

85

HARYANA VIDHAN SABHA

**COMMITTEE ON
PUBLIC UNDERTAKINGS
2018-2019**

(FOURTEEN VIDHAN SABHA)

**SIXTY FIFTH REPORT
ON THE**

**REPORT OF THE
COMPTROLLER & AUDITOR GENERAL OF INDIA ON
PUBLIC SECTOR UNDERTAKINGS
(ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL SECTORS)
FOR THE YEAR ENDED 31ST MARCH, 2015**



(Presented to the Haryana Vidhan Sabha on 27th February, 2019)

**HARYANA VIDHAN SABHA SECRETARIAT,
CHANDIGARH
2019**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Sr. No.		Paragraph(s) No. of the Audit Report	Paragraph(s) No. of the Report	Pages
1		2	3	4
	Composition of the Committee on Public Undertakings			
	Introduction			
	Reports:-			
	2014-15			
1	Haryana Power Generation Corporation Limited (Review)	2 1.8.1 2.1.8 2 2.1 12 2	1-3	1-9
1.	Uttar Haryana Bijli Vitran	3 4	4	10-11
2	Uttar Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam Limited Dakshin Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam Limited	3.7 (Part-A)	5	11-13
3.	Haryana State Industrial and Infrastructure Development Corporation Limited	3 9	6	14-15
4	Haryana Agro Industries Corporation Limited	3 12	7	16-19
5.	Appendix			20-29
6.	List of Pending observations/recommendations			30-33

**COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE
THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC UNDERTAKINGS
2018-2019**

CHAIRPERSON

- 1 Shri Mool Chand Sharma, MLA

Members

2. Dr Raghuvir Singh Kadian, M L A
3. Shri Abhay Singh Chautala, MLA
4. Shri Bikram Singh Yadav, MLA
5. Dr Kamal Gupta, MLA
6. Smt Seema Trikha, M L A
- *7 Shri Ram Chand Kamboj, M L.A
8. Shri Rajdeep Singh Phogat, M L.A
- 9 Shri Tek Chand Sharma, M L A
- **10. Shri Bishamber Singh Balmiki, M L A.

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri R.K. Nandal, Secretary
2. Shri Naren Dutt, Joint Secretary

* Shri Ram Chand Kamboj, MLA has resigned from the Membership of the Committee on Public Undertakings on 03.05 2018 his resignation has been accepted by the Hon'ble Speaker w.e.f. 22 05 2018.

** Shri Bishamber Singh Balmiki has appointed as Member of the Committee on Public Undertaking w.e.f. 04.06.2018 for the remaining period of the year 2018-19

INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairperson of the Committee on Public Undertakings having been authorized by the Committee in this behalf of the Comptroller and Audit General of India as Public Sector Undertakings (Economic & Social Sectors) for the year ending 31st March, 2015 relating to Haryana Power Generation Corporation Limited, (Review), Uttar Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam Limited, Dakshin Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam Limited and Haryana Tourism Development Corporation Limited, Haryana State Forest Development Corporation Limited, Haryana State Roads and bridges Development Corporation Limited and Haryana State Industrial and Infrastructure Development Corporation Limited and Haryana Agro Industries Corporation Limited.

The Committee for the year 2018-19 undertook the unfinished work of the previous Committee(s) and also orally examined the representatives of the Government/Public Sector Undertakings/Boards where necessary. A brief record of the Proceedings of the various meetings has been kept in the Haryana Vidhan Sabha Secretariat.

The Committee are thankful to the Principal Accountant General (Audit), Haryana and her staff for their valuable assistance and guidance during the deliberations. The Committee are thankful to the Additional Chief Secretary to Government, Haryana, Finance Department including his representatives of the Departments/Corporations/ Boards concerned who appeared before the Committee from time to time. The Committee are also highly thankful and appreciates the working of the Secretary, Joint Secretary, Dealing Officer and the Staff of the Haryana Vidhan Sabha Secretariat for their unstinted, whole-hearted co-operation and assistance given in preparing this report.

Chandigarh
The 16th February, 2019

SHRI MOOL CHAND SHARMA,
Chairperson.

REPORT

- 1 The Committee on Public Undertakings for the year 2018-2019 was nominated on 24th April, 2018 by the Hon'ble Speaker in pursuance of motion moved and passed by the Haryana Vidhan Sabha in its sitting held on 6th March, 2018, authorizing him to nominate the Members of the Committee on Public Undertakings for the year 2018-19.
2. The Committee held total 65 meetings during the year at Chandigarh and other places upto 16th February, 2019 till the finalization of the Report.

REPORT

REPORT OF THE COMPTROLLER AND AUDITOR GENERAL OF INDIA ON PUBLIC UNDERTAKINGS (ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL SECTORS) FOR THE YEAR ENDED 31ST MARCH, 2015.

Haryana Power Generation Corporation Limited

(Review)

- 2.1 Functioning of Deenbandhu Chhotu Ram Thermal Power Plant, Yamunanagar and Rajiv Gandhi Thermal Power Plant, Khedar, Hisar.**
- 1. 2.1.8.1 Non deduction of cost of incomplete works and release of under payments**

As per terms of contract, the FTO of the units was to be done on completion of all the outstanding works. Audit observed that the Company decided (15 March 2013) to effect FTO and released Rs 73.54 crore to REL after making deductions on account of non-supply of mandatory spares (Rs. 6.40 crore) and works carried out at risk and cost of REL (Rs 0.44 crore) besides amount (Rs 6.86 crore) incurred on repair of Turbine of Unit I and Unit II respectively despite non-completion of outstanding works valuing Rs 155.78 crore

This non deduction of the cost of incomplete works and the release of payment of Rs 73.54 crore on FTO was an undue favour to REL and compromised the financial interests of the Company to the extent of Rs 229.32 crore

The Government and Management in their reply state that the above amount was included in the counter claims filed (August 2014) in Arbitration case. The reply is not acceptable as the Management was aware of the above pending items/ works at the time of FTO and as such amount was recoverable from the contractor rather than amount being paid

In their written reply, the State Government/Company state as under:-

DCRTPP

FTO was made effective w.e.f 01.05.2013 as approved by BOD in the meeting held on 15.03.2013. When the Unit -I & II were stable and running on full loads subject to resolving of following points only:-

- (i) Functioning of Fourth stream of Ash Handling Plant.
- (ii) Attending of 02 nos. punch points i.e.
 - (a) C&I Auto Loops for Unit-I & II
 - (b) Increase in speed for turbine of Unit-I upto 200 rpm in without opening of control valves.
- (iii) Supply of balance of mandatory spares

5% payment was due to be given to R-Infra at the time of PTO i.e. Rs 89.55 crores but payment released was Rs. 20.36 crores after recovering the amount for lot of

pending issues/ works. Similarly 5% payment was due to be given to R-Infra at the time of FTO i.e. Rs. 92.66 crores but payment released was Rs. 73.54 crores after recovering the amount for the above mentioned (point No. i, ii & iii) pending issues, which were settled with the R-Infra as a "financial settlement" to attend the above points. Hence all the payments released to R-Infra were released in-line & according to the Contract.

As described above, FTO was done subject to only above mentioned three points, as both the units were running stable and on full load. Plants could run on full load when all the system of the plants is in healthy condition.

