

# TEST CHECKING WELL CONSTRUCTION, DISTRIBUTION OF ROOFING TILES AND IMPLEMENTS, AFFORESTATION, AND ANIMAL IMMUNISATION

Report No. 11 of 2002

Well construction -

80% incomplete

60% under utilization

Distribution of roofing tiles -

47 % corruption

**Distribution of implements** 

Partially successful

Afforestation

Successful

Animal immunisation

Successful

# OTHER REPORTS PUBLISHED RECENTLY

1.	MALNUTRITION RELATED DEATHS OF TRIBAL CHILDREN
•	Published on 6/5/2002.
2.	RESETTLEMENT OF TRIBAL FAMILIES DISPLACED BY IRRIGATION PROJECTS
	Published on 27/5/2002.
3.	SCHEME FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO PREGNANT TRIBAL WOMEN
	Published on 25/6/2002.
4.	DYING CHILDREN
	Published on 17/9/2002.
5.	POLITICIANS CONTROLLING AIDED ASHRAM SCHOOLS
	Published on 31/10/2002
6.	STEALING FROM THE POOR – Watershed Development works Published on 8/11/2002.
	LAND, FIREWOOD AND
7.	BUREAUCRATIC PREDATORS
	Published on 22/10//2002
8.	BROKEN DAMS
	Published on 21/11/2002
9.	SCHEMES FOR INCOME GENERATION AND
	DISTRIBUTION OF AGRICULTURAL INPUTS
	Published on 22/11/2002
10.	THE TRUTH ABOUT MALNUTRITION CHILD DEATHS
	Vol. 3, Published on 25/11/2002
	Copies can be obtained from : -
	The Commissioner,
	Tribal Research & Training Institute,
	Government of Maharashtra,
	28, Queen's Garden, Pune 411 001. Phone Nos : (020) 6360941, (020) 6362071
	Fax No.: (020) 6360026

Sr.	Contents	Page No.				
No.						
1.	INTRODUCTION	1				
2.	Report No.1: Control of Foot and Mouth disease	3				
3.	Report No.2: Supply of improved agricultural implements and plant	5				
	protection appliances to tribal farmers during 2000-01 by Panchayat					
	Samiti, Ambegaon, District Pune.					
4.	Report No.3 : Construction of open wells under the SGSY	9				
	("Swaranajayanti Gram Swarojgar Yojana")					
5	Report No.4: Tree plantation on degraded forest land	11				
6.	Report No.5: Replacement of thatched roofs by Mangalore tiles.	14				
,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	Table No.1 - Cost of materials shown on record as distributed to the	16				
	beneficiaries					
	Table No.2 - Material falsely shown as distributed	16				
	Table No.3 - Abstract of the material falsely shown as distributed					
	Table No.4 - Estimated amount of misappropriation					
	Table No.5 - Transportation charges paid by the beneciaries					
	Table No. 6 - Bribe paid for getting benefit of the scheme	18				
	Table No.7 - Land holding	19				
······································	Table No.8 - Awareness among beneficiaries regarding the purpose of	19				
	the scheme					
	Table No.9 - Percentagewise surveyed no.of beneficiaries	19				
*·•	Table No.10 - Villagewise beneficiaries	20				
A	Table No.11 - Educational status of the family members of the	20				
	beneficiaries					
	Table No.12 - List of beneficiaries of 2000-01 in Ambegaon Block	21				
7.	Annexure A	23				
8.	Research Team	24				

#### INTRODUCTION

The Indian system of audit relies heavily on documents like vouchers. Similarly, monitoring of schemes and projects is mainly done in terms of meeting targets of expenditure. Consequently, there is not much awareness or control in respect of funds and physical achievements on the ground. In a previous report under the title "Stealing From the Poor" dealing with corruption in the watershed development programme it was recommended that the physical audit should be introduced and test checking of works by senior officials should be prescribed. The same recommendations would apply in respect of this report also.

This is a small report regarding the sampling of a few beneficiaries from the following schemes:

- 1. Construction of wells.
- 2. Distribution of roofing tiles.
- 3. Immunization of livestock.
- 4. Distribution of agricultural implements.
- 5. Subsidy for afforestation.

These short studies are quick and easy to conduct and give an insight into the functioning of the schemes. Corruption was discovered in the scheme for providing roofing tiles and wastage of resources was found in the well construction programme. These matters would have to be looked into in greater detail. The object of this study is just to highlight the issues and demonstrate the need for conducting small and focused studies.

Regarding the corruption and mismanagement, more information will be available from other reports we have prepared in 2002 dealing with financial assistance to pregnant women (Report No.3), corruption in watershed development works (Report No.6), and broken dams (Report No.8). Three reports on malnutrition and one on the resettlement of project displaced families also indicate mismanaged schemes and absence of accountability for schemes not implemented in spite of funds available, like the Employment Guarantee Scheme (E.G.S.).

