

## CHAPTER XI: MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS

### 11.1 Recovery at the instance of Audit

**Indo Tibetan Border Police recovered an amount of Rs 60 lakh irregularly granted to *Himveer Arthik Sahayata Kosh*, a fund created without the approval of Ministry of Home Affairs.**

Ministry of Home Affairs (MHA) released Rs 1.15 crore for the welfare activities of Indo Tibetan Border Police (ITBP) during 1999-2000. Out of this, Director General, ITBP transferred Rs 60 lakh between February–August 2000 to *Himveer Arthik Sahayata Kosh* (HASK). HASK is a fund created in August 1999 at the instance of DG, ITBP to extend monetary loans at nominal rate of interest to the members of ITBP. This fund did not have the approval of MHA or Ministry of Finance. The transfer of welfare funds to HASK was incorrect and unauthorised.

On this being pointed out by Audit, DG, ITBP withdrew Rs 60 lakh in September 2001 from HASK and deposited it back into the welfare account. The fact that Government funds could be diverted to maintain a welfare fund without the approval of the Ministry is indicative of serious indiscretion in the discharge of delegated financial powers. Appropriate systemic remedial measures need to be devised to prevent recurrence of such irregularities in future.

### 11.2 Extra expenditure due to delay in construction

**Central Industrial Security Force, West Zone, Mumbai, had to pay additional lease premium of Rs 43.56 lakh to City and Industrial Development Corporation of Maharashtra Limited for not completing the construction work of Central Industrial Security Force complex in the stipulated time frame.**

The Central Industrial Security Force (CISF), West Zone (WZ), Mumbai (Licensee) entered into an agreement and lease deed with City and Industrial Development Corporation of Maharashtra Limited (CIDCO), Mumbai for lease of a plot measuring 20,000 square metres for construction of non residential CISF complex at Taloja in January 1992 for 99 years for full premium amount of Rs 1.20 crore paid in October 1991, before the execution of the agreement.

As per the terms and conditions of the agreement, CISF was required to commence construction on the plot within a period of 12 months from the date of agreement and complete it within a period of four years from the same date i.e. by January 1997, failing which the licensee would be liable for an additional lease premium under the terms and conditions of the lease. However, there was no progress of development of plot and construction at Taloja in the time frame accepted under the agreement and the work was not

*Report No. 2 of 2002 (Civil)*

completed within five years i.e. by January 1997. Resultantly, CIDCO in May 1998 levied additional lease premium of Rs 43.56 lakh for extension of three years up to January 2000. CISF paid the additional lease premium of Rs 43.56 lakh in February 1999. CISF obtained further extension up to January 2001 without levy of additional premium.

Scrutiny of records of Deputy Inspector General (DIG), CISF, Mumbai revealed the following:

The CISF referred the matter to Central Public Works Department (CPWD) for preparation of plans and estimates in 1992. The CPWD prepared the preliminary drawings inclusive of buildings for HQ Training Centre and incidentals i.e. compound wall & gate etc. in March 1993. CISF requested CPWD in March 1994 to include the requirement of residential accommodation of CISF in plan estimates. The CPWD accordingly revised the plan in December 1994 and with the approval of CISF (February 1995) presented it to CIDCO in June 1996. CIDCO objected to the revised plan since the original lease deed of January 1992 did not provide for construction of residential quarters. CIDCO in September 1997 conveyed approval to the revised plan subject to payment of Rs 62.33 lakh being the differential amount of premium as decided for the area proposed to be used for construction of residential quarters. CISF paid the amount of Rs 62.33 lakh in January 1999. The work of CISF complex started in January 1998. Though the work has been completed in January 2001, it had not been handed over to CISF as of May 2001.

Thus, lack of initial firm plans and consequent midstream changes, besides delay in execution of the work, resulted in extra expenditure of Rs 43.56 lakh along with Rs 1.20 crore remaining blocked for five years beyond normal period of five years.

While accepting the facts, the Ministry stated in September 2001 that normally residential and non-residential buildings were constructed in the same complex but there was clearly a slip in the present case. Ministry also stated that they would like to give clear-cut instructions to all the Central Para Military Forces in this regard to avoid recurrence of such situations in future. They further added that CPWD also contributed some delay in finalising drawings and estimates but this was not tenable because time required by CPWD was always taken into account while accepting the time frame under the agreement. The delay was mainly due to lack of initial planning and midstream change as the revised plan was presented to CIDCO after more than four years from the date of agreement.

## **National Security Guard**

### **11.3 Procurement of defective Mini Jammer**

<b>National Security Guard incurred infructuous expenditure of Rs 75.09 lakh on purchase of defective security equipment.</b>
---

In order to conduct bomb detection/disposal operations more effectively, National Security Guard (NSG) in July 2000 requested the Cabinet Secretariat for purchase of a Mini Jammer along with spares for VIP security. The equipment is used to jam signals from communication devices meant to detonate explosives remotely. Indent for purchase of the equipment was issued by Special Protection Group (SPG) in August 2000. An order for the purchase of the equipment was placed with M/s Thunderbird Industries Inc., Virginia, USA in August 2000 and the Cabinet Secretariat conveyed necessary expenditure sanction of Rs 75.09 lakh in August 2000, debit to the NSG. As per the conditions of contract the inspection and the test of the equipment was to be made on the charge of the supplier in his factory by the Inspecting Officer deputed by the Government.

Ministry of Home Affairs (MHA) in November 2000 intimated the NSG that the Mini Jammer along with spares and power supply had been procured from USA after proper testing of the equipment.

NSG collected the equipment from SPG in November 2000. The Board of Officers of NSG carried out trials on equipment and reported that the equipment did not meet the specifications claimed by the firm. NSG, in December 2000, during additional trials on the equipment, also concluded that the Jammer could not jam the communication equipment used.

Since the guarantee and warranty period of the equipment was in force till 31 August 2001, NSG in March 2001 requested the MHA to convene a meeting with Cabinet Secretariat and SPG to sort out the issue. No such meeting was held. The equipment, which was lying with NSG, had also not been returned to SPG for further action.

Thus, the expenditure of Rs 75.09 lakh incurred on the purchase of the equipment has been rendered infructuous. Besides, the security concerns remained unaddressed due to lack of appropriate standards in the selection and testing of sensitive equipment with the jamming device.

The matter was referred to the Ministry in September 2001; their reply was awaited as of November 2001.