 2004 and 10th April, 2006 and officials of the State Government of Bihar on 15th June, 2005 and 10th April, 2006.

1.6 The Secretary, Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Agricultural Research and Education) during his evidence before the Committee on 18.10.2004 submitted in brief about the aim and functioning of a Krishi Vigyan Kendra as follows:—

“First of all the Indian Council of Agriculture Research has decided that Krishi Vigyan Kendra should be set up all over the country, so that the latest technical know how received from the Research Centres, Agricultural Universities could be tested on the land of the farmers and the farmers could be imparted training in this regard and the latest technology could be used in the development of agriculture. First Krishi Vigyan Kendra was established in Pondicherry in the year 1974. Since then total 291 Krishi Vigyan Kendras have been established so far in 9th Five Year Plan through out the country. In view of its importance it was decided in the Tenth Five Year Plan that, Krishi Vigyan Kendra should be established in all the rural districts of the country by 2002. Provision of Rs. 860 crores was made for the establishment of KVK and for proper functioning of old KVKs. As on date instead of 291 KVK, 426 KVK has been established so far. At the time when we have submitted before the Committee there were 421 KVKs but now this number has increased to 426. As far as Bihar is concerned 37 KVKs were to be established in 37 rural districts. In the 9th Five Year Plan, 16 KVKs had been established. So far 10 more KVKs have been established in 10th Five Year Plan. Regarding remaining 11 districts the Site Selection Committee has visited 4 districts, and it's recommendation has been received by the Indian Council of Agriculture Research. The Site Selection Committee is yet to visit the remaining districts and the decision in regard to the site for establishing KVK is likely to be taken up on basis of the recommendations made in this regard.”

1.7 When asked about the guidelines/criteria being followed for opening a KVK at a particular place/State, the Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Agricultural Research and Education) *vide* their written communication dated 13.10.2004 submitted as follows:—

“As per the standard procedure a Site Selection Committee is constituted under the Chairmanship of an eminent agricultural scientists, representatives of State Agricultural University and State Department of Agriculture as members, and the Zonal Coordinator as Member Secretary. The Committee visits and assess the logistics available for establishment of a KVK in the

district and based on the recommendation of the Committee a decision is taken. The terms of reference of the Committee are as follows:—

- (i) To examine the suitability of the site based on the proposals received for a particular district.
- (ii) To identify the infrastructure and other facilities available with the respective organization which can be put at the disposal of KVK.
- (iii) To assess the viability of the organization and capacity to provide technological backstopping; and
- (iv) The commitment of the organization to run the KVK according to the principles and guidelines of the Council.

1.8 As regards opening up of a KVK at Jalalpur, the Ministry *vide* their written reply dated 13.10.2004 stated as follows:—

“The Committee, constituted by Rajendra Agricultural University (RAU) regarding the suitability for establishment of a KVK at Jalalpur in Saran district of Bihar, submitted its report to the council on 15.7.2003. The report of the Committee indicates that the farm is not suitable for establishment of a KVK as the complete farm being low land remained water logged for 4-6 months. The report also indicates that the Department of Horticulture tried to develop progeny nursery three times on the farm which could not be made possible.

The Committee was comprised of the Nodal Officer for KVKs of RAU and Training Organiser, KVK Muzaffarpur. The Committee visited the Jalalpur farm and further discussed with District Agricultural and Horticultural Officers, besides Sub-Divisional Agricultural Officer and other concerned persons.”

The Ministry further stated that:—

“Manjhi Farm is located 35 km away from Jalalpur farm. The Site Selection Committee reported that the soil of the farm is fertile and is suitable for cultivation of rice, wheat, maize, pulses, oilseeds and horticultural crops. The farm has irrigation facilities and the basic amenities like medical, educational and electricity are available at the Block Headquarter. The Committee accordingly recommended for the Manjhi Farm.”

1.9 When asked about the year in which approval to open a KVK at Jalalpur was given, the witness while tendering evidence on 18.10.2004 replied that the approval was given on 15.11.2002.

1.10 The representative from the State Government of Bihar, further submitted before the Committee while tendering their evidence on 15.06.05, as follows:—

“From our file it is seen that it contains a request dated 30.09.2002 from the Vice Chancellor, Rajendra Agricultural University addressed to the Commissioner, Agricultural production for handing over the areas of Chinave

at Gopalganj, Manjhi at Saran and Mandli in District Khagaria to the University.There is a reference in the letter for opening of a KVK at Manjhi. There is no record in our files regarding Jalalpur. The sight selection team of the ICAR has also selected and recommended for the Manjhi Farm.”

1.11 To a query as to when the proposal for Manjhi came, the witness replied that:—

“Rajendra Agricultural University has constituted its own Committee. The University had indicated in their report regarding Jalalpur that it will be proper to open KVK at Manjhi Farm. Thereafter, the council constituted its own committee. In addition to Manjhi Farm there was another proposal also received from an N.G.O. which had two sites. Our Committee visited three sites including Manjhi Farm. The report received from Rajendra Agricultural University on Jalalpur had an indication of Manjhi Farm.”

1.12 The Committee when desired to know about the role of the revenue department in opening a KVK on the land of the Agricultural Department, the representative from the State Government of Bihar submitted that:—

“In Bihar the Department of Revenue is the Custodian of the entire land. Whenever a land is allotted to a department, it is allotted for a special purpose. If this purpose is to be changed, a proposal has to be sent to the Revenue Department and they subsequently take the approval of the Cabinet.”

1.13 When asked about the procedure being followed in case of transfer of land for KVK at Manjhi, the representative of Bihar Government submitted that:—

“It is a complete process. The Sub Divisional Agriculture Officer submitted a proposal that the revenue record of the Manjhi Farm was there and there was a map of that land. That land could be given for the KVK. He submitted this proposal to the District Agriculture Officer; The District Agriculture Officer returned it to the Collector with his recommendations. The Collector forwarded it to the Commissioner. The Secretary to the Commissioner forwarded it to the Commissioner, Agricultural production. But, as per the proposal of the Revenue Department the Commissioner will process it properly and give a formal shape to it and it will thereafter be returned to the Commissioner.”

1.14 In response to a query about the communication sent for demanding proposal for formal transfer of land from District Magistrate, Saran through Divisional Commissioner, Saran Division, the State Government of Bihar *vide* their written communication dated 13.6.05 submitted that:—

“Department of Agriculture after giving consent in principle has requested District Magistrate, Saran for preparing a formal proposal regarding transfer of 10 hect. of land of SM Farm, Manjhi, Saran for establishment of KVK *vide* letter No. 431 dated 14.02.2003 & Letter No. 103 dated 27.02.2003.”

1.15 Asked about the reasons for taking undue long time by District Magistrate and Divisional Commissioners, Saran for sending the proposal, when the Revenue Department had already agreed for transfer of 25 acres of land in principle, the State Government of Bihar in their written note dated 13.6.05 submitted that:—

“Sub-Divisional Agriculture Officer, Saran prepared a proposal of land transfer with details and maps. District Agriculture Officer forwarded the proposal to District Magistrate, Saran with his recommendation for transfer of land. District Magistrate, Saran *vide* letter No. 1772 dated 26.07.2003 sent the proposal to Divisional Commissioner, Saran with recommendations that has been scrutinized at Divisional Commissioner level. Proposal has been sent by Divisional Commissioner office *vide* letter No. 26-13/03-27 dated 06.01.2004 to Department of Agriculture.”

1.16 Elucidating the steps taken by the Government to expedite the process, the Bihar Government in their written note have further submitted that:—

“The proposal sent by Divisional Commissioner, Saran was scrutinized in the Department of Agriculture. It was observed that the proposal sent by the Divisional Commissioner did not carry the proposal constituted and recommended by District Magistrate, Saran. The same was communicated to District Magistrate, Saran and Divisional Commissioner, Saran *vide* letter No. 497 dated 12.02.2004 and requested to send the land transfer proposal through the Divisional Commissioner. The District Magistrate, Saran has been requested through reminders letter No. 1816 dated 12.06.2004, letter No. 1465 dated 14.05.2005 and letter No. 1719 dated 11.06.2005. Seeing undue delay in getting proposal from District Magistrate, Saran, the Department of Agriculture sent Divisional Commissioner’s proposal to Revenue and Land Reforms Department. This department turned down the proposal with the observation that the proposal sent by the District Magistrate, Saran should be enclosed in prescribed format.”

1.17 When pointed out about the undue delay being caused by the concerned authorities for transferring land, the official from State Government of Bihar submitted as follows:—

“.....Sir, I would submit that all the schemes of the Government of India are very important There is no denying to the fact that there has been a procedural delay. I would request you to issue a directive to the Chief Secretary to convene a meeting to discuss all matters for execution of all works. All matters will be solved within the time limit fixed by you.”

1.18 Further elucidating the reasons for delay in setting up KVK, the Secretary (DARE) witness replied:—

“The opening of KVK and obtaining land for it are to be decided by both the parties. Indian Agricultural Research Council deliberates on the issue of selection of site of KVK. Our contact point is Vice-Chancellor of Agricultural University. It is between the Vice-Chancellor and State Government because Agricultural University and Agriculture Department

both are under State Government, therefore, they correspond with each other and when the land is actually transferred, then it comes to us with memorandum.”

