



HARYANA VIDHAN SABHA

REPORT

OF THE

COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES

Regarding threatening Shri Hira Nand Arya, M.L.A. on phone
by Shri Rajinder Chaudhary and Shri Sita Ram Jindal,
Jindal Irrigation Limited, Bhiwani and also to
sue him for damages on account of
defamation

11 SEP 1989

HARYANA VIDHAN SABHA SECRETARIAT, CHANDIGARH
SEPTEMBER, 1989

CONTENTS

	<i>Pages</i>
1. Composition of the Committee of Privileges	(iii)
2. Introduction	(v)
3. Report	1—4
4. Annexures	7—13

(iii)

COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE

1988-89

1. Shri Atma Ram Godara	Chairman
2. Shri Bhagwan Sahai	Member
3. Shri Risal Singh	Member
4. Shri Jagpal Singh Chaudhary	Member
5. Shri Balbir Singh Chaudhary	Member
6. Shri Kanti Parkash Bhalla	Member
7. Shri Lachhman Dass Bajaj	Member
8. Shri Mohammad Aslam Khan	Member
9. Shri Piru Ram	Member
10. Shri Muni Lal	Member

1989-90

*1. Shri Atma Ram Godara	Chairman
2. Shri Bhagwan Sahai	Member
3. Shri Balbir Singh Chaudhary	Member
4. Shri Kanti Parkash Bhalla	Member
5. Rao Dharm Paul	Member
6. Shri Mohinder Singh Dahiya	Member
7. Shri Hazar Chand	Member
8. Shri P. K. Chaudhary	Member

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri Sumit Kumar	Secretary
2. Shri Chander Parkash	Deputy Secretary

*Shri Atma Ram Godara, M.L.A., Chairman of the Committee of Privileges, resigned from the Chairmanship/membership of the Committee with effect from 8th August, 1989. Shri Bhagwan Sahai, M.L.A. a member of the Committee, was nominated as Chairman of the Committee of Privileges in the vacancy caused by the resignation of Shri Atma Ram Godara, w.e.f. 31st August, 1989.

(v)

INTRODUCTION

1. I, the Chairman of the Committee of Privileges, having been authorised by the Committee to present this Report on its behalf, present the same to the House.

2. Shri Hira Nand Arya, M.L.A, gave notice of motion against Shri Rajinder Chaudhary and Shri Sita Ram Jindal, Jindal Irrigation Limited, Bhiwani, alleging breach of privilege on the ground that on 27-5-88, he received a telephonic call from Shri Rajinder Chaudhary on behalf of Shri Sita Ram Jindal threatening him for dire consequences and subsequently he received a notice dated 10-6-88 to sue him for damages for Rs. 20 crores on account of defamation.

3. The said motion was moved by Shri Hira Nand Arya and carried by the House on the 26th August, 1988, and thus the matter was referred to the Committee of Privileges for examination and report by the first sitting of the next Session i.e. upto 21st February, 1989. The Committee was required to submit its report by 21st February, 1989 but on a motion passed by the House on 21st February, 1989 it extended the period for presenting the final report upto 11th September, 1989.

4. The Committee held eight sittings on 1-12-88, 19-4-89, 15-6-89, 21-6-89, 28-6-89, 25-7-89, 5-9-89 and 8-9-89 and examined the matter from various aspects.

5. A brief record of the proceedings of each sitting of the Committee has been kept separately in the Vidhan Sabha Secretariat, Chandigarh.

Chandigarh :

The 8th September, 1989

Bhagwan Sabai Rawat
Chairman

REPORT

BRIEF HISTORY

On 22nd August, 1988, Shri Hira Nand Arya, M.L.A. gave a notice of privilege motion under Rule 261 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Haryana Legislative Assembly stating that on the evening of 27th May, 1988, he received a telephonic call from Shri Rajinder Chaudhary of M/s Jindal Irrigation Ltd. of Bhiwani (Annexure A). According to the notice, the phone was attended by one Shri Prithvi Singh and later on by the M.L.A. himself. The caller on the telephone reminded the complainant M.L.A. that during the Budget Session, 1988, the matter regarding sprinkler sets was raised by him and also in the newspapers which according to him was 'Bakwas'. He told the complainant that he could not harm the Jindal Industries as the Chief Minister was in their pocket. He also threatened him, the M.L.A., to keep quiet or he will be silenced for ever. On 10th June, 1988, Shri Hira Nand Arya again received a notice from M/s Jindal Irrigation Ltd. for his highly bogus, motivated, biased and malicious complaint against the firm through his active concert and connivance with one of their competitors thereby causing substantial damage to their goodwill and reputation by the said nefarious practices compelling them to file Rs. 20 crores damage suit against him and his abettors.