Against this background it was considered necessary for this Institute to inspect the office of the Commissioner, Tribal Development, Nashik, as this was the controlling and co-ordinating agency for schemes and programmes covering the tribal population in the State. It is essential to analyse, strengthen and improve the monitoring and evaluation of systems set up in the office of the Tribal Commissioner, Nashik. For this purpose and for checking the accounting procedure two inspection teams were sent from this Institute to the office of the Tribal Commissioner, Nashik. But on both the occasions the teams were refused permission to proceed with the inspection. The matter was brought to the notice of the Minister, Tribal Development who sent the paper to the Secretary, Tribal Development Department, Mantralaya, for examination. A copy of the letter is attached.

This action demonstrates the lack of transparency in the system, the resistance to evaluation by an independent authority and the consequent lack of awareness of what is happening at the grass root level.

This Institute has also been finding it difficult to obtain documents from implementing agencies. The musters showing the employment of labour on watershed development works were not provided either by the Agriculture Department nor by the N.G.O. (Non-Governmental Organization) in spite of repeated requests and the Institute ultimately had to produce the report without being able to check the musters. The report was produced on the basis of the recorded statements of the beneficiaries and other villagers who confirmed that the work was done mechanically by tractor. It thus became obvious that the large amounts claimed by the NGO for labour payment were false.

It was therefore recommended in that report that this Institute should be armed with the authority to obtain records from all implementing agencies and all NGOs that receive Government grants for executing works. However, it is doubtful if any action will be taken on this recommendation because it disagrees with the culture and norms developed within the administration. Secondly, other recommendations given previously in other reports many months ago have produced no result nor have they ever been discussed with this Institute. When there is no transparency no one knows

either about the mism ment nor about the corrective steps recommended. It is mainly

for this reason that copies of reports of this Institute in the year 2002 have been

widely circulated to NGOs, Ministers, officials etc. in the State Government and in

the Central ministries so that not only policy makers but those who can influence

policy making and play a role of advocacy, are exposed to the virus in the system.

This Institute went a step further and conducted an experiment /demonstration

in participatory governance and the methodology for achieving transparency and

accountability. The public issues for this experiment pertained to corruption in urban

government (Pune Municipal Corporation) and land management (corruption of

revenue officials). Though the first issue did not directly pertain to the tribal

population it was felt that concrete issues should be taken up for the experiment to be

successful. Secondly, it was obvious that the enforcement of transparency and

accountability in any area, department or scheme would have an affect on and create a

strong deterrent against corruption for other departments, including the numerous

departments implementing schemes for the tribal population (the departments of

Health, Agriculture, Animal Husbandry, Irrigation etc.). In the experiment people

were invited to seek information from the Government, meet together and analyse and

determine the options available for achieving better governance. However, the

process is slow.

Unless public funds are better managed and misappropriation is punished, the

situation will continue to worsen. Those who benefit from the spoils system would

not alter the status quo. And those who are honest are too frightened. The prevalence

and scale of corruption is proof enough for this observation.

Arun Bhatia. Commissioner,

Tribal Research and Training Institute,

MS., Pune

Date: 26.11.2002

Place: Pune

2(a)

# Control of Foot and Mouth disease

The survey of 15 households with 70 sick animals revealed that the scheme for controlling this disease through animals was successful. The sick animals were immunized by the Veterinary Officer by visiting the village which is situated in a hilly area about 9 kms. from the veterinary dispensary. The scheme is implemented on a 100% subsidy basis. It is an important scheme because livestock is an important asset in tribal areas. The details of the animals immunized are given below:-

# Statement showing the number of animals immunized

Sr.	Name of beneficiaries	Number of animals						
No.		Cows	Buffaloes	Bullocks	Others	Total		
1.	Baliram Bhimaji Gabhale	1	1	5	6	13		
2.	Khandu Maruti Gabhale	2	1	3	-	6		
3.	Parmeshwar Arjun Karale	-	3	2	2	7		
4.	Ganpat Rambhau Bambale	-	1	-	2	3		
5.	Raoji Maruti Lohakare	1	•	2	-	3		
6.	Smt. Jijabai Dulaji Karwande	-	4	2	-	6		
7.	Waman Somaji Gabhale	-	also	1	4	5		
8.	Namdeo Soma Gabhale	-	2	2	_	4		
9.	Suresh Balu Gabhale	-	2	2	_	4		
10.	Bhima Shankar Gabhale	1	-	2	-	3		
11.	Tulshiram Soma Gabhale	-	1	2	1	4		
12.	Chima Bawarja Bamble	2	2	-	_	4		
13.	Maruti Chima Vare	1	2	-	_	3		
14.	Govind Darku Bhawari	-	•	2	_	2		
15.	Dhondibhao Gangaram Bhawari	-	-	2	•	2		
	Total	8	19	27	16	70		

The statement below indicates the land holding status of the beneficiaries surveyed:-

# Status of land holding

Sr.No.	Land holding (ha)	No.of beneficiaries	Percentage	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	
1.	0 to 1 Hect	4	27%	
2.	1 to 2 Hect	5	33%	
3.	2 to 3 hect	5	33%	
4.	4 and above	1	7%	
Nationals and state from to ton	Total	15	100%	

# Supply of improved agricultural implements and plant protection appliances to tribal farmers during 2000-2001 by Panchayat Samiti, Ambegaon, District Pune.