Except above, no issues were in lime light at the time of FTO. So the issues of non-completion of outstanding works valuing of Rs. 155.78 crores were never in the picture and these were got evolved for better performing of the units for longer period under clause no. 2.43.09 of GCC Vol-I. Above issues were discussed with OEM & OES i.e. SEC, China through R-Infra, EPC Contractor that the "EPC contractor is bound to supply the spares for the system supplied by the contractor for 15 years, and the contractor is bound to provide the services for the erection of said spares. In case of spare parts from the same sub-vendor are not available due to obsolescence or any other reason, the contractor shall supply the spares for a period of 15 years from an alternative source"

Teething problems always remain in the system when such huge systems with different applications are running continuously for 14 hours and are dependent on each other. The issues pointed out in Rs. 155.78 crores i.e. for revival of POS of Rs. 4.0 crores, up-gradation of human machine interface server for DCS of Rs. 4.50 crores, revival of EWS servers for DEH Turbine Control System of Rs. 1.64 crores and up-gradation of Silica & Sodium Analyzer in CPU, DM Plant and SWAS System of Rs. 4.13 crore has some the teething problems but were working satisfactory.

At the time of FTO, the issues for the cost of raising of Ash Dyke of Rs. 53.89 crores, cost of packing material of Rs. 62.82 crores, cost of mandatory spares of Rs. 7.57 crores and cost of modification of Dry Fly Ash Evacuation System as well as the issues mentioned in above para were not at all in picture because these issues were not affecting in the performance of the plant in any way and these were raised at the later stage for covering for longer duration of better performance of the plant. All the issues covering Rs. 155.78 crores were put in the counter claims with R-Infra, for which they had gone for Arbitration with HPGCL.

During the course of oral examination the Departmental representative informed to the Committee that the matter is pending before the Hon'ble Court and requested to keep this para pending. The Committee further recommends that the final outcome of the Court case be informed to the Committee immediately.

2. 2.1.8.2 Performance of Boiler Turbine and Generator installed at DCRTTP

The plant manufactured by SEC China (OEM) was supplied for the first time (2004) in India to DCRTTP.

The plant remained under forced outages frequently as detailed below

Year	Unit-I		Unit-II	
	No. of tripping	Outage period (Hours: Minutes)	No. of tripping	Outage period (Hours: Minutes)
2010-11	19	418.14	35	520:55
2011-12	14	484:19	17	5414:14
2012-13	5	7913:21	8	6181:20
2013-14	7	1044.41	10	3653 49
2014-15	8	312:46	11	881 07
Total	53	10173:21	81	16651:25

As can be seen from above table, the plant suffered 134 forced outages during 2010-15, of 26824.46 hours which resulted in generation loss of 6840.12 MUs.

The Major long outages of Unit I and Unit II and their impact on Company is discussed below:

(i) Prolonged outages and extra expenditure on overhauling of Unit I.

There was forced shut down of Unit I of the DCRTTP on 31 March 2012 due to damage of LP rotor. The EPC contractor refused to take up the repair work and suggested to directly take up the matter with OEM AS the unit II was also under forced shut down, the OEM suggested (25 May 2012) to carry out complete overhauling of the turbine and generator of both the units and submitted its offer of repair of LP rotor of Unit I and overhauling of both the units subject to condition that the repair and overhauling charges would not be recovered either from EPC or EOM. The Company had to get (June 2012) the repair of LP rotor done by sending it to Shanghai and overhauling of the Unit at its own cost. The Company had to get (June 2012) the repair of LP rotor done by sending it to Shanghai and overhauling of the Unit at its own cost. The Company had to bear an expenditure of Rs. 9.25 crore (Rs 2.90 crore paid to OEM for overhauling of the Unit I, Rs 0.27 crore on related works and Rs.6.08 crore on spares). The Company had, however, neither invoked the contract performance guarantee given by the EPC contractor nor gone in to arbitration in view of the denial of the EPC contractor to carry out the repair of damaged LP rotor. Besides this, the Company had to bear a generation loss of 1,900.52 MUs and resultant non recovery of fixed cost*3 of Rs 191.95 crore during 2012-13.

3* Per unit fixed cost as allowed by HERC in the tariff order for the relevant years

Further, without exploring the possibility to purchase new rotating blades alongwith repair of rotor, the rotating blades, which were lying at DCRTTPP were also sent to SEC, Shanghai for fitting in the LP rotor. Since these blades were to be kept as mandatory spares, the Company has to place (march 2015) fresh order for procurement of new blades on SEC Shanghai for Rs. 7 58 crore and the same had not been received so far (December 2015) Thus, had the Company placed order for supply and fitting of new blades in LP rotor along with repair work of LP rotor, the transportation charges of old blades to the extent of Rs. 1.80 crore could have been avoided

The Government and Management in their reply state that SEC agreed to repair the unit on a precondition that the cost could not be charged from EPC contractor or OEM Further, these spares were sent to avoid delay. The reply is not acceptable as the Company had not taken any action against the EPC contractor for refusal to undertake repair and at the same time had not explored the possibility to purchase new blades.

(ii) Forced Shut Down on account of damage of High Intermediate Pressure rotor and overhauling of the Unit-II.

The Unit II tripped on 25 September 2011 and had to be shut down due to damage of High Intermediate Pressure (HIP) Rotor Since the OEM gave (21 December 2011) offer for repair of the defective rotor at Rs. 13 crore without any warranty/ guarantee for the repaired rotor, the Company got the rotor repaired at risk and cost of REL While the HIP rotor of the Unit II was under repair, the Unit- I also tripped and on the recommendation of OEM, the Company overhauled Unit-II at its own cost Though the equipments were under performance guarantee, yet the Company could not recover Rs 2 32 crore incurred on overhauling of Unit II from the EPC contractor due to similar precondition that the repair and overhauling charges would not be recovered either from EPC or OEM The Company suffered generation loss of 2,625 23 MUs and non recovery of fixed cost of Rs. 293.16 crore due to continuous outage of 10,295 hours

The Government and Management in their reply stated that SEC agreed to repair the rotor on a precondition that the cost would not be charged from EPC contractor or OEM and recovery of fixed cost is also a matter of case referred to the arbitrator The fact remains that the Company has not taken any action against EPC contractor for refusal to undertake repair

(iii) Forced outage requiring revival of Unit II from OEM.

Even after overhauling Unit II experienced continuous problems and was under forced shut down for 1,006 hours between December 2012 and May 2013 The Unit was again forced shut down on 3 June 2013 for 2156 hours till 4 September 2013

The Company placed (21 June 2013) work order for revival of Unit II on OEM and incurred expenditure of Rs 2.31 crore. The Company did not recover this amount from EPC contractor through the equipment supplied was under performance guarantee up to 30 April 2014. The Unit remained under forced shut down for 2,156 hours and there was generation loss of 646.96 MUs besides non recovery of fixed cost of Rs 74.40 crore.

The Government and Management in their reply stated that the revival of Unit was necessitated due to various operational faults and action has been taken against the officer concerned. The reply is not tenable as the units were under frequent forced shut downs even during performance guarantee period which was valid upto April 2014.

RGTPP

The Company awarded (10 September 2007) contract for construction of two units of 600 MW each to R-Infra at firm price of Rs 3,775.43 crore (Rs. 1,431.01 crore for offshore contract, Rs 1,593.42 crore for onshore contract and Rs. 751 crore for services contract) on turnkey basis. The major milestones relating to commissioning of the units were as under -

Milestone Activity	Unit 1	Unit 2
Scheduled date of Provisional Taking Over (PTO)	28 December 2009	28 March 2010
Actual Commercial Operation Date (COD) ^{4*}	24 August 2010	01 March 2011
Actual date of PTO	10 February 2014	20 September 2014
Actual Date of FTO	15 July 2015	15 July 2015

It was noticed that R-Infra was unduly favoured during the period from declaration of COD to effecting of FTO as discussed below.

In their written reply, the State Government/Company state as under:-

DCRTPP

Contention of the audit about the installation of Boiler Turbine and Generator of the obsolete technology is not Correct. In fact the BTG of DCRTPP & RGTPP units was supplied by SEC China of the prevailing technology and at the competitive rates through international bidding. 58 contemporary Units having similar types of turbines are running in China & boilers with similar technology are being run in India at various places. However with the passage of time every manufacturer has to change the design for the betterment of machine. The machines installed at DCRTPP have also been got repaired from SEC, China as such the existing technology is not obsolete and it is still existing. Moreover, Central electricity authority has also approved the design of the machines.

