

asked about two dozen entrepreneurs working in the DSIDC sheds at Okhla to make out fresh applications for allotment of sheds where they have been working for the last three years;

(b) if so, what are the particulars including the names of the affected persons; and

(c) what are the reasons for asking for fresh applications?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY (SHRI CHARANJIT CHANANA):

(a) No, Sir.

(b) Does not arise.

(c) As a result of a few sheds having fallen vacant, applications were invited from educated un-employed persons for allotment of sheds. The candidates who were earlier selected by the DSIDC under the Entrepreneurial Development Programme in 1976 were also eligible to apply. The reason for inviting fresh applications from them was to eliminate such persons as might have joined service or engaged themselves in other profession and were therefore, no longer un-employed, it may be relevant to add that un-employment is one of the requisite conditions of eligibility for allotment of sheds.

Manufacture of HMT watches

2011. SHRIMATI HAMIDA HABIB-ULLAH: Will the Minister of INDUSTRY be pleased to state:

(a) what is the number of HMT watches manufactured during 1980-81;

(b) what is the number of watches sold so far this year; and

(c) what is the number of watches lying in stocks?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY (SHRI CHARANJIT CHANANA): (a) to (c) The required information for the period April, 1980 to February, 1981 is given as under:

(i) Number of watches manufactured	31.50 lakhs
(ii) Number of watches sold	28.20 lakhs
(iii) Stock as on 1-3-1981	6.70 lakhs

Setting up of sensitive optical instrument factory

2012. SHRI SADASHIV BAGAITKAR: Will the Minister of DEFENCE be pleased to state:

(a) whether there is any proposal under Government's consideration for setting up a new factory for the production of sensitive optical instruments;

(b) if so, what are the details thereof; and

(c) whether any location for the purpose has been decided upon and the reasons for selecting the site?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF DEFENCE (SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL): (a) to (c) There is a proposal under Government's consideration for setting up a new factory for the production of opticals and instruments. It would not be in public interest to give details of the same. Government have not taken a final view on the location of this factory.

Cases under Summary Court-Martial

2013. SHRI SUSHIL CHAND MOHANTA: Will the Minister of DEFENCE be pleased to state:

(a) what is the number of cases in which Summary Court-Martial was held in the Army during the years 1976-80; and

(b) what is the number of such cases which resulted in conviction?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF DEFENCE (SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL): (a) and (b) The number of cases in which Summary Court-Martial was held and the number of cases which resulted

in conviction during the years 1976—80 is given below, year-wise:—

Year	No. of cases in which SCM was held	No. of cases which resulted in conviction
1976 . . .	1794	1691
1977 . . .	1332	1316
1978 . . .	1417	1381
1979 . . .	1448	1415
1980 . . .	1464	1427

Summary Court Martial

2014. SHRI SUSHIL CHAND MOHANTA: Will the Minister of DEFENCE be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that in a Summary Court Martial, the Prosecutor himself is the Judge as also the Executor of the punishment awarded;

(b) whether the accused in a Summary Court Martial has no right to be represented by a Counsel and that the friend of the accused who is detailed is normally a junior officer or JCO having no right to address the court;

(c) whether there is no appeal against the sentence/punishment awarded by the Summary Court Martial;

(d) whether no other Democratic country has such an institution as 'Summary Court Martial' not even the Indian Air Force and the Indian Navy;

(e) if so, whether Government propose to review the scope and powers of the Summary Court Martial in the Army Act, 1950; and

(f) if so, by when a decision is likely to be taken by Government in this regard?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF DEFENCE (SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL): (a) No, Sir.

(b) An accused person in a Summary Court Martial is not represented by a counsel but he has a right to be assisted by a person of his choice including a practising lawyer, who is known as the friend of the accused. The friend of the accused has no right to address the court but can suggest questions and advise the accused on all points.

(c) The aggrieved person can appeal either to the Central Government or the Chief of Army Staff or any prescribed authority against the findings and sentence passed by the S.C.M.

(d) There is no Summary Court Martial in the Indian Air Force or the Indian Navy but an Officer Commanding in those Services, has been given the power of awarding summary punishments to prescribed extent. Under the Naval Act, a Commanding Officer has been given enhanced powers of summary punishments. Under the US system of the military administration of justice, there does exist an institution called 'Summary Court Martial'. Such court-martial has jurisdiction to try persons subject to the US Code except commissioned officer, warrant officer, cadets and midshipmen etc. and award confinement upto 30 days.

(e) No, Sir. The institution of Summary Court-Martial has been found to be effective in speedy administration of justice which is a typical requirement of Army discipline and functioning.

(f) Does not arise.

Amendment of De'hi Gurdwaras Act

2015. SHRI DHARAMCHAND JAIN: Will the Minister of HOME AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) whether there is any proposal under Government's consideration to amend the Delhi Gurdwaras Act; and