

**Detailed Agenda Note for 19<sup>th</sup> Bi-annual Review Meeting with Nodal Secretaries on implementation of MPLADS to be held on 18<sup>th</sup> January 2016 in the Ground Floor Conference Hall of MoSPI.**

**(A) (A.1) Pending C&AG Audit Paras**

Comptroller and Auditor General of India has submitted Audit Report No. 31 of 2010-11 on Performance Audit of MPLADS covering 128 District Authorities of 35 States/UTs for the period 2004-05 to 2008-09. The audit observations as contained in C&AG Report have pointed out violation of Guidelines on various aspects as well as certain irregularities in implementation of the scheme by the District Authorities/Implementing Agencies.

The Performance Audit Report was forwarded to all the States/UTs vide this Ministry's letter dated 18.04.2011 requesting the Chief Secretaries of the States/UTs to direct the District Authorities to furnish the Action Taken Report followed by repeated reminders with request to take urgent corrective measures on the issues raised in C&AG report.

The matter was also taken up in the review meetings of MPLADS with State Government officers and District Magistrates held on 26.02.2013, 20.11.2013 & 23.02.2015 and the state governments were requested to expedite (a) necessary action to get the paras settled as per rules and (b) in case of facts pointing towards malafide violations of guidelines and financial malfeasance, to take appropriate action under law and report on action taken in a time-bound manner.

Complete replies from 17 States/UTs, namely, Arunachal Pradesh, Gujarat, Haryana, Jammu & Kashmir, Kerala, Manipur, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Nagaland, Punjab, Sikkim, Chandigarh, Daman & Diu, Delhi, Dadra & Nagar Haveli, Lakshadweep and Puducherry have been received.

Replies received from the 18 States/UTs have been found to be incomplete in respect of Paras mentioned against each State/UT - Andhra Pradesh (**paras- 7.1.1(i); Assam (paras- 4.3, 6.4 & 6.7); Bihar (paras- 4.3, 4.4.2 & 6.7); Chhattisgarh (para- 6.2.2); Goa (para- 3.4); Himachal Pradesh (para- 6.7); Jharkhand ( paras – 3.4, 4.3(iii), 4.4.1 & 6.2.2); Karnataka ( paras- 3.3 & 4.3(i)(iii) ); Madhya Pradesh ( paras- 3.3, 4.6, 6.2.2(ii), 6.2.3 (A)(D) & 6.7); Maharashtra (paras-3.4, 4.3 & 4.2.1); Odisha (paras – 3.4, 4.3(iv), 6.2.2(ii) & 6.2.3(F); Rajasthan (paras – 3.3 & 3.4); Tamil Nadu ( para- 6.7); Uttar Pradesh (paras-3.3, 4.3 & 6.7); Uttarakhand (para- 3.3); Tripura (para 4.3); West Bengal (paras – 3.4, 4.3(iii)(iv), 4.4.1 & 6.7); A & N Islands (paras 3.3 & 4.3). Details are given at **Annexure I.****

Of the above mentioned Audit Paras there are five Audit Paras of **serious nature**, namely, Para 3.3 (Selection of prohibited works); Para 3.4 (Execution of works for Society/Trusts; Para 4.3 (Delay in execution of works); Para 6.4 (Diversion of funds) and Para 6.7 (Contingency expenses).

***The States are requested to examine the irregularities pointed out by the C&AG expeditiously and furnish the Action Taken Notes (ATNs) on PRIORITY basis to enable this Ministry to furnish Action Taken Notes to C&AG.***

It may also be noted that DG Audit, in reference to the action taken notes on the C&AG audit paras, has advised the Ministry to ensure better delivery of the Scheme by strengthening the mechanisms and ensuring better compliance by improving the follow-up action with the District Authorities/State Governments.

**Accordingly, vide Ministry's Circular No. C-16/2011-MPLADS-(Vol.I) dated 06.11.2015 the State Governments/District Authorities have been requested to take the due cognizance of DG Audit's advised and also requested to:**

- (i) ensure qualitative, rule-bound and timely implementation of the MPLAD Scheme; and
- (ii) not to treat cases of infringement of rules or guidelines as settled unless and until the necessary appropriate action is duly completed.

**(A.2) Action Taken Replies – PAC 55<sup>th</sup> Report on MPLAD Scheme – additional list of points.**

The Action Taken Replies (ATRs) on observations/recommendations of the PAC contained in the 55<sup>th</sup> Report (2011-12) (15<sup>th</sup> Lok Sabha) on MPLADS duly vetted by the Office of C&AG were forwarded to Lok Sabha Secretariat (PAC Branch) in September, 2013.

The Lok Sabha Secretariat (PAC Branch) has recently conveyed additional list of points arising out of ATRs of the Ministry on 55<sup>th</sup> Report of the PAC on MPLADS.

***The additional points in respect of which information from the States are required are as below:-***

**PAC Para 11 (C&AG Para 4.4.1) pertaining to West Bengal:** In the status report submitted to the Ministry, the District Magistrate, South 24-Parganas have informed that the culprits were arrested and have been granted bail by the court and the matter is under sub judice. The District Magistrate, South 24-Parganas / Government of West Bengal are requested to keep the Ministry informed in the matter from time to time.

**PAC Para 6 (C&AG Para 6.6) pertaining to Andaman & Nicobar Islands and Hyderabad:** With reference to C&AG Para 6.6, the Andaman & Nicobar Administration is requested to specify the amount recovered and the amount yet to be recovered.

**(b) Closure of accounts**

**(b.1) Distribution of unspent balance of 14<sup>th</sup> Lok Sabha Members and closure of accounts**

Nodal Departments of the States/UTs for MPLAD Scheme were requested to collect the information about the unspent/uncommitted balances available with the District Authorities after completion of all sanctioned works of 14<sup>th</sup> Lok Sabha and complete the process of distribution of unspent/uncommitted balances by 31<sup>st</sup> December, 2010.

All the states except Bihar have completed the process of distribution of funds among the sitting MPs of 15<sup>th</sup> Lok Sabha. However, despite several reminders to the Nodal Secretary, the information from the State of Bihar is still awaited.

With a view to close the account upto 14<sup>th</sup> Lok Sabha, all Nodal State Authorities were requested vide this Ministry's letter dated 16.03.2011 followed by reminders dated 31.03.2011, 30.06.2011, 15.12.2011, 06.07.2012, 27.05.2013, 05.07.2013, 02.04.2014, 22.08.2014, 01.09.2014, 11.02.2015, 29.07.2015, 14.08.2015 and 19.10.2015 to issue directions to all the District Authorities to send Monthly Progress Reports showing unspent balance as **ZERO** along with the Final Utilization Certificate and the Final Audit Certificate.

State-wise details of closure of saving bank accounts upto 14<sup>th</sup> Lok Sabha MPs is given at **Annexure II**.

***All Nodal State Authorities are again requested to issue directions to all the District Authorities to send Monthly Progress Reports showing unspent balance as ZERO along with the Final Utilization Certificate and the Final Audit Certificate to the Ministry.***

**(b.2) Completion of work of 15th Lok Sabha MPs and closure of accounts.**

Para 3.11 of the Guidelines on MPLADS stipulates that all works for which recommendations are received in the office of the District Authority till the last date of the term of the MP are to be executed, provided these are as per norms and within the entitlement of MPLADS funds of the MP.

Para 3.12 of the Guidelines stipulates that all recommended eligible works should be sanctioned within 75 days from the date of receipt of the recommendation, after completing all formalities. The District Authority shall, however, inform MPs regarding rejection, if any, within 45 days from the date of receipt of recommendations, with reasons thereof. In case of the time limits mentioned in the section falling within the period of operation of model code of conduct notified by the Election Commission, then such period as notified by model code of conduct will not be included in the reckoning of time limits.

Para 4.10.1 of the Guidelines stipulates that the work of MPLADS shall be completed within 18 months from the date of demitting office in case of Rajya Sabha MPs or dissolution of the Lok Sabha. District Authorities shall settle and close the account of the concerned MP after completing all other formalities in another 3 months time, under intimation to the Govt. of India and with detailed information in the Monthly Progress Report (MPR). If the District Authority does not finish the projects within 18 months of demitting of an MP or dissolution of Lok Sabha, the District Authority will be required to complete the balance work out of State/District funds. In no case, any extension will be given and District Authority shall be held responsible in case of any lapse in this regard.

Balances of MPLADS funds left by the predecessor MPs (funds not committed for the works of the predecessor MP) have to be distributed amongst successor MPs as per provisions of Guidelines on MPLADS.

***The Nodal Secretaries of the States/UTs are requested to direct the District Authorities of their State/UT to adhere to the provisions of the Guidelines and to take time bound action for completion of works in time, distribution of unspent balances and closure of accounts.***

**(b.3) Distribution of unspent funds of Rajya Sabha Members**

It has been noticed from the Monthly Progress Reports received from the District Authorities and Performance Audit Reports received from them that a large amount of unspent balance of MPLADS funds of the ex-Rajya Sabha MPs is awaiting distribution amongst the successor Rajya Sabha MPs despite the provision of distribution contained in MPLADS Guidelines and the circulars issued by this Ministry from time to time. The issue relating to the distribution of unspent balance is also repeatedly clarified during training workshops, review meetings etc. However, these provisions of guidelines regarding distribution of unspent balance of Rajya Sabha MPs are not being adhered properly.

641 number of accounts in respect of ex-Rajya Sabha MPs are still alive. Details are given at **Annexure III**. Action for completion of works, if any, and closure of account is to be taken as per provisions of Guidelines.

Para 4.10.1 stipulates that the work of MPLADS shall be completed within 18 months from the date of demitting office in case of Rajya Sabha MPs or dissolution of the Lok Sabha. District Authorities shall settle and close the account of the concerned MP after completing all other formalities in another 3 months time, under intimation to the Govt. of India and with detailed information in the Monthly Progress Report (MPR). If the District Authority does not finish the projects within 18 months of demitting office by an MP or dissolution of Lok Sabha, the District

Authority will be required to complete the balance work out of State/District funds. In no case, any extension will be given and District Authority shall be held responsible in case of any lapse in this regard.

***The Nodal Secretaries of the States are requested to direct the District Authorities of their States to adhere to the provisions of the Guidelines, furnish report of the distribution of unspent balance regularly in a time bound manner and close accounts and send final MPRs with 'Zero Balance' along with the Final Utilization Certificate and the Final Audit Certificate.***

**(C) New Integrated Website for MPLADS**

The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation has developed, through NICSII, a new web based integrated system for monitoring MPLADS funds release, implementation of works and expenditure incurred for macro and micro level monitoring in 2013.

For operationalising this website Ministry has extended its full technical support for the Capacity building of State/UT officials. Ministry has conducted a number of training programmes for the State/UT officials by which more than 750 officials are trained to use this new integrated website efficiently. The Nodal Secretaries of all States/UTs have already been requested vide this Ministry's letter dated 28.11.2014, 21.01.2015, 13.02.2015 05.06.2015 and 14.10.2015 to give necessary instructions to concerned officials to start working on the new website so as to ensure that portal is made functional at the earliest.

However, so far only 152 districts have started uploading the data on the new website. The list of districts which have started uploading the data on the new website may be seen at **Annexure IV**.

***With effect from 01.04.2016 all MPLADS funds releases will be made through the new integrated portal. Therefore,***

***the new portal is required to be made fully functional by all the nodal district authorities at the earliest. It is therefore requested that the defaulting districts may be directed to start uploading the data on the new website immediately.***



## Annexure-I

### Status on C&AG Performance Audit Report No. 31 of 2010-11

Sr. No.	Name of the State/UT	Number of Audit Paras	Number of Paras – complete reply received	Number of Paras – Part reply received	Number of Sub Audit Paras-pending
1	Andhra Pradesh	19	18	01	7.1.1(i)
2	Arunachal Pradesh	17	17	-	-
3	Assam	21	18	03	4.3; 6.4; 6.7
4	Bihar	22	19	03	4.3; 4.4.2; 6.7
5	Chhattisgarh	13	12	01	6.2.2
6	Goa	10	09	01	3.4
7	Gujarat	13	13	-	-
8	Haryana	18	18	-	-
9	Himachal Pradesh	14	13	01	6.7
10	Jammu & Kashmir	23	23	-	-
11	Jharkhand	22	18	04	3.4; 4.3(iii); 4.4.1; 6.2.2
12	Karnataka	17	15	02	3.3; 4.3(i)(iii)
13	Kerala	17	17	-	-
14	Madhya Pradesh	21	16	05	3.3; 4.6; 6.2.2(ii); 6.2.3(A)(D); 6.7
15	Maharashtra	16	13	03	3.4; 4.3; 4.2.1
16	Manipur	15	15	-	-
17	Meghalaya	21	21	-	-
18	Mizoram	20	20	-	-
19	Nagaland	20	20	-	-
20	Odisha	21	17	04	3.4; 4.3(iv); 6.2.2(ii); 6.2.3(F)
21	Punjab	13	13	-	-
22	Rajasthan	19	17	02	3.3; 3.4
23	Sikkim	12	12	-	-
24	Tamil Nadu	24	23	01	6.7
25	Tripura	15	14	01	4.3
26	Uttarakhand	15	14	01	3.3
27	Uttar Pradesh	24	21	03	3.3; 4.3; 6.7
28	West Bengal	21	17	04	3.4; 4.3(iii)(iv); 4.4.1; 6.7
28	A&N Islands	17	15	02	3.3; 4.3
30	Chandigarh	06	06	-	-
31	D&N Haveli	06	06	-	-
32	Daman & Diu	12	12	-	-
33	Delhi	12	12	-	-
34	Lakshdweep	09	09	-	-
35	Pondicherry	13	13	-	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>578</b>	<b>536</b>	<b>42</b>	