^{*4} The Commercial operation date is the date from which the plant has been synchronized to the grid and starts selling scheduled power to the DISCOMs.

(i) **Prolonged outages and extra expenditure on overhauling of Unit I.**

All the spares of LP turbine were not procured under mandatory spares as the LP rotor is consisting of 2x7 stages and the rotating blades and diaphragms of last three stages i.e 5th, 6th & 7th were procured. On 31-03-2012, Unit -1 tripped on high turbine bearing vibrations. After dismantling of LP turbine under the supervision of SEC design engineers, the 5th and 6th stage blades & 6th stage diaphragms were found damaged. FC (Power), Govt., Haryana constituted a committee for suggesting the most suitable course of action to be adopted by HPGCL for effective and successful repair of damaged component in the least possible time. The committee deliberated the issue of the repair of LP Turbine rotor with various Indian firms but due to non-availability of any competitive agency in India, as the size of rotor was 3.6 m and facility for over speed balancing of such a huge rotor was not available, therefore, the matter was pursued with OEM i.e SEC, China and they have agreed to repair the LP Turbine rotor and execute the overhauling of Turbo Generator of Unit- I & II with the conditions 'that repair & overhauling charges would not be recovered from EPC contractor or OEM and the blades and other components available under mandatory spares required to repair the LP rotor for Unit-I shall be supplied by HPGCL free of cost' HPGCL had to agree to the conditions of SEC, China as no other option was left for earliest revival of the Unit. Accordingly, a work order no.54/TG-II/117 dated 22.06.2012 was placed on M/s SEC, China after approval of state govt. of Haryana and Board of Directors, HPGCL. All above facts were brought in the knowledge of approving authorities. Due to timely decision of HPGCL authorities the repaired LP rotor was received back at DCRTTP, Yamuna Nagar on 09.12.2012 i.e. within a period of 4 month (approx). Further If these spares were not sent along with the rotor and a comprehensive order placed along with supply & fitment of spares on the LP rotor then it would have taken more than one and a half year to repair the rotor and unit would have been commissioned in Jan 2014 instead of Feb. 2013 as these spares are not kept in the ready stock by SEC, China. It takes about 12 months to 18 months for new order to materialize had we gone for procurement of fresh blades.

In view of the above explained position, the overhauling of the Unit was carried out as per requirement and the amount i.e. Rs 2.90 Crores (cost for overhauling of Unit-I) incurred on the same was borne by HPGCL.

Out of Rs 1.71 Crores for 17 related works, Rs 1 387 Cr. has already been booked to M/s Rinfra vide JV no. 2013070002784 dated July 2013 (copy attached as annexure-III) and Rs 5 32 lac has been deducted from the bill of SEC, China vide JV no.2013030007450 dated 29.03.2013 (copy attached as annexure-IV). Balance amount of Rs 26.91 lac related to routine overhauling of unit-I for HIP turbine which can't be booked to either Rinfra or SEC,China.

Out of Rs 7.58 Crores for spares, Rs 1.5 Crores has already been recovered from R-Infra and balance amount has been claimed in the Arbitration case which is under progress.

The transportation charges of Rs 1.8 crores as mentioned in the para are not only for the transportation of the blades but this also includes transportation cost of the LP rotor, casing and the same has already been booked to M/s RInfra with the approval of Govt of Haryana. Accordingly amount of Rs 3.49 crores (Rs 1.5 Crores for cost of blades + Rs 1.99 crores for other related works) was booked to M/s RInfra

The claim on account of generation loss due to forced outage of unit has been invoked on RInfra under arbitration case total amounting to Rs 1630.45 Crores.

As there were no lapses on the part of HPGCL authorities and huge amount in crores of rupees was saved on account of generation produced by unit-I due to timely decision of HPGCL authorities by getting repaired the LP rotor.

(ii) Forced Shut Down on account of damage of High Intermediate Pressure rotor and overhauling of the Unit-II

Unit-II was put under commercial operation on 24/06/2008 and remained under operation till 25/09/2011. Unit- 2 tripped due to tripping of station transformer on 25.09.11 and the unit was lighted up but there was no sign of any abnormality at low speed. However, at speed at 600 rpm, the turbine vibrations (at brg No. 1) crossed the permissible limits and machine was put under shut down on 04.10.11. After discussion with HPGCL corporate office, the matter was followed up with R-Infra & SEC China. SEC decided to inspect bearing No. 1 & 2. After inspection brg. No. 2 was found damaged. The same was replaced and machine was put on turning gear on 24.10.11. The eccentricity of the rotor was found high and SEC, China, suggested opening the HIP turbine casing. After thorough checking SEC declared that there is bend of 0.48 mm at the HIP rotor and it is very difficult to repair as M/s Shanghai Turbine Company (STC), the turbine manufacturer for SEC had not repaired rotor run out exceeding 0.2 mm. In view of developing situations, efforts were made to locate firms within the country to handle and repair such type of big rotor. Finally a work order no. 44/TG-II/104 dated 24.01.12 was issued to M/s Siemens Ltd. Vadodra, Gujrat for HIP rotor straightening costing EURO 3,99,567 with the ex-post facto approval of Board of Directors and expenditure incurred on repair of HIP rotor, work of dismantling of HIP and other associated works were charged to RInfra. Copy of JV no 2012090003387 dated 08.09.2012 enclosed as Annexure-V.

Further, for the revival of unit, a work order no.54/TG-II/117 dated 22.06.2012 was placed on M/s SEC, Shanghai, China with the approval of state govt. of Haryana and Board of Directors, HPGCL for overhauling of unit-I & II and repair of LP rotor of unit-I with the provision that the overhauling charges for unit-I & II and repair cost of LP rotor unit-I could not be charged to RInfra or SEC China as already explained above.

The claim on account of generation loss amounting to Rs 1630.45 Crores due to forced outage of unit has been invoked on RInfra and is under arbitration.

(iii) Forced outage requiring revival of Unit-II from OEM

Unit-II remained under forced shut down between Dec-2012 to June-2013 as per details given below

- (a) During Dec-2012 unit was under forced shut down due to HPH-8 valve leakage problem, which was attended & Unit revived back This is a routine problem that can happen at any time during running of the unit
- (b) During April & May-2013 unit was under forced shut down due to increase in vibration at Bearing. No.- 6 & 7 as there was hunting in 220 KV substation, Jorian and negative phase sequence current increased suddenly due to which the vibration trends changed After balancing & alignment of Bearings – 6&7 the machine was synchronized. This type of problem due to grid disturbance is beyond the control of HPGCL as the grid is under the control of HVPNL & Power Grid department
- (c) Unit was again forced shut down on 03.06 2013 due to failure of lube oil supply to turbine. And after revival of turbine, unit was synchronized on 05 09 2013 This was due to operational fault and the officer concerned has already been penalized by the department, so the loss cannot be attributed to the EPC Contractor.

During the course of oral examination the Departmental representative informed to the Committee that the matter is pending before the Hon'ble Court and requested to keep this para pending. The Committee further recommends that the final outcome of the Court case be informed to the Committee immediately.

3. 2.1.12.2 Internal Control

The company has an internal audit cell and had completed audit up to 2013-14 and audit for 2014-15 was in progress (September 2015) However, there was no internal audit manual prescribing the scope and extent of audit checks and areas to be covered. Internal Audit reports did not point out any systemic issues or deficiencies to help Management in decision making process and were limited to observations on reconciliations of payments and stocks, irregular petty purchases, entitlement issues etc.

