

सांसद स्थानीय क्षेत्र विकास योजना
Member of Parliament Local Area Development Scheme

डी. साई बाबा
निदेशक

D. Sai Baba

Director

TEL : 23344933

FAX : 23364197



सत्यमेव जयते

भारत सरकार

सांख्यिकी एवं कार्यक्रम कार्यान्वयन मंत्रालय

211, सरदार पटेल भवन, नई दिल्ली - 110001

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

MINISTRY OF STATISTICS & PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION

211, SARDAR PATEL BHAVAN, NEW DELHI-110001

No. C-30/2013-MPLADS

6th November, 2013

Dated

To

Nodal Secretaries of all the States/UTs

**Subject: All India Review Meeting on MPLADS to be held on 20th November, 2013
– regarding.**

Sir,

As you may be aware, the Ministry of Statistics & Programme Implementation has been convening the All India Review meeting on the MPLAD Scheme with States/UTs twice a year, to review the implementation of the Scheme.

2. The second All-India Review Meeting for this year is scheduled to be held at 10:30 A.m. on 20th November, 2013, at Hall No. 4, Vigyan Bhawan, New Delhi under the Chairmanship of Shri Srikant Jena, Hon'ble Minister of Statistics & Programme Implementation. This review meeting would focus on intensive review of implementation aspects and resolving of pending issues. The detailed agenda notes for the meeting are enclosed.

3. You are requested to kindly make it convenient to attend the meeting.

Encl: As above

Yours faithfully,

D. Saibaba
6/11/13
(D. Saibaba)

Detailed Agenda Note for 17th Bi-annual Review Meeting with Nodal Secretaries on implementation of MPLADS to be held on 20th November, 2013 at Vigyan Bhawan, New Delhi.

(i) (a) **Pendency in the release of MPLADS funds due to non-furnishing of the requisite documents by the concerned District Authorities:** The erring District Authorities are reminded from time to time to submit the requisite documents/certificates for further releases. The State-wise pendency in the releases of MPLADS funds in respect of Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha is given at **Annexure-I**.

(b) **Slow utilization of funds:** States like Bihar (64.11%), Uttarakhand (65.53 %), Odisha (62.74%) and UTs like Puducherry (43.87%), Daman & Diu (61.58%) lag far behind in terms of % utilization vis-à-vis funds released for 15th Lok Sabha. State-wise % utilization figures for 15th Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha are given at **Annexure-II**.

(c) Pending replies to Parliamentary Committee references.

Details of pending Parliamentary Committee references are given at **Annexure III**

(d) **Pending replies to CAG 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 CAG report.

The implementation of works under the Members of Parliament Local Area Development Scheme (MPLADS) is undertaken by the

State Governments/District Authorities, in accordance with State Government's administrative, technical and financial rules. The State Governments have been asked to furnish action taken notes/replies to the CAG audit paras, and the matter is being regularly followed up at various levels.

The matter was also taken up in the recent review meeting of MPLADS with State Government officers and District Magistrates held on 26.02.2013 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.

So far, complete reply from the five UTs of Chandigarh, Lakshadweep, Daman & Diu, DNH and Puducherry and three States viz. J&K, Kerala and Sikkim has been received on all the Audit Paras. Details of Audit Paras involving the States with complete/part replies received are attached at **Annexure IV**.

The States are requested to examine the irregularities pointed out by the CAG expeditiously and furnish the Action Taken Notes (ATNs) on **PRIORITY BASIS** to enable this Ministry to furnish a report to Public Accounts Committee in a **TIME BOUND MANNER**.

Details of State-wise Pending CAG Audit Paras are given at **Annexure-V**

(d) Review of Complaints of serious financial irregularities/misappropriation of MPLADS funds, on which the Action Taken Reports/Factual Reports have not been forthcoming:

Details are given at **Annexure-VI**

(iii) Status of Audit of MPLADS to be conducted by State AGs in the respective states/UTs:

Based on recommendations of 55th (Fifty Fifth) Report of PAC 2011-12, 15th Lok Sabha on MPLADS, the matter was referred to Chief Secretaries of respective states and Administrators of UTs vide letter No. C-16/2011-MPLADFS/55th PAC Report dated 27.06.2013. It was requested to urge the state AGs to develop a mechanism for periodic and regular audit of MPLAD Scheme in each constituency/Districts.

In response to this Ministry's letter, six states viz Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Haryana, Tripura, Madhya Pradesh and West Bengal have informed that State AGs have been requested for conducting regular and periodic audit for MPLAD Scheme in each constituency and district of the state. Mizoram has informed that they have already engaged the state AG for conducting the audit of MPLAD Scheme in the constituency and districts of the state and the audit for the year ending 2012 has already been conducted. Administrator, Daman & Diu has also informed that audit is being done by the State AG.

No reply from other states/UTs have been received so far.

(IV) Status of Internal Audit of MPLADS by Controller of Accounts

A meeting under the Chairmanship of the Secretary, S&PI was held on 10.06.2013 to examine the feasibility of conducting Internal Audit of funds released under MPLAD Scheme.

It was decided in the meeting that Controller of Accounts will immediately start Internal Audit as feasible with the available staff and will take informed decision of selection of districts/constituencies for carrying out Internal Audit. Consequently, the Controller of Accounts was requested vide this Ministry's OM dated 07.08.2013 to take immediate action to start Internal Audit of MPLADS and to furnish Action Taken Report to the Ministry. However, Action Taken Report is still awaited. Controller of Accounts is requested to appraise this Ministry about the action taken in this regard.

(v) Pendency/closure of 14th Lok Sabha and ex Rajya Sabha MPs' Accounts

(a) Distribution of unspent balance of Lok Sabha Members:

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 14th Lok Sabha and complete the process of distribution of unspent/uncommitted balances by 31st December, 2010.

All the states except Bihar have completed the process of distribution of funds among the sitting MPs of 15th 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 14th 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 and 05.07.2013 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**. However, compliance by the States/UTs is still awaited.

(b) 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, the distribution of unspent balance of Rajya Sabha MPs is not being done properly.

In the 16th Bi-annual Review Meeting held on 26.02.2013, it was pointed out that in the state of Chhattisgarh, the unspent balance of Rs. 0.62 crore left by predecessor RS MPs was to be equally distributed among five successor RS MPs. Instead, the DA Bilaspur distributed the unspent amount equally between only two RS MPs, Sh. Ramhdar Kashyap and Smt. Kamla Manhar, in contravention of the instructions on the subject. Nodal District Authorities have assured the Ministry that the unspent amount will be re-distributed as per instructions. However, despite repeated reminders no reply has been received in this regard.

The Nodal Secretaries of the States may direct the District Authorities of their States to adhere to the provisions of the Guidelines and circulars issued by this Ministry properly and furnish report of the distribution of unspent balance regularly.

(vi) **Status of sanction of works up to full entitlement of MPs :** Attention is drawn to this Ministry's Circular Letter No. C-23/2011-MPLADS (Vol I), dated 27.08.2013 wherein the District Authorities have been urged to sanction all the eligible projects recommended by Members of Parliament without waiting for release of funds by the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation as funds are non-lapsable and would in any case flow on meeting the conditions of release.

(vii) Third Party Physical monitoring - MPLADS works

The initiative of physical monitoring of MPLADS asset was started from the year 2007-08 by this Ministry. So far 308 districts have been covered in five phases, out of which the work of physical monitoring was undertaken in 208 districts by NABCONS in first four phases viz. during the years 2007-08 (30 districts), 2008-09 (43 districts), 2009-10 (60 districts), and 2010-11 (75 districts). The reports received from NABCONS in four phases have been examined and observation/lacunae have been communicated to respective District Authorities to take corrective action and send their reports to Ministry. During the year 2012-13, the work of physical monitoring was undertaken in 100 districts in North and West Zone consisting 50 districts in each zone by Agricultural Finance Corporation (AFC). All the reports have been received and are under examination in the Ministry.

The lacunae/shortcomings observed in the monitoring by NABCONS in the second phase, in which 43 districts were covered, were communicated to the concerned districts by November 2009. However, the requisite replies/ action taken reports from the districts, viz. Madhubani and Gaya (Bihar), Shimla (Himachal Pradesh), Chandrapur (Maharashtra), and Dadar and Nagar Haveli have not been received inspite of taking up with the respective State Government in various Review Meetings. It may be ensured that the replies are immediately furnished from the concerned districts.

Out of the 60 districts covered in phase III, the observations on major lacunae/shortcomings with regard to the implementation of the scheme were sent to the concerned district authorities for their comments/replies, by 31st March, 2010. The requisite replies/action taken reports are yet to be received from Mehboobnagar and Srikakulam

(Andhra Pradesh), Sonitpur (Assam), Gopalganj, Rahtas and Saharsa (Bihar), Rajnandgaon, (Chhattisgarh), Kangra (Himachal Pradesh), Dhanbad (Jharkhand), Chamrajnagar (Karnataka), Thrissur (Kerala), Kolhapur, Parbhani and Osmanabad (Maharashtra), Aizwal (Mizoram), Dimapur (Nagaland), Barmer (Rajasthan), Kanpur (Rural) (Uttar Pradesh), and Andaman & Nicobar Islands, inspite of repeated follow up in the Review Meetings. The concerned State Governments may get the replies expedited.

With regard to 75 districts covered in phase four, the lacunae/shortcomings observed in the monitoring by NABCONS were communicated to the concerned districts by September 2011. The requisite reply are still awaited from the districts of Medak and Vishakhapathnam (Andhra Pradesh) Kamrup Rural and Dhubri, (Assam), Bhojpur, Muzzaffarpur, Araria, Munger and Madhepura (Bihar), Durg and Bilaspur (Chhattisgarh), Rajkot and Panchmahal (Gujarat), Bhiwani (Haryana), Anantnag (J &K), Gulbarga (Karnataka), Thiruvananthapuram (Kerala), Mandala, Gwalior and Damoh (MP), Nanded and Amravati (Maharashtra), Chura Chandpur (Manipur), West Khasi Hills (Meghalaya), Cuttack, Navrangpur and Kandmal (Odisha), Gurdaspur (Punjab), Jaisalmer and Banswara (Rajasthan), Tootukkudi, Nagapatinam and Shiv Ganga (Tamilnadu), Allahabad, Kushinagar and Barabanki (UP) and Birbhum and Jalpaiguri (West Bengal). The concerned State Government may ensure the submission of replies.

The major observations made by the AFC with regard to the implementation of the scheme have already been communicated to 37 of the 100 districts covered in phase V to the concerned district authorities for their comments/replies. The State Government may ensure that replies are sent by 31st Dec, 2013.

viii) Familiarization with and discussion on the recent modifications in the Guidelines of MPLADS (after 26.02.2013)

Annexure-I

State: Andhra Pradesh (Total: LS- 42, RS-18)

Year (2009-10)	Installment	LS	RS	Total
2009-10	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2010-11	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	1	1
2011-12	1 st	0	1	1
	2 nd	2	1	3
2012-13	1 st	2	1	3
	2 nd	12	7	19
2013-14	1 st	07	3	10
	2 nd	21	5	26

State: Arunachal Pradesh (Total: LS-2, RS-1)

Year (2009-10)	Installment	LS	RS	Total
2009-10	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2010-11	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2011-12	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2012-13	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2013-14	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	2	1	3

State: Assam (Total: LS- 14, RS-7)

Year (2009-10)	Installment	LS	RS	Total
2009-10	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2010-11	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2011-12	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	1	0	1
2012-13	1 st	1	0	1
	2 nd	5	2	7
2013-14	1 st	1	0	1
	2 nd	7	5	12

State: Andaman & Nicobar Islands (Total: LS- 1)

Year (2009-10)	Installment	LS	RS	Total
2009-10	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2010-11	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2011-12	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2012-13	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2013-14	1 st	1	0	1
	2 nd	0	0	0

State: Bihar (Total: LS- 40, RS-16)

Year (2009-10)	Installment	LS	RS	Total
2009-10	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	1	1
2010-11	1 st	0	1	1
	2 nd	1	1	2
2011-12	1 st	1	1	2
	2 nd	1	2	3
2012-13	1 st	1	2	3
	2 nd	24	7	31
2013-14	1 st	6	0	6
	2 nd	8	1	9

State: Chhattisgarh (Total: LS- 11, RS-5)

Year (2009-10)	Installment	LS	RS	Total
2009-10	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2010-11	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2011-12	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2012-13	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	3	3	6
2013-14	1 st	3	0	3
	2 nd	5	1	6

State: Chandigarh (Total: LS- 1)

Year	Installment	LS	RS	Total
------	-------------	----	----	-------

(2009-10)				
2009-10	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2010-11	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2011-12	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2012-13	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2013-14	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	1	0	1

State: Daman & Diu (Total: LS- 1)

Year (2009-10)	Installment	LS	RS	Total
2009-10	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2010-11	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2011-12	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2012-13	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2013-14	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	1	0	1

State: Dadra & Nagar Haveli (Total: LS- 1)

Year (2009-10)	Installment	LS	RS	Total
2009-10	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2010-11	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2011-12	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2012-13	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2013-14	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	1	0	1

State: Goa (Total: LS- 2, RS-1)

Year (2009-10)	Installment	LS	RS	Total
2009-10	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0

2010-11	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	1	1
2011-12	1 st	0	1	1
	2 nd	0	0	0
2012-13	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	2	0	2
2013-14	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0

State: Gujarat (Total: LS- 26, RS-11)

Year (2009-10)	Installment	LS	RS	Total
2009-10	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2010-11	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	1	1
2011-12	1 st	0	1	1
	2 nd	0	0	0
2012-13	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	12	5	17
2013-14	1 st	8	2	10
	2 nd	6	3	9

State: Haryana (Total: LS- 10, RS-5)

Year (2009-10)	Installment	LS	RS	Total
2009-10	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2010-11	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2011-12	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2012-13	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	1	1
2013-14	1 st	1	0	1
	2 nd	9	4	13

State: Himachal Pradesh (Total: LS- 4, RS-3)

Year (2009-10)	Installment	LS	RS	Total
2009-10	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2010-11	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2011-12	1 st	0	0	0

	2 nd	0	0	0
2012-13	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2013-14	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	3	3	6

State: Jammu & Kashmir (Total: LS- 6, RS-4)

Year (2009-10)	Installment	LS	RS	Total
2009-10	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2010-11	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2011-12	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	1	1
2012-13	1 st	0	1	1
	2 nd	0	1	1
2013-14	1 st	1	0	1
	2 nd	4	2	6

State: Jharkhand (Total: LS- 14, RS-6)

Year (2009-10)	Installment	LS	RS	Total
2009-10	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2010-11	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2011-12	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	2	0	2
2012-13	1 st	2	0	2
	2 nd	3	5	8
2013-14	1 st	3	1	4
	2 nd	6	0	6

State: Karnataka (Total: LS- 28, RS-12)

Year (2009-10)	Installment	LS	RS	Total
2009-10	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2010-11	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2011-12	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	3	2	5
2012-13	1 st	3	2	5

	2 nd	13	7	20
2013-14	1 st	8	2	10
	2 nd	4	0	4

State: Kerala (Total: LS- 20, RS-9)

Year (2009-10)	Installment	LS	RS	Total
2009-10	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2010-11	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2011-12	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2012-13	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	11	7	18
2013-14	1 st	8	0	8
	2 nd	1	2	3

State: Lakshadweep (Total: LS- 1)

Year (2009-10)	Installment	LS	RS	Total
2009-10	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2010-11	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2011-12	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	1	0	1
2012-13	1 st	1	0	1
	2 nd	0	0	0
2013-14	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0

State: Madhya Pradesh (Total: LS- 29, RS-11)

Year (2009-10)	Installment	LS	RS	Total
2009-10	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2010-11	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2011-12	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2012-13	1 st	0	4	4
	2 nd	5	2	7
2013-14	1 st	7	2	9
	2 nd	14	6	20

State: Maharashtra (Total: LS- 48, RS-19)

Year (2009-10)	Installment	LS	RS	Total
2009-10	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	1	1
2010-11	1 st	0	1	1
	2 nd	0	0	0
2011-12	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	1	0	1
2012-13	1 st	1	0	1
	2 nd	35	10	45
2013-14	1 st	8	8	16
	2 nd	4	0	4

State: Manipur (Total: LS- 2, RS-1)

Year (2009-10)	Installment	LS	RS	Total
2009-10	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2010-11	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2011-12	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2012-13	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2013-14	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	1	1	2

State: Meghalaya (Total: LS- 2, RS-1)

Year (2009-10)	Installment	LS	RS	Total
2009-10	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2010-11	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2011-12	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2012-13	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	1	1	2
2013-14	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	1	1	2

State: Mizoram (Total: LS- 1, RS-1)

Year	Installment	LS	RS	Total
-------------	--------------------	-----------	-----------	--------------

(2009-10)				
2009-10	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2010-11	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2011-12	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2012-13	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2013-14	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	1	1	2

State: Nagaland (Total: LS- 1, RS-1)

Year (2009-10)	Installment	LS	RS	Total
2009-10	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2010-11	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2011-12	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2012-13	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2013-14	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0

State: Delhi (Total: LS- 7, RS-3)

Year (2009-10)	Installment	LS	RS	Total
2009-10	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	1	0	1
2010-11	1 st	1	0	1
	2 nd	2	1	3
2011-12	1 st	2	1	3
	2 nd	2	0	2
2012-13	1 st	2	0	2
	2 nd	2	0	2
2013-14	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0

State: Odisha (Total: LS- 21, RS-10)

Year (2009-10)	Installment	LS	RS	Total
2009-10	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0

2010-11	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2011-12	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2012-13	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	7	4	11
2013-14	1 st	3	4	7
	2 nd	11	2	13

State: Puducherry (Total: LS- 1, RS-1)

Year (2009-10)	Installment	LS	RS	Total
2009-10	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2010-11	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	1	1
2011-12	1 st	0	1	1
	2 nd	1	0	1
2012-13	1 st	1	0	1
	2 nd	0	0	0
2013-14	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0

State: Punjab (Total: LS- 13, RS-7)

Year (2009-10)	Installment	LS	RS	Total
2009-10	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	1	1
2010-11	1 st	0	1	1
	2 nd	0	0	0
2011-12	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2012-13	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	2	1	3
2013-14	1 st	2	0	2
	2 nd	9	5	14

State: Rajasthan (Total: LS- 25, RS-10)

Year (2009-10)	Installment	LS	RS	Total
2009-10	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	1	1
2010-11	1 st	0	1	1
	2 nd	0	0	0
2011-12	1 st	0	0	0

	2 nd	0	2	2
2012-13	1 st	0	2	2
	2 nd	4	2	6
2013-14	1 st	6	1	7
	2 nd	15	4	19

State: Sikkim (Total: LS- 1, RS-1)

Year (2009-10)	Installment	LS	RS	Total
2009-10	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2010-11	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2011-12	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2012-13	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2013-14	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	1	1	2

State: Tamil Nadu (Total: LS- 39, RS-18)

Year (2009-10)	Installment	LS	RS	Total
2009-10	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2010-11	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	1	1
2011-12	1 st	0	1	1
	2 nd	2	0	2
2012-13	1 st	2	0	2
	2 nd	8	3	11
2013-14	1 st	21	6	27
	2 nd	8	5	13

State: Tripura (Total: LS- 2, RS-1)

Year (2009-10)	Installment	LS	RS	Total
2009-10	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2010-11	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2011-12	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	1	0	1
2012-13	1 st	1	0	1
	2 nd	0	0	0

2013-14	1 st	1	1	2
	2 nd	0	0	0

State: Uttar Pradesh (Total: LS- 80, RS-31)

Year (2009-10)	Installment	LS	RS	Total
2009-10	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2010-11	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2011-12	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	2	2
2012-13	1 st	0	2	2
	2 nd	20	10	30
2013-14	1 st	20	8	28
	2 nd	39	10	49

State: Uttarakhand (Total: LS- 5, RS-3)

Year (2009-10)	Installment	LS	RS	Total
2009-10	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2010-11	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2011-12	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	1	1
2012-13	1 st	0	1	1
	2 nd	2	0	2
2013-14	1 st	2	1	3
	2 nd	1	1	2

State: West Bengal (Total: LS- 42, RS-16)

Year (2009-10)	Installment	LS	RS	Total
2009-10	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2010-11	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	0	0	0
2011-12	1 st	0	0	0
	2 nd	1	0	1
2012-13	1 st	1	0	1
	2 nd	19	1	20
2013-14	1 st	5	4	9
	2 nd	14	11	25

Annexure II

Position regarding cumulative utilization of funds under MPLADS as on 31.10.2013

S. No.	State	15th Lok Sabha			Rajya Sabha		
		Rs. Crore		% Utilization	Rs. Crore		% Utilization
		Utilized	Released		Utilized	Released	
1	Andhra Pradesh	462.09	595.50	77.60	600.54	692.85	86.68
2	Arunachal Pradesh	29.31	33.00	88.82	37.70	42.55	88.60
3	Assam	131.65	193.50	68.04	244.44	284.35	85.96
4	Bihar	333.68	520.50	64.11	461.15	558.45	82.58
5	Goa	16.18	24.00	67.42	28.99	29.05	99.79
6	Gujarat	259.32	351.00	73.88	340.63	413.05	82.47
7	Haryana	122.32	162.50	75.27	169.11	197.25	85.73
8	Himachal Pradesh	53.31	68.50	77.82	102.25	124.60	82.06
9	Jammu & Kashmir	70.95	105.00	67.57	115.20	138.50	83.18
10	Karnataka	264.60	364.00	72.69	390.49	442.10	88.33
11	Kerala	220.11	267.00	82.44	287.29	338.45	84.88
12	Madhya Pradesh	371.93	444.50	83.67	409.85	448.10	91.46
13	Maharashtra	500.93	604.00	82.94	590.45	695.65	84.88
14	Manipur	29.94	35.50	84.34	40.64	42.55	95.51
15	Meghalaya	20.26	28.00	72.36	36.99	40.05	92.36
16	Mizoram	15.16	16.50	91.88	41.90	42.55	98.47
17	Nagaland	16.53	19.00	87.00	42.62	45.05	94.61
18	Odisha	190.73	304.00	62.74	305.74	391.00	78.19
19	Punjab	157.96	199.50	79.18	247.90	274.90	90.18
20	Rajasthan	279.56	377.50	74.06	328.73	366.00	89.82
21	Sikkim	12.25	16.50	74.24	38.83	42.55	91.26
22	Tamil Nadu	443.25	532.00	83.32	666.26	711.90	93.59
23	Tripura	15.24	21.50	70.88	36.81	39.05	94.26
24	Uttar Pradesh	819.00	1177.50	69.55	962.48	1181.20	81.48
25	WestBengal	448.76	631.00	71.12	536.35	606.65	88.41
26	A & N Islands	15.62	15.00	104.13			
27	Chandigarh	12.52	17.50	71.54			
28	D & N Haveli	13.61	17.50	77.77			
29	Daman& Diu	10.16	16.50	61.58			
30	Delhi	62.14	71.00	87.52	68.07	63.65	106.94
31	Lakshdweep	17.72	12.50	141.76			
32	Puducherry	3.29	7.50	43.87	26.01	27.05	96.16
33	Chhattisgarh	130.62	160.00	81.64	174.46	199.70	87.36
34	Uttarakhand	44.23	67.50	65.53	80.78	100.00	80.78

35	Jharkhand	135.11	190.50	70.92	140.32	178.55	78.59
	Total	5730.04	7667.00	74.74	7552.98	8757.35	86.25

Annexure - III

Pending Parliamentary Committee References

Sl. No	Name of the MP /Complainant	Subject	Status
Rajasthan			
1.	Representation from Smt. Chandresh Kumari, Chairman, Committee on Empowerment of Woman and MP (LS).	The Hon'ble M.P. has complained that her recommendation of Rs. 15 lakhs for purchase of an 108 Ambulance for Govt. PHC, PHALSUND, District Jaisalmer, Rajasthan has been cancelled by the State Government without her consent and that the amount of Rs. 15 lakhs has also not been returned to her MPLADS fund.	<p>In the reply of the CEO, District Council, Jaisalmer received vide letter No. . /BADP/2013/1280, dated 05/02/2013 , it was stated that the District Administration had forwarded an amount of Rs. 15 lakh to the Chief Medical & Health Officer, Jaisalmer for purchase of Ambulance 108 vide cheque dated 30.11.2011 and that the Chief Medical & Health Officer, Jaisalmer forwarded this amount of Rs. 15 lakh to Director, National Rural Health Mission, Directorate of Medical & Health Services Rajasthan, Jaipur for the purchase of Ambulance 108. However, thereafter no report regarding the status of the proposal of the Hon'ble MP has been received in this Ministry.</p> <p>3. In view of the above, Secretary, D/o Rural Development, Govt. of Rajasthan vide this Ministry's letter dated 21.06.2013 has been requested to personally look into the matter and take action for immediate implementation of the recommended work. It is also requested that the reasons for the inordinate delay may be investigated and appropriate corrective action be taken with advice to this Office.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Last reminder 29.10.2013</p>
2	Sh. Bharat Ram Meghwal, MP(LS)	Request for early administrative sanction for works recommended by Sh. Bharat Ram Meghwal, MP(LS) Reference received from Sh. Bharat Ram Meghwal, MP(LS).	Vide this Ministry's letter dated 29.08.2013, District Collector, Ganganagar, has been requested to furnish an Action Taken Report in the matter
Maharashtra			
3	Sh. Jayant Chauhan	The complainant has alleged that Sh. Bhaskarrao Khatgaonkar Patil, Hon'ble MP(LS), Nanded Parliamentary Constituency, has unduly favored the trusts headed by him and his brother. It is also alleged that the Hon'ble MP has misused the MPLADS funds for construction of projects which were not permissible under the MPLADS guidelines and projects worth more than Rs. 25 lac were recommended and sanctioned by him for one particular trust which was not permissible prior to 2012-13.	Factual and Action Taken Report awaited from the State Govt. Last Reminder dated 26.09.2013.