He further added:—

“Sir, Jalalpur/Manjhi are in Saran District. If we receive Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) signed today. We will issue recommendation letter for it by tomorrow evening. We also want that these KVKs should be opened at the earliest. We also want that there should be participation of the KVKs in upgradation and development of Agriculture but here we are helpless because land has to be provided by some other Government. We are not able to provide sanction and funds to Agricultural University before the transfer of land.”

1.19 When asked about the time required by the Government to finish the job, the witness replied that:—

“I will talk to Vice-Chancellor today or tomorrow. I will also talk to Agriculture Commissioner and if you permit I will also talk to Chief Secretary, I will also write letter. It is not possible for me to say the time by which land will be transferred because this is a State subject. I will try my best to see there. Krishi Vigyan Kendra is set up there at an early date.”

1.20 The Ministry of Agriculture in their latest written reply dated 10.4.06 further submitted that:—

“The Government of Bihar transferred 19.90 hect. of land at Manjhi Farm in Saran district in favour of Rajendra Agricultural University (RAU) *vide* Office Order No. 4 (Parkshetra).5/07.857 dated 18.3.2006, which was received in the ICAR on 23.3.2006. The KVK has been sanctioned by the ICAR on 24.3.2006.”

1.21 As regards the position and development of working of existing KVKs the witness submitted:—

“I have visited one of the Site almost 8-9 months ago where these Krishi Vigyan Kendras have been opened. On visiting the place I found that building has been constructed. There was a proposal for boundry wall. Sanction has been issued for that and funds provided. We visited a site where there was no facility of irrigation, we have to arrange tubewell for that, we provided the required funds. The share of funds to be provided by Government of India had been already provided.”

1.22 While furnishing the latest progress made in the matter, the Secretary, Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Agricultural Research and Education) submitted before the Committee during oral evidence on 10.4.2006 as follows:—

“It is true that the pace of progress in Bihar was very low but the progress made in last 25 days is unexpected. 10 KVKs have been established in Bihar during last 25 days. The land for KVK at Manjhi was allotted on 23 March and our Agriculture Research Council had accorded sanction on

24 March itself. As per India 2002 there are 37 rural districts in Bihar and the target was to establish KVKs in all these districts, whereas KVKs have been established in 36 districts. As on date the Baksar rural district is the only station, where KVK is yet to be established. Today, I had a telephonic conversation with the officers of the State Government and they assured me that the land for Baksar will also be allotted in the Cabinet meeting likely to be held tomorrow or day after tomorrow. I feel that if land is allotted within a day or two, the KVK will be established at Baksar in the coming week and the target of India 2002 to establish KVKs in all rural district of Bihar would be achieved cent-percent.

All these issues have been discussed in details with the State Government and they have accorded sanction to fill all the vacant posts. The action is being taken speedily thereon. A detailed action plan will be made during the coming 20-25 days in consultation with the zonal co-ordinator, officers and employees of the Agriculture University and State Government and they will find out the ways to make KVKs more progressive and to fulfil the objectives for which KVKs have been established. These six-seven basic points would be emphasized in particular in the action plan alongwith the other things. Keeping in view the progress made during the last 25 days I would like to submit that I am not only hoping but confirmed that KVKs would contribute immensely in Bihar. For this, I would like to thank the Government of Bihar on behalf of myself and my department for providing land for Agriculture Universities in such a short period. If the land would have not been provided it was impossible to establish KVKs in such a short span.”

1.23 When enquired, if by allotment of land, it means that, a KVK has been established/setup, the witness submitted before the Committee that:—

“The allotment of funds starts from the day when the sanction is accorded for KVK and the letter issued to this effect, and recommendation is made for the utilisation of funds. It is presumed that the KVK stands established from the date of sanction, but to materialise it to implement all schemes. If there are 16 posts it is mandatory to advertise posts and to select people and the entire process takes six months time. Keeping in view the present pace of the functioning of Agriculture University and other people, I don’t think it will take more than six months because, I had a discussion with the Dy. Registrar of the Agriculture University and he had assured that he will initiate the work with the existing staff and in the meanwhile the process of recruitment of new staff will also be initiated. I think if the speed of progress remain the same all these KVKs would be fully operational within six months.”

1.24 When asked, about the time required to make the KVK actually functional so as to provide the benefits to people, for which these KVKs are being set up, the witness replied that:—

“Definitely we are taking full interest. Therefore, last time when we appeared before you on 18.10.2004 we wrote D.O. letter to Chief

Secretary, Agriculture Production Commissioner, Vice-Chancellor on the same day. Thereafter, our officers discussed the issue many times. We issued many reminders also, but finally today we got land, we got land on 23rd March, 2006 and we accorded sanction for KVK on 24th March, 2006. The speed of work is explicit itself. I think it will not take even six months and the people will find KVKs functional in different districts during the season of Khareef. The people will definitely feel the functioning of KVKs in the season of Khareef.”

He further added: —

“A meeting of Hon’ble Agriculture Minister, Government of Bihar, Agriculture Commissioner has been convened on 21st and the decision for allotment of land for these 10 KVKs has been taken on 21st only and 23rd March its recommendations have been forwarded to Union Government. 10 KVKs out of 36 have been established in 25 days and this is what we can see as a grand reality and this fact is very much clear on the ground itself.

The second point is related to the functioning of KVKs. How much we should expect from KVKs. Whether we are treating KVKs as just an extension. Extension, propagation and advertisement are the State subjects and for this purpose States have a fulfilled department. The work pertaining to field demonstration and training of trainers is going on and I want to state here clearly that on an average two thousand people of every district have been imparted training in KVKs of Bihar during last year, it is quantifiable. Similarly, they have organised field demonstrations in respect of various crops and made people acquainted with various techniques in respect of various crops. But the overall development of agriculture will not be possible until the quality products, increase in production, remuneratory prices, arrangement of Commercial Marketing and all such things are not included in agriculture. I just want to state that the KVK at Baksar is the only KVK under the direct control of Indian Agriculture Research Council and the remaining KVKs will function under the control of State Government like Agriculture Universities. We provide grants to them and all these KVKs are being funded 100 percent by ICAR but the entire staffs working therein are from the Agriculture University, which is an organisation of the State Government. We will assist them in this programme, we will assist by funding, we will draft programme and provide consultation, we will even contribute in making assessment so that they may bring improvement in their work undoubtedly we will try our best but, we should definitely accept this fact that KVKs are not as an alternative of propagation and advertising in the country. This service is totally under the State Government and agriculture is a State subject. It is with them as per allocation of business rules. We will say only this much that most of the KVKs will function only to achieve those goals for which these KVKs have been established and most of the KVKs will certainly work in that direction.”

1.25 As regards the funds required to start a KVK, and assessment made to know whether the objectives for setting up KVKs are being achieved, the witness submitted that:—

“In a Five Year Plan period, if it is a new KVK, about Rs. 2.5 crores goes for the construction of building, staff salary, contingency and equipments. It may be Rs. 10-15 lakh here and there but this is a total expenditure as far as one KVK is concerned. As far as review and performance of these KVKs are concerned, after every five years we do have quinquennial review of each of these KVKs. The country was divided into eight zones and experts had visited and given report. The report is available. You may see the overall performance of these KVKs. Eight independent external reviews have been done. It is the resolve of the Government, money is available, that each rural district as per India 2002 will have one KVK by the end of the Tenth Plan. Our target for this year is 75. After that hardly a few KVKs will be left which will be completed after the end of the Plan period. We are moving extremely fast. In the last one year there used to be one Committee for each KVK. Now we have 16 Standing Committees for 16 States. Therefore, the moment a proposal comes, the Committee visit the place and submit its report. We are able to take decisions quickly. Since this is important and is related with the upliftment of rural people, any speed is less. Our endeavour would be to move as fast as we can. We would be submitting the review report to the Committee.”

1.26 The Ministry vide their written reply submitted as follows: —

“Eight Quinquennial Review Teams (QRT) were constituted to review the functioning of the KVKs. The terms of reference of the Committees were as follows:

- (i) To examine the mandate and functioning of KVKs/TTCs in the light of the prevailing agro-climatic and socio-economic conditions of its location.
- (ii) To assess the performance of the KVKs/TTCs against the assigned tasks and responsibilities based on the information furnished by the KVK/TTC and the field visits.
- (iii) To examine whether any changes in the organizational structure, staffing pattern, funding level and norms are called for in order to achieve an improved and effective working.
- (iv) To undertake critical review of the research-extension linkages at the district, block and panchayat level and suggest remedial measures for focusing extension services for women farmers and agricultural development projects.
- (v) To obtain and analyse the responses for the beneficiaries about the impact of the KVKs on agricultural production, productivity and socio-economic upliftment of the identified areas/sections under KVK.
- (vi) To obtain and analyse the responses from KVKs about the impact of TTCs in terms of providing latest knowledge and skills in subject matter areas and training methodology.