**ANDAMAN & NICOBAR ISLANDS**  
**C&AG PERFORMANCE AUDIT REPORT No.31 OF 2010-11**

Sl. No.	Para No.	Text of the Paragraph	Reply	Comments of the Ministry																		
1.	3.3	<p><b>Selection of prohibited works</b> - The following works have been executed which were not permitted as per Guidelines:-</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(Rs.In Crore)</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;">No. of DAs</td> <td style="width: 20%;"></td> <td style="width: 30%; text-align: center;">1</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Works for office and residential buildings for cooperative, private organization and any work for commercial body</td> <td>No. of works</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Amount</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0.13</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Works for religious purposes and works within the premises of religious body</td> <td>No. of works</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Amount</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0.23</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Total</td> <td>No. of works</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Amount</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0.36</td> </tr> </table>	No. of DAs		1	Works for office and residential buildings for cooperative, private organization and any work for commercial body	No. of works	1	Amount	0.13	Works for religious purposes and works within the premises of religious body	No. of works	1	Amount	0.23	Total	No. of works	2	Amount	0.36	<p>As per UT Administration reply, that a Work Tamizhar Sangam was constructed out of MPLADS funds. A letter has been issued to the President of Tamizhar Sangam to furnish the copy of the bylaws and in case its is found that the building constructed out the MPLADS funds is used for commercial purpose needful action will be taken as per MPLADS Guidelines.</p> <p>As per UT Administration reply, that the Work costing Rs 23.14 lakh was constructed out of MPLADS funds to a new organization. A letter has been issued to the President of organization to furnish the copy of the bylaws and in case its is found to be only religious and having social working cause for the benefit of the Community needful action shall be taken as per MPLADS Guidelines.</p>	<p><b>Administrator UT A&amp;N Island has been requested to provide the latest status on both the organization.</b></p>
No. of DAs		1																				
Works for office and residential buildings for cooperative, private organization and any work for commercial body	No. of works	1																				
	Amount	0.13																				
Works for religious purposes and works within the premises of religious body	No. of works	1																				
	Amount	0.23																				
Total	No. of works	2																				
	Amount	0.36																				
2.	4.3	<p><b>(i) Non Commencement of works</b> - 6 works amounting to Rs.0.49 Crore were sanctioned during 2004-09 without obtaining a technical feasibility report from the concerned authorities and could not be started due to non-availability of land.</p>	<p>As per UT Administration reply that there is engineering wing to ascertain the Technical feasibility. Most of the works are in the remotest area in North Andaman where road accessibility was not available during those days and</p>	<p><b>Administrator UT A&amp;N Island has been requested to provide the status of refund of MPLADS fund.</b></p>																		

			<p>03 works were recommended just after Tsunami while the Tsunami Rehabilitation Programme was being done at war footing in all the parts of the Islands. However, the funds have been refunded by the Implementing Agencies and for the remaining 03 works for which sanction issued, the letter has been issued for return of funds.</p>	
		<p>(iii) <b><u>Incomplete works:</u></b> 27 works costing Rs.2.76 Crore remained incomplete 1 to 6 years in 1 DA.</p>	<p>As per UT Administration reply that out of 27 works, 18 works have been completed, 08 works are nearing completion and 01 work is pending for the last 5-6 years. The work construction of the Steel Bridge at Paschim Nagar, Diglipur was sanctioned in the year 10/ 2003 at cost of Rs 20,64,649 and an amount of Rs 15,48,487/- was released to the Implementing Agency in the month of 11/03 to complete the work within a period of 10 months. As per progress report, only 60% of work stands completed. The work is still pending as the contractor has been absconding for the last 5-6 years. The bridge materials have been dumped at work site during 2004. Steel components is yet to be erected. As all the officials were engaged into the Tsunami Relief and Rehabilitation Programme, the up-keep maintenance agreement, the execution of MPLADS works got delayed. The letter have been issued to the Implementing agency to black list the contractor who has been absconding for the last 5-6 years. Taking into consideration the 60% works</p>	<p><b>Administrator UT A&amp;N Island has been requested to provide the latest status of incomplete work.</b></p>

			<p>completion report and availability of steel material, the Implementing agency has been directed to furnish a revised estimate so as to convert the unfruitful expenditure to a fruitful use after taking the needful approval from the Hon'ble M . Reply from the Implementing Agency is still awaited.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

**ANDHRA PRADESH  
C&AG PERFORMANCE REPORT NO. 31 OF 2010-11**

**Sampled District: Anantapur, Cuddapah, Hyderabad, Kurnool, Nellore, Srikakulam.**

Sl. No.	Para No.	Text of the Paragraph	Reply	Comments of the Ministry														
1.	7.1.1	<p><b><u>Andhra Pradesh</u></b> (i) In three test-checked districts (Hyderabad, Nellore and Srikakulam), as against 2,483 works completed during 2004-09, the DAs reported 3,913 works as complete to the Ministry without verifying their data from the executing agency. The DAs did not have the complete list of completed works.</p>	<p><b>Current reply from Srikakulam District</b></p> <p>We are having the completed list of completed works as furnished by the executive agencies and the works completed during 2004-09 was audited by the M/s Nekkanti Raju CO., Visakhapatnam. Para may be dropped.</p> <p><b>Current Reply from Nellore District:-</b></p> <p>During 2004-09 the details of works sanctioned and completed in Nellore Lok Sabha Parliamentary Constituency are as follows:</p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 60%;">No. of works sanctioned:</td> <td style="text-align: right;">620</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Estimated Cost of the works Sanctioned</td> <td style="text-align: right;">Rs. 1071.19 lakhs</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No. of works Completed:</td> <td style="text-align: right;">595</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Estimated Cost of the works completed :</td> <td style="text-align: right;">Rs. 1035.03 lakhs</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Expenditure incurred for completed works:</td> <td style="text-align: right;">Rs. 1008.92 lakhs</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No. of Not started works:</td> <td style="text-align: right;">25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Estimated Cost of the not started works :</td> <td style="text-align: right;">Rs. 36.16 lakhs</td> </tr> </table>	No. of works sanctioned:	620	Estimated Cost of the works Sanctioned	Rs. 1071.19 lakhs	No. of works Completed:	595	Estimated Cost of the works completed :	Rs. 1035.03 lakhs	Expenditure incurred for completed works:	Rs. 1008.92 lakhs	No. of Not started works:	25	Estimated Cost of the not started works :	Rs. 36.16 lakhs	<p><b>District Collector Srikakulam has not explained the reasons for the discrepancy in the number of completed works reported by DAs and the no. of works found by the audit party to be actually completed leading to the Audit Para.</b></p> <p><b>District Collector Nellore has given the number of works sanctioned and completed /not started but has not explained the reasons for the discrepancies in the no. of completed works reported by the District Authorities and the no. of works found by the C&amp;AG audit party to be actually completed leading to the Audit Para.</b></p>
No. of works sanctioned:	620																	
Estimated Cost of the works Sanctioned	Rs. 1071.19 lakhs																	
No. of works Completed:	595																	
Estimated Cost of the works completed :	Rs. 1035.03 lakhs																	
Expenditure incurred for completed works:	Rs. 1008.92 lakhs																	
No. of Not started works:	25																	
Estimated Cost of the not started works :	Rs. 36.16 lakhs																	

**ASSAM**  
**C&AG PERFORMANCE AUDIT REPORT NO. 31 OF 2010-11.**

**Sampled Districts: Dhubri, Kamrup, Kamrup Metropolitan, Lakhimpur**

S.No.	Para No.	Text of the Paragraph	Reply	Comments of the Ministry
1.	4.3	<b>(iii)</b> Incomplete works:- 147 works costing Rs. 3.19 Crore remained incomplete 1 to 4 years in 3 DAs. This includes 75 works for Rs 1.15 Crore for the years 2004-08 which remained incomplete though these reported as complete in the progress report.	As per reply form Deputy Commissioner, Kamrup (M) that out of 07 schemes five scheme have already been completed. Two scheme i.e (i) Construction of Gate at premises of Dihingia Barkhel, Namghar, Sati Radhika Path, Uanbazar and (ii) Children New Art Players, Jorpukhuri, Guwahati are yet to be completed. Efforts are on to complete the work at the earliest.	<b>DC Kamrup has been requested to provide the latest status of completion of 02 works in progress.</b>

2.	6.4	<p><b><u>Diversion of funds</u></b></p> <p>Funds were required to be spent for the intended purposes under the MPLADS diverted to other schemes of State and Central Governments as per details given below:-</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>(Rs. in crore)</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="466 461 1211 699"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="466 461 621 532">Name of DA</th> <th data-bbox="621 461 1037 532">Nature of diversion of funds</th> <th data-bbox="1037 461 1211 532">Amount Diverted</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="466 532 621 699">Dhubri</td> <td data-bbox="621 532 1037 699">Funds were diverted to Sampoonn Gramin Rojgar Yojana (Rs. 1.17 crore) and Remote Village Electrification Programme (Rs. 0.14 core)</td> <td data-bbox="1037 532 1211 699"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Name of DA	Nature of diversion of funds	Amount Diverted	Dhubri	Funds were diverted to Sampoonn Gramin Rojgar Yojana (Rs. 1.17 crore) and Remote Village Electrification Programme (Rs. 0.14 core)		<p>As per reply from DC Dhubri that during the year 2004-05, an amount of Rs. 1.17 crores has been released to S.G.R.Y. The reason for such release is as under:-</p> <p>Under S s he e 75% of the work is paid by food grains and balance by cash. In that particular year, 75% food grains was received from the Government of India but the balance cash component of 25% of SGRy was not received. Since, it is not possible to keep and maintain the food grain stock for a long time, a meeting of MP and MLA was convened on 10.05.2004 and in the said meeting, it was decided to provide 25% form MPLAD and MLA fund. The work under SGRY involved large number of people and accordingly after considering para 3.17 of the Guidelines, the</p>	<p><b>Reply is not satisfactory. State Nodal Authorities has been requested to direct the District Authorities of Dhubri to recoup all the funds with interest diverted for SGRY and take action against the erring District Officials responsible for diversion of MPLADS funds.</b></p>
Name of DA	Nature of diversion of funds	Amount Diverted								
Dhubri	Funds were diverted to Sampoonn Gramin Rojgar Yojana (Rs. 1.17 crore) and Remote Village Electrification Programme (Rs. 0.14 core)									

			<p>above work was undertaken and implemented.</p> <p>Considering the above facts and involvement of large number of beneficiaries, the above fund has been utilized for SGRY scheme after due consultation and approval from the then MP. The cash component of SGRY has not yet been received and it will be recouped and transferred to concerned to MPLADS fund and MLA funds as soon as the said fund is received. It is requested to consider above and to kindly treat the matter as resolved. In future, due care will be taken before sanctioning the fund.</p>					
3.	6.7	<p><b>Contingency Expenses :-</b> DAs had utilized an amount of Rs. 1.30 crore on payment of honorarium/wages/travelling expenses of staff, refreshments for staff, electrification of office building, fuel for official vehicles, purchase of laptops, office furniture, supervision charges etc., which were inadmissible as per detail given below.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(Rs in crore)</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 50%;">Name of DA</th> <th style="width: 50%;">Amount</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td> </td> <td> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Name of DA	Amount			<p>As per reply received from DC <b>Dhubri</b> that 02 Nos of steel Almirah and 02 Nos of Computer tables were purchased during 2007-08 from the contingency fund under MPLADS,. Records for transaction of Rs. 2.00 crores of Rupees is to</p>	<p><b>As per para 4.17 of the MPLADS Guidelines, the District Authority can utilize the contingency expenses on items like purchase of stationary, Office equipment including computer (excluding laptop), telephone/fax</b></p>
Name of DA	Amount							



		Kamrup, Kamrup (Metro), Dhubri	0.05	<p>be maintained every year. So. Many valuable documents like cheque book/pass book/cash book and other valuable office documents are to be maintained year wise and required to be kept in safe custody. Besides the above, on person has been engaged for Data computerization work in daily remuneration system @ of Rs. 90.00 per day from MPLADS contingency fund. A further expense of Refreshment of review meeting of MPLADS is provided from the MPLADS contingency fund. It is requested to consider the above reply and the audit para may kindly be dropped.</p>	<p><b>charges, postal charges, to make MPLADS works monitoring software operational and get the audit certificate and audit of account etc. It has been made clear in the Guidelines that the funds must not be used for meeting the cost of items like purchase of any type for office furniture, vehicles, ACs etc, The reasons advanced by the District Authority are not acceptable. State Nodal Authorities has been requested to take action against the District Officials for sanction of irregular works and the funds be recouped with interest spent on ineligible works.</b></p>
--	--	-----------------------------------	------	--	--

**BIHAR**  
**C&AG PERFORMANCE AUDIT REPORT No.31 OF 2010-11**

**Sampled Districts:** Banka, Begusarai, Khagaria, Madhepura, Patna, Purnea, Rohtas, Siwan (Chhapra)

S.No	Para No.	Text of the Paragraph	Reply	Comments of the Ministry
1.	4.3	<b>(i) Non Commencement of works</b> - 55 works amounting to Rs.1.10 Crore were sanctioned during 2004-09 without obtaining a technical feasibility report from the concerned authorities and could not be started due to non-availability of land.	<p>As per reply from DM Madhepura, there is no such case related to the District.</p> <p>As per reply from DM Patna that there is no such case sanctioned in the District.</p> <p>As per reply from DPO Begusarai that his para does not concerned District Begusarai.</p> <p>As per reply DPO Rohtas that there is no such work under MPLAD Scheme in the district.</p> <p>As per reply from DPO Banka there was no such work in the constituency.</p> <p>As per reply from District Purnea there is no such work related to in the District.</p> <p>As per reply from District Authority Siwan it is not applicable to Siwan district.</p> <p>As per reply from District Khagaira there is no such work related to in the District.</p>	<p><b>Replies received from District Authorities are not satisfactory because it does not conform to the audit observation given in the audit report. State Nodal Authorities are requested to direct the district Authorities to look into the matter and to furnish reply relevant to the audit observation as audit observations must have been supplied by the Audit Party to the sampled districts.</b></p>
2.	4.4.2	<b>Payments made on doubtful muster roll entries</b> -In Bihar, the IA,	As per reply received from DM	

