

बोलते रहिए और अगर आप खत्म कर रहे हैं तो मैं जगेश जी को शुरू करवा देती हूँ।

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद मायूर: महोदया, अंत में मैं यही कहना चाहूंगा कि आज घोटालों के कारण देश की आर्थिक स्थिति में संदेह पैदा हो गया है।

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Is Mr. Rajesh Pilot suffering from jet-lag?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI SUSHMA SWARAJ): He is coming. I have already asked.

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद मायूर: आपने हिम्मत के साथ यह कहा है कि अंतर्राष्ट्रीय बाजार में हमारी साख घटी नहीं है।

श्री मनमोहन सिंह: बड़ी है।

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद मायूर: भगवान आपके शब्दों को सच्चा सिद्ध करें, लेकिन ऐसा लगता नहीं है इसलिए यह अत्यंत आवश्यक है कि आज जो संदेह पैदा हुए हैं, उनको आप स्पष्ट करें।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज): श्री जगेश देसाई। गृह राज्य-मंत्रीजी भी आ गए हैं।

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: Madam Deputy Chairperson, only one sentence.

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज): एक सेंटेंस में आप क्या बोलेंगे ?

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: I will start so that my claim will be there.

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज): आप का क्लेम तो है ही।

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: Madam, the Finance Minister has given a very, very exhaustive statement without concealing any facts. I compliment the Finance Minister on disclosing the total facts as they stood from the beginning to the end.

Madam, now you may call the Minister.

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज): अब गृह राज्य-मंत्री बयान देंगे।

STATEMENT BY MINISTER

Fatal Bomb attack on Shri P. Siva Reddy, Telugu Desam M.L.A., Andhra Pradesh

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI RAJESH PILOT): Madam, with your permission. I make a statement on the fatal bomb attack on Shri P. Siva Reddy, Telugu Desam M.L.A. (Interruptions).

[The Deputy Chairman in the Chair]

As per the information received from the State Government, Shri P. Siva Reddy, Telugu Desam (TDP) MLA from Jammalamadugu was attending the Monsoon Session of the A.P. Legislative Assembly. He was provided with two State Police guards. He also had two private gunmen who accompanied him.

On 7-8-1993 at about 9.00 A.M. Shri P. Siva Reddy, MLA (TDP) alongwith the official gunman Shri K. Nathaneil, Head Constable 477 and two more private gunmen visited the house of Shri N. Chandrababu Naidu, M.L.A. (TDP) and from there he visited the house of Shri D. Venkateswara Rao, MP (TDP) at Banjara Hills, at 10.30 A.M. At 11.40 A.M., Shri P. Siva Reddy asked Shri K. Nathaneil and his two private gunmen to go back to his quarter. No. 135, New MLA Quarters, and he proceeded with Shri Kala Venkata Rao, M.L.A. (TDP) in a Maruti car to attend a marriage at Shri Satya Sai Kalayana Mandapam, Srinagar Colony, without taking any securitymen with him. The gunman of Shri Rao was also not with him. Around

12.00 noon, when he was coming out of the marriage hall and getting into the Maruti car, some unidentified persons hurled bombs at Shri P. Siva Reddy, who died on the spot. Shri Rao, and Shri A. Suryanarayana Raju, former Deputy Speaker, A.P. Legislative Assembly, were also injured in the bomb attack and they were admitted in Hospital and they are progressing. Two culprits have been apprehended so far. The Police have registered a case, under relevant legal provisions, which has been entrusted to the State CID for investigation.

On the afternoon of 8th August, 1993, Shri P. Siva Reddy's body was buried in his native village in Gundlakyunta near Jammalamadugu with police honours in the presence of senior officials. The Bandh call given by T.D.P. on 8th August, 1993, passed off peacefully but for a few minor incidents. Madam, there is a second statement also.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him read the second statement also. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Madam, why can't we dispose of the first statement first? (*Interruptions*)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Don't get agitated. The Minister is requesting something and I have to think of it. Another thing is, we have spent the whole day asking questions and in discussing it. There would be no problem in having it separately. Don't get unnecessarily agitated. Mr. Minister, let one statement be cleared first and then we will ask you to make the second statement. There are two statements. The Members from Andhra Pradesh want to ask some clarifications on the statement relating to Andhra Pradesh. I don't think there is anything for very many clarifications. Those who want to ask one or two questions, they can ask. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Madam, the statement made by the Minister is obviously based on information furnished by the Government at least 48 hours earlier than now. It is not even based on latest information available to us and

supplied by the Government spokesman to the press. Therefore, I am surprised that the Minister chose to depend on this statement when so much water has flowed since then. He should be able to say as to what information he has in regard to the allegations levelled against the Home Minister of Andhra Pradesh. The wife of the deceased MLA, Mr. Siva Reddy herself lodged a complaint against the Home Minister of Andhra Pradesh. The Home Minister of Andhra Pradesh is the prime accused in the case according to the wife of the slain MLA. What have you got to say on that?

