



सत्यमेव जयते

**Report of the  
Comptroller and Auditor General of India  
(Economic Sector-Non Public Sector Undertakings)**

**for the year ended 31 March 2014**



**Government of Uttar Pradesh  
Report No. 2 of 2015**

**© COMPTROLLER AND  
AUDITOR GENERAL OF INDIA  
[www.cag.gov.in](http://www.cag.gov.in)**

**[www.agup.nic.in](http://www.agup.nic.in)**

Government of Uttar Pradesh - Report No. 2 of 2015

**Report of the  
Comptroller and Auditor General of India  
(Economic Sector-Non Public Sector Undertakings)**

**for the year ended 31 March 2014**

**Government of Uttar Pradesh  
Report No. 2 of 2015**

*Table of contents*

Particulars	Reference to	
	Paragraph (s)	Page (s)
<b>Preface</b>		iii
<b>Overview</b>		v-vii
<b>Chapter 1</b>		
<b>Introduction</b>	1	1-5
About this Report	1.1	1
Budget Profile	1.2	1
Application of Resources of the State Government	1.3	2
Persistent Savings	1.4	2
Funds transferred directly to the State implementation agencies	1.5	3
Grants-in-aid from Government of India	1.6	3
Planning and conduct of audit	1.7	3
Lack of responsiveness of Government to Inspection Reports	1.8	3
Government response to significant audit observations (paragraphs/reviews)	1.9	4
Follow up on Audit Reports	1.10	5
Status of placement of Separate Audit Reports of Autonomous Bodies in the State Assembly	1.11	5
<b>Chapter 2</b>		
<b>Performance Audit of Kanpur Development Authority</b>	2.1	7-22
Executive Summary	--	7
Introduction	2.1.1	8
Organisational Structure	2.1.2	9
Audit Objectives	2.1.3	9
Audit Criteria	2.1.4	10
Scope and Methodology of Audit	2.1.5	10
Audit Findings	2.1.6-2.1.11.2	10-21
Finance Section	2.1.6	10
Property Section	2.1.7	12
Planning Section	2.1.8	14
Engineering Section	2.1.9	17
Sale Section	2.1.10	20
Enforcement Section	2.1.11	21
Conclusion	2.1.12	22
<b>Long paragraph on implementation of the various schemes through District Industries Centers</b>	2.2	23-33
Introduction	2.2.1	23
Organisational Structure	2.2.2	23
Audit Objectives	2.2.3	23
Audit Criteria	2.2.4	24
Scope and Methodology of Audit	2.2.5	24
Audit Findings	2.2.6-2.2.10.1	24-31
<i>Schemes sponsored by Government of India</i>		24
Prime Minister Employment Generation Programme	2.2.6	24
Micro & Small Enterprises - Cluster Development Programme	2.2.7	26
<i>Schemes financed by Government of Uttar Pradesh</i>		28
Up-gradation of infrastructure facilities in the Industrial Estates	2.2.8	29
Collective Training Scheme for self employment of persons of Scheduled Caste/Scheduled Tribe under Special Component Plan	2.2.9	30
Handicrafts Marketing Promotion Scheme	2.2.10	31
Conclusion	2.2.11	32

Chapter 3			
<b>Compliance Audit</b>		3	35-39
<b>Housing and Urban Planning Department</b>			
	Undue favour to contractor	3.1	35
	Loss due to delay in releasing possession of the property	3.2	36
	Non-realisation of extra charges on the corner plots	3.3	37
<b>Forest Department</b>			
	Loss due to short-realisation of royalty	3.4	37
<b>Energy Department</b>			
	Injudicious parking of surplus funds	3.5	38
<b>Appendices</b>			
<b>1.1</b>	Statement showing details of outstanding Inspection Reports and Paragraphs	1.8	41
<b>1.2</b>	Statement showing details of outstanding SAR to be presented in State Assembly	1.11	42
<b>2.1</b>	Organisational Chart, Delegation of Powers and Duties of various Officers of Kanpur Development Authority under Section 51 (2) of U. P. Urban Planning and Development Act 1973	2.1.2.2	43
<b>2.2</b>	Statement showing investment in FDs at lower rate	2.1.6.2	48
<b>2.3</b>	Statement showing loss of interest due to non availing of <i>auto sweep</i> facility	2.1.6.3	55
<b>2.4</b>	Statement showing short-realization of rent from State Bank of India	2.1.6.4	56
<b>2.5(A)</b>	Findings related with short-recovery of FAR charges	2.1.8.3	57
<b>2.5(B)</b>	Findings related with inadequate provision for parking space	2.1.8.3	61
<b>2.6</b>	Statement showing scheme-wise budget allocation and expenditure incurred on four GoI schemes and 25 schemes financed by GoUP in 69 DICs for the period 2010-11 to 2013-14	2.2.1	62
<b>2.7</b>	Organisational Structure: Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises (MSME) and Export Promotion (EP) Department	2.2.2	64
<b>2.8</b>	Statement showing scheme-wise expenditure incurred on selected two schemes sponsored by GoI and four schemes financed by GoUP during 2010-11 to 2013-14 in 15 DICs	2.2.5	65
<b>2.9</b>	Statement showing details of cluster proposals approved by GoI, approved project cost <i>vis-a-vis</i> amount received during 2008-09 to 2013-14	2.2.7.1	66
<b>2.10</b>	Statement showing DIC-wise status of approved proposals and proposals lying unapproved against total identified cluster proposals till March 2014 in 15 test checked DICs	2.2.7.1	68
<b>2.11</b>	Statement showing status of allotment of plots in Industrial Estates (March 2014) in 15 test checked DICs	2.2.8.1	70
<b>2.12</b>	Statement showing details of 39 plots allotted but not cancelled by DIC Bareilly and Kanpur Nagar	2.2.8.2	72
<b>2.13</b>	Details of Trades under which training was to be provided under Collective Training Scheme for self employment of persons of Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe	2.2.9	73
<b>2.14</b>	Statement showing status of utilisation of fund by 69 DICs during 2012-13 to 2013-14 in Handicrafts Marketing Promotion Scheme	2.2.10.1	74
<b>3.1</b>	Statement showing calculation of loss of interest on mobilisation advance	3.1	76
<b>3.2</b>	Statement showing calculation of loss of interest	3.2	77
<b>3.3</b>	Statement showing short-realisation of royalty	3.4	78
<b>3.4</b>	Statement showing loss of interest	3.5	79
<b>Glossary</b>		---	80

## Preface

This Report for the year ended March 2014 has been prepared for submission to the Governor of Uttar Pradesh under Article 151 of the Constitution of India.

The Report contains significant results of the performance audit and compliance audit of the Departments of the Government of Uttar Pradesh under the Economic Sector.

The instances mentioned in this Report are those, which came to notice in the course of test audit for the period 2013-14 as well as those which came to notice in earlier years, but could not be reported in the previous Audit Reports; instances relating to period subsequent to 2013-14 have also been included, wherever necessary.

The Audit has been conducted in conformity with the Auditing Standards issued by the Comptroller and Auditor General of India.

## Overview

This Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India on Economic Sector (Non-PSUs), Government of Uttar Pradesh for the year ended 31 March 2014 includes one review, one long paragraph and five paragraphs dealing with the results of performance audit as well as audit of the financial transactions of the Government departments/autonomous bodies. A summary of the important findings is given below:

### 1. Performance Audit

Performance audit is undertaken to ensure whether the Government departments/autonomous bodies have achieved the desired objectives at the minimum cost and given the intended benefits.

#### 1.1 Performance Audit of Kanpur Development Authority

Kanpur Development Authority (Authority) was set up in September 1974 under Uttar Pradesh Urban Planning and Development Act, 1973. The performance audit of the Authority was carried out during 9 December 2013 to 15 July 2014 covering the period of five years up to 2013-14.

Audit findings pertaining to various sections of the Authority are discussed below:-

- The Authority maintained nine current bank accounts under operation without any justification on records. Further, it failed to avail *auto-sweep* facility for current accounts which deprived the Authority from earning interest amounting to ₹ 3.61 crore between April 2009 and March 2014.

**(Paragraph 2.1.6.3)**

- Non-compliance of the order of the Hon'ble High Court requiring determination of the compensation for the possession of land in *Panki Ganga Ganj* area, resulted in avoidable payment of penal compensation amounting to ₹ 145.23 crore.

**(Paragraph 2.1.7.1)**

- An amount of ₹ 4.32 crore deposited for acquisition of land measuring 16.367 hectare, with ADM (LA) remained blocked and no effort was made to get refund of the amount paid by the Authority despite lapse of more than seven years.

**(Paragraph 2.1.7.2)**

- Six maps were approved in contravention to Building Bylaws, which resulted in short recovery of Floor Area Ratio charges to the extent of ₹ 7.75 crore.

**(Paragraph 2.1.8.3)**

- A group housing map was approved on the land marked as railway land in contravention to the Zoning Regulation of Master Plan-2021.

**(Paragraph 2.1.8.4)**



- An expenditure of ₹ 9.01 crore was incurred out of infrastructure fund on works not covered under infrastructure works.

*(Paragraph 2.1.9.3)*

- Authority recovered cess of ₹ 9.17 crore on account of approval of maps. However, it did not deposit ₹ 5.19 crore with cess collector (Labour Department) as of September 2014.

*(Paragraph 2.1.9.4)*

- Authority allotted land at circle rate applicable for agriculture land in place of residential land rates, resulted in short recovery of revenue amounting to ₹ 4.55 crore.

*(Paragraph 2.1.10.1)*

- Due to failure of the Authority to take action under Section 27 of the Uttar Pradesh Urban Planning and Development Act, 1973, four Multiplexes were running without obtaining completion certificates.

*(Paragraph 2.1.11.2)*

## **1.2 Implementation of the various schemes through District Industries Centres**

Industrial policy provided for establishment of District Industries Centres (DICs) in all the districts to provide services and support required by small and cottage entrepreneurs. Suitable financial and organisational support was to be provided to these centres through State Government. The performance audit of the DICs was carried out during July 2013 to February 2014 to ascertain the implementation of various schemes through District Industries Centres covering the period of four years up to 2013-14.

Audit findings pertaining to implementation of various schemes through DICs are discussed below:-

- Under Prime Minister Employment Generation Programme, due to non-maintenance of the records, authenticity of release of subsidy amounting to ₹ 54.54 crore to 1996 beneficiaries could not be vouchsafed.

*(Paragraph 2.2.6.2)*

- Under Micro & Small Enterprises-Cluster Development Programme, implementation of the soft intervention in Steel Furniture Cluster, Lucknow sanctioned in 2009-10, could not be completed (March 2014) even after a lapse of more than four years. Further, Project of Leather Cluster, Gorakhpur was cancelled due to non-adherence of guidelines of the Uttar Pradesh Pollution Control Board.

*(Paragraphs 2.2.7.2 & 2.2.7.3)*

- Under Up-gradation of Infrastructure Facilities in the Industrial Estates Scheme, the DICs failed to ensure adequate infrastructure facilities in existing Industrial Estates due to which 614 plots of 11 out of 15 DICs test checked remained un-allotted.

*(Paragraph 2.2.8.1)*

- In contravention of the guidelines of Collective Training Scheme for self employment of persons of Scheduled Caste/Scheduled Tribe, DICs failed to

ensure 33 *per cent* participation of women candidates in six out of 15 test checked DICs.

*(Paragraph 2.2.9.2)*

- Under Handicrafts Marketing Promotion Scheme, DICs failed to widely publicise the scheme which has resulted in under utilisation of funds amounting to ₹ 1.59 crore.

*(Paragraph 2.2.10.1)*

## 2. Compliance Audit

- The Lucknow Development Authority extended undue benefit of ₹ 1.33 crore to a contractor by releasing mobilisation advance without ensuring availability of clear site and completing necessary formalities required for obtaining No Objection Certificate from Uttar Pradesh Pollution Control Board.

*(Paragraph 3.1)*

- The Agra Development Authority failed to provide the final area of allotted land to allottee within stipulated time and suffered loss of interest of ₹ 20.11 lakh.

*(Paragraph 3.2)*

- The Ghaziabad Development Authority failed to recover charges on corner plots in violation of the State Government order which resulted in short realisation of revenue amounting to ₹ 98.38 lakh.

*(Paragraph 3.3)*

- Consideration of estimated production of timber in place of actual production, for royalty purpose, resulted in short-realisation of royalty amounting to ₹ 6.21 crore.

*(Paragraph 3.4)*

- Uttar Pradesh Electricity Regulatory Commission failed to park surplus funds in higher interest bearing options and suffered a loss of interest amounting to ₹ 3.29 crore.

*(Paragraph 3.5)*

## CHAPTER 3

### 3. Compliance Audit

Compliance audit of transactions of the Government departments, their field formations as well as that of the autonomous bodies brought out instances of lapses in management of resources and failures in the observance of the norms of propriety and economy. These have been presented in the succeeding paragraphs.

#### Housing and Urban Planning Department

##### 3.1 Undue favour to contractor

**Lucknow Development Authority extended undue benefit of ₹ 1.33 crore to a contractor by releasing mobilisation advance without ensuring availability of clear site and completing necessary formalities required for obtaining No Objection Certificate (NOC) from Uttar Pradesh Pollution Control Board.**

Lucknow Development Authority (Authority) awarded (February 2009) work for construction of Sewage Treatment Plant (STP) at *Basant Kunj Yojna* (launched in November 2003), Lucknow to *Jyoti Buildtech* Private Limited and Hindustan Dor Oliver Limited (JBPL and HDOL) a Joint Venture company. Agreement valuing ₹ 21.11 crore was entered on 7 March 2009 for the above work with JBPL and HDOL. Clause 8 of the agreement provided release of mobilisation advance up to 10 *per cent* of the contract value at the interest rate of 15 *per cent* against Bank Guarantee of equivalent amount valid for entire construction period of project.

As per provision contained in Environment Conservation Act 1986, Water (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act 1974, a 'No Objection Certificate' (NOC) from the Uttar Pradesh Pollution Control Board (UPPCB) was required before commencement of construction of Sewage Treatment Plant (STP).

Audit noticed (January 2013) that prior to receipt of No Objection Certificate (NOC) from the UPPCB and ascertaining the availability of site, the Authority released mobilisation advance of ₹ 2.11 crore on 16 March 2009 to JBPL and HDOL against bank guarantee valid till March 2010 (extended up to September 2014). Further, it was noticed that the Authority failed to obtain NOC from UPPCB due to non-provision for proper disposal of effluent essentially required for obtaining NOC. As a result, even after lapse of four years, the work for construction of STP is held up (September 2014) and mobilisation advance of ₹ 2.11 crore paid to JBPL and HDOL on 16 March 2009 along with interest of ₹ 1.33 crore (**Appendix 3.1**) remained unrealised.

Thus, due to release of mobilisation advance to contractor, without ensuring availability of site and obtaining NOC from UPPCB which was the pre-requisite for commencement of the works, the Authority has extended undue favour to the contractor on account of interest of ₹ 1.33 crore and amount of ₹ 2.11 crore paid as mobilisation advance remained blocked for 66 months as of September 2014.

In reply, the Authority stated (September 2014) that Authority has applied (December 2008) for NOC to UPPCB before start of the work. But NOC was not issued by the UPPCB due to improper final disposal of effluent (treated water from STP) and work could not be started due to non-availability of site. It also stated that extension of Bank Guarantee of ₹ 2.11 crore has been obtained upto 15 September 2014.

Reply is not acceptable as the Authority released the mobilisation advance to contractor without obtaining necessary NOC from UPPCB and even before ascertaining the availability of site before awarding the work. Thus, the Authority suffered loss of ₹ 1.33 crore on account of interest as of September 2014.

Matter was reported to the Government (July 2014) and reply was awaited (October 2014).

### **3.2 Loss due to delay in releasing possession of the property**

#### **Agra Development Authority failed to provide the final area of allotted land to allottee within stipulated time and suffered loss of interest of ₹ 20.11 lakh.**

Agra Development Authority (Authority) resolved in its 85<sup>th</sup> Board meeting held on 22 January 1999 *vide* item No.32 (12) that if the allottee submits the amount required for releasing possession of the property and the Authority is not able to give possession to allottee due to some physical or legal reasons, no interest will be levied on the balance amount to be recovered from the allottee.

The Authority, through auction (February 2011), allotted (March 2011) a group housing plot of 7383.93 sqm area bearing No.G.H-4 in Sector-B-2 at *Tajnagari II* Phase scheme to *Ashoka Housing*, Agra. The total cost of plot including freehold charges at the rate of 12 *per cent* was ₹ 16.54 crore<sup>1</sup>. Conditions of the allotment included that allottee was to deposit ₹ 3.99 crore for allotment of property by 10 April 2011. Further, as per condition number 10 of the allotment letter No. 1680/D/A.E (P)/2010-11 dated 5 March 2011, allottee was to deposit full property cost without interest within 60 days from the date of allotment of property.

Allottee deposited ₹ 3.99 crore on 9 April 2011 required for allotment and requested Authority to intimate the final area of the plot for taking possession of the plot. But, the Authority did not intimate the final area of the plot timely and failed to provide the possession of plot within 60 days. Final area (7382.93 sqm) was intimated to allottee by the Authority on 6 September 2011. Due to delay on the part of Authority, balance cost of ₹ 11.08 crore could not be realised from the allottee in time. Allottee deposited the balance amount with a delay of 8 to 139 days during 11 May 2011 to 31 October 2011 without interest.

Thus, due to failure in taking timely action to provide final area as well as possession of the plot to the allottee, the Authority sustained a loss of interest amounting to ₹ 20.11 lakh at the rate of six *per cent per annum* on residual amount of ₹ 11.08 crore (**Appendix 3.2**).

---

<sup>1</sup> (Plot cost ₹ 14.77 crore plus 12 *per cent* freehold charges ₹ 1.77 crore).

In reply (September 2014), the Authority accepted the delay in providing actual measurement and preparing the site plan and stated that delay was caused by unauthorised possession. Fact remains that the Authority sustained a loss of interest amounting to ₹ 20.11 lakh due to failure in providing final area as well as possession of the plot to the allottee.

Matter was reported to the Government (July 2014) and was awaited (October 2014).

### 3.3 Non-realisation of extra charges on the corner plots

**Ghaziabad Development Authority (Authority) failed to recover charges on corner plots in violation of the State Government order which resulted in short-realisation of revenue amounting to ₹ 98.38 lakh.**

As per State Government order no. G.O.780/8-1-09-16 committee/98 dated 27 February 2009, and clarification vide O.N.1762/8-1-9-16 committee/98 dated 18 June 2009, corner charges at the rate of 10 *per cent* were to be recovered from the allottees as an additional cost on the corner plots.

A three side road facing plot was developed (February 2013) by Ghaziabad Development Authority (Authority) for construction of community centre. Further, adjacent to one side of this plot of community centre, two corner plots were also developed by Authority for construction of nursing homes.

Audit noticed (March 2014) that out of the two plots so developed, one Plot no. NH-2 having area of 875 sqm was allotted (April 2013) through auction held on 29 April 2013 at the rate of ₹ 56,000 per sqm and another plot no. NH-1 having area of 823 sqm was allotted (August 2013) through auction held on 20 August 2013 at the rate of ₹ 60,000 per sqm. However, despite being situated at corner, no corner charges on both the plots were levied by the Authority. Non-levy of corner charges on above plots has resulted in loss of revenue amounting to ₹ 98.38 lakh<sup>2</sup>.

In reply, the Authority stated (July 2014) that the plots were sold to clear the un-disposed properties as per direction (July 2013) of the vice chairman and the corner charges were not recovered as the condition for recovery of corner charges was not included in the brochure published for sale/auction. The reply is not acceptable, as corner charges prescribed in the State Government order (G.O.780/8-1-09 and G.O.1762/8-1-9 dated 27 February 2009) was to be levied.

Matter was reported to the Government (July 2014) and reply was awaited (October 2014).

## Forest Department

### 3.4 Loss due to short-realisation of royalty

**Consideration of estimated production of timber in place of actual production, for royalty purpose, resulted in short-realisation of royalty amounting to ₹ 6.21 crore.**

As per para 2.7 chapter 2 of *Van Sanhita*, read with Government Order of Additional Chief Conservator of Forest (Management) U.P. Nainital 333-TC/37-

<sup>2</sup> (823\*60000\*10 *per cent*) plus (875\*56000\*10 *per cent*) = ₹ 98.38 lakh.

71(1) 26.06.1978, Uttar Pradesh Forest Corporation (UPFC) pays royalty to Uttar Pradesh Forest Department (DoF) on allotment of timber, calculated on volume factor basis<sup>3</sup>.

Audit noticed (December 2013) that after exploitation of timber lots, UPFC submits surrender letter to DoF, showing details of actual production of timber *vis-a-vis* estimated volume of timber based on which royalty is calculated. However, despite availability of data of actual production of timber, the royalty was calculated on estimated volume of timber (7111.28 cum) (**Appendix 3.3**).

Thus, consideration of estimated production in place of actual production of timber (11827.45 cum) for royalty purpose, has resulted in short realisation of royalty (4716.17 cum) amounting to ₹ 6.21 crore (**Appendix 3.3**) in six divisions of DoF.

In reply (September 2014) DoF stated that that there is no such Government order for realisation of royalty on actual production basis. Thus, royalty was realised on estimated volume of production basis.

Reply is not acceptable as Principal Chief Conservator, U.P. is the functional head of the Forest Department and issues order for fixation of rate of royalty or volume determination. Hence, it should have considered the actual production in place of the estimated production of timber, for royalty determination in the best interest of the State.

Matter was reported to the Government (July 2014) and reply was awaited (October 2014).

## Energy Department

### 3.5 Injudicious parking of surplus funds

**Uttar Pradesh Electricity Regulatory Commission (UPERC) failed to park surplus funds in higher interest bearing options and suffered a loss of interest amounting to ₹ 3.29 crore.**

As per section 3 and 5 of (Conduct of Business) Rule 2010, Uttar Pradesh Electricity Regulatory Commission (UPERC) receives miscellaneous fees and fines from electricity companies every year. As per section 33 of Electricity Regulatory Commissions Act 1998, UPERC was required to prepare the budget for estimating receipts and expenditure for each financial year.

We noticed that UPERC did not prepare the Budget as required above for the financial years 2012-14, so we examined the status of availability of funds and its utilisation. We, during audit, noticed that after incurring all expenditures, a minimum balance of ₹ 26 crore, ₹ 24 crore and ₹ 47 crore remained un-utilised in the saving bank accounts of UPERC during 2012-14 respectively. Thus, above unutilized funds were available with UPERC for investment as fixed deposits to earn interest at higher rate ranging between 9.25 *per cent* and 10.99 *per cent* during 2012-14. But UPERC failed to adopt the prudent financial management and kept the funds in saving bank account with auto sweep facility bearing interest at the rate of 6.75 *per cent* per annum during the same period.

---

<sup>3</sup> Letter no. – P-398/4volume factor/Gorakhpur Region, Lucknow, Dated: July 10, 2012.

In reply, management stated (April 2014) that the funds were kept in saving accounts to meet the requirements of funds for constructing new building. The reply is not acceptable as funds remained idle for three years and no construction activity has started yet. Moreover, no budget was prepared by the UPERC to identify the un-utilised funds for better investments.

Thus, due to failure to invest the surplus funds in higher interest bearing options, UPERC sustained a loss of interest amounting to ₹ 3.29 crore (Appendix-3.4).