An evaluation study on supply of improved Agricultural implements and plant protection appliances during the year 2000-2001 by the Panchayat Samiti Ambegaon was done. The applications are collected from beneficiaries by the Sarpanch / Gram Sevak and sent to the Panchayat Samiti. The Beneficiary Selection Committee scrutinizes the application forms and sends the list of selected beneficiaries to the Block Development Officer. The scheme is implemented on a 100% subsidy basis. The limit for subsidy per beneficiary is Rs. 6,000/-

The total beneficiaries in Ambegaon taluka are 130 of which 15 (11.5%) were surveyed from 5 villages. The total expenditure for 130 beneficiaries was 3.53 lakhs during the year 2000-2001. The assistance was provided in kind. Out of the 15 beneficiaries surveyed 5 were below the poverty line. The details are given below:-

# Statement showing the improved equipment and implements given to the surveyed beneficiaries

Name of beneficiary	Implements & appliances distributed						
	Spray pump	Iron plough	Nangri 6"	Puddling implement	Hoe	Sickle	
Balu Vitthal Mohare, Phulawade, Tal. Ambegaon	1	l	•	1	-	5	3961/-
Bhaga Maruti Mohare Phulawade, Tal. Ambegaon,	1	1	-	-	-	5	2821/-
Baliram Honaji Hile Phulawade, Tal. Ambegaon,	1	l	-	-	-	5	2821/-
Vitthal Maruti Lohakare, Phulawade, Tal.Ambegaon	1	1	_	-	•	5	2821/-
Yamunabai Namdeo Shelke, Borghar, Tal Ambegaon	L	1	-	1	**	5	3961/-

Name of beneficiary			Total amount				
	Spray pump	Iron plough	Nangri 6"	Puddling implement	Ное	Sickle	
Baban Tukaram Bamble, Borghar, Tal. Ambegaon	1	1	-	-	1	5	3252/-
Baban Punaji Khamkar, Borghar, Tal.Ambegaon	1	I		1		5	3961
Chandrakant Raghunath Walkoli, Borghar, Tal.Ambegaon	1	1	-	-	-	5	2821/-
Punaji Dagadu Ugale, Ugalewadi, Tal.Ambegaon	1	1	-	-		5	2821/-
Luma Bhima Shelke, Gangapur, Tal. Ambegaon	1	1	1	-	-	5	3171/-
Maruti Nimba Marbhal, Borgar, Tal. Ambegaon	1	1	l	••		5	3171/-
Krishnabai Bhaga Gadekar, Gangapur, Tal.Ambegaon	1	l	I	-	**	5	3171/-
Krishna Somaji Kale, Amondi, TalAmbegaon	l	I	_	**	-	5	2821/-
Krishna Namdev Gadekar, Gangapur Tal.Ambegaon	1	l	1	-	-	5	3171/-
Ganpat Raghuji Tatale, Ugalewadi, Tal. Ambegaon	1	1	-	1	-	5	3961/-
					Gı	rand Total	48706/-

The land holding status of the beneficiaries is indicated below :-

# Statement showing land holding of beneficiaries

Sr.	Name of the	No. of	Land holding (acres)						
No.	village	beneficiaries	0 to 1	1 to 2	2 to 4	4 to 6	6 to 10		
1	Phulawade	4	-	1	2	1	-		
2	Bhorghar	5	-	1	1	1	2		
3	Ugalewadi	2	1	1	_	-	_		
4	Gangapur	3	•	-	1	1	1		
5	Amondi 1		-	-	1	-	-		
	Total	15	1	3	5	3	3		

The rate of subsidy for various items is indicated below.

# Rate of subsidy

Sr.No.	Item	Rate
1	Spray pump	1200/-
2	49" Iron plough	1406/-
3	6" Nangri	350/-
4	Rice puddling implement	1140/-
5	Hoe	431/-
6	Sickle	43/-

The expenditure under the scheme in Ambegaon Block is indicated below :-

Sr. No.	Name of item	No. of item	Rate of per item Rs.	Total amount Rs.
1.	Spray pump	130	1200/-	1,56,000/-
2.	49" Iron plough	40	1406/-	-56,240/-
3.	6" Nangri	130	350/-	45,500/-
4.	Puddling implement	50	1140/-	57,000/-
5.	Ное	25	431/-	10,775/-
6.	Sickle	650 (130 beneficiaries x 5 sickle)	43/-	27,950/-
	Grand Total			3,53,465/-

## Recommendations

- 1. There should be greater focus on poorer farmers, especially those below the poverty line.
- 2. Puddling implements have not been used as they were too small.
- 3. In future, implements should be provided after demonstration and testing so that they meet local requirements.
- 4. Hence 57,000/- Rupees out 3.53 lakhs (16%) was wasteful expenditure.
- 5. These puddling implements should be taken back and redistributed in some other area, if possible where soil depth is shallow.