- (vii) To examine problems/constraints, if any, requiring policy decisions, legal, institutional or administrative actions of KVKs/TTCs.”

1.27 When asked about the minimum extent of land stipulated for starting a KVK in a district, the witness submitted as follows:—

“In general about 50 acres of land is required for a KVK but exceptions are there, for example in hilly areas. I understand that the ideal situation is about 50 acres of land but we have examples of 25 acres of land also. Land is one of the components in taking overall decision. We see whether it will serve the purpose or not. All these things are looked into.”

1.28 When pointed out that, the then Agriculture Minister had indicated many Zillas of Bihar for opening KVK and the Ministry had carried out the survey for opening KVK, the witness submitted that:—

“When Shri Chaturanand ji was Minister, that time 7-8 Zillas were indicated like Gopalganj, Saran, Siwan, Aurangabad, Asharia, Katihar, Kishanganj and Purnea. Two Site Selection Committees have been constituted for Katihar, Kishanganj and Purnea districts. In some cases, land could be identified and the same was made available. In some of the places, land was identified and the State Government was requested for transfer of that land and in those places transfer of land took place. In Purnea and Katihar districts, sanction was issued, afterwards transfer of land was pending in those cases, we were waiting for the availability of land.”

1.29 The State Government of Bihar *vide* their written note dated 05.04.2006 further gave the list of Districts in Bihar where 25 KVKs have been established and are working as follows:—

	Name of District	Place	Managed by
1.	SIWAN	BHAGWANPUR	RAU
2.	VAISHALI	HARIHARPUR	RAU
3.	WEST CHAMPARAN	MADHOPUR	RAU
4.	MUZAFFARPUR	SARAIYA	RAU
5.	DARBHANGA	JALE	RAU
6.	SAMASTIPUR	BIROULI	RAU
7.	BEGUSARAI	KHODABANDPUR	RAU
8.	SAHARSA	AGWANPUR	RAU
9.	PURNEA	PURNEA	RAU
10.	KATIHAR	KATIHAR	RAU
11.	MUNGER	MUNGER	RAU
12.	BANKA	BANKA	RAU
13.	BHAGALPUR	SABOUR	RAU
14.	SHEIKHPURA	ARIYARI	RAU
15.	PATNA	BARH	RAU
16.	NALANDA	HARNOUT	RAU

	Name of District	Place	Managed by
17.	ROHTAS	VIKRAMGANJ	RAU
18.	BHOJPUR	ARRAH	Sone command
19.	MADHEPURA	MADHEPURA	RAU
20.	ARARIA	ARARIA	RAU
21.	KHAGARIA	KHAGARIA	NGO Charwak Socio Economic Dev. Trust
22.	KAIMUR	ADHAURA	NGO Banbasi Seva Kendra
23.	JAMUI	JAMUI	NGO Shram Bharati
24.	NAWADA	SHEKHO-DEURA	NGO Gram Nirman Mandal
25.	MADHUBANI	CHANDPURA BAISATH (BENI PATTI)	NGO S.K. Chaudhry & Nyas

1.30 The Bihar Government further submitted that the department of Agriculture has given permissive occupancy *vide* letter No. 857 dated 18.3.06 and No. 1049 dated 29.3.06 to RAU for establishment of following KVKs:—

	Name of District	Name of farm	Area (Hect.)
1.	LAKHISARAI	HALSI	29.70
2.	JEHANABAD	MAKHDUMPUR	10.00
3.	GAYA	MANPUR	10.00
4.	AURANGABAD	SHIRIS	12.00
5.	SARAN	MANJHI	19.90
6.	SHEOHAR	SHEOHAR	5.20
7.	SUPAUL	RAGHOPUR	9.52
8.	GOPALGANJ	SIPAYA (PART)	20.00
9.	KISHANGANJ	THAKURGANJ	10.00
10.	MOTIHARI	PIPRAKOTHI	20.00

1.31 As regards the latest progress made in these Districts, the Ministry of Agriculture *vide* their written note dated 10.4.06 submitted:—

“The KVK at Supaul, Lakhisarai, Aurangabad, Jahanabad were sanctioned on 24.3.2006. The KVK in Gopalganj district was sanctioned on 5.4.2006. The KVK in Araria was sanctioned on 27.2.2004. All these KVKs have been sanctioned in favour of Rajendra Agricultural University. The order for transfer of land at the Seed Multiplication Farm at Lalganj and its physical possession in Buxar district in favour of ICAR Complex for Eastern Region, Patna has not been received. A proposal for establishment of a KVK in

Arwal district has been received on 30.3.2006. Since the district has been newly created, it is not part of the list of 578 rural districts (as per India 2002) already approved by the Government for establishment of KVKs.”

1.32 The State Government of Bihar *vide* their written note dated 5.4.06 further informed that as regards establishment of KVK at Buxar by ICAR proposal has been sent to Revenue Department for transfer of 10.64 hect. land of Seed Multiplication Farm, Lalganj.

1.33 As regards non-functional KVKs, the witness submitted that:—

“There are 8 such KVKs which can be put under non-functional category. So far as KVK Jahanabad is concerned, earlier it was under some command area. The Government gave it’s recommendation for some command area that they will run it. They were also given sanction but they could not run it. Then we approached the Agriculture University. A proposal has come from Agriculture University. Since the sanction was issued in favour of some command area as they had made the recommendation, land was also transferred and other formalities were completed but they could not run it and that is why this KVK was placed under non-functional category. Besides this, there are 7 such KVKs.”

1.34 Giving the list of 8 non-functional KVKs, the witness submitted as follows:—

“Out of the list of 8 KVKs, Jahanabad, Bihar, KVK was given to the Chairman Sone Ganga Command area, which has since been closed. Ujwa, New Delhi which was given to Director NHRDF, Janakpuri is also closed. Kathwa, Jammu and Kashmir was recently transferred to Sher-E-Kashmir University because there was the problem of law and order. Dhanbad, Jharkhand KVK was with Hindustan Fertilizers since Hindustan Fertilizer has been closed Dhanbad, KVK has also been closed. Kolar is in Karnataka. It has also been closed down and Vidisha is in M.P. There are a number court cases against it. Kamarjhad, in Tamil Nadu was with Chairman Mayor Trust Madurai Vardhman, West Bengal was with Chairman Hindustan Fertilizer Corporation Ltd. All these 8 KVKs are not able to function.”

1.35 When asked if any efforts are being made to make these non-functional KVKs as functional, the witness submitted:—

“We should not take it for granted that, they cannot be made to run. We have to run a KVK in that district. As I said just now about Vidisha that if it is transferred to University, we can run that KVK. It is our efforts that KVK runs at all places. If these institutes are unable to run there can be no welfare of these districts. We have to run Krishi Vigyan Kendra in that district at any cost. It would be our continuous efforts to run these KVKs where they are not able to run.”

Observations/Recommendations

1.36 The Committee note the Indian Council of Agriculture Research (ICAR) had decided that Krishi Vigyan Kendra (KVK) should be set up all over the country, particularly in all the rural districts so that the latest technical knowhow received from the Research Centres, Agricultural Universities could be tested on the land and the farmers could be imparted training in this regard and the latest technology could be used in the development of agriculture. First KVK was established in Pudducherry in 1974 and since then, a total of 291 KVKs have been established so far throughout the country.

1.37 The Committee also note from the submissions made by the petitioners that the Government of India had sanctioned a KVK in each district of Bihar, as the farmers were facing flood and drought situations every year. The petitioners' are, of the view that with setting up of Krishi Vigyan Kendra it will be convenient to encourage and train the farmers to adopt commercial and scientific farming, which would help them to achieve success in producing important and commercial crops on their lands through scientific method. According to the petitioners, it was a long pending demand to set up a KVK in Jalalpur, which is a highly backward area of district Saran. A Committee was also constituted by Rajendra Agriculture University (RAU), which submitted its report but no construction work has started so far. The petitioners have, therefore, requested to investigate the reasons for delay in setting up of Jalalpur KVK and starting the construction work of the said centre.

1.38 The Committee note from the reply of the Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Agricultural Research and Education) that the issue of setting up a KVK in district Saran has been under active consideration of ICAR. Initially a site was examined at Jalalpur Village by RAU, Pusa which was not found suitable as the identified area being low lying, the land remained water logged for 4-6 months in a year. The Department of Horticulture also failed to develop a progeny nursery on the said land. However, an alternative site at the Manjhi Farm, located 35 km away from Jalalpur has since been selected for setting up of a Krishi Vigyan Kendra. The Site Selection Committee has reported that the soil of the farm is fertile and is suitable for cultivation of Rice, Wheat, Maize, Pulses, Oilseeds and Horticulture Crops. The farm has irrigation facilities and the basic amenities like medical, educational and electricity are available at the Block Headquarter.

