

Illegal hoarding of red gram

1532. DR. PRADEEP KUMAR BALMUCHU: Will the Minister of CONSUMER AFFAIRS, FOOD AND PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that illegal hoarding of red gram has resulted in its price rise in the country, if so, the details thereof; and

(b) the steps being taken by Government to stop illegal hoarding and step up the active public distribution system?

THE MINISTER OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS, FOOD AND PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION (SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN): (a) and (b) The primary reasons for the increase in prices of pulses, including red gram, is their reduced availability following a decline in production of pulses from 19.25 million tonnes in 2013-14 to 17.20 million tonnes in 2014-15 on account of adverse weather conditions, rise in transportation cost, hoarding and black-marketing. The State Governments/UTs have been enabled to impose stock limits on pulses and have been asked to undertake measures to enforce stock limits and conduct anti hoarding operations under the Essential Commodities Act, 1955. The information regarding Public Distribution System is given in the Statement-I (*See below*). The details of the raids conducted by the States on dealers of Pulses as on 08.12.2015 are given in the Statement-II.

Statement-I***Public Distribution System***

Targeted Public Distribution System (TPDS) is operated under the joint responsibility of the Central and the State/Union Territory (UT) Governments. Central Government is responsible for procurement, allocation and transportation of foodgrains upto the designated depots of the Food Corporation of India. The operational responsibilities for allocation and distribution of foodgrains within the States/UTs, identification of eligible Below Poverty Line (BPL) families, issuance of ration cards to them and supervision over and monitoring of functioning of Fair Price Shops (FPSs) etc. rest with the concerned State/UT Governments.

2. In order to maintain supplies and securing availability and distribution of essential commodities, Public Distribution System (Control) Order, 2001 has been notified on August 31, 2001 which mandates the State and UT Governments to carry out all required action to ensure smooth functioning of TPDS. As provided under the said Order, the State and UT Governments are responsible for implementing TPDS and competent to take action against those indulging in malpractices in TPDS by invoking provisions of clauses 8 & 9 of the said Order. The PDS I Order, 2001 has been superseded

by the TPDS I Order, 2015 notified on 20.03.2015 in consonance with NFSA, 2013. The provisions of the PDS (C) Order, 2001 shall be effective in States/UTs which have not implemented the NFSA or are implementing it only in part. An offence committed in violation of the provisions of these Orders is liable for penal action under the Essential Commodities Act, 1955. Thus, both the Orders empower State/UT Governments to take punitive action in case of contravention of relevant provisions of these Orders.

3. In a continuous endeavour to strengthen and streamline TPDS, the Government has initiated implementation of a plan scheme on 'End-to-end Computerisation of TPDS Operations' during the Twelfth Five Year Plan (2012-17) to ensure transparency and check leakages in the TPDS system. Under the scheme, financial assistance is being provided to States/UTs on cost sharing basis. The cost is being shared on 90:10 basis with North East States and on 50:50 basis with other States/UTs. Under this scheme, as per reports received, as on 31.10.2015, ration card data digitization has been done in 29 States/UTs, ration card data is available on Web Portal in 27 States/UTs, Online allocation is being done in 16 States/UTs, supply-chain management in 8 States/UTs, Transparency Portal set up in 27 States/UTs, online Grievance Redressal Mechanism in 26 and toll free helpline number has been set up in 32 States/UTs.

4. To curb leakages further, under the NFSA *inter-alia*, States/UTs have been asked to either do cash transfer of food subsidy under Direct Benefit Scheme (DBT) or install electronic Point of Sale Device (ePoS) at the Fair Price Shops (FPSs).

5. The National Food Security Act, 2013 (NFSA) also encourages progressive reforms in the TPDS.

Statement-II

Department of Consumer Affairs Enforcement data under Essential Commodities Act, 1955 (Pulses)

(08.12.2015)

Sl. No.	State	Raids conducted, quantity seized & quantity disposed (MT)			
		Raids	Qty. seized	Qty. disposed	Balance
1	2	3	4	5	6
1.	Chhattisgarh	112	5447.93	3257.94	2189.99
2.	Haryana	1652	14.60	Nil	14.60
3.	Karnataka	1351	25545.82	4192.76	21353.07
4.	Madhya Pradesh	969	3373.60	1972.90	1400.70

1	2	3	4	5	6
5.	Maharashtra	5250	86709.39	57167.28	29542.11
6.	Telangana	1924	3316.84	5.12	3311.72
7.	Rajasthan	840	2648.08	332.91	2315.17
8.	Jharkhand	140	282.0	Nil	282.02
9.	Odisha	180	1410.26	1403.86	6.40
10.	Andhra Pradesh	1300	1361.52	352.50	1009.02
11.	Gujarat	203	53.01	Nil	53.01
12.	Himachal Pradesh	500	3.42	Nil	3.42
13.	NCT Delhi	01	81.29	8.13	73.16
14.	Bihar	299	360.41	Nil	360.41
TOTAL		14177	130608.19	68696.40	61914.80

Source: State Governments.

Norms for BPL and APL categories

1533. SHRI PANKAJ BORA: Will the Minister of CONSUMER AFFAIRS, FOOD AND PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION be pleased to state:

(a) the norms for fulfilling a Below Poverty Line (BPL) and Above Poverty Line (APL) category; and

(b) whether it is a fact that Government is considering to replace APL and BPL by 'exclusion' and 'inclusion' categories?

THE MINISTER OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS, FOOD AND PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION (SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN): (a) and (b) The erstwhile Planning Commission estimated the extent of poverty using a poverty line defined in terms of the Monthly Per Capita Consumption Expenditure (MPCE). The methodology for estimation of poverty had been based on the recommendations made by the experts in the field from time to time. Using the poverty line recommended by the Tendulkar Committee for 2004-05 and updating it to 2011-12, the monthly per capita consumption expenditure (MPCE) of ₹ 816 in rural areas and ₹ 1000 in urban areas were the estimated poverty lines for 2011-12. These poverty lines vary from State to State because of inter-State price differentials.