(VINITA MISHRA)

Lucknow

The

Accountant General (Economic and Revenue  
Sector Audit), Uttar Pradesh

23 FEBRUARY 2015

Countersigned



(SHASHI KANT SHARMA)

New Delhi

The

Comptroller and Auditor General of India

25 FEB 2015

---



## CHAPTER 2

### 2.1 Performance Audit of Kanpur Development Authority

#### Executive Summary

Kanpur Development Authority (Authority) was set up in September 1974 under Uttar Pradesh Urban Planning and Development Act, 1973. The Performance audit of the Authority was carried out during 9 December 2013 to 15 July 2014 covering the period of five years up to 2013-14.

Audit finding pertaining to various sections of the Authority are discussed below:-

#### **Finance Section**

##### ***Loss due to non-availing auto-sweep facility***

The Authority maintained nine current bank accounts without any justification on records. Further, it failed to avail *auto-sweep* facility for current accounts which deprived the Authority from earning interest amounting to ₹ 3.61 crore between April 2009 and March 2014.

(Paragraph 2.1.6.3)

#### **Property Section**

##### ***Avoidable payment of penal compensation***

Non-compliance of the order of the Hon'ble High Court requiring determination of the compensation for the possession of land in *Panki Ganga Ganj* area, resulted in avoidable payment of penal compensation amounting to ₹ 145.23 crore.

(Paragraph 2.1.7.1)

##### ***Acquisition of disputed land***

An amount of ₹ 4.32 crore deposited for acquisition of land measuring 16.367 hectare, with ADM (LA) remained blocked and no effort was made to get refund of the amount paid by the Authority despite lapse of more than seven years.

(Paragraph 2.1.7.2)

#### **Planning Section**

##### ***Delay in preparation of new Master Plan***

Absence of new Master Plan over a long span of 15 years entailed the unplanned growth of the city, encroachments on the GoUP land and unauthorised constructions.

(Paragraph 2.1.8.1)

##### ***Non/short recovery of Floor Ratio Area Charges***

Six maps were approved in contravention to Building Bylaws, which resulted in short recovery of Floor Area Ratio charges to the extent of ₹ 7.75 crore.

(Paragraph 2.1.8.3)

##### ***Approval of Group Housing Map on railway land***

A group housing map was approved on the land marked as railway land in contravention to the Zoning Regulation of Master Plan-2021.

(Paragraph 2.1.8.4)



**Engineering Section**

***Expenditure from Infrastructure Fund***

An expenditure of ₹ 9.01 crore was incurred out of infrastructure fund on works not covered under infrastructure works.

*(Paragraph 2.1.9.3)*

***Non deposit of Labour Cess***

The Authority recovered cess of ₹ 9.17 crore on account of approval of maps. However, it did not deposit ₹ 5.19 crore with cess collector (Labour Department) as of September 2014.

*(Paragraph 2.1.9.4)*

**Sale Section**

***Irregular Sale of residential plot at agricultural rate***

The Authority allotted land at circle rate applicable for agriculture land in place of residential land rates, resulted in short recovery of revenue amounting to ₹ 4.55 crore.

*(Paragraph 2.1.10.1)*

**Enforcement Section**

***Operation of Multiplexes without completion certificate***

Due to failure of the Authority to take action under Section 27 of the Uttar Pradesh Urban Planning and Development Act, 1973, four Multiplexes were running without obtaining completion certificates.

*(Paragraph 2.1.11.2)*

**2.1.1 Introduction**

The work of housing and development of the city was carried out by the Improvement Trust up to 1945, thereafter; the Development Board started working and was in operation up to 1960, when *Nagar Mahapalika* was established. The Government of Uttar Pradesh (GoUP) set up Kanpur Development Authority (Authority) under Uttar Pradesh Urban Planning and Development Act, 1973 (Act) *vide* notifications (September 1974 and May 1975) with the prime objectives to:

- promote and secure development of Kanpur area;
- carryout building, engineering, mining and other operations;
- execute works in connection with supply of water & electricity;
- dispose-off sewage and to provide and maintain other services and amenities; and
- acquire, own, manage and dispose-off land and other properties for such development.

The Performance audit of the Authority has been taken up under Section 13 of the Comptroller & Auditor General of India (Duties, Power and Conditions of Services) Act 1971.

## 2.1.2 Organisational Structure

As per Section-4 of the Act, the Authority is a body corporate, having perpetual succession and a common seal with power to acquire, hold and dispose-off properties.

### 2.1.2.1 Constitution of Board of Authority

According to Act, the Board of Authority (BoA) consists of a Chairman, a Vice Chairman, six *ex-officio* members (Secretary, Housing and Urban Planning Department, Secretary Finance Department, Chief Town and Country Planner, Managing Director, U.P. Jal Nigam, *Mukhya Nagar Adhikari* and District Magistrate of Kanpur Nagar and Kanpur *Dehat*), four member from Kanpur Nagar Nigam, and such other members not exceeding three as may be nominated by the State Government.

### 2.1.2.2 Status of the Authority

The day to day activities of the Authority are under the control of a Vice Chairman who is assisted by a Secretary, an additional Secretary, a Finance Controller, a Chief Town Planner and a Chief Engineer. The organisational chart and charter of duties of officers of the Authority is detailed in **Appendix 2.1**. The Authority performs its functions through following sections detailed in **Table 2.1.1**:

**Table 2.1.1: Details of various sections and assigned works**

Section	Work assigned	Headed by
Property	Land acquisition and all work related to <i>gram Samaj, nazul</i> and ceiling land.	Secretary
Planning	Planning as per the Master Plan/the Building Bylaws and approval of maps.	Chief Town Planner
Engineering	Development works of schemes.	Chief Engineer
Sale	Sale of properties developed in the schemes.	Joint/Deputy Secretary
Enforcement	Action under the Act on un-authorized constructions and encroachments.	Secretary/Additional Secretary.
Finance	Management of all the financial matters of the authority.	Secretary.

*(Source: U P Urban Planning & Development Act 1973, Finance & Accounts Manual 2002 and information furnished by the Authority)*

As per the GoUP order (July 2008) proposal of acquisition schemes involving area more than 25 acre of land requires approval of Board of the Authority. Besides, budget for each financial year, proposal relating to cases of land use changes and all policy matters relating to different sections of the Authority are required to be approved by the Board of the Authority.

## 2.1.3 Audit Objectives

The objectives of the Performance Audit were to ascertain, whether:

- process of acquisition of land was completed in time after assessing the suitability of land and process of development of land and allotment was transparent;
- adequate planning for development of land was made, the schemes conformed to the Master Plan and maps/layout sanctioned in compliance with Building by-laws and other applicable rules;
- works were awarded and executed in accordance with the stipulated codal provisions and instructions.

#### **2.1.4 Audit criteria**

The following were the sources of audit criteria adopted for the Performance audit:

- The Uttar Pradesh Urban Planning and Development Act, 1973;
- State Housing policy 1995;
- Building by-laws 2008;
- Master Plan 2021 and Zonal Development Plans;
- Government Orders issued by Housing & Urban Planning Department of the GoUP;
- Board's agenda and minutes, administrative and annual reports, physical and financial progress reports of the Authority.

#### **2.1.5 Scope and Methodology of Audit**

The Performance audit covers the period from 2009-10 to 2013-14. All nine cases of land acquisition in which compensation was paid during the audit period were examined during Performance Audit. Out of 412 contracts entered into by the Authority during the audit period, for construction and development of properties valuing ₹ 426.57 crore, 127 contracts (30.83 *per cent*) valuing ₹ 319.43 crore and covering 74.88 *per cent* of the total value involved, were selected as sample on the basis of stratified random sampling done through IDEA. Besides, 40 out of total 135 cases of maps sanctioned for properties involving area more than 1,000 sqm were examined along with 15 out of 43 cases of bulk sale of properties during 2009-10 to 2013-14.

We explained the audit objectives to the management in an 'Entry Conference' held on 14 March 2014 with Vice Chairman. The audit was carried out during 9 December 2013 to 15 July 2014 during which performance of the Authority was evaluated. An Exit conference was held on 22 September 2014 with Chairman of the Authority.

The Performance Audit report was issued to the Authority (August 2014) and the GoUP (October 2014). The replies of the Authority were received (September 2014) and replies of the GoUP are still awaited (November 2014). The replies and views of the Authority received have been considered while finalising the audit findings.

#### **Audit Findings**

The audit findings pertaining to various sections are discussed in succeeding paragraphs:

#### **2.1.6 Finance Section**

Finance Section of the Authority deals with management of all the financial matters of the authority. Finance section maintains coordination in all financial matters of the Authority it gives comment and offers suggestions in all matters having financial implication and all such proposals moved to the Board. It also prepares budget, maintains financial books and other accounting records. Secretary/Additional Secretary is the sectional head assisted by one Finance Controller/ Chief Account Officer, one Account Officer, one Assistant Account Officers, one Accountant and two Assistant Accountants.

### 2.1.6.1 Income and Expenditure

The Authority maintains its own fund to meet the expenses incurred by the Authority in the administration of the Act and for no other purposes. The income and expenditure of the Authority for the last five years are given below in Table 2.1.2.

**Table 2.1.2: Income and Expenditure of the Authority**

(₹ in crore)						
Sl. No.	Particulars	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
<b>Income</b>						
1	Allotment/auction sale of plots/houses/ bulk sale	72.47	114.34	77.64	103.55	172.34
2	Income from Stamp duty	2.43	1.60	1.43	1.89	2.16
3	Income from Investment	22.64	22.91	38.23	47.66	51.85
4	Other income from properties	22.27	27.78	11.97	29.30	13.80
5	Other Misc. Income	18.94	19.20	27.31	10.11	153.32
<b>Total</b>		<b>138.75</b>	<b>185.83</b>	<b>156.68</b>	<b>192.51</b>	<b>393.47</b>
<b>Expenditure</b>						
6	Development expenses	2.30	4.00	5.19	11.85	22.95
7	Construction work	8.45	0.68	1.20	0.61	0.08
8	Parks & Plant Preservation	1.77	1.70	1.37	0.79	2.27
9	Cost of Sales (Proportionate cost of developed land)	55.81	85.75	58.23	77.99	129.83
10	Other expenditure (Depreciation, Establishment and Miscellaneous expenditure)	48.22	67.23	85.02	68.28	80.62
<b>Total</b>		<b>116.55</b>	<b>159.36</b>	<b>151.01</b>	<b>159.52</b>	<b>235.75</b>
11	Excess of income over expenditure	22.20	26.47	5.57	32.99	157.72
<b>Sub-Total</b>		<b>138.75</b>	<b>185.83</b>	<b>156.68</b>	<b>192.51</b>	<b>393.47</b>

(Source: Audited Balance Sheets of last five years)

It would be seen from the above table that the total expenditure of the Authority increased at annual average rate of 14.02 *per cent*, whereas total income grew at an annual average growth rate of 24.56 *per cent* during 2009-14.

Audit findings on inefficient financial management are discussed in succeeding paragraphs:

#### 2.1.6.2 Loss of interest due to investment in fixed deposits at lower rates

The Authority failed to formulate any policy for investment of surplus funds and invested the same in different Banks without ensuring maximum returns. We compared the interest rate of the various Fixed Deposits (FDRs) made during January 2009 to March 2014 considering the FDRs made on the same day and found that interest rate varied between 5.50 and 9.75 *per cent per annum*. The Authority failed to avail the opportunity of parking the surplus funds at higher rate and has been deprived of the interest earnings amounting to ₹ 0.75 crore as detailed in **Appendix 2.2**.

No specific reply was furnished by the Authority.

#### 2.1.6.3 Loss due to not availing auto-sweep facility

Banks provide auto sweep facility to their customers, on their request, to enable automatic investment of surplus fund lying in current accounts into term deposits. It also allows automatic encashment of term deposits when funds are required to meet an impending expenditure. Interest at the rate of 2.75 *per cent* is provided on the amount transferred to term deposits from current account. The threshold limit for transfer to term deposits from current

account is ₹ two lakh and an average quarterly balance of ₹ two lakh is to be maintained in the current account.

**The Authority failed to avail auto-sweep facility in current bank accounts which deprived the Authority of earning interest amounting to ₹ 3.61 crore.**

We noticed that the Authority maintained nine current bank accounts without justification on records. Further, it failed to avail *auto-sweep* facility for current accounts which deprived the Authority from earning interest amounting to ₹ 3.61 crore as detailed in **Appendix 2.3** between the period April 2009 and March 2014.

In reply, the Authority did not provide any justification for parking the surplus fund at lower rates.

#### **2.1.6.4 Recovery of rent at lower rate**

Erstwhile Kanpur Nagar *Mahapalika* rented covered area of 812.32 sqm for a Branch of State Bank of India at *Moti Jheel* on 11 December, 1967. After the establishment (September 1974) of the Authority, the tenancy of the bank was shifted to it. The copy of the rent agreement was neither available with the Authority nor with the Bank authorities therefore the rent was decided on mutual consent which remained lower than the minimum rent of the area prescribed by the District Magistrate, Kanpur. Thus, due to recovery of rent at lower rates the Authority suffered loss of revenue to the extent of ₹ 1.40 crore between the period January 2007 and March 2014 as detailed in **Appendix 2.4**.

**The Authority suffered loss of revenue to the extent of ₹ 1.40 crore, due to recovery of rent at lower rates.**

In reply the Authority stated (September 2014) that they have asked (April 2014) the bank to deposit the balance amount of rent or to vacate the premises. Besides, legal action has also been initiated against the bank, however, the bank authorities had not responded.

#### **2.1.6.5 Absence of Internal Audit**

As per provision of Section 12 of Finance & Accounts Manual, the Authority was required to maintain a full-fledged Internal Audit Section to carry out audits extensively throughout the year.

We noticed that no internal audit was functioning in the Authority as required by the Finance & Accounts Manual of the Authority. As a result cases of violation of Act, Master Plan, applicable rules & regulations could not be detected by the Authority.

*Authority needs to invest funds in secured and beneficial interest bearing options. Authority may also put a sound internal control mechanism in place.*

### **2.1.7 Property Section**

Property section of the Authority is entrusted with the work of land acquisition along with other miscellaneous works related to *gram Samaj*, *nazul* and ceiling land. Secretary of the Authority is sectional head of the property section, assisted by one Joint Secretary, three *Tahsildars*, two *Lekhpals*, 24 *Ameens* and nine *Surveyors*.

#### **Acquisition of land**

Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (LAA) empowers the Authority to acquire land from the persons for development of housing schemes and for other public purposes.

As per the GoUP order (July 2008) approval of Board, was necessary for land acquisition schemes involving area more than 25 acre. All nine cases of land

acquisition in which compensation was paid during the audit period were examined during Performance audit.

As of 31 March 2014, the Authority was having possession of 5,296.41 hectare land out of which it could utilise only 2,888.02 hectare land whereas 1,063.91 hectare land was under disputes and 1,344.48 hectare land remained un-utilised despite availability.

Proposals for acquisition of land in respect of 160.745 hectare land were awaiting final award from ADM (LA). Besides, for 67.417 hectare land, only preliminary notifications were issued during February 2010 to June 2013. Thus, land acquisition proposal of 228.162 hectare land were pending till July 2014 due to dispute and encroachment on land.

Specific findings on Land acquisition are discussed in succeeding paragraphs:

#### 2.1.7.1 Avoidable payment of penal compensation

Non-compliance of the order of the Hon'ble High Court, requiring determination of the compensation for the possession of land in *Panki Ganga Ganj* area, resulted in avoidable payment of penal compensation amounting to ₹ 145.23 crore.

The Hon'ble High Court of Allahabad in its order dated 30 November 1984 upheld the acquisition of *Panki Ganga Ganj* area and directed to 'determine the compensation in accordance with Section 14 of the Act'. The Order of Hon'ble High Court had never been complied with and compensation was not re-fixed as per directions of the Hon'ble High Court given in November 1984.

We noticed that Hon'ble High Court of Allahabad in its order dated 10 January 2013 further directed to determine the compensation for the possession of land of *Panki Ganga Ganj* area and to prepare an award within three months. For compliance of subsequent order of January 2013, a sum of ₹ 174.43 crore was paid (₹ 60.33 crore in May 2013 & ₹ 114.10 crore in June 2013) to ADM (LA) in respect of 811-15-10 *Bigha* land covered under above cases which included penal amount of compensation of ₹ 145.23 crore.

Thus, non compliance of the order (November 1984) of the Hon'ble Court, resulted in avoidable payment of penal compensation amounting to ₹ 145.23 crore<sup>1</sup>.

Further, out of the land for which compensation was paid, land of 62 *arazi* numbers (Measuring 46.576 *bigha*) could not be taken over as the land was already being used as Ash pond for *Panki* Power House of Uttar Pradesh Rajya Vidyut Utpadan Nigam Limited (UPRVUNL). Thus, compensation of ₹ 10 crore<sup>2</sup> paid in respect of land possessed by UPRVUNL was remained unfruitful. No effort was made to get back the land from UPRVUNL.

The Authority while confirming the audit observation stated (September 2014) that no action was initiated at the level of SLAO. Fact remains that the Authority failed to take timely action to comply the order (November 1984) of the Hon'ble High Court of Allahabad which led to higher payment of compensation.

#### 2.1.7.2 Acquisition of disputed land

Section-16 of LAA provides that possessed land should be free from all encumbrances. Authority proposed to acquire (December 2002) 83 *gata* numbers measuring 23.868 hectare land in *Panki Gangaganj* Village, for developing the *Mahaveer Nagar* Extension housing scheme. Authority paid a sum of ₹ 6.87 crore between February 2003 and February 2006 for the same.

<sup>1</sup> ₹ 50.22 crore in respect of 281, *Bigha* land and ₹ 95.01 crore in respect of 530.15 *Bigha* land.

<sup>2</sup> 46.576 *Bigha*\* ₹ 21.50 lakh.

ADM (LA) declared award (April 2008) of 8.11 hectare land against the proposal of 23.868 hectare land in favour of Authority and award for remaining land (15.758 hectare) could not be declared due to disputes on the title of the land. Further, possession of only 7.501 hectare land was given (January 2007) to the Authority by ADM (LA). Authority requested (August 2009) ADM (LA) to provide the possession of the remaining land of 0.609 hectare (8.11 minus 7.501 hectare) which is still awaited (November 2014).

We noticed that above proposal of acquisition of land was sent without ascertaining the fact that land was free from all encumbrances. Further it was noticed that out of 83 *gata* numbers proposed for acquisition, a management college was existing on the 4 *gata* numbers measuring 0.763 hectares and 49 *gata* numbers measuring 15.755 hectares were under dispute. As a result, the Authority could not commence its housing scheme even after receipt of 7.501 hectare land. Thus, payment of ₹ 1.98 crore made for land for which possession was taken could not achieve its objective.

Further, an amount of ₹ 4.32 crore deposited (February 2006) for remaining land, measuring 16.367 hectare (23.868 minus 7.501 hectare) of acquisition proposal (December 2002), with ADM (LA) remained blocked and no effort was made to get refund of the amount paid by the Authority despite lapse of more than seven years.

The Authority replied (September 2014) that scheme could not be started as land is in scattered form and possession of entire notified land has not been received from ADM (LA). Reply is not acceptable as actual status of land to be acquired was not ascertained before submitting (December 2002) the proposal for land acquisition.

### 2.1.8 Planning Section

Planning section of the Authority is entrusted with preparation of Master Plan, Zonal Development Plan and sanction of maps of properties in accordance with the GoUP orders and Building By-laws. Planning section was headed by the Chief Town Planner of the Authority, who is assisted by one Town Planner, two Assistant Town Planners and eight Junior Engineers. Audit findings relating to planning section are discussed in succeeding paragraphs:

#### 2.1.8.1 Delay in preparation of new Master Plan

As per Section 8 of the Act, the Authority was to prepare a Master Plan for the development area. Section 10 provides that after its preparation, every plan was to be submitted by Authority to the GoUP for approval.

The Authority adopted the Master Plan-1991 (applicable for the period from 1970 to 1991) of the GoUP since its inception in 1974 which remained effective till 1991. After the cessation of Master Plan-1991, preparation of new Master Plan was not done and consequently Master Plan-1991 remained effective till approval (November 2006) of new Master Plan. The process of preparation of new Master Plan-2021 was started in 2002 and it could only be approved in November 2006. Absence of revised/new Master Plan over a long span of 15 years entailed the unplanned growth of the city, encroachments on the GoUP land and unauthorised constructions which are still causing disputed change of land use and irregular compounding of unauthorised construction as discussed in different paragraphs of this report.

Further, Section-9 of the Act provides that simultaneously with the preparation of the Master Plan or as soon as may be thereafter, the Authority was to

**Absence of new Master Plan over a long span of 15 years entailed the unplanned growth of the city, encroachments on the GoUP land and unauthorised constructions.**



proceed with the preparation of a Zonal Development Plan for each of the zone into which the Development Area may be divided. Thus, the Authority was required to prepare the Zonal Development Plan for all the 11 zones of Kanpur Development Area but the Authority failed to prepare the same till date. Non-preparation of Zonal Plan led to haphazard constructions and entailed frequent conversion of land use.

In reply, the Authority accepted (September 2014) the delay in preparation of new Master Plan-2021. The Authority further replied that proposals for preparation of Zonal Development Plan of three zones were approved in January 2013 out of which Zonal Plan of one zone is under process. Fact remains that Zonal Development Plan of each zone was not prepared in accordance with Section 9 of the Act.

### 2.1.8.2 Irregularities relating to sanction of maps

For sanction of maps, four sets of proposed maps is to be deposited along with requisite fees, lease/ license deed documents regarding ownership, site plan. The Authority sanctions maps submitted to it in accordance with Building Bylaws and other regulations applicable at the time of sanction. As per the GoUP order of May 1997 sanction requirement for maps were as given in **Table 2.1.3.**

**Table 2.1.3: Requirement of Sanction of Map**

Sl.No	Area of plot (sqm)	Requirement of Sanction of Map
1.	Above 300	Required sanction of the Authority
2	101 to 300	Considered as deemed sanctioned on the basis of certificate of Architect
3	Below 100	No sanction of the Map of Authority was required subject to fulfilment of conditions of Master Plan.

(Source: The Government of Uttar Pradesh Order No 1614 dated 01 May 1997)

Further, powers of sanction of map rests with Chief Town Planner/Town Planner for plots up to 500 sqm area, for plots having area from 500 to 1000 sqm, it rest with Secretary/Additional Secretary and for plot area above 1000 sqm it rest with Vice Chairman of the Authority. The Authority sanctioned 135 maps (having area more than 1000 sqm) during the period covered under Performance Audit. Out of this, Audit examined 40 cases of sanction of maps for detailed scrutiny and found cases of violation of Building Bylaws viz. non/short recovery of charges for Floor Area Ratio, inadequate provision of parking space, compounding etc. which are discussed in succeeding paragraphs:

### 2.1.8.3 Non-compliance of Building Bylaws

Irregularities noticed on non-compliance of building bylaws which resulted in undue favour to builders as discussed below:

#### *Non/Short recovery of Floor Area Ratio charges*

The Floor Area Ratio (FAR) is the ratio of a building's total floor area to the size of the piece of land upon which it is built. We noticed that the Authority, in contravention to Building Bylaws, allowed excess FAR to the builders by way of non recovery of charges for purchasable FAR, by not deducting the area covered under park/open space/road widening from gross area and by allowing FAR in excess as required under the auction conditions which has resulted in short recovery of FAR charges to the extent of ₹ 7.75 crore in approval of six maps as detailed in **Appendix 2.5 (A).**

Six maps were approved in contravention to Building Bylaws, which resulted in short recovery of Floor Area Ratio charges to the extent of ₹ 7.75 crore.