# Construction of Open wells under the SGSY ("Swaranajayanti Gram Swarojgar Yojana")

This scheme has been changing its name from time to time. Today it is a part of SGSY. The cost sharing between the Central and State Government is in the ratio of 80:20, respectively. The target group are families below the poverty line. The scheme has the twin objective of providing irrigation and generating rural employment.

In the year 2000-01, 12,500 beneficiaries were selected. The subsidy ceiling per beneficiary is Rs.45,000. 10 households were surveyed which had received a total subsidy of 2,25,650 up to 5.11.2002. On completion of the wells they would receive a total subsidy of Rs. 4.5 lakhs.

#### **Findings**

- 1. Out of the 10 beneficiaries assisted in the year 2000-01 only two had been able to complete their wells. Thus 80% of the wells were still incomplete after two years.
- 2. In terms of water utilization it was found that oil engines had been installed on 4 wells (40%). However two of these wells were incomplete and were to be deepened. Protection walls have also to be constructed in respect of 8 wells.
- 3. The monthly progress report of Khed Panchayat Samiti showed that since 1991-92, since the last 10 years, a total of 83 wells had been sanctioned of which only 11 wells (9%) had been completed up to 1<sup>st</sup> September 2002. The details are indicated below:

#### Statement showing No. of beneficiaries and amount of subsidy paid

Sr.	No.of surveyed	Total amount of subsidy	Actual subsidy paid	Percentage
No.	beneficiaries	paid after completion of	up to 15-11-20002	
		well		
1	10	4,50,000	2,25,650	.50%

Statement regarding the wells sanctioned in the Panchayat Samiti from 1991-92 to 2000-2001

Sr. No	Particulars	Total wells sanctioned	Wells incomplete	Wells completed	Percentage completed
A)	Wells incomplete upto 1st April 2002	83	72	11	9.13%
	Total wells	83	72	11	9.13%
B)	Wells sanctioned during the year:-				
	1997-98		7	Nil	-
	1998-99		7	-	4.0
	1998-99		7		-
	1999-2000		42	5	
	2000-2001		23	6	

# Recommendations

- 1. This scheme is for farmers below the poverty line and the cost of constructing wells can be more than Rs.80,000/-, especially in hilly areas where the cost of transportation of cement and sand is higher. It is therefore unreasonable to expect the BPL households to create and invest resources for completing the wells. This is one reason why numerous wells are incomplete and the subsidy given by the government so far for the incomplete wells has produced no returns. Locking up public funds for 10 years without returns because of an unrealistic ceiling has resulted in wastage of money. It is therefore recommended that the ceiling should be flexible and should depend upon the valuation of the work done by the beneficiary household. The ceiling could be placed at Rs. I lakh but this would not mean that every household would receive a subsidy of Rs.1 lakh. The subsidy would depend upon the measurement of the work done.
- 2. The scheme for supply of electric motors / oil engines should be coordinated with the well construction scheme.

# Tree plantation on degraded forest land

Three villages, Amondi of Ambegaon taluka, and Surale and Aptale of Junnar taluka, were visited. The details of the plantation programme are given in the table below:

Sr. No	Year of the scheme	The name of the village in which the scheme was implemented	Area planted (ha)	Trees plant- ed	Survival rate			Total expenditure incurred on plantation of trees	Expenditure incurred on trees not survived	
					Survived		Not survived			
					No.of plants	Percent age	No.of plants	Percen tage		
1	1998- 1999	Amondi Tal- Ambegaon	50.00 H.	31664	23748	75%	7916	25%	23129	5782
2	1998- 1999	Surale, Tal-Junnar	14.59 H.	12000	9600	80%	2400	20%	18885	3777
3	1998- 1999	Aptale, Tal-Junnar	9.75 H.	4985	3988	80%	997	20%	8141	1628
4	199 <b>8-</b> 1999	Manikdoh, Tal-Junnar	30.00H	10360	8288	80%	2072	20%	26121	5224
		Total	104.34	59009	45624	77%	13385	23%	76276	16411

# **Findings**

1. The survival rate has been stated as 75 to 80%. This figure was confirmed on the basis of physical test checking.

Work was provided for a substantial period of three months and the daily wage earned was Rs. 45.80/-

This confirmed the information given by the department. Details are given below.