The Government and Management in their reply stated that preparation of manual is at final stage and it was considering the outsourcing of internal audit function

In their written reply, the State Government/Company state as under:-

1. A detailed Internal audit manual has been prepared and circulated to all the concerned after approval from Board of Directors, HPGCL on 06 06.2016
2. Introductory meeting is being conducted with the internal auditor for understanding the scope of work, extent of checking as well as management expectation from the auditor Internal Audit report is also submitted by the auditors in the prescribed format and the same is being monitored and reviewed at headquarter level. Internal checks and control as defined in the manual is being exercised and issues involving serious objections are being put up before the Audit Committee and thereafter to the Board of Directors with action taken report on the directions given by the Audit Committee. The procedure being followed is in line with the manual and provisions of Companies Act.

3. To improve the quality of the Internal Audit, senior retired Finance Officer of the Corporation has been engaged for monitoring, reviewing and assisting the professional internal audit firm engaged for conducting the internal audit through outsourcing from reputed CA firm. The Internal Audit for the year 2017-18 (1st half) has already been completed and for the year 2017-18 (2nd half) is under progress. As such internal audit being carried out is upto date.

During the course of oral examination, the Committee observed that the recovery process is pending till now, therefore, the Committee recommends that this para may be kept pending till the recovery of the pending amount. The Committee also recommends that when the pending amount be recovered the same may be informed to the Committee immediately.

UTTAR HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM LIMITED

3.4 Loss due to non submission of insurance claims.

4. The Company suffered loss of Rs.0.74 Crore due to non submission of claims to the insurance companies in terms of group accidental insurance policy for fatal accidents.

Uttar Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam Limited (Company) took (16 July 2010) a Group Personal Accident Policy to insure its staff viz. Gazetted and non gazetted employees against fatal and non fatal accidents for the period 17 July 2010 to 16 July 2011. As per terms of policy, the insurance company was to give compensation of Rs 3 Lac in each fatal accident case which was increased to Rupees Five Lac with effect from 1 October, 2010. The field offices are required to intimate the claim within 28 days of the accident to the insurer Company.

Audit observed (February 2015) that though the Company issued guidelines to the field offices to intimate claims to insurance companies in time, it had not devised any internal control and monitoring mechanism to ensure that all the claims were being intimated in time and pursue so that claims could be recovered from the insurance companies. The Company paid compensation of Rs 0.96 crore (Chief Engineer, Operation, Panchkula) Rs 0.58 crore in nine fatal accident cases and Chief Engineer, Operation, Rohtak Rs. 0.38 crore in seven fatal accident cases) during July 2010 to March, 2015 but did not intimate claims of Rs.74* crore to the insurance Companies at all and thus lost the opportunity to recover the same

The Management (December 2015) and Govt (January 2016) stated in their reply that in Rohtak Circle out of total seven cases, in three cases, claims (Rs 15 Lac) were lodged with delay and were rejected and that departmental action to fix responsibility is underway for both the circles

The point remains that the Company suffered loss of Rs.0.74 crore due to its lack of institutionalised mechanism to watch submission and recovery of insurance claims

Reply of CE/OP, Rohtak)

As per statement received from field offices 7 No. FA cases (Claim amount Rs. 38 lacs) were happened / occurred during the period March 2011 to March-2015 out of which for three no. cases, the claim were submitted with insurance company with some partial delay but the company rejected the same and in four no. cases claim was not lodged by the DDOs i.e. Xen/OP. The field offices instructed to take disciplinary action against the delinquent officer / official who have not take action timely with insurance company. The field offices are directed to take action against the officer / official where claim has not lodged with the insurance company (Copy enclosed).

* Rs. 3 Lacx1 case (being prior to October 2010) plus Rs.5 Lacx8 cases = Rs.43 Lac (Panchkula) + Rs.5 Lac x 5 cases plus Rs.3.45 Lac+Rs.2.88 Lac on actual basis = Rs. 31.33 (Rohtak)

(Reply of CE/OP, Panchkula)

The Nigam had purchased a group personal accident policy (insurance policy) for its staff viz. Gazetted and non Gazetted employee covering against fatal and non fatal accidents / permanent disability to bear the compensation of its employees

Workman compensation has already applicable in case of workman and as a matter of concession, erstwhile HSEB has adopted same formula for providing compensation as that of workman cases decided of NFA/FA of Nigam employee/private person and compensation has sanction in all eligible cases of deceased/victim under workman compensation act-1923

As per statement, the claims in respect of 9 No. FA cases have not been lodged with the insurance company. In respect of 2 Nos. Fatal Accident cases, claim has been lodged after stipulated period of 30 days from the date of accident which has been rejected by the insurance company. The instructions have already been issued by CAO, UHBVN, Panchkula vide memo No. Ch-11/CAO/INS-EMP/2014-2015 dated 21.08.2015 to all XENs regarding insurance of employees and lodging of claims with insurance company. SEs 'OP' has also been directed to initiate disciplinary action against the delinquent officers / officials, the name of the persons responsible has been mentioned in the list attached as Annexure-A. However, the Instruction regarding Monitoring and Internal Control system for timely submission of claims of Fatal / Non-Fatal cases has been made to all concerned.

During the course of oral examination of the Departmental representative, the Committee observed that the company suffered financial losses due to non submission of claims to the insurance companies for fatal accidents within stipulated period. The Committee, therefore, recommends that a proper mechanism be devised to ensure that the insurance claims of fatal accidents be claimed within the stipulated period by the concerned officers/officials. The Committee, further recommends that this para may be kept pending till the enquiry by the departmental be completed. Uttar Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam Limited and Dakshin Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam Limited

3.7 Loss in execution of contracts

5. DISCOMs suffered loss of Rs. 33.51 crore due to irregular termination of contract and over payment to contractors.

Part-A To segregate agriculture load from rural domestic load by the two power distribution Companies (DISCOMs) viz. Uttar Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam Limited (UHBVNL) and Dakshin Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam Limited (DHBVNL) awarded contracts for supply and erection of additional 11 KV feeders which hitherto were being fed through common feeders.

UHBVNL awarded (15 June 2007) contract for supply and erection of material at a cost of Rs 33.89 crore to M/s Teracom for construction of 145*14 feeders of 11 KV to be completed by 31st March, 2008. The work was delayed and exclusive upto 31 December 2008 was granted. During currency of this extension period, UHBVNL issued (26 November 2008) 15 days show cause notice for delay in works and terminated the contract on 10 December 2008 after reviewing the progress of work.

By that time M/s Teracom had carried out work of Rs.21.15 crore¹⁵ against which Rs. 10.59 crore had been paid after deducting delay penalty of Rs. 2.40 crore.

The contractor represented (January 2009) to UHBVNL for appointment of an Arbitrator who held (30 July 2011) the termination illegal as UHBVNL had terminated the contract by 14th day from the date of issue of notice and within the extended completion period (31 December 2008). It ordered UHBVNL to pay the due amount and release Bank Guarantee along with interest besides rejecting the claims of Rs.6.29 crore¹⁶ of UHBVNL. The company paid the balance of cost of work done of Rs.10.54 crore along with interest of Rs. 4.53 crore. Company's appeal filed in High Court of Punjab and Haryana and Special Leave Petition filed in High Court of Punjab and Haryana and Special Leave Petition filed in the Hon'ble Supreme Court against the Arbitration award were dismissed on 19 March, 2014 and 11 July 2014 respectively.

We observed that UHBVNL while terminating the contract had ignored the terms and conditions of the contract and thus had to suffer loss of Rs 8.01 crore due to non recovery of claims Rs 6.29 crore and interest on the Bank Guarantee not encashed of Rs 1.72 crore.

After payment to M/s Teracom as per Arbitration award, UHBVNL belatedly observed during reconciliation (July 2014) that the Contractor had not returned material supplied valuing Rs 1.07 crore and decided (July 2014) to initiate legal proceedings against the contractor. However, action is yet to be initiated (November 2015). Thus, due to delay in reconciliation of the material supplied, UHBVNL overpaid Rs.1.36 crore (including interest of Rs 0.29 crore¹⁷).