		<p>National Rural Employment Programme (NREP), Patna, engaged labourers on six works (Two works of Kaccha road construction, two works of renovation of Ahar and two works of construction of community hall) which had already been completed and UCs for them had also been submitted to the DA. While four were shown as completed on 31 July 2006, muster rolls for Rs. 0.06 crore were booked up to 5 December 2006. Similarly, two works had been completed on 30 September 2006 but Muster Rolls for Rs. 0.15 lakh were booked up to 26 December 2006. Thus, the expenditure of Rs. 0.06 crore was doubtful. The Executive Engineer concerned stated (July 2009) that the works were completed out of unspent balances of other works and after receiving the second instalment, the Muster Rolls and other accounts had been prepared. However, booking of Muster Rolls after completion of works and submission of UCs indicated that the expenditure incurred on labourers was doubtful.</p>	<p>Madhepura, there is no such case related to the District.</p> <p>As per reply received from DM Patna immediately after increase in rate of wages, scheduled rate were not changed and the muster roll of directly engaged laborers was prepared in addition to laborers engaged other than scheduled rate and thus the payment was given to more laborers than indicated in the muster roll</p>	<p><b>The action taken by the NREP Patna is apparently irregular. The state Government is requested to look into the matter and take appropriate action including recoupment of funds and disciplinary proceeding against the officials found responsible for irregular sanction.</b></p>				
3.	6.7	<p><b><u>Bihar</u></b></p> <p>Rs in crore</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="409 771 892 893"> <thead> <tr> <th>Name of DA</th> <th>Amount</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Patna, Begusarai</td> <td>0.04</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Name of DA	Amount	Patna, Begusarai	0.04	<p>As per information received from DM Patna that the payment from the Contingency Fund was made to two computer operators for completion of MPLADS works which is in consonance with para 4.17(iv) of the extent Guidelines.</p> <p>As per reply received from District Authority Begusarai payment from the contingency fund was made to daily wager and daily wager peon which stands closed since September 2011.</p>	<p><b>The reply is not in conformity with the audit observations. Payment to daily wagers and computer operators were not permissible as per the then Guidelines. This is serious violation of Guidelines. The payment is to be recouped and action is to be initiated against the district officials found responsible for irregular sanction.</b></p>
Name of DA	Amount							
Patna, Begusarai	0.04							

**CHHATTISGARH**  
**C&AG PERFORMANCE AUDIT REPROT NO. 31 OF 2010-11.**

Sampled Districts: Bilaspur, Jashpur, Raipur

Sl. No.	Para No.	Text of the Paragraph	Reply	Comments of the Ministry																								
1.	6.2.2	<p><b>Incorrected reporting of financial progress by the DAs:-</b> Instead of reporting the actual expenditure to the Ministry, the DAs depicted the entire advance to IAs as utilized in their UCs, thus inflating the figures of expenditure and presenting an incorrect picture of fund utilization under the Scheme as per details given below:-</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">DA</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Year</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Expenditure shown in the UC</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Actual expenditure incurred by agencies</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Over statement of expenditure</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Percent age of overstate expenditure to the actual expenditure</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><b>Raipur</b></td> <td style="text-align: center;">2004-05</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3.83</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3.62</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0.21</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">2006-07</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3.81</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3.55</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0.26</td> <td style="text-align: center;">7.32</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">2007-08</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3.51</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3.09</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0.42</td> <td style="text-align: center;">13.59</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	DA	Year	Expenditure shown in the UC	Actual expenditure incurred by agencies	Over statement of expenditure	Percent age of overstate expenditure to the actual expenditure	<b>Raipur</b>	2004-05	3.83	3.62	0.21	5.8		2006-07	3.81	3.55	0.26	7.32		2007-08	3.51	3.09	0.42	13.59	<p>As per reply received from Collector Raipur over payment over the actual expenditure by Rs. 0.21 lakh in the year 2004-05, 0.26 lakhs in the year 2006-07 and 0.42 lakh in the year 2007-08 has been shown in the utilization certificate. When the payment exceeds from actual expenditure, efforts are made to complete the work with the assistance of</p>	<p><b>Reply given by the DC Raipur does not address the audit observations. Appropriate reply with reference to audit observations may be furnished.</b></p>
DA	Year	Expenditure shown in the UC	Actual expenditure incurred by agencies	Over statement of expenditure	Percent age of overstate expenditure to the actual expenditure																							
<b>Raipur</b>	2004-05	3.83	3.62	0.21	5.8																							
	2006-07	3.81	3.55	0.26	7.32																							
	2007-08	3.51	3.09	0.42	13.59																							

<b>Bilaspur</b>	2005-06	8.19	7.39	0.8	10.83
	2006-07	6.25	5.44	0.81	14.89
	2007-08	8.51	6.79	1.72	25.33

the public. Therefore, the estimated cost is shown in the utilization certificate which is more than the actual expenditure.

As per reply received from Collector Bilaspur the inspection team have seen the MPR sent by the State Govt. in the prescribed format did not take into account the approved works in the dependent District in same Lok Sabha constituency. So there is a difference in the information sent to Central and State Govt. The information to whole Lok

			<p>Sabha constituency which consists of one or more District. So both the information are correct. The objection may be dropped.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

**GOA**  
**C&AG PERFORMANCE AUDIT REPORT No.31 OF 2010-11**

**Sampled Districts:** North Goa, South Goa

Sl. No.	Para No.	Text of the Paragraph	Reply	Comments of the Ministry										
1.	3.4	<p><b>DAs sanctioned excess funds for Societies /Trusts</b> (Rs.In Crore)</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">DAs involved</th> <th style="text-align: center;">No. of societies/trusts</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Amount admissible</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Actual amount sanctioned</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Excess amount sanctioned</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">North Goa, South Goa</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1.25</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1.7</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0.45</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	DAs involved	No. of societies/trusts	Amount admissible	Actual amount sanctioned	Excess amount sanctioned	North Goa, South Goa	5	1.25	1.7	0.45	<p>As per reply received from North Goa District Authority that following works were sanctioned in excess of funds for Societies/Trusts prior to issue of new Guidelines 2005 of MPLADS as these trusts were rendering commendable social service in their field.</p> <p>The Construction of Community Hall near Shree Chaurangipath Bhumika Devasthan Simvado Arpora , Bardez-Goa on 22.11.2004, it has been informed that the project in question was recommended by Hon'ble M for construction of community hall in village Panchayat Arpora, Nagoa Bardez, Goa which was executed by Government Department/ Agency. Therefore, observations raised by audit in Performance Audit report No 31(Civil) of 2010-11 for recoupment of funds in excess of Rs 25 lakh kindly be dropped since the project sanctioned was not for society/trust but for Government Department /Agency i.e (Village Panchayat Nagoa.</p> <p>As per reply received from North Goa District Authority , the following works were sanctioned in excess of funds for Societies/Trusts prior to issue of new Guidelines 2005 of MPLADS as these trusts were</p>	<p><b>Recommendations for condonation from the Chief Secretary of the state is awaited.</b></p>
DAs involved	No. of societies/trusts	Amount admissible	Actual amount sanctioned	Excess amount sanctioned										
North Goa, South Goa	5	1.25	1.7	0.45										

			<p>rendering commendable social service in their area of location:-</p> <p>(a) Bhumika Shikshan Saunsthan at Sattari has been informed on 06.05.2013 that an amount Rs 12,25,657/- was released in excess for in violation to the guidelines for construction of rooms with the request to refund the excess amount followed by reminder on 30.05.2013. The further progress in the matter shall be communicated.</p> <p>(b) Fr. Agnel High School, Pilar, Tiswadi on 8.10.2004 has been informed that an amount Rs 9,28,150/- was released in excess for Construction of Football ground and School Auditorium in violation to the provisions of guidelines of MPLADS. The institute have been requested to refund the amount.</p> <p>(c) As regards action to be taken against the erring officials, it is stated that the projects in question mentioned above were sanctioned during the tenure of Shri SS Keshkamat who has since been retired from Government service on 15.01.2005. State Revenue Department, Government of Goa has intimated that the Government does not desire to take any action as the officials have already retired eight years back.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--



**HIMACHAL PRADESH**

**C&AG PERFORMANCE AUDIT REPORT No.31 OF 2010-11**

**Sampled Districts:** Hamirpur, Kangra

<b>Sl. No.</b>	<b>Para No.</b>	<b>Text of the Paragraph</b>	<b>Reply</b>	<b>Comments of the Ministry</b>				
1.	6.7	<p><b><u>Contingency Expenses</u></b> - DAs had utilized an amount of Rs 1.30 crore on payment of honorarium/wages/travelling expenses of staff, refreshments for staff, electrification of office building, fuel for official vehicles, purchase of laptops, office furniture, supervision charges etc., which were inadmissible as per detail given below.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>(Rs in crore)</b></p> <table border="1"><thead><tr><th><b>Name of DA</b></th><th><b>Amount</b></th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>Kangra</td><td>0.07</td></tr></tbody></table>	<b>Name of DA</b>	<b>Amount</b>	Kangra	0.07	<p>As per reply received from District Authority, Kangra a sum of Rs 0.07 crore was spent by this office for the payment of laptop, wages, honorarium and stationery charges out of contingency of MPLADS. <b>The cost of laptop i.e Rs 54020/- so purchased has been recouped</b> from the State Head and credited into MPLADS contingency account. A sum of Rs 5,55,000 paid by five block (IAs) on account of supervision charges for which they have directed to recoup the amount from the other state head. <b>The compliance is awaited.</b></p>	<p><b>Replenishment of MPLADS funds from State funds may be confirmed.</b></p>
<b>Name of DA</b>	<b>Amount</b>							
Kangra	0.07							

**JHARKHAND**  
**C&AG PERFORMANCE AUDIT REPORT No.31 OF 2010-11**

**Sampled Districts:** Deoghar, Dhanbad, Hazaribagh, Lohardaga

Sl. No	Para No.	Text of the Paragraph	Reply	Comments of the Ministry										
1.	3.4	<p><b>DAs sanctioned excess funds for Societies /Trusts</b> (Rs.In Crore)</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>DAs involved</th> <th>No. of societies/trusts</th> <th>Amount admissible</th> <th>Actual amount sanctioned</th> <th>Excess amount sanctioned</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Dhanbad</td> <td>5</td> <td>1.25</td> <td>1.83</td> <td>0.58</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	DAs involved	No. of societies/trusts	Amount admissible	Actual amount sanctioned	Excess amount sanctioned	Dhanbad	5	1.25	1.83	0.58	As per reply from DDC Dhanbad that in future strict norms of MPLAD fund will be followed in sanctioning fund to Societies /Trusts.	Reply given is not satisfactory. District Authority Dhanbad may be directed to recoup the excess funds with interest and initiate necessary action against the errant District officials for irregular implementation of MPLADS work and furnish reply through State Nodal Authority.
DAs involved	No. of societies/trusts	Amount admissible	Actual amount sanctioned	Excess amount sanctioned										
Dhanbad	5	1.25	1.83	0.58										
2.	4.3	<p>(iii) <b>Incomplete works:</b> 883 works costing Rs. 18.72 Crore remained incomplete 1 to 4 years in 4 DAs.</p>	As per reply from DC Hazaribagh, some works are still incomplete due to local dispute beyond control. Efforts are being made to sort the problem. This will be taken care of after completion of work. Hence the para may be dropped.	DC Hazaribagh is requested to provide the status of works under dispute and likely time to complete the work. If not, the Implementing Agencies be asked to refund the amount.										
3.	4.4.1	<p><b>Non-existence of assets</b> – An M.P. of the Rajya Sabha in July 2004 had recommended the installation of two solar water pump sets (Haribandh and Dumaria in Deoghar district) at an estimated cost of Rs. 0.20 crore. The work was awarded to the firm M/s Kiran Energy Solution Pvt. Ltd, Dhanbad by inviting tender. The DA (Deputy Commissioner cum Nodal officer, Deoghar) paid Rs. 0.08 crore in July 2005</p>	As per reply from DDC, Deoghar that the FIR has been lodged against the firm M/s Kiran Energy Solution	Appropriate follow up action may be taken expeditiously and reported to the Ministry.										

as an advance to the firm for supply and installation of the pump sets. Even after a lapse of four years, the firm had not supplied solar water pumps, as confirmed in the joint field verification conducted by the audit team and the DRDA, Deoghar officials. Thus Rs. 0.08 crore was retained by the firm, without supplying the solar pumps. However, the DA had taken no action till date.

Private Ltd, Dhanbad and the department has been informed and auction letter has been issued by the BDO Sarwan vide letter dated 5.10.2012.

4.

6.2.2

**Incorrect reporting of financial progress by the DAs** - Instead of reporting the actual expenditure to the Ministry, the DAs depicted the entire advance to IAs as utilized in their UCs, thus inflating the figures of expenditure and presenting an incorrect picture of fund utilization under the Scheme as per details given below:-

DA	Year	Expenditure shown in the UC	Actual expenditure incurred by agencies	Over statement of expenditure	Percentage of overstated expenditure to the actual expenditure
Deoghar	2005-06	1.06	0	1.06	100
	2006-07	2.36	2.26	0.1	4.42
	2007-08	1.47	1.42	0.05	3.52
Dhanbad	2005-06	5.79	3.47	2.32	66.86

As per reply from DDC, **Deoghar** that actual expenditure is given based on assessment report.

Reply given by District Collector Deoghar and Dhanbad do not address to audit observation. Collector Deoghar and Dhanbad may furnish proper reply.