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY (Andhra Pradesh): Madam, the statement says that Mr. Siva Reddy asked Mr. K. Nathaneil and two private gunmen to go back to his quarter. I am, asking a specific question. Who were those constables and what were their badge numbers—I mean, the people who were allotted to Mr. Siva Reddy after the Speaker had given a direction in the Assembly in Andhra Pradesh? How much security was given to him and how many people were there? What are their names and what is their badge number and which vehicle was given to them?

SHRI P. UPENDRA (Andhra Pradesh): Madam, this is not a complete statement. All this has appeared in the newspapers. One expected something more from the Home Minister—what the State Government informed him about this matter and what the intelligence agencies were doing, because for the last few days before the murder, Mr. Siva Reddy was apprehending some attack and people from Cuddapah district were gathering in.. Hyderabad in batches. They were staying in hotels for several days. What were the intelligence agencies doing in spite of the complaint of the MLA? Why didn't they take a pre-emptive action?

SHRI MENTAY PADMANABHAM (Andhra Pradesh): Madam, this is a blissfully vague statement and this is not even worth the paper on which it is typed. I am really unhappy about it. This is not the statement which I expected from the Minister. Madam, serious allegations are there. Nothing has been

[Sh. Mentay Padmanabham]

replied here. *(Interruptions)* Madam, you allow me to speak.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have allowed you the whole day. You have discussed this issue the whole day.

SHRI MENTAY PADMANABHAM: You have not allowed me the whole day. You have allowed everybody else during the whole day. *(Interruptions)* This is a matter about which we are concerned. Let me have some say. Let me take some information from the hon. Minister.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All right. But you ask him what you want to ask. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI MENTAY PADMANABHAM: Madam, I would like to know from the Minister whether an attack was made on Mr. Siva Reddy on 8-5-93 in Jammalamadugu village—his native place—and then he approached the State Government. The State Government directed him to take the security from the district authorities. Then he approached the District Superintendent of Police. Having come to know the gravity of the situation, the District Superintendent of Police provided him some security. Later on, the State Government intervened, the Home Minister intervened and the additional security provided to him by the district authorities was withdrawn on 13-7-92. Is it true or not?

Another thing is, in December Mr. Siva Reddy approached the High Court. The High Court gave clear-cut directions to the Government to provide him the security needed for protecting his life. Why didn't the State Government follow the directions given by the High Court?

The next point is this. In the Legislative Assembly itself, on 6th of August, one day before he was murdered, the Speaker gave a specific direction. He gave a specific direction to the Government on the floor of the House that Mr. Reddy should be provided with all the security he needed immediately, without delay. Then why didn't the Government

give that security to him? Normally two security persons are provided to all legislators. Even MPs are provided with two security persons whenever they go to their places. These two security persons are not adequate. They are generally given to all the 227 or 337 MLAs. This is a normal practice. *...(Interruptions)...* This is a normal practice. He wanted additional security. Because of the gravity of the situation, because of the enmity he had with the Home Minister, because of his involvement in local politics, he wanted additional security. That additional security which was given to him by the District Superintendent was withdrawn. Again, he was asking for additional security which in spite of the specific directions given by the State Government, in spite of the specific direction given by the Speaker and in spite of the direction given by the High Court, the Government did not give. Why? What are the reasons for this? Did the State Government explain it to him? Is the State Government prepared to institute an inquiry into this failure of the State Government? Is the Central Government going to institute an inquiry into the failure of the State Government in providing security to Mr. Siva Reddy? What are the replies of the hon. Minister?

श्री मोहम्मद खलीलुर रेहमान (आन्ध्र प्रदेश) : मैडम, यह जो स्टेटमेंट दिया गया है यह बहुत सरसरी है, इससे ज्यादा तफसीलात तो अखबारात् में आई है। इसमें पहले पैराग्राफ में कहा गया है कि “उन्हें राज्य पुलिस के दो गार्ड मिले हुए थे।” तो मैं मिनिस्टर साहब से यह जानना चाहूंगा कि यह जो पुलिस गार्ड फराहम किए गए थे, क्या स्पीकर की हिदायत के बाद किए गए थे या पहले जो थे, वही हैं?

सैंकिड पैराग्राफ में कहा गया है कि बम फेंके गए थे। मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि कितने बम फेंके गए थे, उनमें से कितने फटे और कितने नहीं फटे?

फिर सैंकिड पेज में ही कहा गया है “अंडर रेजीडेंट लीगल प्रोवीजन”, इस

بات کی بھی آپ نے جھمٹ نہیں اٹھائی کہ انڈین پنل کی انڈین پنل کوڈ کے کس سیکشن کے تحت ایف۔آئی۔آر کے تھت ایف۔آئی۔آر۔ ایس کیس کیا گیا؟ اس کی بھی تفصیل آپ نے نہیں بتائی ہے۔ ایک بات اور میں آپ سے یہ جاننا چاہوں گا کہ کیا یہ صحیح ہے کہ مسٹر پی شیوارڈی کی بیوی جنہوں نے پولیس میں درخواست دی ہے اس میں انہوں نے وہاں کے ہوم منسٹر، مسٹر میسورا کا نام لیا ہے اور اس شبہ کا اظہار کیا ہے کہ ان کا ہاتھ اس مرڈر کے پیچھے ہے کیا کوئی ایف۔آئی۔آر۔ ایس ہوا ہے اس درخواست کی بنا پر اور اگر ہوا ہے تو ایف۔آئی۔آر کے کنٹیکٹ کیا ہے؟