The Hon'ble Speaker gave his consent to the raising of this matter and Shri Hira Nand Arya, M.L.A. moved the motion on 26th August, 1988 which was carried by the House and the matter was referred by it to the Committee of Privileges for examination and report by the first sitting of the next Session i.e. upto 21st February, 1989, which was further extended upto 11th September, 1989 on a motion adopted by the House on the 21st February, 1989. The Committee recorded the statement of Shri Hira Nand Arya on 21st June, 1989 vide Annexure B.

On 1st September, 1989, S/Shri Rajinder Chaudhary and Sita Ram Jindal, the alleged contemnors, made applications for hearing, for exemption from personal appearance and for dropping the proceedings through their Counsel, Shri L. R. Goyal, Advocate. Since these applications were addressed to the Chairman, Committee of Privileges, Haryana Vidhan Sabha, Chandigarh, the Hon'ble Speaker referred these applications to the Committee of Privileges for examination and report. In the application for exemption from personal appearance and for permitting to be defended through Counsel, the alleged contemnors requested that they be allowed to defend themselves through their counsel. The Hon'ble Speaker permitted the alleged contemnors to be heard by a counsel appointed by them and approved by the Committee.

On 5th September, 1989, Shri Ashok Aggarwal, Advocate, appeared on behalf of the contemnors and argued the case on their behalf.

Shri Ashok Aggarwal, Advocate, based his arguments mainly on two grounds that as per affidavits of S/Shri Rajinder Chaudhary and Sita Ram Jindal, they had neither made the telephonic call to Shri Hira Nand Arya, M. L. A. nor they had authorised anyone else to put the call through to Shri Hira Nand Arya. In support of his contention, the counsel read out sub-paragraph (iii) of para 4 of affidavit of Shri Rajinder Chaudhary filed before the Committee, which runs as under :—

“That regarding 1st allegation, in the notice pertaining to the alleged threat of telephone, as reproduced above claiming, inter-alia, that the deponent of M/s Jindal Irrigation Ltd. had on telephone claimed that he under instructions of the applicant No. 2 was to convey to Shri Hira Nand Arya, that his utterances on the floor of the Vidhan Sabha during the Budget Session were not to his liking and that Shri Hira Nand Arya should stop making such utterances, otherwise he will be made to stop. The aforesaid allegations, therefore, even according to the case of Shri Hira Nand Arya, MLA, is a communication by the deponent of a message or direction alleged to have been given to him by the Applicant No. 2. The Deponent submits that neither the deponent nor the Applicant No. 2 has anything to do with the alleged telephone call. The deponent further submits that he was never instructed or otherwise directed by the Applicant No. 2 to convey alleged threat to Shri Hira Nand Arya, M.L.A. in fact such like threats are very likely to be engineered by rivals of M/s Jindal Irrigation Ltd. of whom the deponent is an employee and the Applicant No. 2 is the Chairman. Even otherwise alleged telephone threat is a ‘hearsay’ and not admissible under the Law of Evidence.