UHBVNL (July 2015) and Government (November 2015) replied that the contract was terminated as the contractor failed to execute works in line with the execution schedule, the payment was made as per decision of courts and that legal proceedings for accounting/recovery of Rs 1.36 crore are under process and shall be filed accordingly in the legal case. The fact remained that the termination was illegal as also held by arbitrator as UHBVNL had terminated the contract before the expiry of the extended period granted by it for completion of work.

In their written reply, the State Government/Company state as under:-

- Teracom Limited failed to execute works in line with the completion schedule i.e., by 31.3.2008 in contravention of contractual obligations and provisions of the contract even up to 26-11-2008.

-
- | | |
|-----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 15 | Supplied material worth Rs.20.54 crore and executed erection work valuing Rs.0.61 crore. |
| 16. | Delay penalty Rs.2.40 crore, liquidated damages Rs.1.69 crore and extra expenditure incurred in completion of tell over work Rs.2.20 crore. |
| 17. | Interest at the rate 9 per cent per annum from the date of Arbitration award i.e. July 2011 to July 2014 i.e. date of payment. |

- The progress of the project was being monitored by Hon'ble Chief Minister Haryana and during one of the meetings held on 4.12.2008 it was decided to terminate the contract of M/s Teracom as the contractor failed to complete even single feeder out of 121 No's feeders (as per scope of their works) with no valid justification for such abnormal delay in execution of work
- The minutes of meeting held on 4 12 2008, Chaired by Hon'ble CM Haryana clearly indicated the termination of the contract which eventually came in to being on December 10, 2008
- The contractor approached the Hon'ble Court for the appointment of Arbitrator proceedings despite the provision for Empowered officer
- The appointment of Arbitrator by the Hon'ble High Court was the prerogative of the court and Nigam had nothing at its disposal to challenge the same
- However, during legal proceedings / arguments in the case the Advocate of the Nigam argued before the Arbitrator by explaining that the contractor could not complete even a single feeder even up to December 10, 2008 and how could firm complete all the 121 feeders in the remaining period of 21 days only Despite the above argument the termination was held illegal by the Arbitrator
- The decision of the Arbitrator was duly challenged by the Nigam before the District & Sessions Court & then before Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana Court by engaging a Senior Advocate but it is an established & apparent fact that the decision / award decided by the Arbitrator was not revoked.
- The termination of contract was held illegal by various Hon'ble Courts, which was beyond the purview / jurisdiction of the Nigam Nigam exercised all legal options available to oppose the holding of termination as illegal even up to highest respected court i.e. Supreme Court but the earlier decision of Arbitrator's award / lower courts prevailed It is re-emphasized that termination of the work order was in the best interest of the Nigam as the firm failed to erect even a single feeder & the highest administrative authority also opined to terminate the contract since it was practically impossible for the contractor to complete works in remaining period of 21 days only
- The payments made to the contractor were in compliance to decision of Hon'ble courts to evade contempt of court

The process of issuing legal notice to the firm for recovery of Rs 1.31 crore from the contractor is under way and likely to be filed in District Court Karnal court by the Construction wing, as the draft has been approved by the LR HPU.

After perusal of the written reply and oral examination of Departmental representatives, the Committee is perturbed over the Departmental laxity in the proper execution of contracts. The Committee, therefore, recommends that steps be taken to ensure that such type of lapses may not be occurred in future, the progress report in respect of Court case may also be submitted to the Committee.

Haryana State Industrial and Infrastructure Development Corporation Limited.

3.9 Undue favour to an allottee-

6. The Company granted undue favour of Rs. 1.89 crore to an allottee by not charging interest on extension fee.

The Company allotted (October 1994) a plot measuring 8800sq. Meters to M/s Indian Hotel Company Ltd. (allottee) at a cost of Rs. 0.62 crore in phase-VI, Udyog Vihar, Gurgaon for setting up a laundry unit. The allottee took the possession of the plot on 12th October 1995. As per terms and conditions of allotment and the industrial policy as amended from time to time, the allottee was to construct a minimum 25 percent of the Permissible covered Area (PCA) and commence commercial activity by 29th April, 2001*27, failing which plot was liable to be resumed. The allottee completed construction of required built up area up to July 2001 but it did not commence any commercial activity. The company issued (August 2001 to December 2012) various show cause notices regularly to the allottee but the allottee wither did not respond to the notices or in implementation of the project. The Company neither allowed extension nor resumed the plot.

The Company issued another show cause notice (December 2012) in response to which the allottee informed (May 2013) that its laundry project could not be implemented as the hotel industry had been badly hit during the recent years and also terrorist attack on their group hotel at Mumbai. Allottee also informed that it had reworked the project and would be in a position to complete it by January 2014. It requested for grant of suitable extension in time period on payment of all applicable charges, extension fee etc as per the applicable rules. The company on the recommendations of the standing committee empowered to address such issues headed by Principal Secretary Industries Department (GoH) regularized the period of delay in implementation of project and allowed (March 2014) extension upto 20 April 2015 on payment of extension fee of Rs. 250/- per square meter per year as per its Estate Management procedures (EMP)-2011 but without charging any interest which was also a recommendation. The allottee deposited the extension fee Rs 3.08 crore during February to April 2014.

Audit observed that EMP of 2011 provided that grant of extension in implementation of the project would be subject to the payment of

extension fee and interest at the rate of 11% per annum on the amount due for the delayed period. There was no provision in the rules/ policy of the company to waive interest on extension fee. Thus the Company extended undue favour to allottee by not charging interest on extension fee which worked out to Rs 1.89 crore which was in contravention to its EMP-2011.

***27 Including maximum period of extension of one year granted to the allottee on payment of extension fee.**

The Company and Government in their reply stated (October 2015) that the action was duly approved by the BoD which had approved the EMP-2011 and subsequent changes therein from time to time. The reply was not convincing as this action resulted in undue favour to the allottee and loss of Rs 1 89*28 crore to the Company.

In their written reply, the State Government/Company state as under:-

The Corporation has already given a detailed reply to the audit observations based on actual facts of the case. It is reiterated that as per EMP-2011, the maximum permissible extension was for a period of three years (for plot sizes above one acre), hence the extension involved in this case was beyond the provisions of EMP-2011. However, as per clause 12.11 of EMP-2011, in case any of the matter/issue was not covered by the procedures defined in EMP-2011, a Committee headed by Principal Secretary Industries with MD/HSIIDC, MD/HFC & Director Industries as its members was competent to decide the same on merits, equity and justice.

Since in this case, the extension involved was beyond the permissible extension as per EMP-2011, the case was referred to the aforesaid Committee, which took a conscious decision in the matter, on merits considering the peculiar circumstances of the case, to recommend grant extension up to April 2015 by charging extension fee @ Rs 250/- per sq Meter for each year of delay in implementations of the Committee were approved by the Board of Directors of the Corporation, the competent authority, which had approved the EMP-2011 and subsequent changes therein from time to time.

The reply submitted by the Corporation was based on facts of the case. The matter was referred to the Anomaly Committee under clause 12.11 of EMP-2011 only and once the recommendations of the said committee had been approved by the Board of Directors, the action cannot be said to be in contravention of EMP-2011.

During the course of oral examination of the Departmental representative, the Committee desired detailed information on certain points, the Additional Chief Secretary of the Department assured the Committee to submit the desired information within one month. But the information asked by the Committee have not been supplied by the Department till the finalization of this report. The Committee took a serious view and recommend that the desired information be submitted within three months to the Committee.