ایک بات اور میں آپ سے یہ جاننا چاہوں گا کہ کیا یہ صحیح ہے کہ مسٹر پی شیوارڈی کی بیوی جنہوں نے پولیس میں درخواست دی ہے اس میں انہوں نے وہاں کے ہوم منسٹر، مسٹر میسورا کا نام لیا ہے اور اس شبہ کا اظہار کیا ہے کہ ان کا ہاتھ اس مرڈر کے پیچھے ہے کیا کوئی ایف۔آئی۔آر۔ ایس ہوا ہے اس درخواست کی بنا پر اور اگر ہوا ہے تو ایف۔آئی۔آر کے کنٹیکٹ کیا ہے؟

† [شری محمد خلیل الرحمن: اندر پرورش؛ میڈم۔ یہ جو اسٹیٹ منسٹر دیا گیا ہے یہ بہت سہمی ہے اس سے زیادہ تفصیلات تو اخبارات میں آئی ہیں اس میں پہلے پیراگراف میں کہا گیا ہے کہ انہیں راجہ پولیس کے دو گارڈ ملے ہوئے تھے تو میں منسٹر صاحب سے یہ جاننا چاہوں گا کہ یہ جو پولیس گارڈ فراہم کئے گئے تھے کیا اسپیکر کی ہدایت کے بعد کئے گئے تھے یا پہلے جو تھے وہی ہیں۔

سیکنڈ پیراگراف میں کہا گیا ہے کہ ہم پھینکے گئے تھے میں جاننا چاہتا ہوں کہ کتنے ہم پھینکے گئے تھے ان میں سے کتنے پھٹے اور کتنے نہیں پھٹے۔ پھر سیکنڈ پیراگراف میں کہا گیا ہے "اندر ریلیونٹ لیگل پروسیجر" اس بات

کی بھی آپ نے زحمت نہیں اٹھائی کہ انڈین پنل کوڈ کے کس سیکشن کے تحت ایف۔آئی۔آر۔ ایس کیس کیا گیا اس کی بھی تفصیل آپ نے نہیں بتائی ہے۔ ایک بات اور میں آپ سے یہ جاننا چاہوں گا کہ کیا یہ صحیح ہے کہ مسٹر پی شیوارڈی کی بیوی جنہوں نے پولیس میں درخواست دی ہے اس میں انہوں نے وہاں کے ہوم منسٹر، مسٹر میسورا کا نام لیا ہے اور اس شبہ کا اظہار کیا ہے کہ ان کا ہاتھ اس مرڈر کے پیچھے ہے کیا کوئی ایف۔آئی۔آر۔ ایس ہوا ہے اس درخواست کی بنا پر اور اگر ہوا ہے تو ایف۔آئی۔آر کے کنٹیکٹ کیا ہے؟

SHRI JAGMOHAN (Nominated): Madam, the point is, whenever there is a security threat to a particular individual, the Intelligence or the Special Branch of the State Police normally prepares a list of persons from whom the threat is expected. For example, if a particular individual is living in a particular village, they would know the persons who are going to pose a threat to his life. They always engage criminals. So, I would like to know whether the special branch of the State police or the CID, whosoever is concerned with the matter, had prepared any specific list, had drawn any area from which this specific information can be obtained and where a specific watch can be kept on certain individuals and from where these items had been obtained. After all, these are all the instruments through which the threat perception has materialised. I would request the hon. Minister to clarify this. It is an administrative failure of the Director General of Police when a man has been crying for the last six months, "I am under a threat; I am under a threat". So, all these areas should have been explored administratively

† [] Transliteration in Arabic Script.

[Sh. Jagmohan]

and proper actions should have been taken.

The second clarification which I want to seek is that the statement here says that the MLA has told his constables to go to their quarters. What is the varification whether he told them to go or they went on their own, because the MLA is dead.

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY:
It may be a larger conspiracy.

SHRI JAGMOHAN: The MLA is already dead. The constables might say, "We went away." They themselves might have slipped away from duty. You know how these people behave.

My third point is when the threat is so strong you don't leave it to the constables. You have to provide him some intelligent inspector or sub-inspector. It has happened in the heart of Hyderabad. It is not a case of an individual. It is a reflection on the general law and order machinery of the State. These are the three points which I would like to know.

SHRI RAJESH PILOT: Madam, it is a very unfortunate tragedy. I too share the feelings of my colleagues here because their party colleague has died. But they will also appreciate all this detailed information which we have in the Home Ministry and we would like to apprise the House of the information available with the State Government. All these questions have been raised because they are aware of the problem, they are aware of the local problem. I got a statement at 1 o'clock from Manipur. Immediately I rang up the Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh. I said, "It is okay. These are the facts that you are giving to me that he died there and this has happened. But what is the cause, you feel, for this tragedy that has taken place? At least I must tell the House this much that this is the background, this is the cause and this is the reason behind it." He said, "There is a long story to that. There is so much of factional rivalry in that area." Even against the late Siva Reddy there are 23 criminal cases registered, eight murder cases, eight decoity

cases and seven other cases. Such a factional rivalry is there in that area. It is a total rivalry case that these people have there and they have been arrested. (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI MENTAY PADMANABHAM:
He could have told you who the other man is. (*Interruptions*)... The Chief Minister could have told you who the other man is. (*Interruptions*)... Madam, all these things started the day on which Mr. Mysoor Reddy became the Home Minister. Before that there were no criminal cases, there were no decoity cases and there was (*Interruptions*).....