Further the Counsel read out sub-paragraph (iii) of para 4 of the affidavit of Shri Sita Ram Jindal, filed before the Committee, which is as under :—

“That regarding 1st allegation, in the notice pertaining to the alleged threat of telephone, as reproduced above claiming, inter alia, that the applicant No. 1 Rajender Chaudhary of M/s Jindal Irrigation Ltd. had on telephone claimed that he, under instructions of the deponent, was to convey to Shri Hira Nand Arya that his utterances on the floor of the Vidhan Sabha during the Budget Session were not to his liking and that Shri Hira Nand Arya should stop making such utterances, otherwise he will be made to stop. The aforesaid allegations, therefore, even according to the case of Shri Hira Nand Arya, MLA is a communication by the Applicant No. 1 of a message

or a direction alleged to have been given to him by the deponent. The deponent submits that neither the deponent nor the applicant No. 1 has anything to do with the alleged telephone call. The deponent further submits that he never instructed or otherwise directed the applicant No. 1 to convey alleged threat to Shri Hira Nand Arya, MLA. In fact such like threats are very likely to be engineered by rivals of M/s Jindal Irrigation Ltd. of whom applicant No. 1 is an employee and the deponent is the Chairman. Even otherwise alleged telephone threat is a 'hearsay' and not admissible under the Law of Evidence.

The second argument of the counsel was that neither Shri Rajender Chaudhary nor Shri Sita Ram Jindal had sent any notice nor had authorised anyone else to send the notice dated 10th June, 1988 to Shri Hira Nand Arya. It was also sought to be argued by the counsel for the contemners that this Committee may take judicial notice of the fact that in the present world of competitive business and rivalries someone may get a letter pad printed and issue it on behalf of his rival. In support of his contention, the counsel read out sub-paragraph (iv) of para 4 of the affidavits of Shri Rajender Chaudhary and Shri Sita Ram Jindal which are reproduced here as under :—

Sub-para (iv) of para 4 of affidavit of Shri Rajender Chaudhary—

"Regarding second allegation of issuance of a notice dated 10.6.1988, it is submitted that the deponent never issued the said notice and have nothing to do with the said notice. It is further submitted that the said notice was not issued under the instruction and authority of the deponent and in fact that the deponent never authorised any person to issue the said notice on his behalf to Shri Hira Nand Arya, MLA. Hence the deponent is not liable for any consequences of the said notice."

Sub-para (iv) of para 4 of affidavit of Shri Sita Ram Jindal—

"Regarding second allegation of issuance of a notice dated 10.6.1988, it is submitted that the deponent never issued the said notice and have nothing to do with the said notice. It is further submitted that the said notice was not issued under the instructions and authority of the deponent and in fact the deponent never authorised any person to issue the said notice on his behalf to Shri Hira Nand Arya, MLA. Hence the deponent is not liable for any consequences of the said notice."

Conclusions

After considering the material on record and hearing the arguments of the counsel for the alleged contemner, the Committee feel that there can hardly

4

be any two opinions that a telephone call threatening the MLA and a notice served on him to sue him for damages definitely amount to a breach of privilege. The Committee also do not entertain any doubts about the truth and correctness of the contention of the MLA in his complaint. But what needs thread bare examination is that whether the alleged telephone call and the notice are being issued by the contemnors before the Committee in order to hold them guilty of breach of privilege of the august House.

Since neither the complainant in his statement anywhere stated that he recognised the voice of Shri Rajinder Chaudhary nor his voice could be deciphered, in such circumstances it is very difficult to establish the breach of privilege against Shri Rajinder Chaudhary and Shri Sita Ram Jindal on this account. Similarly the identity of the person who signed the notice dated 10th June, 1988 to Shri Hira Nand Arya could not be established. Moreover after carefully considering all the material on record and even after taking notice of the signatures of the contemnors on affidavits and power of attorney submitted to the Committee and comparing the same with the signature put on the alleged notice it could not be established that the signatures put on the notice are of any of the contemnors. This fact also cannot be ignored that in this present world of competitive business and rivalries, anything is possible to run down the rivals. Anybody can get the letter pad printed and issue it on behalf of another man. Further the counsel categorically stated that Sarvshri Rajinder Chaudhary and Sita Ram Jindal or the firm M/s Jindal Irrigation Ltd. had nothing to do with the issuance of notice dated 10th June, 1988 to Shri Hira Nand Arya, MLA for whom as being elected representative of the people, the alleged contemnors had great regards. The counsel further contended that the alleged contemnors had highest esteem and regard for the Committee and the members of this August House and the same has been pleaded in their affidavits submitted to the Committee.

In view of the above, since neither the identity of the person making the call nor the identity of the person who sent the registered letter dated 10th June, 1988 to Shri Hira Nand Arya, MLA could be established, the Committee recommend to close the matter.

