

(घ) यदि हां, तो इस संबंध में ब्यौर क्या है और पिछले 12 वर्षों से उपयोग में नहीं लाई जा रही भूमि का उपयोग करने के लिए सरकार क्या उपाय करने का विचार रखती है?

विद्युत मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (डॉ० एस० वेणुगोपालाचारी): (क) नेशनल थर्मल पावर कारपोरेशन (एनटीपीसी) ने विंध्याचल सुपर ताप विद्युत परियोजना (वीएसटीपीपी) के लिए 6178 एकड़ भूमि अधिगृहीत की है। अधिगृहीत भूमि को निम्नलिखित विद्युत संयंत्र सुविधाओं के लिए उपयोग किए जाने का प्रस्ताव है:

1. विद्युत केन्द्र (विद्यमान/ निर्माणाधीन/प्रस्तावित विस्तार	3050 एकड़
2. नगर क्षेत्र	678 एकड़
3. राख-नहर तथा राख पाइप लाइन गलियारा और सिंगरौली राख नहर विस्तार	2001 एकड़
4. हरित पट्टी	314 एकड़
5. एचवीडीसी बैक-टूल-बैक स्विचयार्ड	135 एकड़

(ख) राख नहर विस्तार (1900 एकड़) तथा हरित पट्टी (300 एकड़) के लिए उद्दिष्ट लगभग 2200 एकड़ भूमि पर निवासियों का गैर-कानूनी कब्जा है। यद्यपि अधिगृहीत भूमि के लिए मुआवजे का भुगतान पहले ही किया जा चुका है, मध्य प्रदेश उच्च न्यायालय द्वारा भूमि खाली करने के आदेश तथा उच्च न्यायालय के इस आदेश के विरुद्ध परियोजना प्रभावित व्यक्तियों द्वारा विशेष अनुमति याचिका को माननीय सर्वोच्च न्यायालय द्वारा 25.1.1997 को खारिज कर दिया गया है।

(ग) और (घ) भूमि का अधिग्रहण वीएसटीपीपी के प्रस्तावित एवं भावी विस्तार एचवीडीसी स्विचयार्ड एवं इस विलुप्त परियोजना के पूर्ण कार्यकाल के लिए अपेक्षित राख निपटान क्षेत्र को ध्यान में रखकर किया गया है।

विद्यमान विन्ध्याचल परियोजना के कारण वायु तथा जल प्रदूषण के वर्तमान स्तर, पर्यावरण एवं वन मंत्रालय तथा अन्य नियामक अधिकरणों द्वारा विनिर्धारित पर्यावरणीय मानकों के भीतर ही है। इस परियोजना के चरण-2 के तहत 500-500 मे०वा० की दो यूनिटों के प्रचालन के साथ भी इस क्षेत्र की पारिस्थितिकी प्रणाली पर किसी तरह के विपरीत प्रभाव की प्रत्याशा नहीं है।

सभी वासभूमि निष्कासितों को पुनर्वास कालोनी में मुफ्त प्लॉट आवंटित किए गए हैं अथवा प्लॉटों के स्थान पर उन्हें अपनी इच्छा के स्थान पर बसने के लिए नकद मुआवजा दिया गया है तथा इस क्षेत्र के निवासियों को जीवन स्थितियों को सुधारने के लिए परियोजना प्राधिकारियों द्वारा अनेक अन्य उपाय शुरू किए गए हैं।

Extension of time by HUDCO for paying instalments

*371. SHRI SURYABHAN PATIL
VAHADANE:
SHRI RAJNATH SINGH
'SURYA':

Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that HUDCO has adopted a dual policy in extending the time for payment of instalments for its project at Andrews Ganj;

(b) whether it is also a fact that one of the parties, M/s. Ansal Builders, have been given possession of land and extension of time for payment of second instalment, while the other tenderer, M/s. M.S. Shoes, have neither been given possession of land nor extension for payment of second instalment, inspite of initial payment of Rs. 70 crores collected from banks and the public; and

(c) if so, what are the reasons therefor and what action is being taken to ensure equal treatment to M/s. M.S. Shoes by HUDCO?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF URBAN AFFAIRS AND EMPLOYMENT AND MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (DR. U. VENKATESWARLU):

(a) No, Sir. The cases referred to are not similar in nature. The extension of time for payments for projects in Andrews Ganj has been operated, keeping in view the conditions specified in the brochure inviting offers, the specific terms and conditions of allotment, compliance thereof and other relevant factors.

(b) and (c) M/s Ansal Properties & Industries Limited (APIL) has been allotted space for building Shopping Arcade over the Car Parking/Basement constructed by HUDCO. As per the terms of allotment, possession was to be handed over after the payment of first instalment and completion of the legal formalities and execution of agreement to sub-lease. M/s APIL was given possession after it complying with all the required formalities. However, the payment of the second and subsequent instalments were held up due to the delay in sanction/regularisation of the plans for the Car Parking basement of HUDCO, as a result of which the plans for the Shopping Arcade to be built by M/s APIL were not entertained by MCD for processing and consequent approval. Hence extension of time for the second and third instalment had to be accorded to M/s APIL. They have also applied for further extension on the above grounds which is still under consideration.

In the case of the properties allotted to M/s. M.S. Shoes Limited (MSSL), two situations emerge, both of which are sub-judice before the Hon'ble High Court and Additional District Judge respectively. These are:

- (i) All the 9 blocks of Guest Houses, Restaurants, Kitchen and Shops; and
- (ii) for the 5-Star Hotel Site.

In the case of built properties of the Guest Houses, Restaurants, Kitchen and Shops, as per the allotment terms, the possession was to be given only after the full payment of the consideration of all the three instalments. M/s MSSL, however, paid the first instalment and did not pay the second and third instalments. M/s M.S. Shoes filed a suit in the Hon'ble High Court seeking extension of time to make payment of the second instalment. The Single Judge, Delhi High Court granted sufficient time over and

above the original time prescribed to M/s MSSL to deposit the second instalment but it failed to do so. On non-compliance, the allotment was cancelled. The Hon'ble Division Bench by an order permitted re-auction of the property. Later M/s MSSL filed another suit in the Lower Court and then withdrew the suit in the High Court. The merits of the case is to be decided by the Courts of law.

In the case of the Hotel Site, the possession was to be given after the payment of first instalment and completion of the legal formalities and execution of the sub-lease agreement. M/s MSSL did not comply with the legal requirements (i.e. obtaining mandatory Income Tax clearance etc.) and the agreement of sub-lease was not and legally could not have been executed in accordance with the provisions of Income Tax Act. The High Court of Delhi also gave them time over and above the terms of allotment for making a part payment of Rs. 15 crores which also was not complied with the M/s MSSL. The non-compliance of the Court Order and the terms and conditions of the allotment resulted in the termination of the allotment.

Due to the cancellation of allotment in respect of the Guest Houses, Restaurants, Kitchen and Shops as well as 5-Star Hotel Site and the consequent forfeiture of the money deposited as first instalment amounting to Rs. 68.67 crores, M/s MSSL has filed fresh suits in the Court of Additional District Judge, Delhi, where the statusquo order was issued in Jan.'97. The statusquo order in respect of the Hotel Site has been vacated. On the facts of the case, there is no question of unequal treatment.