1	2	3	4	5
	h. which is yet to be handed over to CPWD by the Custodian of Evacuee Properties, Bombay. There is some encroachment but its extent is not known.			
2. Bombay Port Trust.	72840— This includes lands let out, leased & land used for BPT's own purpose for Qrs., Rlys. & infrastructures. There . is no vacant land but areas where vacant pos session has been obtain-ned is reserved for BPT's own use.	As per Col 2	Following areas on the Port Trust land have beon identified Location Area Remarks Jamsbed- Ng. 0 1663— (H) Jamsbed— Ji Ng. — Coloba Land given on 15 mon-thly laese. Chatai Chawl cotton Green Sewri 0- 6940 (h) The lesse has unauth-orisedly sublet the premises People Welfare(h) Assoe. Roali. Jn. Wadala. 0 8840 Janta Colony Worli, Bunder. 0. 3834 (h)	
3. Deptt. of Railways.	1007-35	810750	180-654	15. 946..
4. Deptt. of Civil Avn.	932-19	68469	17200	7550..
5. Min. of Defence	. Out of the Defence owned lands 29-782 hsctares and out of the requisitioned/hired land 8-484 beet, are encroached. An area of 62 07 acras is lying vacant and rest of the Defence lands are constructed or utilised as per approved plans.			

Amenities to slum dwellers

2406. DR. BAPU KALDATE: Will the Minister *of* URBAN DEVELOPMENT be pleasedtostate:

(a) whether it is a fact that providing amenities to the slum-dwellers is the responsibility of the State Governments;

(b) whether several State Governments have represented for providing amenities to the slum-dwellers settled on the Central Government land;

(c) whether such a request has been received recently from the Government of Maharashtra; and

(d) if so, whether the Central Government have done the needful?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT (SHRI DALBIR SINGH): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) to (d) Each Central Government Ministry/Department controls its own land. However, on a suggestion from the Government of Maharashtra in mid-70s for provision of basic amenities in slums on Central Government lands in Bombay, by the State Government, it was *inter alia* decided that in lands not required for

immediate use the State Government may provide basic amenities after containing 'no objection' from concerned Central Government Departments, but the land owning Departments would retain their rights to ask for clearance of the lands in future. The land required for immediate use were to be got vacated against payment of certain charges for resettlement. Within these broad guidelines, each individual case is to be decided by the land-owning Department after necessary consultation with the State Government.

Rollini Scheme

2407. DR. H. P. SHARMA: Will the Minister of URBAN DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

(a) the number of persons who got themselves registered with DDA for the allotment of land under Low, Middle and Higher Income Groups in Rohini Scheme in Delhi;

(b) the number of persons out of them who have since been allotted the plots in each category;

(c) the number of persons who are yet to be allotted the plots in each category;

(d) what are the reasons for delay in allotments; and

(e) by when the plots arc proposed to be allotted to all the applicants registered under the scheme, catgory-wise?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT (SHRI DALBIR SINGH): (a) to (c)

Category	No. of Registered Persons	Plots allotted	Plot to be allotted
EWS	18390	10522	7868
LIG	38105	10157	27948
MIG	25889	4766	21123

No Registration was made for Higher Income Group.

(d) (i) The allotment of land to the Co-opeTative Societies and construction of mass housing was given more emphasis and substantial share of the land was used for this purpose.

(ii) Non-availability of services.

(e) All efforts are being made to clear the backlog of registered applicants.

Grant-in-aid *to* Maharashtra State

2408. SHRI JAGESH DESAL Will the Minister of WELFARE be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that a sum of Rupees 202. 97 lakhs was sanctioned to State Government of Maharashtra as grant-in-aid under the first proviso of Article 275(i) of the Constitution during the year 1985-86 in the month of March, 1986;

(b) if so, what are the reasons for sanc tioning this amount at the fag end of tho financial year;

(c) whether it is also a fact that the State Government could not utilize the full amount and requested the Central Government to give permission to utilise the balance unspent amount in the current year; and

(d) if so, whether the permission has been given; if not, what are the reasons therefor?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF WELFARE (SHRl GIRIDHAR GOMANGO): (a) and (b) No, Sir. Government of Maharashtra was first sanctioned Rs. 65. 24 lakhs in November, 1985 for three specific schemes submitted by them. Actual releases were made by the Ministry of Finance in two instalments on 18-12-1985 and 10-3-1986. Specific schemes from all the States did not exhaust