1.39 The Committee, however, note from the submission made by the State Government of Bihar that there was no recording in their file about opening of KVK at Jalalpur. The State Government have further submitted that, "from our file it is seen that it contains a request dated 30.09.2002 from the VC, RAU addressed to the Commissioner, Agricultural Production for handing over the areas of Chinave at Gopalganj, Manjhi at Saran and Mandli in District Khagaria to the UniversityThere is a reference in the letter for opening of a Krishi Vigyan Kendra at Manjhi. There is no record in our files regarding Jalalpur. The sight selection team of the ICAR has also selected and recommended for the Manjhi Farm".

1.40 The Committee are constrained to observe utter lack of coordination between the Ministry of Agriculture and State Government of Bihar over finalization of site for opening of KVK in District Saran resulting in avoidable delays in reaping the benefits from such Kendras in an extremely backward areas of the State. Since the KVK is yet to be set up even after a lapse of approximately more than five years, the Committee cannot but express their serious displeasure over the same.

1.41 The Committee while enquiring about the reasons for delay in transfer of land for Manjhi, KVK, note that the Sub-Divisional Agriculture Officer, Saran prepared a proposal of land transfer with details and maps. District Agriculture Officer forwarded the proposal to District Magistrate, Saran with his recommendation for transfer of land. District Magistrate Saran, *vide* his letter dated 26.07.2003 sent the proposal to Divisional Commissioner, Saran who further sent it to Department of Agriculture *vide* his letter dated 06.01.2004. On scrutinizing the proposal by Department of Agriculture, it was observed that the proposal sent by Divisional Commissioner was not in order and also without the recommendation of District Magistrate, Saran. The Committee are anguished that after repeated reminders dated 12.06.2004, 14.05.2005 and 11.06.2005 by the Department of Agriculture, the Government of Bihar, the District Magistrate, Saran forwarded the revised proposal to the Divisional Commissioner after an inordinate and inexplicable delay of approximately more than 2 years. The Committee express their strong displeasure on the inaction and lackadaisical functioning of the officials of the then Government of Bihar including DM, Saran causing delay in transfer of land by almost 4 years depriving the farmers of the area of their rightful gains.

1.42 The Committee are informed by the Ministry that the Government of Bihar transferred 19.90 hectare of land at Manjhi Farm in Saran District in favour of RAU *vide* office order No. 4 (Park Kshetra). 5/07-857 dated 18.03.2006, which was received in the ICAR on 23.3.2006. The KVK has since been sanctioned by the ICAR on 24.03.2006. The Committee note that besides Manjhi there are other Districts in Bihar for which the Department of Agricultural Research and Education have granted permissive occupancy in March 2006. The KVK at Supaul, Lakhisarai, Aurangabad, Jahanabad, Gopalganj, Araria have been sanctioned in favour of RAU.

1.43 The Committee note that as per India 2002, there are 37 Rural Districts in Bihar where KVKs were to be established. Baksar is the only District for which land is yet to be allotted. The Ministry assured the Committee that the land will be allotted in a day or two and it would be possible to set KVK, at Baksar in a week's time thereby achieving the cent-percent target of India 2002. The Committee also note that in some of the existing KVKs, there was lack of basic necessary infrastructure like boundary wall, irrigation facilities etc. and the Ministry had since taken action therefor and provided necessary funds.

1.44 The Committee note with satisfaction that in Bihar the pace of progress was very slow, but after the Committee was seized of the matter, the progress made in setting up of KVK in Bihar was unprecedented and 10 KVKs were sanctioned in just 25 days in March 2006.

1.45 The Committee, however, strongly deprecate the manner in which both the Ministry of Agriculture and the State Government of Bihar have proceeded with the matter before the Committee took up the issue for the examination. The Committee regret that the target fixed for opening of KVKs in all the rural districts of Bihar by 2002 could not be achieved, even after the lapse of a considerable time, though sufficient funds were available. The Committee are astonished to find that the then State Government of Bihar had failed in their responsibility of identifying a suitable land and in submitting proposal in proper format leading to procedural delay which otherwise could have been easily avoided with proper coordination.

1.46 The Committee desire that, the Ministry of Agriculture in co-ordination with the State Government of Bihar should now expedite the setting up of KVK at Manjhi, District Saran and making it functional in a time bound manner. The Committee, therefore, recommend that requisite fund for setting up of KVK at Manjhi are released without further delay. The Committee also desire that an inspection team may visit KVK Manjhi immediately and thereafter at regular intervals to monitor the progress in the matter.

1.47 The Committee further recommend that a mechanism may be put in place in the Ministry of Agriculture (ICAR) to regularly monitor the progress in setting up of other KVKs in Bihar and ensure that the required staff is provided with adequate infrastructure facilities for smooth running of KVKs.

1.48 The Committee note with concern that there are 8 non-functional KVKs in the country. The Committee are of the view that after setting up of a KVK if it becomes non-functional it is a loss to both the Government exchequer and the local farmers. The Committee, therefore, recommend that the Ministry of Agriculture and the respective State Government should study the feasibility reviving these non-functional KVKs so that the very objective of setting up of a KVK is not defeated.

1.49 The Committee also note that the Ministry have constituted Eight Quinquennial Review Teams (QRT) to review the functioning of the KVKs. The Committee are of the considered view that the QRTs should conduct frequent inspections of the KVKs and ensure that the objectives behind setting up of KVKs are achieved and the farmers are benefited. The Committee would, therefore, desire the Ministry of Agriculture to further strengthen the QRTs for closer scrutiny and more efficient functioning of KVKs.

CHAPTER II

REPRESENTATION FROM SHRI DHARMENDRA KUMAR SINGH COMPLAINING ABOUT NON-APPOINTMENT OF SHRI MANOJ KUMAR SINGH AS POSTAL ASSISTANT DESPITE HIS GETTING SELECTED FOR THE POST

2.1 Shri Dharmendra Kumar Singh, Village-Lakath, Chapra, Post-Yogiyan, Police Station Rasoolpur, District Saran, Bihar, has submitted a representation complaining therein about non-appointment of Shri Manoj Kumar Singh, as Postal Assistant despite his getting selected for the post.

2.2 In the said representation, the petitioner submitted as follows:—

“Shri Manoj Kumar Singh S/o Shri Radha Mohan Singh, Village— Nawada, P.O. Chenva, District Saran (Bihar) was selected for the post of Postal Assistant in the year 1994 under Siwan Sub-Division and an intimation to the said effect was given to Shri Singh through Post Master General Muzzafarpur *vide* Memo. No. R&E-04/93, dated 26.05.1994. Before giving appointment to the post of Postal Assistant, the educational certificates of Shri Singh were verified by the Postal Superintendent, Siwan. Besides doing his Police verification and Medical checkup Mr. Singh was found fully suitable in all tests. In spite of all these verifications and check ups, the appointment of Shri Singh was kept in abeyance on the pretext of checking his Memorandum of marks. About 12 years have elapsed but the appointment of Shri Singh has been kept pending on the pretext of checking Memorandum of Marks. Shri Singh had submitted his original Memorandum of Marks Sheet issued by Bihar School Examination Board and Bihar Intermediate Education Council, Bihar. Under such a situation there is no logic in checking the said certificates and even if, there was any necessity of checking the Marks Sheet, that could have been done after giving appointment to Shri Singh. The verification of any certificate can be completed within a few months. Although 12 years have elapsed since the selection of Shri Singh but the department has not yet completed the work of verification. It is clear from the aforesaid situation that the Department is intentionally harassing Shri Singh.”

2.3 He has further submitted that, the verification of the Marks Sheet has also been done by the prestigious vigilance Department of the Government and they have found them to be correct. They have submitted their Report in this regard also. Even then Shri Singh is being harassed in the name of reconducting of investigations. He has, therefore, requested to get the matter enquired so that Shri Manoj Kumar Singh could get his appointment.

2.4 The representation was taken up for examination by the Committee under Direction 95 of the Directions by the Speaker. The representation was forwarded to the Ministry of Communications and IT (Department of Posts) on 05/09/2006 for furnishing their comments on the issues raised therein.

2.5 In response, the Ministry of Communications and IT (Department of Posts) *vide* their O.M dated 20th September 2006 furnished the details of the case so obtained from the O/o Chief Post Master General, Bihar Circle, as follows:—

- “ (i) Applications were called for on 25.02.1993 to fill up 2 unreserved vacancies, 3 SC vacancies and 1 ST vacancy pertaining to the year 1992 in Siwan Postal Division in the cadre of Postal Assistant by direct recruitment. The recruitment rules in existence at that time provided for filling up of 50% of the vacancies by direct recruitment. The eligibility for direct recruitment was possession of educational qualification of 10+2 Standard or 12th class pass of a recognized University/Board of School Education/Board of Secondary Education by the candidate.
- (ii) Shri Manoj Kumar Singh was one of the applicants for unreserved vacancy who as per the documents submitted by him had obtained 743 marks out of 900 in Intermediate examination conducted by Bihar Intermediate Education Council, Patna.
- (iii) The candidates were selected on the basis of marks obtained in the Intermediate Examination. Wherever candidates possessed higher educational qualification due weightage was given.
- (iv) Based on the said criteria, Shri Manoj Kumar Singh was selected for appointment as Postal Assistant in the Siwan Postal Division.
- (v) The result was communicated to the selected candidates including Shri Manoj Kumar Singh on 26.05.1994.
- (vi) When asked for Shri Manoj Kumar Singh submitted following documents on 20.7.1994:—
 - (i) Original Certificate of Matriculation.
 - (ii) Marks Sheet of Matric Examination.
 - (iii) Marks Sheet of Intermediate Examination.
 - (iv) Marks Sheet of B.Sc. (Mathematics).
 - (v) Marks Sheet of M.Sc. (Mathematics).
- (vii) When Bihar Intermediate Education Council, Patna was approached for verifications of the Marks Sheet of Intermediate examination of the candidate, they informed on 19.10.1994 that the Marks Sheet was ‘incorrect’. Similar report was filed by Complaint Inspector of Siwan Postal Division on 20.10.1994.
- (viii) The matter was again referred to the BIEC when the candidate represented to SPOs, Siwan.

