

## OVERVIEW

### CHAPTER – I

#### Section -A

##### **An overview of Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs)**

There are 2407 PRIs in the State. The Principal Secretary, Panchayat and Rural Development Department (PRDD) is the administrative head of PRIs

*(Paragraph 1.1)*

District Planning Committees (DPC) have been formed in all districts of General Areas but they were yet to perform their mandated functions as envisaged in Article 243 ZD of the Constitution.

*(Paragraph 1.8)*

The State Government appointed nine Ombudsmen and two Deputy Ombudsmen in 11 out of 27 districts in the State under section 27 (1) of the MGNREG Act, 2005. However, there was no provision in the Assam Panchayat Act (AP Act).

*(Paragraph 1.16.1)*

#### Section-B

##### **Financial Reporting of PRIs**

Asset Registers were not maintained by 25 test checked PRIs and the State Government also did not call for any return on the nature of asset, year of creation and monetary value of the assets.

*(Paragraph 1.19.2)*

25 out of 61 test checked PRIs had not prepared Budget Estimates during 2008-09 to 2011-12 and seven PRIs incurred expenditure of ₹2.97 crore without preparation of budget.

*(Paragraph 1.19.3)*

### CHAPTER II

#### **Transaction Audit of PRIs**

An amount of ₹18.15 lakh was fraudulently withdrawn from bank instead of ₹1.15 lakh by tampering the amount of three cheques meant for payment of Value Added Tax (VAT) and implementation of District Development Plan (DDP) scheme. Out of fraudulent withdrawal of ₹17.00 lakh (₹18.15 lakh - ₹1.15 lakh), ₹9.00 lakh was recovered and ₹8.00 lakh still remained unrecovered.

*(Paragraph 2.1)*

Execution of plantation works during the years 2009-10 to 2011-12 under Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (MGNREGS) was doubtful as the Block Development Officer (BDO), Sissiborgaon Development Block (DB) failed to produce any records in support of actual execution of the works amounting to ₹99.24 lakh. Moreover, no evidence of plantation was found during joint physical verification conducted in three cases.

*(Paragraph 2.3)*

The Chief Executive Officer (CEO), Golaghat Zilla Parishad (ZP) unauthorisedly incurred an expenditure of ₹49.51 lakh out of ₹59.72 lakh retained from the District Development Plan (DDP) fund as contingency in violation of the DDP guidelines. The CEO also failed to produce records in support of expenditure of ₹11.85 lakh.

*(Paragraph 2.5)*

Irregular financial assistance of ₹2.15 crore was provided by the Block Development Officer (BDO), Golaghat North Development Block (DB) to 541 beneficiaries which did not belong to the BPL households depriving 541 genuine beneficiaries of the benefit of IAY scheme.

*(Paragraph 2.6)*

Construction of Bamboo Mat Industry at Mandia remained incomplete for five years after spending ₹95.77 lakh resulting in unproductive expenditure. The objective of the scheme remained unachieved as local people of the district were deprived of an opportunity of earning their livelihood.

*(Paragraph 2.8)*

Guide bunds constructed without appropriate technical estimates and approval were not capable of resisting water pressure during flood due to which these bunds were washed away resulting in doubtful expenditure of ₹76.61 lakh.

*(Paragraph 2.9)*

### **CHAPTER – III**

#### **Section -A**

##### **Overview of ULBs**

There are 93 ULBs in the State as on 31 March 2013. Of the 93 ULBs, 75 are in General Areas and governed according to the provisions of the AM Act, 1956. The remaining 18 ULBs falling within the Sixth Schedule Areas are governed by the rules framed by the respective ADCs.

*(Paragraph 3.1)*

Due to short release of ₹997.73 crore the ULBs were unable to implement various welfare activities for the overall economic development.

*(Paragraph 3.7)*

The objective of creating the Municipal window in the State Budget was frustrated due to lack of effective action on the part of the Government to implement its own decisions on devolution of 3Fs to the ULBs.

*(Paragraph 3.8)*

#### **Section -B**

##### **Financial Reporting of ULBs**

The accounts of ULBs were maintained on cash basis instead of accrual based double entry system. The prescribed mandatory reforms were also not introduced by the ULBs.

*(Paragraph 3.16)*



## CHAPTER IV

### Transaction Audit of ULBs

The Ex-Chairman, Sapatgram Town Committee (STC) withdrew ₹2.47 crore from the banks without recording it in the Cash Book and without maintaining any records in support of any expenditure incurred out of withdrawn amount resulting in misappropriation of Government money. Even the present Chairman did not initiate any action to investigate the matter and recover the misappropriated Government money.

*(Paragraph 4.1)*

## CHAPTER V

### Performance Audit on working of the Guwahati Municipal Corporation (GMC)

The GMC neither prepared any long term perspective plan nor short term annual plans during its 39 years of existence. Schemes/works were executed as and when fund was made available to the Municipal authority

*(Paragraph 5.2.1)*

Only four traditional functions were transferred to the GMC against 18 functions listed in the 12th schedule of the Constitution of India. Major functions were either transferred partially or yet to be transferred to GMC as of March 2013 and these were carried out by the line Departments/parallel bodies in violation of the 74th CAA, 1992.

*(Paragraph 5.2.3)*

Annual budgets were approved after a period of six to eleven months from the commencement of financial year and 61.75 per cent (₹59.59 crore) to 90.48 per cent (₹104.34 crore) of the fund was unauthorisedly spent before the approval of final budget.

*(Paragraph 5.3.3)*

₹7.97 crore was spent without budget provision during 2007-08 & 2009-10.

*(Paragraph 5.3.4.3)*

Revenue collection of ₹10.21 crore was directly deposited into the bank accounts without routing through the main Cash Book.

*(Paragraph 5.3.8)*

Building Bye-laws were violated due to lack of supervision by the GMC authority.

*(Paragraph 5.4.1.12)*

Intended objectives of providing shelter to slum dwellers under JnNURM remained unachieved inspite of huge investment of ₹5.39 crore.

*(Paragraph 5.5.2.1)*

One per cent Labour Welfare Cess amounting to ₹4.15 crore collected by the GMC authority was not transferred to Labour Welfare Board till March 2013.

*(Paragraph 5.6.3)*