As per reply from DDC Dhanbad that utilisation report of DA is based on UCs received from the

			2006-07	5.66	5.29	0.37	6.99	Implementing Agencies.	
--	--	--	---------	------	------	------	------	------------------------	--

**KARNATAKA  
C&AG PERFORMANCE AUDIT REPORT NO. 31 OF 2010-11.**

**Sampled Districts: Bangalore Rural, Dharwar, Hassan, Haveri, Kolar**

Sl. No.	Para No.	Text of the Paragraph	Reply	Comments of the Ministry																																							
1.	3.3	<p>Works not permitted as per guidelines:- The following works have been executed which were not permitted as per Guidelines:- (Rs. in Crore)</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2"></th> <th style="text-align: center;">No. of DAs</th> <th style="text-align: center;">6</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="2" style="text-align: center;">Works for office and residential buildings of Central/State Government</td> <td style="text-align: center;">No. of Works</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">17</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Amount</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">0.63</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2" style="text-align: center;">Works for religious purposes and works within the premises of religious body</td> <td style="text-align: center;">No. of Works</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">94</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Amount</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">1.84</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2" style="text-align: center;">All works of renovation, repair and maintenance</td> <td style="text-align: center;">No. of Works</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">35</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Amount</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">0.52</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2" style="text-align: center;">Creation of assets named after person</td> <td style="text-align: center;">No. of Works</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">17</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Amount</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">0.25</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2" style="text-align: center;">Total</td> <td style="text-align: center;">No. of Works</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">163</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Amount</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">3.24</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			No. of DAs	6	Works for office and residential buildings of Central/State Government	No. of Works		17	Amount		0.63	Works for religious purposes and works within the premises of religious body	No. of Works		94	Amount		1.84	All works of renovation, repair and maintenance	No. of Works		35	Amount		0.52	Creation of assets named after person	No. of Works		17	Amount		0.25	Total	No. of Works		163	Amount		3.24	<p><b>1.Haveri District:-</b></p> <p>List of all 29 works regarding construction of Samudaya Bhawan is furnished. All the Samudaya Bhawans are constructed on the Government land. All the works are executed as per MPLAD guidelines. The identified locations are public places and open to all. The properties are handed over to the concerned Gram Panchayats. The works are not taken up at religious places but they are located near to Temple.</p> <p><b>2. Hassan District:-</b></p> <p>4 works namely construction of Shri Chilume Mutt Samudaya Bhawana at Arakagud, Sri Sairam temple at Chennarayapattana town, Bajjima Farooq Madarasa building at Arasiker and Kabballi Timmegowda samudaya bhavana at Kabballi, Chennarayapattana at a total cost of Rs. 9.50 lakh.</p> <p>a. The Chilume Mutt Samudaya Bhavana has been under construction in a private land and the name of Sri Jayadeva Swamy, Chilume Mutt is mentioned in the RTC. After the administrative approval by the DC, Hassan on 18/12/2007 An</p>	<p>Action Taken Report except at point no. 2(d) is not permitted under MPLADS i.e recoupment of MPLADS fund and Departmental action may be furnished.</p>
		No. of DAs	6																																								
Works for office and residential buildings of Central/State Government	No. of Works		17																																								
	Amount		0.63																																								
Works for religious purposes and works within the premises of religious body	No. of Works		94																																								
	Amount		1.84																																								
All works of renovation, repair and maintenance	No. of Works		35																																								
	Amount		0.52																																								
Creation of assets named after person	No. of Works		17																																								
	Amount		0.25																																								
Total	No. of Works		163																																								
	Amount		3.24																																								

			<p>amount of Rs. 3.00 lakh has been released in three instalments to the IA on 15/12/2007, 28/10/2008 and 17/7/2010 respectively. The work was completed by the Hon'ble M. The IA has sent the UC on 25/8/2014 of this work. The construction has not been completed due to shortage of funds.</p> <p>b. Sairam Mandir at Channarayapatna town: Hon'ble M had completed for release of Rs. 0.50 lakh for the construction of Sri Sairam Mandir on 31/8/2005. DC, Hassan had given administrative approval on 21/10/2006 and had released Rs. 0.50 lakh to the IA. The IA has sent the UC of this construction on 10/12/2007. The Add. DC, Hassan had visited the spot on 21/4/2015 and has stated that the Sairam Mandir is in Channarayapattana town. Public have constituted a trust and collected donation from the public for construction of Sairam Mandir. A compound wall for the mandir has been constructed at the cost of Rs. 0.50 lakh from the MP fund., and it is in use by the general public.</p> <p>c. Bajjimmma Farooq Madrasa building at Arsikere: Administrative approval for the construction of Madrasa building at the cost of Rs. 1.00 lakh was released to the IA. The IA has sent the UC for this construction on 10/12/2007. The Addl. DC, Hassan visited the spot on 23/04/2015 and stated that the Bajjimmma Farooq Madarasa building is a residential school. There are 24 children in</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>this school. There are 24 children in this school learning Kannada, English, Urdu and Arabic languages., Urdu and Arabic languages., tailoring classes are also conducted in this school. It is not a religious institution but a trust which caters the need of residential school for the orphans. This school also gets grants for Serva Shikshana Abhiyana. Hence requested to drop this para.</p> <p>d. Kabbali Thimmedowda Samudaya bhawan, Kabbali, Chennarayapatana Tq: Admimistrative approval for Rs. 5.00 lakhs was accorded and Rs. 5.00 lakh was released to the IA in two instalments on 1/12/2002 and 15/6/2005. The Addl, DC visited the spot on 21/4/2015 and has stated that the land where the samudaya bhawan is constructed is an agricultural land which has been handed over to the Gram Panchayat, Kabbali. Samudaya bhawan is used by the general public. Hence requested to drop this para.</p>	
2.	4.3	(iii) <b>Incomplete Works:-</b> 2538 works costing Rs. 31.7 crore remained incomplete 1 to 4 years in 6 DAs.	<p>1. <b>DC, Haveri</b> vide letter dated 17/4/2015 has furnished the completion report in respect of 44 works out of 46 works. The remaining 2 works namely construction of drinking water taps in railway station. Haveri at the cost of Rs. 0.50 lakh and providing steel almera for Haveri advocate association at the cost of Rs. 0.75 lakh was not taken up and an amount of Rs. 1.25 lakhs along with</p>	

			<p>interest of Rs. 29919/- is taken back on 25/4/2015 vide cheque No. 042417.</p> <p><b>2. DC, Bagalkot</b> As per reply received fro DC Bagalkot a total 28 works are still incomplete. The delay was due to site and local problems. Out of which 27 works are completed and 01 work is pending because of site dispute and stands cancelled. Hence, the observations may be dropped.</p> <p><b>3. Hassan District:</b> There are 6 works for the year 2005-06, 11 in 2007-08 and 1 work in 2008-09 are incomplete due to shortage of funds. These works will be completed by utilizing the balance amount of 14<sup>th</sup> Lok Sabha which has been carried over to 15<sup>th</sup> Lok Sabha works amounting to Rs. 21,04,031/-. Hence this para may kindly be dropped.</p>	<p>The works in Haveri are still incomplete and may be completed and reported to the Ministry at the earliest for the settlement of the para.</p>
--	--	--	---	---



**MADHYA PRADESH**  
**C&AG PERFORMANCE AUDIT REPORT No.31 OF 2010-11**

**Sampled Districts:** Balaghat, Damoh, Hoshangabad, Sagar, Shahdol, Shajapur, Ujjain

Sl.No.	Para No.	Text of the Paragraph	Reply	Comments of the Ministry																											
1.	3.3	<p><b><u>Selection of prohibited works</u></b> The following works have been executed which were not permitted as per Guidelines:-</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Rs.In Crore)</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 80%;">No. of DAs</td> <td style="width: 20%;">7</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Works for office and residential buildings of Central/State Government</td> <td>No. of works</td> <td>38</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Amount</td> <td>1.53</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Works for office and residential buildings for cooperative, private organization and any work for commercial body</td> <td>No. of works</td> <td>9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Amount</td> <td>0.41</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Works for religious purposes and works within the premises of religious body</td> <td>No. of works</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Amount</td> <td>0.03</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">All works of renovation, repair and maintenance</td> <td>No. of works</td> <td>57</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Amount</td> <td>1.34</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Total</td> <td>No. of works</td> <td>107</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Amount</td> <td>3.32</td> </tr> </table>	No. of DAs	7	Works for office and residential buildings of Central/State Government	No. of works	38	Amount	1.53	Works for office and residential buildings for cooperative, private organization and any work for commercial body	No. of works	9	Amount	0.41	Works for religious purposes and works within the premises of religious body	No. of works	3	Amount	0.03	All works of renovation, repair and maintenance	No. of works	57	Amount	1.34	Total	No. of works	107	Amount	3.32	<p>As per reply from Joint Director, Dept. of Planning and Statistics, <b>Sagar</b> no in-admissible work was sanctioned in the district.</p> <p>As per reply received from District Authority <b>Ujjain</b>, no sanction is issued for the prohibited works given the guidelines.</p> <p>As per reply from Collector <b>Damoh</b> no in-admissible work is executed in the District.</p> <p>As per reply received from Collector <b>Shajapur</b>, no prohibited work given in the Guidelines is sanctioned in the district.</p> <p>As per reply from Collector <b>Balaghat</b>, out of 57 works, 10 works pertaining to renovation, repair and maintenance were sanctioned by the District Authority keeping in view the necessity, prevalent circumstances and immediate requirement in the public interest. Such type of</p>	<p><b>C&amp;AG in the performance audit report has pointed out execution of total 14 works costing Rs 0.90 crore in 5 districts. Reply received from the 12 districts mentioning that no such work was executed is apparently incorrect.</b></p> <p><b>Audit was conducted in the sampled 15 districts and the objections must have been given to the district authorities in five districts. District Authorities should know the details of audit observations.</b></p> <p><b>State Nodal Authorities are, therefore, requested to direct the District Magistrates of all the sampled district authorities to find out the objection and furnish their replies to this Ministry through the State Nodal authorities.</b></p>
No. of DAs	7																														
Works for office and residential buildings of Central/State Government	No. of works	38																													
	Amount	1.53																													
Works for office and residential buildings for cooperative, private organization and any work for commercial body	No. of works	9																													
	Amount	0.41																													
Works for religious purposes and works within the premises of religious body	No. of works	3																													
	Amount	0.03																													
All works of renovation, repair and maintenance	No. of works	57																													
	Amount	1.34																													
Total	No. of works	107																													
	Amount	3.32																													

			<p>sanctioned has been noted for future guidance. Further district authority is sanctioning the works which are eligible as per Annexure IVE provided in the Guidelines. In this connection, it has been assured by the District Authority that the observations /recommendations given by the Audit authority are being adhered to strictly as per provisions of guidelines of MPLADS. Hence, the audit para may be treated as settled.</p> <p>As per reply from Collector Damoh that no prohibited works given in the Guidelines is sanctioned in the district.</p> <p>As per reply from Collector <b>Shahdol</b>, as per guidelines, sanction costing Rs 48.13 lakh were issued for construction of 12 State go-down for Public Distribution System under Serial 14 Other Public Works not covered elsewhere of Sub Head 'ther ubli Fa ilities' under List of Sector and Scheme Codes and no sanction was issued to any prohibited works.</p>	<p>As per serial 1 of the List of Works Prohibited under MPLADS, office buildings belonging to central, and state Government, their departments, Government Agencies/ Organisation are prohibited. Go-down for PDS being the state Government building is prohibited as per Guidelines.</p> <p><b><i>DC Shahdol is requested to inquire into the matter and instructions be issued to recoup the fund. Action be taken against the erring officials for irregular sanction. Action Taken Note be furnish to this Ministry urgently.</i></b></p>
2.	4.6	<u>Madhya Pradesh</u>	Collector Damoh in their reply has informed that no work was sanctioned with	Reply may be expedited.

		<p><b>In seven districts</b> (Balaghat, Damoh, Hoshangabad, Sagar, Shahdol, Shajapur and Ujjain), <b>1,533 works amounting to Rs. 20.28 crore were executed during 2007-09 by Government Agencies on piece meal basis/departmentally, without any prior approval of the competent authority (Chief Engineer) and without obtaining competitive rates through wide publicity, as prescribed in the PWD Manual.</b></p>	<p>out obtaining the technical sanction. Hence, audit para may be treated as settled.</p> <p>Collector Balaghat in their reply has informed that sanction of recommended works were issued strictly following the provisions of Guidelines of MPLADS. Hence audit para may be treated as settled.</p>																					
3.	6.2.2	<p>(ii) <b>Incorrect reporting of financial progress by the DAs</b> - Scrutiny of MPRs and Annual Accounts in constituencies including two RS MPs of States/UTs further disclosed that the DAs had reported lesser amounts of interest earned in their annual accounts and/or MPRs than those reported in the MPRs of the earlier months resulting in understatement of interest as per detail given below:-</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Constituency</th> <th>Remarks</th> <th>Amount of interest understated</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Balaghat, Damoh, Hoshangabad, Sagar and Shajapur</td> <td>Interest accrued on deposits of Rs. 1.18 crore (Balaghat, Damoh, Hoshangabad, Sagar and Shajapur) was not found recorded in the MPR.</td> <td>1.18</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Constituency	Remarks	Amount of interest understated	Balaghat, Damoh, Hoshangabad, Sagar and Shajapur	Interest accrued on deposits of Rs. 1.18 crore (Balaghat, Damoh, Hoshangabad, Sagar and Shajapur) was not found recorded in the MPR.	1.18		Reply from Shajapur is still awaited.														
Constituency	Remarks	Amount of interest understated																						
Balaghat, Damoh, Hoshangabad, Sagar and Shajapur	Interest accrued on deposits of Rs. 1.18 crore (Balaghat, Damoh, Hoshangabad, Sagar and Shajapur) was not found recorded in the MPR.	1.18																						
4.	6.2.3	<p><b>Discrepancies in figures in MPRs, UCs and annual accounts</b> - Details according to nature of discrepancies is given below:-</p> <p>A. Discrepancies in expenditure figures among the MPR, the annual accounts and the UCs in Madhya Pradesh</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Constituency</th> <th colspan="2">Annual accounts</th> <th colspan="2">Utilisation Certificate</th> <th colspan="2">MPR</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Amount</th> <th>Year</th> <th>Amount</th> <th>Month</th> <th>Amount</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Balaghat</td> <td>2005-06</td> <td>1.79</td> <td>2005-06</td> <td>2</td> <td>Mar-06</td> <td>2.02</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Constituency	Annual accounts		Utilisation Certificate		MPR		Year	Amount	Year	Amount	Month	Amount	Balaghat	2005-06	1.79	2005-06	2	Mar-06	2.02		Reply from Shajapur is still awaited.
Constituency	Annual accounts			Utilisation Certificate		MPR																		
	Year	Amount	Year	Amount	Month	Amount																		
Balaghat	2005-06	1.79	2005-06	2	Mar-06	2.02																		

			2006-07	1.23	2006-07	0.69	Mar-07	1.41			
			2007-08	1.8	2007-08	2	Mar-08	1.88			
			2008-09	3.02	2008-09	2	Mar-09	3.34			
		Damoh	2005-06	2.01	2005-06	2	Mar-06	1.77			
			2006-07	2.72	2006-07	2	Mar-07	1.88			
		Sagar	2004-05	0.73	2004-05	0.79	Mar-05	2.91			
			2005-06	2.71	2005-06	2.25	Mar-06	2.75			
			2006-07	2.16	2006-07	1.46	Mar-07	1.93			
		Shahdol	2004-05	2.16	2004-05	2.06	Mar-05	2.05			
			2005-06	1.45	2005-06	2.14	Mar-06	1.73			
			2006-07	2.61	2006-07	2.14	Mar-07	2.54			
			2007-08	2.5	2007-08	2.33	Mar-08	2.33			
		Shajapur	2004-05	1.53	2004-05	1.3	Mar-05	1.91			
			2005-06	1.96	2005-06	2.67	Mar-06	2.09			
			2006-07	1.54	2006-07	2.05	Mar-07	2.04			
			2007-08	1.82	2007-08	1.74	Mar-08	2.14			
		Ujjain	2004-05	1.06	2004-05	1.06	Mar-05	2.03			
			2005-06	1.81	2005-06	1.81	Mar-06	2.08			
			2006-07	1.57	2006-07	1.57	Mar-07	2.11			
		D	<b><u>Discrepancies in expenditure figures between the UCs and the MPRs in Madhya Pradesh</u></b>								Reply from District Shajapur is still awaited.