Uttar Pradesh			
4	Shri Shivnarayan Singh, Manager, Gaya Prasad Yadav Memorial Higher Secondary School, Allahabad, U.P	The complainant has alleged irregularities in the implementation of MPLADS works in Bhadhoi Parliamentary constituency Uttar Pradesh. He has alleged that he was made to give a bribe of Rs. 1 lakh for getting a sanction of Rs. 5 lakh for the purpose of construction of rooms.	A factual report in the matter is awaited from the Govt. of Uttar Pradesh. Last reminder dated 10.10.2013.
5	Sh. M.P. Singh, Advocate, High Court, Lucknow	Misutilization of MPLADS funds of Hon'ble MP Dr. Akhilesh Das Gupta. The complainant alleges that the Hon'ble MP has recommended MPLADS funds for societies being run by him whereas as per MPLADS guidelines the MPLADS funding is not permissible to a Society/Trust, if the recommending MP or any of his/her family members is the President/Chairman or Member of the Managing Committee or Trustee of the registered Society/Trust in question. Besides that the report alleges that the Hon'ble MP has recommended his MPLADS funds from time to time to B.B.D. U.P. Badminton Academy, Gontinagar, a registered society of which he is a chairman.	Factual and Action Taken Report awaited from the Govt. of Uttar Pradesh. Last Reminder 26.09.2013.
Uttarakhand			
6	Sh. Tarun Vijay Member RS	The Hon'ble MP had proposed construction of a Hall of Fame in Uttarakhand: in memory of the decorated soldiers and freedom fighters of the State. Rajya Sabha Committee on MPLADS has desired that the views of Govt. of Uttarakhand on the proposal may be placed before it.	Views of Govt. of Uttarakhand are awaited. Last Reminder 23.10.2013.
Jammu & Kashmir			
7	Rehabilitation works in cloudburst and flash floods affected areas in Leh (Jammu & Kashmir)	We have been requesting Dy. Commissioner, Leh to furnish progress report of rehabilitation/reconstruction work every month to this Ministry. The Dy. Commissioner, Leh also been requested to specifically mention whether the prescribed procedure laid down by the State Govt. has been followed in the purchase of the Ultrasound Machine at SNM Hospital.	The latest progress report received from Dy. Commissioner, Leh is for the period ending 31.10.2013. The information regarding whether the prescribed procedure laid down by the State Govt. has been followed in the purchase of the Ultrasound Machine at SNM Hospital is also awaited from Dy. Commissioner, Leh. Last Reminder dated 30.10.2013.
Madhya Pradesh			
8	Sh. Premchand Guddu, Hon'ble MP (LS)	The Hon'ble has complained about deliberate obstruction being caused by District Authority in the implementation of MPLADS works	Vide this Ministry's letter dated 26.09.2013, District Authority Ratlam has been requested to furnish a statement indicating the number of proposals recommended by Hon'ble MP for supply of computers to Government, Government aided and unaided educational institutions during the last 5 years, how many of them have been sanctioned/executed.

9	Gajendra Singh Rajukhedi, Hon'ble Member of Parliament (LS)	The Hon'ble MP has expressed his extreme disappointment over the closure of the facilitation centre at District Collectorate, District Dhar, Madhya Pradesh	Vide this Ministry's letter dated 11.10.2013, the State Govt. has been requested to furnish a factual report in the matter.
Tamil Nadu			
10	President, Gandhi Road Car van Drivers and Owners welfare Association, Mannargudi, Nagapattinam, Tamil Nadu.	The complainant has requested for stopping of Scheduled auctioning of license by the Mannargudi Municipality, in Nagapattinam District to collect parking fee of Vehicles in the parking place developed under MPLADS funds of Sh. A.K.S.Vijayan, Hon'ble MP(LS) in Nagapattinam Parliamentary Constituency.	Nodal Secretary, Govt. of Tamil Nadu has been advised to direct the District Authority to examine the matter and furnish an action taken report in this regard to this Ministry, so as to enable us to take appropriate action. However, the said action taken report is still awaited. Last Reminder dated 13.09.2013.
Karnataka			
11	Smt.J.Shantha, Hon'ble MP (LS),	The Hon'ble MP has complained about delay in implementation of MPLAD Scheme and other difficulties faced by her regarding MPLADS funds. It was also requested to take necessary action to release the pending installments in respect of Bellary Lok Sabha Constituency.	In this regard Ministry vide its letter No.L-22/16/2009-MPLADS dated 12.08.2013 and reminder dated 13.09.2013, requested the Nodal Secretary, Govt. of Karnataka to direct the District Authority to examine the matter and furnish an action taken report in this regard to this Ministry, so as to enable us to take appropriate action. However, the said action taken report is still awaited. Last Reminder dated 23.10.2013
UT of Dadar Nagar & Haveli			
12	Shri Jitendra P Maru a social activist of Silvasa	The Lok Sabha Secretariat, vide its OM dated 12-11-2012 had forwarded a copy of letter dated 18 April, 2012 from Shri Jitendra P Maru a social activist of Silvasa, UT Dadra Nagar Haveli addressed to the Hon'ble Prime Minister enclosing therewith two press clippings and a CD containing a recording of the speech made by Shri Narendra Kumar, the then Administrator, Dadra and Nagar Haveli with the request to look into the matter and furnish a factual report and action taken report.	No reply has been received from the Union Territory.
13	Sh. Natubhai G. Patel MP(LS)	Complaint against Sh. G.S.Meena, Collector for non-completion of recommended MPLADS works within stipulated time	Hon'ble MPs representation dated 13-06-2013 was forwarded to the Administrator, Dadra & Nagar Haveli vide letter dated 30.07.2013 for factual and Action Taken Report. Information is still awaited.
West Bengal			
14		Representation regarding delay in execution of relief and rehabilitation measures recommended by MP in the Parliamentary constituency of Darjeeling West Bengal due to non-release of MPLADS funds.	Reminder sent to the State Government on 2-1-2013 for sending the list of works.

15	Dr. Barun Mukherji, Hon'ble MP(RS)	Representation regarding construction of out patient department of Netaji Medical Centre at Joypur of Purulia district organized by Swamy Sahajanand Centre for rural development	A copy of the letter dated 7-2-2012 from the District Magistrate, Purulia addressed to Dr. Barun Mukherji, Hon'ble MP(RS) regarding non-sanctioning of his recommended work was received in the Ministry through the Rajya Sabha Secretariat for comments. The letter was forwarded to the Deputy Commissioner, Kolkata Municipal Corporation vide letter dated 11-2-2013 seeking their detailed comments on the issue. Comments are awaited.
16		Rehabilitation works in earthquake affected areas of Darjeeling	The Rajya Sabha Secretariat, vide letter dated 22-10-2012 have asked for the status with regard to the rehabilitation works to be undertaken in the earthquake affected areas of Darjeeling district of West Bengal from the contribution made by the Members of Rajya Sabha for the purpose. List of works awaited from the State Govt.
17		Rehabilitation works in Cyclone AILA' affected areas of West Bengal. The Rajya Sabha Secretariat have sought information on rehabilitation works taken up in the Cyclone AILA' affected areas of West Bengal, out of the contribution made by the Members of Rajya Sabha from their MPLADS funds.	The State Government had last furnished the progress of the rehabilitation works as on 5-8-2011 vide letter dated 9th August, 2011. A reminder was sent on 07.10.2013 requesting the State Govt. to furnish the latest status report.
A & N Islands			
18	Shri Manoranjan Bhakta, Ex- MP(LS)	Regarding irregularities in implementation of MPLADS works recommended by the Hon'ble MP during his term of 14th Lok Sabha in Andaman and Nicobar Islands	The representation was forwarded to the Deputy Commissioner, South Andaman, A&N Islands on 10-10-2012 for enquiring into the matter and taking corrective action on the irregularities so found and for furnishing the Action Taken Report to the Ministry. A reminder dated 2-1-2013 issued.
Sikkim			
19		Status of rehabilitation works undertaken in the earthquake affected areas of Sikkim from the contribution made by the Members of Rajya Sabha	The District Authority, Gangtok, Sikkim was requested vide letter dated 30-5-2013 to send Quarterly Progress Report of reconstruction works to the Ministry. No report has been received till date.
Rajasthan			
20	Sh. Bharat Ram Meghwal, MP(LS)	Request for early administrative sanction for works recommended by Sh. Bharat Ram Meghwal, MP(LS) Reference received from Sh. Bharat Ram Meghwal, MP(LS).	Vide this Ministry's letter dated 29.08.2013, District Collector, Ganganagar, has been requested to furnish an Action Taken Report in the matter
Bihar			
21	Shri Hukumdeo Narayan Yadav, Hon'ble MP(LS)	Allegations of creating obstacles by the State Government Officials in the implementation of MPLADS works	Representation forwarded to the Chief Secretary, Govt. of Bihar on 25-09-2013 to look into the matter and send a factual report for onward transmission to Lok Sabha Secretariat.

22	Smt. Putul Kumari, MP(LS)	Representation of Smt. Putul Kumari, MP(LS), Banka Constituency regarding slow implementation of MPLADS Scheme in her Constituency.	Representation forwarded to the District Authority and reminder dated 24-9-2013 issued to the Principal Secretary, P & D Deptt. Bihar for details of the projects recommended by the Hon'ble MP indicating the date of recommendation, date of sanction, date of commencement of work, present status of implementation and reasons for delay, if any.
23		Rehabilitation works in Kosi flood affected areas of Bihar	While conveying Ministry's approval to the State Govt. for the rehabilitation works to be taken up with the funds contributed by the MPs, it was requested to direct the officials concerned to prepare and send the PERT Chart for proper monitoring of the works by the Committees of Parliament on MPLADS. Subsequently, several reminders were sent to the State Govt. for upto date status of construction of disaster-cum-community shelters and cattle shelters in the flood affected areas and PERT Chart. However, the information has not been received till date. (Reminders dated 23-6-2011, 7-7-2011, 29-9-2011, 9-11-2011, 7-12-2011, 30-1-2012, 26-3-2012 30-4-2012, 26-6-2012).

Pending Parliamentary Committee References

Sl. No	Name of the MP /Complainant	Subject	Status
1.	Representation from Smt. Chandresh Kumari, Chairman, Committee on Empowerment of Woman and MP (LS).	The Hon'ble M.P. has complained that her recommendation of Rs. 15 lakhs for purchase of an 108 Ambulance for Govt. PHC, PHALSUND, District Jaisalmer, Rajasthan has been cancelled by the State Government without her consent and that the amount of Rs. 15 lakhs has also not been returned to her MPLADS fund.	<p>In the reply of the CEO, District Council, Jaisalmer received vide letter No. . /BADP/2013/1280, dated 05/02/2013 , it was stated that the District Administration had forwarded an amount of Rs. 15 lakh to the Chief Medical & Health Officer, Jaisalmer for purchase of Ambulance 108 vide cheque dated 30.11.2011 and that the Chief Medical & Health Officer, Jaisalmer forwarded this amount of Rs. 15 lakh to Director, National Rural Health Mission, Directorate of Medical & Health Services Rajasthan, Jaipur for the purchase of Ambulance 108. However, thereafter no report regarding the status of the proposal of the Hon'ble MP has been received in this Ministry.</p> <p>3. In view of the above, Secretary, D/o Rural Development, Govt. of Rajasthan vide this Ministry's letter dated 21.06.2013 has been requested to personally look into the matter and take action for immediate implementation of the recommended work. It is also requested that the reasons for the inordinate delay may be investigated and appropriate corrective action be taken with advice to this Office.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Last reminder 29.10.2013</p>
2.	Sh. Jayant Chauhan	The complainant has alleged that Sh. Bhaskarrao Khatgaonkar Patil, Hon'ble MP(LS), Nanded Parliamentary Constituency, has unduly favored the trusts headed by him and his brother. It is also alleged that the Hon'ble MP has misused the MPLADS funds for construction of projects which were not permissible under the MPLADS guidelines and projects worth more than Rs. 25 lac were recommended and sanctioned by him for one particular trust which was not permissible prior to 2012-13.	Factual and Action Taken Report awaited from the State Govt. Last Reminder dated 26.09.2013.

4	Shri Shivnarayan Singh, Manager, Gaya Prasad Yadav Memorial Higher Secondary School, Allahabad, U.P	The complainant has alleged irregularities in the implementation of MPLADS works in Bhadhoi Parliamentary constituency Uttar Pradesh. He has alleged that he was made to give a bribe of Rs. 1 lakh for getting a sanction of Rs. 5 lakh for the purpose of construction of rooms.	A factual report in the matter is awaited from the Govt. of Uttar Pradesh. Last reminder dated 10.10.2013.
5	Rehabilitation works in cloudburst and flash floods affected areas in Leh (Jammu & Kashmir)	We have been requesting Dy. Commissioner, Leh to furnish progress report of rehabilitation/reconstruction work every month to this Ministry. The Dy. Commissioner, Leh also been requested to specifically mention whether the prescribed procedure laid down by the State Govt. has been followed in the purchase of the Ultrasound Machine at SNM Hospital.	The latest progress report received from Dy. Commissioner, Leh is for the period ending 31.10.2013. The information regarding whether the prescribed procedure laid down by the State Govt. has been followed in the purchase of the Ultrasound Machine at SNM Hospital is also awaited from Dy. Commissioner, Leh. Last Reminder dated 30.10.2013.
6	Sh. Tarun Vijay Member RS	The Hon'ble MP had proposed construction of a Hall of Fame in Uttarakhand: in memory of the decorated soldiers and freedom fighters of the State. Rajya Sabha Committee on MPLADS has desired that the views of Govt. of Uttarakhand on the proposal may be placed before it.	Views of Govt. of Uttarakhand are awaited. Last Reminder 23.10.2013.
7	Sh. Premchand Guddu, Hon'ble MP (LS)	The Hon'ble has complained about deliberate obstruction being caused by District Authority in the implementation of MPLADS works	Vide this Ministry's letter dated 26.09.2013, District Authority Ratlam has been requested to furnish a statement indicating the number of proposals recommended by Hon'ble MP for supply of computers to Government, Government aided and unaided educational institutions during the last 5 years, how many of them have been sanctioned/executed.
8	Sh. Bharat Ram Meghwal, MP(LS)	Request for early administrative sanction for works recommended by Sh. Bharat Ram Meghwal, MP(LS) Reference received from Sh. Bharat Ram Meghwal, MP(LS).	Vide this Ministry's letter dated 29.08.2013, District Collector, Ganganagar, has been requested to furnish an Action Taken Report in the matter
9	Gajendra Singh Rajukhedi, Hon'ble Member of Parliament (LS)	The Hon'ble MP has expressed his extreme disappointment over the closure of the facilitation centre at District Collectorate, District Dhar, Madhya Pradesh	Vide this Ministry's letter dated 11.10.2013, the State Govt. has been requested to furnish a factual report in the matter.
10	Sh. M.P. Singh, Advocate, High Court, Lucknow	Misutilization of MPLADS funds of Hon'ble MP Dr. Akhilesh Das Gupta. The complainant alleges that the Hon'ble MP has recommended MPLADS funds for societies being run by him whereas as per MPLADS guidelines the MPLADS funding is not permissible to a Society/Trust, if the recommending MP or any of his/her family members is the President/Chairman or Member of the Managing Committee or Trustee of the registered Society/Trust in question. Besides that the report alleges that the Hon'ble MP has recommended his	Factual and Action Taken Report awaited from the Govt. of Uttar Pradesh. Last Reminder 26.09.2013.

		MPLADS funds from time to time to B.B.D. U.P. Badminton Academy, Gominagar, a registered society of which he is a chairman.	
11	President, Gandhi Road Car van Drivers and Owners welfare Association, Mannargudi, Nagapattinam, Tamil Nadu.	The complainant has requested for stopping of Scheduled auctioning of license by the Mannargudi Municipality, in Nagapattinam District to collect parking fee of Vehicles in the parking place developed under MPLADS funds of Sh. A.K.S.Vijayan, Hon'ble MP(LS) in Nagapattinam Parliamentary Constituency.	Nodal Secretary, Govt. of Tamil Nadu has been advised to direct the District Authority to examine the matter and furnish an action taken report in this regard to this Ministry, so as to enable us to take appropriate action. However, the said action taken report is still awaited. Last Reminder dated 13.09.2013.
12	Smt.J.Shantha, Hon'ble MP (LS),	The Hon'ble MP has complained about delay in implementation of MPLAD Scheme and other difficulties faced by her regarding MPLADS funds. It was also requested to take necessary action to release the pending installments in respect of Bellary Lok Sabha Constituency.	In this regard Ministry vide its letter No.L-22/16/2009-MPLADS dated 12.08.2013 and reminder dated 13.09.2013, requested the Nodal Secretary, Govt. of Karnataka to direct the District Authority to examine the matter and furnish an action taken report in this regard to this Ministry, so as to enable us to take appropriate action. However, the said action taken report is still awaited. Last Reminder dated 23.10.2013
13	Shri Jitendra P Maru a social activist of Silvasa	The Lok Sabha Secretariat, vide its OM dated 12-11-2012 had forwarded a copy of letter dated 18 April, 2012 from Shri Jitendra P Maru a social activist of Silvasa, UT Dadra Nagar Haveli addressed to the Hon'ble Prime Minister enclosing therewith two press clippings and a CD containing a recording of the speech made by Shri Narendra Kumar, the then Administrator, Dadra and Nagar Haveli with the request to look into the matter and furnish a factual report and action taken report.	No reply has been received from the Union Territory.
14		Representation regarding delay in execution of relief and rehabilitation measures recommended by MP in the Parliamentary constituency of Darjeeling West Bengal due to non-release of MPLADS funds.	Reminder sent to the State Government on 2-1-2013 for sending the list of works.
15	Shri Hukumdeo Narayan Yadav, Hon'ble MP(LS)	Allegations of creating obstacles by the State Government Officials in the implementation of MPLADS works	Representation forwarded to the Chief Secretary, Govt. of Bihar on 25-09-2013 to look into the matter and send a factual report for onward transmission to Lok Sabha Secretariat.
16	Sh. Natubhai G. Patel MP(LS)	Complaint against Sh. G.S.Meena, Collector for non-completion of recommended MPLADS works within stipulated time	Hon'ble MPs representation dated 13-06-2013 was forwarded to the Administrator, Dadra & Nagar Haveli vide letter dated 30.07.2013 for factual and Action Taken Report. Information is still awaited.
17	Smt. Putul Kumari, MP(LS)	Representation of Smt. Putul Kumari, MP(LS), Banka Constituency regarding slow implementation of MPLADS Scheme in her Constituency.	Representation forwarded to the District Authority and reminder dated 24-9-2013 issued to the Principal Secretary, P & D Deptt. Bihar for details of the projects recommended by the Hon'ble

			MP indicating the date of recommendation, date of sanction, date of commencement of work, present status of implementation and reasons for delay, if any.
18	Shri Manoranjan Bhakta, Ex- MP(LS)	Regarding irregularities in implementation of MPLADS works recommended by the Hon'ble MP during his term of 14th Lok Sabha in Andaman and Nicobar Islands	The representation was forwarded to the Deputy Commissioner, South Andaman, A&N Islands on 10-10-2012 for enquiring into the matter and taking corrective action on the irregularities so found and for furnishing the Action Taken Report to the Ministry. A reminder dated 2-1-2013 issued.
19	Dr. Barun Mukherji, Hon'ble MP(RS)	Representation regarding construction of out patient department of Netaji Medical Centre at Joypur of Purulia district organized by Swamy Sahajanand Centre for rural development	A copy of the letter dated 7-2-2012 from the District Magistrate, Purulia addressed to Dr. Barun Mukherji, Hon'ble MP(RS) regarding non-sanctioning of his recommended work was received in the Ministry through the Rajya Sabha Secretariat for comments. The letter was forwarded to the Deputy Commissioner, Kolkata Municipal Corporation vide letter dated 11-2-2013 seeking their detailed comments on the issue. Comments are awaited.
20		Status of rehabilitation works undertaken in the earthquake affected areas of Sikkim from the contribution made by the Members of Rajya Sabha	The District Authority, Gangtok, Sikkim was requested vide letter dated 30-5-2013 to send Quarterly Progress Report of reconstruction works to the Ministry. No report has been received till date.
21		Rehabilitation works in earthquake affected areas of Darjeeling	The Rajya Sabha Secretariat, vide letter dated 22-10-2012 have asked for the status with regard to the rehabilitation works to be undertaken in the earthquake affected areas of Darjeeling district of West Bengal from the contribution made by the Members of Rajya Sabha for the purpose. List of works awaited from the State Govt.
22		Rehabilitation works in Kosi flood affected areas of Bihar	While conveying Ministry's approval to the State Govt. for the rehabilitation works to be taken up with the funds contributed by the MPs, it was requested to direct the officials concerned to prepare and send the PERT Chart for proper monitoring of the works by the Committees of Parliament on MPLADS. Subsequently, several reminders were sent to the State Govt. for upto date status of construction of disaster-cum-community shelters and cattle shelters in the flood affected areas and PERT Chart. However, the information has not been received till date. (Reminders dated 23-6-2011, 7-7-2011, 29-9-2011, 9-11-2011, 7-12-2011, 30-1-2012, 26-3-2012 30-4-2012, 26-6-2012).

23		Rehabilitation works in Cyclone AILA' affected areas of West Bengal. The Rajya Sabha Secretariat have sought information on rehabilitation works taken up in the Cyclone AILA' affected areas of West Bengal, out of the contribution made by the Members of Rajya Sabha from their MPLADS funds.	The State Government had last furnished the progress of the rehabilitation works as on 5-8-2011 vide letter dated 9th August, 2011. A reminder was sent on 07.10.2013 requesting the State Govt. to furnish the latest status report.
----	--	---	---

Annexure-IV

**STATUS ON C&AG PERFORMANCE AUDIT REPORT NO 31 OF
2010-11**

Sr No	State/UT	No of Audit paras CAG Report 2011	No of paras - complete reply recd	No of paras - Part reply recd	No of paras - No reply recd
1.	Andhra Pradesh	19	13	06	-
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	17	08	09	-
3.	Assam	21	16	05	-
4.	Bihar	22	10	12	-
5	Chhattisgarh	13	09	04	-
6	Goa	10	09	01	-
7	Gujarat	13	11	02	-
8	Himachal Pradesh	14	12	02	-
9.	Haryana	18	14	04	-
10	J&K	23	23	-	-
11	Jharkhand	22	13	09	-
12	Karnataka	17	08	09	-
13	Kerala	17	17	-	-
14	Madhya Pradesh	21	07	14	-
15	Maharashtra	16	06	10	-
16	Manipur	15	13	02	-
17	Meghalaya	21	17	04	-
18	Mizoram	20	20	-	-

19	Nagaland	20	17	03	-
20	Orissa	21	04	17	-
21	Punjab	13	12	01	-
22	Rajasthan	19	09	10	-
23	Sikkim	12	12	-	-
24	Tamil Nadu	24	14	10	-
25	Tripura	15	12	03	-
26	Uttar Pradesh	24	18	06	
27	Uttrakhand	15	12	03	-
28	West Bengal	21	16	05	-
29	A&N Islands	17	08	09	-
30	Chandigarh	06	06	-	-
31	D&N Haveli	06	06	-	-
32	Daman & Diu	12	12	-	-
33	Delhi	12	11	01	-
34	Lakshdweep	09	09	-	-
35	Pondicherry	13	13	-	-
	Total	578	417	161	

Complete reply received Chandigarh, J&K, Kerala, Lakshadweep, Mizoram, DNH, Puducherry, Sikkim and Daman & Diu

Pending CAG Audit Paras - Andaman & Nicobar

SI No	Para No	Details of Audit Para	Reply Received /Comments of the Ministry
1	3.3	<p><u>Selection of prohibited works</u> - The following works have been executed which were not permitted as per Guidelines:-</p> <p>(i) 01 work costing Rs 0.13 crore utilised for office and residential buildings for cooperative, private organization and any work for commercial body.</p> <p>(ii) 01 Work costing Rs 0.23 crore utilised for religious purposes and works within the premises of religious body.</p>	<p>UT Administration in their reply has intimated 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>Besides another 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 it 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>The Ministry has requested Administrator UT to provide the latest status on both the organization.</p>
2	4.3 (i)	<p><u>Non Commencement of works</u> - 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>UT Administration in their reply has intimated 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 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>The Ministry has requested Administrator UT to provide the status of refund of MPLADS fund</p>

	<p>4.3 (iii)</p>	<p><u>Incomplete works:</u> 27 works costing Rs.2.76 Crore remained incomplete 1 to 6 years in 1 DA.</p>	<p>UT Administration in their reply has intimated 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 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 MP. Reply from the Implementing Agency is still awaited.</p> <p>The Ministry has requested Administrator UT to provide the latest status of incomplete work.</p>
<p>3</p>	<p>5.1</p>	<p><u>Non-maintenance of works register and assets register</u> - The works and Asset Register were not being maintained.</p>	<p>UT Administration in their reply has intimated that the work to maintain Work and asset register is nearing completion.</p> <p>The Ministry has requested Administrator UT to provide the status of Work and Asset Register.</p>
<p>4</p>	<p>6.2.3</p>	<p>Discrepancies in closing balance figures between the UCs and the MPRs in the year 2004-05 have been pointed out.</p>	<p>UT Administration in their reply has intimated that the work has been started and report is being submitted</p>

			<p>shortly.</p> <p>The Ministry has requested Administrator UT to confirm that the discrepancies since figures have been settled.</p>
5	6.2.5	<p><u>Non submission of UCs for funds for natural calamities</u></p> <p>Audit observed that 12 DAs of eight States (Himachal Pradesh, Haryana, Chhattisgarh, Madhya Pradesh, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Rajasthan and West Bengal), released Rs. 6.61 crore to Andaman and Nicobar Islands, Puducherry and Tamil Nadu (Kanyakumari) during 2005-07 for the tsunami rehabilitation works. However, the UCs for expenditure incurred from these funds had not been sent to the DAs releasing the funds by the DAs who had received the funds, as was required under the scheme guidelines.</p>	<p>UT Administration in their reply has intimated that Utilisation Certificates , photographs is in the final stage and the same is being dispatched shortly.</p> <p>The Ministry has requested Administrator UT to provide the latest status on submission of UC for funds for natural calamities.</p>
6	6.2.6	<p><u>Non-submission of UCs by IAs</u> : In A&N Island, out of total works 135 completed during the audit period 2004-09, the IAs did not submit UCs for 46 work amounting to Rs 3.72 crore.</p>	<p>UT Administration in their reply has intimated that some implementation agencies have submitted the Utilization Certificates and District authority is strictly ensuring to receive the UCs. The letter has been issued to all the implementing agencies for submission of the UCs. Reply is still awaited.</p> <p>The Ministry has requested Administrator UT to provide the latest status on submission of UC for execution of works by the Implementing Agencies.</p>
7	6.6	<p><u>Refund of unspent balances by IAs</u></p> <p>(a) Rs 0.15 crore unspent balance arising due to completion of works at lower than sanctioned cost not refunded by the Implementing Agency.</p>	<p>UT Administration in their reply has intimated that out 12 works entrusted to Zila Parishad for execution, 09 works have been cancelled and the entire amount have been received. Out of balance three works taken up, 02 works have been completed and 95% work has been completed of the one remaining work. Some of the unspent balance of works executed at lower cost than the sanctioned cost has been refunded and the rest are sill awaited.</p> <p>The Ministry has requested</p>

			Administrator UT to provide the latest status on submission of unspent balance of MPLADS funds lying with the Implementing Agencies.
8	7.1.2	<u>Uploading of data on website</u> - Data not uploaded	UT Administration in their reply has intimated that erroneous entries made is being corrected and the work is in progress. The Ministry has requested Administrator UT to provide the latest status on up-dation of data on website in progress.
9	7.3.2	<u>No display of work details at the DA offices</u> - Failed to display the work detail in one DA office in the UT audited by CAG.	UT Administration in their reply has intimated that mapping displaying of work is in progress. The Ministry has requested Administrator UT to provide the latest status on displaying of works in the office of the District Administration which is in progress.