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY:
This is a political vendetta and misuse and abuse of power. (*Interruptions*).....

SHRI MENTAY PADMANABHAM:
Mr. Mysoor Reddy, who is the Home Minister for the last two years, is the man who is instrumental in implicating him in all these cases. He could have told you. (*Interruptions*)..... The Chief Minister could have told you about that. (*Interruptions*)...

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY:
The Union Minister of State for Home doesn't know whether the Home Minister of the State has been accused or not. What is he going to contribute to this Parliament, Madam? They are talking about the criminal cases against the late Siva Reddy. I will tell you how many criminal cases are there against a Member of the Legislative Assembly who is supposed to be an hon. Member of the Assembly. He has absolutely dishonourable intentions in his public life. What are they talking about? Can they deny the charges? One of the Ministers was prosecuted in a cabaret artiste's murder case. One of the Ministers in Andhra Pradesh is a rowdy-sheeter registered with a police station. What are they talking about? (*Interruptions*)... This is an exercise to make defiant answers in the Parliament. How dare he says these things? How can he talk like this? (*Interruptions*)... He has received a statement from Manipur. Let him not make a statement. Let him claim that he is ignorant. But don't fool the House like that. I will not be tolerant of that. (*Interruptions*).....

SHRI RAJESH PILOT: Madam, Members can speak as she did. *(Interruptions)*... I know my role; I know my place; I know my duty. *(Interruptions)*.... I want to know how to convey my apology. *(Interruptions)*.....

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY: You didn't tell the House whether the Home Minister of the State has been accused or not. This is a major accusation and you don't know it. *(Interruptions)*...

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA (West Bengal): Madam, I have just one question to ask him. *(Interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Renukaji, I can understand your sentiments. *(Interruptions)*...I can understand your sentiments. *(Interruptions)*. Please. I can understand your sentiments about the deceased. I can understand how sensitive you are about it. I can understand how grieved you are. But raising your voice and getting so agitated is not going to solve the problem. You ask the Minister what you want to ask. He has not completed his reply. If you interrupt him every two minutes, he is never going to satisfy you. First, let him finish his reply. If you still want to ask something, you can ask.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS DUPTA: Madam, I want to ask only one thing.

SHRI RAJESH PILOT: I wanted to know the reasons behind it. He was an MLA who had won from a constituency. He was a people representative. That is why I asked the Chief Minister, "At least, give me some cause. What could be the caste of it?"

So, I have got to share the information. It depends, whether Renukaji likes it or does not like it.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN. He has to ask the Chief Minister. Then he will make his inquiry.

SHRI RAJESH PILOT: I really cannot speak the language which my colleague Renukaji, appreciates or likes. I have got to speak the facts which I have got from the State Government. If I don't

share it with this House, then I will be failing in my duty. I personally feel that doing duty is more important to me than pleasing Renukaji or somebody else. *(Interruptions)*.

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY: He won't be able to ...*(Interruptions)*. The Minister should stick to the facts, not to fiction; please. *(Interruptions)*.

SHRI RAJESH PILOT: Well, I have got to tell the facts which the State Government has given to me. If you want more details, I can certainly get more details from the State Government. But they have told me today that security was asked for earlier. As a Minister of State for Home Affairs, I can ask whether security was provided or not. I really cannot ask from him the details whether the Speaker had asked for the security for that man or not.

I cannot really ask those detailed questions which my colleagues can ask. They will be more aware of it. *(Interruptions)*.

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY: This is amazing. Three days after this man has been.. *(Interruptions)*.

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माधुर (उत्तर प्रदेश) : यह बहुत जिम्मेदारी के सवाल उठाए गए हैं। आप यह कहकर बच नहीं सकते कि मैं उनसे पूछ नहीं सका। अखबारों में छपा है, सदन में कहा गया है, होम मिनिस्टर का नाम लिया गया है, सदन के अंदर की कार्यवाही है। आप कहते हैं कि मैं मुख्यमंत्री से कैसे पूछूँ कि सदन में आश्वासन दिया गया था या नहीं, यह तो बड़ा गलत सवाल है। आप जान-बूझकर छिपा रहे हैं... (व्यवधान) आपको बताना चाहिए कि वास्तविकता क्या है?

SHRI RAJESH PILOT: I think I have not been able to communicate properly. In reply to the details which have been asked today, the details which are being asked and what the hon. Members of the

[Sh. Rajesh Pilot]

Telugu Desam have asked, I have said that as the Assembly is in Session in Andhra Pradesh these questions could be further asked in the Assembly. I have said that I am here to share the information that I have received from the State Government on this question. When the State Assembly is on, when you have got a party there, when you have got an Opposition Leader there, these questions can be further asked at the State level. The State Assembly will be in a much better position than me in getting information and passing it on to you. Otherwise, again there will be lacunae. You might say. "Get that question cleared". It is my suggestion. I am open to the House.