Constituency	Utilisation Certificate		MPR	
	Year	Amount	Month	Amount
Hoshangabad	2004-05	1.89	Mar-05	0.93
	2005-06	1.51	Mar-06	1.55
	2006-07	1.33	Mar-07	1.77
	2007-08	2.15	Mar-08	2.15
Sagar	2007-08	2	Mar-08	1.86
Shajapur	2008-09	1.02	Mar-09	2.08
Ujjain	2007-08	3.27	Mar-08	2.07

  

<b>6.</b>	<p><b>6.7</b></p> <p><b>Contingency Expenses</b> - DAs had utilized an amount of Rs 1.30 crore on payment of honorarium/wages/travelling expenses of staff, refreshments for staff, electrification of office building, fuel for official vehicles, purchase of laptops, office furniture, supervision charges etc., which were inadmissible as per detail given below.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Rs in crore</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Name of DA</th> <th>Amount</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Balaghat, Hoshangabad, Sagar, Sahdol, Ujjain</td> <td>0.14</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Name of DA	Amount	Balaghat, Hoshangabad, Sagar, Sahdol, Ujjain	0.14	<p>As per reply received from Collector Shahdol, the payment of fax bill amounting to Rs. 2170/- and honorarium amount to Rs.20,000/- to the computer operator were paid from the contingency expenses as per Government of India letter C/39/2000-MPLADS dated 21.02.2002. A cooler was also purchased to maintain the temperature of the computer room for maintainability of operation of software system. <b>Besides Rs. 6,200/- were also paid from contingency fund for P.O.L. to inspect the work of MPLAD Scheme as per this Ministry</b></p>	<p><b>Payment of Rs 6,200/- for POL is not admissible under the Guidelines. Action taken for the irregularity may be furnished.</b></p>
Name of DA	Amount						
Balaghat, Hoshangabad, Sagar, Sahdol, Ujjain	0.14						

			<b>letter dated 21.02.2002.</b> However the payment for P.O.L. was not made regularly.	
--	--	--	---	--

**MAHARASHTRA**  
**C&AG PERFORMANCE AUDIT REPORT No.31 OF 2010-11**

**Sampled Districts: Bhandara, Kolhapur, Mumbai, Nagpur, Nanded, Nashik, Parbhani, Raigad, Solapur**

Sl. No.	Para No.	Text of The Paragraph	Reply	Comments of the Ministry										
1.	3.4	<p>(i) <b><u>DAs sanctioned excess funds for Societies /Trusts</u></b> (Rs.In Crore)</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">DAs involved</th> <th style="text-align: center;">No. of societies/ trusts</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Amount admissible</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Actual amount sanctioned</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Excess amount sanctioned</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Mumbai (Suburban), Prabhani, Solapur</td> <td style="text-align: center;">4</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1.31</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0.31</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	DAs involved	No. of societies/ trusts	Amount admissible	Actual amount sanctioned	Excess amount sanctioned	Mumbai (Suburban), Prabhani, Solapur	4	1	1.31	0.31	<p>As per reply District Collector Prabhani that 02 works has been sanctioned for Mahatma Phule Education Society, Prabhani viz Construction of cultural hall costing Rs 20.00 lakh and second construction of boys hostel costing Rs 13.00 lakh. These works were sanctioned before the issue of guidelines of Nov, 2005. The boys hostel will not be completed in the cost of Rs 5.00 lakh. If the sanction would have been given for Rs 5.00 lakh then the work may remain incomplete and there is no use of the asset for the boys. These two works were completed and completion certificate and utilisation certificate have been received from the Implementing Agency. The next proposal for Rs 15 lakh for the same trust has been received for sanctions by this Office. This office had not given the sanction for this proposal and the case was referred to Central Government. But the Central Government has also refused this proposal.</p>	<p><b>It has been observed from the reply that Rs 8.00 lakh has been sanctioned by the District Authority in excess to the prescribed limit of Rs 25.00 lakh to the educational society for construction of boys hostel with out the concurrence of the Ministry. The action taken by the District authority in sanctioning the construction of Boys hostel in excess to the prescribed limit of Rs 25 lakh is a clear violation of the provisions of guidelines of MPLADS. District Authority Prabhani may be instructed to recoup the excess MPLADS funds with interest and initiate action against the errant district officials for not adhering to the guidelines and sanctioning the irregular MPLADS work.</b></p> <p><b>Districts Authority of Mumbai Suburban may be instructed to expedite reply.</b></p>
DAs involved	No. of societies/ trusts	Amount admissible	Actual amount sanctioned	Excess amount sanctioned										
Mumbai (Suburban), Prabhani, Solapur	4	1	1.31	0.31										

			<p>Now the Central Government has taken a decision to sanction the funds for trust/society upto Rs 50 lakh vide letter dated 17.03.2013. So please delete the para.</p>	
2.	4.3	<p><b><u>Maharashtra</u></b></p> <p>8 works amounting to Rs.0.76 Crore were abandoned or left incomplete due to land disputes, encroachment on land, excess expenditure etc.</p>	<p>As per reply received from Collector Nagpur, at the time of C&amp;AG team visit to the Nagpur district, the following three works were notified as unfruitful expenditure on abandoned structures due to faulty planning. The factual position regarding these works is as under.</p> <p>Out of three works, <b>two works namely Construction of Cultural Hall of Porwal Park, Kamptee and Development works in Ranighat Smashanbhoomi, Kamptee have been completed</b> and handed over to the concerned user agencies.</p> <p>In respect of the third work- Construction of water tank and pipeline at Kesori, Tal Kuhi, the concerned IA had submitted the revised estimate and requested to give revised adm. Approval. However, as per the MPLADS guidelines</p>	<p><b>Collector Nagpur may be directed to furnish the latest position for the work.</b></p>



			<p>letter dated 08/04/2010 as the said work was sanctioned during 14<sup>th</sup> Lok Sabha, the revised administrative approval cannot be given and any such escalation or cost overrun has to be borne by IA. These facts are communicated to the concerned IA and asked to complete the work immediately. As per guidelines, suitable action will be taken against concerned IA.</p>	
<b>3.</b>	<b>4.2.1</b>	<p><b>(ii) <u>Sanction of works without adhering to Guidelines</u></b>  (i) During 2005-09, District Collector, Mumbai Suburban accorded administrative approval for 1,118 works, which were of dissimilar nature, costing Rs.62.62 crore on the basis of block estimates submitted by implementing agencies, without obtaining financial estimates from them for each work.</p>		<p><b>District Authority of Mumbai Suburban may be directed to expedite reply.</b></p>

**ODISHA**  
**C&AG PERFORMANCE AUDIT REPORT No.31 OF 2010-11**

**Sampled Districts:** Baragarh, Bhadrak, Jaipur, Kalahandi, Khurda

Sl. No.	Para No.	Text of the Paragraph	Reply	Comments of the Ministry										
1.	3.4	<p><b>(i) DAs sanctioned excess funds for Societies /Trusts.</b> (Rs.In Crore)</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">DAs involved</th> <th style="text-align: center;">No. of societies/trusts</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Amount admissible</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Actual amount sanctioned</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Excess amount sanctioned</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Khurda, Kalahandi</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0.5</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0.92</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0.42</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	DAs involved	No. of societies/trusts	Amount admissible	Actual amount sanctioned	Excess amount sanctioned	Khurda, Kalahandi	2	0.5	0.92	0.42	<p>As per reply received from District Authority, Khurda, it is fact that more than Rs 25 lakh has been released in favour of three institutions namely Kalinga Institute of Industrial Technology, Bhubneshwar, techno School and Nilachal Education Trust, Bhubneshwar. Funds for those three institutions has been released with due recommendation of on'ble M s. The amount so released has already been utilized and the projects have been completed. As the release of more than Rs 25 lakh to the registered Societies violates the MPLADS Guidelines. These institutions are providing technical education facilities to the students, delivering public welfare activities at large for socially challenged children by constructing hostel</p>	<p><b>Amount sanctioned more than the prescribed limit of Rs 25.00 lakh to the three institutes by District Collector Khurda .are violative of the provisions of the MPLADS Guidelines. The excess amount may be recouped and disciplinary action be initiated against errant district officials found responsible for irregular implementation of MPLADS works. Action Taken Report (ATNs) may be furnished to the Ministry for consideration.</b></p>
DAs involved	No. of societies/trusts	Amount admissible	Actual amount sanctioned	Excess amount sanctioned										
Khurda, Kalahandi	2	0.5	0.92	0.42										

			building, class room out of MPLADS funds. In the meantime, the financial ceiling from 25 lakh to 50 lakh has been raised. In the light of the above, the audit para may be dropped. Due care will be taken henceforth at the time of sanction of such type projects.	
2.	4.3	<p><b>Orissa</b> (iv) Unfruitful expenditure on following 3 works amounting to Rs.0.55 Crore were made:-</p> <p>(i) The contractor abandoned the work of construction of Biju Patnaik Kalyan Mandap at Mangalpurs to be built at an estimated cost of Rs. 0.40 crore. The work was awarded (February 2004) to the contractor without following competitive bidding and Rs. 0.36 crore was paid (April 2008) through various running account bills. Further, the concerned BDO (Dasrathpur) did not deduct 10 <i>per cent</i> security deposit of the contractor from running account bills.</p> <p>(ii) Two works for the Construction of a bridge over Haler Nalla near Khairapadar and Reconstruction of Chilipa High School at Dharmagarh taken up during 2003-04 and 2004-05 respectively were left incomplete after incurring an expenditure of Rs. 0.19 crore due to a land dispute (Chilipa School) and theft of steel rods from the foundation and piers</p>	<p>(i) As per reply from Collector Jajpur the amount Rs 40 lakh sanctioned for onstru tion of i u Patnaik Kalyan Mandap at Mangalpur has already been spent. The BDO, Dasrathpur has been instructed to strictly follow the proper tender procedure of the State government as required under para 3.3 of MPLADS Guidelines while awarding the work to the executants. The BDO Dasrathpur has been instructed to deduct 10% security deposit from concerned contractor and furnish compliance.</p> <p>(ii) As per reply from DC Kalahandi construction of High school Chhilpa, the original land holder</p>	<p><b>Reply do not addresses the observation recorded in the audit para. Collector Jajpur is requested to look into the matter and expedite reply.</b></p> <p><b>Collector Kalahandi may be instructed to intimate the present status of work to the</b></p>

		(Haler Nalla),.	<p>Sri Jogendra Patjoshi S/o Binod Bihari Patjoshi is one of the resident of village Chihilpa, who himself donated the land to the Managing Committee, Panchayat Bidya Pith, Chihilpa for construction of said High School building vide Gift Deed No 1245/1989 dated 15.01.1990. the Tehsildar, Dharamgarh has issued possession certificate vide MC No 2100/1994 in favour of the Managing Committee. Later on the donor created trouble for smooth constructions by applying his intelligence as he is a Prof of Law Department , Jyoti Vihar Burla. Later, the case filed by Sri Patijoshi in the court of the civil juge at Dharamgah has been finalized in favour of the school. The High court has also passed the judgement in favour of school. The dispute of the land is over and the construction work is now in progress and it will be completed shortly. Hence, the para may be considered for dropping.</p>	<b>Ministry.</b>
3.	6.2.2	<p><b><u>(ii) Incorrect reporting of financial progress by the DAs</u></b> - Scrutiny of MPRs and Annual Accounts in constituencies including two RS MPs of States/UTs further disclosed that the DAs had reported lesser amounts of interest earned in their annual accounts and/or MPRs than those reported in the MPRs of the earlier months resulting in</p>		

		understatement of interest as per detail given below:-						
		<b>Constituency</b>		<b>Remarks</b>		<b>Amount of interest understated</b>		
		Bhubaneswar		Interest accrued as per MPR for the month of October 2004 was Rs. 0.20 crore but it was depicted as Rs. 0.18 crore in the MPR of September 2006.		0.02		
								District Authority, Bhubaneswar may be directed to expedite reply in the matter.
4.	6.2.3	<b><u>Discrepancies in figures in MPRs, UCs and annual accounts</u></b> - Details according to nature of discrepancies is given below:-						
		<b>(F) Discrepancies in closing balance figures between the UCs and the MPRs</b>						
		<b>Constituency</b>		<b>Utilisation Certificate</b>		<b>MPR</b>		
			<b>Year</b>	<b>Amount</b>	<b>Month</b>	<b>Amount</b>		
		Bolangir	2007-08	3.6	Mar-08	0.98		
								District Authority, Bolangir may be directed to expedite reply in the matter.