Note : In the above cases, the Chief Secretary, A&N Administration vide this Ministry's letters dated 13.05.2013, 11.09.2013 and 15.10.2013 has been requested to direct the concerned department to furnish comprehensive Action Taken Notes (ATNs) on priority. However, reply is still awaited.

Pending CAG Audit Paras - Andhra Pradesh

Sl No	Para No	Details of Audit Para	Reply Received /Comments of the Ministry
1	3.3	<u>Selection of prohibited works</u> - The following works have been executed which were not permitted as per Guidelines:- (i) 01 Work costing Rs 0.03 crore for office and residential buildings of Central/State Government (ii) 03 Works costing Rs 0.19 crore for religious purposes and works within the premises of religious body.	District Ananthapuram in their reply has mentioned that the work of construction of Welcome Arch near Uma Naga 13 th Division is not covered under the list of the prohibited works. As regard durability of the asset referred to in para 1.3 of the MPLADS Guidelines, construction of welcome arch near Uma Nagar, 13 th Division, Ananthapuram is the most durable asset and longer lasting one,

	<p>(iii) 31 works costing Rs 0.18 crore of renovation, repair and maintenance.</p> <p>(iv) Miscellaneous 09 inadmissible works costing Rs .26 crore</p>	<p>welcoming people. Further Para 1.3 of the MPLADS Guidelines is not referred to in the para 3.3 of C&AG Report</p> <p>Further Para 3.5 of the MPLADS Guidelines stipulates where the district Authority considers that a recommended work cannot be executed due to some reason, the District Authority shall inform the reasons to the MP concerned under intimation to Government of India and the State UT Government within 45 days from the date of the Proposal . As the construction of Welcome Arch constructed near Uma Nagar, 13th Division Ananthapuram is not covered by the list of prohibited works, it was sanctioned. Therefore, the sanction is in accordance with the Guidelines. The aspect may kindly be considered as it is a need felt asset of the communities in the area, Ananthapuram town. Further it develops hospitality and brotherhood between all communities living in the area. Hence the para may be dropped.</p> <p>Further PD Ananthapuram in his reply to Nodal State Authorities that Construction of welcome arch is not covered by the list of the prohibited works of the MPLADS guidelines, hence, audit para may please be dropped.</p> <p>Further, it has been intimated by the District, Ananthapuram that there is no provision in the guidelines for re-coupe ment of fund. Action against the concerned District Officials. There is no provision for regular staff. Further there is no lapse on the part of the concerned officials as per the guidelines. As per the objective the arch is a durable structure. Considering the locally felt need of the people and durable asset as per the MPLADS guidelines, it has been taken up for execution. In view of the above the C & AG may kindly be addressed to drop the para.</p>
--	---	--

			<p>Comments of the Ministry :</p> <p>Reply is not satisfactory. Although the construction of welcome arch is specifically not included in the prohibited list of works in 2005 Guidelines. It is reiterated that the objective of the Scheme is creation of durable community assets for use by the public at large (Para 1.3 of the Guidelines) as such Construction of Welcome Arch constructed near Uma Nagar 13th Division Old Town Ananthapuram is not covered under the Guidelines. It may be noted that the list of prohibited items is only indicative. Any item not specifically mentioned in the list cannot be treated as an admissible item. Admissibility is to be assessed in conformity with the objective of the Guidelines.</p> <p>Hence, Collector Anantapur is requested to reconsider their stand and the fund spent on the irregular work be recouped immediately and action against officials responsible for the irregularity be initiated. The Action Taken Report may be furnished to this Ministry.</p>
2	6.2.3	<p>Discrepancies in figures in MPRs, UCs and annual accounts_ - Discrepancies in figures between the closing balance of the Annual Accounts and opening balance of the UC in Secunderabad constituency. The closing balance in UC was 3.18 crore in the year 2006-07 while the opening balance of the during the yer 2007-08 has been shown as Rs 1.35 crore.</p>	<p>No reply has been received from DC Secunderabad. District Collector, Secunderabad has been requested to expedite reply.</p>
3	6.4	<p><u>Diversion of funds</u></p> <p>Funds were required to be spent for the intended purposes under the MPLADS diverted to other schemes of State and Central Governments in Hyderabad, Kadapa, Kurnool, Nellore districts. However, MPLADS funds amounting to Rs 0.01 crore were temporarily diverted to other schemes such as, National Old Age Pension Scheme, Integrated Novel</p>	<p>District Collector, Hyderabad in their reply has intimated that an amount of Rs 8.00 lakh was advanced to the Planning Department on reimbursable basis from the MPLADS account of Shri Bandaru Dattatreya, former MP(LS) in connection with the visit of Parliamentary Committee during 2006-07. Out of which an amount of Rs 746717/- was reimbursed back by the Planning Department during the period</p>

		Development in Rural Areas and Model Municipal Areas NREGS etc. of which Rs. 0.53 lakh remained unadjusted as of October 2009.	<p>from 2006-07 to 2008-09 leaving a balance of Rs 53,283/-. Further sanction of advance from MPLADS without the recommendation of the MP concerned and on reimbursable basis is not permissible as per the MPLADS Guidelines. Hence, the Principal Secretary, Planning Department to the Government of Andhra Pradesh has been requested to refund the diverted balance amount from MPLADS account of Sri Bandaru Dattatreya , former MP(LS) to drop audit para from C&AG.</p> <p>Comments of the Ministry :</p> <p>Reply is not satisfactory. Diversion of funds to any other scheme is violation of the Guidelines. DC Hyderabad may initiate action against officials responsible for the irregularity and MPLADS fund diverted in violation to the MPLADS Guidelines and the MPLADS needs to be recouped with interest immediately. DC, Hyderabad has been requested to intimate the latest status on recoupment of MPLADS funds and action taken against the errant officials to the Ministry.</p>
4	6.6	<p><u>Refund of unspent balances by IAs</u></p> <p>(a) Rs 0.31 crore unspent balance arising due to completion of works at lower than sanctioned cost not refunded by the Implementing Agency.</p>	<p>District Collector Hyderabad in their reply has informed that information on unspent balances with Implementing Agencies will be furnished after receipt of Final UCs from other districts and Commissioner, GHMC, Hyderabad, M.D, HMWS&BS, Hyderabad.</p> <p>The Ministry has requested District Collector, Hyderabad to provide the latest status on unspent balances.</p>
		(c) 32 works amounting to Rs 0.64 crore unspent funds due to works not being started not refunded by the Implementing Agency.	No reply has received from DC Hyderabad. The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to direct the District Authorities of Hyderabad to expedite reply.
		(d) DAs audited had not reconciled the figures of the cash book and bank pass-book as prescribed	No reply has received from DC Hyderabad. The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to direct the District Authorities of Hyderabad to expedite reply.

5	7.1.1	<p><u>Progress Reports</u></p> <p>(i) In three test-checked districts (Hyderabad, Nellore, and Srikakulam), as against 2,843 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>District Collector Hyderabad in the reply has intimated that the information flow is not that smooth as it has to be in the form of progress reports and work completion reports from the executing agencies and particularly from other district authorities. This a universal problem across all the districts which was discussed with the Special Chief Secretary to Government, Planning Department in a videoconference held on 22.10.2009. Certain systems have to be developed at the Government level. Heads of Departments to review the MPLADS works in their districts. In case this is not done, the district implementing officials take a little care to respond to MPLADS progress report as these works account only for a negligible extent out their whole departmental activities. Mere review meetings do not yield much in this regard which is obvious from the fact that the problem persists in all the districts.</p> <p>There should be mechanism to fix the responsibility for implementing agencies to respond to MPLAD Scheme and should be initiated at the nodal agency level in the Government. In these circumstances monthly progress reports are being prepared to the extent reports received and information elicited on inquiry from the implementing agencies. Obviously these differ with the information actually received. However, other nodal district agencies and executive agencies are continuously being pursued and reminded every month to send MPRs to this office by 5th of every month. Improvement in the status of receipt of progress reports is anticipated.</p> <p>(i) The Ministry has requested the District Collector Hyderabad to provide the information (i) works sanctioned and (ii) works completed during the audit period.</p> <p>(ii) No reply has received from</p>
---	-------	---	--

		<p>(ii) In two test-checked districts (Hyderabad, and Srikakulam), during 2004-09, although 1,494 works remained incomplete (as of October 2009), the number of incomplete works was reported as 360.</p> <p>(iii) In two test-checked districts (Hyderabad and Srikakulam), as against the sanction of Rs. 63.07 crore during the years 2004-05 to 2008-09, sanction of Rs. 66.27 crore was reported in the MPRs.</p> <p>(iv) In two test-checked districts (Hyderabad, and Srikakulam), as against the expenditure of Rs. 24.90 crore on completed works during the five year period, Rs. 54.41 crore was reported in the MPRs as spent.</p>	<p>District Hyderabad. The Ministry has requested the District Collector Hyderabad to expedite reply.</p> <p>(iii) No reply has received from District Hyderabad. The Ministry has requested the District Collector Hyderabad to expedite reply</p> <p>(iv) No reply has received from District Hyderabad. The Ministry has requested the District Collector Hyderabad to expedite reply</p>
6	7.5	<p>Internal Audit - States/UTs had not made any arrangements for an internal audit of the Scheme.</p>	<p>No reply has received from State Nodal Department. The Ministry has requested State Nodal Authorities to expedite reply.</p>

Note : In the above cases, the Chief Secretary, Government of Andhra Pradesh vide this Ministry's letters dated 13. .2013 has been requested to direct the concerned state nodal department and nodal district authorities to furnish comprehensive Action Taken Notes (ATNs) on priority. Copies of the letter have also been endorsed to the Nodal Secretary and concerned DCs. However, reply is still awaited.

Pending CAG Audit Paras - Arunachal Pradesh

Seria I No	Para No	Details of Audit Para	Reply Received /Comments of the Ministry
1	3.3	<p>Selection of prohibited works - The following works have been executed which were not permitted as per Guidelines:-</p> <p>(i) 03 Works costing Rs 0.15 crore for office and residential buildings of Central/State Government.</p> <p>(ii) 01 Work costing Rs 0.01 crore for office and residential buildings for cooperative, private organization and</p>	<p>DC West Siang District in their replies has intimated that during the year 2006-07, the Hon'ble MP(LS) recommended the following projects for implementation in respect of West Parliamentary Constituency on public demand of the area on the basis of which the DC Tawang and West Kameng districts had sanctioned the said schemes in accordance with the MPLADS Guidelines of April 2002 of Appendix-2 wherein it was clearly</p>

	<p>any work for commercial body.</p> <p>(iii) 10l works costing Rs 0.28 Crore of renovation, repair and maintenance.</p>	<p>mentioned that special repair for restoration /up-gradation of any durable assets are admissible . Before receiving of the latest guidelines of schemes were implemented. However, after receiving the revised guidelines of November 2005, no such type of inadmissible works have been executed. Hence this para may kindly be dropped from the CAG report. These works are:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Renovation of Cafeteria at Saela Ph-I under Tawang district costing Rs 2 lakh. 2. Renovation of Rest House of Manma Galim Ph-I under Tawang District costing Rs 2 lakh. 3. Special renovation of cultural Hall at Khartok under Tawang District costing Rs 2 lakh. 4. Renovation of Multi Sports Hall at Bomdila, Ph-1 under West Kameng District costing Rs 5 lakh <p>Comments of the Ministry :</p> <p>Reply is not satisfactory. The work mentioned in the reply of Districts of Tawang and Kameng pertains to the year 2006-07 i.e after issue of new MPLADS Guidelines November 2005. As per serial 5 of the Prohibited list of work given in Annexure II of the MPLADS Guidelines of 2005, all renovation and repair works are not admissible. Therefore, the work executed in both the districts are in violation to the MPLADS Guidelines and the funds amounting to Rs 11.00 lakh is to be recouped with interest accrued thereon. Besides, necessary action be initiated against the districts officials for irregular sanction. Action Taken Report may be forwarded to this Ministry for submission to the PAC.</p> <p>Further in their reply, it has been intimated that in the year 2007-08 the Hon'ble MP(LS) had visited to Kamba under West Siang district where the public of this area approaches for</p>
--	--	---

			<p>providing of funds from his MPLADS for extension of IB at Kamba for Rs 3 lakh. Considering the demand of public of this area, the MP recommended Rs 3 lakh for the said scheme since the work is of the public utility. Also scheme extensions of conference Hall at DC's Complex, Bomdila, Phase-I amounting to Rs 3.00 lakh was sanctioned. It is stated that the extension of conference hall is not only meant for Government officials purposes, it is used for public also. The Nodal District Authority releases the funds to the DAs on the basis of sanction orders submitted as per MP's recommendation. As regards implementation of inadmissible works in East Kameng District (Seppa), no such type of inadmissible were taken up during the year 2007-08. However , no such types of schemes shall be entertained in future and will follow the instructions of MPLADS Guidelines scrupulously. Hence , considering the above fact this para may kindly be dropped from the CAG report. The details of work are given below:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. C/o Conference Hall at DC's Office Complex, Bomdila, Ph-1 costing Rs 3.00 lakh. 2. Extension for I.B at Kamba, West Siang District Rs 3.00 lakh. <p>Comments of the Ministry :</p> <p>As per serial 1 of list of Prohibited work given in Annexure II of the MPLADS Guidelines of November 2005, construction of office and residential buildings belonging to Central and State Government, their department, Government Agencies/ Organizations and Public Sector Undertakings are prohibited. The work mentioned in the reply of West Siang District pertains to the year 2007-08 i.e after issue of new MPLADS Guidelines November 2005. Therefore, the work executed in the district are in violation to the provisions of MPLADS Guidelines and therefore, funds amounting to Rs 6.00 lakh is to be recouped with interest accrued thereon. Besides,</p>
--	--	--	---

			necessary action may be initiated against the districts officials for irregular implementation of MPLADS works and the Action Taken Report may be forwarded to this Ministry.
2	5.2	<u>Handing over of assets to the user agency/Assets not put to use</u> -336 works completed during 2004-09 amounting to Rs.14.74 Crore handed over to user agency was not on record.	<p>State nodal department in their reply has intimated that observation raised by the audit will be followed strictly in future and will formally identify the user agencies before or after the sanction of the work. This para may be kindly be dropped from CAG Report.</p> <p>The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to provide the status of 336 works taken on record and have been put to use.</p>
3	6.6	<u>Refund of unspent balances by IAs</u> - Rs 0.08 crore unspent balance arising due to Interest accrued thereon not refunded by the Implementing Agency..	<p>State nodal department in their reply has intimated the interest accrued on MPLADS funds are obtained from District Authorities and deposited in the Nodal District Account. The accumulated amount as and when received are intimated to the MP. The executing agencies are frequently asked to refund the unspent and the interest thereon so accrued, to the Nodal District Authority. All concerned will be asked to follow the instructions in this regard.</p> <p>The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to furnish the status of receipt of unspent balance amounting to Rs 0.08 crore from the implementing agencies.</p>
4	6.8.1	<u>Banking arrangements</u> (a) IAs under the District Authorities audited had clubbed funds available under MPLADS with the funds of other schemes making it difficult to segregate the interest accrued on MPLADS funds.	<p>State nodal department in their reply has intimated that the MPLADS funds are operated in the nationalized bank i.e State Bank of India, Also in saving bank accounts which is also produced before the audit team. As regards, non-maintenance of separate bank accounts of MPLADS funds by the WRD Basar, instructions has been issued to WRD, Basar and other Implementing Agencies for maintaining of a separate bank accounts in any Nationalized Bank.</p> <p>The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to confirm that only one saving bank account is</p>

			being operated separately for each MP.
		(b) DAs audited and IAs had kept the scheme funds in accounts such as fixed deposits, current accounts, Personal Ledger Accounts, Government treasury, etc. instead of saving accounts in a public sector bank.	State nodal department in their reply has intimated that concerned agencies will be directed to follow the guidelines in this regard. Hence, this para may be dropped from the CAG Report. The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to confirm that no MPLADS funds is kept in fixed deposit, current accounts, personal ledger account or Government Treasury.
5	6.8.2	<u>Discrepancy in accounts</u> (a) In two districts audited by CAG, audit of MPLADS accounts by the CA is pending for the year 2006-07 and 2007-08.	State nodal department in their reply has intimated that DC Aalo audits of accounts on MPLADS is carried out by the Chartered Accountant for the year ending along with the Utilization Certificates forwarded to the Government of India. DC Yupia in their reply has clarified that the audit by the CA is conducted in 2 or 3 years instead of conducting it annually in the past. In the meantime, there was shifting of nodal account from Papumpare District, Yupia to Lower Dibang Valley District Roing due to change of RS (MP). Further it is experienced that there is acute shortage of fund at times to conduct audit by the CA for the year 2007-08 out of 0.5 % contingency fund as there is no provision to divert fund except 0.5% contingency charges to meet the charges of CA. Comments of the Ministry As per para 4.17 of the MPLADS Guidelines August 2012, the provision of Administrative Expenses have been amended from 0.5 % to 2% which enable the Nodal District Authorities to utilize the funds annually for these purposes. Hence, State Nodal Authorities has been requested to get the audit done and confirm that the audit for the year 2006-07 and 2007-08 have been audited by the CA.
		(b) District Authorities and	State nodal department in their reply

		Implementing Agencies Audited by C&AG had not maintained MP-wise separate Cash Books and also had not maintained any cash book for the scheme at all.	has intimated that all concerned will be asked to follow the provisions of the guideless in future. Hence, this para may kindly be dropped from the Audit Report. The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to confirm that DAs and IAs are maintaining MP-wise separate cash book.
6	7.1.2	<u>Uploading of data on website- Works sanctioned but Data not uploaded.</u>	State nodal department in their reply has intimated that the Nodal DCs face some problems from time to time as far as uploading of data on website is concerned. Absence of power supply or technical staff is the main reasons for such inordinate delays. Lack of proper training of the staff engaged for such work is another major factor. However, of late, the situation has improved and all efforts are being made to upload the data in the website. Any delay in the process is mainly due to technical problems which are subsequently sorted out. Hence, this para may also kindly be dropped from the audit para. Comments of the Ministry The contention given by the Nodal District Authorities that they are facing difficulties due to non-imparting of training to the district officials on MPLADS guidelines is not correct. In this connection, it may be noted that the training to the districts officials in the state was imparted in the year 2008-09. The proposal for imparting training for the second time has been received in this Ministry and is under process of consideration. The trained personnel be detailed to upload the data on priority. State Nodal Authorities has been requested to provide the year-wise status of uploading of data.
7	7.2.1	<u>Monitoring committee meetings</u> - Monitoring Committees were set up but these had not met even once after their constitution.	State nodal department in their reply has intimated that this para is strictly noted and concerned authorities will be asked to comply with the Ministry's direction in this regard. Hence, this para may be dropped from the CAG

			report. The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to confirm that the State level Monitoring committee meeting are held regularly.
8	7.3.2	<u>No display of work details at the DA offices</u> -Failed to display the work detail in two DA office in the State audited by CAG.	State nodal department in their reply has intimated this para is strictly noted and concerned authorities will be asked to comply with the Ministry's direction in this regard. Hence, this para may be dropped from CAG report. The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to confirm that the works executed are being displayed on the notice board of the District Authorities.
9	7.3.3	<u>Absence of plaques carrying inscriptions</u> - Plaques carrying the inscription not erected on 35 works costing Rs 1.57 Crore in two sampled districts in the state audited by the CAG.	State nodal department in their reply has intimated that District Authorities/Implementing Agencies will be directed to erect signboard indicating the works implemented under MPLADS. Hence, this para may be dropped from CAG report The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to confirm that plaques of all the 35 works executed costing Rs 1.57 crore have been erected by the District Authorities.

Note : In the above cases, the Chief Secretary, Government of Arunachal Pradesh vide this Ministry's letters dated 14.5.2013 and 10.10.2013 has been requested to direct the concerned state nodal department and nodal district authorities to furnish comprehensive Action Taken Notes (ATNs) on priority. Copies of the letter have also been endorsed to the Nodal Secretary and concerned DCs. However, reply is still awaited.

Pending CAG Audit Paras - Assam

SI No	Para No	Details of Audit Para	Reply Received /Comments of the Ministry
1	4.3	(iii) <u>Incomplete works:</u> 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	Deputy Commissioner, Kamrup (M) in their reply has intimated that out of 07 schemes five scheme have already been completed. Two scheme i. e (i) Construction of Gate at premises of

		as complete in the progress report.	<p>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.</p> <p>The Ministry has requested DC Kamrup to provide the latest status of completion of 02 works in progress.</p>
2	6.2.6	<p><u>Non-submission of UCs by IAs</u> - In four district in the state of Assam, out of total works 2778 completed during the audit period 2004-09, the IAs did not submit UCs for 2778 work amounting to Rs 58.47 crore.</p>	<p>DC Dhubri in their reply has informed that Implementing agencies have been instructed to submit the UC and completion certificates immediately.</p> <p>Deputy Commissioner, Kamrup (M) in their reply has intimated that some times submission of UCs by the Implementing Agencies has been delayed due to rainy and flood season. However, all the Implementing agencies have been directed to submit UC in time. Hence, para may be dropped.</p> <p>Comments of the Ministry</p> <p>Replies received are not satisfactory. DC Dhubri and Kamrup (M have been requested to provide the latest status of receipt of UC from the IAs for the works executed.</p>
3.	6.4	<p><u>Diversion of funds</u></p> <p>In Dhubri district Funds were required to be spent for the intended purposes under the MPLADS diverted Rs 1.31 crore to other schemes of State and Central Governments.</p>	<p>DC Dhubri in their reply has intimated that during the year 2004-05, an amount of Rs 1.17 cores has been released to S.G.R.Y. The reason for such release is as under :-</p> <p>Under SRG scheme 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 10.5.2004 and in the said meeting, it was decided to provide 25% from MPLAD and MLA fund. The work under SGRY involved large number of people and benefitted large number of people and accordingly</p>

			<p>after considering para 3.17 of the Guidelines, the above work was undertaken and implemented. 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> <p>Comments of the Ministry Reply is not satisfactory. State Nodal Authorities are 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.</p>
4	6.7	<p><u>Contingency Expenses</u> - DAs of Kamrup, Kamrup(Metro), Dhubri 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.</p>	<p>DC Dhubri in their reply has intimated that 02 Nos of steel Almira 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 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, one person has been engaged for Data computerization work in daily remuneration system @ of Rs 90.00 per day from MPLADS contingency fund. Further expenses 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>Comments of the Ministry Reply is not satisfactory. As per para 4.17 of the MPLADS Guidelines, the District Authority can utilize the contingency expenses on items like</p>

			purchase of stationary, Office equipment including computer (excluding laptop), telephone /fax 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.
5	7.1.2	<u>Uploading of data on website- Works sanctioned but Data not uploaded.</u>	DC Kamrup and Dhubri in their reply has intimated that uploading of data on MPLADS website of district is going on. The Ministry has requested DC Kamrup and Dhubri to provide the latest position of uploading the data on Ministry's website.

