

CHAPTER XII : MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS

Frontier Headquarters, Sashastra Seema Bal (SSB), Patna

12.1 Blocking of funds for over six years and loss of interest

Failure of Sashastra Seema Bal (SSB) Patna to act on Ministry's orders on acquisition of land has resulted in blockage of ₹ 37.28 crore for over six years and loss of interest of ₹ 17.75 crore

Based on proposal (April 2007) of the Sashastra Seema Bal (SSB), Patna, the Ministry of Home Affairs approved (March- August 2010) the purchase of 73 acres of land from the Government of Bihar for ₹ 37.28 crore to establish the SSB's Frontier and Reserve Battalion Headquarters. When the SSB deposited (August 2010) ₹ 37.28 crore, the Bihar Government informed that the original estimates of land price fixed in 2007 (on which SSB had obtained the Ministry's approval) had been revised and requested SSB to deposit the balance ₹ 69.13 crore (based on the revised costs). Ministry however, refused to agree to the revised proposal and advised (July 2012) SSB to send a fresh proposal for alternative location/lesser land. Till date (December 2016), SSB has not sent a fresh proposal to the Ministry and the deposit of ₹ 37.28 crore is lying with the State Government.

Ministry, in its Action Taken Note to the Public Accounts Committee (PAC)¹ relating *inter-alia* to the slow progress of land acquisition, had promised (June 2016) that in future all efforts would be made to complete the process in minimum time. Despite this, the SSB, in this specific case, has made no efforts to purchase alternative land from the State Government and the amount of ₹ 37.28 crore remains blocked.

Thus, inaction of the SSB Patna has resulted in blockage of ₹ 37.28 crore for more than six years, and consequent loss of interest of ₹ 17.75 crore².

SSB Patna has confirmed the facts. The matter was reported to the Ministry in August 2016; their reply was awaited as of January 2017.

¹ Audit Report No. 35 of 2015 'Performance Audit of Construction Activities in Central Armed Police Forces' (Para No. 3.1 – Deviations in Land Acquisition)

² Estimated at the Government borrowing cost ranging at 10.19 per cent to 7.61 per cent between 2011-12 and November 2016

Directorate of Coordination Police Wireless

12.2 CPWD and DCPW failed to transfer possession of premises completed in 2011 rendering expenditure incurred thereon infructuous

CPWD failed to ensure feasibility of water supply, prevent unauthorised occupation of premises and theft of electrical fittings in an office cum residential complex constructed for the Directorate of Coordination Police Wireless at Kohima. Consequently, the-premises completed in July 2011 had not been handed over, rendering the expenditure of ₹ 2.98 crore infructuous.

Ministry of Home Affairs accorded (November 2005) administrative approval and expenditure sanction for the construction of the Inter State Police Wireless Station office cum residential complex of the Directorate of Coordination Police Wireless (DCPW) at Kohima on land leased from the Government of Nagaland in 1998. The Central Public Works Department (CPWD) completed the construction in July 2011. DCPW, however, refused to take over possession since CPWD had not made arrangements for supply of drinking water, though this had been provided for in the estimates.

In terms of paragraph 2.7 of the CPWD Manual, the CPWD is required to ensure feasibility of water supply in the pre-construction stage itself. It was observed however, that even as early as 2008, the ground water survey conducted by the CPWD revealed that there was no underground water up to several meters depth, and therefore, the CPWD dropped the proposal for bore-well. The Nagaland Public Health Engineering Department (PHED) also informed that piped water was not feasible, and agreed (May 2011) to supply water through tankers on payment basis. DCPW however, failed to act in time and sent a team to inspect the premises only in March 2014, when it was found that some works remained incomplete. Subsequently, when a team from DCPW visited in January 2015 for the process of taking over the premises, it was found that electrical fittings were missing or damaged and that some quarters were under unauthorised occupation. A further visit by a DCPW team in June 2016 found that the unauthorised occupants were drawing power from the 200 KV transformer for which DCPW was paying electricity charges since March 2015 to the electricity department.

Thus, failure of the CPWD to resolve at the pre-construction stage the issue of feasibility of drinking water supply and subsequent failures to ensure safety of

the premises against theft and unauthorised occupation has delayed the occupation of premises constructed in July 2011 and resulted in infructuous expenditure of ₹ 2.98 crore on construction and ₹ 6.70 lakh on electricity charge up to July 2016.

DCPW stated (August 2016) that the staff quarters were still occupied by unauthorised occupants and that Director General (CPWD) and Director General of Police, Nagaland had also been approached for remedial action. The Ministry endorsed (November 2016) the same reply of DCPW.

The fact remains that the Ministry and DCPW failed to exercise adequate oversight in the matter leading to inordinate delays in taking possession of the premises.

The matter was also reported to the Ministry of Urban Development in July 2016; their reply was awaited as of January 2017.

12.3 Avoidable payment of sewerage charges

Avoidable sewerage charges of ₹ 1.48 crore during 2007-08 to 2015-16 was paid by Directorate of Coordination Police Wireless. After the issue was raised by Audit, Delhi Jal Board discontinued levy of sewerage charges from the bills of the Institute.

In terms of Delhi Jal Board (DJB) orders of December 2005, sewerage maintenance charges³, were not leviable in areas where sewerage system was either not functional or where the sewer lines had not been laid.

