

>

Title: Observation regarding combined discussion on statutory resolution disapproving the ordinance and consideration of Criminal Law (Amendment) Bill, 2013.

MADAM SPEAKER: Hon. Members, Prof. Saugata Roy raised a Point of Order under Article 123 (2) of the Constitution contending that the Statutory Resolution for disapproval of the Criminal Law (Amendment) Ordinance 2013 should be taken up first and disposed of before taking up the Criminal Law (Amendment) Bill, 2013 for consideration and passing.

Article 123 (2) gives a right to Members to give notice of Statutory Resolution for disapproval of an Ordinance promulgated by the President. Dr. Bhola Singh, Shri Gurudas Dasgupta and Prof. Saugata Roy gave notices of Statutory Resolutions for disapproval of Criminal Law (Amendment) Ordinance, 2013. Dr. Bhola Singh's notice being first in point of time, his name is in the first place against Item No. 21 of today's Revised List of Business, that is, Statutory Resolution. Since resolutions of the three Members are identical, all three cannot be called to speak at the beginning of the discussion. As the Statutory Resolution has been moved by the Member whose name is in first place, other two Members shall get a chance when the turn of their Party comes. This has been the established practice of the House.

It has been a convention of the House that combined discussions on items are taken up if the subject matters of items are such that the items can be conveniently discussed together. This convention has evolved in order to save precious time of the House and to avoid repetition of arguments in the House.

I may further inform that the Business Advisory Committee decided in their meeting held on 13<sup>th</sup> March, 2013 that a combined discussion may be held on these two items. In any case, the Statutory Resolution would be disposed of before the motion for consideration of the Bill is put to vote.

I, therefore, hold that the point of order is out of order.