Sr. Year of		The name of Area		Population		No.of	Tribal labour	Percent	Rate of labour
NO	the scheme	village in which the scheme was implemented	planted (ha)	Total	Tribal	labour- ers	1400011	age of tribal labour	idootii
1	1998- 1999	Ambodi, Tal- Ambegaon	50.00 H.	2061	465	55	11	20%	45.80
2	1998- 1999	Surale, Tal-Junnar	14.59 H.	740	133	50	50	100%	45.80
3	1998- 1999	Aptale, Tal-Junnar	9.75 H.	848	151	50	50	100%	45.80
4	1998- 1999	Manikdoh, Tal-Junnar	30.00H	554	313	75	75	100%	45.80
		Total	104.34	4203	1062	230	186	81%	45.80

The payment made to 10 labourers was confirmed by questioning them. The details are given below:-

Sr. No	Name of the village	Taluka	Name of the beneficiaries	Member of family worked	Rate of labour	No.of days worked
	Amondi	Ambegaon	1. Waman Khema Pardhi	3	45.80	3 months
			2. Narayan Yesu Kale	3		
			3. Devram Sitaram Kale	3		
			4. Thaksen Haribhau Kale	2		
2	Surale	Junnar	Shankar Baban Dudhane	2	45.80	3 months
3	Aptale		2. Smt.Laxmibai Vittal Dudhane	4		
			3. Vishwas Dagdu Ghogare	2		
			4. Tukaram Ramge Dudhane	3		
			5. Smt.Parwatabai Nathu Dudhane	3		5 E
			6. Dnyaneshwar Sanagi Dudhane	3		ind spin
		Total		28	45.80	

#### Recommendations -

- 1. To dig a trench 12 ft. long, 2 ft. wide and 1 ft. deep, the wage rate is Rs. 3/-. In one day, five or six such trenches can be dug. This would provide a daily wage of Rs.15 to Rs.18. In order to pay an adequate wage for one day's work it is proposed that the rate for this trench should be increased to at least Rs. 6/-
- 2. The tree species to be planted should be decided in consultation with the village community. The species should be useful to the village and local knowledge regarding trees should be utilised in determining the species to be planted.
- 3. Regarding fruit bearing species local arrangements should be made regarding harvesting, sharing and marketing of the produce in the future.
- 4. The village community should ultimately to be entrusted with the maintenance of plants. Greater participation in planning and implementation should be achieved.
- 5. From the future income from the plantation a maintenance fund of 30% could be created.
- 6. The concept of giving planted area on lease to groups of poor farmers should be considered seriously. Please see this recommendation in the first two reports on malnutrition and resettlement.

# Replacement of thatched roofs by Mangalore tiles.

In this scheme a subsidy of Rs.4000/- is given of which Rs.2500/- is meant to cover the cost of tiles and the remaining Rs.1500/- are meant for wooden and other items (rafters and battens). It is an important scheme for the tribals leaving under thatched roofs which are unsuitable in heavy rainfall areas in the hills.

Selection of beneficiaries is done by the B.D.O. who sends the names to the Social Welfare Officer, Z.P. In Ambegaon block there were 44 beneficiaries in the year 2000-01 of which 14 beneficiaries have been surveyed.

# **Findings**

- 1. Material worth Rs. 50,764/- was shown on record as having been supplied to the beneficiaries but actually material worth Rs.29,911/- was given. Thus the misappropriation is estimated at Rs.20,853/-. This calculation is based upon the rates of materials given in Govt Resolution (Marathi) No.DVS 2000/Case No.233/MVK-2, dated 13th March, 2001 of the Social Welfare Department.
- 2. Thus the percentage of misappropriation is 47%.
- 3. The misappropriation per beneficiary comes to Rs. 1863/-. For 44 beneficiaries in Ambegaon Block it would be an estaimated Rs. 82,000/-.
- 4. 8 out of the 14 families paid a bribe to the Ex-Sarpanch. 7 paid Rs.500/-, 1 paid Rs.350/-. Two persons who refused to pay were not given any tiles but were shown on record as having received them.
- 5. 12 huts which were constructed were in good condition. However the tiling was not level because rafters and wood have been not been supplied and the wood used by the beneficiaries was not straight.
- 6. In 14 families there were 77 persons of which 24 were not educated. In spite of educated members in most families the demand for bribe could not be resisted.