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर : असेंबली में आश्वासन दिया गया था, स्पीकर की ओर से कहा गया था, क्या आप इस फैंक्ट को ऐसरेटन करके हमको बताएंगे... (व्यवधान) यह बहुत मेजर सवाल है कि असेंबली के अंदर स्पीकर ने आदेश दिया कि इनको सिवयोरिटी दी जाए। होम मिनिस्टर ने मना किया कि नहीं दूंगा। यह फैंक्ट इतना बड़ा है, जो कि सारी कहानी के पीछे है। अगर इस समय आप बताने की स्थिति में नहीं हैं तो क्या आप कल या परसों हमको बताएंगे इस बारे में... (व्यवधान) हमें आपका कमिटमेंट चाहिए... (व्यवधान)

SHRI RAJESH PILOT: I leave it to the Chair.

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर : आज नहीं बता सकते तो परसों बताएं।

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: The most important point that cropped up in the course of the discussion is that the charge is not against the murderers because the murderers have murdered the man. The most important point sought to have been levelled by the hon. Members including me is that there is a complaint

that that man anticipated that some people are after him. He wanted protection. Therefore, the point is, the Government did not give him adequate protection please underline the word 'adequate'. The Government did not give him adequate protection anticipating what can take place and considering the serious nature of the complaints that he had been making from place to place. This man had been knocking at every door. He had gone to the Speaker. He had gone to the High Court. He had gone to the Superintendent of Police. Therefore, the Government is in the dock. Particularly, the Home Minister is in the dock. I would like to know this from you because it involves the right of the Members of Parliament and of Legislatures to get adequate protection because we are discharging certain responsibilities. I would like to know whether, the Central Government will seriously inquire into the complaint that there had been serious dereliction, if not more, on the part of the Home Minister in providing adequate security to this gentleman who happens to be a Member of the Legislature in the background of his making persistent complaints that some people are after his life. Please answer whether you take this point and whether you will initiate an inquiry on your behalf and not depend on the report or any agency of the Government to which this Minister of Home Affairs belongs.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: One minute... (Interruptions)... Let me explain (Interruptions)... The thing is, Mr. Minister, since 12 O'clock discussions have, taken place on these two matters; one is the bomb blast in Tamil Nadu, Madras and the other one is the killing of this legislator. I believe somebody was taking notes of it. Because you have come with a statement, you do not know what happened during the day. Perhaps, that is why you are not in a position to answer the questions which were raised in this House during the day. So someone, if he had made points of it, could have passed on the message that these are the queries made. Apart from the statement which you have got, the information that you are giving, what you got from the Chief Minister, I can understand it. But what queries were raised during the course of deliberations by various Members, I sup-

pose, you should have had the information about them. Then I think you would have been able to explain it much better *(Interruptions)*...

SHRI RAJESH PILOT: Madam, let me respond.. *(Interruptions)*...

PROF. SAURIN BHATTACHARYA (West Bengal): I think after hearing us you would say perhaps, that would be better.. *(Interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He is replying. Everyone of you have already spoken on this subject... *(Interruptions)*...

PROF. SAURIN BHATTACHARYA: No, no... *(Interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have not spoken. Those queries which Mrs. Renuka Chowdhury and others have raised, let him reply to that first... *(Interruptions)*...

PROF. SAURIN BHATTACHARYA: He is a very enthusiastic and efficient Minister. What does this first para mean? Will he in any way explain the serious thing that happened? I mean, he came to the Assembly to attend the Monsoon session. He was given two gunmen and that is all. Is it any background? I mean a better *thing* was expected *of him* even without the coordination between the earlier question and his own statement. Within the short time available it may not have been possible. But over a serious ghastly incident, does this para convey anything? Please tell me. I ask the Minister whether he should not have been a bit more objective and a bit more forthcoming.

SHRI RAJESH PILOT: I have said it earlier. My colleague has pointed out that there was no adequate security available to him. Now he is no more and we all share the sorrow. But he has not carried the security which was provided to him. If there was a gunman and this incident had taken place, I would have put all the blame on the State Government that there was no adequate security... *(Interruptions)*...

SHRI MENTAY PADMANABHAM: He would have got killed. He is a great

man. He has saved the life of a young man.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Mr. Pilot, the point is, the Government did act but whether the State Government acted with seriousness. Please answer the question .. *(Interruptions)*...

PROF. SAURIN BHATTACHARYA: Why did the question of security come? .. *(Interruptions)*.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Madam.. *(Interruptions)*.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gurudas Das Gupta, you have made your point very clear. *Let the Minister answer.* Give him some time to answer... *(Interruptions)*. ..

SHRI RAJESH PILOT: I fully share, as per the circumstances which I have heard from them, that security was not adequate. But what I feel as an individual, as a human being, is when he has not carried the security which was already provided to him the question of adequate security does not come. Now thinking that he also would have been killed... *(Interruptions)*...

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY: Now how did he establish that he did not carry the security guards with him? Who gave the statement?