Note : In the above cases, the Chief Secretary, Government of Assam vide this Ministry's letters dated 14.5.2013, 10.09.2013 and 07.10.2013 has been requested to direct the concerned state nodal department and nodal district authorities to furnish comprehensive Action Taken Notes (ATNs) on priority. Copies of the letter have also been endorsed to the Nodal Secretary and concerned DCs. However, reply is still awaited.

Pending C&AG Audit Para Bihar

SI No	Audit Para No	Detail of Audit Para	Reply Received /Comments of the Ministry
1	3.2(ii)	236 works costing Rs 6.66 crore were recommended by the concerned MPs but these works were sanctioned by the two district authorities costing Rs 7.92 crore.	Reply from Khagaria district has not yet been received. The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to direct the District

		Thus the cost of works exceeded by Rs 1.26 crore than the original cost indicated by the MPs-	Authority of Khagaria, to expedite reply.
2	3.3	<p><u>Selection of prohibited works</u> -The following works have been executed which were not permitted as per Guidelines:-</p> <p>(a) 19 Works costing Rs 0.97 crore executed for office and residential buildings of Central/State Government.</p> <p>(b) 02 Works costing Rs 0.01 crore for religious purposes and works within the premises of religious body.</p> <p>© 188 works costing Rs 2.83 crore of renovation, repair and maintenance.</p> <p>(d) 02 prohibited moveable items costing Rs 0.68 crore were Purchased.</p> <p>(e) 06 assets named after person costing Rs 0.11 crore were created.</p> <p>(f) 01 Miscellaneous inadmissible works costing Rs 0.74 crore (Cleanliness of tanks, ponds etc. and CM Relief fund)</p>	Reply from Khagaria district has not yet been received. The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to direct the District Authority of Khagaria, to expedite reply.
3	4.2.1	<u>Delay in sanction of Works</u> - DAs sanction the 83 works costing Rs 3.17 crore with a delay of more than one year after receiving the recommendation from the MPs concerned.	Reply from Khagaria district has not yet been received. The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to direct the District Authority of Khagaria, to expedite reply.
4	4.3(i)	(i) Non Commencement of works - 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.	Reply from Khagaria district has not yet been received. The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to direct the District Authority of Khagaria to expedite reply.
5	4.5.2	Excess/avoidable expenditure (i) In Bihar, works under the scheme were executed on the basis of estimates prepared on existing schedules of rates in which contractors profit (CP) at the rate of 10 percent were included. For departmentally executed works, contractors profit was to be deducted from the total estimated cost of the work. 46 works were	Reply from Khagaria district has not yet been received. The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to direct the District Authority of Khagaria, to expedite reply.

		<p>executed departmentally by six executing agencies. However the contractors profit was allowed to the concerned officials without deducting it from the estimates. Thus, excess payment of Rs. 0.08 crore was made by the executing agency. The details of the six executing agencies are given below:-</p> <p>Rural Works Division (RWD)-2, Madhepura (Rs. 0.02 crore); Begusarai (Rs. 0.01 crore), Khagaria (Rs. 0.01 crore), Rohtas (Rs. 0.11 lakh) NREP Siwan (Rs. 0.03 crore) and Rohtas (Rs. 0.50 lakh).</p>	
6	4.6	<p>Procedural lapses in the execution of works - Six executing agencies (1. RWD-2, Masaurhi, 2. RWD-2, Patna, 3. NREP, Patna, 4. RWD-2 Madhepura, 5. RWD-2 Khagaria and 6. NREP, Rohtas) paid Rs. 2.02 crore to labourers and purchased materials through hand receipts during 2005-09, in contravention of the State PWD Code, which stated that payment to labourers should be made on the basis of the Muster Roll detailing the nature and period of work executed, sanction order of the estimate and number of labourers engaged.</p>	<p>DPO Madhepura has informed that compliance of this para is being obtained from concerned implementing agency, Executive Engineer, RWD Madhepura. Besides several reminders compliance of this paras is still awaited. Action will be taken accordingly.</p> <p>The Ministry has requested District Authority Madhepura to expedite compliance of audit observations.</p> <p>Reply from Khagaria district has not yet been received. The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to direct the District Authority of Khagaria, to expedite reply.</p>
7	5.1(iii)	<p>Non-maintenance of works register and assets register Assets registers had not been maintained.</p>	<p>Reply from Khagaria district has not yet been received. The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to direct the District Authority of Khagaria, to expedite reply.</p>
8	5.3	<p>Commitment for maintenance and upkeep of assets - No commitment for maintenance of the assets was taken from the user agencies nor any agreement signed before issue of sanction orders and commencement of work.</p>	<p>Reply from Khagaria district has not yet been received. The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to direct the District Authority of Khagaria to expedite reply.</p>
9	6.2.6	<p>Non-submission of UCs by IAs - In five district in the state of Bihar, out of total works 3172 completed during the audit</p>	<p>DPO Madhepura has informed that UCs are being obtained from the Implementing Agencies.</p>

		period 2004-09, the IAs did not submit UCs for the work 2164 amounting to Rs 52.93 crore.	The Ministry has requested District Authority Madhepura to provide latest status on receipt of UCs of the Audit Period. Reply from Khagaria district has not yet been received. The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to direct the District Authority of Khagaria, to expedite reply.
10	6.8.1	Banking arrangements (a) DAs and IAs had not maintained a separate bank account for each MP. Instead, their funds under the scheme were clubbed with funds in the accounts of other MPs.	Reply from Khagaria district has not yet been received. The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to direct the District Authority of Khagaria, to expedite reply.
		(b) IAs under the District Authorities audited had clubbed funds available under MPLADS with the funds of other schemes making it difficult to segregate the interest accrued on MPLADS funds.	Reply from Khagaria district has not yet been received. The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to direct the District Authority of Khagaria, to expedite reply.
		(c) DAs and IAs had kept the scheme funds in accounts such as fixed deposits, current accounts, Personal Ledger Accounts, Government treasury, etc. instead of saving accounts in a public sector bank.	Reply from Khagaria district has not yet been received. The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to direct the District Authority of Khagaria, to expedite reply.
11	6.8.2	Discrepancy in accounts Advance/temporary advance of Rs 0.13 crore given to five departmental officers respectively were unadjusted, despite the transfer and/or superannuation of the officers concerned in the districts audited by C&AG.	Reply from Khagaria district has not yet been received. The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to direct the District Authority of Khagaria, to expedite reply.
12	7.1.2	Uploading of data on website- Works sanctioned but Data not uploaded.	Reply from Khagaria district has not yet been received. The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to direct the District Authority of Khagaria, to expedite reply.

Note : In the above cases, the Chief Secretary, Government of Bihar vide this Ministry's letters dated 15.05.2013 and 07.10.2013 has been requested to direct

the concerned state nodal department and nodal district authorities to furnish comprehensive Action Taken Notes (ATNs) on priority. The letters have also been endorsed to the Nodal Secretary and concerned DPOs. However, reply is still awaited.

Pending C&AG Audit Para Chhattisgarh

Sl No	Audit Para No	Detail of Audit Para	Reply Received /Comments of the Ministry
1	3.3	Selection of prohibited works - one work costing Rs 0.01 crore have been executed which were not permitted as per Guidelines.	<p>State Nodal Department has informed that <u>Bilaspur</u> - Railway Reservation Center was built on the recommendation of honorable MP Shri P.L. Mohale and being used by common public. The work has been completed. However, no such work will be sanctioned in future. The matter is being sent to the Ministry for condoning the work shortly.</p> <p>Comments of the Ministry</p> <p>Work sanctioned and executed is not permissible as per serial No 1 of Annex-II - the List of works prohibited under MPLADS. As decided in the Bi-annual All India Review meeting on MPLADS held on 26 February, 2013, the Collector, Bilaspur was requested to forward details of the case for consideration by the Ministry. However, reply has not yet been received.</p>
2	4.3(iii)	Incomplete works: 595 works costing Rs. 9.94 Crore remained incomplete 1 to 4 years in 3 DAs.	<p>State Nodal Department has informed that out of 595 incomplete works, 594 works have been completed. 01 work is in progress.</p> <p>The Ministry has requested DM Mungeli to provide the latest status in respect of balance 01 incomplete work.</p>
3	6.2.6	Non-submission of UCs by IAs - In three district in the state of Chhattisgarh, out of total works 1910 completed during the audit period 2004-09, the IAs did not submit UCs for 559 work amounting to Rs 11.84 crore.	<p>Reply from DM Bilaspur has not yet been received.</p> <p>The Ministry has requested DM Bilaspur to provide the latest status</p>

			of receipt of UCs in respect of balance incomplete works.
4	7.5	Internal Audit - States/UTs had not made any arrangements for an internal audit of the Scheme	State Nodal Department has informed that the issue of internal audit is being taken up with the State Government and decision will be intimated soon. The Ministry has requested the State Nodal department to furnish the latest status in the matter taken up with the State Government.

Note : In the above cases, the Chief Secretary, Government of Chhattisgarh vide this Ministry's letters dated 15.05.2013, 10.09.2013 and 15.10.2013 has been requested to direct the concerned state nodal department and nodal district authorities to furnish comprehensive Action Taken Notes (ATNs) on priority. The letter have also been endorsed to the Nodal Secretary and concerned DCs. However, reply is still awaited.

Pending C&AG Audit Para Delhi

SI No	Audit Para No	Detail of Audit Para	Reply Received /Comments of the Ministry
1	5.1(iii)	_Non-maintenance of works register and assets register_ Assets register had not been maintained.	Chief Engineer, Municipal Corporation, Delhi has informed that the physical and financial achievement reports are sent to the Ministry on monthly basis. Further instructions as contained in GFR 19 is being reiterated to all Executive Engineers for maintaining assets created under each plan schemes including MPLADS. In view of the above the para may kindly be dropped. Comments of the Ministry As per para 6.4(iii) & (iv) of the Guidelines, the Work Register and Asset Register are to be maintained at the District level and Implementing Agencies level. Non maintenance of work and asset register is in violation of the Guidelines, Director, Local Bodies, Govt of NCT of Delhi is requested to direct the Commissioners of all the three Municipal Corporations to

			<p>confirm that the assets register, as per GFR 19, since inception of the scheme, are being maintained. In case non-adherence to the MPLADS Guidelines, necessary disciplinary action against officials responsible be initiated for the irregularity.</p> <p>The Chief Secretary, Government of Delhi vide this Ministry's letters dated 20.05.2013, 12.09.2013 and 15.10.2013 has been requested to direct the concerned state nodal department and nodal district authorities to furnish comprehensive Action Taken Notes (ATNs) on priority. The letters have also been endorsed to the Nodal Secretary and concerned DCs. However, reply is still awaited</p>
--	--	--	---

Pending C&AG Audit Para Goa

SI No	Audit Para No	Detail of Audit Para	Reply Received /Comments of the Ministry
1	3.4	DAs sanctioned excess funds amounting to Rs 0.45 crore to 05 Societies /Trusts in North Goa and South Goa districts.	<p>North Goa District has informed that following works were sanctioned in excess of funds for Societies/Trusts prior to issue of new Guideline 2005 under MPLADS as these trusts were rendering commendable social service in their area of location:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of Community Hall near Shree Chaurangipath Bhumika Devasthan Simvado Arpora, Bardez-Goa on 22.11.2004 in excess of amount Rs 6.52,101/- 2. Work for construction of Bhumika Shikshan Saunsthan at Sattari on 06.05.2003 in excess fund Rs 12,25,657./-. The institute have been asked to refund the excess amount reminder sent on 30.05.2013. The further progress in the matter shall be

			<p>communicated.</p> <p>3. Construction of Football ground and School Auditorium at Fr. Agnel High School, Pilar, Tiswadi on 8.10.2004 in excess Rs 9,28,150/-. The institute have been asked to refund the amount followed by reminder dated 27.05.2013.</p> <p>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. The matter has been taken up with state Government to take a decision in this regard.</p> <p>Comments of the Ministry</p> <p>The Ministry has requested Collector, North Goa District to provide the present status of recoupment of funds from the concerned institute and Action taken against the errant district officials found responsible for irregular sanction.</p>
--	--	--	---

Note : In the above cases, the Chief Secretary, Government of Goa vide this Ministry's letters dated 20.05.2013, 16.09.2013 and 15.10.2013 has been requested to direct the concerned state nodal department and nodal district authorities to furnish comprehensive Action Taken Notes (ATNs) on priority. The letters have also been endorsed to the Nodal Secretary and concerned DCs. However, reply is still awaited.

Pending C&AG Audit Para Gujarat

SI No	Audit Para No	Detail of Audit Para	Reply /Comments of the Ministry	Received of the
1	3.3	<u>Selection of prohibited works</u> -The	DPOs Navasari, Valsad, Amreli,	

	<p>following works have been executed which were not permitted as per Guidelines:-</p> <p>(a) 01 work costing Rs 0.09 crore executed for office and residential buildings for cooperative, private organization and any work for commercial body</p> <p>(b) 01 work costing Rs 0.02 crore executed of renovation, repair and maintenance.</p> <p>(c) 05 prohibited moveable items costing Rs 0.21 crore were purchased.</p>	<p>and Bharuch have intimated that no prohibited works have been executed under MPLADS Guidelines during the year 2004-05 to 2008-09.</p> <p>District Collector Anand has informed that only one work in 2004-05 for sanctioning of an Ambulance Van for Navsarjan Charitable Trust, Borsad costing Rs 5 lakh that fall under the category of Purchase of Prohibited Moveable Items' was noted by audit. The work was accorded in-principle approval prior to issue of revised Guidelines in November 2005.</p> <p>DPO Junagarh has informed that as per suggestion of Hon'ble MP dated 19.4.2005, only one ambulance was purchased for registered trust which was approved on 09.11.2005 as per old Guidelines. New Guidelines were received on 20.12.2005. As such the work was approved before the new Guidelines. After receipt of new guidelines, no work was sanctioned for registered trust/society.</p> <p><u>Comments of the Ministry</u></p> <p>C&AG in the performance audit report has pointed out execution of total 07 works costing Rs 0.32 crore in 4 districts. Reply received from the 04 districts i.e Navsari, Valsad, Amreli and Bharuch mentioning that no such work was executed is apparently incorrect.</p> <p>Audit was conducted in the sampled 06 districts and the objections must have been given to the district authorities in four districts. District Authority Anand and Junagarh</p>
--	--	--

			<p>have mentioned that there are two works where in the provisions of MPLADS Guidelines have been violated. The other District Authorities should also know the details of 05 works where audit authorities have observed irregularities in executing the MPLADS works.</p> <p>State Nodal Authorities are, therefore, requested to direct the District Collectors of all the sampled district authorities to find out the objection and furnish their replies to this Ministry through the State Nodal Authorities.</p>
2	6.6	<p><u>Refund of unspent balances by IAs</u> (a) Rs 0.12 crore unspent balance arising due to completion of works at lower than sanctioned cost not refunded by the Implementing Agency.</p>	<p>Collector Anand has informed that instructions have been issued to all IAs for refunding of unspent balance for works completed at lower than sanctioned cost of 2004-09</p> <p>The Ministry has requested District Collector, Anand to provide the status of refund of unspent balance.</p>
		<p>(b) 99 works amounting to Rs 1.54 crore unspent funds due to works not being started not refunded by the Implementing Agency.</p>	<p>District Collector Anand has informed that instructions have been issued to all IAs for refunding of unspent balance for works not started during 2004-09.</p> <p>The Ministry has requested District Collector, Anand to provide the status of refund of unspent balance due to works not being started.</p>

Note : In the above cases, the Chief Secretary, Government of Gujarat vide this Ministry's letters dated 20.05.2013, 13.09.2013 and 17.10.2013 has been requested to direct the concerned state nodal department and nodal district authorities to furnish comprehensive Action Taken Notes (ATNs) on priority. The letter have also been endorsed to the Nodal Secretary and concerned DCs. However, reply is still awaited.

Pending C&AG Audit Para Haryana

SI No	Audit Para No	Detail of Audit Para	Reply Received /Comments of the Ministry
1	3.3	<p>Selection of prohibited works - The following works have been executed which were not permitted as per Guidelines:-</p> <p>(a) 01 work costing Rs 0.17 crore executed for office and residential buildings of State/Central Government.</p> <p>(b) 94 works costing Rs 0.70 crore executed of renovation, repair and maintenance.</p>	<p>State Nodal Department in reply has informed that there are four works in Audit observations costing Rs 6.59 lakh in Bhiwani district. Out of this a sum of Rs 1.34 lakh refunded to this and Rs 5.25 lakh has been utilized on the following works:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Chapper Rs.1.90 lakh for Major school repair. 2. Kanheti Rs 2.35 lakh for major school Repair. 3. Karnal Rs 1.00 lakh for major school repair. <p>It is also mentioned that work had already been sanctioned prior to receipt of Revised Guidelines 2005 in the office. No repair work were sanctioned after the receipt new Guidelines. However, the point has been noted and strict compliance is being made.</p> <p>As regard District Sonepat the works were of special repair for restoration/up-gradation of durable assets which were permissible as per MPLADS Guidelines of 2002. The scheme guidelines were further revised in the year November 2005.</p> <p>Comments of the Ministry</p> <p>In the audit para, there are total 95 prohibited works costing Rs 0.87 crore executed in the three sampled districts. Reply received are not satisfactory as the total No of works and cost involved therein do not tally with the works and cost mentioned in the audit para.</p> <p>District Authority may be directed to intimate the total no of works executed in special repair and the total cost involved therein.</p> <p>Audit was conducted in the sampled 03 districts and the objections must have been given to</p>

			<p>three district authorities. District Authorities should know the details of audit observations.</p> <p>State Nodal Authorities have, therefore, been requested to direct the District Authorities of all the sampled districts to find out the objections and furnish their replies to the ministry through the State Nodal authorities.</p>
2	4.2.1(ii)	<p>_Sanction of works without adhering to guidelines - Only rough cost estimates of the works were prepared for all 555 audited works in three test-checked districts (Ambala, Bhiwani and Sonipat) during 2004-09.</p>	<p>State Nodal Department has intimated that DA Ambala has informed that all the works adhering to the scheme guidelines, rough cost estimates were prepared by the executing agencies funds sanctioned and were released after scrutiny.</p> <p>Comments of the Ministry</p> <p>Reply received from Ambala district authority is ambiguous and does not specify whether to prepare rough estimate and later release the funds after scrutiny is in accordance with the state procedure. State Nodal Authorities are requested to confirm that preparing the rough estimate is as per the state procedure. If not, District Authority Ambala may be directed to initiate necessary action against the errant district officials for not adhering to the MPLADS Guidelines.</p>
3	6.2.6	<p>Non-submission of UCs by IAs - In two district in the state of Haryana, out of total works 1352 completed during the audit period 2004-09, the IAs did not submit UCs for the work 139 amounting to Rs 1.60 crore.</p>	<p>State Nodal Department in reply has informed that all the utilisation certificates except one work amounting to Rs. 10.00 lac in respect of Sonapat district have been received. Efforts are being made to obtain the same.</p> <p>Further State Authorities have intimated that DA Ambala has informed that an Accounts Officer of DRDA Sonapat has been deputed for procuring UC of Rs 10.00 lacs from the office of the Financial Adviser and Chief Accounts Officer, Northern Railway Head Office, Baroda House, New Delhi. The latest report is still awaited.</p>

			The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to furnish present status of receipt of Utilisation Certificate from Railways.
4	7.3.3	Absence of plaques carrying inscriptions - Plaques carrying the inscription not erected on 988 works costing Rs 17.42 Crore in two sampled districts in the state audited by the CAG.	The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to direct the District Authority of Sonapat to provide the status of erection of plaques.

Note : In the above cases, the Chief Secretary, Government of Haryana vide this Ministry's letters dated 20.05.2013, 25.09.2013 and 15.10.2013 has been requested to direct the concerned state nodal department and nodal district authorities to furnish comprehensive Action Taken Notes (ATNs) on priority. The letters have also been endorsed to the Nodal Secretary and concerned DCs. However, reply is still awaited.

Pending C&AG Audit Para Himachal Pradesh

SI No	Audit Para No	Detail of Audit Para	Reply /Comments of the Ministry
1	4.3	(i) Non Commencement of works - Eight audited IAs intimated that land for 102 works costing Rs. 1.23 crore was not available. In the remaining 53 cases (cost: Rs. 0.53 crore) no cogent reasons were intimated by the three implementing agencies.	DPO Kangra has informed that 34 works in Indora Block which were not started at the time of audit have now been started, out of which 29 works have been completed and 05 works are under progress which will be completed at the earliest. The sanctioned amount of Rs 5.24 lakh of 09 works have been refunded by the BDO Nurpur to this office and same will be utilized for execution of another works after recommendation of Hon'ble MP. Out of Three works in Nagrota Bagwan block, 02 works are under progress and the amount of one work have been returned by the implementing agencies. The Ministry has requested District Authority Kangra to provide the status of 05 works under progress and also the present status of two in Nagrota Bagwan block which are under progress.
		(ii) 17 works amounting to Rs.0.10 Crore were abandoned or left incomplete due to	DPO Kangra has informed that all the pending works have been started

		land disputes.	except one work in Indora Block which is pending due to court case. The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to direct the District Authority Kangra to provide the latest status of court case.				
2	6.7	<p>Contingency Expenses - 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" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th>Name of DA</th> <th>Amount</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Kangra</td> <td>0.07</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Name of DA	Amount	Kangra	0.07	<p>DPO Kangra has informed that a sum of Rs 0.07 crore was spent for the payment of laptop, wages, honorarium and stationery charges out of contingency of MPLADS. The cost of laptop i.e Rs 54020/- so purchased has been recouped 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, it has been decided to recoup the amount from the other state head. The compliance is awaited.</p> <p>The Ministry has requested District Authority, Kangra to provide the latest status on recoument of Rs 5,55,000/-.</p>
Name of DA	Amount						
Kangra	0.07						

Note : In the above cases, the Chief Secretary, Government of Himachal Pradesh vide this Ministry's letters dated 20.0 .2013, 2 .0 .2013 and 17.10.2013 has been requested to direct the concerned state nodal department and nodal district authorities to furnish comprehensive Action Taken Notes (ATNs) on priority. The letters have also been endorsed to the Nodal Secretary and concerned DCs. However, reply is still awaited.

Pending C&AG Audit Para Jharkhand

SI No	Audit Para No	Detail of Audit Para	Reply Received /Comments of the Ministry
1	3.3	<p>Selection of prohibited works -The following works have been executed which were not permitted as per Guidelines:-</p> <p>(a) 50 works costing Rs 0.64 crore of renovation, repair and maintenance were executed.</p> <p>(b) 08 prohibited moveable items costing Rs 0.27 crore were purchased.</p> <p>(c) 03 assets named after person costing</p>	<p>DDCs, Deoghar, Hazaribagh and Lohardaga has informed that the work is executed as per MPLADS Guidelines on the recommendations of the Hon'ble MP. Repairs and maintenance work was not undertaken.</p> <p>DDC Dhanbad has informed that in order to provide medical facilities to the habitats of remote areas on time Ambulance were provided to</p>

		<p>Rs 6.09 crore were created.</p> <p>(d) 01 Miscellaneous inadmissible works costing Rs 0.01 crore (Cleanliness of ponds, tanks etc. and CM Relief fund)</p>	<p>Reputed and registered social organizations. As per new guidelines, purchase of Ambulance is now widened to allow operation of ambulance through provide organizations. In Dhanbad District schemes shown as prohibited (repairs and maintenance), it was found that they were new constructions as reported by NREP after verification.</p> <p>Comments of the Ministry</p> <p><i>C&AG in the performance audit report has pointed out execution of total 62 works costing Rs 7.00 crore in 3 districts. Reply received from the 04 sampled districts are not satisfactory since number of works and their cost has not been indicated by the districts authority.</i></p> <p><i>Audit was conducted in 04 sampled districts and the objections must have been given to the district authorities in four districts. Districts Authority should know the details of audit observations.</i></p> <p>State Nodal Authorities are, therefore, requested to direct the District collectors of all the sampled districts to find out the objection and furnish their replies to this Ministry through the State Nodal authorities.</p>
2	3.4	<p>DAs sanctioned excess funds Rs 0.58 crore for five Societies /Trusts.</p>	<p>DDC Dhanbad has informed that in future strict norms of MPLAD fund will be followed in sanctioning fund to Societies /Trusts.</p> <p>Comments of the Ministry</p> <p><i>Reply given by the DDC Dhanbad is not satisfactory. State Nodal authority is requested to direct the District authority Dhanbad 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.</i></p>

3	4.3	<p>(iii) Incomplete works: 883 works costing Rs. 18.72 Crore remained incomplete 1 to 4 years in 4 DAs.</p>	<p>District Collector, Hazaribagh has informed that 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.</p> <p>The Ministry has requested DC Hazaribagh to provide the status of works under dispute and likely time taken to complete the work. In case, delay is anticipated, Implementing Agencies be directed to refund the amount.</p>
4	4.4.1	<p><u>Non-existence of assets</u> 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 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.</p>	<p>DDC, Deoghar has informed that that the FIR has been lodged against the firm M/s Kiran Energy Solution 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.</p> <p>The Ministry has requested Collector, Deoghar to intimate outcome of auction letter issued by the BDO Sarwan.</p>
5	6.6	<p><u>Refund of unspent balances by IAs</u></p> <p>(a) Rs 0.02 crore unspent balance arising due to completion of works at lower than sanctioned cost not refunded by the Implementing Agency.</p>	<p>District collector, Hazaribagh has informed that the Implementing Agencies have been directed to refund the unspent balance.</p> <p>The Ministry has requested DC Hazaribagh to provide latest status of refund of unspent funds with interest from Implementing Agencies.</p>
		<p>(b) 02 works amounting to Rs 0.01 crore unspent funds due to works not being started not refunded by the Implementing Agency.</p>	<p>DC Hazaribagh has informed that instructions have been issued to refund the amount for which the work has not been started.</p>

			The Ministry has requested DC Hazaribagh to provide the status of refund of amount for works not yet started.
6	7.1.2	<u>Uploading of data on website- Works sanctioned but Data not uploaded.</u>	District collector, Hazaribagh has informed that uploading is being done on the website in the district. The Ministry has requested DC Hazaribagh to provide the status of works uploaded so far on the website.
7	7.2.1	<u>Monitoring committee meetings</u> - Monitoring Committees were set up but these had not met even once after their constitution.	The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to expedite reply as it pertains to monitoring committee constituted under the Chairmanship of the Chief Secretary.
8.	7.3.1	<u>Inspection of works</u> States/UTs had not inspected any work during 2004-05 to 2008-09.	The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to expedite reply.
9	7.4	<u>Inadequate coverage of areas inhabited by the SC/ST community</u> Audit test check showed that funds sanctioned for areas inhabited by the SC/ST population were short of the requirements prescribed in the Scheme guidelines.	District collector, Hazaribagh has informed that administrative sanction is given on the basis of recommendation received from the Hon'ble MPs. The Ministry has requested district authority Hazaribagh to ensure that the percentage of works in SC/ST areas are met as provided in the MPLADS Guidelines.