- (ix) BIEC informed *vide*. their letter dated 02.12.1994 “.... Verification report in respect of Manoj Kumar Singh Roll PAT No. 8014, Enlistment No. 14599/84 was sent to you as incorrect *vide*. this office letter No. 571/St/94 dated 19.10.1994 as the result the above candidate was pending. Now the result of the above candidate was cleared and verified as per records of the Council. The re-verification report and marks obtained by the above candidate as below...”. Thereby they confirmed the correctness of the Marks Sheet.
- (x) On seeking clarification by Siwan Division, BIEC clarified on 06.07.1995 that after issue of report—dated 19.10.1994 the candidate had challenged the report. On re-examination they found that pending result of the candidate which was subsequently cleared was not verified from the Security Tabulation Register inadvertently. They claimed that it was verified from the General Tabulation Register and verification report was not issued on the basis of Security T.R. . Thus they claimed that incorrect report was issued *vide*. letter dated 19.10.94 which was rectified later on *vide*. report dated 05.12.1994.
- (xi) As the result of the candidate was still pending on 19.10.1994 *i.e.* the date of issue of the first report sent by the Council which was cleared during 19.10.1994 to 05.12.1994 it was felt that there would not have been any Marks Sheet issued to the candidate prior to 19.10.1994. But the fact is that the candidate had applied for recruitment as Postal Assistant in the year 1993, claiming to have obtained 82.5% marks in Intermediate Examination and had also enclosed the attested copy of a Marks Sheet.
- (xii) BIEC again confirmed the correctness of the Certificate on 06.03.1997.
- (xiii) As the above events gave rise to suspicion Bihar Circle referred the matter to Cabinet Vigilance Department, Investigation Bureau, Government of Bihar on 05.05.1997 for thorough investigation.
- (xiv) Cabinet Vigilance after repeated reminders (24 nos.) even at the level of Chief PMG to Addl. Director General (Vigilance), responded after about 9 years on 28.04.2006 whereby they confirmed the correctness of the Marks Sheet of Shri Manoj Kumar Singh.
- (xv) But in the meantime in the year 1999 PMG Muzaffarpur reported to the Chief PMG, Bihar Circle *vide*. his letter dated 19.04.1999 that Sorting Assistant Supt. O/o the PMG, Muzaffarpur had visited concerned college where he found that the marks sheet of Shri Manoj Kumar Singh had been destroyed by white ants.
- (xvi) Another candidate Shri Binay Kumar Rajak’s Intermediate Marks Sheet was also under scrutiny. On 19.10.1994, the Council stated that his marks sheet was incorrect. But subsequently on 5.12.1994 and 6.3.1997 they reported that his marks sheet was correct. But the Cabinet vigilance in its final report dated 28.04.2006 has reported that the marks sheet of Shri Rajak is incorrect.

- (xvii) The Circle had the information that the concerned officer in the BIEC viz. Shri A.K. Upadhaya, Statistical Officer who was corresponding with them was found guilty of manipulation of certain records and had since been dismissed. He was chargesheeted by CBI too.
- (xviii) In view of above facts and circumstances the Circle office has entrusted the matter for investigation to CBI *vide*. their letter dated 24.05.2006.
- (xix) In the circumstances, Shri Manoj Kumar Singh has not been issued a formal offer of appointment so far.
- (xx) Shri Binay Kumar Rajak is the other candidate who has also not been issued any offer of appointment. If fact, he has approached CAT, Patna Bench in the matter.”

2.6 The Ministry of Communication and IT (Department of Post) *vide*. their subsequent O.M. dated 29.12.2006 further submitted that an offer of appointment to the Post of Postal Assistant was issued to Shri Manoj Kumar Singh on 30.11.2006. He has since reported for duty as Postal Assistant on 08.12.2006 Kuchaikot S.O. under Siwan Division.

Observations/Recommendations

2.7 The Committee note that the Siwan Postal Division, Department of Post, Ministry of Communications had invited applications on 25.02.1993 to fill up 2 unreserved vacancies, 3 SC vacancies and 1 ST vacancy pertaining to the year 1992, in the cadre of Postal Assistant, by direct recruitment. The extant recruitment rules provided for filling up of 50% of the vacancies by direct recruitment. One of the eligibility condition for direct recruitment was possession of educational qualification of 10+2 standard or 12th class pass of a recognized University/Board of School Education/Board of Secondary Education by the Candidate. The criteria for selection of the candidate was based on the marks obtained in the Intermediate Examination with due weightage for candidates possessing higher educational qualification(s).

2.8 The Committee further note that Shri Manoj Kumar Singh was one of the applicants for unreserved vacancy. Based on the said criteria, Shri Manoj Kumar Singh was selected for appointment as Postal Assistant in the Siwan Postal Division and the same was communicated to him on 26.05.1994.

2.9 The Committee also note that Shri Manoj Kumar Singh had submitted his original certificate of matriculation, Mark Sheets of Matric Examination, Intermediate Examination, B.Sc and M.Sc (Mathematics) examination on 20.07.1994. However, Bihar Intermediate Education Council (BIEC), Patna when approached for verification of Marks Sheet of Intermediate examination of the candidate, informed on 19.10.1994 that the Marks Sheet was ‘incorrect’. Similar report was filed by Complaints Inspector of Siwan Postal Division on 20.10.1994.

2.10 The Committee note with surprise that, it was only when the petitioner represented his case to Siwan Postal Office, Siwan, the matter was again referred to the BIEC which in response informed *vide*. their letter dated 5.12.1994 about the correctness of the marks sheet stating that, “ the verification report in respect of Shri Manoj Kumar Singh was sent to you as incorrect *vide*. this office letter dated 19.10.94 as the result of the candidate was pending. Now the result of the above candidate was cleared and verified as per records of the Council...”

2.11 The Committee note with concern that, the ordeal of the petitioner did not end despite submission of the correct report dated 05.12.1994 by the BIEC, Bihar Circle referred the matter to Cabinet Vigilance Department, Investigation Bureau, Government of Bihar on 05.05.1997 for thorough investigation on the grounds that BIEC reiterated that the result of the candidates was pending on 19.10.1994 and no marks sheet could have been issued. The BIEC, nevertheless confirmed the correctness of the marks sheet again on 06.03.1997.

2.12. The Committee also take serious objections to the way the Ministry proceeded in verifying the case of the petitioner especially in view of the fact that the petitioner had not only submitted his Intermediate Examination Marks Sheet, but also Marks Sheet of B.Sc. and M.Sc. Mathematics on 20.7.1994. This shows that, the petitioner was a post graduate, thus, the question of his Intermediate result being pending on 19.10.1994 and the same being cleared during 19.10.1994 to 5.12.1994 is not tenable, as pending result of Intermediate a candidate cannot seek admission in any graduate and then subsequently in a Post-Graduate Course.

2.13 The Committee are astonished to note that the Cabinet Vigilance Department, Government of Bihar took nine years to confirm the correctness of the marks sheet of the petitioner on 28.04.2006, that too after 25 reminders even at the level of Chief PMG to Additional Director General (Vigilance).

2.14 The Committee take serious note of the inexplicable non-performance of duty on the part of the Cabinet Vigilance Department, Government of Bihar. The Committee are also not satisfied with the clarification given by BIEC for incorrect verification report submitted in the first instance which was subsequently revised. The Committee strongly deprecate the callous approach of BIEC as well as cabinet vigilance department of Government of Bihar thereby causing iraparable sufferings and delay in the appointment of the Petitioner.

2.15 The Committee, therefore, like to recommend, that the matter may be enquired and the officials responsible for such lapse may be reprimanded and appropriate action taken against them. The Committee would like to be apprised of the action taken in this regard.

2.16 The Committee, however, note from the subsequent submission made by the Ministry that an offer of appointment to the Post of Postal Assistant was issued to Shri Manoj Kumar Singh on 30.11.2006. He has since reported for duty as Postal

Assistant on 08.12.2006 Kuchaikot S.O. under Siwan Division. The Committee notes with satisfaction that through their intervention, the petitioner's grievance has been finally redressed.