52

ANNEXURE

Annexure A

सेवा में

अध्यक्ष,
हरियाणा विधान सभा,
चण्डीगढ़।

विषय : विशेषाधिकार हनन प्रस्ताव।

महोदय,

मैं हीरानन्द आर्य, सदस्य हरियाणा विधान सभा आपको धारा 26 I Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business x x के अनुसार मैं इस महान सदन हनन व सदन के अवमानता (contemptuous) एकट आफ श्री सीता राम जिन्दल, फर्म मालिक व एम0 डी0 जिन्दल एल्यूमिनियम लिमिटेड व जिन्दल-इरिगेशन लिमिटेड, बंगलौर, निवासी हिसार व उसके अधिकारी श्री राजेन्द्र चौधरी, आफिस-जिन्दल-इरिगेशन लिमिटेड, भिवानी के विरुद्ध दे रहा हूँ। जिसमें इस महान सदन व सदस्य के विरुद्ध हम सलाह होकर बहुत ही अपमानजनक शब्द सदन की हैसियत को नीचा करने वाली व derogatory remarks x x भाषा का दिनांक 27 मई, 1988 को फोन द्वारा और बाद में दिनांक 10 जून, 1988 को एक पत्र भी औखी भाषा का प्रयोग किया गया जिसकी कापी साथ नत्थी है।

2. दिनांक 27 मई, 1988 के सायंकाल मेरे पास मेरे घर पर श्री राजेन्द्र चौधरी, निवासी भिवानी ने फोन किया कि मैं राजेन्द्र चौधरी, जिन्दल इरिगेशन लिमिटेड के आफिस भिवानी से बोल रहा हूँ और हीरानन्द आर्य, विधायक से बात करना चाहता हूँ और यह फोन श्री पृथ्वी सिंह ने उठाया और उसने मुझे बतलाया। जिस पर मैंने कहा बोलिए। तो उसने कहा कि श्री सीताराम जिन्दल ने मुझे कहा है कि मैं आपको यह बता दूँ कि आपने पिछले विधान सभा में फुहवारों सिचाई के बारे में पिछले बजट सेशन में बहुत बकवास की और अखबारों में भी बकवास की है। इस तरह से बकवास से तुम सीताराम जिन्दल का कुछ नहीं बिगाड़ सकते। जिन्दल साहब ने मुख्य मंत्री, हरियाणा, चौधरी देवी लाल से भी बात कर ली है और सारी बात हो गई है। मुख्य मंत्री, चौधरी देवी लाल जिन्दल साहब की जेब में हैं। आप उनका कुछ नहीं बिगाड़ सकते। जो जानते हो कर लो। या तो चुप हो जाओगे या हमेशा के लिए चुप कर दिए जाओगे और सरकार भी तुम्हारे कोई आड़े नहीं आ पाएगी। मैंने कहा, चौधरी देवी लाल, मुख्य मंत्री, हरियाणा, किसी पूँजीपति की जेब में नहीं हो सकते। मैं जनप्रतिनिधि होने के नाते किसानों को घटिया फव्वारे वितरण करके उनके शोषण के विरुद्ध आवाज उठाना अपना फर्ज व कर्तव्य समझता हूँ। इसलिए जब तक मेरे में शक्ति है, जरूर विधान सभा में और बाहर आवाज उठाता रहूँगा। मैं इस प्रकार की धमकियों से डरने वाला नहीं हूँ और न ही इस तरह की बकवास सुनने का आदी हूँ और मैंने फोन रख दिया। उसके बाद दोबारा फिर फोन आया जिस पर मैंने बात करते से इंकार कर दिया।