Note : In the above cases, the Chief Secretary, Government of Jharkhand vide this Ministry's letters dated 21.05.2013, 20.09.2013 and 17.10.2013 has been requested to direct the concerned state nodal department and nodal district authorities to furnish comprehensive Action Taken Notes (ATNs) on priority. The letters have also been endorsed to the Nodal Secretary and concerned District Collectors. However, reply is still awaited.

Pending C&AG Audit Para Karnataka

Sl No	Audit Para No	Detail of Audit Para	Reply Received /Comments of the Ministry
1	3.3	Selection of prohibited works -The following works have been executed which were not permitted as per Guidelines:-	DC Haveri has informed that as per recommendation by the Hon'ble MPs, District Authority has executed the works. These places are public

		<p>(a) 17 works costing Rs 0.63 crore executed for office and residential buildings of Central/State Government</p> <p>(b) 94 works costing Rs 1.84 crore executed for religious purposes and works within the premises of religious body</p> <p>(c) 35 works costing Rs 0.52 crore of renovation, repair and maintenance were executed.</p> <p>(d) 17 assets named after person costing Rs 0.25 crore were created.</p>	<p>property and open to all for use. The properties are then handed over to concerned Gram Panchayats. In future, the MPLADS guidelines will be strictly followed to avoid execution of prohibited works.</p> <p>The Ministry has requested District authority Haveri to provide the list of works with cost thereof and the place where works have been executed.</p> <p>DC Hassan has informed that there is no case for works for office and residential building of Central/State Government in the District. However, as recommended by the Hon'ble MP, three works have been taken up for the year 2004-05, 2005-06 and 2006-07 for the construction of Sairam Mandir at Channarayapatna town in the year of 2004-05, Chilume Mutt Samudaya Bhavan at Arkalgud in the year 2005-06 and Madrasa building Bajjimma Farooq at Arsikere in the year of 2006-07. All these three works were already executed for the benefit of the public. Hence this para kindly be dropped.</p> <p>Comments of the Ministry</p> <p>As per Guidelines on MPLADS 2002 and November 2005, the work construction for religious worship is prohibited. Hence the work executed is inadmissible and the funds is to be recouped. District authority Hassan has been requested to take necessary action against the errant District officials and funds be recouped with interest and the Action Taken Notes (ATNs) be furnished to the Ministry urgently.</p>
2	3.5	<p>MPLADS funds were used before utilizing the funds available under other schemes leading to abandonment of work midway or delays occasioned by delayed release of funds - MPLAD funds of Rs.0.35 crore were released for the construction of Samudhaya Bhavans in Bangalore (Rural). Release of funds by the DAs, prior to the utilization of funds from</p>	<p>The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to direct the District Authority of Bangalore (Rural) to expedite reply.</p>

		other sources resulted in unfruitful expenditure. The work remained incomplete even after lapse of a year due to non-receipt of funds from other sources.	
3	4.3	(i) Non Commencement of works - 14 works amounting to Rs.0.60 Crore had not been taken up due to land disputes.	<p>DC, Dharwad has informed that out of 44 incomplete works undertaken during the audit period, 39 works have been completed. 02 works have not yet started during to site problem and 03 works have been started and half of the work has been completed. The contractor are not coming forward to complete the work. The Implementing Agencies have been asked to inspect the site and intimate the status of work completed and funds involved in it. On receipt of report from the Implementing Agencies, the same will be forwarded.</p> <p>Comments of the Ministry</p> <p>The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to direct the DC Dharwad to cancel the work which have not started due to site problem and get back the funds with interest. In respect of three incomplete works, the IAs should be asked to direct the contractor to complete the work. In case, they do not complete the work, Penal action as per sanction letter be taken against the contractor and the entire funds be recouped with interest. If need be, FIR may be lodged against the contractor and the firms may be blacklisted. Action Taken Notes (ATNs) have been requested to be furnish to the Ministry urgently.</p>
		(iii) Incomplete works 2538 works costing Rs. 31.7 Crore remained incomplete 1 to 4 years in 6 DAs.	<p>DC Haveri in reply to the audit para has informed that out of 384 works sanctioned from 2004-09, 259 works have been completed and balance 125 works are in progress.</p> <p>The Ministry has requested DC Haveri to provide the present status of 125 works in progress.</p> <p>DC Bagalkot in response has intimated that a total 28 works are</p>

			<p>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. The issue was brought to the notice of MP and has been requested for change of work.</p> <p>Comments of the Ministry</p> <p>The Ministry has drawn the attention of DC Bagalkot to para 3.11 of the Guidelines wherein it has been stipulated 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. Therefore, no revised recommendations are admissible as per MPLADS Guidelines. The funds received back are required to be distributed as per this Ministry's instructions dated 10.5.2010 amongst sitting members of 15th Lok Sabha MPs</p> <p>DC Hassan has informed that 6 works are incomplete for the year 2005-06, 11 works incomplete for the 2007-08 and 09 works incomplete for the year 2008-09. These works were given administrative sanction and the 1st installment was released. After utilisation of released amount, 2nd installment is released and work is completed as early as possible.</p> <p>The Ministry has requested D.C Hassan to provide latest status of incomplete work.</p> <p>DC, Dharwad in reply has intimated that out of 44 incomplete works undertaken during the audit period, 39 works have been completed. 02 works have not yet started during to site problem and 03 works have been started and half of the work has been completed. The contractor are not coming forward to complete the work. The Implementing Agencies have been asked to inspect the site and intimate the status of work completed and funds involved therein. Report will be forwarded on receipt from the</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>Implementing Agencies.</p> <p>Comments of the Ministry</p> <p>The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to direct DC Dharwad to cancel the works which have not yet started due to site problem and get back the funds with interest IAs should be asked to direct the contractor to complete the work. In case, they do not complete the work, Penal action as per sanction letter may be taken against the contractor and the entire funds be recouped with interest. If need be, FIR may be lodged against the contractor and the firms may be blacklisted. Action Taken Notes (ATNs) has been requested to be furnished to the Ministry.</p>
4	6.2.6	<p>Non-submission of UCs by IAs - In six districts in the state of Karnataka, out of total works 2265 completed during the audit period 2004-09, the IAs did not submit UCs for the work 380 amounting to Rs 7.60 crore.</p>	<p>DC Hassan has informed that UC submitted from the year 2004-05 and 2008-09 for a total sum of Rs 10,58,19,903/-. The remaining UCs of Rs 41,80,097/- will be submitted on receipt from the concerned implementing agencies.</p> <p>The Ministry has requested DC Hassan to provide the status of non-submission of UCs amounting to Rs 41,80,097/-.</p> <p>Reply from District Authority Bangalore Rural, and Haveri have not yet been received.</p> <p>The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to direct District Authority Bangalore Rural and Haveri to expedite reply.</p>
5	6.5	<p>Release of advances in excess of prescribed limits - District Authority released advance to IAs in excess of prescribed limits as against DA may release advances up to 75 per cent (for projects sanctioned up to October 2005) and 50 per cent (for projects sanctioned</p>	<p>The Ministry has requested the Nodal State Authorities to direct Districts Authority of Bangalore Rural, Dharwad, Haveri and Kolar to expedite reply.</p>

		after October 2005) of the estimated amount of a sanctioned work to the IA	
6	7.1.2	Uploading of data on website- Works sanctioned but Data not uploaded.	<p>DC Kolar has informed that details of works sanctioned under MPLAD Scheme have been uploaded upto 2004-05 and uploading of data for the subsequent years is under progress.</p> <p>The Ministry has requested DC Kolar to confirm that uploading of data has been completed for the audit period.</p> <p>No reply from district Authority Bangalore Rural and Haveri has received yet. The Ministry has, therefore, requested the State Nodal Authorities to direct the Districts Authority of Bangalore Rural and Haveri to expedite reply.</p>
7	7.2.1	Monitoring committee meetings Monitoring Committees were set up but these had not met even once after their constitution.	The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to expedite reply.
8	7.3.1	Inspection of works States/UTs had not inspected any work during 2004-05 to 2008-09.	The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to expedite reply.
9	7.4	Inadequate coverage of areas inhabited by the SC/ST community Audit test check showed that funds sanctioned for areas inhabited by the SC/ST population were short of the requirements prescribed in the Scheme guidelines.	<p>DC Haveri has informed that Hon'ble MPs have been requested to recommend work for areas inhabited by the SC/ST community as per guidelines of MPLADS.</p> <p>The Ministry has requested DC Haveri to provide the letter written to the on'ble MP in the matter.</p> <p>DC Hassan has informed that works recommended by the concerned Hon'ble MPs were sanctioned and funds released for areas inhabited by the SC/ST population as prescribed in the Guidelines.</p>

			<p>The Ministry has requested DC Hassan to provide details of works recommended for the SC/ST areas in the constituency during 2004-05 and to 2008-09 along with overall percentage.</p> <p>DC Dharwad has intimated that the works have been undertaken as per the recommendations given by the Hon'ble MP and completed.</p> <p>Comments of the Ministry</p> <p>From the list provided by DC Dharwad, it has been noticed that as per the list given by the Hon'ble MP, only works costing Rs 49.25 lakh have been spent in SC/ST areas which is short by 1.75 crore as per provisions of the Guidelines. State Nodal Authorities are requested to direct DC Dharwad to be careful in future. As provided in the MPLADS Guidelines, work in SC/ST areas must be sanctioned to the full entitlement during the year as provided in the MPLADS Guidelines.</p>
--	--	--	---

Note : In the above cases, the Chief Secretary, Government of Karnataka vide this Ministry's letters dated 08.04.2013, 21.08.2013, 20.09.2013 and 21.10.2013 has been requested to direct the concerned state nodal department and nodal district authorities to furnish comprehensive Action Taken Notes (ATNs) on priority. The letters have also been endorsed to the Nodal Secretary and concerned District Collectors. However, reply is still awaited.

Pending C&AG Audit Para Madhya Pradesh

Sl No	Audit Para No	Detail of Audit Para	Reply Received /Comments of the Ministry
1	3.2	(ii) Works executed exceeding the cost by 0.26 crore indicated by the concerned MPs	<p>Reply from district authorities of Hoshangabad, Shahdol and Shajapur has not yet been received.</p> <p>The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to direct the concerned district authorities of Hoshangabad, Shahdol and Shajapur to expedite reply.</p>
2	3.3	Selection of prohibited works -The following works have been executed which were not permitted as per Guidelines:-	Collector Shahdol in their replies has informed that as per guidelines, sanction costing Rs 48.13 lakh were

		<p>(a) 38 Works costing Rs 1.53 crore executed for office and residential buildings of Central/State Government.</p> <p>(b) 09 works costing Rs 0.41 crore executed for office and residential buildings for cooperative, private organization and any work for commercial body</p> <p>(c) 03 Works costing Rs 0.03 crore for religious purposes and works within the premises of religious body.</p> <p>(d) 57 works costing Rs 1.34 crore executed of renovation, repair and maintenance.</p>	<p>issued for construction of 12 State go-down for Public Distribution System. The sanction to these works were issued under serial 14 of Sub Head Other Public Facilities' under List of Sector and Scheme Codes and no sanction was issued to any prohibited works.</p> <p>Comments of the Ministry</p> <p>As per serial 3 of the List of Works Prohibited under MPLADS, All works involving commercial establishment/units are prohibited. Go-down for PDS being the works involved in commercial activities is prohibited as per extant MPLADS Guidelines. The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to direct the DC Shahdol 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 Notes be furnished to this Ministry urgently.</p>
3	3.4	DAs sanctioned excess funds by Rs 0.48 crore to 03 Societies /Trusts in Shahdol, Balaghat, Shajapur districts.	<p>As per reply from Collector Shahdol, in district Anoopur under Shadol Lok Sabha Constituency, Rs 35 lakh was sanctioned to a trust Kalyanyika Siksha Niketan Amarkantak against the limit of Rs 25 lakh. The Directions issued by the erstwhile Collector Anoopur on the Note sheet is may be perused.</p> <p>The Minisry has requested the Collector Shahdol to intimate the status of case.</p>
4	3.5	<p>Convergence of MPLAD Scheme with other schemes</p> <p>In Madhya Pradesh, schemes which were not to be converged with MPLADS were also taken up for convergence by using MPLADS funds of Rs.2.15 crore as per details given below:-</p> <p>(i) In six nodal districts, 222 works for construction of cement concrete roads, Community Hall and primary schools during 2004-05 were carried out duly</p>	<p>(i) Collector Shajapur has intimated that only one work was sanctioned with the amount of 11 financial commission in the year 2006-07 which</p>

	<p>recommended by MPs based on the recommendation of the XIth Finance Commission on a cost-sharing basis. 25 per cent cost of construction, i.e. Rs.1.37 crore was to be shared by public and Community. However, the same was incorrectly met from MPLAD funds on the recommendation of the MPs concerned, which contravened the guidelines that MPLAD funds should not be used to substitute the public and community contribution on any Central/State Government Programme. The DA, Shajapur stated that necessary investigation would be made, while other five DAs stated that convergence was allowed under MPLADS. The reply is incorrect because public and Community contribution cannot be substituted from MPLAD fund.</p> <p>(ii) DA, Damoh and Shahdol sanctioned Rs.0.73 crore for convergence of MPLAD</p>	<p>is under investigation.</p> <p>District Collector, Balaghat has informed that the construction work sanctioned during the year 2004-05 to 2008-09 under 11th Finance Commission were from interest part of MPLADS funds for which approval was accorded on the instructions of the Madhya Pradesh State Finance Commission issued vide their letter dated 29th September, 2003. During the financial year, the work executed under 11th Finance Commission, only 25% funds were sanctioned from MPLADS funds for the work recommended by the Hon'ble MP in the urgent Public interest on share basis. These sanction of 25% were issued to utilize the funds for Public Welfare Works. Thereafter, no sanction was given from MPLADS funds for work to be executed under 11th Finance Commission.</p> <p>The Nodal District Authority has further assured that the recommendations/directions given under performance audit report 2010-11 is now being adhered strictly and all the sanctions for construction work were issued as per provision of the Guidelines. The instructions/recommendations given by the audit team of C & AG performance audit 2010-11 will be followed strictly. Hence, para may be treated as settled</p> <p>Comments of the Ministry</p> <p><i>(i) The replies received from Shajapur and Balaghat are not satisfactory and do not conform to the audit observations. State Nodal Authorities are requested to direct all the concerned District Authorities to furnish reply of all the 222 works undertaken in six districts and take action against the erring officials for irregular sanction and recoup the MPLADS funds spent for inadmissible works.</i></p> <p>(ii) Collector Shahdol has informed that sanction for 24 works costing Rs</p>
--	--	--

		<p>funds into NREGS for execution of 37 works, taken up under NREGS programme. This was in contravention of the Ministry's clarification that convergence of MPLAD fund in to NREGS did not meet the eligibility criteria under MPLAD Scheme.</p>	<p>59.47 lakh was issued for convergence of MPLADS funds with NREGS to implement the instruction issued by Panchayat and Gramin Vikas Department, Govt. of M.P Vide letter dated 29.6.2007. The issue of sanction has been stopped soon after the receipt of instructions issued by the Government of India vide letter C/54/2005/MPLADS dated 28.06.2010.</p> <p>Collector Damoh has informed that works were sanctioned for Damoh District under the 11th Finance Commission. and the Panchayat and Rural Development Department Government of Madhya Pradesh sanctioned NREGAS work vide circular dated 29.06.2007 under the provision of convergence of NREGAS work with MPLADS Funds. The instructions issued by Government of India will be complied with in future. The responsible officer/employee has retired in 2010. However, all the concerned officer and employee have been directed to execute work as per para 3.17 of the Guidelines to avoid recurrence in future.</p> <p>Comments of the Ministry</p> <p><i>(ii) Reply of District Damoh and Shahdol are not satisfactory as no action has been taken by them for recoupment of funds. State Nodal Authorities are requested to direct all the concerned District Authorities of Shahdol and Damoh to take action against the erring officials for irregular sanction and recoup the MPLADS funds spent for inadmissible work. Action Taken Notes has been sought by the Ministry urgently.</i></p>
5	4.2.1	<p>Delay in sanction of works - DAs sanctioned the work with a delay of more than one year after receiving the recommendation from the MPs concerned.</p>	<p>Collector Hoshangabad has informed that the works were sanctioned as per Guidelines.</p> <p>Comments of the Ministry</p> <p>The reply is not satisfactory. The</p>

			Ministry has requested Collector Hoshangbad to furnish comprehensive reply with detail.
6.	4.3	(iii) Incomplete works: 1128 works costing Rs. 17.92 Crore remained incomplete 1 to 4 years in 7 DAs.	Collector Hoshangabad has informed that directions have been issued for completing the incomplete work. Comments of the Ministry Reply is not satisfactory because 40 works costing Rs 38.00 lakh upto 2008-09 are still incomplete. Collector Hoshangabad has been requested to provide the reasons for non-completion of works and the steps taken to complete the works including penal action taken against the executing agencies for such inordinate delay.
7	5.1	(iii) Non-maintenance of works register and assets register Assets registers had not been maintained.	Collector Hoshangabad e has informed that directions have been issued to Implementing Agencies for maintenance of Asset Register. Comments of the Ministry As per the Guidelines, Asset Register and Work Register are to be maintained at the District level as well as at the Implementing Agency level. State Nodal Authorities have been requested to direct all the District Authorities to take against the erring officials for not adhering to the Guidelines. Action Taken report may be furnished to this Ministry urgently.
8	6.2.2	(ii) Incorrect reporting of financial progress by the DAs - 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	The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to direct District Authority of Shajapur to expedite reply.
9	6.2.3	D. Discrepancies in expenditure	The Ministry has requested the

		figures between the UCs and the MPRs in Hoshangabad, shajapur, Sagar and Ujjain constituency in Madhya Pradesh	State Nodal Authorities to direct District Authority of Shajapur and Hoshangabad to expedite reply.
10	6.2.6	Non-submission of UCs by IAs - In seven districts in the state of Madhya Pradesh, out of total works 3900 completed during the audit period 2004-09, the IAs did not submit UCs for the work 1349 amounting to Rs 21.47 crore.	Dept. of Planning and Statistics, Sagar in their replies has submitted that out of 1431 works sanctioned during the year 2004-05 to 2008-09, 1426 works have been completed out of which completion certificate for 1426 works have been received. Direction have been issued to Implementing Agencies for furnishing the UC for 05 works by 20.05.2013. The Ministry has requested District Authority, Sagar to intimate the status of receipt of Utilisation Certificate for 05 works which is awaited.
11	6.6	Refund of unspent balances by IAs - Rs 0.65 crore unspent balance arising due to completion of works at lower than sanctioned cost and Interest accrued thereon not refunded by the Implementing Agency.	Collector Hoshangabad has informed that unspent balance of Rs 18.51 lakh is the unspent balance with the implementing Agencies. The Ministry has requested Collector Hoshangabad to provide the status of refund of unspent balance with interest by the Implementing Agencies.
12	6.8.1	Banking arrangements - (a) DAs and IAs had kept the scheme funds in accounts such as fixed deposits, current accounts, Personal Ledger Accounts, Government treasury, etc. instead of saving accounts in a public sector bank.	The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to direct District Authority of Hoshangabad to expedite reply.
		(b) DAs audited had not reconciled the figures of the cash book and bank pass-book as prescribed	The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to direct District Authority of Hoshangabad and Shajapur to expedite reply.
13	6.8.2	Discrepancy in accounts -District Authorities and Implementing Agencies Audited by C&AG had not maintained MP-wise separate Cash Books and also had not maintained any cash book for the scheme at all.	The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to direct District Authorities of Hoshangabad to expedite reply.

14	7.3.1	Inspection of works - States/UTs had not inspected any work during 2004-05 to 2008-09.	The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to expedite reply.
----	-------	---	--

Note : In the above cases, the Chief Secretary, Government of Madhya Pradesh vide this Ministry's letters dated 08.04.2013, 22.08.2013, 26.09.2013 and 21.10.2013 has been requested to direct the concerned state nodal department and nodal district authorities to furnish comprehensive Action Taken Notes (ATNs) on priority. The letters have also been endorsed to the Nodal Secretary and concerned DPOs. However, reply is still awaited.

Pending C&AG Audit Para Maharashtra

Sl No	Audit Para No	Detail of Audit Para	Reply Received /Comments of the Ministry
1	3.3	<p>Selection of prohibited works -The following works have been executed which were not permitted as per Guidelines:-</p> <p>(a) 16 Works costing Rs 1.62 crore executed for office and residential buildings of Central/State Government.</p> <p>(b) 06 works costing Rs 0.2 crore executed for office and residential buildings for cooperative, private organization and any work for commercial body</p> <p>(c) 127 Works costing Rs 4.2 crore for religious purposes and works within the premises of religious body.</p> <p>(d) 52 works costing Rs 2.84 crore executed of renovation, repair and maintenance.</p> <p>(e) 21 of prohibited movable items costing 0.33 crore were purchased.</p> <p>(f) 02 assets named after person costing Rs 0.13 crore were created.</p> <p>(g) 03 miscellaneous inadmissible works costing Rs 0.32 crore executed (State Relief fund, organizing sports competitions)</p>	<p>District Collector, Raigad in reply has intimated that following works of renovation repair and maintenance were executed in the District:-</p> <p>(i) Beautification work at bori tank tal. Pen Rs. 3.4 lakh- the work contains providing GI pipe railing around the tank for a height of 1.10 meter. With MS angel and pipe on UCR wall for the safety of people at 6 places tiles flooring passage around the tank for washing and other purposes. Hence, this work is useful for people cannot be treated as the work of beautification.</p> <p>(ii) Beautification work at Dashkriya Ghat Karjat Rs. 1.46 lakh- Hon'ble MP vide his letter dated 01/06/2006 instructed to sanction work as beautification of dashkriya vidhi ghat at Tamnath. Previously it is very difficult for people to perform dashkriya vidhi at this place. Due to unavailability of ghat and place for seating and hence it cannot be treated as beautification work facility for people and construction of ghat for dashkriya which is not inadmissible work.</p> <p>(iii) Beautification work near Shivaji Statue at Kopar Phata Gavan tal Panvel Rs. 1.85 lakh- Hon'ble MP vide letter dated 01/06/2006 instructed to immediately sanction the work as</p>

			<p>Koparphata (Gavan) Chatrapati Shivaji Maharaj statue parisar beautification. Construction of paver block and colouring of compound wall was executed for convenience of people. So the work of beautification near Shivaji statue was carried out. It is noted and in future no work will be sanctioned for beautification.</p> <p>(B) Works for religious purpose:-</p> <p>(i) Construction of community hall near Dyaneshwar Mandir at Wadkhal tal. Pen Rs. 4.65 lakh- This community hall is constructed near Dyaneshwar mandir. The land used for this hall is made available Gram Panchayat vide their letter dated 30.10.2006. To identify the place easily the work is named as community hall near dyaneshwar mandir. Hence, it is requested not to consider the work community hall for mandir.</p> <p>(ii) Construction of community hall at Dhatav tal. Raha Rs. 4.96 lakh- Hon'ble MP vide his letter dated 01.12.2007 instructed to sanction community hall at Dhatav. For this construction Dhatav Grampanchayat has certified there is goathan land available. As per estimate lad bearing with asbestress cement sheet shahabadi stone flooring is done and hence this work cannot be treated as community hall for mandir.</p> <p>(iii) Construction of community hall for Ramji Devashtan at Apte Rs. 9.98 lakh- The work was sanctioned as construction of community hall for Ramji Devasthan mandir parisar. As soon as the point raised by audit party IA was instructed not to start work. The process of cancellation of work is in progress. Fund is not made available for this work at all. Hence it is requested to a accept compliance.</p> <p>(c) Creation of assets named after person- The work was sanctioned as construction of study hall of high school at Pavel however after completion of work named as</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>swargiya Nill Mahajan Abhyasika:- This work is proposed by Hon'ble Shri Manohar Joshi, Member of Parliament (RS) and inaugurated by Hon'ble MP Shri Manohar Joshi. The entrance of this hall is named as swargily Nila Mahajan abhuasika. But at the entrance of this abhyasika a Plaque is erected at worth seeing place prominently that this work is carried out from MPLADS</p> <p>Comments of the Ministry</p> <p>Reply received is not satisfactory. It has been observed from the reply that works executed in the District Rajgad are inadmissible work and MPLADS fund incurred on inadmissible works is to be recouped as per the provisions of the guidelines of MPLADS. The Ministry has requested DC Rajgad to take action against the errant district officials and the Action Taken Notes (ATNs) be furnished to this Ministry</p> <p>Besides, reply on the audit para from district Kolhapur, Mumbai, and Parbhani has not yet received.</p> <p>The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to direct the Nodal Districts Authority of Kolhapur, Mumbai, and Parbhani to expedite reply.</p>
2	3.4	(i) DAs Mumbai (Suburban), Prabhani and Solapur sanctioned excess funds Rs 0.31 crore to four Societies /Trusts.	<p>Reply on the audit para from district Mumbai, and Parbhani has not yet received.</p> <p>The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to direct the Nodal Districts Authority of Mumbai and Parbhani, to expedite reply.</p>
3	4.2.1	<p>(ii) Sanction of works without adhering to Guidelines</p> <p>(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</p>	<p>(i) The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to direct the District Authority of Mumbai Suburban to expedite reply.</p>

