

**GOVERNMENT BILL****The Motor Vehicles (Amendment) Bill, 2014**

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF ROAD TRANSPORT AND HIGHWAYS; AND THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF SHIPPING (SHRI RADHAKRISHNAN P.): Sir, I move:

"That this House recommends to the Lok Sabha that the Lok Sabha do agree to leave being granted by the Rajya Sabha to withdraw the Bill further to amend the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 which was passed by the Lok Sabha on the 18th December, 2014 and laid on the Table of the Rajya Sabha on the 19th December, 2014."

*The question was put and the motion was adopted.*

SHRI P. RADHAKRISHNAN: Sir, I withdraw the Bill.

---

**DISCUSSION ON THE WORKING OF MINISTRY  
OF LAW AND JUSTICE — Contd\*...**

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Hon. Members, now, we will take up Reply to the Discussion on the working of the Ministry of Law and Justice, which was raised yesterday by Dr. E.M. Sudarsana Natchiappan. It was agreed to by the Leaders of the political parties that the reply would be taken immediately after the Calling Attention. Accordingly, I am taking it up. Hon. Minister, please.

THE MINISTER OF LAW AND JUSTICE (SHRI D. V. SADANANDA GOWDA): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, issues raised during the discussion on the working of Ministry of Law and Justice have given me some good feedback, and, certainly, I hope that it will strengthen me in carrying out the functions of my ministerial works. As many as 19 Members have participated in the discussion initiated by Dr. Natchaippa. The issues were discussed at length. I thank all the Members for their valuable suggestions, and, certainly, I would like to assure the Members, who participated in the discussions, that their views would be taken into consideration. Whenever a situation comes up in that direction, certainly, we will take up the issue while considering the suggestions given by the Members who participated in the deliberations.

Before I go into the details for replying to the queries and suggestions given by the hon. Members, I would like to place on record the working of the Ministry of Law and Justice after this new Government has taken over charge.

---

\*Further discussion continued from 29th April.

[Shri D.V. Sadananda Gowda]

Sir, the Ministry of Law and Justice has three departments, namely, Department of Legal Affairs, the Legislative Department and the Department of Justice. The Department of Legal Affairs mainly handles the work of providing legal opinion and legal advice to various departments, appointing Law officers, conducting Government litigation and matters related to the Law Commission of India. The Legislative Department deals with the drafting and vetting of various laws, enactments and rules being framed by various departments, apart from looking into the election-related matters. The Department of Justice looks after the matters relating to judiciary, ranging from appointment and service conditions of judges, infrastructure for the Supreme Court and High Courts to judicial reforms and legal aid to the poor.

However, I would like to inform this august House that the issues relating to investigation and prosecution of cases, issues relating to under-trials and issues relating to jail management are often linked with the Law Department, but this Department has no role to play as far as those issues are concerned, except whenever the bail matters come before the court, only the Department of Law and Justice will look into the matter. Rest of the matters are concerned with various departments because Home Department is the main Department which looks after all other things.

Department of Legal Affairs — a National Litigation Policy has been already formulated. Mr. Natchiappan knows very well that the Law Commission of India has given a Report, the 251st Report, wherein it has stated that a National Litigation Policy is very important because there are so many previous litigations. To reduce the pendency of cases in various courts, a National Litigation Policy is required. Already, various States have come out with State Litigation Policies. So, the Government is already working on a National Litigation Policy. We have drafted it. We are bringing it before the Cabinet and we are getting an approval so that it may reduce the considerable litigations which are pending before the courts.

The Law Commission of India was specially requested to give reports on various reforms of the Government keeping in view the ease of doing business and good governance. It has submitted seven Reports on some important issues. Report on the amendments to the Arbitration Act — yesterday, so many of our friends raised the issue that ease of doing business in India is the need of the hour. So, the Arbitration Act has to be amended and some stringent laws should be incorporated in the amendments so that arbitration should be made easier in India and time-bound arbitration disposal should be made. So, we have already taken the amendments to the Arbitration Act to the Cabinet and we are bringing the Arbitration Amendment Bill before the Parliament

at the earliest. Report on setting up of commercial courts and a commercial division in the higher courts — I have already moved a Bill before this House. So, it is under consideration. Report on amendments to be brought on Prevention of Corruption Act — a Cabinet approval is already taken on this also. So, we are moving that Bill. Repeal of obsolete laws is one of the important areas. I moved two Bills, and the Bill for repealing of 758 Appropriation Acts is also placed before the Parliament. The Department has proposed to decentralize the legal assistance to various Ministries and Departments providing Indian Legal Service officers to be stationed at department level so that legal opinion for all proposals can be speeded up. This is one of the important areas because all departments should have their own legal officers so that the department can dispose of the cases at the earliest. Of course, our Department has opened a new branch office at Bengaluru to cater to the needs of the southern States.