SHRI RAJESH PILOT. The State Government.

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY: Who is the State Government in this case? The accused. They are the primary accused, Mr. Minister. That is exactly what I am trying to tell you... *(Interruptions)*...

SHRI RAJESH PILOT: You cannot accuse the State Government... *(Interruptions)*...

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY: The Home Minister is accused in this case. And he is making the accused to make a note and wasting the time of this House... *(Interruptions)* Madam, our Home Minister cannot understand security sitting in a helicopter and having an air-to-ground missile. We are talking about human lives.

[Smt. Renuka Chowdhury]

We are talking about elected representatives. We are talking about the facts of the case where the wife of the deceased has accused the Home Minister. And he is coming and telling us in language, obviously by his levels of intelligence, which I cannot comprehend, that this note has to be accepted by us. He has got the note at 1 O'clock in the afternoon. The Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh has misled him. This is what it is amounting to. We want to know as to what action the Minister will take, in his capacity, against the Chief Minister if he has not been informed about the fundamental facts of the case.

SHRI RASESH PILOT: Madam, we cannot take the whole House like this... *(Interruptions)* ..

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY: I can. You want to bet... *(Interruptions)* You cannot take the House for a ride... *(Interruptions)*....

SHRI RAJESH PILOT: She cannot rule out all the information of the Government as wrong... *(Interruptions)* It is a responsible State Government... *(Interruptions)*.

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY: I am asking him to substantiate his statement that he did not have the security. Who told him that ? The Government told him. Who has prepared the note for the Government? The Home Minister ... *(Interruptions)*.

THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION (SHRI SIKANDER BAKHT): Madam. I am sorry; what sort of remark comes from the Home Minister? I cannot accept it.. *(Interruptions)*

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY: And the accused has prepared a note... *(Interruptions)*.

SHRI SIKANDER BAKHT: Mr. Home Minister, of course, here is a very agitated Member.. *(Interruptions)*.

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY: Because I am next on the line and I know what is going to happen... *(Interruptions)*

SHRI SIKANDER BAKHT: And the Presiding Officer has already requested her to calm down. But you cannot take the House for granted... *(Interruptions)* That is not the sort of remark that we expect from the Home Minister.

SHRI RAJESH PILOT: The State Government is responsible... *(Interruptions)*

SHRI SIKANDER BAKHT: That was uncalled for... *(Interruptions)*,

SHRI RAJESH PILOT: You cannot reject the statement of the State Government ... *(Interruptions)*

SHRI SIKANDER BAKHT: You cannot make that remark... *(Interruptions)*

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Mr. Pilot, will you enquire into the complaint that the Government had failed to give him adequate protection?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gurudas Das Gupta, will you please sit down? *(Interruptions)*

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: At least concede this point.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister, there are two points which have come out of the whole discussion. One question is, did the deceased tell the Home Minister, the Speaker and the High Court that his life was in danger and that he needed protection and whether the Speaker did give any instruction? *(Interruptions)* Let me tell him what you are asking so that he can understand. Did the Speaker give an instruction that adequate security should be provided for this person? This is one question which is a major question that is being asked. And was the security adequate? What the Mantri said was that two guards are provided even to the persons who go from here as Members of Parliament or Members of Legislatures. But this particular person was in danger .. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI MENTAY PADMANABHAM: Sometimes there are Home Guards.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Was that enough for a person whose life was in dan-

ger, who was asking various people for protection, whatever the reason was? These are the two questions...(Interruptions)

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY: Who established that these men were sent back voluntarily? Who established that the deceased asked his security men to go? The Minister said, 'the Government'. Who prepares the note for the Government? It is the Home Minister. How do you take the word of the Home Minister? He is the accused. Now we cannot fool ourselves. I am not fighting Mr. Rajesh Pilot on an individual basis. I will fight someone else of my own size. I won't fight with him. But he must come out with facts. He cannot give the details at 5 O'clock saying that this is what the Chief Minister told him. I am asking you. How do we accept the Chief Minister's statement? The Chief Minister told him that Mr. Siva Reddy had so many criminal cases against him. What homework has he done? Why didn't the Chief Minister tell him that the wife of Mr. Siva Reddy had accused him? Why hasn't he told him that? What action has the Central Government taken against the Chief Minister now?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Okay. Now for a VIP who is under danger and for whom the Speaker has given direction and the High Court has given direction, do you think the security people should take the advice from the MP or from whom?

SHRI RAJESH PILOT: Madam, I feel there is an apprehension in the mind of the people...(Interruptions)...

SHRI MOHAMMED AFZAL alias MEEM AFZAL (Uttar Pradesh): Madam. I have a point of order. Please allow me.

उपसभापति : आप अपनी जगह पर जा कर प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर बोलिए। कहीं से भी खड़े होने की आदत शुरू मत कीजिए।

Suddenly, you got a brain-wave for a point of order.