2.17 The Committee are, however, of the concerned view that though the petitioner was selected for the post of Postal Assistant in 1994 but, he could join only on 08.12.2006 i.e. after twelve years due to the negligence of the concerned Department. The Committee therefore, desire that the petitioner should not be put at disadvantageous position as compared to those appointed from the same panel. The Committee would like to be apprised of the conclusive action taken in the matter.

CHAPTER III

REPRESENTATION REGARDING IRREGULARITIES IN AWARDING DEALERSHIP/DISTRIBUTORSHIP BY OIL COMPANIES

3.1 The Committee had received a large number of Representation from various quarters regarding irregularities in awarding dealership/distributorship by the oil companies and other related issues. Some of the representation were examined by the Committee and their observation/recommendations in the matter were continued in 15th and 16th Reports of the Committee which were presented to the House on 23.05.2006 and 23.08.2006. In continuation thereof, the Committee have examined the following representations containing issues regarding alleged irregularities committed by the oil companies in awarding dealerships/distributorships at various locations:—

- (i) Representation from Shri Shailendra Kumar Singh, resident of Jaunpur, UP; and
- (ii) Representation from Shri Shyamlal Hambram, resident of District Hoogly, West Bengal.

3.2 The Committee took up the matter for examination in accordance with Direction 95 of the Directons by the Speaker, Lok Sabha and dealt with the above representations in the succeeding paragraphs.

3.3 Representation from Shri Shailendra Kumar Singh

3.3.1 In his representation, the petitioner stated that he applied for the retail outlet dealership at Martinganj, District Azamgarh which is reserved for physically handicapped persons. According to the petitioner, he is having academic qualifications as B.A., B.ED. Owns plot of land, fulfil the criteria of financial condition as advertised and has sufficient experience of the job. However, dealership was allotted to Smt. Geeta Tiwari violating the norms. The petitioner alleged that the selected candidate did not have the required academic qualifications or she did not own a plot of land or fulfil the financial criteria. Further she also submitted a false physically handicapped certificate as she is not physically handicapped. He has also alleged that the first and the second expanelled candidate did not have land at the advertised place.

The petitioner, therefore, requested that the matter may be investigated by an Impartial Committee and the dealership may be readvertised so that a qualified candidate would be selected.

3.3.2 The representation of the petitioner was referred to the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas (MOP&NG) on 13th June, 2006 for their comments on the points/issues raised by the petitioner in his representation. In their response,

MOP&NG *vide.* their communication dated 11th August, 2006 commented as follows:—

- “(i) As regards the allegations that proper evaluation not being done against different parameters of qualifications, land offered and financial position, the matter is under investigation.
- (ii) The matter is under investigation. However, the Medical Certificate produced by Smt. Geeta Tiwari, the first empanelled candidate, it was verified and confirmed to be genuine by the Chief Medical Officer, Azamgarh during investigation of an earlier complaint with the same allegation.
- (iii) It is a fact that earlier, the parameters of evaluation were not indicated in the advertisement inviting applications for RO dealership. However, with effect from 1.11.2005, to bring more transparency, IOCL has started publishing the parameters for evaluation of selection. However, IOC has confirmed that the parameters of evaluation remained the same, then and now.
- (iv) Allegation of irregularities in the land offered by the candidates is being investigated by IOCL and suitable necessary action will be taken by IOCL as per their policy.”

3.3.3 The Committee undertook oral evidence of the representatives of the MOP&NG at their sitting held on 15.02.2007. On being asked about the status of the case, the witness from the IOCL stated as under:—

“Sir when the investigation was conducted on the complaint of Shri Shailendra Kumar, it was found that marking was not done properly and we regretted for that. The empanelled has been cancelled and the disciplinary action has been initiated against the guilty officers and stringent action will be taken against them. We are not conducting re-interview there and we have dropped that location.”

3.3.4 In their latest status report on the representation from the petitioner, the MOP&NG *vide.* their communication dated 13th February, 2007, stated as under:—

- “(i) Regarding the case of Shri Shailendra Kumar Singh, IOC has reported that the proposed re-interview could not be held as BPCL has commissioned a new RO in the close vicinity of the subject location, thus making the same economically unviable.
- (ii) Retail outlet at location Martinganj, Distt. Azamgarh under 'PH' category is not found feasible, hence, the re-interview for the location could not be done. As regards the development of RO at Zhakiya, distt. Siddharthnagar since RO location is found feasible for the development of retail outlet, the re-interviews has been planned on 27.02.2007. Process for initiating action as per Conduct, Discipline & Appeal rules of the Corporation has been initiated by IOCL against erring members of the DSC.”

Observations/Recommendations

3.3.5 The Committee note that petitioner applied for retail outlet dealership at Martinganj, District Azamgarh, Uttar Pradesh. According to the petitioner, the retail outlet was meant for physically handicapped persons. He fulfilled all the conditions of eligibility for retail outlet dealership. However, the petitioner alleged that the dealership was allotted to Smt. Geeta Tiwari violating the norms. The petitioner also alleged Smt. Geeta Tiwari submitted a false physically handicapped certificate and she did not fulfil the criteria for selection of dealership for the said outlet. The first and second empanelled candidate did not have the land at the advertise location.

3.3.6 The Committee further note that the complaint from the petitioner was investigated by the company and it was found that proper evaluation was not done against the different parameters of the qualifications, land offered and the financial position etc. and as a result thereof the panel formed for the purpose was cancelled. Disciplinary action has also been initiated against the officers responsible for the same. The medical certificate produced by Smt. Geeta Tiwari, the first empanelled candidate was verified and confirmed to be genuine by the Chief Medical Officer, Azamgarh during investigation of an earlier complaint with the same allegation. However, the matter is under investigation as informed by the Ministry. The Committee were informed that it is a fact earlier the parameters of evaluation were not indicated in the advertisement inviting application for RO dealership. However, w.e.f. 1st November, 2005, to bring more transparency IOCL has started publishing the parameters for evaluation of selection for retail outlet. However, there is no change in the parameters of evaluation and remained the same then and now. The Committee were also informed that the aforesaid location has been dropped and no re-interview for the same is being conducted. As BPCL has commissioned a new RO in the close vicinity of the subject location and making the same economically unviable.

3.3.7 The Committee regret to note that the select list for the retail outlet dealership has to be cancelled due to wrong evaluation of the parameters by the Selection Committee. The petitioner could have been selected further RO if the parameters for the selection of the candidates would have been evaluated as per the norms/guidelines. However, the Committee are satisfied that the company had taken the corrective action by cancelling the select panel and initiating disciplinary action against the erring officers of the Selection Committee. The Committee desire that the petitioner may be given priority in the selection of RO dealership if there is any proposal to open retail outlet at the new location with economic viability. In view of this, the Committee do not wish to pursue the matter further.

3.4 Representation from Shri Shyamlal Hambram

3.4.1 In his representation, the petitioner stated that Bharat Petroleum Corporation Limited (BPCL) inviting applications from the Scheduled Castes category for the dealership of A-Site retail outlet at Singoor, Distt. Hooghly, West Bengal through

an advertisement. He applied for the said dealership and was interviewed on 19.11.2001. He ranked top in the panel for the allotment of the said retail outlet dealership and was issued Letter of Intent (LOI) on 05.12.2001. In pursuance thereof, he submitted his resignation to his employer which was accepted on 1st January, 2002 and informed Territory Manager (Retail) Kolkata accordingly. However, BPCL has not taken any step to establish and operate the said RO. According to the petitioner he is facing problem to earn his livelihood due to non-establishment and non-operation of the said RO. The petitioner has alleged that BPCL has not arranged the plot of land for the development of A-site RO dealership under the Corpus Fund Scheme and pressurizing him to arrange land for them on long term lease basis. The petitioner, therefore, requested that BPCL may be directed to take measures in the matter and A-site RO may be setup at Singour and the commissioned thereby to manage his livelihood.

3.4.2 The representation of the petitioner was referred to the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas (MOP&NG) on 13th June, 2006 for their comments on the points/issued raised by the petitioner in his representation. In their response, MOP&NG *vide* their communication dated 11th August, 2006 commented as follows:—

“BPCL had advertised 4 times in the news papers for the land. However, only in response to their fourth advertisement, offers of two plots of land had come. But the land was not found technically suitable. Fifth advertisement was given on 21-2-2006 but no response was received. The Corporation is now approaching the District Administration for allotment of Government land for running the RO. BPCL is also being asked to examine whether any near by temporary Company-Owned-Company-Opened (COCO) ROs may be offered to the LOI holder as per existing COCO policy of BPCL.”

3.4.3 The Committee under took oral evidence of the representatives of the MOP&NG at their sitting held on 15.02.2007. During the course of oral evidence, the witness from BPCL stated as under:—

“In respect of this case, we have advertised for land in the paper more than ten times and have also contacted the Collector five times. We still not been able to get and also this candidate has gone to the court and the court's ruling was:

'The oil company has been sincerely trying to get a piece of land as will be evident from the several advertisements published from time to time. It has given the petitioner liberty to inform about the availability of a suitable land for setting up the outlet. For these reasons, I find no scope to give any relief to the petitioner in exercise of writ power.'

That is one thing. But in the meantime many States have given instructions that for SC/ST candidates. That should be offered to them.”