Legislative Department is one of the important departments. My friend was also referring that some simple laws should be made so that each and every individual can understand the law. This Department has drafted a huge number of Bills. Sir, 24 important Bills of various Departments have been drafted since last six months and the Department also drafted about 11 Ordinances of various Departments and Ministries in a short period of six months. The Department has drafted about 13 Amendment Acts in six months. The Department has also scrutinised 23 State Bills and Ordinances. The Department has repealed about 35 original Acts by passing the Bill in the Parliament. The Department has examined repeal of 197 Amending Acts and already moved a Bill to repeal about 758 Appropriation Acts. Department of Justice is one of the areas where almost all the speakers spoke with regard to a speedy delivery of justice and a speedy disposal of the cases. A major achievement of this Department is bringing the National Judicial Appointments Commission Bill by amending the Constitution. Of course, I do not want to talk much about this because the matter is pending before the Supreme Court. The Government has already taken steps. We have already notified the Act and, in fact, the matter is pending before the Supreme Court. It amounts to *sub judice*; so, I do not want to traverse in detail as far as this matter is concerned. ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI SHANTARAM NAIK (Goa): It does not prevent the Parliament ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI D. V. SADANANDA GOWDA: No; I will come to that. ...(*Interruptions*)... Certainly, I do concede that the supremacy of the Parliament should be there. At the same time, independence of the Judiciary also should not be encroached upon. So, to a certain extent, the Government should see that the independence of the Judiciary is there. Of course, I would like to place before this House that almost all the proceedings

[Shri D.V. Sadananda Gowda]

to bring into effect the Act were taken seriously by the Government. It was taken seriously. We had notified it. Afterwards, we wanted to have selection of two eminent personalities but the Chief Justice of India sent a letter to the Prime Minister stating that 'As the matter is pending before the Court, I am unable to participate in the proceedings.' So, the matter was stuck. So, we sought the directions of the Court as to what should be done when the matter is pending before the Court. How should we select two eminent personalities? The directions of the Court would certainly be followed by the Government. Of course, I too feel that Shantaram Naikji has rightly said that the supremacy of the Parliament has to be kept up and it should not be taken away by anybody. So, if NJAC becomes fully functional, the filling up of the posts can speed up and there will be a sharp decline in the pending cases also. I do not dispute that fact. Of course, there are a few other areas. A sum of ₹ 933 crores has been released to the States during the year 2014-15 for infrastructural development of the subordinate judiciary. About 2,251 court halls and about 1,799 residential units for Judicial officers of district and subordinate courts are under construction. The sanctioned strength of the High Court Judges has increased from 906 to 998. The sanctioned strength of Judicial officers in district and subordinate courts has increased from 19,518 to 20,214. Against a target of computerising 14,249 district and subordinate courts in the country under e-court mission mode project, 13,672 courts have been computerised at the end of the phase-I of the project on 31st March, 2015. We are taking up the phase-II of the project also. We have already taken the Cabinet approval for the same. The Department has set up a National Judicial Data Grid to provide online access to case data in respect of more than 4.5 crore cases and about 95 lakh judgments. This data can be accessed by lawyers, litigants and also by common man, if need be. Pendency of cases in district and subordinate courts has declined from 2.68 crore as on 31.12.2013 to 2.64 crore as on 31.12.2014. Pendency of cases in the High Courts has also declined from 44 lakh as on 31.12.2013 to 41 lakh as on 31.12.2014.

There are three Departments of the Ministry of Law and Justice. We are working on it. We will see to it that all possible efforts are made to fill up the vacancies so that the pendency of cases comes down and infrastructure and other benefits should be given to the judiciary.

Dr. Natchiappan has raised a very important issue relating to development of international law and bilateral agreements. He said that these should be handled by the Ministry of Law and Justice. He said that now things are moving very fast, so

international law and bilateral agreements should be handled by a separate wing in the Ministry of Law and Justice.