#### Recommendations

- 1. The Ex-Sarpanch, who had taken the bribe should be prosecuted.
- 2. Government functionaries involved in misappropriation should be prosecuted.
- 3. Material should always be distributed to beneficiaries on fixed dates and in the presence of the village community to reduce the possibility of misappropriation.
- 4. The number of tiles should be increased to 1500 in order to accommodate livestock as well. Beneficiaries stated that forest officials demand bribes if beneficiaries bring material for that ched roofs from the forest for animal enclosures. That ched roofs have to be changed every year.
- 5. All beneficiaries, barring the two that were not given material because they did not pay the bribe, spent money up to Rs.400/- for transporting the tiles from the Panchayat Samiti Office, Ghodegaon, to the village. The truck for transportation was arranged by the Sarpanch. The distance is about 40 kms. For persons below the poverty line the cost of transportation should be subsidized. In this particular case not only was the transportation not subsidized but the village head (Sarpanch) was able to enter the transaction pertaining to transportation which should be avoided. The less middle men, agents and brokers in poverty eradication schemes, the better.
- 6. Physiscal audit and test checking should be introduced.
- 7. The source of information regarding the scheme seems to have been only the Sarpanch. Awareness campaigns should be entrusted to NGO's.
- 8. Application forms should be easily accessible. Some could be kept with BPL families.
- 9. The process of beneficiary selection should be transparent. The list of beneficiaries sent by the village Sarpanch to the Panchayat Samiti should be published in the village.

Table No. 1

Cost of materials shown on record as distributed to the beneficiary

Sr. No	Name of material	Quantity of material shown on record	Price (per unit)	Amount
1.	Manglori tiles	7728	4.75	36708/-
2.	Dhape	224	8.50	1904/-
3.	Rafters	98	124	12,152/-
	Total	•	-	50,764/-

<u>Table No. 2</u>

<u>Material falsely shown as distributed</u>

Sr.	Name of beneficiary	Roofin	g Tiles	Dh	ape	Raf	ters
No		Distribu- ted (on record)	Distribu- ted actually	Distribu- ted (on record)	Distribu- ted actually	Distribu- ted (on record)	Distribu- ted actually
1.	Shantaram Shankar Date	552	500	16	16	7	Nil
2.	Sakubai Punaji Shingade	552	Nil	16	Nil	7	Nil
3.	Tukaram Goma Waje	552	500	16	16	7	Nil
4.	Govind Soma Waje	552	500	16	16	7	Nil
5.	Suresh Bhagu Damse	552	500	16	16	7	Nil
6.	Shantaram Yashwant alias Kahu Damse	552	500	16	16	7	Nil
7.	Baban Narayan Karote	552	500	16	16	7	Nil
8.	Fasabai Chindhu Ambhire	552	500	16	12	7	Nil
9.	Kushaba Chahu Asawale	552	500	16	12	7	Nil
10.	Baban Ganpat Lohokare	552	500	16	15	7	Nil
11.	Chandrakant Soma Waje	552	500	16	11	7	Nil
12.	Ashok Dhondu Joshi	552	500	16	4	7	Nil
13.	Baban Maruti Kirve	552	Nil	16	Nil	7	Nil
14.	Dhanaji Sakharam /Maruti Gangaje	552	500	16	16	7	Nil
	Total	7728	6000	224	166	98	Nil

Table No. 3

Abstract of the material falsely shown as distributed

Roofing tiles			Dhape			Rafters		
Distribu- ted (on record)	Distribu- ted actually	Theft	Distribu- ted (on record)	Distribu- ted actually	Theft	Distribu- ted (on record)	Distribu- ted actually	Theft
7728	6000	1728	224	166	58	98	Nil	98

Table No. 4

Estimated amount of misappropriation

Sr. No	Name of material	* Price (per unit)	Quantity of material not received actually	Total cost (Rs.)
1.	Manglori tiles	4.75	1728	8,208/-
2.	Dhape	8.50	58	493/-
3.	Rafters	124	98	12,152/-
	Total	<b>196</b>		20,853/-

<sup>\*</sup> As per G.R., Social Welfare, Cultural Affairs, Sports Department dt. 13<sup>th</sup> March 2001

<u>Table No. 5</u>

<u>Transportation charges paid by the beneficiaries</u>

Sr.No.	Name of the beneficiary	Transportation charges
1.	Shantaram Shankar Date	400
2.	Sakubai Punaji Shingade	-
3.	Tukaram Goma Waje	400
4.	Govind Soma Waje	400
5.	Suresh Bhagu Damse	400
6.	Shantaram Yashwant alias Kahu Damse	400
7.	Baban Narayan Karote	400
8.	Fasabai Chindhu Ambhire	400
9.	Kushaba Chahu Asawale	350
10.	Baban Ganpat Lohokare	300
11.	Chandrakant Soma Waje	300
12.	Ashok Dhondu Joshi	150
13.	Baban Maruti Kirve	
14.	Dhanaji Sakharam/Maruti Gangaje	400

Two persons have not given any benefit of the scheme hence question of transportation does not arise.