3. इस प्रकार से मैंने विधायक होने के नाते अपने फर्ज को पूरा करने के लिए धमकी देना और विशेषाधिकार हनन तथा सदन का अपमान है और इस प्रकार पूंजी के घमंड में चुप करने की धमकी है व 20 करोड़ रुपए की मान-हानि का दावा अपने विधायक के रूप में फर्ज पूरा करने की रोकने की कार्यवाही है और साथ ही मुख्य मंत्री जी को जेब में बतलाने और एक सदस्य तथा मुख्य मंत्री के विरुद्ध गलत भाषा का प्रयोग कर विशेषाधिकार हनन का सदन का अपमान किया है और इस तरह से पूंजी के घमंड में चुप करने की धमकी देना भी एक गंभीर मामला है जिसकी विस्तार से जांच के लिए विशेषाधिकार समिति को मामला सौंप कर दोषियों को सजा दी जानी आवश्यक है अन्यथा किसी भी सदस्य के लिए जनता की भावना व उसके शोषण के विरुद्ध आवाज उठाना असंभव हो जायेगा और प्रजातन्त्र समाप्त हो जायेगा।

4. अतः यह मामला विशेषाधिकार समिति को सदन के द्वारा सौंप कर कार्यवाई की जावे ताकि विस्तार से जांच करके सदन को भी सूचित किया जा सके।

5. मैं यह सूचना घटना के तुरंत बाद पहले सेशन के पहले दिन प्रथम अवसर पर दे रहा हूँ।

22-8-88

हस्ता/—
हीरोनन्द आर्य,
विधायक।

JINDAL IRRIGATION LIMITED

Phones : 560303, 56215
Telex : 3100226 JINDAL
Grams : JINDSPRINK

96 Rajindera Place New Delhi-110008.

No. 602/87-88/4038
June 10, 1988

REGISTERED AD

**Shri Hiranand Arya, MLA,
Park Colony,
Bhiwani (Haryana)**

Sub. :—Highly bogus, motivated, biased and malicious complained against us through your active concert and connivance with one of our competitors-substantial damage to our good-will and reputation by the said mafarious practices-compelling us to file Rs. 20 crore damage suite against you and your abetors.

Dear Sir,

This communication to you as Notice has been necessaitated following highly vicious, malicious, bogus and motivated campaign being launched and carried on by you in connivance with one of our competitors in the supply and distribution of Sprinkler Irrigation system in the State of Haryana, in a bid to damage wilful and intentionally our good-will and high reputation which he have earned through our sustained quality and continued expansion of marketing base in the State of Haryana. Being zealous and highly frustrated due to our spectacular success in Haryana explicitly on the basis of our quality and good service to the customers and thus commanding commercial bids/say in the Govt. departments and the agro-consumers, our said competitor has virtually made you the stooge and planted you to take commercial revenge/venqiance against us through high monetary consideration. We have served the farming community in the crisis when the drought in shape of natural calamity spred over the State and when your abetor manufacturing company flid away and virtually deceived the farmers showing its usualcolour of greed and profiteering through nafraious practices. We have thus always upheld the public task/interest which is being demolished purposely and intentionally by you and our said competitor, throttling grossly the public interest activities in the State for personal gains.

We have come across a number of press insertions intentionally given by you and the said business,

concern in daily Tribune by feeding misleading information to the press with a criminal intention to defame our company and our good-will in the eyes of the Govt., Departments to quote an instance, your attention is invited to the press

reflection appeared in the said dated 5-5-88 where in you alleged that the sprinkler sets to procured by the Irrigation department to the tune of Rs. 1.5 crores for nals have become useless/defactive immediately after one year.

The supply of Sprinkler Irrigation System to the tune of Rs. 1.5 crores to the Irrigation Department was made by none else but our company and therefore, this allegation has been made against. Our company without any supporting and sustaining facts. As a matter of fact, these sets are highly qualitative and working in very good conditions. The allegation is mischievously planted and is absolutely bogus and has been designed to damage our good-will in the eyes of the department with who we are doing substantial business every year. Similarly, you may refer your baselas aligation that the Sprinkler sets were given at 44,010 more price to the Department of Agriculture, as compared to the irrigation department. The allegation has also been inflicted purposely intentionally knowing fully that the procurement of irrigation department cannot be matched with the department of Agriculture as the former was against the world tender extending a number of benefits under the deemed export scheme which we are afraid that the persons like you and your feeder associates cannot approquits as they know the facts nor they know the procedure contained in the import and export polices. It utterly shows the massive ignorance on your part and on the part of your abotors and feeders which include one of our Calcutta based competitors who in mischiviously feeding all the allegations with the sole and explicit aim to avoide competition in the State of Haryana so that the said company may grab the entires business as they used to do before our entry in Haryana,

Please beaware that all these miscalculated, mativated, vicious and bogus activities being directed against me will never be successful and instead we are serving you this notice to desist from the same failing which we shall be left with no alternative except to file a damages suite against you and your associates abotors which we estimate about Rs. 20 crores which please note. The entires litigations shall be at your risk/cost and you will be solely liable for the consequences for against offences being committed/done as stated above.