***Inadequate provision for parking space***

As per Clause 3.10.3 of Building By-laws 2008, car space of one car for each flat area of 50 to 75 sqm, 1.25 car for each flat area of 75 to 150 sqm and 1.5 car for flats having area above 150 sqm, was required for group housing properties. From September 2011, car space of 1.5 was required as parking space for every 100 sqm of floor area and 10 *per cent* of the total parking area was to be provided for visitors parking.

We noticed that in two cases parking space sanctioned in Maps remained less than that required as per above provisions as detailed in **Appendix 2.5 (B)**.

Inadequate provision of parking space led to unplanned development.

*The Authority may put a mechanism in place to comply with the provisions contained in Master Plan and Building Bylaws while sanctioning of maps.*

**2.1.8.4 Approval of group housing map on railway land**

As per Clause 11.1.9.1 of Zoning Regulation of Master Plan 2021, land area marked for specific uses in the Master Plan was allowed for the same use only. We noticed that as per Master Plan-2021 plot no.84/250 *Jhakarkati*, Kanpur was marked as railway land. The Authority, however, approved (March 2012) a map to construct group housing on the same land in contravention to the Zoning Regulation of Master Plan 2021. No action for cancellation of approval of said map has yet been taken.

In the Exit Conference, the VC stated that a request has been forwarded to the GoUP for cancellation of map approved on railway land.

**2.1.8.5 Sanction of Map without change of land use**

As per Clause 11.1.9.1 of Zoning Regulations under Master Plan-2021, land marked for specific use in Master Plan can only be used for that purpose.

Further as per Section 13 of the Act, the Authority may make any amendments in the master plan which in its opinion do not affect the character of the plan. It further provided that before making any amendments in the plan, the Authority shall publish a notice in at least one newspaper having circulation in the development area inviting objections and suggestions from any person with respect to the proposed amendments before such date as may be specified in the notice and shall consider all objections and suggestions that may be received by the Authority or the State Government.

During Performance Audit, it was noticed that Village *Ishwariganj* was marked as ‘green verge/open space’ and village *Baikunthpur* as ‘residential’ in the Master Plan-2021. However, we noticed that compounding map for use of land for educational purpose was sanctioned in March 2012 on plot numbers. 334 to 344 and 378 to 380 of *Ishwariganj* village and plot numbers 308, 334, 315, 332, 375, 381 of *Baikunthpur* village without conversion/change of land use.

In reply (September 2014), the Authority did not provide any reason for sanction of map without conversion/change of land use.

**2.1.8.6 Short levy of Development Charges**

As per the GoUP order (December 2001) development charges at prevailing rate were leviable on total covered area of the project.

A group housing map was approved on the land marked as railway land in contravention to the Zoning Regulation of Master Plan-2021.

Authority short levied development charges to extent of ₹ 5.01 crore.

We noticed that in one case<sup>3</sup>, the Authority levied (March 2012) development charges on constructed area (8923.56 sqm) in place of covered area (76112 sqm) which has resulted in short recovery of ₹ 5.01 crore<sup>4</sup>.

No specific comment was offered by the Authority in this regard.

#### 2.1.8.7 Non-Provision of houses for Economic Weaker Section and Lower Income Group

As per the GoUP order (September 2011) provision for Economically Weaker Sections (EWS) and Lower Income Group houses was to be made to the extent of 10 per cent of total residential units approved. We noticed that in seven<sup>5</sup> cases Authority approved the maps of group housing without ensuring above provisions and in one case Authority approved the map for group housing (*Mahaveer Sahkari Avas Samiti*) which provided only 24 units in place of 103 units required as per the GoUP order (September 2011).

No reply to the above observation was submitted by the Authority.

### 2.1.9 Engineering Section

Engineering section of the Authority is entrusted with the responsibility of the execution of construction and development works in new and upcoming schemes of the Authority. It determines the cost of various properties. It also holds the responsibility of execution of contracts/issue of work orders for execution of works, verification of bills pertaining to works and bills of other expenses along with obtaining sanctions for the payments. Engineering section is headed by the Chief Engineer of the Authority assisted by four Executive Engineers, 12 Assistant Engineers and 50 Junior Engineers as on November 2014. All powers for sanction and execution of development work vests with the Vice chairman of the Authority.

Audit findings relating to works executed by Engineering Section are discussed below:

#### 2.1.9.1 Delay in development of land and construction works

The Authority executed various development works viz. roads, water lines, sewer lines, drains, and parks etc. under 18 development schemes during 2009-10 to 2013-14. The achievement *vis-a-vis* the works planned for 18 development schemes, during the last five years, is given in **Table 2.1.4** below:

**Table 2.1.4: Details of works planned and taken up by the Authority**

Year	No. of works taken up under 18 schemes	
	Planned in Budget	Actually Taken up
2009-10	7	5
2010-11	N.A.	14
2011-12	15	12
2012-13	16	3
2013-14	15	10
	53	44

(Source: Contract bond register and annual budget of the Authority)

Authority entered into 412 contracts valuing ₹ 426.57 crore during the audit period, for construction and development of properties, out of which 127 contracts (30.83 per cent) valuing ₹ 319.43 crore and covering 74.88 per cent

<sup>3</sup> Maharana Pratap Educational Centre.

<sup>4</sup> (76112 sqm-8923.56 sqm)\* ₹ 746.

<sup>5</sup> Diviniti Housing Pvt Ltd, Hariom Agrawal & Others, Sukhdam Infra, Hari Ganesh Pvt Ltd, M G Infra Pvt Ltd, Smt. Taslim Asraf and Smt. Dulari Devi.

of the total value of the contract involved, were selected on the basis of stratified random sampling done through IDEA along with implementation of *Manyavar Shri Kanshiram Ji Sahari Garib Avas Yojna*. Audit noticed that:

- No scheduled dates for completion of above 18 development schemes were fixed. Without scheduled completion period Authority could not control the delays in completion of schemes executed. As a result, out of 18 schemes, only seven schemes were completed and handed over to Local Authorities during the period from 2009 to 2014. One scheme named O Block *Kidwai Nagar* out of the above 18 development schemes, commenced during 1979, is still lying pending for completion and handing over to local authorities. Besides, eight schemes commenced during the period from 2004-05 to 2008-09 are still lying incomplete despite lapse of more than five years. Consequently, only 44 construction works, planned in the yearly budget of the Authority, could be taken up and balance nine works could not be taken up as of March 2014. Further, out of 44 works taken up only 12 works were completed during 2009-14. However, delays in completion of works/schemes could not be quantified due to non-fixation of schedule date of completion of development schemes.

- As per contract conditions for delay in completion of contract from schedule date of completion a penalty at the rate of one *per cent* of the total value of work was to be levied for every day of delay in completion of contract subject to maximum 10 *per cent* of the value of the work. In contracts, selected for audit, we noticed that there were delays in completion of 35 contracts but, Authority levied correct penalty in only four cases. In 19 contracts, there was a delay of nine months but no penalty was levied by the Authority, however, leviable penalty worked out to ₹ 26.78 lakh. In remaining 12 contracts, Authority levied penalty of ₹ 10.20 lakh only, against required penalty of ₹ 84.91 lakh without any reasons on records. Thus, Authority provided undue benefit of ₹ 1.02 crore to contractors by non/short levy of penalty for delay in execution of contract works.

Authority provided undue benefit of ₹ 1.02 crore to contractors by non/short levy of penalty for delay in execution of contract works.

#### **2.1.9.2 Execution of *Manyavar Shri Kanshi Ram Ji Shahri Garib Avas Yojna***

The GoUP introduced (June 2008) *Manyavar Shri Kanshiram Ji Sahari Garib Avas Yojna* (MSKJSGAY) to provide residential facilities free of cost to the urban poor population. The scheme was implemented in three phases. Authority was one of the executing agencies<sup>6</sup> to carry out the construction work under the scheme. Against the target of 5400 houses; 1500 houses in Phase I (June 2008), 1900 houses in Phase II (January 2010) and 2000 houses in Phase III (April 2011) involving estimated cost ₹ 126.80 crore, Authority completed (December 2009) construction work of 1500 houses under Phase-I with expenditure of ₹ 29.35 crore. Construction work of 3231 houses including development works of Phase-II and Phase-III was still in progress with expenditure of ₹ 96.89 crore (November 2014).

As per the GoUP order of January 2014, the scheme was closed and works under the scheme were required to be completed by 15 February 2014 and compliance report along with remaining unutilised amount was to be deposited to the GoUP by 16 February 2014. We noticed that Authority failed to get the remaining work completed by 16 February 2014 due to inadequate supervision

---

<sup>6</sup> State Urban Development Authority/District Urban Development Authority and Uttar Pradesh Awas Evam Vikas Parishad were other executing agencies.

and monitoring of the works executed through contractors and deficiencies in selection of contractors. Consequently, Authority failed to submit the compliance report as per required schedule.

As per MSKJSGAY guideline (July 2008) works were to be completed within sanctioned cost of work and no further cost escalation was allowed. We noticed that in violation of the scheme guidelines the Authority incurred an extra expenditure of ₹ 9.27 crore under the MSKJSGAY (Phase-II) due to delay in completion and execution of works, which remained unrealised from the GoUP, even after closure of the scheme in January 2014.

The Authority accepted the facts and stated (September 2014) that amount will be adjusted in the scheme on receipt of fund from the GoUP. The reply is not acceptable as chances of receipt of fund from the GoUP under MSKJSGAY are remote as the scheme has already been closed by the GoUP *vide* order dated 27 January 2014.

*The Authority may restrict the expenditure within the monetary limits and complete the works within the time schedules prescribed under the schemes.*

### 2.1.9.3 Irregular Expenditure from Infrastructure fund

As per Office Memorandum of the GoUP number 152 (15 January 1998) 90 per cent of the income of the Authority pertaining to development charges, land use conversion charges, freehold charges, registration fees and 50 per cent of compounding charges was to be kept in a fund with a view to contribute towards infrastructure development of the city.

The Empowered Sub-Committee of the Committee on Infrastructure constituted by Planning Commission of India prescribed (January and April 2008) the broad definition of infrastructure which includes Electricity (including generation, transmission and distribution) and Repair and Maintenance of power stations, Non- Conventional Energy (including wind energy and solar energy), Water supply and sanitation (including solid waste management, drainage and sewerage) and street lighting, Telecommunications, Roads & bridges, Ports, Inland waterways, Airports, Railways (including rolling stock and mass transit system), Irrigation (including watershed development), Storage, Oil and gas pipeline networks.

We noticed that Authority incurred an expenditure of ₹ 9.01 crore which were not covered under above definition of infrastructure expenditure as defined by committee constituted by Planning Commission:

Items of Expenditure	Amount (₹ in crore)
Payment for handing over services of four colonies <sup>7</sup>	7.87
Renovation work in Commissioner's office	0.84
Purchase of bicycle for police	0.30
<b>Total</b>	<b>9.01</b>

In reply the Authority did not provide any justification for sanction of these works under infrastructure fund.

### 2.1.9.4 Non deposit of labour cess

Under Section 3 of the 'Building and Other Construction Workers' Welfare Cess Act, 1996' (applicable from February 2009 in the State), cess is to be levied and collected from the employer at the rate not less than one per cent of the cost of construction incurred by the employer. Further, as per the GoUP

<sup>7</sup> GautamVihar, Jarauli phase-2, Panki and Barra-6.

An expenditure of ₹ 9.01 crore was incurred out of infrastructure fund on works not covered under infrastructure works.

notification dated 15 September 2010, cess is to be levied at the rate of one *per cent* of the construction cost in respect of residential houses having cost more than ₹ 10 lakh. The Building and Other Construction Workers' Welfare Cess Rules, 1998 elaborated that the cess levied under section 3(1) of the said act was to be paid by an employer within thirty days of completion of the construction project or within thirty days of the date on which assessment of cess payable was finalised, whichever is earlier, to the cess collector.

We noticed that the Authority released payment of ₹ 27.25 crore in respect of 47 contracts executed during the period 2009-10 to 2010-11 without deduction of labour cess of ₹ 27.25 lakh from the contractors. Further, in 18 contracts, short deduction of ₹ 11.21 lakh was made. This had resulted in undue benefit to the contractors and loss to the State ex-chequer.

**Authority recovered cess of ₹ 9.17 crore on account of approval of maps. However, it did not deposit ₹ 5.19 crore with cess collector (Labour Department).**

Further, Authority ordered (January 2011) to recover the labour cess on approval of maps. We noticed that the Authority recovered ₹ 9.17 crore on approval of maps as labour cess during January 2011 to March 2014 but it deposited only ₹ 3.98 crore and balance amount of ₹ 5.19 crore was not deposited to cess collector (Labour Department) as required under section 3(1) of the Building and Other Construction Workers' Welfare Cess Rules, 1998.

The Authority stated (September 2014) that amount will be deposited on receiving the demand from Labour Department. Reply is not acceptable as amount once deducted had to be deposited with the concerned authority under the rules.

#### **2.1.10 Sale Section**

Sale section of the Authority is entrusted with the sale of developed properties under the different scheme of the Authority. Sale section performs works relating to registration, mutation and freehold of properties. The allotment/sale of properties is done either through draw of lots after registration of prospective buyers or through open auction. On selection of applicants through above process, it issues allotment letters to successful applicants and executes registered agreements of sale of property. Sale section was headed by the Secretary/Additional Secretary of the Authority and assisted by two Joint Secretary, three Deputy Secretary, three Accountants and five Head clerks.

##### **2.1.10.1 Irregular Sale of residential plot at agricultural rate**

As per allotment rules (clause 3.2 of chapter 17 of Finance and Account Manual 2002), an allotment of land was to be done through lottery of plots or through auction after giving wide publicity. In contravention to the above a part of residential land measuring 4615.22 sqm (Plot no. 1283, 1284 & 1285 in *Bairi Akbarpur Bangar*) was allotted (May 2010) to a builder<sup>8</sup> at circle rate of ₹ 1,200 per sqm applicable for agriculture land in place of residential land rates of ₹ 10,000 per sqm, which resulted in short recovery of ₹ 4.55 crore<sup>9</sup>.

The Authority accepted the observation and stated that land was sold to prevent encroachment. Fact remains that residential land was sold at the land rate of agricultural land.

*The Authority may ensure adherence of allotment rules as defined in 'Finance and Account manual of the Authority while allotment/sale of land.*

<sup>8</sup> Rohit Real Estate Private Limited.

<sup>9</sup> (₹ 51690464 minus ₹ 62,02,856).

### 2.1.11 Enforcement Section

Enforcement section of the Authority is responsible for taking action under the Act on un-authorised constructions and encroachments. Enforcement section was headed over by the Secretary/Additional Secretary of the Authority assisted by two Executive Engineers and four Assistant Engineers with 20 Junior Engineers.

As per the GoUP order of 23 June 1997, primary responsibility for preventing encroachment rests with concerned Assistant Engineer. Section 26-D of the Act provides that whoever specially entrusted with the duty to stop or prevent the encroachment or obstruction under the Act willfully or knowingly neglects or deliberately omits to stop or prevent such encroachment or obstruction shall be punishable with simple imprisonment for a term which may extend to one month or with fine which may extend to ten thousand rupees or both.

We noticed that Enforcement Section of the Authority failed to perform its duties and we found instances where Authority failed to check the unauthorised constructions as pointed out in succeeding paragraphs:

#### 2.1.11.1 Compounding of group housing maps

As per Clause 3.3.5 and 3.3.6 of Compounding Bylaws 2009, compounding is admissible for the unauthorised construction done to the extent of 10 *per cent* of permissible covered area and Floor Area Ratio (FAR) with restriction on further unauthorised construction.

We noticed that in violation of the above provision, Group housing maps were sanctioned (February 2007 to March 2010) by the Authority violating the prescribed limit of 10 *per cent* of covered area and Floor Area Ratio.

For one plot<sup>10</sup>, compounding was allowed (June 2008 to March 2010) to the extent of 715.27 sqm against the original sanction of 582.83 sqm which was 22.72 *per cent* of the permissible covered area and FAR was approved to the extent of 4,989.53 sqm against the original sanction of 2,309.08 sqm which was 116.08 *per cent* of permissible FAR. Similarly, for another plot<sup>11</sup>, FAR was approved (July 2008 to December 2009) to the extent of 5,436.55 sqm against the original sanction of 3,062.20 sqm which was 77.60 *per cent* of permissible FAR. In both the cases enforcement section failed to check the construction done beyond permissible limit.

The Authority stated (September 2014) that compounding was done within the limit of 10 *per cent*. Reply is not acceptable as compounding of unauthorised portion and FAR was allowed in excess of ten *per cent* of permissible covered area and FAR, in violation of clause 3.3.5 and 3.3.6 of Compounding Bylaws 2009.

#### 2.1.11.2 Operation of Multiplexes without completion certificate

As per section 27 of the Act, for any construction done in contravention of Master Plan, Zonal Development Plan or without permission, approval by the Authority, Authority have right to demolish, remove or felling such construction.

Section-15A of the Act provides that no person shall occupy or permit to be occupied any commercial building or use or permit to be used such building or

<sup>10</sup> Plot number 4/276P having gross area 2112.57 sqm situated at Parwati Bagla Road.

<sup>11</sup> Plot number 4/276 having gross area 2438.61sqm situated at Parwati Bagla Road.

**Four Multiplexes were running without obtaining completion certificates required under section 15A of the Act.**

part there of affected by any work until completion certificate is issued by the Authority.

We noticed that Authority approved the maps in respect of four multiplexes<sup>12</sup> in the city which were running without obtaining completion certificates despite lapse of 14 years from the date of sanctioning the map from the Authority as required under section 15A of the Act. But enforcement section of the Authority failed to take any action in this regard under section 27 of the Act.

The Authority accepted the audit observation and stated that completion certificate has not been issued yet. Further, in Exit Conference Chairman stated that a system of taking bank guarantee would be evolved for obtaining completion certificate before operation of commercial buildings. Fact remains that enforcement section failed to discharge its prime duties.

*Enforcement section needs to prepare schedule for regular inspection of sites to check and control the unauthorised constructions.*

#### **2.1.12 Conclusion**

- The Authority failed to avail the opportunity of parking the surplus funds at higher rate and has been deprived of the interest earnings amounting to ₹ 0.75 crore. The Authority maintained nine current bank accounts without any justification on records. Further, it failed to avail *auto-sweep* facility for current accounts which deprived the Authority from earning interest amounting to ₹ 3.61 crore between April 2009 and March 2014.
- Non-compliance of the order of the Hon'ble High Court requiring determination of the compensation for the possession of land in *Panki Ganga Ganj* area, resulted in avoidable payment of penal compensation amounting to ₹ 145.23 crore.
- Absence of new Master Plan over a long span of 15 years entailed the unplanned growth of the city, encroachments on the GoUP land and unauthorised constructions. Six maps were approved in contravention to Building Bylaws, which had resulted in short recovery of Floor Area Ratio charges to the extent of ₹ 7.75 crore. Besides, a group housing map was approved on the land marked as railway land in contravention to the Zoning Regulation of Master Plan-2021.
- The Authority recovered cess of ₹ 9.17 crore on account of approval of maps, however, it did not deposit ₹ 5.19 crore with cess collector (Labour Department) as of September 2014.
- Authority allotted land at circle rate applicable for agriculture land in place of residential land rates, resulted in short recovery of revenue amounting to ₹ 4.55 crore.
- Due to failure of the Authority to take action under Section 27 of the Uttar Pradesh Urban Planning and Development Act, 1973, four Multiplexes were running without obtaining completion certificates.

<sup>12</sup> *Rave-3* (May 2000), *Rave @ Moti* (October 2005), *Z Square Mall* (April 2006) and *South X Mall* (March 2011).



## Department of Micro, Small & Medium Enterprises and Export Promotion

### 2.2 Long paragraph on implementation of the various schemes through District Industries Centres

#### 2.2.1. Introduction

The new industrial policy statement of 1977 of the Government of India (GoI) emphasised upon effective promotion of cottage and small industries widely dispersed in rural area and small towns. For the fulfilment of this objective, the industrial policy also provided for establishment of District Industries Centres (DICs) in all the district to provide services and support required by small and cottage entrepreneurs. Suitable financial and organisational support was to be provided to these centres through State Government.

In pursuance to the GoI objectives, the Government of Uttar Pradesh (GoUP) established DICs in 69 districts during 1978-79, which presently covers the work of entire 75<sup>13</sup> districts of the State.

During the period covered under Audit (2010-11 to 2013-14), DICs implemented 29 schemes at a cost of ₹ 347.14 crore including four schemes sponsored by the GoI (₹ 264.23 crore) and 25 schemes financed by the GoUP (₹ 82.91 crore) as detailed in **Appendix 2.6** and summarised in the **Table 2.2.1** given below:

**Table 2.2.1: Total expenditure incurred on the GoI and the GoUP Schemes through 69 DICs during the audit period from 2010-11 to 2013-14**

(₹ in crore)						
Sl. No.	Particulars	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	Total
1	Four Schemes sponsored by the GoI	114.79	9.61	26.24	113.59	264.23
2	25 Schemes financed by the GoUP	16.03	17.13	20.91	28.84	82.91
	Total	130.82	26.74	47.15	142.43	347.14

(Source: Information provided by Directorate of Industries)

#### 2.2.2 Organisational Structure

Directorate of Industries (DI) is the functional wing of the Department of Micro, Small & Medium Enterprises (MSME) and Export Promotion (EP), GoUP. DICs are under the administrative control of DI. Each DIC is headed by General Manager (GM) and assisted by Managers, Assistant Managers and Supporting Staff (**Appendix 2.7**). DICs are responsible for implementation of various schemes meant for MSMEs in Uttar Pradesh.

#### 2.2.3 Audit Objectives

The objectives of Audit were to ascertain:

- effective utilisation of budget allotted for schemes and expenditure incurred there against;
- compliance of the GoI/ GoUP orders, scheme guidelines etc.;
- effective implementation and monitoring of the schemes to achieve intended objectives.

<sup>13</sup> Including six newly created Districts viz. Auraiya (Etawah), Sant Kabir Nagar (Basti), Shamli (Muzaffarnagar), Sambhal (Moradabad), Hapur (Ghaziabad) and Amethi (Sultanpur).



#### 2.2.4 Audit Criteria

Long paragraph on Implementation of various schemes through DICs was benchmarked against the criteria derived from the following sources:

- Industrial Policy Statement of the Government of India (GoI), 1977;
- The Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises Development Act, 2006;
- Orders of the GoUP, DI and scheme guidelines.

#### 2.2.5 Scope and Methodology of Audit

The Audit covered the period from 2010-11 to 2013-14. The audit was conducted during July 2013 to February 2014. During test check the implementation of two out of four schemes sponsored by the GoI and four out of 25 schemes financed by the GoUP were selected in 15 out of 69 DICs on expenditure basis.

Scheme wise details of the expenditure incurred on the selected schemes of the 15 test checked DICs during 2010-11 to 2013-14 are given in **Appendix 2.8** and summarised in **Table 2.2.2** given below:

**Table 2.2.2: Total expenditure incurred on selected Schemes of 15 test checked DICs during period from 2010-11 to 2013-14**

(₹ in crore)						
Sl. No.	Particulars	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	Total
1	Two Schemes sponsored by the GoI	44.83	1.65	0.00	29.50	75.98
2	Four Schemes financed by the GoUP	0.88	0.96	1.08	1.26	4.18
	Total	45.71	2.61	1.08	30.76	80.16

(Source: Information provided by Directorate of Industries).