There is a move by the Ministry of Law and Justice to see to it that a Group of Secretaries sits to draft bilateral agreements and this should be vetted by the Ministry of Law. At present, it is with the Ministry of External Affairs. As per the Allocation of Business Rules, 1961, each Department will have its own wing which will draft all these things and finally the Law Department will look into the matter whenever it is taken to the Cabinet. The implementation of treaty relating to any matter allocated to a specific Ministry is the subject of the concerned Ministry. In certain cases, the subject matter is assigned to different Ministries under the Allocation of Business Rules. The role of the administrative Ministry arises as and when the treaty is related to one of the subjects assigned to it.

The Ministry of External Affairs being the nodal Ministry dealing with the international law assists in facilitating the negotiation and conclusion of such treaties. But as per the Transaction of Business Rules, whenever a proposal is brought before the Cabinet, we assist them. Certainly, your suggestion is well taken. We will see to it that a separate wing in the Ministry of Law and Justice is there. We will work on it in the coming days. We take serious note of your suggestion.

Another important area that has been debated yesterday was pendency of cases in various courts. I would like to say that it is not in the domain of the Government. The disposal of cases is in the domain of the judiciary. As I said earlier, we do not want to encroach upon the independence of the judiciary. Still, there are several aspects which need to be taken care of by the Government to assist courts in speedy disposal of cases. Pendency of cases in courts is coming down. I can give you the data of previous four years. The number of new cases is huge and that is why the pendency of cases has also gone high. At the same time, I don't dispute that there are several areas that need to be taken care of. Only then can the pendency be reduced. I have the statistics before me of the last four or five years from 2010. In the Supreme Court, 61,081 cases are pending as on 1st March, 2015. But, in the year 2012, it was 66,692; in 2013, it was 62,791. Now, it is reduced. Against that, number of institution of cases has gone up. In 2012, 76,917 new cases have been filed in the courts. In 2013, it was 76,742. In 2014, 89,164 cases have been filed in the courts. So, the filing of new cases has gone up. But, subsequently, the pendency has come down in the Supreme Court also. of course, in the Supreme Court, three vacancies are there. Disposal of cases in the High Courts also has gone up. I can give the statistics for the last five years. In 2010, institution of new cases was about 18,64,975; pendency was 42,49,344. But, in 2014,

[Shri D.V. Sadananda Gowda]

it has come down. It has come down substantially. Now, the pendency is 41,53,957 as on 31.12.2014. In subordinate courts also, sufficient cases have been disposed of even though filing of cases has gone up. In 2010, 1,80,04,311 new cases had been filed. In 2014, it was 1,89,57,097. Now, the pendency has come down. Pendency in 2004 was 2,77,51,191. Now, it has come down to 2,64,88,405. of course, I do concede that the disposal is not up to the expectation of the litigants or the public. But, still, there is a substantial decrease in pendency in spite of the vacancies being not filled up in the courts.

I would like to place before this House various reasons for pendency. Increasing number of State and Central legislations is one of the important reasons. Accumulation of first appeals, continuation of ordinary civil jurisdiction in some High Courts, vacancies of Judges, appeals against orders of quasi-judicial forums going to High Courts, number of revisions, appeals and adjournments, indiscriminate use of writ jurisdiction, lack of adequate arrangement to monitor, track and bunch cases for hearing, etc., are the main reasons for pendency. Of course, several measures have been taken by the Government to reduce the pendency in courts. Pendency reduction drive has been launched during the last four years. Mega Lok Adalats have been conducted. Chief Justices of High Courts have been repeatedly requested to take advance action for filling up backlog vacancies as well as anticipated vacancies in the High Courts. In-principle concurrence has been given to increase the sanctioned strength of High Courts by 25 per cent over the existing strength. State Governments have requested them to operationalise all sanctioned posts by filling up vacant posts of judicial officers. Under the e-court project, 13,672 courts have been computerised by March 31. State Governments have been encouraged to notify State Litigation Policies so as to reduce Government litigations. These are the various steps that have been taken by the Ministry of Law and Justice to ensure speedy disposal of the cases. Of course, even other areas are also covered by us. As far as the infrastructure is concerned, as on 30th June, 2014, there were 15,419 court rooms available for the functioning of the District and Subordinate Courts. In addition to that, 1,300 courts are available in rented premises. Compared to the figures against the working strength of 15,634 Judges as on 31 December, 2014, reported by High Courts, it is noted that adequate infrastructure is available to the current judicial manpower. Yesterday, one of my learned Members said that somewhere the court is functioning in the toilet. But it has not been brought to our notice. It is not true also. So, sufficient court rooms are available. Further, there are about 2,251 additional court rooms under construction and they are at various stages. of course, there are three posts of Judges vacant in the

Supreme Court as on 24th April, 2015; 366 posts of Judges are vacant in High Courts, 4,580 posts of Judicial officers are vacant in District Courts and Subordinate Courts. I think if the NJAC becomes fully functional, all these issues can be resolved. Certainly we can put an end to this.