		<p>implementing agencies, without obtaining financial estimates from them for each work.</p> <p>(ii) Three District Collectors (Mumbai Suburban, Nagpur and Nanded) accorded sanction for 17 works aggregating Rs.2.40 crore by splitting the work into 37 items to avoid tendering procedures required under State Governments rules etc. In the case of 17 works, the Ministry stated that in these cases the works were done as per procedure of the State and there seemed to be no violation of guidelines.</p>	<p>(ii) The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to direct the Nodal District Authority of Mumbai Suburban to expedite reply.</p>
4	5.1	<p>(iii) Non-maintenance of works register and assets register_ Assets registers had not been maintained.</p>	<p>District Nanded has informed that work-wise register and asset registers are maintained and updated by the concerned Implementing Agencies.</p> <p>Comments of the Ministry</p> <p>As per provisions of the Guidelines, Work and Assets Register are to be maintained at the district level as well as Implementing Agency level. Not maintaining the registers is violative of the provisions of the Guidelines. The Ministry has requested DC Nanded to look into the matter and confirm that the Assets Register are being maintained at the district level.</p> <p>Besides, reply from district authority of Kolhapur, Mumbai and Parbhani has not yet been received.</p> <p>The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to direct the Nodal Districts of Kolhapur, Mumbai and Parbhani to expedite reply.</p>
5	5.2.1	<p>Misuse of assets_ The following assets were not being utilized for the purpose for which these were sanctioned:-</p> <p>(i) The school building for Varad Ganesh Primary School, Belewashar Nagar Parabhani, created at a cost of Rs. 0.10 crore was handed over to the Municipal Council. The joint physical verification (A</p>	<p>The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to direct the Nodal District Authority of Parabhani to expedite reply.</p>

		<p>joint physical verification was conducted in Maharashtra by the audit team and concerned District Authority to verify that assets created under the MPLADS were being used properly) revealed that the asset was being used by Shri Beleshwar Shikshan Sanstha for running BCA, BCS courses and not by the primary school for which the asset was created.</p> <p>(ii) The building for Dr. Ram Rodage D Ed College and Shikshan Sanstha at Shelu District, Parabhani was completed at a cost of Rs. 0.20 crore and handed over to the user agency. Joint physical verification by the audit team and concerned departmental authority revealed that the D Ed College was not in existence; and the building was being used for other purposes such as auditorium and computer lab.</p> <p>(iii) A Marathi Medium Primary School was constructed at a cost of Rs. 0.15 crore and handed over to the Municipal Council. Joint physical verification of the asset revealed that an English medium school was functioning from the new building; whereas the Marathi medium school continued to function in the original old building. Thus, the asset was not used for the purpose by the user agency for which it was sanctioned but by a private education society.</p> <p>(v) The joint physical verification of asset Cultural hall at Rahul Nagar, Parabhani executed at a cost of Rs. 0.07 crore showed that the construction was incomplete. Only the column and slab work had been completed within the sanctioned amount. The incomplete work was handed over to the user agency (March 2008) and the asset was being used as a cattle shelter.</p> <p>(vi) The boys hostel at Mahatma Phule Education Society, Parabhani was created at a cost of Rs. 0.13 crore and handed over to the user agency in 2005-06. In a joint physical verification, it was noticed that the asset was being used as a godown.</p>	
6	6.2.6	<p>Non-submission of UCs by IAs - In three districts in the state of Maharashtra, out of</p>	<p>The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to direct the Nodal Districts Authority of</p>

		total works 1078 completed during the audit period 2004-09, the IAs did not submit UCs for the work 356 amounting to Rs 10.40 crore.	Kolhapur, Mumbai and Parbhani to expedite reply.
7	6.6	(b) 120 works amounting to Rs 2.66 crore unspent funds due to works not being started not refunded by the Implementing Agency.	The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to direct Nodal Districts Authority of Kolhapur, Mumbai and Parbhani to expedite reply.
8	6.8.1	Banking arrangements (a) DA and IA had not maintained a separate bank account for each MP. Instead, their funds under the scheme were clubbed with funds in the accounts of other MPs.	The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to direct Nodal Districts Authority of Kolhapur, Mumbai, and Parbhani to expedite reply.
		(b) DAs and IAs had kept the scheme funds in accounts such as fixed deposits, current accounts, Personal Ledger Accounts, Government treasury, etc. instead of saving accounts in a public sector bank.	The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to direct the Nodal Districts Authority of Kolhapur, Mumbai, Parbhani and Raigad, to expedite reply.
		(c) DAs audited had not reconciled the figures of the cash book and bank pass-book as prescribed in audit.	The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to direct the Nodal Districts Authority of , Kolhapur, Mumbai, Parbhani and Raigad, to expedite reply.
9	6.8.2	Discrepancy in accounts - District Authorities and Implementing Agencies Audited by C&AG had not maintained MP-wise separate Cash Books and also had not maintained any cash book for the scheme at all.	The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to direct the Nodal Districts Authority of Kolhapur, Mumbai, and Parbhani, to expedite reply.
10	7.1.2	Uploading of data on website- Works sanctioned but Data not uploaded.	The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to direct the Nodal Districts Authority of Kolhapur, Mumbai, and Parbhani to expedite reply.

Note : In the above cases, the Chief Secretary, Government of Maharashtra vide this Ministry's letters dated 08.04.2013, 22.08.2013 and 26.09.2013 has been requested to direct the concerned state nodal department and nodal district authorities to furnish comprehensive Action Taken Notes (ATNs) on priority. The letters have also been endorsed to the Nodal Secretary and concerned DCs. However, reply is still awaited.

Pending C&AG Audit Para Manipur

SI No	Audit Para No	Detail of Audit Para	Reply Received /Comments of the Ministry
1	3.3	<p>Selection of prohibited works -The following works have been executed which were not permitted as per Guidelines:-</p> <p>(a) 19 works costing Rs 0.83 crore executed for office and residential buildings for cooperative, private organization and any work for commercial body</p> <p>(b) 33 works costing Rs 0.73 crore executed of renovation, repair and maintenance.</p> <p>(c) 01 of prohibited movable items costing 0.04 crore were purchased.</p> <p>(d) 24 miscellaneous inadmissible works costing Rs 1.02 crore executed.</p>	<p>DC Imphal West has informed that non-permissible works are not taken up during the period under report in respect of Imphal West District.</p> <p>DC Senapati has informed that only permissible works were sanctioned and executed in respect of Senapati district.</p> <p>Comments of the Ministry</p> <p>Replies are not satisfactory. The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authority to direct the districts authority of Imphal West and Senapati to provide status of 77 works prohibited under Guidelines of MPLADS costing Rs 2.62 crore as pointed by the Audit Authorities.</p>
2	6.8.1	<p>Banking Arrangements_ - DAs audited had not reconciled the figures of the cash book and bank pass-book as prescribed</p>	<p>DC Senapati in reply has intimated that reconciliation of Bank Pass book and cash Book is done by the Chartered Accountant for every financial year.</p> <p>Comments of the Ministry</p> <p>Reply is not satisfactory. As per provision of the Guidelines, the reconciliation of Cash Book is to be done every month by the District Authority. Non-reconciliation of cash book on monthly basis is violation of the Guidelines of MPLADS. The Ministry has requested the District Authority, Senapati to initiate necessary action against the errant district officials found responsible for the irregularity and Action Taken Notes (ATNs) be forwarded to this Ministry.</p>

Note : In the above cases, the Chief Secretary, Government of Manipur vide this Ministry's letters dated 09.04.2013, 22.08.2013 and 26.09.2013 has been requested to direct the concerned

state nodal department and nodal district authorities to furnish comprehensive Action Taken Notes (ATNs) on priority. The letters have also been endorsed to the Nodal Secretary and concerned DCs. However, reply is still awaited.

Pending C&AG Audit Para Meghalaya

SI No	Audit Para No	Detail of Audit Para	Reply Received /Comments of the Ministry
1	3.3	<p>Selection of prohibited works -The following works have been executed which were not permitted as per Guidelines:-</p> <p>(a) 15 Works costing Rs 0.2 crore executed for office and residential buildings of Central/State Government.</p> <p>(b) 01 work costing Rs 0.01 crore executed for office and residential buildings for cooperative, private organization and any work for commercial body</p> <p>(c) 07 Works costing Rs 0.09 crore for religious purposes and works within the premises of religious body.</p> <p>(d) 07 works costing Rs 0.07 crore executed of renovation, repair and maintenance.</p> <p>(e) 01 of prohibited movable items costing 0.03 crore were purchased.</p> <p>(f) 04 assets named after person costing Rs 0.03 crore were created.</p>	<p>DC West Garo Hills, Tura, in reply has intimated that recommendation of MPs are scrutinized at district level before sanction.</p> <p>DC Shillong has informed that the recommendation of MP are scrutinized for sanction and the work were informed to the MPs to recommend/recast the works as per Guidelines.</p> <p>Comments of the Ministry</p> <p>C&AG in the performance audit report has pointed out execution of total 35 works costing Rs 0.42 crore in 2 districts. Reply received from the districts authorities are not satisfactory. Mere mention that recommendation of MPs are scrutinized at the District level and the on'ble MP was informed about the prohibited works before sanction does not clarify the position on the prohibited works.</p> <p>Audit was conducted in the sampled 02 districts and the objections must have been given to the district authorities in the two districts. District Authorities should know the details of audit observations and clarify the position on the points raised in the audit report.</p> <p>The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to direct the Districts authority of sampled districts to find out the audit observations and furnish their replies to the Ministry urgently.</p>

2	3.4	<p>DAs Shillong and Tura sanctioned excess funds amounting to Rs 0.93 crore for Societies /Trusts</p>	<p>DC Shillong in reply has intimated that the funds sanctioned was as per funds available and as per the recommendation of the M.P. The year wise details of sanction issued in favour of Nazareth Hospital Shillong is given below:-</p> <table data-bbox="1023 450 1437 584"> <tr> <td>2004-05</td> <td>- Rs 36,93,000/-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005-06</td> <td>- Rs 19,75,870/-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005-06</td> <td>- Rs 21,50,000/-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td><u>Rs 78,28,870/-</u></td> </tr> </table> <p>The excess amount of Rs 53,18,870/- was sanctioned to the Nazareth Hospital as recommended by the then MP(RS). The circumstances leading to the sanction of the projects at issue is given below:-</p> <p>(i) The Nazareth Hospital is located in the heart of the city of Shillong is a voluntary non-profit organization established in the year 1959 as an OPD centre. Since then the hospital has been expending its services to the patients from the Hills. Presently, the hospital is 370 bedded and providing super specialty and essential services besides the General Medical Services round the clock. The hospital is now having various department of medical services including blood bank and information desk services are available round the clock for in door and out door patients.</p> <p>(ii) This continuous growth process of Nazareth hospital was facilitated by aids and contribution from the Government of India and various organization from India and abroad.</p> <p>(iii) The hospital have been continuously making efforts in being sensitive to the health care needs of the people especially in the community health issues. In the last financial year, the hospital have provided free care to the tunes of Rs 1,96,46,484.4/- and the hospital has never refused treatment to any patients for financial reasons.</p> <p>(iv) The medical equipments purchased and availed from the MPLAD Scheme are put in good</p>	2004-05	- Rs 36,93,000/-	2005-06	- Rs 19,75,870/-	2005-06	- Rs 21,50,000/-	Total	<u>Rs 78,28,870/-</u>
2004-05	- Rs 36,93,000/-										
2005-06	- Rs 19,75,870/-										
2005-06	- Rs 21,50,000/-										
Total	<u>Rs 78,28,870/-</u>										

			<p>services to the patients. This hospital has been providing services to the people of the hills especially the poor and the needy without any profit motives. The various diagnostic facilities and equipment in the hospital speaks ever growing needs to upgrade technical support of the hospital for the benefit of the people.</p> <p>(v) The state of Meghalaya does not have much health care facility available with latest diagnostic tools and equipments. The capital town of Shillong has been catered with only six hospitals including the Government run Shillong Civil Hospital. Due to deficiency in health care facilities in Shillong, the people from this town in particular and the entire state Meghalaya in general have to rush down their patients to Guwahati for diagnosis and treatment.</p> <p>(vi) In view of the lack of better health care facilities in the state, the MP(RS) recommended the work and the Sanctioning Authority has complied in good faith. The anomalous sanction of MPLAD Scheme have added only marginally to the vast deficit of technological support to the Hospital. Although the sanctioning authority have committed procedural error, yet it is mentioned that the project was implemented in good faith without any financial embezzlement and the people are availing the benefit since the equipments were installed in the hospital.</p> <p>In view of the position and considering the benefit being availed by the people of Shilling out of this mistake which is tremendous, the anomalous sanction and implementation of MPLADS work and calling of action taken report against the erring official may be condoned and the audit para may be dropped.</p> <p>As per reply from DC West Garo Hills, Tura, four works costing Rs 33.43 lakh were sanctioned in Tura Christian Hospital in the year 2005 and 2006 intended to upgrade the</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>Tura Christian Hospital as per the recommendation of the then MP under MPLADS sanctioned for implementation by then Deputy Commissioner, West Garo Hill, Tura, who is contributing to the welfare of the public at large. The work has been completed.</p> <p>Further, the overall health infrastructure and facilities in the entire Garo Hill districts was not at all adequate for catching to the minimum requirement of the general populace of the Garo Hills. The three hospital available in the town are not able to meet the minimum requirement of health services like the ones sanctioned under MPLADS. As such the Community Heath Care in three main hospitals in absence of essential equipments and infrastructure support posed a major hurdle for effective delivery of health service to the mass. Furthermore, owing to Tura Christian Hospital strategic location, and being Christian Hospital, people mostly preferred availing health service from this hospital.</p> <p>Further, DC West Garo Hills, Tura has clarified that Tura Christian Hospital is fully functional Health Service Centre catering to the growing inflow of patients from the entire district, seeking services on all health related problems. Evidently, equipments and infrastructure was met through the funds sanctioned under MPLADS, therefore, may be concluded to have been a blessing and boost in incorporating modern equipments for effective and precise assessments of services. Accordingly , the end result of the scheme has immensely benefitted the community and the populace of the entire district near and far.</p> <p>As a matter of fact, an amount of Rs 8.33 lakh in excess was released for implementation, which was not permissible as per Guidelines for sanctioning to Trusts/Societies. This inadvertent irregularity on sanction of fund may be regularized as the actual</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>utilisation of the amount sanctioned vis-a-vis physical implementation of all works was found to be satisfactory. It may also be specifically mentioned that the fund sanctioned for the works had been done in good faith primarily for the benefit of the population of the districts as a whole for which any case of misappropriation or embezzlement of fund pertaining to the above sanction does not rise and execution of works for the funds sanctioned has been done expeditiously and is completed.</p> <p>In the light of the above , the action for the sanctioning authority may be condoned as the funds were sanctioned purely on the basis of immense and emergent needs of the hospital.</p> <p><u>Comments of the Ministry</u></p> <p>In the instant case, this Ministry has taken up the issue with the State Nodal Authorities Vide this Ministry's letter dated 12.0 .2013 for submitting the case for condonation of infringements with the recommendation from the level of the Chief Secretary in the light of procedure discussed in the review meeting held with the States representative held on 26th February 2013 for further consideration of the Ministry.</p>
3	4.2.2	<p>Identification of Implementing Agency - Based on estimates prepared by user/beneficiaries identified by the MP, the DAs executed agreements with them for maintenance of assets and issued sanction orders to the IAs for implementation of these works. Accordingly, funds for 927 works costing Rs.16.39 crore were released in a phased manner to the user agencies like Trusts, NGOs, Headman of village Durbar, secretaries of schools/colleges, local bodies etc. for execution of the works.</p> <p>The DA, Shillong stated in October 2009 that there was no scope to award works through tendering process as the MPs in their recommendations, had mentioned the</p>	<p>DC Shillong has informed that sanction are issued to the Block Development Officer in Rural Areas and CEO Shillong Municipal Board as per project recommended by MP as their jurisdiction follow the state procedure as per para 3.3 of MPLADS Guidelines.</p> <p>Comments of the Ministry</p> <p>Reply of the DA Shillong is not satisfactory as it does not address on points given in the observations made in C&AG Audit report. The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to</p>

		names of executing agencies.	direct the concerned district authority to clarify the position on the points given in the audit report.
4	4.3 (iv)	Unfruitful expenditure on works :- Advance of Rs. 2.06 crore was released to 18 IAs for 178 test-checked works, sanctioned during 2003-09, in Shillong and Tura, which was distributed among user agencies for execution of works. There was no record available either with the DAs or with the IAs in support of commencement of these works although 5 to 95 per-cent physical progress was recorded in the Monthly Progress Reports (MPRs). The MPRs were prepared without any basis as the user agencies/IAs did not furnish any utilisation certificate in support of physical/financial progress in these cases. Nine IAs stated (September 2009) that the user agencies / beneficiaries would be asked to furnish the details showing physical progress of these works with documentary evidence.	DC West Garo Hills, Tura has informed that while submitting the UCs, the IAs had been directed to submit reports on the progress of works along with photographs before release of second and final installment. DC, Shillong has intimated that the record of the work commencement is entered in the Ministry website on receipt of information from the Implementing Agency. Comments of the Ministry Reply furnished by the DAs are not satisfactory as it did not address the particular observation made in the report. The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authority to direct the Districts concerned to clarify the position on the observations made by the audit authority in the audit report.

Note : In the above cases, the Chief Secretary, Government of Meghalaya vide this Ministry's letters dated 09.04.2013, 12.08.2013 and 26.09.2013 has been requested to direct the concerned state nodal department and nodal district authorities to furnish comprehensive Action Taken Notes (ATNs) on priority. The letter have also been endorsed to the Nodal Secretary and concerned DCs. However, reply is still awaited.

Pending C&AG Audit Para Nagaland

Sl No	Audit Para No	Detail of Audit Para	Reply Received /Comments of the Ministry
1	3.3	Selection of prohibited works -The following works have been executed which were not permitted as per Guidelines:- (a) 06 Works costing Rs 0.07 crore executed for office and residential buildings of Central/State Government. (b) 45 works costing Rs 2.12 crore executed for office and residential buildings for cooperative, private organization and any work for commercial body	State Nodal Department in reply has intimated that the objective of the MPLADS is of developmental in nature based on the locally felt need of the people. The works taken up are ail for the benefit of the community/public in general. (i) The work /sites of construction of roads/boundaries were in the vicinity of the Church. Such facilities are also used by the Church goers as well as

	<p>(c) 01 Work costing Rs 0.01 crore for religious purposes and works within the premises of religious body.</p> <p>(d) 03 works costing Rs 0.07 crore executed of renovation, repair and maintenance.</p> <p>(e) 07 of prohibited movable items costing 0.67 crore were purchased.</p> <p>(f) 03 Miscellaneous inadmissible works costing Rs 0.22 crore were executed (Various inadmissible works)</p>	<p>by the public in general the boundary wall was constructed to prevent encroachment from either side of the party.</p> <p>(ii) At some instances due to limited allocation of state fund the improvement /repair/renovation are taken up according to the urgency proposed by the community or the convenience of the people, thus filling the gap in infrastructure at the local level.</p> <p>(iii) Transport is one of the important factor for the development of an underdeveloped area. The purchase of movable items like Tata Sumo (Vehicle)/ambulance were sanctioned for the basic requirement of people/community.</p> <p>Comments of the Ministry</p> <p>The justification given for one work with in the premises of religious body is acceptable.</p> <p>However, justification given in support of repair/renovation works and purchase of prohibited movable items at serial (ii) and (iii) is not correct. As per serial 4 and 8 of List of works prohibited under MPLADS Repair/renovation/improvement and purchase of movable items are not permissible under MPLADS Guidelines. The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to direct the concerned Districts Authority to initiate action against the erring officials for irregular sanction of work and recoup the funds incurred on repair/ renovation and improvement of works.</p> <p>The Ministry has also requested the State Nodal authorities to direct the districts authority Dimapur and Kohima to provide complete details of prohibited works undertaken (65 in Nos) as pointed in the CAG audit paras in the District of Dimapur and Kohima.</p>
--	---	--

2	4.2.1	<p>Sanction of works without adhering to guidelines - No feasibility study was conducted before commencement of 367 recommended work of Rs.19.00 crore (Dimapur and Kohima).</p>	<p>State Nodal Department in reply has intimated that the work taken up for the execution/implementation are recommended by the Hon'ble MP(LS) and (RS) according to the locally felt needs of the people.</p> <p>Comments of the Ministry</p> <p>Reply is not satisfactory. The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to direct the concerned Districts Authority to initiate action against the erring officials for irregular sanction of work without taking into consideration of provisions of MPLADS Guidelines.</p>
3	7.1.2	<p>Uploading of data on website - Works sanctioned but Data not uploaded</p>	<p>State Nodal Department in reply has intimated that the works sanctioned and data's are uploaded in the website nagadime@nic.in. In district Kohima, the uploading is in process</p> <p>Comments of the Ministry</p> <p>The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to direct the concerned Districts Authority to furnish the latest status on uploading of data on the Ministry of Statistics & P.I, Government of India website mplads.nic.in.</p>

Note : In the above cases, the Chief Secretary, Government of Nagaland vide this Ministry's letters dated 10.04.2013, 22.08.2013 and 26.09.2013 has been requested to direct the concerned state nodal department and nodal district authorities to furnish comprehensive Action Taken Notes (ATNs) on priority. The letters have also been endorsed to the Nodal Secretary and concerned DCs. However, reply is still awaited.