We explained the audit objectives, criteria and methodology to the Department of MSME & EP during an Entry Conference held with Principal Secretary on 31 January 2014. An Exit Conference was held on 28 August 2014 during which audit findings were discussed with the Commissioner and Director of Industries, Uttar Pradesh. The replies of the GoUP have been considered and appropriately incorporated in the report.

#### Audit Findings

Audit findings are grouped under the two categories namely Schemes sponsored by the GoI and Schemes financed by the GoUP and are discussed below:

##### **Schemes sponsored by Government of India**

During the years 2010-11 to 2013-14, an expenditure of ₹ 264.23 crore was incurred on implementation of four schemes sponsored by the GoI. Scheme wise expenditure is given in (**Appendix 2.6**). During the audit, we test checked two out of four schemes sponsored by the GoI viz. Prime Minister Employment Generation Programme and Micro & Small Enterprises - Cluster Development Programme.

Scheme wise findings are as detailed below:

##### **2.2.6 Prime Minister Employment Generation Programme**

The Government of India introduced a new credit linked subsidy programme called 'Prime Minister Employment Generation Programme (PMEGP)' during 2008-09. Objectives of the scheme were to generate employment opportunities

in rural as well as urban areas of the country through setting up of new self-employment ventures/projects/micro enterprises like Printing Press, Steel Fabrication unit etc. The scheme was to be administered by the Ministry of Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises, GoI. *Khadi and Village Industries Commission (KVIC)*, Mumbai was nodal agency of the scheme at the national level and DICs were the implementing agencies at State level.

The maximum cost of the project admissible for subsidy was ₹ 25 lakh and ₹ 10 lakh for Manufacturing sector (Brick Industry, Carpet industry etc.) and Service sector (Photography, Mobile repairing etc.) respectively. The amount of subsidy ranged from 15-35 *per cent* of the project cost depending upon area (urban/rural) and category of beneficiaries (General/Special including SC, ST, Other Backward Class, women etc.).

During the period covered in audit the scheme was operated through the DICs in 2010-11 and 2013-14 only and remained inoperative during the year 2011-12 and 2012-13 to cover up the backlog of subsidy. Under the scheme 69 DICs disbursed loan to 6656 beneficiaries against the target of 6591 beneficiaries. Against the loan disbursed amounting to ₹ 338.70 crore in 2008-09 and 2009-10, after lock in period of three years, subsidy of ₹ 163.19 crore was to be disbursed to 6761 beneficiaries but subsidy of ₹ 135.94 crore was disbursed to 5629 beneficiaries only as of March 2014.

#### 2.2.6.1 Generation of employment

Main objective of the scheme was to generate employment opportunities through establishment of micro enterprises. For measuring the attainment of main objective year wise targets for the two years in which scheme was operated, were fixed. Status of target and achievement for employment generation is detailed in table 2.2.3 below:

**Table: 2.2.3: Status of target and achievement of employment generation under PMEGP**

Year	Targeted employment (Numbers)	Achievement (Numbers)	Achievement (in percentage)
2010-11	33280	18694	56.17
2013-14	26104	18118	69.40

(Source: Information provided by Directorate of Industries).

It would be seen from the table that during both the years targeted employment could not be generated.

#### *Audit Findings*

During the test check of 15 DICs covered for audit following irregularities were noticed as discussed below:

#### 2.2.6.2 Non-maintenance of records of actual availment of capital expenditure

Clause 8.3 of the Scheme guidelines provided that, banks were to claim subsidy on the basis of projection of capital expenditure in the project report and sanction thereof. Subsidy on the actual availment of capital expenditure only, was to be retained by bank and excess, if any, was to be refunded to KVIC, immediately after the project was ready for commencement of production/business. As implementing agency, the DICs were to monitor the scheme. Besides, KVIC instructed, the DICs to maintain data after obtaining information relating to capital expenditure incurred by the beneficiaries and

Due to non-maintenance of the records, authenticity of release of subsidy amounting to ₹ 54.54 crore to 1996 beneficiaries could not be vouchsafed.

extent of utilisation of the subsidy from banks, to ensure proportionate retention/refund of subsidy by banks.

In test checked 15 DICs, no records in support of actual availment of capital expenditure by the beneficiaries were maintained to ascertain proportionate retention/refund of subsidy by banks. As a result, authenticity of release of subsidy amounting to ₹ 54.54 crore to 1996 beneficiaries could not be vouchsafed.

In reply, the Government stated (October 2014) that the DI have issued instructions to the GM, DICs for compliance of the provisions.

#### **2.2.6.3 Failure to ensure refund of subsidy**

As per scheme guidelines the amount of subsidy was to be credited in beneficiaries' account, after three years from the date of first disbursement of loan, otherwise, the amount of subsidy was to be refunded back to KVIC. Further, Joint Director of Industries instructed (August 2011) the GM, DICs to conduct cent *per cent* physical verification of units established under the scheme and to ensure refund of subsidy of closed/ defunct units to KVIC.

The DICs did not ensure refund of subsidy by the banks released for units not established by the entrepreneurs.

We noticed that in four<sup>14</sup> out of 15 test checked DICs, 62 units, which were financed in 2008-09 and 2009-10, were lying either closed or under construction as on 31 March 2014. But the DICs did not ensure the refund of the subsidy by banks amounting to ₹ 92.31 lakh to KVIC in respect of these 62 units not established by the entrepreneurs.

In reply, the Government stated (October 2014) that, the directions to the GM, DICs have been issued for pursuing banks for refund of subsidy in above cases.

#### **2.2.7 Micro & Small Enterprises - Cluster Development Programme**

The Government of India introduced Micro & Small Enterprises Cluster development programme (MSE-CDP) in the year 2006. Main objective of the scheme was to enhance the productivity and competitiveness as well as capacity building of micro and small enterprises through financial support. Under the scheme, cluster is defined as a group of industries located very close to each other, producing similar products/services like Carpet Cluster Bhadohi, Pottery Cluster Khurja etc. For carrying out any cluster project a separate entity was to be formed namely Special Purpose Vehicle (SPV), it may be a Co-operative Society, Registered Society, Trust or a Company.

In Uttar Pradesh, the DIC was the implementing agency to ensure satisfactory and time bound implementation of the activities. As per modified guidelines (2010) of the Scheme, financial assistance was to be provided to cluster units for:

- technical assistance, capacity building, market development etc. being called soft intervention activities. For such activities the GoI grant was limited to 75 *per cent* of maximum project cost of ₹ 25 lakh;
- construction of Common Facility Centers like Design Centres, Training Centre etc., being called hard interventions. For which the GoI grant was limited to 70 *per cent* of maximum project cost of ₹ 15 crore;

---

<sup>14</sup> Sant R. Nagar (Bhadohi), Azamgarh, Moradabad, Gorakhpur.

- development of infrastructure such as development of land, provision of water supply, drainage etc. for which the GoI grant was limited to 60 per cent of maximum project cost of ₹ 10 crore.

#### 2.2.7.1 Approval of cluster proposal

In all the 69 DICs, total 37 projects, costing ₹ 95.42 crore were approved by the GoI since inception (2006) (Appendix 2.9). Out of the above, in 25 projects costing ₹ 14.17 crore, an amount of ₹ 11.62 crore was received till 2013-14. Two projects costing ₹ 11.28 crore were cancelled and remaining 10 projects costing ₹ 69.97 crore are under progress as of March 2014.

A test check of records of 15 DICs revealed that the GoI approved 19 projects (12 soft interventions and seven hard interventions) costing ₹ 50.38 crore during 2008-09 to 2013-14 against the 63 identified proposals costing ₹ 207.81 crore (32 soft interventions costing ₹ 4.62 crore and 31 hard interventions costing ₹ 203.19 crore). Main reasons for non-approval of remaining 44 proposals (20 soft interventions and 24 hard interventions) costing ₹ 157.44 crore were non-submission of online applications, non-adherence of guidelines, failure in obtaining the validation of action plan by the SPV members etc. (Appendix 2.10). We noticed that the GoUP did not ensure follow up of scheme guidelines for submission of proposals to the GoI, which adversely affected the objective of industrialisation in the State.

In reply, the GoUP stated (October 2014) that the DICs are being instructed to sensitise the SPVs for online filing of proposals and adhering the guidelines of the schemes and further stated that action is being taken for sending revised proposals after removing the shortcomings.

#### Audit findings

Audit findings noticed in 15 test checked DICs are discussed in succeeding paragraphs:

#### 2.2.7.2 Non completion of cluster development activities

As per clause 7 of the scheme guidelines, soft intervention activity was to be completed within 18 months. We noticed that out of 12 approved soft intervention projects, implementation of the soft intervention in one project of Steel Furniture Cluster, Lucknow sanctioned in 2009-10 at a cost of ₹ 7.80 lakh, has not been completed so far (March 2014), even after a lapse of more than four years.

The Government accepted (October 2014) and stated that the remaining work will be carried out and the funds will be utilised in future. The fact remains that due to non-completion of soft intervention activity within stipulated time, the scheme objective of providing support for sustainability and growth of Steel Furniture cluster units of the State could not be achieved.

#### 2.2.7.3 Cancellation of cluster development project

Common Facility Centre (CFC) for Leather Cluster, Gorakhpur was approved by the GoI in 2009-10 for project cost of ₹ 2.53 crore. The share of the GoI, GoUP and SPV was ₹ 1.52 crore, ₹ 76.03 lakh and ₹ 25.34 lakh respectively. The GoUP released its share of ₹ 76.03 lakh (October 2010). As per guidelines issued by Uttar Pradesh Pollution Control Board (UPPCB), tannery industries were to be established at a minimum distance of 1.5 kms away from the population area.

The Government did not ensure follow up of scheme guidelines for submission of proposals to GoI resulting in non approval of identified cluster proposals costing ₹ 157.44 crore in 15 test checked DICs which adversely affected the objective of industrialisation in the State.

Implementation of the soft intervention in one project of Steel Furniture Cluster, Lucknow sanctioned in 2009-10, could not be completed so far (March 2014) even after a lapse of more than four years.

Project of Leather Cluster, Gorakhpur was cancelled due to non-adherence of guidelines of UP Pollution Control Board.

We noticed that the DIC Gorakhpur failed to observe above requirement and proposed Leather Cluster CFC within 1.2 km from the population area. Consequently, during site inspection of proposed CFC, the UPPCB found that the actual distance of the site was less than prescribed minimum distance of 1.5 km from population area. It was, South West: 0.12 km, East: 0.50 km, North: 1.2 km, East South: 0.50 km and West North: 1.2 Km in actual. UPPCB denied 'No Objection Certificate' (NOC) in September 2011 and as a result the GoI did not release its share for the CFC and the GoUP share was also refunded in January 2013. Ultimately, Leather Cluster CFC could not be developed and scheme objective was adversely affected.

In reply, the GoUP (October 2014) accepted that due to non-receipt of NOC from the UPPCB, the proposal of Leather Cluster CFC has been dropped.

Fact remains that the NOC was not provided for the project on account of non-adherence of requirement of minimum distance of 1.5 km from population area. During site visit, the UPPCB also found that the actual distance of the site was less than the prescribed minimum distance of 1.5 km from population area. Due to non-adherence of the UPPCB guidelines Scheme objective remained unachieved.

#### **2.2.7.4 Violation of scheme guidelines**

Common Facility Centre (CFC) for Scissor Cluster, Meerut was approved by the GoI in February 2010 with project cost of ₹ 5.11 crore. The share of the GoI, GoUP and SPV was ₹ 1.98 crore, ₹ 1.49 crore and ₹ 1.64 crore respectively. As per the scheme guidelines, the CFC was required to commence the operation within two years from the date of approval by the GoI, which expired in February 2012. The date was further extended upto June 2014 by the GoI. The GoUP and SPV released its share but due to non-submission of action plan for completion of work and approved valuers' report for valuation of cost of building constructed by the SPV, the GoI did not release its share till (September 2014). The construction of the CFC building was completed (March 2014) and machinery was yet to be installed.

In reply, the GoUP stated (October 2014) that action is being taken for removal of shortcomings by the SPV.

*The Government may take steps for effective monitoring of the compliance of the GoI requirements to ensure satisfactory and time bound implementation of the projects.*

#### **Schemes financed by Government of Uttar Pradesh**

During the years 2010-11 to 2013-14, 69 DICs incurred an expenditure of ₹ 82.91 crore out of ₹ 92.01 crore allotted for implementation of 25 schemes financed by the State. Expenditure under the scheme was 90.11 *per cent* of the budget allocation of the scheme. Scheme wise details of expenditure incurred are given in (**Appendix 2.6**).

During the audit, we test checked four out of 25 schemes financed by the GoUP *viz.*:

- Up-gradation of infrastructure facilities in the Industrial Estates;
- Collective training Scheme for self employment of persons of Scheduled Caste;
- Collective training Scheme for self employment of persons of Scheduled Tribe and;

**Formatted:** Indent: Left: 0 mm, Space Before: 6 pt, After: 6 pt, Add space between paragraphs of the same style, Line spacing: single

**Formatted:** Normal, Justified, Space Before: 6 pt, After: 6 pt, Don't adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Don't adjust space between Asian text and numbers

**The Government failed to receive GoI share of ₹ 1.98 crore for setting up of Common Facility Centre for Scissor cluster, Meerut due to non-submission of action plan and approved valuers' report for cost of the building.**

- Handicrafts Marketing Promotion Scheme.

Scheme wise audit findings are discussed below:

### 2.2.8 Up-gradation of infrastructure facilities in the Industrial Estates

An Industrial Estates (IEs) Scheme was introduced by the GoUP in second five year plan (1956-61) to provide developed land/shed and infrastructure viz. roads, electricity, water, drains etc. to the small scale industries with a view to encourage establishment, expansion and modernisation of small scale industries. Under the Scheme, industrial land having area more than five acres, developed at district level was termed as large IEs and industrial land having average area of two acres developed at *Tehsil* level, was termed as mini IEs.

The status of establishment of IEs in 69 DICs since inception till April 2014 is detailed in table 2.2.4.

**Table 2.2.4: Status of allotment of plots/sheds in Industrial Estates**

Sl. No.	Particulars	Period of Establishment	No. of Established IEs	No. of Available plots/sheds	No. of Plots/sheds allotted	No. of Plots/sheds lying vacant	Percentage of vacant plots/sheds
1	Large IEs	1960-1970	80	4786	4703	83	1.73
2	Mini IEs	1985-1992	170	7961	6086	1875	23.55
Total			250	12747	10789	1958	15.36

(Source: Records of DI)

In 2007-08 for providing infrastructure facilities such as road, drainage, drinking water facilities etc. in the existing IEs, the GoUP commenced a scheme named “Up-gradation of Infrastructure Facilities in the Industrial Estates”

The GoUP has so far released ₹ 9.40 crore for up-gradation of infrastructure facilities in 46 IEs of 45 DICs during 2007-08 to 2013-14.

In 15 DICs test checked, an amount of ₹ 39.83 lakh only was released to the DIC Azamgarh and Amroha against which an amount of ₹ 20 lakh (2010-11) and ₹ 19.83 lakh (2012-13) was utilised by these two DICs for construction and maintenance of road and drainage respectively.

#### **Audit findings**

Test check of 15 DICs revealed the following:

##### **2.2.8.1 Absence of infrastructure facilities**

In 15 DICs test checked, we noticed that out of 3732 available plots, 614 plots of 11 DICs were lying un-allotted (April 2014). The total area of the vacant plots in 11 DICs was 45.67 acres costing ₹ 5.43 crore (**Appendix 2.11**). One of the main reasons for non-allotment of plots was absence of adequate infrastructure facilities viz.; road, drainage, drinking water etc. Thus, due to failure of the DICs to ensure adequate infrastructure facilities, existing plots remained un-allotted which defeated the purpose of the scheme to augment small scale industries.

In reply, the GoUP accepted (October 2014) the fact of inadequate infrastructure facilities and consequent lack of interest of the local entrepreneurs in allotment of plots. The GoUP further stated that instructions have been issued to all the GMs, DICs for allotment of vacant plots.

Formatted: Justified, Space Before: 6 pt, After: 6 pt, Border: Top: (No border), Bottom: (No border), Left: (No border), Right: (No border), Pattern: Clear (White)

The DICs failed to ensure adequate infrastructure facilities in existing Industrial Estates due to which 614 plots of 11 out of 15 DICs test checked remained un-allotted.



Thirty nine plots allotted during 1983 to 2010, were not cancelled despite failure of allottees to establish the industries within three years of allotment of plots.

Fact remains that the DICs failed to provide required infrastructure facilities in established IEs even after lapse of 22 years.

#### **2.2.8.2 Non-cancellation of plots for un-established units**

As per revised directives on the Industrial Estates Scheme (April 1992), if beneficiary failed to establish the industrial unit within three years of allotment or within two years of taking possession of plot whichever is earlier, allotted plots may be cancelled. In 15 test checked DICs, we noticed that 13 DICs did not maintain the records showing updated status of the working of the units to whom plots were allotted. In remaining two DICs<sup>15</sup> the allotments of 39 plots allotted during 1983 to 2010, costing ₹ 4.62 crore (**Appendix 2.12**), were not cancelled despite failure of allottees to establish the industries within three years of allotment of plots.

In reply, DI stated (December 2014) that reasons for non-cancellation of plots has been called from respective DICs.

#### **2.2.8.3 Non- development of plots in existing Industrial Estate**

Director of Industries directed (1991) to stop developing new mini IEs, but there was no restriction on development of plots in existing IEs. There was no target of number of plots/sheds to be developed in each existing IEs. We noticed that as per the records of the DI, land of mini IE, *Awala* of DIC Bareilly was lying undeveloped since establishment (1992). Reasons for non-development of plots of the mini IE was not found on records though called for (December 2013).

No reply was furnished by the Government in this regard.

*The Government should ensure development of plots/infrastructure facilities in existing IEs for optimum utilisation of assets created.*

#### **2.2.9 Collective Training Scheme for self employment of persons of Scheduled Caste/Scheduled Tribe under Special Component Plan**

The GoUP initiated a scheme for providing industrial training to the persons of Scheduled Caste/Scheduled Tribe for generating cent *per cent* self employment. This scheme was run under the Special Component Plan (SCP) and was to be financed by the Social Welfare Department of the GoUP. Objectives of the scheme were to provide industrial training to the persons of schedule caste and schedule tribe and to monitor cent *per cent* self employment for trained candidates. The DICs were made the nodal agency for implementation of the Scheme. Training was to be imparted by the Government/Semi-Government institutions like Industrial Training Institutes, Polytechnics etc., selected by the DICs in selected trades like carpentry plumbing etc. (**Appendix 2.13**).

In 69 DICs, during the period from 2010-11 to 2013-14 an expenditure of ₹ 15.20 crore was incurred on training for self employment of persons of Scheduled Caste/Scheduled Tribe under Special Component Plan against the budget allotment of ₹ 15.21 crore. The cost of the training per session was ₹ 2.64 lakh (approximate) including ₹ 15,500 for office maintenance of the DIC and ₹ 1.80 lakh as stipend to the trainees.

#### ***Audit findings***

Findings noticed during the audit are discussed below:

<sup>15</sup> DIC Bareilly and DIC Kanpur Nagar.

**2.2.9.1 Non-Generation of cent per cent self employment**

Main objective of the scheme was concentrated on generation of cent per cent self employment for trained candidates. During 2010-14, 69 DICs trained 20807 candidates after incurring expenditure of ₹ 15.20 crore against the target of 20819 candidates but only 7013 candidates (34 per cent) got self employment.

DICs did not prepare the register to watch the follow up of the status of self employment of the trained candidates.

We analysed the reasons for lower percentage of generation of self employment and noticed that as per the Scheme guidelines, every DIC was required to maintain a register consisting details of the trainees viz. name, address, trade etc. and status of self employment to ensure the follow-up of self employment of the candidates who have undergone the training programme. We noticed that register to watch the follow-up of the status of self employment of the trained candidates to ascertain the achievement of scheme objectives, was not prepared by all the 15 DICs test checked. In absence of follow up register, the DICs were unable to know the trades which are generating self employment and trades which are not generating employments. This information was vital for deciding trades for training in future. Consequently, during last four years, trainings imparted by the DICs could fetch only 34 per cent self employments for trained candidates.

In reply, the Government stated (October 2014) that, all the GM, DICs have been instructed to prepare the follow-up registers for monitoring of self employment generation.

**2.2.9.2 Non-adherence of norms of women participation**

As per the scheme guidelines, at least 33 per cent participation of the woman candidates was to be ensured while selecting the candidates for each year. It was observed that six<sup>16</sup> DICs out of 15 DICs, failed to ensure 33 per cent participation of women candidates in each year of training. The actual women trainees in these six DICs ranged from five to 32 per cent.

In contravention of the scheme guidelines, DICs failed to ensure 33 per cent participation of women candidates in six out of 15 test checked DICs.

In reply, Government accepted (October 2014) the audit observation and stated that directions for ensuring 33 per cent participation of women candidates have been issued to all the GM, DICs by the directorate.

*The Government should ensure that trained candidates are engaged in self employment to achieve the scheme objective.*

**2.2.10 Handicrafts Marketing Promotion Scheme**

The Government of Uttar Pradesh launched, “The Uttar Pradesh Handicrafts Marketing Promotion Scheme 2012” in January 2013, to provide financial aid to the artisans of the State for participation in the fair/exhibition. The objectives of the scheme were to enable the artisans to get a reasonable price for their products through direct participation in fairs and exhibitions and to give national and international recognition to their craftsmanship.

**Audit finding**

Audit finding on the implementation of the scheme are discussed below:

**2.2.10.1 Under Utilisation of Fund**

The details of the fund received from the GoUP and utilisation thereagainst by all the 69 DICs are given in **Appendix 2.14** and summarised in **Table 2.2.5** below:

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0 mm, Space Before: 3 pt, Tab stops: -1.6 mm, Left + Not at 3.2 mm

<sup>16</sup> DIC- Meerut, Moradabad, Bareilly, Amroha, Agra and Bhadohi.



**Table 2.2.5: Fund received and utilised by the DICs**

(₹ in lakh)

Year	Fund released	Fund utilised	Percentage utilisation
2012-13	122.65	23.88	19.47
2013-14	150.00	89.61	59.74
<b>Total</b>	<b>272.65</b>	<b>113.49</b>	<b>41.62</b>

(Source: information provided by the DI)

It is evident from the above that out of ₹ 2.73 crore released under the scheme, an amount of ₹ 1.14 crore only, was utilised by all 69 DICs leaving ₹ 1.59 crore unutilised as of March 2014. Utilisation of the fund was only 41.62 per cent of the fund released. Further, there was no expenditure during 2012-13 and 2013-14 in 14 out of 69 DICs.

In test checked 15 DICs, against ₹ 70.79 lakh released during 2012-14, the utilisation of the fund was only ₹ 43.61 lakh (62 per cent) as of March 2014.

Further, as per the scheme guidelines, the DICs were required to widely disseminate the information of this scheme among the artisans of their districts. The DICs were to issue participation letters to the artisans for participating in the fair/exhibitions notified by the DI.

However, the DICs failed to widely publicise the scheme and did not send the participation letters to the artisans. As a result artisans could not be attracted for the scheme and funds remained under-utilised.