The National Litigation Policy is one of the important areas. As I said, the National Litigation Policy is under the consideration of the Government. The informal team of Ministers, consisting of the Home Minister, the Finance Minister, the Minister of Road Transport, myself, the Law Minister and the Minister of Communication and IT will meet and evaluate the proposal. We will bring it as early as possible.

Another area that is important is the National Legal Service Authority. The National Legal Service Authority is organising Lok Adalats for amicable settlement of disputes. This has reduced the pendency of the cases to a large extent thereby reducing litigation expenses also.

In the second National Lok Adalat which was held on the 6th and 13th December, 2014, nearly 40,81,637 cases which were pending in courts were disposed of, apart from the pre-litigation cases. So, the Lok Adalat has played a very important role in disposal of the cases.

Some of the hon. Members have raised an issue as to why a National Judicial Service Commission should not be constituted. If the National Judicial Service Commission is formed, then, automatically so many things could be resolved through that. The hon. Members also said that the National Judicial Commission should be set up as early as possible. Of course, proposals were prepared on this matter and those were sent to the State Governments and State High Courts. But majority of Judges of High Courts and State Governments have strong reservations against this proposal. High Courts are having an apprehension that they would lose control over the Subordinate Courts, and it would dilute the administration of the Subordinate Courts. They have also said that some language problem will arise, and promotional chances also will be reduced.

Some friends raised the issue of the establishment of a Supreme Court Bench in the southern part of the country. ...(*Interruptions*)... of course, my friends from various corners wanted to have a High Court Bench.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have dealt with most of the points.

SHRI D. V. SADANANDA GOWDA: From Kerala, my friend raised this issue. For Uttar Pradesh also, my friend raised this issue.

SHRI SHANTARAM NAIK: Goa also.

SHRI D. V. SADANANDA GOWDA: Yes, yes. The only thing is, High Court Benches could be established, if there is a proposal from the State Government, after consultation with the Chief Justice. Certainly, their proposals would be considered.

SHRI BHUPINDER SINGH (Odisha): From Odisha, the proposal has come.

SHRI D. V. SADANANDA GOWDA: Of course, I don't say that the Parliament does not have the power. I will not say all that because even the Parliament can, as it is said in the Constitution...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your assurance, that you will try for that, is enough.

SHRI D. V. SADANANDA GOWDA: If a proposal comes from any State after due consultation with the Chief Justice of that State, certainly we would consider it and we will take the necessary steps in that direction. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister, there may be instances where the Chief Justices do not agree. Then, what will you do?

SHRI D. RAJA (Tamil Nadu): Sir, I just want one minute only.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No. Let him finish first. Have you finished?

SHRI D. V. SADANANDA GOWDA: No, no.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think you have dealt with all the points.

SHRI D. V. SADANANDA GOWDA: No, Sir. I have only two more things.

SHRI K. N. BALAGOPAL (Kerala): Junior advocates.

SHRI D. V. SADANANDA GOWDA: Yes, yes. As far as benefits for advocates are concerned and as far as assistance to junior lawyers is also concerned, under the Advocates Act several benefits are being given to advocates who are enrolled under the Advocates Act. If they want any assistance, it is being given under the Advocates Act. Sir, as far as the Benches are concerned, I would like to say one more thing. As far as the Supreme Court Benches are concerned, it can be finalised only after judicial scrutiny. It was sent to the Supreme Court twice, but the Supreme Court has declined. The full team of the Supreme Court sat together and declined to have any Benches in any part of the country. In future, if any proposal comes, the Government will certainly try and will do its level best to see to it that speedier justice is delivered. That is one of the very important areas before us. Thank you very much.



MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. ...*(Interruptions)*... Okay, Duaji.