The Central Police Radio Training Institute (CPRTI), an Institute under the aegis of Directorate of Coordination Police Wireless (DCPW), Ministry of Home Affairs was operating from Ridge Road, New Delhi. Audit observed that there was no separate sewerage line of DJB for the waste disposal of CPRTI. CPRTI was using septic tank for disposal of sewage, which was periodically cleaned by CPWD as part of its annual repair and maintenance. CPWD was responsible for cleaning of manhole, removal of

³ Sewerage maintenance charge is levied for the maintenance of sewerage system and is charged according to volumetric consumption of water. The rate of levy was 50 *per cent* of the volumetric charge and was subsequently revised to 60 *per cent* through DJB notification of December 2009.

silt/sewerage, cleaning of septic tank and cleaning of partially or fully blocked sewer line.

Audit observed that DCPW was paying sewerage charges to DJB despite the fact that it was not using sewerage lines of DJB and had in place alternative sewage disposal system. During 2007-08 to 2015-16, DCPW paid sewerage charges of ₹ 1.48 crore which was entirely avoidable.

On this being pointed out, DCPW stated (April 2016) that the matter was taken up with DJB in April and May 2014⁴, and in response the DJB had informed that “as per provision of levying miscellaneous charges on water consumption, sewer charges were one of them and it was calculated as 60 *per cent* of periodic water charges.” The response of DJB is evidently incorrect in the light of the decision already taken by it in 2005. Audit also independently ascertained that in some areas in Delhi such as Pul Pahlad Pur, Khajoor Road, Budh Vihar (Badar Pur), Jwala Nagar, Shahdara, etc. where there was no sewerage system, the water bills raised by DJB did not include the component of sewerage charges.

Audit simultaneously took up the matter with the DJB regarding its decision to levy sewerage charges on CPRTI despite non- existence of sewer lines. Consequently, DJB discontinued the levy of sewer charges from the bills of CPRTI in December 2016. This also indicated that had DCPW taken up the matter with DJB as early as in 2007-08, the incorrect levy of sewerage charges could have been avoided.

DCPW may pursue with DJB and obtain refund of sewerage charges already paid by it along with interest.

The matter was reported to the Ministry in September 2016; their reply was awaited as of January 2017.

⁴ Audit had earlier raised the issue in 2014.

Central Industrial Security Force (CISF) and Border Security Force (BSF)

12.4 Avoidable payment of excess and penal charges on electricity

CISF unnecessarily paid excess/penal charges of ₹ 64.15 lakh to Chhattisgarh electricity authorities by routinely drawing more power than contract load.

Failure of Border Security Force (BSF) Battalion, to install shunt capacitors to maintain power factor and contract demand load of electricity, resulted in avoidable payment of ₹ 79.75 lakh.

A. In terms of agreements (latest of November 2002) with the Chhattisgarh State Electricity Board (CSEB)⁵, the Third Reserve Battalion, Central Industrial Security Force (CISF), Bhilai, Chhattisgarh was sanctioned electricity load of 150 KVA. For many years, the CISF has been routinely drawing power in excess of this contract demand and paying excess/penal charges, but did not initiate any action to increase the contract load. Finally, CISF requested (June 2012), CSPDCL to increase the load to 300 KVA, and was asked (June 2012) to pay a refundable security deposit of ₹ 4.42 lakh, which had been made mandatory since 14 September 2005 for all Central and State Government departments in Chhattisgarh. Instead of paying the now mandatory security deposit, on the ground that that it had not paid this deposit in terms of the earlier agreements, the CISF initially sought exemption and when refused, sought permission to pay this in three instalments, which was agreed to in February 2015. The power load was increased to 300 KVA in February 2015, and since then, the CISF has paid no excess/penal charges. In contrast, the CISF paid ₹ 22.43 lakh as excess/penal charges in the immediately preceding 12 months.

Thus, as a result of unnecessary correspondence with CSPDCL to get a mandatory refundable deposit of ₹ 4.42 lakh waived and then paid in instalments, CISF incurred avoidable expenditure of ₹ 47.97 lakh between June 2012 and February 2015 alone. Overall, between April 2009 to February 2015 CISF unnecessarily paid ₹ 64.15 lakh on excess power charges. The reply (April 2016) of the Director General CISF to Audit did not dispute the facts. Reply of Ministry of Home Affairs is awaited as of January 2017.

B. The tariff structure of Jodhpur Vidyut Vitran Nigam Limited (JVVNL) requires consumers to maintain average power factor above 90 *per cent* and not

⁵ Reorganised in 2009 into various entities including the Chhattisgarh State Power Distribution Company (CSPDCL).

more than 105 *per cent* of their monthly contract demand. Failure to maintain consumption between these ranges entails payment of power factor and demand surcharge at specified rates. To avoid such surcharge, consumers are required to install shunt capacitors.

Audit scrutiny of electricity bills of BSF Battalion X, for the period December 2012 to March 2016 revealed that the Battalion was routinely paying power factor and demand surcharge from December 2012 for failure to maintain average power factor at the specified level, resulting in avoidable payment of ₹ 72.04 lakh for the period 2012-13 to 2015-16. Audit further noted that the Battalion exceeded sanctioned load of 738 KVA in four months during 2015-16, resulting in avoidable payment of demand charges of ₹ 7.71 lakh.

With regard to the failure to install shunt capacitors, the Battalion replied (November 2015) that JVVNL supplied electricity to BSF posts through a dedicated line and it was the responsibility of Jodhpur Discom to repair and maintain the line. The reply is not relevant, since it is the responsibility of the consumer to install shunt capacitor. The Ministry in their reply (August 2016) stated that despite the installation of new meter and 33 MFD capacitors on every BFL pole, the power factor went below 90 *per cent*. This reply is also not relevant since it is shunt capacitors that facilitate the maintenance of average power factor within specified limits and not the 33 MFD capacitors