Table No. 6

Bribe paid for getting benefit of the scheme

Sr. No.	Name of the beneficiaries	Amount paid	Paid to whom	Remarks
1.	Shantaram Shankar Date	500	Ex-Sarpanch Shri Dinesh Wabale	
2.	Sakubai Punaji Shingade	-	-	Ex-Sarpanch Shri Dinesh Wabale asked for 800/- Rs. but not paid. Therefore no tiles given.
3.	Tukaram Goma Waje	500	Ex-Sarpanch Shri D.Wabale	
4.	Govind Soma Waje	500	_"_	
5.	Suresh Bhagu Damse	500	_"_	
6.	Shantaram Yashwant alias Kahu Damse	500	_11_	
7.	Baban Narayan Karote	500	_"-	
8.	Fasabai Chindhu Ambhire	-	-	
9.	Kushaba Chahu Asawale	-	-	
10.	Baban Ganpat Lohokare	-	-	
11.	Chandrakant Soma Waje	-	-	
12.	Ashok Dhondu Joshi	350	Ex-Sarpanch Shri D.Wabale	
13.	Baban Maruti Kirve	-		Ex-Sarpanch Shri Dinesh Wabale asked for 500 Rs. but not paid. Therefore no tiles given.
14.	Dhanaji Sakharam/Maruti Gangaje	500	Ex-Sarpanch Shri D.Wabale	

Table No.7

# **Land Holding**

Sr.No.	Land holdings (Acres)	No.of respondents	Percentage
1.	Landless	2	14.29%
2.	0-1	1	7.14%
3.	1-2	1	7.14%
4.	2-3	3	21.43%
5.	Above 3	7	50%
	Total	14	100%

Table No. 8

Awareness among beneficiaries regarding the purpose of the scheme

Sr.No.	Status	No.of respondents	Percentage
1.	Respondents aware of the purpose of the scheme from Ex-Sarpanch	5	35.71%
2.	Respondents not aware	9	64.29%
	Total	14	100%

<u>Table No. 9</u>

<u>Percentagewise surveyed no. of beneficiaries</u>

Sr.No.	No.of beneficiaries	No.of families surveyed	Percentatge
1.	44	14	31.8%

Table No. 10
Villagewise beneficiaries

Sr.No.	Name of village	No. of beneficiaries
1.	Terungan	5
2.	Kondhwal	6
3.	Gavandewadi	2
4.	Dhagewadi	1
<u> </u>	Total 4	14

Table No. 11

Educational status of the family members of the beneficiaries

Sr. Name of the beneficiaries Not Angan- Ed				ducation qualification							
No.		edu- cated	wadi	1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>	3 <sup>rd</sup>	4 <sup>th</sup>	5 <sup>th</sup> to 7 <sup>th</sup>	7 <sup>th</sup> to 10 <sup>th</sup>	Above 10 <sup>th</sup>	Total
1.	Shantaram Shankar Date	2	-	-	1	-	•	2	1	-	6
2.	Sakubai Punaji Shingade	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	3
3.	Tukaram Goma Waje	2	-	-	1	-	_	1	2	-	6
4.	Govind Soma Waje	2	-	-	-	2		1	-	_	5
5.	Suresh Bhagu Damse	-	1	-	-	2	_	2	-	_	5
6.	Shantaram Yashwant alias Kahu Damse	1	-	-	1	-	-	-		-	2
7.	Baban Narayan Karote	1	1	1	1	-	-	1	1	-	6
8.	Fasabai Chindhu Ambhire	2	t-st	_		-		_	2	-	4
9.	Kushaba Chahu Asawale	3	1	1	1	-		_	-	4	10
10.	Baban Ganpat Lohokare	3	-	_	1	-	2	4	2	-	12
11.	Chandrakant Soma Waje	1	100	-	-	-	1	-	3	1	6
12.	Ashok Dhondu Joshi	2	-	-	-	1	-	1	2		6
13.	Baban Maruti Kirve	2	-		-	1	-	-	-		3
14.	Dhanaji Sakharam/ Maruti Gangaje	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	3
	Total	24	3	2	7	6	4	12	14	5	77