श्री मोहम्मद अफजल उर्फ मीम अफजल : मैडम, इसके अन्दर जो रेणुका जी ने बात कही है, हम देखते हैं इस हाउस के अन्दर जब भी ला एंड आर्डर का किसी स्टेट का मसला होता है तो यहां पर होम मिनिस्टर का बयान होता है। आम तौर पर हमने देखा कि यह बयान इस तरह का दिया जाता है कि यह होम मिनिस्टर नहीं है, पोस्टमैन है, वहां से ले कर आए और यहां पर बयान दे दिया। लेकिन मैं आपको याद दिला दूं, इसी पर एजीटेशन भी हुआ है (ध्वनधान)

† [شری محمد افضل عرف مہم افضل : میڈم۔ اس کے اندر سب رینوکا جی نے بات کہی ہے۔ ہم دیکھتے ہیں اس ہاؤس کے اندر جب بھی لار اینڈ آرڈر کا کسی اسٹیٹ کا مسئلہ ہوتا ہے تو یہاں پر ہوم منسٹر کا بیان ہوتا ہے عام طور پر ہم نے دیکھا کہ یہ بیان اس طرح کا دیا جاتا ہے کہ یہ ہوم منسٹر نہیں ہیں پورٹ مین ہیں۔ وہاں سے لے کر آتے اور یہاں آکر بول دیا لیکن میں آپ کو یاد دلا دوں اس پر ایجنٹیشن بھی ہوا ہے۔ مدخلت۔]

उपसभापति : जल्दी बोल दीजिए।

श्री मोहम्मद अफजल उर्फ मीम अफजल : अगर नहीं बोलना है तो मैं बैठ जाता हूँ।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Point of order should be pointed also.

श्री मोहम्मद अफजल उर्फ मीम अफजल : अगर वह छोटा नहीं हो सकता तो मैं

† [] Transliteration in Arabic Script.

[श्री मोहम्मद अफजल उर्फ सीम अफजल]

क्या कर सकता हूँ। अगर आप चाहती है कि मैं न बोलू तो मैं बैठ जाता हूँ।

[† श्री محمد افضل عرف ميم افضل : اگر وہ بیٹھتا نہیں ہو سکتا ہے تو میں کیا کر سکتا ہوں اگر آپ چاہتی ہیں کہ میں نہ بولوں تو میں بیٹھ جاتا ہوں۔]

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Point of order should be very pointed....(Interruptions)...

SHRI MOHAMMED AFZAL alias MEEM AFZAL: When a junior Member speaks, I think the Chair is not taking it very seriously...(Interruptions)...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Just a minute. A point of order should be very pointed and it cannot be debated.

SHRI MOHAMMED AFZAL alias MEEM AFZAL: Madam, I am making a point of order. There are two kinds of statements given in this House. When there was a firing in Calcutta, the Home Minister gave his own opinion. He also gave the opinion of the Opposition leaders there. Here, he has not given the opinion of Shri Rama Rao. Is the Home Minister a postman or giving a right judgement in the case? What is the CBI doing? What are their own enquiries?

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY (Tamil Nadu): It is a valid point, Madam.

श्री मोहम्मद अफजल उर्फ सीम अफजल :
जहाँ कांग्रेस की सरकार होगी वहाँ तो पोस्टमैन बन जाएंगे। जहाँ कांग्रेस की सरकार नहीं होगी वहाँ दुनियाँ भर के प्वाइंट्स ले कर आएंगे उसके अन्दर। उस में लीडर आफ अपोजीशन की राय

† I 1 Transliteration in Arabic Script.

भी थी। हमने उस स्टेटमेंट को फाड़ कर फेंक दिया था। (व्यवधान)

उपसभापति : यह जो आपने बोला, यह प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर का सब्जेक्ट नहीं है। यह मंत्री जी से क्लेरिफिकेशन है।

I have not made the statement.

SHRI MOHAMMED AFZAL alias MEEM AFZAL: You can give a ruling, if I am irrelevant.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: See the question. The point which I want to bring to you is that if you want to ask a clarification, you ask the Minister. Don't raise it as a point of order because I cannot give any ruling on that. It is the Minister who should reply.

SHRI RAJESH PILOT: Madam, I see the feeling of the whole House...(Interruptions) ..

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

SHRI RAJESH PILOT: Madam, there is a feeling in the whole House. There are some apprehensions as to whether adequate security was given to him or not. That is one question. When I say "adequate security". I have really to tell the House what the assessment of the intelligence agencies was, how much protection the State Government gave, who was wrong, etc. They are not sure whether adequate security was given to him or not. That is one apprehension. The second apprehension that some Members have got was that the Home Minister of that State was directly involved in some factional rivalry or political rivalry and they feel that when the Home Minister himself was involved, it is very difficult to rely upon the statement of the Government which I have objected to. As an elected State Government and we being the Centre, we have to depend on the information given by the State Government as per the rules and regulations. I really cannot give my opinion. I cannot project my opinion. I have got to have the information, especially in such cases, being given by the State Governments. If the

hon. Members feel, if the House feels, that this statement does not reflect the question which you feel like knowing, I can assure you that by the day after tomorrow I will get further information from the State Government and come before the House. I don't have any objection...*(Interruption)*...

SHRI MENTAY PADMANABHAM: Madam, only one point.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him finish. Have some patience.

SHRI MENTAY PADMANABHAM: He has already finished.

