

which had cropped up during the examination of some other witnesses.

The content of the fresh complaint of Shri Ram Chander dated 27-1-1980 were read over and explained to Shri Singh and he was also advised that he could get the copies of all relevant documents of the case from the Court if the challan is put up in the Court. It is incorrect to say that Shri Singh was told by the SHO that he was not the accused and question of showing him a copy of the complaint did not arise.

The DSP Gurgaon and the SHO, who was HI both reached the Police Station immediately after, knowing the arrival of Shri Singh, who, according to his own report dated 17-2-1980 on the notice issued to him was not expected to come on 14-2-1980 as he required Government vehicle for journey, new from Delhi to Gurgaon and back.

Prior to 29-1-1980, Shri N. K. Singh had joined the investigation earlier only on 4-6-1977 (and not on 26-5-1977 as stated by him) in his office at Delhi whereafter this case was closed.

The SHO did not make any statement whether or not Shri N.K. Singh would be summoned again for interrogation.

Appeal in "Kissa Kursi Ka" case for the Supreme Court

611. SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: Will the Minister of HOME AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the advocate appearing for the State in the appeal before the Supreme Court on the "Kissa Kursi Ka" case had not argued to support the conviction by the trial court; and

(b) whether Government had issued any instructions to their counsel in this regard?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH): (a) and (b) No, Sir.

8 RS—3.

Appointment of Counsel in "Kissa Kursi Ka" case

612. SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: Will the Minister of HOME AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Government have appointed a new counsel to conduct the appeal before the Supreme Court in the "Kissa Kursi Ka" case;

(b) if so, what are the reasons for the change;

(c) whether the CBI had recommended to retain the previous counsel in the case;

(d) whether Government had also transferred the CBI official in charge of the case; and

(e) Whether these changes had not affected the effective prosecution of the case?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) It was brought to the notice of the Government that the previous counsel mentioned in the court on 8-1-80 that the hearing of the appeal may be adjourned to enable the Government to decide whether in view of the change of the Government, they would like to continue with the same counsel or would like to have some other counsel. On the next day, the previous counsel was reported to have informed the court that he was willing to continue as counsel. Taking account of all the circumstances, Government decided to have a new counsel.

(c) No such recommendation was made by C.B.I.

(d) The DIG in charge of the case has not been associated with the case since 29-1-80 consequent on his proceeding on leave and subsequent repatriation to his parent cadre. However other officers associated with the case have not been transferred.

(e) No, Sir.