<u>Table No. 12</u>
<u>List of beneficiaries of 2000-2001 in Ambegaon Block</u>

Sr. No.	Name of beneficiary	Name of Village	Date of material issued		
1.	Ghamaji Sakharam Gengaje	At Kondhwal, Tal. Ambegaon	11-6-2001		
2.	Kisan Shankar Date	_11_	_11_		
3.	Chandrakant Hona Asawale	_11_	_"_		
4.	Govind Soma Waje	_11_	_11_		
5.	Tukaram Goma Waje	_*1'	_"_		
6.	Suresh Bhagu Damse	_11_	_"-		
7.	Dnyaneshwar Shankar Date	_"-	_11_		
8.	Shantaram shankar Date	_!!_	_#_		
9.	Dunda Revaji Damse	.11_	_11		
10.	Manohar Vishnu Karote	_!!_	_"_		
11.	Shantaram R. Damse	_11_	!!		
12.	Shantaram Yashwant Damse	_11	_"_		
13.	Kisan Nama Mohundule	_!!_	_!!_		
14.	Baban Narayan Karote	_1t_	_11_		
15.	Kusaba Chahu Asawale	_!'_	_11_		
16.	Vijay Kisan Pardhi	At Kolwadi, Tal.Ambegaon	_"_		
17.	Rahibai Bhimaji Karwande	_!! <u>.</u> /	_"_		
18.	Bhagubai Punaji Khamse	_**_	_"_		
19.	Raghu Dagadu Lohokare	At Mapoli	18-6-2001		
20.	Jawaji Bhiwa Kokane	At Malin	_11_		
21.	Vitthal Mahadu Kengle	At Chikhali	_0_		
22.	Kisan Maruti Dalvi	_"-	_"_		
23.	Chintaman Gangaram Titkare	-11-	_"_		
24.	Nanda Amba Dangat	_11_	_"_		
25.	Yashwant Bhau Dangat	_11_	_11_		
26.	Thaksen Rambhau Memane	.".	_"_		
27.	Sakharam Dadu Ishte	_11_	_"_		
28.	Shivaji Laxman Kengle	_!!_	11-6-2001		
29.	Yuvaraj Sakharam Pardhi	At Patan	18-6-2001		

Sr. No.	Name of beneficiary	Name of Village	Date of material issued		
30.	Laxman Pandu Bhavari	At Ahupe	7-7-2001		
31.	Baban Krushna Kirve	At Kondhwal	23-7-2001		
32.	Dhawala Dunda Wabale	-	_"1"_		
33.	Ashok Dhondu Joshi	_11_	_"_		
34.	Punaji Tulshiram Bhingade	-11_	_11_		
35.	Bhagwan Rama Bhawari	_***_	_!!_		
36.	Baban Maruti Kirve	_!!_	_11_		
37.	Govind Nana Joshi	_!!_	_11		
38.	Sanjay Kisan Damse		_11_		
39.	Jawaji Sona Arvikar	At Chikhali	!		
40.	Sindhu Dhondu Bhawari	_"_	_+1		
41.	Shrawan Dhondu Pekari	At Sawarli	-1-		
42.	Dhondu Ramchandra Pekari	((	_"_		
43.	Kasabai Chindhu Lohokare	At Terungan	_11		
44.	Baban Ganpat Lohokare	At Terungan	_!!		

# ANNEXURE

Arun Bhatia

I.A.S.,

Commissioner



D.O.No.TRI/COMM/D.I/ 372 Tribal Research & Training Institute, 28, Queen's Garden, Pune 411 001.

Dated: November, 2002

To

8hri Madhukarao Pichad, Hon'ble Minister for Tribal Development, Maharashtra State, Mantralaya, Mumbai-400032.

Sir,

I have three serious complaints, which I wish to bring to your kind attention, as follows:-

- Shri Meena has refused to allow the inspection of his office. I consider it necessary to inspect his office, since the Commissioner, Tribal Development Commissioner is responsible for monitoring and evaluating schemes and also making large purchases. The letter from Shri Meena and my reply are attached for ready reference.
- Shri Meena has refused to show the file pertaining to the complaint against Shri Prakash Wani, Joint Commissioner regarding printing work allotted to a printer in Jalgaon.

Shri Meena has refused to give a copy of the special audit report to the

inspection team. You are requested to kindly instruct Shri Meena to show the file regarding Shri Prakash Wani, to hand over the audit report and to allow the inspection of his office.

With respects

Yours Sincerely Arm Shata

(Arun Bhatia)

Chief Securetary to Government of Maharashtra, General Administration Copy:-

Department, Mantralaya Annexe, Mumbai-400032.

Sery. (I) and W. W. D. II. 2002.

aministration

which is not not in the state of the state

#### RESEARCH TEAM

# Guide, Analysis & Commentary

Shri Arun Bhatia, I.A.S. Commissioner

## Supervision, Data Collection & Analysis

- (1) Shri S.B.Gadewal, Dy.Director
- (2) Shri M.A.Shaikh, Lecturer
- (3) Shri P.S.Wani, Research Officer
- (4) Shri M.S. Gaikwad, Statistical Officer

## **DTP Work**

Shri S.R.Kute, Stenographer (HG) Shri D.D.Gaikwad, Stenographer (LG) Smt.S.S.Bhutkar, Steno-typist Smt.A.J.Gaikwad, Steno-typist

## Investigators

Shri G.K.Jadhav, Research Assistant
Shri G.C.Londhe, Research Assistant
Shri D.R.Gode, Statist.Asstt.
Shri B.B.Navale, Sr.Clerk
Shri D.M.Rathod, Jr.Clerk
Shri R.S.Pawar, Investigator

**Drivers**Shri R.G.Jadhav
Shri I.A.Pirjade