The witness from the Ministry also mentioned as under:—

“It has been mentioned that apart from candidates belonging to Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, for others also the Ministry takes a very compassionate view.”

Observations/Recommendations

3.4.4 The Committee note that the petitioner applied for the dealership of A-Site retail outlet at Singhoor District Hooghly, West Bengal in response to an advertisement by BPCL. The RO was meant for Scheduled Castes category. He was interviewed and selected for the allotment of RO dealership. However, the said RO could not be set up and commissioned. As alleged by the petitioner, BPCL failed to arrange the plot of land for the development of the said RO under the Corpus Fund Scheme. The Committee further note that BPCL had advertised ten times in the newspaper for the land and also contacted the District Collector 5 times. However, inspite of that BPCL could not get the requisite plot of land. In response to their fourth advertisement two plots of land were offered but the same were not found technically suitable. According to the Ministry, the BPCL has also been asked to examine whether any nearby temporary Company-Owned-Company-Operated (COCO) ROs could be offered to the petitioner as per existing COCO policy of BPCL. During the course of evidence, it was revealed that the petitioner had gone to the Court but no relief was given to him.

3.4.5 Keeping in view of the fact that the said RO was meant for the weaker section of the society, concerted and sincere efforts need to be under taken by the oil company, notwithstanding the ruling of the Court in the case, to arrange the plot of land for the development of A-Site RO dealership so that the petitioner who is unemployed may not be allowed to suffer without a source of livelihood. Meanwhile, an alternative arrangement for temporary allotment of COCO RO to the petitioner also need to be examined expeditiously by the company as asked by the Ministry. In view of this the Committee would not like to pursue the matter further. However the Committee would like the apprised of the action taken by the oil company in the matter.

NEW DELHI;
20 March, 2007

29 Phalgun, 1928 (Saka)

PRABHUNATH SINGH,
Chairman,
Committee on Petitions.

MINUTES OF THE FIFTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS
(FOURTEENTH LOK SABHA)

The Committee on Petitions sat on Monday, 18th October, 2004 from 1500 to 1550 hrs. in Committee Room No. 53, First Floor, Parliament House, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri Prabhunath Singh—*Chairman*

MEMBERS

2. Shri Nandkumar Singh Chauhan
3. Shri N.S.V. Chittan
4. Mohd. Mukeem
5. Shri Dharmendra Pradhan
6. Shri Damodar Barku Shingda
7. Shri Vijoy Krishna

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri R.C. Ahuja — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shri Brahm Dutt — *Director*
3. Shri R.K. Bajaj — *Under Secretary*

WITNESSES

*Representatives of the Ministry of Agriculture
(Department of Agricultural Research and Education)*

1. Dr. Mangala Rai — Secretary (DARE) &
Director General, ICAR
2. Dr. P. Das — Deputy Director General
(Agriculture Extension)
3. Dr. B.S. Hansara — Assistant Director General
(Agriculture Extension)

2. At the outset, the Chairman welcomed the representatives of the Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Agricultural Research and Education) and drew their attention to Direction 55 (1) of the Directions by the Speaker regarding confidentiality of the proceedings.

3. Thereafter, the Chairman and Members of the Committee sought clarifications on the representation requesting to enquire about the delay in the opening of Krishi Vigyan Kendra (KVK) at Jalalpur, Bihar.

4. The following important points were discussed by the Committee:—

- (i) The guidelines/criteria being followed for opening a KVK at a particular Place/State.

- (ii) The main objectives for opening of a KVK.
- (iii) The reasons for non-functioning of KVK located at Jahanabad.
- (iv) The latest position in regard to completion and operation of KVK sanctioned for Siwan.
- (v) The number of KVKs at present functioning in the State of Bihar/other States.
- (vi) The recommendations/findings submitted by the Rajendra Agricultural University in its Report.
- (vii) The reasons for setting up a KVK at Manjhi Farm in place of Jalalpur village.
- (viii) Role and response of the Government of Bihar in regard to acquisition of land etc.

5. The Committee directed the witnesses to send written replies to some of the points on which replies were not readily available with them during the evidence.

6. A copy of the verbatim proceedings of the sitting of the Committee has been kept on record.

The witnesses then withdrew.

The committee then adjourned.

MINUTES OF THE EIGHTEENTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE ON
PETITIONS (FOURTEENTH LOK SABHA)

The Committee on Petitions sat on Wednesday, 15th June, 2005 from 1200 to
1305 hrs. in Committee Room No. 63, First Floor, Parliament House, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri Prabhunath Singh — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

2. Shri N.S.V. Chitthan
3. Shri Suresh Kurup
4. Mohd. Mukeem
5. Shri Vijoy Krishna

SECRETARIAT

Shri Brahm Dutt — *Director*

WITNESSES

Representatives of the State Government of Bihar

1. Shri R.S. Tiwary — Commissioner & Secretary,
Tourism Department
2. Shri Navin Verma — Secretary, Human Resources
(Secondary Education) Department
3. Shri K.D. Sinha — Agricultural Production Commissioner
4. Shri R.P. Singh — Director, Agriculture
5. Shri Daya Kant Mishra — Joint Secretary, Department of Revenue

2. At the outset, the Chairman welcomed the representatives of the State Government of Bihar and drew their attention to Direction 55 (1) of the Directions by the Speaker regarding confidentiality of the proceedings.

3. Thereafter, the Committee took evidence of the representatives of the State Government of Bihar.

(i) ** ** *

(ii) ** ** *

(iii) Representation requesting to enquire about the delay in opening up of
Krishi Vigyan Kendra (KVK) at Jalalpur, Bihar.

4. The following important points were discussed by the Committee:—

(i) ** ** *

(ii) ** ** *

- (iii) Reasons for delay in giving of land at Manjhi farms to Rejendra Krishi Vidyalaya for setting up a K.V.K.

5. The Committee directed the witnesses to send written replies to some of the points/information on which replies were not readily available with them during the evidence, at the earliest.

6. The Committee also decided that a communication may go to the Chief Secretary, Government of Bihar for early action in regard to Gautam Sthan and KVK at Manjhi.

7. A copy of the verbatim proceedings of the sitting of the Committee was kept on record.

The witnesses then withdrew.

The Committee then adjourned.

MINUTES OF THE THIRTY FIFTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE ON
PETITIONS (FOURTEENTH LOK SABHA)

The Committee on Petitions sat on Monday, 10th April, 2006 from 1400 hrs. to 1640 hrs. in Committee Room No. 53, First Floor, Parliament House, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri Prabhunath Singh — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

2. Shri Raj Babbar
3. Shri Nandkumar Singh Chauhan
4. Dr. M. Jagannath
5. Mohd. Mukeem
6. Shri Vijoy Krishna

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri A.K. Singh — *Director*
2. Shri U.B.S. Negi — *Under Secretary*

WITNESSES

*Representatives of the Ministry of Agriculture
(Department of Agricultural Research & Education)*

1. Dr. Mangala Rai — Secretary
2. Smt. Sushma Nath — Additional Secretary (DARE) &
Secretary (ICAR)
3. Dr. P. Das — Deputy Director General.
(Agriculture Extension)
4. Dr. R. Prasad — Assistant Director General.
(Agriculture Extension)

*Ministry of Human Resource Development
(Department of Secondary & Higher Education)*

1. Shri K.M. Acharya — Additional Secretary
2. Shri S.C. Khuntia — Joint Secretary
3. Shri Kamal Chowdhery — Director

Kendriya Vidyalaya Sangathan (KVS)

1. Shri R.L. Jamuda — Commissioner
2. Shri Rajvir Singh — Deputy Commissioner (Pers.)

Ministry of Shipping, Road Transport & Highways

- | | | | |
|----|------------------------|---|--|
| 1. | Shri L.K. Joshi | — | Secretary |
| 2. | Shri Indu Prakash | — | Director General,
Ministry of Road Transport & Highways |
| 3. | Shri V.K. Sinha | — | Additional Director General-II |
| 4. | Shri Arun Kumar Sharma | — | Chief Engineer (P-3) |
| 5. | Shri V.L. Patankar | — | Superintending Engineer (P-3) |

National Highways Authority of India

1. Shri Santosh Nautiyal — Chairman
2. Shri Nirmal Jit Singh — Member (Technical)
3. Shri Mahesh Kumar — CGM
4. Shri B.N. Singh — CGM

Government of Bihar, Road Construction Department, Bihar

- | | | | |
|----|-----------------------|---|------------------------------------|
| 1. | Shri R.K. Singh | — | Secretary |
| 2. | Shri Sheo Darshan Ram | — | Chief Engineer (National Highways) |

*Representatives of Ministry of Tourism & Culture
(Department of Tourism)*

- | | | | |
|----|----------------------|---|---------------------|
| 1. | Shri A.K.Mishra | — | Secretary (T) |
| 2. | Shri Amitabh Kant | — | Joint Secretary (T) |
| 3. | Shri V.K. Bajaj | — | ADG |
| 4. | Shri Atul Chaturvedi | — | Director (T) |
| 5. | Smt. Leena Nandan | — | Director (T) |
| 6. | Shri Gajender Kumar | — | Asstt. DG |
| 7. | Shri Naresh Kumar | — | Under Secretary |

2. At the outset, the Chairman welcomed the representatives of Ministry of Tourism & Culture (Department of Tourism) and drew their attention to Direction 55 (1) of the Directions by the Speaker regarding confidentiality of the proceedings. The Chairman also drew attention to Direction 95 which clearly stipulates that the Committee shall also meet as often as necessary to consider representations, letters, telegrams from various individuals, associations etc. which are not covered by the rules relating to petitions and give directions for their disposals,

3. ** ** *

4. ** ** *

5. The representatives of the Ministry of Tourism & Culture then withdrew and representatives of the Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Agricultural Research & Education) took their seats.

