

- (a) For the year 2014-15: Estimated savings was ₹ 14,818.4 crore. 369.72 (average subsidy per cylinder for that year) $\times 3.34$ (number of blocked customers) $\times 12$ (entitled number of subsidized domestic cylinders per annum) = ₹ 14,818.4 crore.
- (b) 2015-16—Estimated savings was ₹ 6,443 crore. 150.82 (average subsidy per cylinder for that year) $\times 3.56$ (number of blocked customers) $\times 12$ (entitled number of subsidized domestic cylinders per annum) = ₹ 6,443 crore.
- (c) 2016-17—Estimated savings was ₹ 8,185 crore. 6.27 (number of blocked customers, Give It Up customers, etc.) $\times 108.78$ (average subsidy per cylinder that year) $\times 12$ (entitled number of subsidized domestic cylinders per annum) = ₹ 8,185 crore.

The total consumption of cooking gas in any given year is a combination of the number of connections at the beginning of the year, bogus connections eliminated during the year through the process of DBT under PAHAL, new connections issued to genuine consumers during the year and normal fluctuations in individual consumption. Hence, the savings from DBTL cannot be correctly computed merely by reference to the total consumption in a year or the total expenditure on subsidy. If the DBT had not been implemented, the outgo on the subsidy would have been higher by ₹ 14,818 crore in 2014-15, ₹ 6,443 crore in 2015-16 and ₹ 8,185 crore in 2016-17. Hence, the total savings from the elimination of fake/duplicate/ghost connections as a result of implementation of DBT for the three years together, as calculated above, is estimated at more than ₹ 29,000 crore. This figure is not comparable with the actual expenditure on subsidy which includes the subsidy on new genuine connections given during these three years. Without implementation of PAHAL, subsidy burden would have been higher than the actual expenditure recorded during these years, even with lower petroleum prices.

Jain temple in Telangana Lying in shambles

*37. SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY: Will the Minister of CULTURE be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government is aware that the old Jain temple built with bricks in terracotta style at Alvanpalli in Jadcherla town of Telangana lies in shambles and is likely to collapse anytime;

(b) if so, the details thereof along with the reasons for not making any effort for restoration and maintenance of this rare structure; and

(c) the steps taken by Government for conservation and rehabilitation of this oldest Jain Temple?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF CULTURE (DR. MAHESH SHARMA): (a) to (c) The Jain temple at Alvanpalli in Jadcherla town of Telangana

is not a protected monument of Archaeological Survey of India. The same is under protection of Archaeology and Museums Department of Government of Telangana. The State Government has constructed boundary wall around the temple.

FIR against IPS Officer of Jharkhand

*38. SHRI SANJIV KUMAR: Will the Minister of HOME AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that very recently an FIR has been directed to be lodged against a senior IPS officer in the rank of ADGP from Jharkhand cadre of IPS;

(b) if so, what is the current status of action in this regard;

(c) what further action is being contemplated by the Ministry in this regard; and

(d) if no action has been taken, the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI KIREN RIJJU): (a) As per information received from the Govt. of Jharkhand, the Election Commission of India has recommended departmental disciplinary action against a senior IPS officer in rank of Addl. Director General of Police of Jharkhand cadre. The Commission also recommended for appropriate proceedings under the relevant service and disciplinary rules against the accused person for, among others, misuse of official position, interference in election, breach of conduct/service rules, etc. and since, the matter also relates to bribery of voters and corruption, appropriate proceedings under the Prevention of Corruption Act and Sections 171B and 171C of IPC.

(b) Since, the officer is serving in connection with the affairs of the Government of Jharkhand, the information in respect of the status of the case has been sought from the State Government which is awaited.

(c) and (d) The matter has not yet been referred to this Ministry by the State Govt., hence, question does not arise.

Closure of regional/field offices of Rubber Board

*39. SHRI K. K. RAGESH: Will the Minister of COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY be pleased to state:

(a) how many regional/field offices have been closed down by Rubber Board during the last three years;

(b) the State-wise and year-wise details of such offices that were closed down;