In reply, the GoUP accepted (October 2014) the low utilisation of fund and non-attraction of artisans and stated that departmental action has been taken against the concerned officials. Fact remains that the scheme objective of providing financial assistance to artisans for enabling recognition of craftsmanship could not be achieved and deprived the artisans to get a reasonable price for their products by participating in fair/exhibition.

#### 2.2.11 Conclusion

- Under Prime Minister Employment Generation Programme, due to non-maintenance of the records, authenticity of release of subsidy amounting to ₹ 54.54 crore to 1996 beneficiaries could not be vouchsafed. Further, the DICs also did not ensure the refund of subsidy by banks, released for units not established by the entrepreneurs.
- Under Micro & Small Enterprises-Cluster Development Programme, implementation of the soft intervention in Steel Furniture Cluster, Lucknow sanctioned in 2009-10, could not be completed (March 2014), even after a lapse of more than four years. Consequently, scheme objective of providing support for sustainability and growth of Steel Furniture cluster units of the State could not be achieved. Further, Project of Leather Cluster, Gorakhpur was cancelled due to non-adherence of guidelines of the Uttar Pradesh Pollution Control Board.
- Under Up-gradation of Infrastructure Facilities in the Industrial Estates Scheme, the DICs failed to ensure adequate infrastructure facilities in existing Industrial Estates due to which 614 plots of 11 out of 15 DICs test checked remained un-allotted. Further, thirty nine plots allotted during 1983 to 2010, were not cancelled despite failure of allottees to establish the industries within three years of allotment of plots.

- In contravention of the guidelines of Collective Training Scheme for self employment of persons of Scheduled Caste/Scheduled Tribe Scheme, the DICs failed to ensure 33 *per cent* participation of women candidates in 6 out of 15 test checked DICs.
- Under Handicrafts Marketing Promotion Scheme, DICs failed to widely publicise the scheme which has resulted in under-utilisation of funds amounting to ₹ 1.59 crore.

## CHAPTER 1

## Introduction

## 1.1 About this Report

This Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India (C&AG) relates to matters arising from performance audit and compliance audit of the Government departments and Autonomous Bodies falling under the Economic Sector of the State.

Chapter 1 of this Report narrates the Budget Profile, the planning and conduct of audit and responsiveness of Government to Audit. Chapter 2 of this Report deals with the findings of performance audit of Kanpur Development Authority and a long paragraph on Implementation of the various schemes by District Industries Centres. Chapter 3 includes audit findings of compliance audit in various Departments and Autonomous Bodies.

## 1.2 Budget Profile

There are 18 Departments and 73 Autonomous Bodies in the Economic Sector of the State which are under audit jurisdiction of Accountant General (Economic and Revenue Sector Audit), Uttar Pradesh, Lucknow. The position of budget estimates and actual there against by the State Government during 2009-14 is given in **Table 1.1**.

**Table 1.1: Budget and expenditure of the State Government during 2009-14**

(₹ in crore)

Particulars	2009-10		2010-11		2011-12		2012-13		2013-14	
	Budget Estimate	Actual	Budget Estimate	Actual	Budget Estimate	Actual	Budget Estimate	Actual	Budget Estimate	Actual
<b>Revenue Expenditure</b>										
General Services	41,055.82	40,641.30	48,363.47	48,019.17	52,787.37	52,946.91	6,2175.69	59,906.72	66,342.70	61,983.49
Social Services	33,836.00	32,064.28	42,120.28	39,566.70	51,259.27	47,390.94	59,081.49	53,300.32	66,219.05	60,756.28
Economic Services	14,415.30	13,308.00	16,147.57	15,725.03	20,290.65	18,292.00	23,639.78	21,337.36	25,552.71	25,710.71
Grant-in-Aid and contributions	3,559.53	3,360.03	4,434.89	4,364.71	5,308.25	5,255.10	6,244.67	6,179.24	9,777.74	9,696.38
<b>Total (1)</b>	<b>92,866.65</b>	<b>89,373.61</b>	<b>1,11,066.21</b>	<b>1,07,675.60</b>	<b>1,29,645.54</b>	<b>1,23,884.95</b>	<b>1,51,141.63</b>	<b>1,40,723.64</b>	<b>1,67,892.20</b>	<b>1,58,146.86</b>
<b>Capital Expenditure</b>										
Capital outlay	24,204.70	25,091.23	22,942.96	20,272.80	25,959.73	21,573.96	26,978.26	23,834.29	32,767.40	32,862.60
Loan and advances disbursed	1,270.95	941.85	1,025.26	968.22	1,240.15	975.57	1,324.78	1,003.24	1,953.73	1,473.34
Repayment of Public Debt	15,254.68	7,668.59	18,164.95	7,383.08	18,356.25	8,287.61	18,843.96	8,909.04	18,587.86	8,166.74
Contingency fund	0.00	0.00	0.00	39.90	87.65	309.64	0.00	262.45	0.00	86.55
Public Accounts Disbursements	1,98,141.05	1,01,780.30	2,33,621.79	1,17,472.99	2,41,622.91	1,30,970.76	2,64,609.27	1,29,471.51	2,84,702.18	4,49,188.03
Closing Cash Balances	--	3,405.36	--	10,304.99	--	13,446.70	--	15,172.42	--	4,020.63
<b>Total (2)</b>	<b>2,38,871.38</b>	<b>1,38,887.33</b>	<b>2,75,754.96</b>	<b>1,56,441.98</b>	<b>2,87,266.69</b>	<b>1,75,564.24</b>	<b>3,11,756.27</b>	<b>1,78,652.95</b>	<b>3,38,011.17</b>	<b>4,95,797.89</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>3,31,738.03</b>	<b>2,28,260.94</b>	<b>3,86,821.17</b>	<b>2,64,117.59</b>	<b>4,16,912.23</b>	<b>2,99,449.19</b>	<b>4,62,897.90</b>	<b>3,19,376.59</b>	<b>5,05,903.37</b>	<b>6,53,944.75</b>

(Source: Annual Financial Statements and Explanatory Memorandum of the State Budget of respective years)

### 1.3 Application of Resources of the State Government

As against the total outlay of the budget of ₹ 2,02,613.33 crore, total expenditure was ₹ 1,92,483 crore. The total expenditure<sup>1</sup> of the State increased from ₹ 1,65,561 crore (2012-13) to ₹ 1,92,483 crore (16.26 per cent) in 2013-14, the revenue expenditure also increased from ₹ 1,40,723.64 crore (2012-13) to ₹ 1,58,146.86 crore in 2013-14 (12.38 per cent). Non-Plan revenue expenditure increased from ₹ 73,673 crore (2009-10) to ₹ 1,26,489.47 crore (71.69 per cent) in 2013-14 and capital expenditure increased from ₹ 25,091.23 crore (2009-10) to ₹ 32,862.60 crore (30.97 per cent) in 2013-14 during the period 2009-14.

The revenue expenditure ranged between 77 and 85 per cent of the total expenditure and capital expenditure ranged between 15 and 23 per cent during the year 2009-14. During this period, total expenditure increased at an annual average rate of 14 per cent, whereas revenue receipts grew at an annual average growth rate of 15 per cent during 2009-14.

### 1.4 Persistent Savings

In 18 cases, there were persistent savings of more than ₹ one crore in each case during last five years as per the details given in **Table 1.2**

**Table 1.2: List of grants with persistent savings during 2009-14**

(₹ in crore)

Sl. No.	Grant number and name	Amount of Savings				
		2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
<b>Revenue Voted</b>						
1	11 : Agriculture and Other Allied Departments (Agriculture)	720.33	217.67	766.37	644.92	596.10
2	15: Agriculture and Other Allied Departments (Animal Husbandry)	19.46	20.15	34.21	23.06	662.21
3	32: Medical Department (Allopathy)	414.68	203.62	145.70	403.79	471.33
4	37: Urban Development Department	54.47	711.79	625.51	238.51	654.69
5	42: Judicial Department	191.88	230.59	172.36	178.52	223.31
6	48: Minorities Welfare Department	350.04	272.00	13.69	104.26	201.19
7	54: Public Works Department (Establishment)	442.11	396.56	238.54	681.45	1041.27
8	61: Finance Department (Debt Services and Other Expenditure)	217.26	77.26	59.73	65.45	87.57
9	73: Education Department (Higher Education)	93.50	571.89	745.76	816.09	348.28
10	83: Social Welfare Department (Special Component Plan for Schedule Castes)	291.56	110.33	792.46	1762.10	1315.74
	<b>Total</b>	<b>2,795.29</b>	<b>2,811.86</b>	<b>3,594.33</b>	<b>4,918.15</b>	<b>5,601.69</b>
<b>Capital Voted</b>						
1	11: Agriculture and Other Allied Departments (Agriculture)	32.74	50.30	100.86	177.73	470.53
2	21: Food and Civil Supplies Department	627.50	3963.00	1811.78	1039.49	4646.82
3	32: Medical Department (Allopathy)	151.78	39.30	147.14	230.68	283.83
4	37: Urban Development Department	374.16	687.12	261.77	737.99	369.91
5	42: Judicial Department	107.22	96.09	78.43	21.23	336.17
6	48: Minorities Welfare Department	134.62	165.56	373.36	164.73	148.22
7	73: Education Department (Higher Education)	20.55	27.27	19.28	123.76	185.35
8	83: Social Welfare Department (Special Component Plan for Schedule Castes)	724.30	103.62	415.46	588.84	524.04
	<b>Total</b>	<b>2,172.87</b>	<b>5,132.26</b>	<b>3,208.07</b>	<b>3,084.45</b>	<b>6,964.87</b>

(Source: Appropriation Accounts of respective years).

<sup>1</sup> Total expenditure includes revenue expenditure, capital expenditure and loan and advances.

### 1.5 Funds transferred directly to the State implementation agencies

During 2013-14, GoI directly transferred ₹ 12,282.27 crore to various State implementing agencies without routing through the State budget. There is no single agency in the state to monitor the funds directly transferred by GoI to the implementing agencies and no data readily available as to how much money has actually been spent in particular year on major flagship schemes and other important schemes which are being implemented by State implementing agencies and funded directly by the GoI.

### 1.6 Grants-in-aid from Government of India

The Grants-in-aid received from the GoI during the years 2009-10 to 2013-14 are given in **Table 1.3**

**Table 1.3: Grants-in-aid from GoI**

Particulars	(₹ in crore)				
	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Non-plan Grants	3,947.97	3,092.99	4,396.73	4,341.00	7,933.79
Grants for State Plan Schemes	5,624.01	6,772.07	6,813.28	5,518.39	6,595.22
Grants for Central Plan Schemes	7,569.25	5,568.59	6,549.89	7,478.40	225.90
Grants for Centrally Sponsored Schemes	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	7,650.26
<b>Total</b>	<b>17,141.23</b>	<b>15,433.65</b>	<b>17,759.90</b>	<b>17,337.79</b>	<b>22,405.17</b>
Percentage of increase/(decrease) over previous years	49	(-10)	15	(-2)	29.23
Percentage of Revenue Receipts	18	14	14	12	13.32

(Source: Annual Financial Statements and Explanatory Memorandum of the State Budget of respective years)

### 1.7 Planning and conduct of audit

The Audit process starts with the risk assessment of various departments, autonomous bodies schemes/projects, etc, critically/complexity of activities, level of delegated financial powers, internal controls and concerns of stakeholders and previous audit findings. Based on this risk assessment, the frequency and extent of audit are decided and an Annual Audit Plan is formulated.

After completion of audit, Inspection Report containing audit findings is issued to the head of the office with request to furnish replies within one month. Whenever replies are received, audit findings are either settled/or further action for compliance is advised. The important audit observations pointed out in these Inspection Reports are processed for inclusion in the Audit Reports of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India, which are submitted to the Governor of Uttar Pradesh under Article 151 of the Constitution of India.

During 2013-14, Compliance audit of 129 units out of 497 unit pertaining to 18 Departments was conducted by the office of the Accountant General (E & RSA), and one Performance Audit was also conducted.

### 1.8 Lack of responsiveness of Government to Inspection Reports

The Accountant General (Economic and Revenue Sector Audit) conducts periodical inspection of Government Departments/Autonomous Bodies by test check of transactions and verifies the maintenance of important accounting

and other records as per the prescribed rules and procedures. These inspections are followed by issue of Audit Inspection Reports (IRs). When important irregularities, etc. detected during audit inspection are not settled on the spot, these IRs are issued to the heads of offices inspected, with a copy to the next higher authorities. The heads of offices and next higher authorities are required to report their compliance to the AG (E&RSA) within four weeks of receipts of IRs.

During 2013-14, four meetings of the audit committee were held in which 14 paragraphs were settled.

A detailed review of the IRs issued up to March 2014<sup>2</sup> pertaining to 18 Departments and 73 autonomous bodies showed that 3911 paragraphs having financial implications of about ₹ 50,290.42 crore relating to 1105 IRs remained outstanding at the end of 31 March 2014. Of these, oldest items pertains to 129 IRs issued during 2007-08 and 317 paragraphs having financial implication of ₹ 154.92 crore had not been settled for more than five years. The details of these outstanding 1105 IRs and 3911 paragraphs are given in **Appendix 1.1.**

The departmental officers failed to take action on observations contained in IRs within the prescribed time framed resulting in erosion of accountability.

It is recommended that the Government may look into the matter to ensure prompt and proper response to audit observations.

#### **1.9 Government response to significant audit observations (paragraphs/reviews)**

In the last few years, Audit has reported on several significant deficiencies in implementation of various programmes/activities as well as on the quality of internal controls in selected departments, which have negative impact on the success of programmes and functioning of departments. The focus was on auditing the specific programmes/schemes and to offer suitable recommendations to the executive for taking corrective action and improving service delivery to the citizens.

As per provision of Comptroller and Auditor General of India's Regulations on Audit and Accounts, 2007, the departments are required to send their responses to draft performance Audit reports/paragraphs proposed for inclusion in the Comptroller and Auditor General of India's Audit Reports within one month. It was brought to their personal attention that in view of likely inclusion of such paragraph in the Reports of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India, to be placed before the Uttar Pradesh Legislature, it would be desirable to include their comments in the matter. They were also advised to have meeting with the Accountant General (E&RSA) to discuss the reports of Performance Audits and Audit Paragraphs. These reports and paragraphs proposed for inclusion in the Report were also forwarded to the Additional Chief Secretaries/Principal Secretaries/Secretaries concerned for seeking their replies. For the present Audit Report, report on one Performance Audit and eight paragraphs (including one long paragraph) were forwarded to the concerned Administrative Secretaries. But Government reply has been received in two cases only.

---

<sup>2</sup> Including 1046 IRs and 3593 paragraphs involving financial implication of ₹ 44,129.02 crore, issued upto 30 September 2013 and outstanding as on 31 March 2014.

### 1.10 Follow up on Audit Reports

According to the Rules of procedure for the internal working on the Committee on Public Accounts, the Administrative Departments were to initiate, *suo- motto* action on all Audit paragraph and Reviews featuring in the Comptroller and Auditor General's Audit Reports (ARs) regardless of whether these are taken up for examination by the Public Accounts Committee or not. They were also to furnish detailed notes, duly vetted by audit indicating the remedial action taken or proposed to be taken by them within three months of the presentation of the ARs to the State Legislature.

The position regarding receipt of Action Taken Notes (ATNs) on the paragraphs included in the ARs up to the period ended 31 March 2014 as on 31 August 2014 is given in **Table 1.4**

**Table 1.4: Position regarding receipt of ATNs on the paragraphs included in the ARs**

Audit Reports	Years	Departments	ATNs pending as of 31 August 2014	Date of Presentation	Due Date for receipt of ATNs
Economic Sector (Non-PSUs)	2012-13	Housing and Urban Planning Department	Not yet received	1 July 2014	31 October 2014
		Forest Department	Not yet received	1 July 2014	31 October 2014
		Infrastructure and Industrial Development Department	Not yet received	1 July 2014	31 October 2014

(Source: Audit Report 2012-13, Economic Sector-Non PSUs)

### 1.11 Status of placement of Separate Audit Reports of Autonomous Bodies in the State Assembly

Several Autonomous Bodies have been set up by the State Government. A large number of these bodies are audited by the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for verification of their transaction, operation activities and accounts, regularity compliance audit, review of internal management, financial control and review of systems and procedures, etc. The audit of accounts of 73 autonomous bodies in the State has been entrusted to the Comptroller and Auditor General of India. The status of entrustment of audit, rendering of accounts to audit, issuance of separate audit report and its placement in the Legislature is indicated in **Appendix 1.2**.

Separate Audit Reports (SARs) of one Autonomous Body issued by Audit for the year 2010-11 and one Autonomous Body issued by Audit for the year 2011-12, are yet to be placed before the Legislature. For the year 2011-12 and 2012-13, SARs have not been issued due to delay in receipts of accounts for 2011-12 and 2012-13 (**Appendix 1.2**). These need to be tabled before the State Legislature at the earliest.

## Appendix 1.1

(Referred to in paragraph 1.8)

## Statement showing details of outstanding Inspection Reports and Paragraphs

(₹ in crore)

Sl. No.	Name of Department	No of IRs Outstanding as on 31 March 2014	No of Outstanding Paragraphs	Total Amount involved	Year from Which paragraphs are outstanding	No of IRs outstanding for more than five year at the end of March 2014	No of paras outstanding for more than five years at the end of March 2014
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1	Housing and Urban Planning	92	709	33251.80	2008-09	21	149
2	Infrastructure and Industrial Development	90	221	256.78	2007-08	39	102
3	Department of Micro, Small & Medium Enterprises and Export Promotion	5	21	107.26	2008-09	1	9
4	Information Technology and Electronics	0	0	0.00	--	--	--
5	Forest	651	2126	2643.87	2007-08	210	564
6	Energy	12	27	3743.20	2003-08	2	2
7	Co-operative	26	56	1789.82	2007-08	5	7
8	Cane Development	53	133	2228.88	2008-09	10	27
9	Tourism	11	40	510.76	2007-08	2	9
10	Environment	6	27	859.59	2008-09	1	4
11	Khadi and Village Industries	5	35	2891.11	2008-09	1	7
12	Handloom and Textile Industries	18	55	195.10	2008-09	5	19
13	Dairy Development	98	334	1020.38	2008-09	18	60
14	Science and Technology	5	37	224.17	2008-09	1	6
15	Civil Aviation	5	19	166.50	2009-10	0	0
16	Madhya Nishedh	5	5	13.18	2008-09	1	1
17	Revenue (except Collectorate)	19	34	329.09	2008-09	4	10
18	Additional Sources of Energy/Non- conventional Energy	4	32	58.93	2007-08	1	5
	Total	1105	3911	50290.42		322	981




**Appendix 1.2**

**(Referred to in paragraph 1.11)**

**Statement showing details of outstanding SAR to be presented in State Assembly**

Sl. No.	Name of Autonomous Bodies	Year upto which SAR placed in Legislature	Year for which SAR not placed in Legislature		Reasons for non-placement of SAR
			Years of SAR	Date of Issue to Government	
1	2	3	4	5	6
1	Khadi Evam Gramodyoge Board, Lucknow	2009-10	2010-11	08.09.2014	Reasons not furnished.
2	Uttar Pradesh Electricity Regulatory Commission (UPERC).	No SAR placed in legislature since established (2003-04)	2003-04 2004-05 2005-06 2006-07 2007-08 2008-09 2009-10 2010-11 2011-12	19.10.2006 05.10.2007 05.10.2007 03.10.2008 17.08.2009 15.02.2010 26.05.2011 08.06.2012 24.09.2014	Reasons not furnished.

**Appendix 2.1**  
**Organisational Chart**  
**(Referred to in paragraph 2.1.2.2)**



Continued.....

Charter of Duties of Functionaries

1. **Vice Chairman** of the Authority shall have the powers of overall supervision, superintendence and control of all the activities of the Authority, its staff, fund and expenditure.
2. **The Secretary** of the Authority shall exercise the powers and perform the duties and ensure the strict compliance of Government orders, maintenance of records and proceedings of the Authority (Reports to Vice Chairman).
3. **The Finance Controller** shall exercise proper and adequate control over the staff of Accounts department and Treasury of the Authority (Reports to Vice Chairman).
4. **The Chief Town Planner** shall have power of preparation of Master plan and Zonal Development plan and compliance of the conditions of Master plan for approval of maps (Reports to Vice Chairman).
5. **The Chief Engineer** shall have powers of execution of Construction and development works in new and upcoming schemes of the Authority (Reports to Vice Chairman).
6. **The Tehsildar** looks after the matter relating to acquisition of land for implementing the schemes (Reports to Secretary).

Continued.....

**Delegation of Powers and Duties of various officers of Kanpur Development Authority under Section 51 (2) of U. P. Urban Planning and Development Act, 1973**

Sl. No.	Designation	Brief Description of power and duties delegated	Section of U P Urban Planning and Development Act 1973	Extent of delegation
1	2	3	4	5
1	Vice Chairman	Appointment to all class III and IV posts (excepting those belonging to the Centralized services and on deputation).	5 (2)	All Powers & Functions
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To hold and manage the properties.</li> <li>• To dispose of land and other properties (except in cases not related to the norms and activities of the Authority).</li> <li>• To carryout building, Engineering, mining and other operations to execute work in connection with the supply of water, electricity, to dispose of sewage and to provide and maintain other service amenities.</li> </ul>	7	All Powers & Functions
		To initiate action for civic survey and master plan for the development area.	8	All powers and functions to the stage of finalization
		To proceed with the preparation of Zonal Development plan	9	All powers and functions to the stage of finalization
		To initiate action for amendment in the Master Plan not effecting the land uses or the standards of population density.	13 (1)	All powers and functions to the stage of finalization
		Disposal of land (approval of allotment, cancellation & restoration).	18	All powers and functions
		To take action for re-entry over the houses/plots.	18	
		Maintenance of fund of the Authority	20 (1)	All powers and functions
Application of fund to meet the expenses of the Authority for which the provision exists in the budget for the year in which the expenditure is actually incurred.	20 (2)	To cause detailed estimates to be prepared, sanction of estimate, tender execution of contracts and sanction of expenditure in each case as a whole in total above ₹ 1 lakh in respect of all the departments of Authority.		

*Audit Report (Economic Sector-Non PSUs) for the year ended 31 March 2014*

1	2	3	4	5
		Power to provide amenity or carry out development at the cost of the owners and levy cess in certain cases.	33	All powers and functions
		Power to require local authority to resume responsibility in certain cases.	34	All powers and functions
		Power to certify the money due and to enforce the recovery.	40	All powers and functions
2	Secretary	Sale permission & Mutation	18	
		Issue of Recovery Certificate & Distress Warrant	18	
		Application of fund to meet the expenses of the Authority for which the provision exists in the budget for the year in which the expenditure is actually incurred.	20 (2)	To cause detailed estimates to be prepared, sanction of estimate, tender execution of contracts and sanction of expenditure in each case as a whole in total up to ₹ 1 lakh in respect of all the departments of Authority.
			20 (2)	To sanction miscellaneous expenditure for all departments of the Authority exceeding ₹ 25000.
			20 (2)	To sign the cheques with Chief Account Officer.
			20 (2)	All types of advances up to ₹ 10000.
3	Joint Secretary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Permission to Mortgage</li> <li>• Issue of Demand notice</li> <li>• Execution of agreements &amp; lease deeds</li> <li>• Delivery of possession of houses &amp; plots</li> </ul>	18	
		Application of fund to meet the expenses of the Authority for which the provision exists in the budget for the year in which the expenditure is actually incurred.	20 (2)	To pass order relating to the refund of earnest money in respect of house/flats/shops of plots up to ₹ 10000 in each case.