SHRI H. K. DUA (Nominated): Sir, I would just seek a clarification from the hon. Law Minister. He has not touched upon the aspect which has become very, very important. The three organs of the State, Legislature, Judiciary and the Executive, are supposed to function in an atmosphere of trust, with restraint and caution. We are witnessing today is an atmosphere of confrontation that is developing between the Executive and the Judiciary. I will not go into the cases why it is developing, and who is to blame. But a palpable confrontation is developing which needs to be checked urgently. Will the Minister assure the House and the country that the Government will do everything possible lest the confrontation becomes more serious and goes out of hand?

SHRI D. RAJA: Sir, I am raising this question which is exclusively in the domain of the Government, not in the domain of the Judiciary. Several Members raised the issue of providing adequate representation to SCs and STs in the appointment of judges. I would like to know whether the Government will give a thought to it and consider such a proposal. Secondly, a number of cases of massacres of Dalits have ended in acquittals at high courts and trial courts-level. Sir, the Minister of Social Justice is also here. I would like to know whether the Government is thinking to go on appeal in all these cases. The issue is very sensitive and also very important because it relates to delivery of justice to SCs and STs.

SHRI A.K. ANTONY (Kerala): Sir, successive Governments in Kerala have been consistently demanding a High Court Bench in Trivandrum for the last 25 years. I also took it up as Chief Minister twice. All Governments have been demanding it consistently for the last 25 years. We have consulted the Chief Justices. But, unfortunately, the Chief Justices are not agreeing to it. Then what is the meaning of consultation? Successive State Governments, all political parties and the Bar Association of Trivandrum have been making this request unanimously for the last 25 years. Even agitations are going on continuously. Please find a solution to this.

श्री नरेन्द्र कुमार कश्यप (उत्तर प्रदेश): सर, मैं आपके माध्यम से एक मांग करना चाहता हूँ कि पिछले 40 सालों से पश्चिमी उत्तर प्रदेश में हाई कोर्ट बेंच की स्थापना का संघर्ष पश्चिमी उत्तर प्रदेश के किसान, वकील, सब लोग करते आ रहे हैं। मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या पश्चिमी उत्तर प्रदेश के दस करोड़ से ज्यादा आबादी में रहने वाले लोगों की सस्ते न्याय की कल्पना को पूरा करते हुए पश्चिमी उत्तर प्रदेश में हाई कोर्ट बेंच की स्थापना करने का ऐलान आज माननीय मंत्री जी करेंगे? ...**(समय की घंटी)**... दूसरा, एस.सी./एस.टी. और ओबीसी को सुप्रीम कोर्ट तक रिजर्वेशन मिले, इस बारे में भी अपना जवाब देने का कष्ट करें। धन्यवाद।

SHRI K.N. BALAGOPAL: Sir, my first point is in regard to a High Court Bench. Hon. Member, Shri A.K. Antony, has raised the same point. I have also raised this issue. In his recent reply, the Minister said that the High Court was not accepting the demand for a Bench. Sir, if they do not accept this demand which is being made for the last 25 years continuously, then the scenario has to change. What will the Government do?

SHRI D. RAJA: I also support it.

SHRI K.N. BALAGOPAL: Secondly, in the Advocates Act, there is a provision to promote and support the junior lawyers. The junior lawyers need to be promoted with some financial support. While speaking earlier, I said that like JRF under UGC, there should be a separate fellowship scheme for two years or three years. That can be used for legal service authority or any other authority. Through a national test, junior advocates can be selected for this scheme. What is the reply of the Government?

SHRI JAIRAM RAMESH (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, I have one suggestion and one question to the hon. Minister. The suggestion is, repeatedly, when this issue of pendency comes up, macro statistics are given that so many cases are pending in the Supreme Court; so many cases are pending in High Courts and so many cases are pending in district courts. That by itself does not convey anything because as the hon. Minister himself has admitted the number of laws has expanded. It is better for Governments to present the time distribution of pendency. It is very difficult to get this information out of Governments. I have tried it. It has been very difficult even for me being in Government. We only get to know that 60,000 cases are pending, two crore cases are pending, etc. It is much better and it is much more useful to have what the time distribution of pendency is; how many of the cases are pending for more than one year or more than two years or more than five years so that we really know...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The other day, Shri Sukhendu Sekhar Roy had mentioned about a case pending for 50 years.