6. Thereafter, the Committee took evidence of the representatives of the Ministry of Agriculture on the representation requesting to enquire about the delay in opening up of Krishi Vigyan Kendra (KVK) at Jalalpur, Bihar.

7. The following important points were discussed by the Committee:—

- (i) details of the latest factual position in regard to opening of KVK at Jalalpur;
- (ii) latest position regarding transfer of land for setting up of KVK at Manjhi;
- (iii) reasons for sanction of KVK to a NGO at Khagaria;
- (iv) latest progress made in setting up of KVKs at Saupaul (Pipra), Kakhisarai (Halsi), Araria, Aurangabad (Siris), Jehanabad (Makhdumpur), Buxar district, Gopalganj, Arwal etc.;
- (v) details of guidelines/criteria being followed for opening a KVK at a particular place/State.

8. The representatives of the Ministry of Agriculture then withdrew and representatives of the Ministry of Human Resource Development (Department of Secondary & Higher Education) took their seats.

9. ** ** *

The witnesses then withdrew.

15. A copy of the verbatim proceedings of the sitting of the Committee was kept on record.

The Committee then adjourned.

MINUTES OF THE FIFTY SECOND SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE ON
PETITIONS (FOURTEENTH LOK SABHA)

The Committee on Petitions sat on Thursday, 15th February, 2007 from 1500 hrs. to
1650 hrs. in Committee Room No. 62, First Floor, Parliament House, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri Prabhunath Singh — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

2. Shri N.S.V. Chitthan
3. Shri Wangyuh W. Konyak
4. Adv. Suresh Kurup
5. Shri Kishan Singh Sangwan
6. Shri Paras Nath Yadav

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri J.P. Sharma — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shri A.K. Singh — *Director*
3. Shri U.B.S. Negi — *Under Secretary*

WITNESSES

Ministry of Petroleum & Natural Gas

1. Shri M.S. Srinivasan — Secretary
2. Shri D.N. Narasimha Raju — Joint Secretary
3. Shri Sanjay Gupta — Deputy Secretary
4. Shri G.C. Daga — Director (Marketing), IOCL
5. Shri S. Radhakrishnan — Director (Marketing), IOCL
6. Shri A.M.K. Sinha — Executive Director (RS), IOCL
7. Shri S. Krishnamurthy — Executive Director (Retail), BPCL

Ministry of Urban Development

1. Shri M. Rajami — Joint Secretary
2. Ms. Aparna — Director (DD)
3. Shri Dinesh Rai — Vice Chairman, DDA
4. Shri V.K. Sadhu — Principal Commissioner, DDA
5. Dr. S.P. Bansal — Additional Commissioner (Planning), DDA
6. Shri S.P. Pathak — Director (TYA) Planning Wing, DDA
7. Shri Pankaj Kumar — Deputy Director (CL), DDA
8. Shri A.K. Roy — Deputy Chief Engineer, Delhi Metro Corpn.

Ministry of Defence

Shri Harcharanjit Singh — Secretary (BRDB)

SPECIAL INVITEE

1. Capt. Jai Narayan Prasad Nishad, M.P. (Rajya Sabha)
2. Shri Mohd. Mukeem, MP

2. At the outset, Chairman welcomed the representatives of the Ministry of petroleum and Natural Gas, Ministry of Urban Development and Ministry of Defence and drew their attention to Direction 55(1) of the Directions by the Speaker, Lok Sabha regarding confidentiality of the proceedings. The Chairman also drew attention to Direction 95 which clearly stipulates that the Committee shall also meet as often as necessary to consider representations, letters, telegrams from various individuals, associations etc. which are not covered by the rules relating to petitions and give directions for their disposals.

3. The Committee took oral evidence of the representatives of the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas, Ministry of Urban Development and Ministry of Defence on the following representations:—

- (i) Representation from Capt. T.R. Taneja of Udai Park, New Delhi and forwarded by Capt. Jai Narayan Prasad Nishad, MP (Rajya Sabha) regarding shifting of site of petrol pump of M/s. Taneja Service Station from Jhilmil Industrial Area, G.T. Road, Shahdara, Delhi;
- (ii) Representation from Smt. Suprabha of village Shekhpura, District Sonpath requesting to enquire into the irregularities done in allotment of petrol pump situated at Gannaur Railway Road (Haryana);
- (iii) Representation from Smt. Sushila Kumari of District Jind regarding appointment of operators for IOC Kisan Sewa Kendra at village Hat, District Jind (Haryana);
- (iv) Representation from Shri Shailendra Kumar Singh of Jaunpur (UP) and forwarded by Mohd. Mukeem, MP alleging about irregularities done in awarding retail outlet dealership at Martinganj, District Azamgarh (UP);
- (v) Representation from Shri Devendra Singh of Varanasi (UP) and forwarded by Mohd. Mukeem, MP alleging about irregularities done in awarding fleet operator retail outlet at Jhakiaya, District Sidharth Nagar (UP);
- (vi) Representation from Shri Shyamlal Hembram of Malipanch Dhara, District Hoogli (West Bengal) and forwarded by Mohd. Mukeem, MP regarding non-establishment of A-site retail outlet dealership in Singoor, District Hoogli (West Bengal);
- (vii) Representation from Dr. K.P. Chaudhry of Tehsil Itwa (UP) and countersigned by Mohd. Mukeem, MP alleging about irregularities done in award of dealership of IOCL at Itwa, District Siddharth Nagar;

- (viii) Representation from Shri Binay Kumar Agarwal of District Dhanbad regarding amendment in partnership deed in respect of S.K.O. dealership of IOC for Katras Area, District Dhanbad (Jharkhand); and
- (ix) Representation from Shri M.L. Jain, a retired officer of IOCL, requesting for release of his promotion order with retrospective effect.

**

**

**

IV. Representation from Shri Shailendra Kumar Singh of Jaunpur (UP) and forwarded by Mohd. Mukeem, MP alleging about irregularities done in awarding retail outlet dealership at Martinganj, District Azamgarh (UP)

The Committee was informed by the Ministry that the complaint of the petitioner was investigated and found that marking was not done properly. The panel had been cancelled and disciplinary action had been initiated against the guilty officer. The petitioner may be granted priority for dealership if an alternate site is considered after determining its commercial viability of the location.

**

**

**

VI. Representation from Shri Shyamlal Hambaram of Malipanch Dhara, District Hoogli (West Bengal) and forwarded by Mohd. Mukeem, MP regarding non-establishment of A-Site retail outlet dealership in Singoor, District Hoogli (West Bengal)

The Committee were informed that BPCL had advertised ten times in the newspaper for the land and also contacted the District Collector 5 time. However, inspite of that BPCL could not get the requisite plot of land. During the course of evidence, it was revealed that the petitioner had gone to the Court but no relief was given to him.

**

**

**

4. The Committee asked the witness to send the replies on points or demands which were not supplied or readily available with them during the evidence, within the stipulated period.

5. A copy of the verbatim proceedings of the sitting of the Committee was kept on record.

The witnesses then withdrew.

The Committee then adjourned.

MINUTES OF THE FIFTY FOURTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE ON
PETITIONS (FOURTEENTH LOK SABHA)

The Committee on Petitions sat on Tuesday, the 20th March 2007 from 1500 hours to 1530 hours in Chairman's Room No. 45(II) Ground Floor, Parliament House, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri Prabhunath Singh — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

2. Shri N.S.V. Chitthan
3. Shri Anant Gangaram Geete
4. Shri C. Kuppasami
5. Shri Dharmendra Pradhan
6. Shri Kishan Singh Sangwan
7. Shri Jyotiraditya M. Scindia

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri A. K. Singh — *Director*
2. Shri U.B.S. Negi — *Deputy Secretary*
3. Shri H.R. Kamboj — *Deputy Secretary-II*
4. Shri V.P. Gupta — *Under Secretary*
5. Smt. Jagriti Tewatia — *Committee Officer*

2. The Committee considered the draft Twenty Fourth, Twenty Fifth and Twenty Sixth Reports and adopted the same with slight modifications.

3. The Committee decided to undertake on-the-spot study tour to Ranchi, Kolkata and Guwahati from 16th April to 20th April, 2007.

4. The Committee also authorised the Chairman to finalise and present the Reports to the House.

The Committee then adjourned.