Thanking you

Yours faithfully

Sd/-

for Jindal Irrigations Limited

Annexure B

मैंने विधान सभा में सीता राम जिन्दल और राजेन्द्र चौधरी के खिलाफ जो विशेषाधिकार हनन का प्रस्ताव प्रस्तुत किया है उस की कापी देख ली है और उसके कन्टेंट्स सही हैं/प्रस्ताव में जो विषय वस्तु मैंने दी थी वह मैंने देख ली है वह वही है।

राजेन्द्र चौधरी ने टेलीफोन पर मुझे धमकी दी थी कि सीता राम जिन्दल ने मुझे कहा है और वह बात में आपको टेलीफोन पर बता देता हूँ कि पिछले वजट सेशन में आपने मेरे खिलाफ बहुत बकवास की यानी फुआरा सैट के बारे में हमारे विरुद्ध विधान सभा में बोले हो और अखबारों में भी तुमने हमारे खिलाफ कहा है। इस तरह बकवास कर के आप सीता राम जिन्दल का कुछ नहीं बिगाड़ सकते। जिन्दल साहब ने मुख्य मंत्री चौधरी देवी लाल से बात कर ली है और सारी बात हो गई है। मुख्य मंत्री चौधरी देवी लाल जिन्दल साहब की जेब में हैं। आप उनका कुछ नहीं बिगाड़ सकते। जो चाहते हो वह कर लो। या तो चुप हो जाओ वरना हमेशा के लिए चुप करा दिए जाओगे और सरकार भी तुम्हारे आगे नहीं अड़ पाएगी। ये बातें राजेन्द्र चौधरी ने मुझे 27 मई को सांय काल कही। उसके कुछ दिन पश्चात मुझे जिन्दल कम्पनी की तरफ से एक धमकी भरा पत्र भी मिला। जो एन्जीविट पी-1 है। जो गाली ग्लोच की भाषा में था कि अगर तुमने कुछ ज्यादा कहा तो आपके खिलाफ 20 करोड़ रुपए का दावा करने का नोटिस दिया जाएगा और इस प्रकार से मुझे विधान सभा में बोलने के कारण और फुआरों का जो घटिया माल लोगों को सप्लाई किया जा रहा था जिसके संबंध में मैंने जो आवाज उठाई थी उसको रोकने के लिए इस प्रकार की बात उन्होंने कही। मुझे 20 करोड़ रुपए के दावे का नोटिस भी दे दिया है। मुझे टेलीफोन पर राजेन्द्र चौधरी ने यह भी कहा कि ये सारी बातें सीता राम जिन्दल ने तुमको कहने के लिए कही थी, जो मैं तुम्हें कह रहा हूँ।

पृथ्वी सिंह हमारी पार्टी का वर्कर है और उस वक्त मेरे पास किसी काम के लिए आया हुआ था। मैंने ये बातें जब टेलीफोन पर सुनी तो मैंने टेलीफोन पर ही जवाब दिया कि मैं इस तरह की बातें सुनने का आदि नहीं हूँ और यह कह कर मैंने टेलीफोन बंद कर दिया। इसके थोड़ी देर बाद फिर मुझे राजेन्द्र चौधरी का एक टेलीफोन आया और उस वक्त उस टेलीफोन को श्री पृथ्वी सिंह ने उठाया और मुझे कहा कि राजेन्द्र चौधरी आपसे बात करना चाहता है जिस पर मैंने कहा कि मैं उससे बात नहीं करना चाहता। राजेन्द्र चौधरी सीता राम जिन्दल का ही कोई कर्मचारी है। राजेन्द्र चौधरी के सीता राम जिन्दल से क्या संबंध हैं इस बारे में पुक्ता पता नहीं। मुझे इतना जरूर पता है कि वह उनका कर्मचारी है। राजेन्द्र चौधरी को मैंने पहले भी एक दो दफा देखा था और उसको बाई फेस जानता हूँ। इस घटना के बाद सीता राम जिन्दल को मैंने बंगलौर में देखा था जहां राम कृष्ण हेगड़े पूर्व मुख्य मंत्री कर्नाटक, श्री बोमई तत्कालीन मुख्य मंत्री कर्नाटक, श्री वी० पी० सिंह व चौधरी देवी लाल मुख्य मंत्री हरियाणा भी मौजूद थे। उस वक्त भी मेरी उनसे सरसरी तौर पर बात हुई थी। मैं सीता राम जिन्दल को उससे पहले शबल से नहीं जानता था। चौधरी रणजीत सिंह, एम० एल० ए० भोजवा कृषि मंत्री हरियाणा ने मेरी सीता राम जिन्दल से इन्टरव्यूशन