***28 Worked out on annual extension fee of Rs.22 Lac due, for the period 2001-02 to 2012-13 at 11 per cent per annum as amount was received during February, 2014 to April, 2014.**

Haryana Agro Industries Corporation Limited.

3.12 Loss of revenue

7. The Company suffered loss of Rs. 7.89 crore due to unscientific and improper preservation of wheat stock.

Haryana Agro Industries Corporation Limited (Company) procures wheat from mandis for central pool on behalf of Food Corporation of India (FCI) and delivers it to FCI as per schedule given from time to time. After delivery of wheat, the Company claims reimbursement of the cost of the foodgrains and other charges from FCI. The claims of the Company are based on the Minimum Support Price,*34 plus statutory charges and other incidental charges of wheat as fixed by the Government of India (GOI) from time to time. As per guidelines of FCI, if the stocks are damaged while in the custody of the Company, the GOI does not reimburse the loss as the safe custody/preservation of procured foodgrains is the responsibility of Company.

Audit observed (November 2014) that FCI had not taken over 5974 85*35 MT wheat of crop year 2010-11 and 2011-12 as

Haryana Agro Industries Corporation Limited (Company) procures wheat from mandis for central pool on behalf of Food Corporation of India (FCI) and delivers it to FCI as per schedule given from time to time. After delivery of wheat, the Company claims reimbursement of the cost of the foodgrains and other charges from FCI. The claims of the Company are based on the Minimum Support Price, plus statutory charges and other incidental charges of wheat as fixed by the Government of India (GOI) from time to time. As per guidelines of FCI, if the stocks are damaged while in the custody of the Company, the GOI does not reimburse the loss as the safe custody/preservation of procured foodgrains is the responsibility of Company.

Audit observed (November 2014) that FCI had not taken over 5974 85 MT wheat of crop year 2010-11 and 2011-12 as the same were damaged and non-issuable due to improper preservation and unscientific storage. FCI categorized the quantity of damaged wheat as unfit for human consumption and as cattle feed to be disposed off through sale to cattle feed manufacturers.

Out of 5974 85 MT of damaged stock, company disposed 2457 55 MT after inviting tenders in January 2014, thereby leaving balance quantity of 3517.30 MT. Subsequently in May 2014, 895 50 MT wheat (794 50 MT Nilokheri, Karnal for the crop year 2011-12 and 101 MT Amin, Kurukshetra for the crop year 2012-13) was also identified as damaged. Out of total 4412 80 MT of wheat (3517.30 MT and 895.50 MT), 4327.70 MT was disposed of after inviting tenders in June 2014. The balance 85.10 MT was designated as either weight loss or shortage. The Company recovered Rs.5 46 crore from the disposal of damaged stock against Rs. 13 35 crore that would have been recovered from FCI had the wheat been stored as per the guidelines of the FCI. Thus, the Company incurred avoidable loss of Rs. 7 89 crore (Rs. 13.35 crore - Rs. 5.46 crore) on disposal of damaged wheat (crop year 2010-11 & 2011-12) due to unscientific and improper preservation.

***34 MSP is the price at which Government is ready to purchase the crop from the farmers directly if crop price lower than MSP.**

***35 Stored at jeet Ram Plinth (Indri-2,440 MT), HAIC mandi (Kurukshetra-1,471.15 MT), Agro Complex (Pipli-617 MT), R.D. Rice Mill (330 MT) and Agro Mandi (Kurukshetra-1,471.15 MT),**

The Company in its reply (June 2015) while admitting the facts stated that wheat stocks were damaged due to longer storage on open plinths. It was also informed that departmental action had been initiated against the concerned officials.

The matter was referred to the Government (May 2015), their reply was awaited (January 2016)

In their written reply, the State Government/Company state as under:-

I) It is true that the Haryana Agro Industries Corporation Limited (HAIC) procures wheat from mandis for the central pool and delivers it to FCI as per schedule given from time to time. After delivery of wheat, the Company claims reimbursement of the cost of the foodgrains and other charges from FCI. The claims of the Company are based on the Minimum Support Price, plus statutory charges and other incidental charges of wheat as fixed by the Government of India (GOI) from time to time. It is also true that if the stocks are damaged while in the custody of the Company, the GOI will not reimburse the loss in such cases, as the safe custody/preservation of procured foodgrains is the responsibility of Company and the loss will have to be borne by the Company.

II) It is submitted that the observation made by the audit is incorrect with regard to wheat stock being damaged due to improper preservation and unscientific storage. In this regard, it is submitted that damaged wheat stock was 6870.35 MT (5974.85 + 895.50), out of which 2770.00 MT damaged wheat stocks pertain to the crop year 2010-11, 3999.35 MT damaged wheat stocks relates to the crop year 2011-12 and 101.00 MT damaged wheat stocks relates to the crop year 2012-13. HAIC had procured 5,59,415.65 MT and 6,99,903.30 MT wheat during RMS 2010-11 and 2011-12 respectively and the damaged wheat was 0.49% and 0.57% of the total wheat stocks purchased by the HAIC during the year 2010-11 and 2011-12 respectively. HAIC had received administrative charges @ Rs 246.50 Per MT and @ Rs 205.60 Per MT during the year 2010-11 and 2011-12 respectively. The total amount received towards administrative charges comes to Rs 13.72 crore and Rs 14.31 crore for the year 2010-11 and 2011-12 respectively. Thus, it is evident that the quantity of damaged wheat stocks was negligible in comparison to the quantity procured by the Corporation. The reason for the damaged wheat stock was longer storage under CAP (Cover and Plinth) and the observation of the audit of improper preservation and unscientific storage is not tenable. HAIC had delivered the wheat stocks to FCI as and when demanded by the FCI. Moreover, HAIC had made all efforts to deliver the wheat stocks to FCI from open plinths. Our District Incharge, FSC, Karnal wrote the following letters to FCI for lifting the wheat stocks lying in open plinths under CAP for the crop year 2010-11 & 2011-12.-

letter No. KNL/269-74 dated 5.10.2012, letter No. KNL/324-25 dated 22.10.2012, letter No. KNL/534-35 dated 27.12.2012, letter No. KNL/603 dated 7.02.2013, letter No. KNL/612 dated 15.02.2013, letter No. KNL/610 dated 21.02.2013, letter No. KNL/726 dated 28.02.2013, and letter No. KNL/864-66 dated 14.03.2012.

HAIC, Karnal had stored 23657 MT wheat stock on Jeet plinth Indri for the crop year 2010-11, out of which 21217 MT stock was lifted by the FCI after persuasion by

the office and balance wheat stock of 2440 MT got damaged due to longer storage on open plinths (CAP) and was declared as non-issuable

HAIC, Karnal had stored 25505 MT wheat stock on open plinths at Taraori for the crop year 2010-11, out of which 25175 MT stock was lifted by FCI and 330 MT balance wheat stock got damaged due to longer storage in open plinths and was declared as non-issuable by FCI. The said damaged stock was sold through open auction

HAIC, Karnal had stored wheat stock of 8148 MT for the crop year 2011-12 in open plinths at Ganesh Rice Mill, Nilokheri, out of which a quantity of 7353.50 MT was delivered to FCI after a gap of one & half year and remaining quantity of 794.50 MT was damaged due to longer storage in open plinth. The said balance stock of 794.50 MT was declared as non-issuable and sold through open auction by the corporation.

HAIC, Kurukshetra had stored the wheat stock for the crop year 2011-12 in open plinths as no covered space was available. A quantity of 3204.85 MT was declared as damaged and non-issuable and the same was disposed off through open auction.

The Mandi Inspectors who were deployed for procurement and delivery of wheat to FCI, had paid full attention on maintaining the health of wheat stock but due to longer storage under CAP, the health of wheat stocks couldn't be maintained and as a result the wheat stocks got damaged. The FCI had also failed to take the delivery of wheat stocks in time despite strenuous efforts made by the Corporation.