Pending C&AG Audit Para Orissa

SI No	Audit Para No	Detail of Audit Para	Reply Received /Comments of the Ministry
1	3.3	<p>Selection of prohibited works -The following works have been executed which were not permitted as per Guidelines:-</p> <p>(a) 04 Works costing Rs 0.07 crore for religious purposes and works within the</p>	<p>Deputy Director (P&S) Baragarh in reply has intimated that the work executed on the community felt need and not constructed on religious land. The works were taken as per guidelines.</p>

		premises of religious body. (b) 25 works costing Rs 0.32 crore executed of renovation, repair and maintenance.	The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to direct the District Authority Baragarh to intimate the details of works constructed on community felt needs to justify the stand taken on audit para.
2	3.4	(i) DAs Khurda and Kalahandi sanctioned excess funds amounting to Rs 0.42 crore to 02 Societies /Trusts.	<p>Dy Director Khurda has informed that 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 Hon'ble MPs. 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. Due care will be taken henceforth at the time of sanction of such type projects.</p> <p>Comments of the Ministry</p> <p>Amount sanctioned more than the prescribed limit of Rs 25.00 lakh each to three institutes by District Collector, Khurda are violative of the provisions of the MPLADS Guidelines. The Ministry has requested the state nodal authorities to recoup the excess funds and the disciplinary action be initiated against errant district officials found responsible for irregular implementation of MPLADS works. Action Taken Notes (ATNs) may be furnished to the Ministry for consideration.</p>
		(ii) DAs Khurda and Kalahandi sanctioned MPLADS funds Rs 2.47 crore to 55 ineligible Trusts/Societies	<p>Dy Director Kalahandi has informed that no MPLADS funds have been sanctioned to ineligible Trusts/Societies.</p> <p>Dy Director Khurda has informed all documents required before sanctioning for the projects are duly verified.</p> <p>Comments of the Ministry</p>

			<p>The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to look into the matter and find out the 55 ineligible trusts/societies to whom the MPLADS funds was sanctioned and Districts Authority of Khurda and Kalahandi be directed to recoup the funds with interest sanctioned to ineligible societies and initiate action against the errant district officials found responsible for irregular implementation of MPLADS work. Action Taken Notes (ATNs) be furnished to the Ministry urgently.</p>
3	4.2.1	<p>Sanction of works without adhering to guidelines In 1,066 out of 1,092 cases (97.62 per cent) test checked in five districts (Baragarh, Bhadrak, Jaipur, Kalahandi and Khurda), land particular/clearance certificate from revenue authorities were not obtained. In 1041 cases, feasibility reports were not prepared before sanction of the project/work.</p>	<p>Dy Director Bhadrak has intimated that land particular, R.I Reports, feasibility report and clearance certificate from Revenue Authorities were verified before sanction.</p> <p>The Ministry has requested the District collector, Bhadrak to provide the complete details of works sanctioned and the observation made by the Audit Authorities at the time of audit.</p> <p>Dy Director Khurda has informed that in case of registered societies, the land status is obtained from the competent authority before sanction of projects. In case of other projects, the concerned Executing Agencies are requested to verify the land particular before sanction of MPLADS works.</p> <p>The Ministry has requested the District collector, Khurda to provide the complete details of works sanctioned vis-a-vis observations made by the Audit Authorities during audit period.</p> <p>Deputy Director (P&S) Baragarh in reply has intimated that works are undertaken adhering to the guidelines and is noted for future guidance</p> <p>The Ministry has requested the District collector, Baragarh to provide the complete details of works sanctioned vis-a-vis</p>

			observations made by the Audit Authorities.
4	4.2.3	Award of works - Award of work was adopted without following the tendering procedure. 5 works amounting to Rs.0.50 Crore executed (Baragarh, Bhadrak, Jaipur, Kalahandi and Khurda districts) by IAs through private contractors without following competitive bidding.	<p>Deputy Director (P&S) Baragarh has informed that some electrification projects were executed through license electrical contractor under the supervision of WESCO Authority as per recommendation of Hon'ble MP.</p> <p>This Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to direct Baragarh district authority to take action against the errant district officials found responsible for not adhering to the state procedure while implementing the MPLADS works.</p> <p>State Nodal Authority has intimated that District Authority Jajpur, Executive officer, Jajpur Municipality and BDO, Dasrathpur have been instructed to strictly follow the proper tendering procedure of the state Government as required under para 3.3. of the Guidelines while awarding the works to the executants. Executive Officer, Jajpur Municipality and BDO, Dasarathpur have also been instructed to take action against the erring officials who are responsible for irregular sanction of MPLADS works.</p> <p>The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to direct the district authority Jajpur to furnish Action Taken Notes (ATNs) to the Ministry urgently.</p> <p>Besides, reply from District Authority Khurda has not yet been received.</p> <p>The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to direct the Khurda district authority to expedite reply.</p>
5	4.3	(iii) Incomplete works: 157 works costing Rs. 2.68 Crore remained incomplete 1 to 4 years in 5 DAs.	<p>Deputy Director (P&S) Baragarh has informed that Implementing agencies have been instructed to either complete the sanctioned work or to refund the unutilized amount.</p> <p>The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to direct the District Authority, Baragarh to</p>

			take action against the errant district officials found responsible for irregular implementation of MPLADS work as well as against the Implementing Agencies for not invoking the penalty clause given in the Administrative Sanction.
		<p>(iv) Unfruitful expenditure on works Unfruitful expenditure on following 3 works amounting to Rs.0.55 Crore were made:-</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 (Haler Nalla).</p>	<p>(ii) Dy Director Kalahandi in reply has intimated that original land owner Sri Jogendra Patjoshi S/o Binod Bihari Patjoshi is one of the resident of village Chihilpa, who himself donated the land to Managing Committee, Panchayat Bidya Pith, Chihilpa for construction of said High School building vide Gift Deed No 1245/1989 dated 15.0.1.1990. 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. As it has occurred inadvertently, he may be excused. Further, no such situation will arise.</p> <p>The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to investigate the matter and direct the District Authority of Kalahandi to confirm that the funds have been recouped with interest. Action may also be initiated against the errant district officials found responsible for irregular sanction of work under MPLAD Scheme.</p>
6	5.1	(ii)_Non-maintenance of works register and assets register - Registers maintained were found to be incomplete.	District Khurda has informed that the Executing Agencies to maintain work register. Besides steps are being taken to maintain the work register at District level.
		(iii) Non-maintenance of works register and assets register_ Assets registers had not been maintained.	District Khurda has intimated that all Executing Agencies have been requested to maintain asset register. Besides steps are being taken to maintain the assets register at District

			<p>level.</p> <p>Comments of the Ministry</p> <p>Reply is not satisfactory. As per para 6.4 (iii) of the Guidelines on MPLADS, the District Authority shall also maintain a work register of all the assets created with the Scheme funds at the district level as well Implementing Agencies level. Non-adherence to the provisions of Guidelines of MPLADS is violative of the Guidelines. The Ministry has requested the District Authority of Khurda to initiate disciplinary action against the errant district officials for not adhering to the provisions of the Guidelines.</p>
7	5.3	<p>Commitment for maintenance and upkeep of assets - No commitment for maintenance of the assets was taken from the user agencies nor any agreement signed before issue of sanction orders and commencement of work</p>	<p>Deputy Director (P&S) Baragarh has intimated that the content noted for future reference.</p> <p>District authority, Khurda in their reply has intimated that User Agencies have been requested for maintenance of the projects in future.</p> <p>The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authority to direct the District Authority of Baragarh and Khurda to confirm that an undertaking on commitment of upkeep and maintenance of assets created has been undertaken from all the user agencies.</p>
8	6.2.2	<p>(ii) Incorrect reporting of financial progress by the DAs_ - Scrutiny of MPRs and Annual Accounts in Bhubaneswar 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> <p>Interest accrued as per MPR for the month of</p>	<p>The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authority to direct the District Authority, Bhubaneswar to expedite reply.</p>

		October 2004 was Rs. 0.20 crore but it was depicted as Rs. 0.18 crore in the MPR of September 2006. Thus less interest is Rs 0.02 crore.															
9	6.2.3	<p>Discrepancies in figures in MPRs, UCs and annual accounts_ - Details according to nature of discrepancies is given below:-</p> <p>F Discrepancies in closing balance figures between the UCs and the MPRs</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Constituency</th> <th colspan="2">Utilisation Certificate</th> <th colspan="2">MPR</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Amount</th> <th>Month</th> <th>Amount</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Bolangir</td> <td>2007-08</td> <td>3.6</td> <td>Mar-08</td> <td>0.98</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Constituency	Utilisation Certificate		MPR		Year	Amount	Month	Amount	Bolangir	2007-08	3.6	Mar-08	0.98	The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authority to direct the District Authority, Bolangir to expedite reply.
Constituency	Utilisation Certificate			MPR													
	Year	Amount	Month	Amount													
Bolangir	2007-08	3.6	Mar-08	0.98													
10	6.2.6	<p>Non-submission of UCs by IAs - In four districts in the state of Orissa, out of total works 1985 completed during the audit period 2004-09, the IAs did not submit UCs for the work 240 amounting to Rs 4.12 crore.</p>	<p>Dy Director Khurda has informed that since inception of the scheme against the total funds of Rs 4976.87 lakh, a sum of Rs 4656.58 Lakh has been utilized by March 2011 and as against the expenditure of Rs 4656.38 lakh, UCs for an amount of Rs 4398.61 lakh have been obtained. Weekly review is being done for obtaining the balance Utilization Certificates.</p> <p>The Ministry has requested the District collector, Khurda to provide the latest status on balance UCs.</p>														
11	6.3	<p>Distribution of funds of ex-Rajya Sabha (RS) MPs - The unspent balance amounting to Rs.1.26 crore in respect of Rajya Sabha MPs has not been distributed.</p>	<p>Dy Director Bhadrak in reply has intimated that necessary steps has been taken.</p> <p>The Ministry has requested that the District collector, Bhadrak to provide the latest status on distribution of unspent funds of ex-MP(RS).</p>														
12	6.4	<p>Diversion of funds</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>State Nodal Authority in their reply has intimated that Collector Jajpur, BDO Bari and BDO Dasrathpur have been instructed to recoup the amount Rs 9.70 lakh diverted from MPLADS funds to other scheme.</p>														

		<p>Funds Rs 0.44 crore were diverted from MPLADS to schemes such as Sampurna Gramin Rojgar Yojana, Mid Day Meal scheme, OAP, FDR and IAY in Bhadrak, Bargarh, Kalahandi, Khurda, Jajpur districts. Rs. 0.44 crore of the diverted funds were not recouped as of August 2009.</p>	<p>The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to provide the present status of recoupment of MPLADS funds.</p> <p>Dy Director Bhadrak has informed that Indra Awas Yojna (IAY) is a approved scheme of Government of India. As per Guidelines of 1997,1999 and 2002, the IAY (low cost house) were sanctioned.</p> <p>Comments of the Ministry</p> <p>The reply is not satisfactory. Construction of Low cost house is not permissible as per extant guidelines. MPLADS funds is required to be recouped with interest. The Ministry has requested the District collector, Bhadrak to recoup the funds with interest and initiate necessary action against the errant district officials found responsible for the irregularities in the implementation of MPLADS work.</p>
13	6.6	<p>Refund of unspent balances by IAs</p> <p>(a) Rs 0.04 crore unspent balance arising due to completion of works at lower than sanctioned cost not refunded by the Implementing Agency.</p>	<p>Dy Director Bhadrak has informed that concerned implementing agency have been requested to refund the unspent balance, if any, arising due to completion of works. The same will be intimated on receipt from the IAs.</p> <p>Deputy Director (P&S) Baragarh in their reply has informed that Implementing Agencies have been instructed to refund the unspent balance on completion of the projects.</p> <p>Comments of the Ministry Replies are not satisfactory. Non-refund of unspent balance of MPLADS funds within 30 days after completion of work by the Implementing Agencies is in violation to the MPLADS Guidelines. The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to direct the District Authority of Bhadarak and Baragarh to get back the unspent funds and initiate action against the errant district officials for not-</p>

			adhering to the provisions of MPLADS Guidelines while executing the MPLADS works.				
		(b) Rs 0.49 crore unspent balance arising due to Interest accrued thereon not refunded by the Implementing Agency.	<p>Collector Jajpur has informed that Implementing Agencies viz BDO, Bari, Danagadi and Barchana are taking steps to refund the unspent balance arising due to interest accrued thereon.</p> <p>Dy Director Bhadrak has informed that concerned implementing agency have been requested to refund the unspent balance, if any, arising due to interest accrued thereon. The same will be intimated after receipt.</p> <p>The Ministry has requested the Collectors Jajpur and Bhadrak to provide the latest status of recovery of interest on unspent balance lying with the Implementing Agencies.</p>				
14	6.7	<p>Contingency Expenses -</p> <p>(a) 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" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th>Name of DA</th> <th>Amount</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Baragarh, Bhadrak, Jajpur, Kalahandi, Khurda</td> <td>0.26</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Name of DA	Amount	Baragarh, Bhadrak, Jajpur, Kalahandi, Khurda	0.26	<p>Dy Director Bhadrak has informed that the payment was made for MPLADS works for Monitoring Software System in Bhadrak District. This was done as per the provisions of the guidelines from 2005-2010 only Rs. 173960 were incurred on the Monitoring Software System of the District.</p> <p>The Ministry has requested the State Authority to direct the District authority to furnish the evidence substantiating the claim.</p>
Name of DA	Amount						
Baragarh, Bhadrak, Jajpur, Kalahandi, Khurda	0.26						
15	6.8.1	(d) DAs audited had not reconciled the figures of the cash book and bank pass-book as prescribed	<p>Deputy Director (P&S) Baragarh has informed that the content has been noted for future reference.</p> <p>District Khurda has informed that all the Executing Agencies have been requested to reconcile the figures of the Cash Book and Bank Pass Book as prescribed.</p> <p>The Ministry has requested the District Authorities of Baragarh and Khurda to confirm that cash book and pass book are being</p>				

			reconciled on monthly basis as provided in the provisions of MPLADS guidelines.
16	6.8.2	<p>Discrepancy in accounts</p> <p>District Authorities and Implementing Agencies Audited by C&AG had not maintained MP-wise separate Cash Books and also had not maintained any cash book for the scheme at all.</p>	<p>Deputy Director (P&S) Baragarh has informed that the content has been noted for future reference.</p> <p>The Ministry has requested the District Authorities of Baragarh to confirm that MP-wise separate cash book and separate cash book for the scheme is being maintained.</p>
17	7.2.1	<p>Monitoring committee meetings - Monitoring Committee was set up in the State and the meeting of the monitoring committee held thrice in the year 2007-08 and twice in 2008-09.</p>	<p>The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to expedite reply.</p>

Note : In the above cases, the Chief Secretary, Government of Orissa vide this Ministry's letters dated 15.03.2013, 26.08.2013, 30.09.2013 and 21.10.2013 has been requested to direct the concerned state nodal department and nodal district authorities to furnish comprehensive Action Taken Notes (ATNs) on priority. The letters have also been endorsed to the Nodal Secretary and concerned DCs. However, reply is still awaited.

Pending C&AG Audit Para Punjab

SI No	Audit Para No	Detail of Audit Para	Reply Received /Comments of the Ministry
1	3.3	<p>Selection of prohibited works -The following works have been executed which were not permitted as per Guidelines:-</p> <p>(a) 05 works costing Rs 0.22 crore executed for office and residential buildings of Central/State Government.</p> <p>(b) 21 works costing Rs 0.2 crore executed of renovation, repair and maintenance.</p>	<p>DC Nawanshehar has informed in respect of work Development of sitting facilities in D.C. office Nawanshehar under audit observation that having no sitting facilities for the General Public at DC Office Nawanshehar, S Varinder Singh Bajwa, Hon'ble MP(RS) was requested to provide Rs 3.00 lakh for development of sitting facilities in DC Office. On the recommendation of the Hon'ble MP, the sitting facilities costing Rs 3.00 lakh was provided to the General Public which is now being used by the general public at large for their personal works.</p> <p>The State Government has further added that the sitting facilities had</p>

been developed for the various uses of general public on the Government land in their interest near the DC's office and has enclosed a certificate from the Revenue Officer certifying that the building has been constructed on Government land and out of DC office complex. As such the funds were used to create the above facilities absolutely keeping in mind the welfare of the local residents. With these facilities, people have been benefitted immensely. Hence, the audit para may please be settled.

Comments of the Ministry

Work recommended for Office and residential Building belonging to Central and State Govt. are in admissible as per list of works prohibited under MPLADS given in Annexure-II of the Guidelines Hence, the work is not permissible and the amount is to be recouped. Action to be taken against the erring officials for sanctioning the irregular works.

DC Faridkot has informed that keeping in view the necessity of the public, a visitor-cum-meeting hall was required to be provided to avoid the inconvenience for the general public, who comes to meet and discuss/explain their grievances. There was no proper shelter and civic amenities for them near DC's Camp office. On the public demand Hon'ble S. Sukhbiir Singh Badal, the then MP Lok Sabha (14th) Faridkot constituency has proposed and recommended to construct a visitor cum-meeting room with provision of drinking water, wash room etc near DC's Camp Office, where a required piece of land was available without any extra cost. This visitor room is not a part of DC's official residence. For this purpose, an estimated amount of Rs 5.00 had been sanctioned by Hon'ble MP, Faridkot constituency. The sanctioned amount is within the purview of MPLADS scheme guidelines. This amount of Rs 5.00 lakh has been incurred and

			<p>utilized for the very same work and has proved to be very beneficial for redressal of grievances and meeting the general public. It is again specified that this visitor room is being utilized regularly for general public. Hence, it is requested to regularize the incurred amount of Rs 5.00 and get the audit para 3.3 of CAG Audit Report No 31 be settled.</p> <p>Comments of the Ministry</p> <p>The clarification given by the Deputy Commissioner has not been substantiated by any evidence which certify that the work is not in the DC Complex. As per serial 1 of List of works prohibited under MPLADS given in Annex-II, construction of office and residential building to central, state Government and their departments are prohibited. Although the work is for the welfare of public at large yet have been executed within the DC office complex. The work falls under the category of prohibited works, hence, found to be violative of MPLADS Guidelines. Therefore, the funds are to be recouped for irregular sanction and the Disciplinary Action be initiated against the District Officials found responsible for irregular sanction.</p>
--	--	--	--

Note : In the above cases, the Chief Secretary, Government of Punjab vide this Ministry's letters dated 25.04.2013 has been requested to direct the concerned state nodal department and nodal district authorities to furnish comprehensive Action Taken Notes (ATNs) on priority. The letter has also been endorsed to the Nodal Secretary and concerned DCs. However, reply is still awaited.

Pending C&AG Audit Para Rajasthan

SI No	Audit Para No	Detail of Audit Para	Reply Received /Comments of the Ministry
1	3.3	<p>Selection of prohibited works -The following works have been executed which were not permitted as per Guidelines:-</p> <p>(a) 43 works were executed costing Rs 0.82</p>	<p>CEO, Jila Parishad Sikar has informed that out of three works at serial 3 one work costing Rs 7.55 lakh have been regularized. No expenditure have been made on</p>

	<p>crore for office and residential buildings of Central/State Government.</p> <p>(b) 06 works were executed costing Rs 0.2 crore for office and residential buildings for cooperative, private organization and any work for commercial body.</p> <p>(c) 03 works costing Rs 0.12 crore executed of renovation, repair and maintenance.</p> <p>(d) 06 prohibited movable items costing Rs 0.21 crore were purchased.</p>	<p>prohibited works at serial 1 and 2 respectively. The work relates to construction of Porch near Collectorate Bhavan and not related construction of collector's Building.</p> <p>Further, CEO Sikar has clarified that the office of the District Collector is on the 1st 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 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>Comments of the Ministry</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 has been 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</p>
--	---	---

			<p>Guidelines and furnish the Action Taken Notes (ATNs) to this Ministry for consideration.</p> <p>CEO, Sriganganagar has informed that the 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>Comments of the Ministry</p> <p>The work of installation of EPBAX system, AC with stabilizers, purchase of computers for SDM offices 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. CEO Sriganganagar has been requested to furnish a report to this effect to this Ministry for consideration.</p>
2	3.4	<p>DAs Pali , Tonk and Bharatpur sanctioned excess MPLADS funds Rs 0.51 crore to 03 Trusts/Societies</p>	<p>CEO Zila Parishad, Bharatpur has informed that one work each were recommended by the MPs of Bharatpur and Biyana to Adarsh Vidya Mandir Samiti, Bharatpur considering separate entity of each schools and as per Guidelines not more than 25 lakh were sanctioned in each case.</p> <p>Comments of the Ministry</p> <p>Reply is not satisfactory. As per para 3.21 of the extant Guidelines not more than Rs 25 lakh can be spent from MPLADS fund for one or more works of a particular</p>

			<p>Society/Trust. If a society has availed of the MPLADS funds upto Rs 25 lakh, no more work can be recommended for the Society /Trust under the scheme. The sanction issued for two works to a particular society is inadmissible work. The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Department to take action to recoup the funds more than 25 lakh from the Trust/society with interest accrued thereon, take necessary action against the errant district officials and a copy of the Action Taken Notes(ATNs) be furnished to this Ministry for consideration.</p>
3	4.2.1	<p>(i) <u>Delay in sanction of Works</u> - DAs sanction the work with a delay of more than one year after receiving the recommendation from the MPs concerned.</p>	<p>The Ministry has requested State Nodal Authority to direct the district authority Tonk to expedite reply.</p>
		<p>(ii) <u>Sanction of works without adhering to guidelines</u> Out of total 4,044 works sanctioned for Rs.82.40 crore, feasibility study was not conducted for 2,079 works costing Rs.37.58 crore (Bharatpur: 1,471 works of Rs.27.15 crore; Sikar: 608 works of Rs.10.43 crore).</p>	<p>State nodal department has informed that the Implementing Agencies are also mentioned by the Hon'ble MP while recommending the work. However, the execution of work is ensured only as per para 2.11 of the Guidelines. District Authority only nominates the Implementing agencies like Panchayati Raj institution in Rural Areas, Local self Government in Urban areas and line departments who are capable to execute the work like PWD, PHED and Municipal corporation etc. Lupin Human Welfare and Research Foundation is also nominated as implementation agency because they are capable to execute the work.</p> <p>Comments of the Ministry</p> <p>The reply is not satisfactory. Audit para mentions that feasibility study was not conducted in 1471 works. The para does not relates to identification of implementing agencies. State Nodal authorities has been requested to direct the District Bharatpur to reply as desired in the audit report.</p>
4	4.2.2	<p><u>Identification of Implementing Agency</u> -</p>	<p>The Ministry has requested the</p>

		The executing agencies were identified/selected by the recommending MPs for 2674 works of Rs.53.93 crore in six test-checked districts (Bikaner, Sikar, Tonk, Sriganganagar, Pali and Bharatpur) during 2004-09. Further, the Lok Sabha MPs, Bayana and Bharatpur recommended a NGO (Lupin Human Welfare and Research Foundation, Bharatpur) as IA, for 122 works of Rs.3.02 crore during 2004-09 in the areas of PRIs and ULBs.	State Nodal Authority to direct District authority Sriganganagar to expedite reply.
5	4.3	(iii) <u>Incomplete works:</u> 178 works costing Rs. 1.91 Crore remained incomplete 1 to 4 years in 5 DAs.	<p>CEO Zila Parishad, Bharatpur has informed that 35 work of 14th Lok Sabha and 04 works of Rajya Sabha MP were not shown. The work which have not been started have been cancelled. Now only one work of Lok Sabha and one work of Rajya Sabha are under progress and efforts are being to complete the same.</p> <p>District authority Bharatpur has been requested to provide the latest status of two incomplete works.</p> <p>CEO Pali has informed that during the year 2002-03, one work costing Rs 1.24 lakh, 2005-06, one work costing Rs 1.74 lakh and in year 2008-09 four works costing Rs 10.06 lakh are only incomplete. All BDOs & other Implementing Agencies have been reminded to complete the incomplete work in time and furnish the UC of the work. EE(Eng) and Dealing Assistant have been strictly directed to follow it time to time. Two works of Railway crossing ROB have been completed and the one work Construction of Community centre at Abkai Dhani has been cancelled.</p> <p>The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to direct the district authority Pali to provide the latest status of incomplete work.</p>
6	5.3	<u>Commitment for maintenance and upkeep of assets</u> - No commitment for maintenance of the assets was taken from the user agencies nor any agreement signed before	The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authority to direct District authority Sriganganagar to expedite reply.

		issue of sanction orders and commencement of work.	
7	6.2.6	<p><u>Non-submission of UCs by IAs</u> - In six districts in the state of Rajasthan, out of total works 3750 completed during the audit period 2004-09, the IAs did not submit UCs for the work 744 amounting to Rs 14.96 crore.</p>	<p>CEO Zila Parishad, Bharatpur has informed that Implementing Agencies have been instructed for furnishing the Utilization/Work Completion Certificate. There is delay in getting the Utilization Certificate from the other district.</p> <p>The Ministry has requested the district authority, Bharatpur to provide details of work sanctioned, work completed, utilisation Certificate received, balance work and the Utilisation certificate etc.</p> <p>District Authority Sriganganagar has informed that Implementing Agencies have been instructed to furnish the UC and work Completion Certificate within 30 days from the date of completion of work.</p> <p>The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authority to direct district authority Sriganganagar to furnish categorical reply whether the UC's for the completed work till March 2009 have been received or not. If not, the reason for delay may be intimated to this Ministry.</p>
8	6.5	<p><u>Release of advances in excess of prescribed limits</u> - District Authority released advance to IAs in excess of prescribed limits as against DA may release advances up to 75 <i>per cent</i> (for projects sanctioned up to October 2005) and 50 <i>per cent</i> (for projects sanctioned after October 2005) of the estimated amount of a sanctioned work to the IA.</p>	<p>The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authority to direct District authority Sriganganagar to expedite reply.</p>
9	6.6	<p><u>Refund of unspent balances by IAs</u></p> <p>(a) Rs 0.01 crore unspent balance arising due to Interest accrued thereon not refunded by the Implementing Agency..</p>	<p>State Government has informed that the districts authority have been directed to get refund of unspent balances with interest from the Implementing Agencies.</p> <p>State Nodal Authority has been requested to direct the districts authority of Bharatpur and Sriganganagar to expedite reply.</p>

10	6.8.1	<p><u>Banking arrangements</u></p> <p>(b) DAs audited had not reconciled the figures of the cash book and bank pass-book as prescribed</p>	<p>State Nodal Authority has been requested to direct the district authority of Bharatpur and Sriganganagar to expedite reply.</p>
----	-------	---	--

Note : In the above cases, the Chief Secretary, Government of Rajasthan vide this Ministry's letters dated 11.04.2013, 21.08.2013 and 30.09.2013 has been requested to direct the concerned state nodal department and nodal district authorities to furnish comprehensive Action Taken Notes (ATNs) on priority. The letters have also been endorsed to the Nodal Secretary and concerned DCs. However, reply is still awaited.