**RAJASTHAN**  
**C&AG PERFORMANCE AUDIT REPORT No.31 OF 2010-11**

**Sampled District**

Sl. No.	Para No.	Text of the Paragraph	Reply	Comments of the Ministry																												
1.	3.3	<p><b>Selection of Prohibited Works</b> The following works have been executed which were not permitted as per Guidelines:-</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(Rs.In Crore)</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 70%;"><b>No. of DAs</b></td> <td style="width: 10%;"></td> <td style="width: 20%; text-align: center;">5</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Works for office and residential buildings of Central/State Government</td> <td>No. of works</td> <td style="text-align: center;">43</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Amount</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0.82</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Works for office and residential buildings for cooperative, private organization and any work for commercial body</td> <td>No. of works</td> <td style="text-align: center;">6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Amount</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">All works of renovation, repair and maintenance</td> <td>No. of works</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Amount</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0.12</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Purchase of prohibited movable items</td> <td>No. of works</td> <td style="text-align: center;">6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Amount</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0.21</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Total</td> <td>No. of works</td> <td style="text-align: center;">58</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Amount</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1.36</td> </tr> </table>	<b>No. of DAs</b>		5	Works for office and residential buildings of Central/State Government	No. of works	43	Amount	0.82	Works for office and residential buildings for cooperative, private organization and any work for commercial body	No. of works	6	Amount	0.2	All works of renovation, repair and maintenance	No. of works	3	Amount	0.12	Purchase of prohibited movable items	No. of works	6	Amount	0.21	Total	No. of works	58	Amount	1.36	<p>As per received from CEO, Jila Parishad Sikar that out of three works at serial 3, one work costing Rs 7.55 lakh has been regularized. No expenditure has been made on prohibited works at serial 1 and 2 respectively. The work relates to construction of Porch near Collectorate Bhavan and not related to construction of collector's building.</p> <p>Further, CEO Sikar has clarified that the office of the District Collector is on the 1<sup>st</sup> floor and keeping in view the inconvenience and problems of the visitors and the rural people who meets the Collector, it was considered appropriate to construct the waiting room. This construction was technically possible only after raising the pillar from the ground floor. Therefore, the former MP recommended the work, construction of porch and waiting room and subsequently</p>	<p>As per serial 1 of the List of works prohibited under MPLADS, construction of building belonging to central and state Government, their department are prohibited. Construction of Porch near collector Bhavan at a cost of Rs 7.55 lakh falls in the categories of state Government building and hence, the work executed is in violation of the Guidelines. This construction forms part of collector's office and is not useful for the public at large. State Nodal Department is requested to direct the CEO, Zila Parishad, Sikar to recoup the MPLADS funds and initiate necessary disciplinary action against the errant district official found responsible for irregular sanction in violation of the Guidelines</p>
<b>No. of DAs</b>		5																														
Works for office and residential buildings of Central/State Government	No. of works	43																														
	Amount	0.82																														
Works for office and residential buildings for cooperative, private organization and any work for commercial body	No. of works	6																														
	Amount	0.2																														
All works of renovation, repair and maintenance	No. of works	3																														
	Amount	0.12																														
Purchase of prohibited movable items	No. of works	6																														
	Amount	0.21																														
Total	No. of works	58																														
	Amount	1.36																														

			<p>sanctioned by the DC. It may be added that this construction is not part of the official building and is being used by the public at large. In the waiting room no official work is being done. This waiting room is being used by the visitor and general people who comes to address their problem before the Collector. The executed work is a kind of public benefit and general welfare and hence, as per the Guidelines. The para may be settled.</p> <p>Further CEO Sikar has clarified that total sanctioned cost of two works is Rs 4.11 lakh and not Rs 7.5 lakh as indicated in the performance audit report. As regard disciplinary action against the errant officials is concerned , the proposal will be sent soon to Gramin Vikar Vibhag.</p>	<p><b>and furnish the Action Taken Report (ATR) to this Ministry for consideration.</b></p> <p><b>This Ministry has requested for recouping the funds incurred on the works in violation to the Guidelines. It is the CEO Sikar who has intimated the total funds incurred in violation to the Guidelines. This Ministry has further requested for furnishing the ATR against the errant officials , the Same is still awaited. It is requested the same may be expedited.</b></p> <p><b>The work of installation of EPBAX system, AC with stabilizers, purchase of computers for SDM offices</b></p>
--	--	--	--	---

			<p>As per state reply, in Sriganganagar constituency this work pertains to Hanumangarh district and relates installation of 2 AC and Stabilizer, EPBAX telephone line costing Rs 1.38 lakh and purchase of computer costing Rs 3.00 lakh for SDM office Ganganagar, Raisingh Nagar, Karanpur, Ghadsana and Suratgarh. The assets not being movable has been installed in the Government Building. Besides as per report received from Hanumangarh district that Wireless instrument costing Rs 3.00 lakh is permanently installed instrument. Hence para may be dropped</p>	<p><b>and wireless instrument are prohibited works and hence, funds with interests need to be recouped immediately. The erring officials found responsible for irregular sanction may be identified and necessary disciplinary action may be initiated against them. A report to this effect may be forwarded to this Ministry for consideration.</b></p>											
2.	3.4	<p><b><u>DAs sanctioned excess funds for Societies /Trusts</u></b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>DAs involved</th> <th>No. of societies/trusts</th> <th>Amount admissible</th> <th>Actual amount sanctioned</th> <th>Excess amount sanctioned</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Pali, Tonk, Bharatpur</td> <td>3</td> <td>0.75</td> <td>1.26</td> <td>0.51</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			DAs involved	No. of societies/trusts	Amount admissible	Actual amount sanctioned	Excess amount sanctioned	Pali, Tonk, Bharatpur	3	0.75	1.26	0.51	<p>District Authority, Bharatpur has informed that different works were recommended by the MPs of Bharatpur and Biyana to Adarsh Vidya Mandir Samiti, Bharatpur. These works were considered separate works and sanctioned as per provisions of Guidelines and not more than 25 lakh were sanctioned in each case.</p> <p>District Authority, Pali has informed that charge sheet framed under CCA Rules 1958 Rule 16 to Shri Govind Rathore and Smt Rabha Taforer's and Shri V.K Purohit former</p>
DAs involved	No. of societies/trusts	Amount admissible	Actual amount sanctioned	Excess amount sanctioned											
Pali, Tonk, Bharatpur	3	0.75	1.26	0.51											



			<p>APO(Engg) Zila Parishad Pali and Dealing Assistant Babu Lal Meena and sent to Deputy secretary, Rural Development Department Rajasthan Jaipur vide this office letter No 2044 dated 12.01.2010, 2536 dated 11.02.2010, 262 dated 30.06.2011 and 746 dated 4.5.2012 for onward transmission to Appointment Authority for necessary action. Progress will be communicated to Audit.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

**TAMILNADU**  
**C&AG PERFORMANCE AUDIT REPORT No.31 OF 2010-11**

**Sampled Districts:** Chennai, Erode, Kanyakumari, Karur, Krishnagiri, Vellore, Virudhunagar

Sl. No.	Para No.	Text of the Paragraph	Reply	Comments of the Ministry				
1	6.7	<p><b>Tamil Nadu</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;">(Rs in crore)</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">Name of DA</th> <th style="text-align: left;">Amount</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Erode, Kanyakumari, Karur, Krishnagiri, Vellore, Virudhunagar</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0.24</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Name of DA	Amount	Erode, Kanyakumari, Karur, Krishnagiri, Vellore, Virudhunagar	0.24	<p>District Authority, Kanyakumari has informed that an amount Rs 4,37,139/- lakh has been booked as petty supervision charges for 34 Nos. of works implemented by EE (PWD) Buildings, Kanyakumari. The petty supervision charges have not been included in the work estimates submitted by the PWD. On verification of the provisional completion report, the petty supervision charges levied due to necessary unforeseen expenses on execution of work. <b>In this connection, it is reported that, necessary action will be taken to recoup the above amount from EE (PWD) Buildings,</b> and the above amount will be credited to the MPLADS account. The same will not occur in future.</p> <p>It has also been intimated while preparing estimate, the provisions are made for 2.5% as unforeseen charges to meet the difference in cost of materials, and another 2.5% for supervising charges to supervise the quality of work made for temporarily provided technical assistant.</p> <p>The above unforeseen contingencies charges and petty supervision charges are</p>	<p><b>DC Kanyakumari has not intimated about the recoupment of funds. District Authority Kanyakumari may be directed to recoup the funds and intimate the present status.</b></p>
Name of DA	Amount							
Erode, Kanyakumari, Karur, Krishnagiri, Vellore, Virudhunagar	0.24							

			<p>included in the completion report were approved by the competent authority. Provision of petty charges were also approved in the PWD code.</p> <p>As per reply received from District Authority, Erode as per audit report, it was observed that Rs 69, 913/- has been booked as petty supervision charges in respect of 15 works. On verification of the completion report, the petty supervision charges were given while executing the work. Since, no clear instructions were received in this regard. Now necessary instructions had been given to all the Implementing agencies, not to include petty supervision charges in the completion report. Now a days no petty supervision charges are booked in the Completion reports. In this regard, necessary instructions had been given to all the implementing agencies. Hence, the audit objection may kindly be dropped.</p> <p>As per reply received from DC, Karur, no clear instructions was received at the time of expenditure incurred. The expenditure was incurred on the basis of necessity and urgency. Now after the audit, the prohibited item of expenditure such as salary, travel cost etc. are not incurred in the district.</p> <p>As per reply received from DC, Virudhnagar, due to unavoidable circumstances contingency expenses were expended during the past years but not completely restricted as per the Guidelines.</p>	<p><b>Replies from District Authorities Erode, Karur and Virudhnagar are not satisfactory. Action to recoup the MPLADS funds may be taken. Action against the district officials found responsible for not adhering to the provisions of the guidelines of MPLADS may also be initiated and reported to the Ministry.</b></p>
--	--	--	--	---

			<p><b>It has been further clarified by District Authority Virudhnagar, an amount Rs 24,046/- was booked on petty supervision charges for 3 works executed by EE, PWD Building (C&amp;M) Division, Virudh Nagar and remitted in the form of DD from MPLADS funds account of the MP on 11.09.2014 as per statement of bank account.</b></p> <p>District Authority Vellore in their reply has informed that the contingency expenses under MPLAD Scheme is being incurred only for the purchase of stationeries, phone charges and computer accessories for office us as stipulated in the Guidelines of MPLADS . Whereas no expenses is being incurred for other expenses and also instructions given to Implementing Agencies not to incur any petty supervision charges. Hence the reply may be kindly be dropped.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

**TRIPURA**  
**C&AG PERFORMANCE AUDIT REPORT No.31 OF 2010-11**

**Sampled Districts: North Tripura, West Tripura**

Sl.No.	Para No.	Text of the Paragraph	Reply	Comments of the Ministry
1.	4.3	<p><u>Tripura</u> Unfruitful expenditure on following 14 works amounting to Rs.1.21 Crore were made:-</p> <p>(i) Work for construction of a Town Hall at Kumarghat, sanctioned in August 2001, was suspended with effect from August 2002 after incurring an expenditure of Rs. 0.12 crore, as an injunction was imposed by the Hon'ble High Court due to a land dispute</p>	<p>(i) As per reply received from District Authority North Tripura Construction of Town Hall at Kumarghat was started on the Govt. Khas land with the initiative &amp; requisition of Kumarghat Nagar Panchayat and Executives Engineer RD was made I/O for the work from Nov, 2001 vide work order Executive Engineer taken up the construction, costing of Rs. 30.68,303 lakh with the MPLADS funds and Urban Development Fund in total Rs. 30.00 lakh (MPLADS Rs. 20.00 lakh + Urban Development fund of Rs. 10.00 lakh). The work have been done up to roof level. In the meantime one person namely <b>Sri Panna Lal Ghose &amp; others filed a case against the SDM, Kaillashahar claiming title of the plot on which construction works was taken up.</b> Hearing the petition of Sri panna al hosh Hon'ble High Court order to maintained status-quo from 27-08-2002. By the time the construction of the Town Hall was made up to roof level incurring an amount of Rs. 22.91,037/- from MPLADS fund. Considering long pendency in Settlement of the dispute, the fund which is remain un-utilized Rs. 7.08,963/-was utilized in other project i.e construction of School Building under Kumarghat Block. The Executive Engineer had no fault in taking up the work at the initial stage since there was no dispute over the land. On disposal of the dispute the Town Hall construction will be completed.</p>	<p><b>The reply received on audit observations at serial (i), (iv) &amp; (V) are not satisfactory and point out violation of guidelines and use of MPLADS funds for unfruitful work. State Nodal Authority may be requested to look into the matter and direct the concerned district authorities to recoup the fund with interest and initiate action against the district officials found responsible for the irregularities. The action taken report may be sent to the Ministry.</b></p>

	<p>(ii) Two works for construction of a community hall at Salema and Manik Bhandar in Dhalai district, sanctioned during 2000-02, were suspended with effect from June 2008 after incurring an expenditure of Rs. 0.52 crore for want of fresh allotment of funds in view of time and cost overrun.</p> <p>(iii) Three works, sanctioned between 2000-01 and 2005-06, were suspended after incurring an expenditure of Rs. 0.46 crore for want of allotment of the second instalment of funds.</p> <p>(iv) Work on construction of an irrigation plant, sanctioned in July 2007 without preparing estimates, was abandoned after incurring an expenditure of Rs. 0.40 lakh due to technical non-feasibility.</p> <p>(v) Three works costing Rs. 0.22 crore, sanctioned between May 2007 and May 2008, had not been started as of September 2009 due to non-selection of sites or site disputes. Even before finalization of the sites, the IAs had procured the required</p>	<p>(ii) As per reply received from District Authority North Tripura, the work has been completed.</p> <p>(iii) As per reply received from District Authority North Tripura, the work has been completed.</p> <p>(iv) As per reply received from DM West Tripura the recommendation made by the on'ble M S fund amounting to Rs 12.00 lakh was placed with BDO Teliamura in two spells for setting up of irrigation plant in Satish Bhowmik Para Paddy Field at Gamaibari under MPLADS. In November 2007, BDO Teliamura intimated that he had no rig machine. Then the matter was referred to the Chief Engineer, PWD, Kunjaban for examining the scope of taking up the work and prepare plan and estimate. As per estimate BDO, Telimura placed Rs 8.299 lakh with the EE, Rig Division, Kunjaban for execution of the work. It was intimated by Rig Division that the work was abandoned due to non-availability of suitable water bearing Strata for which Rs 0.39,634/- was incurred for borehole. On hearing the matter the on'ble M S vide his letter dated 12.11.2009 had intimated that attempt was made to plant the deep tube well in Gamaibari field at Teliamura but the trial was not successful due to insufficient ground water level, as a result of which an alternative proposal for construction of a community hall at Madhya Brahmacherra under Brahmacherra G.P was made. Accordingly the construction work is going on and to be completed very soon. <b>Final reply is still awaited.</b></p> <p><b>(v) As per reply received from DM West Tripura there were some</b></p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>materials (Cement, M. Steel, GCI Sheets etc.) between October 2007 and June 2008 at a cost of Rs. 0.08 crore and these remained idle in stores for one to two years. The IAs also retained the balance funds of Rs. 0.14 crore in cash.</p> <p>(vi) Out of 11 deed firms to whom the work of construction of a pucca drain near the fish shed at G. B. Bazar was awarded in April 2006, only six firms had completed their portion of work by November 2006. The remaining five firms had not executed the works as of September 2009, leading to expenditure of Rs. 0.02 crore incurred on the project remaining unfruitful.</p>	<p><b>disputes in respect of three works costing Rs 0.22 crore sanctioned between May 2007 to May 2008 due to non-selection of sites or site disputes. Even before the finalization of the sites, the Implementing Agencies had procured the required materials (Cement, M. Steel, GCI Sheets etc.) between Oct 2007 and June 2008 at a cost of Rs 0.08 crore and these remained idle in stores for one to two years. The Implementing Agencies also retained the balance funds of Rs 0.14 crore in cash.</b></p> <p>(vi) As per reply received from DM West Tripura the unspent balance fund of Rs 1.71 lakh towards construction of a pucca drain near the fish shed at G.B Bazar has been refunded by CEO, AMC vide Cheque No 343961 dated 09.04.2010 due to non-execution of the work by the remaining five firms.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