However, in regard to disciplinary action against the responsible official for damaging wheat stocks, it is submitted that Sh. Nanak Chand, deployed as custodian of the wheat stock stored on Jeet Open plinth, Indri (Karnal) was charge sheeted on 06.04.2015 for shortages/ less gain and less realization due to damaged wheat stocks for 2440 MT. A regular departmental inquiry has been got conducted. Punishment for recovery of Rs. 2,71,67,726/- has already been awarded vide order dated 28.03.2018.

Sh. Narain Singh deployed as custodian of the wheat stocks stored on open plinth at Taraori (Karnal) was issued chargesheet on 09.12.2013 for damaging of 330 MT wheat stocks. Sh. Narain Singh had filed CWP 26819 of 2015 in the Hon'ble High Court and disciplinary proceeding has been stayed. The next date of hearing in the case is fixed for 10.08.2018.

Sh. O P Mehata was the custodian of the wheat stocks stored at Ganesh Rice Mill, Nilokheri. Sh. O P Mehata has expired on 05.09.2013. The damage wheat stocks was liquidated through tender after the death of the custodian. Therefore, chargesheet could not be issued to him for damaging of 794.50 MT wheat stocks for the crop year 2011-12.

The matter was placed before the Board in its meeting held on 28.06.2017 to write off the loss on account of damaged wheat stocks of 794.50 MT. As desired by the Board, the case was referred to the State Govt. on 03.08.2017.

Sh. Jujhar Singh, custodian of the wheat stocks stored on Open Plinth at Amin was issued chargesheet for damaging of 101 MT wheat stocks for the crop year 2012-13 on 01.09.2015. A regular departmental inquiry has been got conducted and the Inquiry

Officer has proved the charges leveled against him. The disciplinary proceeding will be finalized after adopting the due procedure

Sh. Gurbax Singh, custodian of the wheat stocks stored on Open Plinth at Kurukshetra is responsible for damaging of 3204.85 MT wheat stocks. The matter is under investigation as the preliminary inquiry has been entrusted to Smt. Gauri Midha, HCS. And the chargesheet will be issued after the receipt of the report of the preliminary inquiry.

From the above, it is amply clear that the wheat stocks were damaged due to longer storage in open plinths (CAP).

After perusal of the written reply and oral examination of the Departmental representatives, the Committee observed that the loss of Rs.7.89 crore accrued due to the laxity of corporation as the stocks were not kept properly and scientifically. The Committee, therefore, recommends that responsibility be fixed and action against the erring Officer/Officials be taken in time bound manner and intimated to the Committee.

Annexure-III

DEENBANDHU CHHOTU RAM THERMAL POWER PROJECT, YAMUNA NAGAR			
(A UNIT OF HARYANA POWER GENERATION CORPORATION LTD.)			
Registration Office:-C-7, Urja Bhawan, Sector-6, Panchkula-134109			
AN ISO-9001, ISO:14001 & OHSAS:18001 CERTIFIED COMPANY			
Voucher No.	2013070002784	Voucher Type: JV	Voucher Date
GL Voucher No.		Period	Preparation Date:
		July 2013	25th July, 2013
			Transaction Status:
			Authorised for Posting
Work Group : Sr A.O , DCRTTP			
Document Ref. A sum of Rs.34998400.00 is charged to M/s Rinfra against 2x300 MW EPC			
Narration	contract on a/c of works got done at their risk & cost during warrantee period and lubricants & consumable used upto FTO as per intimations received from various division as per detail attached.		

Sr. No.	Account Code	Stn/ Unit	Debit Amt. (Rs.)	Credit Amt. (Rs.)	Instrument No.	Instrument Date	Instrument Type
1	28.810 Misc Advances recoverable from firms. R00005 Reliance Infrastructure Ltd.,	STN	34998400.00	0.00			
2.	74.104 Repair & mtc-engine and engine driven generating units.	U-1	0.00	4822374.00			
3	74.104 Repair & mtc-engine and engine driven generating units.	U-2	0.00	4822374.00			
4.	74.105 Repair & mtc-boiler plant and equipment	U-1	0.00	11088981.50			

Annexure-IV

Voucher No. 2013030007450		Voucher Type: JV		Voucher Date			
GL Voucher No.		Period		March 2013		Preparation Date: 29th March, 2013	
				Transaction Status: New			
Work Group : Sr. A.O., DCRTPP							
Document Ref. A sum of Rs.946975 /- is to be recovered from M/s SEC, Shanghai, China in view of XEN/TG-I,							
Narration DCRTPP letter Memo No.Ch-3/TGM-84, dated 29.03 2013 as per detail attached being material and man power arranged as per the request of SEC, China							
Sr. No.	Account Code	Stn/ Unit	Debit Amt. (Rs.)	Credit Amt. (Rs.)	Instrument No.	Instrument Date	Instrument Type
1	28.810 Misc Advances recoverable from firms. S00105 SANGHAI ELECTRIC GROUP Ltd.,	STN	946975.00	0.00			
2.	74.104 Repair & mto-engine and engine driven generating units.	U-1	0.00	946975.00			
Total Transaction Amt. (Rs.)			946975.00	946975.00			

Annexure-V

<p align="center">DEENBANDHU CHHOTU RAM THERMAL POWER PROJECT, YAMUNA NAGAR (A UNIT OF HARYANA POWER GENERATION CORPORATION LTD.) Registration Office:-C-7, Urja Bhawan, Sector-6, Panchkula-134109 AN ISO-9001, ISO:14001 & OHSAS:18001 CERTIFIED COMPANY</p>				
Voucher No.	2012090003387	Voucher Type: JV	Voucher Date: 8th Sep-2012	
GL Voucher No.	201209-JRN-000902	Period	Sep- 2012	Preparation Date: 8th Sep-2012
				Transaction Status: Posted
Work Group : Sr. A.O., DCRTTP				
Document Ref.	WORK ORDER NO.-44/TG-II/104 DATED 24.01.2012			
Narration	BILL OF M/S SIEMENS LIMITED, OPP MAKARPURA RAILWAYS STATION VADODRA, GUJARAT AGAINST WORK ORDER NO.-44/TG-II/104 DATED 24.01.2012 AND BILL FOR THE PERIOD 4.2.2012 TO 7.9.2012 FOR PROVIDING OF POTOR STRAIGHTENING OF THE STC 300MW HIP ROTOR UNIT-II			

Sr. No.	Account Code	Stn/ Unit	Debit Amt. (Rs.)	Credit Amt. (Rs.)	Instrument No.	Instrument Date	Instrument Type
1	28.810 Misc Advances recoverable from firms. R00005 Reliance Infrastructure Ltd ,	STN	23158307.00	0.00			
2.	43.100 Liability for supply of materials/works Account (O&M) S00011 SIEMENS LTD.	STN	0.00	22695141.00			
3.	46.924 TDS on contractors payments S00011 SIEMENS LTD.	STN	0.00	463166.00			
Total Transaction Amt. (Rs.)			23158307.00	23158307.00			

PARA NO. 3.4

Statement showing workman Compensation in Fatal Accident cases of Nigam's employee in respect of (OP) Circle UHBVN, Sonepat w e.f March, 2011 to March, 2015.