करवाई थी। जब मुझे टेलीफोन पर धमकी मिली और उसके बाद जिन्दल कम्पनी की तरफ से 20 करोड़ रुपए के दावे का धमकी भरा पत्र मिला तो मैंने इस बारे में मुख्य मंत्री हरियाणा को पत्र लिखा था। जब मैंने मुख्य मंत्री को पत्र लिख दिया तो मैंने पुलिस में रिपोर्ट करने की आवश्यकता नहीं समझी। सीता राम जिन्दल की दो फर्म हैं, एक जिन्दल इरिगेशन लि० और दूसरी जिन्दल एल्युमिनियम लि०। इनका हेड आफिस जहां तक मुझे जानकारी है बंगलौर में भी है और गाजियाबाद में भी है। यह धमकी भरा टेलीफोन मुझे भिवानी से ही किया गया था और भिवानी में ही मैंने सुना। मेरी पहली बार सीता राम जिन्दल से मुलाकात बंगलौर, जिस जगह मुख्य मंत्री हरियाणा ठहरे हुए थे, वहां पर हुई। वहां हम पार्टी के अधिवेशन में गए, हुए थे। भिवानी में सीताराम जिन्दल की फर्म का सब आफिस है।

श्री कान्ति प्रकाश भल्ला : क्या बंगलौर में सीता राम जिन्दल ने डिनर दिया था और क्या आप उसमें शामिल हुए थे।

श्री आर्थ : यह ठीक है कि जौधरी देवी लाल जी, मुख्य मंत्री हरियाणा, वी० पी० सिंह जनता दल अध्यक्ष, कर्नाटक के तत्कालीन मुख्य मंत्री बामई साहब, और पूर्व मुख्य मंत्री हेमडे साहब तथा हरियाणा के कई मंत्री और विधायकों को डिनर दिया गया था और उसमें मैं भी शामिल था। मुझे इस बात का उस समय ज्ञान नहीं था कि डिनर कौन दे रहा है। जिस समय श्री जिन्दल से बंगलौर में मेरी मुलाकात हुई उस समय सीता राम जिन्दल ने मुझे यह कहा कि आपको मेरे बारे में कोई गलतफहमी हो गई है मैंने ऐसा कुछ नहीं कहा। श्री रणजीत सिंह ने भी मुझे कहा कि यह अच्छे आदमी हैं। कोई ऐसी बात नहीं है। मैंने यह कहा इनके एक कर्मचारी का होसला नहीं हो सकता। वह मुझे इनका नाम लेकर टेलीफोन पर इस तरह की धमकी दे और इनको पता न हो। जब मुझे इनकी कम्पनी की तरफ से 20 करोड़ वाला पत्र मिला तो इन सारी बातों की कन्फर्मेशन उससे भी हो जाती है। मैं इस विषय में और सबूत भी प्रस्तुत करूंगा।

To

The Chairman, Privileges Committee,
Haryana Vidhan Sabha.

Sir,

I am to state that at this stage I do not want to produce more evidence against Shri Sita Ram Jindal & Rajender Chaudhary. So at present it may be treated as closed.

Thanks

Yours

Sd/-

Hira Nand Arya,
M. L. A.

Ram Singh

© 1989

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