*Appendices*

1	2	3	4	5
4	Chief Engineer	Application of fund to meet the expenses of the Authority for which the provision exists in the budget for the year in which the expenditure is actually incurred.	20 (2)	To cause detailed estimates to be prepared, sanction of estimate, tender execution of contracts and sanction of expenditure in each case as a whole in total up to ₹ 20000 in respect of all the departments of Authority.
5	Executive Engineer	Delivery of possession of houses & plots.	18	
		Application of fund to meet the expenses of the Authority for which the provision exists in the budget for the year in which the expenditure is actually incurred.	20 (2)	To cause detailed estimates to be prepared, sanction of estimate, tender execution of contracts and sanction of expenditure in each case as a whole in total up to ₹ 10000 in respect of all the departments of Authority.
6	Law Officer	Application of fund to meet the expenses of the Authority for which the provision exists in the budget for the year in which the expenditure is actually incurred.	20 (2)	To sanction purchase expenditure and payment of fees to the advocate, oath and court commissioner public notary and other litigation expenses in respect of Law Department in each case up to ₹ 1000.
7	Chief Account Officer / Sr. Account Officer/Chief engineer, All Joint Secretary, All Executive Engineers	Application of fund to meet the expenses of the Authority for which the provision exists in the budget for the year in which the expenditure is actually incurred.	20 (2)	To incur and sanction contingent expenses and to sanction payments out of imprest placed at the disposal of the department concerned in each case up to ₹ 500 miscellaneous expenditure all head of offices for their department. Total sanction in a month does not exceed ₹ 5000.

**Appendix 2.2**  
**(Referred to in paragraph 2.1.6.2)**

**Statement showing investment in FDs at lower rate**

Sl. No.	FDR No.	Date of issue of FDR	FDR issuing Bank	Branch Name	Amount invested	Rate of Interest on which FDR made	Name of Bank offering higher interest rate	Branch Name	Rate of interest offered	Diff in rate of interest	Amount of loss (₹)
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1	487901	21.01.09	Allahabad Bank	Swaroop Nagar	54787900	7.5	Punjab National Bank	Kidwai Nagar	8.5	1	547879.00
2	659087	10.02.09	Indian Bank	Kanpur Cantt	9000000	8	Allahabad Bank	Barra	8.77	0.77	69300.00
3	659088	10.02.09	Indian Bank	Kanpur Cantt	9000000	8	Allahabad Bank	Barra	8.77	0.77	69300.00
4	659089	10.02.09	Indian Bank	Kanpur Cantt	9000000	8	Allahabad Bank	Barra	8.77	0.77	69300.00
5	659090	10.02.09	Indian Bank	Kanpur Cantt	9000000	8	Allahabad Bank	Barra	8.77	0.77	69300.00
6	659091	10.02.09	Indian Bank	Kanpur Cantt	9000000	8	Allahabad Bank	Barra	8.77	0.77	69300.00
7	659092	10.02.09	Indian Bank	Kanpur Cantt	9000000	8	Allahabad Bank	Barra	8.77	0.77	69300.00
8	659093	10.02.09	Indian Bank	Kanpur Cantt	9210987	8	Allahabad Bank	Barra	8.77	0.77	70924.60
9	665969	20.02.09	Oriental Bank of Commerce	Mall Road	6000000	8.25	Allahabad Bank	Swaroop Nagar	8.77	0.52	31200.00
10	665970	20.02.09	Oriental Bank of Commerce	Mall Road	8800000	8.25	Allahabad Bank	Swaroop Nagar	8.77	0.52	45760.00
11	665971	20.02.09	Oriental Bank of Commerce	Mall Road	9500000	8.25	Allahabad Bank	Swaroop Nagar	8.77	0.52	49400.00
12	665972	20.02.09	Oriental Bank of Commerce	Mall Road	9000000	8.25	Allahabad Bank	Swaroop Nagar	8.77	0.52	46800.00
13	665973	20.02.09	Oriental Bank of Commerce	Mall Road	7500000	8.25	Allahabad Bank	Swaroop Nagar	8.77	0.52	39000.00
14	665974	20.02.09	Oriental Bank of Commerce	Mall Road	9200000	8.25	Allahabad Bank	Swaroop Nagar	8.77	0.52	47840.00
15	970511	25.02.09	Allahabad Bank	Swaroop Nagar	9500000	8.5	United Bank of India	Kalpi Road	9	0.5	47500.00
16	970512	25.02.09	Allahabad Bank	Swaroop Nagar	9500000	8.5	United Bank of India	Kalpi Road	9	0.5	47500.00

*Appendices*

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
17	970513	25.02.09	Allahabad Bank	Swaroop Nagar	9500000	8.5	United Bank of India	Kalpi Road	9	0.5	47500.00
18	970514	25.02.09	Allahabad Bank	Swaroop Nagar	9500000	8.5	United Bank of India	Kalpi Road	9	0.5	47500.00
19	970515	25.02.09	Allahabad Bank	Swaroop Nagar	9500000	8.5	United Bank of India	Kalpi Road	9	0.5	47500.00
20	970516	25.02.09	Allahabad Bank	Swaroop Nagar	9500000	8.5	United Bank of India	Kalpi Road	9	0.5	47500.00
21	970517	25.02.09	Allahabad Bank	Swaroop Nagar	9500000	8.5	United Bank of India	Kalpi Road	9	0.5	47500.00
22	970518	25.02.09	Allahabad Bank	Swaroop Nagar	9500000	8.5	United Bank of India	Kalpi Road	9	0.5	47500.00
23	970519	25.02.09	Allahabad Bank	Swaroop Nagar	9500000	8.5	United Bank of India	Kalpi Road	9	0.5	47500.00
24	970520	25.02.09	Allahabad Bank	Swaroop Nagar	9500000	8.5	United Bank of India	Kalpi Road	9	0.5	47500.00
25	970521	25.02.09	Allahabad Bank	Swaroop Nagar	2529902	8.5	United Bank of India	Kalpi Road	9	0.5	12649.51
26	499	31.03.09	Punjab National Bank	Juhari Devi	5000000	8	State Bank of Bikaner & Jaipur	T P Nagar	9	1	50000.00
27	N.A.	31.03.09	Punjab National Bank	Juhari Devi	5000000	8	State Bank of Bikaner & Jaipur	T P Nagar	9	1	50000.00
28	457	31.03.09	Punjab National Bank	Juhari Devi	5000000	8	State Bank of Bikaner & Jaipur	T P Nagar	9	1	50000.00
29	462	31.03.09	Punjab National Bank	Juhari Devi	5000000	8	State Bank of Bikaner & Jaipur	T P Nagar	9	1	50000.00
30	505	31.03.09	Punjab National Bank	Juhari Devi	5000000	8	State Bank of Bikaner & Jaipur	T P Nagar	9	1	50000.00
31	471	31.03.09	Punjab National Bank	Juhari Devi	5000000	8	State Bank of Bikaner & Jaipur	T P Nagar	9	1	50000.00
32	377526	31.03.09	Bank of Baroda	Govind Nagar	5000000	8.5	State Bank of Bikaner & Jaipur	T P Nagar	9	0.5	25000.00
33	377527	31.03.09	Bank of Baroda	Govind Nagar	5000000	8.5	State Bank of Bikaner & Jaipur	T P Nagar	9	0.5	25000.00



*Audit Report (Economic Sector-Non PSUs) for the year ended 31 March 2014*

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
34	177826	31.03.09	Bank of Baroda	Govind Nagar	5000000	8.5	State Bank of Bikaner & Jaipur	T P Nagar	9	0.5	25000.00
35	177827	31.03.09	Bank of Baroda	Govind Nagar	5000000	8.5	State Bank of Bikaner & Jaipur	T P Nagar	9	0.5	25000.00
36	133828	31.03.09	Bank of Baroda	Govind Nagar	5000000	8.5	State Bank of Bikaner & Jaipur	T P Nagar	9	0.5	25000.00
37	133829	31.03.09	Bank of Baroda	Govind Nagar	5000000	8.5	State Bank of Bikaner & Jaipur	T P Nagar	9	0.5	25000.00
38	168763	31.03.09	United Bank of India	Main Branch	5000000	8.5	State Bank of Bikaner & Jaipur	T P Nagar	9	0.5	25000.00
39	168764	31.03.09	United Bank of India	Main Branch	5000000	8.5	State Bank of Bikaner & Jaipur	T P Nagar	9	0.5	25000.00
40	169143	31.03.09	United Bank of India	Main Branch	5000000	8.5	State Bank of Bikaner & Jaipur	T P Nagar	9	0.5	25000.00
41	169144	31.03.09	United Bank of India	Main Branch	5000000	8.5	State Bank of Bikaner & Jaipur	T P Nagar	9	0.5	25000.00
42	669935	31.03.09	United Bank of India	Main Branch	5000000	8.5	State Bank of Bikaner & Jaipur	T P Nagar	9	0.5	25000.00
43	669936	31.03.09	United Bank of India	Main Branch	5133479	8.5	State Bank of Bikaner & Jaipur	T P Nagar	9	0.5	25667.40
44	37537	31.03.09	Punjab National Bank	Kidwai Nagar	9000000	8	State Bank of Bikaner & Jaipur	T P Nagar	9	1	90000.00
45	37555	31.03.09	Punjab National Bank	Kidwai Nagar	7805045	8	State Bank of Bikaner & Jaipur	T P Nagar	9	1	78050.45
46	37546	31.03.09	Punjab National Bank	Kidwai Nagar	9000000	8	State Bank of Bikaner & Jaipur	T P Nagar	9	1	90000.00
47	819175	27.11.09	State Bank of India	Khapra Mohal	9000000	6	Punjab National Bank	Kidwai Nagar	6.5	0.5	45000.00
48	819176	27.11.09	State Bank of India	Khapra Mohal	9000000	6	Punjab National Bank	Kidwai Nagar	6.5	0.5	45000.00
49	819177	27.11.09	State Bank of India	Khapra Mohal	9000000	6	Punjab National Bank	Kidwai Nagar	6.5	0.5	45000.00
50	819178	27.11.09	State Bank of India	Khapra Mohal	9000000	6	Punjab National Bank	Kidwai Nagar	6.5	0.5	45000.00

*Appendices*

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
51	819179	27.11.09	State Bank of India	Khapra Mohal	7813326	6	Punjab National Bank	Kidwai Nagar	6.5	0.5	39066.63
52	58420	24.12.09	Central bank of India	Bhusa Toli	5000000	6.25	State Bank of Bikaner & Jaipur	T P Nagar	6.75	0.5	25000.00
53	339380	17.02.10	State Bank of India	Motijheel	4311751	6	Allahabad Bank	Kidwai Nagar	6.5	0.5	21558.76
54	915531	26.02.10	United Bank of India	Kalpi Road	13609108	6	Allahabad Bank	Shakkar patti	6.5	0.5	68045.54
55	3276	09.03.10	Andhra Bank	Civil Lines	10164523	6	Allahabad Bank	Swaroop Nagar	6.5	0.5	50822.62
56	340328	10.03.10	State Bank of India	Motijheel	9000000	6	Allahabad Bank	Swaroop Ngr	6.5	0.5	45000.00
57	340329	10.03.10	State Bank of India	Motijheel	9000000	6	Allahabad Bank	Swaroop Nagar	6.5	0.5	45000.00
58	340330	10.03.10	State Bank of India	Motijheel	9000000	6	Allahabad Bank	Swaroop Nagar	6.5	0.5	45000.00
59	340331	10.03.10	State Bank of India	Motijheel	9000000	6	Allahabad Bank	Swaroop Nagar	6.5	0.5	45000.00
60	340332	10.03.10	State Bank of India	Motijheel	9000000	6	Allahabad Bank	Swaroop Nagar	6.5	0.5	45000.00
61	340333	10.03.10	State Bank of India	Motijheel	9000000	6	Allahabad Bank	Swaroop Nagar	6.5	0.5	45000.00
62	340334	10.03.10	State Bank of India	Motijheel	9000000	6	Allahabad Bank	Swaroop Nagar	6.5	0.5	45000.00
63	340335	10.03.10	State Bank of India	Motijheel	9000000	6	Allahabad Bank	Swaroop Nagar	6.5	0.5	45000.00
64	340336	10.03.10	State Bank of India	Motijheel	1157844	6	Allahabad Bank	Swaroop Nagar	6.5	0.5	5789.22
65	12	31.03.10	Punjab National Bank	Karrahi	10000000	6	State Bank of Bikaner & Jaipur	T P Nagar	6.75	0.75	75000.00
66	46586	27.11.10	Punjab National Bank	Kidwai Nagar	5287295	7.25	State Bank of India	Motijheel	8	0.75	39654.71
67	46595	27.11.10	Punjab National Bank	Kidwai Nagar	5287294	7.25	State Bank of India	Motijheel	8	0.75	39654.71

*Audit Report (Economic Sector-Non PSUs) for the year ended 31 March 2014*

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
68	46601	27.11.10	Punjab National Bank	Kidwai Nagar	5287294	7.25	State Bank of India	Motijheel	8	0.75	39654.71
69	46610	27.11.10	Punjab National Bank	Kidwai Nagar	5287296	7.25	State Bank of India	Motijheel	8	0.75	39654.72
70	46629	27.11.10	Punjab National Bank	Kidwai Nagar	5287294	7.25	State Bank of India	Motijheel	8	0.75	39654.71
71	46638	27.11.10	Punjab National Bank	Kidwai Nagar	5287294	7.25	State Bank of India	Motijheel	8	0.75	39654.71
72	46647	27.11.10	Punjab National Bank	Kidwai Nagar	5287295	7.25	State Bank of India	Motijheel	8	0.75	39654.71
73	46656	27.11.10	Punjab National Bank	Kidwai Nagar	5287294	7.25	State Bank of India	Motijheel	8	0.75	39654.71
74	46665	27.11.10	Punjab Nat. Bank	Kidwai Nagar	5287295	7.25	State Bank of India	Motijheel	8	0.75	39654.71
75	46674	27.11.10	Punjab National Bank	Kidwai Nagar	5287294	7.25	State Bank of India	Motijheel	8	0.75	39654.71
76	4970	02.12.10	Punjab National Bank	KDA Branch	5000000	7.25	State Bank of India	Khapra Mohal	8.5	1.25	62500.00
77	4989	02.12.10	Punjab National Bank	KDA Branch	5000000	7.25	State Bank of India	Khapra Mohal	8.5	1.25	62500.00
78	7311	04.02.11	Punjab National Bank	Birhana Road	5760988	5.5	Bank of Baroda	Chunni ganj	9.65	4.15	239081.00
79	7320	04.02.11	Punjab National Bank	Birhana Road	5760990	5.5	Bank of Baroda	Chunni ganj	9.65	4.15	239081.09
80	7339	04.02.11	Punjab National Bank	Birhana Road	5760989	5.5	Bank of Baroda	Chunni ganj	9.65	4.15	239081.04
81	7348	04.02.11	Punjab National Bank	Birhana Road	5760991	5.5	Bank of Baroda	Chunni ganj	9.65	4.15	239081.13
82	339380	17.02.11	State Bank of India	Motijheel	4548950	8.25	Bank of Baroda	Chunni ganj	9.65	1.4	63685.30
83	82290	21.02.11	Andhra Bank	R K Nagar	10000000	9	Punjab National Bank	Juhari Devi College	9.5	0.5	50000.00
84	15535	11.03.11	Punjab National Bank	Rawatpur	5266960	9	Bank of Baroda	Birhana Road	9.85	0.85	44769.16
85	15544	11.03.11	Punjab National Bank	Rawatpur	5266960	9	Bank of Baroda	Birhana Road	9.85	0.85	44769.16

*Appendices*

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
86	1017466	30.03.11	Allahabad Bank	Raipurwa	5333008	8.75	Canara Bank	Mall Road	10	1.25	66662.60
87	1017467	30.03.11	Allahabad Bank	Raipurwa	5333008	8.75	Canara Bank	Mall Road	10	1.25	66662.60
88	21	30.03.11	Punjab National Bank	General Ganj	13728516	9.5	Canara Bank	Mall Road	10	0.5	68642.58
89	124026	30.03.11	Central bank of India	Mirpur Cantt	5299697	9.25	Canara Bank	Mall Road	10	0.75	39747.73
90	124027	30.03.11	Central bank of India	Mirpur Cantt	7949547	9.25	Canara Bank	Mall Road	10	0.75	59621.60
91	124028	30.03.11	Central bank of India	Mirpur Cantt	7949547	9.25	Canara Bank	Mall Road	10	0.75	59621.60
92	1017468	30.03.11	Allahabad Bank	Raipurwa	5333008	8.75	Canara Bank	Mall Road	10	1.25	66662.60
93	1017469	30.03.11	Allahabad Bank	Raipurwa	5333008	8.75	Canara Bank	Mall Road	10	1.25	66662.60
94	10	30.03.11	Punjab National Bank	Kidwai Nagar	50000000	9.5	Canara Bank	Mall Road	10	0.5	250000.00
95	168764	31.03.11	United Bank of India	Govind Nagar	5777066	9	Punjab National Bank	Kidwai Nagar	9.5	0.5	28885.33
96	168763	31.03.11	United Bank of India	Govind Nagar	5776803	9	Punjab National Bank	Kidwai Nagar	9.5	0.5	28884.02
97	59937	31.03.11	Punjab National Bank	Kidwai Nagar	8850443	9	Punjab National Bank	Kidwai Nagar	9.5	0.5	44252.22
98	50068503038	27.06.11	Allahabad Bank	Govind Nagar	4192602	9	Bank of Baroda	Fazalganj	9.5	0.5	20963.01
99	50068503152	27.06.11	Allahabad Bank	Govind Nagar	10244836	9	Bank of Baroda	Fazalganj	9.5	0.5	51224.18
100	50068503083	27.06.11	Allahabad Bank	Govind Nagar	10244836	9	Bank of Baroda	Fazalganj	9.5	0.5	51224.18
101	1009790	27.06.11	Allahabad Bank	Swaroop Nagar	9539471	9	Bank of Baroda	Fazalganj	9.5	0.5	47697.36
102	1009791	27.06.11	Allahabad Bank	Swaroop Nagar	9539471	9	Bank of Baroda	Fazalganj	9.5	0.5	47697.36
103	1009792	27.06.11	Allahabad Bank	Swaroop Nagar	9539471	9	Bank of Baroda	Fazalganj	9.5	0.5	47697.36
104	1009793	27.06.11	Allahabad Bank	Swaroop Nagar	9539471	9	Bank of Baroda	Fazalganj	9.5	0.5	47697.36
105	1009794	27.06.11	Allahabad Bank	Swaroop Nagar	9539471	9	Bank of Baroda	Fazalganj	9.5	0.5	47697.36
106	1009795	27.06.11	Allahabad Bank	Swaroop Nagar	9539471	9	Bank of Baroda	Fazalganj	9.5	0.5	47697.36
107	1009796	27.06.11	Allahabad Bank	Swaroop Nagar	4623561	9	Bank of Baroda	Fazalganj	9.5	0.5	23117.81
108	51786	19.08.11	Allahabad Bank	Lakhanpur	10182661	9	Punjab & Sindh Bank	T P Nagar	9.5	0.5	50913.31
109	32143209242	14.01.12	State Bank of India	Khapra Mohal	22357621	9	Oriental bank of Commerce	Landmark	9.75	0.75	167682.16

**Audit Report (Economic Sector-Non PSUs) for the year ended 31 March 2014**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
110	26456	21.03.12	Oriental Bank of Commerce	Landmark	20000000	9.75	Bank of Baroda	Sarvodaya nagar	10.25	0.5	100000.00
111	34	22.03.12	Punjab National Bank	KDA Branch	11535607	9.5	Bank of Baroda	Patel Nagar	10.25	0.75	86517.05
112	43	22.03.12	Punjab National Bank	KDA Branch	11533445	9.5	Bank of Baroda	Patel Nagar	10.25	0.75	86500.84
113	58	31.03.12	Punjab National Bank	Juhari Devi	37140034	9.5	Bank of Baroda	Tilak Nagar	10.3	0.8	297120.27
114	203076	03.05.12	Bank of Baroda	Fazal Ganj	11478812	8.75	Allahabad Bank	Lakhanpur	9.5	0.75	86091.09
115	933065	22.12.12	State Bank of India	Motijheel	8957011	8.5	Allahabad Bank	Lakhanpur	9	0.5	44785.06
116	929435	22.12.12	State Bank of India	Motijheel	8957011	8.5	Allahabad Bank	Lakhanpur	9	0.5	44785.06
117	931411	22.12.12	State Bank of India	Motijheel	8957011	8.5	Allahabad Bank	Lakhanpur	9	0.5	44785.06
118	1388535	14.03.13	IndusInd Bank	Swaroop Nagar	10971995	9	Bank of Baroda	Govind Nagar	9.51	0.51	55957.17
119	79295	21.03.13	Allahabad Bank	Gumti No 5	4991883	9	Allahabad Bank	Lajpat Nagar	9.5	0.5	24959.42
										<b>Total</b>	<b>7516463.93</b>

**Appendix 2.3**  
**(Referred to in paragraph 2.1.6.3)**  
**Statement showing loss of interest due to non-availing of *auto sweep* facility**

Sl.No.	Name of Bank	Interest Amount (₹)
1	2	3
1	State Bank of India, Motijheel, Current A/c No. 10500637173	19482647.98
2	State Bank of India, Arya Nagar, Current A/c No. 30192716962	344321.84
3	State Bank of India, Naubasta, Current A/c No. 30192148826	2846733.65
4	State Bank of India, Ratan Lal Nagar, Current A/c No. 30192728060	3252852.60
5	State Bank of India, Usmanpur, Current A/c No. 30192749295	1246566.76
6	ICICI Bank, Ashok Nagar, Current A/c No. 083205001222	1358460.21
7	State Bank of India, Motijheel, Current A/c No. 10500637195	6588754.09
8	Punjab National Bank, Mall Road, Current A/c No. 255002100678031	646598.34
9	IndusInd Bank, Kanpur Branch, Current A/c No. 200004159524	355410.26
<b>Total</b>		<b>36122345.73</b>

Appendix 2.4

(Referred to in paragraph 2.1.6.4)

Statement showing short-realisation of rent from State Bank of India

Total covered area provided to Bank = 8744 sqft (812.32 Sqm)

- (A) Rent as per DM circle rate w.e.f January 2007 to July 2008= ₹ 130 per sqm per month= ₹ 105602 (812.32 x 130 per sqm)  
 (B) Rent as per DM circle rate w.e.f August 2008 to July 2010= ₹ 250 per sqm per month= ₹ 203080 (812.32 x 250 per sqm)  
 (C) Rent as per DM circle rate w.e.f August 2010 to July 2011= ₹ 300 per sqm per month= ₹ 243696 (812.32 x 300 per sqm)  
 (D) Rent as per DM circle rate w.e.f August 2011 to July 2013= ₹ 350 per sqm per month= ₹ 284312 (812.32 x 350 per sqm)  
 (E) Rent as per DM circle rate w.e.f August 2013 to March 2014= ₹ 400 per sqm per month= ₹ 324938 (812.32 x 400 per sqm)

Sl. No	Period	Total months	Rent as per circle rate	Rent recovered by Bank	Difference	Total
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6=4-5)	(7=3x6)
1	Jan 2007 to May 2008	19	105602	43513	62089	1179691
2	June 2008 to July 2008	2	105602	65270	40332	80664
3	August 2008 to July 2010	24	203080	65270	137810	3307440
4	August 2010 to July 2011	12	243696	65270	178426	2141112
5	August 2011 to July 2013	24	284312	65270	219042	5257008
6	August 2013 to March 2014	08	324938	65270	259668	2077344
					Grand Total	14043259

## Appendix 2.5 (A)

(Referred to in paragraph 2.1.8.3)

## Findings related with short-recovery of FAR charges

Sl. No.	Name of the builder	Audit observation	Financial impact (₹ in crore)
1	2	3	4
1	<i>Mahaveer Sahkari Awas Samiti</i>	<p>Clause 3.5.1 (VII) of revised Building Bylaws (September 2011) provides that for group housing projects situated on private land in new/undeveloped area, FAR of 2.5 was permitted with condition that charges for difference of FAR of 2.5 and 1.5 was to be recovered as purchasable FAR.</p> <p>We noticed that while sanctioning the group housing map in <i>Barry Akbarpur Kachchar</i> area during June 2013, FAR of 111557.54 sqm was allowed without levy of FAR charges on the difference of 2.5 and 1.5 FAR. Thus, FAR charges amounting to ₹ 8.40 crore<sup>1</sup> on differential purchasable FAR of 45194.26 sqm was not recovered. Instead the authority recovered ₹ 6.90 crore which resulted in short recovery of ₹ 1.50 crore.</p> <p>The Authority did not provide any reason for short-recovery of FAR charges in reply.</p>	1.50
2	<i>Ratan Colonisers</i>	<p>As per Clause 3.3.6 (X) of the Building Bylaws, for Group housing projects, FAR was to be provided on net area after deducting area for roads, park and open area and community services.</p> <p>We noticed that a group housing map was sanctioned in <i>Naramau</i> (on plot measuring 18846 sqm) in June 2009. The Authority allowed FAR of 46421.42 sqm on gross area (18846) instead of net area (15571.10 sqm, calculated after deducting the area for road widening). This resulted in short recovery of ₹ 0.96 crore<sup>2</sup> for additional FAR so given.</p>	1.32

<sup>1</sup> (111557.54 - 67791.37 sqm) / 2.5 \* ₹ 12000 \* 0.40.