SHRI JAIRAM RAMESH: Yesterday, Shri Sukhendu Sekhar Roy raised one issue and I would like the hon. Minister's response to that. He raised the issue relating to the Bail Act, that we need to codify the provisions under which we can bail. We know that there are huge variations within our country on conditions under which the bail is given. I would like the hon. Minister to reveal what his thinking is on the suggestion of having a Bail Act in India.

SHRI T.K. RANGARAJAN (Tamil Nadu): Sir, I support the points raised by the hon. Members, Shri Jairam Ramesh...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You only seek your clarification. You need not support him.

SHRI T.K. RANGARAJAN: The cases are pending. The poorest of the poor are standing before the Supreme Court, High Courts and District Courts. So, when will they get the relief? Otherwise, we know that police intervenes and rowdies intervene, and they try to settle the cases. Here also, the innocents get affected. Secondly, there are States which have not passed the Lokayukta Act. What is the Government's position on those Governments? Will they insist on them to pass the Lokayukta Act as early as possible?

SHRI RANGASAYEE RAMAKRISHNA (Karnataka): Sir, the hon. Minister has mentioned that the Government has hardly a role in controlling the pendency. I agree with that. But I suggested one thing yesterday. Forty per cent of pendency relates to cases where the Government itself is involved. Now take the cases of the Government going against the employees. Many times, it happens that when things can be sorted out within the Government, they say, "No, no, you go to the Court." Okay, let the people go to the Court. But will the Government, at least, take a decision that they would not indulge in appeals against the Court decisions in favour of its employees?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: And spending enormous amounts. Mr. Minister, if you have the reply now, you give. If you don't have, you can write to them later.

SHRI D.V. SADANANDA GOWDA: Sir, one of the issues that has been raised by Shri Dua is that there is confrontation. I don't think that there is any confrontation between the three wings of the Government. There may be difference of opinion but, obviously, no confrontation. This is quite clear that on matters pending before the Courts, the Government has said that they do not want to encroach upon the powers of the Judiciary. At the same time, we also say that our Parliamentary democracy should be given responsibility. That is what we are saying. So, there is no confrontation as far as that matter is concerned. As far as High Court Benches are concerned, the infrastructure needs to be provided by State Governments, and the management of court affairs and other things will be done by High Courts. So, there should be a proper proposal from the State Government. It is only after due consultation with the Chief Justice, can the Government go ahead with this.

Then, with regard to advocates, specially, junior advocates, which was raised by my friend, the Advocates' Welfare Fund Act, 2001, entails social security for such

[Shri D.V. Sadananda Gowda]

**4.00 P.M.**

persons. of course, as far as junior advocates are concerned, usually, it is the concern of State Governments. Some State Governments are providing some stipends to advocates...

SHRI K.N. BALAGOPAL: That is a meagre amount of ₹ 3,000 or ₹ 5,000.

SHRI D.V. SADANANDA GOWDA: This is an issue that needs to be taken care of.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN, (DR. SATYANARAYAN JATIYA) *in the Chair.*]

As regards High Court Benches of Western U.P., in the recent communication from the Ministry of Law and Justice, the Chief Justice of Allahabad High Court has stated that there is no proposal from the State Government in this regard. So, we are unable to take up that issue as far as Uttar Pradesh is concerned. But we do appreciate the views of our hon. senior Member, the former Minister, Shri Antony. His Government is there in Kerala. So, if he is able to coordinate with the Chief Justice of the Kerala High Court and if the Chief Minister sends a proposal, certainly, the Government will look into the matter and we will take care of these things.

Sir, my friend says that. Certainly, I will verify if there is a proposal from Odisha by the Chief Minister, and, if acceptance is given by the Chief Justice, certainly I will look into the matter.

SHRI BHUPINDER SINGH: This proposal is there.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. SATYANARAYAN JATIYA): Shri Bhupinder Singh to move a Resolution urging upon the Government to take measures to complete all the pending projects of the country, particularly in Odisha.

---

#### PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

##### **Resolution re. deep concern over long pending Railway Projects in Odisha and other States; and taking urgent measures for their speedy completion**

**श्री भूपिंदर सिंह (ओडिशा) :** महोदय, मैं निम्नलिखित संकल्प उपस्थित करता हूँ :

"इस तथ्य को ध्यान में रखते हुए कि:-

- (i) स्वतंत्रता प्राप्ति के 67 वर्षों के पश्चात् भी देश के अनेक जिलों को रेल मार्ग द्वारा नहीं जोड़ा गया है;