SHRI RAJESH PILOT: The information being given by the State Government has to be equally respected and relied upon. I cannot really say that whatever information that is given by the State Government cannot be relied upon. We have to rely on it and then only the infrastructure in the country can function. I cannot also say that my opinion and the State Government's opinion should be different. I might differ from them. But as per rules, we have got to depend upon the information supplied to us by the State Government. I will again review all these questions raised by various Members. I will especially review the question which my young lady has raised. She is very right that she cannot take on me.. *(Interruptions)*...

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY: I cannot stop to such level.

SHRI RAJESH PILOT: I am very highly obliged that she can only take on a person of her size. She is not of my size and I totally agree with her. I am really a weak individual. And now, Madam, with your permission, I change over to the incident in Madras...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI MENTAY PADMANABHAM: Madam, only one point...*(Interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Afzal has raised a piont.. *(Interruptions)*...

SHRI MENTAY PADMANABHAM: Madam, only one point he is trying to avoid.. *(Interruptions)*...

SHRI VITHALRAO MADHAVRAO JADHAV (Maharashtra): Madam, he has already said that he would come out with more information, that he would come out with more information the day after tomorrow. What more do they want?.. *(Interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He has said that he would make an inquiry... *(Interruptions)*...

संक्षेप में बोल दीजिए।

SHRI MENTAY PADMANABHAM: Madam, I am always brief. The main accusation is that because of the factional fight with the Home Minister, the Home Minister has all along been acting in this matter with a mala fide intention. That is the main accusation. Now, I would like to know from the honourable Minister from the Centre whether he would investigate into the lapses on the part of the Home Minister there. He has got his own agencies. The matter can be entrusted to the CBI or to the other agencies which are under the control of the Central Government. Because he happens to be the Home Minister there, we have no belief in the State Government. So, can he assure this House that he would entrust this matter, the culpability of the Home Minister, the mala fide intentions of the Home Minister, to an independent agency which is under the Central control? This is the point which I would like to know from the Minister.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr. Jethmalani.

SHRI VITHALRAO MADHAVRAO JADHAV: How can he say?...*(Interruptions)*... He has already said that he would get more information the day after tomorrow.. *(Interruptions)*...

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY: Because he is the accused...*(Interruptions)*..

SHRI MENTAY PADMANABHAM: He is the accused *here*...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY: There is no diplomatic immunity for him ... *(Interruptions)*...

SHRI P. UPENDRA: Madam, J have something to say on this...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI (Karnataka): Madam, the honourable Minister has now promised that he would go back and seek further information and share it with the House. May I suggest that he must inquire at this stage into only one point? In para 2 of his statement, he has already said that the police have registered a case. Now, it has been said by more than one responsible Member of this House that the First Information Report has been lodged by the widow of the unfortunate deceased and in the FIR it is expressly stated that the Home Minister has something to do with the murder of her husband. If this thing was given to you when you went there to make inquiries from the Home Minister or the Chief Minister, surely it was your duty then to have inquired whether the Home Minister was directly involved. Under these circumstances, did you take some steps to ensure that an honest investigation was carried out? And, will you come back to us and tell us that if the Home Minister is directly involved as mentioned in the FIR, what steps you are going to take to ensure that the investigation is going to be fair and honest.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes Mr. Mody.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRASAD MODY (Rajasthan): Madam, I have a different point.

Madam, the honourable Minister is aware that in our country now we have had bomb blasts city-wise, in Bombay, Calcutta and Madras, and we are having assassinations • and kidnappings. We had assassinations even in Bombay of a number of MLAs and we have had assassinations of our Prime Ministers, and these are going on in the country. How would the honourable Minister react to the present law and order situation? Ordering an inquiry has become an exercise so much so that when an incident has occurred, it is a simple affair of saying that an inquiry would be instituted and then the subject matter becomes whether a C.B.I. in-

quiry will be instituted. The question is whether the Home Minister is at all convinced that it is able to see and judge for itself in advance. Normally, in countries abroad, more particularly in circumstances where people are threatened with death, there is adequate security to pre-empt a situation being created like that. The honourable Minister has just now said that this man was involved in a number of murders and other incidents and in a large number of cases. It is all the more reason why the Home Ministry should have given him protection to see that his life might not be in danger. I would rather ask: Is the Home Minister aware of it? I think he should be. If there are a number of cases of murders and other incidents in which the MLA was involved, it is all the more reason why the Intelligence should have taken adequate precautions. I do not understand how the victim can tell his own security man that he does not need any security. What security is it when he says that he does not need it and that is accepted? Is that all to it? And, after the man is dead, can you just make a statement saying that the dead man is not alive because he did not want any security? Is this the value that we attach to human life?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now the second statement.

SHRI MENTAY PADMANABHAM: Madam, let the Minister react. Jethmalaniji suggested something. I suggested something. Let the Minister react on that.

AN HON. MEMBER: The Minister is coming back.

SHRI MENTAY PADMANABHAM: That is all what we wanted from the Central Government. (*Interruptions*) I know very well that this is a State subject. The State Assembly is on. It will take care of it. But this is all what we wanted from the Central Government.

SHRI RAJESH PILOT: I will bear in mind the facts which the hon. Member has mentioned when I do further enquiries from the State Government.