<sup>2</sup> (46421.42 - 38927.75 sqm) / 2.5 \* ₹ 8000 \* 0.40.



1	2	3	4
		<p>Further, As per clause 3.3.5 of building bylaws 15 <i>per cent</i> of plot area was to be deducted for parks from the gross area.</p> <p>We noticed that while allowing FAR, area for parks was not deducted from the gross area as required under Clause 3.3.5 of Building bylaws which resulted in allowing excess FAR of 2826.90 sqm valuing ₹ 36.18 lakh<sup>3</sup>.</p> <p>The Authority replied (September 2014) that the decision was taken by the technical committee. Reply did not address the audit observation.</p>	
3	Sanjay Agrawal, Keshawpuram	<p>As per Clause 3.3.5 of Building bylaws, 15 <i>per cent</i> of plot area was to be deducted for parks from the gross area for the purpose of allowing FAR.</p> <p>We noticed that a group housing map was sanctioned in <i>Vinayakpur</i> (on plot measuring 8108 sqm) in December 2010. The Authority allowed FAR of 11769.73 sqm on gross area (8108 sqm) instead of net area (6891.80 sqm.) without deducting the area for parks. This resulted in short recovery of ₹ 43.92 lakh<sup>4</sup>.</p> <p>The Authority stated (September 2014) in reply that coverage and FAR was allowed as plot was adjacent to scheme of Authority. The reply is not acceptable as no relaxation is there in clause 3.3.5 of Building Bylaws for plots adjacent to scheme of authority.</p>	0.44
4	Shristi Dwellings Limited	<p>A revised group housing map was sanctioned for plot no. 4/276 P measuring 2112.57 sqm in <i>Parwati Bagla</i> Road in March 2010. Authority against the allowable FAR of 3709.58 sqm (1.5 of 1690.40 sqm after deducting area for road widening plus 33 <i>per cent</i> purchasable FAR plus 10 <i>per cent</i> for compounding) allowed FAR of 4989.53 sqm to the builder. This resulted in undue favour and short recovery of ₹ 0.96 crore<sup>5</sup> for Additional FAR so provided.</p>	0.78

<sup>3</sup> (18846\*0.15)/2.5\*₹ 8000\*0.40.

<sup>4</sup> (11769.73- 10337.70 )/1.5\*₹11500\*0.40.

<sup>5</sup> (4989.53 sqm -3709.58 sqm )/1.5\* ₹ 28000\*0.40.

1	2	3	4
		<p>For another plot of same builder (number 4/276 measuring 2438.60 sqm) Authority approved a revised group housing map in December 2009. Authority against the total admissible FAR of 4981.29 sqm (1.5 of 2269.90 sqm after deducting area for road widening plus 33 per cent purchasable FAR plus 10 per cent for compounding), allowed FAR of 5436.55 sqm which provided undue benefit of ₹ 33.99 lakh<sup>6</sup> to the builder.</p> <p>Against the total recoverable charges of ₹ 1.30 crore the authority recovered a sum of ₹ 51.87 lakh which resulted in short-recovery of ₹ 0.78 lakh.</p> <p>The Authority stated (September 2014) that compensatory FAR was allowed for land left for road widening. Reply is not acceptable as land for road widening is to be transferred free of cost to Authority for availing compensatory FAR which was not done in this case.</p>	
5	MVR Housing Private Limited	<p>As per Clause 3.3.6 (X) of the Building Bylaws, for Group housing projects, FAR was to be provided on net area after deducting area for roads, park and open area and community services.</p> <p>A revised group housing map was sanctioned in <i>Tilak Nagar</i> (on plot measuring 3640.81 sq.m) in June 2011. The Authority against the allowable FAR of 6307.68 sqm (on net area 2867.13 sqm after deducting area for road widening), allowed FAR of 7942.02 sqm to the builder. This resulted in undue favour and short recovery of ₹ 1.62 crore<sup>7</sup> for Additional FAR so provided.</p> <p>Further, as per clause 3.3.5 of building bylaws, 15 per cent of plot area was to be deducted for parks from the gross area.</p> <p>We noticed that 15 per cent of plot area was not deducted for parks while allowing FAR as required which resulted in allowing excess FAR of 546.12 sqm valuing ₹ 54.47 lakh<sup>8</sup>.</p> <p>No comment was offered by the Authority in reply.</p>	2.16

<sup>6</sup> (5436.55 - 4981.29)/1.5\*₹ 28000\*0.40.

<sup>7</sup> (7942.02 sqm - 6307.68 sqm)/1.5\*₹ 37400\*0.40.

<sup>8</sup> 546.12/1.5\*₹ 37400\*0.40.

*Audit Report (Economic Sector-Non PSUs) for the year ended 31 March 2014*

1	2	3	4
6	Rohit Surfacants Private Limited	As per condition of the auction notice dated 29 August 2007, ground coverage of 40 <i>per cent</i> with FAR of 1.2 for the plot sold through auction was allowed. But the Authority in contravention of condition of the auction, allowed the FAR of 2 to <i>Rohit Surfacants Private Limited</i> which provided undue benefit of ₹ 1.55 crore <sup>9</sup> to the builder. The Authority did not provide any justification for the same in reply.	1.55
		<b>Total</b>	<b>7.75</b>

<sup>9</sup> (5154.14-3092.49)/1.2\*₹18000\*0.50.

**Appendix 2.5 (B)**  
**(Referred to in paragraph 2.1.8.3 second paragraph)**  
**Findings related with inadequate provision for parking space**

Sl.No.	Name of the builder	Nature of irregularity
1	2	3
1	<i>Mahaveer Sahkari Awas Samiti</i>	<p>A Group housing map was sanctioned in Barry <i>Akbarpur Kachchar</i> area in June 2013 with Floor area of 111420.34 sqm. As per Building Bylaws, total required parking worked out to 1672 car space (111420.34/100*1.5) against which parking of 1143 cars was proposed for the project.</p> <p>The Authority replied (September 2014) that provision was not applicable at the time of sanction of map. Reply is not acceptable as map was approved in June 2013 when provisions of revised Building Bylaws 2011 were applicable.</p>
2	<i>Sukhdham Infrastructures</i>	<p>A Group housing map was sanctioned in <i>Singhpur Kachchar</i> area in January 2012 with Floor area of 11618.64 sqm. The parking space for 107 cars was provided on the basis of covered area of flats whereas as per revised bylaws, parking is to be provided at the rate of 1.5 car space of each 100 sqm of covered area which in this case worked out to 174 (11618.64/100*1.5) against which provision of 114 was approved.</p> <p>The Authority replied (September 2014) that map was approved as per norms applicable at that time. Reply is not acceptable as revised Bylaws were approved in September 2011 whereas map was approved in January 2012.</p>

**Comment [a1]:** Please refer comment at serial number 23 above.

**Comment [a2]:** Please refer comment at serial number 23 above.

Appendix 2.6

Referred to in paragraph introduction and 2.2.7.4)

Statement showing scheme-wise budget allocation and expenditure incurred on four GoI schemes and 25 schemes financed by the GoUP in 69 DICs for the period 2010-11 to 2013-14

(₹ in lakh)

Sl. No.	Name of the Scheme	2010-11	2010-11	2011-12	2011-12	2012-13	2012-13	2013-14	2013-14	Total	Total
		Budget	Exp.	Budget	Exp.	Budget	Exp.	Budget	Exp.	Budget	Exp.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
<b>A Schemes sponsored by the GoI</b>											
1	Prime Minister Employment Generation Programme (PMEGP)	N/A	9839.10	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	N/A	8122.90	N/A	17962.00
2	Micro & Small Enterprises Cluster Development Programme (MSE-CDP)	N/A	610.46	N/A	172.80	N/A	44.74	N/A	224.56	N/A	1052.56
3	Assistance to state for Developing Export Infrastructure and other Allied Activities (ASIDE)	N/A	956.04	N/A	765.40	N/A	2460.31	N/A	3011.19	N/A	7192.94
4	Establishment of Nucleus cell under Census Scheme	N/A	73.24	N/A	22.98	N/A	119.43	N/A	0.00	N/A	215.65
<b>Total (A)</b>			<b>11478.84</b>		<b>961.18</b>		<b>2624.48</b>		<b>11358.65</b>		<b>26423.15</b>
			<b>₹ in crore</b>		<b>9.61</b>		<b>26.24</b>		<b>113.59</b>		<b>264.23</b>
<b>B Schemes financed by the GoUP</b>											
1	Upgradation of Infrastructure Facilities in the Industrial Estates	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	42.46	400.00	342.46
2	Collective training scheme for self employment of persons of ST under SCP	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	1.50	1.50	1.50	1.50	7.00	7.00
3	Collective training scheme for self employment of persons of SC under SCP	317.00	316.81	450.00	449.38	350.00	350.00	397.00	397.00	1514.00	1513.19
4	Handicraft Marketing Promotion Scheme	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	125.40	23.87	300.00	89.60	425.40	113.47
<b>Total (Sl. no. 1 to 4)</b>		<b>419.00</b>	<b>418.81</b>	<b>552.00</b>	<b>551.38</b>	<b>576.90</b>	<b>475.37</b>	<b>798.50</b>	<b>530.56</b>	<b>2346.40</b>	<b>1976.12</b>
5	Technical Upgradation of Mudha Hadicrafts at Gadh Mukteswar, Ghaziabad	33.00	33.00	50.00	50.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	83.00	83.00
6	Subsidy to CGCRI, Khurja	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	80.00	80.00

**Appendices**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
7	Udyamkarta Vikash Yojna	5.00	5.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	5.99	6.00	6.00	23.00	22.99
8	Laghu Udyamio ko protsahan hetu pursakar yojna	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	40.00	40.00
9	All India Pradeshik Handicraft Week.	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.68	3.00	2.70	11.00	10.38
10	Zila udyog bandhu and single window at district level	17.50	17.48	17.50	17.50	35.00	34.92	35.00	35.00	105.00	104.90
11	Technical Upgradation Scheme	200.00	200.00	200.00	200.00	100.00	100.00	200.00	200.00	700.00	700.00
12	Design workshop for training and development of artisans.	60.00	60.00	60.00	60.00	60.00	59.40	120.00	117.00	300.00	296.40
13	State Prize for renowned artisans.	2.00	2.00	6.00	4.00	26.00	15.60	20.00	20.00	54.00	41.60
14	Rajya Punji Upadan Yojna	13.44	13.44	42.70	4.98	63.00	63.00	67.42	41.72	186.56	123.14
15	Grant to Udyamita Vikas Sansthan	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	27.00	27.00	27.00	27.00	54.02	54.00
16	Special State Capital subsidy for Block level pioneer units.	56.40	56.39	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	56.40	56.39
17	Pension scheme for Shilpkar	15.60	15.60	18.00	18.00	30.00	18.38	30.00	20.58	93.60	72.56
18	Twarit Niryat Vikas Protsahan Yojna	563.00	563.00	597.70	597.70	924.50	924.50	1709.50	1709.50	3794.70	3794.70
19	Vayuyan Bhada Sahayta Yojna	26.57	20.00	15.00	15.00	15.00	15.00	15.00	15.00	71.57	65.00
20	Scheme related to participation in National & International Trade Fairs	65.00	65.00	65.00	65.00	70.00	70.00	95.00	95.00	295.00	295.00
21	Scheme related to special auditing of Entrepreneur Development Scheme.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	6.23	6.23	0.00	0.00	6.23	6.23
22	Scheme related to Handicraft Upgradation in AMU	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	28.00	28.00
23	Interest subsidy to Female Entrepreneurs Scheme	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	257.45	0.00	257.45	0.00
24	Construction of building of DICs	94.30	94.30	115.50	83.63	106.36	106.36	120.00	26.74	436.16	311.03
25	Construction of general Feature Handicraft Centre in Rampur	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	129.13	129.13	50.00	0.00	179.13	129.13
	Total (B) (Sl. no. 1 to 25)	1609.83	1603.02	1785.40	1713.19	2215.12	2090.56	3590.87	2883.80	9201.22	8290.57
	₹ in crore	16.10	16.03	17.85	17.13	22.15	20.91	35.91	28.84	92.01	82.91
	Grand Total (A+B) (₹ in crore)		130.82		26.74		47.15		142.43		347.14

**Appendix 2.7**  
**(Referred to in Paragraph 2.2.2)**  
**Organisational Structure**  
**Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises (MSME) and Export Promotion (EP)**  
**Department**



**Appendix 2.8**  
**(Referred to in paragraph 2.2.5)**

**Statement showing scheme-wise expenditure incurred on selected two schemes sponsored by the GoI and four schemes financed by the GoUP during 2010-11 to 2013-14 in 15 test checked DICs**

(₹ in lakh)

Sl. No.	Name of the Schemes	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	Total
<b>(A) Schemes sponsored by the GoI</b>						
1	Prime Minister Employment Generation Programme (PMEGP)	4049.04	0.00	0.00	2734.61	6783.65
2	Micro and Small Enterprises Cluster Development Programme (MSE-CDP)	434.57	165.11	0.00	215.18	814.86
Total (A)		4483.61	165.11	0.00	2949.79	7598.51
₹ in crore		44.83	1.65	0.00	29.50	75.98
<b>(B) Schemes financed by the GoUP</b>						
1	Up-gradation of Infrastructure Facilities in the Industrial Estates	20.00	0.00	19.83	0.00	39.83
2	Collective training for self employment for persons of SC under Special Component Plan	67.23	95.79	79.89	90.88	333.79
3	Collective training for self employment for persons of ST under Special Component Plan	0.39	0.06	0.09	0.09	0.63
4	Handicrafts Marketing Promotion Scheme	0.00	0.00	7.92	35.69	43.61
Total (B)		87.62	95.85	107.73	126.66	417.86
₹ in crore		0.88	0.96	1.08	1.26	4.18
Grand Total (A+B)		4571.23	260.96	107.73	3076.45	8016.37
₹ in crore		45.71	2.61	1.08	30.76	80.16



**Appendix 2.9**  
(Referred to in paragraph 2.2.7.1)

**Statement showing details of cluster proposals approved by GoI, approved project cost *vis-a-vis* amount received during 2008-09 to 2013-14**  
(₹ in lakh)

Sl. No.	Name of the Cluster	Year	Approved Project Cost				Amount Received			
			GoI	State	SPV	Total	GoI	State	SPV	Total
<b>(A) Hard Intervention</b>										
1	Modern Carpet Backing Plant for tufted Carpet, Bhadohi	2008-09	360.37	83.75	73.38	517.50	333.00	83.75	73.38	490.13
2	Glass Beads Cluster, Varanasi	2008-09	525.00	126.50	223.50	875.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3	Leather Cluster, Gorakhpur	2009-10	152.06	76.03	25.34	253.43	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
4	Scissor Cluster, Meerut	2009-10	198.19	148.64	164.59	511.42	0.00	148.64	163.68	312.32
5	Hosiery Cluster, Kanpur	2013-14	392.37	112.10	56.06	560.53	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
6	Textile Printing Cluster, Pilkhua, Ghaziabad	2013-14	347.50	198.50	115.50	661.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
7	Tools and Training Centre, Moradabad	2013-14	1050.00	300.00	187.24	1537.24	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
<b>Sub Total of 15 test checked DICs</b>			<b>3025.49</b>	<b>1045.52</b>	<b>845.61</b>	<b>4916.62</b> say 49.17 crore	<b>333.00</b>	<b>232.39</b>	<b>237.06</b>	<b>802.45</b>
8	Pottery Cluster, Kurja	2009-10	109.74	36.58	36.58	182.90	109.74	36.58	36.58	182.90
9	Stainless steel, Brass and German Silver Utensils Cluster, Mirzapur	2012-13	1350.00	0.00	319.00	1669.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
10	Carpet Cluster, Shahjahanpur	2013-14	275.00	0.00	155.00	430.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
11	Chikankari Cluster, Barabanki	2013-14	104.67	22.42	22.42	149.51	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
<b>Total (A)</b>			<b>4864.90</b>	<b>1104.52</b>	<b>1378.61</b>	<b>7348.03</b>	<b>442.74</b>	<b>268.97</b>	<b>273.64</b>	<b>985.35</b>
<b>(B) Infrastructure Development</b>										
12	Industrial Infrastructure, Nunhai, Agra	2013-14	638.96	159.74	0.00	798.70	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
13	Industrial Infrastructure, Shikohabad, Firozabad	2013-14	258.86	64.71	0.00	323.57	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
14	Industrial Infrastructure, Partapur Meerut	2013-14	681.90	170.48	0.00	852.38	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
<b>Total (B)</b>			<b>1579.72</b>	<b>394.93</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>1974.65</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>
<b>(C) Soft Intervention</b>										
15	Glass Beads Cluster, Varanasi	2010-11	3.70	0.42	0.00	4.12	3.70	0.42	0.00	4.12
16	Carpet Cluster, Bhadohi	2008-09	9.00	1.00	0.00	10.00	9.00	1.00	0.00	10.00
17	Steel Furniture, Lucknow	2009-10	7.00	0.80	0.00	7.80	7.00	0.80	0.00	7.80

Appendices

(₹ in lakh)

Sl. No.	Name of the Cluster	Year	Approved Project Cost				Amount Received			
			GoI	State	SPV	Total	GoI	State	SPV	Total
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
18	Fan Engineering Cluster, Varanasi	2009-10	6.48	0.72	0.00	7.20	6.48	0.72	0.00	7.20
19	Silk Brocade Cluster, Varanasi	2009-10	6.48	0.72	0.00	7.20	6.48	0.72	0.00	7.20
20	Textile Printing Cluster, Ghaziabad	2009-10	7.00	0.80	0.00	7.80	7.00	0.80	0.00	7.80
21	Rice Cluster, Bareilly	2010-11	8.10	0.00	0.90	9.00	8.10	0.00	0.90	9.00
22	Glass & Wooden Beads Cluster, Meerut	2010-11	14.00	0.00	1.00	15.00	11.00	0.00	1.00	12.00
23	Embroidery Cluster, Meerut	2011-12	13.99	0.00	2.18	16.17	10.68	0.00	1.68	12.36
24	Artificial Jewellery Cluster, Meerut	2012-13	10.32	0.00	2.20	12.52	5.00	0.00	2.20	7.20
25	Black Pottery Cluster, Azamgarh	2010-11	9.54	1.96	1.30	12.80	9.54	1.96	1.30	12.80
26	Readymade Garment Cluster Gorakhpur	2013-14	10.25	0.00	1.15	11.40	5.25	0.00	0.73	5.98
	<b>Sub Total of 15 test checked DICs</b>		<b>105.86</b>	<b>6.42</b>	<b>8.73</b>	<b>121.01</b> Say 1.21 crore	<b>89.23</b>	<b>6.42</b>	<b>7.81</b>	<b>103.46</b>
27	Woollen Duree Cluster, Jaunpur	2009-10	6.70	0.75	0.00	7.45	6.70	0.75	0.00	7.45
28	Jute Wall-hanging Cluster, Gazipur	2009-10	7.11	0.79	0.00	7.90	7.11	0.79	0.00	7.90
29	Chikan Embroidery Cluster, Barabanki	2009-10	5.40	0.60	0.00	6.00	5.40	0.60	0.00	6.00
30	Mint Cluster, Badayun	2010-11	4.50	0.00	0.50	5.00	4.50	0.00	0.50	5.00
31	Screen Printing Cluster, Farrukhabad	2010-11	4.50	0.00	0.50	5.00	4.50	0.00	0.50	5.00
32	Carpet Cluster, Shahjahanpur	2010-11	9.87	2.06	1.47	13.40	9.87	2.06	1.47	13.40
33	Powerloom Cluster, Mau	2010-11	6.79	0.00	1.16	7.95	6.79	0.00	1.16	7.95
34	Powerloom Cluster, Jhansi	2010-11	4.98	0.56	0.84	6.38	4.98	0.56	0.84	6.38
35	Zari Zardozi Cluster, Unnao	2011-12	9.86	0.00	1.58	11.44	6.65	0.00	1.04	7.69
36	Gaura Stone Cluster, Mahoba	2012-13	10.53	0.00	3.13	13.66	7.05	0.00	0.00	7.05
37	Brassware cluster Sant Kabir Nagar	2013-14	11.35	0.00	2.86	14.21	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	<b>Total (C)</b>		<b>187.45</b>	<b>11.18</b>	<b>20.77</b>	<b>219.40</b>	<b>152.78</b>	<b>11.18</b>	<b>13.32</b>	<b>177.28</b>
	<b>Grand Total of 37 cluster proposals (A+B+C)</b>		<b>6632.07</b>	<b>1510.63</b>	<b>1399.38</b>	<b>9542.08</b>	<b>595.52</b>	<b>280.15</b>	<b>286.96</b>	<b>1162.63</b>
	<b>₹ in crore</b>		<b>66.32</b>	<b>15.11</b>	<b>13.99</b>	<b>95.42</b>	<b>5.95</b>	<b>2.80</b>	<b>2.87</b>	<b>11.62</b>
			Project cost of 25 projects in which funds were received (₹ in crore )							14.17
			Project cost of two cancelled projects at serial number 2 and 3 (₹ in crore )							11.28

Appendix 2.10

(Referred to in paragraph 2.2.7.1)

Statement showing DICs wise status of approved proposals and proposals lying unapproved against total identified cluster proposals till March 2014 in 15 test checked DICs