## UTTAR PRADESH

### C&AG PERFORMANCE AUDIT REPORT No.31 OF 2010-11

**Sampled Districts:** Ambedkarnagar, Balia, Barabanki, Bijnore, Badaun, Etawah, Gonda, Jalaun, Kannauj, Kushinagar, Maharajganj, Mirzapur, Shahjahanpur, Siddarthnagar, Sultanpur

Sl. No.	Para No.	Text of the Paragraph	Reply	Comments of the Ministry																	
1.	3.3	<p><b>Selection of Prohibited Works</b> - The following works have been executed which were not permitted as per Guidelines:- (Rs. In Crore)</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 80%;">No. of DAs</td> <td style="width: 20%; text-align: center;">5</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Works for office and residential buildings of Central/State Government</td> <td style="text-align: center;">No. of works</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Amount</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Works for religious purposes and works within the premises of religious body</td> <td style="text-align: center;">No. of works</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Amount</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">All works of renovation, repair and maintenance</td> <td style="text-align: center;">No. of works</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Amount</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Purchase of prohibited movable items</td> <td style="text-align: center;">No. of works</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Amount</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Total</td> <td style="text-align: center;">No. of works</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Amount</td> </tr> </table>	No. of DAs	5	Works for office and residential buildings of Central/State Government	No. of works	Amount	Works for religious purposes and works within the premises of religious body	No. of works	Amount	All works of renovation, repair and maintenance	No. of works	Amount	Purchase of prohibited movable items	No. of works	Amount	Total	No. of works	Amount	<p>As per reply received from DM <b>Barabanki</b>, prohibited works have not been selected.</p> <p>As per reply from received from DM <b>Shahjahanpur</b> that no prohibited works sanctioned in the District.</p> <p>As per reply received from DM <b>Maharajganj</b> that there is no such type of work in the District . The works are being executed as per Guidelines.</p> <p>As per reply from DM <b>Mirzapur</b>, no works has been executed which was not permitted as per Guidelines in District Mirzapur.</p> <p>As per reply from <b>DM Ambedkar Nagar</b> that no prohibited works was executed in the District.</p> <p>As per reply received from <b>DM Kannauj</b> that the works recommended by the MPs are sanctioned taking into account eligibility of works as per Guidelines.</p> <p>As per reply from DM <b>Etawah</b></p>	<p><b>C&amp;AG</b> in the performance audit report has pointed out execution of total <b>14 works costing Rs 0.90 crore</b> in 5 districts. Reply received from the 12 districts mentioning that no such work was executed is apparently incorrect.</p> <p><b>Audit was conducted in the sampled 15 districts and the objections must have been given to the district authorities in five districts. District Authorities should know the details of audit observations.</b></p> <p><b>The District Magistrates of all the sampled districts may be instructed to find out the objections and furnish their replies to this Ministry through the State Nodal</b></p>
No. of DAs	5																				
Works for office and residential buildings of Central/State Government	No. of works																				
	Amount																				
Works for religious purposes and works within the premises of religious body	No. of works																				
	Amount																				
All works of renovation, repair and maintenance	No. of works																				
	Amount																				
Purchase of prohibited movable items	No. of works																				
	Amount																				
Total	No. of works																				
	Amount																				



			<p>that only those works are executed which are permissible as per MPLADS Guidelines.</p> <p>As per reply from DM <b>Sultanpur</b> that works in the Districts are sanctioned as per provisions of the Guidelines.</p> <p>As per reply from DM Gonda that this para is not related to the district.</p> <p>As per reply from DM Badaun, a Special Audit was conducted covering the financial year 2004-05 to 2008-09 wherein no such works which goes against the MPLADS Guidelines have been found executed. Hence, the para does not may be treated as settled.</p> <p>As per reply from CDO Sidarthnagar that no prohibited work were executed in the District.</p> <p>As per reply from DRDA Kushi Nagar that there is no such type of work in the district. The works are being executed as per guidelines.</p> <p>As per reply from DM, Balia that there is no such type of work in the district Balia. The works are being executed as per Guidelines.</p> <p>As per reply from DM Jalaun that Milan Kendra in Kauch Nagar was constructed by Uttar Pradesh Samaj Kalyan</p>	<p><b>authorities.</b></p> <p><b>District Authority Jalaun has intimated about one work costing Rs 2.40 lakh executed near a Religious place. However, on examination , this does not appear to be the work which the Audit Authorities have pointed out</b></p>
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>Nirman Nigam at cost of Rs 2.40 lakh near Vajjay Lankeshwar Hanuman Mandir. The construction was not made in the religious site. The construction site is just 20 meter away from the religious place. The construction was done outside the religious site.</p>	<p><b>because the cost of the prohibited work in the religious place is Rs 0.04 crore.</b></p>
2.	4.3	<p><b><u>Incomplete works:</u></b> 446 works costing Rs. 15.25 Crore remained incomplete 1 to 4 years in 15 DAs.</p>	<p>As per reply received from DM Sultanpur, out of total 212 work sanctioned by the District Authority, 135 works were completed within the period of one year and balance were completed after one year.</p> <p>As per reply received from DM Shahjahanpur, out of 59 incomplete works, 2 works costing Rs 1.53 lakh were completed after one year due to local dispute.</p> <p>As per reply received from DM Bijnore out of the total works sanctioned, only three works have been delayed more than one year. Efforts are being made to avoid recurrence of such lapses.</p> <p>As per reply received from DM Barabanki, all work got completed on time.</p>	<p><b>Status of incomplete works reported in the audit para may be furnished.</b></p>

			<p>As per reply received from DM Maharajganj all works from 2004-05 to 2008-09 have been completed.</p> <p><b>As per reply received from DM Ambedkar Nagar there is only 04 works are incomplete. Notice have been issued to the executing agencies. In case satisfactory reply is not received , strict action will be initiated .</b></p> <p>As per reply received from DM Badaun the efforts are made to complete the work within the prescribed period as per Guidelines.</p> <p>As per reply received from DM Kannauj out of 07 incomplete works in the District beyond the time period of one year, six works have been completed. The only one institutions has not able to utilize the funds of first installment. <b>FIR has been lodged against this institution and the concerned Education Board have been directed for de-recognition of the institutions.</b></p> <p>As per reply received from DM Jaulan there is no such case reported in the District.</p> <p>As per reply received from DM Balia there is no such case reported in the District.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>As per reply received from DM Etawah all sanctioned works are complete upto the year 2009-10.</p> <p>As per reply received from DM Kannauj 07 incomplete works have been completed and completion certificate have been received.</p> <p>As per reply from DM Gonda all the works have been completed.</p> <p>As per reply received from DM Sidarthnagar all the work sanctioned during the years 2004-05 to 2008-09 have been completed.</p> <p>As per reply received from DM Kushi Nagar at present there is no incomplete works.</p> <p><b>As per reply received from DM Ambedkar Nagar out of 04 works, 02 works have been completed. As regard balance 02 works FIR has been lodged in the Police Station under clause 188/12 of IPC 409 against the Manager Educational Institute Vimla Devi Samarak Balika Junior High School, Bidhar and under clause 3/13 of 419 and 420 IPC against Educational institute Shri Bhavani Bhikh Singh Sarv Laghu Madhyamik Vidyalaya, Narainpur Pritampur for misuse of MPLADS funds which are under investigation.</b></p>	
--	--	---	--

3.	6.7	<p><b>Contingency Expenses</b> - DAs had utilized an amount of Rs 1.30 crore on payment of honorarium/wages/travelling expenses of staff, refreshments for staff, electrification of office building, fuel for official vehicles, purchase of laptops, office furniture, supervision charges etc., which were inadmissible as per detail given below.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Rs in crore)</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="491 837 1264 961"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="491 837 915 899">Name of DA</th> <th data-bbox="915 837 1264 899">Amount</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="491 899 915 961">Etawah, Siddarhnagar</td> <td data-bbox="915 899 1264 961">0.06</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Name of DA	Amount	Etawah, Siddarhnagar	0.06	<p>As per reply received from DM Siddarath Nagar, as prescribed in the Guidelines, only 0.5% Contingency fund for computer, AC for computer room, stationary and payment of honorarium to the official working for MPLADS is being spent in the district. So far an amount 3,67,269/- have been spent during the period 2004-05 to 2008-09 from the contingency fund. In this connection it is also intimated that the computer/laptop has been installed in the first floor of the DC Secretariat building for the use of the DC office. Keeping in view the operational capability of the computer during the summer, an AC was purchased for the computer room. AC has not been purchased for use of officer or employee of the DM Office. Contingency fund is not being used for any other purpose except as per provision of the Guidelines.</p>	<p><b>DC Siddarath Nagar may be requested to recoup the funds sanctioned for irregular works and furnish compliance report.</b></p>
Name of DA	Amount							
Etawah, Siddarhnagar	0.06							



**Uttarakhand**  
**C&AG PERFORMANCE AUDIT REPORT No.31 OF 2010-11**

**Sampled District: Bageshwar, Pithoragarh, Udham Singhnagar**

S.No.	Para No.	Text of the Paragraph	Reply	Comments of the Ministry																		
1.	3.3	<p><b>Selection of Prohibited Works</b> The following works have been executed which were not permitted as per Guidelines:- (Rs.In Crore)</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>No. of DAs</td> <td></td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Works for office and residential buildings for cooperative, private organization and any work for commercial body</td> <td>No. of works</td> <td>109</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Amount</td> <td>1.75</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Works for religious purposes and works within in the premises of religious body</td> <td>No of works</td> <td>02</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Amount</td> <td>0.02</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Total</td> <td>No. of works</td> <td>111</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Amount</td> <td>1.77</td> </tr> </table>	No. of DAs		3	Works for office and residential buildings for cooperative, private organization and any work for commercial body	No. of works	109	Amount	1.75	Works for religious purposes and works within in the premises of religious body	No of works	02	Amount	0.02	Total	No. of works	111	Amount	1.77	<p>As per reply received from District Magistrate <b>Bageshwar</b>, that no expenditure on works for office and residential building of central/State Government has been made in this districts. Only 44 works costing Rs 0.58 crore has been utilized for construction of class room of Government schools, Government aided schools, Private recognized school. All works are admissible as per provisions of MPLADS Guidelines. Project and Scheme code of items executed have been indicated against each work. All works have been executed on the recommendations of</p>	<p><b>The current reply of District Bageshwar is not satisfactory. The works mentioned at Sl. No. 17, 18 and 22 of the list, involving an amount of Rs. 3.70 Lakhs are prohibited work under guidelines. As such action against the errant officials responsible for sanctioning such prohibitive works be taken and funds of Rs. 3.70 Lakhs spent for such works be recouped with interest.</b></p>
No. of DAs		3																				
Works for office and residential buildings for cooperative, private organization and any work for commercial body	No. of works	109																				
	Amount	1.75																				
Works for religious purposes and works within in the premises of religious body	No of works	02																				
	Amount	0.02																				
Total	No. of works	111																				
	Amount	1.77																				

			<p>the MP and are in accordance with the need of the public.</p> <p>No works for religious purposed and works within the premises of religious body has been executed in the District.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--



**WEST BENGAL**  
**C&AG PERFORMANCE AUDIT REPORT No.31 OF 2010-11**

**Sampled Districts: Hooghly, Kolkata, Paschim Medinipur, Purulia, South 24 Parganas**

Sl. No.	Para No.	Text of the Paragraph	Reply	Comments of the Ministry										
1	3.4	<p><b>DAs sanctioned excess funds for Societies /Trusts</b></p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">DAs involved</th> <th style="text-align: center;">No. of societies/trusts</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Amount admissible</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Actual amount sanctioned</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Excess amount sanctioned</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">24 Pargana, Paschim Medinipur, Hoogly, Purulia</td> <td style="text-align: center;">6</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1.5</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2.76</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1.26</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	DAs involved	No. of societies/trusts	Amount admissible	Actual amount sanctioned	Excess amount sanctioned	24 Pargana, Paschim Medinipur, Hoogly, Purulia	6	1.5	2.76	1.26	<p>Reply received by the state govt. from the Sampled districts are given below:-</p> <p><b>Purulia-</b> All the schemes were re o ended by various on'ble MPs (Rajya Sabha) for which KMC is the nodal agency and D.M. Purulia is the Implementing agency. Accordingly it should be pointed out by the Nodal Authority before sanctioning. Nodal Authorities are contacted regularly. KMC was contacted recently to stop sanctioning funds in favour of Vidyasagar foundation as it is a private institution.</p> <p>As per state reply, the district authority has been asked to submit a detailed report about the total utilisation of the fund of Rs 1,05,72,500/- for the purpose for which it was sanctioned and the details of the creation of the assets</p>	<p><b>DM Purulia may be directed to recoup the excess payment beyond Rs 25 lakh with interest accrued thereon and initiate necessary action against the errant district officials found responsible for irregular sanction of work beyond the prescribed limit of 25 lakh for trust/society.</b></p> <p><b>Latest position in the matter may please be furnished.</b></p>
DAs involved	No. of societies/trusts	Amount admissible	Actual amount sanctioned	Excess amount sanctioned										
24 Pargana, Paschim Medinipur, Hoogly, Purulia	6	1.5	2.76	1.26										

			and its usage by the target group.	
2	4.3(iii)	<p><b>West Bengal</b> 3008 works costing Rs. 94.24 Crore remained incomplete 1 to 15 years in 5 DAs.</p> <p>In five test checked districts (Hooghly, Kolkata, Paschim Medinipur, Purulia and South 24 Paragna), out of 20,385 works costing Rs. 378.08 crore sanctioned during 1993-94 to 2007-08, 1,499 works costing Rs. 57.01 crore remained incomplete for one to three years. 1,004 works costing Rs. 24.14 crore remained incomplete for four to six years. 311 works costing Rs. 10.29 crore remained incomplete for seven to nine years and 194 works of Rs. 2.80 crore remained incomplete for 10 to 14 years. The DAs did not maintain records regarding non-commencement of works by IAs after release of funds to them. No action was taken to obtain refund of unutilised funds even though the IAs did not report the status of works for years. DMs of Hooghly and South 24 Parganas stated (June 2009) that they were unable to monitor such large number of works due to lack of adequate infrastructure.</p>	<p>State Government has informed the following:-</p> <p><b>KMC MPLADS schemes are monitored on regular basis and Implementing Agencies are reminded in respect of incomplete works. Computer system generates computerized reminder system of the incomplete works. KMC is monitoring the system regularly for ensuring timely completion of the works.</b></p> <p><b>Hooghly</b> The reasons of the delays were due to inadequate infrastructure of the District Authority. Letters as well as reminders were issued to IAs and monitoring meetings have been held with all stake holders and district /sub-division and block level for re-fund of unutilized fund. However, the District authority will revisit their monitoring mechanism.</p>	<p><b>Reply received from KMC is not as per the observations made in the audit para. KMC may be instructed to look into the matter and furnish specific reply as to why the works remained incomplete from 1 to 15 years and the action taken to complete the work within the specified period.</b></p> <p><b>District Authority Hooghly may be requested to furnish the present status of 23 schemes which are yet to completed.</b></p>