Sr. No.	Name of Employee With Design.	Nature of accident (FA/ NFA)	Date of Accident	Name of SDO 'Op' S/Divn.	Name of 'Op' Divn.	Name of Circle	Amount of Compensation (Rs in Lacs)	Compensation Order No and Date	Claim Lodged with Insurance Company (Yes/No)	Claim Settled (Yes/No)	Compensation paid by Insurance/Nigam	Remarks
1	Ram Dia, ALM	FA	31 12 10	Rai	City Divn Sonepat	Sonepat	287747	577 dt 20 01 12	No	No	No	Er K C Narwal Xen, H C Dharambir
2	Parveen Kumar, ALM	FA	24 09 12	Kurdli	City Divn Sonepat	Sonepat	345040	738 dt 08 01 13	No	No	No	Er B S, Garg, Xen, H C Anand Parkash
3	Ram Kumar, LM	FA	08 07 11	City Sonepat	City Divn Sonepat	Sonepat	612360	861 dt 15 07 14	No	No	No	Er K C Narwal Xen, H C Anand Parkash
4	Pahalad Singh, LM	FA	15 01 12	Kharkhoda	S/U Divn Sonepat	Sonepat	556520	857 dt 03 07 14	No	No	No	Sh S K Ahuja, Xen and Sarla Dev H/C
5	Sukhbir Singh, LM	FA	26 09 12	City Ganaur	S/U Divn Sonepat	Sonepat	570720	895 dt 11 12 14	Yes	No	No	Case not claimed timely Rejected due to delay by insurance company Sh S K Chawla on leave due to

6	Baljeet, ALM	FA	31 12 13	Kharikhoda	City	Divn Sonapat	Sonapat	890840	909 dt.17 03 15	Yes	No	No	his mother death and Sarla Devi H/Clerk.
													Case not claimed timely Reject due to delay by insurance company Sh J.S Nara and H/Clerk Sarla Devi
7	Dilbag Singh, ALM	FA	29 05 12	Kathura	Gohana Divn	Sonapat	Sonapat	584800	833 dt.30 10 13	Yes	No	No	Claim lodged with insurance company in timely but the company not release the amount court case under process.
	Total							3848027 00					

Para No. 3.4

Annexure -A

Statement Showing Workman Compensation in Fatal Accident of Nigam's Employee in respect of 'OP' Circles Yamuna Nagar, Kurukshetra, Kaithal & Karnal w.e.f. March 2011 to March 2015.

Sr. No.	Name of Employee With Design.	Nature of accident (FA/ NFA)	Date of Accident	Name of 'OP' S/Divn.	Name of SDO XEN 'Op' Divn.	Name of Circle	Amount of Compensation (Rs. in Lacs)	Compensation Sanction Order No and Date	Claim Lodged with Insurance Company (Yes/No)	Claim Settled (Yes/ No)	Compensation paid by Insurance/ Nigam	Persons responsible for non submission of claims against whom charge sheets have been issued.
1	Sh Om Pal, LM	FA	22.09.10	Chhachhrauli	Jagadhri	Y/Nagar	6.78	53/AC-120 dated 23.01.14	No	-	Nigam	1 Sh Ashok Kumar, LM 2 Sh Ilam Singh, LM
2	Sh Jaswrat Singh	FA	04.06.11	Naraingarh	Naraingarh	Y/Nagar	5.89	61/AC-120 dated 12.02.14	No	-	Nigam	1 Sh Subhash Chander, LM/SDC (Reid)
3	Sh Satpal, ALM	FA	NFA on 28.05.11 converted into FA on 14.07.11	Chhachhrauli	Jagadhri	Y/Nagar	6.65	67/AC-120 dated 24.06.14	No	-	Nigam	1 Sh Ashok Kumar, LM 2 Sh. Ilam Singh, LM
4	Sh Gian Chand, ALM	FA	22.10.11	Chhachhrauli	Jagadhri	Y/Nagar	6.12	59/AC-120 dated 11.02.14	No	-	Nigam	1 Sh Ashok Kumar, LM 2 Sh Ilam Singh, LM
5	Sh Ranjit Kumar, ALM	FA	24.03.13	SIU Jagadhri	Jagadhri	Y/Nagar/List docx	7.37	68/AC-120 dated 24.06.14	No	-	Nigam	1 Sh Vijay Kumar Goel, UDC (Reid) 2 Sh Surjeet

**Details of Pending Recommendations of the Committee till the
Finalization of this Report.**

Sr. No.	Board/Corporation	Report No.	Recommendation	No. of Recommendation
1	2	3	4	5
1.	HVPNL/HPGCL/ UHBVNL/ DHBVNL	35th	23 HPGCL	1
		38th	21 UHBVNL	1
		52nd	7,8,10,11 HVPNL 12 UHBVNL	5
		53rd	1 HPGCL 42 UHBVNL	2
		56th	3 DHBVNL	1
		57th	6 UHBVNL/ DHBVNL	1
		58th	1 DHBVNL	1
		60th	2,3 DHBVNL	2
		61th	1,2,4 UHBVNL & DHBVNL	3
		62nd	5 HPGCL 13-14 HVPNL	3
		63rd	1-7 UHBVNL & DHBVNL	7
		64th	3-7, 12-13 UHBVNL & DHBVNL	7
		64	1 DHBVNL	1
	TOTAL			35
2	Haryana State Industrial and Infrastructure Development Corporation	53rd	16,17,20,23	4
		57th	4	1
		58th	4	1
		60th	8	1
		62nd	6-10	5
	TOTAL			12

3	Haryana Financial Corporation	49th	2,3,4,5,6	5
		50th	4,23	2
		52nd	18	1
		56th	5,6	2
		57th	9,10	2
	TOTAL			12
4	Haryana Agro Industries Corporation Ltd.	16th	6.29	1
		23rd	14-16	3
		38th	8	1
		48th	27-33	7
		52nd	17,20,21	3
		53rd	29-36	8
		56th	2	1
		57th	7	1
		58th	6,7	2
		59th	8-16	9
		62nd	11	1
		64th	15	1
	TOTAL			38
5.	Haryana Land Reclamation & Development Corporation ltd.	53rd	39	1
	TOTAL			1
6.	Haryana Warehousing Corporation	49th	13	1
		52nd	19	1
		53rd	28, 47	2
		55th	8,9,10,11,13	5
		60th	7	1
		63rd	8-14	7
		64th	1-2	2
	TOTAL			19

7	Haryana Seeds Development Corporation Ltd	49th	9	1
		53rd	3,4	2
		64th	8-10	3
	TOTAL			6
8.	Haryana Tourism Corporation Limited	48th	11	1
		53rd	25-27	3
		58th	5	1
		59th	4,5	2
		62nd	1-4	4
TOTAL			11	
9	Haryana Forest Development Corporation Limited	58th	3	1
TOTAL			1	
10	Haryana SC Finance & Development Corporation Limited	60th	6	1
		63rd	1	1
TOTAL			2	
11	Haryana Roads & Bridges Development Corporation Limited	55th	14	1
		57th	8	1
		60th	4	1
		61st	5,7-12	7
		62nd	15-16	2
		64th	14	1
TOTAL			13	
12	Haryana Police Housing Corporation Limited	60th	5	1
TOTAL			1	
13	Haryana Women Development Corporation Limited	64th	16	1
TOTAL			1	

14	Haryana Backward Classes and Economically Weaker Section Kalyan Nigam Limited	64th	18-23	6
	TOTAL			6
Sr. No.	Board/Corporation	Report No.	Recommendation	No. of Recommendation
1	2	3	4	5
Outstanding recommendation in respect of Non-General working companies				
1.	Haryana State Small Minor Irrigation & Tubewells Corporation	42nd	27	1
		51st	5,6	2
	TOTAL			3
2.	Haryana State Small Industries Export Corporation	19th	11 (General)	1
		43rd	3,4,7	3
		51st	8	1
	TOTAL			5
3.	Haryana Mineral Limited	41st	18	1
		45th	1-14 (General)	14
		48th	23,24,41	3
	TOTAL			18
Outstanding recommendation in respect of General working companies				
1	Haryana Urban Development Authority	47th	1-20	20
	TOTAL			20

© 2019

Published under the authority of the Haryana Vidhan Sabha and Printed by the
Controller, Printing & Stationery Department, Haryana, Chandigarh