Pending C&AG Audit Para Tamil Nadu

Sl No	Audit Para No	Detail of Audit Para	Reply Received /Comments of the Ministry
1	3.2	<p>Works executed without formal recommendation of MP -1 work costing Rs.0.04 Crore in 1 district was executed without formal recommendation of MP.</p>	<p>DA Kanyakumari has informed that the damaged building of the Pullyoorsalai Govt. High School has been demolished and the school administration rushed to the local MLA of area to provide a building for the school urgently. Due to urgency and for want of MPLADS fund, the local MLA approached the District Collector with a request to build a school building for the said school with an assurance from the MP to provide fund from MPLADS</p> <p>Due to urgency the District Collector has sanctioned the work in anticipation of MP's recommendation. Subsequently the MP has given the recommendation letter for the building work. Hence there is no violation of guidelines.</p> <p>Further no work has been sanctioned without the recommendation of the MP. The instruction is taken into account and the recommendations other than MP will not be entrained.</p> <p>Comments of the Ministry</p> <p>Reply is not satisfactory. To</p>

			execute work without the formal and proper recommendations of the on'ble MP is violative of the Guidelines. Nodal State Authorities has been requested to take against the errant district officials responsible for executing work without adhering to the Guidelines and Action Taken Notes (ATNs) be furnished to the Ministry for consideration.
2	3.3	<p>Selection of prohibited works -The following works have been executed which were not permitted as per Guidelines:-</p> <p>(a) 16 works were executed costing Rs 1.06 crore for office and residential buildings of Central/State Government.</p> <p>(b) 67 works were executed costing Rs 1.4 crore for office and residential buildings for cooperative, private organization and any work for commercial body.</p> <p>(c) 177 works costing Rs 6.93 crore executed of renovation, repair and maintenance.</p> <p>(d) 49 prohibited movable items costing Rs 0.13 crore were purchased.</p>	<p>District authority, Virudhnagar has informed that works of renovation, repair and maintenance carried out to protect the capital works. In future, this type of works will not be admitted as per the Guidelines.</p> <p>State Nodal Authorities has been requested to direct the Collector Virudhnagar to provide details of work under taken from 2004-05 to 2008-09 under this category.</p>
3	3.4	DAs Kanyakumari, Karur, Krishnagiri, and Vellore sanctioned MPLADS funds Rs 0.93 to 46 ineligible Trusts/ Societies	<p>District Authority, Kanyakumari, has informed that the total 29 public distribution shop (PDS) costing Rs. 60.46 lakh were constructed and handed over to the Rural and Urban local bodies. All the assets created are being utilized by the public.</p> <p>Reply is not satisfactory. DC Kanyakumari has been requested to confirm whether the reply pertains to audit para No 3.4 or para 3.3. Nevertheless sanctioning of funds to ineligible trusts/ societies is violative of the guidelines. The PDS constructed falls under commercial category which is prohibited under MPLADS Guidelines. The Ministry has requested the State Nodal authorities to look into the matter and direct the district authority Kanyakumari to recoup the funds and action be taken agents the</p>

			district officials found responsible for irregular sanction of MPLADS work. The Action Taken Notes (ATNs) may also be forwarded to the Ministry for consideration.
4	5.3	Commitment for maintenance and upkeep of assets - No commitment for maintenance of the assets was taken from the user agencies nor any agreement signed before issue of sanction orders and commencement of work	The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to direct the districts authority of Chennai and Kanyakumari to expedite reply.
5	6.3	Distribution of funds of ex-Rajya Sabha (RS) MPs The unspent balance amounting to Rs.1.77 crore in respect of Rajya Sabha MPs has not been distributed.	The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to expedite action as per 4.8 of the MPLADS guidelines to distribute the unspent amount of EX-MPs(RS) after obtaining the information from the districts authorities.
6	6.6	Refund of unspent balances by IAs (a) Rs 0.12 crore unspent balance arising due to completion of works at lower than sanctioned cost and Interest accrued thereon not refunded by the Implementing Agency.	District Authority Kanyakumari has intimated that from the year 2004-2005 to 2008-2009, a total 802 works were sanctioned at an estimated cost of Rs. 10.60 crore inclusive of the interest amount. After utilizing the amount, a balance of Rs. 24.13 lakh including interest is to be refunded by the IAs. The Ministry has requested DC Kanyakumari to provide the latest status of refund of amount from the IAs.
7	6.8.1	Banking arrangements (a) DA and IA had not maintained a separate bank account for each MP. Instead, their funds under the scheme were clubbed with funds in the accounts of other MPs.	District authority, Virudhnagar has informed that it has been observed by the audit authority that 63 No. of work costing Rs. 246.65 lakhs were executed by Executive Engineer (PWD) WRO, Vaippar Basin Division, Virudhnagar, Divisional Engineer (Highways) Virudhnagar, and Executive Engineer (PWD) WRO Upper Vaippar Division, Rajapalayam. The amount released by the DA had not been credited into separate savings Account of MPLAD Scheme and it was kept in Treasury Account. In this connection, it was reported that all the above IAs had been instructed to keep the MPLAD Funds in separate savings bank Account of Nationalized

			<p>Bank. However, the above agencies had not done so and MPLAD funds were remitted into Government Deposit Account and expenditure incurred by obtaining the letter of credit.</p> <p>The Ministry has requested the District Collector Virudh Nagar to provide the present status of opening the Saving Bank Account in the nationalized bank by the Implementing Agencies. If not, they may asked to ensure that the separate bank account is maintained in each case.</p>
8	7.2.1	<p>Monitoring committee meetings</p> <p>- Monitoring Committees were set up but these had not met even once after their constitution.</p>	The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to expedite reply.
9	7.3.1	<p>Inspection of works</p> <p>States/UTs had not inspected any work during 2004-05 to 2008-09.</p>	The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to expedite reply.
10	7.5	<p>Internal Audit</p> <p>States/UTs had not made any arrangements for an internal audit of the Scheme</p>	The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to expedite reply.

Note : In the above cases, the Chief Secretary, Government of Tamil Nadu vide this Ministry's letters dated 12.04.2013, 26.08.2013 and 1.10.2013 has been requested to direct the concerned state nodal department and nodal district authorities to furnish comprehensive Action Taken Notes (ATNs) on priority. The letters have also been endorsed to the Nodal Secretary and concerned DCs. However, reply is still awaited.

Pending C&AG Audit Para Tripura

Sl No	Audit Para No	Detail of Audit Para	Reply Received /Comments of the Ministry
1	3.3	<p>Selection of prohibited works -The following works have been executed which were not permitted as per Guidelines:-</p> <p>(a) 02 works were executed costing Rs 0.31 crore for office and residential buildings of Central/State Government.</p>	DM West Tripura in reply has informed that on scrutiny record (Project Register), it has been found that no such works were taken up in Western Tripura District which is prohibited under MPLADS. However, repair/renovation of school building

		<p>(b) 06 works were executed costing Rs 0.36 crore for office and residential buildings for cooperative, private organization and any work for commercial body.</p> <p>(c) 01 work costing Rs 0.11 crore executed of renovation, repair and maintenance.</p>	<p>was recommended by the Hon'ble MP for sanction. On the basis of recommendations, sanction was accorded only in the interest of students and reduce the drop out students.</p> <p>Comments of the Ministry</p> <p>Reply is not satisfactory. Repair/renovation of office building is prohibited as per the extant guidelines. The Ministry has requested DM West Tripura to furnish the details of works pertaining to renovation /repairs of school building along with the administrative sanction issued for the purpose. It has also been requested that action be taken to recoup the funds sanctioned against irregular MPLADS works and action be also initiated against the errant district officials found responsible for not adhering to the provisions of guidelines of MPLADS.</p>
2	4.3	<p>(i) <u>Non Commencement of works</u> - 10 works amounting to Rs.0.89 Crore had not been taken up for execution as of March 2009 due to reasons such as land disputes, non availability of site, non availability of suitable water bearing strata, site problems etc.</p>	<p>DM West Tripura, has informed the status of works given below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. one work costing Rs 25.00 lakh for the year 2008-09 work is in full swing. 2. One work costing Rs 12.00 lakh for the year 2007-08, the construction is going on and will be completed very soon. 3. One work costing Rs 9.50 lakh for the year 2007-08 i.e construction of cultural Hall-cum-classroom at Ishanpur HS School could not be started due to some natural reason. However, initiative has been taken for immediate execution of an alternative project. 4. One work costing Rs 25.00 lakh was given to EO, Khowai, NP for execution. But the fund withdrawn from EO Khowai NP and placed with EE, RD, Western Division III, Teliamura during the month of March, 2011. The execution is going on in full swing and due to be completed by August 2012.

			<p>5. One work costing Rs 12.00 lakh was recommend by the Hon'ble MP for setting up of irrigation plant at Gamaibari Teliamura. On the basis of administrative approval and expenditure sanction was also given to BDO Telimura. But due to some technical problem ,the said project has been modified for construction of community hall at Madhya Brahmacherra G/P to Teliamura. The construction work is going on and work will be completed by September 2012.</p> <p>6. One work costing Rs 9.50 lakh was taken up for construction of cultural Hall cum class room at Ishanpur H.S School but could not be started due to site problem and inadequate fund. However, now the balance fund has been arranged from convergence with BADP. Now work started and will be completed by March 2013.</p> <p>The Ministry has requested the state nodal authorities to direct the DM West District Tripura to provide the latest status of six works under progress.</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>(iv) DM West Tripura in reply has intimated that the recommendation made by the Hon'ble MP(RS), 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 0.39634 lakh was incurred for borehole. So the question of unfruitful</p>

			<p>expenditure may be ignored. On hearing the matter the Hon'ble MP(RS) 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.</p> <p>The Ministry has requested the state nodal authority to direct DM West Tripura to provide the latest status of construction of community hall at Madhya Brahmacherra under Brahmacherra G.P under progress.</p>
3	6.6	<p><u>Refund of unspent balances by IAs</u></p> <p>(b) 02 works amounting to Rs 0.19 crore unspent funds due to works not being started not refunded by the Implementing Agency.</p>	<p>DM West Tripura has intimated that one work costing Rs 9.50 lakh was taken up for construction of cultural Hall cum class room at Ishanpur H.S School but could not be started due to site problem and inadequate fund. However, now the balance fund has been arranged from convergence with BADP. Now work started and will be completed by March 2013.</p> <p>The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to direct DM West Tripura to provide the latest status of work now started and undertaken.</p>

Note : In the above cases, the Chief Secretary, Government of Tripura vide this Ministry's letters dated 12.04.2013, 29.08.2013 and 1.10.2013 has been requested to direct the concerned state nodal department and nodal district authorities to furnish comprehensive Action Taken Notes (ATNs) on priority. The letters have also been endorsed to the Nodal Secretary and concerned DCs. However, reply is still awaited.

Pending C&AG Audit Para Uttrakhand

SI No	Audit Para No	Detail of Audit Para	Reply Received /Comments of the Ministry
1	3.3	<p>Selection of prohibited works -The following works have been executed which were not permitted as per Guidelines:-</p> <p>(a) 109 works were executed costing Rs 1.75 crore for office and residential buildings for cooperative, private organization and any work for commercial body.</p> <p>(b) 02 works costing Rs 0.02 crore executed for religious purposes and works within in the premises of religious body.</p>	<p>District Magistrate Bageshwar has informed that no expenditure on works for office and residential building of central/State Government has been made in this districts. Like wise no funds were incurred on works for office and residential building for cooperative, private organization and any work for commercial body, no expenditure was made on works of renovation, repair and maintenance. Only one work i.e construction of class room in a recognized school Saraswati Sishu Mandir School has been executed which is as per the provision of the Guidelines. The funds utilized for the purpose has been reconciled. Thereafter no work has been sanctioned.</p> <p>D.M. Pithoragarh has informed that there is no such reference in the District and no prohibited work as given in the guidelines is being executed.</p> <p>Comments of the Ministry</p> <p>Reply received from Districts authorities of Bageshwar and Pithoragarh are not satisfactory. District Udhamsingh Nagar has not furnished any reply till date. The sampled districts selected by C&AG for the Performance Audit Report 2010-11 were Bageshwar, Pithoragarh and Udhamsingh Nagar. As such the 112 prohibited works amounting to Rs 1.77 crore have been implemented in the three districts. The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to direct all the sampled districts to furnish complete Action Taken Notes (ATNs) in respect of all the 111 prohibited works pointed by Audit Authorities.</p>
2	7.1.2	<p>Uploading of data on website - Works sanctioned but Data not uploaded.</p>	<p>DM Haridwar in reply has informed that against total 696 works upto year 2009, 463 works have been uploaded</p>

			<p>and the remaining 233 works are being uploaded. The percentage of works not yet uploaded is 33.47%.</p> <p>The Ministry has requested DM Haridwar to provide the latest status of uploading of remaining 233 works.</p> <p>DM Garhwal has informed that out of 2272 works executed during the audit period, 264 works have been uploaded. The balance of works will be uploaded soon.</p> <p>The Ministry has requested DM Garhwal to provide the status of uploading of remaining works.</p>
3	7.2.1	<p>Monitoring committee meetings - Monitoring Committees were set up but these had not met even once after their constitution.</p>	<p><i>The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to expedite reply.</i></p>

Note : In the above cases, the Chief Secretary, Government of Uttarakhand vide this Ministry's letters dated 12.04.2013, 03.09.2013 and 4.10.2013 has been requested to direct the concerned state nodal department and nodal district authorities to furnish comprehensive Action Taken Notes (ATNs) on priority. The letters have also been endorsed to the Nodal Secretary and concerned DCs. However, reply is still awaited.

Pending C&AG Audit Para Uttar Pradesh

SI No	Audit Para No	Detail of Audit Para	Reply Received /Comments of the Ministry
1	3.2	<p><u>Works executed on recommendation of representatives of MP</u></p> <p>04 works costing Rs.0.06 Crore in 1 district were executed on the recommendation made by representative of MP.</p>	<p>Reply from DMs Bijnore and Etawah has not yet received. The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to direct the District Magistrates of Bijnore and Etawah to furnish reply as pointed by the Audit Authorities.</p>
2	3.3	<p><u>Execution of Prohibited/ ineligible works</u> The following works have been executed which were not permitted as per Guidelines:-</p> <p>(i) 05 Works for office and residential</p>	<p>DMs Barabanki, Shahjahanpur, Maharajganj, Mirzapur, Ambedkar Nagar, Kannauj, Etawah, Sultanpur, Gonda, Badaun, Sidarthnagar and Kushi Nagar in their replies have intimated that no prohibited works</p>

	<p>buildings of Central/State Government costing Rs 0.21 crore</p> <p>(ii) 01 Works for religious purposes and works within the premises of religious body costing Rs 0.04 crore.</p> <p>(iii) 07 works of renovation, repair and maintenance costing Rs 0.40 crore.</p> <p>(iv) 01 Purchase of prohibited movable items costing Rs 0.25 Crore.</p>	<p>have not been executed in their districts.</p> <p>DM Jalaun in their reply has informed that Milan Kendra in Kauch Nagar was constructed by Uttar Pradesh Samaj Kalyan Nirman Nigam at cost of Rs 2.40 lakh near Vaijay Lankeshwar Hanuman Mandir. The construction was not made in the religious site. The construction site is just 20 meter way from the religious place. The construction was done outside the religious site.</p> <p>Reply from Nodal District Authorities of Bijnore and Balia has not yet received.</p> <p>Comments of the Ministry :</p> <p>C&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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 because the cost of the prohibited work in the religious place is Rs 0.04 crore.</p>
--	---	---

			The Ministry has also requested the State Nodal Authority to direct the districts Authorities of Bijnore and Balia to expedite reply.
3	4.2.1	<u>Sanction of works without adhering to guidelines</u> - In Kushinagar district, the Executive Engineer of the IA prepared estimates without preparing the analysis of rates of different items of works for two works costing Rs.0.11 crore.	<p>DRDA Kushi Nagar in their reply has intimated that the name of the work and implementing agency are not indicated in the audit paragraph. The information about the same was requested with the Senior Audit Office concerned of the office of Principal AG, UP Allahabad. But the same has not yet received to this office. Hence, it is not possible to submit the specific replies to the audit points. However, analysis of rates not available with the preliminary estimate are necessary with the technical sanction subsequently.</p> <p>The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Department to direct DM Kushinagar to find out the details of 02 works executed by the implementing agencies in the Nodal district or Implementing District.</p>
4	4.3	<u>(iii) Incomplete works:</u> 446 works costing Rs. 15.25 Crore remained incomplete 1 to 4 years in 15 DAs.	<p>DM Ambedkar Nagar in their reply has intimated that 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 .</p> <p>The Ministry has requested the state nodal department to provide the latest status of incomplete work with reasons for delay in completion along with corrective action taken to avoid recurrence of such irregularities. Action may be initiated against the erring officials found responsible and Action Taken Report may be furnished to the Ministry urgently.</p>
5	7.3.1	<u>Inspection of works-</u> States/UTs had not inspected any work during 2004-05 to 2008-09.	The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to expedite reply.
6	7.3.2	<u>No display of work details at the DA offices</u> Failed to display the work detail in fifteen	<p>Reply from District Magistrate Bijnore has received.</p> <p>The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to direct</p>

		DAs office in the State audited by CAG.	the District Magistrate, Bijnore to expedite reply.
7	7..4	<p><u>Inadequate coverage of areas inhabited by the SC/ST community</u></p> <p>Audit test check showed that funds sanctioned for areas inhabited by the SC/ST population were short of the requirements prescribed in the Scheme guidelines.</p>	<p>Reply from District Magistrate Bijnore has received.</p> <p>The Ministry ahs requested the State Nodal Authorities to direct the District Magistrate, Bijnore to expedite reply.</p>

Note : In the above cases, the Chief Secretary, Government of Uttar Pradesh vide this Ministry's letters dated 12.4.2013, 04.09.2013 and 03.10.2013 has been requested to direct the concerned state nodal department and nodal district authorities to furnish comprehensive Action Taken Notes (ATNs) on priority. Copies of the letter have also been endorsed to the Nodal Secretary and concerned DCs. However, reply is still awaited.

Pending C&AG Audit Para West Bengal

Sl No	Audit Para No	Detail of Audit Para	Reply Received /Comments of the Ministry
1	3.3	<p>Selection of prohibited works -The following works have been executed which were not permitted as per Guidelines:-</p> <p>(a) 03 works were executed costing Rs 0.21 crore for office and residential buildings of Central/State Government.</p> <p>(b) 215 works were executed costing Rs 5.6 crore for office and residential buildings for cooperative, private organization and any work for commercial body.</p> <p>(c) 21 works costing Rs 0.61 crore executed of renovation, repair and maintenance.</p> <p>(d) 43 prohibited movable items costing Rs 1.48 crore were purchased.</p> <p>(e) 01 Miscellaneous inadmissible works costing Rs 0.11 crore (PM Relief fund for Tsunami) executed.</p>	<p>In reply received by the state Government from the Sampled districts has intimated the following:-</p> <p>Hooghly Following three buildings of Panchayat Raj institutions involving Rs. 21.00 lakh were inadvertently sanctioned on the recommendation of concerned MP.</p> <p>I. Construction of guest house of Khanakul-I GP-Rs. 4.00 lakh; The funds have been recouped and deposited in the MPLADS account of the MP.</p> <p>II. Construction of guest house of Khanakul-I PS-Rs. 5.00 lakh;</p> <p>III. Construction of annex building of Pursurah P.S.-Rs. 12.00 lakh.</p> <p>Remaining balance of two works costing Rs 17.00 lakh is expected to be recouped shortly. PRI are trying</p>

			<p>hard to mobilize resources for the recoupment.</p> <p>State nodal authority has informed that the district authority has been instructed for the recoupment of the fund spent on inadmissible works by March, 2013.</p> <p>The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authority to provide the latest status of recoupment of funds against the two remaining works.</p>
2	3.4	<p>DAs 24 Pargana, Paschim Medinipur, Hoogly, Purulia sanctioned excess funds amount to Rs 1.26 crore to 06 Societies /Trusts</p>	<p>In reply received by the state Government from the Sampled districts has intimated the following:-</p> <p>Purulia- All the schemes were recommended by various Hon'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>State Nodal Authority has informed th 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 and its usage by the target group.</p> <p>The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authority to provide the latest position in the matter.</p>
3	4.4.1	<p><u>Non-existence of assets</u> 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</p>	<p>State Nodal Authority in reply has informed that the superintendent of Police , South 24 Parganas furnished and action taken report on the FIR lodged by the District Planning Officer, South 24 Parganas. As per SP'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</p>

		<p>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>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 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.</p> <p>The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to direct DM 24 Praganas to provide the present status of the case.</p>
4	6.3	<p><u>Distribution of funds of ex-Rajya Sabha (RS) MPs</u> - The unspent balance amounting to Rs.8.48 crore in respect of Rajya Sabha MPs has not been distributed.</p>	<p>State Nodal Authority in reply has informed that there are 30 ex-MPs of Rajya Sabha in this state. Out of 30 ex-MPs , distribution of unspent balance of 29-ex-MPs have been completed. Regarding the distribution of unspent balance of Shri Bratin Sengupta, ex-MP(RS), a report regarding the implementation of works had been sent to Ministry. Action will be taken on receipt of instructions from the Ministry.</p> <p>The Ministry has already conveyed the State Nodal Authority about the decision taken in the matter and has requested to distribute the unspent amount of the ex-MP(RS) as per para 4.8 of the Guidelines. The reply in the matter has not yet received from the State Nodal Authorities.</p>
5	6.6	<p><u>Refund of unspent balances by IAs</u></p> <p>(b) Rs 0.24 crore unspent balance arising due to Interest accrued thereon not refunded by the Implementing Agency..</p>	<p>The Ministry has requested the State Nodal Authorities to direct the DMs of Kolkata, Paschim Medinipur, Purulia, and South 24 Paragnas to expedite reply.</p>

Note : In the above cases, the Chief Secretary, Government of West Bengal vide this Ministry's letters dated 04.09.2013 and 4.10.2013 has been requested to direct the concerned state nodal department and nodal district authorities to furnish comprehensive Action Taken Notes (ATNs) on priority. The letters have also been endorsed to the Nodal Secretary and concerned DCs. However, reply is still awaited.

Annexure- VI

Complaints of serious nature regarding mis- Utilization of MPLADS funds			
Sr. No.	Name of the Complainant	Brief Subject	Status
Uttar Pradesh			
1	Roshan Lal	It has been alleged that the MPLADS funds (Rs 3 lac) were got recommended from Sh. Akhilesh Yadav (Former MP of Kannauj) for construction of classrooms in Amar Saheed Veerangana Awanti Bai Primary School, Auraiya, and also got sanctioned from District Authority on the basis of wrong declaration by the Headmaster and Manager of the School, whereas the school was located in a private land. Also, the rooms constructed were being used for their personal benefit.	<p>A detailed factual report dated 13.02.2013 in the matter was received from Project Director, DRDA, The report states that the manager and Principal of Amar Shaheed Veerangna Awanti Bai Primary School has been served a Show Cause Notice dated 15.02.2013 by CEO, Auraiya to submit his version within a week failing which a recovery of Rs. 3,85,500 (alongwith 18% interest from the date of use) will be made from him as land revenue arrears in pursuance of MPLADS guidelines. Also, the CEO, Auraiya, vide his letter dated 15.02.2013 has directed the Block Development Officer, Sahar, Auraiya, to lodge an FIR against Sh. Amar Singh, the manager and Principal of Amar Shaheed Veerangna Awanti Bai Primary School, Auraiya in the concerned Police Station for misuse of Rs. 3 lakh of MPLADS fund and take action for recovery of the misused amount.</p> <p>The above position has been intimated to Lok Sabha Secretariat vide this Ministry's letter of even number dated 28.02.2013.</p> <p>State Govt. to take follow-up action .</p>
2	Ramesh Bahadur Singh	The complainant has alleged irregular use of MPLADS funds of Sh. Rewati Raman Singh, MP(RS)	Action Taken Report awaited from District Authority, Allahabad. Last Reminder 30.10.2013
Madhya Pradesh			
3	Ramesh Mishra Chanchal	He has alleged misappropriation of MPLADS funds by entrusting work relating to purchase of computers and training for schools to a fake and fraudulent firm "Computer Studies and Services" by various District Authorities of Chhattisgarh and Madhya Pradesh.	Govt. of Chhattisgarh has written that no such work was awarded to the said fraudulent firm in any of the Districts of Chhattisgarh. A factual report is awaited from the Govt. of Madhya Pradesh. Last Remminder dated 31.10.2013

Chhattisgarh			
4	Sh. Ravi Verma	He has complained of embezzlement of Rs. 68 lakh in respect of the MPLADS funds of Sh. Sohan Potai, MP from Kanker Lok Sabha Constituency, on the basis of the Audit Report of the Local Fund & Audit Deptt., Govt. of Chhattisgarh.	<p>A report dated 21.02.2013 of District Collector, Kanker in the matter has been received from Secretary (Planning & Statistics Department), Govt. of Chhattisgarh vide his letter dated 02.05.2013. The report identifies the guilty officials and recommends disciplinary action against them.</p> <p>A copy of the report has been forwarded to Lok Sabha Secretariat vide this Ministry's letter of even number dated 17.05.2013.</p> <p>State Govt. to take follow up action.</p>
Odisha			
5	Complaint from Sh. Ranadhu Nayak and others, Badhrak	Issues such as misappropriation of MPLADS funds in the construction of Sahaspur Bridge in Bhadrak district, its poor quality, wide-spread corruption involved in the project etc. have been raised in the representation.	A report dated 16.02.2013 was received from Planning & Coordination Department, Govt. of Orissa. Certain clarifications regarding the report which were asked vide out letter of even number dated 09.04.2013 are awaited from Planning & Coordination Department, Govt. of Odisha.
Maharashtra			
6	Complaint of Sh. Vilas Muttemwer, Hon'ble MP(LS) from Nagpur Constituency	The Hon'ble MP had brought to the notice of the Ministry in April, 2012 that a Community Hall/Auditorium recommended by him at Katol Road, adjoining Raj Bhawan in the premises of the Vidharbha Relief Committee and which was handed by the Implementing Agency to the Vidharbha Relief Committee on 06.02.2010 was now used for commercial purpose.	A report dated 30.03.2013 was received from the Govt. of Maharashtra. Vide this Ministry's D.O. letter dated 09.10.2013, the State Govt. advised that Nagpur Imporvement Trust who is responsible for the maintenace of the Community Hall constructed with MPLADS funds should fix user charges for hiring of the Community Hall that are reasonable and affordable by the general public and should make arrangements of maintenance and operation within the ambit of the user charges so fixed and in this regard, NIT may follow the principles and procedures mutatis mutandis as laid down under Para 10(b) & (c) of Annexure II-A of the Guidelines on MPLADS in respect of ambulances/hearse vans.State Govt. to take follow-up action.
West Bengal			

7	Complaint from Shri Bharat Prakash Rai and others	The complainants allege inappropriate use of MPLADS funds by the Hon'ble MP of Darjeeling Constituency, Sh. Jaswant Singh,	Vide our letter dated 14.05.2013, the DM, Darjeeling has been asked to furnish reasons for sanctioning funds in violation of MPLADS guidelines. Reply is awaited.
---	---	--	---