			<p>There are 23 schemes which were not started costing Rs 91.32 lakh. They are yet to be completed. Further 12 scheme remain incomplete with an unspent balance of Rs 25.83 lakh. Implementing Agencies are responsible for the delay. Implementing Agencies are already advised to complete the schemes by December 2011 or refund the amount with accrued interest thereon.</p>	
4.3(iv)	<p>(v) Works remained incomplete due to shortage of funds after spending the entire MPLDS funds due to preparation of incorrect financial estimates.</p> <p><b><u>West Bengal</u></b></p> <p>47 test-checked works amounting to Rs.2.82 Crore in five districts remained incomplete due to shortage of funds after spending the entire MPLADS funds, due to preparation of incorrect financial estimates and failure of DAs to secure funds for escalated costs.</p>	<p><b>South 24 Paraganas</b> - It has been observed that the frequent increase in prices of input materials has created a stumbling block for implementation of the schemes. Also the revision of the PWD schedule of rates of works not being effected in unison of the increase in market price of the input materials had added to the problem. At times the honorable MPs are requested to allocate additional fund which are granted at times. The problem occurs most</p>	<p><b>South 24 Praganas District may be directed to furnish reply relating to incomplete works mentioned in the Audit Para.</b></p>	

			<p>in case of schemes allocated by the on'ble M s at the fag end of their terms where allocation of additional fund becomes remote.</p> <p><b>Paschim Mednipur</b> In some ases it is found that on'ble M s are recommending schemes in which total project cost is much more than their sanctioned amount. In those cases concerned IA certifies that rest amount will be borne by them. But in some case they could not complete the s he e. on'ble M s again send recommendation for release of funds against those incomplete schemes. However, presently the District Authority is releasing fund to complete the scheme.</p>	<p><b>District Authority Paschim Mednipur may be requested to furnish the present status of work under completion.</b></p>
3	4.4.1	<p><b><u>Non-existence of assets</u></b> – DM, South 24 Parganas released Rs. 0.05 crore in May 2008 to the Secretary, Taldi-I Village Education Committee for construction of a classroom at Rajapur Free Primary School at Taldi-I under Canning-I Block. Though the DM had received the Utilisation Certificate (UC) for the entire amount of Rs. 0.05 crore, Audit found in July 2009 that the classroom was not constructed. At the instance of Audit, the DM of South 24 Parganas directed the Block Development Officer, Canning-I to investigate the matter. The DA confirmed (October 2009) the misappropriation of funds by the Secretary, Talidi-I and in-charge of Rajapur Free Primary School, against whom, the First Investigation Report was lodged. Further developments were awaited.</p>	<p>As per state reply, The superintendent of Police , South 24 Parganas furnished and action taken report on the FIR lodged by the District Planning Officer, South 24 arganas. As per S 's report vide memo No 112E dated 14.02.2013, it may be stated that during investigation of the case the allegations were substantiated and IO of the case arrested one Nakul Bolde S/O Lt Nishikanta Bolde of South Rajapur, on 07.11.09 and FIR named accused Bimal Kumar Haldar surrendered before Lower Division Court on 03.06.2009. After completion of the investigation IO has submitted</p>	<p><b>DM 24 Praganas may be requested to provide the present status of the case.</b></p>

			Charge Sheet against both the accused in the case vide canning PS CS No 414/10 dated 06..11.10 V/S 406/409/120B/34 IPC. The case at present is sub-judice.					
4	6.7	<p><b><u>West Bengal</u></b></p> <p style="text-align: right;">(Rs in crore)</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Name of DA</th> <th>Amount</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>South 24 Parganas, Kolkata</td> <td>0.03</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Name of DA	Amount	South 24 Parganas, Kolkata	0.03	<p>State Government has informed the following :-</p> <p><b>South 24 Paraganas-</b> Given the huge amount of schemes recommended by the MPs throughout the year and their monitoring envisages a huge amount of Data Entry works for which two data entry operators are engaged by the district whose wages are being booked from the MPLADS Contingency in absence of any other available resources. For proper maintenance of the computers engaged for MPLADS works <b>up-gradation of electrical arrangement were made and a cost of Rs. 29,834/- was booked in the contingency fund. Small amount for refreshment form MPLADS contingency was made at various monitoring meetings at the district level, here on' le M s representative /Govt. Officials attended.</b></p>	<p><b>Rs 29,834 incurred is violative of guidelines. This amount may be recouped and action against erring District Officials be initiated. Action Taken Notes may be furnished to this Ministry.</b></p>
Name of DA	Amount							
South 24 Parganas, Kolkata	0.03							

## Annexure-II

### State wise details of closing of MPLADS Saving Bank Accounts upto 14<sup>th</sup> Lok Sabha MPs

Sr. No.	Name of the State/UT	Total number of Former MPs (LS)	Total number of MPLADS accounts closed
1.	Andaman & Nicobar Islands	01	00
2.	Andhra Pradesh	42	04
3.	Arunachal Pradesh	02	01
4.	Assam	14	04
5.	Bihar	40	-
6.	Chandigarh	01	01
7.	Chhattisgarh	11	03
8.	Dadra and Nagar Haveli	01	01
9.	Daman and Diu	01	01
10.	Delhi	07	-
11.	Goa	02	01
12.	Gujarat	26	14
13.	Haryana	10	03
14.	Himachal Pradesh	04	01
15.	Jammu & Kashmir	06	01
16.	Jharkhand	14	02
17.	Karnataka	28	01
18.	Kerala	20	04
19.	Ladshadweep	01	-
20.	Madhya Pradesh	29	10
21.	Maharashtra	48	10
22.	Manipur	02	-
23.	Meghalaya	02	-
24.	Mizoram	01	01
25.	Nagaland	01	01
26.	Odisha	21	03
27.	Puducherry	01	-
28.	Punjab	13	06
29.	Rajasthan	25	02
30.	Sikkim	01	01
31.	Tamil Nadu	39	05
32.	Tripura	02	01
33.	Uttarakhand	05	01
34.	Uttar Pradesh	80	28
35.	West Bengal	42	33
36.	<b>Nominated</b>	<b>09</b>	<b>02</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>552</b>	<b>146</b>

## Annexure-III

### State wise details of closing of MPLADS Saving Bank Accounts in respect of former MPs (Rajya Sabha)

Sr. No.	Name of the State/UT	Total number of Former MPs (RS)	Total number of MPLADS accounts closed
1.	Nominated	34	02
2.	Andaman & Nicobar Islands	-	-
3.	Andhra Pradesh	55	09
4.	Arunachal Pradesh	02	-
5.	Assam	19	04
6.	Bihar	57	07
7.	Chandigarh	-	-
8.	Chhattisgarh	11	-
9.	Dadra and Nagar Haveli	-	-
10.	Daman and Diu	-	-
11.	Delhi	07	-
12.	Goa	02	-
13.	Gujarat	32	02
14.	Haryana	21	01
15.	Himachal Pradesh	10	01
16.	Jammu & Kashmir	12	01
17.	Jharkhand	18	-
18.	Karnataka	35	06
19.	Kerala	27	04
20.	Ladshadweep	-	-
21.	Madhya Pradesh	32	08
22.	Maharashtra	59	02
23.	Manipur	03	-
24.	Meghalaya	04	01
25.	Mizoram	02	02
26.	Nagaland	04	03
27.	Odisha	39	03
28.	Puducherry	03	-
29.	Punjab	21	08
30.	Rajasthan	29	04
31.	Sikkim	03	01
32.	Tamil Nadu	66	09
33.	Tripura	03	-
34.	Uttarakhand	08	01
35.	Uttar Pradesh	111	35
36.	West Bengal	43	17
	<b>Total</b>	<b>772</b>	<b>131</b>

## Annexure IV

<b>Districts which are using new integrated MPLADS Website</b>		
Sr. No.	State	Nodal District
1	<b>Assam</b>	KAMRUP METROPOLITAN
2		LAKHIMPUR
3		NOWGONG
4	<b>Bihar</b>	ARARIA
5		BHOJPUR (ARRAH)
6		GAYA
7		PATNA
8	<b>Chhattisgarh</b>	BASTAR
9		BILASPUR
10		DURG
11		JANJGIR-CHAMPA
12		JASHPUR
13		KORBA
14		RAIGARH
15		RAIPUR
16		RAJNANDGAON
17		SURGUJA
18		UTTAR BASTAR KANKER
19	<b>Delhi</b>	EAST DELHI Mpl. Corp.
20	<b>Gujarat</b>	AMRELI
21		BHAVNAGAR
22		JAMNAGAR
23		SURENDRANAGAR
24		VADODARA
25	<b>Haryana</b>	AMBALA
26		BHIWANI
27		HISSAR
28		JIND
29		KARNAL
30		KURUKSHETRA
31		REWARI
32		ROHTAK
33		SIRSA
34		SONEPAT
35	<b>Himachal Pradesh</b>	KANGRA
36		SHIMLA
37	<b>Jammu &amp; Kashmir</b>	SRINAGAR
38	<b>Jharkhand</b>	DHANBAD
39		DUMKA
40		GIRIDIH
41	<b>Karnataka</b>	Haveri



42		UDUPI
43	<b>Kerala</b>	ALAPPUZHA
44		ERNAKULAM
45		IDUKKI
46		KASARAGOD
47		KOLLAM
48		MALAPPURAM
49		THIRUVANANTHAPURAM
50		WAYANAD
51	<b>Madhya Pradesh</b>	BETUL
52		BHOPAL
53		DAMOH
54		DEWAS
55		HOSHANGABAD
56		JABALPUR
57		JHABUA
58		KHANDWA
59		KHARGAON(WEST-NIRMAR)
60		PANNA
61		RAISEN
62		REWA
63		SAGAR
64		UJJAIN
65	<b>Maharashtra</b>	AURANGABAD
66		CHANDRAPUR
67		JALNA
68		KOLHAPUR
69		MUMBAI CITY
70		NANDURBAR
71		NASHIK
72		OSMANABAD
73		PARBHANI
74		PUNE
75		SANGLI
76		SATARA
77		THANE
78		WARDHA
79	<b>Meghalaya</b>	WEST GARO HILLS
80	<b>Nagaland</b>	DIMAPUR
81	<b>Odisha</b>	BALASORE
82		CUTTACK
83		JAGATSINGHPUR
84		KENDRAPARA
85		KEONJHAR
86		MAYURBHANJ
87		PURI
88	<b>Punjab</b>	TARN TARAN
89	<b>Rajasthan</b>	AJMER

90		ALWAR
91		BIKANER
92		DAUSA
93		JAIPUR
94	<b>Sikkim</b>	EAST DISTRICT
95	<b>Tamil Nadu</b>	DHARMAPURI
96		PERAMBALUR
97		VELLORE
98	<b>Telangana</b>	HYDERABAD
99		MAHBUBNAGAR
100		NIZAMABAD
101	<b>Uttar Prades</b>	AGRA
102		ALIGARH
103		ALLAHABAD
104		AMBEDKARNAGAR
105		BAGHPAT
106		BANDA
107		BAREILLY
108		BULANDSHAHR
109		CHANDALI
110		CHITRAKOOT
111		ETAWAH
112		FAIZABAD
113		FARRUKHABAD
114		FATEHPUR
115		FIROZABAD
116		GAUTAMBUDHNAGAR
117		GHAZIABAD
118		GORAKHPUR
119		HAMIRPUR
120		HARDOI
121		JALAUN
122		JHANSI
123		KANPUR NAGAR
124		KAUSHAMBI
125		KHERI
126		LUCKNOW
127		MAINPURI
128		MATHURA
129		MEERUT
130		MUZAFFARNAGAR
131		PRATAPGARH
132		RAE BARELI
133		RAMPUR
134		SAHARANPUR
135		SITAPUR
136		SONBHADRA
137		UNNAO

138		VARANASI	
139	<b>West Bengal</b>	BANKURA	
140		DARJEELING	
141		HOOGHLY	
142		HOWRAH	
143		JALPAIGURI	
144		KOLKATA	
145		MALDA	
146		MURSHIDABAD	
147		NADIA	
148		NORTH TWENTY FOUR PARGANAS	
149		PASCHIMI MEDINIPUR	
150		PURBA MEDINIPUR	
151		SOUTH DINAJPUR	
152		SOUTH TWENTY FOUR PARGANAS	
	<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>152</b>