Sl. No.	Name of DIC	Identified cluster proposals				Approved cluster proposals				Clusters proposals lying unapproved				Reasons
		Soft Intervention	Hard Intervention	Total	Value (₹ in lakh)	Soft Intervention	Hard Intervention	Total	Value (₹ in lakh)	Soft Intervention	Hard Intervention	Total	Value (₹ in lakh)	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1	Lucknow	3	1	4	107.60	1	0	1	7.80	2	1	3	99.80	Non-submission of details of land & building, Financial parameters and user charges and signed copy of online application
2	Amroha	3	2	5	1338.44	0	0	0	0.00	3	2	5	1338.44	Cluster proposals not as per revised guidelines
3	Azamgarh	1	4	5	3303.53	1	0	1	12.80	0	4	4	3290.73	Cluster proposals not as per revised guidelines and non-submission of online application
4	Bareilly	3	3	6	607.16	1	0	1	9.00	2	3	5	598.16	Non-submission DPR and SPV details
5	Moradabad	3	3	6	4193.14	0	1	1	1537.24	3	2	5	2655.90	Action plan was not validated by the State Government and cluster members
6	Varanasi	5	4	9	4086.49	3	1	4	893.52	2	3	5	3192.97	Non-submission of revised DSR, DPR not as per revised guidelines and not sending signed copy of online application
7	Allahabad	2	1	3	32.00	0	0	0	0.00	2	1	3	32.00	DSR not validated by the State Government and cluster members, action plan not as per guidelines, DSR not as per revised guidelines and non-submission of revised DPR
8	Meerut	3	3	6	1040.97	3	1	4	555.1	0	2	2	485.86	DPR not sent

*Appendices*

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
9	Gorakhpur	1	2	3	373.74	1	1	2	264.83	0	1	1	108.91	DPR at State Screening Committee level
10	Sitapur	2	2	4	961.12	0	0	0	0.00	2	2	4	961.12	DPR not as per guidelines
11	Ghaziabad	2	2	4	2049.42	1	1	2	669.30	1	1	2	1380.12	DSR and DPR at State Screening Committee level
12	Firozabad	0	1	1	634.18	0	0	0	0.00	0	1	1	634.18	DSR and DPR is under preparation
13	Bhadohi	2	1	3	547.10	1	1	2	527.50	1	0	1	19.60	Pending at DI Kanpur
14	Agra	2	1	3	946.25	0	0	0	0.00	2	1	3	946.25	Pending for approval with the GoI
15	Kanpur Nagar	0	1	1	560.53	0	1	1	560.53	0	0	0	0.00	---
<b>Total no. of proposals</b>		<b>32</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>20781.67</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>5037.63</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>15744.04</b>	
<b>Project cost (₹ in crore)</b>		<b>4.62</b>	<b>203.19</b>	<b>207.81</b>	<b>1.21</b>	<b>49.17</b>	<b>50.38</b>	<b>3.41</b>	<b>154.03</b>	<b>157.44</b>				

Appendix 2.11

(Referred to in paragraph 2.2.8.1)

Statement showing status of allotment of plots in the Industrial Estates  
(March 2014) in 15 test checked DICs

Sl. No.	Name of the DIC	Name of the Industrial Estate	Large/ Mini	Area (Acre)	DI Rate (₹/sqm)	Value (1 Acre= 4046.86 sqm) (₹in lakh)	Available plots	plots allotted	Vacant plots	Area of vacant plots (in acre)	Value of vacant plots (₹ in lakh)
1	2	3	4	5	6	7 (7=5*6*40 46.86)	8	9	10 (10=8- 9)	11 (11=5*10/8)	12 (12=11*6)
1	Agra	Nunhai	Large	71.23	2262.00	6520.39	197	197	0	0.00	0.00
		Achhnera	Mini	2.00	700.00	56.66	30	30	0	0.00	0.00
2	Amroha	Joya	Large	5.00	1175.00	237.75	23	17	6	1.30	62.02
3	Azamgarh	Sarfuddinpur	Large	7.00	6000.00	1699.68	29	29	0	0.00	0.00
		Patri Nizama	Large	5.16	1600.00	334.11	148	135	13	0.45	29.35
		Baldev-manduri	Mini	3.26	101.00	13.32	42	38	4	0.31	1.27
		Sudni Phoolpur	Mini	3.03	112.00	13.73	40	38	2	0.15	0.69
		Lalganj	Mini	2.25	101.00	9.20	33	33	0	0.00	0.00
4	Bareilly	Mehnagar	Mini	2.50	117.00	11.84	43	0	43	2.50	11.84
		Bhojipura	Large	38.34	600.00	930.94	89	89	0	0.00	0.00
		C. B. Ganj	Large	16.90	1500.00	1025.88	73	73	0	0.00	0.00
		Meerganj	Mini	2.50	1050.00	106.23	55	43	12	0.55	23.18
		Faridpur	Mini	1.21	1000.00	48.97	60	60	0	0.00	0.00
		Ramnagar	Mini	18.00	350.00	254.95	161	161	0	0.00	0.00
		Bithri-chainpur	Mini	2.50	150.00	15.18	47	47	0	0.00	0.00
		Mazganwan	Mini	5.00	150.00	30.35	72	0	72	5.00	30.35
		Bhadpura	Mini	2.50	150.00	15.18	65	0	65	2.50	15.18
		Shergarh	Mini	2.50	225.00	22.76	47	0	47	2.50	22.76
5	Ghaziabad	Aawala	Mini	5.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0.00
		Loni	Large	25.00	5500.00	5564.43	79	79	0	0.00	0.00
6	Moradabad	Harthala	Large	13.99	4100.00	2321.24	71	71	0	0.00	0.00
		Mundapandey	Mini	2.00	250.00	20.23	49	15	34	1.39	14.04
		Billari	Mini	2.00	250.00	20.23	64	64	0	0.00	0.00
		Chandausi	Mini	2.50	350.00	35.41	43	43	0	0.00	0.00
7	Varanasi	Chandpur, Maheshpur	Large	46.21	3900.00	7293.21	189	185	4	0.98	154.35
		Chiraigaon, Pach.	Mini	3.69	0.00	0.00	43	41	2	0.17	0.00
8	Sitapur	Sarai Malhui	Large	15.83	675.00	432.42	48	43	5	1.65	45.04
		Khairabad	Large	10.00	675.00	273.16	31	31	0	0.00	0.00
		Sidhauri	Mini	2.41	462.00	45.06	48	47	1	0.05	0.94
		Mahmudabad	Mini	2.36	468.00	44.70	82	82	0	0.00	0.00
		Mishrik	Mini	2.62	199.00	21.10	81	73	8	0.26	2.08
9	Kanpur Nagar	Panki	Large	19.41	3000.00	2356.49	31	31	0	0.00	0.00
		Kalpi Road	Large	38.00	8000.00	12302.45	108	108	0	0.00	0.00
		Chaubepur	Mini	3.15	250.00	31.87	54	54	0	0.00	0.00
		Ghatampur	Mini	4.36	155.00	27.35	50	0	50	4.36	27.35
		Patara	Mini	3.80	155.00	23.84	60	54	6	0.38	2.38
		Billhore	Mini	6.10	110.00	27.15	46	1	45	5.97	26.56
10	Firozabad	Kakwan	Mini	6.10	155.00	38.26	46	13	33	4.38	27.45
		Shikohabad	Large	10.80	700.00	305.94	50	50	0	0.00	0.00
		Firozabad	Large	40.69	4000.00	6586.67	83	83	0	0.00	0.00
		Usaini	Mini	5.00	174.00	35.21	94	94	0	0.00	0.00
		Tundla	Mini	2.50	246.00	24.89	60	60	0	0.00	0.00

**Appendices**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
11	Bhadohi	Bhaidpur and Hamidpatti, Aurai	Mini	4.74	0.00	0.00	59	0	59	4.74	2.17
		Gyanpur	Mini	3.15	115.00	14.66	33	25	8	0.76	3.55
12	Lucknow	Talkatora	Large	48.66	3135.00	6173.45	161	161	0	0.00	0.00
		Mohanlalgaanj	Mini	2.33	135.00	12.73	80	71	9	0.26	1.43
		B. Ta. Mishrpur	Mini	2.33	135.00	12.73	54	48	6	0.26	1.41
		Kakori	Mini	2.24	135.00	12.24	1	1	0	0.00	0.00
13	Gorakhpur	Nathmalpur Go.	Large	17.45	5500.00	3883.97	72	72	0	0.00	0.00
		Khargupurkhajni	Mini	2.84	95.00	10.92	40	40	0	0.00	0.00
		Hariharpur	Mini	1.99	120.00	9.66	34	32	2	0.12	0.57
		Baasgaon	Mini	2.74	98.00	10.87	45	41	4	0.24	0.97
		Barhalgaj	Mini	4.55	129.00	23.75	75	25	50	3.03	15.84
14	Meerut	Partapur	Large	40.00	3882.00	6283.96	129	129	0	0.00	0.00
15	Allahabad	Naini	Large	26.94	1000.00	1090.22	37	37	0	0.00	0.00
		Phoolpur	Large	25.00	350.00	354.10	52	52	0	0.00	0.00
		Soraon	Mini	3.00	350.00	42.49	45	45	0	0.00	0.00
		Meja	Mini	3.00	350.00	42.49	51	27	24	1.41	20.00
		<b>Total</b>		<b>655.36</b>		<b>67156.67</b>	<b>3732</b>	<b>3118</b>	<b>614</b>	<b>45.67</b>	<b>542.77</b> <b>(₹ 5.43 crore)</b>
Status of 20 Large IEs							1700	1672	28	4.38	290.77
Status of 38 Mini IEs							2032	1446	586	41.29	252.01

Appendix 2.12

(Referred to in paragraph 2.2.8.2)

Statement showing details of 39 plots allotted but not cancelled by DIC Bareilly and Kanpur Nagar

Sl. No.	Name of DIC	Name of the IE	Large/Mini	Period of allotment	Area (in acres)	DI rate of allotment (August 2011) (₹/ Sq. m.)	Total plots	Details of plots under consideration			
								Plots in which units not established	Plots under construction	Total	Value (₹ in lakh)
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11 (11=9+10)	12 (12=11*6*4046.86*7/8)
1	Bareilly	Bhojipura	Large	1983-2010	38.34	600	89	5	10	15	156.90
2	Bareilly	C.B.Ganj	Large	1983-2006	16.90	1500	73	0	6	6	84.32
3	Bareilly	Meerganj	Mini	1989-2002	2.50	1050	55	16	0	16	30.90
4	Kanpur Nagar	Panki	Large	2009	19.41	3000	31	1	0	1	76.02
5	Kanpur Nagar	Kalpi Road	Large	2010	38.00	8000	108	1	0	1	113.91
Total					115.15		356	23	16	39	462.05 say (₹ 4.62 crore)
one acre = 4046.86 sq. m.											

## Appendix 2.13

(Referred to in paragraph 2.2.9)

Details of Trades under which training was to be provided under Collective Training Scheme for self employment of persons of Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe

Sl. No.	Name of the Trade
1	Carpentry
2	Plumbing
3	Security Guard
4	Medical Nursing
5	Repairing of Two-wheelers
6	Repairing of Puncture (Tyre)
7	Repairing of Tractors
8	Repairing of Electric Meter
9	Making small electrical fittings and electrical repairing
10	Mason work
11	Bamboo craft
12	<i>Kaleen and Dari</i> weaving
13	Boring mechanic
14	Lathe machine mechanic
15	Electrician
16	Embroidery and printing of Saris
17	Tailoring



Appendix 2.14

(Referred to in paragraph 2.2.10.1)

Statement showing status of utilisation of fund by 69 DICs during 2012-13 to 2013-14 in Handicrafts Marketing Promotion Scheme

(₹ in lakh)

Sl. No.	Name of the DIC	Fund released		Fund Utilised		Percentage utilisation	
		2012-13	2013-14	2012-13	2013-14	2012-13	2013-14
1	Bhadohi	2.00	3.14	0.00	3.14	0.00	100.00
2	Agra	2.00	3.50	2.00	3.50	100.00	100.00
3	Allahabad	1.80	3.00	0.20	1.89	11.11	63.00
4	Azamgarh	1.80	2.00	0.40	0.30	22.22	15.00
5	Bareilly	1.90	3.00	0.65	3.00	34.21	100.00
6	Firozabad	2.00	3.00	0.19	1.62	9.50	54.00
7	Kanpur Nagar	1.80	3.00	0.21	2.19	11.67	73.00
8	Moradabad	2.00	5.00	2.00	5.00	100.00	100.00
9	Varanasi	2.00	3.50	0.00	3.50	0.00	100.00
10	Amroha	1.60	2.00	1.60	2.00	100.00	100.00
11	Lucknow	2.25	3.00	0.50	1.64	22.22	54.67
12	Meerut	2.00	3.00	0.00	3.00	0.00	100.00
13	Gorakhpur	2.00	3.00	0.17	2.74	8.50	91.33
14	Ghaziabad	2.00	2.00	0.00	1.98	0.00	99.00
15	Sitapur	0.00	1.50	0.00	0.20	0.00	13.33
	<b>Sub total of 15 test checked DICs</b>	<b>27.15</b>	<b>43.64</b>	<b>7.92</b>	<b>35.70</b>		
16	Mathura	1.80	2.00	0.00	1.40	0.00	70.00
17	Mainpuri	1.60	2.00	0.80	0.99	50.00	49.50
18	Aligarh	2.00	2.00	0.18	1.98	9.00	99.00
19	Kashiram Nagar	1.50	2.00	0.00	0.20	0.00	10.00
20	Etah	1.60	2.00	0.08	1.10	5.00	55.00
21	Hathrus	1.40	2.00	1.40	0.36	100.00	18.00
22	Fatehpur	1.50	2.00	0.00	0.20	0.00	10.00
23	Pratapgarh	1.60	2.00	0.04	0.40	2.50	20.00
24	<b>Kaushambi</b>	<b>1.40</b>	<b>1.50</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>
25	<b>Ballia</b>	<b>1.40</b>	<b>2.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>
26	Mau	1.30	2.00	0.00	0.10	0.00	5.00
27	Badayun	1.60	2.00	0.00	1.35	0.00	67.50
28	Pilibhit	1.80	1.50	0.00	1.50	0.00	100.00
29	Shahjahanpur	1.60	3.00	0.00	2.61	0.00	87.00
30	Basti	3.10	4.00	0.40	1.64	12.90	41.00
31	Siddharth Nagar	1.60	2.00	0.00	1.27	0.00	63.50
32	Banda	1.80	2.00	0.00	0.17	0.00	8.50
33	<b>Hamirpur</b>	<b>1.60</b>	<b>2.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>
34	<b>Mahoba</b>	<b>1.60</b>	<b>1.86</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>
35	<b>Chitrakoot</b>	<b>1.80</b>	<b>2.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>
36	Gonda	1.80	2.00	1.28	1.78	71.11	89.00
37	Bahraich	1.80	2.00	0.36	1.41	20.00	70.50
38	Shravasti	1.50	2.00	1.16	1.22	77.33	61.00
39	Faizabad	1.80	3.00	1.75	3.00	97.22	100.00
40	Sultanpur	1.80	2.00	1.72	1.99	95.56	99.50
41	Barabanki	1.80	3.00	0.87	1.83	48.33	61.00
42	Ambedkarnagar	1.80	2.00	1.79	2.00	99.44	100.00
43	<b>Kushinagar</b>	<b>1.60</b>	<b>2.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>

Appendices

Sl. No.	Name of the DIC	Funds released		Fund Utilised		Percentage utilisation	
		2012-13	2013-14	2012-13	2013-14	2012-13	2013-14
44	Deoria	1.80	2.00	0.00	0.60	0.00	30.00
45	Maharajganj	1.80	2.00	0.00	1.81	0.00	90.50
46	Jhansi	1.80	2.00	0.00	2.00	0.00	100.00
47	Lalitpur	1.80	2.00	0.00	1.98	0.00	99.00
48	<b>Jalaun</b>	<b>1.80</b>	<b>1.50</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>
49	<b>Kanpur Dehat</b>	<b>1.50</b>	<b>2.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>
50	Etawah	3.30	4.00	0.00	1.35	0.00	33.75
51	Farrukhabad	1.80	3.00	0.00	0.10	0.00	3.33
52	<b>Kannauj</b>	<b>1.80</b>	<b>1.50</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>
53	Raibareilly	1.80	2.00	0.00	0.10	0.00	5.00
54	Unmao	1.80	1.50	0.00	1.50	0.00	100.00
55	<b>Hardoi</b>	<b>1.50</b>	<b>1.50</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>
56	<b>Lakhimpurkhiri</b>	<b>1.60</b>	<b>1.50</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>
57	Bagpat	1.50	1.50	0.00	1.50	0.00	100.00
58	Bulandsahar	3.60	2.00	1.51	2.00	41.94	100.00
59	Gautambudhha Nagar	2.00	1.50	0.00	0.56	0.00	37.33
60	Rampur	2.00	2.00	0.10	1.90	5.00	95.00
61	Bijnaur	1.60	2.00	0.00	1.84	0.00	92.00
62	Mirzapur	2.00	1.50	0.00	1.50	0.00	100.00
63	<b>Sonbhadra</b>	<b>1.50</b>	<b>1.50</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>
64	Saharanpur	2.00	5.00	1.06	4.97	53.00	99.40
65	Gazipur	1.50	1.50	0.00	1.50	0.00	100.00
66	Chandauli	1.50	1.50	0.00	0.20	0.00	13.33
67	Balrampur	1.60	0.00	1.46	0.00	91.25	0.00
68	<b>Muzaffarnagar</b>	<b>1.60</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>
69	<b>Jaunpur</b>	<b>1.50</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>
	Grand Total	122.65	150.00	23.88	89.61		
	₹ in crore	1.23	1.50	0.24	0.90		

**Appendix 3.1**

**(Referred to in paragraph 3.1)**

**Statement showing calculation of loss of interest on mobilisation advance**

**(in ₹)**

Mobilisation advance	Period	Rate of Interest	Interest amount	Remark
2,11,00,000	17.03.2009 to 30.09.2014	15 per cent	1,75,41,904	Interest rate as per contract bond
Total interest			1,75,41,904	
Security deposit available			42,74,000	
Loss of interest income			1,32,67,904	

**Appendix 3.2**  
**(Referred to in paragraph 3.2)**

**Statement showing calculation of loss of interest**

Total cost of property (land cost +Free hold charges) (₹)	16,54,00,032
Amount deposited within time against demand(₹)	5,46,46,382
Amount unpaid within stipulated time (₹)	<b>11,07,53,650</b>

Date of Allotment	Due date of Deposit(60 days from date of allotment)	Opening Outstanding (₹)	Actual date of deposit	Amount deposited (₹)	Closing Outstanding (3-5) (₹)	Period of outstanding	Delay in deposit (days) (column 4-2)	Interest at the rate 6 per cent per annum (on column no.3) (₹)
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
03.05.2011	03 May 2011	1,10,753,650	11 May 2011	2,00,00,000	9,07,53,650	03.05.2011 to 11.05.2011	8	1,45,648.64
	12 May 2011	9,07,53,650	13 June 2011	3,00,00,000	6,07,53,650	12.05.2011 to 13.06.2011	32	4,77,389.06
	14 Jun 2011	6,07,53,650	31 Oct 2011	6,07,36,550	17,100	14.06.2011 to 31.10.2011	139	13,88,179.29
<b>Total</b>								<b>2011216.99</b>

**Appendix 3.3**  
**(Referred to in paragraph 3.4)**

**Statement showing short-realisation of royalty**

SI No.	Name of the division	Actual production as per surrender letters of UPFC ( cum)	Estimated production as per sale list/allotment letter by UPFD ( cum)	Difference in quantity (cum)	Royalty on difference of quantity ( ₹)
1	DFO wild life division, Sohagibarwa, Maharajganj	825.4152	641.2790	184.1362	29,87,653.00
2	DFO wild life division, Sohelwa, Balrampur	4355.6344	1805.4678	2550.1670	4,44,07,645.00
3	Divisional Director Social Forestry Division Raebareilly	1987.0481	1205.7991	781.2490	36,13,393.00
4	DFO wild life division, Katarniaghat, Behraich	1280.9449	888.0282	392.9167	56,03,248.00
5	Divisional Forest Officer, Forest division Faizabad	452.9605	159.9579	293.0026	22,31,143.91
6	Divisional Director Social Forestry Division, Barabanki	2925.4449	2410.7480	514.6969	32,86,844.00
	<b>Total</b>	<b>11827.4480</b>	<b>7111.2800</b>	<b>4716.1700</b>	<b>6,21,29,926.91</b>

## Appendix 3.4

(Referred to in paragraph 3.5)

## Statement showing loss of interest

Sl. No.	Year	Minimum Balance in the year (₹ crore)	Differential rate of Interest (10.99-6.75) and (9.25-6.75) Per annum (In per cent)	Interest for one year (₹ crore)
1	2	3	4	5 = (3x4/100)
1	2011-12	26	4.24	1.10
2	2012-13	24	4.24	1.02
3	2013-14	47	2.50	1.17
Total				3.29

**Glossary**

Abbreviation	Full form
A/c	Account
Act	Uttar Pradesh Urban Planning and Development Act, 1973
ADM (LA)	Additional District Magistrate (Land Acquisition)
AG	Accountant General
ARs	Audit Reports
ATNs	Action Taken Notes
Authority	Kanpur Development Authority
BoA	Board of Authority
C&AG	Comptroller and Auditor General of India
CFC	Common Facility Centre
cum	Cubic Meter
DI	Directorate of Industries
DICs	District Industries Centres
DoF	Department of Forest
DPR	Detailed Project Report
DSR	Diagnostic Study Report
E&RSA	Economic and Revenue Sector Audit
EP	Export Promotion
EWS	Economically Weaker Sections
Exp.	Expenditure
FAR	Floor Area Ratio
FDRs	Fixed Deposits Receipts
GM	General Manager
GoI	Government of India
GoUP	Government of Uttar Pradesh
HDOL	Hindustan Dor Oliver Limited
HUPD	Housing and Urban Planning Department
IDEA	Interactive Data Extraction and Analysis
IEs	Industrial Estates
IRs	Inspection Reports
JBPL	Jyoti Buildtech Private Limited
KDA	Kanpur Development Authority
KVIC	Khadi and Village Industries Commission
LAA	Land Acquisition Act, 1894
MSE-CDP	Micro & Small Enterprises Cluster Development Programme
MSEs	Micro and Small enterprises
MSKJSGAY	<i>Manyavar Shri Kanshiram Ji Sahari Garib Avas Yojna</i>
MSME	Micro, Small & Medium Enterprises
NOC	No Objection Certificate
PMEGP	Prime Minister Employment Generation Programme
PSUs	Public Sector Undertakings
SARs	Separate Audit Reports
SC	Scheduled Caste
SCP	Special Component Plan
SLAO	State Land Acquisition Officer
SPV	Special Purpose Vehicle

---

Abbreviation	Full form
sqf	Square Feet
sqm	Square Meter
ST	Scheduled Tribe
STP	Sewage Treatment Plant
UPERC	Uttar Pradesh Electricity Regulatory Commission
UPFC	Uttar Pradesh Forest Corporation
UPFD	Uttar Pradesh Forest Department
UPPCB	Uttar Pradesh Pollution Control Board
UPPCL	Uttar Pradesh Power Corporation Limited
VC	Vice Chairman